

COUNCIL OF STATES

Friday 26th February 1954

The Council met at two of the clock,
MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

RESOLUTION RE COMMISSION ON THE WORKING OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mathur on behalf of Mr. Dhage will move his Resolution.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, with your permission I beg to move this Resolution, which stands in the name of my hon. friend Shri Dhage who has been called away from here on some urgent public duty, that:

"This Council is of opinion that a Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and prominent non-Members be appointed to review the working of the Five Year Plan and to suggest ways and means of making the Plan more effective and popular."

I wish to state at the very outset that we have no intention of availing of this opportunity of discussing this Resolution, to hurl and heap accusations on the Government for the short-falls and failures of the Five Year Plan. As a matter of fact, we have been very anxious and we have been very keen on this particular subject which we consider to be of great and vital national importance, because our entire future hangs on a proper plan and on a proper implementation of that plan. Even our Budget is framed with that background and as an earnest of what I have just stated, it has been my practice to avail of the inter-session period for going to all the various States. I have gone to Punjab, PEPSU, Rajasthan; to Bengal; to Bihar; and I have visited many of

these major river valley projects with a view to study our problems, with a view to meet the people and with a view to make my humble contribution, if I could make any. And I submit that it is only as a result of my going about all these places and meeting people that I am making these few remarks. I had the privilege of meeting the Governor of Punjab. I had the privilege of meeting the Chief Minister and also of discussing the problems with all the leaders of public opinion. I met the man who is working at the dams, the labourer, the man in the street and as a result of my experience I feel, and we in our party felt, it expedient that such a Resolution as this one must be given notice of. This Resolution is a very simple one, but it is all-embracing. What we have demanded is to pass this Resolution, that:

"This Council is of opinion that a Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and prominent non-Members be appointed to review the working of the Five Year Plan and to suggest ways and means of making the Plan more effective and popular."

After all, the achievement of freedom, as everybody would agree, would have no meaning if we cannot reconstruct our economic and social structure. Freedom and independence would be without any grace with no attraction and no purpose. I have said all this just to emphasise the importance of the subject before us, and in the hope that we all will give serious and sober consideration to the matter and try to take stock of the situation after these three years of the working of the Plan, and see how far we have succeeded and if it is really necessary to make certain changes where we have failed, why we have failed and what steps should be taken to make the Plan more popular and more effective.

I shall now give certain facts and figures about the Plan and the progress that has been made, which will

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

not only justify the course suggested in this Resolution, but, I am sure, will also emphasise the urgency of the course suggested by me. At this stage, I have no intention of going into the fundamental questions. I am only taking the Plan as it is, the Plan as it stands and the progress that has been made. I am simply stating the facts. And in doing so I venture to submit that this Plan is at best, only a budget of expenditure with no little confusion and sometimes, with no little conflict between the Centre and the States.

Sir, let us take first what the Planning Commission thought about the implementation of the Plan so far as the States are concerned. The Planning Commission in its estimate of resources, had assumed that States would be able to contribute about Rs. 408 crores for the implementation of the Plan. It was, even at that time, thought that Rs. 232 crores would have to be raised by certain fresh taxations. You will remember that we here in this House—many of us—who had examined the Plan and who knew a little about the resources of the States and the possibilities, pointed out in unmistakable terms to our illustrious Finance Minister that we were not proceeding on realistic lines, that it would certainly not be possible for the States to raise the amounts which they were asking the States to do and on which they were basing their calculations and that if we did not have a realistic approach and attitude, then naturally the definite consequence was that we would have shortfalls in the Plan. But the Finance Minister ridiculed this idea, and he called us pessimists. But what has happened? After two or three years, it is the Finance Minister who stands exposed, who stands absolutely ridiculed. Today it is not possible even for the Finance Minister with all his ingenuity to say that there will not be any shortfall of about Rs. 100 crores or at least of about Rs. 80 crores on this particular item alone. To us who do not claim to be experts, it was absolutely plain as cards even at that

time; and just by way of illustration I will place certain facts before you. For the Government of Rajasthan, the Planning Commission thought that out of the sum of Rs. 16,80,00,000, Rs. 9 crores would be contributed by the Centre and Rs. 7,80,00,000 would be contributed by the Rajasthan Government. Well and good. If that was possible, nobody could have any earthly objection to it. But, you will remember that here on the floor of this House I pointed out to the hon. the Finance Minister and asked him what the use was of trying unnecessarily to deceive himself and deceive others, because it was not at all possible for the Rajasthan Government to raise this amount. It was proposed at that time that out of this amount of Rs. 7,80,00,000, Rs. 4,60,00,000 would be the savings from current revenues; they further thought that the balance of Rs. 3,20,00,000 would be found by sale of securities held in reserve and withdrawn from cash reserves. Now, may I point out that in spite of the best efforts made by the Government, the Government instead of having any surplus, instead of finding a single pie for making up this Rs. 4,60,00,000, have all the time been running a deficit budget? So, there is no possibility of getting this amount; they may do some jugglery with the figures and anything that pleases the Planning Commission and the Finance Minister, but it can never be disputed that all these three years they have been running a deficit budget. And according to the forecast given by the Central Government expert, there is again a deficit. As regards the amount of Rs. 3.2 crores which they were to get out of the sale of securities, I may tell you that all the securities are pledged with the Imperial Bank of India I am not pleading here the claims of the Rajasthan Government at all. What I mean to submit and what I want to emphasise is that the Plan was absolutely unrealistic; even when the Plan was drawn up we pointed out that there would be a shortfall of about Rs. 100 crores so far as contributions from the States were concerned and that has been borne out. I

have quoted figures from Rajasthan because I have them at my disposal to show to you that we have proceeded absolutely on false and flimsy grounds. Now if we find a shortfall, it is due to nothing which happened during the course of this year and a half.

This sorry story does not end here. It is not only a question of shortfalls in the contributions by the States. It is very fresh in our minds that only the other day when the President addressed Parliament, he mentioned about the river valley projects and the good progress which we have made there but he was very clear that we had not made the progress that we had expected and the only place where he could lay his fingers and say that we have done well, was about the Community Projects. Here, I would like to invite, with all respect, your attention to what the hon. the Finance Minister said the other day in Calcutta, on the 2nd of October, 1953. What the Finance Minister stated there was that we had had real shortfalls in the Community Projects and education. Only two months back, he made it absolutely clear that progress in our Community Projects was not good and that there was a shortfall. He said the same thing about education. I do not know how to reconcile what the hon. the Finance Minister said with what the President has stated here in his Address to Parliament. The Finance Minister also gave his reasons why there was a shortfall in the Community Projects. He made out a case and said that because of want of trained personnel there was not much progress but the fact remains that here on the one hand the Finance Minister himself admits that there has been a great shortfall in the Community Projects and the President himself has admitted that we have not done well so far as the development of cottage industries is concerned.

As I stated in the very beginning, it is my only purpose to bring home to this House that there is a real and

genuine need for us all to sit down, consider and review the progress and to examine our resources. I think, I have made out a case, it is not my purpose here to discuss the entire Plan, it is not my purpose here nor it is the purpose of this Resolution to give an alternative Plan because the suggestion here is that we must have a committee to review the position, examine our resources and to suggest how the Plan could be made more effective and more popular. I have given these facts and figures just to convince the House that there is not only a necessity but an urgency for us to adopt this course.

Proceeding further, I would like to invite the attention of the House to the administrative set up. I can cite hundreds of instances, but in the limited time at my disposal I will cite only two instances to show how our administrative set up both at the Centre as well as in the States, is not only incompetent but quite unsuited to discharge the responsibilities of a welfare State. The Planning Commission, very recently and very rightly thought that they must do something about the scarcity areas. They invited schemes and sanctioned money. Here I want to impress upon this House how efficient our administrative set up is in the discharge of its responsibility. Regarding these schemes for scarcity areas, the Planning Minister informs me, that these schemes are to be sanctioned only in chronically scarcity areas so that these schemes, when taken up, may be beneficial to those areas. They are very kind and I am very grateful to them for sanctioning twenty-six schemes for Rajasthan. They propose to spend about Rs 2½ cores on these schemes. But, would you believe it if I say that all these twenty-six schemes are located in areas which are the most fertile, areas which are the best part of Rajasthan? Out of these twenty-six, there is not one single scheme which is located in any of the chronically scarcity areas. Bikaner, Jaisalmer and a part of Jodhpur, com-

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

prising an area of about 60,000 square miles are the chronically scarcity areas and there is not a single scheme in those areas. While expressing my gratitude for the schemes, I wish to point out the type of administrative machinery which cannot chalk out the schemes, which does not know what it says, what it means and what it does.

• I will point out another small instance just to bring home the fact that the administrative machinery is not suitable. I wrote a small personal d.o. letter to the Minister for Planning telling him that for a particular village he may sanction Rs. 1,500 for improving the rural water supply. I further took care to tell him in that letter that if he wanted that the village should contribute something, the village was prepared to contribute one-third or even one-half of the cost; they were prepared to give the labour. He was kind enough to write to me saying "the matter is being considered". It is one year since then and I have not heard anything about it.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Did you send any reminder?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: My d.o. must be travelling from the Minister, possibly, to the havildar of the village and then will come up from the havildar of the village to the Minister. And what is the state of affairs? Rajasthan has got an allotment of one crore of rupees, and out of this one crore of rupees they have not been able to spend even one lakh of rupees. And yet a Member of Parliament, who is very well known to the Minister, who himself had been, fortunately or unfortunately, a Minister in that State, certifies the necessity of improving the water supply. He gives a guarantee that he is prepared himself to contribute and to get whatever you want from the people and yet it is one year that nothing has happened. I have given this as an instance and mind you: Who are the officers in Rajasthan? They are only the I.C.S.

and I.A.S. officers sent from the Centre who are concerned with it.

So, I submit that the administrative machinery, as it obtains today, is entirely unsuited and we must definitely think about it. I have all the time missed no opportunity in this House to impress upon the House that we must wake up and change this administrative machinery. It is not only the administrative machinery, but it is more definitely the procedure, the way in which the work is being conducted that has got to be absolutely revolutionised if you want to make any progress.

You will see even in this list of Resolutions that my second Resolution is on this very subject. I gave notice of a similar Resolution even in the last session. But all the time, the Government is fooling us. They fool themselves and they want to fool others. They quote foreign experts and say: Well, ours is one of the best administered States. We have got the best administrative machinery. Here is the foreign expert who has given the certificate that this is one of the 13 best administered countries of the world.

Possibly for the first time the awareness and seriousness of the situation was realised by the ruling party at their Agra Session of the Congress when they passed a sort of resolution on this subject and I thought that they felt really that something must be done. And lately, I have read in certain papers that the Prime Minister has appointed a special officer, Shri A. K. Chanda, to go into this matter, but I am not aware whether this officer is examining the whole issue or he is only concerned with the set up of the Secretariat here. I cannot repeat with greater emphasis that it is not only in the Secretariat but it is also and more necessarily at the district level that a complete change of the administrative machinery is called for—change in the procedure of the conduct of business and it has got to be changed if we are to make any progress whatsoever.

Without underestimating in any way the importance of what has been achieved in Rajasthan and at other places, I wish to ask a few straight questions. Is it not a fact, that our standard of living has not improved in the slightest during these three years? Is it not a fact that in another two years there is no possibility whatsoever of our standard of living improving even by a fraction? I think expert opinions have already expressed themselves on this subject. Again I ask: Is it not a fact that we are faced with the acute problem of unemployment even at a time when we are in the midst of the Five Year Plan, and is it not so even in the areas where the Plan is in full swing with its river valley projects and the construction of dams? So should we not hesitate, pause, examine and think that there must be something fundamentally wrong? Is it not a fact that even during the period of the Plan, our machinery for the manufacture of engineering equipment is lying idle? The report of the Committee for idle capacity is there. And, is it not a fact that we would have been much worse, almost miserable, but for the cessation of the Korean War and for the bumper crops with which we have been favoured during the last two years? If we are honest and have clarity of thought we will have to confess that the Plan, even if it were implemented successfully, will not give us even the pre-war standard of living. Our earnings have not kept pace with the prices. Of course, earnings have increased, but they are in no proportion to the prices which are obtaining at present as compared to the pre-war levels, and there is no chance of the income of the major section of the population being in direct proportion to the prices. And if it is so, the standard of living will be poorer than what it was in pre-war years.

I am not obsessed by any ideas from any foreign countries—Russia, China or America. Russia had an absolutely different set-up. Russia, I know, had different problems. There was much

smaller population and there were vaster resources. Then there was dictatorship. They had gone through a revolution. We cannot compare ourselves with Russia. Again the same thing about China. They also have gone through a revolution. Even in China, so far as I know, they have not been able to solve most of their problems. They are most vocal about agrarian problem. If I am correctly informed, they have created more problems by giving the land to the tiller. They do not know how to bring it under cultivation. They are faced with difficulties. I do not mean to say that they have not done anything. They have no doubt advanced and advanced very well. Similarly about America, where there is an inflated standard of living, which cannot be maintained for long. We will have to strike our own course and while I criticised the Plan I said that we lacked vision; we lacked vigour and that there were strong reasons for us to think over and reconsider the Plan.

I will throw a few suggestions, and the first thing is this. While we take into consideration the resources of this country, we never take into consideration the greatest resource, and that is the man-power. We have always been talking about organizing the public enthusiasm. But is it not a fact that 90 per cent. of our people even do not know that anything like a Plan exists? They do not even know it. So, how can they be interested in it? I would suggest what is absolutely necessary. Of course, our Prime Minister is devoting an hour or two to our foreign policy. He is devoting an hour or two to meet people connected with general administration. He will do much better if he would devote three or four hours a day to enthuse people to organize teams of workers, and to see that the entire masses are mobilised and aroused and are yoked to the construction of new India.

We should not dream at this moment about collective farming, but, definitely, here too I have a suggestion to make. We must give the land to the tiller. Perfectly true.

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

There is a lot of landless labour and we are giving fresh lands to fresh people. Wherever we give this land to new people that should be on a collective basis and it would be easier. And the Government should give them all sorts of aid and assistance in order to demonstrate and to impress on them the inherent strength of the system of collective farming.

One word more I will say about industrialisation. In this sphere, I wish only to suggest that the large scale industry should be linked up with the small cottage industry. Our cottage industry will never be a success until and unless it is linked up and it becomes a supplement to the large scale industry, until and unless the produce of the small scale industry is taken up by the large scale industry or by the Government. The marketing is the most important thing so far as small scale industry is concerned and in the heavy industry our first concern should be to put up heavy plants for the manufacture of the machinery, tools and implements that we require.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This Council is of opinion that a Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and prominent non-Members be appointed to review the working of the Five Year Plan and to suggest ways and means of making the Plan more effective and popular."

There is one amendment which may be formally moved and I will put both the Resolution and the amendment for discussion.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Sir, I move:

"That for the words 'a Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and prominent non-Members', the words 'a Parliamentary Committee of eleven Members' be substituted."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution and the amendment are before the House.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI:

प्रो० एन० आर० मलकानी : माननीय सभापति जी, मैं बड़े अदब के साथ यह दुस्ती आप के सामने पेश करता हूँ, क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि ऐसी योजना, जो कि इतने बड़े पैमाने पर शुरू की गई है और जिसमें सारे हिन्दुस्तान का भना होने वाला है, इस मुल्क में इस में पहले कभी नहीं हुई। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि इस योजना में काफी तरक्की हम लोगों ने पाई है, लेकिन फिर भी अभी बहुत कुछ करने को रह गया है, और हमको सोचना है कि कहा तक हम अपने प्रयत्नों को, कोशिशों को बढ़ावें, ताकि हम अपने लक्ष्यों तक पहुँचें।

पंच-वर्षीय योजना के तीन उद्देश्य हैं, और मेरे खयाल से वे तीन कसौटियाँ हैं जिनको हमें अपने सामने रखना है। पहला उद्देश्य है कि धन का उत्पादन सब में ज्यादा हो; दूसरा रोजगार है, सब को रोजगार मिले और कोई बेरोजगार न रहे। तीसरा उद्देश्य उत्तम और आला दर्जे का उद्देश्य है और वह है सामाजिक न्याय, या उसे सामाजिक समानता कहिये। इन तीन कसौटियों को मैं पहले लूंगा।

पहले हमें देखना है पहली कसौटी को, यानी धन का उत्पादन किस कदर हुआ है और किस कदर हम पीछे रहे हैं। मेरे पिछले भाई साहब ने इसके बारे में कुछ कह दिया है, मैं भी उस पर थोड़ा बहुत कहूंगा। योजना की किताब सारी की सारी हमारे सामने है, उसकी समरी (summary) यानि सार मैं नहीं देना चाहता लेकिन उसके कुछ आंकड़े आपके सामने पेश करूंगा। मैं हमने सोचा था कि बी हजार सत्तर करोड़ रुपये हम खर्च करेंगे।

इसके वास्ते साधन भी हमने बनाये थे । हम देखते हैं कि तीन साल के अन्दर हम लिफ्ट एक हजार करोड़ खर्च कर चुके, बाकी हमे खर्च करना रह गया है । आप जानते हैं कि हाल में यह भी फसला हुआ है कि पौने दो सौ करोड़ रुपये और बढ़ाये जाय ताकि रोजगार बढ़े और धन का उत्पादन भी बढ़े । तो इस तरह से मैंने देखा कि बाकी दो सालों के अन्दर हमको हर साल ६२२ करोड़ खर्च करना पड़ेगा और अब तक जो हिनाब खर्च का रहा है वह ढाई सौ, तीन सौ, साढ़े तीन सौ करोड़, जो कुछ भी हो, रहा है । हर साल हमें ६०२ करोड़ ५० खर्च करना पड़ेगा, सोचना पड़ेगा कि किस तरह से हम इसे खर्च करेंगे । रुपया पानी नहीं है, वचरा नहीं है, बल्कि धन है । हमें सोचना पड़ेगा कि हमारे पास क्या साधन हैं, क्या व्यवस्थाएं हैं । दूसरी चीज यह है कि हमने जो एक हजार करोड़ खर्च किया है— मैं मानता हू कि वह केन्द्रीय सरकार से मजूर हुआ और राज्य सरकारों ने खर्च किया— क्या वह दरहकीकत खर्च भी हुआ, और अगर खर्च हुआ तो किस स्थान को कितना फायदा हुआ और किस हद तक फायदा हुआ, यह हमें देखना है । मिर्क रुपये की मजरी से काम नहीं चलता है, वह किस तरीके से खर्च हुआ, किन महकमों और मुलाजिमों पर खर्च हुआ, कान से सामान पर, कौन से इक्विप-मेंट (equipment) पर लगाया गया, और कहा कहा लोगों की बहबूदी पर खर्च हुआ, ये सब हम जानना चाहते हैं । यह जो हमारे मन में शका होनी है कि कौन से बहबूदी के कामों पर ये रुपया खर्च हुआ है, यह शका दूर की जानी चाहिये ।

आप जानते हैं कि ये खर्चा करने के लिये जो रुपया रखा गया है उसे हम पूरी तरह से नहीं लगा सके हैं, और आगे चलकर हम देखते हैं कि इस प्लान (Plan) के अन्दर और भी

सीरियस गैप्स (serious gaps) हैं ।

यह प्लान तो कम्प्रेहेन्सिव (comprehensive) है, देश को रक्न देने वाला है, ताकत देने वाला है, लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि वह ताकत नहीं आई, ताकत पैदा करने की इच्छा भी नहीं दिखाई देती, न इन्तजाम है, न सगठन है और न स्पिरिट (spirit) है । यह देख कर दुख और दर्द होता है । ममनतू, कम्यूनिटी प्रोजेक्ट (Community Project) जिसको सामूहिक योजना कहा जाता है—उमके लिये हमने काफी इन्जाम रखा है, काफी खर्चा भी किया है और मैं मानता हू कि प्रगति भी काफी हुई है और उसमें ज्यादा ही भी नहीं सकती । उमके अन्दर एक नया मिद्दान देश को ताजगी देने वाला लाया गया कि श्रम-दान होगा, लोग अपनी मदद करेंगे, स्वावलम्बन का भाव पैदा होगा ताकि जहां कहीं श्रम की जरूरत पड़ेगी वहां पुरो मदद हम लोग करेंगे । इसके जरिये कई जगह ऐसा हुआ भी है कि नया वातावरण, नया वायुमंडल पैदा हो चुका है । मैं जानता हू कि ३०० सामूहिक योजनाएं और ६०० नेशनल एक्स्टेंशन प्रोजेक्ट्स (National Extension Projects) भी हैं । ये कुल मिला कर १२०० होते हैं । किताब कहती है कि ४३७ योजनाओं में कुछ न कुछ काम हो रहा है, बाकी में शुरुआत तक नहीं हुई । तो आप देखते हैं कि एक नया सिद्धान्त निर्धारित करने के बावजूद भी हम योजनाओं पर पूरा अमल नहीं कर पाये हैं । इसी तरह ग्राम उद्योगों के बारे में बारबार बड़ी बड़ी बात कही जाती है, शायद आप सुनते रहते हैं, लेकिन मैं देखता हू कि नतीजा कुछ निकलना ही नहीं है । केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने लिए १५ करोड़ और राज्य सरकारों के लिए १२ करोड़ रुपये मजूर किये और आप जानते हैं कि सेस (cess) से कई करोड़ रुपये

[Prof N. R. Malkani.]

हुए जिसके लिये भी केन्द्र में मंजूरी हुई है। लेकिन जब मैं किताब देखता हूँ तो यह पाता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने १५ करोड़ में से ५० लाख खर्च किये, और राज्यों ने १२ करोड़ में से ३ करोड़ खर्च किये। मैं जानता हूँ कि वह रुपया राज्यों तक नहीं पहुँचा है और इसका नतीजा भले की दृष्टि से कुछ भी नहीं हुआ है। बल्कि मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जो ग्राम उद्योग या घरेलू उद्योग हैं मर रहे हैं और मारे जा रहे हैं और पनपने नहीं पाते। मैं तो देखता हूँ कि हमारी आखों के सामने ग्राम उद्योग मर गया। लेकिन हम में पहिचानने की काशेस (conscience) नहीं है, न दफ्तर वालों को ही इसकी जरूरत है न हाकिमों को, और मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि न मंत्रिमण्डल को ही कुछ खयाल है। सिद्धान्त की दुहाई देना एक तरह का फैशन (fashion) हो गया है, और नतीजा कुछ समझ में नहीं आता है।

आगे बढ़कर मैं देखता हूँ कि एजुकेशन (education) की भी हालत करीब करीब वही है। चूँकि इस पर मैं पिछली दफा बोल चुका हूँ इसलिए मैं ज्यादा नहीं बोलना चाहता। इस पर भी मैं देखता हूँ कि जब कि १५५ करोड़ रुपये, केन्द्र और राज्यों के लिये मिलाकर, मंजूर किये हैं तो खर्च हुआ है आधा—७४ करोड़ रुपये। और उस बुनियादी तालीम की दुर्गति ही हुई है और उसके लिए विश्वास और श्रद्धा नहीं रहती। उसके बारे में मैं क्या कहूँ? आपको यह सुनकर भी दुःख होगा कि “सोशल सर्विसेज” (social services) जिसमें वाटर सप्लाई (water supply), मलेरिया की रोक-थाम, बड़े बड़े मेटर्निटी (maternity) और चाइल्ड वेलफेयर सेंटर (child welfare centre) वगैरह का जिक्र है,

इनके लिए कोई खर्चा दिखाया ही नहीं गया है। सैंक्शन (sanction) तो दिखाई जाती है कि इतने करोड़ रुपये की हुई, किताबें भर-असल किताबें मंजूर हुआ और कितना खर्च हुआ उसका विवरण पता नहीं। मगर भाई जानना चाहत है कि इतने करोड़ रुपये का एलोकेशन (allocation) है, मंजूरी है तो वह क्यों नहीं खर्च हुआ। अगर हमारे जिस्म में ताकत नहीं है, हमारी सेहत ठीक नहीं है, हममें तालीम नहीं है तो कहा से ताकत हमारे मुल्क में आएगी?

इसी तरह से हाउसिंग (housing) का सवाल है। यह भी एक बहुत ही कठिन सवाल है जिसको हम लोगों ने पूरा करना है। मगर मैं इसके सम्बन्ध में आप लोगों के सामने ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि माननीय चेयरमैन (Chairman) साहब को घंटी बजानी पड़े, मैं इस से डरता हूँ, इसलिए मैं इस सवाल को यही पर खतम करता हूँ।

आप सब लोग यह जानते होंगे कि हमें अभी बहुत कुछ करना है, काफी करने को है, इसके वास्ते हमको इन्तजाम करना होगा, पूरा प्रयास करना होगा, जोर लगाना होगा मेरे वास्ते यह चीज काफी नहीं है, हमको और भी ज्यादा प्रयत्न करना होगा। जैसा कि मैंने अभी बतलाया देश की उन्नति के लिए तीन कसौटियाँ हैं, इनमें से दूसरी कसौटी जो रोजगार की है सब से मुख्य है। इस ओर कुछ प्रगति हुई है किन्तु जितनी प्रगति होनी चाहिये वह नहीं हो पा रही, इसकी ओर हमें विशेष ध्यान देना होगा।

आप सब लोगों को विदित है कि रोजगार के सम्बन्ध में शहरों से ही ज्यादा शिकायत आती रहती है। लोग यह शिकायत करते हैं कि हम बिना रोजगार के मरे जा रहे हैं हमको रोजगार दिलाया जाय। देहात के लोग

शहरो में आ जाते हैं और यह शिकायत करते हैं कि हमको रोजगार नहीं मिलता। वे लोग देहांत को भूत जाते हैं, सरकार की आर से भी देहांत के लोगों को रोजगार दिलाने का प्रयत्न कम ही होता है।

कुछ ही दिन हुए मैं चार दिन तक विनोबा जी के साथ रहा और उनके साथ विविध समस्याओं पर काफी देर तक बातचीत हुई। उन्होंने कहा कि भाई! आजकल अखबारों में बेरोजगारी की समस्या के विषय में काफी चर्चा है। जहां तक अनेम्प्लायमेंट (unemployment) का सवाल है, बेरोजगारी का सवाल है, वह कोई बड़ा सवाल नहीं है। सवाल तो अन्डर-एम्प्लायमेंट (under-employment) का है, लोगों के पास पूरा काम नहीं है। बेरोजगारी अवश्य है मगर वह कोई बड़ी चीज नहीं है। हमारे देश के देहांतों में २८ करोड़ लोग रहते हैं। साल में वे लोग तीन महीने, छ महीने और कभी कभी तो नौ महीने तक बेरोजगार ही रहते हैं, अगर दुर्भाग्यवश किसी वर्ष अकाल हो गया हो तो तब उस हालत में बारहो महीने उनको बेरोजगार रहना पड़ता है। इस ओर किसी का भी ध्यान नहीं जाता, यह उनका कहना था और मैं भी इसको मानता हूँ। जहां तक शहरों की बेरोजगारी की समस्या है वह तो है ही, मगर सबसे मुख्य समस्या देहांतों में बेरोजगारी की है, जिसकी ओर हमें विशेष ध्यान देना है। शहरों में तो कुछ लाख ही लोग बेरोजगार मिलेंगे, मगर हमारे देहांतों में नौ करोड़ों लोग बेरोजगार हैं। इस बेरोजगारी की समस्या को हल करने की दिशा में जो कुछ भी प्रयत्न देश में किया जा रहा है, वह केवल श्री विनोबा जी द्वारा ही किया जा रहा है।

(Time bell rings)

I have got one or two very important points to make I want five minutes more, if you do not mind, Sir.

श्री पूज्य विनोबा जी ने ५ करोड़ एकड़ भूमि एकत्र करने का जो लक्ष्य बनाया है वह इसी आधार पर बनाया गया है कि हमारे देहांतों में जो बेरोजगार लोग हैं, उनके काम दिलाया जाय। इस लक्ष्य को पूरा करने के लिए वे देश की पैदल यात्रा कर रहे हैं। मगर मुझे अफमास के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जो हलचल उन्होंने शुरू की है, उनको हम सब लोग स्वीकार तो करने हैं, उसी लिए हम उनको धन्यवाद तो देते हैं, पर उनके इस काम में जिस तरह से सहयोग उनको मिलना चाहिये था, वह उनको नहीं मिल रहा है। राज्यों की ओर से भी इन कार्य में उनको उचित सहयोग नहीं मिल रहा है।

एक बात मुझ और कन्हरी है और वह यह है कि अगर हम अपने प्लान को पूरा करना चाहते हैं तो हम पूरे सहयोग से, पूरी ताकत से देश में जा उन्नति के लिये कार्य किये जा रहे हैं, उनको जल्दी से जल्दी पूरा करें। अगर हम ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तो दूसरी जो हमारी प्लान होगी उसका भी यही हाल होगा। हम जो दूसरी प्लान की बात साच रहे हैं वह इसी स्थिति को ध्यान में रखकर सोच रहे हैं कि वह एक क्रान्तिकारी प्लान होगी, एक इन्कलाबी योजना होगी। वह क्या चीज होगी वह लोगों को सोशल जस्टिस (social justice) देगी, पूरा एम्प्लायमेंट (employment) देगी, देश की नेशनल इन्कम (national income) दुगुनी कर देगी, उससे द्वारा गांव गांव में पचायत घर बन जायेंगे और एक तरह से देश में पचायत राज्य कायम हो जायेगा, और यह तब ही हो सकता है जब कि हम अपने गांवों से इन चीजों को शुरू करें। गांव के लोगों को अपने साथ लेकर हम इन कार्यों को पूरा करें, उनके दिलों में जागृति पैदा करें, तब ही हम अपने देश को देश की जनता को खुशहाल बना सकते हैं। अगर हम अपनी पहली ही प्लान को पूरा न

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]

क रेगे, उसको अधूरा ही छोड़ देंगे तो यह मुमकिन नहीं कि हम अपने देश की नेशनल इन्कम को दुगना कर सकें और इस समय जो बेरोज़गारी की समस्या हमारे सामने है उसको हल कर सकें।

अब सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि हम किस तरह से अपने प्लानों को पूरा कर सकते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में जो कमीशन (Commission) और कमेटिया बनाई गई हैं, अगर हमने उनको अपने मंजिले तक पहुँचाना है तो उन कमेटियों में ऐसे आदमियों को रखना होगा जो कि उस काम को पूरा करने की जानकारी रखते हों। साथ ही साथ हमको इनके कामों की जांच भी करनी चाहिये कि कहां तक हमारा काम बढ़ा है। इस कार्य का भार हमारे माननीय मिनिस्टर (Minister) साहब के ऊपर है, वह मेरे पुराने साथी हैं, मैं उनकी पूरी इज्जत करता हूँ। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि वह पूरी सच्चाई, कोशिश और हिम्मत के साथ अपना काम कर रहे हैं। मगर उनकी सच्चाई से इतना बड़ा कार्य पूरा नहीं हो सकता है, उन्हें देश की जनता को भी अपने साथ लेना होगा तब ही यह कार्य पूरा हो सकेगा। मुझे यहाँ पर यह भी कहना पड़ता है कि सरकारी अमले के दिल में यह स्थल है कि माननीय मेम्बरों को केवल चाय पिला दी जाय ता सब कुछ हो जायेगा। वे यहां तक ही उनको अपने साथ ले जाना चाहते हैं। मेरा अपना स्थल है कि यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है, मेम्बर लोगों का अगर सहयोग लिया गया तो वे भी देश की उन्नति में अपना पूरा जोर लगाने को तैयार हैं। अगर हमें सचमुच अपने देश को आगे बढ़ाना है, बेरोज़गारी की समस्या को दूर करना है, देश की नेशनल इन्कम को दुगना करना है, तो सरकारी अमले में काफी सुधार करना होगा। इसके लिए यह जरूरी है कि हमारा

जो पांच साला प्लान है उसमें सुधार करने के लिए पार्लियामेंट (Parliament) के ११ मेम्बरों की एक कमेटी बनाई जाय जोकि इसमें सुधार करने के लिए सुझाव दे सकें।

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 75.]

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Chairman, I am in favour of this Resolution but I oppose the amendment. I do think that there are good enough people outside these two Houses of Parliament, whose assistance and co-operation could be utilised by Government in order that they may be able—the Government may be able—to properly assess the progress that has so far been made, and the manner in which the Plan has got to be reorganised, and also the machinery that they should develop in order to see that the Plan is implemented to the fullest possible extent. I do agree that there is need for the reorganisation of the administrative machinery, but I am not able to agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Mathur, when he says that there is no vision behind it. I am convinced that the Minister for Planning is himself a visionary and has been one of the primary authors of this Plan and has been extremely keen to see that this is implemented, but, most unfortunately for him and for us both, at the State level and also at this Government's level there is not enough co-operation forthcoming. And that is one of the reasons, I think, for the failure of this Plan either to strike the imagination of the people or to give them any satisfaction. I do not wish to tire the House by quoting figures. The report of the National Income Committee, published in all the daily papers today, shows that in the last three or four years, there has been no increase in the real income of the people of this country. That ought to be enough warning to us.

The Plan is failing at the district level and it is failing at the State level also. That was made clear the other day when the proposals for granting

money for the development of small projects in the State of Andhra were brought to the notice of this House at question hour. These projects, costing Rs. 1,10,00,000 were supposed to have been recommended by the local Government, but at this level only a small project costing Rs 8 lakhs or a little more was sanctioned. All the other five projects were dropped. They said that it was with the consent of the local Government. How the local Government came to agree to this—with what pressure or persuasion from the Centre—we do not know. But we do know one thing that for this State there were six projects, for which the people have been clamouring for decades in the past, and for many of which schemes also were prepared by the local Government and yet at the Centre this has happened.

Similarly, instead of the local people going to their own Government, as used to be the case before the Plan was inaugurated, and persuading their respective Governments in order to take up any schemes that they wanted, they are obliged now to come here again and again on deputation and beg the experts of the Central Government to agree to this scheme or that scheme and so on. And with what results? There is that famous project of Nandikonda, it is otherwise known in the dossiers of the Planning Commission as the Kistna Pennar Project. The other day the President was good enough to say that one project of the Kistna river was going to be taken up and when I asked our friends about it, they said "You need not have any doubts. It is likely to be the Nandikonda Project." For the last two and a half years, this thing has been kept hanging fire. Long before elections and especially after the elections, people had been coming over here again and again to the Planning Commission—the Government as well as the people themselves. And the answers that we got were that the papers were not coming once from Hyderabad, another time from Andhra and later on that the engineers were going to meet and when

they met they could not come to any decision. Therefore, they postponed their meeting and they were going to meet again to finalize the matter. The latest that I heard was that the estimates on the Andhra side were complete but the estimates on the Hyderabad side had not yet been completed. We do not know, therefore, for how long there is likely to be a delay in this matter. This thing has been kept hanging fire for two and a half years and how much longer they are going to wait—possibly till after the end of the Five Year Plan before they make up their minds to take the particular project. And if so, at what level they are going to build these dams and at what cost etc. we do not know.

I have given you these two instances and there was a third given by Mr Mathai himself. Are not these enough to convince the House that there is really great need for a careful examination of this very basis on which the Five Year Plan was started to start with, has been implemented during the last one and a half years or one year and also they propose to implement it, and also reorganize it? At the very time when it was brought before this House, I sounded a note of warning that co-operatives in actual process of cultivation might not be popular, that co-operatives were not likely to be profitable and anyhow they should not be imposed upon our people in spite of the peasants themselves and peasant proprietorship ought to be encouraged and ought to be developed. They would not agree. They would not give any categorical assurance. Only the other day an enquiry was made jointly by the Bombay Government as well as the I C A R into the working of the four processes of cultivation viz, peasant proprietorship, tenancy cultivation, co-operative cultivation and collective farming in Baroda district. What were the results and what were the findings of that joint investigation? They found that the peasant proprietorship had yielded best results, next came the tenancy cultivation, third came the collective farming and fourth was the co-operatives. They

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

have given the order in the processes of the four relative methods of co-operation and collectives. Does this not show to the Planning Commission that they should try their best from now on, at least, to give every possible encouragement to the peasant proprietorship in our country? The peasant proprietors form more than 60 per cent of the total agricultural population and they deserve encouragement. Now we find from this report itself, which was published this morning, that more than 60 per cent of our working population is employed in agriculture and 45 per cent of our total national wealth is being produced by agriculture. Yet, when this question of unemployment arose and the Congress Committee made so much noise at Agra and later on at Kalyani that they were going to face up this question of unemployment, they had it before them, primarily the unemployment that was prevailing in the industrial sector. If there had not been the closure of a number of mills and the unemployment that arose therefrom and the vociferous capacity of our own industrial proletariat, I would like to know whether the Government would have cared to recognise the existence of this unemployment problem at all. But is it not a fact that this unemployment problem is a much greater, more acute, more serious and a poignant one on the rural front not only among the agriculturists but also among the cottage industry workers? Our friend Prof Malkani has been drawing attention to the plight of our own small industries and the millions of people who are employed in them. Ten millions of them are employed in small industries, and hunger strikes and marches of our own handloom weavers have had to be organised in more than one State in order to draw attention of the Government to their plight. What does the Government propose to do? Do they propose really to reorganise their own programmes and plans in order to provide additional employment to them? The President himself has confessed the other day and what is more, there is

one particular disability that is dogging the steps of this Government. The other day you were yourself witnessing it. When I put a question, the Prime Minister came and said that some experts from abroad had met him, explained things to his satisfaction and, therefore, he thought that their deputation was justified by their report. The very next moment we were told that the report had not yet been submitted. It is just enough for a foreigner to come here and satisfy our Prime Minister. He goes on with the impression that the foreigners are already submitting their report and the report must be very good and, therefore, the results are going to be very good. I drew his attention as well as that of the House to the fact that we sent our own experts to Japan who brought the experts and some machinery also and then a factory was installed and then the whole thing was done away with merely because it did not please the new Minister for Industry. This is how things are happening. Now so many friends have been clamouring about the foreign experts. I have no objection to foreign experts being brought here to this country but I want everyone of these Ministers to have the courage of their convictions and to see that every pice, that we are spending on the foreign experts as well as on our own experts in the various schemes, brings the best possible results and they are able to go to our own Prime Minister, tell their own Cabinet Committee or the Economic Committee and convince them about the utility of the expenditure that they are making. Instead of that they simply want to get the mercy of somebody or other high up in this Government for the whole of the Five Year Plan to go through. This is a wrong way of going about it.

They said that there is a lot of unemployment among the middle classes. How did they propose to tackle it, I want to know? In Madras there is the new educational plan. Why have they thought of it? Because they do not have enough money and

at the same time the Constitution places the duty on our State Governments to achieve compulsory elementary education within a period of 10 years. Therefore, Rajaji has wisely thought of reducing the number of hours for which the boys are to be kept in schools and increasing the number of hours for which the teachers are to work, so that he would get more students educated with a lesser number of teachers. That is one way of solving it. The other way is, as was suggested by the Bhore Committee, to employ more teachers. Does the Government of India have any plan at all in order to help our own State Governments to employ more teachers? There is scope there for nearly a million people. Now, do they propose to send all these educated unemployed people to our rural elementary schools? As you all know, there is a kind of prejudice against a teacher's job or teacher's profession especially in elementary schools, and our graduates are not willing to go there. Unless the Government makes it perfectly clear to those people that unless they are prepared to go and work for two or three years there they cannot be allowed to apply for any other job, they will not be willing to go there. Between these two ways, they have to make up their minds whether they are going to follow this method or whether they are going to allow Rajaji's scheme to spread over to the whole of India so that you can get more work from the same number of teachers and in that way bring about unemployment even in the sector of teaching in schools.

3 P.M.

There is marketing to be done, for instance. Tobacco has been there waiting for these marketing facilities. The Ministers had gone to that place the other day and I am indeed very glad that at long last they had thought fit to do that. All these months tons and tons of tobacco had been groaning for marketing facilities there and yet nothing was being done. I do not know what is proposed to be done now. I had written to them making

a few suggestions, but most unfortunately I have not even got a reply. But if it had been in any other country, if they had such agricultural produce to be kept for a long time pending proper marketing, three things would have been done. First of all, they have the system of giving advance credit to the agriculturists. On this point I would like to remind the House that though I have been asking for the establishment of an Agricultural Finance Corporation, they have not yet thought of it. Secondly, they give grants for the construction of co-operative godowns. In this respect also they have done nothing at all from the Centre. Here and there a State Government can be seen nibbling at it, and that is not at all enough. Thirdly, in such cases, the Government themselves come forward in order to promote these marketing facilities. But in none of these three directions the Government have done anything appreciable.

And then there is great need for constructing what are known as warehouses. Has the Government of India thought of that? They have built a few warehouses, it is true, for storing foodgrains when they had to hold in their stocks of the foodgrains that they were importing into this country. But what about sugar, *gur*, cotton and the various other commodities. For them nothing has yet been done. These may have to be stored for some time waiting for better prices or better markets; for this, however, the Government should develop a proper plan.

Then what about the minerals? Our own mineral deposits have yet to be developed; but when we put questions, we find that the Government have not even got the information about these minerals. The other day a question was asked whether there is iron ore in Kistna district; but they have no information, though it is being sent to Bezwada over a distance of 40 miles at a cost of Rs. 15 per ton. The Government know nothing at all, not to speak of providing any marketing facilities to these people in order to safeguard them against the merchants,

[Prof G Ranga]

to safeguard and protect the merchants also against the importers, who are keeping down prices. So great was the competition among our own merchants that the prices of iron ore were pushed down by the Japanese exporters. But nothing is being done to prevent this, because the Government do not even have the information. We have big chapters here about the proper exploitation of our minerals, about their development to meet our industrial needs, but here is the Government without any information. I asked them if they had struck oil in Kistna district, but there also they confessed their ignorance.

Then there is this question of the local projects. My hon friend Shri Nanda, having got tired of the administrative machinery, decided that Rs 50 lakhs out of the sum of Rs 2 crores placed at his disposal by Parliament for the development of local projects, may be utilised for the projects recommended by the Bharat Sevak Samaj.

THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA) : Not only the Bharat Sevak Samaj, but any other organisation also.

PROF G RANGA : Very well, or by any other organisation.

(Time bell rings)

Please give me two minutes more, I do not know how much more is left to me. I as a member of the National Executive of the Bharat Sevak Samaj discussed this matter with the Government and I was told that they would be willing to pay 50 per cent of the cost of any small project costing not more than Rs 20,000. I went round and got a proposal and sent it up. Then I was told that that had to be sanctioned by a local engineer. That was quite reasonable and proper. But then I found that no one—neither the local Board engineer, nor the PWD engineer nor even the overseer—would give us any estimate and the

last two months were wasted over these small gentlemen. Therefore, I submit that unless these defects are removed, unless these bottle-necks are removed it will not be possible for you to make any progress at all.

For these reasons, I am strongly in favour of this Resolution and urge the hon Minister to accept it, for it will strengthen the hands of Government and it will strengthen his own hands.

In conclusion, I would request the Government to adopt the suggestion made by Shri M Visveswarayya that you should have planning committees from the district level upwards. You should have these committees from the district level and they should not be the monopoly of any one party. All parties interested should be invited to join it, not even the monopoly of Members of Parliament or of legislatures. All the people who are keen on helping the Government in the proper working of the Plan should be free to give their help so that the Plan may really be the people's Plan and a progressive Plan.

SHRI RAMA RAO (Andhra) : Sir, my friend Mr Ranga, has been referring to striking oil somewhere near my district or in the Kistna district. I do not know whether it has been done, but I am certain that he will not strike oil in this House with this Resolution.

I would say that there is absolutely no necessity for a Parliamentary Committee of the sort that is being proposed. Why do you want it? I can understand a Committee of the House of Commons going to Kenya to investigate into the horrors perpetrated by the British representatives there, because it is rightly a political question, a colour question, a racial question, a question of the highest import otherwise also. But here it is the Planning Commission's affair, not a matter for politicians or Members of Parliament. I refuse to believe that any good will come out of the efforts of Members of Parliament in an investigation of a highly technical character. I would rather leave it to

the experts, to men who know the job. This is no matter for amateur bungling or political meddling and muddling. I would, however, support that a clear analysis of the situation as it has resulted from the working of the Five Year Plan for some time now should be made but by experts, and then we shall have a clear appreciation of the excellent work that has been done.

Look at the Resolution. It says:

"This Council is of opinion that a Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and prominent non-Members be appointed to review the working of the Five Year Plan and to suggest ways and means of making the Plan more effective and popular."

PROF. G. RANGA: There is no criticism in it.

SHRI RAMA RAO: It falls into two sections. What will Members of Parliament do? They have their own peculiar approaches and complexes. Prof. Ranga could write his report here and now. I could write out one myself tomorrow, and the Communist Party could have written one six months ago. The second part of the Resolution deals with making the Plan "more effective and popular". This reminds me of the fallacy we get in deductive logic. "Have you left off beating your wife?" If I say, "no", it means I am still beating her. If I say "yes", it means I was beating her. I see the ladies over there laughing at me. So this is the danger of this Resolution. If we admit that a Commission of the nature referred to in the Resolution is wanted, for making the thing "more effective and popular", you would be making a false and humiliating confession, which we are not prepared to make.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

The amendment is worse than the Resolution. It is decidedly worse, for it wants politicians wholesale. Elections are coming and politicians certainly have some use, but not here to examine plans and projects.

The main difficulties or disabilities of any Planning Commission are financial and administrative. Not even 2,000 Members of Parliament are going to produce the needed finance. Not even 20,000 of them are going to build a bridge or dig a canal. What is the value of the opinion of such people on a subject of this kind? I have suffered enough from immature people as a journalist. With all the experience of a lifetime I attempt to produce a newspaper. My proprietor comes to me and, because he happens to give me a salary at the end of the month, tells me, "This leading article is no good. That telegram has not been properly displayed. My grand-nephew's daughter's picture has not appeared in such and such an issue." This is the kind of immature wisdom that is inflicted upon professionals. I would rather not have anything of that kind.

I remember, Mr. Deputy Chairman, when about July last I was in Trivandrum for a meeting of the Federation of Indian Working Journalists Organisation and visited some project—it is an impossible name to pronounce—and the man in charge was telling me, with all the pride of a really intellectual Malayali, that Dr. Savage had given about them the opinion that they were spending only lakhs while others were spending crores of rupees elsewhere. He was proud of it. Our friends of the Communist Party in particular are very afraid of foreign experts. You know Dr. Savage is an expert. What is wrong if we consult him? At my age I would sit at the feet of any foreign expert, young or old, if he can teach me a little more of journalism. Similarly, any one of us, engineer or otherwise, old or young, should only be too willing to learn more and more from foreign experts. Incidentally let me refer to the Ramadasagara Project across the Godavari. Foreign experts were for it, but the local heroes of the Madras Government sabotaged it. I would rather have foreign experts who not only bring in more wisdom and impartiality but also have a variety of experiences gained all over the world.

[Shri Rama Rao.]

The Plan has been well conceived and let us not turn up the plant that is growing. The second Five Year Plan is coming; probably it will be sounder. We are able to do better and better as a result of experience.

Have we not gained international appreciation for the good work that we have been doing? Yes. Friends of the Communist Party would be happy to get good chits from Moscow; but they do not like us of the Congress ruling in this country to get appreciation from other parts of the world. If they are entitled to get recommendations from their friends, we are entitled to obtain the appreciation of experts elsewhere in the world.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Madras): Getting chits from America.

SHRI RAMA RAO: America is a splendid country; it has produced the greatest irrigation engineers. Certainly they can give lessons to Moscow and Russian engineers so far as irrigation-engineering is concerned.

So far as the Community Projects are concerned, our Prime Minister has stated repeatedly—and I take it that the Prime Minister has the authority to speak on that subject more than any one of us—that our Projects have been progressing well and that 95 per cent. of them have been successful. Against the word of the Prime Minister of India, I would not accept any hostile opinion and, therefore, let the matter drop there.

I know that certain improvements in the Plan would be absolutely in place. The international situation, as it is developing day by day, is bound to cause us anxiety and we must, therefore, force the pace of a self-reliant economy. It is also a fact that unemployment is increasing day by day, in spite of all that we have been doing. We are faced with a paradoxical situation—more production and more unemployment. I would, therefore, ask the attention of the Minister of Planning in this connection to the

important question of birth control. You may go on doing all the best things in the world, but unless you tackle the problem of population, you will not be able to solve the problem of unemployment. So long as there are jobless men going hungry and naked in this country, your Plan, good as it is, will not get that amount of appreciation to which it is legitimately entitled.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): What do you suggest?

SHRI RAMA RAO: When I think of the great projects that have been coming into existence, the excellent work done by our engineers, the splendid co-ordinating organisation the Planning Commission typifies, I feel proud of the Plan and the progress our country has been making. I am anxious to refer to a single matter, that we should have more canals like the Don-Volga Canal and that the waters of the Ganga should flow into the Tambaraparani. I am anxious, generally speaking, that this country should be well-knit and well exploited, but all these things are matters for experts. Meanwhile, let us raise our hands in salutation to the engineers who have been engaged in the great and noble task of rebuilding this country. Mr. Rajagopalachari is fond of quoting the example of Bhagiratha and saying that he was a great engineer, not so much a mystical being. I believe, coming from Andhra, that Sir Arthur Cotton who built the barrages across the Godavari and the Kistna, has been of greater service to that part of the country than all the men of the I. C. S. put together. The tremendous irrigation projects that have been built during the last two hundred years in this country have done us much good and that the progress that is being made on the other projects these days will lead to increased economic prosperity. Meanwhile, let us say, "Hats off to our engineers; hats off to our engineers."

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, as the time at my disposal is short, I shall

check the temptation of making any comments on the speech of my friend Mr. Rama Rao, most probably having his swan song in this House. I shall not grudge his speech of today if, in any way, it is helpful in getting him back to the House so that we shall be pleased to listen to him.

SHRI RAMA RAO: It is unfair to me. I care two hoots whether I get back or not.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: If he has taken it that way, then, of course, I withdraw it, because I do not like to cause him any pain.

However, I take up the other matters. I take my stand to support the Resolution moved by my hon. friend Mr. Mathur. In this Resolution and in his speech, he has not made any excessive or exorbitant demand upon the Government. What he demands is simply that a review of the Plan should be undertaken and it is absolutely justified. We have three or four years' experience of the working of the Plan and then a second Five Year Plan is also in the offing. But, before the second Five Year Plan comes into existence, it is absolutely necessary to evaluate the results of the first Five Year Plan. I shall not today repeat the fundamental criticisms of the Plan made from our side. The hon. gentlemen sitting on those Benches are not prepared to accept them nor are they able to accept them but what is necessary is leaving apart the questions of ideologies and politics for the time being and to see whether the Plan which has been undertaken and for which expenditure has been incurred is helpful to the nation or not. In this demand, the people are justified. We have seen the working of the Plan in action and I submit that if my hon. friends sitting on the other side want to be honest to the objectives they have set before themselves in the Plan, they should themselves come forward to examine this Plan. How is it that we see that when the Plan visualised increasing employment potential, we find in reality

employment decreasing, the menace of unemployment growing not only in the industrial field but in the rural field also? The recent figures supplied by the Employment Exchanges, which we know reflect only a fraction of the real unemployment situation, show that unemployment is not on the decrease. We debated the question of unemployment in this House and the Government, ultimately, had to agree that there has been an increase in unemployment and the Government had to come out with an amendment to the Five Year Plan; special plans were announced to relieve unemployment but still we find that unemployment is gradually on the increase.

In January, the total number of unemployed on the registers of Employment Exchanges reached the figure of 5,44,317; if we compare this with the figure of people placed in employment, we find that the latter figure is gradually decreasing. Whereas in December 1952, 15,215 applicants could be placed in employment, recently only 13,606 applicants were placed in employment. The number of educated unemployed requiring employment has also gone up even after the sanction of large sums of money on the several projects for relieving this problem and those expenses which have been incurred have been incurred only for relieving to some extent this problem. Then when in one breath the Government argues: "We are giving the opportunities for employing 80,000 teachers of whom 20,000 or 30,000 are soon going to be employed", on the other hand we see the picture that the teachers have to go on strike in the U. P., Punjab and West Bengal. They are thrown into prison because of their demand for a slight increase in their pittance. I refer my hon. friend to page 9 of the 'Progress of the Plan'. There, under the head 'Expansion Adjustments' some reasons have been offered for this growing menace of unemployment, but these reasons show that they are not alive to the real problem. For the unemployment increase, among the reasons shown is that the "conditions characteristic of buyers"

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.] markets begin to affect employment." But what are the conditions characteristic of buyers' market? Fall in the purchasing power of the buyer. How is that coming in? Has the Government made any serious effort to examine that? One of the reasons given here is that there is a steady shift of workers from villages to towns. Why is that taking place? We see that in the Plan it is visualized that there will be improvements in agriculture and there will be improvement in the life of the agricultural people and various tenancy reform legislations. On the other hand we see the growing tempo of evictions of peasantry and, therefore, they are being forced to leave their home villages and come to the towns to increase the army of the unemployed. We have heard many schemes about cottage industries, but what happens actually? The previously unemployed people engaged in the cottage industry cannot dispose of their accumulating stock. With the paltry loan given to them they produce further stock but that cannot be sold. Why? It is because millions of peasantry are being deprived of their purchasing power as they are being thrown out of employment. In the export industry there is slump. Why? It is because of the pattern of our foreign trade. It is because of our exclusive dependence on trade with certain countries. In the smaller industries, they have to retrench personnel. Why? There is no serious effort to examine the recommendations, even to look into the recommendations and findings of the committee appointed by Government itself.

The other day I had put in a question to the Commerce and Industry Ministry about the findings of the Mulgaonkar Committee and I found the answers given vague, namely, that from time to time, in writing or verbally, they make some reports and the different Ministries examine those reports. The weaker units in the better organized industries have to retrench personnel. Why? In all these pic-

tures we find on the one side that there are certain visualizations of certain aims, and in performance we find actually exactly the opposite.

I could multiply examples. As regards the river valley projects large developments are visualized. But what is happening? At present in many places the peasants have to protest against the imposition of betterment levies, against the excessive amount of betterment levies imposed upon them. Power is produced but it is produced in such an unplanned way that it means a huge waste of expenditure.

I tried to elicit some information from the Ministry of Irrigation and Power. Though they gave me answers, I did not find them clear enough. What I have heard, I am submitting. I shall mention the case of the Kumardhubi Electric Works, which I understand is lying idle. Perhaps many of you know that lakhs of rupees were sunk into it. I cannot understand why no proper plan was made. Formerly, the plan was that electricity will be supplied to Mython and Panchet from Sindri, but later on they started taking it from somewhere else. In this way money was sunk. When the power projects started to generate electricity, it could not be properly utilised. Moreover electricity cannot be utilised unless there is industrial development, and industrial development cannot take place when our own industries are being ruined. May I know how much more time I have?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes more.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: So I shall hurry up. As our own industries are being ruined gradually, the working of foreign capital in the different industries was raised by us on many occasions. On one occasion I accepted the challenge of Mr. Karmarkar and said, "Let us study the actual working of foreign capital here." I said that I was not against the healthy participation by a foreign capital, but

"Let us see how it is working, whether to the benefit of the national industry or to the detriment of the national industry." That offer was not accepted from the side of the Government. Mr. Karmarkar personally said, "I am ready to study." Foreign capital coming and investing itself in consumer industries, industries manufacturing typewriters, sewing machines, electric bulbs, soap and so on, is thereby ruining our national industries. So about all these things it is absolutely necessary that a strict impartial enquiry be undertaken by a committee consisting of Members of Parliament and prominent non-Members.

Before I resume my seat, I wish to draw your attention to another aspect. The working of the Community Projects should be examined from another angle and that is in the background of the grant of American military aid to Pakistan, because according to the agreements with the United States of America, American technical personnel have been granted diplomatic immunity. They have been granted immunity and liberty to roam over the country at their free will, and we know what is happening in the Middle East. It is very significant that in today's papers we read along with the announcement of the grant of American military aid to Pakistan, a *coup d'etat* in Egypt and a revolt in Syria. We know what is happening in the Middle East. We hear that Iran will soon enter into a military agreement. We know how some time earlier the *coup d'etat* took place in Iran. The lessons of history should not be forgotten at the cost of the prosperity and sovereignty of our nations.

With these words, Sir, I resume my seat.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh):

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज (मध्य प्रदेश) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव इस सदन के एक सदस्य मित्र ने रखा है उसका मैं विरोध

करता हूँ, साथ ही श्री मलकानी ने इस प्रस्ताव में जो सशोधन रखा है उसका भी मैं विरोध करता हूँ। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री इस प्लानिंग (planning) के काम में बहुत दिनों से लगे हुए हैं। जब से वह प्रधान मंत्री हुए और इस प्लानिंग कमीशन (Planning Commission) के मुखिया हुये केवल तब से ही वह इस काम में नहीं लगे हुये हैं बल्कि इसके कई वर्ष पहले से उनके दिमाग में यह बात थी, और वह इस दिशा में सोचने और कार्य करते चले आये हैं। फिर जब कमीशन बना तब देश के अच्छे से अच्छे लोग इस कमीशन में शरीक किये गये, कृष्णमाचारी साहब भी उसमें लिये गये, वह भी उसमें रहे, और उनके ही जैसे अन्य लोग उसमें शरीक किये गये, और उन्होंने प्लान (Plan) बहुत मोच समझ कर तैयार किया। प्लान बनने के बाद लगभग ढाई या तीन साल उसको कार्यान्वित होते हो चुके हैं। अब केवल दो या ढाई साल का समय और बाकी रह गया है। इसी के बीच में यह प्रस्ताव इस सदन में लाना कि पार्लियामेंट (Parliament) के मेम्बरों द्वारा इसकी जाच की जाय कि इस प्लान का कार्य ठीक तरह से हो रहा है या नहीं, एक बेतुकी सी बात मालूम होती है। मैं आप से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि काम तेजी से हो रहा है या मंदी से हो रहा है, अच्छा हो रहा है या बुरा हो रहा है, वह एक अलग बात है परन्तु काम के बीच में ऐसे कमीशन की नियुक्ति कर देने का अर्थ यह होगा कि जो कुछ भी कार्य हो रहा है वह और भी मन्दा हो जायेगा।

SHRI S. MAHANTY:

श्री एस० महन्ती : क्यों ?

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ:

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज: वह इसलिये कि लोग सोचेंगे कि भाई कमीशन बैठा है, पता नहीं कि हम अच्छा काम कर रहे हैं या बुरा

[Shri R. U. Agnibhoj.]

काम कर रहे हैं, इसलिये जब उसकी रिपोर्ट (report) आयेगी और उसके ऊपर विचार होन के बाद जैसा कहा जायेगा वैसे काम को आगे बढ़ावेंगे। तो इस तरह प्लान के एक्जीक्यूशन (execution) में, प्लान के कार्यान्वित होने में, बाधा पड़ेगी।

मेरे मित्र कहते हैं कि अनइम्प्लायमेंट (unemployment) का सवाल हिन्दुस्तान में सब से बड़ा सवाल है और न कल्याणी कांग्रेस सेशन (session) ने, न केन्द्रीय सरकार ने और न प्लानिंग कमीशन ने इस पर कोई ध्यान दिया है। मैं आप से बहुत आदर और आदर से कहूंगा कि कहीं लोग इस प्रस्ताव का यह मतलब न निकालें कि कुछ पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर भी कुछ समय के लिये अनइम्प्लायड (unemployed) रहते हैं इसलिये वह इस रेजोल्यूशन (Resolution) द्वारा इम्प्लायमेंट खोज रहे हैं। मैं आप से यह आर्ज करना चाहता हू कि हम लोग जो कि इस प्लान को जल्दी से जल्दी कार्यान्वित करना चाहते हैं उनको यह सोचना चाहिये कि आखिर काम केवल बात बरने से ही पूरा हो जाता है या काम करने से पूरा होता है। दुनिया में जो लोग काम करने वाले होते हैं उनका यह सिद्धान्त होता है कि वर्क मोर एण्ड टॉक लेस (work more and talk less) लेकिन हमारे देश का यह दुर्भाग्य है कि हमारे यहां यह है कि "टॉक मोर एण्ड वर्क लेस" (talk more and work less).

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa): The Prime Minister does this.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ:

श्री आर० यू अग्नि भोज : प्राइम मिनिस्टर (Prime Minister) के प्रति अपने ये शब्द कहे उसके लिये मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि जितना वह बोलते हैं उससे सौ गुना

ज्यादा काम करते हैं। अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर की कार्य शक्ति को आप देखें तो मैं कहूंगा कि संसार का कोई ह्यूमन बींग (human being) नहीं है जो कि आज हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर से अधिक काम करने में लगा हुआ हो इसलिये मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को जो काम करना पड़ता है, जितनी उनकी जिम्मेदारियां हैं और उनके पास आज दुनिया के और देश के जितने सवाल हैं उन सब कामों को करने हुये भी, उन सब जिम्मेदारियों को उठाने हुये भी उन्होंने प्लानिंग कमीशन की मददगी की थी और उनकी सहायता में यह काम हो रहा है। जो काम उनके प्रधान मंत्रित्व में हो रहा है उसमें नुक्ताचीनी करने वाले हमारे जैसे कुछ सदस्यों का एक कमीशन बैठाने में, कोई सुधार नहीं होने वाला है। ऐसी बात नहीं है कि ऐसा कमीशन बैठाने में उसमें हम कोई सुधार कर सकते हैं। इसलिये मेरी आपसे यह विनय है कि आप और हम इस कार्य की नुक्ताचीनी न करें बल्कि यह देखें कि जो काम है वह ठीक तरह से कैसे हो।

यह बहुत बड़ा देश है। मैंने माना कि संसार के बड़े बड़े देशों ने बहुत उन्नति की है परन्तु हमारा यह देश शताब्दियों से विशिष्ट रहा है, गरीबी में पीड़ित रहा है, तरह तरह की आपदाओं का शिकार रहा है, इसलिये अगर आप यह चाहें कि पांच साल के अन्दर सब चीज में उलट फेर हो जाय—छप्पर में इसको पुराना महल पांच साल में बनाना चाहें—तो ऐसा संभव नहीं है, इसके लिये समय लगेगा। रोम वाज नॉट बिल्ट इन ए डे (Rome was not built in a day)। इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि इनने बड़े विशाल देश, जिनकी कि मनुष्य संख्या सारे संसार की मनुष्य संख्याका पांचवा हिस्सा है और जो कि हजारों वर्षों से गुलाम रहा, को बनाने के लिये पांच साल का समय कोई बहुत बड़ा समय नहीं

है। और उस पांच साल में अभी तो ढाई साल का समय ही बीता है। फिर हमारे प्लानिंग कमीशन और प्लान की भी एक सीमा है। यह प्लान यह कहाँ कहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की वर्तमान, भूत और भविष्य की जितनी भी कठिनाइयाँ हैं वह सब की सब हम आने वाले ढाई साल में पूरी की पूरी दूर कर लेंगे ? उसके लिये तो हम आगे प्लान बनायेंगे और बनाते जायेंगे। हाँ, अगर आगे बनने वाले प्लान के लिये आप यह कहें कि जब अगला प्लान बने तो उसमें पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को शामिल किया जाय तब तो मैं उस का कुछ मतलब समझ सकता हूँ परन्तु इस प्लान के लिये ऐसा कहना ठीक नहीं है। फिर पार्लियामेंट की बैठक कम से कम साल में ६ महीने होती है, इस सदन की बैठक कम से कम ६ महीने और हाउस आफ दी पीपुल (House of the People) की बैठक करीब ९ महीने होती है और इस में हमारे पार्लियामेंट के सदस्य रोज़ भाषण देते हैं। तो फिर इस के बाद कमीशन बैठाने की क्या जरूरत है, साहब ? जितनी भी प्लानिंग के एक्जीक्यूशन में खराबियाँ हैं उन को आप बतायें, रोज़ लिखिये, रोज़ बोलिये, कौन मना करता है ? लेकिन उस के लिये अलग से कमीशन बैठाना, उस के कार्य की गति को मन्दा करना होगा।

प्लानिंग में अगर कोई खामी है तो उस का दोष हमारे और आप के ऊपर है। एक तरफ तो कहते हैं कि देश में बहुत अनइम्प्लायमेंट फैला हुआ है, काउज इंडस्ट्रीज (cottage industries) बैठी जा रही हैं और दूसरी तरफ कहते हैं कि जो देश में कमी है वह सब जल्दी ही पूरी हो जानी चाहिये। मशीन के काम करने से और हाथ के काम करने से बहुत फर्क पैदा होता है। आप देश के हर एक नंगे और भूखे को जल्दी से जल्दी पूरा का पूरा कपड़ा देना चाहते हैं, अधिक से

अधिक अन्न देना चाहते हैं, तो इसके लिये आप को पुतलीघर भी चलाना होगा, बड़े बड़े ट्रैक्टर (tractors) भी खरीदने होंगे बड़े बड़े कारखाने भी खोलने होंगे, उनके लिये इमारतें बनानी होंगी, मशीनें लगानी होंगी, और विदेशों से मशीनें मंगानी होंगी। इस में काफी समय लगना स्वाभाविक है, फिर इस के साथ ही साथ देहात के उद्योगों की भी मदद करना चाहते हैं। एक जुलाहे में इतनी शक्ति तो है नहीं कि वह हजारों आदमियों का तन ढक सके। वह शक्ति आप पुतलीघर से ही पा सकते हैं। तो फिर यह स्वाभाविक है कि आप पुतलीघरों की ओर ध्यान देते हैं और इंडस्ट्रलाइजेशन (industrialisation) के लिये प्रयत्न करते हैं। ऐसी हालत में यह कोई आश्चर्य की बात नहीं है कि हमारा ध्यान काउज इंडस्ट्रीज की तरफ से, विलेज इंडस्ट्रीज (village industries) की तरफ से थोड़ा बहक जाय और इधर उधर चला जाय। तो फिर जो राष्ट्र के बनाने वाले लोग हैं उन को यह कहना है कि हम १० साल तक नंगे भूखे रहेंगे, परन्तु ग्रामोद्योग की मदद करेंगे। फिर उन को यह भी चाहिये कि अगर १० साल तक कपड़े की देश में कमी हो तो उस की शिकायत देश से और सरकार से न करें। तभी हम कह सकते हैं कि पुतलीघर न हों, देश में इंडस्ट्रलाइजेशन न हो। और यदि उन को आज ही सब कपड़ा चाहिये, आज ही सब अन्न चाहिये, आज ही अधिक से अधिक कपड़ा और अधिक से अधिक अन्न और दूसरी चीजें चाहियें तो फिर मशीनों को तो मंगाना ही पड़ेगा, चाहे वे रूस से आय या अमेरिका से आयें, कहीं न कहीं से उन्हें लाना ही होगा और उस के लिये शिकायत नहीं होनी चाहिये।

मेरे एक मित्र ने अमेरिका और पाकिस्तान के पैक्ट (pact) के सम्बन्ध में

[Shri R. U. Agnibhoj.]

बहुत कुछ कहा। हम यह मानते हैं कि संसार में किसी भी राष्ट्र को अपने अस्त्र-शस्त्र और धन को लड़ाई का साधन नहीं बनाना चाहिये। अमेरिका की इस नीति से आज हम सहमत नहीं हैं कि एक ओर तो वह यह चाहे कि हम संसार की सब तरह की मदद करें और दूसरी ओर यह भी चाहे कि संसार में लड़ाई हो जिस से कि हमारा रोजगार बढ़े और हमारा व्यापार चले। ये दोनों चीजें एक साथ नहीं चल सकती। परन्तु इस चीज से तो हम सहमत होंगे ही कि देश की वृद्धि के लिये, कल-कारखानों की वृद्धि के लिये, नहरों की वृद्धि के लिये, खेती की वृद्धि के लिये, यदि वह हम को ईमानदारी से मदद देता है तो हमें उसे लेना चाहिये और उस में कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये। यह नीति न हो कि चूंकि मैं साहूकर हूं इसलिये जो कर्जदार है उस को खा जाऊँ और उस का खन चूस लूँ परन्तु यदि मानवता की दृष्टि से, संसार में सत्रमुच शांति स्थापित करने के लिये वह हम को मदद देना है तो हमें बड़ी खशी से, बड़ आनन्द और हर्ष से उस को ग्रहण करना चाहिये। परन्तु यदि वह एक बहुत ही दुष्ट साहूकार के माफिक कर्जदार का गला दबाने के लिये कर्ज देता है तो उसे केन्द्रीय सरकार को कदापि स्वीकार नहीं करना चाहिये क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान कभी गुलाम हुआ है तो रोजगारियों के द्वारा ही। रोजगारों के नाम पर विदेशों से लोग यहाँ पर आए, यहाँ रोजगार जमा कर उन्होंने धीरे धीरे अपना शासन स्थापित किया। अमेरिका हमारे देश पर ऐसी कोई नजर न रखे इसलिये हमें खूब सावधान रहना चाहिये।

हम ने अहिंसा से, सत्य और मानवता की लड़ाई से संसार की उस समय की मानी जाने वाली विशाल शक्ति का लोहा लिया। संसार में उस महायुद्ध में जिस शक्ति के

सामने हिटलर तबाह हो गया, मसोलिनी गायब हो गया, जापान ने जहाँ संसार में सब से पहले सूर्य उदय होता था भी घुटने टेक दिये, उस शक्ति को हिन्दुस्तान की सत्य और अहिंसा की लड़ाई ने हरा कर अपने को मक्त कराया। इसलिए अमेरिका को यह चीज ध्यान में रखनी चाहिए कि संसार में अस्त्र-शस्त्र और धन-द्रव्य ही बड़ी भारी चीज नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान की आवाज, हिन्दुस्तान की अन्तरात्मा, हिन्दुस्तान की स्पिरिट (spirit) वह शक्ति है कि जब तक संसार कायम रहेगा तब तक वह पथ-प्रदर्शन करेगी। मैं इन सब बातों को कहते हुए आप से पुनः प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि अपने देश में जो हमारी प्लानिंग की स्कीम चल रही है उन की नुक्ताचीनी हमें कम करनी चाहिये। “ए बैड वर्कमैन क्वारल्ल्स विद हिज टूल्स” (a bad workman quarrels with his tools). हमें “प्लान बुरा है” यह कह कर प्लान की अवहेलना कर के उस को कमजोर नहीं बनाना चाहिये। जिस स्थिति में वह चल रहा है उस में कमियाँ और खामियाँ हो सकती हैं, उस के काम करने के तरीके में कुछ बुराईयाँ हो सकती हैं। उन बुराईयों को निकालने के लिये हम केन्द्रीय सरकार से, उस के मंत्रियों से, अफसरों से और अपने देश के लोगों से कहें कि वे अधिक उत्साह से और अधिक प्रयत्नशील हो कर इस योजना को फलीभूत बनावें। इतना कहते हुए मैं प्रस्ताव और उस पर दिये गये सशोधन का विरोध करता हूँ।

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 76.]

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to lend support to the Resolution under discussion. This Resolution has raised a fundamental question whether the First Five Year Plan has progressed according to our expectations and stipulations or not. My reply to it is an emphatic, 'no.' I

do not say so, in the spirit of carping criticism, nor do I speak just to make a broadside against the Government. Let us approach this subject empirically. Let me also say at the outset that my sympathies were with the Plan and are still with the Plan. My sympathies were with the Plan when I considered the background in which this Five Year Plan was evolved. Let us go back to the days of 1951. Deteriorating food shortage, inflationary pressures, rising spiral of the cost of living index, fall in industrial production, expanding imports and decreasing exports—that was the background in which the Five Year Plan was conceived. Therefore, my sympathies were with the planners, but in order that the Plan should have been successful, it was fit and proper that the Government should have shed their conventional ideas and their bureaucratic approach, and should have taken it up in a spirit of crusade. I do not wish to refer to the chapter on Public Administration in the Five Year plan and to the recommendations of the Gorwala Committee on Public Administration or what happened thereafter. But today the Plan has failed because the administrative set up was not adequate. I will leave it at that.

Now, let me go to the various aspects of the Plan. It has been stated by my hon. friends, Mr. Rama Rao and Mr. Agnibhoj, with a good deal of gusto that this Plan has progressed—progressed like the car of Jagannath. They are professional optimists. I do not dispute their findings. But the standard by which we should judge the progress of the Plan is to see the expenditure that has been incurred so far. If we judge the Plan according to that criterion, what do we find? The total budget of the Five Year Plan was of the order of Rs. 2,069 crores which was further augmented by Rs. 175 crores, but at the end of the third year of the Plan, we have spent less than Rs. 1,000 crores. May I ask how my hon. friend is going to spend nearly Rs. 1,500 crores more in the remaining

two years, unless he is going to throw it away? Let us go to the private sector. In the private sector for 42 industries plans were made, and the total investment was stipulated at Rs. 233 crores. May I ask the hon. the Planning Minister, how much has been invested so far in the private sector? The House may see that after the end of the third year, the private sector has invested only Rs. 53 crores. How does the hon. Minister propose to make the private sector invest all the rest? Should I remind him, once again, that the private sector does not mean business? Indian capitalists are not worth their name. They are speculators, they are *baniyas*; they do not mean business.

That explains why you are getting this increasing unemployment. Here also my sympathies are with the Government. This House must be knowing that even in a highly developed country like the United States, where capitalism has reached its zenith, three million unemployed people are running about for employment. One need not go to the Press to gather this information. It is there, very much there, if only you read the novels of the leftist American novelists. If a capitalist country like America is not able to solve the problem of unemployment, we should not expect that this Five Year Plan will do it in India. But, having said that much, one should have legitimately expected that this Five Year Plan, after three years of its operation, should have opened up new opportunities for employment. May I ask the hon. Minister for Planning what new opportunities for employment have been opened up by this Five Year Plan?

SHRI GULSHER AHMED (Vindhya Pradesh): Go and see the different projects.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I have seen much more than you have seen. You have seen them at Government expense, but I have seen them at my own cost. That makes the difference

[Shri S. Mahanty.]

Before I was unnecessarily interrupted by my hon. friend over there, I was asking whether this Plan had opened up any new employment opportunities. It has not. When I say so, I say after having satisfied myself as to my contention. My friend, the hon. the Deputy Minister for Planning, knows that every earth-moving machinery working at the Hirakud Project has robbed about 500 people, able-bodied men, of their work. The machinery that you have purchased from America through a loan from the World Bank at 3.4 per cent. interest, may have solved unemployment problem in America, but it certainly has not solved the unemployment problem here in India. May I ask what has happened to the Committee that was about to investigate into the question, as to what extent we should employ machinery in the river valley projects? I do not know when their report is going to be received. This is not a very businesslike attitude at all.

Now a lot of noise has been made that the Opposition was speaking about it as professional pessimists. Let us come to facts. Let us come to the industrial production. The index of industrial production in 1950 was 117 and after having spent a thousand crores in the name of the Five Year Plan, in 1953, it has only advanced 17 points. Today the industrial production is 134. May I ask whether this is commensurate with the amount spent? The reply is again an emphatic 'no'. Coming to living index, I have not the figure of living index available with me at the moment but I can say without the least apprehension of being contradicted that the living index has not dropped to an appreciable extent than what it was in 1952-1953.

My friends will say that we have made progress in food production. That is the only claim which the representatives of Government can make. They have made some progress in the production of food. As it was said during the course of the debate on the President's Address, 4.4 mil-

lion tons of food was produced more than what it was in 1951/52, but I should also warn this House and point out that this increase in food production has not been due to the investments which they have made in the sector of Grow More Food. Here is the report which says that this production of more food has been due more to good weather conditions than to investments which Government have made. They can say that there has been more production in the textile industry, but what about the sugar industry? Even though we know, three new units have gone into operation after 1951, India is still importing sugar. Therefore, if we take the cumulative picture, we come to the conclusion—and that is the inescapable conclusion—that the Plan has not proceeded according to our anticipations and expectations.

Then I would invite the attention of the hon. Minister and of this House to another aspect, viz., the voluntary co-operation of the people with the Plan. No plan is ever going to succeed if the voluntary co-operation of the people is not roused and yoked to this great effort. Towards that end the Bharat Sewak Samaj was conceived. When the original idea of the Samaj was mooted, it was suggested that it would be above party politics, that it would have nothing to do with party affairs, that it would be above all parties and so on. It was a very welcome attitude. But what has happened? I can say without the least chance of being contradicted that it has been formed by party considerations and party considerations alone. Otherwise why, in a State like Orissa, has the Bharat Sewak Samaj not yet started its activities? The reasons are these. There is no one in the Congress in Orissa who can work as a promoter or convener of this Bharat Sewak Samaj but people there are hungry for development. People are willing to contribute even 50 to 60 per cent. towards the cost of all these works, but since there is no Congressman to take up this work, the Bharat Sewak Samaj has not been started.

Then I ask you: Why not reduce this Plan? There are items, we find, like Youth Camp, one crore. May I ask the hon. Minister whether he is in a position to give us a report on its activities? How is this being spent and what tangible result has it attained?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Not yet started.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Then Publicity, 1.5 crores.* May I tell this House that items like this are meant simply to butter the breads of their own party men, for their own ends, which is not going to advance the country nor is it going to make any helpful contribution towards the implementation of the Five Year Plan? We then see what they call Social Welfare Organizations for which we have sanctioned Rs. 4 crores. In India, a land of urchins, where in every village you will find naked, hungry millions, children without education, without medicine and without food, etc., how dare you suggest that by spending Rs. 4 crores within a period of 5 years you are going to ameliorate the condition of children and women? Unless you change the basic concept of society, unless the very foundation is changed, you cannot simply fulfil all these laudable objectives. (*Time bell rings.*) Of course, we will have more opportunity to discuss all these things in the course of the debate on the Budget, with more facts and figures, but from an unbiased appreciation of the working of the Plan, not only myself, not only the Members of the Opposition, but the country outside, has come to the conclusion that the Five Year Plan has not proceeded according to the anticipations. Therefore, it makes all the more incumbent on the Government that the Resolution of my hon. friend Mr. Mathur should be accepted in all good grace so that the representatives of the people as well as eminent public men may shoulder the responsibility and co-operate with Government in fulfilling the targets of the Five Year Plan.

MAJ.-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY (Nominatd): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have a lot to say about the technical aspects of the Five Year Plan, but I would not indulge in that as there is not sufficient time. I will limit myself to making a few observations on the factors which are preventing the Government from executing the Plan properly. In that connection I would first refer to the system of administration under which we are functioning. Our Government took over the administrative machinery devised by the British. They had some specific objects of their own and for that it was a suitable form of administration. The British never intended to develop the country through Five Year Plans of development or increasing the productive resources of the country and agriculture. I would ask the Government to look into this matter whether the administration under which they are functioning is suitable for the purpose. Next is the problem of public support. We have heard a good deal about it and it is perfectly true that if we are going to succeed in running our development programmes, there must be a great deal of co-operation on the part of the public. The administrative machinery under which we function, was built on the principle of keeping as great a distance between the people and the administration as possible. We are still working on the same pattern. If we do want the co-operation of the people, as we must, I think, we will have to create a different form of administration that brings the administration and the people closer together. My friend, the mover of the Resolution, gave a good example of how things work at present. He submitted a memorandum to the Government. The Government is probably very willing to attend to it, yet the memorandum has taken a whole year to go round the routine circle, before any action could be taken. Under those conditions, it will be agreed that no worth while development can be carried out.

Similarly, we have taken over a Constitution which was devised by the British. I think when the British

[Shri S. Mahanty.]

gave Provincial Autonomy to the Provinces, they were not thinking of development programmes. If we do want to carry through the Five Year Plan of development, it is a matter of extreme importance that the Central Government should have the power both to devise the Plan and to execute it, and if we do want to succeed in our effort, I think a great deal of the Provincial Autonomy will have to be taken away. It is not necessary that they should have the present autonomy. The States need a good deal of autonomy for cultural and educational purposes. But an autonomy that makes them almost independent States competing for resources, it cannot but hinder development. I ask the Government of India to look into this matter. It is a matter of extreme importance. Present is the appropriate time to attend to this problem because

4 P.M. there is a demand for re-division of the country on a linguistic basis. This demand is going to be conceded, I am sure about that. There is a Commission at present going into this matter. While this is being done—when new States are being designed—I hope the Government of India will bear in mind, when changing the Constitution, to reduce or minimise the autonomy of the States as much as is necessary to the development plans functioning properly.

The third factor that is interfering with the proper functioning of the Plan is, obviously, our foreign trade. Our foreign trade was given a shape by the British. We produce raw materials for the running of the industries of the United Kingdom and America. Fifty two per cent. of our total exports still go to those countries. And they give us in return not capital goods needed for our development but consumer goods. If we are going to work our Five Year Plan, it is a matter of extreme importance that we should think it over again, think afresh, how to run our foreign trade to get capital goods for implementing

the Five Year Plan of industrialisation. We cannot go on as we are doing. At present our commodities go to these two countries. We sell them our raw materials, and we get in return what they can give. For a number of years, now it is perfectly obvious that these countries, for one reason or the other, have been saying that they are busy making armaments for a free world and they cannot spare heavy capital goods for our development purposes. Similarly, the so-called sterling balance has been a curse. It has kept us tied to the economy of the United Kingdom. In the hope of getting something from that country, we have geared our production to their needs. The result is that although the sterling balances are there, we are not getting the particular type of assistance that is needed for developing our country to increase its productive resources.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I did not want to intervene in this debate, but the speech of my hon friend Shri Rama Rao has provoked me to answer some of his charges. We are not ashamed to say that we get inspiration from Soviet Russia and China and other democratic countries, but it is really slandering us, when anybody says that we get chits for it. Everybody in this country, including the Ministers have prided themselves on the fact that they want to derive benefit from the experience of humanity, wherever it may come from—from any part of the world. So are we. Let me tell this House that we are not anti-American. We also have great respect for the American people and for their great achievements. But it is one thing to admire the American people and their achievements and another thing to see the way in which those achievements are being mis-utilised by a few handful of monopolists in America, even at the cost of the American people themselves, for dominating the whole world. It is from that angle that we criticise the American imperialists. We still continue to admire the

American people, in spite of the slanders from certain quarters that we are influenced by the Soviet model.

The second point that I want to deal with is about the foreign experts and that also was a point raised by Mr. Rama Rao. He said that we were in season and out of season, condemning these foreign experts. That again is a slander and an utter misunderstanding, to say nothing more. We are not against foreign experts coming here and giving us help and advice, whether they be from America or Britain or from any other country. Let them **come and help us to build up our projects** and our independent industrial development. But what we object to is that these American experts are not coming here to help us. Under cover of coming here to help us they do something else. If they really want to give us help, why do they require special diplomatic immunity? Why **can't they come as ordinary technicians** and abide by the rules and laws of our country so that if they misbehave they may be dealt with under those laws? Why do they want this special immunity? That is exactly why we strongly object to their coming. They come in as so-called American experts, they give this so-called aid, but in reality they are trying to dominate the whole country and they are trying to spy on our resources and pry into all our secrets. It is against this sort of thing that we want the Government to take precautions. Government has been refusing to listen to us. They may refuse to listen, but the people will have to be aware of these American machinations, especially in view of yesterday's declaration of the President of the American Government that they propose to give military aid to Pakistan. And of course, they have offered a bait by saying to India that if India also wants American aid they would be prepared to give it readily. This has justified our Prime Minister's stand that we are not against aid, that we do not object to American aid to Pakistan because it is going to threaten our country, but because we do not

want foreign imperialists to come back to Asia. We want them to quit the whole of Asia, not only Asia but Africa also. Of course, we have got our own differences with the Nehru Government. We have our own suggestions to drive away the foreign imperialists from our country. But that is a different matter altogether.

After removing these misconceptions created by some of the statements made again and again against our Party, I would like to deal with the Five Year Plan itself. We support the Resolution of the hon. Member Shri Mathur, that a Commission comprising of Members of Parliament and prominent non-Members be set up to review the working of the Plan, to suggest ways and means for making it more effective and popular, and to enlist the co-operation of the people.

It is very unfortunate that a Member from the other side remarked that the suggestion of including Members of Parliament had come because some of the Members were unemployed.

PROF. G. RANGA: Who said that?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Some hon. Member on the other side said that the appointment of a Commission was intended to get employment. From the very beginning of Parliament we, on our side, have been saying that it is better to fix salaries for Members. We suggested a salary of Rs. 300 per month and a daily allowance of Rs. 10 so that there would not be any wastage of money by way of Rs. 40 per day and so many other allowances. This moderate wage scale would be in accordance with the standard of our people. It would give a decent standard for Parliament Members and they could devote their whole time to their work. When we put forward the demand for appointment of a Commission, it was not intended to get us more appointments and more money. If any such impression is in the minds of Members on the Government Benches, let them accept our standing

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

suggestion for the fixation of a monthly salary of Rs. 300 and we would be prepared to work in all the Committees for the betterment of the lot of our people.

For this Plan, the question of getting the co-operation of the people is the most important one which the Government also realises. I do not know how the Government is going to get the co-operation of the people as long as it refuses to come out with radical agrarian reforms. It is very strange that while the Planning Commission has suggested and the Government of India stands by it, that the family holding is that which one man can till with one plough and a pair of bullocks and that the maximum that any person can hold is three times to that, the Planning Commission and the Government of India have allowed the Hyderabad Government to fix up a ceiling which works out to 40 or 50 acres of wet land or about 200 acres of ordinary dry land. This was protested against by some of the old Congress-men like Swami Ramanand Tirth. There is another factor worse than this. The Union Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Deshmukh, goes on writing articles and expressing views that any radical reduction in this limit would be opposed because it is not in the interests of the agriculturists. If these are the contradictory policies, naturally there is very little hope of getting the co-operation of the vast majority of the people.

I will come now to the other aspects. Mr. Ranga has made suggestions about the Nandikonda and other projects which have been there on the anvil for a long time. Government has been refusing to sanction such schemes. Mr. Mathur has also indicated the long delay which occurs in carrying out of even minor schemes. In this connection, I would mention the best way to get the co-operation of the people so that they can dig their own wells, build their own roads and conduct their own schools and

hospitals. After all the object of the Community Projects, the National Extension Scheme, etc., is this; it has also been mentioned that the second Five Year Plan should be basically started from the villagers—not by appointing more administrative authorities at the top but by devolving responsibility, both for finance and planning, on local boards. Now, the Government says that 50 per cent. of the money set apart for the Community Projects is being spent on the administrative machinery; this money is not really going to the building up of the country. Since Government goes on multiplying the administrative machinery whatever money is likely to be made available would be completely wasted. The only way is to ask the *Panchayats* and District Boards to plan on the basis of their needs. If there is corruption in the *Panchayats* and District Boards, the way to solve that is not to abolish them as the Andhra Government proposes to do—which was saved only by the casting vote of the Speaker on a most unpopular measure—but to give more powers to them and ask the villagers themselves to check up their own representatives and also to give them the right to recall if anybody is bought over or if any one refuses to carry out the demands of the people. It is only when the village *Panchayats* or the District Boards deal with these small things of running their own schools, their own hospitals, their own drinking water facilities that real co-operation would come. Why should the Government be afraid of giving ample powers to these bodies and also ample funds? Today most of the village *Panchayats* and District Boards do not have enough funds and, therefore, they have become useless.

It is no doubt true that the industrialisation of the country has to be carried on. Some projects are there but they are not enough. There should be many more bolder plans for industrialisation. What do we see now? We are seeing unemployment increasing both in the urban as well as in the rural sectors. Of course, we know

that the industrial unemployment problem catches the eye; similarly, the educated unemployed catch the eye because they are vocal. I know that these problems are to be solved but if you think that you are going to solve them without solving the problem of the rural unemployed, you are entirely mistaken. The rural people are not going to leave you in peace until their demands are fulfilled; they are going to march to the cities either as destitutes seeking employment or as disgruntled people roused to their justified demands. The way to solve the unemployment problem is not by curtailing civil liberties and hanging people as was recently done in Bihar. The Bihar Government hanged three miners in spite of the repeated demands from all corners of the country and also from different parts of the world asking for mercy to be shown to these three miners. If you resort to suppressing the people in the name of keeping law and order, if you keep them starved and go on hanging their leaders, you will not get the co-operation of the people for the Five Year Plan. This is the way to set the whole country ablaze in spite of the dangers that are threatening us from the American Imperialists. How do you expect the co-operation of the people when you do not come out with plans assuring the people that their education, their health, their drinking water facilities, their land, etc., will be protected? The teachers' problem has been prominently brought to the fore but the Government comes out with a meagre plan of employing in the course of three years, 80,000 teachers. Education is so big a problem.

(Time bell rings.)

I will finish in a minute, Sir.

Taking our large population of 36 crores, and assuming that one teacher would be required for 25 students, we would be requiring—I have made a rough calculation—about 30 lakhs of teachers for our children from the age of five to fourteen.

PROF. G. RANGA: At least one million.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: The thing to be done is to employ 30 lakhs of teachers; if it is not possible within one year, it may be done in two or three years. If we do that, we can carry out the Directive in the Constitution of affording free compulsory education to the children between the ages of five and fourteen by the year 1960.

Similarly, in the case of health personnel, we would be requiring 4 lakhs of doctors, 7½ lakhs of midwives and another 7½ lakhs of nurses and about 5 lakhs of compounders. The total comes to about 25 lakhs of health personnel to serve the minimum needs of our people. We know how meagre the available number is and we also know the responsibility. What is to be done? The Government does not think of employing our educated men and women in this direction. If the Government puts the blue-print of such a plan, to be achieved not later on but within the next five years, before the people, then only it is possible to get the co-operation of the people, and the Plan though with a modest beginning could be implemented very soon. In this connection also the question of high salary comes in. We want the salaries of the Government officials and the Ministers, etc. to be cut down, though that in itself is not going to give you very big amounts. It may save a few crores of rupees. The point is not whether it saves a few crores of rupees, but the question is the tremendous difference between the low-paid and the high-paid. It is this that corrodes the morale of the people, which is not very helpful to carry out the Plan.

In this connection also there has been so much talk about reorganisation of the administrative personnel and the services, and the rooting out of corruption and other things. I would like to tell the Government that they cannot do away with cor-

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

ruption as long as they do not evolve a method to check the profits of the monopolists who go on earning lakhs and lakhs of rupees every year and who are ever ready to bribe not only the few officers connected with their business but the whole Government itself. They are corrupting the whole administration and unless the Government is prepared to attack corruption at its very root, nothing good will happen to this country.

These are some of the issues and this Commission, which according to the Resolution is to consist of Members of Parliament and prominent non-Members from outside, can certainly take them up, and suggest ways and means to the extent that the Government is prepared to accept them, so that some enthusiasm can be infused into the people and some immediate things could be carried out.

With these words, Sir, I resume my seat.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, before I go to the Resolution proper I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Mr. Sundarayya to an inconsistency in his speech. He said that he was not an anti-American but all along he was expressing himself against America.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: That is against American imperialists—not against the American people.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: In answer to Mr. Rama Rao's point that his party members are getting chits from Russia or elsewhere the hon. Mr. Sundarayya said, "The Congress leaders have been going on saying that good things, wherever they come from, must be taken. There was nothing wrong in it." At the same time Mr. Sundarayya had an objection to this Government inviting foreign experts. I want to know.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I have no objection to inviting them.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: But you said so.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: What I said was this: "You are giving these experts diplomatic immunity because you have taken their money under their Technical Co-operation programme with certain conditions attached to it, namely, that the money has to be spent in consultation with these people and as such conditions restrict our freedom, the kind of diplomatic immunity that you are giving to these people which our own specialists do not enjoy, should not be given to the American technicians or to any other foreign technicians."

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I do not know how this can be made a point at all against the Government. It is well known that we have accepted foreign assistance without any strings and the experts are coming here not for political purposes but on their technical missions, and unless we find the experts or any one of them doing the work which Mr. Sundarayya seems to impute to them, namely, spying, it is unfair on our part to attribute such things to any foreigner. In fact there are Americans here, Englishmen here and there are people of all nationalities of the world here. They are here at our invitation and to assist us. To impute motives that because they are foreigners, they are going to spy upon us is a thing which is unwarranted by facts. Therefore, I do not like hon. Members on the other side to make such imputations. Of course, it is a different thing when we have a case. It is a different thing when something is found out against them, but it is wrong to accuse other nationalities ...

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: What about Kashmir?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Kashmir is not the thing we are discussing now. You do not know for a fact what is happening in Kashmir nor I. Unless facts come before our notice, that Members of Parliament should make

imputations is a thing which, in my humble opinion, should be avoided. Anyway, that was beside the Resolution.

The Resolution concerns two points. One is to review the working of the Five Year Plan. The appointment of a Commission is suggested to review not the Plan, but the working of the Five Year Plan. Secondly, it is to suggest ways and means to make the Plan more effective and popular. These are the two things which this Resolution seeks to achieve, but in support of this Resolution the arguments that have been advanced have missed these two points. I will briefly summarize the arguments.

One hon. Member says, "The Five Year Plan omits to do that and to do this. There is the unemployment problem in the country. Nothing has been done for it. There is poverty in the country. Nothing has been done for it." The hon. Mr. Mathur moving the Resolution said, "So much has to be done in Rajasthan, that there must be agricultural co-operative marketing arrangements....."

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I never said for Rajasthan for one minute.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: You said at least that agricultural marketing arrangements and so on should be done.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I said, "I am most grateful to the Commission for what they are doing."

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I am instancing these points to show that, instead of showing how the Plan has not been working properly or what has been wrong with the machinery, the Members who have supported this Resolution have gone on pointing out the omissions of the Five Year Plan or the things that the Five Year Plan ought to do, things which ought to have been included or the things which ought to have been done. Nobody disputes these points. Poverty, from this country, must go. Unem-

ployment must go. Agriculture must improve. Ways and means must be found to industrialise the country on more rational plans, and as the hon. Mr. Sundarayya said, there must be a review of our economic structure and so on and so forth. Nobody disputes these points. These things are to be done. Just as Mr. Ranga was saying, there are so many other projects which are to be taken, for example, the Nandikonda Project. If I am to plead for my State there are so many projects which, as you know, can be suggested. The Planning Commission does not say, "We have done all that." The very fact that the Five Year Plan is evolved, is to do these things and to make an attempt towards that end in however small a measure, consistent with the resources of the country and consistent with the circumstances that are prevailing in the country. Well, it is a different question to argue that the Five Year Plan must be changed into a different thing. For instance, to say.....

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I never said a word about it.

PROF. G. RANGA: He is only assuming a point.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I am not saying that Mr. Mathur said it. It is one thing to say that the Five Year Plan is not the proper plan under the circumstances and there must be a different plan, but this Resolution does not seek to do that. It is quite another thing to say that the working of the Five Year Plan, that the execution of the Five Year Plan, is not according to the aspirations of our people. That is what the Resolution wants us to say. Well, in order to show that the working of the Five Year Plan is not according to the plan or is not successful, I do not find any argument advanced in support of it. I do not also find any alternative remedy suggested.

Let us see what a Commission of Parliament Members and non-Members can do in this. Well, the Five Year Plan visualized a machinery.

[Shri Govinda Reddy.]

Now they have got for the different projects different bodies. For the D. V. C. series of projects, there is the D. V. C. Board. For the other projects they have different Boards and then for the other things that the Five Year Plan visualizes we have got the National Development Council. We have got the Regional Development Councils. We have got the Administrator of Community projects and so on and so forth. Right from the top, from those who have visualised this scheme, up to the lowest man there is a regular scheme. It is going in a clock-work arrangement. It is working. Well, to suggest that this is not proper or to suggest that some Members can sit and revise this, in my opinion, is not the right thing to suggest. What can we, Members of Parliament, do? Can we transplant this system and place another system?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: We can suggest.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: No suggestion has been made as to in what respect this system or this arrangement is not functioning. No suggestion has been made that instead of this machinery, there should be another machinery. All that has been said is that that thing is not done; this thing is not done. We agree there are so many things to be done. Well, according to my estimation, although the machinery that has been evolved is not an expert machinery, although it is not functioning to the maximum extent, still it is a good executive machinery that we can visualize under the circumstances. Considering the basic structure of the Plan and considering the fact that we have to enthuse, as hon. Members have pointed out, the masses into the Plan—taking the illiterate, the literate and the Government servants as a whole—and evolve an organised structure to work out the Plan, the arrangement that the Planning Commission has brought about is the best under the circumstances. I would still like to wait for somebody to show how this is

wrong and how this is not working properly.

Then, what are the ways and means that we can suggest for making the Plan more effective? Well, nothing prevents Members of Parliament or members of the public from offering the Planning Commission suggestions in this regard. In fact, the Planning Commission has invited everybody to suggest to them better ways of working the Plan. Everybody's co-operation is invited. If we have got better ways and means to suggest, can we not suggest them to the Planning Commission? Can we not do so? Why should there be a Commission for that? All right, there will be a Commission. Will the Commission be successful in evolving a different kind of machinery? I can very well visualize the Commission itself being divided on its alternative arrangements. This is a thing which is very complex in nature. If it is the construction of a project or if it is the installation of an industry, then of course we can say, 'let a committee look into it'. These are specific problems that could be tackled; a site has to be selected; we have to find out where the raw materials are available; we have to judge whether that is the best site or not. For such things, we can appoint a Commission. But, this is concerned with the whole national development. There is not one problem in this. There are numerous problems. We have got the problem of building up our agriculture, of building up our industry, of changing our social structure by organising a rational educational system. So much of social welfare work has to be done; so much of health work has to be done. In a matter of such complex nature, would it be advisable for a Commission to go into this work? Supposing we had a Commission to go into this, what will be the work that it will be able to turn out? I can understand any definite problem being taken up—health, agriculture or industry. If we think that the Planning Commission has not got a right plan for any of that, if we think that there is an alternative plan

on our side, then we can appoint some Members as a committee and ask them to go and discuss it with the Planning Commission and convince them that the alternative arrangement is the best. As we all know, the Planning Commission is an expert body. They have laboured hard. I do not say that the Plan that they have evolved is perfect. In fact, there are changes that can be done. If it were in the hands of others, perhaps they would have made it differently. But the Commission in the light of their experience, in the light of the statistics that they have gathered and in the light of the efforts that they have put in all these long years, have evolved a scheme and also a machinery to work it out. When we agree with the scheme, we must give them also the freedom to evolve the machinery. Any suggestions that may be put forward, of course, are welcome. So, I suppose there will be no purpose served in appointing a Commission of Members of Parliament or of the public to go into this, when it is open to us to give whatever suggestions we have to the Planning Commission. Therefore, Sir, I do not feel that I could accept this Resolution or support it.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this Resolution and I would draw the attention of the hon. Members to the fact that this Resolution does not criticise wholesale the Planning Commission's Report. It only says that the Plan is not fully effective and popular, and that a Commission should be appointed to suggest ways and means of making the Plan both effective and popular. It is not a wholesale criticism of the Plan.

Some hon. Members have said in this House that because the hon. the Prime Minister is Chairman of the Planning Commission, we should not open our mouths to criticise it. We are not criticising the hon. the Prime Minister; we are not criticising the Planning Commission. We are only suggesting—and hon. Members on the other side have also realised—that the Plan is not popular and effective.

Somebody has to suggest ways and means of making it more effective and popular. If you just individually send your opinion to the Planning Commission, probably they are getting hundreds and thousands of such suggestions from morning to evening every day, and they cannot attend to them. But if there is a Commission with the sanction of Parliament behind it, naturally that Commission's recommendation will carry weight and conviction. The hon. Member who has just sat down said—and I think his criticism was very right when he said—that it was no use suggesting an alternative plan.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I did not say so. I said, "It is open to us to suggest alternative arrangement."

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: This Resolution is not for suggesting a new plan. This Resolution is only suggesting ways and means of improving the present Plan. He asked, "What are the types of defects in the Plan which can be set right by this Commission?" I will point out only a few of them. In the first place, this Plan has laid the greatest stress on irrigation projects, on river valley projects which are serving three purposes. Now, I submit, Sir, that the first thing is that these projects are too costly. The layman feels that the cost of making these dams is very high. Naturally, our engineers are experts and the mere suggestion of it may be considered to be a reflection on the expert knowledge of our engineers. Far from it, I only suggest that in a poor country like ours, even if we want to make these dams, we have to make them in such a way that we can afford them. Secondly, these dams are made of a type to produce a large quantity of electric power and, therefore, the dam is made very high. And naturally, it becomes very costly. A Commission if it goes into this question is going to suggest some alternative to making a very high dam and impounding a large quantity of water, the Commission may suggest—because

[Shri Kishen Chand.] *

there are going to be some non-Members of Parliament who may be experts in this subject—that the whole scheme of these irrigation projects might be altered without changing the Plan. Instead of one big dam, they can have a number of small dams on the same river. Instead of having a cement concrete dam, they can have a stone masonry dam. I do not want to go into all these details because it is for the experts to find ways and means of doing these things. Similarly, they may, instead of dividing their attention among half a dozen dams, concentrate on one dam at a time. It is already seven or eight years and we are still going on with the work. Probably it will take another five or six years before even one dam is completed. Would it not have been better if they had taken up one dam at a time and completed it within two or three years, and then had taken up the next one and so on? That way, at least one dam could have been completed by this time and more irrigation facilities could have been available. Our main cry is food. We have been particularly lucky in that due to some atmospheric conditions, we have been having a series of good rainfalls, and it is only on account of good rainfalls that our food position has improved. They come in a cycle; it is called the sun spot theory. It is quite possible that after two or three years we may have again a few lean years. What are we going to do then? These irrigation projects, at the rate at which they are being constructed, would irrigate only about 8 per cent. of our total area. If we really want to improve our food position, we have to irrigate all the land. I would therefore suggest that, if this Commission is appointed, it will go into the question that how quickly we can complete these irrigation projects and introduce new minor irrigation projects so that the whole country benefits by it. Our countrymen live in villages, and there are five lakh villages in our country. How do we expect them to be enthusiastic about Hirakud or Damodar Valley? They are hundreds of miles away from these project

areas and they do not know anything about them. They realise that these projects are not going to affect them. How can they be enthusiastic? If we have a small project, whether it is a tank or a small bore well, near about their villages, certainly they will become enthusiastic. I do not say this about all the projects in the Plan. The Community Projects are certainly doing very good work. I will come to them later on; but at the moment I am discussing only the big projects.

The other main item in the Plan is transport. For the last two or three days, we have been discussing the Railway Budget, and I do not want to say anything about it here, but the general opinion has been that our railways are not progressing as rapidly as they should, in spite of the fact that Rs. 450 crores out of the Plan is going to be spent on them. There also the proposed Commission will carefully examine and suggest ways and means of improving the railways.

The third thing is social service, i.e., giving of educational and health facilities. Several Members have pointed out that hardly anything has been done in the Plan for providing education and health facilities, except for the opening of a few schools here and a few hospitals there. The gigantic problem of educating nearly five to six crores of people in this country between the ages of 5 and 14, has not yet been tackled. If that colossal problem is taken up, it will not only find a solution for the unemployment problem among the urban educated classes, but it will make democracy itself really effective. Every year we see in the States' budgets a small additional allocation for the improvement of educational and hospital facilities, and the States' Finance Ministers take credit for the opening of about 25 new schools or two or three new dispensaries in their States. When the problem is so gigantic, the mere opening of a few schools is not going to solve it. Mr. Sundarayya has very rightly pointed out that for educating these $4\frac{1}{2}$ crores or 5 crores of our boys and girls between the ages of

5 and 14, we require 30 lakh teachers. Had we really spent the amount earmarked in the Plan for education and other social services, there would have been a marked improvement in the removal of illiteracy from our country. Out of the Rs 250 crores allotted, had we even spent Rs 150 crores on education over and above the normal expenditure on education, it would have meant the employment of about two or three lakh teachers, and these two or three lakh teachers would have really helped in the spreading of education. Similarly, you will be surprised that there are no health facilities in our villages. For miles and miles, for even hundred of miles you hardly see any dispensary, and yet we say that this Plan has earmarked about Rs 100 crores for health facilities.

I therefore say that this Commission is very important. This Commission is not going to prepare any alternative plan. This Commission is going to make the present Plan more effective and popular and suggest ways of improving it. That Commission is going to suggest ways and means of spending money rapidly on the spreading of education. That Commission is going to suggest ways of opening new dispensaries and hospitals in the rural areas.

As I said the Community Projects are really doing very good work and if we can extend them and expand them, they will bring immense benefit to our countrymen. I realise that our peasants are becoming manure-minded. They have realised that a better use of manures would improve their yield. Will it not be better if a Commission of this type suggests ways and means of extending the Community Projects and teaching the peasants to make better use of manure, to adopt methods of crop rotation, and so on? The real object of the Plan should be the raising of the standard of living of the people and this is only possible if the Community Projects teach the rural population new methods of land improvement, new methods of cultivation, self-help in

housing schemes, in crop rotation and various other things. Many hon. Members have said that unemployment is rampant in our country. Instead of calling it unemployment, I will use the word 'under-employment'. This Commission is going to suggest ways and means of removing under-employment. Sir, I wholeheartedly support this Resolution.

SHRI H P SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) Sir, I am sorry that I feel it my duty to oppose the Resolution as well as the amendment. My grievance with the hon. mover of the Resolution is that in spite of the assurance that he gave us at the very start that he will not avail himself of the opportunity of moving this Resolution to point out the failures and shortcomings of the Five Year Plan, while I listened to his speech, I found that he did nothing else but that. He said that the Plan was nothing else but an estimate of expenditure. If he had ever undertaken any big task to accomplish—and an able ex-administrator as is, he must have had to do with big things—he must have known that in the initial stages of any big undertaking, there is nothing but expenditure whether you estimate it or you allow it to remain unestimated and it is only a statement of expenditure. A time, I assure my hon. friend, is sure to come when there will be an income side also of this Five Year Plan and that income side will be a very considerable and a very comprehensive one. Then the hon. mover talked of deficits in the Five Year Plan and the manner in which the amount from Rs 2 069 crores has been raised by another Rs 200 or 300 crores. Now that was but natural because the Plan was never intended to be a stagnant or static plan. It was an ever-growing organisation and that it is growing and more expenditure is needed is but natural. I find that the hon. mover's whole frame is overflowing with energy and enthusiasm but it does not find proper channel to run through, and therefore I would very humbly suggest to him that he along with his friends should form a group

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

and begin working constructively for the Five Year Plan. Instead of wasting his time in these unnecessary and infructuous undertakings like the presentation of a Resolution to appoint a Commission which will be just like changing horses in mid-stream while the Plan is still in the third year of its inception, he should devote his whole time, energy and attention to the development of the Plan itself and I am sure that that will give his conscience greater consolation, greater comfort and greater peace. He thinks that there was no reason that the Plan ought to have been taken in hand. I am simply surprised to hear that. Was the country to be left in the state in which the present-day administrators found it? The Plan was conceived with the best of motives, with the intention of improving the conditions of the country, developing the country in all its aspects. So with that laudable motive in view, I do not know what else the initiators of the Five Year Plan could have done other than what they have actually done.

Granting for the sake of argument for a moment that the Plan has failed, I am reminded of a proverb, very hackneyed though it is, yet it is a very popular proverb, that 'Failures are the pillars of success'. It is only by failures that we learn how to improve matters and the proposed Commission is itself, in the estimate of my hon. friend, a method to make the Five Year Plan more popular, more enthusiastic and also more to enthuse the people for the support of the Plan.

Now my friend Mr. Mahanty said that in his part of the country people were full of enthusiasm—that there was very great enthusiasm for the Plan—but there was nobody to make use of that enthusiasm. On the other hand, the mover of the Resolution complained that there were millions and millions of people, who did not even know and who did not understand what the Five Year Plan was. Now, these are the suggestions which come from the same side of the House

and one is simply bewildered, what one is to make out of these suggestions. I admit, I have not travelled like my hon. friend, the mover of the Resolution, over the vast tracts of the country in order to find out what the progress of the Plan is, but so far as my own State of Uttar Pradesh is concerned, I find that the entire Pradesh is full of enthusiasm. There are evidences, concrete evidences, of progress; community development projects training centres, irrigation canals, *panchayat ghars* and so many other things which fill one's heart with joy when one looks at those improvements, are the result and the outcome of the Five Year Plan.

Now, if the hon. mover of the Resolution thinks that the qualification of being an ex-administrator is the only method by which the Five Year Plan can be improved, I would make to him a sporting offer and it is this that he should, henceforth, get together all ex-administrators that he knows and make use of them; let them form a group and at the next general elections fight the elections on that very particular issue of the progress—the improvement or the failure of the Five Year Plan. The Plan is speaking for itself, and it shall more vividly speak for itself in the years to come and therefore, for my part, I am not at all dissatisfied with the role that the administrators of the Five Year Plan are playing. One thing that I dislike is the administrators of the country to be always, in season and out of season called as bureaucrats. The more you do that, the more you dishearten them or discourage them. The use of the word 'bureaucrat' was quite right when there was an alien Government, but I cannot even imagine that our administrators will grow so callous as to become bureaucrats and to abuse the power which is entrusted to them to make the country better and more prosperous.

I read in a certain book that while we had been taught to fly in the air like birds and swim in the water like fish, we had not been taught to live on mother earth from which we get

all the necessities of life. Now this Five Year Plan is wholly and solely concerned with the development of earth. It is from earth that we get our food. It is out of the earth that we get our cotton textiles. It is out of the earth that we get all the minerals.

5 P.M. From there we get the water we drink and the food, we eat. The entire concentration of the Plan is for the improvement of the land or the earth and that is the one sure guarantee that the result of the Plan, in the ultimate analysis will be good, and that the result of the working of this Plan, will be a sound and encouraging one.

One friend said that when there was a danger of external invasion, that would be an opportunity to rouse the people to revolt and that remark came from no less a responsible friend than Shri Sundarayya. I do not mean to say that he longed for that day. But he was very much dissatisfied with the progress of the Plan. (*Interruption by Shri P. Sundarayya*) I am interpreting him in the correct way, I think. He probably meant that the people would be so very dissatisfied with their lot that in spite of there being a danger of foreign invasion, they would not care to meet that but they would come out with their own demands for food and drink and all that. I don't think, I am interpreting him wrongly because I claim to understand what he said.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It is total misinterpretation of my speech.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: You can correct it afterwards. But this I will say. I will be the last man to preach such a doctrine to any one. My whole theme of life has been and is for all people who reside in this country to love their country. Patriotism is the greatest form of religion. Patriotism is the only thing that can stand us in good stead in the face of the greatest danger that one can think of and therefore, I would like all hon. Members of this House and through them

the residents of their constituencies to support the cause of the Five Year Plan, to make it successful and to bring about the desired prosperity, peace and happiness of the country at large.

SHRI SARDAR SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, when I first came to this House this afternoon, I was really not clear in my mind as to whether I would support this Resolution or not and I was not convinced of the necessity of setting up the kind of Commission, which Mr. Mathur has proposed. But after listening to the speeches made by Members of the Treasury Benches, I really fear that there is no alternative to accepting Mr. Mathur's suggestion. I am quite clear that most of the Members of the Congress Party have either not read this Resolution or if they have read it, they have not understood it. I admit that my hon. friend Shri Govinda Reddy got somewhere near it, but having got on to the subject, for some mysterious reason he got off it. As far as I can see, this debate is now becoming a debate on the merits and demerits of the Plan itself. That certainly is not the intention of this Resolution. If you examine it, you will find that it contains two points. The first one is about the setting up of a Commission in order to "review the working of the Five Year Plan". I emphasise the words "working of the Five Year Plan". So it is the actual working of it that has to be examined and not the merits or demerits of the Plan itself. The second point is of course the suggesting of "ways and means of making the Plan more effective and popular". That is merely a corollary to the first point. Why is it necessary to set up a Commission in order to review the working of this Plan? That is the point which Members on the other side might legitimately have debated on. But instead of answering that point and arguing that such a Commission is unnecessary or that it is harmful, they merely go on taking a blissful opium-eater's attitude, that things are going on fine and therefore there is nothing further to be done.

[Shri Sardar Singh.]

Now, if you will permit me, I will quote a few sentences and they, I think, will explain why it is necessary to have such a Commission in order to review the working of this Plan. The fact of the matter is, as far as I can see, there are very few people in this country who are clear as to what the achievements of the Planning Commission have been, and what we have succeeded in doing during the last three years in terms of the Plan, which we have conceived. Now, if you talk to the members of the Planning Commission, they will tell you that everything is going fine, that we are doing better than we have expected etc. etc. On the other hand, if you go to the critics of the Plan they will be equally emphatic in condemning the Plan. They will say that there is a shortfall here and there is a shortfall there and in fact, nothing at all has been done and that the Plan is bound to fail. Now, why is this difference of opinion? It is because nowhere are we told clearly to what extent the Plan has been fulfilled and to what extent it has not been fulfilled. Here is a pamphlet published by the Government of India "Progress of the Plan". I turn to the Preface and if you will permit, I shall read two or three sentences which will show what I mean.

"The third year of the Plan will end in March 1954. Although useful results have been secured, the greater part of the task remains to be accomplished and the programmes to be carried out during the next two years are larger in scope than those undertaken during the first three years. There is need, therefore, for a sense of urgency and intense effort on the part of the administrations of the Central and State Governments as well as the people."

And so it goes on. Later on it says:

"It has been sometimes suggested that the present Plan is inadequate because it is expected to raise the national income by only 11 to 12

per cent. above the level estimated for 1950-51."

Nowhere among these platitudes is stated what has actually been achieved and what remains yet to be done. Then I turn to page 31 of the pamphlet and under the heading "Education" they say:

"In the sphere of education, 1,368 new schools were started and 225 schools were converted into basic schools."

Now, does this mean that the Plan has been fulfilled or has not been fulfilled? This is answered nowhere. The report goes on in the same way, about village roads, village councils and so on. I am making these remarks to show that what we really want is not given here. We want to know how much of the Plan has been fulfilled. The Planning Commission has not told us that so much has been fulfilled and so much remains. They give pages and pages of words, and these merely evade the issue. But whenever we read accounts or reports of the working of plans in other countries, like the plans in the Soviet Union or the plans in Eastern Europe—I mention these countries because these are the only countries which have been having plans—you can find out in a couple of paragraphs where the plan has been fulfilled and where it has been under-fulfilled or over-fulfilled.

If it has not been fulfilled, what are the reasons for the failure? Here, if you go to one expert he will say that it has been under-fulfilled in this matter; if you go to the Planning Commission they will give a vague answer that it has not been fulfilled. In fact, with due deference to the members of the Planning Commission for whom I have the greatest respect, there is complete confusion and it is for that reason that we want a Commission composed of Members of Parliament and others to be set up so that this House—I mean Parliament which is the supreme body in this country—and through the Members of

Parliament the public at large, may be given a very clear picture of the progress. If we are not progressing then we must know clearly the reasons for our shortcomings and what can be done in order to overcome the obstacles. Now, I do not wish to go into the question, as most of the Members of this House have done, whether the Plan itself is a good Plan or not because that, to my mind, is irrelevant so far as this particular Resolution is concerned, but I would like to show just one or two facts in order to demonstrate that *prima facie* at least, a case can be made out that the Plan has met with obstacles. In the first place, it is quite clear that unemployment in this country has gone up. Now, there may be reasons for this unemployment; we are not concerned with what the causes of this unemployment are. But if you have got a country which has got a Plan for building up then it is quite obvious that you should be able, instead of allowing more unemployment to come in, to provide greater employment than what existed previously and yet quite obviously that is not being done. Now, here is a point which clearly requires some kind of an answer but to this day I have not seen anywhere explained why it is that the new projects have not been able to absorb the extra amount of labour unemployed and instead of that you get unemployment going up and up and up.

SHRI GULSHER AHMED: It may be due to the increase in population.

SHRI SARDAR SINGH: If it is due to increase in population then your Plan should have provided for that. Why has it not done so?

(Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go on.

SHRI SARDAR SINGH: I am not suggesting that you may not have a very good reason for that point but all I am saying is that at least it is a point which *prima facie* requires to be

answered and that is not being answered.

Similarly, there is this point. In the Budget which we have for the current year, the Finance Minister had proposed deficit financing to the tune of Rs. 140 crores as is very well known. Now, another Rs. 110 crores were supposed to be raised by loans and so on. In fact, I believe the amount of loans raised has been only of the order of Rs. 50 crores which means that you should be having deficit financing of something like Rs. 200 crores. But, in actual practice, that is not the case because it is clear from the closing balance that not only have you got no deficit financing but that actually you have got your sterling balances which are favourable and which you have not been using; this means that you have neither used the sterling balances nor the rupee balances. Now, this means, in other words, that we have got plenty of money; we are not handicapped on account of finance and that finance is there for being utilised for the development of this country. In that cases, why is it not being utilised? The answer is that you have not got projects which can absorb this finance. Surely, *prima facie*, one would say that that only means that the Planning Commission has been caught napping. What has happened is that we find ourselves with such favourable finances on hand and yet the Planning Commission has not come forward with projects to be able to absorb the money. Now, there again, I wish to point out that it is perfectly possible that the Planning Commission may have a good reason for that. All I say is that those reasons are not being made clear. They are not being made clear to the country and you cannot expect to create any enthusiasm in the public, among the citizens at large, unless the picture is made extremely clear. Now, therefore, I wish to make it clear that the reason why we, Members on this side of the House, have come up with a proposal that a Commission should be set up is that we feel that in the first place it is very necessary, if you want your plans to be successful, that

[Shri Sardar Singh.]

Members of Parliament who are the representatives of the people, should be kept clearly in the picture of the day to day activities. I do not mean to suggest that the Commission, which we have proposed should be a super-planning body as certain other hon. Members in the course of their speeches have suggested—I am not suggesting that—but I do maintain that a very clear picture is necessary to be given to Members of Parliament and, through the Members, to the public, of what is happening in the country in order to be able to build up the enthusiasm of the people so that the Plan can be successfully fulfilled. That is the only reason, why I wish to support this Resolution. I would also like to point out that since none of my hon. friends on the other side of the House has given a single argument why such a Commission should not be appointed, I presume that they will all join me in supporting this Resolution for having such a Commission set up.

SHRI GULSHER AHMED Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like first to deal with the remarks of the hon. Member who preceded me. In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of this House to the speech of the President in which he has made a reference to the Five Year Plan. I quote "The Planning Commission have undertaken a revision of the First Five Year Plan, particularly to provide more employment." As hon. Members know, as soon as Government came to know that in the country there was an increase of unemployment or under-employment, they took up the matter seriously; they invited experts of the country. And most of the Members know that these experts came to Delhi and, after studying the question, tendered their advice. On the basis of that advice, Government is going to revise the Five Year Plan and they are going to find out ways and means of checking this unemployment. For that reason, the Planning Commission is going to allot more money. The hon. Member has asked why the Planning Commission had not thought before that the population

would be increasing day by day, and for the absorption of which they ought to have devised some means. May I draw the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that in the Five Year Plan itself, the Planning Commission has recommended that some ways and means should be found for checking the growth of population but knowing the social susceptibilities of the people in this country, they were not very strong in recommending that people in this country should try to check the growth of the population? There are, of course, so many means by which the growth of population can be checked. Unfortunately, what happens in this country is this, that being religious-minded people, we think that not to have children is a sin and that to have children is a blessing without knowing the consequences of having more children, without knowing whether we will be able to provide them with food, clothing and education, so that the children might become good citizens of the country in the future. One of the reasons why unemployment has crept up in this country is this, that there is a general tendency among the people of this country to get everything done by the Government, they do not like to work but just want everything to be done by the Government because the country has become a free country. They do not feel the responsibility of the citizens of a free country. That idea and that feeling which should be in the people of a free country has not come in them.

The second point is that most of the hon. Members on the other side say that the Plan is very good, everything is good but some how or other, "we are not being consulted"....

SHRI S. MAHANTY: No, no, I protest.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go on.

SHRI GULSHER AHMED: In other countries what happens is that if there is a plan prepared by the party in

power, the other parties always try to give the maximum help in the fulfilment of that plan. When the period comes to an end then they try to judge and see whether what they have envisaged in the plan has been fulfilled or not. After that they criticise and suggest ways and means of improving it. The Plan period is not over. So it is too early to think of appointing any other Commission. The Plan was made by a Commission of experts and non-experts belonging to different parties and to different walks of life.

So far as the Resolution is concerned, I would say that, in view of the fact that the Five Year Plan is going to be revised by the Government—I am sure that the revised Plan will come before the House and the hon. Members will get ample opportunities to discuss the revised Plan and make good and concrete suggestions—there is no need of appointing a Commission. If the hon. Members are not satisfied even with this they have got other opportunities also. They can put questions in Parliament. They can move Resolutions on a particular subject in which they are interested if they find that the Planning Commission is not doing very well even after the revision of the Plan. There are so many other means open to Parliament by which they can have control over the functioning and the execution of the Five Year Plan.

Now I would like to deal with the point which Mr. Mathur has raised about the machinery which is responsible for implementing this Five Year Plan. He says that the machinery is not very efficient, that it is not very good. In this connection I would tell him that this country has been free only for five years. This country had never had any experience of even a small plan for doing any economic or social good in this country and naturally the Civil Service has never been used to any kind of plan. They are just learning things. It is well known that by trial and error we learn to do thing well. So we are in the process of learning things. Most of the hon. Members know that Russia

was the first country in the world which made this experiment of planned economy with a view to distribute the wealth of the country equitably and justly. They had made their plans but had done that by stages. They could not reach the target by the first plan. They went in for the second plan and when they could not completely achieve their object they went in for the third plan. In Czechoslovakia the same thing happened. After the *coup* they had their first plan and after some time they revised it and produced a second plan. It must not be forgotten that it is a new experiment which is being done in this country. In a vast country like ours there is not one problem but many. If the hon. Member makes a close study, there is every problem in this country, social, political and economic and various other relating to life and everything has got to be attended to. To do that thing naturally one requires efficient and expert people. It is not a layman's job. Members of Parliament cannot say that they know everything and that they can solve all the problems. I do not think that by appointing a Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and non-Members anything can be done so far as the working of the Five Year Plan is concerned.

In this connection I would like to just make a reference to some of the works that have been done under the Five Year Plan. There is the pamphlet which I hope most of the hon. Members have been supplied with. The title of that pamphlet is 'Building New India'. There it has been given what are the works which have been completed, which are still to be completed, how long it will take to complete them, what is the money which is going to be spent and what part of them, if any, has been completed. So the charge that some hon. Members have made that the Government is not furnishing full information to the people is not fair and it is not correct. So far as it is possible they are doing it. Probably the hon. Members know

[Shri Gulsher Ahmed.]
that in the Congress Sessions in Hyderabad and Kalyani they had tried to show to the people who came and gathered there, what things they wanted to do and what had been done. They had tried to explain the whole working of the plan.

In respect of the Civil Service, we the members of the Congress Party have agreed that there are certain rules of procedure which are outmoded and that they should be changed and to that effect at the Kalyani Session it was declared that we were shortly going to appoint a committee to see how far the rules and procedures of administrative machinery could be changed in order that work could be done quickly and effectively. So far as that complaint of the hon. Member is concerned, the Government knows it fully that there are certain difficulties on account of the present rules and regulations, but they cannot be changed overnight. It is a very big question and it must be referred to some committee to examine the whole question. The present administrative system has been working for the last 200 years. There are so many rules and there are volumes of books containing these rules. So the Congress which is responsible for the governance of this country has made the declaration in the Kalyani Session that they feel that there are certain procedures and rules which require replacement and amendment and they have declared that they would shortly appoint a committee which will go into the whole question and see what are the rules and procedure that can be amended so that things can be done quickly and efficiently. So, so far as that part is concerned I think my hon. friend will be satisfied that, when this whole question will be discussed and amendments and changes will be made, naturally the working of the Five Year Plan will also benefit by those amendments and changes in the rules and regulations of the administration.

After that I would just like to reply to my hon. friend Mr. Mahanty. He

said that this Five Year Plan had not opened up more avenues of employment. I was really surprised to hear this because my hon. friend comes from a place where the construction of a very big project, the Hirakud Dam, is going on and where thousands and thousands of people are employed. I had been to the Damodar Valley Project. I have seen the seven dams which are under construction and in which thousands and thousands of people are employed. There is the Bokaro thermal station which is supplying electricity to the Damodar Valley Corporation and it is expanding with a view to supply electricity to the Sindri Fertilisers and to so many other projects, for example, the Cable Factory which is going to be constructed. There are so many other projects where thousands of people are working. When such is the case, I do not see how my hon. friend says that this Five Year Plan has not opened more avenues of employment for the people of this country. I ask my hon. friend what would have happened to these people in the absence of any plan in the country. The position of unemployment in this country would have been more chronic and more disastrous.

In the end I would say, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that in view of the fact that the Government is going very soon to revise the Five Year Plan—and naturally it will come before this House—I do not think there is any necessity for appointing any Commission to go into the question to find out the defects in the working of the Five Year Plan.

With these words I take the seat.
Thank you so much.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, so far as the underlying purpose of the Resolution is concerned, there can be no difference of opinion; there can be no disagreement. Who will not want, in this country or in this House, to see that the Plan is made effective and popular? We are all anxious to make it more and more effective and more and

more popular and efforts are being made towards that end. I cannot claim that everything possible is being done. I am aware of the fact that much more remains to be done. But my only complaint is that the Resolution, the specific method proposed in the Resolution, will not help the hon. Member or us to realise that aim any better at all. I believe, there are other ways. There are other methods which may be more capable of achieving the same purpose that the hon. Member has in view. Therefore, this Resolution has to be opposed.

I have listened to the speeches made on the floor of this House with care. I was waiting for some indication as to the nature of the urge for setting up such a Commission. I was on the lookout to find what really was the purpose, what really was the utility of such an arrangement. I sought enlightenment about the good that such an arrangement could do. What is it that we are going to gain by it? What shall we lose if we do not have it? I am very sorry to say that I received no light on that aspect—the real, important, crucial aspect of the whole Resolution.

My friend opposite—I think it was the hon. Member Shri Sardar Singh—questioned this side of the House and said that no Member had shown why this suggestion should not be accepted. Really, the burden was on that side—the hon. the mover of the Resolution and others who supported it—to show what good it will achieve and what purpose it will serve. And whatever has been urged later on in support of the Resolution does not furnish really any cogent reason for accepting such a proposal. I am not going to say that whatever was said in this House was useless. I am prepared to admit that very useful suggestions have been made and very sound ideas in some respects have been thrown up. I would like to benefit myself from all those suggestions, but the question is whether all that material put together makes out a case in support of this proposal. It does not do that.

We were not supposed to take up the question of the whole basis of the Plan—the merits of the Plan. That has been acknowledged by a friend opposite. But as a matter of fact we did nothing else, or at any rate, for the most part we were questioning the fundamental basis of the Plan. For example, should there be a radical reorganisation of our land policy, of our land system? Well, I want a radical reorganisation. We have made proposals to that effect and in course of time we would like to do much more. But is that the question which this Commission that is proposed, is going to tackle? I am afraid that this Commission will not be in a position to do so.

Similarly, there was the other question about foreign capital. Apart from the merits of the Plan itself we have dealt with many things which are cut side the Plan—the political implications, the question of teachers strike and so on. All these things, I believe, really do not come within the purview of this discussion. There was the question of *panchayats*—whether we should have them and use them more. Certainly, I agree that we should use them much more. We should build the Plan from below and the *panchayats* should be the central agency for that purpose so far as the rural areas are concerned. But is that matter going to be dealt with by this Commission? Then, about the size of the Plan, I agree, we should have a much bigger Plan. But is that Commission going to settle the size of the Plan?

An hon. Member on that side brought up the question of Irrigation and Power. He said that there should be minor irrigation. We have plenty of minor irrigation works—Rs. 112 crores, and in addition we have Rs. 40 crores for scarcity areas. He said that the Commission could be useful for the purpose of settling the height of the dams. It takes years and years for engineers, with consultants from outside and experts of all kinds, to come to a decision as to what is the appropriate height—whether it should be five

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.]

feet more or five feet less. It is a highly technical matter. Is this Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and some people from outside going to decide such a technical matter as that? They will have to go to college and learn engineering and spend some years on projects before they can attempt to do that. In the meanwhile five projects will have been gone through. Therefore, no Commission could ever attempt such a thing.

Then there was another thing. The hon. Mr. Ranga pointed out that there were several schemes which somebody had proposed and that they were not included. Another hon. Member on the other side—I think the hon. the mover of the Resolution himself—drew our attention to the fact that in the case of certain areas which were really entitled to inclusion on the ground that they were scarcity areas.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: On a point of clarification, Sir, I never said that. What I just pointed out was about the working of the Plan, what was actually wrong with the machinery, and that they did not know what they were doing. I never asked to give a scheme here or a scheme there. I only pointed out that machinery was not functioning properly and well and that it should be reorganised.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You said for an area of 60,000 sq. miles.....

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I said about the scarcity areas. What I said about the scarcity areas was that the Planning Commission must do something about the scarcity areas. It was very good of them that they had sanctioned 24 schemes. I said they had sanctioned Rs. 2½ crores for the scarcity areas but they never knew that this money was being spent not in the scarcity areas but elsewhere. I never asked that money should be sanctioned for this or that scheme. All that I wanted to

say was to point out that the Planning Commission was not having proper personnel and machinery to know what they were doing. That was my point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You also mentioned that out of the 36 schemes only two schemes were in the scarcity areas.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I said, not even one.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what the hon. Minister is referring to.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: No, Sir. The hon. Minister says that I asked for more schemes exactly on the lines of Mr. Ranga. Mr. Ranga wanted a certain project here and a certain project there. I never asked anything like that. I never asked for any revision of the Plan, any project, any scheme or any money.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Sir, really there is no occasion for any kind of dispute here. I also was not casting any reflection on the hon. Member that he wanted something for himself or for his area. What I was trying to bring out was that in the Plan in certain areas schemes were not provided for although they might be entitled to a higher priority and that was exactly what the hon. Member wanted to make out that certain schemes were given to certain areas which possibly did not deserve them, because the Administration did not know enough about the conditions there. Now the point that I was making is this. Will this Commission—when the Administration in that State, the M. L. As. and all others concerned could not do this properly—consisting of five or ten people from here along with a few people from outside be able to go to that area—the Rajasthan area or the Andhra area or anywhere—and decide as to what kind of schemes should be excluded and what should be taken up? My point is that it is not a task which can be performed adequately or at all by a Commission of this kind.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I may be permitted to make this clear. I never suggested that this Commission which was being proposed would go into all these things. My only point was that the Planning Commission had not got the proper administrative machinery and that was all that I suggested.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have mentioned it, Mr. Mathur.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I do not hold any brief for the Planning Commission in the sense that everything that has been done by or through the Planning Commission is perfect. I will come to that. Much improvement remains to be effected. A good deal of improvement is still due. It means that some other arrangements, certain change of machinery, etc. have got to be made so that these difficulties may be removed. I entirely agree with that position. But to have a Commission like this, it will require a large number of experts and administrators, and this Commission will become a much bigger Commission than the Planning Commission. I do not doubt the capacity of our Members of Parliament to understand, to interpret and to analyse the various factors. They will do all that. They are all capable of doing that, because it is their job. It is their knowledge of things that we require in a greater and greater measure. The only point was that, if they tried to tackle all these things, each scheme would require a Commission, and there would have to be hundreds of Commissions in order to deal with a hundred things. But they are not a hundred but many more schemes, and it will not be possible for a Commission like that to deal with everything. I am assuming that what was urged in the course of the discussion was that this proposed Commission would be able to remove the difficulties. Otherwise, it would hardly be relevant. Therefore, it is that I am trying to make out that it will not be possible for them to do that. Nandikonda was brought up, whether there was any delay, on account of whose action, and all that.

Questions can be asked about it in Parliament, and answers should certainly be given, but a Commission will not be needed for the purpose of finding out whether the engineers in the Hyderabad side or Andhra side are procrastinating or delaying matters. The more relevant thing to consider would be the question of the working of the Plan, and if it can be shown that the Plan is not working satisfactorily and that there are ways of improving its working, certainly that can be the basis for making the suggestion that is contained in the Resolution.

Some hon. Members implied and stated that there was no progress at all, that nothing was happening at all and that the plan was not popular and not all effective. That is not true. It will take some time for me to say from the various reports and materials that I have got how we are going ahead, how we are making progress. For example, in the case of food. This was the sorest thing for the nation to be not sure of the next day and of what would happen to them so far as food requirements were concerned. Today we are free from this anxiety. Is it such a small thing? This is a very substantial gain. Much progress has been made in agricultural production and in industrial production also. I have got some figures. Against the target of 7.6 million tons of more food production, by 1952-53, 4.4 million tons of additional production was achieved. The first estimate of grains and pulses in 1953-54 shows an increase of 8 million acres or 5.8 per cent. increase as compared to last year. This reduces our dependence on imports. While in the calendar year 1951, 4.75 million tons of food-grains were imported, in 1953 only 2 million tons were obtained, and consequently there was a saving of Rs. 130 crores in foreign exchange.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: May I ask a question?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At the end.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: One hon. Member—I think it was Mr. Sardar Singh—asked, “What is this Plan? We have seen some plans of other countries, where you know, from the data given, what has been done, what is being done and whether the targets have been realised, but we do not get any information here.” I am prepared to acknowledge this fact that we have not achieved the same perfection, the same standard of refinement, the same accuracy in evaluating the progress of the Plan and giving to this House and to the people in precise terms and in percentages as to how far we have achieved the targets. We have not been able to do it in several directions, in several matters, but we are trying to improve the position. But, any person who reads these reports will be able to gather a sufficiently clear idea of the progress that is being made and he will also find that in several matters figures are given about the extent of the achievement, and it is not all quite so obscure as the hon. Member intended us to believe. For land reclamation I have got the figures. Against a target of 14 lakh acres, five lakh acres have been reclaimed in the first two years. This is only illustrative. We have given various facts and figures which will enable any person, who is keen on it, to understand the degree of progress that is being made. He will not be entirely disappointed. I am just explaining the directions in which we are making headway. One is food. The other is raw materials, without which our industries would not have been running. We all remember what was the plight of our industries previously because they were not sure of the availability of raw materials. Today the textile and other industries are working almost to full capacity, because they are sure of their raw materials. That is a very substantial gain and it has helped us in various directions.

Hon. Members mentioned industrial production. Of course, nobody can deny that industrial production has increased. Apart from the figures—133 or

137 whatever the index is—the fact is there patent. One can compare this with the conditions experienced in the earlier years.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: What about sugar?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Apart from sugar, there are other things in which I will not be able to show some degree of progress. In sugar also, compare the quantity that is being produced with that produced previously. The quantity has definitely increased, but along with that our appetite for sugar has also increased. But we will see that our capacity to produce sugar is also increased. Industrial production has increased. We have got numerous projects in the public sector which are making progress, satisfactory progress; so also in the private sector efforts are being made. In the case of the public sector too during the last three years, we have not proceeded on any proportionate basis. We have done less than what should have been done say in three years—three-fifth of the plan—we have fallen short of it. In the same way in the private sector and the reasons may be, of course, different. The question of resources comes in there more but taking all the figures of expenditure under the Plan one fact will strike you that although we fall short of what might be expected on a proportionate basis, we have been stepping up the expenditure from year to year. That is a very important fact and in that lies the hope that what is expected of us in subsequent years is now very likely to be achieved. I could give those figures in simpler form. I reckon that the expenditure in the first year was about an eighth, in the second year about a sixth and in the third year, as is estimated, will be about a fifth which means that about half has been accomplished.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE in the Chair.)]

But we have been steadily upgrading the capacity to spend and in the next

two years we have to spend very much more. I realize the magnitude of the task but the fact is that we have been making progress, we have improved our administrative capacity and removed bottlenecks. We are encountering difficulties and problems and we deal with them as they arise. And there, I believe, is the reason for the optimism that in the course of the next two years our performance will be at a much bigger rate than it has been achieved so far. I cannot promise with absolute accuracy whether the plan will be cent per cent or 95 per cent. or 99 per cent. achieved, but it will be very largely achieved. That is the hope and that will be our effort.

I gave some idea of how we are going on with the working of the Plan. Regarding the question of making it popular, some hon. Members said that they did not see any enthusiasm, that they had gone to some places—I do not know to which places they had gone and where they did not find such enthusiasm—but there are many of us who move about in the country, who meet large numbers of people and can bear witness to the fact that whatever the imperfections may be on our side and on the side of the Government, the Planning Commission and others so far as the people are concerned, their enthusiasm is boundless. And not only enthusiasm in some vague terms. There is almost a kind of determination to make good the opportunity that freedom has brought, to make something out of it. There is that very great keenness and eagerness and we are turning it into some good purpose but not fully. We have to do much more. In the course of my tours, I saw our exhibition train, at several stations. I found, it was not possible to cope with the number of visitors who wanted to see the Plan and understand it, and everywhere that has been the experience. Maybe we have not been able to meet the demand for literature. We have produced some literature but the demand is really going ahead of the supply. We are trying

to make an effort in that direction also. The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting has a separate unit created for this purpose. Money has been provided for it and an integrated scheme has been sanctioned and I believe that much more will be done in that direction also. But I must admit that when I say all this in support of the contention that progress has been achieved, I shall not be held to say in reply that we are quite satisfied with the progress. Personally I am very much dissatisfied. I believe that very much more has to be done and when some hon. Members there said that they want to bring up this proposal in order to strengthen our hands to help us to accelerate the working of the Plan, I would welcome that and I would be eager also to co-operate with them. The question is whether the proposal does that; whether it has the effect of accelerating the Plan in any way, to any degree. If it were so the proposal would be welcomed but I am afraid that it cannot have that effect and I have explained some of the reasons.

Now I come to the matters which were brought up in the debate with regard to the working of the Plan itself and then judge whether the proposed Commission will help us to deal with those difficulties and bottlenecks and impediments in the way of the proper implementation of the Plan. I am not quite satisfied generally—I am particularly dissatisfied regarding certain sections and sectors of the Plan. For example, hon. Mr. Malkani spoke about cottage industries. Several others also spoke about it. I have no hesitation in admitting that we have not made as much progress as we should have. I do not want to enter into all the reasons. In certain matters we have not made enough progress and we are conscious of that fact and we are trying to make up the deficiencies which are responsible for that lack of progress. We are trying to do that as much as possible. Take Basic Education. There are several other directions also and whatever is responsible for lack of

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda]

progress in that direction is being examined and any suggestions by hon. Members here or in the other House or anywhere else will be extremely welcome in order to help us, but this cannot be done by a Commission. I will explain how a Commission will be less useful than a large number of Members of Parliament co-operating and collaborating in that work. The examples that were given are lack of resources particularly in the case of States. It is true that there may be some difficulties about resources in some States—no, all. It is an uneven position. Some of the States are having more facilities than others. In several cases efforts are being made to improve the position. The question of resources—whether a particular State can have more taxes etc. will not really be a matter for a small Commission to handle. There is the Taxation Enquiry Committee which is looking into all that. Therefore, this question of resources on which a great deal of emphasis was laid will not be a matter for the Commission. I must personally also try to emphasise that fact that the matter of resources is an extremely important matter for us. This Plan is a very modest plan, we want to raise the resources for the Plan very much more and we must have more resources and we must explore the ways and means to try to get those resources and any suggestion that can help us in that connection will certainly be highly welcome.

There was the question of administrative machinery. We are also deeply keenly, acutely conscious of the defects of the administrative machinery. The Planning Commission's report may be referred to for evidence of that realisation. A number of recommendations have been made. Numerous defects have been examined and have been pointed out there and recently, hon. Members must be aware of the fact, the Prime Minister himself has been emphatically pointing out those defects and has also taken certain steps to remove them but could the adminis-

trative machinery be examined by this Commission? This will certainly be a task very much beyond it. Even the Planning Commission is finding it hard to deal with all the administrative problems and a Commission of this kind and of this size will not be able to advance the cause or improve the administration very much. About the question of unemployment, I will not challenge the statement that the position is really something very unsatisfactory. We have much more unemployment now than we should have. We should have no unemployment at 6 P.M. all in the country. But the question that we have to face is whether we are not taking any steps to improve the position in this respect. The recent additions and readjustments of the Plan were all intended to meet the situation arising out of the worsening situation in respect of unemployment. Maybe that we have not dealt with it completely, that we have not been able to conquer this problem of unemployment. But no suggestion has been made beyond what we are already aware of and are trying to carry out ourselves. If the problem is so big that a single plan is not able to or capable of dealing with it effectively, then it is not the fault of the Plan, it is the fault of the situation. We cannot undo the wrongs and neglect of centuries. It is true, these things will have to be done in a much more aggressive way. I admit that much more will have to be done. But the fact that there is unemployment and we have not succeeded in eradicating it is not really something that can be brought as a reason for setting up a Commission. We discussed the question of unemployment in this House and in the other also and we have had a number of suggestions and all these are being examined with a view to their being availed of.

The question of cottage industries is there. I refer to it because some hon. Members said that we should do much more for them. The question of foreign experts was also mentioned in this con-

text—also that the Prime Minister consulted the experts and felt that everything was all right. But the very fact that we get these foreign experts shows how keen we are to take help from every possible source. But this matter of foreign experts is not really the matter under discussion. I only wanted to clarify the position. There were several other things mentioned—the use of power, local works etc. etc. In all these questions I apply the same test. Are we going to be better off very much by adopting a machinery of this kind, for the purpose of removing these defects and improving the position in this respect? I do not think so and I hope hon. Members will agree with me that that is not the proper course to be adopted.

But the question still remains. I have not answered the whole question. Hon. Members will ask me, "On the one side you admit that things are not moving in a perfect way, that there is room for dissatisfaction. What are you doing about it?" Sir, it is my responsibility to say what should be done. I will in the first instance bring to the notice of the House the fact that when the Planning Commission was set up, the very Resolution which set up the Commission defined the scope of the work of the Commission. There were two spheres of its activities. One was the formulation of the Plan and the other its implementation. Regarding the implementation of the Plan they state it in very clear terms:

"The Planning Commission will—

(4) indicate the factors which are tending to retard economic, development, and determine the conditions which, in view of the current social and political situation, should be established for the successful execution of the Plan;

(5) determine the nature of the machinery which will be necessary for securing the successful implementation of each stage of the Plan in all its aspects.

(6) appraise from time to time the progress achieved in the execution of each stage of the Plan and recommend the adjustments of policy and measures that such appraisal may show to be necessary; and

(7) make such interim or ancillary recommendations as appear to it to be appropriate, etc. etc."

Thus it will be seen that this is a very clear direction to the Planning Commission. This becomes an important duty of the Planning Commission. But that was not all. Government then proceeded to take another step. They decided to set up the National Development Council. This National Development Council was set up by the Resolution of August 6th, 1952, to review the work of the Planning Commission from time to time, to consider important questions of social and economic policy affecting national development, to recommend measures for the achievement of the aims and targets set out in the national Plan, including measures to secure the active co-operation of the people and so on. So there is already this machinery. That machinery has been set up in order to carry out these directions. The Planning Commission has made its own arrangements. It has various divisions manned by experts who participated in the task of formulating the Plan and have turned their attention now to the question of the implementation of the various proposals made in the Plan.

But even that is not sufficient. We are having consultations with representatives from all the States regarding the progress of the Plan and on specific problems. We have been going to the States, talking to their representatives there, to the Ministers and others. But that is not enough too because actual inspection at the spot and actual contacts are necessary. For that purpose we have appointed advisers, capable people of great experience—administrative experience in

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.]

the services. They go out to the States and talk and discuss with the people there and see things for themselves and give such guidance and help as they can and they give us reports as to how best things can be further improved. They have been to most of the States and to some of the States twice. We have also a Land Reforms Committee, a machinery for evaluating the work of the Community Projects and so on, and there is the National Development Council on the top of it all. Besides these, in the States they have their own implementation machinery. I am not prepared to say that it is fully satisfactory. In some States it is better than in others. In several other States nothing very much has been done. It has all to be done. The States should set up appropriate active planning implementation set-up, wherever it does not exist. That is a direction in which things should improve. But many States have a satisfactory set-up at the State level, and some at the district level and at lower levels also, particularly in the case of the Community Projects.

We in the Planning Commission do feel that all that is not enough. More has to be done. We ourselves feel it. We see conditions around us and the nature of the difficulties that arise and we have acknowledged these difficulties in the various reports. We have not made any secret of these things. We know that things are not altogether all right everywhere and that more has to be done and we have thought of measures through which we shall make up these deficiencies. In these measures the role of Members of Parliament is very important and very vital. In many things that we have to do, we think we should get much more help from Members of Parliament, in this House and the other, than what we have been getting so far.

Not that we have been neglecting this aspect altogether. In the case of

the Community Projects, sixty-six Members of Parliament have been associated for discussion and consultation and we ourselves have been taking the help of Members of Parliament in various other matters but that is not enough. Members of Parliament are associated in the States too, to an extent but not enough. We think, that we should devise ways of more effective participation by Members of Parliament in the work of implementation of the Plan. If we appoint a Commission like this, what will happen is that it will mean loss of interest among the Members of Parliament rather than creating more interest. If a few Members are set aside for this work, the others would think that there is a Commission functioning which will do its job; the best thing is to wait for its report which may be submitted after a very long time. So this will reduce the interest that Members of Parliament take and, therefore, it will be of great disadvantage to the Plan and to the Planning Commission. It may also—I hope it will not and of course, such a thing is not going to happen anyway—possibly reduce responsibility at other levels. There are now some people looking after this thing and such a Commission will divert attention. This is not the time, when we want our attention to be diverted by starting any kind of enquiry. Still, Members of Parliament have to perform their function. In the first place, they should have much more of information than we have been able to give them; we are giving information but that is not enough; they should have much more detailed information. I think that is to be done. This question of implementation is a continuous function. We have to keep the Plan under review continuously and in that task of keeping the Plan under review, Members of Parliament must be fully associated. We have now got an Advisory Committee; we had panels at the time of preparing the Plan but we have not used them afterwards very much. There are a very few Members of Parliament in the Advisory Committee and we should re-constitute that

apparatus by associating more Members of Parliament so that they can be with us much more in discussing, in considering and examining the Plan and thereby helping us to improve things and remove the obstacles. We should have groups of Members who will take special interest in selected problems in selected spheres and, in association with the Planning Commission. They could visit the various projects and study them. This will be a proper specialisation, a proper division of work and the Members of Parliament can make a much bigger contribution. We want the contribution not only of four or five Members of Parliament who will be on such a Commission but we want the contribution of every Member of Parliament and we do not want to be denied that advantage. Therefore, the idea is to enable the Members of Parliament to play their part effectively for which purpose they should have information; for that purpose they should be associated continuously with the work of the Planning Commission particularly because the second plan will have to be evolved. We have to start evolving the machinery. Therefore, this is the way, I believe, which will be more effective in making the Plan effective and popular than the way suggested in this Resolution.

In addition to that, Members of Parliament should take much more interest in the work in the States. That should be made possible. In some States there are committees of a large size but really they cannot function that way. There should be sub-committees of these committees or some other ways should be found by which more Members of Parliament can be more actively associated in the different States,

These are some of the ideas; it will take too much of time for me to elaborate the various ideas which we could employ and which we could work out for purposes of achieving this object. I have given some hints, some directions

in which our mind is working and when they crystallise we may be able to place them before the House.

I have dealt with both the things, the objections that we have to the course suggested in the Resolution and what we ourselves have to offer for the purpose of achieving the object that the hon. Member has in view. We need, as I said, help from every source and the hon. Members here as well as in the other House can furnish a great deal of help to us in the task of making the Plan more effective and more popular and we will, Sir, fully utilise all those potentialities.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I must express my deep gratitude for the support which has been given to this Resolution not only by all sections in the Opposition but even by distinguished hon. Members like Prof. Malkani, Prof. Ranga and Major General Sokhey and I am also grateful to the hon. Minister for Planning for giving due consideration and explaining his viewpoint.

I am afraid that there has been some misunderstanding in the mind of the hon. Minister while he was dealing with this Resolution and was disposing of certain arguments. He argued at great length and wanted to convince the House that he had better methods to suggest for the association of Members of Parliament and he also elaborated them to an extent. My purpose in bringing forward this Resolution is not to seek any association of Members of Parliament. When I say this, I do not mean that the association of Members of Parliament would not be healthy and welcome but the purpose of this Resolution is entirely different. I should like to know how the appointment of this Commission in any way debars the hon. Minister from seeking the association of Members of Parliament in the way he is thinking of. This Resolution does not ask him to stop seeking the association of members of Parliament. The purpose of

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]
 this Resolution is very clear and it is almost obvious and I do hope that the hon. Minister will take into consideration the fact that not only all the sections of the Opposition but other Members have also given their full and hearty support to this Resolution. During the speech that I made while moving this Resolution, I spoke for about half an hour, not for one moment did I devote my time in telling the House and the Minister about any alternative approach or any alternative plan because that is not within the scope of this Resolution. The Resolution only demands the appointment of a Commission to review the working of the Plan and all I said was only to the effect that there were conditions at present which demanded such a course. When I elaborated my point and gave instances they were all to this effect and to this purpose only. I only made out a case showing the conditions prevalent. I again wish to repeat, as I said at the very outset that the purpose of this Resolution was not to hurl and to heap accusations on the Government. Maybe that the Government has been doing their very best but all the same, the fact remains that there are conditions, which I mentioned in the course of my speech, which do demand that a review should be made and that we should find ways and means of making the Plan more effective, more purposeful and more popular. As a matter of fact, it has been conceded even by the Government—they admitted it—that the Plan was not being implemented properly because of the administrative machinery not being properly tuned to it. Now they are thinking what should be done about it. The hon. the Prime Minister, who is more anxious than I am because the responsibility rests on his shoulders, thought about the way and he appointed an officer, Mr. A. K. Chanda, to go into this matter and this was also mentioned by the hon. Minister for Planning. But my contention is that that is not the proper thing to do and that will never ensure

any proper implementation of the Plan and a proper revision of the administrative machinery. That is my point, and that is why I think a Commission of the type which I envisage and which I suggest and which I support will be a better agency to advise the Government on this point. Among individual officers more capable than Mr. Chanda possibly—I do not as a matter of fact doubt his abilities—was Shri Gopalswamy Ayyangar and he suggested certain administrative reforms here at the Centre. Then followed Mr. Gopwala. He made a report and that is again in the cold storage. He has definitely made a reference to this particular problem. Again we have another expert from outside—I don't mean to suggest that I am against foreign experts. These two Indian experts have gone their own way. That expert from outside is Mr. Appleby and he also submitted his report and he has again come to further advise the Government and thereafter follows Mr. Chanda. My definite opinion is that all these reports will go the same way as the previous reports have gone, and we must not forget that Mr. A. K. Chanda, with all his abilities, cannot tear himself away from his past background. He cannot get himself dissociated from his lifelong training and certainly he is not a proper person who can advise the Government in this matter. He can definitely be a very useful member of this Commission. We must bring about a fresh outlook on this matter. People who have got expert administrative knowledge and people from the public sector, who live in the midst of the people and the difficulties, who know where the lacuna lies, who understand the difficulties of the people, will be able to advise you better, as to how the administrative machinery can be set right. That is why, I suggested this Commission.

The hon. Minister in his opening remarks said that no arguments have been given for the appointment of this Commission. As a matter of fact, my whole speech was devoted to it. I

never suggested any alternative programme and I never suggested any alternative schemes. I only told him what are the conditions. I made a very restrained speech of course and I gave only facts and figures which would enable the Government to appreciate and understand my viewpoint that in spite of possibly all their very best efforts, the Plan is not being implemented as it should be implemented. I gave them concrete instances for that very purpose and my suggestion was that this Commission should be appointed and I have advanced you further reasons why it should be there

All the hon Members from the Congress side, except the Minister, who spoke, gave absolutely no reasons whatsoever against this Resolution. There was, of course, one objection and a very relevant objection which was made and that objection was that if in the midst of the crisis we appoint a Commission, the attention of the Members would be diverted. That is of course a relevant objection, but my feeling is just the other way round. It would not divert in any way the attention of the Members. It will make them more alert. They will get themselves prepared and get ready to help and assist this Commission. There are certain difficulties which they cannot themselves get over and if they have nothing to be frightened of, if they do not fear being put under an examination by an expert body, by administrative experts as well as by people representing the public, there is absolutely no reason why they should oppose the appointment of a Commission.

My another purpose—let me make it clear—in asking for such a Commission was this. At present it is being considered as a sort of a party plan with Members of all shades of opinion not being taken into confidence. Of course you may have your own plan—I have no objection—but here you have got the assistance and support of the people, of all sections of people, people who are independent distinguished people, people from Parliament—I do

not say that a Member here who has no experience should be appointed. In Parliament we have people who have got experience of administration. We have got people who are technical experts, like Dr. Sokhey. They may give you fresh ideas. They may suggest to you ways and methods. You are absolutely living in your own fossilised ideas. It would definitely help you to have a fresh outlook. That is why I suggested, and that is why I still maintain that such a Commission is necessary. It does not mean any insinuation against the Government. I have never said that the Government is not doing their very best but that is not enough, that is not sufficient and the conditions and circumstances which I stated on the floor of the House make it obviously clear and they demand that a fresh outlook should be brought on this subject and whatever lapses, whatever shortfalls are there should be examined.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

It is very wrong to think, as the hon. Minister appears to think, that this Commission will go into the details of every scheme and examine the technical details. That is not the purpose of the Resolution. It might have been suggested by a Member here or there but the purpose of this Resolution is to go into those broad principles and to assist and help the Government and to give them popular support. It is not necessary that the body which I ask you to set up will go into every technical scheme, and I must submit that we are very much suffering from certain basic defects. It was very necessary that we should have had some all-India overall picture. There should have been some scientific survey. There is no reason why we should have any doubt and apprehensions in our minds that the members of this Commission will not be of any assistance to the Government. I have purposely provided that the membership should not be restricted to Parliament only, so that you can have experts on administration and on technical knowledge. At present you are working

[Shri H C Mathur]
like this Either there is the party direction or you have the services who look to you to help you in this matter Don't you think that people who have got the same love for the country will be able to make any contribution in this matter? It is therefore, Sir, that I press this Resolution which I have moved

प्रो० एन० आर० मलकानी : दुस्ती

• के सम्बन्ध में मैं दो शब्द कहना चाहता हूँ ।

†[PROF N R MALKANI I want to say a few words regarding the amendment]

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN No speech please Do you press your amendment?

PROF N R MALKANI I am not making a speech

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Either you withdraw your amendment without a speech or press it

प्रो० एन० आर० मलकानी : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं क्यों विदङ्गो (withdraw) कर रहा हूँ । मेरा मतलब यह है कि यह गलतफहमी दूर हो जानी चाहिए कि प्लान (Plan) को हम नहीं चाहते और न उसकी रूपरेखा बदलना चाहते हैं । दूसरी बात यह है कि मेबरो के पास इन्फार्मेशन (information) बहुत कम आती है और हम चाहते हैं कि वह हमें बराबर मिलनी चाहिये ।

†[PROF N R MALKANI I want to say why I am withdrawing it I mean that the misunderstanding that we do not want the Plan or that we do not want to change its out-line should be removed The second thing is that the Members receive very little information We want that we should always be furnished with information]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN You cannot make a speech There cannot

be a conditional withdrawal Either you press your amendment or withdraw it

PROF. N R. MALKANI I accept what the hon Minister has said

वे खुद कह रहे हैं कि वे ऐसी चीज बनायेंगे जिससे योजना में हम लोग अपना पूरा सहकार दे सकें । हम अपना पूरा सहकार देने के लिए तैयार हैं । अगर हमारा सहकार कमेटी की तरफ से न ले और ग्रुप (Group) की तरफ से लेवे तो भी हम खुश हैं । अगर आप हमारा सहकार लेने को तैयार हैं तो मैं दुस्ती वापिस ले सकता हूँ ।

†[PROF N R MALKANI He has said that the Government would constitute a body through which we can extend our full co-operation in the implementation of the Plan. We are ready to extend our full co-operation If they want us to co-operate in the form of a group and not in the form of a Committee, even then we shall be pleased If they are ready to have our co-operation, I can withdraw the amendment]

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Do you press your amendment?

PROF N R MALKANI Sir, I beg leave to withdraw it

The amendment* was by leave withdrawn

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is

"That this Council is of opinion that a Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and prominent non-Members be appointed to review the working of the Five Year Plan and to suggest ways and means of making the Plan more effective and popular"

The motion was negatived

†English translation

*For text of amendment, vide col 1149 *supra*

RESOLUTION RE COMMISSION TO
EXAMINE THE ADMINISTRA-
TIVE SET UP AND PROCEDURE
OF WORK IN THE GOVERNMENT
OF INDIA.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan):
Sir I move:

"This Council is of opinion that a Commission be appointed to examine the present administrative set up and procedure of work in the Government of India and to suggest suitable changes for ensuring expeditious disposal of the work."

I think it is a common complaint—not a complaint from the side of the Opposition only but a general complaint that the administration, as it is being carried on at present, is not attuned to the requirements of a welfare State. The Government recognises this and accepts it. The Government has during this six to seven years, made some sporadic efforts but without any results whatsoever. Apart from this, this is a much larger question. My Resolution covers almost the entire problem of services, because when I talk of the administrative set up, I cannot ignore how this administration is built up. We will have to take into consideration the recruitment of the services; we will have to take into consideration the training of the services; we will have to take into consideration the promotion of services; and we will have to take into consideration the procedure which is prescribed for their conduct of the work. This problem has assumed far greater importance and significance since independence. There are various reasons for it. The first is that at the time of independence we had to relieve quite a large number of senior officers who were foreigners and this left the Government in certain difficulties in finding proper personnel to fill those posts. Then came the partition and along with it came another difficulty, and that was the expansion

of work in the Government. I think, the number of officers has increased manifold during these few years. But what has happened is that we have not been able to keep pace with these problems or tackle them properly. On the other hand, what happened was that the quality of the officers began to deteriorate and today we are all aware that a great rot and deterioration has set in the services. And the services are very important. They are the only instruments through which the policies of the Government are to be implemented. As I was just pointing out while discussing the other Resolution.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra):
Sir, there is no quorum.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (*After taking a count*) There is quorum now.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: These are all very important points. I think the Government of India and the Home Ministry, constituted as they are at present, I am sorry to have to say, are absolutely incompetent to deal with the problem. The House will remember the administration has not even been able to just take one part of it—frame rules and regulations for the administrative services. This matter has been before the Government for a very long time. This concerns the administrative machinery. It was for the first time, when this Parliament met and when the first administrative report of the Home Ministry was circulated to the hon. Members, mentioned in that report by the Home Ministry that within a few months these rules would be finalised and placed before Parliament. But unfortunately two years have elapsed, but nothing has happened. Possibly, it has not been realised what will be the effect of such dilatoriness. The existing rules which have, as a matter of fact, not been scrutinised and examined by Parliament are in operation according to the interpretations and fresh orders issued by the Government.

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

Then, there are other factors also which compel me to say that an examination and review of this matter has become necessary. The difficult economic conditions in this country and the ways in which the controls have been operated have had a great demoralising effect on our services also. And then came the popular Ministers. There has been no proper adjustment between the Ministers and the services. I think it is very necessary that the hon. Ministers know, so also the services know, where they stand, what their responsibilities are, what their duties are and what their relationship is. What has happened today is that honest officers—and I do not say that there are no honest officers; there are certainly officers who are honest, who are capable and who are also as patriotic as any of us here—are in difficulties. I also know that there are officers who are inspired by zeal and by a sense of duty, but it very much pains me to bring to your notice and through you to the notice of the Government that it is only these officers who are in difficulties. These officers are considered to be inconvenient and are shunted out to less responsible posts. On the other hand, we have got a set of rules which gives such security to even the clerical staff that those people who work arduously can look forward to no reward, because the senior officers to whom they are responsible have absolutely no power. There are officers who absolutely neglect their duty and they can afford to do so without any fear of punishment.

Again, there is the problem of corruption and favouritism. It is most unfortunate that this evil has corroded our services and today we find everybody running after *sifarish*. It pains me very much to find that people have not got confidence even in the Public Service Commission. They rush about from place to place just to see how not got confidence even in the Public Service Commission. To a man of my understanding such a thing is inconceivable, and with all respect to the hon.

members of the Public Service Commission, I very much regret to have observed that. They may be independent, they may be fearless, but there is such a universal feeling and people do make attempts to gain positions through methods other than their own merits. It is there, and to whomsoever you talk in public life, you will find that this complaint is almost universal. Those who are in business feel that it is almost impossible to have any straight business. They must gain the support of some officer either through *sifarish* or through bribe. That has an unhealthy effect on the life of the country. So, I do feel that this question demands a thorough examination.

If I were to give you instances of dilatoriness which is the next thing mentioned in the Resolution, you will be surprised to find that even in departments which are considered to be most efficient, we find representations going uncared for, unattended to, not for months but for years and years. Nothing happens. Now, at this particular stage when we are rebuilding our country, when we are spending crores and crores of rupees on our Five Year Plan, when we are expanding our budgetary provisions, it is extremely essential that we should look into this matter of the administrative machinery and see that it is completely overhauled.

The first thing that I would suggest is this. There should be an absolutely different institute for the training of the higher classes of officers, e.g., the I.A.S. I will give you one instance. There was a young friend of mine who wanted to appear for the I.A.S. examination. He had on a previous occasion already appeared for the examination and had been selected for the I.P.S. He was receiving training at Abu. He came here for an interview for the I.A.S. examination. The Principal asked him, "Where do you propose to stay in Delhi?" and advised him not to stay with his ordinary friends who were of the clerical status but to stay in a hotel like Imperial Hotel or some other hotel of that type, in order to maintain his

standard and status, or to go and stay with somebody big. This is the attitude; this is the outlook. It might have been all right for our old foreign masters not to mix with the people and not to consider a human being as a human being, but this attitude still persists. This is the type of mental outlook which is being imparted to our officers even to this day. You will be simply surprised to know that I actually saw one of the Assistant Engineers here in Delhi shaking hands with a Member of Parliament as if he was doing him a favour, sitting in his chair all right. He does not realise that a Member of Parliament takes precedence over the Secretary of a Department. He has got no appreciation of what a representative of the people means; he has no appreciation of what the people mean. I have been extremely fortunate and lucky in that, personally speaking, not only here but also in my own State, not because of my status as a Member of Parliament but because of my background. I am not stating this as a complaint from a Member of Parliament. I am stating this only to give indication of the sort of attitude, the sort of training, our friends are having, and it is time that we do our very best to have an institution where proper training is given. This might have been all right in the past, but now things have changed, the whole complexion has changed, conditions have changed. Not only are we now a welfare State, but I must also point out that the mood and the attitude of the people have changed. Unless and until our officers are properly trained, they will do greater harm to the administration than good. It is therefore that I wish that this question is examined by a Commission consisting of proper personnel and I would certainly like some Members of Parliament to be included in that Commission. That is not because it will do any honour to the Members of Parliament, it is not because any Member of Parliament is very anxious to be associated with Government ..

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): There is nothing wrong with that

135 CSD.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: but because if this Commission is to be effective and if the report of this Commission has got to be implemented it is necessary that Members of Parliament should be there. Then you will not venture or dare to shelve it as you have been shelving the previous reports.

While moving this Resolution, I have purposely avoided mentioning any concrete cases because it is not at all difficult to mention any number of cases representing the characteristics, the particular outlook and the particular features which I have enunciated. It does not behove and I do not think it is necessary to enunciate here certain cases of corruption at all levels. It is not necessary here to mention certain cases of favouritism at all levels and to mention that the Ministers do this or that. It does not suit my taste at least. If the hon. Minister does not challenge the fundamentals which I have stated, I will give instances—not from Rajasthan—but from Delhi itself. I will give you instances if you so choose from the Delhi State which is under the control of the Home Ministry but that is not my intention or purpose. I wish the gravity of this Resolution, the importance of this Resolution is realized. I hope the hon. Minister will not make similar observations as were made by the hon. Minister for Planning. He must rather convince the House that they are capable of doing something better. They have been wanting to tackle this problem all these 7 years. Can the hon. Minister refute any of these things? As a matter of fact as we all know and as I just mentioned, in connection with the other matter, the Prime Minister has appointed a particular person to go into this matter and to suggest ways and means for the expeditious disposal of work, I have to repeat those arguments only because this is a different Resolution and what I said in connection with that Resolution will not be taken notice of by the hon. Minister who will make a reply. That is why in passing I will have to make a reference to it, otherwise it would be

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

very easy for the hon. Minister to say that we are quite alive to the situation and we have already taken appropriate action and no further action is necessary. Not to enable him to make such a reply I wish again to mention that a single officer of the Government will not be able to make any effective contribution in this matter. I also wish to be very clear, even in regard to this officer who has been appointed, as to what are his terms of reference and whether his sphere of work is restricted only to the Secretariat work or it goes beyond that. Because so far as my information goes his activities are only to be confined to the Secretariat activities here but to my mind what is much more important is the district level. Possibly the hon. Minister will say that we have nothing to do with the district level but I think the all India services are a Central subject. These are all-India services and the only important officers at present are drawn from these all-India services. All the key positions not only at the Centre but in all the States are held by these officers for whose efficiency, recruitment and training the Central Government to a very great extent is responsible. The Superintendent of Police, even the Assistant Superintendent of Police and all the high-up officers are on an all-India basis. It is therefore very necessary that not only the training of these officers, not only the procedure and mental outlook of these officers but all the various things must be enquired into and that can only be done, so far as I think, by a sort of Commission which I have suggested. In this Resolution I have not mentioned Members of Parliament because there may be a Member of Parliament here or there who had administrative experience but we must have officers who have not only the administrative experience but who have also some experience of the working of other countries and of the working of their services. Let us not be confined only to the privileges and all those things connected with the services. I hope the hon. Minister will accept this Resolution.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That this Council is of opinion that a Commission be appointed to examine the present administrative set up and procedure of work in the Government of India and to suggest suitable changes for ensuring expeditious disposal of the work."

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Mr Deputy Chairman.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can speak on the next non-official day. There are two messages from the House of the People. The Secretary will read them.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

I. THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) BILL, 1954.

II. THE ABDUCTED PERSONS (RECOVERY AND RESTORATION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1954.

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the Council the following messages received from the House of the People signed by the Secretary to the House:

I

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 132 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Appropriation (Railways) Bill, 1954, which was passed by the House at its sitting held on the 25th February, 1954.

The speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."