

[ Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. ]

As a matter of fact, curiously enough after this argument was raised in the other House and it was reported, I received through our Ambassador in Germany a message from the Editor of that German paper which had been quoted here and he was saying that he was rather disturbed. He said "What is this ? I did not write anything. This is a translation by somebody from the German; it was mistranslated. I know very well that the Prime Minister of India is in no way bound by any allegiance. I am not so ignorant." He is quite angry about it and said, "Somebody mistranslates it in this way, and I am accused of saying something which I did not." Because the whole thing is not correct.

## RESOLUTION RE FIVE YEAR PLAN

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Prime Minister to move the following Resolution :

This Council records its general approval of the principles, objectives and programmes of development contained in the Five Year Plan as prepared by the Planning Commission.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : Sir, with your permission may I add a sentence to what I was just saying ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : It will be irrelevant now.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : May I at least express my regret that I caused you and the House some inconvenience by not being present here at 11 o'clock as I ought to have been but it is difficult to be in two places at the same time.

About a week ago I presented to this House the Report of the Planning Commission containing the Five Year Plan. Now I have much pleasure in moving the Resolution which you have read out, viz.

That this Council records its general approval of the principles objectives and programme

of development contained in the Five Year Plan as prepared by the Planning Commission.

I have a sense, if I may say so, of great satisfaction at being privileged to move this Resolution in this House today. In some way or other I have been connected with this kind of planning for a large number of years. I have talked about it, written about it and 14 years ago the then President of the Congress, Shri Subhash Chandra Bose, appointed in consultation with others a National Planning Committee and he was good enough to invite me and then appoint me as Chairman of that Committee and for about a year or so I functioned as such with great benefit to myself—I don't know how far others benefited by it—but it was a work which brought the whole picture of India before me, the many problems of India, the variety of them, the difficulties of them and it was a fascinating subject. The work of the Planning Committee was going on in which a very large number of people had been associated, firstly as Members of the Planning Committee and secondly as Members of about 29 sub-committees which the Planning Committee formed. We really got into our fold about 200 to 300 eminent experts from all over India. That work however had to be suspended because of other developments in the country which resulted in some Members of the Planning Committee being removed from their normal scenes of activity, by being sent to prison and other places. After that, an attempt was made to carry it on but it was very difficult. Other things happened and again we were removed from our normal activity. That was unfortunate. Nevertheless, even in that period very useful work was done by that National Planning Committee and it could not be completed but it has produced, as many hon. Members might know, quite a large number of reports—more than 20 or so—of the sub-committees as well as that of the Planning Committee itself. I mention this not only to show my personal connection with this business of planning

but also to show how the country and the nation has been interested in it. Naturally, when we dealt with it in those days, it was rather on a non-official level, slightly on the academic level, because we were not dealing with the problems as they were; but we were laying down a kind of a chart of things as we wanted them to be which was very useful and very necessary. Later on the Government of India, as then constituted, formed a large number of panels, industrial panels and the like, and their reports reside now in the pigeon-holes of the Secretariat. Now the whole conception of planning, as the National Planning Committee undertook was an integrated conception, covering almost every feature of the national activity. The conception of planning which the Government of India then of that day undertook, although they called it planning—and they had a Planning Member—was really not valid in that sense but looking at individual industries and trying to see what should be done about them. That is a useful thing in its own way but the two conceptions are completely different and I would like the House to appreciate that, because the word 'Planning' is used in a very vague way. Many of our friends in industry think of planning in a very limited way—a very useful but a very limited way—they think of a particular sector of our economy and put forward proposals as to how it should be made better or how the production could be increased. That is good in so far as it goes but that is not planning in the sense—in the integrated sense—that the word is understood now. Because, if you advance on the industrial front and you forget the agricultural front, well, something happens which pulls down the industrial front also. If you advance on the agricultural and industrial front and forget some other front, let us say of the services, that is the specialised services that will do the work, if you forget let us say, the transport or something else, then both the industrial and agricultural fronts get into difficulties, so that you cannot proceed, unless you look at it as a whole as far as you can. Otherwise you have bottlenecks and the

like. Otherwise you don't have that integrated development that presumably you require.

Now, I don't pretend to say that the Report of the Planning Commission—this Five Year Plan,—is a perfect document of the integrated development that is laid before this House and the country. But I do say that this is an attempt—if you like, a feeble attempt—it is an attempt to face that problem in an integrated way, and to face it not only in an integrated way, but keeping the realities before us that is, not in an academic way—I mean no disrespect to the academicians—what I mean is we are not dealing with things in a vacuum. We have to take things as they are and taking them as they are, we try to integrate them. The approach to the problem is in that way.

All that I claim for this Report is that this is an earnest attempt, an integrated approach to the question of planning in India. I have no doubt that there are many imperfections in it. I have no doubt that it can be easily criticised here, there and everywhere. Nevertheless, I do venture to say that the Report, for the first time, puts up before the country this entire problem, in agriculture, industries, social services etc., and makes us all think, of this problem as a whole, in relation to the realities of the situation. It is really the first attempt of the kind. I myself referred to previous attempts, but they were of a different kind. This is the first attempt, in a realistic way, to keep in view what has been done and what is being done, to draw up a plan for the future.

Now this is called the Five Year Plan. As a matter of fact, as the House probably knows, two years out of the five years are over. In effect, therefore, it is a plan for the next three years. That means, when we started making this Plan, we had to accept what had already been decided upon, what had been done and what was being done. To some extent every plan, wherever it may be, has to accept what is happening. We cannot start absolutely from scratch. Even more than that, we had to remember that our resources are not unlimited, and a large part of our resources were committed to things

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]  
that were being done. To mention some of the major items, there are some river valley schemes, the Bhakra Nangal, the Damodar Valley, Hirakud and so on. We had spent crores of rupees on them and we were half-way through them, and it is most undesirable for us to say, "Well, we are going to start from scratch ; scrap everything that we have done." Apart from that, they are fine schemes, very important schemes. But it is true that if we had started from scratch, we might have laid more emphasis, a little more emphasis, on smaller schemes, rather than get caught up in three or four large schemes which absorb all our money, however good they may be. But there they were, half-way through and we had to pursue them, although perhaps, in true perspective, we were spending more on those few projects than we would have spent, if we had the previous making of these before us. So all these were limiting factors which we had to abide by and which we could not ignore.

Then again,—you may call it a limiting factor or not, but it is a factor which has to be borne in mind by the Planning Commission—we had to function within the terms of the Constitution of India. The Planning Commission could not simply scrap the Constitution and propose some things which did not fit in with the Constitution or the various rights etc., laid down in it. I say all this because criticisms may be raised that the Planning Commission did not do something which actually would have meant going outside the four corners of the Constitution. Now, I do not mean to say that this Constitution which we have laid down and which we respect and honour, that every syllable and every article of it is so sacrosanct that we cannot change it. Of course, if we so desire we can change it and we have to change and we will change it, not the whole Constitution, but anything that we think comes in the way of the nation's growth ; and for my part, the sole test we should apply is, what is right from the point of view of the

growth of the nation and what is wrong. If anything comes in the way of that growth, undoubtedly, we should change, even though it may mean an amendment of the Constitution. But thus, when it comes up in that form, we will consider. Meanwhile, obviously we go on the basis of our Constitution and we proceed on the basis of things as they are and then try to change them.

Now, this business of changing things as they are, can be approached in a variety of ways. There is the way of what is called, rather loosely, the revolutionary way. And rather loosely, people think that revolution means the breaking of heads and generally creating an uproar. Well, that sometimes happens and has happened in history, though probably far bigger revolutions have taken place which have affected human society tremendously without the breaking of heads or the uproar. Take the industrial revolution, or that part of it which is called the electrical revolution, or the other technological advances which have really changed the world tremendously and are changing the world and thereby the whole structure of society. They do not involve, as such, the breaking of heads, though they often enough involve tremendous suffering for the people—these technological changes. So we have to be clear about the thing. It is not a question of planning only, but the approach to this question. Are we going to bring about the social or economic structure that we want, by methods of violent revolution or violence in any form ? Or is it possible for us to bring these changes about, more or less, by what might be called the democratic method or the peaceful method ? In theory, of course, the democratic method ought to be adequate for it. It is not adequate if a minority of the people want to impose their will on the majority. It may be, of course, that the minority is right and the majority wrong. I am not prepared to say that the majority is always right and the minority is always wrong ; but the fact remains that the democratic method ought always to be possible for a country giving effect to

the wishes of the majority when that majority wants something to be done. I know that difficulties arise and the majority may be misled by modern methods of propaganda or something, that the majority may be made to misbehave and go the wrong path. I leave that out. Anyhow, so far as we are concerned we follow the peaceful democratic methods of progress. I am not, for the moment, saying that from any moral or political plane—although that has great value—but, from the purely practical plane because, any other method which may be the outcome of our impatience or enthusiasm or general sense of frustration will lead and is likely to lead not to the results aimed at. If we are prepared to think that for the moment and for the next generation, let us not care for the results, let us not worry so that we might build for future generations to come, well, theoretically that may be something. If it is necessary to sacrifice the present generation, it may be something more than that; that is to say, in trying to change over, if that inevitably involves the destruction not only of the evil but, of a large amount of the good, you suffer a set-back; the nation, the community, suffers. It takes mighty long to build afresh; building is a difficult matter—destruction is easy. Therefore, from every practical point of view, a method of possible democratic progress, where democracy is working freely, seems to me logically inevitable. Where democracy is not working—for the moment I am talking about political democracy—where there is, well some other form of authoritarian control, then different questions arise as how to get things done. But, I leave that question aside because, at any rate, we have political democracy in this country. Now, I said ‘political democracy’ deliberately because certainly we have not got economic democracy in this country. The 19th century meaning of democracy was political democracy; but gradually, it has come to mean something more than that, economic democracy which, ultimately, means a removal of the Great differences that exist between the different classes, in-

dividuals, etc., and an equalisation and building up of an egalitarian society with, as far as possible, equal opportunities to everyone. Of course, I do not suggest that everybody should be levelled down to a certain level; but, generally speaking, these differences should cease to be and opportunities should be open to all. That is to say, if democracy has got to function, it must become progressively economic democracy and that is the problem of today; either political democracy becomes, more or less, full blooded economic democracy or, democracy ceases to be democracy and something else takes its place, and, that ‘something else’ being, more or less, of an authoritarian type—whether you call it the Conservative authoritarian type or the other but, both are authoritarian. So, we arrive at this conclusion that we should aim at economic democracy. We should adopt methods which are peaceful and which can be adopted really when you have got a frame-work of political democracy based on adult suffrage.

Having decided that—I hope this House will agree with this stage of my argument—then, the question comes as to how we set about it. Well, naturally, our ambition is limited by our strength to do it; we are having an unbounded ambition to do many things as quickly as possible; but, ambition is good; ambition to achieve, and to go ahead gives one strength but, ambition is not by itself enough. You must have the resources. There are certain resources which can be measured, more or less, and weighed; there are others which are uncertain factors. Wherever the human factor comes in, it is an uncertain factor. The same group of persons or the same country may function on a heroic level occasionally and on a terribly pedestrian level at other times. It just depends. Of course, no community functions continually on the heroic level more likely on a pedestrian level but, on occasions, it can be pulled up. That is a difficult matter; but, it is an essential matter nevertheless, because, after all any plan that you may make is only very partly

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

a Governmental plan. If it is to succeed, it must function through the people, that is, through the non-official level and through the vast numbers of people in the country who take their share in building up that plan. If there is that co-ordination between Governmental and the peoples' activities in giving effect to a plan, then, things move rapidly. So, there is that uncertain factor.

Now, why do we want this plan ? It is rather an absurd question for me to put in this way, but why do we want progress—shall I say—or higher standards ? Well, the answer is obvious ; but, apart from the obvious answers that we want ourselves and our people to be better off, to get rid of their poverty, their unemployment, their hunger and to raise the general level of things so that they may not only have material advantages but, possibly, have an intellectual, moral, spiritual and cultural life. That is obvious, of course. Positively, one wants to do that. Negatively, one wants to do it because if one does not do it, one goes down in the modern world ; one can't compete with the other countries ; one can't even maintain one's freedom. Independence is not a matter of vote of this House ; independence is a matter ultimately of a certain relative strength of the country which can meet any crisis or any outside attack whether it is military or non-military, economic or whatever it is. Therefore, negatively it becomes essential for us to build ourselves to maintain freedom. It is not a question of just doing something which we consider desirable but, something which will become essential and inevitable, merely from the point of view of keeping going, because, there is no such thing as remaining where you are. You have to go ahead or you sink, slide back and become weaker economically and, politically also. There is no other way of looking at it. It is looking at it in a broader way, in a larger perspective. Looking back over the last 100 years or so, much more, 200 years, if you like, you see this gradual development in the Industrial Revolution beginning with Western Europe, with England

and elsewhere, spreading elsewhere and finding, in a sense, its culmination at the present moment, technologically speaking, in the United States of America. Now, this process has been very unique and, I am not sure—I speak with all respect—if most of us realise its uniqueness. It is something which started upsetting the world ; it started various forces ; the movement was releasing certain forces at a pace which was quite new in human history. I won't go into details but give one simple instance.

Throughout human history, there was, so far as transport was concerned, for going from one place to another, a certain pace and rate. Throughout human history, up to the coming of the Industrial Revolution, the fastest method of travel was probably riding a fast horse. It did not make any difference in thousands of years. Suddenly other things came in and change them. And they come in every day, and we take them for granted. Now when we go to a place, we fly there, and the normal aeroplane is already out of date : we want a jet plane now, to go 600 miles or 700 miles an hour. And so, the whole question of transport and travel and communications has changed out of recognition. Take radar, for instance, which is an amazing growth. Most people do not deal with it. It is an amazing growth of that idea of communication. I put this before the House as an example. I could give many other examples of technological change which are equally remarkable. We take them for granted.

But the odd thing is that we do not follow that up by realising that this tremendous change in technology has resulted in tremendous changes in methods of production, in methods of distribution, in all kinds of things, and thereby has affected human society to a tremendous extent. Human society has to adjust itself to those changes ; if it does not, well, it may perish.

Now, our country has been affected by the impact of the Industrial Revolution in a kind of passive and negative way for these 100 years. The positive

impact came very slowly. And now what we are really up against is that we are accepting this fact and going ahead to adopt the consequences of the Industrial Revolution, not all, I hope, but the industrial consequences of that Revolution, in India. We have to, of course. It is not a question of choice. Every country has got to, if it is to go on. That is what is happening. And it is happening inevitably all over the world, and creating tremendous problems. Among those problems are the problems of war and peace, which follow from this—the consequences of this development of technology. It has on the one hand brought enormous benefits to the human race, and for the first time has demonstrated that the problems of the human race are capable of solution. We have enough resources in the world to solve them. And yet at the same time it has made them much more difficult of solution and has brought into being weapons etc. of destruction which are terrible.

But another aspect of this is how this progressive technological development is affecting powerfully the mind of man. The machine becomes more and more important. The machine becomes more and more human. The machine develops gradually some kind of a mind. I am not exaggerating : I am saying exactly what is happening now. And while the machine becomes more and more human, the human-being becomes more and more a machine. It is a very curious and dangerous development, all this. And I suppose greater forces are behind this than can be controlled by any country, and certainly not by any law or decree.

I have ventured to place before this House some of those considerations which really do not directly come into our Five Year Plan but which are important for the House to consider in order to have some kind of background, because that background is governing whether it is the question of war or peace, whether it is the question of economic development, whether they are questions which lead to the formation of political theories and the rest. Anyone can see today that the

economics, generally speaking of the 19th century, are completely out of date. That does not mean that some of them do not subsist. Certain principles, certain ways, always subsist, but the basic economic outlook of the 19th century is completely out of date. Maybe, there are some individuals—I regret to say there are many individuals—who still live in the 19th century. But that is another matter. But they are out of date today to solve the problems of today—and so in fact almost any theory that might be advanced and that has been advanced including what might be called great revolutionary theories. They have contained great principles, great truths, and yet they tend to get out of date in changing technologies, in changing circumstances. For, after all, any theory is based on the existing situation. I am leaving out for the moment moral and ethical considerations which may be based on more basic truths. I am not referring to them. But when you base a theory on practical considerations, economic considerations, etc., theories are likely to be affected if the basic consideration changes. Take methods of production, for instance. It is even now possible to grow food without land, soilless food—it is not commercially done, but it is possible. You can conceive if that was done in a big way what would happen to the entire land problem. The whole theory will be upset. The whole question of land for agricultural purposes becomes upset. That is not a problem for us today, but I just mention it to you to show how whole theories and approaches become upset and all your revolutionary approaches also get upset because technology has advanced, has taken a big step forward. So that, if we want to understand the modern world, we have to remain all the time on our toes, physically and mentally alert, and not allow ourselves to get into a rut of thinking—especially not allow ourselves to be caught in any dogma. And, with all respect to you, Sir, dogmas are, in economic and other matters, as bad as dogmas in religion. Certainly we can always learn a great deal from them, because a dogma originally had some substratum of truth, but it was

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru..]  
left behind as the world changed. We have to take this problem in a dynamic, living way. We learn from the truths that are enshrined in old theories, but we always try to keep in touch with the changing world.

Now, planning should be that. And if it is that, what you plan today may not be wholly up-to-date tomorrow. It has to adapt itself to changing circumstances. Therefore, if you approve of this Five Year Plan today and something happens a year later or two years later which makes you think afresh, we think afresh and change it. Well, Sir, after 2 1/2 years this Plan is sought to be finalised by the Planning Commission and it has come up before Parliament for approval. Yet there can be no finality about this at any time, and it has to be a changing, dynamic thing—changing in approach, changing actually in the way it is given effect to, changing in accordance with popular reactions to it. It is from this point of view that I would like this House to consider it. It is, if I may repeat, the first effort in an uncharted domain—almost uncharted—because planning means full information, full data, full statistics, and we have not got them. The first thing before one plans is to get as much information as possible. That we have not got. Take a subject like food, of the most essential importance. We have relied for statistics about food production on the reports sent to us by State Governments; State Governments have relied on the reports sent to them by District Magistrates; District Magistrates have relied on the reports sent to them by patwaris. So, the Government of India issues big reports based on statistics collected by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. They have produced the statistics—the Indian Council—which have been carefully examined and tabulated.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): But all are false.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : Well, I wouldn't go so far as that but I venture to say that in the final analysis, you reach the patwari there, and

an untrained patwari. And if the patwari.....

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Sir, one minute to interrupt ? So far as the patwari is concerned.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let the Prime Minister continue.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : The hon. Member has been touched in a tender spot. So that the honest patwari, if he makes a slightest error, it is magnified. There are innumerable patwaris and in fact we get data totally unreliable—not false, but totally unreliable. In fact the latest attempts at collecting data more scientifically have been made by what is called the sampling survey method, which is the modern method, giving fairly precise results and fairly rapid results and we have only yesterday or day before yesterday, I believe, received the first report of this sampling survey of various things including food—a very illuminating document no doubt—and at some time or other presumably it will be available to hon. Members too, not just yet.

Now this Report gives information about food consumption and food production, which is very far remote from the other data that we have had thus far, about anything—from 20 to 25 per cent. different—a big difference. It immediately colours our whole view of the food problem.

Now, as I was saying, our planning, except in a school-boy debating way, has to be based on facts and statistics, not on theories, not on our urges, not on our desires. Of course desires come in and urges come in. And we have not got enough statistics. Of course we have got some and we have to get along with what we have. We cannot give up planning and wait for a few years to get statistics. We have and we are trying to build up this collection of properly scientific statistics and in this matter, although we have not gone far in extent, we have even now a fairly high reputation in the world in regard to quality, if not quantity. Therefore, there is no reason why we should not do it well.

And again we have to plan for the whole of India. Ours is a federal structure with a large measure of autonomy with the States, each State pulling in its own direction, each State naturally thinking, more of itself than of others. Take the food problem again. There is always the difficulty between the surplus States and the deficit States. The surplus States have the surplus viewpoint, the deficit States have the deficit viewpoint. And it is not easy to combine the two. We have tried it, and I must say that the States help us very much, not that they obstruct. But generally the approach is bound to be different, so that this drawing up of a plan had to meet with a large number of hurdles throughout and if as a result it is not as precise and as accurate as it ought to be, it is not surprising.

Frankly speaking, I am astonished at the fact that we have produced this document, in the form that we have produced it and with the material that it contains. I am surprised at the measure of success we have achieved in spite of all those difficulties that we have had to face and so, I would beg of this House to consider this Plan with this background. Be critical, be condemnatory by all means. We want to get going with it. We want to improve it. At the next stage—whenever it is—we want to improve it, in the process of giving effect to it and all that. But I would beg of the House not to proceed in considering this document in a theoretical way of what we like to have, because we want many things to happen which at the moment are not within our control, but to see it in a practical way—of course to begin with—by considering the objectives that have been laid down in the Plan, the general principles and objectives, because they govern the whole Plan. If you agree with those, then the rest, to a large extent, is detail—very important, nevertheless detail—and the rest also is not only detail, but a large part of that detail is something to which we are bound hand and foot by past commitments. We cannot get out of it, for instance our river valley schemes and others.

56 C. S. D.

Many hon. Members often have said and no doubt will say: "Oh, you must pay far greater attention to small schemes, small irrigation schemes." Well, for my part, I entirely agree with them. But I cannot wipe out the great river valley schemes that we are taking up, we have taken up and we might have to take up still, because we have to think in terms of the balanced development. Small schemes are very essential and from the point of view of pure agricultural development, a large number of small schemes, may be far more profitable than a big river valley scheme. That is perfectly true. We should therefore lay stress on that. Nevertheless, there are other factors of a big river valley scheme of essential and basic importance. The river valley scheme is not merely important in agriculture, but it is a basic picture of the future problems and we must keep that basic picture of the future. Because, the river valley scheme is not merely important from the irrigation point of view, but also for hydro-electric power which is essential for a nation's development. A nation's strength is measured by the power resources it has. And India is terribly poor in that. The other day—I do not know what the position is now, but a few years back—I was told that one factory in Canada produced more power than what the whole of India produced. One factory in Canada, no doubt a big factory. So, you can see our backwardness by that and it is necessary to increase our power resources. You are not going to do it very much by these small schemes. You have to have big schemes and also when you have this big scheme, you can develop industry there—and it becomes a way of developing industry and many other things.

Now again, most people agree that agriculture is important. Nevertheless, criticism is offered that in this Plan we have not paid enough attention to industrial development. It is a just criticism and yet unjustifiable. We want industrial development because essentially our living standards will go up only by industrial development.



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

But how are we to have industrial development. On what foundation, on what basis are we going to have it? If agriculture is not stable there will be no foundation for industrial development. It is essential, therefore, from every point of view that first attention should be paid to agriculture in all its forms, including land policy, improvement in methods of agricultural production, etc., whatever they might involve. Our production, as the House must know, is terribly low as compared with other countries. What we produce per acre is very little, and the problem before us is of course expanding our cultivation but much more intensively improving our production. Therefore, agriculture becomes important. It does not matter how much importance you attach to industry—and we do attach importance to it and I say that without industrial development, industrialisation, you will not really raise living standards adequately—but you cannot advance industry without having agriculture on a firm basis. In fact, all these questions cannot be considered separately from one another. The whole objective of the planning is having a balanced outlook, balancing one with the other. You cannot proceed along one front only. You will be held up if you do not go ahead on the other fronts also. Therefore, in this Plan first attention is paid to the food problem, the agricultural problem. A good deal of money is sought to be spent for the improvement of agriculture, on major production in agriculture. The river valley schemes also, of course, help industry greatly.

Next, we come to industry. In industry, it would be easy, terribly easy, to put up a fairly large number of factories producing consumer goods. It would not cost too much. It would be showy, but these factories of consumption goods would depend on the basic industries of other countries. We could not be wholly independent in the matter and we would be terribly dependent on other countries even for our machines and for other important

things. Therefore, if you want industries, we have to concentrate on those basic industries, key industries, mother industries, call them what you like. We want iron and steel. We have got to go ahead with iron and steel. We want the basic industries, the chemical industry and the others. We have to go ahead with them. When we go in for those basic industries, they take a lot of money and they produce results after some time. They do not produce results immediately. So, your money gets tied up, just as your money is tied up in the river valley schemes. In fact, the process of industrialisation in every country has involved putting in a great deal of your resources into something which does not yield dividends for a considerable time. Therefore, it becomes a great strain on the country, and the more rapid the industrialisation, the greater is the strain, and again to go back to what I said, one will have to be prepared to bear that strain. To what extent that strain can be borne depends upon the people of the country, upon the Government of the country, but there is a limit beyond which people cannot bear. They crack up. People bear much more in authoritarian regimes but there, they are forced to bear more. In a democratic set-up you may have to go a little more slowly. You cannot industrialise without that strain, unless you industrialise with money flowing from outside, with foreign money, foreign aid even though other evils flow which I would not go into now, but it must be recognised that industrialisation means strain, means blocking up your resources for future good and if you do that before firmly entrenching yourself on the agricultural sector, you are lost, because this strain would immediately be felt by the vast agricultural population and the whole thing will crack up.

Now, talking about industry, in this Report we have indicated that there should be a public sector and a private sector. It should be remembered that even now the public sector in India is fairly extensive, fairly important and during the last three years it has been growing fairly rapidly, but

apart from that, it is our intention that it should grow; it is our intention that the public sector should progressively grow at the expense of the private sector but only provided that we are not, as a theory, giving effect to something which we like but when we are prepared to do that with advantage to the country, that is, when we are not only prepared but when it will be advantageous to the country. You remember also that the private sector itself, if I may say so, is not entirely private, or even if it is private, it is not entirely governed by the theories of free enterprise and the like as is feared, because the whole conception of a planned economy is that the private sector itself is to a large extent controlled, i.e. brought into the four corners of the Plan. If any part of the private sector wants to go outside the Plan, it cannot be permitted to do so. It will break the Plan. It has to function within the steel structure, the steel framework, of the Plan. Within that it may have freedom. Then, again, the question arises, must arise, in regard to profits, dividends, etc. just as it arises in regard to wages, salaries, etc., that there must not be profits above a certain level. In these matters, therefore, the private sector itself is not so terribly private and uncontrolled. There cannot be any uncontrolled sector, free sector, completely free sector or *laissez faire* economy. That theory, if I may say so, is as dead as the 19th century, and even those countries which talk a great deal about it, if you examine what they are doing, are themselves getting away from it with fair ability in large sectors of their economy. So, in this Report we aim at progressive socialisation. Whatever we say, we say moderately and rightly so, because we do not want to say more than we can do but we would like to do more whenever it becomes feasible or possible, and I would like to draw your attention to some parts of the first four chapters or so, to what we have said in regard to banking and insurance. We are not touching banking and insurance at the present moment, but it is clear that banking and insurance, just as everything else, must be

thought of in terms of the Plan, in terms of building the Plan, of helping the economy in the Plan. Further, great changes may have to be brought about in them towards specialisation etc., but we don't suggest that positively there but we do say that that is a thing which has to be looked into not necessarily after the period of this Plan but even during the period of this Plan if necessary.

So I have tried to place before the House, if I may say so, the broad features, not of planning, but to some extent, of the Plan without going into full details. This Plan is based on the Draft Plan, Draft Outline as it was produced some 15 months back and which has been considered by the country for over a year, criticised, commended and sometimes condemned and since then the Planning Commission has consulted all manner of groups and parties and viewpoints and associations, as many as they could reach. In effect, therefore, this Plan, for which, of course, the responsibility is that of the Planning Commission only, is in effect a Plan which is something much more than that produced by the Members of the Planning Commission. We have been in constant touch with the State Governments. There is, as the House perhaps knows, what is called a National Development Council, consisting of all the Chief Ministers in the country and some Ministers here and the Planning Commission that has already considered this Plan and generally approved them. So we have been in intimate touch with the State Governments. Apart from that, we have been in touch, as I said, with other organisations and groups representing different viewpoints. I don't mean to say that we have accepted everything that they said—that was impossible—because they themselves were in conflict with each other but we had paid due attention to everything that was said. It does not matter from where it came and we tried to profit by it and in so far as it is possible for us to include it in the Plan. Naturally we could not put in completely contradictory approaches.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Therefore, I claim that this Plan is in a sense a joint plan to the making of which vast numbers of people in the country have contributed. So far as the Draft Outline was concerned, it was apart from those whom we consulted—and I was happy to find in my recent travels how in many schools and colleges, it had become some kind of a basis for considering the problems of India and thus we have been making the people of India planning-conscious which is important from many points of view, from the point of view of plan of course, but more so from the point of view of making the people think of this entire country of ours, of its varieties and problems and think of them finally as one integrated problem. That is to promote them to think of the unity of India in its variety and diversity. So I submit this Plan before this House and I trust that this House will approve of this Resolution that I have put forward not merely, if I may say so, passively but enthusiastically.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

That this Council records its general approval of the principles, objectives and programme of development contained in the Five Year Plan as prepared by the Planning Commission.

I shall ask the movers of the amendments to move their amendments at this stage and take up the Resolution and the amendments for discussion later.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Sir, I move :

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

“but considers that the report must be so modified as to carry out the Five Year Plan without waiting for any external borrowing or aid of a nature which will infringe upon the independent status of our country.”

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

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

“but this Council regrets to note that the Plan has neglected the development of underdeveloped areas and has ignored sound and accepted principles in this respect.”

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : Sir, I move :

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

“but is of the opinion that the plan—

(a) does not provide suitable steps for the early establishment of a ‘welfare State; ;

(b) does not suggest adequate measures for raising sufficiently the standard of living of the rural population from its present low level and assuring full employment to all persons ;

(c) does not embody proper methods for financing the Plan by nationalisation of key industries and banking institutions and does not make enough use of deficit financing for this purpose.”

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras) : Sir, I move :

That in the Resolution

(i) for the word “principles” the words “principle of National Economic Planning, but regrets that” be substituted ; and

(ii) the following be added at the end :—

“do not materially change the conditions of our people”.

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA (Madras) : Sir, I move :

That in the Resolution for the words “records its general approval of” the words “having considered” be substituted ; and at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

“regrets that the Plan does not promise the ending of the exploitation of British capital which is one of the main causes of India’s backwardness and poverty.”

Sir, I also move :

That in the Resolution for the words “records its general approval of” the words “having considered” be substituted ; and at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

“regrets that the Plan does not promise any democratic transformation, political, administrative or economic, but on the contrary seeks to perpetuate the present state of affairs.”

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Madras) : Sir, I move :

That in the Resolution for the words “records its general approval of” the words “having considered” be substituted ; and at the end of

the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"regrets that the proposals contained in the Plan will not release the productive forces, industrial or agrarian, for the utilisation of the natural resources of the country."

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal) :** Sir, I move :

That in the Resolution for the words "records its general approval of" the words "having considered" be substituted; and at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"regrets that the proposals contained in the Plan will not bring about the rehabilitation of the refugees, promote education or improve the health services."

**SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) :** Sir, I move :

That in the Resolution for the words "records its general approval of" the words "having considered" be substituted; and at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"regrets that the proposals contained in the Plan would not lead to the industrialisation or the economic advancement of the country, but would, on the contrary, bring additional burdens on the people and increase the country's economic dependence."

**SHRI B. RATH (Orissa) :** Sir, I move :—

That in the Resolution for the words "records its general approval of" the words "having considered" be substituted; and at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"regrets that the Plan promises the intensified exploitation of the workers and peasants as well as increased taxation and other financial burdens on the people."

**SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA :** Sir, I move :

That in the Resolution for the words "records its general approval of" the words "having considered" be substituted; and at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"regrets that the Plan does not seek to develop transport and communications between different parts of regions speaking the same language but separated under different State Administrations and that the Plan does not contemplate unification of such linguistic regions."

**SHRI K. C. GEORGE (Travancore-Cochin) :** Sir, I move :

That in the Resolution for the words "records its general approval of" the words "having considered" be substituted; and at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"regrets that the Plan does not seek to prevent the flow of the profits earned by foreign owned concerns out of the country and make them available for financing the development schemes."

Sir, I also move :

That in the Resolution for the words "records its general approval of" the words "having considered" be substituted; and at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"regrets that the Plan pays very little attention to the development of under-developed regions."

**SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa) :** Sir, I move :

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added namely :

But regrets—

(i) that the administrative machinery proposed to be set up, under the aegis of Government officials, for the execution of the Plan is entirely inadequate for the purpose and is not in keeping with the democratic temper of the times ;

(ii) that the distribution of the plan is not equitable, nor does it offer adequate opportunities for raising the standard of living in backward States; and

(iii) that for the financing of the Plan items of taxation suggested in the States sector will result in increasing the burden on the weak shoulders of the poorer sections of the society, which are groaning under the weight of the present taxation."

**SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal) :** Sir, I move :

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"but is of opinion that the Plan—

(a) maintains, by and large, the *status quo* and does not envisage measures nor provide institutional patterns necessary for the establishment of a socialist society ;

(b) does not assure full employment; and

(c) does not provide a suitable machinery for the formulation and the implementation of the Plan."

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO (Orissa) :  
Sir, I move :

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added namely :—

"I regrets—

(a) that the Plan does not provide for adequate machinery for its implementation;

(b) that the Plan does not indicate the administrative and financial control over the proposed expenditure ;

(c) that the Plan does not envisage the integration of Defence with socio-economic planning, which is the essence of manpower mobilization in modern times ;

(d) that the Plan has nothing to enthuse the masses of our countrymen ;

(e) that the Plan gives no indication of training the Defence personnel and rehabilitating ex-servicemen in the proposed socio-economic drive ;

(f) that the Plan discloses no programme for manufacturing stores, equipment and other defence requirements in this country ;

(g) that the Plan has not considered the vast possibility of utilizing the Chilka-Gopalpur area not only as a defence base to protect the East Coast but also for coastal industries and the development of agriculture ;

(h) that the Plan gives no indication of utilizing the Hirakud area with its vast mineral and hydro-electrical possibilities, along with the protection it affords from possible enemy attack for locating Defence Industries,

(i) that the Plan does not take proper account of the dangers besetting our social life and stability through the repercussion of the policy and means whereby it is expected to be carried into effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Amendment No. 17 is disallowed because it is a dilatory motion.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras) : Sir, I move :

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"and having considered the same this Council urges that provision should be made to include the Krishna Valley scheme as recommended by the Khosla Committee in the Five Year Plan and take immediate and effective steps for the implementation of the same."

Sir, I also move :

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :—

"and having considered the same this Council urges that adequate provision should be made for the housing of agricultural labour in the rural areas in the field of social service."

Sir, I also move :

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"and having considered the same this Council regrets to find that no adequate provision is made for medium and long term finance to the agriculturists through co-operatives."

Sir, I also move :

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :

"and having considered the same, this Council urges that the Plan be subject to review by Parliament at least once a year, with a view to adjust the Plan according to changing circumstances that would be brought about by the actual working of the Plan."

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin) : Sir, I move :

That for the original Resolution the following be substituted, namely :

This Council is of opinion that the planning envisaged in the Report of the Planning Commission is inconsistent with the historical creative spirit of the toiling masses and retards the process of the building up of new society which will ensure equality of opportunity and progress in terms of the Directive Principles of State Policy contained in the Constitution of India."

MR. CHAIRMAN : The main Resolution and the amendments are before the House for discussion.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : Mr. Chairman, although as compared to the Draft Plan, the final Plan incorporates no fundamental changes, yet it registers certain improvements in some aspects. There is, for example, a larger expenditure provided for which I believe, will give the Commission wider powers of manoeuvrability although how the increased expenditure will be financed will be a different story. It appears also that the final Plan has given some thought to problems which were overlooked in the Draft Plan viz., problems of foreign

commerce and balance of payments. The Plan has also shown some increased awareness of land problems although the fundamental issues still await solution. In the second place, I agree with the Prime Minister when he stated in the other House that the Commission has laboured indefatigably. The huge tomes it has produced is ample evidence of that fact although whether the Plan should have been introduced and presented in such bulk is a moot point. In the third place I agree with the Prime Minister when he stated that the Plan has been widely publicised and made the people more plan-conscious although as I shall have occasion to refer later on, this propaganda is not, in the form in which it has been made, without serious dangers. I am afraid I cannot agree with the Prime Minister when he stated that this Plan constituted the first attempt at presenting an integrated plan covering the whole economy. That honour, in all fairness, should go to the Bombay Plan. The Bombay Plan forestalled this Plan in two respects—firstly it made people plan-conscious and secondly it elaborated a plan with definite targets and objectives. Having said that, I feel I have exhausted everything that I can say in favour of the Plan and I have a lot of things to say against the Plan.

Firstly, as the Prime Minister himself has said, we have no statistics. The Plan, therefore, must have been in many respects unreal and I feel that the Plan has not also fulfilled all the terms of reference that were referred to it. One of the terms of reference was this. The Commission was enjoined to make an assessment of the material, capital and human resources of the country, and I submit, Sir, that has not been done adequately. It is also surprising that even though this Government has been in power for five years, it has not been possible sufficiently to strengthen its statistical agencies and machinery. We should have had, after the five-year period, more reliable statistics on which to base the Plan. In the absence of statistics, it is not possible to formulate plans on any satisfactory basis. For, the lack

of statistics in many respects allows for nothing more than observations of wide scope.

In the second place, Sir, the Five Year Plan presented to us is a treatise on what a plan should do. It is nothing more than that. It is not a practical plan. It is a treatise on Indian economies. It is very interesting and helpful. But, I would have wished that the idealistic and the wishful approach and the practical approach were kept separate and presented in two separate volumes, so that it would have been helpful to persons who wanted to study the Plan only, not to cover such a huge volume. I believe that the bulk in which the Plan is embodied is a very strong argument against its practical character.

Then, Sir, in the third place, in so far as it is a plan, I believe, it is applicable only to the public sector although the Prime Minister has stated—and it is also mentioned in the Plan—that the public sector is going to be controlled, but there will not be much more control than we have experienced so far. In so far as the Plan relates to the public sector, it appears to me that it is not much more than a list of public projects, the majority of which were already under execution. It has been aptly stated that a bunch of projects to be carried out by Government with Government's own resources can hardly be considered an economic plan.

Fourthly, Sir, it is extremely doubtful whether in a market economy that is an economy which is not totalitarian in character and completely directed, and with our imperfect knowledge of resources and means, whether in those conditions, it is at all possible to plan very far ahead except in respect of certain matters or in certain sectors such as big irrigation projects, power stations, nationalized industries and so forth. The Five Year Plan, in the conditions I have stated, can be no more than a mere indication of aspirations. For, national income, Sir, depends upon many imponderables, such as productivity, vagaries of nature, the trend of trade and other things as well. A Five Year Plan covering the whole

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

economy under these conditions is no more than a gamble. I wish the Commission had emphasized this feature of the Plan.

Sir, these are certain general observations I have to make on the Plan, and then, I come to some specific observations : Firstly, about the formulation of the Plan. The Prime Minister tried to make out that it was a Plan which we might call almost national in character. I submit to you, Sir, that this is nothing of the kind. Only in the final stages certain persons were invited to give their opinions and it cannot be said on the basis of that that it is a plan which has been nationally evolved. How was the Plan formulated, Sir ? It was only yesterday that I received this answer to a question that I had put down in relation to the present machinery for the formulation of plans at State and Central levels : "Plans relating to different aspects of the development are formulated at the Centre by the Ministries concerned and in the States by the departments concerned. In the Central Government proposals are considered by the Planning Commission and the Finance Ministry before decisions are taken by the Government. In the States, as a rule, they are considered by a State Development Committee which consists of the Chief Secretary, Development Commissioner and other departmental Secretaries before they are approved by the State Cabinet. The plans of both the Central and the State Governments have now been brought together in the Five Year Plan". So, it indicates, Sir, that the Plan has been drawn up by the Secretariat officials working in their cloistered preserves and this is particularly so at the State level, and I submit, Sir, under the circumstances, it cannot be considered a National Plan.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Has not your party been represented ?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : I mentioned the fact that all the parties were invited at the final stages to give their opinion, but they had no part or power in the

formulation of the Plan. No party had any power in the formulation of the Plan. It was a plan formulated by the Government.

AN HON. MEMBER : By the Members of the Planning Commission.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : The Planning Commission was appointed by the Government.

In the second place, there is no satisfactory machinery for implementation of the Plan. I was surprised—I am sure you would have been surprised also—at the answer that I received yesterday in reply to a certain question about implementation of the Plan, that I had put down. Although, Sir, nine months had elapsed since the end of the first year of the Five Year Plan, the answer to the question of 'Implementation' was that "up-to-date information was being ascertained from Central Ministries as well as from the State Governments", which means that the Government does not really know anything as to how the Plan is being implemented. Can you, under these circumstances, say, Sir, that the Government is very serious about this Plan ? It appears, Sir, that the intention of the Government is to devote the first five years to planning the Plan and at the end of the five years, probably, something in the nature of a plan will emerge.

In the third place, I have to say something about the rate of industrial development to which the Prime Minister had also referred. Nobody suggested, Sir, that agriculture should not improve. Nobody suggested that industries should get everything. The main question is as to how a balance should be struck and I submit, Sir, that the emphasis which has been placed on industry is not sufficient. Here, a comparison with the Bombay Plan is interesting. In the first year of the Five Year Plan—of what is known as the "Bombay Plan"—5.6 per cent. of the expenditure was to be devoted to industry and 14 per cent. to agriculture and in this Five Year Plan, industry gets 8.4 per cent. and agriculture as such, 17.4 per cent. If you take certain

other projects relating to agriculture, it comes, according to my calculation, to 25.5 per cent., although I found in an article by Professor Vakil that the amount allotted to agriculture constituted 38 per cent. of the total expenditure. I am not quite sure of that figure.

**SHRI GOVINDA REDDY :** Includes development also.

**SHRI B. C. GHOSE :** But, to make the comparison more comparable, it is necessary to add to the expenditure on industry in our Plan, expenditure on major irrigation projects and power. If you take that, altogether the expenditure on industry comes, according to my calculation, to something like 27.4 per cent., whereas in the Bombay Plan it was 56 per cent. The effect of this on industry, on national income and, therefore, on capital formation, has to be very seriously considered. It would appear to me doubtful if the expectations in the Plan under these heads would be fulfilled.

In the fourth place, I should have liked the Planning Commission and the Government to be more explicit in their attitude towards the problem of centralization or decentralization. As the Prime Minister has said this morning, human beings are becoming more and more machine-like and we should try to stop that process. That can be done only by a process of decentralization in all economic activities. But there is no clear indication of that policy in this Report. For example, with regard to the future of small and cottage industries a list of possible alternative policies is indicated on page 82 of this Report. But no clear-cut decision is laid down. Sir, it is a characteristic feature of this Plan that whenever any complicated issue is presented, or presents itself, then, it is by-passed—the final decision is by-passed and nothing clearly is said about that.

In the Five Year Plan that is placed before us, there is no prospect of an egalitarian society emerging at the end of the five-year period. We do not

know what will happen even after twenty-seven years in spite of the Prime Minister's statement in favour of evolving a classless society. Because as you will realise most of the economy—the major portion of it—will be under private enterprise. And, it may be quite possible that the disparities of income will, instead of decreasing, increase at the end of the five-year period.

There is also no scheme for taking the question of full employment into effective consideration. Of course, the Planning Commission has not approached that problem from that point of view. All that it states is that if certain public works programmes are undertaken, then employment will increase.

Then, Sir, what is the objective of the Plan ? It states that the income—the *per capita* income—is to be doubled in twenty-seven years' time, that is, by 1977, and at the end of the first five-year period, there may not be any increase in the *per capita* income from what it was in the pre-war period. Now, Sir, is that an objective which is likely to satisfy the common person, the common man ? In twenty-five years' time, we shall probably all be dead. We are not interested in what will happen in 27 or 30 years. In the next place, the Plan does not assure an integrated price policy for agricultural and industrial goods. Nor does it state specifically that minimum prices may be fixed for agricultural produce. I do not want to elaborate on that point.

Lastly—no, Sir, I have two points more—I have to say something about Finance. I am sure that the Planning Commission itself knew that it was their weakest point. It is all based on certain assumptions. If your assumptions come correct, you are all right. But even if the assumptions come true, there is a gap of 655 crores. What I wanted to say first is that the revenue surplus calculated to be obtained at the Centre and the States is extremely problematical, particularly in regard to the States. On this, the Report itself



[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

says that it would appear that the task of organizing the finance required for implementing the Plan is, by and large, yet to begin at the State level. The revenues of the State Governments have been rising for the last two years but expenditure outside the State plans has been more than absorbing these increases. It would appear that there has also been a tendency for schemes outside the Plan to be taken up in addition to those already in it. In the circumstances, I cannot imagine how the Planning Commission can consider that it will have that amount of revenue surplus in the States as it expects.

Then, Central revenue surplus is also extremely problematical, because it depends on terms of trade, customs revenue, vagaries of nature, famine and so forth.

Then the Commission has not taken into account the effect of the likely award of the Finance Commission. In so far as more money may have to be paid by the Centre for purposes which are not developmental in character, that will make another inroad on the resources that we have.

Then, estimate of borrowings appears to me to be rather optimistic. But even assuming that all these were to prove all right, even then there is a gap of 655 crores of rupees. And how are we going to fill the gap? External aid, increased taxation or deficit financing? It appears to me that we have drawn up the Plan and we are hoping like Mr. Micawber that something will turn up at the right moment. I do not want to say anything about external aid because that will have a full discussion, I am aware, although, I want to say this much—that so much dependence on foreign countries does not appear to be conducive to our national interests, whatever the Government may say about there being strings or no strings attached to such aid. About taxation, I do not think that there is very much scope for large resources being obtained from fresh taxation.

The only weapon that is available is probably the death duties. About deficit financing I could go on talking for an hour and not finish the question of deficit financing.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : On the discussion of the Plan, do you have any planning regarding the length of speeches?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) : It has already been planned.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : About deficit financing, every economist knows the theoretical grounds, the theoretical considerations which might make deficit financing not harmful. But I need not explain, I am quite sure, that the war and post-war experience have shown us the dangers of deficit financing, and unless we have an administrative machinery which can control the economy in such a way that there will be no rise in prices even though there has been an increase in purchasing power, deficit financing will always be dangerous. And I am definite that we have not that machinery by which we can say that we can insulate our society against the dangers of inflation. Under those conditions it will be extremely undesirable to resort to deficit financing, because it will upset the basis of the Plan itself.

Sir, I had stated at the outset, that I would have wished that so much fanfare had not accompanied the preparation and presentation of the Plan. It is not a Plan in any real sense of the term, unless we say that any measure of control or of conscious choice or selection entails planning. Not only is it not a plan on the Russian model—I am aware that nobody, including the Government, claims that it is—it is not a plan even in the comparatively loose sense in which the Labour Government in Britain is recognised to have taken recourse to economic planning. It is not a plan primarily because it is not imbued with any definite social purpose and direction. A mere reference to the directive principles of

State Policy in the Constitution is not a sufficient objective to convert a list of public schemes or projects into a Plan. A mere aspiration to establish a more egalitarian society does not also constitute a sufficient social purpose or direction. Even in the classical capitalist countries, needs of the State are probably reducing the extent of disparities in incomes, without, in any way, changing the essential capitalist structure of society in those countries. The imposition of death duties does not by itself make a capitalist society any the less capitalistic, as the experience of Great Britain has shown. What is necessary is some social purpose and direction, which unfortunately, both this Government and the Plan lack. What would you say, Sir, of a Plan which would satisfy everybody—the capitalist and the vested interests on the one hand, and the common people, the workers and peasants, on the other? One may wax lyrical over such a concept, but I submit it is not a feasible proposition. It appears to me, Sir, a polyglot Planning Commission could not be expected to produce anything but a hybrid plan, if you call it a Plan at all. These circumstances have, incidentally, placed on those of us who believe in democratic planning on socialist lines, a heavy responsibility. For, this plan is being advertised as an example of democratic planning. But, neither in its concept, nor in its formulation, nor in its implementation, is it essentially anything of the kind. Further, hopes have been unnecessarily roused which cannot be fulfilled. As I stated earlier, Sir, the Plan envisages doubling of the *per capita* income in 27 years. This is not likely to enthuse the common man. On the contrary it might expose him to a sense of frustration, and probably make him lose all confidence in democratic planning. And, he may then be attracted by the advocates of extremism. That is why I wished the Government had not made so much of this pedestrian programme of economic development, which they call a Plan, and roused expectations, which, for one thing, cannot be justified by the Plan, and cannot, in any case, be fulfilled. It will therefore devolve upon us to propagate the truth

about the Plan, that it merely maintains, by and large, the *status quo*, that it does not envisage any radical change in the social system which alone could bring about a welcome and appreciable improvement in the economic conditions of the common man that it lacks social purpose and direction, so that people may not lose all confidence in democratic planning along socialist lines, and in a mood of despair be induced to strengthen the forces of destruction. That is the task we shall have to address ourselves, the duty we shall have to discharge.

1 P. M.

The Council then adjourned for lunch till half past two of the clock.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at half past two of the clock MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay) : Sir, I rise to welcome the first Five Year Plan presented by the Prime Minister. Unlike many critics, I consider it to be quite a good plan and the information collected in this report is very valuable. It is a kind of an encyclopaedia on every subject. It is a document of great merit which at its back has labour of two years and more. The information collected in this report is very valuable. It is an attempt in the right direction and any criticism that the Members may have to offer, it demands an appreciation of labour which has been involved in producing the Plan.

Sir, although the planning started during the last two and a half years, simultaneously with its functioning in some projects, it has really started many years ago. As stated by the Prime Minister, Sir, there was the National Planning Committee of the Congress headed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It started, if I remember right, some time in the year 1937 or 1938 and it had produced a large number of valuable reports according to the circumstances prevailing at that time. The guiding spirit at both the places—in the Planning Committee as well as in

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]

the Planning Commission—is one and the same, namely, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, although he did it in different capacities, before, as the President of the National Congress and now as the Prime Minister of India and the Chairman of the Planning Commission. There were one or two more plans in between also in the field.

As I have stated before, this is a very good plan and very valuable information is given in these two volumes. However, one difficulty remains for Members like me, that the planning which took so many years to be prepared cannot be properly read and digested in a few days and so I make my remarks with great deal of hesitancy. Under the circumstances, one could only jump from subject to subject and make a few observations on a few of them and that also on a very few aspects of those questions.

Sir, from the plan it appears that about 44 per cent. of the money which is going to be spent will be on agriculture, irrigation and power, 25 per cent. on transport and communications, 24 per cent. on special service and rehabilitation, including education, health, medical relief, scheduled classes and tribes, housing and labour welfare; social welfare, compared to other things, gets the last place in this planning. Eight to nine per cent. is given to the industries and the rest to miscellaneous items.

The Planning is going to cost Rs. 2,059 crores and the expenditure is distributed State-wise which is given in the Report. Of these, 60 per cent. is going to be found by the Centre for its own projects and for assisting State projects like Bhakra-Nangal, Hirakud Dam, Damodar Valley, Harike, Koyna, Krishna, Rihandi, Chambal and Kosi. The rest of the money is supposed to be found out by the States themselves. The Central schemes are partly State schemes and partly Central schemes. For instance, Railways, Sindri Factory, Telephone Equipment and the Chittaranjan Locomotive Workshop, come in this category. Wherever the Centre

gives money to the States, in most cases it is supposed to be a loan to be realised in the long term. How much would be realised and how much could be realised, are matters for conjecture. The expenditure is divided between the Centre and the States and the domestic resources available are estimated at Rs. 1,258 crores, excluding Rs. 156 crores already received by way of external aid and with the inclusion of that amount, the whole amount available would be Rs. 1,414 crores. The balance will come partly from sterling balances which will be only to the extent of Rs. 290 crores, as the rest of the sterling balance will be needed to back up our currencies.

So, the remaining gap of Rs. 555 crores, that is to say, a gap between Rs. 1,414 crores and Rs. 2,059 crores can come partly from sterling balances and partly from foreign assistance or from taxation or loans or simply by deficit financing. The deficit financing cannot be incurred beyond Rs. 290 crores because this will be against our sterling balances; but deficit financing is bound to give rise to some kind of inflation. So far as raising of loans is concerned, I wonder whether there will be any scope for it because even for the initial figure of Rs. 1,258 crores we shall have to raise loans.

Then take taxation. I wonder if there is any more scope for taxation beyond what we have imposed at present. It is true that compared to other countries our taxation is the lowest, i.e. only 7 per cent. but, Sir, we should not forget that in this country tax-payers are very few compared to other countries. The average low income *per capita* cannot bear any more taxation and those, who can pay taxes are complaining that they are paying through their noses. Even now, we are trying to tap every source, not leaving much scope for the future taxation. We may increase the production, but if we deprive the people of the means of purchasing, then the people are not likely to be much elated about it. What we purchased with one rupee before the war, today costs more than five rupees. A man having an income of Rs. 100 per

month now has the purchasing power of only Rs. 25 on the pre-war level. Even today, Sir, our production in many sectors has increased, but the purchases are less. We have more cloth, but less number of buyers. The other day I read in the papers that we have more cinemas but less number of people who go and see them. This makes it clear that purchasing power of the people is less. For instance, the sales tax in Bombay, which had so much of agitation, has affected the common man a great deal, because ultimately it is the common man who pays it. After all, Sir, if we are planning for the happiness of the common man and if he is not going to be happy, then he will not appreciate the merit of the Plan.

The deficit financing will also be a doubtful factor, if people have no money, we would not find people buying loans. These factors make us lean more on the external assistance. If we get a further sum of, say, Rs. 365 crores, we can safely finance our plan; but this will also depend on our relations with the countries that give. The world situation is changing every day and every hour and one can never say how much the countries who are able to give today will be able to give tomorrow and, God forbid, if the world is involved in a war which, in spite of so many peace talks, cannot be ruled out, the situation of many countries will be quite different than what it is today. There may be a desire on their part to give; but, whether they will have the capacity to do so is a different matter. Besides, we do not know that the estimates given today will continue to be the same during all these five years. Whatever projects are already undertaken have shown that even during the present peace time, the estimate fluctuated so much that whatever money was provided was never enough. Now, we do not know that in the changing world whatever we have provided today will be found sufficient to complete those projects tomorrow. However, the Prime Minister said today that even the plans may change but, that is a different matter. I am quite aware, Sir, that there is also a Colombo Plan

and we hope to get something from that Plan too. According to the Colombo Plan, we are likely to get money as well as technical assistance and whatever we are likely to get under this Plan is merged in the Five Year Plan. Sterling will be used for getting goods; sterling which we are going to get for getting goods and the foreign aid will also come in the shape of machinery and goods. I do not know whether this will cause any inflation. We gain by the foreign aid if it is a gift; if it is a loan it is a deferred payment. But, in case we do not get these foreign helps for any reason inflation is bound to result because, either we cut down our plan which will be difficult because it will be a waste of all money which we would have spent or we print more money and that starts the spiral of inflation.

However, the plan is reasonable. The planning depends mostly on our own resources and let us hope that the external aid visualised in the plan also will be forthcoming and there will not be any hitch for getting it.

There are some members, members like Mr. Ghose, who do not like the idea of having external help. They are afraid that there will be strings attached to it. Personally, I do not.....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : I did not say that.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : With or without strings.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : I do not like the extent, to which foreign aid is being dependent upon.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI : Then, I take the correction. I do not see that there is anything wrong in getting help from the countries who are willing to give it. Even Russia had taken loans from foreign countries in initial stages. The United States itself is an example of development through foreign capital. All American capital had come from different countries and today it is one of the most advanced countries of the world, not dependent upon any outside help. Of course, every one agrees

[Shrinati Lilavati Munshi.]

that there should not be any strings attached to any foreign aid that we may receive. As a matter of fact, the conflicting pull from different sides which is going on at the present moment no country can afford to have string with us, and secondly supposing we don't take foreign aid, can we keep out of the world conflict which may take place any moment ? It may be that it may not take place at all. And if we do not take when it is available, we are the loser. At the same time if we take without sufficient caution it is harmful. Besides, our Prime Minister has again and again assured us that he will never be a party to get any help with strings attached. Today, Sir, it is not one country which is helping us. Countries that are helping us are Canada, Australia, New Zealand, United States of America and even Norway ; there is a peculiar thing about Norway. Norway not only gave the Government funds but it is raising funds from its own public to the tune of Rs. 67 lakhs. Our heart must go out to a country like that which comes forward to help us with this kind of gesture.

Of Rs. 1,258 crores provided, there are 230 crores coming from the new taxation by the States ; but, there is one danger with regard to this money we have to guard against. I understand that the States are spending amounts, not only on the planned schemes but outside schemes and so ultimately, they may find themselves short of money for planned schemes. There is another thing we have to guard against. There is a danger of inflation on account of release of so much extra money in such a short time that instead of the living index coming down it may go up. People may then ask, how they were better off if they have to pay more for their daily necessities instead of getting anything more.

Then, there is a question of controls. It is argued that controls are necessary in order that we may pursue our planning. In theory controls may be good but in practice it is a debatable

solution. On the grounds of principle one cannot take any objection to controls but in practice it can be objected on grounds of administration. It has resulted in corruption, inefficiency, human greed and red tape. With the controls for so many years our deficit went on increasing with regard to essentials like food and clothes. With the relaxation of controls, we have seen production going up in sugar, jute, cotton and even food. After all, controls are necessary for the happiness of human beings but now we are trying to adjust human beings to controls so that we may go on prolonging them. With all due respects to the economists, on the whole, one would like to say that control of everything and anything beyond a certain point has affected efficiency and integrity of human beings. It is like an octopus, which has killed the soul of many people as well as their initiative, and honesty. So far, it has only increased the departments, jobbery, corruption, inefficiency and red tape.

As I said in the beginning, there are so many subjects in the Plan and such a vast field is covered that one can only pick out a few points at random during the time that is available to any Member.

First of all, Sir, now I would like to take one point from the Health programme and that is the family planning. I am glad that our Government is very keen to encourage family planning but, then, I wonder, Sir, that the one way which can lead to the family planning, has been avoided in this Plan. In our country there are so many people who are suffering from leprosy, tuberculosis or madness or some other incurable diseases. The sterilisation of these unfit people is one of the ways which will save our country from the growth of feeble and diseased people. I wonder why our Government has not taken this point into consideration. Such people cannot look after their children and may transmit their diseases and increase the burden of the whole society, generation after generation. Even in the Family Planning Conference this point was urged. Here also, we are talking of

family planning, and still in the Parliament when a private member brought a bill on the subject of sterilisation of the unfit, Government disapproved of the bill and the member was ridiculed by the Government as well as by the Members. If this is the attitude of the Government and the Members of the Parliament on such a vital subject, I wonder how we are going to have family planning.

In the matter of education, I am glad that our Government has recognised the necessity of manual work and social service done by the students. As far back as the year 1946-1947, I had moved a resolution in the Bombay Legislative Assembly for the conscription of students on the following lines:

"That a scheme be instituted", I am quoting the relevant passage, "by virtue of which those who appear for the Matriculation Examination with the exception of those eligible for higher education or technical training in Industry, Commerce, Agriculture and Medicine, be conscripted for serving as teachers in primary schools in villages or towns for a period of two years with the salary scales prescribed by the Government.

"That those who are exempted from the compulsory service at the Matriculation stage, as mentioned above, also be conscripted after graduation in any service for two years to work as teachers in Secondary Schools or any Industry, Agriculture and Medicine which may be constituted by the Government provided they were not required to join any compulsory military training instituted by the Government."

This question was debated for a long time in that Assembly. The Bombay Government appointed a Committee on that which recommended only the voluntary social service. This idea, independently of my resolution, of course, found favour with Maulana Sahib, if I remember aright and the Prime Minister also in some of his speeches recently preached the same idea. This idea was approved by Gandhiji too, when I referred the matter at that time to him, and now

I am happy to find that this idea finds favour in this Five Year Plan.

Now I jump to the subject of social welfare. Here also I am happy to find that it is recognised that the protection, care, shelter and rehabilitation of women are not adequate in the country and cases of neglect are frequent. It says that there is a need for more institutions to be organised by local self-governing bodies and private social agencies and that the personnel for regulation, inspection and control of homes should be under the management of trained personnel. Such homes should provide shelter, medical aid and assistance for marriages and there is need to strengthen existing specialised and private agencies like the vigilance associations and societies for the prevention of traffic in women. I am so very thankful to the Government for including this comprehensive programme in the Five Year Plan. I hope, Sir, that they will be equally ready to help schemes of the above description.

There have been sporadic and localised efforts at the amelioration of women's condition but no sustained effort has been made. In a large number of cases, particularly in the poor and lower middle classes, women have been assigned an inferior position and not given their rightful place in the home and in society. Many women, either due to poverty or youthful exuberance or due to illtreatment, fall victim to the guiles of vicious members of the society and are exploited. It is good that society and the Government are becoming aware of this huge problem.

The programme of child welfare is equally necessary and finds an adequate place in the Plan. Family and youth welfare also did not escape the attention of the Planning Commission and these are some of the subjects to which they have devoted their attention.

During the many years that I have been in public life, it is my good fortune that I have had opportunities to get myself associated with the institutions working for all these and a

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]  
number of other causes. From my personal experience I can say a number of things with regard to these problems, but I am sure I shall get some other opportunity of doing so at the appropriate time.

The only thing in conclusion that I would like to say is that we have now before us a big Plan and our Government is anxious to implement it. The only thing about which I am afraid is that we may not get the right type of personnel for doing this work. It is not only the money but also the right type of people who are needed for working out these plans. The paucity of trained personnel—personnel with a missionary spirit—is the rock on which many of our schemes have floundered. It is not only education in social welfare that provides the right type of personnel. I have seen quite a number of graduates of the social welfare schools who are supposed to be trained in this kind of work but are merely treating social service as a profession rather than as missionary work. So many times there is a conflict between ideology and exigencies of situations. Our experience in the past shows that we have spent a large sum of money on many projects without getting the desired results. I hope the Government and the Planning Commission will guard against this danger and successfully implement these plans.

Sir, I congratulate the Government and the Planning Commission on having produced a Plan which takes notice of so many problems and shows the way to tackle them.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras) :  
Sir, the idea of a national economic plan, as the Prime Minister himself stated in the other House, has caught the imagination of every country, and our Government also has come forward with this Five Year Plan, after five years. It is our duty to see whether this economic plan, this first Five Year Plan, will satisfy the fundamental urges of the people, the fundamental urges which the Planning Commission's report itself has recognised, the funda-

mental urges which express themselves in the demands for the right to work, the right to adequate income, the right to education and the right to a measure of insurance against old age, sickness and other disabilities.

Let us see the targets which the first Five Year Plan has set before the country and which the Government expects the country to achieve, and whether those targets satisfy the fundamental urges. Take the question of food, which is the most important thing. From the figures which are given in the report, you will see that today, with a population of 350 million, we are consuming, including the imports of 3 million tons which we are getting, about 13.71 oz. per day, per adult. We are consuming 2 oz. of pulses, and half an ounce of oil. The Planning Commission quotes the report of the Nutrition Committee which lays down the following requirement per head per day : 14 oz. of grain; 3 oz. of pulses; 2 oz. of oil and 5 oz. of meat, fish and eggs, apart from 16 oz. of vegetables and fruit and 10 oz. of milk. This is the minimum food that is required. And what does the Government plan to do ? The Government by 1955 hopes to increase both food grains as well as pulses by 7 1/2 million tons, which would, according to the Government, give us 14 oz. per head. And as regards pulses, the present consumption of pulses is 2 oz., and the same 2 oz. would be available then. That means, even according to the standard laid down by the Nutrition Committee, we will be eating in 1955 1 oz. less in pulses. And as far as oil is concerned, our consumption now is half an ounce per head whereas 2 oz. are required. The present production of oilseeds is 5 million tons, and at the end of 1955 we will be producing practically the same amount of oilseeds. That is to say, after five years we will in no way be better off in regard to fats, Sir, that 3 P.M. means we do not improve at all our food consumption. Not only that let us compare these nutrition standards <sup>with</sup> ~~the~~ jail standards which we had in 1935. The Jail Manual at that time provided for 20 oz. of grain, 4 oz. of

pulses, 2 oz. of oil, 2 oz. of sugar, etc. etc. That means after 20 years or 10 years of the Congress Government we will not be having even the jail ration which was considered even meagre in 1930-35. I do not know why the Nutrition Committee has reduced the standards. It seems the Government is satisfied with this low standard of 14 oz. recommended by the Nutrition Committee. Even then, it does not guarantee milk, it does not guarantee oil, it does not guarantee pulses, it does not guarantee meat, fish and other things. It merely says, "You will get 14 oz. of gram." This all shows that the Government plans at the same starvation level at which we are today. If the jail rations have to be issued at 20 oz. each, it is not 53 million tons of cereals that we would be wanting, but we would be requiring 76 million tons of cereals and pulses not 8 million tons, but 16 million tons and oilseeds not 5 million tons but 20 million tons. Sir, with regard to food, this is the target which the Government places.

Now take the question of clothing. Before the war, everybody knows that our *per capita* consumption was 16 yards. But according to the Planning Commission's Report we are today using 3,300 million yards, which would give us approximately 9 to 10 yards *per capita* as clothing. In 1955 the Government calculates that 4,700 million yards will be available as mill cloth and 1,700 million yards—practically double the present production of handloom cloth. I do not understand on what basis the Government, the Planning Commission has arrived at this figure. As we all know, the present crisis of handloom industry. What will happen when there will be double the output from the handloom industry? At the same time the Government allows 1,000 million yards to be exported, which would give us *per head* consumption in 1953 of about 14 yards, even if the Government's plans succeed. That means we will not be consuming even cloth as much as we have been consuming before the war.

Now, let us take the footwear. The Government says that in 1950 the production was 85 million pairs. Our population was 350 millions, which gives one pair for four persons. In 1955 the Government plans for 91 million pairs and the result would be that as per the Government's own calculation, taking the population at 380 millions, we will once again be having less than one pair for four persons. This is all about food, clothing and footwear. Now, as far as housing is concerned, the Government has planned only for industrial labour to a small extent and the Government has not concerned itself with shelter for all the persons in India.

Now let us come to education. What does the Government say about it? Today only 40 per cent. of the children of school-going age are those between 6 and 11 years are going to school. I am not talking of those children of 6-14 years, for which age group the Constitution provides that within ten years these children must be educated. Taking the primary standard as being 5th standard, the Government says that 40 per cent. of the children of school going age are attending schools today. But out of these only 40 per cent. reach the 4th standard. The remaining 60 per cent. give up their studies even before they reach the 4th standard, which means that whatever they learn in the first or the second standard, they forget it later on. So the result is that only 16 per cent. of the children of school going age—between 6 and 11 years—attend the schools and the Government says that if they have to carry on the directive of the Constitution, nearly Rs. 400 crores will be necessary to give education to those of the age group of 6 to 14 years, apart from the training of teachers, apart from the money that is necessary to be spent on buildings. But yet the Government proposes to spend only about 100 crores or so for the education of our children. This means that our children will not be educated and will continue to be ignorant. For how many years and decades



[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

they will continue to be ignorant, we do not know.

Now, take the question of hospitals and medical aid. Today the Government figures reveal that we have got one doctor for every 6,300 persons and the Government provides, during the next five years, for 12,000 to 15,000 additional doctors to be trained. But on the basis of one doctor for every thousand persons, we would be requiring 3 lakhs and 60 thousand doctors. Today we have got about 60 thousand doctors and to train three lakhs more doctors which we would be requiring, it would require, on the basis of Government's own calculations, at least one century more before we have got enough doctors as any civilised country should have. Again the position regarding midwives and nurses is much worse. Today we have got one midwife for 60 thousand persons, whereas in the civilised and advanced countries one midwife for 400 persons is there. Now, on that basis it will take another century and a half before we have got enough midwives.

Sir, these are the targets that the Government have aimed at. The targets point out that at the end of five years after the Government has spent two thousand and sixty-nine crores, we shall be where we are—the same level of starvation, consuming very little cloth, with our children uneducated and with no proper medical facilities, even at the end of five years.

Now, the Government says and as the Prime Minister himself in the morning said, we should not judge this Plan from the point of view of what we require, because naturally we will be desiring so many things, but we should judge the Plan on the basis of the resources which we have got and he says that on the basis of the resources which we have got, nothing more can be done. This is the best plan and this is the only possible plan that could be achieved. But even taking these as our targets, can the

Government be sure that we will be able to fulfil these targets? I say 'no' because these targets depend on the consumption of the goods that are produced by the factories. But as we know already, the textile mills that have already produced some 4,500 million yards are unable to sell their cloth and therefore they are exporting cloth outside or closing their factories. We know, with regard to sugar, that 14 lakh tons of sugar was produced. The result was that 4 lakh tons were there in stock which could not be consumed and therefore the Government is frantic in trying to export it. This is the fate of our sugar.

Now take the question of food itself. We know that we are deficit in food, the people are starving and there is trouble. Government after Government says: "It is not the food stocks that are deficit, but because the people have no purchasing power to purchase the food that is available," with the result that we find starvation in Rayalaseema, in Mysore, in Tamil Nad and in other places. Even in the surplus districts of Andhra, where food stocks are plenty, 50% of the rural population, the agricultural labourers have to go without food for several months because they cannot buy it at double the rates that are prevailing now when compared to those before decontrol came in. Food decontrol has meant that in both the scarcity and surplus area people are paying blackmarket prices. The other day the hon. the Food Minister conveniently forgot to bring to the notice of the House the real facts about the surplus areas, and he was content with citing facts only with regard to the scarcity areas. He said that prices were coming down but he did not mention that prices were going up in the surplus areas to the old blackmarket rates. Sir, what is the truth? The purchasing power of our people is so low that even the present production which is very meagre cannot be consumed by our people. Even if the Government targets of food production, which are rather small, are realised, how are they going to dispose of the increase? This they cannot do unless

the purchasing power of the people is increased, and naturally the private industrialists and producers will not produce these things and the targets will remain only on paper, and the Government cannot do anything to make these people produce more. These are all imaginary targets and even if the targets which you have set are reached, you are not going to dispose of the goods. We should see that the goods that we produce by our industry and by our agriculture reach the people but here the Government does not come out with any proposal to reduce the burden either on our agricultural population or industrial population. It does not assure them a guaranteed wage, it does not assure them freedom from debts, freedom from exorbitant rents. Now, I will take section by section.

Take the peasantry who form 80% of our population for whom the Government says it is going to spend 45% or 47% of the money that they are going to invest in the Plan. Now, let us see whether this is going to benefit the agriculturists at all. The Government says that it has come out with a great plan for land reform, that it has abolished zamindaris and jagirdaris and that it has proposed an upper limit to the land which any man can possess, i. e., three times the family unit,—an amount of acreage which a family can work. It sounds very radical. Here is a quotation:

“The idea of an upper limit for land has already been given effect to in two different ways, namely, (1) as a limit for future acquisition and (2) as a limit for resumption for personal cultivation.”

Sir, this does not limit the present holdings. What the Government proposes to do is that no owner can buy or acquire more than three times the family unit, or if he takes away land from the tenant, then he will not be allowed to take more than three times the family unit. Therefore, the Government does not limit the present holding, take the surplus land and give it to the peasant.

Nor does it lessen the burden on the tenants-at-will. It says it has abolished the zamindari system and the jagirdari system and that the tenants today are practically ryotwari tenants, that they have got proprietary rights. We know, on the other hand, Sir, from the various Acts for the abolition of zamindari and jagirdari that even the occupancy tenants have to pay compensation, eight times, ten times or fifteen times the rent as the case may be. We know what this amounts to. It means, on the basis of previous Congress calculations themselves, that about Rs. 500 crores have to be paid by these tenants for the lands of these zamindars and jagirdars. The Government says that they have to purchase the land which they have been cultivating at the market rates. They may reduce it but that does not matter. Government does not break the present holdings and distribute the land among the peasantry so that they can go ahead with the cultivation without any burdens on them.

Then, what about the tenants-at-will? Here again, the Government says that the tenants-at-will have no right to the land which they cultivate. They have to pay three-fourth or half or, where the conditions for the tenants are favourable, about one-third of the gross produce. Even taking it at one-fourth of the gross produce, I do not know how many crores it will work to. The tenants-at-will work, the landlords do not work, but still the tenants-at-will have to pay how much we cannot say, but some approximate figures can be got. It will not be less than another Rs. 500 crores. This means that the tenants and the tenants-at-will will have to pay about Rs. 1,000 crores.

Now, come to the question of debts. We do not know the actual debt figures. The Government have not given any figures, but the Banking Enquiry Committee in 1937-38 had gone into the matter and if I remember aright, they calculated the rural indebtedness at Rs. 1,800 crores. But the Government says that during the course of the War due to increased prices this indebtedness has gone down. But on what basis they say it, they do not indicate. In

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

Madras State, with its irrigation facilities, etc., Messrs. B. V. Narayanaswami Naidu and Satyanathan, who investigated the question of rural indebtedness, have said that during the last war in spite of the increase in price levels, it is not the general peasantry who have benefited through these increased prices but only the upper section of the peasantry and that the position of the smaller tenants have deteriorated and therefore more indebtedness is actually prevailing. Sir, Government have their credit co-operative societies and through their banking institutions they have given a credit of Rs. 43 crores to the rural peasantry, and as such we can take it for granted that the peasants are being forced to pay interest on the amount of Rs. 1,800 crores, at least Rs. 1,000 crores taking it at a lesser figure. Government does not come with any proposal to reduce the burden of the peasant nor does it assure the land to the actual tiller of the soil. The result would be that the peasant would not be able to buy the goods. The purchasing power will be reduced nor would the peasants be enthused to come forward and work the great projects which the Government is placing before the people. I don't know how far the present plan for 7.6 million acres will succeed. The Government says that it is going to construct huge projects. But they have undertaken only 3 or 4—Bhakra, Nangal, Hirakud and Damodar and these they are going to continue but they are not going to start any other new project during the next five years because the provision made is only 40 crores which is very little and that also only towards the end of this Plan that they are going to take up if the funds are available. So with these plans before us we cannot enthuse the peasants.

On the top of this the Government comes and says that the peasant must pay betterment fees because it is going to benefit them. There is no river valley scheme actually giving any betterment to them but still the peasant has to pay. I have information from Uttar Pradesh that though the schemes

actually have not been brought into existence, the betterment taxes are being levied. Similarly in other places they are doing it. That means the peasant is not being relieved of his burden. The money that he earns does not go back to improvement of agriculture itself but is being taken away by the landlords and other sections, which means instead of financing the agricultural industry, you are allowing the landlords and others to exploit the peasantry to their own profit at the cost of the agricultural peasantry and at the cost of the national economy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have only 3 minutes more.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : I would require 10 or 15 minutes more. I started late.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up as soon as possible.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : I will now come to the question of wage earner. What is the Government's proposal with regard to the wage earner? They say :

"To restore the pre-war real wage, as first step towards the living wage, through increased productivity resulting from rationalisation and the renewal or modernisation of plant."

So the object is that Government does not propose to increase the wages. It will take steps to see that wages are kept at the present level. This is the prospect for the wage earners. So the purchasing power is not increased for the peasants. Not only this but the goods produced by them will not be sold and there will be an industrial crisis in the country. How do the Government propose to carry on its Five Year Plan? They hope to get the finances from :

738 crores from Current revenue,  
520 crores capital through loans,  
156 crores already taken on loan,  
390 crores by deficit financing, and  
365 crores from foreign resources.

I am not going to enter into the question of political strings that may be attached to foreign loans. This means that we depend for the financing of this Plan on the taxable revenue surplus, which the Government hopes it will have, and on the borrowings, which I submit is not going to be practicable. Is there no way out ? I come to the last point as my time is up. Is there no other way of planning ? Even to achieve these targets you need not depend upon foreign capital, or the borrowing itself. Only if you are ready to take the profits of the industrial private sector, you can meet it. What is the industrial basis of our country as given in the Plan ? The Commission says that the public sector consists of 1,236 crores of rupees and says there is another 1,000 crores in the municipalities, port trusts, etc. whereas the private sector—it is private individuals big and small—consist of 1,500 crores and Government is satisfied and they say that the public sector is the dominant sector. It will be quibbling with figures. Out of the 1,236 crores for public sector, 836 crores are of railways and industrial capital is only 93 crores—industries and electrical concerns—I am not speaking of hydro-electric projects—whereas in the hands of the private sector they have 1,500 crores. That means Government has got control over 100 crores of capital whereas the private sector has got 15 times more. The net product of the industrial sector the Government gives us 500 crores in 1950 and 680 crores by 1955. I don't know what they mean by net production. I hope in this they have deducted the salaries and wages paid. If not and if you take 50% of this for salaries per year 250 crores would be the net product from this private industry which means in the course of 5 years 1,250 crores would be the capital accumulation. Out of this something may have to be written off for some other purpose. Even if 60% is taken, there would still be 750 crores which would completely wipe out these deficits which the Government have estimated in their planning. But the Government has not proposed to take away these profits. We are not

here demanding the total abolition of profits or taking over all the profits. Nor am I today proposing revolutionary changes like confiscating foreign capital and utilising the proceeds in India. There are 600 crores of foreign capital which has been accumulated at the sweat and blood and toil of our people and the British imperialists have got it. Our present demand is not all those things. Even in the private sector which has 1,250 crores accumulation during the five years, if we take 60 % of it and put it back in industries, this deficit would be wiped out. Government does not propose to do it. That is why I say that the Government finance will be in jeopardy. Already the Provincial Governments are crying out that they are not able to meet the budget deficits. Even the Central Government does not know how much deficit they are likely to face. The result would be that the financial basis for the whole plan would become shaky because the Government does not want to curtail the profits of the private capitalists. It does not want to curtail the profits of the foreign imperialist and the result is, even these moderate targets, even the targets which keep our people at starvation level cannot be achieved by this Plan.

*(Time bell rings.)*

Sir, I am finishing.

Now, what is the way out ? National Planning, we want. We want our peoples' economy to increase. It is this : distribute all land over the limit to which you have suggested, free to the tenants-at-will, reduce the debts; then guarantee a fixed price, fair price to the peasant. Then the peasant will plan, indeed, free from the rack-rent. He will come forward, dig the canals and build the agriculture and industry into a most prosperous state.

Then, Sir, with regard to Industry; restrict the profits of the capitalists; take away those profits of the capitalists; withdraw that profit and plough them back in the industry. You will have

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]  
 enough capital to meet our needs. But, how to do these things ? Keep the wages—do not follow a policy of restricting wages. But guarantee fair wages. Guarantee employment, and in this way you will get the workers to keep the industry going on—the industrial peace of which you speak so much in your Report. It is only by adopting an entirely different social objective, an entirely bold, radical reform, both in agriculture and in industry, that any planning could be done; and it is this which you have refused to do and that is why my amendment says,—while we welcome the idea of National Planning—says that the targets and the programme which the first Five Year Plan has put before the country do not materially change the conditions of our people. It leaves them at the same starvation level. It leaves them in the same barbaric and uneducated life in which they are today.

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR  
 (Bihar) :

प्रो० आर० डी० सिंह दिनकर (बिहार):  
 श्रीमन्, अभी जब मेरे पहले वाले वक्ता बोल रहे थे, तब मुझे उर्दू के एक शेर की याद आ रही थी.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Please speak in English.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY :

श्री एम० गोविन्द रेड्डी : आप अंग्रेजी में बोलिये ताकि सब लोग समझ सकें।

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR  
 Sir, my pronunciation in English is hideous and I am ashamed to speak in that language. I am not going to make myself a laughing stock.

कम्युनिस्ट ग्रुप के लीडर का भाषण सुनते समय मुझे जो शेर याद आया वह इस प्रकार है :

दोनों जहान दे के वो समझे कि खुश हुआ,  
 या फिर आपड़ी कि तक़रार क्या करें।

In English the couplet may mean. Having given the riches of the two worlds, I considered him to be happy and contented. But he still has a grouse and he still invents new pretexts for quarrel."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The hon Member can speak English.

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR. It is very bad English, Bhupesh Babu. Several of my friends have ridiculed me for my hideous pronunciations and I do not want to be ridiculed here.

इस योजना के खिलाफ जो कानाफूसी चलती है उसे मैंने सुना है, इसके खिलाफ अखबारों में जो छोटे मोटे बयान छपे हैं, उन्हें भी मैंने देखा है और यहां विरोधी पक्ष द्वारा जो बातें कही जा रही हैं, उन्हें भी मैंने समझने की कोशिश की है। मेरा ख्याल है कि जैसी आलोचनाएं इस योजना की की जा रही हैं वैसी आलोचना स्वयं विश्वकर्मा की योजना की भी की जा सकती है। एक बात ठीक है कि योजना के खिलाफ कोई लगती हुई दलील नहीं आ रही है। "उपज बढ़ाकर भी तुम पौष्टिक भोजन नहीं दोगे। डाक्टरों का इन्तजाम करके तुम लेडी डाक्टरों का प्रबन्ध कैसे करोगे ? और कारखानों में उत्पादन बढ़ा कर भी तुम कारखानों का माल जनता तक कैसे पहुंचाओगे ?" यह कोई आलोचना नहीं है, यह सिर्फ बाल की खाल उधेड़ना है। यहां, उससे एक बात निकलती है कि हमारी योजना के खिलाफ विरोधियों को कोई मजबूत दलील नहीं मिल रही है और वे जो कुछ भी कह रहे हैं, वह आलोचना का शौक पूरा करने के लिए, मैं इसे भी राष्ट्रीय योजना की विरोधियों के द्वारा कोई गद्द प्रशंसा ही मानता हूं। इस

योजना में जिन बातों का उल्लेख नहीं है, उन्हें आगे ला कर आप सरकार की निन्दा नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि यह योजना हमारी आखिरी योजना नहीं है। यह हमारा पहला कदम है, यह भारत के नव निर्माण की नींव है, इसके पूरा होने पर भी नई योजनाओं से काम लेना होगा। इस देश की बीमारी सैकड़ों वर्ष पुरानी है और उनका इलाज भी दो चार साल में नहीं निकल सकता। देखना यह है कि हम जो पहला कदम उठा रहे हैं वह काफी पुष्ट और प्रबल है या नहीं तथा वह उस मार्ग पर पड़ रहा है या नहीं जिस मार्ग पर काफी दूर चलने के बाद एक सर्वथा नवीन देश अस्तित्व में आने वाला है। अगर हमारी पहली योजना इन तमाम शर्तों को पूरा करती है तो फिर सभी पार्टियों का एक ही कर्तव्य रह जाता है कि वे धीरज के साथ इस योजना को सफल बनाने में सरकार का साथ दें।

AN HON. MEMBER :

एक माननीय सभासद : यह प्लान २०० साल तक पूरा नहीं हो सकेगा।

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR :

प्रो० आर० डी० सिन्हा दिनकर : अजी, २० वर्ष तो देखिये।

AN HON. MEMBER : ' No, Sir, 27 years according to the Plan itself.

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR : In 20 years you will enjoy its fruits.

श्रीमान्, आलोचकों का ध्यान सिमट कर दो चीजों पर खास तौर से पड़ा है। एक तो है कृषि और दूसरी है उद्योगीकरण। कृषि के विषय में आलोचना का मुख्य अभि-प्राय यह है कि योजना में भूमि-वितरण की घोषणा क्यों नहीं की गई। साथ ही कुछ लोग यह भी कहते हैं कि कृषि योजनाओं

पर इतना अधिक खर्च क्यों किया जा रहा है, और उद्योगीकरण के बारे में यह शंका है कि उद्योगों के राष्ट्रीयकरण की योजना क्यों नहीं बनाई गई तथा नये उद्योगों के बारे में योजना इतनी अनुदार क्यों है।

जहां तक कृषि का सवाल है, भूमि-वितरण की घोषणा सचमुच नहीं की गई है। मगर कमीशन ने विनोबा जी के भूदान यज्ञ के महत्व को स्वीकार किया है, भूमि-सम्पदा को लेकर देश में जो विपमनाएं हैं उन्हें अवांछनीय माना है और यह भी कहा है कि जमीन के बारे में कोई न कोई सीलिंग निर्धारित करना ही होगा। योजना के भूमि-सम्बन्धी मुद्दाओं को देखने के बाद इस बात में कोई संदेह नहीं रह जाता है कि इस योजना की परिणति भूमि वितरण में हो कर रहेगी। लेकिन भूमि-वितरण की रूपरेखा क्या होगी इसका निर्णय तब किया जायगा जब कि जमीन का सर्वे हो ले और सरकार को यह विश्वास हो जाय कि वह जो नीति पसन्द करती है उसे कार्यरूप में परिणत करने की स्थिति देश में उत्पन्न हो गई है।

इसी प्रकार गैर सरकारी उद्योगों के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात भी कुछ स्थितियों के अधीन है। हमारे विधान में मुआवजे की शर्त मौजूद है और मुआवजे के मद में पैसा फसाना अभी कोई अवलमन्दी का काम नहीं होगा। हमारा तुरन्त का उद्देश्य उत्पादन बढ़ाना है और उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए यह अच्छा है कि गैर सरकारी कारखाने समाज के हित के लिए चलते रहें और सरकार जो पैसा जमा करे उससे वह नये कारखाने खोलती जाय। कमीशन तो विधान के अन्दर काम कर रहा था। वह क्यों कहने जाय कि मुआवजे वाली शर्त को तोड़ दो? यह काम पार्लियामेंट कर सकती है और जब उसकी जरूरत आन पड़ेगी पार्लियामेंट समाज के

[Prof. R. D. Sinha Dinkar.]

हित के लिए उस शर्त को तोड़ देगी। फिर भी कमीशन ने "स्टेटस को" (status quo) को कायम रखने का सुझाव नहीं दिया है। इंडस्ट्रीज डवैलेपमेंट एंड कंट्रोल एक्ट तथा इस्टेट ड्यूटी बिल कमीशन के ही सुझावों से बने हैं जिससे यह बात साफ जाहिर होती है कि कमीशन गैर सरकारी कारखानों को समाज के हित में चलने वाला यंत्र समझता है। ये गैर सरकारी कारखाने भी हमारे नियंत्रण में हैं और उनसे अभी हमें कोई भय नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, जो भी आदमी किसी वाद विशेष में फँसा हुआ है, उसे यह योजना पूरी तरह पसन्द नहीं आवेगी। यह योजना ऐसी है जो न तो नूजीवाद के अर्थों में है, न साम्यवाद का पूरी संगिनी। यहाँ तक कि यह समाजवाद या गांधीवाद के ढाँचे में भी पूर्ण रूप से नहीं समा सकता। आज में इसके निर्माताओं का उद्देश्य साम्यवाद, समाजवाद या गांधीवाद को आकार देना नहीं, बल्कि भारत की अगल जाति का कल्याण करना है और उसी के अनुरूप उन्होंने भारत की मिट्टी और भारत के आसमान तथा हम भारतीयों की सुविधा असुविधा तथा हमारी राह की कठिनाइयों का ख्याल करते हुए एक ऐसी योजना बनायी है जो और कुछ होने के पहिले भारतीय है। इस योजना के प्रारूप पर देश के अनेक स्थानों में आज एक वर्ष से गहरा विचार विमर्श हुआ है। प्रोफेसर और .....

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA :

श्री एम० पी० एन० सिन्हा : यह योजना नीकरीवादो है।

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR : I think if the hon. Member kindly listens to me in patience he will gain something in knowledge.

विद्वानों के बीच कालिजों और यूनिवर्सिटियों में तथा पत्रकारों और राजनीतिक

दलों में इस पर विचार हुआ है और कमीशन के पास बहुत से सुझाव भी आये हैं जिनका निचोड़ इस योजना में मौजूद है। अतएव, यह योजना कमीशन के दस पाँच सदस्यों के दिमाग से नहीं, बल्कि पूरे देश के मास्तिष्क से निकली है। आज पूर्वाह्न में जिन सदस्य महोदय ने यह कहा कि यह योजना राष्ट्रीय नहीं है, वे गलत बोल रहे थे। यह योजना एक तरह से सारे देश के मत से तैयार हुई है और आलोचना इसकी हम जो भी कर लें, मगर, इस बात से हम इन्कार नहीं कर सकते कि एक बड़े देश के करोड़ों लोगों की किस्मत को संभारने के लिए इतनी बहुमुखी प्रजातांत्रिक योजना दुनिया के इतिहास में पहले कभी नहीं बनी थी। यह योजना भारत के हृदय से निकली है। यह योजना इस देश की जनता की इच्छाओं का परिणाम है। यह योजना हमारी राष्ट्रीय उमंगों का नक्शा है, यह हमारे कौमी मनसूबों की तस्वीर है। यह हमारे भविष्य की जगमगाती हुई रेखा है। यह हमारे अरमानों का समुद्र है। यह उस महान जाति के स्वप्नों का उद्यान है जो अभी अभी आजाद हुई है और जो धीरे, मगर, निश्चित कदम के साथ अपने नये सौभाग्य से मिलने जा रही है। भगवान करे, यह योजना पूर्णतया सफल हो।

मैं प्लानिंग कमीशन के मेम्बरों को बधाई देता हूँ कि देश ने उनके जिम्मे जो काम सौंपा था उसे उन्होंने बड़ी ही खूबी से अंजाम दिया है और बधाई की सबसे बड़ी बात तो यह है कि निन्दा से डर कर या स्तुति के लोभ में आकर उन्होंने खुशामदी योजना बना कर सस्ती बाहवाही लूटने की गलती नहीं की, बल्कि उन्होंने इस मुल्क की जरूरतों को समझा। हमारी राह में जो कठिनाइयाँ हैं उनका वाजिब तौर पर ख्याल रखा और

जिस राह पर चल कर जनता कम से कम तकलीफ झेल कर थोड़ी से थोड़ी इन्तजारी कर के ज्यादा से ज्यादा फल पा सकती है, उसी राह पर चलकर उन्होंने यह राष्ट्रीय योजना तैयार की। यह योजना शान्तिपूर्ण है क्योंकि इससे होनेवाली क्रान्तिया हलचल पैदा नहीं करेंगी। यह योजना क्रान्तिकारिणी भी है क्योंकि शान्ति की गोद यहां इतनी विस्तृत है कि क्रान्ति, चाहे तो, मजे में अपना पांव फैला सकती है।

श्रीमन्, यह सारा देश जजेर, मलिन और कंगाल है और नव निर्माण का ऐसा कोई भी काम नहीं है जिसमें चौबीस घंटे से अधिक विलंब सहने की चीज हो। मगर आदमी तो आखिर आदमी ही है। जो काम पच्चीस साल में होने वाले हैं उन्हें वह पांच साल में पूरा नहीं कर सकता। इसलिए, प्लानिंग कमिशन की बुद्धिमत्ता का यह भी एक प्रमाण है कि उसने सब से जरूरी काम को सब से पहले रखा है और उसी हिसाब से उस पर सबसे अधिक खर्च करने की भी व्यवस्था की है।

इस देश की मुख्य समस्या कृषि की समस्या है क्योंकि हमारे समाज को सारा ढांचा ही खेती पर ठहरा हुआ है। खेती की तरक्की नहीं हुई तो यह देश रसातल जाने वाला है। ३६ करोड़ लोगों का यह विशाल देश जिस में भोजन मांगने वाले लगभग चालीस लाख नये मुंह हर साल पहुंच जाते हैं। यह विशाल बंगाल देश जिसने अरबों का फारेन एक्सचेंज पेट की ज्वाला को शान्त करने के लिए स्वाहा कर दिया और जो आज भी अपने दोजूख को भरने के लिए विदेशों से अन्न मंगाने के सिलसिले में लगभग एक डेढ़ अरब का फोरन एक्सचेंज हर साल स्वाहा करता जा रहा है। मगर, यह आलत कब तक चल सकती है ?

और अगर कोई विश्व युद्ध उठ खड़ा हुआ और जहाजों का आना जाना बाधित हो गया, तब हमारा क्या हाल होने वाला है ? मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि जो समस्या सब से जरूरी है उसे योजना में सब से ऊंचा स्थान दिया गया है और २० अरब के कुल बजट में से लगभग दस अरब रुपये कृषि के विकास के लिये खर्च किये जाने वाले हैं। “माइनर इरीगेशन” और “रिवर वैली स्कीम” को लेकर जो नुक्ताचीनी चल रही है उससे मैं अवगत हूं। लेकिन, मेरा निश्चित मत है कि दोनों ही प्रकार की योजनाएं साथ-साथ चलनी चाहिए क्योंकि हमें केवल अपनी ही पीढ़ी के लिए नहीं, आगे की पीढ़ियों के लिए भी योजना बनानी है और इस देश का अस्थायी और स्थायी दोनों ही प्रकार से उद्धार करना है।

आज सवेरे जब प्रधान मंत्री जी बोल रहे थे तब मुझे ऐसा लगा कि वे उद्योगीकरण के लिए कुछ ज्यादा उत्साह में हैं। सच पूछिये तो उद्योगों पर कमिशन की भी ममता मालूम होती है, क्योंकि प्रारूप में उद्योगों पर जो रकम रखी गई थी, योजना में उसे अधिक रखी गई है। इस योजना में उद्योगों का स्थान कुछ हीन हो गया है और बहुत से लोग यह कहते सुने जाते हैं कि कमिशन ने देश के उद्योगीकरण पर काफी ध्यान नहीं दिया। यह अपनी अपनी दृष्टि की बात है। अपने तर्क मैं तो यह समझ नहीं पाता हूं कि बड़े उद्योगों से इस देश का कैसे उद्धार होगा। सच पूछिये तो मुझे तो इसमें भी शंका है कि हम उद्योगीकरण की स्थिति में हैं भी या नहीं।

गांधी जी उद्योगों के नाम पर मुख्यतः गृहोद्योगों का प्रचार चाहते थे और उस समय हम सबको मालूम होता था कि वे शायद पिछड़े हुए किस्म के व्यक्ति हैं। मगर अब जब हम देश का नक्शा बदलने को आजाद



[Prof. R. D. Sinha D.inkar.]

हैं तब हम भी घबरा रहे हैं, हम भी भयभीत हो रहे हैं। बात यह है कि हम चाहने पर भी अपने देश को तुरन्त बड़े-बड़े कल कारखानों से भर नहीं सकते। उद्योगीकरण की बड़ी योजनाओं की सफलता के लिए यह जरूरी है कि आरंभ में काफी वर्षों तक हम पेट पर पत्थर बांध कर गुजारा करें। मगर यहां की जनता तो आज ही बेहाल है। उसके पेट पर पत्थर अब भी बंधा हुआ है अगर उसे और तकलीफ में डाला गया तो समाज का ढांचा टूट जायगा, शासन का आधार उलट जायगा। हमारी तुरन्त की आवश्यकता जनता को थोड़ी अच्छी अवस्था में लाना है और उस दृष्टि से यह योजना काफी उपयोगी है।

आज प्रातःकाल किसी भाई ने बम्बई प्लान का हवाला दिया था। बम्बई प्लान में उद्योगीकरण की जो त्रिवर्षीय योजना बनायी गई थी उसमें कहा गया था कि वहां बेसिक उद्योग कायम करने के लिए कम से कम २५ अरब रुपये चाहियें। जाहिर है कि ऐसी खर्चीली योजना में लग जाने पर हम कृषि, शिक्षा, स्वास्थ्य, आदि किसी भी चीज की ओर ध्यान नहीं दे सकेंगे। और २५ अरब रुपये जमा करने के लिये एक ओर जहां देश की जनता को भूख, अशिक्षा, बीमारी और ग़नग़ना को वर्षों बर्दाश्त करना पड़ेगा, वहां विदेशों से कर्ज की बड़ी रकम लिये बिना भी हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता। और गरीबी में गिरपतार आदमी जब कर्ज लेता है तब उसकी आजादी गिरवी पड़ जाती है। फिर उद्योगीकरण के बाद भी हम १५ फी-सदी से अधिक लोगों को रोजगार नहीं दे सकते। यानी मौजूदा जन संख्या में से

६ करोड़ लोगों को काम मिलेगा। मगर १०वें साल के खत्म होते न होते फिर ४-५ करोड़ नये आदमी और तैयार हो जायेंगे। यह भी सोचने की बात है कि टैक्सेशन और महंगी से जनता और गरीब हो जायगी और फिर हमारे माल हमारे ही देश में नहीं बिकेंगे। यदि विदेशी बाजार की आशा में यह माल तैयार किया जाय तो उन्नतिशील देशों के मुकाबले हम ठहर नहीं सकेंगे। और विदेश में भी, जैसे अफ्रीका और योरप में, अब अन्न की ही खोज है, कनजूमर्स गुड्स की नहीं। मेरे जानते देश के उद्योगीकरण की आशाओं को अभी कुछ दिन विश्राम करना होगा। पहले कृषि का काम काफी विकसित कीजिये। उसी से आपके उद्योगीकरण का भी पक्का आधार पैदा होगा।

श्रीमन्, दूसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह शिक्षा के विषय में है। शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में उच्च शिक्षा के ऊपर प्राथमिक और सामाजिक शिक्षा को तरजीह देकर भी कमीशन ने अपना वस्तुवादी दृष्टिकोण प्रकट किया है। कालेज बहुत खुल चुके हैं और नीचे जो अशिक्षा फैली हुई है उससे उनका कोई मेल नहीं है। यह भी खुशी की बात है कि कमीशन ने बेसिक शिक्षा की अनिवार्यता स्वीकार कर ली है। किन्तु, इस सम्बन्ध में एक बात है जिसे मैं जोर देकर कहना चाहूंगा और वह यह कि बेसिक प्रणाली को सिर्फ स्वीकार करने से काम नहीं चलेगा, देश में आपको वह वातावरण उत्पन्न करना चाहिए जिसमें यह प्रणाली कामयाब हो सके। बेसिक शिक्षा की सफलता तब है जब आप श्रम की प्रतिष्ठा को स्वीकार करें, जब आप में यह भाव नहीं रहे कि जिसे सेक्रेटरी या मिनिस्टर बनना है उसे बेसिक स्कूलों में नहीं जाना चाहिए। आज जनता बेसिक स्कूलों को शंका से देखती है, उसे यह भ्रम

सता रहा है कि हो न हो यह स्कूल उनके लिए हैं जिनसे समाज मोटा काम लेने वाला है। अगर इस भ्रम को दूर करना है तो आप सरकारी परदों का रंग धूसर हो जाने दीजिये, मटमैला हो जाने दीजिये। सरकारी दफ्तरों में देशी भाषाओं का प्रचलन होने दीजिये और जनता को यह समझने का मौका दीजिये कि भारतीय गणतंत्र का राष्ट्रपति किसान का बेटा नहीं, कोई किसान भी हो सकता है।

श्रीमन्, बेसिक योजना इस देश की टीमटामवाली नयी संस्कृति की बुनियाद को बदलने की योजना है। इस योजना के साथ उन लोगों का कोई मेल नहीं हो सकता जो तन से स्वदेशी और मन से विदेशी हैं, जो अपने हाथ से मोटर भी नहीं चलाते मगर सारे देश से कुदाल चलवाने को बेचैन हैं। बेसिक शिक्षा अगर कामयाब नहीं हो रही है तो इसकी जिम्मेदारी उन संचालकों पर है जिनके मन में भारत के गांव नहीं बल्कि नगर बसते हैं जो उस शिक्षा पद्धति की उपज हैं जिसे तोड़ने का काम सरकार उन्हें सौंप रही है।

स्वदेशी की भावना का अनादर, गृहशिल्पों की उपेक्षा, देशभाषा की अवहेलना और अंग्रेजी तथा अंग्रेजियत पर एक किस्म का अन्धा प्यार, ये चारों एक ही रोग के चार रूप हैं और जब तक ये रोग इस देश से नहीं निकलते, बेसिक शिक्षा की योजना कभी भी कामयाब नहीं होगी और यह योजना अगर कामयाब नहीं हुई तो आदमियों के इस विशाल जंगल में आप शिक्षा का प्रकाश नहीं फैला सकेंगे। बेसिक शिक्षा की योजना जन शिक्षा की योजना है। अगर जनता को आप उसकी भाषा देने को तैयार नहीं हैं तो उसकी शिक्षा की प्रगति सात जन्मों में भी

नहीं होगी। मुझे आशा है कि इस देश की सरकारें बेसिक शिक्षा की फिलासफी पर एक बार फिर गौर करेंगी और अगर वे इस फिलासफी की कीमत देने को तैयार नहीं हों तो लज्जा के साथ सिर झुका कर इस योजना को बन्द कर देंगी।

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

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : Sir, the Planning Commission Report has been introduced with all the fanfare and trumpet which naturally deserves very serious and weighty attention on our side. We have been treated to a treatise which has been given in the form of a summary, and I have gone through almost all the pages of that summary.

Basically, I agree with the Prime Minister. There is importance in a planned economy. But the question at once resolves itself into this : "In what way might a plan be implemented ?" There are two approaches to planning. One approach is the Communist approach, the dictatorial approach. They say, that admittedly they, (that is the capitalists) too, have something akin to a Plan, but these plans are prognosis, on the basis of which it is impossible to direct the country's economy. Our plans are not prognosis, guess plans, but instructions which are compulsory for all management, and which determine the future course of the economic development of our country. You see that this implies a different principle—the principle of the Communist dictatorship

And then, Sir, we have the Democratic Socialist Party's approach to a planned economy and it is this. There is only one basis on which planning can succeed in a democratic society and that is the conscious understanding by each section of its place in the community as a whole and the deliberate acceptance of the

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

resulting obligations and achievements. In a democracy such as ours, in which difference of opinion is largely expressed and diverse groups and multifarious interests are in existence, there cannot be one economic policy or one economic price or wage structure. Planning is bound up with extreme confusion regarding the aims and methods of the economic system and that means personal restrictions on the individual, both as producer and as consumer.

Sir, having given these two juxtapositions of a planned economy, let us see what our country requires. In the present aspect of our life, planned economy under the guidance of these bureaucrats in Delhi is planned misery. You will see from the records that are there, that the statistics that they have got are all out of date or useless. The law of average, Sir, is the law of misery. If you say that a man must have 2,300 calories for his existence and another man an equal quantity of 2,300 calories, one of them will live and the other will die. I require, Sir, only 2 oz. of rice, though I look fat and people who are industrial workers, people who are engaged in active manual labour, require 1 lb. of rice. What is the basis or average that you can bring in a planned economy? You go and measure the depth of a river, strike the average and get into it, Sir, you will never come back to preside over this House. This seems to be the basis of calculating what is required for our planned economy. In this country, Sir, we have got resources, natural and artificial. The natural resources are to be tapped. In that aspect of a planned economy, if you employ compulsion in a democratic society, obviously you will fail. You must have the support of the people as a whole. If you want to get that, give them only directions and develop the plan according to your resources and then your plan will succeed. Is there a genuine appreciation of that basis here? That is what I would like to ask.

Sir, this Planning Commission is a packed body of "yes" men and "yes" women. I know of an instance of a lady who was defeated at the elections, but was elevated to this Planning Commission. If these people are there and they draw out or chalk out a plan and ask us to swallow their plan, it is impossible for us to swallow, much less digest it. Therefore, if you want to succeed in drawing up a national plan, my suggestion would be, first of all, to have people really representing all the elements of this nation, represented in both Houses of Parliament, to have a joint committee, accept their views, get them discussed threadbare over a table and then bring out a scheme, which even our comrade Shri Sundarayya will accept without demur. The point at issue is, it must be a real national plan, not a Congress plan. Even many Congress people who are here have very grave differences of opinion and if a whip is not issued, I am sure the Planning Commission's Report would be thrown out. What I mean to suggest is that even Congressmen do not view this Plan with approval. When they come into this House, they keep their brains out and hearts in their pockets and when they are inside they act according to their leader's wish and raise their hands. Therefore, I request the Government to consider this question in all its aspects and make out a truly national plan. If you take up that idea, then all views—yes, no and everything else—will be discussed and then we can iron out our differences and differentiate between the grain and the chaff and accept the grain and throw out the chaff. Then you go to the country, not on the basis of controls or directions by law, but with real leadership, leadership of the genuine type which people will respect—not the bureaucratic leadership that I have been criticising here as an unwanted leadership, but the true type that springs from the bottom and grows up.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :  
Please speak on the Plan.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Yes, Sir, I am speaking on the Plan. What is this plan ? It is for improving the life of the people and for that you want the co-operation of the people and you must have the correct leadership which will create enthusiasm among the people in order to make them subscribe to the development of the whole Plan. Sir, look at the achievements in South India—those huge pyramids erected there.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Pyramids are in Egypt and not in South India.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : .....pyramids or gopurams. Look at the Agra Fort, look at the other huge structures. They are the results of human endeavour. We are not worried about your moneys. We have crores of people who are available to us. Sir, what is credit ? It is money power guaranteed and backed by labour power. Our asset is 35 crores of people and that asset of ours must be galvanised into the proper channel in order to make your Plan a successful one.

Now I come to the economic structure of society. This country has been in chronic want for the past so many years. It has been under foreign rule for so many years. Of course, if we ask this Government overnight—like Alladin and the wonderful lamp—to transform the entire structure of society and make the land flow with milk and honey, that is quite impossible. Under the colonial economy, our plan was bound up with international events and affairs. What will happen to our country if our trade becomes deficit ? They have made a provision for Rs. 290 crores of deficit financing to be met by progressive releases from the sterling balances with the United Kingdom. I will ask the Finance Minister—he is not here—but I ask him whether, if there is an adverse balance of trade for us, he will be able to get this Rs. 290 crores ? You will not. Therefore that expectation of getting this much money, that aspect of the Plan is a

problematical one.

Now, I will come to other finances which are being taken into account for the implementation of the Plan. Here the total amount which has been estimated for its implementation is Rs. 2,059 crores; but according to their own figures, they have resources only to the extent of Rs. 738 crores. Out of this sum of Rs. 738 crores, they expect the States to find out Rs. 532 crores. I know so far as Madras State is concerned, it is suffering from acute want of money. They already have a deficit of about Rs. 15 crores in their Budget. In that State, the Chief Minister asked people to pray for rain, and God responded with a vengeance. We had rains and we got a cyclone also. As a result of that, we lost Rs. 10 crores and also the lives of 500 persons. That is the condition as far as the finances of that State are concerned. They are facing a serious situation there. Therefore, it is impossible for the people to pay. In the same manner, so many other States are also crying for want of money. So it is not possible to find this much of money. Then what is it that we are going to do ? We go in for external borrowings. External borrowing is not a bad thing in itself. But as I have been telling repeatedly here, external borrowings should not be of a derogatory type resorted to by a really sovereign State. There will be strings attached to the loans even if you get the money. Even if the money is given it will not be given with grace. That is why I asked this Government to take to other measures. We are the suppliers of raw materials to two big countries, two big importers of raw materials in the world. Under the colonial economy our country's resources used to be exploited by one—John Bull—and now there is another also added—Uncle Sam. Why not demand decent prices for our raw materials from these two countries ? That will balance for the imports that we have to get from them. Then there will be no need for us to go on a borrowing basis. We are suffering from want of good prices for our export of raw materials.

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

This colonial economy is killing us even today. You have independence in politics, but, you are dependent economically and that kind of economic dependence will not allow you to implement any 5-Year or 10-Year or any plan whatsoever. Therefore, Sir, we should have the power of selling our commodities to foreigners at better prices so that we may get more and we may balance our budget, and, then, Mr. Nanda will get as much money as he wants for his plan. That is an important point which our friends must always bear in mind.

Now, Sir, referring to cottage industries, we are intending to spend about 8 crores. We should leave that hallucination. In our place this so-called charkha and khaddar which were used by us as symbols to approach the masses to rouse their enthusiasm for political work, are out of date today. Hundreds of bales of cloth produced in South India are lying idle. The Government have subsidised ; even then they are not able to sell, with the net result that they have reduced the prices of khaddar by 25%. They have reduced the prices and are asking the people to purchase but still there is no response.

What is required, Sir, is to see that these peoples' resources are harnessed in such a way that they are utilised for national regeneration and not for the revival of old antiquarian systems.

Then, Sir, out of our people who number 36 crores in all, leaving the 10 crores of people who are a drain on others because they do not do any work by way of manual production because they live in cities, the productive 26 crores are all distributed over an area which is called India. Now, they are engaged in production for 3 months and they have to eat out of it for one year. For the whole of the 9 months, they are idle. How can you harness these village people, distributed from one length of the country to the other ? If you give

them employment for the balance of 9 months, your resources, your income, your opportunities will get doubled, not in 27 years' time, but in 3 years' time. That is the thing that you must have in mind and we must use our scientific talent for the purpose and not be guided by paper plans of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research.

Now, Sir, we have seen that the changing of conditions is changing us. When the Government is not able to provide according to the demands of the people, they ask us to change our habits. You can as well ask the leopard to change its spots. How can people, accustomed to different tastes and habits, change their habits of food and go on living like Dhanalakshmi of Coorg, who is living on air for the last six months. Is it the wish of the Congress Party that all of us in India should live on air ? No, Sir. You may do anything with me, but, I will not change my habit of eating ; I insist upon getting good food and then I will fight and speak and do better things for humanity. Sir, the fundamental need of man is food and if you say, you should change your food, you should starve once a week, or observe *ekadasi* four times a month, if you talk like that, then, this is not the purpose for which this Government was constituted. Therefore, Sir, I request them to think in a practical, realistic way and not to be swayed by slogans of planning of the so-called economists. There are economists and economists. There are Socialist economists ; there are Communist economists and there are economists who do not know any economics at all. That is the kind of economic jargon that is thrown on us and we are expected to follow it in our course of action.

Sir, in an organised plan, there is a tug of war between the alleged advantages of the over-all plan and the claim of the individual to elementary liberties. We will be dictated to by a caucus and will have to put our blind faith in the

omnipotence and omniscience of the supreme planning autocrats. That is the position to which our country has been brought. Of course, it is impossible for us to swallow the kind of dictum that comes out of these so-called planners. I do not want to be thrust upon in this way. I will fight, I will struggle, but, give me the initiative, give me the where-withal. That is what is required of the planners.

You have got 835 crores. You can put it to better use ; you need not regiment life and you can give the initiative to the people and they will rise to the occasion. There is another important point which I should bring to the notice of this House. The Government do not seem to think that there is India beyond the south of the Vindhya mountains. For a population of nine crores distributed among four States and constituting one fourth of the total population, a grand sum of 245 crores is provided out of 2,059 crores. What a crumb !

The Prime Minister made a reference to changing the Constitution. This Constitution, which has been well thought out, which took, for the Congress Party, three years to produce, which has been established in this country on the basis of adult franchise, giving liberty and freedom to all citizens alike, is to be changed. For what purpose ? To subserve the interests of the planners, to help the supreme bureaucrats who want to dictate the pattern of our life, in this country.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : He is misquoting. Excuse me, for my interruption. The Prime Minister said that if necessary, the Constitution can be changed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let him go on. Yes, Mr. Rajah.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Changing the Constitution is a thing to which very serious thought must be given. There are two aspects of the problem. There is already a tendency, a planned tendency, Sir, to make the people sub-

serve the interests of the bureaucracy. The economic function of a police State is to hold down consumption of the people, especially of the peasant population while their surplus production.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Where is the police State, Mr. Rajah ?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : I said "the economic function of a police State".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We are not concerned with that.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : ....is drained off.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You are getting irrelevant.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : .....for the purpose of a fixed capital investment. The execution of this policy develops an extreme centralism. That is the kind of point I am trying to bring to your notice. If power is decentralised, the rate of accumulation will be lessened. The nearer the responsibility to the people, the more it is responsive to the peoples' suffering. From the centralist policy to the creation of a vast bureaucracy, to serve the requirements of the central direction is the logical step. Everything is butchered to the requirements of the plan.

So, Sir, we must concentrate our attention on one aspect, upon only one economic aspect, namely, that without the voluntary enthusiastic and proper support of the entire mass of humanity any plan is bound to fail in a democratic society. The approach to the problem is either on the basis of dictatorship, in which we have nothing to do in a democracy or, on the basis of democracy in which we have everything to do with the people. The need to develop a plan must be based upon our resources, our capacity to implement those plans and not upon the fact that somebody else will come to our aid. We must create internally our strength, we must have all the resources to ourselves and then we must develop this plan.

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

As Kalidas said to King Bhoja, this Government also is having three afflictions as follows :

*Asaney virpa peedastu*

*Sisu peedastu bhojaney*

*Sayaney dara peedastu*

*Tripeedastu Narendra thay.*

The Brahmins of Boston and Pandit Mountbattens are the first headache of the Government ; the food problem is the next headache ; and thirdly the sophisticated and civilised ladies who are wanting divorce are the third problem of the Government. These three problems are facing them and they are unable to know how to solve them. Have a realistic approach to life. You will be feeling better and your plan will succeed.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY (Madras) : Sir, the speeches on this Plan today have been the most constructive since the 24th of last month. We from this side, not out of a duty because we belong to this Party, but because we have great faith that this Plan will succeed, congratulate the Government and the Planning Commission on the very good Report that they have produced and placed before us. It is quite reasonable. It is absolutely necessary that they should give top priority to food. Everyone of us, to whichever party he may belong, does realise that the vast problem in our country today is the deficiency in food and that we have to become self-sufficient in food. Towards that end, the planners have allotted almost 39 per cent. of the total money to the improvement of agriculture—for irrigation, for power, and for other things that would help to achieve an increase in our foodstuffs. They have done that. But unless they make an effort to see that the money is properly spent, we may have spent the money but the results may not be as good as expected. For instance, they have allotted a good amount for financing the agriculturists for the purchase of seed, manure and other agricultural requirements. But

with the experience that we have in our villages, we do realise how difficult it is for the agriculturists to go and get his loan. He has to walk miles to the taluka office, and in many cases there will be mamool to pay.

If he applies for a loan of Rs. 100, I do not know what amount he will be able to bring back to his house after meeting all the demands, external and internal. Therefore, unless we protect the agriculturist from these difficulties, it will not be useful. Also, the matter of time is an important factor. If you want to give him seed, you must give it at the proper time. If he is to be given manure, it must be given to him at the proper time. If the loan comes to him six months after he has made the application, it serves no purpose. Therefore, these two factors, disbursement of the amount and the time taken to do it, are the two important things which will have to be taken care of.

Then, Sir, the planners have allotted a fairly good amount for minor irrigation. With my little experience I may bring to the notice of Government the fact that even the small amounts which the State Governments have allotted to districts for the purpose of undertaking minor irrigation works could not be spent for lack of overseers and engineers. One has to go to the remote corners of the village, make an estimate and then spend the amount. The staff is very small and the number of works are so many that it is not possible to meet the demand. Therefore, though the planners have allotted a fairly good amount—Rs. 47 crores originally, and then again Rs. 30 crores more—what purpose will it serve if we do not have trained staff, if we do not have enough overseers and engineers ? Therefore, it comes to this, that first we must train enough technical personnel like overseers, engineers, and so on. Unless we do that, our minor irrigation works will not be a complete success.

Coming to land policy, I think it is an urgent problem which must be dealt

with immediately by the State Governments in particular. We have abolished zamindaris. We have taken over zamindari lands and paid the zamindars a small compensation. It is not right for anybody to hold thousands of acres when we have taken over zamindaris and given compensation. It is, I know, a colossal problem and we cannot take over the whole of the land in the country from big landlords and pay them compensation. We will have to find a way out. We will have to pay them either by bonds or by some other method, or make the tenant pay in 10 or 20 years. If the Government is not in a position to pay, the tenant become the owner by paying in instalments for 20 years. Some solution must be found for this problem also. Unless this problem is solved, our country can never prosper. The tenant today has no interest in the land. He cultivates the land simply like a machine. He is sure that what little he gets is not completely his but that he will have to share a major portion of it with somebody else who is not working on the land. Unless this problem is solved, it will be very difficult to solve the problem of food in this country.

I know there is a feeling in the countryside that this Government is taking away land from petty landholders also who are owning 100 or 200 acres but that it does not touch the millionaires who are having industries and house-owners who are getting thousands of rupees as rent per month and other people who are in trade and get millions and millions of money—that the Government is not taking over their properties but is only taking over agricultural land. But, Sir, because that is not done, that is no reason why we should object to this good thing being done. If both things are good, let us begin at one end and see that this thing at least is done and done well. So I am in full agreement with the policy that land must be taken over and given to landless people or to tenants so that they may cultivate it with greater enthusiasm and so that more food can be grown.

Then, Sir, the planners have fixed the higher limits for land. I would suggest to the planners that lower limits also must be fixed. It is no use dividing land into bits of half an acre and an acre. It is impossible to cultivate land if it is cut up into bits like that. A family unit of a dozen people or half a dozen people cannot live on half an acre. It will be very difficult for them to plough or manure it. They cannot depend upon a very small piece of land. Therefore, instead of simply asking the small holders to group themselves into one co-operative farming society. Government must compel them to group themselves into a society in order to make it a cultivable unit of 30 or 40 acres. If you can take land from the landlord, it is not difficult to force the small holder to come into a co-operative unit and grow better food. In the summary of the Plan it is said:

“It is, therefore, important that small and middle farmers, in particular, should be encouraged and assisted to group themselves voluntarily into co-operative farming societies.”

This, in my opinion, is false sympathy. Having compulsorily taken over zamindaris why should you not apply compulsion here also and make them group themselves into one unit of 30 or 40 acres and make them cultivate the land on a co-operative basis? That, I think, is absolutely necessary.

Now, I come to major projects. They have taken up good projects. As an Indian I am proud of the fact that they have been spending crores of rupees and they have taken up very good projects. As an Andhra I am happy that public opinion has triumphed, but as a Rayalaseema representative, I am sorry we are nowhere in the picture. I try to forget that I come from Rayalaseema, and I try to feel that I am an Indian, but having been born there, having lived among those unfortunate people who have been permanently suffering from famine, it is impossible



[Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy]  
for me to forget. I am reminded of it every day, and particularly, when I was going through the details of this Plan, I felt terribly wounded to know that though there was a lot of sympathy shown, nothing in actual practice came to us. I know Dr. Katju's great sympathy for Madhya Bharat, which elected him, and he has achieved a very remarkable success in getting the Chambal project included in this Plan. I know, Sir, two months ago it was not there. I have also seen him fighting with the Members of the Planning Commission that it should be included, although they said that it was not possible. I therefore congratulate him on his ability to get this project included. I wish, Sir, Rayalaseema could have elected one Minister, so that there would have been somebody who could have fought on our behalf also. I know Sir, Andhra has gone Communist. But Rayalaseema is not so. We have returned about 60 per cent. of Congressmen. Only one Communist has come to the Parliament from all the five districts. Therefore, I say, Sir, that this is an area that is neglected, it is an area that needs proper attention. Planning is very good. We should plan for the whole country. It is like giving good tonic to the whole body. The whole body should be treated so that it should be healthy. But I must tell the planners that it is very necessary that they must take care of the limb which is diseased. It is no use ignoring the finger or the leg which is wounded and not dressing it. They must plan for areas which are backward; they must plan for areas which are neglected. Unless they do that, it will not help the country and it will not bring the nation to a particular level. It is no use improving a particular area industrially and by other methods.

Now, Sir, coming to industries, I do not want to poke my nose in it because I am a born agriculturist, not an agriculturist in theory, put in practice. So I do not want to say much on industries. My other friends are there who are a better authority to speak on that. But I am proud, Sir, that this

country which has been importing so many things from abroad, has today been able to export some cloth, some sugar and some other things. I congratulate the industrialists and others who have done it. But, Sir, they must also bear the full brunt which they are not doing and I hope they will do it.

And now, Sir, I will come to foreign capital. It is said that foreign capital should not be taken. But I am very glad today that Mr. Ghose and Mr. Sundarayya have not touched that subject at all. They skipped over it. I am very glad over it. We have been condemning foreign capital. But today neither of them spoke about it and I am very glad, Sir, that from now onwards better understanding of the problem will be there and the policy of total condemnation of foreigners and foreign capital will be given up, because here we are not discriminating against anybody. We are prepared to take capital from Russia. Let them send us machinery today. I do not think our Government will refuse to take either money or machinery or men, if there are any in those countries—trained men. We are prepared to take them. That has been made clear. There is no discrimination. Only unfortunately, Sir, they are not able to send us anything and we are obliged to take from the countries which can help. Therefore, I do not want to say much about industries and the foreign capital also because we are not attached to any bloc. We are attached to everybody who is prepared to help us.

Only one thing, Sir, that the Government must take care of. When we take foreign capital and foreign industrialists, Government must make it a point to compel the foreign industrialists and capitalists to train as many people as possible—at least 80 to 90 per cent. of Indians—in that business. Otherwise we will be in the soup. If by chance, like Iran, we may have to nationalise our industries some time later, there will be no personnel for us to run them, and we will be left in the lurch. We have to learn from the experience of Iran where there is oil, oil factories and machinery but they are not able to

make use of them and let us take example from them and let us compel them to train our people.

Now, Sir, small scale industries are there. I do not think it is an exhaustive list. We are still there in the same stage of khaddar making, bee-keeping and match making. Sir, I do not think match making is absolutely necessary for the small industry. I think, Sir, it is a total failure. It is not able to compete with the big industry. I know of match factories in South India. At least hundred small cottage industries have suffered losses and perhaps they have closed, because it is cheaper for the big factories to go into production in this trade. There are many other things which can be produced by these small scale industries where people who have no employment and who have got a small capital can make an attempt and learn things. Therefore, Sir, it is absolutely necessary that these cottage industries must be developed and developed to such an extent that in each State we can produce things which are needed.

Sir, educated men are asked to take to manual labour. It is no doubt a good theory to say, Sir, that "Educated persons should be persuaded to rid themselves of prejudice against manual employment and should be encouraged to receive sufficient training for manual jobs". But how many people can do it? You are asking educated men to go and plough the land. Sir, the type of education that we have given them does not suit the job that we want them to do, i.e., to plough the land. You must give them such type of education that will benefit them and make them useful after they complete their course. So, Sir, now we will have to change the whole system of education and then alone they would become useful.

I do not want to discuss the details of all schemes like public health and all these things because the time at my disposal is short. But I will say one thing about public health. I must say that there are villages in very many areas where people have to walk miles

and miles to get their drinking water. And every day they have to do so. It is high time we give them relief. It is their Government and our beloved leader is at the helm of affairs and I hope that the drinking water problem, which is absolutely necessary—the minimum need of the human being—will be tackled and given top priority.

To make the whole Plan a success, one thing is of primary importance and that is the existence of an honest administration. You may spend two thousand crores or two hundred thousand crores or much more, but the whole programme will fail as long as you do not have honest men who will have to do this job. Honesty is the main thing that we have to develop in this country. If there is any suspicion against an officer, that is enough proof and he should be sacked. One great leader was telling me a few years ago—I may tell his name—Rajaji was telling me a few years ago that it is not enough to be honest. But you must be so honest that even your enemy will not question your integrity and character. That should be the motto of everybody, whether he is a politician, an officer or a chaprasi or a clerk. One must be so honest and above board that his honesty cannot be questioned even by his enemy. Dishonest people are not always in the lower ranks. We see them even in the top ranks drawing thousands and thousands and still making millions and millions. Such people must be hanged outright and shot from the nearest field. But unfortunately we have not hanged even one of them till this day. Unless we do that, this Plan would not succeed. Thus alone our country will be saved and smaller men will also be cared for.

Now, Sir, to come to the other speakers. Mr. Ghose gave a few good suggestions, though he said that this Plan is useless and will be ineffective. He said that this Plan would take 27 years to double the national income. I ask Sir, is 27 years a long period? If Mr. Ghose wants to grow a garden today, is he going to reap the fruits tomorrow morning? Would he not intend it for his sons and grandsons? If he builds a house, will he plan it only for

[Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy.]  
the period of his life or will he plan it for the future generations also? So also when he plans for a country we don't plan to reap the fruits tomorrow in our own life time only but to make our country great in future also. That is the purpose of the Plan. Therefore I say that 27 years is not a long time. You are wrong and not the planners.

Then, Sir about deficit financing and other things he spoke indeed very well; so I do not want to touch that subject, because I am not as conversant with those subjects as my hon. friend Mr. Ghose is. Then, Mr. Sundarayya said, that we disagree with everything because the Communists say them. If they say any good things, we agree with them. When they say, restrict profits, I am one with them; when they say, guarantee wages, I am one with them. We are not agents of anybody. We do not want to make the rich man grow richer and bloat himself. We want to tax him as much as possible and if possible eliminate him also. Being in the Opposition, it is very easy to criticise. We cannot eliminate him by beheading him in the Communist way. Take the question of zamindari abolition. It took two years to bring in legislation to that effect. We are paying them compensation in order to enable them to live as honourable human beings, but here probably the Communists would have beheaded them, taken away their lands and not have given them any compensation. But we believe in democracy. We believe in democratic ways. We want to pursue democratic methods, and we will certainly not adopt the Communist methods; even if it is going to mean some lapse of time, we are going to wait for a better opportunity, for better circumstances for achieving our objectives. So, Sir, we are not going to disagree with everything that the Communists say. We are going to agree with them so far as their good suggestions and therefore Government will certainly make a note of their suggestions for the betterment of the labourers.

Then, Sir, coming to my friend, Mr. Rajah, he gave us very nice idlies and

coffee yesterday, but let me tell him that those idlies are not going to corrupt us in any way and that we are not going to vote for his amendment on that account. He said, Sir—and I take it as a compliment—that we come to the House after leaving our brains outside. That is a compliment really. He accepted that we have brains, but what about the people who have brains neither outside nor inside the House? Without meaning any disrespect to the House or to any hon. Members of this House, at least to that extent we are better off. Yes, we keep our brains outside but we do it in order to subordinate ourselves to the great leader of our country. We are not subordinating ourselves for our own good but we are doing it in the interests of the nation. We are certainly proud that we are supporting this Government. We are not going to get any better government tomorrow; it is bound to be worse.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Question.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Therefore, Sir, I request all hon. Members to support this Government, to support this Plan in the interests of the nation and the future generations to come.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, planning is not a gamble. It is always related to certain circumstances. Planning also means how best to get over the obstacles in the way of our progress. In that sense, every housewife is a planner, but the difference between a housewife and the Planning Commission is that a housewife plans with her eyes open, while our Planning Minister and the Planning Commission plan with their eyes closed. In this context I would invite your attention to every chapter of these two voluminous reports that have been inflicted on us. In every chapter you will find that there are no data, no statistics. I was very much interested in geological survey but I found to my utter amazement that in a simple matter like a geological survey, there are no statistics or no data given.

Therefore, in this sense, this planning is a gamble, and it is going to be a gamble, because we do not know what we have. Even supposing that this will lead to some progress, I do not think that the progress will be commensurate with our desire or our wishes. Disappointment has therefore been expressed about the targets of the Five Year Plan, but we have to remember that the Five Year Planners are not magicians who can bring rabbits out of their hats. I would invite your attention to the Fourth Five Year Plan which has just been completed in the U. S. S. R. Even after the completion of this Fourth Five Year Plan in 1950, the U. S. S. R. produced 180 million yards of woollen cloth, which comes to 2'8" per head. Coming to cotton textiles, the U. S. S. R. after the completion of the Fourth Five Year Plan produced 158 million yards, that is about 2 yards per head. At the end of the Fourth Five Year Plan, it was stipulated that 240 million pairs of shoes would be produced, but in fact 205 million pairs were produced, i.e., one pair per head, as against three pairs in the U. S. A. and two pairs in the U. K. Even in food production, it has been admitted that the U. S. S. R. did not proceed according to the targets that they had fixed. On the whole, the conditions of the people in the U. S. S. R. are not better today—even after the completion of the Fourth Five Year Plan and on the eve of the Fifth Five Year Plan—than what it was before the Second World War. As the Prime Minister has indicated, and rightly indicated too, this is only a beginning, a humble beginning, to achieve a great ideal. Having said that much, I will come to the Five Year Plan and say that its success would depend in the ultimate analysis on the mechanism through which this is going to be implemented. Now the Government want to execute the Five Year Plan mainly through Government machinery, through the administrative machinery, but as the Planning Commission itself admits, there has been some deterioration in the public administration in recent years. Even though the Planning Commission appointed the Gorwala Committee to go into the standard of public adminis-

tration and suggest ways and means for its improvement, I regret that nothing has been done in the matter. Moreover, the people are nowadays looking upon the Government as hostile, as their oppressors. Why? This has to be analysed with all the vigour and with all our energy. Nepotism and favouritism have corrupted the very basis of administration, so that people have absolutely lost their faith in justice. Therefore, this is an occasion when the Prime Minister should reiterate his faith in a pure administration, an administration which is above board and where there is no scope for the slightest slur of favouritism or nepotism. Then the Planning Commission have also suggested that there should be some sort of movement to weed out corruption from our public life, from our political life and from our official life. In this context I would invite the attention of the Prime Minister to two movements that have been recently launched in China—the Shu Fan and Wu-fan. The Shu Fan movement was started by the public, not under the aegis of the Government or Administration. Wherever a man or an officer or a man holding any political office was suspected of any corruption he was criticised and condemned in public meetings and then ultimately he was brought before the law. The Wu-fan movement was started in which even subordinates and workers could criticise their masters and employers wherever the latter was corrupt. So I would suggest that these two movements should be taken up immediately and legislation should also be enacted to mete out exemplary punishment to erring officers. Thirdly every officer or person holding any important political office should be made to submit yearly returns of his acquisitions of movable assets and immovable property... ..

AN HON MEMBER : Only in his name or *benami* also ?

SHRI S. MAHANTY : It will include *benami* also. In this context I will express my disappointment over the achievement of the Special Police Establishment which was brought into

[Shri S. Mahanty.]  
existence for the special purpose of weeding out corruption from our administration. The other day during question hour, I brought to light a case in which the S. P. E. has been delaying for over nearly 8 months over a case of bribery where an engineer was charging 7 1/2 per cent. over every bill of payment and thereby amassed nearly 3 or 4 lakhs of rupees. Here is an illustration before you. So with this machinery you cannot entrust this Five Year Plan. As has been rightly pointed out by a Member of the Opposition in their hands, this Five Year Plan is going to be the "Five Years of Misery".

Then I will come to the positive aspect of the administrative machinery that has been enunciated. Now in the district level planning has been entrusted to the district authorities. That means the responsibility of executing the Five Year Plan in a particular district will devolve upon the District Magistrate but that gentleman combines in himself the executive and judicial functions of the district. In the past the G. M. F. and the Vanamahotsav and other programmes were entrusted to him. But because he was already overburdened with so many activities with so many responsibilities, that he could not pay attention to any of these functions, to any of these activities as a result of which it all ended in a fiasco. So here what I propose is that the administrative machinery should be thoroughly decentralised. In the State level there will be State Development Councils which should not comprise mainly of some officers as at present. It should include all Members of Parliament of the particular State and at any rate it will also include certain persons with outstanding knowledge of the local problems. Then there is the District Council which will be composed of the Members of the local Assemblies of respective districts and then Sub-Divisional Development Councils will include Members of the various localities and then when you come to the Village Council it will include only the elected Members of the Village Panchayat. Now of course there is a Panchayat,

but I cannot say what is happening in the other States, but in my State all the Panchayats are nominated by a political boss somewhere in the town. Nowhere have we got an elected Panchayat. Then the multi-purpose village worker for development who will be the agent of all development work should be no other than the elected Head of the Panchayat otherwise with all the responsibilities which are going to be placed on that multi-purpose village worker—if he is a Congressman who only knows how to please the Congress boss somewhere else, then you will see that every village will be a battlefield. Because the responsibilities are great; he has to carry a great amount of public confidence behind him, otherwise none of the plans which you are intending to carry out in the village level is going to be effective at all. Then these autonomous Development Councils will work in close co-operation with the administration and every year the progress of the various Development Councils will be discussed by Parliament so that at every stage we will know to what extent we have progressed and what we have left still to be done. In this context, I welcome the suggestion for the creation of the Bharat Sewak Samaj. Of course doubts have been expressed about it. Personally I also believe that it may be utilised as a subsidiary Congress organization keeping in view the next general elections but it is always better and it pays also to be optimistic. If I may say so, its Russian synonym is Kosmosol. Even in the U.S.S.R. when they were working their First Five Year Plan they enrolled thousands of youths under Kosmosol. If, therefore, the Bharat Sewak Samaj works according to its aims and objects and is not converted into a subsidiary Congress Organisation keeping in view the next elections, then I hope it will achieve the objects for which it has been established.

Coming to the second part of my amendment I would say that undeveloped States like Orissa have enough reason to feel that the distribution of the Plan has not been quite equitable. Not only Orissa but also other undeveloped an

under-developed and backwards States who looked upon the Five Year Plan for progress, for betterment have been sorely disappointed. You know Orissa is a land of villages steeped in ignorance where you don't get roads, or facilities for education and yet that Orissa has been granted the lowest sum for rural development so far as A Class States are concerned. It has been given 352.9 lakhs while urbanised State like Bombay has been given 2871.9 lakhs on Rural Development. A land with 50 per cent. of aboriginal population has been allocated the lowest amount—116.4 lakhs for the amelioration of the backward classes while Bombay gets 213.6 lakhs and U. P. gets 236.2 lakhs.

Then, Sir, in Orissa, we have 12,782 miles of roads which are now without any repairs. According to the estimates, one has to spend Rs. 1,200 in repairs for every mile of road. But at the moment, the Government of Orissa are spending only Rs. 200 for a mile of road; but even then there is no money in the exchequer as a result of which for many years these roads are lying without any repair.

Then, I will invite your attention to the condition of Education in Orissa. Orissa spends the lowest amount on Education. It spends 10 per cent.; while Bombay spends 20 per cent.; Bihar 15 per cent.; Assam 12½ per cent.; and Madras 19 per cent. I do not mean to suggest that Orissa Government have no basic concept of social justice or conscience. Nothing of the sort. It is because of the simple reason that there is no money to spend. Though the State has many resources, it has no money for its developments. Orissa is a classical example in this respect. You know, Orissa stands first so far as the mineral wealth of India is concerned. Orissa stands second so far as forest wealth is concerned. While it has an annual revenue of 7 crores, Saurashtra, with a population of 41 lakhs and an area of 21,000 sq. miles has an annual revenue of 8 crores of rupees. It is due to the fact that every year we are being denied a sum extending to about a

crore of rupees because of export of raw material over which there can be no levy of sales tax under the Constitution. Therefore, it behoves upon the Government to see that such undeveloped areas like Orissa or Assam should be given high priority in their development schemes.

A lot of things have been said about Agriculture. I am not an economist, but every layman knows that in agriculture, very soon the law of diminishing returns operates. If you are going to concentrate wholly and thoroughly on land, then, after some years, every additional investment will result in decreasing returns. This has been already in operation in Orissa. In the course of the debate on Food, I tried to impress upon the Government that the economy of such undeveloped States should be so balanced, so integrated, that when the law of diminishing returns operates on the Agriculture sector, the developed industries would have been there to lend a helping hand. But, what do we find? We find that a highly industrialized State like Bombay gets Rs. 103 lakhs for cottage industries and Rs. 250 lakhs for other industries. Similarly, in West Bengal, for cottage industries, 74.3 lakhs have been allotted, while Orissa has been allotted 23 lakhs. Madras is also a highly industrialized State. It has got for other industries 85 lakhs and for cottage industries 106 lakhs of rupees. Yet, Orissa, which needs so much of industries, has been given a paltry sum of 93.2 lakhs out of which cottage industries get 23 lakhs. Even that sum for cottage industries is inadequate. Orissa is famous for her cottage industries. Already, the textiles of Orissa are enjoying a good international market. Thousands and thousands of artists and artisans are languishing away simply because there is no money. Therefore, at least in my State, there is nothing to cheer, so far as this Plan is concerned.

5 P. M.

And then, Sir, in this context, I will also bring in another factor. I have indicated earlier that Orissa is the first State in India so far as mineral resources are concerned. At present Hirakud

[Shri. S. Mahanty.]

project is being worked out of a loan received from the Centre. Our Prime Minister was so eloquent this morning about increased electricity output. I am perfectly in agreement with him, but what are we going to do with all those kilowatts that we are going to produce from the Hirakud project or any other river valley project, or multi-purpose project, unless those kilowatts of energy are utilised for some industry. We are certainly not going to eat these kilowatts. When we are not going to get any immediate returns, I wonder how the Centre believes that it is going to get back the loan that has been given so far. In this context, I would request Government to expedite setting up an iron and steel plant in Orissa for which there is abundant scope, because of its nearness to coalfields and because of its nearness to high-grade manganese mines. It would be an ideal place for an iron and steel factory.

Now, coming to the financial aspect, we find that out of the 2,069 crores that is proposed to be invested, we are depending for 738 crores of expenditure from public savings, that means savings from revenues of the Centre and State Governments, after meeting their non-developmental expenditure. And then, from private savings we are hoping to get 520 crores. Then, from foreign aid, which has amounted so far to 156 crores. The deficit still amounts to 655 crores, and this 655 crores we are now thinking to make up by additional measures of taxation, by borrowings and by deficit financing. Deficit financing involves injecting additional purchasing power into the community. Therefore, it has always inflationary tendencies and possibilities. In this context, deficit financing is a sort of indirect taxation because the prices of the consumer goods will be on the increase. Therefore, deficit financing, in the ultimate analysis is a sort of indirect taxation which hits the poorer classes of the people most.

Then as regards deficit financing, of course, we have got to draw Rs. 290 crores from the sterling balances and

that has been the ceiling of our deficit financing. As has been pointed out by Mr. Ghose this morning, unless there is a suitable mechanism for the administration of deficit financing, it will almost surely result in a disaster. At any rate, I think, it is premature to sit upon judgment so far as deficit financing is concerned.

Now, the balance that remains—Rs. 365 crores—is to be met from taxation unless we are going in for foreign aid. Therefore, for these 365 crores, we have to depend on taxation unless we are going in for foreign aid. A lot of agitation is going on in this country about foreign aid. When foreign aid is attached with political strings, certainly we have every reason why we should object to it. But those Communist friends, those who condemn foreign aid,—I most respectfully invite their attention to the 1922 Genoa Congress when the Bolshevik delegates, in approved Bolshevik form, even bourgeois fashions were canvassing for foreign loans. At that critical hour of her history, Soviet Russia, entered into a treaty, a most humiliating treaty—Brest Litowsk—with Germany and other capitalist countries, which allowed the exploitation of natural resources in Soviet Russia. Alas, in the history of nations, as in our individual lives we have ups and downs and when the tide is up we have to bend down our head, but that does not mean that we are going to accept foreign aid with strings attached. We should accept foreign aid in such a manner that in the end, they have all the strings and we have all the loans. Otherwise, we have practically reached the limit—our taxpayers have reached a situation in which they cannot pay any further tax. To refresh your memory, I might add, Sir, in course of the discussions on the last General Budget, the consensus of opinion in this House as well as in the other House was that the taxation limit has already been reached, and to give immediate relief to the tax-payer, a Taxation Enquiry Committee should be appointed, which would find out ways and means to see how best relief could be given, so far as taxation is concerned.

The time at my disposal is very short. I will only take two more minutes, by saying that the Government is pinning its faith on raising revenue from taxation. I might here invite the attention of the Government of India to the statement of the Finance Minister of Orissa. He says in so many words, that in Orissa not a single pie could be raised by way of taxation. On the other hand the question of giving relief to the taxpayer has become urgent. Here is what he says : "The rate of taxation has reached its peak in Orissa—Sales tax, agricultural income tax, stamp duty, entertainment tax, motor vehicle tax, tax on petrol etc., are comparatively higher than what they are in the different sister States. There is therefore no room for further enhancement of cesses and taxes". In this context, for such a permanently deficit province like Orissa, how do you hope that you are going to raise money in the public sector by means of taxation ? Therefore, I have come to the position that the only national course would have been that we would have started, not in such an ambitious manner—from malaria control, up to increase output in every sector. Instead of being so ambitious we would have invested all our resources in the agricultural sector so that the money, the resources that we could obtain by exporting our foodgrains to other countries outside—could have been spent in developing the industrial sector. But I cannot express my disappointment too adequately at the conduct of the capitalists and the industrialists of the country. They should remember that the capitalists of Great Britain gave Britain an Empire, so also the capitalists of the U. S. A.

AN HON. MEMBER : So also the Congress !

SHRI S. MAHANTY : Therefore, they could have saved the public sector from the drain of its limited resources for natural development. The resources that would have become available by intensive development of agriculture, would have gone a long way in expanding the scope of the public sector without imposing new taxation, new

burden of taxes on the poorer strata of the people who are already over-burdened. Thank you.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I congratulate the Members of the Planning Commission for bringing home to the country the realism of the assets and resources which are existing in the country for national development. The idealist and armchair suggestions put forward by some hon. Members were based on fantastic assumptions of the resources of the country and the productive assets that exist in the country. I say, Sir, when they read this Report—valuable Report it is—which has given all the details—another Report containing so much more greater details is also coming out—when they read it they will know exactly the position where we are standing. At the present moment, owing to the Plan which is before us, 75 per cent. of our available resources are to be spent on agriculture, irrigation, power generation, transport and communications, and social services. Sir, I think nobody will object to this because agriculture is most essential to us, when we have imported foodgrains to the extent of 750 crores since 1948. Power resources are most important because our industries, small scale as well as large scale, have starved for want of power, and our production has suffered in the past three years on account of want of power resources in all the places. With regard to irrigation the crop is dependent on rain and whenever the cultivator expects 20 annas of harvest, he is disappointed that due to the absence of one rainfall his crop is 6 annas only. Our railway system and our ports have not been cared for owing to the replacements not being made during the war. We require all these. Agricultural and industrial development will be useless if these activities are not carried out. Our education was at the lowest ebb. There is hardly 10 per cent. literacy in the country. With regard to health also, there were no hospitals with good equipment or nurses. So 75 per cent. ought to be spent for all these. Now Sir, the resources which the Planning Commission has put be-



[Shri S. Mahanty.]

fore us are in the neighbourhood of 1258 crores, which they have taken into consideration after all available taxation which the Centre and the States will be able to levy. So that all the resources of the next five years have practically come on the estimate. If we have so many schemes on our hand, schemes which they have approved to the extent of 2,000 crores, and other schemes which they also approve to the extent of further Rs. 4,000 crores, how are we going to finance them? That is the main problem, and I think the realism has gone home to the country—that our finance, our power, our resources are limited, and priorities must be fixed for whatever activities we are conducting. This is not enough Sir. If you look you will find what our productive assets existing in the country are. Many people have fantastic notions of our productive assets. Productive assets are those which produce goods of production or consumption. The productive assets are 1236 crores held by the Central Government in form of railways, irrigation projects etc., Rs. 1,000 crores held by the State Governments, and Rs. 1,500 crores held by private sectors in the form of corporations and others. When I mention, or when I say, productive assets of the country, I want to make it clear, I do not mean buildings or estates which are not productive. Therefore, all our productive assets of the country comes to Rs. 1,500 crores in the hands of private individuals and corporations, including banks and others. Now Sir, if this is our position, we have to advise Government as to how we should proceed. The advice which has come from the Opposition is of a destructive nature, which is meant to demolish the pattern we have built, which we have in existence. An hon. Member, Mr. Sundarayya, has gone further. He made a fantastic assumption when he said that about Rs. 233 crores are existing, and multiply it by five, you will get 1,200 crores which can be tapped by the State, and our problems will be solved. I am sorry to say Sir, that he has not read the Report correctly, or practically, he has forgotten his mathematics.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : Those were The Eastern Economist figures.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH : I refer him to volume II, Chapter XXIX, paragraph 33, which he has taken, and which says that the total investment necessary for financing expenditure on the Plan in the public and private sectors is estimated at 327 crores ; Rs. 90 crores in the public sector and 233 crores in the private sector. He has forgotten that this whole amount of 233 crores is not for one year, but for five years. There is, therefore, no such thing as Rs. 1,200 crores on which we can lay hands. He must see what the total assets are. The figure of Rs. 233 crores which he has mentioned is for the whole period of five years. He cannot expect wrong figures to be swallowed.

I am only pointing out these items to show that no one should mislead the House by wrong statements. One should study the figures properly and see what amounts can be obtained. We have received foreign aid of Rs. 156 crores and if we want to go further with this Plan, hon. Members opposite will admit that this amount is not adequate. Even then we require Rs. 650 crores and the Planning Commission has after closely examining the position estimated for a release of Rs. 290 crores from our sterling balances. This is the only approach because we have those balances with England and they will be released according to calculations which the Planning Commission have made during the next five years.

Even then we are short by about Rs. 350 crores.

If we do not get external aid, how are we to go ahead with our schemes? Are we to scrap them? My hon. friend Shri Sundarayya asks us to do this, that and so many other things. But our resources are limited. If they take some pains to go through this Report, they will find in the 39th Chapter there are so many items on which everyone of us, political leaders, social workers, industrial and commercial men, all can serve the country in various ways and implement this Plan.

If we do that, then the standard of life in the country will be raised and we will actually be doing good to those for whom we claim to be doing good.

Now I come to the private enterprises. For these also Government have provided. In the first place there are the major irrigation and power schemes and electricity has been increased to 1.4 million k.w. Electricity is most useful if we want to develop industries in the private sector and produce essential commodities. Therefore this increase of electrical power is most essential. Hon. Members who accuse the Planning Commission or the Government should do so after reading the Report. In Chapter XXIX there are Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. In Appendix 1, 16 central projects which have been launched on are listed and which will be completed in a great measure by the end of the planning period ; and 8 projects are launched on by the State. In these projects, only we can produce greater wealth for the country. We will find that the development is on the right lines and that we are going on right lines, because we have given priorities to those goods which we want most and without which we cannot do.

As regards private enterprises, Rs. 233 crores are to be spent in five years and not in one year. And this has to be invested in productive industries which are set out in Appendix 2 and there are 42 such items. Out of these 42 industries, 80 per cent. are for essential items, for producing goods which are most essential, not for producing consumer goods. Out of this Rs. 233 crores for which priorities are assigned, 26 per cent. go for iron and steel, 20 per cent. for petroleum refineries, 16 per cent. for heavy engineering industries, 8 per cent. for heavy chemical industries and 5 per cent. for cement and 4 per cent. for paper. These constitute about 80 per cent. and each one of them industries is important for our development and also important for attainment of self-sufficiency. I say this because we are living, as we know, in troubled times, with war in the air and when

nations want to devour each other. In such times we should not allow our limited resources to be frittered away, but should use them in order to attain self-sufficiency.

In the private sector also, to a great degree, as the Prime Minister said, we have introduced the element of control. These have been, in a way semi-nationalised, by the measures adopted during the last eighteen months, and also by the measures recommended by the Planning Commission. If this continues, there will be no exploitation, no higher profits and everybody will be engaged in work which is in the interest of the nation, and so will be serving the country. I may point out some of these measures. The Industries Development and Regulation is there. By that industries will be regulated when a notification is issued. Thirty seven industries have been thus regulated by the issue of notification. As regards some industries in the private sector, the regulation is that the prices which they charge from the consumer will be controlled by the State. The quality of the product should also be up to a certain specification and standard. The quality will also be examined by the State to see if this standard is being maintained and whether the product is of the right standard. Then the third condition is that the production up to the installed capacity should be there. If these conditions are not fulfilled, then the Government will step in and take charge of the industry and completely control it. Mr. Sundarayya says unless you nationalise them, you cannot take any headway. But I may tell him that just as there are political and social leaders who do much for the uplift of the country, there are also people in industries and in commercial fields who can use their talents for the good of the country. This collective intelligence of these persons engaged in commercial and industrial undertakings should not be under-estimated. They are making their contribution in the advancement of the country. Even if you take over the industries, their services will be required, because they have the neces-

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]  
sary experience, ability and organisational power.

Hon. Members opposite say that it is necessary to reduce disparities in incomes. Even they will agree that these are being gradually reduced. The profits are now being brought down and there are economic readjustments taking place in all sectors of our life. The higher incomes are being brought lower. The Estate Duty Bill will further bring down the inequality. Therefore this Government and the Planning Commission are doing all in their power to bring commercial and industrial activities in such a way as to achieve objectives which are laid down by our Constitution. According to that, Sir, they are proceeding in the matter and, as the hon. the Prime Minister has said, that is progressive socialisation in the country which we must try to understand. What does it mean? Practically what the Socialist Party desires to do in one or two years, the Planning Commission and the present Government are trying to do in a period of seven or eight years and they want to go at a pace which will be slow, but certain steps by which the edifice of economic salvation which they build for India will be permanently maintained. It is very easy to say, Sir, that this thing should not be done and that thing should be done. I mean to say that the political leaders in the Opposite Party are trying to induce the country into believing that the present Government is not doing the right thing, and this is with a view to gain political power but, if it is properly examined, it would be found that the present Government is dealing with the development of industries in the private sector with a firm hand. This is neither adequate nor sufficient. I will explain further and say that the region-wise development is also under active consideration of Government and there is going to be a licensing order by which no industry can be started unless Government issues a licence and that no industry can be expanded unless Government issues a licence. Another thing, Sir, is the location of industry and development of under-de-

veloped areas. For this, there is Capital Issues Control Order by which diversion of capital is tried to be controlled. These are the steps taken and I think, Sir, looking at the number of amendments, that the Planning Commission's Report has not been properly studied. They have advocated for developing backward areas, as far as possible, but, we must also look to our means, we must also look to our ability and we must have patience to carry out our schemes.

Now, as regards the private sector, there are also Development Councils sought to be established for each industry and each industry will be supervised by the Development Council which will be constituted by Government. With regard to the Development Councils, I may say, Sir, in order that Government may succeed and, in order that the opponents may not score over the incapacity of administration of Government in controlling this private sector, I have to request that Government should be very cautious in regard to the personnel of these Councils. When they constitute these Development Councils, it should be borne in mind that only persons who believe in the present social and economic objectives of the Constitution are taken in on those Committees and they should be prepared and able to devote sufficient time to those. I mean to say, Sir, that this should be enforced because this is a kind of economic warfare which we are fighting and we must conduct on those lines. We must try to secure the best talent, best experience in the country and, at the same time, we should see that the criticism which is existing in the country does not have any ground because we are fighting against another type of civilisation or, we are fighting against doctrines imported from foreign countries. In order to fight this ~~meant~~ <sup>case</sup>, the administration shall have to be very alert in controlling what they do.

Now, Sir, we examine another thing here. For the development of small scale and cottage scale industries, a provision of Rs. 27 crores is made. In the recommendations of the Planning

Commission, they have proposed a cess on large scale industries if they are competing with a small scale industry, or is not in the national interest and this cess will be on such industries which Government consider fit to be carried on by small scale as well as cottage scale. This is not only enough, but even no licence will be given to any large scale industry to develop or expand if that production can be had from cottage scale industries.

Sir, therefore, with regard to these amendments which are proposed with regard to development of cottage scale and small scale industries, I mean to say, Sir, Government are doing all in their power. They will enforce it if this Report is adopted and approved and I think, Sir, those who disagree with this Report or those who do not believe in the objectives of the Constitution will not be doing any service to the nation in throwing out such recommendations which are very vital for the growth of our nation.

Now, Sir, the unemployment problem is existing in our midst and, therefore, they have emphasised that the pressure on agriculture should be shifted by development of small scale and large scale industries. The Planning Commission have said that there are 1,20,000 clerks who are in the Employment Exchange Register ; there may be many more outside. Out of this, there are 17,000 graduates who can understand what happened in the past, how the Russian Revolution was there, how the French Revolution was there, how the Soviet economy is working, how the American capitalism is at present functioning. Sir, in order that these youths may not be misled and led into the traps of those who want political power, I say, Sir, development of the small and cottage scale industry should be carried on with great vigour in order that our country may be strong, and we may be able to give the maximum employment to the maximum number which is the aim and goal of this Planning Commission's Report. I say, Sir, there is no pampering of the capitalists in the Report, there is no pampering of

any vested interest but, there is the main objective of how to bring maximum benefit to the country.

Now, Sir, with regard to the other factors, I have to point out that our income will not increase to double the amount in less than a period of twenty-five years. I think, Sir, the Planning Commission have under-estimated and they have not properly emphasised the values which are to be put on the production that will come and the values which are existing today. According to the present values today, the income will be double after twenty-seven years. I do not agree with that assumption ; I say, Sir, that with the additional production in the country, the values will go down and our present index which is 380 will go down, to 250 and our additional wealth will rise in terms of quantities. The quantities produced will be more than double and I say, Sir, it will not be double in a period of twenty-seven years, but it will double much earlier.

With regard to the disparities of income, Sir, it is mentioned that our income is not going to rise, but the income in the higher level will only be rising. The income of the average man, which is put down as Rs. 250 will rise substantially in the case of lower income groups according to the proposals and the measures which are thought fit to be adopted and the income in the higher income groups are gradually bound to diminish. These are the recommendations and, I mean to say, Sir, that every man and woman should try to see how we can build a society. With the social and the economic objectives which have been laid down by the Constitution and with the development programme be accepted by the House, it will be the duty of those who believe in this Plan, to put his head into it and try to help Government in the problem of its implementation. I hold that it is the responsibility of the intelligent classes in India who are now, called for action and if the intelligent classes in India do not behave in a way in which they should behave for the good, of the nation then, whatsoever party they may

[Shri. C. P. Parikh.]

belong to, whatsoever class they may belong, they shall have betrayed our country and history will say that the Indians, after obtaining political freedom, did not know how to act. Sir, I am appealing on this ground that this Plan has to be carried out and carried out with great vigour, with as much vigour as possible.

With regard to the opposite political parties who do not agree with this, I will say, that they want to destroy the political fabric ; they want to demolish the society which is existing ; they want to destroy individual freedom which is existing, in order that there may be chaos and anarchy in the country and they may have power. They will not have power, I can assure them here that it is the foreigner who will have the power. We have invited foreigners for the last 1,300 years due to our internal quarrels and, I think, Sir, if we cannot adjust those quarrels, history will say that the present generation has failed and, I think, Sir, the blame will rest on those who do not agree with or obey the majority.

With these words, I again recommend this Plan to the House.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA (Bihar) : Sir, at this fog end of the day I do not think I should take much time. I will try to be brief, without going too much into the details of the Plan, I will finish within 10 or 15 minutes.

Sir, the whole point is this. We on these benches have just now been criticised as insincere men and as trying to get into power. But I assure that particular friend who said that and others, that there is no such desire to get power of the type which my friends over there have got. If one gets power of such a type where one gets powerless, it is no use getting that power. I do not for a moment doubt the honesty of the Prime Minister or of the other honest Congress Members. But what is the result ? The result is that in spite of all their sincerity and honesty things are not moving in the right direction. And why are they not moving

in the right direction ? That is the point. We are face to face with that problem.

Sir, coming now to this Plan, we have had the privilege of listening to many distinguished Members who have given facts and figures about the shallowness and the unworkability of the Plan itself. I as a layman believe in results. We have had five years of Congress Government in this country. They all came with good intentions. They were trying to improve things. But have things improved ? It is true that it takes time to improve matters, but there should be some direction in which things improve ; there should be something to show how things are improving. Is it not a fact that when we talk to these very friends who come and support this Plan here or the administration here, when we talk to these friends outside, they say, "What can I do ? This is bad. That is bad. The services are absolutely masters of the situation. There is rampant corruption....."

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : We do not say all is white.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA : This is my experience. The hon. Member may not say that, but his brothers are saying it.

The point is that, as I have already said, there is no doubt about their intentions. But it is also a fact that they are helpless. It has been said in the Plan—it has been rather over-emphasised—that the success of the Plan depends on the co-operation of the people and the enthusiasm that they show. But you can take it from me, and many hon. Members on this side also have pointed it out, that there is absolutely no enthusiasm among the people in the present conditions. What do the people want ? You are talking of this scheme and that scheme ; foreign loans ; private sector and public sector ; and so on. But the people judge only by results. Go to the countryside. We who sit here do not live in towns. Those who live in towns take things

differently. But the condition of the masses in the countryside is miserable.

One hon. friend has asked : "Why are you in a hurry ? Why do you want the fruits of this Plan in your lifetime ?" My friend Mr. Ghose said that by the time the Plan yields results most of us will be dead. I agree entirely with him. I for one want to see the objectives achieved in my lifetime, within ten or fifteen years or less. Well, we have seen things being done in our neighbouring country, China, and in Russia. Why then should we not be anxious and eager to see that things improve in our country within the shortest possible time ?

The other point is that we are all talking about finance. This planning should be the planning of a house-wife. My friend Mr. Mahanty from the great land of Utkal started with a housewife and ended with a flirt. (*Interruption.*) That is what he said. He said there was no harm in taking loans, but you get the loan, and later on the other man gets the strings. I say it is impracticable and not very moral. I rise today to warn the country against this infiltration of America. I use that word advisedly. I know that many people do not like that. America has been throwing money into this country and has been sponsoring plans like Community Projects, the Four Point Programme etc., and all sorts of plans. It is all bad. In my part of the country we were very happy not to see a white face, but today you find people from America everywhere. I do not for a moment say that our Government is a party to it willingly. But perhaps they are foolish enough to act in a way which may culminate in losing our independence. God forbid that such a thing should happen. There was no greater man in India or anywhere else than Mahatmaji. And many people who were intimately connected with him know that when, before his death, the question came up of getting foodstuffs from America, and when the question of taking a loan on that account from the United States of America came up, he said : " For heaven's sake, do not do it." He said that houses

built with a loan and lands purchased with a loan went to the Mahajan. Well, Sir, we know what happens in a village, in a family : if you do certain things by taking a loan, if you build a house and spend on your clothes and purchase lands, by borrowing, ultimately in 99 cases out of 100 the land and the house go to the Mahajan. So, I warn the Government on no account to think of taking loans from America. Harness our own resources and plan within those resources. It does not matter if we do not achieve results within five or ten years. But do not do a thing which is harmful. Why is it that a mighty State like America is giving loans to us ? Is it out of charity alone ? Is it through magnanimity that they are giving loans ? There is that example of Korea. Why is the United States poking its nose there and causing bloodshed ? It was a domestic affair of the Koreans—North Korea and South Korea. Why on earth should America go and poke its nose into the affairs of other countries ? Take the case of China. There was the Government, and there were the people. They have a sort of the Government—good, bad, indifferent : no concern of ours. But America is maintaining a man in Formosa—Chaing-kai-Shekh. and meeting all his costs. Why ? So that one day this fellow will jump again into China and thereby give America a very good market for her trade.

Consider the industrial advancement of that country also. They have advanced industrially to such an extent that they have lost all human ideas about the freedom of other countries. Well, is it our idea to develop so much as to seek markets, and then to wage war, and to get into schemes against other countries ? Heaven forbid ! We do not want that. We want to live peacefully with our neighbours and with the peoples of the globe. So, Sir, whatever be your resources, you must plan within those resources.

That is point number one.

Secondly, Sir, it is no use talking about all those high-sounding words. We have seen certain schemes under-

[Shri M. P. N. Sinha.]

taken in the States. For example, much has been said about the minor irrigation schemes. I will read to you in two minutes the statement of a very responsible Minister of Bihar. So much money has been earmarked for minor schemes. I believe the result will be the same.

Sir, I will read out what Dr. A. N. Sinha, the Deputy Chief Minister of Bihar said on the 22nd November at Gaya. Sir, I am sorry there is no sufficient light. Can I get some light, Sir ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He may give the substance.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA : He said Sir, that crores of money spent on minor irrigation has been wasted in Bihar. In respect of these projects—Hirakud project, Damodar Valley project and other schemes like your Industrial Finance Corporation—charges have been levelled of dishonesty and incompetency. Sir, I take those two things together. I think an incompetent man, an incompetent officer, an incompetent colleague is as bad as a dishonest one. So, I would urge the Government, Sir, and I would tell them—I mean well by their Plan—that if they want really that they should succeed in this Plan, then they should be very strict about the administration of that Plan. Sir, I find there have been charges levelled against the responsible men here in the Centre and in the States, enquiry has been made and the result is that somebody is only transferred. Members of the Party have been accused of very dishonest acts. Well, instead of sacking them, they have been promoted. Take for example, Sir, the case of my State of Bihar. I am not a Congress man but I am a Bihari. I decided that if some are dishonest, they should not be given Congress tickets. But the High Command said....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please speak on the Plan, Mr. Sinha.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA : . . . that those men who were found dishonest, will not be given party tickets but they got it and they have got into office in Bihar and they will now have to do this planning. I say, Sir, the object of the Plan is to help the country. But my fear is that they will plan their own things and they will not plan for the benefit of the country. I therefore request the Government that planning should be done in an honest way and a dishonest agency cannot do it. Therefore, Sir, I would request the High Command and the Government of India to see that where there are charges of dishonesty against officers or members of the Government, those people should be removed outright and then there may be some chance of the success of the Plan.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, I had to say many things, but for want of time I cannot do so.

DR. S. K. BHUYAN (Assam) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Resolution moved by the Prime Minister that the Council should accord a general approval to the First Five Year Plan.

To me the Plan appears to be an epic endeavour to bring about not only the economic uplift of India, but improvement in all possible directions, including the sphere of intellectual progress. The Planning Commissioners are thus perfectly justified in their assertion that planning should aim at "raising the standard of living of the people and to open out to them opportunities for a richer and more varied life". The Plan is an integrated one, as each scheme has been drawn up to fit in with the objective of all-round progress. The Plan is flexible and is thus capable of modifications here and there in the light of actual experience ; and it is the first quinquennial plan to be followed by plans at subsequent stages. Conscious and deliberate planning has been undertaken in the past, but not on this comprehensive, colossal and multi-purpose scale. In other places, people have been directed to

work out similar plans, but in India people have been induced to co-operate in the implementation of the Plan, as without their active and enthusiastic support no plan of this dimension can even attain success. There is no element of conscription or compulsion about the working of the Plan.

I have been specially impressed by the provisions made for educational progress in different States. Grants have been made, in one State or the other, for improvement of primary and secondary education, for improving the pay and prospects of school teachers, for establishing high schools and colleges for girls, for improvement and expansion of Government and private colleges and technical institutions, for establishment of new universities and expansion of existing ones, for improvement of oriental education and establishment of libraries, and for the working of the National Cadet Corps Scheme.

The one thing which has appealed to me most in the educational part of the Plan is the encouragement which it gives to private studies on the part of women as well as of men as I have myself been a sponsor of this idea some years ago. We can just imagine the vast number of persons whose lives become frustrated because they cannot pursue their studies owing to ill-health, poverty or lack of foresight. The Planning Commissioners have now admitted, as a measure to relieve congestion in colleges, that "immediate facilities should be provided for private study through correspondence courses and Radio lectures and allowing students to take various examinations privately." They have even affirmed that the "non-possession of a degree should be no bar to taking the competitive examination for recruitment to the services".

As regards the State of Assam, we are grateful for the provisions for various schemes which are enumerated in the volume on Development Schemes. A crore of rupees has been allotted for preventing further erosion of the town of Dibrugarh, and another crore for navigation, embankment and drainage projects. The Umtru project will

supply electric energy to Gauhati and surrounding areas. Provisions have been made under Agricultural and Rural Development, Major Irrigation and Power Projects, for Industry (Cottage Industry and other industries), for Transport and for social services like Education, Medical, Public Health, Housing, Labour and Labour Welfare and Welfare of Backward Classes. A considerable amount has also been provided for the development of the North East Frontier Agency. The provisions made for the establishment of the Agricultural College which is already functioning and for the development of the Prince of Wales Technical School at Jorhat into a College of Engineering and Technology are highly welcome measures.

I would mention here that help is necessary in other directions as well. Assam is a very backward State, but it has marvellous resources both in natural wealth and man power. As it is not a very highly industrialised area, private donations mainly emanate from the tea-planters whose condition as we all know, is far from satisfactory at present. So, we have to depend on Government for our schemes of improvement. There is a very great pressure on the finances of the State which are crippled by the natural calamities to which the State is frequently exposed. I would therefore urge upon the Planning Commission to allot to Assam sufficient funds for improvement in a few other directions as well.

Some relief is urgently needed to help teachers in schools and colleges. The education of children and youths will be seriously hampered if teachers are not kept above wants ; if they have to eke out their income by other means like private tuitions, and make themselves tired and exhausted for their work in the class room.

The N. C. C. Scheme in Assam should have further monetary reinforcement from the Central Government. A time may come when the people of Assam will have to take a major share in the defence of their land ; and in view of



[Dr. S. K. Bhuyan.]  
the martial races living in the State, the initial military training imparted under the N. C. C. Scheme is imbued with great potentiality.

The expansion of the aided colleges in buildings and equipment should also be facilitated by grants to be newly provided in the Plan.

Women in Assam have progressed very rapidly in the educational field. There is only one women's college, viz., The Handgini Girls College at Gauhati. A sum should be provided for its all-round improvement.

The newly established University at Gauhati is crippled in its progress for want of funds. Expansion has become impossible and the buildings which can be erected with the funds available now will rarely meet the actual needs. Besides teaching the usual curricula of a University, the Gauhati University can specialise in intensive research and studies in anthropology, languages, geology, zoology, mineralogy, botany and forestry, for which there are ample opportunities in and near the State. The University can be developed, funds permitting, into a centre where intellectuals of Eastern India of both the categories—advanced and backward—can meet their compatriots from other parts of the Union for the study of that unique civilisation which has sprung and grown on the banks of the Brahmaputra, representing the best that can be given by the culture of the Aryans and the habits and customs of the non-Aryan tribes. The University can ultimately grow into a Purba-Bharati, as a torch to illuminate the dark corners of Eastern India. India has received the impact of the civilisation of the Gangetic valley but it is still a stranger to what has been going on in Assam. Grants to the University of Gauhati will thus be utilised for purposes which can be described as all-India and federal. The allotment granted for the five years 1951-56 should be raised to a crore at least for the same period to enable the University to erect its buildings and execute measures of immediate expansion.

With these few words, I support the Resolution which has been placed before the Council.

SHRI B. RATH : Sir, I thought that the consideration of the Planning Commission's Report would not be converted into a debate of the views expressed by other hon. Members, but my hon. friend Mr. Parikh has tried to pooh-pooh the idea expressed by Mr. Sundarayya with regard to the sources from which capital can be made available without depending on foreign loans or on the budgets of the States or the Centre, without having recourse to deficit financing, and without imposing any fresh taxes on the people. If he takes a proper look at the Plan and not in the circumscribed way in which he looks at it, he will find that there is plenty of money in the private sector which has enabled them during the last few years to give dividends even to the extent of 15 per cent. and 16 per cent., which has enabled them to make profits amounting in some cases to even cent per cent. of the total investment. If only my friend had thought of the nation's interests, he would have found that there is sufficient capital to develop their own industries for their own profit in future years. Of course, when I suggest to him that he should be at least broadminded enough to make a little more investment, he would never agree. I am not asking him to throw his money away but to distribute it among themselves. I knew that if they invest more, they will get more dividends and will get more profits. Apart from its being in their interests, it will also help in the development of the country. That is all that we want of them.

Then, Sir, coming to the Plan itself. If we are to discuss the Plan in the way we have been asked to do, it will not do any justice to the House, because in the two volumes there are many details which need discussion, not merely the first four Chapters, as has been stated by the Prime Minister as the basis for discussion. Sir, it is not the aims and objectives or our approach that will give us food, that will give us clothing. It is the real content of the Plan itself that will show us the targets that we are to

achieve in the next five years. Sir, the targets that are before us, the materials before us, show that we can in the next twenty-seven years double our national income. We know very well that the majority in this country live below the subsistence level. We know very well that the majority of our people have no clothes to wear. We should discuss the Plan in this context. Sir, I would not venture to go into the theories that have been laid down in this Plan, but I will try to show how the Plan is going to be worked in the next five years. I will just take facts as they are in a memorandum published by the Government of Orissa.

6 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : How much more time will the hon. Member take ?

SHRI B. RATH : I will take some 10 or 15 minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can resume your speech tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till ten of the clock on Wednesday, the 17th December 1952.