

[Shri P. C. Borooah]

to Indian, one after another in quick succession, the odd staff, and those holding managerial positions, are being replaced by people recruited from outside the State. This is the state of affairs there which is making the people lose faith in authority. There is serious discontent prevailing and if our planners and men at the helm fail to read the writing on the wall, I fear to think what serious consequence the State will have to bear.

I had many other points to raise, but since the Prime Minister is the next speaker, I conclude.

**The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I have welcomed this debate, even though I have been somewhat surprised and, if I may say so, disappointed, at the approach of some of the Members to it.

There is the approach of some hon. Members who attacked the very basis of the idea of planning. It is perfectly open to them to hold any views, however much I may think them to be without the slightest foundation, based on sense.

**Shri Ranga (Chittoor):** Nobody has opposed the idea of planning from our side. We are opposed to *your* planning.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That was not what the hon. Member's colleague, Shri M. R. Masani, said in his speech.

**Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot):** Please quote it.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** He objected. He said that our having a Planning Commission is opposed to the concept of all democracy.

**Shri M. R. Masani:** That is true.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is you do not object to planning, but you do not want to have any agency for planning.

**Shri M. R. Masani:** Only an advisory body, an expert body.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The Planning Commission is an advisory agency, nothing more.

**Shri M. R. Masani:** No, no.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Apart from that, it has been a real education for me to read—I am sorry I was not present here—Shri Masani's speech. It is so amazing in its lack of sense, lack of approach and of understanding of the whole concept of planning, the whole concept of progress, that I am surprised a person of his intelligence should have made it. Many other Members, even from this side, have concentrated on odd bits here and there. What they have said may be relevant, may be worth while, but the whole object of this exercise was to see it as a whole, to see the picture as a whole; in fact, not only to see this picture as a whole, but to see the picture of the last 12 years of planning as a whole, and then come and concentrate a little more on the last 2½ years and then decide what we should do about it.

There is no doubt that there has been failure to achieve the targets in some matters, and more especially, there is no doubt that one matter which concerns all of us most is agriculture in this respect, and we must look into it and try to improve it and get rid of the difficulties that have come in our way. That is so, but one must keep a balanced view about what has been happening.

Planning has been going on for last 12 years—the First and the Second Plans and now half the Third. I think it would be useful to see generally what has happened in the whole course of the planning period.

The first thing is that during this period we have succeeded largely in putting an end to the economic stag-

nation that India suffered from during the previous 50 years or more. That is no small achievement. Our national income increased by 42 per cent, agricultural production by 41 per cent, food production by 46 per cent, industrial production went up by 94 per cent. There has been considerable expansion of irrigation, power and transport. Through our steel plants,—to which more particularly Shri Masani objects; he thinks it is a vicious thing for the State to have steel plants—machine building plants etc., the foundations of industrial growth have been laid. There has been rapid advance in education, especially technical education, and in several other fields. There has been a spectacular advance in many branches of science and technology. In spite of an increase of 21 per cent in our population, consumption levels rose; food consumption from 1800 calories per capita went up to 2100; cloth consumption from a little over 9 yards per capita per year at the beginning of the Plan to 14½ yards. Our health schemes have made remarkable progress. Malaria has been practically eliminated, and typhoid is greatly reduced. As a result of this, the death rate has gone down considerably, and the expectation of life has risen from 32 at the beginning of the 'forties to about 50 now.

These developments are significant as far as they go, very significant, and it will not be easy to find a parallel to all this change and development in any other country, developing country, situated as India is. But real importance of all this lies in all this being a base for future progress. We have laid the foundations on which progress in future might be faster.

Therefore, in looking at this two-and-a half year period—I would remind the House that nearly half that period was a period of emergency, about a year, which has cast special burdens on us, on our finances, on everything that we do—we must keep the whole picture, because it must be

remembered that although planning is a continuous process, the normal progress in a five year plan cannot be measured as if one-fifth of the plan progress takes place in the first year, another one-fifth in the second year and so on. Usually, at the beginning of the Plan, at the beginning of any scheme, foundations are laid, but the actual results do not come out till the end of the period. It is possible—I cannot say what will happen—that in the remaining two years of the Plan, much of the ground may be covered, or, may not be covered. Therefore, I would beg the House to consider all this planning business in proper perspective, and in a balanced way.

If I may say so, looking carefully at what has been done, I am naturally disappointed at many things, more especially in agriculture. The reasons for that are a different matter. Agriculture is the toughest problem before any country, developed or undeveloped. The most developed countries are suffering very much from difficulties in agriculture today, as the House probably knows. Even highly advanced countries are suffering from it. You may apportion blame between Planning Commission, the Government of India, myself and the State Government, and it is not because of blame that I am saying this, but ultimately the thing depends upon the farmer, the actual cultivator, and ultimately, the question is of pulling him out of a certain rut, helping him to do so, giving him incentives and help and all that, and to bring about a mental change in him.

The whole object of the community development movement, which has often been criticised, was to do that, and I do submit that in spite of many failings, it has done that to a good extent, and it is doing that, and it ultimately led to Panchayati Raj, which cannot bear fruit immediately, but which is a revolutionary movement, which will undoubtedly bear good fruit.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

So, I do not propose to enter into the many criticisms made, but I am sure that all that has been said will be carefully considered by those who have to deal with it, either in the Planning Commission or in the Government. More particularly, as I said, I am very much concerned about the steps to be taken in regard to agriculture, but I would rather deal with the general approach to this question.

Apart from this perspective view which I beg the House to consider, I would say something about planning for the special benefit of hon. Member Shri Masani. Planning has been talked about for a long time, but it first came in the all-India picture by the appointment of a National Planning Committee in 1938, I think, and that worked for two or three years.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): By Netaji Bose.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** By Shri Subhash Chandra Bose, and he was pleased to appoint me as the chairman of that committee. Unfortunately, that committee, although it worked hard, could not work easily or smoothly, because from time to time, many of us members were in prison. The British Government came in the way. Nevertheless it did a good deal of useful work.

Very soon after there came a plan which is often known as the Bombay Plan, produced by some of the leading, top-ranking, industrialists of this country. I am sure hon. Member Shri Masani must remember that. It is interesting to see what that plan, produced by industrialists wholly, with whom he is associated so closely, said. He objects to our laying stress on two things, I think—heavy industries, and also the public sector. I would like to quote a little about the approach of this Bombay Plan, the industrialists' plan. This Plan argued for a bold approach to economic development with special stress on the growth of heavy and basic industries,

—exactly what the hon. Member Shri Masani objects to—such as power, fuel, steel, machine-building plants etc., in addition to agriculture. They are regarded as being crucial for sustaining the satisfactory growth of the economy. In fact, the need of planning was accepted in it. Of course, they may object to the people who plan. The need for planning was accepted and special stress was laid on heavy industries. The strategy of our plan has been based on this. I need not say much about agriculture because we accept agriculture is the basic thing and it must be helped to advance. Although the results in agriculture have not been so obvious, it has advanced very much and will advance rapidly in view of the change in mentality of our peasantry. Foundations have been laid and if we act upon them the advance should be rapid. We have built up some kind of infra structure in the field of power, transport and technical skills which should help.

13 hrs.

Chiefly criticism has been made of that high priority has been given for basic industries and there was criticism of the rule of the public sector also. Even the Bombay plan of the big industrialists laid great stress on basic industries, as indeed those who study this question must. It is only a political approach which ignores the facts of the situation and which leads astray hon. Members who presumably ought to know better. The role of the public sector—that again is not for me to defend. It has been so often placed before this House and accepted by it that to go through it all again seems rather discourteous to the House. Now, how is the Plan produced? The Planning Commission considers it in great detail. Today, it is working on the Fourth Plan which is to commence years hence. It consults all the States; the officers and

Ministers discuss with them and ultimately a draft is produced and is fully considered and then placed before the National Development Council in which all the States are represented. Then it comes before Parliament finally, probably twice, first the interim draft and then the final Plan. Then it is accepted. It goes through repeated phases of consideration at all levels. Quite apart from the fact that we want the draft interim plan to be considered even by panchayati raj organisations and numerous planning boards or planning committees, people from the universities and others are invited to consider it and send suggestions. Thus in formulating the plan a very large measure of consultation takes place with public men, experts, university people, students, senior students and rural areas and panchayats. Even so, some better method could be evolved to associate the public even more. Undoubtedly the more we bring them into the picture, the better. But the House will realise that the Plan as evolved right from the first Plan onwards is essential, in spite of some people in this House not liking it being called the national Plan.

**Shri Ranga:** Question.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am glad that hon. Acharya displayed that he does not like the Plan; it is well-known; it is notorious. In this matter the hon. Acharya and his few straggling colleagues stand rather isolated. Mr. Masani threatened us that the whole people will rise against us and push us out of seats of authority etc., because of the Plan. What the people will do we shall see. But may I suggest in all humility that now or later or ever they will not come in large numbers to cheer Mr. Masani's gospel whatever happens.

**Shri M. R. Masani:** In Rajkot they did.

**Shri Ranga:** In Chittoor they did, in spite of your colleague on the right.... (Interruptions.)

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The hon. Member has expressed his opinion as I have expressed mine and I too have some knowledge of the Indian people. My point is that planning has not only been accepted by the country and by Parliament once but repeatedly, after full discussion and it is rather odd for this basic thing to be attacked at this stage. Secondly, the strategy of the Plan is a good strategy. There may be many mistakes here and there but you cannot do without the Planning Commission. I would have often criticised it about its bureaucratic tendencies, this and that. I should like here and now to say that I am full of admiration for the work the Planning Commission has done. (Interruptions.) Some things are beyond the understanding of some hon. Members.

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar):** How do bureaucracy and admiration go side by side?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have criticised the growth of bureaucracy, the large numbers, etc. But in the last 12 years the Planning Commission, apart from such mistakes as it has committed—everybody makes mistakes—has performed an essential task; without it we could not have progressed. As my colleague the Finance Minister pointed out, we are a federal structure and it has served to bring the various States together and have an integrated planning. If it had not been there, the Central Government could not have done their job because immediately difficulties would have arisen that the Central Government was encroaching on the rights of the States. It is an advisory body; I repeat it and the States and the Centre can approach them and discuss things with them. Almost everything that they have said about the States is after consideration and after reaching an agreement with the States.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** How can it be advisory when the Prime Minister himself is the Chairman of the

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

Commission? There should be a non-official Chairman, then.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** But surely the Prime Minister is also capable of advising.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** No, no. You are more the executor of the Plan . . . (Interruptions).

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There had been two approaches to the Planning Commission, apart from Mr. Masani's approach which we may ignore as of no importance. One group says that the Planning Commission must consist of Ministers only, and no outsiders. Shri Hanumanthaiya, I think, said that. The other approach is that it should consist of experts only and no Minister should be there. These are contradictory approaches. I think that a Planning Commission consisting of Ministers only would not serve the purpose at all. It cannot function properly, and apart from the fact that the Ministers are heavily worked, they could not approach the States as the Planning Commission does. They cannot sit down and give their whole time to it as the Planning Commission is supposed to do. If you have only experts, that might be possible, but the connection between the Government of the day and the experts would not be a very close one. Therefore, it was advised that the Planning Commission should consist of whole-timers plus two or three members of the Government, members of the Cabinet so that this liaison should be kept up and they should be able to say what the Government's reactions are to various proposals. But essentially it is the permanent members of the Planning Commission, full-time members, who are working hard. I have been Chairman of it. Frankly, I am invited to it once in two months to attend some policy meeting. I go there. I cannot, and it is beyond my capacity to deal with day-to-day problems. The Planning Commission has got a body of advisers, experts, panels and others. It may be that

they can reduce their advisers or it may be that better people can be appointed. But we are considering principles and not individuals.

I think that, first of all, a Planning Commission is absolutely essential. I say we cannot move without it, and if any Government tries to move without it, it will come to trouble. Secondly, broadly, the composition of the Planning Commission as it is, is helpful: that is, a number of whole-time people working and some Ministers associated with it closely, and sometimes other Ministers also are invited when their questions come up. It is helpful. The whole question of the Planning Commission can always be reviewed as to how we can improve it. We propose to review it from time to time; we are doing it.

Here, I would like to pay my tribute to the work done in the Planning Commission by the previous Deputy Chairman, our present Home Minister. He has devoted himself to this work with extreme enthusiasm and devotion and practically built up the Planning Commission.

**Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur):** May I put a question? What is the precise function of our Ministers who are invited to the Planning Commission? What is the exact function of the Ministers: whether they would suggest improvements or supply information or whether they try to supply them with ideas?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Apart from the whole-timers there, only Cabinet Ministers are members there. Their function is exactly the same as that of others, except that they could not afford time. They give certain ideas, and they listen to ideas, and on important matters they give their views or they initiate; they can function like any other member. Normally their function is generally limited to basic matters, that is, they would not normally sit down with the State Minis-

ters and discuss with them and the Planning Commission, which absorbs a great deal of the Planning Commission's time. They join in a discussion of the whole Planning Commission just like any other member. Their views carry weight no doubt but they do not dictate to the Planning Commission. Obviously, in a matter involving finances, the Finance Minister's views carry great weight, but it is not much good that the Planning Commission decides something which cannot be accepted or acted upon by our Finance Minister.

So, it should be remembered that the Planning Commission is an advisory body. But it is true, being an expert body such as it is, its advice carries great weight; its advice given to the States, purely advisory, does carry weight.

I would like to point out one thing even in this. If you plan you must, broadly speaking, know what you are planning for, and whom you are planning for. You must have some picture of the future. Some people who object to planning, presumably have a picture as it is today—there have been gradual improvements here and there, but more or less as it is today; the topdogs remain as topdogs and the bottom-dogs remain at the bottom,—with a little more facilities here and there. That is the essential point: what kind of picture you have for the future. Of course, we can generally say we want good life for all our people. That is a vague statement to which almost anybody would agree. But if you think that out, it ultimately leads you,—it leads me anyhow and I think the great majority in this House and the country—to some kind of socialistic structure of our fabric. Socialism has become, like many other words, rather a vague word. I admit it, because even now some capitalist countries talk about it in their own terms. Even Shri Masani talks about some kind of socialism in which the present order will continue. Now, therefore, we have to put it broadly: we want to plan for a socialist State.

We want to plan for as great a measure of equality as possible. We want to plan for equality of opportunity for everybody in India, and we want to do all this in the democratic structure of the State. I think that we shall succeed. I cannot say how long it will take us.

Meanwhile, naturally, the major problems for us are to increase production; only then can we supply the goods that people want, and keep an eye on distribution so that it should not result in heavy accumulations on the one side and lack of them on the other. These are the broad approaches. We are not tied up to any doctrinaire system of socialism. But these are the broad approaches which I think are fundamental to socialism. These are broad approaches which are accepted now in the greater part of the world and even in the capitalist world, much more so; there is no developing country that I know of which does not accept them. It is inevitable. There is no other way. If we adopted the normal capitalist approach, it would lead us nowhere; I submit to this House with great confidence.

Therefore, we have adopted a mixed structure. We have a private sector and a public sector, the public sector being the most important and dominating the economic policy. Otherwise there is no point in having a public sector helping the private sector because we want all kinds of production; we want it to be helped. As a matter of fact, in our economy, what is the private sector? The whole of our land is private sector. It is an enormous business. All our small industries are very very largely in the private sector. The whole conflict comes—not conflict but a certain pull—in two ways, about certain basic industries which some of the private sector have; some of them want more, because not only they might prove to be very profitable but we give them economic power. I think it is highly objectionable and it ought to be pre-



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

vented, namely, economic power to be in the hands of a small group of persons, however able or good they might be. That is our broad approach. If you put this approach to the Planning Commission, immediately they have to deal with questions of production both in the private sector and public sector, question of preventing accumulations, etc. They have not done that very effectively, I will confess. I hope they will do so in future more effectively and our Government will do so more effectively too, in spite of the difficulties that may arise from hon. Members opposite.

Even in this report, Members have laid great stress on the failures of it. Mr. Masani's view of India today is a very dismal view.

**Shri Tyagi** (Dehra Dun): May I remind him that Mr. Masani was once the closest friend of the Prime Minister and his own disciple?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is not quite correct. But that is the tragedy of it that people can go astray even with the best of tuition. But you can always live in hope. Mr. Masani knows how to change rapidly.

**Shri M. R. Masani:** You have to change with the times; you cannot live in the past.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Quite right.

The planning that we have done in the last few years—not 2½ years only—has created an infra-structure on which we can base progress later on in regard to power, transport and technical skills—it is very important—and has created a climate, if I may remind the House, of unprecedented buoyancy even in our private enterprise. It is well known that private enterprise has prospered as it has never done previously ever since we have planned, for the simple reason that they have certain assured things to aim at and they are profitable.

But as I said even in these 2½ years, we have laid stress on some failures, but rather ignored the success that we have attained even in these 2½ years in many respects. Agriculture is the major thing where we have not succeeded in the last two years for various reasons, some in our control and some not in our control. Agriculture still depends on natural factors, which are not wholly within our control. They can be lessened somewhat. I think we should give very special attention to agriculture, but that is basic. I have mentioned some of these things.

I mentioned the previous Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission and expressed my admiration for the work he has done for planning. I should like to welcome the new Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission.

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav** (Barabanki): Political corruption!

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The philosophy guiding the Swatantra Party is, I think, that of free enterprise and free market forces. The influence of free market forces is quite inadequate to reflect the true needs of a community where millions have no employment or no income to make their needs felt. But even if market reflects to some extent the current demands, it does not reflect the changing needs of the future, which is desired to be greatly different from the present. The view of those who believe wholly in free enterprise is a static view or is a very slowly changing view. Where you require rapid changes in the social framework, it is wholly inapplicable and it can only produce possibly social disaster in the end.

I should like the House to remember what we have to contend against. We argue about things, but we have to contend against in India something which no other country has to contend against; that is, social habits and

practices, which come in the way of planning or progress. They are changing, I admit. But it is a terrible obstruction, in which possibly all of us will agree that trying to change the social habits of 450 million people is a big job. We have, I think, by planning in these years and by this progressive industrialisation and community development, tackled that problem somewhat indirectly and with some success.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Have a clean and efficient administration also.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I entirely agree with the hon. Member, but I would say—I say so with some confidence—that all this talk of corruption in India is exaggerated.

**Some Hon. Members:** No; no.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Ghosts of Jaipur!

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am not denying it; I think we should deal with it with all strength. But I would like hon. Members just to compare it with what is happening in the United States of America, the richest country. I can name many other countries.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : भ्रगर वहां कृष्णन है तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि यहां जो कृष्णन है, उसको आप जस्टीफाई करें।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am not justifying it. I am saying that the general attitude of Members opposite is to create an atmosphere of frustration in the country in regard to planning, in regard to progress, and it is not good. We have taken up an enormous task, tremendously big task and that requires public appreciation and public support. If one creates an atmosphere of frustration all round, it is obvious that if the hon. Members themselves are frustrated, they cannot bring about any radiance in other people. They must change their own frustrated minds first.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Eliminate corrupt minds first.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am not accusing hon. Members with corrupt mind.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** You referred to frustration on this side. Eliminate corrupt mind on that side first; otherwise your Plan will fail, I warn you.

**Shri Tyagi:** Let us co-operate.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : आपका खर्चा ज्यादा है।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Here we are engaged, as everyone knows, in a tremendous task, a task which is almost unparalleled in history, partly because of the bigness of the country with large population and also because we almost started from scratch. After the British left, we were so low down. Hon. Members have sometimes quoted our place in the statistical tables of other countries, our annual income, and per capita income which is very low undoubtedly. Why is it so low? It is because we started with this very very low position. And with all these practices—and we have to break conventions which come in the way—we have to change all these and we are changing them with some rapidly. This was a task before us and this is a task before us: low income and gross poverty. (*Interruption*).

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir):** There is running commentary going on. What is all this?

**An Hon. Member:** You are adding to it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I referred a little while ago to the Bombay Plan. I am sorry, I just found a passage from it. I will read it out for the benefit of some Members opposite. This was written 20 years ago. About half a dozen or ten, the biggest industrialists in India then and now were interested in it.



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

"It is an important part of our proposals regarding industrial development that in the initial stages, the attention should be directed primarily to the creation of industries for the production of power and capital goods. Nothing has more seriously hindered the development of India's industrial resources than the absence of these basic industries and we consider it essential that this lapse should be remedied in as short a time as possible. Apart from its importance of quickening the pace of industrial development in India, it will have the effect of ultimately reducing our dependence on foreign countries for plant and machinery required by us and consequently of reducing our requirements of external finance."

I hope that hon. Members opposite the Swatantra Party will ponder over what some of the people they admire greatly have said about it.

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta:** There was also a Gandhian Plan of Shri Sriman Narayanji. He is a Member of the Planning Commission now.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Planning, as has been said, is a continuous process. What is done today bears fruit much later. Thus, the habit of viewing the success of the Plan in relation to the target of a particular year betrays a lack of understanding of the dynamic processes of development, as in the very next year sometimes the target may be exceeded. The lessons have to be drawn are, the need for strengthening technical organisations for detailed planning and execution of projects and the necessity for advanced planning to take full account of the inevitable time-lags. This is, if I may say so, one of the failure of our planning in the past that projects have not been technically examined at an early enough stage and also perspective

planning has not been thought of as much as it should be. Now, to some extent we are doing it because, as I said, the Fourth Plan is being considered now and the consideration means most careful working out of the Plan. It is not a question of putting down big schemes—do this and do that—but each scheme, each project, is being worked out in smallest detail as to how many engineers will be employed there, what class of engineers, how many scientists should be there and all that. That has to be done and ought to be done for every project. These are the major lessons apart from the many other improvements that we should try to make. But we must strengthen technical organisation for detailed planning and execution of projects. I have not referred to the fact that—we plan here—the States' planning structure are rather not very advanced and it is the States who have to deal with these things that are planned and we have to try to improve the planning in the States. I will draw the special attention of the House to perspective planning—planning is, in effect, perspective planning; only it should be more perspective than as hitherto is being done.

Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain referred very specially, I think, to family planning and that only two pages are devoted to it in this report. I do not quite understand him. I am all in favour of family planning. But how this report should have dealt with, in ten or twenty or hundred pages, I do not understand. As a matter of fact, at the present moment there is a conference being held in Vigyan Bhavan which I had the honour to inaugurate yesterday. It is the first Asian Population Conference; it is the first conference of this kind ever held anywhere dealing with population problems. It appears that except one country which has gone ahead in Asia—possibly elsewhere too—that is Japan, the next in Asia which has done most in the matter is India.

That is one reason why they have held the conference here and many people want to know what we are doing, what success we have attained, etc. I think, we have made considerable progress, basic progress, although naturally the success you can measure only after a number of years and India is such a huge country that every work that you may do is lost in the multitude of the human beings here.

**Shri Karni Singhji (Bikaner):** Is the Prime Minister satisfied that the family planning message has actually reached the masses? I think, very few people know about it.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have just said that in India the population is so big and in such matters so ignorant that most messages only reach a relatively small number compared to the population. But, I think, the progress made here is not unsatisfactory and, if I may say so, the family planning is not the business of putting up a factory to produce certain contraceptive devices. Here, any question of birth control is intimately connected with education.

**Shri Karni Singhji:** The message of family planning has to reach the masses. They have to believe that it is wrong in our present high increase context to have too many children.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I entirely agree with the hon. Member. It is also to reach the people who are supposed to be not the masses but the classes. Even they have not got it yet.

**Shri Karni Singhji:** Everybody.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** What I am saying is that the essential condition of birth control, etc., on a big scale is education and a certain economic status and a certain growth in our economy.

**Shri Karni Singhji:** Our news reels carry no such message. There must be something in the news reels also.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Any apparatus, any method, as I was discussing the other day, costs about Rs. 4 or Rs. 5 a month. Can you ask the masses of India to spend Rs. 5 a month? There the difficulty arises. It has to be cheap and some measure of education is necessary not only to understand it but even to use any method.

I would like to tell Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain that a good deal of research work has been done in India—good research work.

**Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur):** That is not what the mid-term appraisal says.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not remember what the report says. But a good deal of research work has been done; maybe, it should be more. But we are one of the countries where research work has been done apart from the Rockefeller Foundation in America and one or two other countries.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Only on chemical contraceptives.

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta:** Has the message reached the Members of the Lok Sabha at least?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There is one thing that I should say where I am disappointed, if I am disappointed at anything; we should, of course, try our hardest. But I am specially disappointed in regard to agriculture, although I do believe that seeds have been sown which will show results and rapid results in the future. But, on the whole, looking at the picture I am not at all dismal about it; I am not at all disappointed about it. Only, many difficulties appear which we had not seen previously. We have to face them.

**Shri Maurya (Aligarh):** You may be disappointed or not, Government may be disappointed or not, but the farmers and the landless labourers are disappointed just like anything.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** No doubt, the hon. Member has helped in that disappointment.

**Shri Tyagi:** Is there any intention to make a village-wise survey of the possibilities?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** What I was going to say was this. One thing that distresses me very greatly is that although I am convinced that the great majority of our population has bettered itself, may be, a little, and is better and is eating much more food than before and has more calories and more clothes, yet, there is a goodly number of people in India who have not profited by planning, and whose poverty is abysmal and most painful, and I do think that some method should be found to remedy the situation. The normal planner proceeds like this; he makes a theoretical approach. It is very good in theory, but it sometimes ignores certain human factors. He says that on this thing we want production, and the best way to have production is to do something, say, to put up a factory or something in a place where it will yield most results. The result is that they go on gathering these factories and things like that in the special places. And as they gather things, it becomes easier to start another factory there. That may be logical, and they may produce more, but it is not very human, considering the size of India.

Also, I begin to think more and more of Mahatma Gandhi's approach. It is odd that I am mentioning his name in this connection; that is to say, I am entirely an admirer of the modern machine, and I want the best machinery and the best technique, but taking things as they are in India, however rapidly we advance in the machine age—and we will do so—the fact remains that large numbers of our people are not touched and will not be touched by it for a consider-

able time. Some other method has to be evolved so that they become partners in production even though the production apparatus of theirs may not be efficient as compared to modern technique, but we must use that, otherwise it is wasted. That idea has to be borne in mind. We should think more of these very poor countrymen of ours and do something to improve their lot as quickly as we can. That is troubling me a great deal.

Ultimately, it is a question mostly of the agricultural masses, and I think that agriculture, unless it is allied to some other industry, will often not bring rapid results. I think that animal husbandry is one thing which has to progress and which can be allied to agriculture. Also, there can be small industries there. There are many things that can be done, and we hope we shall try to do that. But I hope that the House would remember the magnitude of the task before us. It is stupendous, and we must approach it in the proper spirit. We should not approach it with frustrated minds. That is not the way to approach any task, especially the biggest task. But we have to approach it with confidence, with strength and with a belief in our people and we should try to put this faith across to them, and if we have it in an ample measure, they will also be affected and they will also get it. Of course, we should try to learn all the lessons from this report and from other sources as to how to improve this method of planning, because without planning I do not think that we shall make any real progress, certainly not the kind of progress that we desire.

**Shri Ranga:** I am extremely sorry that the Prime Minister's speech has been so disappointing. He is talking of frustration, but his whole speech breathes of frustration. He talks of disappointment. But what else is it but disappointment that we derive from the speech that he has made