

श्री सरजू पांडे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उत्तर प्रदेश में प्रेसिडेंट्स रूल हैं। गाजीपुर की पुलिस ने एक कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के कार्यकर्ता के घर को बन्द कर दिया है। उसका सारा घर लूट लिया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि होम मिनिस्टर से आप इस के ऊपर बयान दिलवाइए, वह इस की सफाई करें।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Sir, taking the opportunity of rule 377, the Members on that side make false allegations. It is the responsibility of the Member concerned to prove the allegation. Yesterday, the hon. Member, Shri Phool Chand Verma, made an allegation that the DAVP has spent Rs. 5 lakhs in connection with the University students' elections. It is a baseless and false allegation; it is without any foundation or truth. I challenge the hon. Member; the Member has to prove it. Let him apologise. He must apologise for the allegation. It is a false and baseless allegation. It is their responsibility to prove it. This forum must not be misused; they are misusing this forum. (*Interruptions*).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कभी कभी सोचता हूँ कि आप क्यों ऐसा करते हैं? मैं इतना खुश हुआ आज कि आखिरकार कोई बात तो आज आई है, नेशनल प्लान पर बहस होनी है, अब उस पर भी आप उसी तरह कर रहे हैं? आप को तो खुश होना चाहिए कि नेशनल प्लान आज आ रहा है। लेकिन और बातों में लगे हुए हैं। पार्लियामेंट इज मेट फार ब्राडर इशूज।

(SHRI D. P. DHAR): I beg to move:

"That this House do consider the 'Approach to the Fifth Plan 1974-79', laid on the Table of the House on the 20th February, 1973."

At the outset I should very respectfully beg to share your feelings that a discussion on this very important and significant document which relates to the future of our country has at long last been possible in this House. I had hoped and I had wished that this discussion should have taken place a little earlier but that was not to be and that is why at the present moment I am presenting this paper under the burden of a few constraints.

In the first instance, as I said, it is rather late to discuss this approach paper, but none the less it is a matter of pleasure and privilege for me that an opportunity has been afforded. Late, because we are almost in the process of completing the draft plan; and we shall therefore have the added pleasure and privilege of taking into account the valuable suggestions and opinions which this hon. House may express, so that as far as is within our power we shall try to incorporate them and give them a position of significance and honour in the planning process itself.

We are meeting today under some what altered circumstances since the plan approach was framed. There have been changes in the domestic scene and there have been more significant and more disquieting changes in the global scene. It is against this background that we have to examine the basis and validity and relevance of the postulates that underlie the plan document.

As is well known, the approach document has two aspects. In the first instance, it enumerates as clearly as possible the objectives which we seek to achieve and the strategies which are necessary for achieving those objectives. Secondly, we have also endeavoured to work out details, targets and programmes and

12.20 hrs.

MOTION RE: APPROACH TO THE
FIFTH PLAN

THE MINISTER OF PLANNING

[Shri D. P. Dhar]

other institutional reforms so that we are able, in concrete terms, to achieve the objectives that have been set forth in this approach document.

As I submitted, the state of our economy has undergone a considerable change. It has been going through very severe stresses and strains and it is very natural therefore for us to take these changes and stresses and difficulties into account, because we cannot forget that even though these difficulties might appear to be of short-term duration and they may appear to be temporary in character, they are bound to affect in some degree and to some extent the formulations of tomorrow.

What are the most prominent changes or stresses which the economy has undergone during the last year or so? In the first instance, many difficulties have arisen as a result of a lean and very unfavourable agricultural year. We have had a considerable diminution in the overall production in the agricultural sector. This, along with several other factors—but this being the basis offender in this game—has led to the spiralling of prices and they have galloped for quite some time. This in itself has not only caused suffering to many sections of our people but has also had rather deleterious effects on our economy.

Secondly, the position has been made somewhat more difficult, the position has aggravated somewhat, because of the high prices which quite a large number of commodities which we import have recorded in the world market. As I put it one day, there has been literally an invasion of high prices from abroad on our domestic economy. This has been particularly noticeable in food. This then is another source of agony, this then is another source which is having its inevitable consequences on the state of our economy. The other factor which has been responsible for

these imbalances has been due to the existence of a very large liquidity in the system. And, this has led to its own results. I do not want to repeat at any great length these various factors, because they have been discussed in one form or the other in this august House on several occasions before. These then are the three factors which we have to take into account in assessing, if I may submit with all respect, the validity and the relevance of the fundamental strategy of the approach document.

As far as agriculture is concerned, we have mentioned in the approach document that it is absolutely essential that the production in this sector has to be increased substantially, that investments have to be made so that we are able to increase the production of particularly those items of agricultural commodities which have lent themselves to a sharp rise in prices. This has been stated in the approach document and this has been repeated by us during the various exercises that we have undertaken and its relevance becomes all the more important today because of the traumatic experience through which the people of this country have passed as a result of weather aberrations and its consequential harmful effects on agricultural production.

We have not only to think in terms of greater production but we have also to ensure that what we produce is made available to the people, that the poorer, vulnerable sections of our society get the fruits of the large investments that we make in agriculture, that the food we produce, the articles of daily consumption, eatables, the bare necessities of life in which there is a substantial augmentation of production, do really reach the hands of the people who need them. Therefore, the suggestion which was made in the approach document, that this country has to rely upon a healthy effective and efficient distribution system, has been

emphasised and has been vindicated by the experience that we have gone through recently. Not only that. This distribution system must not be left to the tender mercies of the speculative, profiteering elements of our society....

SHRI PILOO MODY: Or the crooked elements of our society.

SHRI D. P. DHAR: I am glad you have brought a new dimension to this definition, which is very relevant.

SHRI PILOO MODY. I just included him also

SHRI D. P. DHAR: If you are talking purely literally, it is difficult for you to bend and it is not my habit even with regard to a friend to be uncharitable in the use of language. I repeat for the sake of my dear friend, Shri Piloo Mody, that the slogans of free market are all right; that the slogans that crooks as well as profiteers and blackmarketeers should have a free field-day in this country is all right, but not if you have to achieve two basic purposes. I am not bringing in any ideology; I am only mentioning the specific needs of the situation in this country. These two specific basic needs are, firstly, that we have got to feed the vulnerable sections of our people, whether they are in towns, or landless labour or marginal farmers in the villages and rural areas. This is the responsibility of the society. This is the responsibility of Government. This is what has been stated in the approach paper, and the situation that has developed unfortunately has vindicated this position.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): It is nothing new.

SHRI D. P. DHAR: But if we reiterate our faith in something good, that should not be pooh-poohed; that should be welcomed.

The other thing I submit for your kind consideration is that we should

procedure sufficient quantities of food indigenously, within the bounds of this country in order to feed this system. Otherwise, we are going to plan for utter poverty, for a system which will be always dependent upon alien and foreign mercies.

The other thing that has been said with regard to agriculture in the approach paper—I think it is equally valid today—is that we have to release the creative energies of rural India, and these energies cannot be released merely by empty slogans. These energies can be released by effective implementation of land reforms. I am not thinking, again, of land reforms in terms of social justice or bringing the much needed succour and help to the deprived sections of our society in rural India. I am thinking of land reforms as a basic instrument of restructuring our society in rural India, so that the creative energies of our millions are released for greater production and greater prosperity.

This is the other element that has been mentioned in the Approach document. As we are discussing the Approach document, I have no wish, no desire, to enter into controversies. I am only stating what has been stated in the document, what in the opinion of the Planning Commission, what in the opinion of the Government of India and what in the opinion of the National Development Council is of relevance and validity for our conditions.

The second matter that has been stated in the Approach document and to which I would draw the special attention of you, Sir, and the hon. Members of this August House, is our emphasis on the core sector. When we said this at the time of the formulation of the Approach paper, at the time this paper was made public, quite a number of voices were raised, not only criticisms but even in derision of this objective. Today, as I

submitted, the market conditions in the world, the price situation in the world, has again brought home to us the need and significance of laying more emphasis than we had even in the Approach Paper, on the development of the core sector.

I will give only one example, with your permission, Sir, of a few items. The trade terms today are so heavily unfavourable to developing countries that it is a source of great concern to all of us and it should be a source of great concern not only to this side of the House but also to the other side of the House. As I submitted a little earlier, the foodgrain prices in the world market have recorded an all-time record. The prices of steel which we import, the prices of fertilisers which we import, the prices of oil which we import, have risen phenomenally. Therefore, it is bound to have a very serious effect on the balance of payments situation. When, occasionally, we refer to the developments in the global context, sometimes, this aspect of the matter is not clearly appreciated.

What is the lesson that we have to draw from this? The only lesson that we can draw from it, as was indicated in the Approach document even before the prices of these various commodities touched these high levels, is that we have got to acquire self-reliance and self-sufficiency. That is why a considerable investment has been designed in these sectors. I submit with all respect that the importance of developing heavier industries in the core sector, the need for bringing greater efficiency into the functioning of the core sector, is absolutely imperative for the survival of this nation as a free and a dignified entity.

The third matter of the high importance that has been mentioned in the Approach paper related to the question, the objective, of removal of poverty and reduction of unemployment. In the matter of unemployment the Approach paper said and, with

all respect, I reiterate the logic and the wisdom, if I may say so, of this strategy that, in the first instance, there must be a fuller land-use by institutional arrangements.

I did mention that one of the most important arrangements is land reforms and tenancy protection, etc. But, apart from that, better land utilisation has also been conceived in specific programmes of area development, of improving some of our chronically drought-prone areas, of bringing special programmes to relieve the difficulties and poverty of the marginal farmers of small farmers, and these programmes have been worked out and will be adequately listed and quantified in the Draft Plan which, as I submitted, is *lovely*—to be ready fairly soon.

As far as the question of unemployment and removal of unemployment is concerned, we also have said in the Approach Document and I think there is no escape from accepting this—namely, to endeavour to have an accelerated rate of growth. We have postulated a 5.5 per cent rate of growth. There is a criticism that this is an unattainable objective. It has been said that the rate of growth should be somewhat lower. But when this criticism is levelled against the Approach Document, I would like those friends to give us the benefit of an alternative solution to some of the basic things that we have got to deal with. What effect will it have on employment? What effect will it have on our balance-of-payments situation? What effect will it have on our objectives of achieving self-reliance and self-sufficiency? What effect will it have on the question of raising production in this country?

Therefore, it is our humble view in the Planning Commission that to aim for a lower rate of growth is to aim for a mediocre remedy, an inadequate remedy for some of the big problems which this country is facing.

The second thing, as I submitted, is the large expansion of employment opportunities for the common man so that there will be a larger and more diffused and widespread generation of incomes. We have also conceived in the Approach Paper that essential social consumptions apart from private consumption have got to be provided, like health, education, drinking water, etc., we have also said that priority has to be given to the production of articles of mass consumption to match the new incomes. Here, I would like to venture to offer a word of explanation. In the Approach Paper we have said that the pattern of consumption has got to be somewhat altered. 'Somewhat' perhaps may be an euphemistic way of saying. It has to be basically altered. We have to think of an unknown commodity called the consumer who is not given what he needs.

Therefore, the emphasis in the entire process of production is to shift to the production to the manufacture of articles of mass consumption. They have to shift from the production of commodities of elitist consumption. Perhaps this may deprive quite a number of our friends a small luxury like eating a chocolate or two.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is only children who eat chocolates.

SHRI D. P. DHAR: But there are some overgrown children also.

Nevertheless, this is imperative. But, apart from this, my submission is that the Approach Document ventures to submit this with all humility but with all seriousness, that the time has come when the distortions which have entered into our productive system have to be removed, not only removed but the productive system itself has to aim at drastically different objectives entirely. This, I submit should be continuously made, whatever one may say.

The other factor which I mentioned was this. The other difficulty as I said, was born out of the excess liquidity in the market. We have said in the Approach Paper and our apprehensions, our fears have been borne out by facts, that any deficit financing which is not relatable to production in real terms, will cause inflation and, therefore, will be one of the direct causes of high prices. We have, therefore, re-emphasized the need for keeping the deficit financing at the lowest possible level. As a matter of fact we are revising the figures which have been postulated in the Approach Document with regard to deficit financing in the lower direction. And this is absolutely essential....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): But the trend is in the higher direction.

SHRI D. P. DHAR: The trend, with all respect to Shyamnandan Babu, is not in the higher direction. Perhaps you, as an economist of note, would agree that never before....

AN HON. MEMBER: Acha.

SHRI D. P. DHAR: Well, I must submit that I, in all humility—and I do have humility fortunately do believe that one has to learn a good deal from Shyamnandan Babu.

Therefore, I would draw his very kind attention to one or two facts which perhaps may not substantiate the observation which he was pleased to make a little while ago, that there is a trend in the upward direction. It has never happened in this country that at one go, expenditure has been reduced by Rs. 400 crores. It has never happened in this country that Rs. 300 crores were just impounded from the institutions. It has not happened so far....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: But you have already incurred Rs. 350 crores of deficit financing.

SHRI D. P. DHAR: I am talking of the remedial aspect.

[Shri D. P. Dhar]

Therefore, while the hon Member is perfectly at liberty to be critical, as far as the level or the size of deficit financing is concerned—the hon Member is perfectly at liberty to question the justification—I think that justification was unavoidable, it was an unalterable justification for having had to indulge in this size of deficit financing. He is perfectly at liberty to question that, question our premises, on which that deficit financing was based. But he, at the same time, I am sure, will have the charity to concede that the measures which were taken are of a substantial character. I am afraid of using the word, revolutionary, so that, it does not hurt some sentiments of a revolutionary type. Therefore, Sir, this is, by and large the framework of the Approach Document which I have had the privilege of presenting for the consideration of the august house.

I had a few Substitute Motions and I pondered very sincerely and very objectively on the contents of those Motions—particularly the one which was rather drastic in the use of its language, namely, that the Paper, the Approach Document, should be scrapped. On the contrary, I felt, after viewing the economic situation—no doubt a difficult situation, which should cause all of us concern,—after looking at it ruthlessly and dispassionately, I have not been able to find a better approach to meet this situation even under the altered circumstances, than the one which has been elaborated in this Document.

Of course, there can be modifications, there can be changes, and suggestions to that effect would be most welcome. That is what we are concerned with. But I cannot conceive of any alteration in the fundamentals of this approach I cannot conceive of altering the very basis on which the structure of this Approach has been built.

Sir, Planning is a difficult process. It is not merely an expenditure programme. It is not merely putting together of Budgets of States and the Centre for five years. The most important factor, the central factor, which should occupy the mind of every economist, every politician, every hon. Member of the House is the future of the Man in India. It is that future that has got to be safeguarded. It is that future for which we plan, I must caution Hon. Members that there are no soft options, if I may say so. Options are hard. Choices are difficult. And, this Honourable House will be called upon to make hard and difficult choices.

We have only indicated the framework of a policy. When the policies are actually spelt out in the Draft Plan, where they will be spelt out, they where they will be spelt put, they will be very drastic; they will be very severe and they will be very demanding. But I have no doubt in my mind that our faith in our people in our system, should enable us to make this choice and to succeed to serve the objectives that I have very briefly elaborated here.

Sir, I do not want to take any more time of the hon House.

With these words, I again commend the document for the kind consideration of this august House.

MR SPEAKER: Motion moved

"That this House do consider the 'Approach to the Fifth Plan 1974-79', laid on the Table of the House on the 20th February, 1973."

There are a large number of Speakers on both sides. So, what I propose to do is that, I shall call the first Member from the Opposition and the first Member from the Treasury Bench who can take twenty minutes each. But, all the other Members from the Treasury Bench will not take more than seven to ten minutes each.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Give us fifteen minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: This is what is suggested by your party.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: May I make one submission on the discussion on the Approach Paper? The discussion might be permitted to go to the next session. Let us have a full and detailed discussion as much as possible. Otherwise this five or ten minutes will not do. Our no-confidence motion is not coming up on the 5th Sept.

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you at pains since yesterday to give all explanations for not bringing in the no-confidence motion?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Shri Bhagat also says that it has happened in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Samar Mukherjee, Your party is allocated 39 minutes. You may take it yourself or give some share to others.

Before that, there are substitute motions. Are you moving them? Shri Mavalankar is not present in the House. (Interruptions) Excepting him, I take it that all the others are moving them (Interruptions).

How can I take the motion as moved when Shri Mavalankar is not present?

The time allocation is as follows:—

C.P.M.	39 minutes.
C.P.I.	37 minutes.
J.S.	34 minutes.
D.M.K.	34 minutes.
Congress	9 hours.

Of course, the Congress has got quite a good share.

U.I.P.G.	23 minutes.
Congress (O)	21 minutes.
Swatantra	11 minutes.
S.P.	8 minutes.
Unattached	23 minutes.

That is all I have to say. Now you may move your Substitute motions.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I beg to move.

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Approach to the Fifth Plan 1974—79', laid on the Table of the House on the 20th February, 1973, recommends that in view of the changed economic context, the present approach document be rejected and a new approach document formulated to suit the changing economic conditions and requirements". (1)

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Madras South): I beg to move:

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Approach to the Fifth Plan 1974—79', laid on the Table of the House on the 20th February, 1973, recommends that in view of the mounting unemployment, under-employment and hidden unemployment, the present approach document be remoulded and a new approach document be formulated to provide for full-employment in our Federation". (2).

DR LAXMINARAIN PANDEYA: (Mandsaur): I beg to move:

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Approach to the Fifth Plan 1974—79', laid on the Table of the House on the 20th February, 1973, recommends that in view of imbalanced development of urban and rural areas, fast increasing poverty and mounting unemployment, the present approach document be radically overhauled and

[Dr. Laxminarain Pandeya]

a new document be prepared in order to provide equal opportunities for the development of urban and rural areas, check mounting unemployment so that the said document may fulfil the hopes and aspirations of the people in the context of the changing social and economic conditions of to-day". (3).

SHRI S. M. SIDDAYYA (Chamarajanagar): I beg to move:

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Approach to the Fifth Plan 1974—79', laid on the Table of the House on the 20th February, 1973, recommends that—

(a) Rs. 1350 crores be allotted to the Government of Mysore for plan expenditure and Rs. 337 crores under the non-plan expenditure;

(b) in view of the little change in the socio-economic conditions of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, the present approach document be radically overhauled and a new document be prepared in order to dovetail a separate Five Year Plan for the development of these backward communities within the framework of the national Plan and State Plans with clear cut physical and financial targets for their all round development and to provide for a definite Social Policy Resolution for implementation as a time bound programme;

(c) prohibition be introduced throughout the country;

(d) the active participation of the representatives of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the formation of the Plan at all stages be ensured for its success and implementation and at least Rs. 500 crores for Scheduled Castes and Rs. 750

crores for Scheduled Tribes be set apart for their welfare in the Fifth Plan;

(e) Planning Commission and the Central Government should ensure that the benefits intended to flow to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes actually flow from the general sector schemes and any reduction in the expenditure on plan schemes due to economy measures does not affect the schemes for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes; and

(f) the scheme of post-matric scholarships be immediately reviewed with a view to linking the quantum of scholarships with the rise in cost of living and to abolish the means test in the case of Scheduled Castes and legislative and executive measures be taken to abolish scavenging in the country". (5).

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Samar Mukherjee.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): Mr. Speaker, Sir, now this approach document is being discussed in a bit of new context when the country is passing through an unprecedented price rise.

13.00 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Now, we had more than six months time to test the main premises formulated in the approach as well as the basis thereof. The approach to the Fifth Plan has been prepared on the basis that there should be stability of prices. But the course of development during the last six months has shown that this basis or premise of stability of prices has absolutely gone. Again, the approach has been based on the fact that there should be more

and more self-reliance, and our dependence on imports will be reduced, but again the course of development during the last six months has proved that that basis has also gone, because the hon. Minister has told us just now that there has been price invasion from the international world, and in the matter of imports of every item, whether it be steel, fertiliser or oil, there has been hike of price-rise and the imbalance between imports and exports is increasing. So, our dependence on imports is not being reduced but on the contrary it is increasing.

The hon. Minister said that though there were some distortions in the various formulations, the basis of the Plan was sound. Here lies our main criticism. The basis of the Plan is absolutely the old basis; it is not a new basis on which our entire society has to run. The Plan has been prepared within the framework of the system in which we are now living. That system is the capitalist system which has led from capitalism to monopoly capitalism. The exploitation by the feudal forces in the villages has still very dominant and has not gone. Unless the fundamental basis is changed unless there is complete elimination of the exploitation by the feudal forces over land, unless there is complete elimination of domination and particularly the element of economy will not come out of its present crisis.

The crisis in our economy is not an accident and it is not an isolated thing. It is the logical result of the system of exploitation under which capitalism has been built up and the capitalist economy has developed. So the idea that this crisis is a passing phase is absolutely a wrong idea. Our economy will be faced with more and more crises and the crisis is bound to get accentuated further so long as the old property relations remain intact and Government refuse to make any vital break-through in those property relations. They have refused to

attack monopoly capitalism, they have refused to attack the feudal forces; they have refused to attack the imperialist assistance to our economy and our dependence on them. 26 years of Congress rule has failed to complete the tasks of the democratic revolution, namely the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks. Still, they are carrying the old heritage of the old imperialist and feudal exploitation, though they have tried to modify it to a certain extent. That is why the crisis is precipitating. It has accentuated and it is bound to grow more and more.

The Minister has said that now the invasion of price rise has come from outside. That is the global invasion. In the newspapers, the report has come out that there has been a global rise in prices. That is true. But also in that news you might have seen that price rise is a phenomenon in the capitalist world. There have been figures to show how much rise there has been in France and other countries, but also there is a report from the communist countries. "The picture is difficult to analyse. The reports from Soviet Union, German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria indicate that the food prices with Government control have remained stable." Why is it a different picture? This shows that there is price rise only in the capitalist countries. Because you are depending on the capitalist countries in the international field, and that is why you are to bear the brunt of this price hike.

In China, what is the position? There is a report that in China, despite drought, there has been a vast improvement in the agricultural sector. In the current year, China's foodgrains production is expected to reach a level of 250 million tonnes. Some people have come back from China. Dr. B.K. Bosu, who was a member of the Medical Mission, has recently come back and he has given a statement to the newspaper that in

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

China there is no food scarcity, no food problem, and that the people are getting sufficient quantity of food at the cheapest prices

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): They made a massive import.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Dr. Basu has made it clear that the entire import that China has made is for supplying the Vietnamese to help the Vietnamese liberation struggle. (Interruption). Even if it is accepted that China imported, there has been no rise in price. In China, despite deficit, despite import, there has been no rise in price. Why? Why is it possible in China and not possible in India? Because in India you are building up a capitalist system, and in China they have developed a socialist system.

It has been the argument advanced by the Minister by the ruling Congress, that because of a war with Pakistan, because of some other extraneous factors, there has been so much price rise, deficit financing, inflation and all these. That is why we are not able to control the price and corruption, he said. But here is the report in this weeks Blitz, a report from A. Raghavan who has come from Vietnam. He writes that there are no hoarders or profiteers in Vietnam, where there is heavy bombing going on. They are in the midst of a serious life and death struggle. "While I was waiting at the State Bank to change some money, an Arab diplomat asked me 'How long I had been in Hanoi.' 'I was a lucky man,' he said, for, he had been sweating it out for months with no posh restaurant, no night-clubs, nothing whatever, to cater to the creature comforts of the diplomatic community."

"The Viet-Namese are adequately fed and modestly clothed. Everybody gets his or her quota of rice, quota of sugar, etc. all of which are strictly

rationed. No problem of hoarders and profiteers in North Viet-Nam. Adults get 20 kg. of rice each and the price of 10 kg. of rice is 4 dong, that is Rs. 8." In the newspaper report it appears that in South Viet Nam the prices of vegetables have increased in one year by 140 per cent in Saigon. How different it is in North Viet-Nam? Why? Because they are developing a different social system, socialism there lies the departure, the breakthrough. You are talking of democratic socialism, but not practising. You are defending all the big business, hoarders and profiteers. Vegetables in saigon cost 140 per cent more than a year ago. That is in South Viet-Nam where all types of exploitation and corruption are there. Society is corrupt to the core because at the helm of affairs are capitalists, hoarders and landlords and vested interests. They are acting as stooges and handmaids of American imperialism.

There is a report in *Economic Times* which says that 'profits keep soaring'. It says that a study by *Economic Times* of profits and dividends reveals that more than 100 companies have retained their pre-tax profits of more than one crore each during 1972-73. Many companies had profits in the region of or exceeding 4 crores. What is interesting is, it says that among those who return larger profits are units with foreign collaboration, or foreign equity and managerial control. You should keep in mind these words. The *Economic Times* says:

"Where bonus issues are made in lieu of higher dividends it is obvious that the aggregate repatriation of profits by way of dividends tends to be larger in the subsequent years. It is astonishing that all these devices escape the assertedly vigilant eyes of the Controller of Capital Issues. And so the drain on foreign reserves at a critical juncture in our economy goes almost unnoticed."

What about foreign companies? It says:

"Foreign controlled companies which have declared high rates of dividend are Godfrey Phillip (35 per cent); Food Specialities (25 per cent); Phillips India (24 per cent) CAFI (25 per cent) and ESSO (81.25 per cent)"

This is the economy you are building and you are claiming that you are leading the country towards socialism. This is nothing but a hoax. You are defending vested interests but are trying to cover it up with this type of slogans, you are cheating the people in this way. The very basis of the Fifth Plan is exploitation, it is exploitation-based. In the first para of the basic objectives, you say that the establishment of a fully democratic socialist society has been accepted as the goal. But what is the performance? These are the results of your performance; I read out to you just now.

You have said that removal of poverty and attainment of economic self-reliance are the two major objectives which the country is set out to accomplish. But this is not new. This is the same thing you declared in your Bhubaneswar resolution. This is the same as the objectives of the first, second, third and fourth five year plans. The result of these plans after 26 years is that the disparity has further grown. In your approach paper you have admitted that disparity has grown. Those who have prepared the document have developed certain logics and counterpoised two variants of two models. They have said categorically that if the 1968-69 variant is accepted, the more the plan develops, the more disparity grows. This is written here. That means, you are accepting that during the four five year plans, disparity has been growing. But the objective you have declared is removal of disparity.

You want to remove poverty. Certainly that should be the main objective, but really within the frame-

work of these property relations or production relations, can you remove poverty? You cannot do so unless this very system is fundamentally and basically changed. Land ceiling legislations have been adopted in 1953-54, but what about their execution? Here comes the report of the Planning Commission's Task Force on Agrarian Relations. This report was submitted after the approach document was submitted. In this report, the task force has said:

"Thus, the overall assessment has to be that programmes of land reform adopted since independence have failed to bring about the required changes in the agrarian sector."

This is the admission of this task force. They have further stated which type of democracy we are building in the villages.

"In the context of socio-economic conditions prevailing in the rural areas of our country, no tangible progress can be expected in the field of land reforms in the absence of the requisite political will. The sad truth is that this crucial factor has been wanting."

It is wanting because those who are at the helm of affairs are directly linked up with the vested interests. So, the class character of the Government is clear. It is a landlord capitalist Government led by big bourgeois. Here is definite proof of that.

"The sad truth is, in no sphere of public activity in our country since independence has the hiatus between precept and practice, between policy pronouncements and actual execution, been as great as in the domain of land reforms."

So, your professions are very good, but your performance is just the contrary. That is why this plan is bound to fail. Again there will be a reproduction of the existing relations of production that means there will further disparity between the affluent sections and common masses, between

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

the rich and the poor. It is inevitable. The result is that the economy will have to pass through bigger and bigger crisis; it is not a temporary phenomenon, a passing thing. So, the time has come for some hard thinking.

Your Approach to the Plan is based on the calculation that there will be stability in price. It is something which has already been blown up. Your objective is to raise the standard of living of the 30 per cent of the people who are at the bottom to a level which is above the poverty line. Your arbitrary fixation of the poverty line shows how callous you are. You have fixed a per capita consumption limit of less than Rs 20 per mensem as below the poverty level. If a person gets a consumption capacity of Rs. 20 per mensem, he is not considered poor. That means all the factory workers are above the poverty line and they are not poor. This shows your total bureaucratic attitude towards the common people, the toiling masses. This is the usual attitude of the capitalists, the landlords to the workers and poor people. This outlook also shows the class character of the Government.

What is the solution given here? In order to raise the level of the 30 per cent of the people at the bottom, you want to reduce the consumption of the people at the top of 30 per cent. It is not clearly mentioned as to how you will reduce the consumption. You say that you will put some restraint on their consumption capacity, but it will not be at the accrual point of income. They will be allowed to earn as much income as they can. You are not prepared to hit them there. But after allowing them full income through black money, hoarding, intensive exploitation of workers in the factories by mechanisation and various other methods, you try to put some restrictions. It is not clear as to how these restrictions will actually work in practice.

If there is no full land reform, if the toilers are not made the owners

of the land in the rural areas, there will not be any removal of poverty. That is the basic and fundamental thing. Yet, all the laws of the country and the entire socio-economic structure is just opposed to it. So, you will not be able to make any headway. In your approach to the Plan you say that the land ceiling should be completed by December, 1973. But nobody is thinking of executing the land ceiling policy, now.

So, these slogans remain absolutely baseless. These will never materialise because you are not, really, interested in attacking the upper sections of society.

What is the suggestion made? I refer to pp. 52-53—I quote:

"There is little chance of carrying conviction with the workers and employees about the need to exercise due restraint in putting forth wage claims if a similar discipline cannot be imposed on those who draw their income from property and enterprises"

Can you impose discipline on these upper sections of the people? You are absolutely powerless. They are more powerful than you. You Ministers will be removed but they cannot be put under discipline. Then, your way out is—I quote

"In private industry and trade, excessive incomes arise from (i) exercise of monopoly power and adoption of restrictive practices etc."

But I have just read out how monopolies are being given full scope to increase their profits how they are increasing profits at the cost of the common people. So, you are expecting to put discipline on them!

Then, you say:

"(ii) resort to corrupt practices by management...."

Here, I say, corruption is now widespread. You are absolutely powerless to check corruption.

As regards "(iii) exploitation of workers, suppliers and consumer", that exploitation is further intensified. The work load is heavily increasing, the workers are being retrenched. In Calcutta, the Jay Engineering Factory is closed. It is not running because Lala Chait Ram, the big business magnate, has demanded that thousand workers should be retrenched as they are surplus. He is now putting pressure on the union to increase the heavy work-load. So you cannot control the exploitation of workers.

Coming to '(iv) black-marketing and profiteering', you cannot control it.

Then, you say, "(v) abuse of quotas, permits and licences, and (vi) tax evasion and avoidance." You are powerless there.

This is the solution given by the Approach paper.

'In the interest of equality and stability incomes policy must seek to restrain to the maximum the excessive incomes arising from all sources.'

You are not trying to check these things. You are powerless there; you are absolutely weak. You want to restrict their excessive incomes. How can you Plan operate? How can you go towards socialist society? Is this the way going towards socialist society? No. This is the capitalist way. You are defending this type of exploitation. You are not prepared to even check these monopolies, this type of black money and this type of corruption and exploitation.

That is why, I say, the entire basis of the Plan Approach is absolutely class-based and class-oriented. During the last four Five Year Plans, the capitalism has been further strengthened. Money has been concentrated more in the hands of a few big business families. This process is going on. Your Fifth Five Year Plan has also prepared a ground for that. Therefore, our basic criticism of this Plan Approach is that it will repro-

duce the same thing in a bigger magnified way.

Your slogan of self-reliance has been completely blown up. I want to give some figures. Here is another Report submitted to the Government recently, by a high-level committee set up to examine and review the guide-line pertaining to foreign collaboration. This Report was submitted in July, long after the submission of this Approach paper. The conclusion of the Report is that too high a price is being paid for foreign collaboration. The Report says that the Government has taken more than three years to act on the recommendations of the Dutt Committee which was submitted before. The Committee made certain recommendations. The Study Group has submitted its report and it says that the total number of collaboration proposals approved till now have exceeded 3000. The collaboration is increasing, the foreign capital is coming and the foreign capital is taking back their profits and charges for know-how and other charges on a big scale. Those reports are also coming in the daily press and if you go through all these, you will see that this slogan of self-reliance is absolutely a bunkum. There are other figures also. The slogan of self-reliance is also a misnomer, a deception, and under cover of that you are really having secret deals with all foreign monopoly capitalists to come to some secret understanding. Mr Dhar has just now said the because of objective compulsion—understand objective compulsion—, unless we give greater importance to the core sector, the future of the economy will be totally bleak, more and more we will have to depend on imports. More and more their prices are rising and they are using all types of manoeuvres to extract money from the Government. Recently, yesterday or the day before yesterday, I read in the Economic Times that already there have been some deals by the Government with the three oil companies—probably Burmah Shell, Esso and Caltex. Instead of nationalising, they

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

have decided to purchase some more shares and become 51 per cent shareholders. There, the terms and conditions are that a higher price has to be paid. Also the unauthorised refining which these Companies were doing so long illegally has been legalised by the Government and some payment will be made to these foreign companies. That means, further extraction. They have extracted money from the Government and they will repatriate that money to their home countries.

How Government is faithful to its slogan of self-reliance can also be judged from the new industrial policy. The new industrial policy has opened further scope for investment by foreign monopoly capitalists in India; the sectors which were previously restricted are now being opened up. There is one statement. Mr. H. N. Sethna, Chairman of the Fertiliser Corporation of India, has stated that a number of mechanical failures occurred mostly in imported machines.

It is, therefore, difficult to accept that Government intends to pursue a policy of self-reliance. It seems from government loans that Government is going to rely on private foreign capital or costly foreign bank loans. This is mortgaging the country to protect the present property relations.

Moreover, in this Approach to Fifth Plan there is already provision for Rs. 3,000 crores of foreign aid. Government have said in this document that they want to reach a stage when the net foreign aid will be zero as regards debt servicing. But the total money that the Government have to pay to the foreign countries in terms of debt servicing and in terms of other liabilities goes on increasing. And your loan of Rs. 3,000 crores probably will not be sufficient to reach that stage. So, you will have to more and more depend on foreign loans, particularly, from the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank and that will also increase our dependence on foreign aid.

A rate of growth of 5.5 per cent is envisaged. We want that rate of growth should be further increased. But on the basis of the present indications of production and the experience of the last two decades and the past four Plans where the rate of growth has further decreased and specially the performance in the Fourth Plan does not justify the claim that your target of 5.5 per cent production growth you will be able to attain and maintain.

Similarly is the question regarding exports. Now exports have become a compulsion to us in order to repay back the debt-servicing and our liabilities. All these foreign companies are taking huge profits out of the country. One company is taking ten times the amount they have invested, in one year. There are astonishing figures. I think you all know about this—how the foreign companies are repatriating huge amounts of profits from this country. So, if these things are allowed, then the question of a favourable balance of trade is out of question. Moreover when England has entered the ECM our exports have become more difficult in ECM countries which have big competition with other capitalist countries in the world market. That is why pressure is put by the big business and the private monopolists here that more and more relief is necessary. Already, the Commerce Minister has declared that the jute industry will be free from export duty. This means you will have to impose a greater tax burden on the common masses to make up that deficit and by imposing further burden on the people through indirect taxes you will help a further rise in prices and if there is a further rise in prices, our exports will not get any encouragement and if there is an internal rise in prices, exports are bound to suffer and the imports will increase. There will be a favourable trend for more imports and if internal prices rise continuously, the Indian capitalists will seek disposal of their goods in the internal market because here in India

itself they can get more profits than in the external market. That is why the rise in prices is a discouraging factor for increase in exports.

Because my time is up, I am concluding with these words that the time has come for a serious thinking—here I agree with Mr. Dhar—it is necessary. So, I request you to give your serious thought to this.

Now, two types of social systems are being counter-posed. If real socialism is built up, we will be able to solve all the basic problems of the masses. There is no unemployment in China. There is no unemployment in Vietnam and in all the socialist countries. Your system has completely failed to solve the unemployment problem. There is no price rise in socialist countries. Your system has completely failed to check the price-rise and the prices are rising sky-high. So, people will judge and choose between your system and the socialist system.

Whether you want existing system or a true socialist system—the crisis has posed the choice of this alternative before the people. More and more our people will realise the differences of these two systems and more from below they will come forward with that alternative choice and there is no other way. This is the only way out. But for the time being, our suggestion is this. You must be bold enough to attack the foreign monopolists and the foreign capitalists. Our suggestion to the Government is this. You should take over all foreign concerns, you should put moratorium on foreign debt payments, there should be no foreign loans or borrowings on onerous terms, you should embark upon nationalisation of Indian monopoly houses which are the sources of black money. You should take away all the lands of landlords who do not contribute their manual labour in the essential agricultural operations and distribute them to landless labourers and poor peasants

with preference to Harijans and adivasis. There should be cancellation of all their debts to money-lenders and landlords, there should be close economic relationship with the burgeoning socialist world including China. There should be development of economic relations and friendly ties with underdeveloped countries like ours.

Sir, these are the ways of achieving self-reliance and these measures will help us to come out of the crisis at the present stage. I hope some awareness and reality will dawn on them and they will start re-thinking about the whole system. Unless property relations are changed and a fundamentally new system is built up there is no hope for the future.

श्री मधु लिमये (बांका): मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ? मे पहले भी उठाना चाहता था लेकिन बूकि मुझे कुछ सबूत इकट्ठा करना था इसलिए मैंने समय किया।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have seen that. Just a minute. Please sit down. Hear me first. I have just got your letter. I am examining it. This cannot be raised in the midst of a discussion.

श्री मधु लिमये उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन की व्यवस्था का सवाल है। It is according to the rules. आप मंत्र पहले कहने का दीजिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please listen to me. What you have written to me relates to something else. I will examine. You can do it. after this item is over and before the next item is taken up. Your subject matter does not relate to the subject presently under discussion. It will be gravely irregular if I were to divert the attention of the House to this thing. I am having it examined and before we take up the Private Members' Business at 3 P.M. I shall try to give you an opportunity.

Shri B. R. Bhagat:

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Shahabad): The House will agree that it is discussing one of the most important documents which has been placed on the Table of the House, The Approach to the Fifth Plan, on the successful implementation of which depends the future of this country, the future of the new society, the socialist society, that we are trying to build up. The Planning Minister in his inimitable style has very ably and comprehensively presented this document and in a realistic manner he did not fight shy of saying some unpleasant things also. That shows his clarity of vision and the candidness with which he is approaching this problem. It is only in this way that this problem can be approached.

I am sorry to say so. We have heard the total denunciation completely—I would say rather subjective denunciation—because, I think, that almost every word in this document that has been said has been rejected. I felt that perhaps, there is no meeting ground between the hon. Member who spoke just before me and what is presented in this Approach paper. That is because he may be speaking from the text book of his party and the society to which he belongs. It is not realistic to compare what is happening in China with us here. It is true that one fact should be accepted. Somebody called this document as a document of hoax. Look at the first sentence in this document. That is removal of poverty and economic self-reliance. How can we call this as a hoax? Later on, however, he has accepted the principles behind the Approach as unexceptionable. He has dealt with the principles. But, he thinks that this Government will not be able to implement that. In our economy certain distortions have taken place in this country. You cannot call this document which re-

gisters the future of this country as a hoax. That shows the mental attitude and the philosophy which the hon. Member is having. He is going out of the reality of the situation. Take for example what the Planning Minister himself has said. The basic assumption—the major assumption—in a planned development is the stability of price—this is what he has said. And he has expressed a deep concern on the recent spiralling of prices. I know it has posed a great problem to you and to the country. But the fact remains that this is a temporary phenomenon. This should not obscure the definite progress that has been registered in this country. See the situation today and the one that was in existence a few years ago. We are now facing a terrific economic situation and drought situation. These have completely upset our economy. It has knocked our bottom out of the economic stability. Even then we have been making progress. That is because of the strength of the economy—the infrastructure that has

been built over a period—we have been able to make progress without dependence on outside help. If you compare the situation four or five years ago, that is, in 1967-68, we declared the Plan too rigid. Similar economic situation was there. That is why development plans and various programmes could not be undertaken. See the difference to-day as compared to what it was five years ago. There are some people to-day who say that we could have a plan holiday. I think it is not only a Gospel truth but, if I may say so, it is anti-national to speak of a plan holiday. You can call it anti-people. But, it is not in the interest of the people. They completely ignore the strength of the economy to-day. I think, the Planning Minister has very rightly said that the approach to meet the situation is to strengthen our basic instrument of plan implementation and to have a re-appraisal of the resource position—the entire planning programme—so as to stren-

gthen the plan against distortions that are taking place and not to throw our hands into helplessness and to say that we have a plan holiday. I think the hon. member said so many undesirable things. He was telling that our approach is to build up a socialist society and how to eliminate monopoly capitalism. We are in agreement with all this and there is no difference of opinion about it. Why should we wax eloquence over this? The only difference is that he wants to do it in a certain manner but we are trying to do it in a certain manner. The socialist pattern of society that we have envisaged for this country is different from the society which he and his party has in mind. We want a democratic socialist society but he wants a completely regimented society. Therefore, it may be possible that there are certain advantages and disadvantages in these two societies. It is better to accept this fact. Look at the economic situation in Europe. Look at the capitalist society in Europe or even the affluent society in Western Europe and North America. They all are facing the problems of high prices.

Then, there is also the problem of the floating exchange rate. Such a situation does not obtain in the socialist societies, and there is a very good record of stability of prices there. That is also admitted. It is also to be admitted that much of the problems that we have to face is an extension of the international economic forces, particularly the importation of inflation through floating exchange rates and so on. We have to put up with it, and we have suffered because of this we have also suffered because our production relations and means of economic production, have not been completely insulated from these factors. All this is true. But the steps that we are taking, the basic objectives that we have, the target of development and the policy and the objectives and the framework that has been adopted in the Plan, etc. point to the right direction. That

is the first point that I would like to make.

The main distortion that has taken place and which in some way shadows the future vision of progressive growth and growth with social justice in this country is because of the high prices. I think the Planning Minister will be well advised to take the House and the country into confidence on how he is going to tackle this problem. Of course, I know that there are exercises going on in the Planning Commission and in the Government, and they are going to tackle this problem successfully. But they will have to underline the instrument of Plan implementation.

My hon friend talked of the consumption level of Rs. 20, but that was on the basis of the 1960-61 prices. To reach this consumption level at 1970-71 prices, one would require Rs. 27, and to reach it as the 1973-74 prices, one would require Rs. 45. But the level of the lowest 30 per cent bracket of the population is below that. So, is it not wise if we take steps towards the removal of poverty and we find a consumption level of Rs. 45 at 1973-74 prices.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: He may have that pious wish, but it will not be fulfilled.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I do not subscribe to that prophecy of doom. Anyway, I am pointing out that it is a very correct step to raise the consumption level of the lowest 30 per cent bracket of our society, and this can be done only in one way. Therefore, I agree that it is a right step that the Plan approach document envisages that the consumption level of the top 30 per cent bracket of the society will be reduced from Rs. 84 to Rs. 60 in the rural areas and from Rs. 113 to 108 in the urban areas, which means a reduction of five per cent or so. I think that a further exercise is needed, and I hope the Planning Minister will be well advised to do

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

this, because I do not know whether by a mere reduction by 5 per cent of the consumption level of the top 30 per cent bracket, we shall be able to increase the consumption level of the lowest 30 per cent bracket of the society to the level of Rs. 44 or 45. I think this has to be gone into further, because on this depends the strategy, the policy framework and the implementation of the Plan because this country is now at a time when a very drastic reduction in the consumption pattern of the affluent sections of the society is needed, and we cannot just do lip-service to it but we have to take serious action on it. Some people say that we should shut out the air-conditioners and refrigerators; if it produces results, it may be done, but the basic thing is something else. Take, for example, the very important question of cotton textiles.

We are exporting Rs. 110 crores worth of cotton textiles. And we are importing Rs. 113 crores worth of cotton every year. And with this Rs. 113 crores worth of cotton, you know the fine cotton goes for the consumption, for the requirements of the upper 30 per cent bracket of our people. What interest does it serve? Why can't we fashion the production pattern of the entire textile industry? Why don't you have four to five varieties for mass consumption? They can be produced much cheaper in the public sector, and if necessary, not only modern mills have to be organised to produce mass consumption cotton textiles but the entire finer variety should be reserved for exports. This will not eliminate the import of cotton but it will be a bigger step towards the reduction of the consumption of the affluent section, the conspicuous section, of the people.

Similarly housing. Take country like Japan for example. It is a capi-

talist country. It is a model of the most successfully developed examples in the world today. But even in the earlier stages what was its position? I had been there in those days, and I saw almost half of Tokyo obliterated and pot-holes everywhere. But there was a ban: nobody could construct a house in Tokyo for a number of years. Everything was confined to public buildings or hotels or hospitals. The entire resources of cement and iron everything that was scarce, was used in that direction. Why can't we do so here? Now, we have the poor people, the middle class people and others who cannot afford to live in a decent house, whereas the other luxury buildings are going on. So, why can't we take a policy decision? For example, we should ban house construction of more than a lakh of rupees, and all the scarce resources like cement and iron should be utilised for building public buildings/housing for the slum clearance schemes and catering to the needs of the poor people. You see how Moscow was developed in the 60's. Almost eight million flats a year were constructed in Moscow. They have devised not only cheap construction but the entire thing was oriented towards mass consumption and mass requirements, whereas here, whether it is housing or textiles or various other items, the entire production pattern is oriented to the needs of the upper 30 per cent bracket of the population. Therefore, we should not only satisfy ourselves by making a statement that the consumption pattern of the upper section should be reduced, but we have to concretise the steps and take bigger steps in which they can be done, and only if you put this in a proper manner we will be creating a climate in which not only we will be achieving our objective but will be having real people's participation and enthusiasm and the hopes of persons like Mr. Samar Mukherjee who say that this Government will not be doing anything will also be belied.

Sir, I would like to issue a very friendly advice to the Planning Minister. Because of the distortions in the price, namely, a high price rise, there is already a talk of the high prices having eaten into our resources. Somebody said the Plan is in for a cut of 10 per cent, to maintain the same physical target or to maintain the same rate of growth of 5.5 per cent or we may have to increase the financial resources and financial targets. That will mean an additional resource mobilisation and with all its implication in the balance of payment situation.

Here, I must compliment the Planning Minister and his expert advisers. This Plan as a purely technical model has been conceived more scientifically; may be so because they have the experience of the four Plans and this Plan has a flexible element built into it. The first Plan was purely on the Keynes model, on which performance and other things as a growth indicator were emphasised. The second Plan was conceived by Prof. Mahalanobis as a page from the Soviet Planning, in which the emphasis was on capital goods as a growth indicator and a public sector was created.

14.00 hrs.

That Plan did not take into account the demand distortions or the balance of payments distortions. Later on when balance of payments constraints appeared, the talk 'save the core' was there. The third and the fourth Plans were a little advancement on the Second Plan; they took into account the demand conditions. But the Fifth Plan approach that we have is based on the inter-regional optimisation of the model. It is the concept of optimality which is the basic factor in this. It is neither a static model nor a homogenous model; it is a non-homogenic, non-linear model. You have fixed the physical targets; you have terminal points whether it is steel or oil or food production but you have also introduced

into it a flexible element and if distortions are there in one place, it will affect the others. The entire Plan is the core, whether it is agriculture or industrial development or even education and social services; it is completely welded together and it stands or falls as a whole. Therefore to talk of a core today is a misnomer. I compliment the Planning Minister for introducing a new technique in planning which meets the requirements of the situation and the new dimensions that the economy is taking. I think if the implementation is correct and good, the plan is built in against distortion.

I shall come to the implementation aspect because the entire thing rests on implementation. Planning is nothing unless it brings about a change in society and reorientation of production relation in the rural or industrial economy and creates a new man and emphasises on the toiling millions in the villages and urban areas. It is the entire restructuring of society: it is social engineering. If, we have failed in implementation in the past, it is not a shame. We have attempted big. It was restructuring completely medieval society, colonial society which was exploited for ages. It can be changed through a big national effort. Therefore what is required is a new approach and people's involvement, political involvement and faith in the Government. That is why I was very much pained by the speech of Mr. Mukherjee which tried to destroy that faith and weaken the will of the country. That is not the way in which a plan is implemented. He also wants the plan to be implemented. Therefore, the responsibility of implementing the plan rests on the party to which I belong, although it is not a party plan. It is a national plan and the total involvement of the people is required. Therefore, whether it be the public sector or the rural sector, we have to refashion our administration and

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]
the Planning Minister was very much right when he referred to efficiency in public sector or rural sector or any other sector. Today that country survives which produces the highest efficiency, where productivity per man is the highest. Take the example of Japan or any other socialist country.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nobody disputes this generality.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT. I am sorry you are saying this is generality.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nobody disputes the necessity for efficiency that is what I was saying.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I was making the point that a big chunk of resource mobilisation is there in the management of the public sector. Almost 14,000 to 15,000 crores of rupees account for that. So, we have to improve the management of the public sector and enlarge its scope by going into the consumer sector etc. Similarly, in the rural areas unless you improve the relations between the tiller and the owner and unless land reforms are implemented, we cannot make a big impact. Take the example not only of socialist countries but even Japan, where land reforms have been implemented. It is a small farm unit but the efficiency is so high and productivity is also very high. In India the small farmer finds it hard to get seeds, fertilisers and other extension activities. In a country like Japan, all these things go the door of the farmer. So, unless we change the psychology of the district administration and see that everything goes to the farmer, the efficiency of the farmers cannot increase and so productivity from land cannot increase. That is the most important thing. Sir, I have not got the time to go into the other aspects of implementation.

I will conclude by saying that the approach to the fifth plan is in the direction of building up a socialist so-

cist, removing poverty and achieving measure of self-reliance. But it has to be implemented with the greatest efficiency in all the sectors.

श्री सरजू पांडे (गाजीपुर) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम लोग पाचवी पञ्चवर्षीय योजना की दिशा पर बहस कर रहे हैं। यह सही है कि इस प्लान एन्टीच में एक नई दिशा देने की बात कही गई है। लेकिन पिछले पञ्चवीस वर्षों का इत्सा अनुभव क्या है? हम ने देखा है कि देश में एक तरफ धन बढ़ा है और दूसरी तरफ गरीबी बढ़ी है, एक तरफ देश के बहुत से भाग आगे बढ़े हैं और दूसरी तरफ बहुत से भाग पिछड़ गये हैं। आज देश में ऐसे क्षेत्र भी हैं, जिन को देख कर यह नहीं मानूँ होगा कि देश में प्लानिंग जमी कोर्ट चीज है।

मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा है कि प्लानिंग में देश के नव-निर्माण की दिशा हेतु चाहिए, प्लानिंग के द्वारा समाज का पूरा ढाँचा बदलना चाहिए। उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि जब तक जमीन की समस्या पूरी तरह हल नहीं होगी तब तक हमारे समाज में परिवर्तन नहीं आयेगा। सब से बड़ी समस्या यही है कि प्लानिंग को लागू कैसे किया जाए। प्लानिंग को कार्यान्वित किस तरह किया जाए। क्या यह सही नहीं है कि सारी प्लानिंग ऊपर बैठ कर की जाती है और आज भी इस बारे में जनता का सहयोग प्राप्त नहीं किया जाता है?

जब हमारे मन्त्री लोग प्लान एलोकेशन करते हैं या प्लानिंग के बारे में फैसले करते हैं तो वे फैसले पूरी तरह से राजनैतिक दृष्टि से किये जाते हैं। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। 17 मार्च को उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्य मन्त्री, श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी, ने क्रिनास कमिशन के सामने भाषण देते हुए कहा कि उत्तर प्रदेश के कुल 54 जिलों में से 35 जिले पिछड़े हुए हैं, लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकार की ओर

से प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो धन का बंटवारा हुआ, उस में उत्तर प्रदेश को 24 रुपये प्रति-व्यक्ति के हिस्से में दिया गया, जबकि अन्य राज्यों को 41 रुपये प्रति व्यक्ति दिया गया है। दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में उत्तर प्रदेश का केन्द्रीय धन प्राप्ति करने में पन्द्रवा नम्बर था। इसी तरह स उन्होंने बहुत सारे कोटेशन दिये हैं जिस में उन्होंने कहा है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में 39 प्रतिशत ऐसे गांव हैं जिन का सड़को में कोई संबंध नहीं है। दवा में शिक्षा में, हर जगह राजनाति में काम लिया जाता है जिस का नतीजा यह होता है कि हमारे प्रदेश के बाका हिस्से पिछड़ रहे जाते हैं और कुछ हिस्से आगे बढ़ जाते हैं। हमारे पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश की दशा कितनी खराब है उस का वर्णन नहीं किया जा सकता। मुझे मालूम है इसी सदन में कांग्रेस के ही एक सदस्य ने रोते हुए उस का वर्णन किया था। उस समय पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जिन्दा थे और तब पटेल कमीशन नियुक्त किया गया था। लेकिन मे समझता हूँ कि पंचवर्षीय योजना में जिस के ऊपर बहस हो रही है उस की दिशा में कोई आमूल परिवर्तन नहीं है। अर्थात् जो अप्रोच प्लान की दिशा बनाई गई है उस के उद्देश्य में कहा गया है

" the stress on a more effective and integrated population policy, the emphasis on employment opportunities, the provision for a National Programme of Minimum Needs, the accent on uplift of backward classes and development of backward regions, and the envisaged public procurement and distribution system to ensure availability of essential goods to the poorer sections of the population at reasonably stable prices "

यह सारी चीजें यहाँ सिद्धान्त में लिख दी गई हैं। अक्सर दरभंगसल यह लागू होया या नहीं,

कौन से मसौदा है जो इन को नू करेगी ? मैंने अपने स्कोच में कहा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी खुद जिस की यह सरकार है उस के अपने मेम्बर इस का बिरोध करने हैं। और ने प्लान बनाया अनाज के राष्ट्रीयकरण का और कांग्रेस के बड़े बड़े नेताओं ने जो बड़े बड़े मार्ग है उन्होंने अनाज नहीं दिया। (अवधान)

श्री श्री सावित्री इयांग (आवला) यह सच गनत है।

श्री सरजू पांडे प्रायः जिल्लाईय नहीं। रोज गड बड करत है। पंजाब का उदाहरण हमारे सामने है। लैंड रिफार्म की खूब ब ने डोनी है। प्रोमिनिस्ट्स माहव ने फरमाया कि बिना लैंड रिफार्म के सामाजिक परिवर्तन न हो आगा कांग्रेस पार्टी में बड़े बड़े ऐसे लोग बैठे हैं जो पंजाब में बड़े बड़े लोग हैं जो लैंड प्रेवेंस करत है, स्पीकर खुद (अवधान) मैं किसी व्यक्ति के बारे में आरोप नहीं लगाना चाहता। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्लान का वह पार्टी कैसे मासेज तक ले जाएगी जो पार्टी खुद ही इस में विश्वास नहीं करती, खुद ही इस बात का नहीं मानती ? उस मशीनरी में कैसे इसको मासेज तक ले जाएंगे ? आप की व्यूरोक्रेसी जैसी है उस से क्या आप यह काम कर सकते हैं ? घर साहब, आप अकेले कुछ नहीं कर सकते न धारिया साहब कुछ कर सकते हैं। आप दोनों आदमी कुछ नहीं कर सकते जब कि आप के पास इस को मासेज में ले जाने वाली कोई राजनैतिक पार्टी न हो और दूसरे उस को इम्प्लीमेंट करने वाली व्यूरोक्रेसी न हो। आप की जो नीकर-शाही है यह क्या समाजवाद में यकीन करती है ? इस से समाजवाद का कोई नाता है ? इस से प्लानिंग से कोई ताल्लुक है ? इस के अन्दर गरीब जनता के लिए कोई प्यार है ? 25 वर्षों के बाद भी खुद आपने कहा इस प्लानिंग में कि 20 करोड़ आदमी हमारे देश में ऐसे हैं जिन की बिलो पावर्टी आमदनी है, जो 20 रुपये महीने पर जिन्दगी बिता रहे हैं। तो यह प्लानिंग किस तरह चलेगी ?

[श्री सूरज पाण्डे]

भ्राज भी मुझे ताज्जुब हो रहा है उत्तर प्रदेश में 35 जिले पिछड़े बताए गए हैं लेकिन उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने सिर्फ आठ जिलों को रिक्तमेंड किया है ? यह मेरे पास दैनिक "भ्राज" प्रकाशित है, इस में लखनऊ का समाचार है कि राज्य सरकार ने राज्य के पूर्वी क्षेत्र के 8 जिले ब्राजमगढ़—जहां घर साहब गए थे, यह बिलकुल पोलिटिकल डेसिशन है, घर साहब इसलिए गए थे कि चन्द्रजीत यादव आप के महा-मंत्री हैं, इसलिए यह उन का जिला इन्क्लूड कर लिया गया बैकवर्ड जिलों में और उस के अलावा बहराइच, गोंडा, फैजाबाद, सुल्तानपुर, यहां भी बड़ी बड़ी बिग गन्स हैं....

एक आत्मनीय सवाल: यह बैकवर्ड नहीं हैं?

श्री सूरज पाण्डे : गाजीपुर को क्यों नहीं इन्क्लूड किया? जौनपुर को क्यों नहीं इन्क्लूड किया? दूसरे जो जिले बैकवर्ड हैं उन को क्यों नहीं इन्क्लूड किया ? आखिर क्या बात है ? ब्राजमगढ़ में क्या खास बात हो गई ? इसलिए की वहां के चन्द्र जीत यादव है, इसलिए घर साहब वहां गए, उन्होंने दस हजार आदिमियों के बीच में आषण किया। मैंने शुरु में ही कहा था कि आप भ्राज जो भी फैसला करते हैं वह पोलिटिकल किया करते हैं। नहीं तो आठ ही नहीं पन्द्रह जिले हैं। आप ने गाजीपुर को क्यों नहीं इन्क्लूड किया ? आप ने बांदा, हमीरपुर, हरदोई को क्यों नहीं इन्क्लूड किया ? ये जिले जो बिलकुल पिछड़े हुए हैं इन को क्यों नहीं उन में शामिल किया। हमारे यहां गाजीपुर में एक ही फैक्ट्री थी ओपियम फैक्ट्री, वह भी सुना है कि नीमच में बंद हो गई, वह भी अब टूटने वाली है। तो पहला मेरा आरोप है कि आप राजनैतिक फैसले करते हैं। बरना पिछड़ेपन का ख्याल होता तो वह तमाम जिले इस में इन्क्लूड किए जाते जो पिछड़े हुए हैं। डंग से आप प्लानिंग करते तो आप ये देखते कि कौन सी चीज ब्राज जरूरी है। आप मुल्क में पानी नहीं दे सकते खेती के लिए कौन क, मुल्क में पीने का पानी

नहीं है। तो क्यों नहीं इस के लिए फैसला किया जाता ? लोगों के लिए पीने का पानी नहीं है। करोड़ों करोड़ हमारे देश में हरिजन हैं जिन को काम देना तो दूर रहा, मकान देना तो दूर रहा आप उनको बोधन से मुक्ति नहीं दिला सकते। आप उनको आदमी का दर्जा नहीं दिला सकते। तो फिर प्लानिंग का अर्थ क्या है ?

इसलिए अप्रोच प्लान में आप सिद्धांत चाहे कितना भी बघारे उस के साथ हमारा कोई झगड़ा नहीं है। लेकिन हम यह कह रहे हैं कि इस देश में प्लानिंग चलानी है तो सही माने में इस की पूरी पूरी दिशा बदलनी पड़ेगी। प्लानिंग का जो हम शास्त्रीय विवेचन कर लेते हैं उस से काम नहीं चलेगा। प्लानिंग करना है तो देखना पड़ेगा कि हमारे मुल्क में प्राथमिकता किस को देनी है ? पहले जो लोग पिछड़े हुए हैं उनको प्राथमिकता देनी चाहिए। सबसे ज्यादा जो देश का पूंजी पति वर्ग है, मोनोपली बनाने हैं जो भ्राज सारे हमले कर रहे हैं मैंने चेम्बर आफ कामर्स की स्पीच पढ़ी थी, उन्होंने कहा था कि देश में प्लान चलाना है तो पहला काम करें, हड़ताल करना बन्द करें दूसरा काम करें कि प्लान हाथीड़े करो। तीसरा काम यह करो, प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाना चाहते हो तो बेज कीज करो। मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब ने शोलापुर में किसी एक बयान में यह कहा था कि हड़ताल करने का राइट है। यह मैं ने किसी प्रकाश में पढ़ा था।

भ्राज हमारा यह कहना है कि अप्रोच प्लान पर घर साहब पुनर्विचार करे। जो बातें पिछली ला रहे हैं उन से हमारा कोई एतराज नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो पिछली प्लानिंग है उस में कुछ नई दिशा देने की कोशिश की गई है। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसको कम्पलीट तौर पर नये सिरे से ले जाएँ और देश में राजनैतिक आधार पर फैसले न करें। जो इलाके हमारे पिछड़े हुए हैं उन के ऊपर जोर लगाने के लिए आप को कोई न कोई काइटीरिया मुकर्रर करना पड़ेगा। यह नहीं कि कौन बैता कहता है या और कौन लोग कहते हैं इस से फैसला हो जाए।

Fifth Plan

दूसरी बात मुझे कहनी है कि इस देश में लेब रिफार्म की बात आप ने कही। हम पूरी तरह सहयोग करने के लिए तैयार हैं। लेकिन आप अपनी व्यूरोक्रेसी को अगर ठीक नहीं करेंगे तो सारी भूमि का बटवारा कामजों में हो जाएगा और जमीन किसी को एक घूर भी नहीं मिलेगी क्योंकि यहाँ सब से ज्यादा यह लोग जाए बैठें हैं तो जमीन का बटवारा कैसे होगा ?

गल्ले की प्राइस की बात है। आप ने कहा कि सारी दुनिया में प्राइसेज बढ़ी है। एक स्कूल के लड़के से किसी ने पूछा कि क्यों माई, तू फ़ैल हो गया ? तो कहने लगा कि हम अकेले थोड़े ही फ़ैल हुए हैं, सारा स्कूल फ़ैल है। सारी दुनिया पर हम बहस नहीं करने जा रहे हैं कि सारी दुनिया में क्या है ?

हिन्दुस्तान में आज हम जानते हैं जो आज की प्राइसेज है यह आर्टिफिशियल और बनावटी है। आज हमारे देश में गल्ले की कमी नहीं है। मैं तो खुद मीके पर गया था और मुझे हैरत हुई। जब तक मे खुद नहीं गया था मीके पर मालूम हो रहा था कि दरअसल गल्ले की कमी है, लेकिन इसी दिल्ली में सब्जी मंडी में मैं ने जा कर देखा तो मालूम हुआ कि अबाह अनाज हमारे देश में भरा हुआ है। लेकिन व्यूरोक्रेसी आज उस को निकालने के लिए तैयार नहीं है न प्राइसेज पर कंट्रोल करने के लिए तैयार है। इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान में अगर यह चीज चाहते हैं तो मोनोपली घरानों को खत्म करना पड़ेगा। यह आप ने वादा किया है। बेकारी के लिए आप ने कहा है कि पांच वर्षों में पांच लाख आदमियों को काम मिलेगा। लेकिन तब तक डार्ड करोंड़ बेकार बन जाएंगे। तो उस से फायदा क्या होगा, देश में रोजगार देना जरूरी है, काम देना जरूरी है, खाना देना जरूरी है, अगर ऐसी प्लानिंग आप करते हैं जिस में ये चीजें नहीं निकलती हैं, जो मैं समझता हूँ कि अग्रोच से ही कोई गड़बड़ी है। तो इस अग्रोच को बदल कर इस प्लानिंग को

इस ढंग से लाना पड़ेगा जिस से नीचे की जनता उस प्लानिंग में हिस्सा ले सके। तब जा कर सही माने में प्लानिंग सफल ही सकेगी।

श्री राज देव सिंह (जानपुर) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे सामने इस समय पाचवे प्लान का एप्रोच डाक्यूमेंट है, जिस पर चर्चा चल रही है। मैं सबसे पहले अपने प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर साहब को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ, उन्होंने बहुत बड़ा टास्क अपने ऊपर लिया है—गरीबी को हटाने का—और मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि वे अपने उद्देश्य में कामयाब होंगे।

एप्रोच डाक्यूमेंट का पहला ही पैराग्राफ हमारे सामने मौखिक उद्देश्य रख देता है। इस में दो टास्क हैं—एक रिमूवल आफ पावर्टी और दूसरा एटर्नैट आफ इकनामिक सेल्फ रिलायंस—इन दो टास्क को सामने रख कर हमारी अगली पंचवर्षीय योजना चलेगी। ये दो टास्क बहुत से महत्वपूर्ण कार्य करेंगे—जैसे प्रीवेंशन आफ कन्सन्ट्रेशन आफ इकनामिक पावर। बहुत दिनों से लोग चाहते थे कि पावर कुछ हाथों में सन्निहित न हो कर बाइडली डिस्ट्रीब्यूट हो। दूसरा रिडक्शन आफ डिस्परिटीज इन इनकम एण्ड वेल्थ—यह भी उतना ही महत्वपूर्ण है। एटर्नैट आफ बेलेस्ड रिजनल डवलपमेंट की समस्या आज भी हमारे देश में बहुत से क्षेत्रों में है। ऐसे बहुत से पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्र हैं जो देश के अन्य भागों बड़े हुए क्षेत्रों के मुकाबले बहुत पिछड़े हुए हैं। यह प्लान डाक्यूमेंट इस तरह भी सब का ध्यान दिलाता है और आशा की जाती है कि इस दिशा में बहुत कुछ किया जाएगा। यन् रिजनल इम्बेन्स एक प्लान से तो नहीं मिल सकता, लेकिन इस योजना से हमारे बैकवर्ड एरियाज आगे बढ़ेंगे—ऐसी मुझे उम्मीद है।

मैं एक बात प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर साहब को कह देना चाहता हूँ—आज हमारे देश में आबादी का 40 प्रतिशत हिस्सा ऐसा है जो

[श्री राजदेव सिंह]

बिलोमाजिनल लेबल है। उस के पाग इतना पंसा नहीं है कि अच्छा खाना खा सके, अच्छे मकान में रह सके और अच्छा कपड़ा पहन सके—यह हालत पिछली चार योजनाओं के पूरा होने के बाद है आज गरीबी का जा चित्र हमारे सामने है वह इस बात को जाहिर करता है कि इन योजनाओं के चलते हुए अमीर-अमीर हुआ है और गरीब-गरीब हुआ है। यद्यपि हमारे प्लानों की यह मशा नहीं थी। उनकी मशा यही थी कि जो भी प्लानिंग हो, यह इस उद्देश्य को सामने रख कर हो कि एक आदमी को दोनो वस्त्र खाना मिले वह इन्सान बन सही मायने में जा नागरिक के गुण होने चाहिए, उस के पास जो सहुलियतें होनी चाहिए, वे उसे प्राप्त हो। अगर हमारे विकास की योजना उस तरफ नहीं चलनी है तो हम कह सकते हैं कि हम इस मामले में काम-याब नहीं हुए।

आज भी चार पंचवर्षीय योजनायें सम्पन्न होने के बाद—अपने देश में मिचार्ड का प्रबन्ध हम केवल 5 प्रतिशत कर पाये हैं। जिस समय देश को आजादी मिली, उस समय साढ़े बारह फीसदी मिचार्ड के साधन हम को मिले थे, लेकिन पिछले 25 वर्षों में साढ़े तीन हजार करोड़ रुपये खर्च करने के बाद हम केवल 5 फीसदी मिचार्ड के साधन बढ़ा पाये हैं और अब इस नई पंच वर्षीय योजना में उस को बढ़ा कर आप का इरादा 27 फीसदी करने का है—वह किस तरह से पूरा होगा, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। आज भी अच्छी फसल के लिए किसान आसमान की तरफ देखता है। हमारे ट्यूब-वैल और नहरों की तरफ नहीं देखता है—यह हमारे लिए बड़ी शर्म की बात है।

इस में कोई शक नहीं कि जिस तरह से हमारी पिछली चार योजनायें चली, उनमें कहीं न कहीं गलती थी, क्योंकि जिस लक्ष्य की लेकर चलाने गई थी, वह लक्ष्य अच्छा था,

लेकिन वह काम पूरा नहीं हुआ। केन्द्रीय सरकार ने 1962 में एक स्टडी ग्रुप मैट-अप किया था, उस के मुताबिक 22 करोड़ पौनूशेन थी, जो करीब 40 फीसदी होती हैं, उस के बाद इसमें कोई ज्यादा फर्क नहीं पड़ा—ये 22 करोड़ लोग ऐसे थे जो बिलो पावर्टी लाइन थे। आप कल्पना कीजिए—1947 में स्वराज्य मिला उस समय जो बच्चा पैदा हुए आज 25-26 साल के हो चुके हैं, गरीबी में उनकी परवरिश हुई है और आज भी हो रही है, जब वह कमरे के करीब आएंगे, उस समय तब शताब्दी खत्म हो जाएगी और उस समय हमारे देश की आबादी जो आज 55 करोड़ है बढ़ कर 110 करोड़ हो जाएगी उस समय हम साधन कहाँ से जुटा पाएंगे। आज तक यह है कि गरीबी में आदमी पैदा होता है गरीबी में ही उस को परवरिश हाता है और गरीबी में ही वह इस दुनिया में चल बसता है।

हमारे प्लान में की कोशिश यह होनी चाहिए कि गरीबी जितनी जल्दी हो सक करे। आज गरीबों के सामने तरह तरह की मुसंबतें हैं—उन के पेट में भूख है उन्हें बीमारियों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। जो नैचुरल कैलेमिटीज आती हैं—बाढ़ आती है, सूखा पड़ता है—इसके भी वही लोग शिकार होते हैं।

एक स्टडी ग्रुप श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण जी को अध्यक्षता में 1961 में बनाया गया था—

Study Group on Welfare of the Weaker Sections of the Village Communities

उन्होंने 1961 में अपनी रिपोर्ट दी, जिस के अनुसार—

"Between 40—50 per cent of the household (5 or more members) had an income of less than Rs 500 per annum 80 per cent of the rural

household had an income of less than Rs. 1000. 20 per cent of rural household have no land 25 per cent had a holding of land of less than an acre and 45 per cent are in a pitiable condition"

20 फीसदी ऐसे हैं जिनके पास जमीन नहीं है और 25 फीसदी ऐसे हैं जिनके पास एक एकड़ से भी कम जमीन है—इस तरह से 45 परसेंट लोग इस सैटेगरी में आते हैं—इन का गरीब वर्ग कैसे हो जाता है समझ में नहीं आता है।

इस टाकुमेंट का आखरी पैरा "इन्वाल्मेंट आफ रियुपिल" का है। लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि इन्वाल्मेंट आफ रियुपिल कहा होता है? स्टेट कैपिटलज में प्लानज तैयार किये जाते हैं, उसके बाद सैन्टर को भेज दिये जाते हैं यहाँ उन को रैन्सोलिडेट किया जाता है। फिर उन में अलग-अलग बात करके प्लानिंग की जाती है। यह सब उन के लिए होता है जो गावों में रहते हैं—आप बन्दोबस्त गावों वालों का इन्वाल्मेंट इस प्लान में बनाने में कहा है। जहाँ गावों में कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है वे लोग ही उनको बनाते हैं। इन लिए मेरा मुद्दा है कि यह प्लान तो बन गया, इसे तो पोस्टगोन ही कर दें, लेकिन अगला प्लान जब आये तो वास्तव में जनता का इन्वाल्मेंट इस में होता चाहिए। आज हर जगह कम्युनिटी प्लान है हर गाव में एग आदमी गाव के मुखिया की हैमिलर रखता है उसका इन्वाल्मेंट इसमें होना चाहिए। उन्हें मातृम होना चाहिए कि हम को क्या चाहिए और क्या आज हमें मिलने जा रही है, उन को इसके साथ शामिल करना चाहिए।

दिवकत यह है कि हमारी सरकार ने मिक्सड इकानामी कबूल की है, लेकिन हम जाना चाहते हैं—सोशलिज्म की तरफ। यह भी ठीक है कि सोशलिज्म की कई परिभाषाएँ हो सकती हैं, लेकिन कम से कम प्रोड्यूसन और डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन—हर चीज को जनता के पास सही तरीके से पहुँचाने

की जिम्मेदारी—डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन का गार्मेंटिजेशन—ये दोनों सरकार के हाथ में हानी चाहिए, सभी लोगों तक सही चीज पहुँच सकती है।

यह मैं थोड़ा सा यू० पी० के बारे में कह देना चाहता हूँ—यह सबसे बड़ी स्टेट है। 1971 के सेंसस में उन की आबादी 883 लाख थी। और इस समय 9 करोड़ के लगभग है। पारुलेण। बा ग्रोथ दूसरा स्टेटों के मुकाबले में यू० पी० में ज्यादा है। क्योंकि प्रकृति का नियम है कि जहाँ गरीबी होती है, वहीं आबादी तभी से बढ़ती है। उत्तर प्रदेश की आबादी देश की आबादी का 16.1 फीसदी है और एरिया देश के एरिया का 9.1 फीसदी है। अगर यू० पी० जैसी बड़ी स्टेट जिसकी इतनी बड़ी पापुलेशन हो, इतना बड़ा क्षेत्र हो पिछड़ी रहती है, उस की तरफ विशेष ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता तो यकीन मानिए पूरा देश वही तरकीब नहीं कर सकता है। हमारे बन्दोबस्त के जो फेर्मर्स थ उन्होंने कान्ट्री-क्यूरेट अरैम्जनी में मैन्स किया था।

"The meaning of nationalism is that the total wealth of the country belonged to each and every citizen in equal measure and any system of distribution of revenue leading to inequality between man and man, between one province and another is not a fair and just system"

कास्टीड्यूशन के फेर्मर्स का यह इन्टेंशन था। इतना ही नहीं, प० इंदयनाथ कुजूर जो कि सोशलिस्ट नहीं थे, एक लिब्रल थे, उन्होंने कहा था—

"If a federation meant anything it meant that there should be a transfer of wealth from the richer to the poorer province." (At that time U.P. was not backward).

[श्री राजदेव सिंह]

वे यू० पी० के रहने वाले थे इस ध्यान से उन्होंने नहीं कहा था बल्कि पूरे देश को सामने रखकर उन्होंने यह बात कही थी। यू० पी० की फर्स्ट और सैकेंड प्लान में टोटली इन्वोल्व किया गया जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि आज पूरी स्टेट बैकवर्ड है। यू० पी० के 36 जिले ऐसे हैं जो कि मोर बैकवर्ड है और 27 जिले ऐसे हैं जो कि मोस्ट बैकवर्ड हैं। इस तरह से यू० पी० के पूरे 54 जिलों की हानत आप समझ सकते हैं। वहां पर एवरेज पापुलेशन तीन सौ व्यक्ति पर स्ववायर किलोमीटर है। लेकिन मैं प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर साहब को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि प्लानिंग ऐसा शुरू होने के पहले यू० पी० की पर-कैपिटा इनकम और स्टेट की तुलना में अच्छी थी। उस समय यू० पी० की पर-कैपिटा इनकम 259.62 रु० थी जब कि पूरे हिन्दुस्तान की पर-कैपिटा इनकम 247.50 रु० थी। सैकेंड फाइव इयर प्लान के बाद यह 259.62 में घटकर 245.68 रु० रह गई। यानी दो प्लान के बाद यू० पी० और गरीब हुआ 1960-61 की प्राइसेज के हिसाब से। 1966-67 में यू० पी० की पर-कैपिटा इनकम और भी नीचे चली गई। वह 227.60 रु० रह गई जबकि कट्टी की पर-कैपिटा इनकम 313 रुपए हुई। इसमें हम समझ सकते हैं कि यू० पी० की बात पहली और दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में बिल्कुल अनसुनी कर दी गई, उसकी तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। इसी तरह से तीसरी और चौथी योजना में भी उनके साथ इन्फाफ नहीं किया गया। यू० पी० की 60 पर-सेन्ट पापुलेशन माजिल लेबिल के नीचे हैं जबकि कुल देश की 40 परसेन्ट पापुलेशन माजिल लेबिल के नीचे है। 1971 के अन्त में यू० पी० की पर-कैपिटा इनकम 276.05 थी जबकि कुल देश की 347 रु० थी। आप देखें कि कितना फर्क है।

मैं प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर साहब से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक यू० पी० के लिए कोई खास एसाटमेंट नहीं करेंगे

तब तक वहां पर जो पिछड़ापन है उसको दूर नहीं कर सकते हैं। हालत यहां तक रही कि फर्स्ट और सैकेंड प्लान में, दस सालों में यू० पी० को सेंटर की तरफ से एक भी प्रोजेक्ट नहीं मिला। 1951 से 1969 तक सेंट्रल असिस्टेन्स का प्रति व्यक्ति औसत जो है वह यू० पी० में 106 रु० जबकि तमाम राज्यों का औसत था 141 रु०। 1951 से 69 तक 18 वर्षों में—तीन पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं और तीन एक साला योजनाओं में सेंट्रल असिस्टेन्स का प्रति व्यक्ति औसत यू० पी० में 106 रु० था तो अन्य राज्यों में जैसे उड़ीसा में 203 रु० था। उड़ीसा भी पिछड़ा हुआ राज्य है। राजस्थान का औसत 190 रु० था—यह भी पिछड़ा हुआ राज्य है। मध्य प्रदेश का 155 रु० था—यह भी पिछड़ा हुआ राज्य है। कश्मीर का औसत 405 रु० था, यह भी पिछड़ा हुआ राज्य है। आसाम का 189 रु० था, यह भी पिछड़ा हुआ राज्य है। तो फिर यू० पी० जो कि एक पिछड़ा हुआ राज्य है उसको पीछे क्यों छोड़ा गया यह समझ में नहीं आता है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ सेंट्रल असिस्टेन्स का जो पैटर्न है उसे कुछ ऐसा चेन्ज करना चाहिए जिससे बैकवर्ड एरियाज जो है वह आगे बढ़ें और थोड़ा सा डेवलप एरियाज के मुकाबले में आ सके। साथ ही साथ यू० पी० गवर्नमेंट ने पंचवर्षीय योजना में सेंट्रल असिस्टेन्स 3500 करोड़ रुपए लगाकर अपनी स्पीम बनाई, अपना प्रोग्राम बनाया लेकिन यहाँ पे प्लानिंग डिपार्टमेंट से उन्हें इस्टिमेशन गए है कि चौथी योजना की जो रकम थी सेंट्रल असिस्टेन्स की उससे दूनी रखें, उससे ज्यादा न रखें।

श्री जन्मलाल बन्नाकर (दुर्ग): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, योजना को तैयार करने के लिए जो आधार पुस्तिका तैयार की गई है उसको मैं ने मुझे अंत तक पढ़ा और उसको पढ़ने से जितनी खुशी हुई उससे अधिक खेद और दुःख हुआ। उसका कारण यह

कि इसमें सिद्धान्त की बातें काफी अच्छी भी गई हैं लेकिन जहाँ तक उनको व्यवहार में लाने की बात है, चार पिछनी पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में कार्यक्रम को ग्राम में लाने में जो कमजोरी रही है जिसके कारण हम उसको ग्राम में नहीं ला सके हैं वही कमजोरी इस योजना में भी है। जहाँ तक कार्यक्रम को व्यवहार में लाने की बात है, मैं इस छोटा सा उदाहरण दूँ। यह योजना किसके लिए तैयार की जाती है? आखिर योजना जो तैयार की जाती है वह देश की गरीब जनता के लिए होती है। योजना इसलिए बनती है कि हम उन लोगों के जीवन को सुखी बना सकें लेकिन जिस गरीब जनता के लिए खास तौर से देहात की गरीब जनता के लिए योजना जो बनाई जाती है वह बिना उनसे पूछे बना ली जाती है। हमने उनको इसमें हिस्सेदार बनाने का कभी भी आखिरी प्रयास नहीं किया है। होता यह है कि जितनी भी योजनाएँ बनी हैं वह सरकारी कर्मचारियों के विभिन्न दलों की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर सरकारी अफसर ही उसको तैयार करते हैं और हमारे मुख्य मंत्रीगण तथा केन्द्रीय मंत्रीगण उसमें कुछ परिवर्तन करने ज्यों का त्यों स्वीकार कर लेते हैं। इस योजना में कहा गया है कि जिले को आधार मानकर योजना तैयार की जायेगी। लेकिन जिले में आखिर कौन योजना बनाने वाला? वहाँ पर जो कलेक्टर है वह पटवारी से या रेवेन्यू इन्स्पेक्टर से कुछ आकड़े मगाकर ऊपर भेज देगा और उसी के आधार पर योजना तैयार हो जायेगी।

महात्मा गांधी ने आजादी की लड़ाई में जनता को हिस्सेदार बनाया था और इसी लिए स्वाधीनता संग्राम में जन आन्दोलन का रूप धारण किया। अब देश भर की जनता के विकास के लिए जब हम योजना बना रहे हैं तो उसमें जनता को हिस्सेदार क्यों नहीं बनाते हैं? जिसके लिए हम योजना बनाते हैं उससे हम कभी सलाह नहीं लेते। आज जो

व्यक्ति इनकमटैक्स पेयर है, जो ग्रामद्वी पर टैक्स देते हैं उन्हें से आप योजना बनवाते हैं। इसलिए जितनी कमजोरी पहले हर योजना में रही है उतनी ही कमजोरी इस योजना में भी है। आज इस सम्बन्ध में कोई यह कह सकता है कि जनता को किस प्रकार से इसमें हिस्सेदार बना सकते हैं? तो उसका उत्तर यह है कि आज जितने भी हमारे गाँव हैं वहाँ पर ग्राम पंचायतें हैं और उनके ऊपर सामुदायिक ब्लाक हैं और जब तक उन ग्राम पंचायतों और ब्लाक को इकाई मानकर योजना तैयार नहीं की जायेगी तब तक योजना कभी भी सफल नहीं हो सकती है; इस देश की गरीबी दूर करने वाली योजनाएँ तैयार नहीं हो सकती हैं। आज जो कहा जाता है कि बिलो पावर्टी लाइन (कमाल स्थिति) पर गाँव के लोग रहते हैं उनका दिक्कत और शिकायतें कभी भी दूर नहीं होगी।

जैसा कि श्री योजना मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में बताया कि यह जो योजना है उसमें कोई बैंक चेंज, बुनियादी परिवर्तन नहीं हो सकता है। मेरा निवेदन है श्री भी समय है, चार महीने में हर एक ब्लाक में, ग्राम पंचायतों से उनकी आवश्यकता के निर्माण कार्यक्रम यहाँ से प्रभावशील भेजकर मगाये और उनके आधार पर योजना तैयार करे क्योंकि उसके बिना योजना सफल नहीं हो सकती है। यदि ऐसा नहीं किया गया तो नतीजा यही होगा कि इस देश की तरक्की रुक जायेगी। आगे कोई दूसरा योजना मंत्री आयेगा तो उसको इसी आधार पर योजना बनानी पड़ेगी और तभी इसमें तरक्की हो सकेगी।

इसी प्रकार से इस योजना में सबसे बड़ी कमी यह है कि इसमें किसी को यह महसूस नहीं होता है कि योजनाओं को पूरा करने की जिम्मेदारी किसकी है। मेरा विश्वास है कि जब तक जिम्मेदारी फिक्स (निश्चित) नहीं

[श्री चन्दूलाल चन्द्राकर]

की जायेगी, प्रत्येक जिले में नहर या टयूब-वेल से सिंचाई, सड़क, स्कूल, अस्पताल—हर-एक चीज के लिए किसी व्यक्ति को जिम्मेदार नहीं बनायेगे तब तक आज, क्या, अगले पांच दस साल में भी योजना को असली रूप नहीं दे सकेंगे। इसलिये योजना को रेन्सोसिबिलिटी प्रोग्रियेन्टेड (जिम्मेदारी बांटकर) बनाना बहुत जरूरी है। आजादी के 27 साल बाद भी हमारे देश में एक लाख 70 हजार गांव ऐसे हैं जहाँ एक भी विकास कार्यक्रम नहीं हुआ। न सड़क है, न बिजली है न सिंचाई की व्यवस्था न स्कूल और न अस्पताल है जब हम लोग देहात में जाते हैं तो लोग यह कहते हैं कि आजादी के बाद बर्बर जैसे शहर के लिये 2,000 करोड़ रु० की व्यवस्था की जा रही है, बलवत्ता के लिये की जा रही है लेकिन गांवों के लिये क्या है? वहाँ एक छोटी सी सिंचाई योजना भी नहीं है। और यह हमलिय होना है कि जिना ग्राम पंचायत में पूछ योजनायें नैयार की जाती हैं। कहा जा सकता है कि ऐसे कम संपर्क स्थापित करें। गांव एक प्रभावशाली बनाये और उस को प्रत्येक ग्राम पंचायत के पास भेजें कि किस गांव में सड़क बिजली सिंचाई, स्कूल और अस्पताल की व्यवस्था नहीं है, और आप जिस चीज को प्राथमिकता देना चाहते हैं? कितने शिक्षित लोग बेरोजगार हैं, कितना कामकारी नौकरी मिली है और किस गांव में पानी के पानी की व्यवस्था नहीं है, और प्रत्येक गांव के कितने लोगों को आज रहने के लिये मकान बनाने के लिये जमीन नहीं है। प्रत्येक गांव में पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था और मकान बनाने के लिये कम से कम जमीन की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। यह 25 साल में नहीं हुआ इस का कारण यह है कि जितनी योजनाएँ बनायी गयी हैं

शहर वालों द्वारा दफ्तरों के कमरों में बैठ कर बनायी गयी है। आज चीन में जितने मफसर, मंत्री या समझू, मदम्य होते हैं उनको प्रति दो वर्ष में शायद 2, 3 महीने गांवों में रहना पड़ता है और ऐसी जगह रहना पड़ता है जहाँ सड़क नहीं है, बिजली नहीं है। इसलिये उन लोगों को वहाँ की तरलीफें मालूम होनी हैं और तभी ठीक में योजना बननी है। इसके विपरीत हमारे अधिकारी किसी गांव में नहीं रहते हैं। अगर किसी गांव में जाते भी हैं, यह यदि उन की जीप खराब हो गई तो ग्रामपंचायत में रहेंगे जहाँ कम में कम प्राधुनिक माधन उपलब्ध हो।

इस पुस्तक में एक विवेकवान जरूर है इस बार क्षेत्रीय अनुमानता को दूर करने की बात कही गई है। तबिन व्यक्तियों की बात जहाँ आती है वहाँ चर्चा उद्घरण के लिये राज्यों को जो रकम दी गई है जा पिछड़े हुए राज्य हैं जहाँ उपयोग नहीं है तबिन से पिछड़े हुए हैं उन्हीं राज्यों का कम पैसा दिया गया है। जब तक समूचे देश में एक ऐसा इनफ्रा-स्ट्रक्चर तैयार नहीं होगा जिस में अधिक से अधिक लोग काम कुछ करें तब तब समुन्नत विकास नहीं हो सकता। और यह तभी होगा तब देश के प्रत्येक देशी क्षेत्र के लिये कम से कम 10 लाख की प्राजादी के बीच में मन्टी परगज प्रेसीडेंस ट्रेनिंग कम डेमोन्स्ट्रेशन फार्म हो और इसी तरह में 10 लाख की प्राजादी के बीच में मन्टी परगज इन्स्ट्रियल ऐंस्टेट का ट्रेनिंग सेंटर हो जहाँ लोग काम सीख कर अपनी आजीविका कमा सकें।

जहाँ तक नीतिकरिया देने की बात है, पहली बात तो यह है कि शिक्षा पद्धति में परिवर्तन करना पड़ेगा। दूसरी बात यह है कि जो यू० पी० ए० सी० है उस की रैक्यू-मेंट नीति ध्वजनी पड़ेगी और ऐम्प्लायमेंट

एक्सचेंज को यह आदेश देना चाहिये कि जिनके व्यक्ति के पिना की आय 500, 700 रु० से अधिक हो उनके लड़कों को नौकरी न दे कर गरीब लोगों के लड़कों को ही नौकरी दी जाय। आज होता यह है कि जितनी पंचवर्षीय योजना बनायी जाती है उसके बारे में शहर के लोगों को तो मालूम होता है लेकिन गांव के लोगों को नहीं मालूम होता है। इसलिये हर एक ग्राम पंचायत में पुस्तकालय खोले जायें और जितनी योजना सम्बन्धी पुस्तकें हैं वहां भेजी जायें और उन पुस्तकालयों में यह अवश्य हो कि जिस प्रदेश की जो भाषा हो उसी भाषा में वे पुस्तकें भेजी जायें जिस से लोग उन को पढ़ सकें।

योजना में कार्यक्रमों को कार्यान्वित करने पर सब में ज्यादा जोर देना चाहिये था लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हुआ। स्वयं हम को यह लेना चाहिये कि आज गांवों में सिचाई और बिजली ले जाने के लिये सब में अधिक प्राथमिकता देनी चाहिये।

योजना मन्त्रालय के आडों में मालूम होता है कि देश के कुछ क्षेत्रों की कुछ लोगों की आय में बहुत वृद्धि हुई है और कुछ क्षेत्रों में कमी हुई है। क्या यह योजना की असफलता नहीं है? योजना मन्त्रालय को अच्छी तरह से मालूम है कि देश में अधिक पिछड़ा हुआ है। लेकिन फिर भी उन क्षेत्रों की अभी भी इस पंचवर्षीय योजना में उपेक्षा की गयी है पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्र और ग्रामों बड़े हुए क्षेत्र की पहचान का आधार क्या है? मन्त्रीजी कहते हैं कि हर एक क्षेत्र वाले कहते हैं कि उन का क्षेत्र पिछड़ा हुआ है। लेकिन योजना मन्त्रालय के कुछ आंकड़ों हैं जिन में बताया गया है, नेशनल मैग्नेट्स सर्वे में बताया गया है कि कुछ क्षेत्र ऐसे हैं जहां लोग बिलों पावर्टी लाइन, कंगाल की हालत में रहते हैं, जैसे मध्य प्रदेश है। जिस को

कंगाल कहते हैं वही हानन मध्य प्रदेश की है। 77 प्रतिशत लोग मध्य प्रदेश में कंगाल हैं। उसी तरह से प्रति व्यक्ति आय देश भर में वहां सब से कम है। इसी तरह में सिचाई की व्यवस्था मध्य प्रदेश में सबसे कम है। वहां 8 प्रतिशत जमीन में सिचाई की व्यवस्था है जब कि राष्ट्रीय औसत 23 प्रतिशत है। इसी तरह से प्रति हेक्टर उत्पादन गेहूं 7 क्विंटल है और चावल 8 41 क्विंटल प्रति हेक्टर है। जब कि देश भर का औसत है 11 24 क्विंटल प्रति हेक्टर।

उसी तरह से चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह फैसला किया था कि सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों के और पहाड़ी क्षेत्रों के विकास की जिम्मेवारी केन्द्रीय सरकार रखेगी। इस का परिणाम यह हुआ कि कुछ पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों को ज्यादा पैसा मिला। उदाहरण के लिये नागालैंड को विकास के लिये प्रति व्यक्ति के हिस्से में 678 रु० दिया गया जब कि देश में विकास के लिये प्रति व्यक्ति के औसत में प्रत्येक क्षेत्र को 65 रु० दिया जाता है। देश भर को प्रति व्यक्ति में औसत में प्रत्येक राज्य को 65 रु० मिलना है। लेकिन मध्य प्रदेश की प्रोमत् से भी कम मिलना है। इसलिये आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि मध्य प्रदेश जो कि पिछड़ा हुआ है और क्षेत्र में भी सबसे बड़ा राज्य है वहां प्राथमिक आवश्यकता को कमा नहीं है वर्षों भी अच्छी होनी है खनिज पदार्थ वन सम्पदा की कमी नहीं है इतना सब दाते हुए भी केन्द्र की मध्य प्रदेश के प्रति उपेक्षा की नीति है और आज जितना मध्य प्रदेश के साथ अन्याय हो रहा है उतना किसी अन्य राज्य के साथ नहीं हुआ है। आज न्यूनतम नीड्स प्रोग्राम न्यूनतम आवश्यकता कार्यक्रम को सरकार को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिये। जो मिडियम प्लानिंग कमीशन में न्यूनतम नीड्स प्रोग्राम के लिये तय किया है उस के अनुसार मध्य प्रदेश को 385 करोड़ रु० मिलना चाहिए स्वयं योजना मन्त्रालय के एक अध्ययन दल ने ऐसा कहा है।

[श्री चन्दूलाल चन्द्राकर]

जिस से लोगों को कम से कम पीने के लिये पानी तो मिल सके। लेकिन उस को काटकर योजना मंत्रालय ने 282 करोड़ कर दिया गया है। मैं चाहूँगा कि मिनिमम नीड्स प्रोग्राम जो है उस को केन्द्रीय सरकार अपने हाथ में ले। मध्य प्रदेश काफी पिछड़ा हुआ क्षेत्र है वहाँ सब से अधिक आदिवासी है ऐसी विशेष परिस्थिति होते हुए भी केन्द्रीय सरकार का ध्यान उस तरफ नहीं जा रहा है। मैं योजना मंत्री से कहूँगा कि मध्य प्रदेश की तरफ ध्यान दे और मिनिमम नीड्स प्रोग्राम को अपने हाथ में ले।

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, well begun is half done. The approach paper which the Minister has produced and presented to this House is very good in all respects.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): All is well that ends well.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY: That can also be added. I am hopeful of that. I do not want to make a speech. But I want to give some figures. When India got Independence, the land available per head was one acre and 20 kuntas.

Today it is only three-fourths of an acre; that is the land-man ratio; it is reduced by fifty per cent. On the day of Independence we were 30 crores people and now we are sixty crores. Our food production has increased by 100 per cent, industrial production by 250 per cent; we have got colleges, schools, hospitals, roads, everything. Yet our poverty has not gone. The basic cause is the increase in population. In western countries population doubles in 150 years; in our country, it doubles in thirty years. How are our Ministers going to produce enough food and services and employment for everybody? Unless

and until the growth of population is arrested, what is going to happen? As a matter of fact it must go on reducing. In several developed countries population decreases progressively. In Germany and Japan they had to give incentive to produce more children. Unless and until steps are taken here, I am going to tell our young Minister here that he is going to fail miserably in this country. There are political parties on the opposite side who want to create trouble by producing more children; they are competing with each other to produce more children? (Interruptions).

Government should provide only for two children per family, not more than that. When Nixon in America could not feed one person in one family, how is Indira Gandhi going to provide for five persons in a family? The land-man ratio in America is 6 acres to one man; in Russia it is 5 acres to one man; here it is not even thirty kuntas per person and every year it is reducing by 2½ per cent and in thirty years we will have enough land only for graveyards, mandirs and roads and nothing for cultivation. That is why the Government should give attention to allotment of funds for family planning. They are going to spend 19 paise in one rupee on this. How are they going to control population growth, I do not understand.

Before Independence the services were 25 per cent; now they have increased four-fold, to 100 per cent. Their salary and remuneration takes away about two-thirds of the entire budget of the Centre, States and municipalities. How are you going to meet the plan expenditure? Year after year that expenditure is increasing. One could complain against my own party Government that they are going on conceding point after point, benefit after benefit to all the wor-

kers. But what are the workers doing? They are going on strike. The electrical engineers, the doctors were threatening to go on strike. On each one of them the society had spent more than a lakh of rupees. But then they get jobs and go on strike; they do not care for their fellow-beings. We had four wars with Pakistan and one war with China. We had cyclones and droughts and floods. The country suffered some losses on account of these. But the losses suffered on account of strikes and lockouts are almost double the other loss. Government believes in socialism and wants to do good to these people. But is there any social discipline among those people? There the Government has miserably failed. I want the Government to see that there is no strike. If there is even one day strike, they must be dismissed from service and new people available in the country must be appointed. The Government should be prepared to face the consequences of it. They are not even 08 per cent and they are ruining and eating away more than 75 per cent of the budget of the municipalities, State Governments and Central Government

Fertiliser supply in the country today is not more than 50 per cent. The water available in the country is going waste. I want that there should be indigenous production of fertilisers. I am not interested whether the fertiliser factory is located in my district or in my State or elsewhere. Previously they said they will have 12 fertiliser factories. Now they have reduced it to 5. I submit that we should have at least 20 fertiliser factories so that we may have enough food for our people.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Ausgram): He is blaming the opposition parties. How many children has the President of India got?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur): Sir, I welcome this document, which makes it clear that there shall be no plan holiday, which has come with some important objectives and which has exploded many a myth. I find it has got triple objectives. It has been stated categorically that growth by itself is not sufficient to raise the standard of the people. When a few of us were trying to challenge it some years back, we were told by the economist in the Planning Commission that growth will take care of other things as well, I mean social objectives. I am happy that Mr. Dhar and Mr. Dharia now tell us that it is not so. Of course wisdom has dawned on the Planning Commission after a long time that growth by itself is not enough for the attainment of the social objectives we have laid down. We have seen all these years that growth has increased the disparity between the rich and the poor. Therefore, I welcome this document which says that growth, self-reliance and social justice must go together. It was said that self-reliance cannot be had in this country if you want growth. Our economists used to say, we must have lean from outside as much as we can from America and other countries.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can continue on Monday. This debate will continue on Monday.

Before we take up private members' business, I will hear Mr. Madhu Limaye's point of order.

15.00 hrs.

RE: NON-CIRCULATION OF ANSWERS TO TWO QUESTIONS TO PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

श्री मधु लिमये (बांका) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने आपको जो चिट्ठी दी है, पहले मैं उस को पढ़ता हूँ और फिर मैं अपने व्यवस्था के प्रश्न को पेश करूँगा। मैं ने आप को यह पत्र लिख कर दिया है :