

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

should be no reason by which the Government can say, especially at this time, that because the Travancore-Cochin Government has to collect the information from factories dispersed in various places, it is not possible. We want to know whether it would be possible for the hon. Minister to give us definite information about this lock-out before we disperse at the end of the session. The House must be taken into confidence.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : After we get the information, whatever the Government of India is able to do it will do in addition to what is given in the report. Whatever, in the circumstances, is possible we will do in the matter and settle the question.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon cum Mavelikkara) : The cashew-nut factories are only in two taluks in Central Travancore.

Mr. Speaker : I will suggest to the hon. Minister that he may try to communicate with the Government of Travancore-Cochin and try to get the information before Parliament disperses. He will make every effort.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : Yes.

Shri Abid Ali : Even if the Assembly in Travancore-Cochin was meeting, the Government there would have taken some time to obtain information from the districts. They could not have made a statement off-hand.

Mr. Speaker : In other words, every effort would be made to collect the information before Parliament closes.

RESOLUTION RE SECOND FIVE-YEAR PLAN

Mr. Speaker : The House will now take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the 23rd May, 1956 :

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

The discussion will be both on this Resolution and the amendments.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad) : Will you kindly permit me to remind you that today is Friday and it is past Question

Hour. According to the convention which we have recently established, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs is now expected to make a statement about the order of Government business next week. He is not even present in the House. He was here five minutes ago. He has vanished.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam) : This is rather unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker : We will get along. In the meanwhile...

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao : He comes in between and makes a statement. That is what he did before.

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Members after lunch will meet again at 3 or 3-30. If the House is full, I will ask him to make a statement.

Shri Kamath : I request that it may be made in your presence.

Mr. Speaker : Shri A. K. Gopalan.

Shri Gadilingana Gowd (Kurnool) : We have got amendments.

Mr. Speaker : Hon. Members will kindly send to the Table Office the numbers of the amendments. I will go through them, and if they are in order, I will admit them.

Shri A. P. Gopalan (Cannanore) : We are discussing the Second Five Year Plan, mainly its principles and approach.

Mr. Speaker : Leaders of various groups will take half an hour, except in particular cases where I will try to extend it by 15 minutes more. Others will take from 15 to 20 minutes.

Shri A. K. Gopalan : A year ago the plan-frame was published. It contained several guiding principles with special emphasis on basic and heavy industries and the public sector. The monopoly elements of the private sector after the publication of the plan-frame went all out to denounce and scuttle the plan-frame. They were against the expansion of the public sector and development of heavy and machine-building industries, but the enlightened public, with all the weaknesses of the Plan, supported these proposals especially the proposal that the basic industries as well as the machine-building industries must be

given top priority. The Planning Commission and the Government tampered with the plan-frame. I do not want to go into details because the plan-frame as it was published and the Five Year Plan recommendations are there and will show the difference.

The next thing that I want to point out is that there was a big difference between the First Five-Year Plan and this as far as consultations were concerned. There were some panels like the Labour Panel, the Panel on Land Reform etc., and there was also a consultative committee including Members of Parliament where there were some discussions. I only want to point out that though there were all these panels, the recommendations that had been made by these panels, especially the Panel on Land Reform, had not at all been considered by the Planning Commission and they have not been included. Even the unanimous recommendations of the consultative committee were not considered by the Planning Commission.

As far as the objectives are concerned, every patriotic Indian will acclaim them. Unlike the First Five-Year Plan, the Second Plan makes a clearer and more definite declaration of its objectives. The four principal objectives that have been given are: increase in the national income so as to raise the level of living in the country, rapid industrialisation with particular emphasis on the development of the machine-building industry, large expansion of employment opportunities and reduction of inequalities in income and wealth and a more even distribution of the economic power. These are the main objectives of the Plan. The question is: how to achieve them? What is the approach by which these objectives can be achieved quickly? Here comes the difference. The difference is not about the objectives. About the objectives there is absolutely no difference. There is no difference regarding the increase in national income or raising the standard of living. But what is the approach, what is the method by which these objectives are sought to be achieved? Is the increase in national incomes going to benefit the common man whose living standard should be raised?

The only ideology with which I approach this Plan is this. The most important problems facing us today are poverty and unemployment. We must get rid of unemployment and prevent

unemployment in the future. We must improve the standard of living of the people, not merely of one section, but of all sections, especially of the poorer sections. And how does the Plan, the policy and the method help us to solve these closely connected problems? It is from this point of view that I approach this Plan.

There is certainly some advance in the Second Five Year Plan as compared with the First Year Plan. The Second Plan contains proposals for economic and developmental activities on a scale larger than that in the First Plan. In many respects, the physical targets of production and development have been set higher. The financial allocations in the Second Plan are twice those of the First Plan. These are the items of improvement in the Second Plan as compared with the First Plan.

I do not want to go into the details of the difference between the allocations in the First Five Year Plan and those in the Second Five Year Plan. In the case of some items like agriculture, community development projects, industry and mining, transport and communications, the percentage of allocation is more than that in the First Plan. In the social services, irrigation and power, the allocation is less than that in the First Plan.

The most important thing is that industry and mining which had been neglected in the First Plan have been given an important place in the Second Plan. But the allocations for social services have been cut down. Certainly, the allocations in respect of education and health should not have been reduced. In order to increase the standard of living, to increase the national income, and to get rid of poverty and unemployment, two things are necessary. The first is that we must embark upon a rapid industrialisation of the country, and the second thing is that we must carry out radical agrarian reforms.

Now, what does increase in the standard of living mean? It means bigger and better supply of food, supply of clothing, housing and other facilities. There must be increased production, both industrial and agricultural. Production requires the use of tools, implements and other machinery. The only way of bringing about increased production is to increase our stock of

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

tools, implements and machinery. This in turn means an increase in the capital investment.

So far as industries are concerned, there are two types of industries, the consumer-goods industries and the basic industries. The larger the supply of steel, the bigger is the production of steel, implements and machinery, and the bigger will be the supply of both producer and consumer-goods, we have a manufacturing industry in India, crores of rupees will remain in our own country. At present, we are importing machinery, because we have not started factories to fabricate heavy machinery needed especially for the production of steel, cement etc. But if we have manufacturing industry in our own country, our dependence on foreign supplies could be greatly reduced. This is the first way in which we can remove the main obstacle in the way of rapid industrialisation.

The Second Plan has ignored these important aspects of the Plan-Frame. The Plan-Frame had earmarked Rs. 1,100 crores or 26 per cent of the total outlay, on industry and mining. Coming to the details of the outlay on the Second Plan, for industry and mining in the public sector, barring the steel plant, the total outlay is Rs. 350 crores. The allocation for the rest of the public sector is very much negligible.

Coming to the scope of the private and public sectors, the Plan-Frame had suggested that the public sector must be expanded rapidly and relatively faster than the private sector, and it was said that the ratio must be 2:1. But this approach has been abandoned in the Second Plan. Coming to the private sector, as the Prime Minister said the other day, nobody wants to condemn the private sector. There is no question of condemnation of the private sector. We want the private sector for some time, provided it does not lead to monopolies and accumulation of wealth, and provided the interests of the country and the objective of national reconstruction are not in any way jeopardised. As we have seen many times, the private sector stands in the way of rapid industrialisation and also sometimes against the development of the public

sector. From the proposals of the Second Plan, it would seem that instead of the public sector gradually securing an ascendancy over the private sector, it is the private sector that continues to maintain its preponderance in our economy. This is contrary to what the Plan-Frame had suggested.

Now, I come to the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956. It does not promise us any radical change in the relative position of the two sectors in our economy. It does not recognise one or two basic things, namely that in order to strengthen and expand the public sector it is necessary not only to start new State-owned industries but also to nationalise big industries and units in the private sector. So far as nationalisation is concerned, the Prime Minister said the other day that he does not want nationalisation by payment of big compensation and having the old machines; he wants to have new things. But the reason why we say that there can be nationalisation is that it can be had by payment of the minimum compensation, because there has been an amendment to the Constitution in this regard, and it is only Parliament which is going to decide that big compensation should not be given.

There are industries like tea, coal and rubber, where the question of old-model machines does not come in. These are industries which give good revenue to the State. Unless we have got State-owned and revenue-yielding industries, it will be impossible for us to get the necessary resources. If we want resources for reconstruction and development, we have to tap the resources from the revenue-yielding private sector.

Then again, why should we not nationalise the British and other foreign concerns? There are the tea gardens, for instance. The other day, there was a question in regard to the Kannan Devan Tea Estate, where 260 square miles of area has been given for a very small sum of money, and during these years, there has been a profit of more than 60, 70 and 80 per cent even after the payment of dividend and other things.

If we want to implement our Plan, and if the objective in view has to be achieved, it is quite essential that the State-owned industries must be there,

and we must be sure that these are big industries that yield more resources and revenue for Government.

The Plan-Frame refuses to see the urgency of measures to restrict the operation of foreign private capital and extricate our national economy from its stranglehold. The Plan-Frame proposed only an outlay of Rs. 400 crores on industry in the private sector, so that on the one hand, we shall have the resources available for development of heavy and basic industries in the public sector, and on the other, it would be possible also to encourage cottage and small-scale industries.

The Plan-Frame proposed that the demand for the consumer-goods should be met as largely as possible from the cottage and small-scale industries. The Second Five Year Plan has not only modified this approach, but has raised the investment in consumer-goods industries. It has further sanctioned heavy private investment in industries like aluminium, ferro-manganese, cement and so on, all of which, in the interests of the country and in the interests of rapid industrialisation, should have been taken up in the public sector.

There is one other thing also that I would like to point out, namely that while acquiring shares in equity capital, the iron and steel company has been allotted a sum of Rs. 115 crores from the public exchequer. The private sector has been allowed to undertake investment even in industries like silk and rayon. I feel that these things can claim no priority in the present state of our planned economy. Further, part of the funds of the National Industrial Development Corporation will also go to the private sector. The huge concessions which have been given to the private sector would mean two things. Firstly, they will stand in the way of rapid industrialisation and secondly they will stand in the way of the expansion of the public sector. On the contrary, the huge resources should have been left for planned investment on the basis of proper priorities in our economy. The expansion of large-scale industries in the private sector in this way will lead to retrenchment and also to unemployment. It will threaten the

small-scale and cottage industries. Besides, the monopolists will also strengthen their position.

We want to make it clear in this respect that we want that small-scale and cottage industries should be encouraged in the present context of our economy, because they will go a long way to solving the problem of unemployment, by absorbing as many people as possible.

Coming to the question of labour, I would say that industrial progress is linked with the labour policy. And what is labour policy? The legitimate demands of the workers for increased wages, dearness allowance, bonus and so on, and improvement in working conditions must be made an integral part of promoting industrial progress. The Plan denies the demand for a minimum wage increase on the basis of the already increased productivity. As far as production is concerned, as a result of the First Five Year Plan, there has been increase in production. When there is increase in production, when there is increase in productivity, there is no increase as far as wages are concerned. Not only that. It is said also that if there is no enthusiasm on the part of the workers, we cannot implement the Second Five Year Plan. In order to produce, more, he must have the enthusiasm and he must be convinced that if he produces more and there is more profit, he will have a share of it. So as far as the lessons of the First Plan are concerned, though production was more and profits were more, there has been no corresponding increase in the wages of workers. Except in one or two industries, this is the position so far as the workers' wages are concerned.

If there must be enthusiasm among workers, then certainly the approach must be different. They must be told that if they produced more and if the profit increased, they would have a share in it. This should be the approach in the Plan as far as labour incentive is concerned. But that is not actually so. Without a revision of wages, there can be no enthusiasm among the working classes and among the public, and to that extent, the successful implementation of the Plan will not be there. It has also been said by all the labour unions in this country that as far as labour

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

is concerned, the Second Five Year Plan has completely ignored the necessity of creating enthusiasm among the workers.

The next question is about trade union rights and other things. Even day before yesterday and today in this House, we had questions. Even this House had not been able to know when there was a lock-out in which 20,000 workers were affected. Even after five days, we do not know what is the position. Day before yesterday, we had been discussing the strike situation in Kazipet and Khargpur. What is the position? It has been said here that labour is responsible for this. If there was a machinery by which every dispute could be settled within a fixed time, I am sure there would have been no question of a strike at all, because it is the worker who suffers if there is a strike. The worker, as a human being, will never like to suffer. Even after waiting for two or three years or four years, they find that there is no machinery to settle disputes. It is only to call the attention of Government, it is only to press on them, that they have been waiting for so long and something must be done for them, that this has been done. So unless and until a quick machinery is set up, whereby the disputes can be settled and unless and until more rights are given to the workers, and trade union democracy is guaranteed to them, I am sure there cannot be a settlement.

It has been said by the Railway Minister that there are three or four unions. In the Labour Panel we had made a suggestion—I do not go into details for want of time—that Government should take the initiative, call for the opinion of the workers, take a secret ballot on the union they want to join; then let Government say that according to the majority opinion of the workers, let the workers have one union. This suggestion has been made. Now it is the Government that should try to see that in order to have industrial peace, there must be unity among the workers. Instead of trying to do that, Government are trying, by taking sides with this section or that section, to see that the unity of the working class is spoiled.

Then I come to the subject of resources for the Plan, which is very important. If we say that there must be basic industries or heavy industries which must be given priority and more

money, if we say that health and education have been neglected, the most important question is: what are the resources available? What is the approach of the Government and what is our approach? How do we say that more resources can be found? The proposals for raising the financial resources for the Plan are in direct conflict with the objectives of the Plan. For resources, the Plan resorts to methods which cannot but hit the people and depress their living standards. I will be able to show this.

As far as resources are concerned, it banks on extremely uncertain factors, and that is why in the Plan, in many places it is said that there must be flexibility. Flexibility means that we will have to change the allocation and other things one year or the next year, because as far as resources are concerned, there is uncertainty. Expenditure of Rs. 480 crores in the public sector is proposed. As far as domestic resources are concerned, the Plan follows the two routine methods of getting funds through taxation and pumping new currency into circulation. In respect of taxes, in addition to Rs. 800 crores, another Rs. 350 crores fresh additional taxation is proposed for meeting the gap. Thus, out of taxes will come Rs. 1,150 crores, of which new taxes will account for Rs. 800 crores.

We are not at all against taxes. It is very necessary to use this method of taxation much more vigorously for tapping the rich to afford tax relief to the common man, on whom the burden of taxes has been increasing. Between 1946-47 and 1953-54, the union excise duty imposed by the Central Government showed a rise of Rs. 62 crores from Rs. 108.2 crores to Rs. 170.4 crores. When the First Plan started, it was only Rs. 85.6 crores. During the First Plan, it stepped up to Rs. 100 crores. In the same period, income-tax including corporation tax has gone up by less than Rs. 3 crores, notwithstanding the profits of big business.

It is proposed that State Governments should raise Rs. 225 crores. The Central Government also would raise a little amount. States have to raise Rs. 112 crores through sales tax alone. Even in the current year, many States have come with a proposal to tax the common people.

and

Then there is a proposal for deficit financing to the tune of Rs. 1,200 crores, which is fraught with grave danger. It is said that Rs. 1,200 crores is a very safe limit. But Professor Kaldor has said that Indian economy is not capable of absorbing Rs. 1,200 crores of deficit financing. He was one of those who gave some suggestions on planning. Deficit finance would result in rise in prices and a further decline in the living standards of our people. As far as rise in prices is concerned, though the Government have said there is no rise, in prices, in terms of actual realities, prices are rising. Reports are coming to us from many States that there is a rise in prices today. The rise in prices will also upset the financial calculations of the Plan, and there is no knowing where it will ultimately end.

No one will oppose deficit financing. We will have to resort to deficit financing sometimes. But we must try to avoid this reckless gambling. For the reconstruction of the country's economy, the savings of the community must be tapped. Borrowing from the public is, no doubt, one of the effective means for doing so. There are two kinds of borrowing. Loans are raised from the market by offering high interest. Our criticism is that a high interest should not be paid. What is necessary in our economy today is the adoption of a policy of compulsory loans, mobilising the savings of the richer classes on a much wider scale and on terms favourable to the community. Unless such an approach is made, the policy of public loans is not going to fully tap the resources lying with the princes, the big landlords and monopolists and other richer sections of people in the society. It is from them that we can get the resources. We have to fully tap that source for the resources.

With regard to small savings, I say the approach is unrealistic. As against Rs. 270 crores, it is now proposed to raise Rs. 500 crores. This is expected from the lowest level of people living in sub-human conditions, without any savings whatsoever. From the First Plan, you will find that the income of 150 million people is about Rs. 13 each; out of that, each man has to purchase some articles for his use. According to the Rural Credit Survey, a sum of Rs. 750 crores is needed as credit. So what the masses need is relief from debt burdens and extension of credit facilities.

The Second Plan overlooks this grim reality. I do not know how the small savings approach can succeed with these lower income groups. There is also another thing, what is called 'self-inflated' tax.

12 NOON.

Under the Community Projects and Ten Years Blocs, wherever there is some construction of house or other thing, the people have to give half; where it is Rs. 20,000 they have to provide Rs. 10,000 and where it is Rs. 30,000, they have to provide Rs. 15,000. This is something which does not come into the framework of taxes.

External assistance to the extent of Rs. 800 crores has been provided for. The Prime Minister said that there will be more production and food will be sent out. Which is the country which is going to take food from us? As far as Burma is concerned, that country is not going to take food from us. When we increase production how much resources will we get from it? In the first Plan we had only Rs. 204 crores of external assistance. Now, we have provided for Rs. 100 crores annually. I do not know from where we are going to get such heavy resources.

There are resources, if only Government would look to them and tap them and give up the policy of obliging certain sections of the vested interests in this country who sit over the savings of the nation. The following are the things by which you can get resources. Raise the income-tax in higher income-tax levels and tighten up the income-tax administration. Over Rs. 100 crores could be collected by this. Prof. Kaldor has said that there is an amount of about Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 crores which goes out by way of tax evasion. But the Government say that it is not so much and that it is only about Rs. 30 or Rs. 40 crores. Then, again, capital gains tax will also provide another source of revenue; a levy on personal wealth of princes, big landlords and big businessmen will also bring in a good amount. Instead of allowing privy purses and compensation to landlords, get from them a levy on personal wealth. Impose ceilings on dividends and secure the excess over the ceilings as compulsory loans. If you do not want to abolish remittances abroad of profit by foreign firms keep them secured by State loans. There must be a revenue yielding public sector and for that start some State-owned

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

industries and also nationalise some of the most important foreign industries. State trading is another thing. We do not know how much we will get in this case because figures are not available. When we discussed this question, it was admitted even by the Government that there can be about Rs. 100 to Rs. 200 crores from this source. The structure of our public finance needs orientation. There is no use of asking the masses to sacrifice. Let the masses produce more and let them make sacrifices in the field and the factories. I am sure the people will not grudge any sacrifice for truly nation-building work if the Government turn to them after fully tapping the richer classes. If we tell the people that we have fully tapped the richer classes they will be ready to give whatever they can. As far as resources are concerned, what we say is, take the resources from where they are.

The next point is about national income and living standard. It is said that the national income has increased by 25 per cent and the *per capita* income has increased by 18 per cent. Every effort must be made to increase national income. As far as the first plan is concerned, it is said that the income has been raised by 18 per cent. What is the condition of the masses? Their condition has become worse. 185 million persons spend less than Rs. 13 per month on consumer goods and half of this amount is spent in kind or in the form of home-grown food and home-made articles. This is the summary that has been given to us. This is the condition after the first Five Year Plan. The living standard depends on national income. I want to know whether there is any proposal to have wage increase; is there any proposal for raising the earnings of persons, the working people. There is nothing in the Plan. It is not given there that the wages will increase or that the earnings of the other sections of the working people in the country will increase. I do not know how an increase in the national income will benefit all the sections of people. This has been put aside. When there is an increase in national income, there is no equal distribution of the increase. What will happen is that the rich will become richer and the poor the poorer. Prof. Kaldor has also stated in his report that as far as an increase in the national

income is concerned, there is this danger if you do not look into it, and money will get accumulated in the hands of the higher income groups.

As far as the unemployment problem is concerned, we have been discussing it. There is a certain percentage of employment promised by the Plan. But, according to the labour policy and the land policy, there is no distribution of the land to the agricultural labourers and peasants, who constitute 35 to 40 per cent. of the population in the country. When there is nothing to distribute in land, I do not know how the plan can solve the problem of unemployment.

The other day, the Prime Minister, speaking about regional disparities, said that it is true, when we are having a Plan, that we must have a picture on an all-India basis. He himself said that there are great disparities. As far as unemployment is concerned, especially educated unemployment, there are certain States where the situation is very grave, even as the Government themselves have said. Even in places where there are materials, where there are several conveniences, the economic backwardness of the places and the industrial backwardness as also the gravity of the situation of unemployment have not been taken into account in the allocation of these industries. Though we should not look to the regions so far as the development of India is concerned, it is also necessary that regional disparities must be looked into and industrially backward areas must be given priority.

As far as the agrarian question is concerned, the Plan has failed thoroughly. The Prime Minister said the other day that we want more production and that he expected 40 per cent. more production. How can we expect this 40 per cent. increase with our agrarian policy? I have been reading that there are about 12 crores acres of land in our country that can be cultivated. We want rubber. We want tea. There are thousands and thousands of acres for growing tea, for growing rubber and other money-crops. I ask, what has the Plan frame done about these things. It is not stated there that when the second Five Year Plan begins work, every piece of land will be cultivated and that the landless labourers will be given land. They constitute about 35

per cent of the population. If you want to increase the living standard of the people, if you want to increase national income, the living standard of the agricultural labourers, who have got 4 or 5 months' work, should have some land given to them so that they can improve their living standards and get more money. It will also help industrialisation. Unless there is internal prosperity, unless whatever is produced, consumer goods or other things, is consumed in the country, industrialisation will never be successful. The agricultural labourer who gets today only Re. 1 per month and that even for four months in a year, will get instead one or two acres of land. By that the national income is increased; by that his living standard is increased and he is creating more internal market by the amount of money that he gets. Unless we develop the purchasing power and create internal market, I cannot understand how we will be able to solve not only the question of a rapid industrialisation but also the other question of increasing the national income as well as the living standard of the people. Nothing has been done till now in this direction. There are crores of acres of land owned by Government and also crores of acres of land owned by private landlords, big landlords, which have not been cultivated till now, which are useful for cultivation and which the people want to cultivate. The most important question of putting every piece of land under the plough and creating wealth in this country has been forgotten.

The next point is the eviction of the man from the land. The right has not been granted to him. Evictions have not been stopped. The matter has been left to the State Governments and nothing has been done. If after five or ten years the land will be taken away from the man, how can you expect him to do his best. When we come to this question separately, we will be able to understand more clearly what happened after 1947, how many persons who had lands had become landless labourers, what were the tremendous amounts of eviction that took place in all the provinces after 1947. There is no distribution of land done. Also exemption from ceilings will give us no land. There has been an instance in Hyderabad. I will not go into detail but others who spoke would have said this. In Khammam District, the result was that there was no land available at all except for a very few persons. When Govern-

ment stated that there would be no ceiling on land all the lands had been transferred to some other persons so that the ceiling that was fixed was observed everywhere and people had only just the ceiling or below the ceiling.

As far as agrarian policy is concerned, there is no reduction in rent. The matter has been left to the provinces. Instead of reducing it to one-sixth, it must be reduced to one-fourth or one fifth. That matter is left to the State Governments, as I said earlier.

Most of the recommendations of the Land Reform Panel have not been accepted. If those recommendations had been accepted, then the agrarian policy would have helped in achieving all the objectives of the Plan and also in creating internal market. That has not been done.

Lastly, I wish to say a few words about the people's co-operation. Everybody has said that there must be the people's co-operation and without that co-operation, the Plan will never be successful. Until and unless you enthuse your men, agricultural or industrial, until and unless there is some machinery by which you can create enthusiasm in them, you cannot be sure that there will be development as much as we like it to be. What is the machinery there? Yesterday the Prime Minister stated that as far as the public sector is concerned, he wants to give more power to the executive. He stated also that some foreign visitors who came here—Mr. Mikoyan and others—had said that they wanted it to be done. We cannot compare the situation in other countries and then say that in this country, in the present situation, most power should be given to the executive. There are the panchayats and there are the community projects as well as the national extension schemes. When there is a panchayat in a village, why should there be a community project set up there with some officers. These schemes should come under the village panchayats, elected by the people. When a panchayat takes up something, certainly the co-operation of all sections of the people will be there. I do not know why there should be a community project separately, why there should be a national extension service, when the panchayats have nothing to do. The panchayat, which is the basic unit of the

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

representatives of the people, has nothing to do at all levels. If we want the co-operation of the people, then the panchayats and local bodies must be given the responsibility for implementing these schemes. They must understand that their primary responsibility is that as far as the objectives of the Plan are concerned, they get the co-operation of the people and see that the Plan is implemented. When we come to the discussion of this question next time, we will give the administrative set-up that we should have under the Second Five Year Plan in order that the objectives may be achieved. But so far as the present set-up is concerned, let me say this. A collector in a district is referred to by several authorities. An educational officer refers his problems to him; so also a medical officer goes to him. The collector is made responsible for everybody; he does not know about education, or medicine. As far as the present executive officers are concerned, they will not be those who can give some suggestions and help you. We must have an administrative set-up on the principle of elected bodies from the lowest level to the highest, where they will be able to get the co-operation of the people. Until such a machinery is set up, we will not be able to get the co-operation of the people, and if there is not complete co-operation of the people, then certainly the Plan will not succeed. As far as the principal objectives and approach are concerned, this is all that I have to say.

So far as industrialising the country for solving the question of unemployment and for raising the standard of the people are concerned, action may be taken by not only the Government but also by other parties and individuals in the country, and our party is always ready to co-operate with all of them to see that our objectives are fulfilled. But according to us, if these objectives are to be achieved, the agrarian policy, the labour policy as it is today will not help. We want the Government to consider whether what we have said is correct. If what we have stated is correct, then certain changes may be made when the Plan comes to be worked so that it may be successful by getting the co-operation of all sections of the people. This is what I have to say so far as the main principles and objectives of the Plan are concerned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha) : I have nothing to add as regards the business for the next week to what I stated on Friday last.

The Travancore-Cochin State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill and Indian Income-Tax (Amendment) Bill will be brought forward on Monday, the 28th May. Time permitting, discussion on the working of the Preventive Detention Act will also be initiated on that day. The Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill, as reported, will be brought forward for consideration and passing on the 29th May, and discussion on the Preventive Detention Act resumed thereafter, if it is not finished that day.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad) : On a point of clarification, I would request you to see that this convention takes firm root in our parliamentary procedures, and even if the hon. Minister has not got any fresh business to state, he must come and say that he reiterates the earlier position stated on the previous Friday. That is a most important thing. If this convention takes root, it will help every individual Member of the House and on every Friday, the hon. Minister must make it a point to be here at 11-30 A.M., immediately after the question hour.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha : It has taken roots.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat) : I do not know if I have understood the matter aright. On Monday, at the end of the day, the Preventive Detention Act will be taken, up and then there will be a break and we will take up the Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill and then again we go and take up the Preventive Detention Act. I submit that it will be better to take up the Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill to start with and finish it, instead of breaking the two. I do not know the need for breaking the two.

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Member wants to take up the Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill on the 28th itself.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha : The only thing then is that the voting should not take place on the 28th. We have just announced in the House that the Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill would be taken up on the 29th May