

[Shri Raghu Ramaiah]

given to the subversive and violent activities in the country by certain political parties and by some foreign powers on a motion to be moved by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

- (5) Further consideration of the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, 1968, by Shri Nath Pai, as reported by the Joint Committee, on Wednesday, the 14th May, 1969.
- (6) Consideration of motions for modification of Citizenship (Amendment) Rules, 1968, given notice of by Shri Madhu Limaye and of All-India Services (Conduct) Rules, 1968, given notice of by Shri Narendra Kumar Salve, to be taken up on Thursday, the 15th May, 1969, at 4-30 P.M. at 5 P.M. respectively.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS rose—

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI (Hapur) : What about Telengana ?

MR. SPEAKER : I do not want discussion. (*Interruptions*). Order, Order please. Bengal and Bihar are also there. I would like to say that he has given enough programme for 2 months. Still you are not satisfied and want some more things. If you want all those things, you will have to sit till July and continue in the next session also.

12.19 hrs.

MOTION RE FOURTH FIVE
YEAR PLAN DRAFT—*contd.*

MR. SPEAKER : Yesterday the Plan discussion had taken about 4 hours 5 minutes. We have still 4 hours. That means it will go to Monday also. On Monday we will have not only Prime Minister's reply but some members may speak for an hour or so. Mr. Tenneti Viswanatham was on his legs and he has taken 12 minutes. We will continue the Plan discussion till 3 O'clock when we will take up non-official business. We will sit till 6 O'clock. There is an half-an-hour

discussion also. Mr. Viswanatham may resume his speech.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam) : Mr. Speaker, Sir yesterday, I was on the point why our Plans are failing. And, one of the chief reasons why the public undertakings particularly are failing is that the persons who are kept in charge have no trust in the efficiency of the public undertakings. This must be remedied by calling away all those who have no trust in public undertakings and find for them some other remunerative places.

Another point is this. In the implementation of the Plan, in respect of the disbursement of loans and grants, the people do not receive the loans and grants in full, the amount which are debited against them. In between, there are several persons by whom this money is knocked off. And this is leading to not merely sabotage of the Plan targets, but is also creating any amount of discontent. Besides this, the targets aimed at by the Planning Commission are generally upset by the costs which run higher and higher than what the Plan originally assumes, because, every year there are increases in excise duties. These increases in excise duties, particularly those on the essentials for the common man, lead to the demand for higher wages and therefore, higher costs of projects. And therefore, they lead to higher taxation, and again, higher deficit budgets and therefore, higher inflation.

There must be some discipline in the Finance Ministry. There should not be procedural delays. Generally files are passed on between Department to Department, Shirking decisions. Not only that, but they pass between the Centre and the States. Even for ordinary schemes and projects the officers of the Centre have no trust in the officers of the States. Often times they are asked to come to Delhi with various files. The Central officers scrutinise and re-scrutinise and waste their time. That only leads to additional overhead expenditure and causes undue delay. This can be remedied if the Centre trusts the States and acts with a sense of participation and jointness with the States. It should not be done as if the Centre is

superior to the States and the States are some beggars or donees at their feet. Unless these things are remedied, the Plan targets cannot be fulfilled. Not only that. The cost becomes higher and higher.

The common man feels the existence or the non-existence of the Government at certain points of which food is the most important thing. Food is not freely available. Still there is statutory rationing and the total availability now is only 14 ounces as against 16 and 18 which we are getting hitherto. Also the opportunity for work is less. Unemployment is increasing. Therefore, the Government must create opportunities for self employment. And one suggestion which I make is this.

All the consumer industries must be thrown open for these people for self-employment. That also would mean re-designing of the machinery, re-designing of small scale machinery to be utilised by small-scale men. These are called small-scale industries but what happens is that the big industrialists come in and enter into the field of small-scale industries. That must be stopped.

Then, Sir, I want to say about housing conditions. The housing conditions are horrible in this country, not only in villages but in cities also. They are getting overcrowded. Nearly 60 to 70 per cent live in slum conditions. I expected that the Planners will make some massive provision with regard to housing and housing programmes. If they cannot do it, Sir, we can set up Statutory Housing Corporations so that private capital may come there and build houses. Private engineering skill may be there; private architects may be there and there will be further employment and in the meanwhile we will get better housing facilities.

Then, there must be honesty of purpose. If there is no honesty of purpose, everything else will fail. But if there is honesty at the top, that will create zeal in the minds of officers. On the other hand, if there is laxity among Ministers, that will lead to laxity in the Secretaries and this will lead to laxity among Heads of Departments, which will lead to laxity among engineers that may mean laxity among contractors and we all know what this has led to. Public funds are going into unaccount-

ed coffers and there is almost a parallel five year plan run by the unaccounted money. That must cease. There must be self-discipline among the Ministers and this will lead to self-discipline among others. Want of this is sabotaging even the good bits of the plan. The Plan was bad because there was no sense of priorities in it. The planners did not recognise the urgency of food. The part food played was known better by our ancient Rishis. That is why they said ANNAM VAI BRAHMA. They knew that the prosperity and everything in the country depended upon availability of food. That is why ANNAM VAI BRAHMA. Government are burdened with the duty of providing for it. Our people do not understand that. They think that they can produce big Plan books which will bring food.

One word about the borrowing programme. We are told that we are going to get Rs. 3,730 crores of external assistance. Out of that, Rs. 1,215 crores are for repayment of loans. This was the element of compound interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 6 per cent which rate on Rs. 1,215/- crores. We should never borrow to repay previous loans. We deprecate it in co-operative banks, we deprecate it in ordinary banks. We do not lend money in order to pay the previous loans. That will go on adding to the debts. Therefore, the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister must seek rescheduling of debts or loans as an alternative.

These are some of the things which led to the unsatisfactory conditions and these unsatisfactory conditions have led to demands for higher wages, higher D. A., strikes, labour troubles, and student troubles. Therefore, I submit that the Prime Minister who is in charge of the Plan, and also the Head of the Planning Commission and other Ministers must revise their notions and start a fresh chapter of self-discipline. She said that the Plan has come of age. It is 21 years after Independence and it is natural. After independence, this Government has also come of age. Therefore, the Ministers must start fresh life and give fresh air to this country. Then the people will be grateful. Otherwise, the happenings which are now seen in some light States, are sure to spread to other States also. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER : Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha. The next speaker is Shri Hem Barua.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barb) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is very kind of you to allow me to participate in this discussion. We are discussing this Plan at a very crucial moment. In the country today, there have been many developments which probably were inherent in the federal structure of the country. When there was one Party having majority in all the States as well as the Centre, the real complexion of federal structure could not be evolved. The Congress was the ruling Party in all the States and therefore the Congress Working Committee and the High Command of the Congress were the deciding authorities. But in the changing situation today, the stresses and tremours that we find are not so unnatural.

In our Constitution we had provided for a federal structure and today we find that the federal structure is being evolved. The postponement of the plan was a tremendous opportunity for Government to recondition its thinking and its policies according to the new demands of the situation. There is nothing sacrosanct about the past decisions or past policies ; if they require to be changed in the present conditions they should be changed. Policies cannot be determined in terms of the full stop. No Government functions and no country functions in terms of a full stop ; they function only in terms of commas ; an individual does not also function under a full stop ; life grows and progresses, and therefore, we have to condition ourselves to the changing situation. The individuals of today and the institution of today are thinking and they are suggesting what the country has to do. This was a tremendous opportunity. The great debate that is taking place in the country is itself a process of this evolution of a pattern. Therefore, I do not view the attitude of criticism that we find today about the Plan as something bad, or as a criticism of the persons who are in charge of the Plan or the government or a criticism of individuals who have been manning the Planning Commission certainly had its great utility in the early years of planning, but since then the context has been changing. When we put stress on heavy industries, probably it

was very necessary at that moment. But economics is a science, and yet the last word on economic possibilities has not been said.

In France, when the French economy was having the strongest currents of economic stability, suddenly a situation arose in which the French economy got a severe setback with the result that so many new developments have taken place now in France. The affluent economy of Germany is also not without stresses and strains. Affluence itself is providing for a lot of stresses and strains. Only the other day Germany provided for the levying of export duties so that the exports of Germany may be toned down. So an entire policy is being evolved to suit new and changing conditions. During the time of the gold drains also the strongest economics could not sustain themselves against the stresses and strains. Therefore, there is no last word on economic decisions.

Therefore, to make political capital out of it and to say that a particular decision which was all right in a particular context should remain as a sacrosanct decision for all time to come is an attitude which cannot conform to the realities of the situation.

Today, the States are making demands for increased resources. I do not see any reason why such demands should be looked upon with great suspicion. After all, the Governments which have been voted to power in various States have also some aspirations : they have also made certain promises to their people and they have also been duly elected to the Assemblies. If they want to change certain priorities, certainly it is their right to change those priorities. The Planning Commission can act as a friend, guide and philosopher, but the Planning Commission cannot have the last word in everything. There should be a consensus ; there should be a participation and it should be on a partnership basis. The federal structure requires partnership of the States and the Centre. There is no requirement of subordination of the States to the Centre.

If there is a strong Centre, that has been provided for in the interests of the weaker sections of society, those sections which are have-nots, and those regions which are have-nots and which are back-

ward regions. There is an inherent demand from those people and from those areas for a strong Centre, and that was exactly why the founding fathers of our Constitution had provided for a strong Centre. In every State, there are backward areas. The votes in the ballot box are not the deciding factor for the welfare of these backward regions in the respective States. Therefore, the founding fathers of our Constitution provided for a strong Centre which may look to the interests of these areas which probably may have a sense of insecurity. There are backward regions in every State, and patches of backward regions and backward classes and Harijans and tribals; in the multi-tier society that we have, there are many tiers which are backward; even in the backward classes, some are more advanced than the others. So, one has to look after their interests. A Strong Centre has been provided for primarily to bring about a balance in the country. The Centre should supplement and subsidise the aspirations of the people of the backward areas and backward regions. That is how the Centre has been made strong politically and economically. There cannot be two opinions on this that there should be no erosion of the authority of the Centre. But it cannot be denied at the same time that today we have a complex of various States being manned by various parties; in one State, one party may be running the State, while in another another party may be running it. There is bound to grow a collective wisdom in this process, but that can grow not through subordination but only through consultation and through participation.

12 30 hrs.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

In this context, I think the Planning Commission could have done a better job. But in the Draft Plan, we find that the physical outlines of the Plan are the same. As if the Plan could have come very easily three years earlier. In these three years, it was up to the Planning Commission to have an open debate in its own premises, to take advantage of the open debate being conducted in the country. But from this document, I do not see evidence of that realisation. We still are guided by assump-

tions, the assumption that the public sector will do good. That is our assumption. Well, I would like that to come true. But still it remains an assumption, not a reality.

How much is the public sector assumed to give for the Plan? Rs. 1730 crores. But what has been the performance of the public sector in the last three years? What a jump we have provided for the public sector? Are we going to administer some coramin to the public sector? Will it start doing extraordinarily good all of a sudden, keeping in view its record in the last three years of Rs. 350 crores by way of additional resources? How do we assume that the public sector is going to give us Rs. 1730 crores in five years? The country should certainly have been taken into confidence as to what are their *via media* what are the ways and means they are going to follow to improve the performance of the public sector.

I am sorry to say that in spite of the fact that the ARC brought out certain suggestions in regard to the organisation of the public sector, there is no incorporation of these in their working. There is the difficulty of accounting. Parliamentary control of the public sector has to change. Now, has Parliament ever obstructed the process of understanding? Members of Parliament here are not omnipotent. They come here with certain knowledge. To create a better understanding with the parliamentarians in the job of the planning Commission, of the country and of industries as such.

Suppose the system of parliamentary control changes, who is going to take the initiative and have this kind of debate? The demand for Standing Committees has been made by parliamentarians. Yet Government have been luke-warm towards it.

In a federal structure, I think with the open debate that we conduct here, conditions are not conducive to real intimate thinking on the problem. We discuss for five days a budget of Rs. 2,000 crores. Even if we speak two sentences on the entire public sector, well and good. We get 10 minutes, 15 minutes. Government spokesmen when they reply probably touch—barely touch—on these matters. Is this the way we can have a better understanding with parliamentarians?

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

I find that the entire discussion of the Plan in parliament has become unreal. The public sector has an investment of more than Rs. 4,000 crores. I suggest that there should be a separate budget for the public sector which should be discussed here. But there is no such debate.

The committee system could have provided an intimate working with the parliamentarians as well as with Government. The public sector functionaries, the managing director, Chairman and others could have been brought directly into contact with parliamentarians. Naturally Parliament is the eyes and ears of this country. Nothing can remain away from us. That is understandable and understood. Therefore, why should there not be better understanding created between parliamentarians and the public sector directly, not through secretaries, joint secretariat or deputy secretaries. Even a section officer can say what are the projects and what are the improvements in the public sector.

I would like Government to spell out how the situation is going to be improved in the public sector to such an extent that in five years we are going to jump to Rs. 1730 crores realisation from it when in three years we have collected only Rs. 350 crores.

The emphasis we put in the First and Second Plans on heavy industry has undergone a change. Initiating the discussion, the Prime Minister said yesterday that we have given priority to irrigation in plan discussions. It is an economic law that when you see that a certain accumulation of resources has taken place in projects where the gestation period is long, you divert your resources to some other project with short gestation periods, and thus have a balance between the two. In the Second Five Year Plan, we made this mistake. If we repeat it now, we will again have a setback. The Second Plan mistake was that industrial development took place by more 150 per cent.

Probably it went to 161 per cent. Everybody was jubilant that India had achieved miraculous industrial advancement without realising that the Plan is a complete link and if one sector slackens and the other sector become more vigorous, it was not a healthy phenomenon. While

the industrial targets were over fulfilled, there was shortfall in the transport requirement. The foreign exchange could not be balanced : food production could not come up to expectation ; there was set back in respect of power. In other words, in place of the target for industry, agriculture, power transport, foreign exchange, etc. if some sectors fell short by fifty per cent and other sectors exceed their targets by fifty per cent the balance is disturbed. Even during the Third Plan period, we increased the capacity of certain industries but fulfilment could not come because we could not supply the inputs needed, inputs such as power, etc. I know that we are not working more than 44 per cent capacity in fertilizer factories. Recession is also one of the reasons. But the main reason is that we have not been able to keep the supply of inputs flowing to the required level. In this poor country resources are so scarce and even mobilising available resources is difficult. Is it not paradoxical that on the one hand we cry hearse for resources and on the other hand we have the maximum proportion of unutilised capacity. Can we afford this luxury ? Therefore, when the Congress President said that unutilised capacity must not be allowed to remain unutilised, it was a very relevant point. Even the Prime Minister has said in her statements that this country cannot afford to put a premium on inefficiency. What is the premium ? It is that we do not utilise the capacity. It means that more investment had been made than was needed and there is no return from that investment. That is also a premium on inefficiency. I thought that this particular aspect would get the maximum attention in the plan document. I do not find such a picture. Unless and until basic changes are brought about in the approach to the public sector projects and unless they are linked to Parliament in the way I suggested, it could not be done.

The Secretariat may be a very efficient secretariat but it was never meant to be a secretarian to run commercial undertakings: it was to run the civil services which it did very well. That was its sphere of activity. It is not necessary for the Secretariat officers to be born omnipotent. It is only in this country there is this kind of costly wastage : one person is one day Joint

Secretary in a ministry ; the other day he is chairman of the electricity board ; the third day chairman of Hindustan Antibiotic and fourth day chairman of the Hindustan Steel Ltd. They are not the special creations of God. As a house wife, I cannot do pounding of rice which is done in our families inspite of my education ; an uneducated woman will do it much better because she knows the technique. I do not pretend that we are all omnipotent. It is a fallacy that the Secretariat officers sitting here can say the last word on everything—the last word in wisdom or the last word in organisation or the technological competence. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you must have read the book *Industrial State* by Galbraith. In that book he says that there is so much in common in the economic structure of the USA and Russia though one functions under the capitalist system and the other under the socialist system. Technology has so much advanced that the entire structure of the organisation has been entrusted to technically competent people.

Neither the politicians in Soviet Union nor the owners of Industry in America can afford to interfere in the technology of the public sector or the industrial undertakings today. Therefore, he suggested that the world has become very much smaller today. Competence is the last word. Executive competence is the clicking word which has been prevailing in America as well as in the Soviet Union. That is the change that has been happening in the world of economic growth. Therefore, I think that in the country also, if we can change the priority, it will be good. I am glad that the insistence has been on those projects which have a short gestation period. It is not a matter of philosophy. A very wrong idea has come : left, right and centre. This has given a most distorted picture in our country today. I do not understand at all what is left, what is right and what is the centre. I do not understand the philosophy behind it.

Now, is it so abnormal a thing to be done ? Suppose, you have invested, out of Rs. 100 in one plan, Rs. 50 on two project allowing the gestation period, and you see that we will lose there. You divert left-over resources to those projects which have a short gestation period. Which is that doctrine of socialism which is badly affect-

ed by this philosophy ? I do not understand. There is so much slogan-mongering because nobody has any real idea as to what exactly can be done to meet the challenges of the situation.

About the new, changing situation of the Centre-State relations, there are two aspects. One is the political aspect. This discussion has nothing to do with the political aspect except certain broad policies. But I shall confine myself to the economic aspect. I feel that the time has come when there should be a kind of reassessment of the allocation of resources. I agree with some of the points that are made, may be they are from the opposition parties. But it does not matter. They are the elected governments of the people. I agree that the pattern of evolution of financial assistance must undergo a change. Today, the States have a loan which they have to pay to the Centre ; it is about Rs. 6,000 crores. Rs. 5,991 to be exact. That is the amount of loan which is on the head of the States which they have to pay to the Centre. Can they ever pay that ? It is a misnomer to talk about it and say that it is a loan. Very soon, the time will come when the Centre will have to write off these loans, because it is impossible, and it is more impossible to pay them back even if one finds Ali Babas treasure. Therefore, an entire reassessment of the devolution of economic responsibility must be undertaken now. That is why I said that the Plan discussion has come at a very crucial time, when there was a lot of need to go into these aspects of the Plan.

I am glad that this debate is taking place today. I find that even without going into the obligation of changing the Constitution, this devolution can be done ; you could do it. The Finance Commission can devise a system whereby this could be done. I am of the opinion that 90 per cent of the income-tax must go to the States straightway. This recommendation came when the third Round Table Conference met, where the financial responsibility of the Centre in a federal structure had been incorporated. What was the Government of India Act of 1935 ? We have not realised that the time has passed so much since the Government of India Act of 1935. The whole relationship has changed. And therefore, I feel that the decision of the

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

expert committee at the time of the third Round Table Conference must be now implemented. 90 per cent of the income-tax must be allowed to go to the States. It may be 90 to 95 per cent; something like that. The surcharge on income-tax can remain with the Centre.

Then, the duty in respect of excise; the present proportion is smaller. A much bigger proportion must be given to the States. There was a time when land revenue was realised without specifying the needs of the Centre and the needs of the States. Where is the land revenue? Land revenue has become insignificant source of revenue today. *(Interruption)*.

I shall wind up in two or three minutes. Secondly, I would like to submit that the Centre should not take this obligation of having a system of grants-in-aid. Why should there be such a system as grants-in-aid? The Centre's power remains with the Centre. What is important is that a sense of belonging should be there, in respect of the backward regions and the backward classes. I submit to the Government, through you, that the system of grant-in-aid should be discontinued except that certain criteria and certain norms may be devised whereby grant-in-aid can go and supplement and subsidise the income of the backward areas and the backward classes.

Suppose there are tribal areas or other areas which are economically backward. They require more funds. The States cannot supplement them today. In every State, there are backward areas like Telengana in Andhra, Vidarbha in Maharashtra, Chotanagpur in Bihar, the eastern districts in UP and so on. Only Punjab has done well as a whole. There are backward areas in Gujarat also. Therefore, the criteria of grants-in-aid should be linked up with the requirements of backward regions. The centre should create a sense of belonging in them. The Centre will remain strong, because the minorities would want it to be strong. If they cannot succeed in the ballot in their respective States, they would look to Centre as their guardian. Let the minorities, let the have-nots, demand that the centre should be strong. The Centre can create a sense of belonging in these backward regions. If the State spends

Rs. 100 there, let the centre supplement it by Rs. 50, rather than giving general grants-in-aid, which never come back. Let the centre discontinue this practice, declare a moratorium on the repayment and evolve a system of supplementing the income of backward areas.

There should be a permanent Finance Commission. You may call it Inter-State Finance Council or by any name. The Constitution provides that the President can have a privy council for advising him on State matters. One such economic council should also be constituted permanently to go into the question. The very basis of the Planning Commission has to change. It should remain the friend, philosopher and guide to the Centre as well as to the States. It may provide the national structure of the plan, but the priorities should be left to the individual States. My State might like to spend more on education rather than on agriculture. Our Assembly is competent to look to the interests of the people of my State. My State may not have a genius for industrial development. If we invest more in irrigation, our fruitfulness and the country's fruitfulness will increase. That may be our feeling. Therefore, the fixation on priorities among agriculture, irrigation, education, health, labour etc. should be left to the States and the Centre should not interfere in it.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : Sir, the Government of India's resolution of March, 1950 has enunciated the objectives of planning in this country. We have to study this draft fourth plan against the background of those objectives. If we look at this plan from this standpoint, we find there is a desperate attempt to stabilise the economic disequilibrium which is there today in the country. Therefore, this Plan is not a dynamic plan so far as our economy concerned.

Unfortunately, there is not even a mention of the word 'socialism' in this. But the objectives enunciated in the resolution have specifically said that planning in India will bring the country to the brink of, if not into, economic equality through socialism. There is nothing of that sort in this plan. When I read the plan, I found a brief analysis of the so-called benefits accruing out of the so-called social control

of banking, but there is no mention of the progress made towards socialism in the course of the third plan which preceded this. Are we to understand that the Government of India and the Planning Commission which is almost a parallel Government, have said good-bye to socialism? If so, let them come forward and say so.

According to this resolution, the planning benefit will be social gain, not personal gain. But here we find personal gains only, not social gains.

Whatever that might be, in this approach to the Plan it has been specifically pointed out that the Plan had to be postponed because of certain eventualities, and one of those eventualities was the invasion by China and Pakistan of this country. Yesterday also the Prime Minister made a reference to it.

It is a fact that there was aggression by China and Pakistan, but any calamity of that sort should give a fillip, an opportunity, to gear up our economy. But in our case we have postponed the Plan only because of the fact that China and Pakistan aggressed on us.

There are other causes also given in the body of this Plan. It is said that there was a crisis in agricultural production and therefore the Plan had to be postponed. If there was a crisis in agricultural production—in fact there was a crisis in agricultural production—it is a sad commentary on the three Plans that preceded this Plan.

Other reasons vindicating or justifying the postponement of the Plan are also given. Natural calamities like floods and droughts are mentioned. Floods and droughts have adversely affected our agricultural production. But, at the same time, it is one of the jobs of Government to see that wherever there are droughts water is provided, irrigation facilities are provided and drinking water is provided. It is one of the jobs of Government to see that in drought affected areas like Rajasthan or Tamil Nadu, which the Prime Minister visited, drinking water and irrigation facilities are provided. But in this Plan we find a passing reference to irrigation facilities that they propose to make available to the people. No top priority is given to irrigation facilities. Irrigation facilities will not only eliminate the problem of droughts and floods in this country but they will also

generate an economy based on agriculture. There is nothing like that.

What about the problem of floods. Floods, may I tell you, are an annual visitation in Assam. During the 14 years subsequent to 1951 the State Exchequer has lost on an average Rs. 7.7 crores a year. In 1966 the floods were the most acute in Assam and the State lost property belonging to the people estimated at Rs. 247 million. Many lives were also lost. It is not a matter of joke. Floods, apart from retarding progress of agriculture and bringing untold miseries to human lives, destroy property and inflict damage on the State Exchequer also. Therefore there is a demand in this country coming from different parts for further allocation of finances to the States.

When the three Plans were formulated the basic political pattern of India was of a similar nature. Now with the recent elections the pattern has been disturbed and a new pattern has emerged. But somehow or the other the Fourth Five Year Plan does not take any note of that disturbance caused in the basic political pattern. This is something very startling. The Plan should have been formulated in the light of that change in the basic political pattern in this country. There has been no attempt made in this Plan to formulate the Plan in the light of the basic change in the political pattern in our country. It has been formulated in the usual manner. Planning Commission is a vast empire and the Planning Commission has brilliant men. But their brilliance somehow or the other is not reflected in this Draft Fourth Plan. That pains me most, but what to do?

There is another reason given for the postponement of this Plan.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member may continue his speech after lunch. We will adjourn for lunch now and meet again at 14.00 hours.

13 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.