

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy]

which cannot be done through a short-notice question. Therefore, an opportunity may be taken either through a motion for papers or through any other method so that this matter may be properly discussed.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Is it not the responsibility of the Government to preserve law and order in the country ? Therefore, they must come out with a statement to enlighten the people as to what they are doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Have you to say anything ?

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : So far as law and order is concerned, of course, adequate steps will be taken by the Government to deal with the situation.

PROF. G. RANGA : That the Government have already shown.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : I was thinking of the other issue, the issue regarding a separate Andhra State. That is a question which has assumed urgency in view of the developments. Well, that matter is under the active consideration of the Cabinet.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Since how long ?

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : I cannot give an assurance, unless the Cabinet has come to a decision. A statement on that subject will be before the House as soon as the Cabinet has come to a decision.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, an opportunity should be given to the House for discussing the matter.

RESOLUTION *RE* THE FIVE YEAR PLAN

MR. CHAIRMAN : We come to the further discussion of the Resolution moved by the Prime Minister on the 16th of December.

SHRI B. RATH (Orissa) : Sir, since dealing with the Planning Com-

mission's Report yesterday, I find that the situation in Andhra has deteriorated. It is perhaps in keeping with the policy of reducing the population of the State. Sir, yesterday I made some appeal to our friends on the other side, specially to those friends who belong to the Congress, to make a little more reduction in their profits, which is still heavy, in order that the State may not be, and the Government will not be, required to apply for foreign loans or to tax the poor people in order to finance the Five Year Plan. Now, Sir, as I was speaking, I had made a reference to the memorandum that was submitted by the Government of Orissa to the Central Government. That memorandum completely belies the statement or assertion that has been made in the Five-Year Plan that the States were consulted before planning in the State sector was embodied in the Five-Year Plan. Here we find that the Planning Commission's Five-Year Plan summary report says on page 26 that "These State plans were drawn up initially over a year ago in consultation with the State Governments concerned, etc., etc." That means that this Plan was drawn up in the state sector after the State Governments were consulted. I submit that although planning on behalf of the States was undertaken in consultation with the State Government, as I stated above, I may say with the information in my possession, that this consultation was nothing but a demand on the State Government by the Planning Commission to curtail the expenditure in the State sector under the Five-Year Plan.

Sir, here is what they say in the memorandum which was submitted to the Finance Commission by the State Government of Orissa, regarding the allocation of more money for the execution of schemes under the Five-Year Plan. How was this amount of 17 crores fixed ? It says the Planning Commission has asked the State Government to make a Plan and send it to the Planning Commission about their requirements. That, the State

Government submitted, but the Planning Commission rejected that Plan of the State Government. I read the relevant portion "The State Government's Plan however suffered a drastic cut at the hands of the Planning Commission, which insisted on the total expenditure being reduced to Rs. 15 crores."

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the chair]

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : Is there any Minister, State Minister or Deputy Minister now in the House ?

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : There seems to be a planned emptying of the benches.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mrs. Lakshmi Menon is there. She is taking notes.

PROF. G. RANGA : But this is a more important thing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI B. RATH : As I was saying, the State Plan however, suffered a drastic cut at the hands of the Planning Commission, and they insisted on the total expenditure being limited to Rs. 15 crores excluding the expenditure on the Hirakud Dam Project. That is one of the tragedies, and there is another tragedy here just now before the House—that Members of the Government, those who pilot the Plan here, those who ought to be interested in the discussion on the Plan here, find it convenient to absent themselves, and leave the House in the hands of a Parliamentary Secretary, who is perhaps third or fourth in rank, in the hierarchy of the Cabinet.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. It is irrelevant to the discussion.

SHRI B. RATH : Why is it that there is no member of the Government here, when we are discussing the Plan ?

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh) : It is most unparliamentary language that the hon. Member has used re-

garding the Parliamentary Secretary. Will you please, Sir, if you so choose, request the hon. Member to withdraw those remarks ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Rath, please withdraw those remarks. The Chair has got sufficient powers to get the hon. Member here to withdraw those remarks against the Parliamentary Secretary. Mr. Leader, will you please see that some responsible Member is always present on such occasions ?

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : Sir, I was here, my Secretary was here. We have been doing Council work. Instead of disturbing the House, I had been out for a small discussion with my Secretary, on work concerning this Council. I did not notice that there was no other hon. Minister here. In that case I would not have gone out before somebody came in. But, it is no use hurling abuses against Ministers on every possible and impossible occasion. There was no desire on my part to slight the House. It was only for the purpose of avoiding disturbance to the House while the debate was on, that I went out for a minute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please see that there are no further occasions of this kind.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : I note it, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please resume the debate.

SHRI B. RATH : I was saying that the consultation was really a case of pressure on the State Government to curtail their schemes under the Five Year Plan. It was not real consultation as mentioned by the Planning Commission, which the State Government has, in so many words, stated in its memorandum. As I said, Sir, they have no other alternative. The State Government had to recast their Plan to bring the total expenditure within the reduced ceiling fixed by the Planning Commission, and as a result, only those schemes, only those of the schemes that were started under our

[Shri B. Rath.]

post-war plan, which we are continuing, could be included in the Five Year Plan. So, Sir, this is what the Five Year Plan is in the State sector. You will find that the schemes that are being undertaken in the name of the Five Year Plan are nothing but continuation of the schemes that were started in the year 1947, in the other great name—Post-War Plan. And, there has been no addition to it. There has been no change in it, and that is why the schemes of the Orissa State that we find in the post-war plan to be about 147 in number, under the different heads such as agriculture, animal husbandry, medical, public health, co-operation, education, etc., have, under the Five Year Plan, been reduced to less than one hundred. The plans which were not started in the post-war plan were taken up in the Five Year Plan. And we have to wait for years before this great Five Year Plan is going to give benefit to the people. It will be found that for the development of agriculture it was planned in the 5-year post-war plan that an agricultural college would be established in the State of Orissa, but now it has been abandoned under the Five Year Plan because this claim, this desire of the State Government, cannot be met. Similarly you will find that other post-war schemes have been curtailed. What has been the result? You will find that in the years, during the three years under the post-war scheme, 12 crores of rupees were spent. That means during the years before the Five Year Plan was started, even our State Government was spending Rs. 4 crores every year, on post-war schemes. Now, in the Five Year Plan, the allotment is Rs. 17.84 crores. That means that the amount that will be spent per year is 3.568 crores. The schemes under the post-war plan will cost the State Government Rs. 3.568 crores during the five years which has started from the year 1951, i.e., the amount that was being spent under post-war plan, has been reduced in the Five Year Plan to the extent of Rs. 43.2 lakhs. And that is our 5-year plan which

our friends on the other side want to welcome because it will fleece more money from the people, it will fetch our friends a big block of investment in the agricultural and industrial sectors.

(Time bell rings.)

Is it time Sir? Under the circumstances, Sir, I submit that if the Report is carefully studied, it will reveal that the planning in the States sector for each of the States is nothing more than what was there in existence under the post-war plan. Nor does it increase or add to the wealth of the States people and therefore I submit that if at all the Government is interested, if the Planning Commission is really interested, to improve the status of our people, to improve the country as a whole, they should have taken seriously the requirements of the people, in the countryside, instead of Delhi. They should not ask the State Governments to prune their schemes in such a manner that it will be convenient for the Planning Commission to embody in the State plans, and increase the size of the volumes which are presented to Parliament in such a manner that the discussion will be rushed through in a way, that nobody can attempt to make a serious and critical study of the Plan and make their own suggestions about it. With these words, Sir, I close my speech.

SHRI AKHTAR HUSSAIN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I want to address the House first, on the land policy as laid down in the Planning Commission Report. In paragraph 16 of chapter 12, it has been stated that it is intended to impose a limit on the size of the holdings. It should be taken into consideration, whether agricultural production can be considerably increased by the continuance of large holdings. I think a balanced view of this problem, has been taken in the Plan and it appears that they are still awaiting developments and trying to ascertain by experience whether it would be in the best interests of the agricultural prosperity of the country to have large scale farming or to subdivide

the existing large farms into small insignificant fragments so that people with dogmatic views may be able to say that they have succeeded in distributing land among all the people or among as great a number as possible. The other view is that if it is really intended to increase our agricultural production and to have a larger amount of grain for our people should we have small holdings or should we have large holdings which would enable improved machinery and modern methods of cultivation to be adopted. It is possible that if modern methods of cultivation are adopted, our yield per acre may increase to the same extent as that of more advanced agricultural countries. But if we have small holdings, who will pay for the tractors? Who will arrange for the other machinery necessary for the proper cultivation of the land? Who will provide the money for the maintenance, development and supplies of improved seeds and other things? The question will have to be considered by the Planning Commission later either in implementing the Report or in making further provisions at subsequent stages of the Plan and it will have to decide at some time whether we should give up the idea of having large farms and fixing up limits which would lead to the confiscation of the farms that exist now. Lack of clarification would be a discouragement to those people who invest money and run large farms. Nobody would like to invest in large farms if he has to lose it soon. We just heard this morning the Deputy Minister for Defence stating that we import a large quantity of milk products from abroad and that we spend as much as Rs. 57 lakhs approximately of our wealth for such imports for the armed forces alone. He also informed us that to save these imports we would require a farm of about 2,000 acres to run a proper dairy farm in order to produce milk products required for the armed forces. I ask, why should that not be done? Why should we not have such a farm and produce these milk products? If we pay due regard to

the promotion of animal husbandry and take steps to enhance the cattle wealth of our own country, if we try to have our own milk, if we develop our own vast natural pastures, we can certainly produce these milk products that we at present are importing from abroad. But these cannot be arranged for if we have small holdings where people have only a limited area over which they can carry on the various pursuits associated with large scale farming. I hope the House will agree with me when I say that our real wealth is mainly big development of agriculture, that ours is primarily an agricultural country and what we need most is to develop our agricultural wealth and our cattle wealth. If only we develop our cattle wealth properly we will be able to save the expense that we incur in importing these milk products from abroad. There is no reason why that should not be adequately developed. Of course, I do not suggest that the Planning Commission has not taken into consideration these subjects. I want still greater emphasis to be laid on our agricultural development and on the development of our cattle wealth. If our hill-sides are developed into good pastures, there is no reason why we should not have as many good cattle in our country as are to be found in other countries which export milk products. There are certain very small countries in the world which are of a size of not more than a division in our country; still in those countries such a large quantity of milk and milk products are produced that they are able to export them to other countries. And here we are, with a very large area in our country, with very fertile lands, but we have not developed our pastures and have not increased our cattle wealth. We should develop them and bring about such a state of development that we would be able to make these milk products at least to meet our needs and thus save the money that we spend now in importing these things from other countries. Some patriotic capitalists should come forward and invest the requisite amounts in

[Shri Akhtar Hussain.]
this business of dairy farming. If they do that, our real wealth would considerably be increased and the amount which we now spend outside, could be spent for this development in our own country.

I would therefore, suggest that it would not do to fix the ceiling for the size of the farms. According to modern methods for carrying on agricultural operations, it is necessary to have large farms in order to make the pursuit of agriculture profitable and a farm has to be of large size to be a self-contained unit. I am disposed to think that if, in order to satisfy some impossible demands for distributing land by cutting large farms into small portions and fragments and distributing it among the people, ceiling fixed for holdings will be low, I am afraid it will not be possible to carry on agriculture profitably. On small farms neither agriculture nor dairy farming nor horticulture can be worked efficiently. Instead of a large number of small holdings, if large farms are maintained, we will be able to increase the productivity of the soil considerably. Therefore, I would like to suggest to the Planning Commission, that if in their future modifications, or in the implementation of the Plan they are inclined towards the Left, they are likely to be left behind in the road to prosperity ; whereas, if they are inclined towards the Right, they would be on the right road to prosperity and progress.

The other thing about which I would like to address a few words is about horticulture. Our horticultural wealth also needs considerable attention at the hands of the Planning Commission. We grow such a large quantity of fruits, fruits of all kinds. In my own State of Uttar Pradesh, I know we have been exporting mangoes outside and this has been bringing in valuable foreign exchange for

us. The development of the business of growing all those fruits that grow in our hilly regions, is also something that deserves more consideration, and I hope capitalists would be coming forward to make their contribution in this field. We should be able to grow even better fruits and in larger quantities so that we may be able to meet our own needs and also have a surplus which we may export to other countries.

I wish again to emphasise that we are a predominantly agricultural country and our wealth is really the raw material that we produce from the soil or which is dependent on growth from the soil. This is the real source to be tapped. The other sources also are very valuable and tremendous. We have iron in plenty and we have many other minerals. I do not say that full attention should not be paid to the development of our mineral resources. But those should be only in respect of areas where these mines or minerals are available. But in the vast majority of cases in all our states what is available is mainly the produce of the land. Therefore, our industrial development should be in areas where we produce our raw materials. Our factories should be set up in areas where we grow our raw materials for the factories to manufacture.

For instance, if there is any area where oilseeds, groundnuts or sugarcane or cotton or any other commercial crop is grown, there should be factories in that particular area for the development of those resources. It will not do to set up a cotton mill in an area where there is not much of cotton available locally. Supposing we import cotton of the superior qualities, set up a mill, import machinery as well as long staple cotton from abroad and then go on manufacturing, that would not really add to the wealth or the material prosperity of this country. What we should try to develop most should be what we grow ourselves and then, after our multi-purpose schemes for power and

irrigation are completed, when we have plenty of power and we have our iron factories working properly, then, the time would come for proceeding with further industrial development. At this stage, we should really concentrate on pushing ahead our schemes for the generation of power, our schemes for the development of agriculture, animal husbandry and the promotion of horticulture; but, the priority should be given to agriculture. I am very happy to find that since the last Report, the importance of agricultural development has been appreciated and realised by the Commission and, in the revised Plan, they have allotted a larger sum for the development of agriculture. To this extent, they are certainly entitled to the congratulations and the gratitude of people who are interested in the promotion of our agricultural prosperity and who are firm believers in the fact that the greatness of our country lies in the promotion and progress of agriculture because, after all, Sir, I would beg of you to remember that we attained our greatness at a time when there were no industries here. It was only our agricultural prosperity that attracted the attention of foreign countries. It was our Indo-Gangetic Plain which was considered to be the granary of the world at that time and, I am happy to inform you, Sir, that in our own State of U.P. they are developing the sub-mountainous areas and getting jungles cleared for the promotion of our agricultural activity and they are doing very well. If it had not been for what has been done in U. P., the amount of imports of grams from other countries would have been very much larger. I wish the House appreciated it. The Planning Commission has realised it and it is hoped that further attention would be paid to what is really our main source of wealth because, we find, as we go abroad, that the countries that have grown great, that are prosperous, have done so by developing what nature has given to them, what providence has bestowed on them in the shape either of agricultural land or mineral resources. So, the

natural resources are really the things that have to be developed and it is a matter of considerable satisfaction to me that the Commission has appreciated it. I do hope that the persistent demand of people who are attached to dogmatic principles and who clamour for imposition of their dogmatic views regardless of as to how we can do that without regard to their applicability to Indian conditions, to our genius and to our requirements would not lead the Commission to accept those dogmas without any regard to the applicability of such dogmas to this country. Sir, it behoves us all as a united people to express our high appreciation of the good work that has been done by the Commission. Under the guidance of our Prime Minister, the Commission has been prevented from adopting any view of a dogmatic nature. They have inclined neither to the extreme right of free enterprise nor to the extreme left which results in authoritarian principles, which in this country are applicable neither in politics nor in economics. We have struck a very happy balance and I accordingly commend the Plan for the acceptance of this House.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it has been said that the Plan that we are discussing is not national and that, properly speaking, it cannot be called a plan. It is true that it is not a national plan for, not all parties accept all its premises; but, as it was placed for discussion before the public in July last, I think, it would be true that, while it has been criticised, it has, in a large measure, been supported even by those who felt that it did not go as far as it should. The other criticism, namely, that the Plan cannot be called a plan in the proper sense of the word, has, I think, a little more basis in it. This is not a plan in the sense in which some totalitarian countries have tried to build up their economy. But, we have to remember the character of our Constitution and both the advantages and the drawbacks of democracy. If we realise that we have to take the people along

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

with us, a Plan of the kind that was followed, say, in Russia, seems out of question here. It would, however, be correct to say that while the section relating to agriculture, irrigation and power represents integrated schemes, the other sections seem rather to consist of a number of plans put together, a number of projects put together. I can exemplify this by referring to the section relating to industry. It is true that the industries that are referred to there are very important but, the expenditure to be incurred on the public sector is so small that the chapter on industrial development seems to have little relation to the rest of the Report. I should, however, Sir, today like to consider the Plan from a somewhat different point of view. Let us suppose that this Plan represents the maximum achievement possible for us during the next five years. Let us also suppose that the recommendations that have been made are the best that could have been made in the circumstances. It is still necessary for us to see whether the Plan is workable, whether we shall have the financial, the material and the human resources to carry it out.

But before I deal with that I should like to refer to the resolution moved by the Prime Minister yesterday. The resolution asks the Council to record its approval not merely of the principles and objectives that the Five Year Plan lays before us but also the programme of development contained in it. Now, Sir, the other day when the Prime Minister laid a copy of the Plan on the Table and asked that it should be discussed on the 16th of this month, I suggested that more time should be given to hon. Members to study the Plan. He replied that the most important part of the Report consisted of the chapters relating to the principles and objectives and that they could be discussed, because they could easily be studied in a week. I thought, therefore, that the resolu-

tion that he would place before us would be confined to these two points only. Yet he has asked us in this resolution to give our approval not merely to the principles and the objectives of the Plan but also to the programme of development. I submit that this is not fair. No one in this House, however industrious he may be, could have had the time to go through even one-fourth of the two bulky volumes that were laid on the Table the other day. And to ask us today to give our approval to the entire programme is, I submit, contrary to what the Prime Minister gave us to understand the other day, and contrary to all canons of fairness.

I shall now consider the financial resources available to us for carrying out the Plan. If we compare the Plan as laid before us now with that outlined in July last, we find that while the former plan consisted of two parts, in the present Plan the two parts have been fused together and they together form a single plan. But this has not altered the conditions required for its successful execution. The plan laid before us in July envisaged, taking both the parts together, an expenditure of Rs. 1,793 crores, that is, about Rs. 1,800 crores, and the total budgetary resources amounted to Rs. 1,121 crores; that is, there was a deficit of Rs. 672 crores. The Plan as laid before us now requires a total expenditure of Rs. 2,069 crores, and the budgetary resources, including the loans received by us so far, amount to Rs. 1,414 crores. The deficit is therefore of the order of Rs. 655 crores. There is thus hardly any difference between the financial gap that is to be bridged in order to carry out the Plan.

It was proposed last year that deficit financing might be resorted to to a certain extent by drawing on the sterling balances. That, we are, told, may increase our resources by about Rs. 290 crores. There will still remain a sum of Rs. 365 crores to be provided. The Report says that the additional capital required

must be received either in the shape of foreign loans or must be derived from extra taxation and internal borrowing or in some other way. But, Sir, in spite of the optimistic forecast with regard to the increase in the national income that the Plan would lead to, I doubt whether it would be possible to impose taxation to the extent envisaged in case foreign loans are not available. In order to find the money for the Plan it was estimated that certain sums of money would be provided by the Central and State Governments. The draft outline proceeds on the assumption that the State Governments would be able to save about Rs. 81 crores during the period of the Plan on revenue account; and that they would be able to incur development expenditure to the extent of 275 crores from their resources—I mean recurring resources. The total amount therefore that the State Governments were expected to provide amounted to 356 crores. Now the final Plan expects the States to provide 408 crores, i.e. 52 crores more. I understand that about 30 crores of this is nominal. It takes account only of the expenditure already being incurred on development, but which somehow or other was not taken account of in the draft outline of the Plan. The net increase amounts to 22 crores only. The States, therefore, will be expected to provide a total revenue surplus of 81 plus 22 i.e. 103 crores in five years. But what is the condition of the State finances? Can we in the present state of things expect them to come up to our expectations? Sir, in 1951-52 there was a surplus of 50 lakhs only, taking all the States together. There were some surplus States and some deficit States. But taking all the States together, the total surplus amounted to 50 lakhs only. The Budget of 1952-53 provides, taking all the States together, for a deficit of 8 1/2 crores. Now, Sir, take the Part B States. According to the revised figures for 1951-52, the Part B States taken together were to have a surplus of about 2 1/4 crores. But this surplus has been converted into a deficit of

2 3/4 crores in the Budget of 1952-53. The excellent Summary of the Commission's Report that has been circulated to us realises that the position of the States is a very difficult one. It says :

"From a preliminary review of the working of the State plans for 1951-52 and the budgets of the State Governments for 1952-53, it would appear that the task of organising finances to the pattern required for implementing the Plan has by and large yet to begin at the State end. The revenues of State Governments have been rising over the last two years, but the expenditure outside the State plans has been more than absorbing these resources".

It further says :

"It is proposed that a re-appraisal of the State finances as well as review of development schemes of the State Governments be taken up as soon as possible after the publication of this Report".

Sir, nearly two years have passed and three years only remain and the task of organising the State finances to the required pattern—as the Summary says—has not yet begun. We cannot, therefore, be optimistic. We cannot, therefore, reasonably feel that the funds required for the execution of the Plan will be available. The Centre itself is not in a very prosperous financial condition. But for the large surplus secured in 1951-52 on account of the under-estimation of the revenue, I doubt whether the Centre itself would have been in a position to provide the 130 crores of money which it is expected to save during the period of the Plan.

Now, Sir, in this connection we have to take account of the proposal of deficit financing. If our economy were a thoroughly stable economy, if we were producing certain things in abundance, say food, we might think of deficit financing without feeling that it would have serious consequences. But what is the situation now? The Commission has made it clear in its Report that controls must be maintained and strictly administered if the Plan is to be carried out. The execution of the Plan

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

within the limits proposed depends obviously on the price level. But if the price level rises on account of the withdrawal or slackening of controls, it is obvious that all the calculations of the Commission will be upset. The most important thing requiring to be controlled is food. The Commission has pointed out the serious effect that the withdrawal of controls would have on the Plan and it says that during the period of the Plan the systems of procurement and rationing must be maintained intact. It goes further and says that whatever relaxation may be thought desirable or whatever alteration in the forms might seem suitable, should be made only after the food target prescribed in the Plan has been reached, i.e. for five years, it wants that there should be no change in the existing system of food controls. Yet we find, Sir, that a psychology of decontrol is being promoted in the country and if the changes that have already been made make us feel that further changes may be made in the future, notwithstanding the Prime Minister's insistence on keeping the basic approach and strategic controls unaltered, I mean, in such a state of things, Sir, deficit financing cannot be envisaged with equanimity. In any case, we can allow deficit financing only to the extent to which extra money can be provided by the withdrawal of food grains from our sterling balances for they would not directly lead to inflation, though they would tend to increase the competition of food, which at the present time is admittedly insufficient for our needs.

I have devoted so much attention, Sir, to the factors affecting the financial availability required by the Plan. I shall now say a word or two about the personnel required for its execution. Now, one of the most important parts of the Plan relates to increased agricultural products. We know, Sir, that our scheme—the Grow More Food Campaign—has not proved to be successful to the extent that we desired it to be, because

of the lack of suitable agencies for acting as a liaison between the Government and the cultivators.

The Report now seeks to make good this deficiency by proposing to establish a National Extension Service. It approves of the recommendations of the Grow More Food Enquiry Committee on this subject. These recommendations require that the main responsibility for the execution of the Plan in the districts should be placed on the shoulders of the District Officers and that there should be competent workers at the village level who will not merely be technically qualified but who will also try to gain the confidence of the villagers and to understand their needs as a whole. In order to enable these workers to equip themselves for the very responsible task that will be entrusted to them, the Krishnamachari Committee proposed that they should receive training for at least one year. Let us suppose that the proposals are put into effect. It will be a year before trained village workers will be available and only two years will then be available for the execution of the Plan, but I am doubtful whether it will be possible in the course of a year or even in the course of three years to train all the village workers that will be required by the Plan. The Commission says that these village workers should be able to look after one-fourth of the villages. I doubt, Sir, whether we shall be able to provide the number of workers that will be needed. I know, Sir, that there are Community Projects which are expected to help materially in growing more food, but even so, I cannot help thinking that, if the recommendations of the Food Enquiry Committee are to be properly carried out, to expect adequate results from them in a period of three years, would be to take an optimistic view of the situation.

Now, Sir, take the officer at the top. We all well know the conditions under which the District Officer works at present. One may go to any province and one will hear complaints

there about the extent of interference with the work of the District Officers. It is undoubtedly the right of the Ministry to supervise the actions of its officers, but as is well-known, the complaint is that the decisions of the District Officer are upset on political grounds and that they do not know what their authority is. They are discouraged and demoralised. Unless, therefore, steps are taken not merely to have a Village Extension Service but also to enable the District Officer to exercise his authority properly, the Plan cannot succeed. A change must be made in the angle of vision of the higher authorities. The Commission has not referred to it. Yet, this matter seems to me to be more important than any of the several questions that have been dealt with in connection with the execution of the Plan. Unless, Sir, the District Officer is given a reasonably free hand and is made to feel that his discretion will not be interfered with at the bidding of any important person or party, no machinery that may be devised for the execution of the Plan will work properly.

Lastly, I should like to refer to the finances that the agriculturists will need in order to meet their seasonal requirements. Following the recommendations of the Krishnamachari Committee, the Commission has, I believe, recommended that the Government should provide about Rs. 100 crores to the co-operative societies so that they may be in a position to lend the money required by the cultivators, and the Commission has suggested that the number of co-operative societies should be increased so as to cover, I think, one-third of the population. The number of workers required for this purpose and the finances that must be available in order to enable them to work successfully can be easily imagined. When the Central Banking Enquiry Committee considered this matter twenty years ago, it was thought that about Rs. 1800 crores would be needed to meet the needs of the agriculturists.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal) : The prices have increased four times now.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : And a much larger sum will be needed now because of the increase in prices and the large efforts that the cultivators are expected to put forth.

Now is there any reasonable hope that the workers and the funds will be available to the required extent ? I wish the Plan every success. To the extent it is carried out it will add to our real resources and will enable us to go forward at a more rapid pace afterwards but we should not conceal from us the impediments that lies in our way. They are many and serious. It is therefore necessary that the administrative machinery should be reorganized and strengthened to the utmost. This is the first requisite in my opinion of successful planning, and the second thing is that we must have an agency that will be able to win the friendship of the agriculturists and be able to persuade them to put forward the local effort without which no plan can be successful. I should have liked to say something about the question of employment but as my time is up, I don't want to proceed any further. I am not pessimistic but I have tried to take a realistic view of our resources and I have done so in order to lay emphasis on certain factors that do not seem to me to have received adequate consideration at the hands of the Commission.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
Mr. Agarwala.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) : Sir, may I make a suggestion and also seek the Chair's protection, for the usefulness of this Council, to what I have to say ? I tried to achieve it through unofficial sources viz., the Government whip yesterday. Without meaning any disrespect to the hon. Deputy Minister here, there are 3 Ministers who are Members of the Planning Commission and one of them

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

I take it is going to reply to this discussion. It is most unfortunate and regrettable that not one of them is present during the discussion and I don't know how they are going to reply to it. Rather it gives us an impression that the discussions that we are having here today is extremely useless and if that were so, I would suggest to you that we move for a closure and be done with it. If the Government thinks that the Council is—and it certainly is—capable of contributing something by way of criticisms and suggestions on this Plan, I would most earnestly request you to see that at least one Member of the Commission is here who probably will reply to the discussions so that the Council's usefulness may at least be kept up in form if not in reality.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
Shri Agarwala.

SHRI R. G. AGARWALA (Bihar) : While going through the Report of the Planning Commission I feel that it has taken into account all aspects of the national economy but more stress is laid on irrigation, power, transport and communication and social services. About 92% has been spent on these projects and only 8% has been given to the industry. I think the allocation of 8% to industry is very low when compared with the wealth they produce and the labour they employ. Now mineral is one aspect of the industry and as most of the hon. Members have not dealt with that problem, I will deal with that problem. India holds a very important position so far as production of minerals is concerned. It produces coal, iron ore, manganese, mica, limestone etc. The industry is there for the last 100 years but no improvement has been made in it. The foreigners who were here and ruling the country were not for the benefit of this country but for simply taking the raw material for their industries abroad and this is why this industry has been neglected. Now

with the emergence of independence to our country we should plan for conservation. Mineral is a wasting asset and once the mineral is taken out and used, it is wasted for ever for the nation. So every development plan in the industry should be taken with conservation. Broadly speaking I will divide minerals of the country into three categories. Basic minerals which are used in the basic industries of our country in the country's development such as coal, iron ore and limestone. Then minerals which are partly used in the country and largely for export such as manganese. Then there are minerals which are entirely for export and not used here like mica.

I will take coal first. We have enough sources of coal and it is estimated that our reserves are to the tune of 20,000 million tons. So far as low grade coal is concerned, our position is very secure. But so far as coking coal is concerned, our resources are only 2,000 million tons. While according to the committee appointed in 1949 our consumption of coking coal will increase from 3.7 to 8% million tons yearly, I submit that more conservation methods should be adopted for the coking coal. I am glad to see that the Planning Commission has very rightly pointed out on page 12, Volume II, as follows :

“(i) Production of metallurgical coking coal may be maintained at the present level but under no circumstances should new fields be developed. The closing of mines producing coking coal is recommended only in cases where they can be reopened without large capital outlay.

(ii) Stowing, blending and washing should be enforced by law. It is believed that enforcement of stowing will lead to reduction in output of coking coal.

(iii) Selective mining should be stopped effectively.

(iv) The replacement programme, i.e., for replacement of coking by other coals, should be taken up in two stages. As an initial step, the selected ‘A’ and ‘B’ coking coal used in the railways and for other non-essential purposes should be replaced by non-metallurgical coal. When this programme has been completed, the replacement of the grades I and

II coking and semi-coking coal should be taken up”.

I think after giving effect to these recommendations our position so far as coking coal is concerned will be very fair. Now I come to iron ore. It is estimated that our reserves of iron ore are to the tune of 10,000 million tons, and we can base our industries on a permanent basis on that estimate. But we are at present exporting some iron ore to different countries. Now with the establishment of a new steel plant we may be in a better position to export pig iron in place of iron ore which will bring better revenue and our exchange will be better and moreover our internal consumption of iron ore is also increasing and the establishment of a new plant which is provided in this Five Year Plan will add to the basic industry in this country.

Now I will come to manganese. It is partly for consumption here and mostly for exports. India holds a very good position so far as production of manganese is concerned. I should submit that there are huge dumps of low grade manganese lying in all the mining centres, these huge dumps should be reclaimed by blending high grade into low grade. Moreover there are some British firms who are engaged in this indirectly and they are exporting high grade manganese in place of low grade so that they may have less profits for this country and more for their own country. This is not only affecting our exchange but also our income-tax as well as our Royalties which are based on the percentage of manganese content in it. In order that this may be stopped one ore-testing station should be opened in every export centre of India and no ore untested should be allowed to be exported. Further, Sir, the Government should fix up the percentage beyond which no manganese should be exported so that the persons interested in the industry should be compelled to mix low grade one with high grade in order to make it exportable.

A Ferro manganese plant should be established in India. I am told the cost is not very heavy. It may amount to 3 or 4 crores of rupees and it will bring three to four times of the value of manganese etc.

Then I come to mica. This is a mineral which is entirely for export and there is no use for it in India. Mica is a very peculiar mineral as it has no effect of any outside forces such as cold, heat, water, chemicals and electricity. An 1" thick piece of mica can be split into 2,000 layers and when it is a peculiar material, its occurrence is also peculiar. In the case of coal we can find out the extent of tonnage of coal but in the case of mica we have to probe inch by inch in order to prove the reserve of the mine.

So, Sir, it should be taken into consideration ; it is very costly, because the methods of taking it are very costly. The Mining Concession Rules of 1948 formulated by the Government of India have limited or rather specified the area for different minerals. Mica is one of them and as, Sir, mica is purely for export and I do not think that the limitation of area so far as this mineral is concerned is desirable. Division of area into so many bases will lead to more production and as mica is not used in India—mica is going out of India—it will tend to decrease the price. Now, while we are losing the national wealth in mica, we are also losing dollars or foreign exchange as the case may be. I do not therefore think that the limit should be provided, rather I suggest that minimum area should be fixed and not the maximum. The maximum should be left to the sweet will of the lessee or the lessor as the case may be. Our policy so far as these minerals which are entirely for export are concerned should be under-production and not over-production so that we may get fair price.

Now, Sir, there is no use for mica in India. I suggest that a mica plant should be set up in India so that

[Shri R. G. Agarwala.]

we may get a higher value for mica which is at present sent out as raw material. Further, Sir, heavy electrical industries based on mica should also be established in India. Our country is developing so much hydro-electric power and we will, therefore, be requiring huge quantities of electrical machineries and it is very desirable that heavy electrical industries should be established immediately, so that we may be able to meet the increasing demand of electric equipments.

I will also speak something about the Bureau of Mines. For the development of mines and minerals, the Government of India have established a Department called the "Bureau of Mines". This Department has opened its office at Delhi and Calcutta. I do not think, Sir, that the Bureau of Mines can be of much use if it is far away from the mining centres. It should open its branches at the mining areas in States like Bihar, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, etc., etc. It should be manned by qualified technicians say mining engineers, so that their advice may be handy to the industry. Moreover, Sir, these engineers when posted in different States will have easy inspections and they can always advise the industry and suggest ways and means whereby conservation and development may go together.

Sir, the financial aspect of opening this office can be solved very easily without additional expenditure to the Central Government. There is already a Department of Mines working in each State and mostly on each mineral. If the Bureau of Mines is amalgamated with the Mining Department, this expenditure problem can also be solved. The Inspector of Mines looks to the safety of labour, while the Bureau of Mines will look to the safety, development and conservation of the mines.

I will submit, Sir, that these suggestions should be put into operation

by the Government at a very early date. In the end, I thank the Planning Commission for the attempts that they have made to put the country on a sound footing and to make the country self-sufficient as far as possible. Thanks.

PROF. G. RANGA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, one of our friends has stated that this is not a national plan. But my hon. friend Dr. Kunzru felt inclined to think that it certainly can be taken to be a national plan. I began to think about it, whether I can possibly agree with Dr. Kunzru. Now, what is the meaning of a national plan? If it means for all the people of the country—that is one thing. If it can be considered to be a plan which is acceptable to all the important sections of the people, that is another. If on the other hand, in the implementing of it all the different sections of the people and all the political parties have taken part—that is the third point. If all the political parties have been approached for their co-operation for the implementation of the Plan—that is the fourth point. If I were to look at all these four aspects, I find that it is difficult for me to accept Dr. Kunzru's contention that it can be taken to be a national plan.

First of all, Sir, we have heard yesterday from a Communist Party spokesman—and from that it is very clear—that the Communist Party is not co-operating with this Plan. Then, secondly, we heard the Socialist Party spokesman. He has also dissociated from it. Then, coming to my own Party.

SHRI B. GUPTA : My hon. friend is misinterpreting the Communist Party's stand with regard to the Five Year Plan. Our views about the various projects will be communicated to the Government of India and to other parties in due course. We are now only participating in the general discussion.

PROF. G. RANGA : They have taken half an hour in order to make this

explanation. Well, I take it that they are not behind it. The Socialist Party also is not behind this Plan.

Then, let us look at the four aspects of this. In the making of the Plan, in the very beginning when the National Planning Committee was established, the Communists and Socialists were also invited to co-operate with it and they were co-opted on the various Committees. But the agriculturists and the artisans wanted to be included on those Panels and in the Committee. The Committee was not at that time prepared to accept that co-operation. Later on, at the persuasion of Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Kumarappa was included in it and Dr. Kumarappa found himself face to face with its approach of planning by centralising everything in this country and bringing it under the control of the State—then Provincial Governments and the Union Government here—and not developing any decentralisation. Therefore, he has resigned, with the result that in the earlier attempts, neither the farmers, the agricultural workers, nor the artisans came to be as effectively associated with the Plan as they should be or desired to be. Later on, other attempts were made by the National Congress when an economic sub-committee was appointed. The Socialists were on it in a prominent way and they co-operated with it and they made certain recommendations. That Committee's report was there. It can be considered to be the handiwork of three sections and each was prepared to co-operate with it—those who represented the farmers, the Socialists and the Congress people. But at a later stage, the Socialists went out of it. We were associated with these attempts and in the end the National Planning Sub-Committee prepared a plan for what is known as the National Economic Conference, where the Chief Ministers were brought in. They put their approval upon that draft plan. It was all publicized. Then the National Planning Commission came to be appointed. When that Commission was appointed, I

made harsh remarks and I find that my remarks are justified even today. On this Commission, there was no proper representation either. There was some representation for the industrialist and proletariat but there was no representation for the agricultural class or for the handicrafts men. Yes, there was no representation for the industrial workers as the Congress had seen them through my hon. friend Mr. Nanda. There was also representation for the superannuated officers ; there was also representation for the Provincial Ministers, but certainly, there was no representation for these important classes. That Commission was going on working. It appointed a number of panels and on them there was representation for a number of experts, but no representation for the important class of people, the farmers. Then a draft plan was made. Was this draft plan discussed in all the State Legislatures ? Was it presented to the members of all political parties in the interim Parliament at the committee-stage so that they could have discussed it in the manner in which Dr. Kunzru could have liked it to be discussed and our friends, Mr. Sundarayya and Mr. Ghose could also have liked it to be discussed with all the figures and facts and quotations from the various statements and demands and hopes and aspirations ? There was no such opportunity given at all.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras) : On a point of information Sir, I might tell the hon. Member, that the Madras Legislative Assembly discussed the Plan in detail.

PROF. G. RANGA : I congratulate them. At long last.....

SHRI B. GUPTA : We would like to hear your views about the Plan.

PROF. G. RANGA : I am coming to it. At long last, the Plan was prepared. They appointed—a Bharat Sewak Samaj to develop work to supplement the Plan. We all agreed to

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

work in it. They wanted to make it a non-political organisation. Whom did they invite ? They invited some of the political parties, but they did not invite some others. But in view of the fact that so many of us were very keen to see that it became a success, we had to offer our own services. We had almost to threaten these people that we will take the public into confidence if our co-operation is not sought after. With ~~f~~very great difficulty it was that they sought our co-operation. What did we find ? The suggestion that we made there that the people whom we represented ought to be given effective representation and that the co-operative movement in this country should be invited was given the go-by. My friends here—it is up to them to say whether they were also invited—but so far as my knowledge goes, they were not invited. I do not see any reason why all the political parties should not be invited. Therefore, it is not a Plan which has been evolved with the co-operation of all political parties. Next, this Plan, they say, is going to be implemented with the co-operation of all political parties. Because, we have already seen that two of the important political parties in the country are not prepared to associate themselves with the implementation of this Plan for their own reasons, how can we take this to be a National Plan ?

Then Sir, I represent my own party—The Krishikar Lok Party. I am not able to associate, I can tell you, the farmers or the artisans whom we represent with the collectivist plans that are suggested here. I take strong exception to the many academic suggestions that are made here, for the so-called solution of the land problem. Then, there are handicrafts too. There too, their recommendations have been very halting. They do not propose here, to show any kind of energy to implement all the things that they have themselves suggested.

And what they themselves suggest is not satisfactory.

Then Sir, coming to the other point as to when this Plan is to be implemented, an year and a half ago, it was supposed to have started, the implementing of it. It is going on now. We are told that all these multi-purpose projects are under progress and so on. Apart from the multi-purpose projects and power projects, there are some of these various other projects that they have already taken up, like DDT, the machine tool factory, and various other things like the cable manufacturing factory, one iron and steel manufacturing plant, and various other things. We wanted the nationalisation of the Imperial Bank of India. No mention. We wanted also nationalisation of the sugar industry. No mention. We wanted greater control of the industry. There is no mention. We were promised Sir, the establishment of what is known as an Agricultural Finance Corporation in the States and also for the cottage industries. Nothing has been done. Now, there is the Industrial Finance Corporation. It was to be coupled with similar corporations in the States in order to finance the middling as well as small scale cottage industries. Nothing has been done. They only express the hope, but there is no guarantee. All these things which have been promised all these years, they do not propose to do these. What is it that they proposed to do ? Even to this extent, my hon. friend Dr. Kunzru said, they are not likely to have funds. I quite agree with him. I want this side also to be examined. The question is whether they will be able to raise the funds. How do they propose to do it ? It is suggested here that the farmer and the agricultural worker, the industrial proletariat, have all to be prepared to bear more and more taxation in the years to come. They have said, not once but several times, that the topmost men have already borne too heavy a burden of taxation, and therefore not much

more can possibly be expected from them, and so the other people must be ready. They say : "Our taxation burden is 8 per cent. of the national income. The basis on which it has been based is very narrow. Therefore, it should be widened." What does that mean ? The farmers who are already over-burdened with taxation have got to bear more and more. The industrial workers and the agricultural workers, who are already paying so much to Government, should be prepared to pay very much more. So you see, all these things are an indication to the Finance Commission to suggest various ways and means by which taxation can be levied upon our masses. Then they talk of a betterment tax to finance the irrigation schemes. Our friends here were complaining that too much attention is being paid to agriculture and agricultural development. Let us remember one thing—that a good portion of the agricultural development is supposed to be financed through what is known as betterment levy. May I ask, is that fair ? Some friends have said that undeveloped areas should be developed and should be given preference. And, if they are given preference, how ? At their own cost ! All these great gentlemen of the towns who are going about enjoying, they are not to be touched. Sir, one of our friends, the capitalists' spokesman, yesterday was saying that they could not bear any more taxation, and actually, they would like to have further remissions of tax if only Mr. C. D. Deshmukh, the Finance Minister, would agree. But these people in the deficit areas, people who have been crying for more water, more electricity, irrigation facilities, etc., would be made to pay through their nose, in order that they might have development, that is at the cost of the poor agriculturists. Not being satisfied with this, they suggest that the betterment levy has got to be collected from them, through money—on the spot payment or instalment payment—or even through land ; that is, a portion of the land of the poor

peasant has got to be given to these gentlemen. Why ? Because, in order to enable them to develop their projects. Is it not unfair that you should be taking away one portion of the land even while talking of development of land ? Moreover why should Government take into account speculative prices of land when peasants are interested only in the agricultural incomes they can get from the introduction of irrigation ? Only farmers want a living from their holdings and the Government talks of land values. That is the funny side of the land problem. Some people have been making rather some ill-considered statements—and they derive their strength from the statement of one of the ex-Ministers, and an ex-Member, who had the temerity of criticising Vinoba Bhave and suggesting gifts of land from the various small peasantry, because, the small peasantry are not able to produce efficiently. It is a big question whether the small holder is not now producing more per acre than the large land holder. Our friends talk about this in a nice, clever manner. They do not say it straightaway that big holdings are more productive. Why not say : Sir, there are 162 million tillers ; there are 34 millions who cultivate others' land. They are altogether 200 million people. Why not say to these people : "Look here, your holdings are all useless, wasteful. Your work is not scientific. Why don't you use tractors and such other machinery so that you can produce surplus in order to enrich our towns people—people who sit on the desks, and the rest of us ? Otherwise we are going to dispossess you." They do not say so lest all these vast masses might rebel against the planners. From one end of the Plan, they are going to distribute land and from the other end, they are going to dispossess all these poor people through legislation, as they say, in a calculated, but slowly and in a persuasive manner. From the one end the Communists and from the other this Government wish to squeeze the small holdings out of land economy. Sir, this

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

controversy between the small and big holdings is a century old and it is wrong for the planners to decide against small holders.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: You are talking of land-lordism.

PROF. G. RANGA : You have not heard me correctly. Yes, I was saying that the planners wish to dispossess all these poor people, and convert these lands into big private farms. They do not have objection to the starting of capitalist land-holding concerns. Because, men like Ambalal Sarabhai can have 2,000 or 3,000 acres of land. And they have use for it, because they are able to show that they are getting superior yield. He will be allowed to go on merrily, because he will be able to show splendid results from his lands. He has on his land scientifically trained managers. So more and more encouragement will be given to them. Then there will be co-operative societies and these will give scope for the employment of these gentlemen's sons and nephews who are unemployed—these educated unemployed people. They will be appointed as managers and under the management of these people, the poor kisan will be working like.....

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : Slaves.

PROF. G. RANGA : Yes, they will be forced to work like slaves. Is that what they want to achieve ? That is what is supposed to have been achieved by Soviet Russia ; what is sought to be achieved in China. My friends here may like it, but I do not like it. Sir, I do want my subsistent farmers to remain in possession of their holdings for about the same reason—I do not say for the same reason—that you want to provide for your educated unemployed. That is, our peasants too need employment and their holdings are a source of such employment. The educated unemployed ask the Government for employment ; but the

kisan does not ask the Government for employment. On the other hand, he only asks you for leaving him alone, in possession of his land, to allow him to carry on his productive activities. To that extent you should be grateful to these two hundred million people. They do not bandy you about, they do not trouble you. They find their own employment. But the planners want to come in their way. A cultivator may have two or three acres. But each acre gives employment for fifty days. To that extent he is not a burden on the State. For the other three hundred days only he expects Government help. If he has five acres he gets employment on his own land for 250 days. He does not become a liability on the State to that extent. On the other hand, so far as the town people are concerned, these educated people, all the 365 days look to the Government for employment. And if they are not provided with proper employment, they are prepared to kick up a revolution with the help of various friends. Therefore, I do not want these small holders to be upset. I do not want them to be coerced. I do not want them to be dragooned into all these various kinds of farms which you want to bring into existence without their co-operation. If you attempt to do things in that coercive manner, I want to warn the Government that so far as this recommendation goes, the farmers are not going to and they are not prepared to accept it.

I come now to the tenants. My friend over there put me the question, whether I was in favour of land-lordism. I am not favouring land-lordism, but I favour land ownership and protection of our tenants. Our friends here and our friends over there are both united in squeezing out the land-owner, the poor peasant. They themselves have stated that the maximum should be three times. I have stated in my minority report to the Agrarian Reform Committee that it should be five times. The Sarvodaya Committee by which some of my friends here swear, have fixed it at six times. The Planning Commission

wants to go back and wants to be as academic as possible, and wants to make it three times. Even if it is three times, up to that, do not interfere with these peasants. But help them with what they want. Are you providing them with those equipments that they want ? Are you helping them to be more efficient in regard to manures, in regard to finance ? My hon. friend Pandit Kunzru told us just now and Mr. Sundarayya also told us yesterday how it was that these people got indebted, how they have become even more indebted so far as certain stratas of them are concerned, even after the war. These people pay from 12 to 24 per cent. interest for their loans. You have your industries and for them the Industrial Finance Corporation, for instance, lends money at 6% interest. But what about these poor farmers ? You ask them to show profit, to show more production. But the point I want to ask is, which industry in the world can become productive, can become profitable, if it gets its finance after paying an interest of 24 per cent. ? What facilities have you created for them ? You created the Reserve Bank and charged it to have a sort of special branch in order to finance rural folk. But what are its achievements ? That is what I would like to ask. What have you done for their manures, for their finance co-operative godowns, tested seeds and other basic equipment ? There are to be the roads, and that is the only bright feature. But even that bright feature does not reach the farmer. When the road reaches the village limit, the farmer is expected to provide labour, often free labour, and other contributions to construct the further reaches of the road. And the peasants are prepared to make these contributions and to give you their co-operation. But where is the spirit of co-operation from your end ? Therefore, I say, your Plan has to become a national plan first. It has to become a national plan so that it may be accepted by the farmer, by the artisan, by all the different classes of our people. And for that your Government itself has to be changed. It

should change from being a party government here. The time has come when there should be a national government in this country. You should extend your hand of co-operation to all, your invitation to all the parties here. If any party is not willing to co-operate with you, it will be its own fault. But with such parties, as are willing to co-operate, you should form a coalition government, not only here but all over India. Then it will be possible for you to implement the Plan. Otherwise you will not be able to implement it. With various parties going about the country, from village to village, from town to town, saying "this is not your Plan, this is no Plan for you," with all their non-cooperation and obstruction, would it be easy for you to implement this Plan I want to ask you. My hon. friends here already told you yesterday that only within 27 years, you are going to develop the national income of our people. Till that time the people have to be patient. Are they going to be patient ? Hungry people are not going to be patient. Shivering people are not going to be patient. There will be patience where there is hope. That is what our Prime Minister said yesterday, and I agree with him. But how long will they be patient when there are people who go about saying, this is not our plan, we have nothing to do with it ? If on the other hand you reconstitute your government, you will succeed in maintaining the public morale and encouraging them to be patient and co-operative in working for their own progress. Let them not sit here on the high pedestal of a party government and say that the line you draw is the law for everybody, therefore everyone should prostrate before us. If you do that, you will not be able to implement the Plan. You cannot prevent the masses from rising against you whenever it becomes possible for them to do so. Then they will say, "Look here, you are not the proper leaders for us."

Sir, there is this invidious distinction between the rural people and the urban people made by the Plan. My hon. friend Dr. Kunzru although he

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

does not say so—I take him to be a protagonist of the urban people. I demand parity between the rural and urban peoples in the plans you make. And this Government, if you examine the Plan, you will find in the implications behind the recommendations, wants to keep the control over the economic and social activities of every individual in this country, every group in the country for the benefit of urban peoples and thus go farther and falter away from the ideal that Mahatma Gandhi held up, the ideal of decentralisation. Here the idea is that there should be control as much as possible at every centre of social activity. Centralisation and control from the top here, with a number of experts is the special burden of the song of this Plan. I have told you what I think about the experts—these gentlemen who have created an artificial food famine in the country, the gentlemen who made the Prime Minister go wrong by 20 per cent., as he said yesterday. So with the help of experts like Shri Nanda.....

THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA) : I am not an expert.

PROF. G. RANGA : Pardon ?

AN HON. MEMBER : He says he is no expert.

PROF. G. RANGA : No, but you look like one. So they want to control the whole thing. But this, I may tell them, is going away from Mahatma Gandhi's ideal. I know they have got their answer. They will say, in the village it is the village panchayat which is going to be given the control. But what does this mean ? It means that the non-agriculturists will be controlling the agriculturists and the agriculturists will be controlling the nonagriculturists people in the village, fighting among themselves. No peasant will be able to go to sleep in confidence that he will be kept by the morning in possession of his holding and if you are a peasant, Sir, I would only sympathise with you. If you go to sleep at night, you can-

not be sure if in the morning, you will have your holding in your possession, or whether your neighbour would not have made a representation to the village panchayat saying that you are not using your labour, you are not cultivating your land properly, and therefore, show cause why you should not be dispossessed. That is the game of this Plan. There would not be any peace at all in the villages. These gentlemen in Northern India have not so much experience of village panchayats as we have had in the past 40 years and we know to our cost what these village panchayats have come to be. Factions, there will be plenty, quarrels, there will be plenty and there will be plenty of other trouble and you are going to hand over the minority of people to the majority no doubt with all these powers in their hands and, then, say to them 'Look here, it is your own village panchayat which has got to decide your fate. Can we entrust our panchayats with such drastic powers. This is what the gentlemen are trying to do. Now, have they studied properly the work of the co-operative societies in this country, the manner in which the internal organisation is developed, their elections, their disputes their quarrels and all the rest of it? If they had made any such practical study of these things at all, they would not have been so very professorial-like as they appear to be in simple saying "yes, there will be compulsory co-operation"'.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member is also a professor.

PROF. G. RANGA : Yes, Sir ; but I have been trying to rusticate myself and trying to become a peasant, and, these people who are not even born peasants, they want to become professors.

(Interruption.)

Sir, the co-operative societies and the village panchayats as they are conceived in this Report are not going to be properly worked at all and, therefore, the farmer cannot be expected to

be handed over—I mean by farmers not only the land-owning peasants but also tenant farmers—to these organisations. Sir, these organisations which will control the farmers will be controlled through the mamlatdar to whom my hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru, wants to give much more power than they have already got. If anybody were to go into that question, he would be able to find out how the Tenancy Act is being implemented in Gujrat by the mamlatdars who are the hand-maids of the past Revenue Minister who is also the present Chief Minister. I do not want these peasants, agricultural workers also to be handed over bound hand and foot to these mamlatdars. Hon. Members may ask, if you are not going to employ the mamlatdars, how are you going to regulate your own economy and ensure greater agricultural production? My answer is that if you were to pay remunerative prices to our producers, they will do it. Have they not done so in regard to sugar, in regard to jute.....

(Time bell rings.)

in regard to cotton, in regard to oil-seeds, in regard to wheat and rice, for the matter of that? People are there ready to work hard and efficiently. Yet there is so much of talk now in favour of the big holdings and not smaller holdings. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen who are grumbling about working for about 8 or 10 hours in these offices and various other concerns that the peasants work much harder than these people. Our peasants never ask for all sorts of holidays; on the other hand, they work themselves right up to their bone. And yet these are the people who are unconscionably termed as being inefficient, and also incapable and useless. They are not efficient. They are much more efficient, much more capable, much more hard working, much more conscientious and you should be thankful that they have been carrying on this most essential productive effort, they have been feeding our millions in this country in spite of the neglect of these people for ages, ages and ages and, even after you have achieved your own freedom.

How much time did I take, Sir? I want a little more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Three minutes more.

PROF. G. RANGA : What time are you giving me, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have taken 27 minutes.

PROF. G. RANGA : Sir, I agree with those friends who said that there should be maximum holdings; but, if there were to be a maximum for rural incomes and holdings then I want simultaneously steps to be taken in regard to urban income, urban properties and urban employments. If, on the other hand, you are not going to do it and if you are going to come down with your axe upon the farmers, then I can tell you that the farmers are not likely to accept it and all your schemes will remain imaginary. Panditji said yesterday that it should not be a school book plan, but, what else is it? Yes, it is very good and it is becoming popular and I am not surprised because our students are, after all, sensible people. Instead of having to read Banerjee's book, Dutt's book and Jathar and Berry's book. This book is very convenient for our students to enable them to pass their examinations; for Indian economics you do not need any better treatise in order to show the various facets of Indian economy and, beyond that, what is it?

Then, there is this local, parochial criticism: how much do you propose to do for the South and for the North? We had this discussion, Sir, when we were discussing the Industrial Finance Corporation. The same criticism holds good here also. My hon. friends do not seem to have paid any attention at all to the war-time Congress demand that these industries and, naturally, the economic development should be diffused as much as possible and diffusion seems to be such a scarce commodity so far as this Plan goes.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : A crumb for the South.

PROF. G. RANGA : They say that there should be assistance for the village workers. My hon. friend, Mr. Sundarayya, already, drew attention yesterday to the little provision that is made for this section of workers, agricultural workers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Time is up.

PROF. G. RANGA : What is proposed to be done for them ? I am sure that there must be legislation for enabling them to get the unoccupied or undeveloped lands of landlords. How are they to get it ? The unoccupied land of the Government has got to be placed at their disposal. There should be a law for that ; otherwise, what will happen is that the capitalists will be able to get it. In all these new projects, Sir, there is plenty of Government land, and also land of the rich and that land has got to be purchased or acquired. You can find that out and make the land available for the landless first of all and, then, for the very small holders and not for the others. There should be a law for that. There is no suggestion at all in regard to these matters.

Then, there is this housing problem. My hon. friend—I do not complain but, I congratulate him—Mr. Nanda who specialised in the welfare of industrial workers, has been fortunate in providing Rs. 20 crores for industrial housing. But, what about rural housing ?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Nothing.

PROF. G. RANGA : Not that they were not forewarned. I told him when I was one of his colleagues in the sub-committee ; but, no, they would not think about it. I told them when this Draft Report was being discussed ; no use. I warned them again at the time of the Budget discussions here ; no use. What is the use of making any serious suggestion to this Government ? They have certain pet ideas ? What are they ?

They are the pale imitation of the communist ideas, pale imitation of Sovietism boiled down in this fashion so that it would be a Nehru Plan. You may put Nehru's name on it, like Elizabeth's picture on those coins but, it would not become a Nehru Plan ; it would not become a Gandhian Plan. It would only become a pale imitation of the Soviet Plan. Such a pale imitation will not do for us and we cannot accept it, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Dr. Barlingay. You may begin. There are 4 minutes more.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh):

डा० डबल्यू० एस० बारलिंगे (मध्य प्रदेश): अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी आपने श्री रंगा साहब का भाषण सुना और मैं आप से यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि बहुत बातें उन्होंने कहीं वह बहुत ठीक कहीं और उन सब के लिए हम लोगों के मनो में काफी सहानुभूति है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब हम लोगों ने स्वराज्य नहीं पाया था तब इस देश में काफी दिक्कतें थीं, हम लोग उस वक्त ब्रिटिश सरकार के दास थे और उसका अनुभव हम रोजमरा करते थे। अभी रंगा साहब ने जो बातें कहीं हैं वह उसी किस्म की बातें कहीं हैं। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि इन सब दिक्कतों को किस तरीके से दूर किया जा सकता है। यह जो प्लान हमारे सामने रक्खा गया है वह सब तरह से ठीक है, यह बात मैं नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। प्लान की पूर्णता के बारे में तो मैं आप से इतना ही कहूंगा कि केवल परमेश्वर ही ऐसी चीज है जो कि पूर्ण है। हम जो लोग हाउस के इस तरफ बैठे हुए हैं और उस तरफ के जो लोग हैं, हम में से बहुत कम लोग यह मानते हैं कि चूंकि हमारा सरकार ने यह प्लान किया है, इसलिए यह प्लान सब तरीकों से पूर्ण है। ऐसा मानने वाला मैं नहीं हूँ। लेकिन जो कांग्रेस के लोग हैं उनकी एक विशेषता आज तक रही है, वह हमेशा उन सब चीजों के ऊपर एक ही यानी व्यवहारिक दृष्टि

से ही देखते हैं। दूसरे पक्ष और कांग्रेस पक्ष में एक अन्तर है वह अन्तर उसी तरह का है जिस तरह पहिले कांग्रेस वालों में और महात्मा गांधी जी के अनुयायियों में था और वह यह था कि सब को स्वराज्य चाहिये था। आज भी कौन नहीं कहता कि स्वराज्य नहीं चाहिये। लेकिन महात्मा गांधी जी ने ऐसे व्यवहारिक उपायों से काम लिया और ऐसा हम लोगों के सामने रखा कि उस रास्ते से जाने से हम लोगों को स्वराज्य मिल गया।

श्री रंगा साहब ने किसानों की दिक्कतों के बारे में जो बातें कही हैं वह उन्होंने बहुत ठीक कहीं हैं। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि हम किस रास्ते से जायें। मैं आपसे इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो प्लान इस सरकार ने इन मौजूदा हालातों में तैयार किया है उसके सिवा आज हम कोई दूसरा प्लान नहीं करना संभव नहीं समझते हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member may resume his speech at 2-30.

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

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

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY:

डा० डबल्यु० एस० बारलिंगे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि प्रोफेसर रंगा साहब ने इस देश में दिक्कतों के बारे में जो कुछ यहां पर कहा है, वह सब ठीक हो सकता है, और उसके लिए मेरे मन में काफी सहानुभूति है। लेकिन आज हमारे सामने जो मुख्य सवाल है वह यह है कि जितने भी दुःख हमारे सामने हैं, आज की हालातों में और आज की परिस्थितियों में हम उनका किस तरह से निवारण करें। रंगा साहब ने यह कहा कि यह जो प्लान है, नियोजन है, यह राष्ट्रीय नियोजन नहीं है। अब यह सवाल उठता है कि आया यह राष्ट्रीय नियोजन है या नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ इसका जवाब हमारे मंत्री महोदय देंगे। लेकिन हम लोगों के सामने जो मुख्य प्रश्न

है वह यह है कि जिस किस्म का प्लान, जिस किस्म का नियोजन हमने बनाया है, उसको हम ठीक समझते हैं या नहीं। मैं तो आप से यहां तक कहूंगा कि भले ही यह नियोजन राष्ट्रीय हो या, न हो फिर भी हमारी सरकार ने तो बनाया है, कम से कम कांग्रेस ने तो बनाया है। तो आप लोग जहां तक इस प्लान को ठीक समझते हैं वहां तक आप लोग सहयोग कर सकते हैं और यह आप लोगों का फर्ज हो जाता है। जहां आप उससे सहमत नहीं हैं वहां आप भले ही उसमें सहयोग न दें। लेकिन यह जो प्लान बनाया गया है उसके बारे में आप यह नहीं कह सकते हैं कि यह बिल्कुल ही खराब है और इसको रद्द कर देना चाहिये। अगर इस प्लान के बारे में जो दूसरी तरफ लोग बैठे हैं वह यह कहते हैं कि जहां तक बने हम इस नियोजन का साथ देंगे तो फिर भी हमारा काम बन जायेगा। हम इन सब चीजों को केवल व्यवहारिकता की दृष्टि से देखते हैं। शुरू से लेकर आज तक जो हमारे दूसरे प्रतिपक्षी हैं उनमें और हममें हमेशा अन्तर ही रहा है। व्यवहारिकता की दृष्टि से देखा जाय तो हम लोग जो हैं, एक तरीके से सुपर कम्युनिस्ट सुपर सोशलिस्ट भी हैं।

हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई जो अपने को गरीबों का हमदर्द बताते हैं और जो हमारे बारे में सोचते हैं कि हम गरीबों के हमदर्द नहीं हैं, वह गलत बात सोचते हैं। जब हमारे सोशलिस्ट भाई कहते हैं कि इस देश में सोशलिस्ट आर्डर आ जाना चाहिये तो क्या आप लोग समझते हैं कि हम लोग कोई ऐसी बात कहते हैं कि हम यह चीज देश में नहीं चाहते हैं, कि सोशलिस्ट आर्डर इस देश में जल्दी से जल्दी आ जाय? यहां पर बहुत सी बातें कहीं गई हैं कि हम यह चीज नहीं चाहते हैं। मगर हम उन सब चीजों को इस देश में लाना चाहते हैं जो कि अच्छी हैं। मगर सवाल केवल मध्य और कार्यप्रणाली का है कि वह किस तरह से की जानी चाहिये। अगर इन सब बातों को देखा जाय तो हम लोग सुपर कम्युनिस्ट और सुपर सोशलिस्ट हैं।

DR. W. S. Barlingay.]

अब मैं इस प्लान के बारे में जो मेरे थोड़े से विचार हैं वह आप लोगों के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं यह समझने वालों में हूँ कि कोई भी प्लान कोई भी नियोजन तब तक यशस्वी नहीं माना जा सकता है, वह भी खासकर हमारे जैसे लोकतंत्रवादी देश में, जब तक कि वह यश माप करने का कोई टैस्ट न रखता हो। वह टैस्ट यह है कि इस प्लान से इस देश का आदमी या नागरिक अच्छा बनेगा या खराब। कुछ लोग समझते हैं कि इस देश में अगर कई बड़ी इंडीगेशन स्कीमें हो जायें, कई बड़ी बड़ी इंडस्ट्री हो जायें और पैसा आ जाय तो देश सम्पन्न हो जायेगा। मगर मैं यह बात नहीं मानता। अगर प्लान ठीक है तो उसकी मुख्य पंख यह होनी चाहिये कि ५ वर्ष के बाद इस देश के आदमी उत्पादन करेंगे, उससे इस देश की जनता की हालत अच्छी हो जायेगी या नहीं। हम लोगों को यह मूल बात समझनी चाहिये कि जो मुख्य चीज है वह देश की मनुष्य शक्ति या काम करने की ताकत है। पहिली बार इस देश में लोकशाही की स्थापना हुई है और इस राष्ट्र के लिए जो पहिला काम करना है वह यह है कि इस देश की शिक्षा पद्धति को किस प्रकार से आमूल परिवर्तित किया जाय। इसी एक टैस्ट को मैं सबसे बड़ा टैस्ट मानता हूँ।

कुछ दिन पहिले आपने सुना होगा कि यहां पर परराष्ट्र से कर्जा लेने की बात उठी थी। जहां तक मुझे स्मरण है उसके बारे में बोलते हुए श्री भन्ज देव जी ने कहा “ऋणकर्ता पिता शत्रुः”। उसके उत्तर में हमारे माननीय फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर श्री देशमुख जी ने कहा था : “मित्रमन्त्रिवरः परम् । ऋणात्पुत्रा वितश्यन्ति, वृद्धि । राष्ट्रं तु गच्छति ।” मैं समझता हूँ कि इसका ठीक उत्तर यह होना चाहिये “ऋण तु कुर्वन् शिक्षार्थं पिता मंत्री सुहृद् भवेत्”। तो इसका अपवाद यह हुआ कि जो राष्ट्र का मंत्री है वह ऋण कर सकता है। लेकिन मैं यह जानता

हूँ कि ऋण एक बुरी चीज है फिर भी अगर शिक्षा पर वह खर्च किया जाता है तो ऋणकर्ता पिता और मंत्री मित्र होता है। यह मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ।

मैं यह चीजें इसलिये कह रहा हूँ कि मुख्य बात जो आपको इस नियोजन में देखनी है वह शिक्षा के बारे में है। शिक्षा के बारे में आपने इस नियोजन में क्या प्रबन्ध किया है? मुझे यह दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस नियोजन में अभी जो कुछ में पड़ चुका है उससे यह मालूम होता है कि शिक्षा के बारे में जो कुछ होना चाहिये था वह इसमें नहीं है। इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे तीन बातें कहनी हैं, मेरे पास समय कम है और मैं आपका ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लूंगा।

पहली बात जो मुझे इस विषय में कहनी है वह यह है कि इस देश में जितनी स्त्रियां जितनी लड़कियां हैं, कम से कम उनके लिए शिक्षा तो अवश्य अनिवार्य होनी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि कुछ दिनों पहिले यह मसला हमारे सामने माननीय श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मैनन ने रखवा था। मुझे उनकी पूरी बातों का स्मरण नहीं है कि उन्होंने इस विषय के बारे में क्या कहा था क्योंकि मैं उस वक्त मौजूद नहीं था। लेविन मैने यह चीज केवल श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मैनन के कहने पर ही यहां पर आप लोगों के सामने नहीं रखी है, इसके पहिले भी मेरा हमेशा यही मत रहा है। मैं मध्य प्रदेश में कुछ दिनों तक एजुकेशन का इनचार्ज रहा और वहां भी मैं ने यही कहा था। अगर हमारी सरकार स्त्रियों के लिए शिक्षा अनिवार्य कर देगी तो एक बड़ा भारी प्रश्न वह अपने लिए सुलझा लेगी। इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि अगर स्त्रियां शिक्षित हो जायेगी तो वह अपने लड़के और लड़कियों को भी आसानी के साथ शिक्षा दे सकेंगी और इस तरह से देश में कोई भी अशिक्षित नहीं रहेगा।

दूसरी चीज जो मुझे कहनी है और जिस के बारे में प्रोफ़ेसर दिनकर जी ने भी कल यहां पर जिक्र किया वह यह है कि हमारी शिक्षा कैसी होनी चाहिये। हम यहां पर प्राइमरी एजुकेशन बेसिक एजुकेशन और सोशियल एजुकेशन और सब किस्म के एजुकेशन के शब्द का प्रयोग करते हैं। मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि यह सब बात मुझे ठीक नहीं मालूम पड़ती है। "एजुकेशन इज वन पीस" (education is one piece) यह जो सोशियल एजुकेशन प्राइमरी एजुकेशन और बेसिक एजुकेशन और अन्य किस्म के एजुकेशन शब्द का प्रयोग किया जाता है वह ठीक नहीं है। मेरा कहना यह है कि इस देश में केवल एक ही शिक्षा पद्धति होनी चाहिये। और जितनी भी दूसरी शिक्षा पद्धति है वह जल्द से जल्द नष्ट हो जानी चाहिये। इस समय जो शिक्षा पद्धति देश में अच्छी हो सकती है वह केवल बुनियादी शिक्षा पद्धति बेसिक शिक्षा पद्धति है, बेसिक एजुकेशन (basic education) है दूसरी कोई भी शिक्षा पद्धति इस देश के लिए ठीक नहीं हो सकती है।

तीसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह हैलथ शिक्षा, स्वास्थ्य शिक्षा के बारे में है। प्लानिंग कमीशन ने इसके बारे में जो कुछ भी कहा है इससे मैं पूर्णतया सहमत हूं। प्लानिंग कमीशन ने चैप्टर ३२, पैराग्राफ ६८ में यह कहा है।

"All progress in public health depends ultimately on the willing assent and co-operation of the people and their active participation in measures intended for individual and community health protection. Considering how much illness is the result of ignorance of simple hygienic laws or indifference to their application in practice, no single measure is productive of greater returns in proportion to outlay than health education".

मैं इससे पूर्णतया सहमत हूं मगर इसके साथ ही साथ जो प्रायरीटी (priority) का सवाल है उसके बारे में प्लानिंग कमीशन ने हैलथ और एजुकेशन को पांचवा स्थान दिया है। आप इसके बारे में पैराग्राफ ८ को पढ़िये तो आप को साफ़ मालूम हो जायगा। उसमें वाटर सप्लाई

और सैनीटेशन (water supply & sanitation) के लिये पड़ना प्रायरीटी देने दी गई है। मैं इन चीजों को प्रायरीटी देने के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, यह भी हमारे राष्ट्र के लिए बहुत महत्व की चीजें हैं। हमारी जितनी भी कैनल की स्कीमें हैं, और जो दूसरे प्रोजेक्ट हैं वह सब महत्वपूर्ण हैं। उसके बारे में मुझे कुछ कहना नहीं है। परन्तु कहने का मतलब यह है कि जो सब से ज्यादा महत्व की चीज है वह शिक्षा है और हैलथ एजुकेशन है। अगर हम हैलथ एजुकेशन के बारे में ज्यादा ध्यान दें तो हमारी जो और चीजें हैं वह आप से आप सुलभ जायेगी। इसलिये प्रायरीटी के बारे में मुझे खासकर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना है इस बात की ओर कि आप हैलथ एजुकेशन को पहली जगह दें। इसके बाद सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि हैलथ एजुकेशन में कौन २ सी चीजे आनी चाहियें इसके बारे में मैं आपका थोड़ा सा समय लूंगा।

इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे बड़े अदब से कहना है कि हैलथ एजुकेशन के सम्बन्ध में हमारे यहां जो पुरानी योग विद्या है उसको अपनाना चाहिये। इस बात को हमें नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि इस देश में अभी तक एक बड़ी भारी संस्कृति रही है। इसके साथ ही साथ मैं इस सम्बन्ध में आयुर्वेद के बारे में भी आप के सामने कुछ कहना चाहता हूं। प्लानिंग कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में इस विषय में कुछ भी नहीं कहा गया है। यह बात हम भूल जाते हैं कि हमारे इस देश में एक बड़ी भारी वैद्यक पद्धति मौजूद थी और आज भी वह प्रयोग में है। मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता कि जो कोई पुरानी चीज है वह सर्वथा अच्छी होनी ही चाहिए और जो नई चीज है वे सब खराब हैं। लेकिन मैं यह आप से अवश्य कहना चाहता हूं कि इस देश में आयुर्वेद काफ़ी फैला हुआ है और इस बात को आपको रखना चाहिये। आयुर्वेदिक प्रणाली एक ऐसी चीज है जिस का आप विरोध नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि आप

[Dr. W. S. Barlingay.]

इस बारे में प्लान में खर्च देखिये, ९९.५५ करोड़ रखा गया है। आप सोचिये कि इतनी रकम से आयुर्वेद के लिये क्या हो सकता है? मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक आप इस के बारे में ज्यादा ध्यान नहीं करेंगे तब तक यह प्रणाली सफल नहीं हो सकती है। मैं आपके सामने और भी आंकड़े रखना चाहता हूँ कि इस बारे में आगामी ८ वर्ष में जो खर्च होने वाला है वह देखा जाये तो आदमी निराश हो जाता है। स्वास्थ्य के लिए जितना पैसा खर्च होने जा रहा है उसका केवल सौवां हिस्सा आयुर्वेद के लिए खर्च होने वाला है उससे आयुर्वेद की उन्नति कितनी होगी यह कोई भी जान सकता है।

आखिर में मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक इस आयुर्वेद का भविष्य हमारे डाक्टरों के हाथों में रहेगा तब तक यह तरक्की नहीं कर सकेगा। एलोपैथिक से मेरा किसी तरह से भी बैमनस्य नहीं है। मैं उसका शत्रु नहीं हूँ। मगर मेरा आप से यह निवेदन है कि जब तक आयुर्वेद का भविष्य डाक्टरों के हाथ में रहेगा जैसा कि मौजूदा हालतों में है तब तक यह इसकी तरक्की होने वाली नहीं है। आज आयुर्वेद के प्रति डाक्टरों की जो वृत्ति दिखाई पड़ती है उस में शास्त्रीय नहीं मानता इसलिये मेरी सरकार से यह प्रार्थना है कि आयुर्वेद के लिए एक अलग डिपार्टमेंट खोला जाय और उसके लिए एक अलग डिप्टी मिनिस्टर होना चाहिये।

दूसरी चीज जो मुझे आपके सामने कहनी है वह होमियोपैथी के विषय में कहनी है। होमियोपैथी इस देश में काफ़ी पैसा बचाने वाली है। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि इस देश में होमियोपैथी ने काफ़ी उन्नति की है और इससे जनता को काफ़ी लाभ हुआ है। मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि प्लानिंग कमीशन ने इस विषय के बारे में जो रिकमेंडेशन (recommendations) किये हैं अगर उन सब

को पूरा किया जायेगा तो इस देश के ऊपर एक बड़ा भारी उपकार हो जायेगा।

अन्तिम बात जो मुझे आप से कहनी है वह यह है कि प्लानिंग कमीशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में सिर्फ़ अरबन एरिया (urban area) के बारे में ज्यादा महत्व दिया है। ऐसा मालूम होता है। मैं केवल रिपोर्ट में इतना पढ़कर बैठ जाऊंगा। पैराग्राफ़ १३ और चैप्टर ३२ में यह दिखाया गया है कि अरबन डिस्पेंसरीज में ११.४ का बढ़ावा होने वाला है मगर रूरल एरिया (rural area) की डिस्पेंसरीज (dispensaries) में केवल १०.२ का ही बढ़ावा है। मुझे आप से निवेदन करना है कि यह ठीक बात नहीं मालूम होती है। इस देश में अगर हम लोग जिन्दा हैं तो तमाम किसानों और मजदूरों के ऊपर ही जिन्दा हैं, जैसा कि हमारे प्रोफेसर रंगा साहब ने कहा है। मैं यह बात इसलिये बना रहा हूँ कि उनके भाषण में काफ़ी सत्यता मालूम होती है। मैं यह बात फिर कह कर आपको यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो बात हो रही है वह ठीक नहीं हो रही है। मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि हम को ज्यादा से ज्यादा ध्यान रूरल एरिया की तरफ देना चाहिये जहां कि मच्छा हिन्दुस्तान रहता है।

[For English translation, see Appendix III, Annexure No. 82.]

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, whatever my feelings and they are very strong and whatever my differences and they are very fundamental, against certain features of this Plan, still I would like to express my deep gratitude for the labour that has been poured in the preparation of this Plan—I have said labour and not thought—and to thank the members of the Planning Commission and all those who have contributed to it and the staff and officers who have worked so hard to make it possible for the Government to place this Plan before us.

Now, coming to the amendment I have tabled, I consider that amendment to be of very fundamental importance, viz., the neglect of the development of the under-developed and less-advanced areas which are part and parcel of the Republic. What is the policy, what is the principle—I am not asking about a particular amount to be given to a 'A', 'B' or 'C' States—in allotting funds for the development of the under-developed areas? I definitely thought, Sir, that these areas would receive the first consideration of the Government. As a matter of fact, only the other day the President of India, while speaking at Gandhidham, just in a few words gave expression to the policy relating to the less-advanced areas. The President said :

“If political independence is to have a real meaning, it must be translated into economic terms. There has to come about a general levelling up of economically less-advanced parts of the country”.

If I had followed him correctly, the Prime Minister also while enunciating policy, said the same thing. Now, the big question is, “Have you followed this principle and policy in drawing up this Plan?” I venture to submit that if this Plan is anything, it is a complete negation of this policy and principle enunciated by the President and the Prime Minister. Sir, this is not a matter of argument. Here are facts and figures which cannot be disputed. If you just look at the provisions made for the various States, you will find that among the Part A States, Orissa which is supposed to be the least developed, has got the least. Bombay which is the most advanced gets the most. I do not say that the total amount is more. I would not expose myself to criticism on that account. You take it on a *per capita* basis or per sq. mile basis. You will find that among the Part A States Orissa gets Rs. 12 per individual; Assam gets Rs. 19; Bihar gets Rs. 14; Bombay gets Rs. 41; Madhya Pradesh gets Rs. 20; Madras gets Rs. 25; Punjab gets Rs. 16; U. P. gets Rs. 15; West Bengal gets Rs. 28. West Bengal

and Bombay get the most per individual. Now, Sir, coming to the Part B States, the state of affairs is still worse. Hyderabad gets Rs. 22 per individual; Madhya Bharat gets Rs. 28; Mysore gets Rs. 40; P.E.P.S.U. gets Rs. 23-8-0; Rajasthan gets Rs. 11; Saurashtra gets Rs. 49 and Travancore-Cochin gets Rs. 30. The first is Mysore and the second is Travancore-Cochin. Of course, from the other end, Rajasthan gets Rs. 11, the lowest that has been given. This is all per individual. Rajasthan, that unfortunate part of the country, which has got vast areas to be developed, gets Rs. 1310 per sq. mile, while the maximum in any Part B State is Rs. 30,000 per sq. mile in the case of Travancore-Cochin.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Mysore ?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR : Mysore gets Rs. 12,000 per sq. mile.

I do not want to argue very much on this point. This is the provision which has been made for the various States. But the major part of the outlay comes from the Centre. If you will just examine how this outlay from the Centre goes to the various States, you will find that the picture gets darker and more dismal and it gets so dark that there is no light visible so far as Rajasthan is concerned. Sir, when the State was integrated, an agreement was signed between the Rajpramukh of Rajasthan and the President of India. A particular stipulation was made in that agreement, which was signed in 1950. I will just read it :

“.....and particularly in relation to its development in different directions having regard to the fact that the State is backward in several respects as compared with Part A States. The Government of India will undertake a systematic enquiry into this problem with a view to rendering financial and technical assistance at the earliest opportunity. It will not be enough if as a result of Federal financial integration the State is treated in the matter of grants and other forms of assistance in exactly the same way as Part A States”.

It was stipulated, it was considered expedient, that a special enquiry.

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

a systematic enquiry, should be instituted immediately to give financial assistance to this State. More than two years have elapsed and an enquiry has not been instituted. Is this the sincerity with which the Government of India wants to fulfil its obligations? Is this the treatment which can enthuse the people? You are asking for the co-operation of the people. You are asking them to go ahead and give you all the assistance. Is this the way in which you ask for it?

I submit that there has been such a cry and the Government has been so anxious about fulfilling their obligations to the Princes regarding their privy purses but how are you implementing here your own obligations to the people and the country?

Sir, the policy and the principles as enunciated aim at levelling up while the drawn up programme in this Plan will bring it down, and here are the facts which cannot be disputed. I should certainly like to know if the policy of the Government is something different from what I have gathered from the Prime Minister and from the President's statement which I have just quoted to you. I have not got the time now to analyse the provisions made under the different heads, otherwise I will carry conviction with this House that there is nothing in it which can enthuse the people. Will you be surprised to know that what you have provided for education to be implemented in five years was granted, as a matter of fact, it was sanctioned and implemented during one year in one part of Rajasthan? What we did in one year on education is now given to cover five years? How is that going to enthuse the people? Going to the medical field I don't think there is anything at all. We are getting absolutely nothing. We are not thinking in terms of expending but we are only worried about deterioration which has started and whether we will be able to arrest the deterioration. The amenities which the people were already enjoying are being withdrawn.

The Gandhi Hospital in Jodhpur which is supposed to be one of the finest in Northern India is being started for medicine and the instruments are not being replaced and thousands of people who took advantage of the indigenous systems because the Vaidyas were being given subsidy from the State—they are finding themselves in difficulties because this subsidy is under suspension. Going to the roads, and development of the means of communication, about which our administration is feeling genuine difficulties I will say that owing to the political set up of this area which was divided into scores of States, there could not have been any centralised plan regarding the development of roads. So it was naturally expected that when the whole State is integrated and when the administration is faced with all sorts of difficulties, they will do something really very substantial in the plan about it. Here I will tell you what the Road Development Adviser of the Government has said. He himself felt that the development of roads in the newly integrated State of Rajasthan is one of the highest importance and urgency. It has failed very prominently in the over-all plan of development and 9 crores of rupees which was the least they demanded, even that is not granted. I think I should not accuse the Government for not giving for the roads. We can do without the roads but what about drinking water to the people? The imbecile Government of Rajasthan asked for a few crores to provide water to human beings—not for cattle.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : To provide for the Paniwala Maharaj.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR : If I were to come to that, I will tell you much. Because the Paniwala Maharaj was living in the same house in which my brother lives and I know more about him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please speak on the Plan and not about the Paniwala Maharaj.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR : Paniwala Maharaj is part and parcel of the Plan. He was responsible for the scheme for underground water. The Rajasthan Government wrote half a dozen D.Os. to the Central Government to relieve it of the Paniwala Maharaj and still the Paniwala Maharaj continued. Well, I was myself particularly associated. As a matter of fact I know when I was there in Jodhpur Government—I was working as the Chief Secretary there—this very Scheme was sponsored there and I had turned it down as a scandal. This Samadri scheme about which the Prime Minister made reference twice in this speech as if he had discovered in Rajasthan a great source of water which will solve the food problem not only of Rajasthan but of the whole of India—he made a reference to it while delivering a speech in at Kanpur. Do you know what that scheme has ended into ? They have not been able to water even 100 acres of land. The Minister for the Central Government Shri Jairamdas Daulatram who was then looking after the Food portfolio.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What the Paniwala Maharaj did is not relevant. What the Plan does or does not—on that you can speak.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR : It arises because this is how we are solving the water problem. Well, I would not digress. What I submit is as I looked into the various items provided in the Plan, it only created a deep sense of frustration. I don't find anything which I can tell the people. Already they feel that a gradual deterioration is there in the State and there is absolutely nothing to enthuse them in the Plan. 9 crores of rupees have been provided and they think the Rajasthan Government will be able to contribute something. To a State which is not even able to pay their Government servants their salaries in due time—they are worried even about that and they are overdrafting—where is the money coming from I do not underst and.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : 3 minutes more.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR : I am representing the under-developed areas.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : 3 minutes more.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR : It is not a question of asking for more for a particular State. I again want to stress and repeat. If we have not got enough money, let us cut down our whole plan—I don't mind it. If you cannot find the money, you can curtail the whole plan but the question is of equitable distribution. How are you going to treat the under-developed areas, that is the point. If we are going to cut the plan to 100 crores, let it be so but you cannot just do violence to what you yourself enunciate and I don't understand how we are going to patch the resources of the State. How are you going to raise all this money ? It appears to me to be nothing but a patch work and that is not going to materialize. Atleast I know that for most of the States, as pointed out by the hon. Mr. Kunzru, it is impossible to find any part of the money. The Prime Minister has stated that he is prepared to change the Constitution. He has definitely stated in the Lower House that he is prepared to apply some gentle pressure and persuasion. Sardar Patel did not apply gentle pressure, he only used persuasion and got all the States. Am I to understand that we have become so bankrupt now that even by persuasion, not even by applying gentle pressure we cannot get all the money ? If you tackle only 50 persons in the whole of India, the 50 industrialists and ex-Maharajas—I don't want to liquidate them, I am not suggesting that, let them have their luxuries and their luxurious living but they have idle jewellery and gold which if taken into consideration and if they could be persuaded as is envisaged, as I quoted from the

[Shri H. C. Mathur]

Prime-Minister—if a gentle pressure is applied,—I think you can get more money than you want for the implementation of the whole Plan.

DR. RAGHU VIRI (Madhya Pradesh)

डा० रघुवीर (मध्य प्रदेश): अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रकार जीवन में जितनी न्यूनताएं हैं उनको पूरा करने के लिये यह जो पंचवर्षीय योजना बनी है जिसको आज हम त्रिवर्षीय योजना भी कह सकते हैं क्योंकि लगभग डो वर्ष इसको बने हो गये हैं। यह योजना देश के कल्याण के लिये बनाई गई है और हमारे देश में जितनी न्यूनताएं हैं उनको पूरा करने के लिये बनाई गई है, यह बड़ा हर्षास्पद है।

इस योजना में केवल एक आधारभूत न्यूनता है जिसकी ओर मैं आपका ध्यान आकृष्ट करूंगा और मेरे बोलने का उद्देश्य भी यही है। यह केवल मात्र आर्थिक योजना है। जो बड़े बड़े उपाय देश को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये इस योजना में बताये गये हैं, मैं उनसे सहमत हूँ और इसके लिये शासन को बधाई देता हूँ। उन्होंने सब कठिनाइयों के होते हुए भी इस योजना को सामने रखा है और मुझे आशा है कि यदि इस पंचवर्षीय योजना का पूरा तरह से प्रयोग नहीं हुआ, कुछ अंश का ही प्रयोग हुआ तब भी देश पहले की अपेक्षा आगे जायेगा।

जब मैं उत्पादन की बात करता हूँ तब उसका अभिप्राय मनुष्योपयोगी साधनों के उत्पादन से है। किन्तु उसके साथ जो मनुष्योत्पादन वृद्धि है उसमें हमको नियंत्रण करने की आवश्यकता होगी। इस संबंध में कुछ नहीं किया जा रहा है। पांच वर्ष में सवा छः प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हो जायेगी। इस वृद्धि के कारण हमको अधिक उत्पादन की आवश्यकता होगी। इस विषय में हमने कोई उपाय नहीं सोचे। योजना का अर्थ होता है कि हमें प्रति मास और प्रति वर्ष किस वस्तु की कितनी आवश्यकता होगी, देश की आवश्यकताओं को देखते हुए हमें कितना

उत्पादन करना होगा। मनुष्य उत्पादन में हमें पहिले नियंत्रण करना है किन्तु दिखाई यह देता है कि इस पंचवर्षीय योजना में इस विषय में कोई भी योजना नहीं है।

इस योजना को पूरा करने के लिये कई बातों की आवश्यकता होती है। उन में से एक परम आवश्यक शिक्षा का विषय है। लोगों को शिक्षित बनाया जाय। यह युग ज्ञान का युग है, विज्ञान का युग है, ज्ञान महत्तम साधन है। यह प्रतियोगिता का युग है। इस युग में जिस प्रकार के शिक्षित मनुष्यों की देश को आवश्यकता होती है यदि हमने उस प्रकार मनुष्य तैयार नहीं किये तो हमारी योजना के सफल होने में बड़ी बाधा पड़ेगी। आज हमारे देश की शिक्षा दुर्बल है, लंगड़ी है और लूली है। वह परिस्थितियों पर विजय प्राप्त करने में समर्थ नहीं है। आज हमारी दशा भिखारी के समान है। आज हमारी यह दशा है कि छोटी छोटी बातों के लिये, कि किस भूमि में किस प्रकार का अन्न पैदा होता है, कपास और गन्ने की वृद्धि किस प्रकार से होगी, इन बातों के लिये हमको अमेरिका से स्पेशलिस्टों को बुलाकर पूछना पड़ता है। जिन छोटी छोटी बातों का हमारे किसानों को जानना चाहिये था वे बातें हमारे विशेषज्ञ भी नहीं जानते। इसका कारण यह है कि जब तक हमारी भाषा में यह ज्ञान नहीं आयेगा तब तक हम इन बातों का ज्ञान साधारण जनता तक नहीं पहुंचा सकते।

एक ओर तो हम देश में अंग्रेजी शिक्षा को बढ़ाते ही चले जा रहे हैं और दूसरी ओर हम अपनी भाषा को नहीं बढ़ा रहे। हमारी भाषा तब तक नहीं बढ़ेगी जब तक इस देश से अंग्रेजी का साम्राज्य संपादित नहीं होगा। क्षुद्र टुकड़ों के लिये अंग्रेजी का हम लोग आश्रय लेते हैं। इस समय कहा जाता है कि हमारे देश में लगभग ४०-५० लाख अंग्रेजी सीखे हुए व्यक्ति हैं और

उनमें से दो तीन लाख ऐसे हैं जो अंग्रेजी के अच्छे ज्ञाता हैं । क्या उन लोगों के ऊपर यह भार नहीं है कि भारतीय भाषाओं के ज्ञान भंडार को बढ़ायें । क्या ५० लाख अंग्रेजी जानने वालों का यह कर्तव्य नहीं है कि देश की भाषा में साहित्य समृद्धि का भार अपने ऊपर लें । यह बात ठीक है कि अन्वेषकों को अंग्रेजी का ज्ञान होना चाहिये । किन्तु मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अंग्रेजी भाषा ही का ज्ञान उनको नहीं होना चाहिये किन्तु पंच भाषा, जर्मन भाषा और रूसी भाषा का भी उनको ज्ञान होना चाहिये । जिससे हमारी दृष्टि संकुचित न होने पावे । पर यहां प्रश्न अन्वेषकों का और विद्वानों का नहीं है । यहां तो प्रश्न सामान्य जनता का है । हमें देखना होगा कि शिक्षा के प्रथम दस वर्षों में समान्य विज्ञान का आधार पक्का हो । हाई स्कूलों में युवकों को मातृभाषा का सम्पन्न ज्ञान होना चाहिये । उसके द्वारा उनका अधिकांश समय ज्ञानोपार्जन में लगे । यह नहीं कि बिल्ली और चूहों की कहानियां बतला कर उनका जीवन नष्ट किया जाय । इस अवस्था में युवकों को ठोस ज्ञान की आवश्यकता है, इसलिये आजकल जो स्कूलों का पाठ्य-क्रम है उसको परिवर्तन करने की बड़ी आवश्यकता है । यह प्लानिंग कमीशन का काम है ।

यह युग काम का है । इस प्रकार की शिक्षा न देकर विद्यार्थियों का बहुमूल्य जीवन नष्ट न किया जाना चाहिये । मातृभाषा को स्थान अधिक दिया जाना चाहिये जिससे विद्यार्थियों में विचार शक्ति उत्पन्न हो । इस योजना को ५ वर्षों में सफल बनाने के लिये हमें इंजीनियरों की आवश्यकता होगी, डाक्टरों की आवश्यकता होगी, नर्सों की आवश्यकता होगी, लोहारों की आवश्यकता होगी और कई प्रकार के कारीगरों की आवश्यकता पड़ेगी । हमारे विश्वविद्यालय और हमारे स्कूल किसने बनाये हैं । अंग्रेजों ने अपने उद्देश्यों को पूरा करने

के लिये इनको बनाया । जिस प्रकार अंग्रेजों ने हांगकांग में रेल बनाई और उसके चलाने के लिये उन्होंने विद्यालय बनाया कि वहां पर उस रेल में काम करने के लिये क्लर्क तैयार हो सकें और दूसरे कामों में अंग्रेजों को शासन करने में सहायता दे सकें, उसी प्रकार उन्होंने यहां के विद्यालयों को भी बनाया । अब अंग्रेज यहां से चले गये हैं । हमारे विद्यालयों की शिक्षा प्रणाली भी पूर्णतया परिवर्तित हो जानी चाहिये । आज हम क्या देखते हैं कि एक बी० एस० सी० पास किया हुआ युवक जब विद्यालय से निकलता है तो उसको क्लर्क बनना पड़ता है । यही बात ला पढ़े युवक के साथ है । इस प्रणाली को हमें जड़ से उखाड़ना होगा और समस्त शिक्षा प्रणाली का कार्यक्रम नये सिरे से बनाना होगा ।

इसके साथ ही साथ हमारी पाठशालाओं में बच्चों का अत्यधिक बहुमूल्य समय नष्ट होता है । जब मैं पिछली बार जर्मनी में गया तो मुझे हामबुर्ग की पाठशालाओं में जाने का अवसर हुआ । मैंने अध्यक्ष से कहा आप अपनी पाठशालाओं में हिन्दी भाषा की पढ़ाई आरम्भ करें । अध्यक्ष महोदय ने उत्तर दिया कि हमारी जर्मनी की शिक्षा का, जर्मनी की नहीं किन्तु सारे योरोप के देशों की शिक्षा का यह एक मूल सिद्धान्त है कि जबतक योरोप के बच्चों को अपनी सभ्यता का ज्ञान अच्छी प्रकार न हो तब तक यूरोप के बाहर की सभ्यता के अध्ययन करने का अधिकार नहीं । जो विद्यार्थी योरोप के बाहर की भाषा का ज्ञान प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं वे स्कूल के पश्चात् युनिवर्सिटी में ही उसका अध्ययन करने का अवसर प्राप्त कर सकते हैं । यदि हमारे यहां यह नियम होता कि स्कूलों में ३-४ वर्ष तक विद्यार्थी अपनी मातृ-भाषा का ज्ञान प्राप्त करें । उसके पश्चात् ५-६ वर्ष विज्ञान के आधार भूत सिद्धान्तों से परिचय करें । इसी प्रकार से आजकल हमारे स्कूलों और युनिवर्सिटीयों में जो शिक्षा दी जाती है, उसमें जो इतिहास

[Dr. Raghu Vira.]

और भूगोल पढ़ाया जाता है इंग्लैंड और यूरोप का ही पढ़ाया जाता है। हम इस बात को भूल गये कि हमारे साथी और पड़ोसी कौन हैं। तिब्बत हमारा पड़ोसी है, चीन हमारा पड़ोसी है, पाकिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी है, ब्रह्मा हमारा पड़ोसी है, लंका हमारा पड़ोसी है, इन्डोनेशिया हमारा पड़ोसी है और थाईलैंड हमारा पड़ोसी है। इन देशों के बारे में हमारे प्रत्येक विद्यार्थी को ज्ञान रखना आवश्यक है। केवल शिक्षा की ही दृष्टि से नहीं किन्तु राजनीति की दृष्टि से भी इनके बारे में जानना परम आवश्यक है।

हमको अपने विद्यार्थियों को योरोप और पश्चिमी देशों में ही नहीं भेजना चाहिये किन्तु अपने पड़ोसी देशों में जैसे तिब्बत, चीन, जापान और बर्मा में भेजना चाहिये। इन देशों के साथ सब प्रकार अधिक से अधिक सम्पर्क रखना चाहिये। इन देशों के साथ मित्रता करने तथा सहयोग करने की परम आवश्यकता है। यदि आप मुझे क्षमा करेंगे तो मैं कहने का साहस करूंगा कि बारबार विदेशों में जाने और शिक्षा पद्धति देखने और फिर अपने देश की शिक्षा पद्धति को देखने से मुझे एक श्लोक स्मरण आता है :

संगीत साहित्य कला विहीन :

साक्षात्पशुः पुच्छं विषाण हीन :

आज हमारे शिक्षालयों में संगीत का नाम नहीं, कला का नाम नहीं। चारों ओर नीरस ही नीरस। मुझे अपने जीवन में, अपने मित्रों के जीवन में और अपने देश के जीवन में कला नहीं दिखाई देती। अपने भवनों में कला नहीं, जितने भी शासन के भवन बनते हैं उनमें भारतीय कला का कहीं भी स्थान नहीं है। आज हम अमेरीका के डिजाइनों को लेकर अनुकृति करते हैं।

आज संसार हमारी ओर ताक रहा है और हम जीवन के आध्यात्मिक आधार को छोड़ते जा रहे हैं। यह देश आध्यात्मिकता के लिये प्रसिद्ध रहा है। इस देश के सैकड़ों जनों ने अपना जीवन जंगलों में, पहाड़ों की गुफाओं में बिताया। संसार हमारी ओर ताक रहा है और हमारी संस्कृति का नाम लेता है, किन्तु आध्यात्मिकता को इस देश से सर्वथा लुप्त कर दिया है। हमने अपने को इतना नीचे गिरा दिया कि कहा नहीं जा सकता।

इस योजना में शिक्षा के प्रसार के लिये कोई योजना नहीं। हमारे देश में थोड़े से लोग साक्षर बन गये हैं। क्या ५ वर्षों में जनता साक्षर हो जाएगी? नहीं। इससे यहीं सिद्ध होता है कि हम २० वर्षों में जिस लक्ष्य को पहुंचना चाहते हैं वहां तक नहीं पहुंच सकेंगे। हमारे पास कोई योजना नहीं कि जिससे हम देश को साक्षर बनायें। यदि हम इसमें सफल न होंगे तो इतने बड़े लोकतंत्र में विशाल योजनाओं को पूरा करने में भी असफल रहेंगे।

हमारे विश्वविद्यालय उच्चतम ज्ञान के क्षेत्र हैं, विद्यावृद्धि के पीठ हैं। उनका जितना दिन पर दिन बढ़ता ही रहना चाहिये। इस विज्ञान के युग में, इस प्रगति के युग में जब कि एक देश दूसरे देश से आगे बढ़ने की होड़ लगाये हुए है, ऐसे समय हमारे विद्यालयों का एक काम है, वह काम यह है कि ज्ञान की सीमा विस्फारित करते रहें। हमारे विद्यालयों में सब विषयों के बारे में ज्ञान की सुविधा होनी चाहिये जिससे कि बड़े बड़े विषय में भी ज्ञान मिल सकें। यह यंत्र-युग है, इसमें हमें हर प्रकार की विद्या का ज्ञान होना चाहिये और इस तरह का प्रबन्ध हमारे विद्यालयों को करना चाहिये। अभी जब मैं जर्मनी में था तो मैं मारबुर्ग विश्वविद्यालय देखने गया। आप सुनकर चकित होंगे कि जर्मनी में पिछले ४० वर्षों में अर्थात् सन् १९०१ से १९४० तक २० विद्यालयों ने ५ लाख अन्वेषण निबन्ध प्रकाशित किये हैं। हमारे विद्यालयों को भी

इसी प्रकार बनना होगा, यहां पर निश्चय रूप से राम वेतनभोगी अध्यापकों का स्थान नहीं, केवल अन्वेषणात्मक की जो प्रकृति के रहस्यों की उद्घाटनकला में विद्यार्थियों को दीक्षा दे सकें। इस प्रकार के विद्यार्थियों का यहां स्थान है। हमारे विद्यालयों में आविष्कार होने चाहियें। सब प्रकार के अन्वेषण और गवेषण होने चाहियें। आविष्कार आधुनिक जीवन के प्राण है। मस्तिष्क के साथ हाथ और आंख भी चलनी चाहियें।

अन्त में, किसी भी देश के इतिहास का मूल मंत्र शुद्ध देश प्रेम होता है। जिस देश में शुद्ध देश प्रेम न हो वहां लोलुपता का साम्राज्य फैल जाता है। हमें ऐसी शिक्षा अपने बालकों प्रौढ़ों और स्त्री पुरुषों को देनी होगी जिससे उनके हृदयों में देश के प्रति शुद्ध प्रेम हो। भारतीय हृदय दुर्बल है और देश के प्रति निष्ठुर है। हमें उसमें देश प्रेम भरना है। यह हम शिक्षा के द्वारा ही कर सकते हैं और उसको हमें शीघ्र-तिशीघ्र करना चाहिये। यदि हम यह नहीं करेंगे तो इसका परिणाम सर्वनाश होगा। बख्तियार खिलजी ने केवल ३,००० घोड़ों को लेकर पेशावर से पटना तक सारे देश को थोड़े ही समय में अधीन कर लिया। उस समय किसी ने उसका सामना नहीं किया। इसका कारण था कि उस समय लोगों में देश प्रेम की भावना ही न थी। यदि होती तो वह मिलकर उसका सामना करते। आज हमें देश में शुद्ध प्रेम की भावना उत्पन्न करने की परम आवश्यकता है।

आप अपने पड़ोसी देश चीन को देखिये। सन् १९३६ में वहां जापानियों ने आक्रमण किया। चीन की जनता ने विदेशी आतताइयों का सब प्रकार से सामना किया। उनके पास कोई अधिक संगठित सेना न थी। उनके लोग शिक्षित भी न थे। न उनके पास किसी प्रकार के

आधुनिक हथियार ही थे। किन्तु उनके पास सबसे बड़ा हथियार था 'देश के लिये प्रेम'। इस देश प्रेम की भावना से ही अन्त में जापानियों को हार खानी पड़ी। मेरे पास जापान के विद्यार्थी पढ़ते थे। मैं ने उनसे यह बात पूछी कि क्या जापानी चीन में नहीं रह सकते। उत्तर दिया कि कोई भी जापानी यदि चीन के किसी भी गांव में जाय तो रात को सो नहीं सकता।

मैं आपका अधिक समय नहीं लूंगा, एक बात कहकर समाप्त करूंगा। वह बात मुझे अपने शरणार्थी भाइयों के संबन्ध में कहनी है। हमारे शासन ने शरणार्थियों के लिये पर्याप्त काम किया और आगे भी करता जा रहा है किन्तु मैं ने जर्मनी में जो दश शरणार्थियों की देखी है उसको मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूं। उनकी सहायता के लिये जो नियम बनाये गये हैं और बनाए जा रहे हैं उन नियमों की पुस्तक मैं आपके सामने रख रहा हूं। इसका नाम है: "Lastens-ausgleichsgesetz"

हमारे देश में जो शरणार्थी हैं और जिस प्रकार के कष्ट उन लोगों को करने पड़ रहे हैं उसी प्रकार के कष्ट जर्मनी के शरणार्थियों को भी सहन करने पड़े हैं। दूसरे महायुद्ध से उनके घर नष्ट भ्रष्ट हो गये किन्तु वहां की जनता ने इस सारे कष्टों को समान रूप से अपनाया। मैं योजना विभाग से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जिस प्रकार इस पुस्तक में उनके बसाने का कार्यक्रम बताया गया है उसी प्रकार यहां भी हो।

जर्मनी में शरणार्थियों को देश की सम्पत्ति समझा जाता है। वे देश के लाल समझे जाते हैं। जर्मनी को सुझाव दिया गया था कि वह शरणार्थियों को कैनाडा भेज दे किन्तु वहां की जनता ने और वहां की गवर्नमेंट ने उनको जाने से रोक दिया। जर्मनी वालों ने कहा ये हमारे देश के रत्न हैं हम इनको बाहर न जाने देंगे। यही लोग विपत्ति में काम आयेंगे और देश को सब

[Dr. Raghu Vira.]

प्रकार से लाभ पहुँचायेंगे। अब तक ६० लाख व्यक्तियों को उन्होंने बसा दिया है।

हमारे देश में जो शरणार्थी हैं उनके लिये हम उत्तरदायी हैं, उनकी आपत्तियों के लिये और उनके प्रत्येक कष्ट के लिये हम उत्तरदायी हैं। उन्होंने इस देश की स्वतंत्रता के लिये कष्ट सहन किया। इसलिये यह सारे देश को कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि वे इन लोगों की सहायता करें। यही लोग हमारे दुःख के समय काम आयेंगे। यही शरणार्थी हमारे देश के रक्षक होंगे।

[For English translation, see Appendix III, Annexure No. 83.]

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister in presenting the Plan has in a very eloquent speech said that we must consider the broad principles of the Plan and its objective and not be led by this or the minor or major detail and find fault with it, or approve it. It is stated in the Plan that its central objective is to raise the standard of living of the people and to open out to them opportunities for a richer and more varied life. We have to examine the full meaning of the objective and see whether the Plan fulfils it by increasing the per capita income of the rural and backward population to a decent minimum. The Plan states that the total national income will increase to Rs. 10,000 crores from Rs. 9,000 crores, that is to say, by 11 per cent. During this period the population will increase by nearly 6 per cent. So the net per capita income may increase by $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. from Rs. 255 to Rs. 267. Thus all this planning which has entailed two years labour of our best brains has resulted in a plan which increases per capita income by Rs. 12 per year, or one rupee per month. Is this the great achievement of the Government which deserves our approval and commendation? The Plan expects food-sufficiency by 1956, on a 14 oz. ration basis. Mr. Sunda-

rayya has explained that many elements in a balanced diet, like fat and proteins supplied by oils and pulses will continue to be deficient. Thus for supply of this unbalanced diet there will be big river valley projects which will be shown to foreign visitors who will patronisingly congratulate our Government for their marvellous achievements. There are at present 55 community projects which are serving as expensive centres of propaganda and costing a lot of money without doing any good to the rural population or helping in raising its standard of living. Social services will cost nearly Rs. 340 crores and will result in increasing schools and hospitals in urban areas which will swallow the largest part of this money, while the rural areas may get a large number of poorly paid one-teacher schools and some Ayurvedic or allopathic dispensaries under poorly paid compounders.

As regards the industrialisation of the country, the Plan proposes to spend the large amount of Rs. 173 crores of which Rs. 94 crores will go to the public sector and Rs. 79 crores to the private sector; the rest of the financing of private sector being done by industry itself. And for financing this Plan, we expect aid and loans from foreign countries to the tune of Rs. 300 crores, besides Rs. 200 crores already arranged for, and further foreign capital in the shape of investments in the industries in private sector; and completed by deficit financing to the tune of Rs. 300 crores. These loans and additional foreign investment together with those at present made will mean a payment of nearly Rs. 80 crores per annum for interest and profits to be repatriated and will carry a capital liability of nearly Rs. 1,000 crores which has to be paid some day. I am afraid that this Plan does not deserve to be called a plan as it fails in its principal objective of raising the standard of living of the entire people of this country; at best it may be considered as a statement of expenditure for the next five years. The Plan wants to overawe the lay reader

by its voluminous details of facts and figures and the critics are silenced by asking them to be realists.

A practical plan can be drawn up which will raise the per capita income of the nation from Rs. 255 to Rs. 400 with the additional advantage that per capita income of rural population which stands at present at Rs. 180 may reach the figure of Rs. 360 that is to say, exactly double the present value. Sir, I do not wish to place another plan before this House in the short time at my disposal; I want to consider only the three main items suggested by me in my amendment. If the House agrees with these basic ideas, the Planning Commission can surely draft a detailed plan on that basis. But before we think of any plan, some fundamental facts have to be remembered. The National Income Committee has estimated that the total agricultural income is Rs. 4,150 crores, and if we estimate the additional income from rural population engaged in mining, factory labour and small cottage industries, at another 350 crores, the total income of the rural population of 25 crores comes to Rs. 4,500 crores, i.e. Rs. 180 per head per year. Even this income is an average with very large variations ranging from Rs. 100 to Rs. 500 and over. A plan to be successful and to attain its objective must raise this per capita income to Rs. 360 with a variation limit ranging between Rs. 300 and Rs. 450. The agricultural produce from our land has to be increased and better distributed, but the Plan under discussion has only suggested big irrigation and community projects for it. No attempt has been made for the full employment of the rural population, except pious hopes for a few cottage and small scale industries. The Plan has shirked the whole problem of raising the standard of living of the rural population. The abolition of zamindari is a step in the right direction. There is great land hunger among the peasant who has never owned a bit. He wants some land, be it one acre, two acres or more, and thinks that if it is distri-

buted to him, he will be able to solve the problem of poverty. Acharya Vinoba Bhave is doing remarkable work in this direction. The Communists also want land distribution. Several hon. Members who have already spoken have stressed this point. The total cultivable land area in our country is 30 crore acres divided into 5 lakh villages with a population of 27 crore. If we take averages, a village has a population of 550 and cultivable area of 600 acres. If five persons make a family, the typical village will have 110 families and allowing 10 families as engaged in services necessary for agriculture, the remaining 100 families will claim this 600 acres to be divided equally, giving 6 acres to each, probably split up in three parts, to allow for wet and dry land. If the plan had suggested equitable distribution, it would have been something, but the ceiling of land holding is going to be fixed at 30 to 50 acres. Thus among these 100 families, about 20 families will own an average of 15 acres each, taking up 300 acres; another 50 families will own 5 acres each, occupying 250 acres and the remaining 30 families will consist of landless workers or will possess an acre or two.

If the average produce per acre yields about Rs. 135, the family owning 5 acres can earn Rs. 675 giving a per capita income of Rs. 135 per year. This is due to the fact that yield per acre in our country is the lowest in the world. No amount of Tacaavi loans for improved seeds and manure can increase the production of peasants owning 1 to 5 acres of land. He must pass a large part of his time in looking at the sky and praying for timely rains. His resources are nil and so he is ruined if the rains fail him. Any Government aiming to become a welfare State must guarantee him full employment and minimum wage for 8 hours' work.

श्री किशोरी राम बिहार: क्या यहां पर माननीय मेम्बर अपना भाषण पढ़ सकते हैं ?

*[SHRI KISHORI RAM (Bihar) : Can the hon. Member, Sir, read out his speech here ?]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : I want to save the time of the House.

Instead of fumbling for statistics here and there, I am reading them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can only refer to your notes but not read the written speech.

SHRI B. RATH : The precedent has already been established. Yesterday, hon. Members from the other side made written speeches.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There cannot be any wrong precedent.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : The Planning Commission should have prepared a scheme that every able bodied person in a village gets a minimum wage and also a share in the management and profits arising out of agricultural operation in the village. Even a village is too small as a unit. Hence, if five villages are worked as one farm owned by the villagers and directed by an elected panchayat with technically qualified staff under them, it may be possible to considerably increase production. The Planning Commission has recommended co-operative farming to small and medium holdings but my plan is very different from it.

Cottage
Any private owned farm of about 3,000 acres run on scientific lines will give a minimum production of 10 lakhs from agriculture and dairying alone. There is no reason why a co-operative farm run on business lines may not give equally good results or even better if ~~cottage~~ *cottage* results industries and housing schemes are attached to it. Details of production from farm and cottage industries will vary from place to place but

all adult persons numbering nearly 1,600 will get full employment and be paid an average wage of Rs. 500 per year, absorbing about Rs. 8 lakhs. The remaining Rs. 2 lakhs will suffice for paying bonus to workers, share of profits to the owners of land and the cost of running a school and a hospital in that farm.

PROF. G. RANGA : Is there any such colony anywhere now ?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : It will be possible for a farm to provide electricity and filtered water by tap connection to every house. In a population of 2,750, the number of school going children will be 400 for whom a full fledged school will be maintained by the farm. A small hospital with fully qualified Doctor will be attached to it. The villagers will give their land as their share in the co-operative farm, but, cash money to the extent of Rs. 1½ lakhs will be necessary as working capital. The Government is estimating an expenditure of Rs. 360 crores in this Plan on agriculture and Community Projects and the share of social services which will go to the rural centres, will amount to Rs. 240 crores, making a total of Rs. 600 crores. If this Rs. 600 crores was distributed as cash payment to these 1 lakh farms, each will get Rs. 60,000. The farms may also be permitted to accept another Rs. 90,000 from the richer sections of the village population and co-operative banks and the rural credit section of the Reserve Bank of India. As the total capital of each farm will be nearly Rs. 10 lakhs, the cash subscribers will not be able to have any dominating voice in the management of the farms. The hon. Members can suggest alternative methods of running these farms, but, the basic idea of this economy will be to make all farmers as wage earners and owners. A wage earner can be insured for sickness and disability and even for old age pension by paying a small premium from his monthly income. He is free from all worries about the vagaries of weather and rain. In the initial stage there may be some opposition from rural population but, if the scheme is properly

explained to the peasants and their right of ownership is not taken away, they will gladly accept it.

The majority of houses in a village are mud huts covered with thatch and it will be better to build model villages in the centre of these farms extending over 5 villages and covering an area of about 8 square miles. Each village family will get a pucca 5 room house. The 550 dwelling houses together with accommodation for school, hospital, administrative offices, stores, godowns and shops will require a big outlay, but, the farm will be able to build it up out of its own resources in about 8 years. With 1,600 workers on the rolls, all extra labour when not occupied on farm operation will build roads, dig wells and build these houses, etc.

The Planning Commission has accepted that the food production has not increased during the last four years in spite of all efforts of the Grow More Food campaign. In view of the fragmentation of land and the very small holdings, often distributed in two or three sections, increase in food production is almost impossible. Irrigation will give some increase, but it will be nullified by further fragmentation and the utter poverty of the peasants with holdings of one or two acres.

The hon. the Prime Minister has said that technological advances will considerably change the structure of our villages provided it can be scientifically applied for which great resources are needed and this is only possible in very large farms.

(Time bell rings.)

I have taken only 10 minutes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
You have 3 minutes more.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : I am entitled to 20 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
You have taken already 17 minutes.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : The Government, on the advice of experts have invested a lot of money on heavy tractors and bulldozers. In a country where per capita land is only .8 acre, any imitation of methods of farming in countries where per capita land is 6 acres or over is very wrong. And now, let us examine the question of big projects which is an essential part of this plan. It has been stated that these projects will irrigate 16 million acres of land. Now, all agricultural experts have come to the conclusion that as a source of irrigation, these big multi-purpose projects are too costly as compared to minor irrigation schemes, tank irrigation and well irrigation. Considering our meagre resources, would it not have been much better to have depended on minor schemes instead of major ones. There is a suspicion that the major schemes have been introduced to make the plan spectacular to foreign observers. The hon. the Prime Minister has stated that rapid industrialisation of the country is essential for raising the standard of living and yet we find that the Plan has provided only Rs. 173 crores for it and, out of this, Rs. 94 crores will go to the public sector and Rs. 79 crores to the private sector. The private sector will have to primarily depend on its own resources and to the investment of foreign entrepreneurs and capitalists. There is no clear indication of the objectives of the Government regarding the nationalisation of industries. I would remind the hon. the Prime Minister.....

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
You pass on the rest to the hon. Minister. He will thank you.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND :that during the last 25 years.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
You are taking other's time. Please wind up.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : I want 2 minutes more, Sir,.....he has fought for the nationalisation of key

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

and basic industries, and, now, when an opportunity occurs, he feels shy of it. The Plan should have indicated which industries will be taken up and how they will be nationalised. A start has to be made and I would suggest that if all banking concerns and insurance companies are nationalised, it will not only give the right orientation to our economy, but will greatly help in the financing of the Plan. The foreign companies and investment are a great drain on the resources of the country and they should also be nationalised immediately. I beg to move my amendment.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJEE (Nominated): Sir, at the outset I wish to express my hearty approval and convey my congratulations to the Planning Commission on having produced a monumental report which is completely scientific in its character and comprehensive in its contents. I want to go further and say that perhaps this report will rank for some time to come as the Bible of national economic reconstruction so that all those who have industrial projects to promote cannot do better than to turn to this report for necessary guidance and for necessary facts and data.

At the same time I think, Sir, that perhaps it is better for me to offer certain suggestions so that they may be considered by the Commission in their proper light, and I also wish to suggest certain changes in emphasis and priorities which are indicated in the Plan itself.

My first point is this. Perhaps the report should have contained a preliminary account of the economic background of India to which the Plan must relate itself. In fact, to the extent to which the Plan relates itself to the realities and facts of the economic situation, to that extent it will succeed. Now, what is our economic background? The economic background is one of appalling poverty of India, poverty for which the people

of India alone are ultimately responsible. Now, to understand the extent of our poverty we have only to turn to our Budget. Our Budget shows an annual revenue of Rs. 400 crores roughly speaking. And against that you have to consider certain figures of revenue for other countries like the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has a revenue of Rs. 500 crores per month, although the United Kingdom is only about a twelfth of the physical extent of India, and in population about a sixth. And as regards the United States, the revenue runs into astronomical figures; but I have made a calculation and found that the revenue of the United States Federal Government is Rs. 400 crores per day. Against this background of colossal poverty, which is even now growing you have to frame a plan very, very cautiously indeed. The only source of increased revenue by which we can make our country richer is production. Unless there is an increase of production the inadequacy, the utter inadequacy of our national revenue will continue, and perhaps may get worse.

Take, for instance, agriculture. Undivided India was the land of seven lakh villages, as against only 40 towns. India was built up through the ages as a rural and not as an urban civilization, and therefore, the nation in India still lives in the village and in the cottage. It is, therefore, with very great accuracy that the Planning Commission has given top priority to the needs of agriculture. But how to improve agriculture and the conditions in which it is pursued in this country? Agriculture is consigned to the keeping of undersized, uneconomic holdings to which reference has been made by previous speakers. Now there is the growth of population and there is not enough land to go round. I happened to serve on an important agricultural commission known as the Flood Commission, which went into the figures of agricultural conditions. We found out that even then the average quota per head of an agriculturist would be less than one acre. Now, what improvement can you expect to achieve

in the field of agriculture on the basis of these numerous uneconomic holdings which are liable to further fragmentation on account of our laws of inheritance? You may say that you can abolish intermediaries and so forth; but even if you give land to the tiller of the soil, with what gift of land will you approach the tiller of the soil? The limits of intensive cultivation have been reached in these too small subsistence farms. Therefore, there is hardly any way by which you can improve agriculture and the yield of food, except by drastic remedies. How are we to apply these drastic remedies? Suppose you nationalise the entire agricultural land of the country; you must be able to redistribute it on the basis of economic holdings, which means that if the size of an economic holding is taken to be about 5 acres, at once you throw out of employment millions of dumb agriculturists, because you cannot find enough on which they can subsist. So, what I mean to say is this, that the problem of agriculture is very difficult. Indeed, it implies a social revolution, and it will take decades for its full accomplishment, and even if you proceed very cautiously it will be very difficult to replace these undersized holdings by economic holdings.

Now, the Commission to which I have referred also commented on the subject of agricultural idleness. The cultivators remain in a state of enforced idleness during the off seasons of agriculture, which extend to about half the year. How are you going to employ these agricultural millions when they have no work in the fields nor is there work awaiting them in the factories? Therefore, the Commission has rightly suggested that you must have a programme for the development of rural cottage handicrafts which might be introduced to the villagers at their homes. But what is wanted is a regional survey of those possible rural industries on the basis of the raw materials that are available in different regions. So, in that way, in every direction we find there are very great obstacles.

Now, coming to the tiller of the soil, I should like to say with all the emphasis at my command that there is a good deal of misconception about the part which the tiller of the soil will play in the development of agriculture. Evidence was led before the Commission of which I happened to be a member, to the effect that a cultivator is he who does not cultivate. Now, it may be a paradox. But the real reason is this, that the cultivator is always anxious to raise himself in the social scale, and he would like to be an employer of agricultural labour rather than cultivate the land with his own hands. In fact it is impossible to subletting in any sphere and especially in the economic sphere, so that you will be up against all those tendencies which will militate against the factors on which you are banking. There will be a new kind of so-called landlords in place of the old ones that have been eliminated. So that is another point to which I would draw your attention.

Then as regards the standard of production in industries, our record is very poor indeed. It has been held by all experts all over the country that the standard of production in India is only about one-third or one-fourth of the standard attained in foreign progressive countries. But, so far as the industrial development is concerned, I find that the private sector, consisting of about 42 selected industries, covers about two-thirds of the industrial effort of the entire country and therefore the Commission has rightly concluded that there must be scope given to some extent for private enterprise as against nationalisation. Now, as regards nationalisation of the public sector, I have an important suggestion to make which is this, that top priority must be given to the development of the most important national key industry, namely the steel industry. Now, the steel industry must be organised at once on a proper basis because the country's strength ultimately depends upon its steel production.

Now, so far as the figures show, our achievement in the field of steel industry is not very satisfactory. India's

[Shri KISHEN CHAND.]

total requirements of steel amount to about 35 lakh tons per year and out of this amount, the installed capacity can produce only 15 lakh tons and the actual output is hardly one lakh tons. It has descended even to 90 thousand tons and therefore we have to make up for all this loss of effort. Now, look at the picture of other countries. Our friends opposite must be glad to know that Russia started with only 4 lakh tons of steel in the year 1922. But in the year 1952 because the U. S. S. R. Government laid very great stress and attached first priority to the development of the steel industry, as a result of this paramount recognition by the Government of the importance of steel industry, in 1952, the U. S. S. R. has been able to show a production of 4 crore tons of steel, while the U. S. A. has still her record to show, namely about 11 crore tons of steel per annum. So what I mean to say is this that perhaps the Planning Commission might have addressed itself more closely to the paramount need of developing the steel industry of India, which should occupy a top priority in their schemes.

Now, next to steel, I should like to press the claim of the aluminium industry about which in fact some scientists say that the next century is the century of aluminium, because aluminium is so much required for defence, for aircraft and other industries. So, this also has to be taken into account but I find there is not much reference or attention given to the need of developing the aluminium industry.

Now, as regards the electrical—heavy electrical and chemical—industries, enough attention should be paid to the development of these industries instead of consigning them to the domain of private enterprise, because private enterprise will not be able to cope with the demands of the country.

Now similarly I have got a few other suggestions to make. About the steel production I just wanted to say

one point, namely that in India the cost of steel production is the lowest in the world—about half to two-thirds of the cost incurred in other countries, because India can command the resources of the best ore, coal and limestone. So with all these natural advantages, it is rather strange that steel production in India does not show any great progress.

Now similarly there is the automotive industry. We all should know the importance that automotive industry is taking in the economic life of the whole world and in fact it is of the greatest importance for the needs of defence and security. But coming to actual figures, we find that our progress is very slow indeed. For instance, in U. K. one in 16 persons owns a motor car, in Australia one in 7, in France one in 18, in U. S. A. one in 6 and in India one in thousand. So I do not know how long this sort of conditions will continue, because automotive industry, besides producing the luxury motor cars, has very many uses for the purpose of defence and therefore this industry demands far greater attention. It occupies a very important field in the entire industrial life of the country.

Similarly there is the question of locomotives. Now the Report says that we have a stock of about 2,092 locomotives and these require urgent replacement. Now, how will replacement be carried out? Our production in five years is estimated at 200 locomotives—at the rate of about 40 locomotives per annum. So I do not know how this paramount need in the supply and production of locomotives, can be fulfilled unless special attention is paid on behalf of Government.

Then Sir, there are many other good points in the Report itself and I will just make a passing reference to them. But my main difficulty is this. I do not know how exactly we are going to finance all this development, considering the conditions of our revenues. And you all know how the revenue has to be spent on some of the major heads

—the Debt Service taking away 36 crores, Administration 56 crores, Defence about 200 crores—and I have calculated that there is hardly any surplus out of our revenue which exceeds more than 4 crores. I suggest that perhaps it is better for the Finance Ministry to so prepare the Budget that they should first of all fix the percentages of revenue for different subjects in proportion to the total revenue, for instance in U. K. in spite of the tremendous expenditure on armaments, the U. K. spends only 32 per cent. of its total revenue upon its huge armament programme and its military expenditure. And yet the social services absorb about 30 per cent. only.

(Time bell rings.)

May I have three more minutes ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Three minutes more, Dr. Mookerji.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI : The story is a very long one no doubt and I have to say so many things, but now, Sir, I wish to end on education.

Now recently the British House of Commons voted crores of rupees in order to organise the national education of the country on a proper scientific basis and that scientific basis rests on only one point, namely, the relationship between the number of teachers and the number of the taught, because the English educational opinion has fastened upon this primary need of education, namely, that the success of education, must depend ultimately on the personal touch and direction which the teacher can impart to the pupils. Now if you have a class of 50 or 100 pupils to deal with, you are really going in for the ideal of mass production in education and it will fail to have the desired effect. In England, they have swung to the other extreme by importing the German system of education. The German system of education has been very very successful. That is proved by the last Great War. And English education has been completely revolutionised on that basis—that enough funds should be voted so that the foundation of national greatness

may be laid in a scientific system of education, which ensures to every pupil the attention that he deserves at the hands of his teachers.

And this educational reform can only be achieved by bringing in that primary condition, namely the proportion of the teachers to the taught, which is 1:6, one teacher for every six pupils. On that basis, unless Indian education, from the primary to the highest stage, is modernised on this scientific and only conceivable basis and its efficiency made more effective, I am afraid we shall not be able to develop as a nation.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, the objective of planning is indicated in this Plan as raising “the standard of living of the people and to open out opportunities for a richer and more varied life”. In the Draft Outline of the Plan, it was mentioned :

“ In a community which launches upon planning there must be a large measure of agreement as to the ends of policy, and the Plan must express this agreement on fundamentals. The successful implementation of the Plan presupposes effective power in the hands of the States for determining policy and directing action along defined lines and there must be an efficient administrative machinery with personnel of requisite capacity and quality to administer policy.”

While the principles have been laid down here, our Government lacks all these things. This Plan was prepared by the Congress Government and placed before us as a national plan. It says that it is going to change the economic structure of our country. The Prime Minister while introducing this Plan, said that the aim of the Plan is to bring about economic democracy, but in analysing the programmes suggested here in this Plan I have to submit that we are not going in that direction at all. It is hardly possible for anybody to go into all the aspects of the Plan at this stage and in the time at our disposal and suggest ways and means of improving it. Anyhow, I will try to make some remarks on some of the aspects of the Plan.

When we draw up a plan for a country like ours, we must understand the

[Shri K. L. Narasimham.]

present economic structure of our country. The present economic structure reveals that 80% of our population is dependent on agriculture. This is an undeveloped economy and on this economy we want to raise the standards of the people and go into a new economy. So, when we draw up a plan for the present economy of our country, the utmost priority should be given to agriculture. While importance is given to agriculture in the Plan, the methods suggested for improvement are not in the right direction. What is the dominant feature of our agricultural economy? It is the concentration of land in the hands of rent-receivers and the progressive pauperisation of the landless peasants who form nearly 40% of the population. So, the basic problem of our country is the reorganisation of the existing land system and the redistribution of holdings. Redistribution alone however, can only be the preliminary to tackling the problem of agricultural development, raising the technique of agriculture to modern levels bringing in use of machinery and reclaiming vast areas of uncultivated land will solve the problem. It is mentioned here :

"The principle that there should be an upper limit to the amount of land which an individual may hold is, therefore, recommended for adoption.

An upper limit for land may be fixed for (1) future acquisition and (2) resumpt on for personal cultivation. These are both essential steps in land reform."

It is mentioned in the Plan that steps should be taken by the States taking into consideration the local conditions there. So, this land policy does not mean the abolition of landlordism, but only putting a ceiling on the holdings. They are not definite about this. They have left it as vague as it can be, and they have suggested that it should be done in due course. Now, is this going to solve the problem of land and raise the standards of the peasant? Now, I have to submit that this is not going to solve the problem. On the other hand, as Prof. Ranga said in the morning, it visualises capitalistic farming, wherein machinery will be used

and wherein the small holders are compelled to come under co-operative farming. This means that they keep the system of landlordism intact. Then, coming to the other methods, they have suggested here co-operative farming and giving of loans to the agriculturists for the purpose of manures, etc. But there, we have our own experience to go upon. Coming from Madras State, I know how these things work. If a peasant asks for a loan, he gets it only after six months. That too all peasants do not get. Only the rich peasants can get the loans. When they give them bonus, in certain cases, that also was declared after a particular period was over. So, real help is not being given to the peasants. On the other hand, these things only help the landlords in our State. The methods suggested in the Plan are only a continuation of the policy followed by Congress Governments and even the previous Government. When we examine the Royal Commission Report of 1927, the reports of the various Committees that have gone into this question, down to the latest Kumarappa's Report, they all say that unless we reorganise our land system, the problem of agriculture is not going to be solved, especially in a country where 80% of the people live on agriculture. Unless this problem is tackled in a proper manner, you are going to unleash the forces of production. Unless you solve this problem in a proper manner, you are not going to raise the status of the peasants even after the completion of this Plan. You will be only benefiting certain classes of people owning land.

Then, you suggest here a minimum living wage for agricultural labour to be decided by the State Governments. I know a Minimum Wages Act has been passed, but we do not know when they are going to fix a minimum wage. Fixing a minimum wage for agricultural labour is not the solution. The only solution is to give land to the landless labourers. By this, I should not be misunderstood to say that I am asking for the land to be distributed to the entire population. If I say that,

your argument will be that this is fantastic, as there is no land to be given to all people. I know that there will be some people who cannot be given any land. But my suggestion is that you need not give land to all people. There will be some people to whom you cannot give land. But you bring them to industry and give them work there. Balance your economy in such a way that you co-ordinate agriculture and industry to the benefit of the peasant and the worker and it is in that way that you should evolve your Plan.

Coming to the next important factor of production—the labour—the suggestions that are made here in the Chapter on Labour can be summarised in one sentence. It suggests more production, less wages, high prices—that is the formula enunciated in this chapter. So they insist on more production and by insisting on production they suggest that the primary task of a labourer there is to look after the production and then if he talks about wages, it is suggested that any increase would be inflationary. It says :

“An increase in wages at this juncture may injure the country's economic stability by raising the costs of production. The volume of employment may also be affected adversely. Wage increase should therefore be avoided except to remove anomalies, or where the existing rates are abnormally low or if increased productivity can be obtained from renewal or modernisation of plant, or to restore the pre-war real wage.”

So the wage increase question is dealt with in this form. You are not assuring the labour the minimum living wage and at the same time when prices are going up and when they ask for more wages they are told that if you increase the wages, it will have an inflationary effect. So the demand of wage increase is ruled out under this formula. So the Plan suggests a freezing of wages at their minimum level and they say it is pre-war real wage and in the same Chapter deals with the industrial relations, wages and social security, working conditions, employ-

ment and training and productivity and under this they say there are various Acts like the Minimum Wages Act under which the minimum wages will be fixed. I can say from the experience of the Madras State how those minimum wages are fixed. Rs. 25 was fixed to an ordinary Municipal worker as the minimum wage and Government is still discussing with the Union there that Rs. 25 includes D. A. also. That is how the minimum wage was fixed in the Madras State. I need not take much of the time of the House. These wages are fixed on the reports of the District Magistrates and also under the plea that the industry cannot pay and so they say you must bear the burden. So the Plan put before the industrial worker is ‘You produce more and take less’. So the austerity is only to one section of the population viz., industrial labourer who is not provided with the social security measures. If you take the history of our country, what are the social security measures you have got. They speak of Workmen's Compensation Act, Maternity Benefit Act, Provident Fund Act or the Employees' Insurance Act which I understand is not being implemented in Madras State. They say it will come in 1953 and that too only in Coimbatore. Beyond that the Insurance Act applies only to Delhi and Kanpur and that in Coimbatore after a year. So you don't have sufficient social security measures, you don't have proper housing or better conditions of service. In addition you are saying that you would freeze the wages and you ask them to produce more. Further you are adding to the workload by rationalisation methods and benefiting the capitalists in our country. So the underlying formula under this Plan as I understand is only ‘More production, less wages and higher profits’. These are the dominating features in this.

Coming to the Chapter on transport and communications, you find nearly 400 crores are allotted to it. What for ? These 400 crores are to be spent for rehabilitation work, viz.,

[Shri K. L. Narasimham.]
replacing the old coaches or the locomotives and other materials. It does not speak about extension of the railways or of strengthening our workshops. It does not speak of making our railways a real national industry not depending on foreign help or aid. So after 5 years it will still be dependent on foreign help. It will bring all the material from the outside countries. They say 80 crores will be contributed by the Centre and 320 crores by the Railways which means you are going to burden the common man, you are going to burden the trader who moves his goods from one place to the other and you don't give proper facilities to the worker who works there and at the same time you want to depend on Canada, U. K. or J. S. A. for your machinery. The Chittaranjan Workshop and the Coach-building Factory in Perambur, if you go into the history of those things, you will be surprised. The Perambur Coach-building Factory is not there. I come from the same area and am unable to find where it is, except a Board. Payments were made in advance to the firm and they are going to build that after some years. You say you are going to build that factory with the aid of the foreign capital but here you are not strengthening your own workshop. On the other hand you are depending on others and getting your material from elsewhere and having the rail transport in the interest of those people to link up the country from one corner to the other. You are keeping the same old railways built by the Britisher and you give them facilities to take away the raw materials by developing coaches and by rebuilding the railways and keeping intact the communication so that he can take away the raw material from our country.

Coming to the other aspects of the Plan viz., there are multi-purpose projects and there are 55 of them and they say they are going to spend a lot on that. I have no objection to the projects—I really want projects but how you work these projects. They

are to be worked with the technical assistance from America and those projects, with 300 villages grouped together and with the education centres and so many other things, will be worked by another man from America whom you are bringing here to advocate his Hollywood culture and in the name of these projects he will use these Centres for his propaganda for his culture—the culture of gangsterism—and that is going to be the plan for our country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please withdraw that word. You said 'culture of gansterism'. It is unparliamentary.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM: I withdraw that word. Now I will conclude by saying that this Five Year Plan promises high prices of goods, and taxation for the people, rationalisation, unemployment and wage cuts, increase of work for the working classes and enormous profits for the monopolists and foreign financiers. It is just mortgaging our economy to foreign imperialist exploitation. Our dependence on the economic front is still there and we are not going to raise the standard of living of the people and in that way the Plan is not in the interest of the people in general.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND (Madhya Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I would like to congratulate the Members of the Planning Commission on the completion of what may almost be called a Herculean task. I would like to congratulate them specially on behalf of the women, because in the Plan, particularly after the appointment of a woman Member to the Commission, they have drawn the attention of the country towards the urgent need of diverting the country's resources on a large scale to women's welfare. Sir, you would agree with me when I say that in attending to women's welfare, the Commission has really, in a way attended to men's welfare also, because the education of the Nation or of men even, up to the age of

seven is in the hands of women and if women are not provided educationally and from the point of view of health, they would not be fit teachers of the new generation.

Sir, a number of people from the Opposition has criticized the Plan. And they have tried to call it not a perfect Plan.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : No Plan at all.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : I am not going into the various points. But I would like to give a few examples to show just how some of the criticisms are superficial or have been levelled only because they are in the Opposition and feel they could not have done their duty if they had not attacked the Plan. In this connection, I am reminded of a sanskrit saying which I am afraid in these days of Parliamentary rule and democratic system are not likely to be remembered by the Opposition.

बलादपि सुभाषितम् ग्राह्यम्

Baladapi Subhasivam Grahyaam

Or, to put in vernacular :

पड़ो अपादन ठौर कंचन त्यजत न कोय ।

Taking for granted that the plan is absolutely useless to them, there are so many things that they will have to admit as good and for those reasons at least, they should have tried to concentrate their suggestions on constructive lines rather than condemning it outright. Now nothing can be absolutely useless or can be completely good. I would ask my friends, if they found any fault with the Plan, or if they found it to be utterly useless, why is it that when draft Plan has been before the country for almost 14 months they have not taken the trouble at least to prepare a part of the Plan as a sample Plan and given it as a gift to the country ?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : They have.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : I have seen the Socialist Party's Plan. It is available in the market. I have purchased it. But I am talking of my other friends. The hon. Member who interrupted me just now has not spoken so far. So my reference is not to him. So, at least some portion of the Plan, they could have produced in a way they consider ideal.

Then, we could have understood their criticism. I am reminded in this respect of a story. Some of our children play a game which is sometimes called by us "Tailing the Horse". Well, Sir, there were some ladies who were standing there conducting the game. They were heartily enjoying the children's mistakes. When a lady pointed out the mistake, a mischievous girl asked the lady "Why don't you try?" Sir, the same is applicable in this case. When you point your finger to something saying it is absolutely useless, it is time that you tried it yourselves.

Sir, I shall now first begin with the various criticisms of the Opposition Members levelled against the Plan. But I would also try to deal with the suggestions that I would like to make before that. Sir, the Plan gives ample scope to every shade of opinion of our countrymen to co-operate in some way or the other but in a country like ours, where we are used for the last hundred years to having things done for us, it is not really going to help unless encouragement comes in from all sides and our people are going to help to make the plan a success, that is, in other words, going to help themselves. It is therefore the duty of all our friends from the Opposition—everybody does not belong to a Party, there are independents also who call themselves the champions of the weal of "the common man", more than the Members of the Congress, to encourage our people or to carry on propaganda amongst the people asking them to help in making the Plan a success. After all, so much money is being borrowed from other Governments and our friends

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] are saying that it should not be borrowed. As a passing remark, I would say it is a very strange thing they ask. If you borrow, then they would ask : "Why did you borrow ? If you do not borrow, they then would ask : "Why did you not borrow ? Get it from some country or the other," so that always they have something to say. If you plan, they would say : "Why did you plan, the country is not ready." On the other hand, if you have no plan, they would say : "Why did you not plan ?". It would all help to create public opinion to accept the Plan not only generally, but enthusiastically and for this, the Government should, I feel, at least introduce conscription for social service. In introducing conscription, if Government, Sir, finds it difficult to introduce that measure, which need not be apparently sound, these friends of ours can, because it would be in accordance with the ideology the majority of them profess, help the Government to adopt the principle of conscription as a policy.

The principle of conscription, as I said to begin with—because organisation is very difficult—could be applied for children in schools up to high school stage, and for college students, and also later on, when, after one or two years' real experience, the administrative difficulties have been overcome, it could be applied for all youth, as it was applied in other countries during war time. The Government has more or less said that the successful implementation of the Plan is such a vital thing that it would more or less, make or mar the country, and as such, it would not be wrong to put the implementation of the Plan on a war basis. If you accept that principle, then it would be the first duty of the Government to introduce conscription. Now the Secondary Education Commission is sitting and it would be for that Commission to accept this principle. If a number of other members also feel the same difficulty viz. of getting voluntary help in the implementing of

the Plan, they should also voice the same feelings, viz. ask for the introduction of conscription.

I would now say a few words, Sir, about our University, High School and Primary education. University education, though it may not be practical, numerically, as it stands is rather top-heavy. It is not possible for the country to give as much money for high school and university as it would wish to ; and it is also not possible for it to introduce compulsory education in the primary stage. I would suggest that at least from the top side, i.e., from university education, so much money could be diverted to secondary education, and early steps could be taken to make eight years' education, from the primary to the middle school stage, compulsory. Sir, in Japan today, and in many other countries, nine years' education is absolutely compulsory and free. Similarly, Sir, some expenditure on education could be saved, by not leaving it, at least as a short-term measure, for 10 or 15 years, to such expensive regulation schools. We could give primary education, for instance, or even middle school education, in open air schools. After visiting Bolpur I have seen that wonderful atmosphere in which education was imparted and received because of the unconventional ways in which it is imparted. Even the students, boys and girls, take real joy in it. So far as village and other schools are concerned, if you will make this one of the conditions of the grant, it will save expenditure on brick and mortar. Sir, it is mentioned in our Constitution, it is one of the clauses of our Constitution, to bring in compulsory education for all within 10 years' time. We must make it a point to take action under this. Now is the time. I would suggest that Government should make it a point to see that at least one State, or some portions of every State, introduce compulsory education. Vocational guidance is also essential and necessary. A good deal of our education is wasted on account of the fact that very often students do their B. Ag. and then suddenly change over to Law ; or

sometimes do their B. A., and then try to get admission to science or medicine. For the reason that it would be very difficult, to get trained personnel, to start with, a beginning could be made, on an experimental scale, to give vocational guidance in certain middle or high schools, in some of the States. In this respect, Sir, our States are not likely to take any initiative unless they are forced to do so, on the ground of expense. Most of them are in financial difficulties as it is today. So far as the Central Provinces are concerned, I have seen the report of Tarachand Secondary Education Committee. They have asked the Centre to give 60 per cent. of the expenditure for their education, and they would contribute 40 per cent. Sir, if the Centre does give any percentage of that expenditure on secondary education, it should make it a condition that they introduce some of these necessary measures to harness the younger generation to national work and to give them proper guidance for education without waste of energy. I would then, Sir, request the Central Government also to ask the State Governments to make arrangements for mid-day meals for children and also to give them milk, powdered or otherwise, and make it available to children in schools in the lower forms free of charge. Sir, I have often emphasised that children, even up to the age of 14—I do not know whether they should do it in the colleges, as they have also to bear the strain of drilling and games etc.,—children up to the age of 14, coming to schools, have to play their games, and walk to school and back home; they cannot stand the strain. They have taken their first meal while leaving their homes at 9 o'clock probably, and have their next meal when they return home in the evening. Many of them cannot afford their lunch. So this mid-day meal is absolutely necessary, if the country is to be given correct education, and if the children are to be properly benefited by the education they receive. Otherwise, the physical instruction, the compulsory game, etc. have no meaning at all. How can you expect the students to show any in-

terest in their games, and then compete in the Olympics and other games, when their physique has not been properly developed? In our country, on account of the poor nourishment they get, the children in the schools do not have proper health. They do not have even a clean place to take their meals in a clean manner, if they were to take it at all.

Sir, it is most important for the Centre to implement this Plan because it would put together all the resources of the country, but it should be possible to have co-ordination of the Government departments. Sir, most of the delay in the Government departments is due to the fact that one department does not know what is happening in the other department. For instance, Health, Education, Food and Information and Broadcasting—these are all departments which must have all their activities properly co-ordinated, sitting at a common table. It is no use inviting Ministers from other States, like the Finance Ministers coming for the Finance Ministers' Conference, or the Chief Ministers' Conference, etc., which more or less, aim at the same thing, namely getting the work for a common aim done in co-ordination. Sir, another thing, As time is short I am just hinting at these points. Nationalisation of resources, to which the Prime Minister has also referred. In the private sector, when Government gives help to private industrialists, Government should insist on taking a certain percentage of shares themselves in that industry. That would be the best way of gradually nationalising industry. Similarly, Sir, to make the younger generation socialist, welfare-State-minded, and also to give even the middle class or the poor sections of the society, pure food, particularly in urban areas, Government could undertake, under this Plan, in every State—in every big town with a population of about 20,000, a kitchen service, where meals could be had in a better and on a more or less no-profit-no-loss basis—that is the Scheme of the United Nations Organisation—and put it under the Women's Welfare Section.

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

Sir, some of my women friends in Social Services have, particularly at a meeting where women were invited to advise the Planning Commission on certain matters concerning women, mentioned that the funds set apart for women—viz. Rs. 4 crores—were not sufficient. I am sorry I do not subscribe to that view, for the simple reason that though I would like to have more money under education which is meant for men or women only—it can be both for boys and girls—that Government should concentrate more on women's education, for the reason which some of our friends mentioned in this House, that women is the educator of both homes, the home where she is born and the home where she goes to, and also the entire nation, as I have already said. Sir, in my opinion, the money is adequate for the reason that there are not enough women social workers available to make use of these funds.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Three minutes.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND : Sir, I would plead with you to give me more time because we women are half of the population of the country, and there are very few women members in the House. There are certain aspects of the Plan which can be really looked at only from the women's point of view.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes, You have three minutes.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND : That is exactly what you gave our men members. I would crave your indulgence, Sir. I will go ahead ; otherwise I would be losing time. Sir, I was saying that the money is enough for the simple reason that at the present time we have not enough trained women workers available to make use of this money that you have given us. Secondly, because the money that is allotted was originally for five years,

but now we have barely 2½ years left. And when another plan starts—the Second Five Year Plan—it is hoped that in the light of experience gained, we will be able to utilise more funds from Government. Moreover, I feel that some of the money allotted for men's activities should be diverted, to some extent, for activities which are for the common welfare of both men and women. Then, Sir, it was suggested yesterday by one of our friends that the question of imposition of controls was a source of corruption and evil, and should be removed. Sir, I do not subscribe to that view. It is necessarily a question of policy, and the Government has decided not to remove control in the interests of the Plan. This Plan has got to be implemented.

I would, before I close, mention some of those points which were brought forward by the Opposition and show how the grounds on which they criticised the Plan are superficial. For example it was said by—I won't mention the names.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You may leave it to the hon. Minister.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND : Pardon ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You may leave that to the Minister. He will reply to those points.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND : I will only just mention two or three of them for the edification of the House. For some Members might not have been present when these points were made out. Prof. Ghosh said that the presentation was made in a bulk and also that the portion dealing with idealism and that dealing with practical things should have been given separately. Others said that it was not a practical Plan, in view of our human and material resources. Leaving all these to be dealt with by the hon. Minister, I would only say that this is only the first and not the last plan. This is the first plan and there will

be several other plans as has been mentioned by Government, which would take us to the target in 27 years when our income is expected to be doubled. Sir, I would say to these people who are completely disappointed with the Plan that no plan can be satisfactory to all, that nothing can ever satisfy everybody. I would only appeal to those who are impatient to see the objectives envisaged by the Plan immediately, to remember the old saying, "Rome was not built in a day". Also that to have planned is better than not to have planned at all—to change the famous quotation a little. It should be made obvious to people on the other side who do not see the good of having a plan, that all around we see plans and regulation in nature. See the morning and the evening sun how the days are regulated. If human affairs were also to be guided according to a plan, we would be able to get the best out of our resources.

Sir, one thing more I may be permitted to say. I think it was Mr. Sundarayya who said—I did not expect him to say it—that after the Plan has been worked out, after this period of 25 years or so, we would have less food, that we would have less cloth and less shoes.

(MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.)

I would ask him whether.....

AN HON. MEMBER : That is statistics.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND : Whether it is a question of statistics or not, I would ask Mr. Sundarayya, if there had been no plan, if the country proceeds according to the present methods, what would happen ? Does he think that there will be more of these things ? Having a plan would certainly avoid waste and give the people more of these which they want.

Finally I would make an appeal to all the Members of this House to

realise that this is a venture which is of a gigantic magnitude, a venture which this country with its democratic set-up is making and the whole world is looking at this venture with great interest. It is for us, irrespective of parties or individual affiliations, to see that the Plan becomes successful, and like the Pandavas, in this venture which is of a national character, let us all be one hundred and five and not a hundred against five. All the Congress people will, of course, support the Plan, not only as put down in the Resolution, but I am sure, most enthusiastically and I think there will be no better ending to an appeal to the House than my asking them to think and work in the spirit of our Vedic prayer :

“सहवीर्यम् करवावहे”

and in that spirit and in that way, let us all work in the Bharat Sevak Samaj which expects all people of all affiliations to come in and accept them all. Nobody should keep back from this work under the impression that this work will be used to influence the next elections. If, Sir, any particular party is accused of using the Bharat Sevak Samaj for its party propaganda, this can be said of every other party that they would use it themselves, I don't think anybody would be able to stop that. To keep back from this work on such imaginary grounds would not be right and we should not stop from doing something for the betterment of the common man which all of us profess we want to do, and that is why we are here. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SARDAR SINGH (Rajasthan) : Mr. Chairman, in the course of this debate, we have listened to a variety of criticisms of this Five Year Plan. There has, for example, been the criticism from my hon. friend Prof. Ranga which is to the effect that this Plan is no good whatsoever, and so the best we can do is to scrap the entire plan. So let us go home and go to sleep. Now, criticism of that kind, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid, cannot appeal to us because once you have accepted the proposition that we are

[Shri Sardar Singh.]
going to have a planned economy, if you criticise this Plan on these lines, then what have you to replace it with ? As far as I can see, nothing has been suggested that can replace it. It may be that gentlemen who have criticised this Plan have something in their minds. But so far I have not been able to make out what it is that they want to replace this Plan with. On the other hand there was criticism from certain other quarters with respect to particular items in this Plan, that is to say, about the choice of priorities. Now, a plan implies the choice of priorities. You have to choose to which project or scheme you want to give preference, whether to this one or to some other, where a choice is concerned, one can always criticise any plan because there is always room for difference of opinion. One person may prefer one order of things and another person may give preference to another order. On the whole, Sir, I think the framers of this Plan are to be congratulated because, in the face of the many difficulties with which they have been confronted, I think they have performed their task, if I may say so, remarkably well. But I would like to point out one thing about this Plan and it is this. I think this particular plan has not been sufficiently ambitious. I believe this country of ours could aim at something much higher than what this plan has envisaged.

Now, let us examine some of the figures of this Plan and compare them with what has been done in the way of planning in certain other countries. The rate of economic progress as is visualised in this Plan is something like a little over 2 per cent., a year over this five year period. And if you take into consideration that the population is rising at the rate of between 1.2 and 1.3 per cent. a year, it means that the rate of rise of per capita income is just a little under one per cent. That is the per capita income. Now, as against this, let us consider what has been done in Japan and, then, I will give certain figures from China. Now,

it is being claimed officially from Japan that between 1948 and 1952 the rise of the national income has been 25%. I do not know whether that figure can absolutely be relied on but, even if that particular figure is somewhat exaggerated, I believe, it is correct to say that, in any case, the rise of the national income has been not less than 15%. Now, on a per capita basis this means that the rise has been according to official figures 8% per year as against our rate which is rather under one per cent.

Now, so far as China is concerned, we have had some remarkable figures given which have appeared in official publications. I do not quite know what these figures imply because, Sir, they have been given on a percentage basis and a full analysis on that basis has not been possible. I would like to ask the hon. the Finance Minister—who is going to wind up this debate I understand—if he can throw any light on these particular figures which, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read out. These are all figures of targets planned. Now, taking 1949 as the base year, by 1951 it is claimed that they are going to have a final output of 584 in pig iron, 675 in steel sections and 650 in steel ingots. Tungsten production, with the same base, was scheduled to rise to 446 ; tin to 600 ; electrolytic copper to 420. Sugar production, with 1950 as the base year, that is 100, was to rise to 151 at the end of this year. Paper was to rise to 169. Now, we get further, in agriculture—I am mentioning agriculture because in our Plan special priority has been given to agriculture—with 1949 as the base year ; rice production was to rise to 131, wheat production to 122, soya bean production to 214, cotton production to 256, jute production to 723 and tobacco production at 464. It is also being claimed that the purchasing power of the people is 30% higher in 1951 than in 1950.

Now, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, how these figures compare with what is promised us in this Plan ; but, I

presume that the Members of the Planning Commission, when they framed this Plan did have some idea as to how our Plan would stand when compared with certain other countries. I do not refer now to countries which are highly industrialised such as the United States or the United Kingdom ; but there are other countries which are starting, more or less, from scratch as we are, which have been backward in the past and I do feel that one of the essential things which has to be borne in mind by us, Sir, is that we cannot afford to have a Plan which can be described as falling short in many aspects as compared with plans of the other countries.

Take, for example, the investment figures which we are proposing to go in for. Now, if I am correct, we propose to invest over this 5-Year period something like 4% of our national income. As against this, Sir, as I have already shown, in Japan, somewhere between 15 and 25% was invested ; and let us, further, take the case of Eastern Europe, because Eastern Europe, we must remember, was predominantly an agricultural area before the plans got going after 1945. Now, in Eastern Europe, the rate of investment during the period of the Plan was 25%. Here again, our investment of 4% seems meagre as against the figures in other areas which, I presume, are not very different ; I mean, the conditions are not so very different from our own that they cannot be compared. The fact that the disparity is so great, I feel sure, needs to be remedied. What is required, if I may say so, Mr. Chairman, is that in going ahead with this Plan, as has been said by the author of the Plan and indeed accepted by this House, there has to be co-operation from the entire population of the country and you can only get that co-operation when you have got a Plan which is so grand in its conception that it arouses enthusiasm which, shall I say, promises so much in the way of reward that every citizen of this country can really be made to

feel that it is his Plan, that he is going to benefit by seeing that the targets set by the Plan are achieved.

Now, of course, the question will come up that, if the Plan has to be a more ambitious Plan than it is, how is it going to be financed, in what way is the matter going to be tackled ? When you have got such experts as the hon. Minister for Finance and his colleagues, that is mainly a thing which is for him to tackle ; but if I may say so, there are one or two directions that I can see from reading the Plan, in which the targets may perhaps have been set rather higher than they have been. For example, take cloth production. Now, the target which is being set under this Plan is 4,700 million yards. As against that, the Birla Plan of 1947 had set a target of 9,000 million yards and we also have the further fact that last July and last August, we actually reached a rate of production of 5,000 million yards. Surely, it is, therefore, possible that the target in the case of cloth production could be very much higher or, something like 6,000 million yards or thereabouts.

Now, there is another aspect, Mr. Chairman, which has already been put before the House by one or two speakers before and, especially by my hon. friend who comes, as I do, from Rajasthan, that is the question of under-developed areas. I do not wish to repeat the points which have already been made but, what I do wish to place before the Government is this. In the case of under-developed areas, if you do not help them, how are they going to be developed at all ? The attitude which is being taken in this 5-Year Plan is to say to these under-developed areas—when I say that, I am chiefly concerned with my own State, Rajasthan, because under the Plan, I think there is only one other State which is PEPSU which gets less, totally than we do—“Bad luck, boys ; you have missed the bus. At the end of the 5-Year period, we shall see whether we cannot help you some more, but, this time, we

[Shri Sardar Singh.]

cannot do anything for you". I quite understand the difficulties, Mr. Chairman, which must have confronted the Planning Commission when it came to a choice of priorities between this State and that State or between this project and that project. But I must say that this question of undeveloped areas is a very serious problem, because unless you have enthusiasm all over the country, how are you going to get your targets of the Five Year Plan achieved. In Rajasthan, with the exception of the Chambal Scheme—and even there only the first stage of that scheme is going to be tackled during the five years—there is no single great scheme undertaken during the five year period of the Plan. So, in effect Rajasthan, I am afraid, has been written off completely so far as the Plan is concerned. Surely it should have been possible, and I believe it is still possible for the Planning Commission to take this aspect into consideration, and perhaps they can see their way to giving us greater aid so that we can go back to the people of Rajasthan and tell them, "Here is a plan which is worth carrying out. You are going to benefit by this," and within five years, you will see that we can work the Plan and we can go ahead from one success to another.

There is one other aspect of the Plan, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to refer to. That is, of course, the old question which has been dealt with by so many other speakers and in so many newspaper articles : that is the question of priority as between industry and agriculture. In this Plan you have given priority to agriculture. Very good and logical arguments have been adduced in order to justify that position. But may I point out that in most other countries where the question of economy on a planned basis has been tackled, heavy industry has always been given priority ? What is going to happen here ? It is your heavy industry which is going to produce capital goods which will enable you not only to progress in build-

ing up industry but also in building up agriculture. Moreover, a very great need for this country is defence, and without heavy industry you are not going to be able to mobilise your force fully. We have been pursuing the policy of neutrality in foreign affairs. But if I may say so, Mr. Chairman, neutrality in difficult times, that is to say, in a time of war, can only be maintained if you are sufficiently strong to keep your neutrality, or in other words, if the difficulty of taking over India is so great that no opponent would like to undertake the task. I do not know what is being done in the way of defence planning. It may be that this question is already in the minds of Government or in the minds of the framers of the Plan, but I do urge the Government that this is an object which must be kept constantly in view, that our defence industries and our defence forces must be built up to a point where we can enforce the policy of neutrality and not merely depend on the goodwill of other nations to allow us to keep our neutrality.

This Plan, as I have said, is a step in the right direction, and I think that you will get the overwhelming majority of the people of this country to support the idea of the Plan and to work it out and to carry it to a successful conclusion. But I do beseech the Government not to treat the people as though they were children. Let us have a plan which has ambitious targets, and I believe that more ambitious targets can be set. Let us tighten our belts ; let us march forward and onward, and I am sure that this country can develop along progressive line of economy, by means of your Plan.

SHRI D. NARAYAN (Bombay):

श्री डी० नारायण (बम्बई) : सभापति जी, इस योजना की टीका टिप्पणी करना तो सहज बात है मगर किसी योजना को बनाना और उसे कामयाब करना एक बहुत ही मुश्किल काम है। हमारे सामने जो योजना है उसे जिन महानुभावों ने बनाया है, उन्होंने इसे बहुत ही मेहनत और समझ वृक्ष के साथ बनाया है। उसके पीछे अनुभव

है, तपस्या है, अध्ययन है और उस पर मेरे जैसे साधारण मनुष्य का कुछ कहना धृष्टता की बात हो जाती है। परन्तु बात यह है कि जो उद्देश्य हमारे सामने इस योजना में रखे गये हैं वह मेरी निगाह से पर्याप्त नहीं हैं। इसमें यह कहा गया है कि हमारे जो साधन हैं वह सीमित हैं और हर आदमी के लिए उनका उपयोग करना है और दूसरी बात यह है कि अधिक से अधिक उत्पादन करना है। यह दोनों काम करते हुए आज कुछ कुछ उद्योगों को तो बुनियाद भी दे दी गई है।

हिन्दुस्तान एक बहुत गरीब देश है और आज से गरीब नहीं है, कई वर्षों से गरीब है और गरीबी हद तक पहुंच गई है। सिर्फ गरीब ही नहीं है, दुखी भी है, निरक्षर है और इस गरीबी का सवाल इस तरह के प्लान से हल हो सकता है और वह जनता में उत्साह पैदा कर सकता है। आज इस गरीब देश की जरूरत सब से बड़ी जरूरत जो है वह उद्योग की है। उद्योग चाहिये, अन्न चाहिये, और वस्त्र चाहिये। अन्न देने की कोशिश तो इस प्लान में कर दी गई है। वस्त्रों की भी व्यवस्था है, परन्तु हर एक स्त्री पुरुष को जो काम करना चाहता है, जो काम कर सकता है, उस को उद्योग देने की कोई खास तजवीज इस प्लान में नहीं है।

हिन्दुस्तान आप जानते हैं एक कृषि प्रधान देश है, यहां २९॥ करोड़ जनता गांवों में बसती है। २९॥ करोड़ जनता में से पौने २५ करोड़ खेती, इसमें से २ करोड़ ७० लाख जनता जमीन की मालिक है यानी ओनर कल्टीवेटर (owner cultivation) है। करीब ३ करोड़ ४० लाख परिवार ऐसे हैं जिनके पास जमीन नहीं है। जहां भी खेती और मजदूरी करने को मिलती है उससे वह लोग अपना गुजर बसर करते हैं। इस तरह से करीब १० करोड़ आदमी ऐसे हैं जिनको इस तरह से काम करना पड़ता है। इन लोगों को १२ महीने तो काम नहीं मिलता है। हमारे देश में जो खेती होती है उसमें साल में

सिर्फ ६ महीने और ८ महीने ही काम करना होता है। खेती पर निर्भर रहने वाले कम से कम ४ और ६ महीने तक निरुद्योगी रहते हैं। इसलिये इस देश की सब से बड़ी समस्या यदि कोई है तो वह अनइम्प्लायमेंट (unemployment) की है, या अन्डर इम्प्लायमेंट (under employment) की है। इस तरह के अनइम्प्लायमेंट और अन्डर इम्प्लायमेंट की समस्या इस तरह की योजनाओं से हल नहीं हो सकती है। जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में कहा वह इस तरह का उत्साह पैदा नहीं कर सकती है।

आप जानते हैं कि आज हिन्दुस्तान उद्योगों का भूखा है, वही प्लान हिन्दुस्तान में चल सकता है जिसमें हर एक स्त्री पुरुष को उद्योग देने की तजवीज हो। हां ग्राम उद्योग का जिक्र किया गया है। ग्राम उद्योग वह शक्ति है जो कि इस कमी को पूरा कर सकती है परन्तु ग्राम उद्योगों का जो जिक्र किया गया है, जहां तक मैंने देखा है वह स्टेप मदरली (step motherly) के तौर पर है, मेहरबानी के तौर पर है। ग्राम उद्योग से ही हमारा काम होने वाला है, यही हमारा आखरी आधार है। मैं मानता हूं कि आज के हालातों में, आज के वातावरण में यह बात कठिन है, परन्तु यह बात समझ लेनी चाहिये कि हमारे निरुद्योगी लोगों को यदि उद्योग देने की, धन्धा देने की शक्ति किसी में है तो वह ग्राम उद्योगों में है और किसी दूसरे मार्ग से हमारी यह समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है।

अब आप ग्राम उद्योगों को देखेंगे तो जो लोग गांवों में रहते हैं वह लोग हमारे किसान हैं, वह लोग खेती का काम करते हैं। इसके साथ साथ जो छोटे छोटे धन्धे हैं जैसे चर्खा कातना, दूध और घी का काम, गुड़ बनाना और तेल इत्यादि जो धन्धे हैं वह लोग किया करते हैं। परन्तु आप देखते हैं कि जितने भी ये छोटे धन्धे हैं वह दिन पर दिन कम होते चले जा रहे हैं। इन ग्राम उद्योगों की उन्नति कैसे हो सकती है कि जब

[Shri D. Narayan.]

[क इनके सामने मिल इसी तरह की चीजें तैयार करने वाली हो गई हैं। मिलों को जो सुविधाएं हैं, जो कनसेशन हैं वह हमारे ग्रामउद्योगों को नहीं मिलते हैं। इन हालतों के होते हुए भी अगर हम अपने ग्रामउद्योग को बढ़ावा दें तो इसमें हजारों आदमी काम में लग सकते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान में काम करने वालों की तादाद कम नहीं है। मिल और कारखानों में जितने मजदूर काम करते हैं उनसे कई गुना ज्यादा हमारे ग्राम-उद्योगों में लोग कर रहे हैं और कर सकते हैं।

हमारे देश में ४०० से ऊपर कपड़ा मिलें हैं मगर इन मिलों में कोई ७ लाख से ज्यादा मजदूर काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। हमारे कारखानों को ही ले लीजिये। हमारे देश में करीब २९ हजार कारखाने हैं और उनमें करीब ५० लाख आदमी काम कर रहे हैं। इसी तरह से आप छोटे छोटे उद्योगों को ले लीजिये, तो आपको यह दिखाई देगा कि हमारे देहातों में जो उद्योग हैं अगर इनका अच्छी तरह से इस्तेमाल किया जाय तो वह देश के कई लाख आदमियों को रोजगार दिला सकते हैं, यह शक्ति सिर्फ ग्रामउद्योगों को ही है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे अर्थ व्यवस्था का क्रम केन्द्र होना चाहिये और हमारी आर्थिक योजना की जो मध्यम बिन्दु है वह शून्य है। आज हमारे ग्रामउद्योगों का मध्यम बिन्दु चर्खा होना चाहिये जो कि हमारे राष्ट्रपिता ने दिया है।

मनुष्य की जरूरतों में अन्न के बाद यदि कोई चीज है तो वह वस्त्र है वस्त्र के लिए हमें कपास गांववालों से लेनी होती है। परन्तु जो कपास शहरों में मिलों में जाती है वह वस्त्र के रूप में गांवों में वापस आ जाती है। अगर आप गांव गांव में वस्त्रों का प्रचार करें तो वह लोग भी सी तरह से इस चीजमें स्वावलम्बी हो जायेंगे जिस तरह से आप अन्न के बारे में योजना बना रहे हैं। अन्न और वस्त्र की इस देश में आवश्यकता है, अगर सरकार

इन योजनाओं की पूर्ति करती है तो बहुत से उद्योग इसके सहारे चल सकेंगे। इसलिये मेरा सरकार से यह कहना है कि ग्राम उद्योग ही ऐसी चीज है जिससे हम अपने सारे देशवासियों को काम दे सकते हैं।

मगर मेरा यह कहना है कि हमारे देश में यंत्र चलेंगे, यानी यंत्र की संस्कृति चलेगी या मानवता चलेगी। यंत्र और मनुष्य का संघर्ष आज सारी दुनिया में चल रहा है। हमारे देश में भी इसका संघर्ष चल रहा है। यदि आप इस संघर्ष का हल नहीं करेंगे तो हमारे प्रश्न हल होने वाले नहीं हैं। आज यह प्रश्न केवल हमारे देश का ही प्रश्न नहीं है यह सारे संसार का प्रश्न बन गया है। इसलिए मेरी आपसे प्रार्थना है कि आप हिन्दुस्तान में यंत्र की मर्यादा को निश्चित कर दीजिये तब हम यह सोच सकेंगे कि कौन सा उद्योग कह पर किया जाना चाहिये। आप जानते हैं कि आज सारी दुनिया में यंत्रों ने एक तहलका सा मचा दिया है। यंत्रों के आप अगर गुलाम बन जायेंगे तो इससे हमारे देश को नुकसान होगा। इस बारे में आप योरुप को देखिये जब से वहां पर यंत्रों का जाल बिछा है तब से वहां एक युद्ध के बाद दूसरा युद्ध चलता आ रहा है। यंत्रों की गुलामी को आपको नष्ट करना होगा। जब तक आप इसकी गुलामी को खत्म नहीं करेंगे तब तक इस देश में बेकारी की समस्या हल नहीं होगी। यह बात हमको सोचनी होगी कि मनुष्य को स्वावलम्बी बनाने के लिये हमें कौन से उद्योग उसको देने चाहियें अगर हम इस सम्बन्ध में यंत्रों की मर्यादा को निश्चित नहीं करेंगे तो हमारी कठिनाइयों का हल होने वाला नहीं है। यह सब से पहिली बात मुझे आपसे कहनी है।

दूसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह अन्न के विषय में है। आप इस देश में मास प्रोडक्शन (mass production) करना चाहते हैं। यदि आपको जनता में आत्म विश्वास पैदा करना है, उनमें उत्साह पैदा करना है, छोटे छोटे जिलों

को अन्न के बारे में स्वावलम्बी बनाना है तो आपको इसके लिए बड़े इरीगेशन (irrigation) की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी। यह काम तो छोटे छोटे माइनर इरीगेशन (minor irrigation) से किया जा सकता है। आपने ५५८ करोड़ रुपया बड़े इरीगेशन में खर्च करने का फ़ैसला किया है। इससे केवल ८० लाख एकड़ ज़मीन में लाभ होगा और वह सींची जा सकेगी। आपने यह तय किया है कि ३० करोड़ माइनर इरीगेशन में खर्च किया जायेगा और इससे ११० लाख एकड़ ज़मीन सींची जा सकेगी। इसमें जो पैदावार होगी वह केवल २० लाख टन होगी। इस तरह से आप देखेंगे कि इतने बड़े पैमाने पर हम खर्चा करते हैं और वह खर्चा जनता का हो रहा है मगर उससे बहुत कम लाभ जनता को पहुंचता है। इसलिए मेरा आपसे यह कहना है कि आप इन बड़ी बड़ी योजनाओं को छोड़कर छोटी २ माइनर इरीगेशन की योजनाओं को अपनाइये जिससे जनता का पैसा भी कम खर्च होगा और ज़रादा पे ज़रादा उसको फ़ायदा पहुंचेगा।

आप जानते हैं कि इस देश में हर साल कहीं न कहीं अकाल पड़ता ही रहता है। मैं जिस प्रान्त से आता हूं उसके ८ जिलों में से दो तीन जिले ऐसे हैं जहां पर हर साल अकाल पड़ता ही रहता है। इसी तरह से अगर हम इन जिलों में जहां कि हर दूसरे और तीसरे सालों के बाद जो अकाल पड़ता है उसको रोकने का प्रबन्ध न करेंगे तो इससे देश को और वहां की जनता को दुःख पहुंचता ही रहेगा। इसलिए इन क्षेत्रों के लिए कोई ऐसी तबज़ीज़ की जानी चाहिये जिससे कि इस तरह के स्थानों पर अकाल पर काबू पाया जा सके। आपको इस बात का विशेष ध्यान देना होगा कि गत ५० वर्षों से किन किन स्थानों में इस तरह से अकाल पड़ा है या सूखा की स्थिति हुई है। उन स्थानों के लिए आपको कोई न कोई योजना अवश्य बनानी चाहिये ताकि उन प्रदेशों के लोगों को इस प्रकार के दुःख को फिर सहन न करना पड़े।

दूसरी बात जो इस प्लान में लिखी गई है वह बड़े बड़े इरीगेशन स्कीमों की है, उन पर काफी खर्चा दिखाया गया है। मगर जगह तो इस तरह की स्कीमों में नहीं चलाई जा सकती है, हर जगह नदियां और बैलीज़ (valleys) आपको नहीं मिल सकती हैं। मगर इसके साथ ही साथ हर प्रदेश की अपनी आवश्यकताएं हैं और आपको हर प्रदेश को स्वावलम्बी बनाना चाहिये हर एक प्रदेश अपनी बैहतरी चाहता है और अपने को स्वावलम्बी बनाने की कोशिश करना चाहता है। तो आप सोच सकते हैं कि इस तरह से आप हर एक प्रदेश को सन्तुष्ट नहीं कर सकेंगे। डेमोक्रेसी (democracy) के सिद्धान्तों को आप अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं तो फिर इस तरह से क्या नतीजा होगा।

दूसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि आपने इस प्लान में सोशल वेलफेयर (social welfare) की बात कही है। आपने इस में बुराइयों की जड़ को मिटाने की बात कही है। मगर जब आप इस देश में जो बुराइयां हैं उनको अपने सामने रखेंगे तो आपको सहज ही में मालूम हो जायगा कि हमारे समाज के अन्दर अभी तक कितनी बुराइयां मौजूद हैं। हमारे शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट और ट्राइब्स (scheduled castes and tribes) के अन्दर कितनी बुराइयां हैं जो अभी तक अपने पाव जमाई हुई हैं और जिससे इस जाति को बहुत नुकसान पहुंच रहा है। मैं आपसे नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हम करीब ३० और ३५ वर्षों से इस देश में जो शराब की बुरी प्रथा चलती आ रही है, जिसके लिए हम आज तक लड़ते चले आ रहे हैं वह अभी तक मौजूद है। इस चीज़ के लिए हमने बड़े आन्दोलन किये हमारे हज़ारों और लाखों आदमियों ने, जिनमें स्त्री पुरुष थे, जेल गये और इस को मिटाने के लिए कई प्रकार के कष्ट सहे। हमारे विधान में भी यह कहा गया है कि प्रोहिबिशन (prohibition) को इस देश में जल्द से जल्द पूरा लागू कर देना चाहिये। आप इस बात को सहज ही में समझ

[Shri D. Narayan]

सकते हैं कि इस शराब ने हमारे समाज को खराब कर रखा है और यहां पर जड़ जमा रखी है। हमारे शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट और ट्राइब्स को ज़िम्मे बरबाद कर दिया है, उस के लिए आने इस प्लान के अन्दर कोई भी व्यवस्था नहीं की है और न उसका इसमें किसी प्रकार का जिक्र ही है। हां हर वक्त यह कहा जाता है कि अगर हम इसको बन्द कर देंगे तो हमारा रेवन्यू कम हो जायेगा और देश की आय कम हो जायेगी। तो मैं आप से नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि इस तरह से एक बुराई को समाज के अन्दर कायम करके आप पैसा कमाना चाहते हैं तो इससे देश का भला होने वाला नहीं है। लोभ पाप का मूल हुआ करता है। यहां पर यह कहा जाता है कि देश में चोरी और दूसरी बुराइयों को खत्म करने के लिए कानून बने हुए हैं मगर अभी तक देश से चोरी और दूसरी बुराइयां खत्म नहीं हुई हैं। तो मेरा आपसे यह कहना है कि जब तक मनुष्य जाति है उसमें इस तरह की बुराइयां अवश्य रहेंगी। इसलिए मेरी आपसे यह प्रार्थना है कि आप इस विषय की ओर अवश्य ध्यान दें और हमारे शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट और ट्राइब्स में इस बीमारी से जो बरबादी हो रही है उसको आप मिटावें।

दूसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि जिस तरह से मैंने देहांत को बेकारी का ऊपर जिक्र किया है उसी तरह से आज हमारे पढ़े लिखे लोगों की बेकारी का जिक्र आपके सामने करना चाहता हूं। मैं मास प्रोडक्शन के खिलाफ हूं। मैं केन्द्रीय व्यवस्था के खिलाफ हूं। मैं डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन (decentralization) चाहता हूं। आज हमारे युनिवर्सिटियों में जो मास प्रोडक्शन हो रहा है उससे देश को नुकसान हो रहा है बेकारी बढ़ती ही जा रही है। आज हमारे पढ़े लिखे लोगों को उद्योग नहीं मिलना है और इस तरह से वह देश के लिए एक भार साबित हो रहे हैं। मैंने रिपोर्ट में देखा कि जो हमारे इम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज देश में है उनमें उद्योग पाने के लिए जो अर्जियां आती हैं उनमें १०० में

से ४ आदमियों को नौकरी मिल जाती है और ९६ प्रतिशत लोग बेकार रह जाते हैं। मैं सपन्नना था कि इस प्लानिंग कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में इन बेकारों की संख्या मालूम हो जायेगी और उनके लिए कुछ न कुछ अवश्य प्रबन्ध किया जायेगा। इस रिपोर्ट में हम यह भी नहीं देखते हैं कि हमारे देहानों में कितने बेकार लोगों की तादाद है और पढ़े लिखे बेकार लोगों की कितनी तादाद है। इसलिए मेरी आप से प्रार्थना है कि इस बेकारी को दूर करने के लिए आपको कोई न कोई कदम अवश्य उठाना चाहिये था। अभी मुझे इस विषय में एक बात याद आ गई है। अभी हाल ही में हमारे माननीय चेयरमैन माहब ने इलाहाबाद विश्वविद्यालय कन्वोकेशन में जो भाषण दिया था उसका थोड़ा सा अंश पढ़कर मैं म्नाता हूं। उन्होंने इस विषय के बारे में सारे देश का ध्यान दिलाया था :

“ If even men who are highly qualified do not find suitable employment, they become frustrated and a socially insecure class provides the material for revolution. Man's hunger and poverty and the prolonged unemployment of intellectuals” he added “are the greatest allies of all subversive movements.”

इस तरह से आपको मालूम हो जायेगा कि आप अपने घर के अन्दर गन पाउडर पैदा कर रहे हैं। इसलिए मेरी आपसे प्रार्थना है कि इस विषय की ओर आपको विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये और जल्द से जल्द उनको रोजगार दिलाने का प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये। अगर यह लोग बेरोजगार रहेंगे तो समाज के लिए एक भार साबित होंगे और समाज के अन्दर कई तरह की खराबियां आ जायेंगी जिससे देश की उन्नति में बाधा होगी। इसलिए यदि आप इस देश में शांति चाहते हैं तो आपका यह परम धर्म हो जाता है कि देश में जो शिक्षित बेकार हैं उनको आपको अवश्य काम धंधों में लगा देना चाहिये।

एक बात जो मैं आपके सामने कहना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि इस प्लान में मिनिमम और मैक्सिमम इन्कम (minimum and maximum income) की कोई बात

नहीं रखी गई है। हिन्दुस्तान में जो काम करता है, उद्योग करता है, उसको कम से कम इतना मिलेगा, इस तरह की बात इस प्लान में दिखाई नहीं देती है और न इस बात की कोई तजवीज इसमें रखी गई है। इसमें यह बात अवश्य रखी जानी चाहिये कि कम से कम इतनी आमदनी होगी और ज्यादा से ज्यादा इतनी आमदनी होगी। मनुष्य मनुष्य में थोड़ा बहुत ईश्वर ने फर्क पैदा कर दिया है परन्तु हम लोगों ने अपनी व्यवस्था से और ज्यादा फर्क पैदा कर दिया है। एक को तो एक रुपया भी नहीं मिलता है और दूसरा हजारों की आमदनी करता है। हमारे यहां जो लोहार हैं, बढ़ई हैं, डाक्टर हैं, वकील हैं, सरकारी अफसर हैं, और जो दूसरे लोग हैं वह सभी मनुष्य हैं। उनकी आमदनी में इतना अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिये। हां थोड़ा बहुत अन्तर हो सकता है मगर इतना अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिये कि मनुष्यता ही चली जाय। एक दूसरे के साथ मनुष्यता का भाव ही खत्म हो जाय, ऐसा फर्क मेरी समझ में नहीं होना चाहिये। यह बात कलित तो अवश्य मालूम होती है मगर हमको इस बात को इसी तरह नहीं छोड़ देना चाहिये। इसके लिए हमें अवश्य यह बात रखनी चाहिये कि कम से कम आमदनी ब्या होनी चाहिये और ज्यादा से ज्यादा आमदनी ब्या होनी चाहिये।

इसके बाद मुझे आपका ध्यान इस देश की शिक्षा की ओर खींचना है। हमारे देश में जो पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं उनकी संख्या १५ और १६ फीसदी है। जिस देश में सिर्फ १७ फीसदी आदमी दरतखत करना ही जानेंगे वह देश कहाँ जाने वाला है। हमारे देश में करोड़ों लोग ऐसे हैं जो कि खबर भी पढ़ना नहीं जानते हैं। इस तरह की बात हम कब तक अपने देश में बरदाश्त कर सकते हैं। तो फिर आप ही समझ सकते हैं कि कितने वर्षों में हम इस देश को अच्छी तरह से साक्षर बना सकेंगे। इस प्लान में इस विषय के बारे में कोई विशेष बात नहीं रखी गई है कि हम अपने इस देश में लोगों को इतने समय में साक्षर

बना सकेंगे। अगर हम इस तरह की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं करेंगे तो हम जो प्लान बना रहे हैं वह सफल नहीं हो सकती है।

इस के बाद हमारे विधान में जो प्राइमरी कम्पलसरी एजुकेशन (primary compulsory education) की बात बनलाई गई है उसकी ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। इस बात की ओर इस प्लान में कोई इशारा नहीं किया गया है। सन् १९१२ में स्वर्गीय गोखले जी ने मांग की थी और उन्होंने इम्पीरियल कौंसिल में यह प्रस्ताव पेश किया था कि हिन्दुस्तान में प्राइमरी एजुकेशन, प्राथमिक एजुकेशन होनी चाहिये। बिना साक्षरता के हमारी डेमोक्रेसी लंगड़ी और अंधी ही रह जायेगी। ४० वर्ष से ज्यादा हो गये हैं मगर अभी तक इस ओर कोई प्रगति नहीं की गई है। जहाँ पर पहिले देश था वही पर आज है। हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद हो जाने के बाद हम यह सोच रहे थे कि हम अपने देश को साक्षर बना देंगे, हम अपने बच्चों को कम्पलसरी प्राइमरी एजुकेशन देंगे मगर ऐसी कोई तजवीज इस प्लान में नहीं है। मुझे आशा थी कि सरकार इस विषय में अवश्य कुछ न कुछ बात रखेगी।

अन्तिम बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि प्लान तो बनाया गया है वह बहुत ही अच्छी बात है। आज की हालातों में जितना हो सकता है, उतना करने की इसमें कोशिश की गई है। इस प्लान को कामयाब करने की बात है तब ही यह योजना सफल हो सकती है। इसके लिए जरूरी बात है कि जितने भी हमारे अफसर इस प्लान को चलाने वाले हैं वे और जनता जब तक इसमें पूरी तरह से सहयोग नहीं देगी तब तक यह प्लान कामयाब नहीं हो सकता है। हमने लाखों रुपया खर्च करके यह प्लान तैयार किया है, हमारे विद्वान और पढ़े लिखे लोगों ने इस प्लान को तैयार किया है। जिन अफसरों ने इस प्लान को तैयार किया है उन्हीं को इसको पूरा करने का

[Shri D. Narayan]

काम भी सौपा जा रहा है। मगर मैं अन्त में आपसे यही प्रार्थना करूँगा कि अगर आप इस प्लान को कार्यान्वित करना चाहते हैं तो इस काम को उन लोगों सौपा जाय जो लोग इस देश के लिए घुल घुल कर मरना जानते हों और जो उसी के लिए जिन्दा रहते हैं।

[For English Translation see Appendix III, Annexure No. 84.]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. C. D. Deshmukh to make statements on—

- (i) The Commonwealth Economic Conference held recently in London.
- (ii) Certain matters arising out of the debate in the Council of States on the Industrial Finance Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1952.

STATEMENTS

COMMONWEALTH ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

THE MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI C. D. DESHMUKH) : Sir, with your permission, I wish to make a statement on the Commonwealth Economic Conference which I recently attended in London on behalf of the Government of India.

The purpose of this Conference was to hold consultations between the Commonwealth countries as to the economic policies that should be adopted by the sterling area countries for strengthening their balance of payments and as to the action that could be taken towards the expansion of the world production and trade. The conclusions of the Conference were published in a Press Communique in London on the 11th December 1952. I am laying copies of this communique on the Table of the House for the information of the hon. Members. [Placed in Library. See No. P. 100/52.]

It is clear that if the sterling area countries are to play their part, in-

dividually or collectively, in securing an expansion of world trade, each country must follow sound internal economic policies. Such policies are most essential for achieving a healthy balance of payments position. The essence of these policies is to live within one's means and to adjust investment and consumption to levels which the economy can afford. By releasing more goods for export and by restraining demand for imported goods, these policies help in achieving external balance.

Such internal measures are also necessary for sound development of increased production on an economic basis. They are, therefore, equally indispensable for countries seeking to develop their resources.

Hon. Members will have observed that the Conference has also stressed the need for sound development policies on the part of the sterling area countries. Increased production is to be secured of those commodities which would help in the improvement of balance of payments and an increased expansion of trade. The Conference, however, recognised the essentiality of capital investment for basic development for improving the standards of life in under-developed countries, in so far as such development was a necessary foundation for further economic progress.

The Conference reiterated the objective of unrestricted multilateral trade and payments and of convertibility of sterling as a pre-requisite for the expansion of world trade on a multilateral basis. These objectives are to be achieved by suitable progressive stages. While measures that are to be taken by the sterling area countries will undoubtedly help in strengthening the balance of payments of the sterling area, rapid and effective progress towards convertibility of sterling and a multilateral system of trade and payments cannot be made by the efforts of the sterling area countries alone. Complementary action is equally necessary on the part of other trading