

LOK SABHA DEBATES Date 27.11.54
(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

3695

LOK SABHA

Wednesday, 22nd December, 1954.

*The Lok Sabha met at eleven of the
Clock*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12 NOON.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

**STATEMENT RE RECOMMENDATIONS OF
PRESS COMMISSION**

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): I beg to lay on the Table a statement giving the factual position regarding consideration of certain recommendations of the Press Commission. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 37]

**NOTIFICATIONS UNDER SEA CUSTOMS
ACT**

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the Customs Notifications Nos. 116 and 117 dated the 2nd October, 1954, under sub-section (4) of section 43B of the Sea Customs Act, 1878, as inserted by the Sea Customs (Amendment) Act, 1953 [Placed in Library. See Nos.—505/54]

EVIDENCE ON UNTOUCHABILITY

(OFFENCES) BILL

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the evidence tendered before the Joint Committee on the Untouchability (Offences) Bill, 1954 on the 2nd November, 1954. [Placed in Library. See No. S-311/54]

3696

**COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF
MEMBERS FROM THE SITTINGS
OF THE HOUSE**

SEVENTH REPORT

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg to present the Seventh Report of the Committee on Absence of Members from the sittings of the House.

**COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEM-
BERS' BILLS AND RESOLU-
TIONS**

NINETEENTH REPORT

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg to present the Nineteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

Shri B. G. Mehta (Gohilwad): I beg to present the Minutes of the Estimates Committee (July 1952-June 1954), Vol. 3.

**MOTION RE PROGRESS REPORT
OF FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR
1953-54**

The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda): I beg to move:

"That the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan for the year 1953-54 be taken into consideration."

This debate is a very welcome opportunity for taking stock of the nations economy. It is quite fit and proper that the representative of the people in Parliament bring under review periodically the pace and direction of economic development in the country.

[Shri Nanda]

Sir, for this purpose the Planning Commission, at intervals, periodically, furnishes Progress Reports. The Report that we have before the House now relates to the year 1953-54. I may point out that although this report is for the year 1953-54, it does not restrict itself to the performance in relation to that year. It covers all the three years that have elapsed as period of the Plan and it would, therefore, be possible for Members of the House to take a comprehensive view of the situation, the performance for the whole period and the trends that have manifested themselves during this period. This is going to be discussed as a whole, I believe.

I am sure Members have read this Report and they will find it to be a very explicit and a very straightforward document. It is full of material, packed with facts and figures. And, it will be found that this material has been presented in a very objective manner, and the conclusions which emerge from this material have also been presented very objectively. I am not surely expected to repeat the contents of this document here. I think all that is necessary for me to do is to touch on a few salient features and to attempt a broad assessment of the way the Plan has worked and the manner in which the economic situation has developed.

Now, we are here to judge the record of activity during this period. How shall we judge it? Hon. Members will have found deficiencies. There are deficiencies and we do not belittle them. We do not make light of them. We are conscious of them. There is, for example, the question of our resources. Without adequate resources, there can be no development. We must develop an adequate capital base. Without that we can increase neither production nor productivity. And, I must admit that in the matter of establishment of heavy industries, we have been slow. But let us take cognizance of this fact that this was a modest sized Plan. Looking ahead, we will be able to spend about

Rs. 2,000 crores. That is very likely. But, even at that level, of spending, it is quite possible, it is quite likely that we may be incurring a deficit to the extent of about Rs. 600 to 650 crores and we are thinking of greatly enlarging the size of the Second Five Year Plan. We have not, I believe, as yet found ways of mobilising those resources on the scale required, and on the much bigger scale that they are going to be required in future and we have to do something about it. All of us have to apply our minds to it.

Then, there is the question of employment, for example. It is very clear again that in the matter of employment, we have not offered any satisfactory solution so far. It is true that so far as the Plan is concerned, there was awareness of the fact that in view of the conditions and circumstances it would not be possible to liquidate unemployment in the country or even to increase employment opportunities to the extent that additional population might warrant, because there was a limited amount of investment visualised. There are other factors, apart from the question of resources.

There is the question of the system of education. Have we been able to co-ordinate the system of education with the pattern of employment that we have or expect to create to serve the needs of employment? I do not think we have done that and this is linked up with the question of basic education.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Who is responsible for that?

Shri Nanda: This is linked up with basic education and we have gone ahead somewhat. But still our ideas have not fully crystallised though they have crystallised somewhat, and they have not been applied on the scale that would be necessary for the purpose of furnishing a quick answer to this problem.

We have also another difficulty in the matter of employment. Employment, it is expected, will be furnished very much more through cottage industries and small-scale industries. And, although we have done something in that direction, I am afraid, we have not found the key to the problem of finding a way of harmonising the various techniques. In a country like ours it is inevitable that there is not going to be a single technological level. Not the highest technological level for everything. We will be availing ourselves of the highest technological level, techniques, mechanical aids in certain industries, and yet we want our cottage industries to live. This requires a great deal of new thought and of new organisational methods and approach. We have not yet been able to find an adequate answer to that. That will be hindering the expansion or progress of employment opportunities. I am discussing the question of employment where we have deficiencies, of which we are aware. There is also the fact very well known that while there is unemployment on one side, there are shortages on the other side, and we are trying to make them up. We are expanding our training programmes, but still those shortages remain. I need not say very much more about this aspect, but there is another aspect also where, we feel, deficiencies persist. For a new kind of economy, for an economy which has got in it the dynamism to expand so that it can answer the requirements of a nation which now not content to wait at lower levels of subsistence, the industrial framework is to be adjusted, re-organised and reformed. We have done something about it. I do not think we have done everything. We have to do very much more. Take, for example, the question of the co-operative system. That report on rural credit, which will soon be in the hands of the Members, makes it very clear that over so many years, we have not really been able to find a way of giving such impetus to the co-operative movement that it can play a significant role in our economy. This is the position regarding the co-

operative movement. Regarding land reform, for example, this is a part of the institutional reform which is an essential part of the whole process of the change that we have visualised. There has to be a radical change particularly in order that the institutional framework should fit into the new conditions that we want to create. About the land reform there will be occasions to give more details. We have made some progress on that front, but that is inadequate, and we are now insisting that the States should have a phased programme and go ahead with that as soon as possible. I hope that the progress which, to my mind, is unsatisfactory—it is considerable but unsatisfactory—will be very much accelerated in the next two years.

I have given a clear account of the deficiencies. There may be others also. Let us not forget the fact that we have been functioning in a particular situation. Let us not forget the inherent difficulties of the situation, and the immense difficulties of the situation, and the extent to which we have made progress in various directions, therefore, has to be judged in the light of those difficulties. Also let us see this: Are we not making efforts to improve things, to set right things and make up the deficiencies? I am quite clear in my mind that these efforts are genuine, these efforts are sincere and, therefore, they are bound to fructify. It is not only the efforts; even, take the achievements in spite of all these difficulties, in spite of all these drawbacks and handicaps; we have done not a little and now we are out of the difficult situation regarding food, for we were all nervous about the next day, but today we are free from all those risks and all those worries. What does it mean? It does not mean that we have only got food; it means that we are in a position to go forward with confidence. We have created conditions for much more rapid development in the future. This is the implication of that.

Take the organisational side. We are improving our organisation, setting

[Shri Nanda]

up various institutional arrangements and rectifying the defects in our procedures. Take the instance of the Community Project, the National Extension Service. It is one single thing that is going to do much for agricultural production and bringing other relief and advantages to the village community. It is a very big organisational advance. We are creating a new apparatus through which we can function more effectively. On the side of public co-operation, which is essential where democracy is concerned and when we have to develop on democratic lines, we must enlist public co-operation, and we must have the fullest participation of the people. On that matter, our experience in local works, and our experience in many other directions is very heartening. Recently, hon. Members have had some idea of the fact on the Kosi Project, thousands and thousands of people are offering themselves and the latest that I know about it is that they have offered their services in the construction of eight miles of embankment on one side—on the western embankment. These are indications, and this is one aspect. Hon. Members will have also to judge this effort and the Progress Report in relation to the task that were set out in the Plan itself. What had we set out to perform? We have to judge the progress report rightly, legitimately, in relation to those targets, and it will be said that during this period, when we look at the figures, they will be shown to be not quite adequate. It may be so, but I will request hon. Members to look at another aspect of it. The total today in proportion to the five-year period may not be quite adequate, but let us keep in mind the fact as to how we stand today in comparison with what our position was in the first year of the Plan, in the second year of the Plan and now. Our figures will be—I am not giving all the figures; I am giving the percentages to bring out the relationship—that in the case of the Centre, for the first year 10.52 per cent, and

for the third year, 15.17 per cent, and in the case of the States, 14.37 per cent. and 20.22 per cent. respectively. If we take the two together, it will be about 12.44 per cent. against 17.19 per cent. now. Take the Budget of the fourth year. It is very evident that the entire size of the Budget or the magnitude of the Budget is not going to be realised completely, but as the Budget stands, it will be 27.0 per cent. It may be a little less in terms of realisation, but still look at the jump. This shows that our spending capacity has greatly increased, our tempo has moved up and this is a fact which is of the greatest significance. This is a momentous fact, which shows what we are capable of doing in course of time. Therefore, we can understand that we will be able—if not the whole of the amount that we have now indicated as the size of the Plan—to do about Rs. 2,000 crores, and in that Rs. 2,000 crores also, coming back to the idea of resources, our deficit may be Rs. 600 crores or more. Therefore, the question of resources again comes back as the most important single thing to which we have to pay attention.

I have spoken of the tasks. Now what were those tasks? The long-range objectives of the Plan were clearly stated in the terms of reference of the Planning Commission. Those objectives are derived from the Constitution of India and may be briefly expressed as the attainment of a rising standard of living, full employment and economic equality. It was indicated in the Plan that we have to advance along many fronts. It was clearly visualised that certain immediate priorities had to be attended to and that progress in many directions had to come after planning had initiated the process of development, prepared the ground and realised certain short-term aims. Our immediate task were imposed on the Plan by the prevailing situation. It was a situation of serious economic disequilibrium and uncertainty. The pressing aim was then expressed as the need to correct the maladjustment in the

economic situation caused by the war and the partition. This referred particularly to the acute shortage of food and raw materials which was being felt and the rising price level due to these shortages and the inflationary pressures existing at the time. These shortages had to be removed and the rising trends in the cost of living had to be checked.

In relation to the wider objectives, the Five Year Plan was to be a preparation for laying the foundation for more rapid development. We may discuss the details of outlay in different directions, the progress or lack of it under several heads. But the crucial test of the progress of the Plan during the period is how far we have succeeded in making headway in these two directions. We may recall the economic condition which determined the shape and texture of our First Plan three or four years back. When the Plan was being formulated the position in respect of food-supplies was grave indeed. In the year 1950 the total production of cereals was 45.52 million tons. We imported 29.6 lakhs tons, thus giving an average of 13.67 oz. per adult per day. Even at this low rate of consumption the deficit in cereals by 1956 would have been 7 million tons. The situation was such in 1951 that we imported foodgrains of Rs. 216 crores and it will be remembered that for several years food had to be subsidised.

With regard to industrial raw materials also, acute difficulties were being experienced. The textile mills did not have enough cotton, the jute mills did not have enough jute. There was an import of Rs. 138 crores worth of cotton in 1951-52. This situation naturally demanded that the top-most priority should be accorded to the requirements of agriculture. This was done. Large allotments were made for irrigation, major and minor, and ample provision was made for other schemes for development of agriculture. The Plan was further strengthened by about Rs. 40 crores for chronic scarcity affected areas nature too co-operated and gave fair

conditions over large areas of the country. As a result, food production went up by 11.4 millions tons, cotton production by a million bales and oil-seeds by half a million tons. Thus in 1953-54 our production targets have been more than fulfilled in respect of food-grains and oil-seeds. For cotton 80 per cent. of the target has been achieved. It has to be acknowledged that in respect of jute and sugar, the position is far from satisfactory. It may be useful to indicate the factors which have contributed to the improvement in the economic production.

The increase in irrigated area is perhaps the outstanding factor in the situation. Major irrigation has added 2.8 million acres and minor irrigation, including wells and tube wells was responsible for 5.3 lakh acres. We have already spent Rs. 28.5 crores on minor irrigation. Reclamation both by the Centre and the States has helped to a considerable extent. The total acreage of reclaimed land so far is 12.3 lakh acres, a little more than half the target. It is a significant fact that the consumption of fertilisers has increased from 2 lakh tons before the Plan to more than 4 lakh tons last year, and nearly 6 lakhs tons this year. There are various other programmes, including land improvement schemes, supply of improved seeds, plant protection, etc., which have, of course, played a certain part. Efforts have been made to strengthen the position of the farming community by increasing the funds available to them. There has been considerable improvement in respect of short term as well as long term credits. The Community Projects and the National Extension Services have made their own contribution, although in view of the fact that this is a recent development, this contribution has to be measured less in terms of actual quantities than in the potentialities which have been created. I may quote from a recent assessment by the Programme Evaluation Organisation:

"The success of new tillage which consists in better seeds, better cultivation methods, better

[Shri Nanda]

fertilisers and a more plentiful and assured supply of water is already an accomplished fact and the overall effect is so striking and obvious that there can be no doubt that the object of increasing production is being steadily attained."

In the industrial sector, we have, during the course of the three years, attained a position of having reached or fulfilled the targets in respect of mill-made cotton textile and vegetable oils and made an appreciable progress towards plan targets for cement, salt, matches, woollen manufactures, etc.

We cannot, however lose sight of the fact that in several industries where fuller utilisation of capacity was envisaged in the Plan, the achievement has been small compared to additional production envisaged by 1955-56 as in the case of superphosphate, glass, sulphuric acid, jute, automobiles, electric fans, radio receivers, machine tools. In the case of the sugar industry progress recorded in 1951-52 received a set-back in subsequent years, so that there is a considerable gap between capacity and production.

While it has to be acknowledge that very largely the increase in production has arisen because of fuller utilisation of existing capacity, some part of the increase is also owing to the creation of additional installed capacity.

Thus while the increased levels of production recorded in respect of railway rolling stock, ball bearings, sewing machines, hurricane lanterns, dry batteries, electric transformers, soda ash, cotton textiles, woollen textiles, power alcohol and vanaspati industries.....

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam):
Vanaspati also!

Shri Nanda: have mainly or entirely resulted from a better utilisation of the capacity that was already in existence in 1950-51, in the case of ammonium sulphate, bicycles and caustic soda industries, the increased production was achieved mainly through the new units which went in-

to production during the Plan period. In the case of cement and rayon industries, the increase in production resulted both from the new units that went into production during the plan period, as well as by a more intensive utilisation of the capacity which existed in 1950-51.

The Five Year Plan includes a large number of long term industrial projects, particularly in the category of capital goods and consumer goods industries which are expected to go into full production only during the period of the second Five Year Plan. The full benefits of these schemes would be felt only in the Second Plan Period, although considerable investment would have been made on these projects during the present Plan period. In this category fall industrial units like the expansion of Tata Iron and Steel Company, the expansion schemes of the Indian Iron and Steel Company. Rourkela Iron and Steel Plant, the establishment of an Aluminium plant by the Indian Aluminium Co., Ltd., the Integral Coach Factory, the heavy steel casting plant of the Tata Locomotive and Engineering Company, the plant for the manufacture of heavy electrical machinery, expansion programme of the Sindri Fertilisers, expansion of the soda ash schemes for the production of benzene, Hexachloride, Penicillin, Streptomycin, etc., the Industrial Explosive Factory in Bihar State to be set up in collaboration with the Imperial Chemical Industries, and the manufacture of dyes and a petrol refinery proposed to be set up by Caltex Co. The total investment, in fixed capital, of the new industrial units and expansion schemes in the private and public sectors is a useful index of industrial development. There are difficulties in making such estimates for the private sector. According to the best estimates available, Rs. 52 crores were invested in the private sector in the first two years of the Plan and Rs. 44 crores in the third year, making a total of Rs. 96 crores. In the public sector, against the provision of Rs. 94 crores, during the first

three years, the investment was estimated to be about Rs. 31 crores. It is anticipated that against the total investment of Rs. 327 crores for both sectors, investment during the Plan period might fall short by about Rs. 50 crores.

The House is well acquainted with the problems which our railway system had to face after the war, and the extent of over-age and worn-out equipment which handicapped the railway system, and confronted the Government with a heavy programme of rehabilitation. For this it was originally intended to obtain 1,038 locomotives, 49,143 wagons and 5,674 coaching vehicles. These targets were later increased to and orders placed for a larger magnitude. In actual fact, we have during the first three years 510 locomotives, 26,270 wagons and 2,734 coaching vehicles added to the rolling stock. Other programmes connected with the railways such as renewal of tracks, sleeper renewals, etc., are also proceeding according to schedule. Some of the dismantled lines have been restored and some new lines also have been constructed.

On these immediate priorities of the Plan—Agriculture, Irrigation and Power, and Transport—two-thirds of the outlay on development had been allocated.

The Progress Report for the third year of the Plan drew attention to the short-falls in expenditure both in the Centre and in the States. This feature has evoked a considerable amount of comment in this House as well as elsewhere, and I should like to say something about it. The total expenditure for the first three years was estimated to be about Rs. 885 crores, that is, a little over 40 per cent. of the expenditure contemplated in the final Plan leaving the balance for the fourth and fifth years. Figures of expenditure on development are a pertinent index of the fulfilment of the Plan, but to get the right perspective, they should be seen in relation to actual physical achievements. It is also necessary to remember that during the greater part of the first two

years, the Central Government and the States worked on the basis of a draft Plan. The Plans for the first year were more or less along the lines of the budgets which had been drawn up for that year. At that time, the general emphasis was on keeping down Government's financial commitments; several Part B and Part C States were still now to their tasks, and States like Punjab, West Bengal, PEPSU and Uttar Pradesh were faced with large problems of rehabilitation of displaced persons. At the beginning of the second year of the Plan, following the general elections, new Governments took office in the States and devoted attention to the finalisation of the Plan. It was, therefore, inevitable that during the first two years the Plan made a rather slow beginning.

It is from the third year that both at the Centre and in the States determined efforts began to be made to carry out the tasks laid down in the Plan. At the beginning of the Plan several States were able to continue projects which they had begun earlier during the period of post-war reconstruction. They were, therefore, in a position to step up expenditure in accordance with the Plan. Taking the States as a whole, during the first three years, about 50 per cent. of the Plan which was approved in 1952 was carried out. The achievement was greater in fields of development such as irrigation and power and transport, where the administrative machinery was better equipped than in fields like agriculture and small industries to which the Plan brought a new emphasis. I venture to think that the measure in which in every part of the country today new developments are taking place and almost every State has mobilised its machinery for achieving the targets in the Plan, is a true index of the momentum which the Plan has already gained. At the Centre, judged in terms of expenditure on development, it would seem that about a third of the Plan was carried out during the first three years. In the third year, this increased to about 17

[Shri Nanda]

per cent. and in the fourth year the amount budgeted was more than a quarter of the total size of the Plan. There were two main reasons why the Central Ministries needed more time than State Governments in increasing the tempo of expenditure with which they were directly concerned. The first reason is that a number of programmes at the Centre entailed expenditure through the machinery of the State Governments such as, for instance, the provisions for Grow More Food, welfare of scheduled tribes and backward classes, cottage and small-scale industries basic and social education and health programmes. It took time for the Central and State Governments to get together, determine the lines of action in detail and strengthen the machinery for the administration of these programmes in the States. The second reason is that several projects, specially in industry and transport, which the Central Government was itself to carry out required preparatory period for technical study and consultation before they could be undertaken. In both respects the situation has now greatly improved and the Central Ministries as well as the State Governments are much better equipped than they were to undertake the tasks placed upon them by the Plan. I do not claim that the Plan as originally drawn up will be fulfilled in every detail, but I would venture to suggest that the more important targets of the Plan will be achieved and, when the time comes to assess the results of the First Plan as a whole, the shortcomings will be seen to be less numerous and less significant than we might sometimes fear.

The Plan, as finalised, contemplated an addition to the stock of productive capital owned by Central and State Governments to the extent of Rs. 1,190 crores. Against this, the investment undertaken in the first three years is Rs. 555 crores, that is, nearly one-half. The outlay on social capital is also similar in proportion, being Rs. 199 crores in the first three

years against a Plan figure of Rs. 425 crores. There are, however, larger gaps in that sector of the Plan in which the primary aim was to build up productive capital in private hands in agriculture, industry and transport. Here the outlay in the first three years is a little over a quarter of the figure contemplated in the Plan. Thus, the achievements up to the third year are more concrete in these fields which received a high priority in the Plan such as agriculture, irrigation and power and transport.

The House would be interested, I am sure, to learn of the marked progress now being made in the implementation of road construction programmes throughout the country. The bulk of this programme is in the States where, taking the country as a whole performance is well up to the programme and during the first three years about 60 per cent. of the expenditure provided for in the Plan was incurred.

In the field of social services, programmes at the Centre are intended mainly to supplement and strengthen programmes in the States which account for the bulk of the provision in the Plan. In pursuing this objective the Central Government has taken several steps to assist States in programmes for industrial housing, welfare of scheduled tribes and backward classes, for malaria control and rural and urban water-supply, for expansion of primary education and the reorganisation of both primary and secondary education and a number of programmes for the training of personnel who are in short supply.

The third year of the Plan was in many ways a vital year for its implementation. In particular, one development which took place during this year led the Government to find ways of strengthening the Plan. This was the increase in urban unemployment which drew public attention during the early months of 1953-54. The House will recall the measures taken

to expand the Plan by something like 10 per cent.

Let us consider now the impact of all this activity during this period on the overall economic situation in the country. It is very clear that the economic situation has improved considerably and we are ready to go forward with far far-reaching programmes. In many ways the economy is now better balanced. Shortages of the war and post-war period have been removed, prices have come down and the balance of payment position has improved with the reduction in food imports. Although in several respects the results of recent years are encouraging, there are also certain shortcomings. Of these, one of the most important concerns the question of resources, to which I have already made reference in my introductory remarks.

But the position is that the normal budgetary resources of the Government have to be increased at all costs if there is to be a higher rate of development. This question was reviewed recently by the National Development Council and it was proposed that for the next budget States should explore fully the possibilities of increasing their resources for development, such as enhancement of betterment levies, enhancement of water rates, revenue resettlements, surcharges on land revenue in the higher brackets, receipts from commercial undertakings and so on. The National Development Council stressed the need for action in respect of betterment levies on new areas which were coming under irrigation. The mobilisation of the savings of the community through every means possible lies at the centre of the entire problem of development. In this respect our effort has fallen short of what we were expected to do.

If one surveys the field of planning in our country and reviews the experience of the past three or four years objectively, certain points of strength and weakness stand out. I have already mentioned in my introductory remarks the features which

will encourage us and also shortcomings of which we have always to remain aware and to remove which we are making a constant effort. It is too early yet to strike a balance. In the picture as it lies before us there are signs of hope and encouragement as well as signs of warning. Large as some of the results achieved may seem to be, they are small in comparison to the magnitude of our problem. The need for intensive national effort and sacrifice is greater than ever before and it is in the measure in which our Plan becomes the symbol of hope and service and the means for increase of opportunity for the common citizen that the nation can hope to succeed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan for the year 1953-54 be taken into consideration."

Some amendments have been tabled. I will ask hon. Members if they want their respective amendments to be placed before the House.

I reserve to myself to suggest to any hon. Member if I have any doubts regarding any portion or the whole of any amendment and ask him how far it is in order and, if I find it is not in order, to avoid that particular portion. Subject to these conditions I am admitting these amendments now.

Shri Raghubir Sahai (Etah Distt.—North East cum Budaun Distt.—East) I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan for the year 1953-54, while appreciating that—

- (a) the agricultural production has increased,
- (b) the industrial production has maintained a steady upward trend,
- (c) the prices especially of food-grains, have fallen considerably,

[Shri Raghubir Sahai]

(d) the controls on foodgrains have been relaxed, and

(e) the balance of payment position has improved, is of the opinion that—

- (1) there are as yet no tangible signs of the solution of the problem of unemployment, especially of the educated class,
- (2) the prices of other commodities have not proportionately come down as compared with the prices of foodgrains, and
- (3) there is very little publicity about the achievements of the Plan so far as the man in the street is concerned, with the result that there is lack of urge, desire and zeal on the part of the people as a whole, which is so essential to make the Plan a success,

and therefore, considers it necessary that greater attention be directed towards these matters and suitable steps be taken to remedy this state of affairs, especially in dealing with Community Projects, the personnel in charge of which should possess special qualifications and a living faith in respect of the Five Year Plan and the entire system of education be so over-hauled that the Universities, instead of pursuing their 'obsolete' curricula in a conservative manner, may attune it to the rapidly changing social and economic structure of the country and be able to turn out youngmen who could be fitted in in the implementation of the Plan at all levels."

Shri Gadilagam Sreed (Kumool):
I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House, having considered the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan for the year 1953-54 is of the opinion that proper steps have not been taken by the Gov-

ernment—

- (i) to give adequate publicity to the various schemes of the Plan in the rural areas,
- (ii) to remove red-tapism, still rampant in the services, to be able to secure early approval of various schemes by the departments to speed up the works under the Plan,
- (iii) to relieve educated unemployment by speedily enforcing the Central Education Scheme throughout the country,
- (iv) to supplement the medical personnel to give medical aid to the rural population, and
- (v) to give facilities to the agriculturists by supplying improved agricultural implements, by setting up State factories to manufacture these machines."

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore)
I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House, having considered the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan for the year 1953-54, is of the opinion that while the progress achieved is impressive, the tempo of progress on the following has to be accelerated:—

- (a) Community Projects and National Extension Service,
- (b) land reforms,
- (c) village and small-scale industries and rural banking, and
- (d) implementation of recommendations relating to improvement in administration."

Dr. Ram Krishna Singh (Shahabad South): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House, having considered the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan for the year 1953-54, is of the opinion that in view of the fall in prices of agricultural commodities proportional reduction should be made in the irrigation and other agricultural taxes which have been enhanced due to the Five Year Plan."

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan for the year 1953-54, is of the opinion that—

- (a) considering the magnitude of the difficulties that had to be encountered, the progress of the First Five Year Plan, has been generally satisfactory, and
- (b) for the fulfilment of the Plan, it is necessary to accelerate the tempo of progress for the remaining period of the Plan and to implement more vigorously the measures of reorganisation in Agriculture, Industry and other fields recommended in the Plan."

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Casts): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan for the year 1953-54, is of the opinion that—

- (a) the rural problems such as communications, medical aid and education have not been tackled,
- (b) land reforms so far made have not benefited the tillers of the soil,

(c) no steps have been taken to rehabilitate the beggars whose number is increasing day by day, and

(d) South India has not been benefitted by the Five Year Plan."

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I beg to move:

(1) That in the substitute motion proposed by Shri Raghunir Sahai, the following be added at the end:

"but regrets to record that the progress in respect of animal husbandry is extremely unsatisfactory and immediate steps for rapid improvement in this direction should be taken."

(2) That in the substitute motion proposed by Shri Gadlingana Goud, the following be added at the end:

"(vi) to take immediate steps for rapid improvement in respect of animal husbandry where the progress has been extremely unsatisfactory."

(3) That in the substitute motion proposed by Shri N. M. Lingam, the following be added at the end:

"(e) animal husbandry, where the progress has been extremely unsatisfactory,"

(4) That in the substitute motion proposed by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, the following be added at the end:

"and is further of the opinion that the progress as regards animal husbandry has been extremely unsatisfactory and it is necessary in the interests of rural welfare to devote special attention for rapid improvement in this direction."

(5) That in the substitute motion proposed by Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, the following be added at the end:

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.]

"(c) in the essential interests of rural welfare, it is necessary to devote special attention to animal husbandry in respect of which the progress has been extremely unsatisfactory."

(6) That in the substitute motion proposed by Shri veeraswamy, the following be added at the end:

"(e) the question of animal husbandry in the whole of India has not received the attention it deserved and immediate steps are necessary for its rapid improvement."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If one is adopted, the others will be barred later on.

The original motion and the amendments are now before the House for discussion.

Shri S. N. Das (Darbhanga Centre): I would like to make a submission. In the discussion on economic affairs a large number of Members were given an opportunity and I think that the same set of persons may be given an opportunity to participate in the discussion on this motion also. I would request you kindly to see that those who had not participated in the discussion on economic affairs are permitted to participate in this.

Some Hon. Members: We support it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have got a list of those who took part in that discussion, as many as twenty-three including the Ministers. I have got that list side by side. But I cannot avoid a few hon. Members who will be the spokesmen of their respective parties. Therefore, except with regard to two or three such persons, I will certainly try to give an opportunity to those who have not taken part in that discussion and an opportunity to others of there is sufficient time.

I would like to remind hon. Members that eight hours have been allotted for this discussion on the whole. We started today at 12 o'clock at 12-01 to be precise. We shall go on till five. There are five hours today and three hours tomorrow. But I would like to remind hon. Members that after this the discussion on the Report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is coming on. Hon. Members have been stating that somehow the discussion is not allowed to go on for as many hours as are provided for and the hours provided for are not sufficient. Six hours are provided for that discussion. On Friday we have only got two, or two and a half hours at the most. Therefore we may not be able to finish that discussion during this session unless hon. Members are prepared to sit till six today and tomorrow. But even at four o'clock we do not have quorum, what to say about six o'clock. That is the difficulty. Hon. Members will try to make up their mind by 4-30 and if they are inclined we will sit for half an hour or an hour more today and try to do some justice to it and try to conclude it. Subject to this the proceedings will go on.

I have already received chits and I have noted down as many as thirty-six names. There are others who may not send chits but on account of their importance they have to be called. I am not bound exactly by the chits; I am bound by persons who rise in their seats also. Therefore, may I suggest that if all the thirty-six who want to participate are to get an opportunity, each hon. Member may try to make his points in ten minutes or at the most fifteen minutes?

Shrimati Renu Chakaravartty (Basilhat): In an important debate like this debate on the Five Year Plan, if we are to discuss the agrarian sector which has not come in for any discussion at all, it will be impossible in ten and fifteen minutes. If we have to speak on behalf of a party which has a particular policy...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What shall I do?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I would request that we may be given twenty to twenty-five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right, I will give twenty-five minutes for the Communist Group.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Out of eight hours only twenty-five minutes?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Thirty-three divided by five hundred into eight hours. It comes to....

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: It is ridiculous.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is ridiculous? You have fixed eight hours. I have no objection; if it is eighty hours I would have distributed one hour each. Hon. Members go there and in the Business Advisory Committee say it is all right and then say here ridiculous. Whether their conduct is ridiculous or mine is ridiculous, I cannot understand.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is not a political matter at all. It is an economic matter and therefore more time should be given to the Congress Party according to its number.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (My-sore): Various Groups are represented in the Opposition. I suggest that half of the time may be given to the Opposition Members.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: No, no. This is not a party matter. All Members are equally entitled to a chance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. There are eight hours or 480 minutes. Divide it by 500. One minute for each Member. If a Group consists of 33 Members, they will have 33 minutes. They may distribute among themselves. I have no objection to a

Group consisting of 30 or 40 Members distributing among themselves the 30 or 40 minutes. Let them not put up more Members and want 20 minutes or 15 minutes each. This is a Plan where everybody is interested. Merely saying that it is my Government's Plan would not be useful so far as hon. Members coming from this side are concerned. They also want to speak. I shall give one minute for every Member. At that rate, Groups may choose their spokesmen. Let them choose one person and let him take all the time; I have no objection.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): There are unattached Members also.

One minute for each individual will not be sufficient.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will request them if possible to meet and choose their speakers and I shall allow five or ten minutes. The same thing will apply to the Independent Group also.

Shri Veeraswamy: As Shri S. N. Das suggested, I request you to give chances to those who have not spoken on the economic affairs motion.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): This allotment is not fair, if I may be permitted to say so. After all, this Report has to be discussed in order that we may draw certain conclusions at the end of the discussion. You know all the Members of the House. You know who would have something significant to say on this subject. Not only on this subject, but on every question. I would submit that efforts should be made to permit the Members who have something significant to contribute whatever their party to speak.

An Hon. Member: This is not any thing new.

Shri Asoka Mehta: The debate is not for the satisfaction of the Member here. It is for the satisfaction of those who have sent us. It is not fair to distribute time like that. I have got the least objection to the entire

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

time being given to the Congress Party.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): Do you think that the Congress Party has nothing to contribute?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Every Member should be given an opportunity.

Pandit S. C. Mishra (Monghyr North-East): In that case, it would be better if you have a list of Members whom you will permit to participate in the debate so that they may go to the Central Hall and come only when they are called.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You are making my task more difficult. I am not participating in the debate. It seems more difficult to allot the time than speaking from there. It is true that representative opinion must be allowed to be stated for the benefit of the House, for the benefit of the Government and for the benefit of those who have sent us here. At the same time, hon. Members who are leaders of Groups want themselves to speak and their followers to speak. I knew Pandit S. C. Mishra.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: You know me well, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He does not agree. He thinks I make a distinction between persons competent to speak and not competent to speak. Why should I take this on my head? I think every hon. Member is competent to speak on every subject. Of course, I shall give due regard to all these matters and try to distribute the time. Perchance, if I am able to allow to a group only at the rate of one minute, it will be the minimum. It would be increased in proper cases. But let us see. We shall now go on.

Shri Raghuramiah (Tamil): I do not want a remark made by Shri Asoka Mehta to go uncontradicted. It

affects the prestige of every Member of the House. I can understand one saying that representative groups should be given time. But, to go further and say that only some hon. Members have got something to contribute, is an aspersion which I think we should all protest against.

Shri Asoka Mehta: May I point out, Sir, that I have made it clear that there are different subjects? I do not think that every Member is competent to speak on every subject. We deal with a variety of subjects. I am quite sure that different Members here are competent to speak on different subjects. I was only suggesting competence arising in reference to particular subjects.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): What is the use of making this remark?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the harm if an hon. Member thinks he knows?

Shri Bogawat: He should say that and not cast an aspersion on anybody.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nobody can be an expert on every subject.

Shri Karni Singhji (Bikaner-Churu): As a citizen of free India, I feel extremely proud of the progress and the gigantic strides that my country has made in achieving the results that we have already achieved in the first three years of the Five Year Plan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is a representative of the Independent group. Shri Tulsidas and Shri Karni Singhji are Independent representatives. Shri Tulsidas is a businessman. Shri Karni Singhji will voice their grievances.

Shri Karni Singhji: It is extremely easy to criticise any Plan. I say we should look at this from a constructive point of view. India has faced terrific odds: partition, floods, famine and so

on. In spite of that, in such a short time, we have been able to achieve something and I think as free citizens, we have got a right to pat ourselves on the back. But we should not rest on our laurels. We have got to build up our country further. It will take many more years: perhaps with another three or four Five Year Plans, we will be able to attain self-sufficiency. I feel that to attain self-sufficiency and to get a move on with our Five Year Plans, all of us in this House, no matter to whatever groups or parties we may belong, have got to join hands and pull together. I would like to take this opportunity to say, and I am quite sure that everybody in Rajasthan will agree with me, that the Prime Minister and the Members of the Planning Commission deserve to be congratulated on what we have been able to achieve in such a short time.

Looking at some of our achievements today in such a short time, we have some of the World's largest dams span our rivers. To quote an Englishman whom I met a few days ago, he said that he could hardly believe that India in these five years could have achieved so much. That, I feel, is the view of many foreigners who have visited India after four or five years. It is a great tribute to our country and to our administration.

The hydro-power network is spreading over the face of India. Even the desert of Rajasthan is going to have several hundred miles of hydro-power network giving power to the smallest villages, thereby helping to solve our unemployment problem through industrialisation. Practically everything that we see in India today is assembled by Indian labour. Practically every motor car that we see on the road is assembled by Indian men. We have got a marked self-sufficiency in food. We can boast of some of the most beautiful and luxurious modern buildings, both in the field of industries and governmental buildings, we can be seen anywhere in the world.

Our Indian Airlines, today, have begun to cross the globe and carry our message of goodwill.

1 P.M.

In spite of all the good things we have achieved, there are certain aspects in which we are still wanting and which require every effort on our part to overcome. The biggest hurdle in the path of full implementation of the Five Year Plan is corruption. Everybody here, I am sure, has, at some stage or other felt that corruption is coming in the way of the progress. I may be pardoned for saying this. The other day, while discussing with certain important people about how best to stamp out corruption, I was told by one of them that corruption is so rampant that a person would be a fool who does not accept bribes. That is a statement of fact. I am afraid he was right.

An Hon. Member: Who was that man?

Shri Karni Singhji: He was a man who belonged to Rajasthan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But he is a fool who gives the bribe.

Mr. Ram Subhag Singh: He is compelled to give. (Interruptions)

Shri Karni Singhji: He who gives and he who takes are both Indian citizens, and therefore, I think we have to do something about it.

The next thing that comes in our way is red-tape. As you know, Sir, India is a welfare State, and a poor man's country, and in this country of ours the poor man has the greatest difficulty in achieving speedy justice. I would like to illustrate it. For example, there is a villager who comes from his village and he has quite a legitimate case. I am sure it would take him at least three years of

[Shri Karni Singhji]

"greasing" hands from table to table before he can get even elementary justice. If we brag to be a welfare State and a poor man's country, this is the first thing we must put right, so that the common man can get cheap justice and quickly.

Another thing which is particularly true of Rajasthan or certain Part B States is what I term the poison of regionalism. It is due to this that the Five Year Plan cannot be given its full and due consideration, as regional considerations play a more important part and not considerations of where natural resources are most abundant or unemployment is the most acute.

Switching over to Rajasthan and the Five Year Plan, I feel that we have seriously lagged behind in Rajasthan as can be seen from the Progress Report. On pages 18—19 it says:

"Relatively speaking, that is, admitting the fact that the overall rate of spending has been behind schedule, the progress of expenditure (50 per cent. and over) in the first five States listed above may be said to be satisfactory, and the progress of expenditure in the next six (40 per cent. and over) may be regarded as fair, while in the rest of the States the rates of expenditure achieved have to be considered as seriously lagging behind."

That is, Rajasthan comes under that category. I feel that in the interests of the people of Rajasthan, the Central Government has got to pull up the administration there. The pre-requisite of any administration which can cope with a Plan of this magnitude is ministerial stability. You will agree with me that in Rajasthan we have anything but ministerial stability. In six years, or rather in less than six years, we have had six Ministries.

An Hon. Member: Nothing but France.

Shri Karni Singhji: I am afraid I have become quite tired of quoting France every time here, but I think we are getting pretty close to France. I am happy to see that the High Command has at last put its foot down and said that no more changes will be brooked. I wish the new Ministry all success, but I hope that, if any further changes are coming in the Ministerial set-up of Rajasthan, the Central Government will consider President's rule for us, for I am sure we would be much better off that way. I say that because I feel that the present Chief Minister is a young man and should be given every chance to prove his mettle.

The Chief Minister, Mr. Sukhadia, has given us a very hopeful picture of industrialisation for Rajasthan, and we all welcome it, particularly as it is going to employ a large number of our unemployed labour. Here again, I hope that he will live up to his word.

An Hon. Member: How long will he last?

Shri Karni Singhji: It is very important in a place like Rajasthan that we should industrialise in a big way, and preferably nationalise the industry, so that thousands and thousands of unemployed labour—a large number of them caused due to integration—are fully provided with jobs.

Rajasthan—and the northern part of Rajasthan in particular—is going to get by 1956. I hope a very large network of hydro-electric power, and unless we plan and locate our industries at the right places, we will never be able to use this hydro-electric power properly. We know for a fact that there is going to be a surplus amount of hydro-electric power, and I also know, and I am sure everybody also feels, that no large industry can be

started in a year. It will take at least four years before we can get a major industry going. I had suggested this two years ago speaking on the Five Year Plan, but unfortunately we are still where we started and Rajasthan can hardly boast of any new industry worth the name.

A few suggestions have been put forward, especially with reference to northern Rajasthan, for industrialisation. The first is about the ammonium sulphate factory. We hope that one of these factories will be situated in Rajasthan. This ought to employ at least 1,000 people. A cement-cum-sulphur factory, which, I believe, ought to be somewhere near a gypsum deposit, can, with effect, be located near Bikaner city. This also will employ at least 2,000 people. A car assembly factory can likewise be installed in Rajasthan. We have the best system of railways, we have the man-power and the labour, and skilled labour for work. We are getting hydro-electric power. With this, we may employ as many as 10,000 people in the car industry.

The existing coach-building factory at the workshops of the Northern Railway in Bikaner can be doubled. This ought to employ another 1,000 people in Bikaner.

The latest scheme for irrigating Rajasthan is the Rajasthan canal which is quite different from the existing canal systems—that is, the Gang Canal system and the Bhakra system—and it is reckoned that if this canal comes into being, which, I believe, is now being included in the Second Five Year Plan, we should be able to find employment for 125,000 rural unemployed families, taking 32 acres as a basic unit. 125,000 families is a lot of people, and if we can find employment for them, even, say, within the next five or ten years, we will have taken a gigantic stride to solve our unemployment difficulties in the rural areas.

While concluding—I should not like to take the time of other Members—I sincerely hope that in the interests of the welfare of our country, all of us here will pull our weight together, no matter what party we belong to, so that in the minimum period possible, India will have attained complete self sufficiency.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Yesterday, in the course of the economic debate, we heard an amazing speech by Pandit Nehru which was largely devoted to bantering a very respected and eminent scientist whom any other country in the world would be proud to possess; and immediately after speaking about the pride he felt in the people of India and charging those who criticised the Plan as being against the people, it was a surprising tone he adopted towards one who has risen from the people against great odds to heights of eminence which any person in any country would be proud to attain. I think the real reason was that Dr. Saha had really put his hand on some of the sore spots, and I hope within the short time given to me to point out one or two of them—facts which Dr. Saha had correctly pointed out. Here, before I proceed, I should also like to say that the demagogic fashion in which Pandit Nehru tried to say that all those who criticise the Plan really undermine and actually are going against the people is absolutely wrong. Just because the Plan is there, it does not mean that if you are for the Plan you are for the people. It means that we have to see today what the people of India have been doing, how they have been fighting against many of the measures which have actually brought great suffering to them, and how the anti-people policies of Government have been fought by them with so much courage; and that is why we say all honour to the people, but it does not mean necessarily all honour to the Plan.

I am going to devote myself chiefly to that sector to which the First Five Year Plan has given the greatest em-

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

phasis, that sector being the sector of agriculture. Firstly, I should like to say that it is a peculiar thing that both Shri C. D. Deshmukh and Pandit Nehru said that the huge unemployment figures which we face today have to be solved outside the rural sector, and that, chiefly, it is a problem which has to be solved within the urban sector and within the sector of industry. Now, there is no doubt that we cannot progress without a much larger degree of industrialisation. But still if we are really to see the huge figures for whom we have to create employment, it is absolutely necessary to get at least a portion, a significant portion, absorbed in the rural sector. Secondly, we have to see that every precaution is taken so that the process towards landlessness, towards destitution by eviction and other methods, is fully protected against.

I would like to point out here that certain figures given by the Finance Minister have to be reconsidered. Now, take the question of the employment potential we have to create, the potential which will be necessary in the next ten years. According to the figures that he has given, there are 15 million unemployed. If we take that as a static figure, and accept that there will be no increase in it right throughout the ten year period and that we shall only have this 15 million to deal with, and add to it 1.9 million of annual increase in the working force. If you multiply that 1.9 million by ten, it does not come to 24 million but it comes to 34 million in all. I think there are some wrong calculations done by the Finance Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is 1.9 million multiplied by ten?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: That will come to 19 million. 19 million plus 15 million is 34 million.

I am very wary of using figures because I know that the Finance Minister is a master juggler in these figures, but I have found that this is a substantial figure. 24 million is a big figure, but when it comes to 34 million, certainly, the amount of investment will have to be even more. That is why it is all the more necessary to find out how we will be able to absorb a larger portion in that big sector of national income, that big and important sector in an under-developed country like India, which is the rural sector.

It is here that we have to see what is the record of Government. In spite of the various claims about the great opportunities of employment through production, and their working for removing inequalities, what is it that we see. The first and foremost great phenomenon we have to face today is the mass-scale evictions that are going on right throughout India. We say that if you are unable really to give land to the peasant without compensation which is their legitimate demand and right, at least you have to see that you stop evictions. Just as stopping of retrenchment is important in the industrial sector, so it is important to stop the evictions that are taking place in the rural sector. In Andhra, for instance, Government is one of the biggest land-owners. It owns about 13 lakhs of acres of cultivable waste, either under revenue or forest head. Now, what has been happening there? The Andhra Government have been stubbornly opposing the distribution of this waste land. Even in those areas where the agricultural labourers have taken this waste land today, they are being evicted under the plea of giving them to "political sufferers". Then, again, we see that there is another type of eviction, for instance, in the inam villages where large numbers of the agriculturists are being evicted, and they are being evicted from lands which they have been cultivating from time immemorial. There is another category

there, where the tenants and share-croppers are under the *pattadars*; they have also not got that security of tenure. I can go on quoting from Punjab and from various other parts of India to show that this problem of eviction is a very big problem, but not one word has been said in the whole review and assessment of the Five Year Plan about this phenomenon, how it is increasing, what is its effect on the labour potential, whether it is increasing employment or unemployment, etc.; no assessment has been made of this big factor up till now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In Andhra particularly, if the Government are trying to evict those landlords or rich men who have kept adjoining lands, and if for the purpose of giving them to landless people, they pass legislation, is the hon. Member against it?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I do not think you have understood my point. May be, it is my fault. My point was that the Government owns certain waste lands there, and those were the waste lands which were being demanded by the agricultural labourers; some of it has been taken over by Government, and the labourers are now being evicted. The same is true in Malabar also. For instance, in the Kuthali estate, which belongs to Government, there are 2,000 acres of fertile land. There, an agitation has been going on, but up till now, that land has not been given to these people. I can give other examples also. Actually, instead of giving them the land, they are being arrested. This whole question of.....

Shri Velayudhan: This land belonged to a particular zamindar. When he died, it was taken over by Government.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I think I am speaking with authority on this point, and I feel that if there is anything to be said against it or for it, it can be stated later on.

The general phenomenon is that the question of evictions assumes serious

proportions. Not only is eviction being carried out in areas of waste lands, fallow lands, etc. or in areas of a ryotwari nature, but in certain areas, as my State, for instance, it is taking place under the plea of land reforms. Certain clauses in the Bill itself, which is intended for that purpose, have given rise to further eviction. For instance, in the West Bengal States Acquisition Act, there is a clause which says that land above 33 acres, which is given to share-croppers, or has been sub-let, can be acquired by Government. So, immediately, large-scale evictions have started taking place. In this way, we find that this whole phenomenon of eviction has resulted in upsetting the equilibrium, or I should not use the word 'equilibrium,' but say that it has rather upset and thrown into the ranks of the unemployed larger and larger numbers of the cultivating peasantry.

I would also like here to make a passing reference to what we feel.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Certainly, the House would like to know this, for it is a matter for the House to vote for or against; and if I put a question, I put it on behalf of the entire House. I would like to know, in regard to eviction, whether it is the hon. Member's contention that these big landlords, who have occupied Government waste lands, ought not to be evicted, for the purpose of giving it to the poorer people.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I have made very specific reference to agricultural labourers. I think I have made that point clearly.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Who are the persons in occupation of these lands?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Agricultural labourers are in occupation of these lands. If you allow me to go on you will know about it.

Shri Kasliwal (Kota-Jhalawar): I may point out that so far as Punjab is concerned, all these evictions have been completely stopped.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: And tenants have been secured for ten years.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. members will have an opportunity later.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Let us know which part of India has completely stopped evictions. I would be very glad to know it. The general and total effect is that there is not one word about this question in the.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House would certainly like to know whether eviction by itself is not an offence. Supposing there is a landlord who has an enormous wealth of land and he has occupied the adjoining land, and Government have not evicted him so far, is it wrong for Government to evict him now...

Shri Dasaratha Deb (Tripura East): Thirty thousand acres of land belonging to tribal peasants in Tripura has been requisitioned by Government, and now those peasants are landless.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: One can go on arguing in this way, but the point is this: Have the evictions been stopped on every occasion? Is it really going to stop now? I have not heard any such argument that evictions cannot be stopped. And what is the category for whom we want to give land? The category for whom we want to give land is the agricultural labour, the poorer section. We are talking of unemployment. We are not talking about zamindars. We are not talking about employment for the zamindars. We are talking about employment for those for whom we want to give employment, that is, the agricultural labourer and the peasant. I say, that it is important to take note of this question of eviction, in order to find out how much we can stop this section of cultivating peasants from sliding back to destitution and landlessness. That is the point that I am trying to make. It is not a question of giving land to the zamindar by the backdoor of stopping eviction, trying to give protection to them.

The other point which I would like to make in this connection is the

question of ceilings. Up till now, wherever land reform has been carried out, there we find that this land reform has not actually resulted in large amounts of land being made available for distribution to the peasants. The reason for this is this whole question of ceilings. If we really take both employment potential and production into consideration, we feel that one basic factor which gives the biggest incentive to the growth of agriculture and the rise in production is the incentive of ownership in land to be given to the peasant. That is the experience of China. That is the experience of our own country itself. Wherever the peasant has felt security of his tenure where he knows that the land belongs to him even a very small plot of land, he has doubled and increased the production. This whole question of ceiling has raised a great controversy. There has been instances where even certain Ministers of State have voted against putting a ceiling on land, with the result that large areas of land still remain in a few hands, we say that the ceilings have to be fixed in such a way that the maximum amount of land is made available to the peasant. I cannot go into the details of what should be the unit etc. Obviously, it cannot be done within the short space of time which we have at our disposal, but we do say that that amount must be of the minimum and that minimum may not always be what we would call an economic holding.

Now, the question arises, how then are we to increase production. What is it that we have seen? We have seen that it is an incorrect, and a fallacious, argument to say that by giving the largest numbers of people land, and reducing the per capita share of land we will be reducing agricultural production. The first step that we have to take is land reform, and distribution of land to the largest number of people. The next step is towards forming co-operatives. In forming co-operatives we have to ensure one thing, that the disparity between the amount of land allotted

to the sharers of the co-operatives will not be too great. Otherwise, what is it that we will find? A person who has 100 acres of land and another person who has only 10 acres of land will be going into the same co-operative, and we say that that will merely make the rich man dominate over the poor, and will slowly lead to the ruin and destitution of the latter. This whole thing has to be assessed. Why is it that we have not been able to go forward with co-operatives? It has been admitted that the progress in co-operatives has not been great. What is the reason for it? It is this, that we have to have a minimum ceiling, and we have yet to release a large portion of land for distribution to the peasants. These are the two reasons which obviously stand in the way, and I feel that this is a very important point which we have to take into consideration.

Now, here in the progress report, we have seen that our food production has gone up. The analysis of why we have got this production has not been very clearly worked out. In one place, it has been said that almost all of it can be attributed to good weather. In another place, it is said that a part of it is also due to greater coverage, a rise in the area under cultivation. But actually, what do we find? The two States which have spent a large amount of money in agricultural development, both Uttar Pradesh and Bombay, have not shown any rise in comparison with States like Rajasthan where very little has been spent. Therefore, there must be something more in it, and we have to have a right assessment of it. We have to see that this increase does not remain an unstable thing, something that is only dependent on the vagaries of the weather. We have had good crops even earlier without the Plan we have had a big increase, due to good weather, timely monsoons etc. It is a big factor even now, but if we have to assess the conscious efforts made, as to what has been the actual and real results of the Plan, then we have to go to the assessment

of land reform, land distribution and various other factors. In that way, we will have to assess it.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Furnea): What about removal of controls?

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: I am going to take up now the question of agricultural prices today, and with it also I will have to ask something about rural finance, which we are not clear about. The hon. the Finance Minister says that in a month's time, we will have the whole report before us. But one thing I should like to get clear. The question of giving rural finance, either on short-term or long-term basis, will be on the basis of credit-worthiness. Now this question of credit-worthiness keeps out of the area of rural credit those who have at the moment not got security of tenure. The question of ownership of the land also has to be taken up with this question of credit-worthiness. I would like to know how far, and what percentage, will really be able to benefit from the recommendations of the Committee and by the setting up of rural co-operatives, as has been promised.

Now, the other factor in connection with production, after the question of land, is the question of fair prices for agricultural produce. We all know how prices have been falling. Prices of sugar, jute, pepper, coconut, arecanut tobacco, tapioca, groundnuts, cashew-nuts—all have fallen. I have not the time to go into the question of sugar and jute. We have seen how we have not reached even the highest peak levels of the pre-1949 period. Actually, whatever increase we have recorded in record years has again recorded a fall. At the same time as we see this big slide, we also see that profits are being made by the manufacturers—huge profits, as a matter of fact. That is why we feel that in this report, unless we take into consideration this question of how to stabilise prices, how we are going to really stop this sliding down of the prices of

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.]
 agricultural commodities, we will not be able to effect a steady and stable increase in production. Even if we have the potential of increase it, there will always be a tendency for the production to fall. Therefore, there must be some sort of a settled price policy to protect the growers. With it also inevitably comes the question of protecting agricultural labour. The entire question has to be examined. We have to see how we have not been able even to apply minimum wages to agricultural labour right throughout the country. Only in very very little areas it has been made applicable. Sometimes the wages of agricultural labour are very low. Now all this plus the effect that it will have on the slide in prices and on the national economy has to be worked out.

I can give other examples, but I will now go on to the question of the national income.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member wants, she can take the full 29 minutes. But if another hon. Member from her Group has to speak, she must resume her seat. I leave it to her.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I will just take two minutes because there is another Member who wishes to speak.

Although I had much to say, I would just like to point out two facts. One is about the national income. The national income over here, in the progress report, is given at Rs. 252 in 1951-52 and Rs. 261 in 1952-53. Now this increase, I think, is unreal. This has to be seen from two points of view. One has already been pointed by Shri Meghnad Saha, that the increase in the population between 1949-1954 has not been taken into consideration. If that had been calculated, this increase would have been negligible. The other factor is that the national income is derived from agricultural income plus industrial income. In 1948-49, prices were high. Now, there is a steep fall. If we calculate today the total income in terms

of constant prices, and then take the population of 1953-54, I think the increase would be much less. As such, I think we should know in real terms what the national income is. I am not now going into the standard of living, though that is the real indication of the increase in the well-being of the people. But judging the national income by averages would lead us to incorrect conclusions.

The next point I would refer to is about the figures which Shri Jawaharlal Nehru gave about increase in industrial production. Actually he quoted certain wrong figures. He said that the index number in 1953 was 111. I think that the correct figure is 135. It is a small correction. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru who always says we are careless about saying things, should be careful in quoting figures.

I should like to point out that the base year here is 1946. But we have to note that 1946 was by no means a good year for industrial production. It was much less than the peak war years. Therefore, the *Eastern Economist* has said that with 1939 as the base year, production has gone up to 126.8 in 1943-44, and in 1946-47, it dropped to 105. Seen in this context, it means that the increase in production in the third year of the Five Year Plan was only a little more than the peak levels reached during the war, and I think Shri Meghnad Saha was perfectly correct when he pointed this out, through the Prime Minister in a bit of temper lashed out at him.

I am afraid I have not been able to cover all the points I had to put in. But I would like to say two words on this question of "peaceful approach". Nobody wants violence. If things can be done by peaceful means, we should do it that way. Nobody wants violence. The point is, what are the things that we are seeing today? On the one hand, in regard to land policy, we see that the question of evictions has not been dealt with firmly on an all-India scale. On the other hand, the question of land reform, and availability of land for distribution to the peasants has not been dealt with properly. The question of building up

co-operatives with the ceilings on land has also not been taken up. We have seen that the medium size industries have been closing down in my State. I have got the figures with me but I have not the time to give them. We have to help these medium size industries. How to control the big monopolists, how to actually expand the pace of capital production and the public sector, all these things have to be taken into consideration. On the one hand, we see that big industries like the sugar industry are given so many concessions, so many concessions are given to these big capitalists and big monopolists in the way of taxation relief and other things—crores of rupees—and yet what has happened. The prices have not fallen down and huge profits have been accumulated. At the same time, we have seen retrenchment both in textiles and the sugar industry. We see that the question of labour insurance has not been tackled. I believe a Committee has been set up. That is all we did. We do not know when it will come into force.

When we talk about peaceful approach, the peaceful approach must be judged from the point of view of an objective and that objective must be to see that the inequalities are removed that the poorer sections and the labourers and the workers and peasants get a fair deal. Those who are well placed will have to be curbed by peaceful means, certainly, but if peace is not to be there, it has to be done with controls. That has to be done by the State and that is what we want to see. There is no question of socialism. We are far far from socialism. Even within the capitalist system we can have certain improvements and that is what we want the Government to go ahead and do.

डाक्टर राम सुभग सिंह : मैं बहुत ध्यान से सुन रहा था और समझ रहा था कि कम से कम कोई ऐसा सुझाव आयेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में कर का जो बोझ बहुत ज्यादा हो रहा है उस में कमी की जाय। लेकिन वैसे कोई सुझाव नहीं आया, इसलिये मुझे कुछ कहना है।

मंग संशोधन बहुत मामूली हैं, और वह इस प्रकार हैं :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House, having considered the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan for the year 1953-54, is of the opinion that in view of the fall in prices of agricultural commodities, proportional reduction should be made in the irrigation and other agricultural taxes which have been enhanced due to the Five Year Plan."

यह प्रस्ताव मैं इस लिये रखता हूँ, चूँकि अभी नन्दा जी ने जो भाषण दिया था प्लानिंग कमीशन वर्गरेह से बाज बाज मौकों पर जो वक्तव्य दिये जाते हैं, उन से यह ज्ञात होता है कि उन लोगों को वास्तविक स्थिति का पता नहीं है। अभी नन्दा जी ने कहा कि हाल में ही जो डबलपमेंट काउंसिल की बैठक हुई थी उस में सभी स्टैंडर्स के चीफ मनिस्टर वर्गरेह थे। उस में उन लोगों ने बताया कि हर प्रकार के टैक्सों बढ़ाये जायें और उस का नाम उन्होंने रक्सा एन्वैन्समेंट आफ दि बेंटरमेंट टैक्स, वाटर टैक्स, सरचार्ज आन लैंड रेंवेन्यू, वर्गरेह वर्गरेह। ऐसी बातों को उन्होंने कहा। अभी बीकानेर के महाराज ने जिस बात को यहां कहा अर्थात् यह कि घूसखोरी बहुत बढ़ गई है और शायद प्लानिंग कमीशन का ध्यान इस तरफ कम गया है। मैं इस बात का पूर्णतया समर्थन करता हूँ। जो पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना बनाई गई उस में यह शामिल है कि यहां के उन अफसरों को तरक्की न दी जाय बल्कि उन के विरुद्ध आवश्यक कार्रवाई की जाय जो घूसखोरी या और प्रकार के भ्रष्टाचार के लिये जवाबदेह हों। लेकिन इस रिपोर्ट में अब तक मुझे इस की कोई चर्चा नहीं मिली। आज यहां पर एक सवाल आया था उस सवाल के जवाब में उपमंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि उन को ऐसी बातों का पता नहीं है। इसी लिये मैं कहता हूँ कि प्लानिंग कमीशन को मौजूदा वास्तविकता को, वास्तविकता का पता नहीं है।

[डाक्टर राम सुभग सिंह]

जब मैं टैंक्स के बारे में यह कहता हूँ कि टैंक्स को कम किया जाना चाहिये तो मैं यह भी कहता हूँ कि टैंक्स में वृद्धि स्थिति की जानकारी किये बगैरे की गई। यदि प्लैनिंग कमीशन को इस बात का पता होता कि हिन्दुस्तान की किन किन नहरों में उतना पानी नहीं मिलता है जितना पानी मिलना चाहिये, या किन किन क्षेत्रों में जहाँ पर ट्यूब वेल्स सरकार की आरंभ से या पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत लगाये गये उन में कितने बर्ग फुट पानी देने की व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिये थी और कितने बर्ग फुट पानी किसानों को मिलता है, यदि इन सब बातों का पता उन अफसरों को होता या दूसरे लोगों को चाहे वह मंत्री हों या प्लैनिंग कमीशन के मंत्री हों, पता होता तो वे लोग इस कर को न बढ़ाते। मैं अपने यहाँ की बात कहता हूँ। हमारे यहाँ जहाँ एक घंटे में २२,००० बर्ग फुट पानी मिलता था वहाँ अब केवल १२,००० बर्ग फुट पानी मिलता है। तो यों ही बिना किसी बात को जाने हुए कर की वृद्धि हो गई है। इसी प्रकार वाटर रेट्स की भी वृद्धि इतने प्रतिशत हो गई क्योंकि पानी कम मिलता है। इसी प्रकार सम्पूर्ण देश में कहीं २०० प्रतिशत और कहीं ३०० प्रतिशत इस टैंक्स की वृद्धि की गई १९४९, १९५२ और १९५२ में। उस के साथ किसानों पर और भी तरह तरह के टैंक्स लगाये गये। हमारे फाइनन्स मिनिस्टर साहब, जो यहाँ से इस समय चले गये हैं, हर साल एक चिट्ठी पढ़ते हैं कि फलों किसान ने बहुत खुरी से ५ रु० भेजे हैं। लेकिन यदि वे मुझ से पूछते और यदि वे कार्रवाई करने को तैयार होते, वे कुछ समय हम लोगों को दें तो मैं उन को हजारों चिट्ठियाँ जिनका सरकार फाइनन्स मिनिस्टर के अफसरों और तम्बाकू बोन वाले किसानों से हैं दिखाता कि किस प्रकार से उन अफसरों द्वारा हिन्दुस्तान भर के किसानों को सताया जाता है और वे किस प्रकार से घूस लेने के लिये किसानों को तबाह और बरबाद करते हैं। इस के अलावा और भी अफसर हैं। जहाँ तक पानी देने अर्थात् पीयूष सेट्स

का सवाल है, कहां पर कितना पानी मिलना चाहिये या किस को ट्यूब वेल लगाना चाहिये, इन बातों का पता उन लोगों को नहीं होता। प्रांग्स रिपोर्ट में खर्च के सम्बन्ध में लिखा हुआ है कि केवल ४० प्रतिशत रुपया ही खर्च हुआ। मंत्री महोदय ने भी कहा कि इस पर उन को भरोसा है कि हमारी प्रांग्स बहुत अच्छी चल रही है और बहुत कम खर्च हुआ है। हम को भी दो, चार कम्प्यूनिटी प्रांजेक्ट्स के देखने का मौका मिला है। ज्यादा खर्च का हिस्सा एस्टीमेशन पर जाता है उन को आँकना चाहिये कि उस खर्च का एंजीवमेंट क्या है। हमारे फाइनन्स मिनिस्टर या नन्दा जी यदि एंजीवमेंट बतलाते कि कितने प्रतिशत वहाँ के लोगों को सन्तोष हुआ तो अच्छा होता। यदि वह यह बतलाते कि उन के काम में, उन के कार्यक्रम में कितनी सरकारी हुई तब तो हम को कुछ सन्तोष हो सकता था लेकिन उन का आँकड़ा यह कि हम ने ४० प्रतिशत खर्च किया और खर्च करने की मशीनरी हमारी बहुत सन्तोषजनक रूप से काम किये जा रही है। हम उन के इस सन्तोष को बहुत नागवार मानते हैं, क्योंकि उन्हीं सब आदिमियों के कारण हमारे ऊपर कर का बोझ इतना बढ़ा जाता है।

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

अब आज जो हमारा प्रस्ताव है उस के अनुसार एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइसेज में जो कमी हुई है उस अनुपात को मैं लेना चाहता हूँ। आज नन्दा जी ने कहा था कि हम को अब फूट नहीं इम्पोर्ट करना पड़ रहा है और हमारी उपज बढ़ गई है। खाना अब बाहर से नहीं मंगाना पड़ता है इस का अर्थ तो किसी दूसरे व्यक्ति को है और इस के लिये भी कि हमारे कीलबेटर्स इतना सहयोग दे रहे हैं। प्लैनिंग कमीशन इस के लिये अपनी पीठ नहीं ठोक सकता कि क्यों हमारा फूट प्रोडक्शन बढ़ा। हाँ, इतना जरूर है उन लोगों ने नदीयों को बांधा और कुछ और कार्रवाइयाँ भी कीं। लेकिन इस का ज्यादा अर्थ किडवाई साहब को है। इस का अर्थ प्रकृति के है, क्योंकि इन्हीं ज्यादा

हुई। मैं पहले टैंक्सों को ही लेंता हूं। इन सै कल्टीवेटर्स पर बहुत बोझ पड़ गया है। ऊख का ही सवाल ले लीजिए। पहले जहां इस के लिए ८ या ६ रुपये प्रति एकड़ सिंचाई के दाने पड़ते थे अब १५ रुपये दाने पड़ते हैं। इस के इलावा लैंड रिवेन्यू और बेंटरमेंट चार्जेज भी दाने पड़ते हैं। इस तरह से इस की कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन पांच गुना बढ़ गई है।

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta—North-west): May I draw your attention to the fact that very few Ministers are there present in the House—the Ministerial Benches are empty? Would you kindly see that Ministers are present on this important discussion?

Mr. Chairman: The Deputy Minister of Planning is taking notes.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): It does not look nice that Parliament is attended only by Deputy Ministers.

Mr Chairman: Shri Nanda, the Minister of Planning, was here for a long time and he has gone out for a short time.

An Hon. Member: This is lunch time.

Mr. Chairman: It does not matter because the Deputy Minister is there taking notes for him.

... डा० राम सुभग सिंह : तां में कह रहा था कि किस तरह से ऊख की कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन बढ़ गई है और इस में चार या पांच गुना की बढ़ि हो गई है। वाटर रेंट बढ़कर ४५ रुपया हो गया है और बेंटरमेंट चार्जेज और लैंड रिवेन्यू इस के इलावा हैं। इसी तरह से धान की सिंचाई के लिए पहले ८०,००० गैलन पानी दाने के ८ रु० ८ आ० लिए जाते थे लेकिन अब १५ रुपये लिए जाते हैं और बेंटरमेंट चार्जेज और लैंड रिवेन्यू अलग लिया जाता है। इतना ही नहीं, जैसा कि मल्लिका साहिब ने अभी

कहा, अफसर भी बहुत ज्यादा ज्यादातियां करते हैं और बर्गेर रिश्वत लिए बात ही नहीं करते। मैं एक छोटी सी भिसाल आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूं। एक किसान को अपनी जमीन की सिंचाई के लिए एक रुपया प्रति एकड़ आंवरीयर को और आठ आना प्रति एकड़ ऑपरेंटर को दाना पड़ता है। आंवरीयर की तरफ से वह भी हुक्म हो जाता है कि एक बीघा जमीन में जां भी धान पैदा हो वह उसके घर पहुँचा दिया जाए। यदि वह ऐसा नहीं करता तो कई तरीकों से हेंसान किया जाता है, उस को समय पर पानी नहीं दिया जाता और जब किसान देखता है कि उस के खेतों को पानी नहीं मिल रहा है और उसके खेत सूख रहे हैं तो उसे स्वभावतः बड़ा दुःख होता है। उस पर भी उससे कहा जाता है कि तुम्हें कानून के अनुसार पैनल्टी देनी होगी। इन सब बातों की तत्कालिक कार्रवाई जानी बहुत जरूरी है। आज हमारे किसानों की हालत क्या है।

यू० पी० की रिपोर्ट में सामने है और उस में दर्ज है कि पांच प्रतिशत को खाना पीना मिलता है और बाकियों की हालत बहुत खराब है। उन पर जो कर्ज है उसका भार वे सहन नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। अगर कोई एक गाय बेचने के लिए जाता है तो उसको इसके १०० रुपये ही मिलते हैं जब कि पहले उसकी कीमत लगभग २०० रुपये थी। अगर आज वह साड़ी या धोती खरीदने जाता है तो उसको एक धोती के पीछे तकरीबन तीन आने या चार आने टैंक्स देना पड़ता है। इन के इलावा लैंडलेंस लेबररज जो हैं और जिनके पास सिर्फ एक बैलगाड़ी ही होती है, उनकी हालत और भी खराब है। कृषि पदाधारों के भाव गिरते जा रहे हैं, परन्तु जो टैंक्स उन को देने पड़ते हैं उनके रेट्स बढ़ते जा रहे हैं और कहीं कहीं तो वह आठ या नौ गुना बढ़ गए हैं। इस के विपरीत कृषि पदाधारों के भाव १६ और १८ रुपये से गिर कर ६ रुपये प्रतिमन पर आ गए हैं। अभी तक इन सब चीजों की ओर प्लानिंग कमिशन का ध्यान नहीं गया

[डाक्टर राम सुभग सिंह]

हैं और यदि जल्दी ही कोई कार्रवाई इस सम्बन्ध में न की गई तो स्थिति खराब हो जाएगी। इन मामलों में शीघ्र कदम उठाने की आवश्यकता है। इसी के साथ साथ प्लैनिंग कमिशन के हाथ में सभी चीजें हैं। नसकें हाथ में हेल्थ हैं, एंजर्जेशन हैं और एक दो और चीजें हैं। वेल्फेयर स्टैंड में यह माना जाता है कि हम हर आवश्यक सुविधा साधारण आदमी को दें। साधारण आदमी का हमारा दृष्टि में एंजर्जेशन का स्टैंडर्ड बहुत गिर गया है। हेल्थ का भी स्तर हमारा यहां गिरा हुआ है। अभी हाल में यहां पर जब भा साहब ने उस सम्बन्ध में सवाल किया तो तरह तरह के उत्तर मिलते हैं। आज इस बात की बड़ी आवश्यकता है कि हेल्थ की कम से कम सुविधा गरीबों को मिले। आज जब प्लैनिंग कमिशन इतना रुपया खर्च कर रहा है तो इतना तो होना ही चाहिये कि एक गरीब आदमी बिना घस दिये कम से कम अस्पतालों में भरती हो सके। हम देखते हैं कि हमारा दृष्टि में शिक्षा का स्टैंडर्ड भी उसी अनुपात में गिरा है जिस अनुपात में कि हमारा यहां टैक्स बढ़ा है। इन बातों की तरफ हमारा और सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिये।

जहां तक अनइम्प्लायमेंट का सवाल है हमें अभी यह सुन कर बड़ी खुशी हुई कि २४ मिलियन जॉब्स सरकार क्लियर करने वाली है और हमारा फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर शायद काफी जॉब्स दे भी चुके हैं। लेकिन उसके चलते ऐसी स्थिति पैदा हुई है कि एक नौजवान आदमी भी गांव में नहीं रहना चाहता और जो नौसा काम करने लायक होता है वह उसी दिन गांव से उड़ कर सरकारी नौकरी का दरवाजा खटखटाने के लिये उड़ जाता है, और वह नौकरी के लिये दरवाजा क्यों न खटखटाये। प्लैनिंग कमिशन द्वारा श्रम को महत्व नहीं दिया जाता कागज पर आम्बेडकर में दर्ज है लेकिन वास्तव में उस पर जमल नहीं होता। हमारा मिनिस्टरों की और प्लैनिंग कमिशन के

मैम्बरों को अपने पीछे चलने वाले चपरासी की बो फाइल लेकर उनके पीछे पीछे चलता है, उसकी आर्थिक दशा की ओर भी ध्यान देना चाहिये और जब तक हम श्रम को उचित महत्व नहीं प्रदान करेंगे तब तक हम इस दृष्टि से बेकारी की समस्या को सफलतापूर्वक दूर नहीं कर सकेंगे। आज जिस तरह की नीति पर चला जा रहा है उससे अनइम्प्लायमेंट की प्राक्काम हल नहीं हो सकती, क्योंकि आज की हालत में किसान काहे को हल चलायेगा, वह तो सरकारी नौकरी की तरफ भायेगा। किसी साहब ने कहा था कि हम चाहते हैं कि अगर कुछ आदमी मोटर पर चलें तो और दूसरों को भी मोटर चढ़ाने को मिले, लेकिन आज हमारा यहां क्या हालत हो रही है। आज एक आदमी बड़ी शान से दूसरे तमाम आदमियों को तबाह करके मोटर पर चलता है, तो हमें इस आर्थिक शोषण को समाप्त करना होगा। मैं चाहूंगा कि जीवन के हर क्षेत्र में कृषि के क्षेत्र में और हर क्षेत्र में मजदूरी का एक न्यूनतम वतन स्तर स्थिर किया जाय कि उसी मजदूरी अवश्य दी जाय और एक ऐसा वातावरण तैयार करें जिसमें गरीबों को इतनी आर्थिक सुविधाएं प्राप्त हों ताकि वह अपना जीवन यापन कर सकें और ताकि यहां के बसने वाले गरीब लोग नौकरी करने के वास्ते यहां दौड़ दौड़ कर न आयें। मैं यह नहीं मानता कि किसान हिन्दुस्तान के पिछड़े हुए हैं या जैसा कि कहा जाता है कि वे सीएकशनरी हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान में जो कुछ प्रोग्रेस है वह किसानों और मजदूरों की बदौलत ही हुई है क्योंकि यदि किसान नहीं होते तो शायद हम लोग और कोई भी यहां इस पार्लियामेंट में नहीं होते और न कोई आन्दोलन ही सफल हुआ होता। किसी भी पार्टी की जो कुछ जड़ है वह किसानों अथवा मजदूरों के ही बल से है, पार्टी इन्हीं के ऊपर चलती है। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि एग्रीकल्चरल जनता के ऊपर जितने टैक्स हैं, वे उसी अनुपात में कम किये जायें जिस अनुपात में कृषि पदार्थों का मूल्य गिरा है।

Shri Raghuramaiah: The speech of the hon. Minister of Planning this morning in commending the progress made with the Plan, I think, is a very modest speech, because he has not only pointed out the very many items of progress which we have achieved, but also some of the difficulties with which the planners are faced. One of them he has stressed, and I think quite rightly, and that is unemployment. The object of a socialist State, as it is commended to be, is not only to increase production but also—this is more important or rather the ultimate objective—to see that there is proper distribution and that there is an increase in the standard of living. The success of the Plan, therefore, is to be gauged by the measure in which we will increase the employment in this country, and the schemes that are being added on to our First Five year Plan with this objective are to be commended. But I would suggest that perhaps a greater effort should be made in that direction within the period of two years at our disposal. Wherever we go we find enormous number of young people queuing up for jobs. We have created that atmosphere in the country where government service seems to be the be all and end all of a young man's career. We have got to change that atmosphere and the question arises as to how it can be changed. By rapid industrialisation and by employing all the young men in the new industries that will come up in the country. But there is one great hitch for that, because as stated by the Finance Minister yesterday, the Government of India seem to be thinking of providing jobs which will secure for a young man about Rs. 1,000 per year. I do not know how this is going to fit into our present pay structure. The greatest hindrance, at the present moment, to the country's progress is the pay structure of the government servants. We have got the colossus of some people drawing Rs. 5,000, and Rs. 10,000. How many jobs of that category can be created? It is practically impossible. Even if you create 10 million jobs wherein our young men can get Rs. 100, by itself it may

be all right, but when compared to Rs. 3,000 and Rs. 4,000 it will lead to more dissatisfaction and greater frustration.

We have got, therefore, to treat it on a more radical basis. While creating employment we must bear in mind the economic structure of this country. We should not make the youngmen who are going to get Rs. 100 feel that they are not treated in the proper manner which they would feel when they find others getting Rs. 3,000 and Rs. 4,000.

The question has been raised of late in a very prominent way in regard to the privy purses of the Maharajas. There is a growing consensus of opinion in this country today that the anomalies that were created by the privy purses must be rooted out. I would say there is a growing feeling, a consciousness throughout the length and breadth of the country that perhaps we have made a mistake in having allowed this high pay structure. So, some radical reform is called for. It may be by voluntary appeal and if voluntary appeal fails it may be by legislation. I would therefore, strongly impress upon the Government that they should take up the question of reducing the present enormous salaries of government servants, while at the same time they should go ahead with further and further increase in employment.

Sir, however many jobs more we may create, whatever further employment we may add, there is one thing which is now eating the very vitals of the body politic of this country and the earlier we cure it the better it will be for the progress of this country. The Maharaja of Bikaner has referred to corruption. I am sorry to say that corruption is on the increase, corruption in every walk of public life, and I do not know whether we are doing enough to stop that corruption. The removal of corruption from the body politic of this country must be taken up as the biggest target in our Plan. Unless

[Shri Raghuramiah]

that is done, public opinion will not be behind any plan that we may put forward. Everywhere there is a feeling that a good portion of the money that is put into this Plan is going into the private coffers of the employees who are administering the Plan.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): May I ask whether our Prime Minister believes like that?

Shri Raghuramiah: I am not the Prime Minister. I am giving expression to my own personal views.

It is no use hood-winking ourselves that wonderful things are taking place. They are taking place, there is no doubt. But the public consciousness is impaired by the feeling that there is corruption everywhere. In every country from which corruption has been rooted out, I have heard that they have done it as major programme their plan—a two year programme, or three year programme to root out corruption. The most severe punishment should be given to those who receive bribes and they must be made publicly ashamed of their conduct. Six months imprisonment, or eight months imprisonment for a man who has accumulated some Rs. 30 crores or Rs. 40 crores of money by way of corruption is a mockery. I would therefore, suggest to Government that they should give the highest priority to this and see that corruption is rooted out. Unless we root out corruption, whatever we may do will not achieve that amount of public approbations as it ought to achieve.

There is another thing which I would commend to Government. Young people today are not only without employment, but they are suffering from a sense of frustration and there is a high sense of indiscipline among them. Of late we, some of us, have had the good fortune of visiting an institute here, the Kasturba Niketan, one of the Rehabilitation Centres, wonderfully organised by one of our Deputy Ministers, Mr. Bhonsle. The amount that is spent on the training given to the young

people there is, I am told, very negligible. The time factor involved is very little; within a period of two weeks or three weeks, or six weeks, they are able to train up a whole lot of young people into a disciplined life. That, Sir, is a thing which I would very greatly commend.

We must not forget the fact that we are in a democracy. Democracy has its own disadvantages. Many more things are possible in a totalitarian State which are not possible to us. To get things done under fear of penalty or under fear of death is easy in a totalitarian State; but in a democracy everything has to be done by persuasion, by training, by a proper handling of the youth of the country. I feel that we have not started in right earnest about it. We have got to expand the scheme which is now being worked out so wonderfully well by Mr. Bhonsle throughout the length and breadth of the country. Young people want a slogan. We have got to give them a slogan, and unless you give it, you will not have that youthful co-operation for your Plan.

They talk of economic equality. We certainly have done something. This Government has and I feel is doing, its very best to achieve that economic equality which is the objective of a socialist State. I am not referring merely to the Estate Duty Act. Of late, the returns are not perhaps so very encouraging. I mean the land reform to which some of the previous speakers have referred. Some of the States have limited holdings. Some of the States are going to limit holdings. But I would suggest that limitation of holdings of agricultural land is not the be all and end all of this programme. You must at the same time take up limitation of all other property. It is not fair to the agricultural classes that you should limit only land holdings and you should not limit other acquisitions. A man having crores and crores of rupees, and having several buildings in a City goes untouched; that is not fair to the other sectors which you are going to equalise.

Take companies. The amount and the extent of the dividends which some of the shareholders get is enormous: 20 per cent, 30 per cent, 40 per cent. In the name of the socialist State I ask Government to see that a limitation is placed even on these dividends, in the same manner as the Government is now trying to limit agricultural holdings.

About the minimum price of agricultural labour, I certainly agree with some of the previous speakers that the time has come for assuring labour a minimum standard of living. There are difficulties of course. Minimum wages for agricultural labour can only be fixed when you are in a position to fix the price of agricultural commodities. Yesterday I understood that Government is contemplating some kind of a price fixation for some of the agricultural products like maize, etc. I would suggest that they should fix the minimum price for all agricultural commodities and that will facilitate the fixing of minimum wages for agricultural labour.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): But not as low as they are reported in the papers—Rs. 5-8 per maund of jowar.

2 P.M.

Shri Raghuramaiah: The price fixed must be reasonable. The prices must enable the agriculturists to make both ends meet. It must be economical. As a matter of fact, we are very proud of the achievements of the Planning Commission in having increased food production. But what is happening? In some of the States, the price of agricultural produce has gone down enormously. It is slowly becoming uneconomical for agriculturist to raise, for instance, paddy in that part of the country from which I come. Therefore, in fixing a minimum price for agricultural products, I entirely agree with some of my friends, we should see that the prices are economical to the agriculturists. In commenting thus upon agricultural prices, it is not my object to take away the approbation which is certainly due to

the work that has already been done by the Planning Commission. The work is enormous. There has been a general public awareness of the fact that we are going ahead. There are difficulties, of course, and the greatest thing which the Planning Commission has so far done is to make the public realise that planning is not such an easy thing, that it is a very difficult process, especially when so many crores of people are involved. It is easy, of course, to decry. I was thinking that probably the greatest menace, the greatest danger to the success of the Five Year Plan is not any defect or default on the part of the Government, but the existence of what I would call a sixth column in the country. I call it sixth column because we have already heard of the fifth column. In war-time, if a national of a country helps the nationals of other countries by espionage, he is said to indulge in fifth column activities. In peace-time, time in time out, when certain people go on decrying, go on criticising whatever comes in the name of their country, whatever the country has achieved, and if that becomes a habit, well, the person who acquires that habit is—I would call him—a member of the sixth column. Unfortunately, those of us who have been outside this country lately have come to realise that there are a good many members of the sixth column in this country. Of late, one of our friends had been to Russia. Having gone there, he has written some love letters to some people in this country, and in those love letters, he has stated that the so-called dams in India are just like municipal drains when compared to the big, the wonderful dams that are being built in Russia. Well, it is a shameful statement. I do not know whether that gentleman has toured this country and seen the wonderful things that are being done in this country.

श्री विश्वरूप त्रिपाठी (सारन व चम्पारन) :
जिन्होंने पत्र लिखा हैं मैं उन का नाम जानना चाहता हूँ।

Shri Raghuramaiah: It is unnecessary to mention names, nor is it possible for me to do it, because there are so many of them going out every day and trying to decry the greatness and glory of this country. I happened to mention this because in some countries which we happened to visit, some people told us—they told me particularly—that some people decry our country and that they are our own nationals. They say: "Your own nationals come and tell us that you are doing nothing, that your Government is wasting money and that there is terrible distress and dissatisfaction among the people". In view of the bell you have rung, Sir, I shall close my speech with the remark that while we should be proud of the achievements which the Planning Commission has made, this is not the time for any complacency. We should certainly do a bit more to create employment in the country, to create that amount of public confidence and public co-operation without which it would be impossible for any Plan to succeed.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha (Patna East): I would have liked the Finance Minister or his deputies to be present here because I would like to deal with the financial aspect of the progress report of the Five Year Plan, but unfortunately they are not here. There is no doubt that India's achievements in the first three years of the Five Year Plan which have been reviewed in the Planning Commission's progress report of 1953-54, are very commendable in the spheres of agriculture as well as industry. Agricultural production has vastly increased. I do not agree with the hon. lady Member who spoke earlier that agricultural production has increased only due to the weather conditions. This is not a fact. Nobody can challenge this fact that because of the increase in fertilisers, because of the scientific methods of production, agricultural production has increased. Even in foodgrains, the target that was fixed for the Five Year Plan has been exceeded during the course of

three years. Two more years are left still to have more and more production of foodgrains, and I think in the course of the five years this target will be very much increased, much more than what we see now.

I now come to the index of industrial production. My hon. lady friend made it a point to criticise the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister as regards the figures. I was surprised when she said that the Government, with all their departments and bureaux could not collect the figures, that they have been collecting since years and years. But how my lady friend could be in possession of such vast resources as to say that the Prime Minister as well as the Finance Minister have made mistakes.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: It is a simple case of multiplication.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: It is a very strange case of multiplication! I want to tell the House that the index of industrial production that was arrived at in the base year, 1948, was 105. The hon. lady Member said that she cannot believe it, because during the war period, the index number was very high. We cannot compare the figures of the war period with those of the normal times. The war period was certainly an abnormal period and normal times cannot be compared to those of abnormal times. But we can find from the present report that in 1954, during the first five months, the index figure came to 140. That means there was a spectacular rise in the industrial production also. Many people have said that agricultural prices are falling. I do agree that they are falling, but we must remember that with the Korean war situation, the prices went up abnormally high. The prices have to, in the normal course, come down to a certain extent, and here also they had to come down. So, if the prices have come down to a certain extent, there is nothing to worry about. I would like the Members of the Congress Party to say that there is nothing to worry about.....

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik Central): Why only Congress? She must appeal to the House.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:..... because, after all, the situation that is at present obtaining in our country does not indicate that the prices will be falling further. I only say this to the Congress Benches and not to Opposition because it is their purpose to make this issue a political issue. For them falling of prices is very welcome because they can make it a political issue. There is nothing for me to suggest otherwise or make any amends to them.

But satisfactory as all this has been, it must be remembered that the maintenance of this rate of progress itself would require more resources than are at present available. In reply to a question, the hon. Minister stated that the size of the Plan which was originally Rs. 2,069 crores had to be increased by about Rs. 216 crores in order to mitigate this tide of unemployment. Accordingly, the outlay of the Plan in the present schedule, with the additional figures, is of the order of Rs. 2,285 crores. But during the three-year period which ended in March, 1954, the actual expenditure has only been Rs. 885 crores. This is really the point where we have to devote all our attention. This low level of expenditure is very undesirable, during the plan period and during the period of planned economy. The Centre's share accounts for Rs. 445 crores and the States for Rs. 440 crores. Even in 1953-54, the actual expenditure by the Centre and the States, as against the budget provisions of Rs. 237 crores and Rs. 176 crores respectively, was Rs. 188 crores and Rs. 167 crores respectively. In 1954-55 a substantially larger amount is proposed to be spent—a sum of Rs. 356 crores by the Centre and a sum of Rs. 216 crores by the States. A large outlay of this, I am sure, will go to irrigation and power projects.

The lags in expenditure on the Plan which have come to the light must be

judged in the context of the circumstances of the last three years. During the first year before the Plan was finalised the budget was presented. In the second year there was a slight recession of the Indian economy, and the whole energy of the Government was devoted more to stabilise the economic system than to expand the economy and to devote its attention to the Five Year Plan. It was only in 1953-54 that the planners devoted their energy to the implementation and expansion of the Plan. Therefore there is nothing surprising in the fact that there was a lag in expenditure. And we hope that this lag will not be there in future. The authorities say that the lags were due to the insufficient working out of schemes in advance. With regard to this attitude of the authorities I wish to say something. I do admit that allowance should no doubt be made for teething troubles. But to say that the schemes were not worked out in smallest details is not an excuse; and in future I do not think that this should be an excuse that the Plan could not be worked out according to the schedule because the details of the programmes were not worked out. Schemes should be visualised to the smallest details and the fullest investigation should be made. It is not only for criticisms that the fullest investigation should be made but with the object of preventing recurrence of mistakes, when the plans go wrong, whether in terms of money or of time.

Some of the defects, which according to the authors of the report have caused delay in the implementation of the Plan, include the lack of availability of certain types of equipment. Three years have passed now and I do not think it is proper for the authors of the Plan to say there is still lack of material to push forward the Plan. The second aspect they have pointed out is that they are faced with the shortage of technical personnel. And the third is that they have not been able to set up and put the administrative machinery into gear.

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

I am very happy to know that they are trying to devote their attention to increase the technical personnel in the country. But to say that the administrative machinery has not been put into gear, I do not think can be a good excuse. The country is not going to take it as a good excuse. Most of the Members have raised this point that the attention of Planning Commission must be directed towards putting the administrative machinery in gear. There were questions by some hon. Members and I could see the anxiety of the Members of Parliament who wanted to express the feeling that the officers, the administrative machinery is not co-operating. They are not prejudiced against the officers. But I am sorry to say that the hon. Minister when answering the question said that nothing objectionable has been received so far. They are not supposed to be a body who should be sitting idle in this matter. Is it a business of a Member of Parliament to go and report about the misconduct or lack of co-operation of the administrative machinery to a Ministry? It is an indication, a proof of the feeling in the country that the country is not inspired with the progress of the present administrative machinery. In spite of the Plan—and I really feel that the Plan as it is put before the country is highly commendable, I am proud to feel that no country in the world, in a democratic set-up has put forward such a comprehensive and scientific plan—but to say that the administrative machinery is not in gear is not a good excuse, and I think the whole attention of the authorities should be directed to that aspect.

There is another aspect, namely shortfall in resources. Even the Finance Minister in his speeches year in and year out has said that there has been shortfall in resources. And the States are rather more guilty in this respect than the Centre. The Centre is expected to raise during the 1951-56 period Rs. 726 crores. It has raised Rs. 324 crores over the three year per-

iod, and I think at this rate it could raise Rs. 540 crores over the five year period. The States are expected to raise Rs. 532 crores during the Five Year Plan period. But so far they have raised during the period under review only Rs. 212 crores. At this rate they would be able to raise only Rs. 353 crores over the five year period. We have seen that the Centre, during these three years, had to devote its energy for providing funds for Central purposes as well as for State purposes. Almost all the States have been demanding resources without providing the resources that they themselves have been allotted to provide under the Plan. Although the States have so far received Central assistance to the tune of Rs. 122 crores, they had to rely to the extent of about 25 per cent of their share of expenditure under the Plan, on depletion of cash reserves and increase in short-term indebtedness. Therefore the report rightly holds that financing in this manner of as much as 25 per cent of the Plan at the low levels of expenditure, recorded in the Plan in the first three years, is a matter which must cause concern. The Planners have properly realised the importance of this matter and I hope that they will devote their energies to see that this shortfall of expenditure in the Plan is not there.

I have so many other points to make, but as the time is not there I will not take the time of the House.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): We were not very enthusiastic about the effects of the Five Year Plan; not because we belong to the Opposition but because of the way in which the Plan was framed and because the objective conditions expected for the fruition of the Plan were not existing. We feel that the hundred and one problems with which we are faced do require very serious consideration, a sort of consideration which is beyond party affiliations. But unfortunately the problems of this country are being utilised for party purposes.

Leaving that aside, the real problem is to consider whether the schedule framed by the Five Year Plan is implemented or not, whether certain results which they anticipated as the Plan goes on unfolding itself are being concretised or not.

Take for instance corruption. The Five Year Plan stated that there is rampant corruption and that we will have to carry on a continuous war against corruption. What is the nature of this war, this report has not given us any information about. That is one aspect.

Then, securing public co-operation. Because the soul of a Five Year Plan if it is really to do some good to the country must be the voluntary, enthusiastic co-operation of the people. No country in this world has succeeded in implementing any Plan worth the name without securing such co-operation. What do we find? we find that this Five Year Plan is left to the tender mercies of inefficiency, incompetence and the wasting habits of a bureaucracy. This is not carrying on the Five Year Plan with the co-operation of public. It is only bureaucratising the administration working out the Plan. Naturally, what we find is growing corruption. Instead of creating more food and more jobs for the unemployed, we are adding to the corruption and inefficiency. Therefore, if we say that we are not satisfied with the results of the Five Year Plan, no one, even no Congress member can say that we are saying this because we happen to belong to this side of the House.

I do not want to utilise my time by traversing over a larger number of areas than I should. I propose to pinpoint the agricultural conditions that are obtaining in this country. A separate chapter was devoted in this big tome for the purpose of developing agriculture, particularly for solving the food problem. In this Plan, on page 180, it is said:

"A policy of price stabilisation must have in view certain maxima as well as certain minima. At a time when the economy is subject to inflationary pressures, the emphasis is inevitably on the maintenance of the maxima. But, if the trend of prices is persistently downward, a system of controls with defined procurement prices can be used—indeed should be used—to safeguard the interests of the producers by preventing prices from falling unduly. Judicious purchases by Government at defined prices are thus an excellent device for establishing prices and for evening out to some extent inter-State disparities."

I shall be more justified in asking whether this para of the Five Year Plan has been implemented. You know that when controls were removed, we feared that there will be a rise in agricultural prices. Because, that happened in 1947 when the controls were raised. When these controls were removed, immediately thereafter, Shri H. N. Mukerjee did table an adjournment motion in order to invite discussion about the enormous rise in prices. Unfortunately, instead of an inordinate rise in prices, which would hit the consumer hard, we find a precipitate fall in agricultural prices. What is the fate of this agricultural community? I am speaking with great feeling, because the agricultural community forms a very large section of the picture. Out of 36 crores of people, about 24 crores live on agriculture, to put it properly. Most of them are small peasants. What is their fate? Shri Jawaharlal Nehru has on many occasions said that the peasant in India is the most neglected creature. It is the middle classes who are in power. The middle classes are controlled by the vested interests. The industrialists and manufacturers from merely a fraction of our population. Still, their interest is becoming the predominant interest. Everybody talks about capital formation, talks about incentives to industry. Is it not

[Shri S. S. More.]

necessary that we should see that even the agriculturists get some incentive? Have they been created by God as automatic machines which can work without the petrol of incentive? That is my question to the Treasury Benches. What is the fate of our agriculturists due to the falling prices? I am referring to the Reserve Bank of India Bulletin for November, 1954 which gives index figures of prices. You will find the figures there are very instructive. The prices of rice, wheat, gram have gone down. Only tea has shown some accretion. Otherwise there is fall in the prices to the tune of 16.8 points in the case of rice, 17.6 in the case of wheat, 35.8 in the case of gram, 13.1 in the case of *gur* and 0.3 in the case of sugar. Take for instance industrial raw materials. The prices of cotton and jute have gone down; the price of groundnut has gone down to the tune of 50.4 points. I need not give all these figures. It is a very dismal picture which gives a feeling of disquiet, of something disastrous which is going to happen in this country. What has Government done to stabilise the prices? That is a very pertinent question that one can ask. I have read in today's papers that Government intend to make some relief purchases: bajra at Rs. 6 a maund, maize at Rs. 5-8-0 a maund and jowar at Rs. 5-8-0 a maund. You are aware that the peasant has no staying power. The moment the crop is gathered, there are so many inelastically pressing claims which force him to take his produce to the market. In a month or two, the produce will have gone into the hands of the middlemen and they will be benefitted by your delayed schemes.

In spite of what the Planning Committee has recommended and their declaration that they want to have a stabilising machinery where a minimum price shall be fixed and a maximum price shall be fixed and that prices will not be permitted to go

under a certain minimum and go beyond a certain maximum, some machinery has yet to be devised, why that machinery has not been devised? The prices are showing a tendency to fall in a precipitate manner. Yet, the Government in their complacency feel that they have got the requisite administrative machinery to stabilise prices. They have said in their Press Note that necessary instructions for the purpose of purchasing these articles which are showing a tremendous fall in prices, have been issued. But I fear that there is no machinery worth the name. My submission is that this is not a very happy thing to think about. It is a fact that our food situation has eased to some extent. But, it has eased to some extent not because of the cleverness of the Treasury Benches or the drive of the Government.....

Some Hon. Members: Oh!

An Hon. Member: Because of Shri S. S. More.

Shri S. S. More:....or the vigour or capacity shown by the planners, but it is the small peasant who has laboured hard to show better results. (interruptions).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member should be allowed to proceed in his own way.

Shri S. S. More: Are we showing solicitude to the small peasant? Are we showing any solicitude to safeguard the interests of these peasants? I think my hon. friends from the Congress will not be so allergic to criticism from the opposition. Facts are facts and they must be accepted whether the Congress is in office or somebody else is in office. The falling prices are going to ruin the peasant even if the Congress is in power, or somebody else is in power. It is extremely necessary that all sections in this House should stand solidly and irrevocably for the interests of the peasants. Look at the capitalists.

Those who represent the interests of the capitalists, whether they belong to this side of the House or that, speak with the voice that their interests should be protected, that they should be given some incentives, that they should be given some protection. Unfortunately, the so-called spokesman for the peasant and the landlord, are more obsessed by their party alignments and they speak with different voices with the result that the peasant for whom we are supposed to stand suffers and there is nobody to place his case.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri S. S. More: My submission is that the prices are going down. What is to be done? We say we are planning democratically. But a democratic Government is expected to take lessons from the conditions prevailing. I would refer you to the report of the Prices Sub-Committee of which Shri V. T. Krishnamachari, who happens to be the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission, was the Chairman, and what did they say? I quote from page 60, paragraph 112:

"We are aware of the desire in certain quarters to reduce the level of agricultural prices....."

And what are those quarters? They are the industrial quarters, the manufacturing quarters. They want the raw material at the cheapest rate. The imperial powers were trying to purchase raw material at the rock bottom rate. Now, an indigenous imperial interest is developing in this country which is likely to go in the same direction.

"We are aware of the desire in certain quarters to reduce the level of agricultural prices, particularly the prices of foodgrains, on the plea that agricultural prices influence the costs of production of industry, and weaken the competitive capacity of Indian manufacture in the domestic as well as in the foreign markets. While we are not unmindful of

the importance of these considerations, we are of the view that prior consideration should be given to assuring an adequate return to the tiller of the soil. Once this is achieved the increased purchasing power of the agricultural masses will be adequate insurance for the success of industry. Any deliberate efforts to reduce agricultural prices merely to safeguard the interests of urban areas or of the manufacturing industry will be at the cost of the standard of living in the rural areas which is already notoriously low."

I would request you to note this:

"The unorganised character of agricultural interests in this country has resulted in their case having gone by default in the past."

I know that time is pressing, but I want to point out that this prices Sub-committee recommended that in fixing prices, we must take into consideration not only the cost of production, but also the cost of living. Now, here, the cost of production is not taken into consideration. I asked on many occasions whether Government have any reliable statistical data to give us the cost of production of the different foodgrains, the different articles, the raw materials which are produced by our illiterate and ignorant peasant, and the Finance Minister on one occasion was frank enough to admit that there was no such data. Even after the prices Sub-committee recommended this—it was a report submitted in 1946—during the last eight years we have not been able to collect any reliable data for the purpose of fixing what should be the remunerative price for the peasant, with the result that the fate of the peasant is left in a very fluid, nebulous state, and nobody is there to look after him.

In the Five Year Plan which was planned by Eastern Germany, they

[Shri S. S. More]

made it a point to say: 'We shall fix the minimum prices, we shall fix the maximum prices, we shall devise a machinery for the purpose of giving ample protection to the peasant who is the backbone of the country.' But, here, the backbone is being ignored, neglected, slighted, and possibly only the collar-bone of industry is taken care of.

In the progress Report, some reference has been made on page 52; they give figures about the falling prices, but they speak in a sort of complacent way. They speak in a self-satisfied manner. They seem to heave a sigh of relief that prices have gone down. They say:

"The improved food situation has also led to a marked fall in the prices of cereals and pulses which at the commencement of the Plan were causing considerable anxiety."

I say that this marked fall in prices is a marked symptom of a calamity which is going to overtake this country, because if the peasants lose their incentive, what is there for them—nothing but despair and frustration. Whatever gains we have secured during the last two or three years are likely to be frittered away.

Again, I would refer to the interim report of the Foodgrains Policy Committee. You will realise that the food-grain prices as they were devised under the procurement scheme were a bit higher than the prices that are obtaining now. In spite of that fact, this Foodgrains Policy Committee which was presided over by Shri Purshottamdas Thakurdas, says this at page 20. In almost every case they say the price paid to the producer must be increased. What was the ground for this recommendation? The prices fixed by Government even for purposes of procurement were not remunerative prices, were not giving a sufficient incentive to the producer, and

therefore they said that the prices ought to be increased.

I would refer to one instance. Take the instance of *gur* prices. Now, I have got figures which I have no time to disclose to the House, but the cost of cultivation per acre for sugarcane comes to Rs. 1,900. And what is the actual price the peasant gets?—something like Rs. 1,400 to Rs. 1,500. So, the peasant is likely to suffer a net loss of Rs. 400 per acre. Is it going to help the situation in the country? If the production of sugarcane goes down, our sugar situation becomes not sweet, but difficult, bitter, and what will happen? Government will have to come out with an import policy. They are not prepared to take into consideration the interests of the indigenous peasant who is bearing all the burnt, who is carrying all the load of the difficulties on his broad shoulders, but they are prepared to give better prices to the producers from other countries when they go in for import.

I do see that you are persisting with your bell, but I say it is high time for Government to realise that they must take into consideration the interests of the small peasants who constitute about 65 per cent of the total population, and that alone will save the situation, and not such wordy, bulky plans which lead us nowhere.

श्री श्री रमजीर सिंह (रोहतक) : मैं पहले प्लानिंग कमीशन को और श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा जी को बधाई देता हूँ कि अब तक उन्होंने इस तरह से इस प्लानिंग को प्लान किया। और जो काम हुआ है उस के लिये वह बधाई के पूरे मुस्तहक हैं। इस के साथ साथ मैं देश के किसानों को भी बधाई देता हूँ।

इस प्लान के अन्दर अन्दाज़न ५५० करोड़ रुपया किसानों की पैदावार को बढ़ाने के लिये रक्खा गया था। प्लान का नतीजा यह होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के पहले पाँच सालों में जो अन्दाज़न ५०० करोड़ रुपये का खर्च था

से आया। इसी प्रकार से अन्दाजन २५० करोड़ रुपये का बटसन बाहर से आया। और १५० करोड़ रुपये की कपास बाहर से मंगानी पड़ी। जिस का अन्दाजा कोई १२०० करोड़ रुपये बैठता है। प्लेन पर करीब ५५० करोड़ रुपये खर्च करने का नतीजा यह होगा कि आने वाले पांच सालों के अन्दर देश को १२०० करोड़ रुपये का सामान बाहर से नहीं मंगाना पड़ेगा। इसलिये यह जो प्लेनिंग का काम है उस के लिये मैं प्लेनिंग कमीशन और किसानों को फिर बंधाई देता हूँ।

लेकिन इस के साथ साथ मैं कुछ अर्ज भी करना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर पिछले १२ सालों के अन्दर कान्जुमर को बचाने के लिये कंट्रोल लगाया गया और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने अन्दाजन ३०० करोड़ रुपये हर साल इन्वेस्ट किया ताकि कान्जुमर के मफाद सुरक्षित रहें और कान्जुमर की खर्च करने की ताकत के मुताबिक उस को इतना सस्ता अनाज मिल सके कि उस की जरूरत पूरी की जा सके। लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान में कृषि संसार के अन्दर एक अजीब हालत है। आप चाहे ५० पी० के अन्दर जाइये या बिहार के अन्दर जाइये, वहाँ कहीं गन्ने की कीमत गिरने के खिलाफ, कहीं गेहूँ की कीमत के गिरने के खिलाफ आवाज है तो कहीं मकई की कीमत के गिरने के खिलाफ आवाज है। कहीं रबर की कीमत के गिरने के खिलाफ आवाज है। समापनी महोदय, एक जमाना था जिस जमाने के अन्दर एक नारा था, बड़ा असर रखने वाला नारा था : "लेट टु दि टिलर"। लेकिन आज हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और कांग्रेस की कृपा से वह नारा तकरीबन कार्य रूप में परिणत हो चुका है। और आज जमीन तकरीबन काश्तकार के पास है। लेकिन आज एक और सवाल पैदा हो गया है। पहले जिस वक्त भू-बढ़ाने की बात कही जाती थी तो लोग कहा करते थे कि यह बड़े बड़े जमींदारों का सवाल है। आज यह ६० और ७० फीसदी लोगों का सवाल है। अगर उनकी पैदावार की कीमत जितनी कि उनका खर्चा है उसके मुताबिक दी जाती है तो आप यकीन रखिये

कि आने वाले जमाने में कोई भी ताकत चाहे वह कितना ही मजबूत क्यों न हो, कोई भी गवर्नमेंट, चाहे वह कितनी ही मजबूत क्यों न हो, किसानों की इस आवाज को दबा नहीं सकेगी और इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि यह प्लेन की कामयाबी हमें दिखाई देती है वह नाकामयाबी में तबदील हो जाएगी खूब अगर किसानों के पास परचीजंग पावर नहीं होगी तो आप की जो इंडस्ट्री है चाहे वह प्राइवेट सेक्टर में है और चाहे वह पब्लिक सेक्टर में है वह धरी-की धरी रह जाएगी। कोई दोस्त है जो यह समझते हैं कि यह बहुत मुश्किल सवाल है और हमारी कुछ दिन हुए एंगिकलचर मिनिस्ट्री के एक बड़े अफसर के साथ बात हुई और उन्होंने भी कहा कि यह एक बड़ा कठिन सवाल है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उस मिनिस्ट्री के लिए जिस ने किदबई साहब के होते हुए इतनी बड़ी खाद्य समस्या को हल किया वह कोई मुश्किल चीज नहीं है। वे समझते हैं कि इस में कोई खतरा है लेकिन इस में कोई खतरा नहीं है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने पीछे दस्ता है कि किदबई साहब के सैक्रेंटरवेंट ने एलान करवाया था पंजाब सरकार और ५० पी० सरकार से कि गेहूँ के भाव अगर १० रुपये फी मन से गिरें तो यह दोनों सरकारें गेहूँ को खरीदने के लिए बाजार में आ जाएंगी। इस एलान का असर यह हुआ कि गेहूँ के भाव १० रुपये से नीचे गिरने से रुक गए। इसी तरह का एक एलान सरकार की तरफ से आज भी शायद हुआ है जिस में कहा गया है कि वह मकई, (मैज) बाजारा इत्यादि के भाव एक खास कीमत से नीचे नहीं गिरने देंगी और यदि वे भाव गिरें तो सरकार खुद बाजार में आएगी और वे चीजें खरीदेंगी। मेरा ख्याल है कि इससे कुछ न कुछ फायदा जरूर होगा गो यह मैं मानता हूँ कि जो कीमत रखी गई है वह किसानों के साथ एक मजाक है।

Mr. Chairman: Is it economic price?

श्री० रणबीर सिंह : मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि आज के जमाने में जो कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन है उसके हिसाब से अगर हम सोचें तो यह

[चौधरी] रणवीर सिंह]

इकोनॉमिक ग्राइस नहीं हैं। लेकिन बहरहाल सरकार ने एक कदम उठाया है और उस कदम के उठाने के लिए मैं श्री जैन और श्री दशमुख को बधाई देने वगैरह नहीं रह सकता। मैं समझता हूँ कि आगे को भी अगर सरकार की दूसरी मीनिशनरी उनके रास्ते में रोड़ा न बनी और प्लानिंग कमिशन ने कोई रोड़ा न जटकाया तो शायद जो एक तरफ उनका कदम बढ़ा है किसानों की भलाई के लिए इसे और आगे बढ़ाया जाएगा।

रक्षा संगठन मंत्री (श्री ल्हागी) : किसानों की उन्नति में कोई रोड़ा नहीं जटका सकता।

श्री रणवीर सिंह : हाँ, मेरा तो विश्वास है कि डिफेंस मीनिस्ट्री भी उनके रास्ते में रोड़ा नहीं बन सकती क्योंकि फौज में जो आदमी काम करते हैं वे उन्हीं के बाल बच्चे हैं जिन के हाथ में हमेशा हल ही होता है और अगर उनके दिल को आप ने आज दुखाया तो आप यकीन रखिए कि आप की डिफेंस मीनिस्ट्री जो है वह एक कागजी मीनिस्ट्री रह जाएगी।

मैं जब कर रहा था कि किसानों ने इस दश की तरक्की के लिए एक बहुत आसान रास्ता बना दिया है। दश के अन्दर अनाज की, कपास की और दूसरी चीजों की पैदावार बढ़ाकर दश को और प्लानिंग कमिशन को एक ताकत दी कि अगर उन के दिल में कुछ हिम्मत है, गुर्दा है तो इस दश को वे आगे बढ़ा सकते हैं। इस बात को कहते हुए मेरा इशारा डीफेंस फाइनेंसिंग की तरफ है। आज शांति से और बगैर किसी किस्म की गड़बड़ी के ज्यादा डीफेंस फाइनेंसिंग के जरिये दश की जितनी आप तरक्की करना चाहें, कर सकते हैं।

इसके इलावा अब मैं कुछ अपने इलाके के बारे में भी कहना चाहता हूँ। दिल्ली के पास से एक नदी गुजरती है जिस का नाम यमुना है और जिस में काफी पानी जाता है और कई नफा तो लोगों को यह सतरा पैदा हो जाता है कि कहीं दिल्ली डूब न जाए। दश में बड़ बड़

बांध बनाए जा रहे हैं और कई सौ करोड़ रुपये इन पर खर्च किए जा रहे हैं। यमुना नदी पर बांध बनाने के लिए सिर्फ १५ करोड़ रुपये की जरूरत है। अब मैं ने ५० पी० असेम्बली की कार्रवाई असवार में पढ़ी है। बड़े ताज्जुब की बात है कि इतना बड़ा सवा होतें हुए बजाय इस बात के कि वह यह कोशिश करता कि यमुना के ऊपर बांध बनाने के लिए कुछ रुपया देता था प्लानिंग कमिशन से पंजाब, सरकार की तरह रुपये की मांग करता ताकि यमुना का पानी किसानों की भलाई के लिए इस्तेमाल में आ सके, अब वह कहता है कि इस पानी का बटवारा ठीक तौर पर कर दिया जाए और ५० पी० को ज्यादा पानी दिया जाए। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस बांध के हो जाने से यमुना की बाढ़ी में जो भी किसान बसते हैं उनका बहुत फायदा हो सकता है और इस में ५० पी० के किसान भी आ जाते हैं। चिराग लले अंधेर वाली मिसाल पर न चलते हुए मेरा निवेदन है कि यमुना पर बांध बनाने के वास्ते जो कि दिल्ली के कॉर्पोरल के पास से गुजरती है पंजाब सरकार की १५ करोड़ रुपये की मांग को पूरा कर देना चाहिए। यह डर है कि पंजाब सरकार को भाखड़ा बगैरह के लिए काफी रुपया कर्ज के रूप में दिया जा चुका है। इसी डर से १५ करोड़ रुपये दूसरे पांच साला प्लैन में दिये जायें जिस की पंजाब सरकार ने मांग की है। लेकिन मैं जब करूँगा कि यमुना पर बांध बनाना बहुत जरूरी है और यह रुपया पंजाब सरकार को इसी पांच साला प्लैन में दे दिया जाना चाहिए।

अब मैं थोड़ा सा लोकल वर्क्स के बारे में अब करना चाहता हूँ। आज हम देखते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के अफसर दश की तरक्की उतनी तेजी से नहीं कर सके हैं जितनी तेजी से प्लानिंग कमिशन या सरकार चाहती थी। और मेरे ख्याल से इसकी वजह यह है कि उनके साधने और काम करने का तरीका ही जबीब है। अब हम ने ४ करोड़ पिछले साल के लिये और ६ करोड़ रुपया इस साल लोकल वर्क्स

पर खर्च करने के लिए रखा है जो कि उन लोगों को दिया जाएगा जो अपनी भूमि से काम करना चाहेंगे वरन् कि वे इस खर्च का आधा हिस्सा खुद बरदाश्त करें। इस काम में भी अफसरों को फंसा दिया गया है जिन के पास आगे ही 2000 करोड़ रुपये से कहीं ज्यादा रुपया खर्च करने को है। लोकल वर्क्स के कार्यों के लिए रुपया खर्च करने के लिए इन अफसरों से मंजूरी लेना जरूरी रखा गया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बात की रोकथाम तो होनी चाहिए कि इस रुपये का नाबावज इस्तेमाल न हो। लेकिन जो अफसर अपना फर्ज पूरी तरह अदा नहीं कर सकते उनसे इस रुपये को खर्च करने के लिए मंजूरी लेने की शर्त लगाना ठीक न होगा। मेरी जर्ज है कि पांच साला प्लान की प्रोग्रेस के प्रसार से जिन लोगों के दिलों में जोश पैदा हो गया है और वे काम करना चाहते हैं और उनकी उन्नति में कोई रोड़ा न अटकाया जाए और जितना रुपया वे खर्च करना चाहें उसका आधा यानी 50 फीसदी उन को जल्दी से जल्दी दिया जा सके, इन स्कीमों के लिये अफसरों की मंजूरी लेना आवश्यक नहीं होना चाहिए।

Shri T. Subrahmanyam (Bellary): This debate provides today an opportunity to have a sort of stock-taking and an assessment of what has been achieved and what remains to be achieved with regard to the implementation of the Five-Year Plan. This great national undertaking was taken up with a view to utilise the material and human resources of our country for the purpose of eradicating poverty, providing employment to all the people and raising the standard of life of our countrymen.

While we assess what has been achieved, we should also remember the legacy that we have inherited from the past foreign rule. There is room for criticism and for differences of opinion, but an unequalled condemnation of what has been achieved and a deliberate attempt to inculcate opposition to the implementation of this great Plan is, I say, almost criminal. You remember what a

crisis we had to face in our country a couple of years ago. There was a serious food shortage and then we had to import from America 4.7 million tons costing nearly Rs. 216 crores. Everywhere it appeared as if there would be a breakdown on the food front. Our Government took courage, our country gave them support and the plan was implemented. Nature also was bountiful, helpful and favourable. Therefore, we tided over the crisis. All the food controls were removed. In this connection, it will not be out of place if I mention here that I took a very anxious and earnest part in seeing that these food controls were removed. I am gratified to note that against the target of 7.6 million tons of increase in foodgrains, we have actually got an increase of nearly 11.4 million tons in the third year of the Plan. With regard to cotton also, there has been some increase. But there is a shortage with regard to sugar and jute. With regard to sugar in the first year production was nearly 15 lakh tons. Then there was a decrease because there was a fall in the price of sugarcane. Now, an attempt is made to start more sugar factories in South India. In Bombay, 11 co-operative concerns have been given licences, in Mysore there is one cooperative concern which is in my own district of Bellary which has secured a license. In this connection, I would request the Central Government to provide these co-operative concerns with as much financial assistance as is possible and see that these undertakings are successfully implemented.

Then with regard to irrigation and power, the immediate programme is expected to add 8.5 million acres of new irrigation and 1.1 million kilowatts of electric power up to March 1954. More than 2.8 million acres have been or are being brought under irrigation and an additional capacity of 450,000 kilowatts is there. In this connection, I must say that we must pay special attention at this stage with regard to the development of the acreage that is to be brought under irrigation. Big dams are being con

[Shri T. Subrahmanyam]

structed. In my own district, the Tungabhadra project has been constructed, and canals have been dug. We should immediately attend to the problem of completing distributaries and seeing that fields and lands are levelled to make them fit and suitable for irrigation. For this purpose, the ryots and villagers require some long term loans; otherwise, they have no resources. Day before yesterday, the Finance Minister was pleased to make a statement according to which he was thinking of starting a commercial banking institution to provide credit facilities for rural areas also. I appeal to the Government that this should be implemented and given concrete shape as early as possible so that either the local land mortgage banks or other banking institutions or the local State Governments, by means of taccavi loans, may be able to provide enough credit facilities to the villagers and peasants.

I must say a word with regard to industries. Our index for 1953-54 rose to 138.3. Chittaranjan produced 64 units in 1953-54 as against 17 in 1951-52 and the 1955-56 target is 100 locomotives. This is proceeding well. With regard to steel, I am afraid we are not making as much progress as possible. It is gratifying to note that in Rourkela a plant is being installed with the help of German experts. Some Soviet experts are now in India with a view to help Government to start a third steel plant. In Bellary we have very excellent iron ore of the most precious quality and in limitless quantity. That has been recommended by Mysore Government—it has come out in newspaper report—and I hope that the Government will take up consideration of this matter.

One word I have to say with regard to small cottage industries and village industries. For lack of finance, marketing facilities and technical assistance, these small-scale industries and village industries have not received that adequate and practical encouragement they should receive. During the Plan period, Rs. 15 crores

were provided for expenditure on these cottage and village industries. But actually Rs. 14.3 lakhs were spent in 1951-52, Rs. 29.3 lakhs in 1952-53 and 79.9 lakhs in 1953-54. In addition, financial assistance to khadi and handloom has been provided from the cess fund expected to be Rs. 6 crores per year. I must say in this connection that the hon. the Finance Minister and the hon. the Commerce and Industry Minister have given very great assistance to the khadi and handloom industries. I am afraid that the Textile Inquiry Committee Report which was submitted to us recently does not give sufficient encouragement. It actually depresses the handloom industry. The estimate of handlooms in our country, according to one version, is 2.8 million; according to another, it is 1.5 million. These are the limits. The dependents on these numerous handlooms are several million. According to one report, the number is 15 million and according to another, it is 20 million. The whole mill industry employs only about 7,50,000 people in the organised cotton textiles, about 50,000 people are employed in power loom units. The mill industry produces about 4,800 million yards. The power looms produce about 200 million yards. Handlooms produce about 1400 million yards a year.

According to the Textile Inquiry Committee report, the employment potential in the handloom is very great; it is 20 times what it is in the mill industry. If the recommendations of the Committee are implemented, I am afraid the handloom industry will be ruined. They have said that in some areas all these handlooms should disappear and power looms should take their place. Of course, some automatic looms are also recommended. In this connection, I must say that I am positively opposed to the introduction of power looms in this context, because while we are trying to provide employment to as large a number of people as possible, we cannot afford to take up a process or

an idea by which people who are provided with employment will be deprived of it and thrown out of it in the years to come. Day before yesterday, the Finance Minister was saying that in a decade about 24 million people will be provided with employment. But the proposal to introduce power-looms is not a thing which is going to help. I am not against the improvement of hand-looms; I am against outmoded looms and uneconomical looms. But we must see that these looms are replaced by better looms, better type of looms, by which the production capacity will be increased, the output will be doubled, trebled and quadrupled. I am certainly against a process which throws large numbers of people—lakhs and millions of people—out of employment and creates a problem, a terrific problem, on account of which there may be a breakdown of the economic structure altogether.

3 P.M.

Now, the idea should not be for having labour saving machines but for labour utilising machines.

I will refer to only one matter, that is the small scale or village industries. The Ford Foundation International Planning Team for Small Industries recommended the establishment of four regional institutes of technology for small industries which would act as agencies and assist the small industries in improving their technique of production and management etc. There is nothing wonderful about this recommendation. At the same time I must say that it is a very helpful recommendation. Some time back, I put a question to the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry and said that the matter of finalising an improved *charkha* should be taken up by the Government Technological Institutes and it should not be left only to the All India Spinners' Association. In the last exhibition a *charkha* was exhibited which had four spindles and which could produce three to four times the yarn that can be produced in an ordinary *charkha*. The yarn was also uniform and strong. This matter

should not be left to private agencies only and should be taken up by Government. For the last 35 years we have been trying to improve the *charkha* by which the spinner would be able to get three or four times more yarn and which will put more purchasing power in his hands. It has not been done till now. I submit that the stage has been reached when priority should be given to this problem and this must be tackled at once. There is a great deal of urgency about this matter. I have no objection even if these *charkhas* are manufactured in large factories but it should be neat, plain and efficient—something like the Singer Sewing Machine and should give an output of three to four times and give more purchasing power to the spinner.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury (Nabadwip): After hearing all the speeches I certainly think that no 'ism' is going to be of any use to us. It is nationalism that we need.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.-South): Ladyism also.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury: I suppose so.

Our plan is certainly based on a nationalistic spirit. I heartily congratulate the makers of the Plan. It goes without saying that it is very good. How far the implementation has gone, whether it is enough or not is a matter for consideration. It is quite true that in a welfare State if we are to have all the amenities that we want, the nationalisation of various industries must be there and we must not be frightened to go ahead with it. An Hon. Member opposite said the other day that "money is muck." I agree that money is much. It is the amenities that money can bring that really matters. If we are to have better conditions, better educational facilities, better hospitals, better health facilities, then we must have more money. How are we to get it until we nationalise the industries that make for the development of the country? Private enterprise could not do this. That is one of the things—as another hon. Member

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury]

opposite put it to the House the other day. What have we learnt from Russia and China? I think what we could learn with profit is getting foreign aid. China has taken aid from Russia and Russia took aid from America and England during her building period. We need not be apprehensive of taking foreign assistance on honourable terms, because, it is quite true that ultimately it is trade and not aid that we want. We want free trade and even importing is not so bad if we can get on to exporting matter more than what we import. It has been said that politicians think of the next elections but statesmen think of the next generation. It is on this basis that we must build and the Plan will undoubtedly lead us on to build for the future generations.

A vast field yet remains for private enterprise. I would recommend that the Industrial Finance Corporation and such like bodies—though much fault has been found with the personnel of these bodies and I am not competent to say who should be there and who should not be there—should help smaller private industries more, because private industries form a very big sector. It has become the fashion to have a lot of loose talk about nationalisation of every thing and also to hurl invectives at industrialists. In the private sector, there is much scope for developing employment and giving revenue to Government. I have got train figure. If you only look at the private sector from the employment point of view, it will be found that big industries like cotton textile, jute, engineering, metals and minerals and chemical and others give a total employment for 13,94,000 workers and factories and plantations employ another four million and odd workers. If all these have an average of four or five persons dependent on them, then approximately more than 16 million people are directly interested in the continuance and proper functioning of private enterprise.

In this connection, I would say that in the Five-Year Plan more stress might be laid on the private sector, and that they may be helped in every way. Improve labour conditions by legislation. Impose your taxes where there are bigger profits and thus increase your revenues but not to the extent so as to discourage the industrialist. He must have a certain return for his brains, work and risks. George Cannins—I think—said, many years ago, "In matters of Commerce the fault of the Dutch, is offering too little and asking too much!" It would not be feasible to ask too much in that sense of the industrialist because after all human nature is human nature.

Why is the industrialist or the capitalist necessarily anti-national? Have we not had people who had a certain amount of money and yet who were nationalistic? Did not Subhash Bose himself come from a family that was well placed? Is not our Prime Minister the product of a family that had a certain amount of wealth and is he not one of the most ardent nationalists? Why should our industrialists be necessarily anti-national? I have never understood it. To get the best out of the private sector and the public sector would mean a thorough co-operation and co-ordination between the two. I am sure the private sector would not be backward in putting forth their efforts for nation-building. It is the human element that counts and nothing else does count. There may be bad industrialists but I assure you there are bad peasants as well. Now that we have got over the difficulties of partition to a good extent, I think, the private sector should have a little more help in the Five-Year Plan if it were at all possible.

In the various notes that have been supplied to us in the Progress Report there is a note on machine tools. There is one point which I would like to bring to the notice of the Planning Section, if I may. We are yet import-

ing about Rs. 199.3 lakhs worth of machine tools and there are 14 factories which are manufacturing them. This is an industry which goes practically hand in hand with the basic industries, hence, it is very important and for this reason I think, it should get more help for establishing itself.

There is another industry that causes a lot of apprehension in the public mind as far as we can make out when we go round our constituencies. It is the tea industry as it stands today. It has a lot of foreign capital in it. It is sold by foreign agency houses and shipped by foreign shipping. If there can be some policy of Indianising these things, then, I think, the Plan would find more support. This policy should be enforced a little more.

Secondly, when Government gives orders, surely the Government orders should have the first priority in our own factories and it should not be given to companies with foreign capital.

There are a lot of things said by the Trade Unions. My submission is that members of Trade Unions, must realise where their real interest lies, what conditions are really good for the country and what is not good—even for the Trade Unionist himself labour must realise that a strong trade union is very good but that trade union must be practical and fair. Honest discussion can get over most things.

Regarding the publicity of the policies of Government, I think the Press today must take a very great part in making this really understandable to the public. The Press in India is second to none it is one of the finest. It is vital and live, not muzzled and dictated to, hence the Press must enthusiastically take up the objects of the Plan and put it in the right way so as to create, guide and form public opinion.

The publicity of the Plan itself can be taken up much better by the In-

formation and Broadcasting Ministry than by pamphlets. Pamphlets are read by very few. The rural parts of India can be reached by the Broadcasting Ministry if that money was spent on mobile vans and various stations that would give publicity to the Five Year Plan.

On the refugee problem, I would only stress this bit that Rs. 32 crores have been granted to West Bengal. No doubt it is a large amount of money, but really the scheme needs vast expenditure and I would recommend that some more money be granted to deal with this problem. It is not only grants and loans that the refugees need, there must be some way of looking after them after the rehabilitation has been done. When they have invested the money in land, surely they must have something besides the 30-acre ceiling, because thirty acres of land would not give them a living in many places and they will be made refugees again! In this connection, the displaced person must have some special conditions. Whenever we are offered a Chinese or Russian pill as a panacea for all our ills, I am always reminded of a story. There was once a void and he said to his patient who was very ill, "Look here, there is only one cure I can give you and that is that you have to swallow a whole coconut." The patient said "If I do that, voidraj, I will die." The void said "Well, that is just it till you die—you can't be cured!" The Chinese or Russian pill, taken as such, would mean death for us! Our own policies and plans, administered with thought and imagination will, I am convinced, see us through.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I do not want to minimise what has been achieved so far by the Planning Commission and I do appreciate that whatever has been done is for the good of the country. Moreover, Shri Nanda, our Minister of Planning, was so apologetic in his defence, so docile in his speech and so weak in his tone that it will be sheer cruelty if we criticise him severely.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Pity him or sympathise with him.

Sardar Hukam Singh: He began with his faults and concluded with his achievements. That is a good process and I appreciate it, but there are certain difficulties which I must bring to his notice and consideration. The first is a complaint that I have to make and it is this. He agrees with me that there has not been any improvement in the machinery that is to execute the Plan. That is most essential. You might plan anything and you might write out volumes of very high standards, but it depends upon the machinery that is to execute that Plan whether you can achieve anything or not. This was remarked by my friend, the Maharaja of Bikaner, about some officers in the service of Rajasthan, that is, that everybody thought that he who would not accept a bribe is a fool, and I also endorse that there is such a feeling, because people say:

लूट पढ़ी में जो लूट न, वह भी नामाकूल ।

There is a loot going on on every side and one who does not participate in it is certainly a fool. He will repent because he does not take advantage of the opportunity that is offered to him. Therefore, the first thing that the Minister ought to set his attention on will be to improve the machinery so that this work can be done more efficiently. There was a question this morning that the District Magistrates are left with these tasks and they are overburdened with other responsibilities and they have not the spare time to attend to these things, these meetings etc. and therefore the functions that these Advisory Boards have to perform do suffer. I have also a little experience of that. Perhaps without consulting us, it was thought advisable that Members of Parliament and Legislatures should be associated with these Advisory Councils. Within these two years I have been called many a time, but I could attend only once, and when I went, I found that

the District Magistrate came about an hour and a half late. We sat and waited, and I do not blame that man because he might have other duties to perform. But how could there be any enthusiasm for the Members of Parliament or of State Legislatures when I myself, going after two years, found that the presiding officer did not come and there was nobody to take the initiative to conduct the meeting. When some of us thought that we could transact the business in the absence of the presiding officer, the District Magistrate, the officers over there said that that was not possible.

Then, there is another Advisory Committee and from them I have been receiving notices for meetings. After three or four meetings, the officer concerned wrote to me that he would report to the higher authorities to reconstitute the advisory body because the Members of Parliament and the State Legislature were not attending at all. I just sent him a reply that that was very good. These meetings are fixed only a day or two before and then the notice is sent. Sometimes you get the notice after the date of the meeting. Anyhow, it is not possible for us to attend the meeting at such short notice.

Mr. Chairman: In Gurgaon and Hissar districts the meetings are fixed generally on particular days of the month.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): That is because you are there.

Sardar Hukam Singh: We do not know on what date the meeting will take place.

Shri B. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): Even during Parliament session we get notices of such meetings. (Interruption).

Sardar Hukam Singh: Anyhow, it is not possible for us to perform any useful functions. Therefore, I would

request the hon. Minister to reconsider these things, and if really they have to do any useful service, some revolution should be brought about so far as this thing is concerned.

Now come to land reform. I am only making suggestions and I cannot make a long speech. I am in favour of equitable re-distribution of land and I do not like the intermediaries to continue. I am against the big holdings of these *jagirdars*. There is another problem as well, and it particularly exists in the Punjab—I do not know if it exists in other States. We are peasant proprietors and we are fixing the ceiling as well. I do not know whether there are any other States where this is done, but it will do good. Anyhow, I am in favour of giving land to landless proprietors. There is another class which is going landless, and that is not being looked into. In the Punjab, there is a good number of peasants who have uneconomic holdings—having one acre, two acres or three acres—and they depend upon agriculture. Such peasants used to get their neighbours' lands. Where the neighbour had, say, 25 acres and he kept only 12 or 15 acres for his own plough and bullocks, he used to spare the remaining 10 acres for this small tenant, which he would cultivate as a tenant, and in that case, he can continue in agriculture to maintain his family. But now when there is the law that a man can claim and keep to himself whatever he can cultivate himself, certainly that man is very jealous of the tenant or cultivator because he thinks that this cultivator might appropriate that piece of land and might become the owner. Therefore, he is shy of it and he does not give that land even to that tiller for cultivation. The position becomes that this man is a small holder and he has uneconomic holding. He is not allowed to till his neighbour's land because the other man has the fear that this man might become the owner of that part

of the land if it is given to him for tilling. Therefore, he is thrown out and he does not get the land, and he is left with one or two acres. We are focussing our attention on the landless labour. That is all right and I am also in their favour, but what about this poor man, who wants to stick to agriculture but is thrown out? He cannot leave his land and go to the town for labour. He has to remain there on the land and starve there, and he cannot be given fresh land because he is not a landless labour.

Mr. Chairman: You want that he must have an economic holding?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Exactly; that should attract the first attention of the Planning Commission. When these land reforms are being introduced, those persons who have uneconomic holdings should have preference, even over those who are landless, because they should be retained in that job first of all and they do deserve our sympathy.

Then there is another industry to which I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister. During the last session also there was a one-hour debate about the automobile industry. The Minister for Commerce and Industry admitted that so far Government had not been able to do much and he gave us an assurance that perhaps, next time he came here he might give us certain concrete things. I now ask the Planning Minister whether really something is being done in that direction or not.

The automobile industry is very essential in times of peace as well as essential and we ought to develop it war. We had about 12 assembling plants. Now the production programme has been taken over by the Hindustan and the Premier Automobiles. Even their installed capacity

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

is not being utilised, because the demand is not sufficient. The Tariff Commission was asked to go into the question. That Commission made a thorough enquiry and it made certain concrete suggestions in that direction. But what was the result? They advised that the States should adopt a go-slow policy with regard to nationalisation of transport. In that case only could the demand increase. But what do he find. The States are going on a wreckless speed without having any definite or phased programme which the Planning Commission has asked them to submit. They are nationalising it. Even in the Progress Report for 1953-54 it is put down that the licensing policies of some of the States are responsible for retarding the growth of this demand. When I raised this question last time, I gave some instances. The Punjab Government has been issuing licenses from week to week. With the Damocles sword hanging over the head of the operator, he is not inclined to go in for new vehicles. The operators are not against nationalisation. Let it come. By all means, we would welcome it. But Government should have some policy. The Planning Commission should draw up a plan according to which the States should proceed, or putting it in a reverse way the States should submit their programme to the Planning Commission for the Planning Commission's decision. In that case each man may at least know when he is to hand over his vehicle to Government, and he will adjust his programme in that way.

Now the policy of nationalisation of road transport has been going on for the last eight or ten years. Some routes have not been acquired; but because the licensing period is renewed from week to week or month to month, no replacements have been made and therefore the demand for motor vehicles has remained low.

When I raised this question last time on the floor of the House it

was taken notice of and in one region Jullundur.

I remember when the time came for renewal of the license; instead of renewing them for a longer period, they said: "You go on now; they will remain valid from day to day." Previously the validity of the licence was from week to week; they now said that they will be renewed from day to day.

Mr. Chairman: How could that be managed? How could license be taken every day.

Sardar Hukam Singh: That is exactly the difficulty. The authorities told the operators: You go home; when we want we will take it over; there is no question of any further renewal. Is it possible for the automobile industry, which is so important for our country, to be developed under these circumstances?

When I wrote to the Planning Commission they replied to the effect that they had asked the Punjab Government to submit a phased programme, and when that is received they would take a definite decision. There was a statement of the Punjab Minister that he had submitted a phased programme and he was going on with nationalisation. But I remember to have read somewhere that the Planning Commission complained that they had not received any programme. I do not know which of the two is correct. Anyhow, if the Governments want to take over the road transport, the operators are prepared for it, but there should be some definite programme by what stages it is going to be taken over, so that these citizens might not suffer, and the whole capital that is invested in it might not be ruined. That is also national capital.

One thing more: that is about Singer sewing machines. This is a very important industry. There are several units in the country that have been producing these machines and I feel that we can be independent of

all imports if we chalk out a definite programme. There are about 250 units in North India and they are producing a good number of sewing machines. They compare favourably with those that are imported from abroad. Even in Ludhiana alone, the investment in this industry is about Rs. 28 lakhs. About 6,000 workers are engaged in this industry.

The Tariff Commission has recently recommended that the protection enjoyed by this industry should be withdrawn. I am not opposed to it. If it is felt by the Tariff Commission, an expert body, that it is not necessary to continue protection to this industry, I would not oppose it. I am told that about 7,700 machines are being produced; 90 per cent. of the components are produced locally; the remaining 10 per cent. is imported from abroad. Japan is the main country from which this 10 per cent. is imported.

One fact which I wish to bring to the notice of Government—I wish the Commerce and Industry Minister were here—is that the licenses for the import of this 10 per cent. were not given to the actual consumers. Now there is an association of the producers at Ludhiana. They want that the license for the import of these components should be given to them. But that license is not given to the actual users, but to thousands of other persons who are professionals in imports. They import the parts that are needed here and they pass it on to the industry at five or six times the value, and in some cases, I am told, ten times the value; because these components cannot be produced here, these manufacturers have to go in for them at whatever price they can get. That black-marketing can only be stopped if it is planned like this: that the actual needs of the consumers or of those manufacturers are ascertained and licence is given to them directly, or, it should be ensured that they get the parts that they require at reasonable profits. But this is not happening

and the industry is suffering. There is danger that they might give up their business altogether. Therefore, I request that this might also be looked into. The Planning Minister might see that this difficulty is removed.

DELIMITATION COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Shri Barman (North Bengal-Reserved-Sch. Castes): I beg to present the report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Delimitation Commission Act, 1952.

Mr. Chairman: I have to inform the Members that copies of the Select Committee's Report, which are being stencilled, will be available at about 4 P.M. at the Table Office.

MOTION RE PROGRESS REPORT OF FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR 1953-54— Contd.

श्री भुवनेश्वरबाबा (भागलपुर मध्य) : दो लोग से हमारा यहाँ पर इस बात पर बहस हो रही थी कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर के जरिये हमारा देश की एकानमी बने या स्टेट के जरिये। इसी बात के ऊपर बहस हो रही थी। हम लोगों के सामने मुख्य उद्देश्य यह है कि हमारा यहाँ ज्यादा से ज्यादा माल बने और उस का फायदा सब को मिले। यानी जितने भी लोग हैं सभी में जो प्रोड्यूस हो और जो उस से धन निकले उस का वितरण हो। यही उद्देश्य होना चाहिये और यही उद्देश्य हमारी गवर्नमेंट के सामने है तथा इसी उद्देश्य की दृष्टि से सब बातें होनी चाहियें। जिस रास्ते से अधिक Production हो वही रास्ता अवलंबित करना चाहिए किसी Dogma को लेकर बैठना ठीक नहीं। कल जब हमारा वित्त मंत्री जी बोल रहे थे और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी कहा था कि हम लोग जो बातें यहाँ पर कर रहे हैं प्राइवेट सेक्टर की और स्टेट इन्डस्ट्री की, उस से यहाँ पर लोग यह समझते हैं कि थोड़ा ही से प्राइवेट सेक्टर और थोड़ा से मिल जानर है और यही लोग हैं जिन के ऊपर उन का ध्यान चला जाता है।

जब उन का ही यह कहना है तो जो हम कहते हैं वह साबित हो जाता है हम लोग जो बराबर द्वाताओं में जा कर दस्तते हैं उन को कोई फर्क नहीं मालूम होता है । इस के अलावा जैसी हमारी पापुलेशन बढ़ रही है उस में यह पता चलता है कि १.५ मिलियन लोग, जैसा कि उन का भी फिगर है, हर साल काम करने के लायक तैयार होते हैं । एक तरफ तो जितने हमारे बरोजगार लोग हैं उन को काम नहीं मिलता और दूसरी तरफ रोज रोज हमारी आबादी बढ़ रही है, उसे तो हम लोग कम नहीं कर सकते हैं । जो रिपोर्ट अब तक हमारे सामने पेश की गई है उस से पता नहीं चलता है कि कहीं पर कोई कमी हुई हो ।

अब मैं आप लोगों को जो बात बतला रहा था कि सरकार उस सेक्टर की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देती जो सेक्टर करोड़ों के रूप में है, उस पर आता है । हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि यहां पर जो थोड़े से लोगों का सेक्टर है उसी के ऊपर लोगों का ध्यान जाता है लेकिन इस बड़े सेक्टर के ऊपर किसी का ध्यान नहीं जाता है । हमारे नन्दा साहब ने बतलाया कि हमारे यहां बहुत कुछ तरक्की हो गई है, बहुत सी इन्डस्ट्रीज उन्होंने बतलाई कि इन इन इन्डस्ट्रीज में तरक्की हो गई है । उन्होंने वनस्पति का नाम लिया कि आज कल हमारे देश में वनस्पति की इन्डस्ट्री में इतनी तरक्की हो गई है कि बहुत सी वनस्पति इन्डस्ट्रीज हो गई हैं और सब जगह वनस्पति घी मिलने लग गया है । मैं इस को एक आइडियलोजी के रूप में आप को नहीं बतलाता हूं मैं यह नहीं कहता कि यह जो वनस्पति है उस से राष्ट्र के ऊपर क्या प्रभाव पड़ता है तथा हमारे स्वास्थ्य की क्या हानि होती है । परन्तु मैं आप लोगों को यह बतलाना चाहता हूं कि जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर द्वाताओं में काम करता है उस के घी के आउटपुट की कीमत १००० करोड़ रुपये आंकी गई है । अब अगर हमारे नन्दा साहब इस बात में खुश होते हैं और यह कहते हैं कि हमारी तरक्की हो गई और हम ने वनस्पति इन्डस्ट्री को सब जगह

कायम कर दिया है और सब जगह वनस्पति घी मिलता है तो हम को देखना चाहिये कि उस का असर हमारे द्वाताओं के करोड़ों प्राइवेट सेक्टर पर क्या पड़ता है । जिन के प्रति हमारे वित्त मंत्री और प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने ध्यान आकर्षित किया जो १००० करोड़ रुपये का घी जो नापा गया बतलाया गया है इसका किस तरह से इस्तेमाल किया गया और वह कहाँ गया । कई लोग गो हत्या बन्द करो, गो हत्या बन्द करो के नारे लगाते हैं, लेकिन मैं उनसे पूछूंगा कि उन्होंने ठोस काम क्या किया है या वे सिर्फ बातें ही करना जानते हैं ।

मेरा कहने का मुद्दा यह था कि हम लोगों का जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर है वह द्वाताओं में है और वहीं पर वह काम करता है । वहां पर छोटी छोटी इन्डस्ट्रीज चलती हैं और मेरे विचार में हमें उन्हीं की तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिये । जब जब मिनिस्टर साहब यह कहते हैं कि मैं फुल एम्प्लायमेंट देता हूं और मैं इकोनॉमिक इक्विलिटी के हक में हूं वो मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती कि किस तरह से वह फुल एम्प्लायमेंट देंगे और किस तरह से वह इकोनॉमिक इक्विलिटी लायेंगे । जब कि वनस्पति के कारखाने कायम करके जिन में कुछ ही लोगों को काम मिला, करोड़ों घी बनाने वाले प्राइवेट सेक्टर को खतम कर दिया । यह भी कहते हैं कि खादी के लिये हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने तीन करोड़ रुपया दिया है और हर रुपये में तीन आने हम ने दिये हैं । मैं कहता हूं कि इस से कुछ भी नहीं होने वाला है । हमारा जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर है वह द्वाताओं में काम करता है, गांवों में काम करता है और जब तक हम इस सेक्टर की उन्नति नहीं करेंगे तब तक हम यह नहीं कह सकते कि हम ने कोई उन्नति की है । शहरों के प्राइवेट सेक्टर या पब्लिक सेक्टर की उन्नति या अवनति देख कर हम लोग यह कह देंते हैं कि हमारे देश में इतनी उन्नति हो गई, इतनी प्रोग्रेस हो गई, इतने आदमी काम पर लगाये गये, यह यार्ड स्टिक उन्नति को नापने का नहीं होना चाहिये, यह

[श्री भुक्तभुक्तवाला]

गलत यार्ड स्टिक हैं। जब तक दहातों के Private Sector के तिर्ये जिनका सहमा हमारी विदेशों सरकार ने तो कर ही दिया था, हम लोग भी बात तो करते हैं पर कार्यवही कोई एंसी नहीं करते हैं जिससे वे पनप सकें और आनी खाई हुई रोजगारी को फिर जीवित कर सकें। यह तभी सम्भव है जब कि सब लोग जो गांवों में करोड़ों की तादाद में हर प्रकार के काम करने वाले हों उनकी बनी चीजों का व्यवहार करें कम से कम जब तक उनको दूसरा काम न मिल जाय। इसके तिर्ये हमें अधिक कीमत देनी हो तो है।

Shri Velayudhan: When I was hearing the speech of the Planning Minister I was trying to compare it with the speech made by the hon. Prime Minister, who is the Chairman of the Planning Commission, in the Development Council meeting that was held in November last. During these last five or six months we had come across a lot of speeches, commending as well as criticising the progress of the Plan, from the planners as well as from outsiders. When I compared the speeches of the planners as well as the speeches of those who criticised the Plan, I could discover that the bitterest critic of this Five Year Plan was the Prime Minister himself. You might have read the speech made by the Prime Minister in the Development Council. I was to some extent amused to read it because it was a downright criticism of the Planning Commission's activities and its progress.

What is the reason for this apologetic appearance before the House of the Planning Minister in regard to the activities of the Planning Commission during the past three and a half years? I do not blame him at all. Because I have felt that the whole basis of the Five Year Plan, the whole philosophy behind it was based on a kind of an imperialist economy, based on an economy of exploitation, based practically on an economy of extortion of the millions

of people of this country. A plan like this will not satisfy the people of India. During the last two days we were having the discussion on the economic policy. And yesterday the Prime Minister himself bluntly said that not only the objectives but the approach to the planning for plenty for the people of India is a socialistic approach. I do not know, there was a terrible confusion, a terrible conflict in the mind of the Treasury Bench itself, in the mind of the party in power itself. Otherwise this Plan would not have been a haphazard development, otherwise it could not have been minimised by the people of this country. The Prime Minister was saying the other day that there is a section of people who are under-rating the progress of the country. I must humbly say that I am proud of the progress made by the country in the last seven years. Wherever we go we see great national activity, unprecedented in the history of the world taking place in India today—such an unprecedented and intense national activity not to be seen in any country in the world, either Europe or Russia, except China. This progress is there. But I am not willing to give credit for this to the Treasury Bench or to the Congress Party which is in power. It is because of the basic factor in which we are placed, in which India is placed today. That is why this national activity is now seen all over the country. It was here that this opportunity should have been seized by the Planning Commission, by the planners by the Congress so as to see that a target is fixed and achieved in the swiftest and minimum time possible.

Yesterday when the Finance Minister spoke on the economic policy he put a target of employment in the country for ten years. Do you think that the country is going to wait for ten years for full employment? It is impossible for a country where millions of the people are peasants, where millions of the people are workers.

where millions of the people are suffering on a starvation basis. It is impossible to wait for ten years for full employment.

There is nothing lacking as resources in the country; there is nothing lacking as co-operation in the country; there is nothing lacking as technicians in the country. The Prime Minister himself when he spoke in the Development Council referred to this. There is something basically wrong when we have plenty of technicians coming that there is a clamour and a complaint that there is lack of technicians. He said bluntly that it was a ridiculous position. If we want engineers in the country we have got thousands of people coming over. But at the same time if we go to the Planning Minister, Shri Nanda, or his officers, they will say: we have not got enough engineers; we have not got enough technicians.

Therefore, the Prime Minister has bluntly stated that we must make use of the available resources in the country, whether we have got technicians or half-trained men or even untrained men. We cannot wait for long and allow time to pass to gear up the machinery.

Turning to my State which I think has been a problem State for India during the last 15 or 16 years, I must say that the unemployment position in my State is most acute in India. I am very grateful to the Finance Minister as well as to the Prime Minister for giving a lot of attention whenever questions regarding Travancore-Cochin come in.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): They are not doing anything.

Shri Velayudhan: When I say I am grateful to the Government, I am not saying that I am satisfied with what they have done. I must say that the problem in my State is tremendous. It is an important problem. It is a problem which will have great effect and influence on the future political set-up of India. There is great unemployment in my State. In the statistics

given in the report of the Planning Commission, it is stated that we have made use of about 43 per cent. of the grant that is already given. At the same time, there is a Budget deficit of Rs. 2 and 2/3 crores in that State. This is a kind of capitalist economy which is in force at the moment. But, I must admit, as the Prime Minister pointed out yesterday that the largest investor in the country is the peasant or the worker and that any plan of economic development will have to be based on the peasant or the worker.

There is political uncertainty in my State: an uncertainty created not by any of us, but, I may humbly say, by the Congress party in the State itself. It is said that we are in the lap of the President's rule. We are also told that the Congress is coming into power again through some backdoor.

Some Hon. Members: No backdoor.

Shri Velayudhan: I must say to my friends in the Congress Benches and Treasury Benches that the Congress is a discredited body in my State.

Shri Achuthan (Cranganur): Question.

Shri Velayudhan: The Congress is never going to be in power in my State.

Shri A. M. Thomas: On a point of order, Sir, I do not know what relevancy this has got with regard to this discussion.

Shri Velayudhan: It has got every relevancy.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of Order.

Shri Velayudhan: I say, the Congress is a discredited body in my State. Therefore, I am not willing to see the Congress coming into power in the present set up.

Shri A. M. Thomas: What is the reason why my hon. friend wanted

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

to join the Congress a few months back?

Shri Velayudhan: This allegation is absolutely false.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. This is not an occasion for reciprocal exchanges. The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Velayudhan: What my hon. friend say is a patent lie...

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member is still going on. Why does he go on like this. He ought to have stopped when the Chair asked him to stop. He ought to have sat down when the Chair was standing and speaking. He is an old Member of the House and he ought to observe discipline.

Shri Velayudhan: What my hon. friend said is absolutely false.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Morarka: (Ganganagar: Jhunjhunu): During the last two days in the debate on the economic policy and today in this debate on the progress of the Plan, we have been often told that there cannot be two watertight divisions of the industrial policy, as private sector and the public sector. I do not know whether there can be such a division or not or whether there should be such a division between these two sectors or not. But I do not want that the basic industries or the key industries, must be reserved exclusively to the public sector and no private enterprise should be allowed to operate in that field. The 1948 Resolution clearly laid down that all the new enterprises, in the future, would be initiated and developed by the State. And even for the existing enterprises, it was said that after 10 years, that is, sometime in 1958, the policy would be reviewed and if at that time it was considered necessary, then, they may be also owned by the State. This was a deliberate decision of policy taken by the Government in 1948.

Sir, you know as well as the House does that the nationalisation policy of the Labour Government in England sprang from a deep-seated conviction that the basic industries and the essential raw materials must be owned and managed in the interests of the whole community and not by any particular section or by private enterprise in the interest of few.

Our progress in this public sector has been, by and large, very satisfactory. Out of 80 crores which the Central Government planned, we have already invested Rs. 50 crores in the various projects and public enterprises. This is an evidence of our progress. If we include the investment of the States also, then out of Rs. 89 crores that was planned, we have invested Rs. 60 crores.

In spite of this progress, I must say something about the management of these public corporations. It is gratifying to note that Government has selected the public corporation as an instrument or as an institution for owning and managing these state industries. By and large, the management of these public corporations is satisfactory as I said before. But, there are a few guiding principles which must be observed, when one adopts public corporation as the institution of management for these public enterprises.

The first principle is that the public corporation should be free from detailed scrutiny and detailed enquiry of the Parliament. That does not mean that Parliament should have nothing to do with the policy of these corporations. But, so far as the day to day management is concerned, Parliament should not interfere.

The second guiding principle is that the personnel of these public corporations should be free from the rigid rules of the civil service. Here again, this sound principle was evolved after long experience in other countries. In commercial and industrial

enterprise, no rigidity of service should be allowed to come in.

The third principle is that as far as possible these public corporations should be free from the profit motive. There should be present the 'social service' motive. Though a public corporation is supposed to pay its way and be self-sufficient, profit should not be the guiding factor.

The fourth guiding principle is that the finances of these corporations should be self-contained and should be divorced from the national Budget of the country.

Then, Sir, I want to make a few suggestions regarding these corporations. The first is that so far as the head of the executive or managing director of this corporation is concerned, there should be some security of tenure of service. I do not know, but I believe that in one corporation alone, the Sindhri Fertiliser factory, in a period of less than three years, we had six managing directors. On an average it gives a life of less than six months to a managing director. Not a very long period either for them to show results or for us to expect any results.

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): The Industrial cadre.

Shri Morarka: The Finance Minister says Industrial cadre. Unfortunately, we have not yet built one. I do hope that the Government's attention will be directed to this and we would very soon have an industrial cadre.

My second suggestion is that since most of these corporations are in a monopolistic position, and since these public monopolies can be as dangerous as any private monopolies, I wish that in each corporation we must have a consumers' committee which will safeguard the interests of consumers.

Thirdly, since in these public corporations we do not have parliamentary

scrutiny or the shareholders to watch their interests and put questions in general meetings there must be an Audit Commission appointed at intervals of five or seven years. That is done in England. These Audit Commissions must report to the Government, to the Minister concerned, and also to Parliament about the achievements of the various Corporations. They also make recommendations for improvement, if any.

Another suggestion is that the corporations should take more and more co-operation from businessmen and public men. So far we have found that the management of these corporations has been left to the civil servants. The management of these corporations requires something more than the mere ability to collect revenue or to maintain law and order.

4 P.M.

you require some sort of imagination, some sort of power to take decisions, and wider experience of managerial ability. There is no doubt that in this country we have got business enterprise, we have got persons of public standing who can contribute to these requirements greatly. The civil servants are very capable and no doubt they are eminently suitable for administrative purposes, but it is yet to be seen how far they would meet the demands for economic development. In this connection, I would only quote what Mr. Durbin, an ex-member of the British Cabinet said once about these civil servants. He said:

"They are intelligent, charming and conscientious men; but they are not men of imagination or action. They are slow, cautious and obstructive. They are shrewd but not wise, dependable but not creative. They are too often cynical rather than realistic."

I am anxious to make this suggestion because it is on the success or the failure of these enterprises that the case for future nationalisation, for future socialisation of the other

[Shri Morarka]

means of production would depend. If we fail in these corporations, then the case for nationalising other industries would also be prejudiced. It is therefore imperative that we take all steps and reasonable care to ensure that our public enterprises do not show lesser degree of success than the enterprises in the private sector.

Coming to the private sector, I must say that though the progress in this sector is not unsatisfactory or less satisfactory than the public sector, yet, there was apparent dissatisfaction in the minds of the public, and Government was also not very happy about its development. So a committee, under the chairmanship of Shri A. D. Shroff, was appointed to find out the reasons for the slow progress in the private sector. After a detailed enquiry, the committee came to certain conclusions and diagnosed certain reasons for this slow progress.

The first reason that Committee gave was that the socio-economic climate of the country is such that the people are discouraging private enterprise. They are deprecating the profit motive and they have developed a sort of prejudice against private enterprise. This reason is more psychological than real, and I do not know what concrete steps can be taken to overcome this.

The second reason was, according to the Committee, the threat of nationalisation. The Committee says that even though our Plan has accepted the private sector and assigned a definite role to this sector, yet the people in the country seem to tolerate this sector rather than accept it as a means of development. Here again, I have got one suggestion to make, and that is, the Government should examine whether it would not be possible for them to give the same guarantees to some of the concerns which require big investments and take longer time to fructify, guarantees similar to those given to the oil refineries. The oil refineries, as you know, are mostly alien concerns, and

if similar guarantees are given to the Indian nationals, I do not think anything would be lost.

Another reason given by the Shroff Committee for the slow progress was that the labour policy of the Government was creating a lot of hindrances. It was the considered opinion of the Shroff Committee that the Government had recently passed so many labour legislations that the cumulative effect of all those was to slow down or curb the incentive to invest in the private sector. There is no doubt that we are pledged to the policy of social justice, but we also agree that our ability to do social justice has to be equated to the economic development of our country. It is no use equating that to the high philosophy of social justice of advanced countries and at the same time carry on our production with inefficient and old methods. If we want to have the full standards for labour, if we want to have ideal conditions for labour, then our means of production also should be ideal.

Finally, I will say only one thing; that so far Government has given a lot of attention to public interest. They have exercised control over industry, they have regulated the means of production in the public interest. But Government has completely ignored the other aspect, equally important, and that is the economic efficiency of the enterprise. Government should keep two things in mind when they exercise control over or regulate any enterprise, viz., the public interest and the economic efficiency. How would public interest be served and how long would it be served if there is no economic efficiency and as a result the concern ultimately has to go out of production? The public interest would then be in greater jeopardy than what it would be otherwise.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Meghnad Saha. I would request him to be rather brief because many Members are anxious to speak.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Yesterday there was some talk about the

achievements of our Planning Commission. I was told that my figures were not correct. I want to correct that idea.

What I said was this, that Mr. G. L. Mehta in a speech in New York had claimed that as a result of the Five Year Plan, our national income had gone up by 13 to 14 per cent. I said that it is a very bad way of advertising the achievements of the Plan, because the real index is the increase in the per capita income. I have got these figures from the Statistical Institute, Calcutta. The figures are: 248.6 in 1949-50; 246 next year; 251.7 next year; and this year, i.e., 1953-54, it is 261.2. So, if you calculate, apply a little mathematics, it comes to a five per cent increase in the per capita income in the course of four years. Therefore, there has been practically not any increment in the per capita income—only one per cent per year; and therefore, to reach the doubling of the national income, which Russia did in ten years, we shall require about 60 to 70 years. This has been my contention, that the whole Plan, the First Five Year Plan is not a Plan at all, it is a muddle.

Hon. Members: What is it?

Shri Meghnad Saha: Muddle. It is not a Planning Commission, it is a Muddling Commission. The Plan has been a miserable failure.

Now, even these figures are subject to a certain amount of suspicion. In the last year, the average per capita income was Rs. 251.7, and this year it has shown a huge increase to Rs. 261.2. So, I looked into this fact, and I find from the report of the Planning Commission which has been given to us that almost the whole increment has been in agriculture, if their figures are to be believed. On page 3 it is claimed that our agricultural production has gone up by 18 per cent since 1950-51. Since our production in that year in agriculture was Rs. 4,500 crores, 18 per cent of it comes to Rs. 810 crores. Mind that all these figures are calculated in the standard rupee of 1949-50. It is claimed that we have got a 13 per

cent increase in the aggregate national income. Even accepting this figure, suspicious as it is, the total amount of increase in the national income comes to Rs. 1,100 crores. If you take out from that Rs. 800 crores, only Rs. 300 crores remain, to be attributed to industries and other causes to which I have drawn attention on page 14 of my *Rethinking our Future*, which the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Prime Minister must have got, for I sent them complimentary copies. Our total industrial production was worth about Rs. 1,500 crores, and if we ascribe about half of these Rs. 300 crores, to industries it comes to Rs. 150 crores. So the industrial production could not have gone up by more than ten to twelve per cent. The claim of 40 or 30 per cent is absolutely incorrect. And that was the point which I made out, and on which the Prime Minister got wild. I had never compared my figures with 1946 figures as stated by the Prime Minister. I had started from the year 1949-50. I think I have explained the position taken by me yesterday, and if the hon. Prime Minister, instead of relying on hearsay, had before him the Parliamentary Debates, he would not have committed the blunder which he had done.

Even this increase in agricultural production is not ascribed, even by the Planning Commission, in the Report that we have got here, to their efforts. They say that much of it is due to successive good monsoons. Supposing in the next two years, we have got bad monsoons, then, I think, the per capita income will come down from Rs. 261 to Rs. 253 or Rs. 256, and we would be exactly where we had been in the beginning of the Plan. So, the large claims that are being made on behalf of the Plan are absolutely groundless. I am sorry to say all that, and I shall expand it later.

We have been given very rosy pictures of the plans which are going to come in the next five years. The Indian Statistical Institute, under Professor Mahalanobis, has engaged a very large number of great foreign

[Shri Meghnad Saha]

experts to make the second Five Year Plan, of which we expect to hear from the hon. Finance Minister. I had gone to the Statistical Institute, and I had talks with all these experts and I had asked them to read my *Rethinking our Future*. They have read it, and they have told me: "what you have said is absolutely correct, we do not differ from you." But our friends here on the Government Benches seem to think that unless, a statement comes from a European there is no truth in it, and that we Indians are incapable of saying the truth. May I ask the hon. Finance Minister to ask Dr. Rubinstein, Dr. Bettelheim and other three really great experts, who have come here, their opinion on my *Rethinking our Future*, which has been given to him as a complimentary copy, as also to the Planning Commission as well as others, and ascertain whether I have stated the correct view on Planning or not.

We have been told that they are making a very good plan. I have seen some of these plans, when I was there. They are indeed making a very good plan; they are making a very detailed plan. But I am putting a pertinent question to our Government members, which I shall illustrate by means of an example. A very great painter who was asked to make a very good painting made it and gave it to his master. The master said, well, we have got a very good painting, but for its appraisal I shall send it to my private friends and other experts. He sent the painting to his other friends, the private experts, and asked them, would you kindly put a black dot wherever you think this painting is not good. By the time the painting came back to the master, everything was a mass of black ink. It is a very good plan that has been made by the Statistical Institute; I have no doubt about that and our thanks are due to Prof. Mahalanobis and his coworkers. But it will go to many of the friends of the Government for opinion; it will go to all our industrial friends,—I would not name them by families—

the Kungs, the Soongs, the Lis and Chiangs of India, and all of them will be asked to put a black dot on it, and other friends also will put a black dot on it, I am sure when it will come back, you will find nothing but a mass of black ink remaining there.

The planning which we had made in the old National Planning Committee, and which I have reviewed in my *Rethinking our Future*, was quite good. There was nothing wrong in it. It was not detailed. We are now making a detailed plan, and I hope that when this plan is ready, the Government may see its way to give effect to it.

We have heard something about the formation of finance from the mouth of our Finance Minister. It is good that he is thinking of raising investment finance to ten per cent of our national income. I have said so a year ago, that unless you increase your investment from the present figure of five per cent to ten or twelve per cent, we shall not substantially increase our national per capita income. The question which comes after that is very important. It is not only a question of making investments. We may make ten per cent investment, but that investment must be properly done, it must be in spheres which will give a return. I find no indication in the plan, as to how that will be done. In the plan, we find that a large amount of money is being diverted to sectors which are very unprofitable, the community projects, and so on, which do not give a return but have advertising and vote catching value for the Congress. The only sector which can give you a good return, and of which the country is in great need, is the industrial sector. The raw materials in this country are there on the ground, and we have to pick them up and transform them into industrial goods, iron and steel, soda ash, chemicals and so on.

We find that since 1947, nobody has given an iota of thought as to how the proper investment has to be made in the industries. The much-lauded

1948 policy, of which we are hearing so much from the Government Benches, does not come from their head. I know it—I had been contacting the Indian Government for a long time—it was the late Sir Ardeshir Dalal who was Minister of Planning, who had prepared that Plan in 1946. And that Plan has been taken over by this Government, and nobody in this Government has given an iota of further thought to it. The Ministry of Planning was somehow—I do not know why—for some dark reasons, abolished in 1946 when this Government came into power; we had two years of economic confusion from 1946 to 1948.

Shri S. S. More: What else today?

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East cum Ballia Distt.—West): Much improvement.

Shri Meghnad Saha: After 1948 the industrial policy which was stated by Sir Ardeshir Dalal was put before us by the Congress Government, and they are taking very great glory for it, just as they are taking all the credit for the river valley projects, the plans for increase of power, for the Sindri Fertiliser Factory and other things. May I say, as one who has been connected with the Government of India in the pre-Independence days as member in several committees, that this Government do not deserve any credit for any of the constructive works that had been started? As regards the Sindri Fertiliser Factory, I might claim that I was responsible for bringing that point of view before the country in 1943.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Thank you.

Shri Meghnad Saha: There was a great famine in Bengal then, and I sponsored an article in the *Science and Culture* about it, and I was told that I would be put in jail. I had said, why this dearth of food, it is because we have no fertilisers in this country and Lord Linlithgow, the Viceroy, was against the use of artificial fertilisers. This article came before the

Viceroy's Cabinet, and Sir Ramsay Mudaliar took it up, and appointed a committee consisting of Sir James Pitkeathly and two other Indians. They made all the plans, but when the plans were ready, these came before the Congress Government. But there was an apprehension that the whole plan was going to be wrecked, because a very great Congressman said, we have got plenty of cow-dung in this country, and therefore, no artificial fertilisers are necessary. Anyhow, the cow-dung theory did not find favour because the late lamented Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee was there. He said, the plan is there, some work has been done on it, I must see that it is worked up to a finish. That is the whole story of the 'Sindri fertiliser plant, for which the present Congress Government is taking credit. The same thing holds good about the Damodar Valley project, about the Bhakra-Nangal project and other projects for which the Congress Government are taking all the credit. The credit for all these river valley projects—if it is to be given to anybody—should be given to Dr. Ambedkar.

An Hon. Member: Or to the Britishers.

Shri Meghnad Saha: He was a member of the Viceroy's Council. He saw the whole thing through and laid the foundation for it. All that this Government have done is to mismanage affairs.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Was he then in Government or not?

Shri Meghnad Saha: Yes, at that time.

Shri S. S. More: Not of yours.

Shri Meghnad Saha: He was Minister of Fuel and Power in the Viceroy's Cabinet.

I wish to explode the myth that the Congress has been responsible for anything constructive which has been done in this country, except to waste money on community projects and on

[Shri Meghnad Saha]

many other themes. If you have to industrialise this country, you must give your brain a racking, which you have not done so far. Nobody in the Government has gone deep into this matter of industrialisation of the country. You have to follow what the Chinese have done. They are very keen on industrialisation. Formerly, they followed the Chiang-Kai-shek pattern, and Chiang-Kai-shek brought the country to disasters. Now, out of 36 Ministers, 12 are in charge of industrialisation. Here we have got only half-Ministers and quarter-Ministers for industrialisation. In China, there are 36 Ministers; of these, 12 are for industries. We have got here one Minister for industry and commerce combined; so industry is only half a Ministry. Now, if you want to industrialise the country properly, you must do it seriously....

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: More Ministries?

Shri Meghnad Saha: There should be five or six Ministers for industry and every Minister must give his whole time to the Ministry, not doing industry and commerce and everything else simultaneously.

So, if we have to do planning for the country, we must think very radically and I think my *Rethinking our future*, which everybody there has got, will provide a very safe guide.

श्री ए० एन० विशालंकार (जालन्धर) : पिछले दो दिन मैं हमने अपनी आर्थिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में बहस की है....

Mr. Chairman: At this stage, I may announce that the Delimitation Commission (Amendment) Bill will be taken up after this motion is concluded tomorrow.

श्री ए० एन० विशालंकार : किसी भी चीज को ज्ञान के लिये यह जरूरी है कि हमारे सामने ध्येय और नीति बिल्कुल साफ हो। यह बहुत ही प्रसन्नता की बात है, और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ऐतिहासिक तौर पर एक महत्व की बात है कि कल इसी हाउस में अपने ध्येय के सम्बन्ध में हमने बिल्कुल साफ निर्णय किया

है कि हमारा ध्येय एक सोशलिस्ट सोसाइटी बनाने का है। मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत सारी कठिनाइयाँ जो हमारे प्लानिंग में और हमारी आर्थिक नीति को अमल में लाने के सम्बन्ध में रही हैं, इस ध्येय के साफ हो जाने के बाद दूर हो जायेंगी। जिस आर्थिक नीति के ऊपर हम चलते हैं या जिस प्लान पर हम कार्य करते हैं उसमें बहुत महत्व की बात यह है कि हमारा एंटीच्युह या हमारा दृष्टिकोण क्या है। भले ही आप अच्छे से अच्छा प्लान बनायें लेकिन उस को चलाने वालों का और उस पर काम करने वालों का दृष्टिकोण न बदले तो अच्छे से अच्छा प्लान और अच्छी से अच्छी योजना भी असफल हो जाती है।

प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पब्लिक सेक्टर के सम्बन्ध में हमने काफी सांच विचार किया और आखिर यह हमने तय किया कि व्यवसाय के अन्दर प्राइवेट सेक्टर से, काम ले कर पब्लिक सेक्टर के पास आ जाय। आखिर यह भी आपने सांचा कि हम पब्लिक सेक्टर क्यों चाहते हैं? उसका कारण साफ है कि पब्लिक सेक्टर से हम यह आशा करते हैं कि उसका दृष्टिकोण प्रगतिशील है। उसके अन्दर ह्यूमन आउटलुक या सोशल आउटलुक, सामाजिक दृष्टिकोण को ज्यादा महत्व दिया जाता है जब कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में प्राफिट मॉटिव होता है अर्थात् नफा कमाने का ध्येय और उसी को ज्यादा महत्व दिया जाता है। प्राइवेट सेक्टर में इस बात का ख्याल नहीं किया जाता कि नफा कमाने वालों के अतिरिक्त जो लोग काम करते हैं, जो लोग वस्तुतः सम्पत्ति पैदा करते हैं, उनकी क्या दशा है। लेकिन पब्लिक सेक्टर से हम यह आशा करते हैं कि वह इन तमाम चीजों को सामने रख कर तमाम इकोनॉमिक और आर्थिक नीति के अन्दर एक तरह का समन्वय उत्पन्न करेगा, बॉलेंस उत्पन्न करेगा, जिससे जो लोग मंहनत करने वाले हैं, और जो लोग फायदा या नफा उठाने वाले हैं उनके हितों में परस्पर विरोधी भाव न रहे। अगर हमारे पब्लिक सेक्टर में भी वह दृष्टिकोण नहीं आता और पब्लिक सेक्टर

में जितनी इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, जो भी काम चलते हैं, उनमें अन्दर वह ह्यूमन एलिमेंट, मानवीय भावना काम नहीं करती तो हमारा उद्देश्य असफल हो जायगा। मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि पब्लिक सेक्टर के अन्दर भी हम लोग प्राइवेट सेक्टर वालों पर बहुत कुछ निर्भर करते हैं। हमारा अन्दर एक तरह का इनफीरियोरिटी कॉम्प्लेक्स है, हीन भावना है। हम समझते हैं कि हम लोगों को, गवर्नमेंट के काम करने वालों को, इन कारोबारों को चलाना नहीं आता है और इसीलिये हमें जो लीड लेनी है, इनिशियेटिव लेना है और दूसरी जो बहुत सी चीजें करनी हैं, वह हमें प्राइवेट सेक्टर वालों से लेनी हैं। अभी कल भी बातचीत हुई, परसों भी इसी बार् में बातचीत हुई और आज भी इस बार् में चर्चा हुई कि हमें एक इंडस्ट्रियल कैंडर की जरूरत है। ऐसे लोगों की जरूरत है जो इन कारोबारों को चलाता जानते हों। अभी तक हमारी जितनी भी कर्मियाँ बनती हैं, जो भी सलाह मशविरा करना होता है वह प्राइवेट सेक्टर के प्रोपराइटर्स से होता है। उन्हीं से सलाह ली जाती है। हमने कभी उस कैंडर से सलाह मशविरा करने की कोशिश नहीं की जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर के प्रोपराइटर्स और बिल्कुल नीचे दर्जे के मजदूरों का है। इन दोनों के बीच में एक और भी कैंडर काम करने वाला है जो मैनजिरियल कैंडर होता है, वे लोग तमाम चीज को चलाते हैं, हमने उनको अपने विश्वास में लेने की और उनका भी सहयोग हासिल करने की कोशिश नहीं की। हमें उनका भी सहयोग और विश्वास प्राप्त करना चाहिये और हम बहुत ज्यादा भरोसा प्रोपराइटर्स जो मालिकान होते हैं उन पर न करें। अगर हम ऐसा करें तो हम काफी फायदा उठा सकते हैं। इस चीज को सामने रखते हुए मैनजिरियल कैंडर का आप लोग उपयोग करिये और वे नेशनल भावना से ज्यादा प्रभावित हो सकते हैं वनिस्वत मालिकान के। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ पर पब्लिक सेक्टर और प्राइवेट सेक्टर को हम मिला कर काम करते हैं, जो ब्राइट कंसर्न हैं उनमें अन्दर हम हीन भावना को छोड़ दें, इनफीरियोरिटी कॉम्प्लेक्स को छोड़

दें और पब्लिक सेक्टर के अन्दर इनिशियेटिव हम अपने हाथ में रखें, इंडस्ट्रियल कंसर्नस के अन्दर हम अपना डॉमिनेशन रखें। कल हमने यह प्रस्ताव पास किया है और यह निश्चय किया है कि हमारा ध्येय सोशलिस्ट स्टेट बनाने का है। हमें इस बात को सम्म कर देना चाहिये कि जितने भी इंडस्ट्रियल या एग्रीकल्चरल कंजर्न हैं उनके अन्दर डॉमिनेशन, ऊपरी हाथ, अथवा कंट्रोल और नीति का संचालन पूरी तरह से स्टेट के हाथ में या पब्लिक सेक्टर के हाथ में रहेगा, प्राइवेट सेक्टर के हाथ में नहीं रहेगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर का यह डॉमिनेशन खत्म होना चाहिये। मैं अनुभव करता हूँ कि जब हम एक सोशलिस्ट सोसाइटी बनाना चाहते हैं तो हमें उन चीजों को सामने रखना चाहिये। हमारा प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि आखिर हमारी जो प्रगति होती है वह कुछ पहले की ऐतिहासिक अवस्थाओं से कीडिशंड होती है, कुछ पहले की ऐतिहासिक अवस्थाएँ हमें प्रभावित करती हैं। यह बिल्कुल ठीक बात है लेकिन साथ ही हमें अपने सोसाइटी को पुरानी अवस्थाओं के चंगुल से, अथवा पुरानी श्रृंखलाओं से जकड़ नहीं रखना है, उनसे कुछ अपने को आजाद रखना है, पुरानी श्रृंखलाओं से हमें कुछ अपने को बहुत बांध कर नहीं रखना है। अभी हमारा दोस्त श्री मोरारका ने अपनी स्पीच के दौरान मैं शराफ कामेटी की रिपोर्ट से कोटेशन दिया और प्राइवेट सेक्टर में तरक्की की धीमी रफ्तार के बारे में यह वजह बतलायी कि इस गवर्नमेंट ने बहुत सारा लेंबर लाज बना दिये हैं और नेशनलाइजेशन का खाँफ है, उसने इंडस्ट्री को इन कानूनों में जतना जकड़ दिया है कि वह तरक्की नहीं कर पाते, यह जो एक मेन्टैलिटी है कि हम पुरानी चीज से अपने को रिकीडिशन नहीं करते, हमें उस को भी दूर करना है। हमारा सामने आज जो कीडिशन है यानी इस समय जो हमारी जनता है, निर्धन जनता है, हम से वह कुछ डिमान्ड करती है। उस के अन्दर अपनी अवस्था को सुधारने की स्वाहिश है। मैं जानता हूँ कि वह

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार]

एक दिन में नहीं सुधार सकती, हम तमाम जनता के लिविंग स्टैंडर्ड को एक दम नहीं बढ़ा सकते, लेकिन यह कहना काफी नहीं है। आज जो लोग ४०, ४५ रुपये महीना ले कर अपना गुजारा करते हैं, जिन को हम बहुत कम इन्फ्लेमेट द कर काम लेते हैं, चाहे वह गवर्नमेंट सर्विस में हों या किसी क्लसरी जगह, यदि हम उन से कह दें कि तुम्हारी अवस्था एक दम नहीं सुधार सकती इसीलिये तुम चुपके बैठो, या जो बंकार हैं उन से कह दें कि हम तुम्हारे लिये कुछ नहीं कर सकते इसीलिये तुम कुछ समय तक सन्तोष करो और तुम को चुप बैठना चाहिये, तो यह चीज चल नहीं सकती है। मैं यह इसीलिये कह रहा हूँ कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में और पब्लिक सेक्टर में हम रोज कहते हैं कि जो स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग आज है उस प्रकार का स्टैंडर्ड कुछ समय रहना ही है। आज लंबर का जो स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग है उस को हम रोज करोगे तो हमारी तमाम इन्फ्लेक्शन रुक जायगी इस को मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। यह ठीक है कि लिविंग का स्टैंडर्ड हम बहुत नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं, लेकिन फिर भी उस को बढ़ाना है। जिन लोगों का स्टैंडर्ड नीचा है उन के स्टैंडर्ड को ऊँचा करने के लिये मैं यह नहीं कहता कि जिन की तन्हाहें ज्यादा हैं उन की तन्हाहें एक दम कम कर दी जायें लेकिन उन पर तथा ज्यादा आमदनियाँ पर हम कुछ रोक जरूर लगा सकते हैं। आप ने यह चीज नहीं की है। आप यह कर सकते हैं कि प्राइसेज इस तरह से रंगुलेट कर कि जो आम लोगों के इस्तेमाल की चीजें हैं, आम लोग जिन चीजों को खरीदते हैं वह उन को सस्ती मिलें। भले ही लग्जरी गूड्स मंहगे हो जायें। लग्जरी गूड्स इतने मंहगे हो जायें कि जिन के पास दौलत है वह भी उन का उपयोग न कर सकें, वह अपनी दौलत का डिस्पोज न कर सकें। ऐसा आप कर सकते हैं। अगर आप आस्टेरीटी को चलाना चाहते हैं, अगर आप जनता के बेटरमेंट का इन्तजाम करना चाहते हैं और जनता की आमदनी को कौण्टलाइज करना चाहते हैं तो

हमें इसी नीति पर चलना होगा कि आम लोगों के इस्तेमाल की चीजें सस्ती हों लेकिन जो और लग्जरी गूड्स हैं वह मंहगे हों। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि रेशम ऐसी चीजों पर अब बहुत टैक्स बढ़ा दें। परन्तु जो कि रोजमर्रा इस्तेमाल की शानशांकित की चीजें हैं उन पर आप कीमत बढ़ायें। ऐसी चीजों जो मामूली अवस्था के आदमी खरीद नहीं सकते, ऐसी चीजों की प्राइसेज में हम इजाफा कर सकते हैं। इस नीति को हम अवश्य बरतें। लेकिन अगर हम टैक्सेशन के जरिये इस को करते हैं तो वह आम लोगों का नजर नहीं आता है। जिस आदमी को २००० रुपये महीना मिलता है उस से आप ४०० टैक्स के रूप में ले लेंगे हैं, लेकिन वह इतने चुपके से चला जाता है कि किसी को इस का पता नहीं चलता है। आज जो हमारे गरीब भाई हैं जिन को २५ रुपये महीना मिलते हैं वह फर्क नहीं कर सकते हैं दूसरों की अवस्था में जो कि १६०० रुपये पाते हैं क्योंकि जो कुछ टैक्स के रूप में उन से लिया जाता है वह अलग से ही चला जाता है। आज जो आम मॅन्टैलिटी है इस दृश के अन्दर बिना कुछ शंकायाम करें अब की लगायें आप उसे बदल नहीं सकते हैं। आज आप पैदावार के लिये, ज्यादा प्रोडक्शन के लिये लोगों के अन्दर उत्साह नहीं पैदा कर सकते हैं और लोगों की जो भावना है उस को भी ठीक नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसीलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम ऐसी नीति बनायें जिस से हम जो पुरानी गूड्स हैं, जो पुरानी लकीरों के अन्दर सोचते हैं, उस से थोड़ा हट कर सोचें।

अनएम्प्लायमेंट के बारे में हम कहते हैं कि वह दूर नहीं हो सकता, लेकिन अगर हम एक दूसरी तरह से सोचें कि अनएम्प्लायमेंट क्या चीज है, हम देखेंगे कि आज हमारे देश के अन्दर कोई आदमी ऐसा नहीं है जो खाना न खाता हो। कोई भी आदमी भूखा नहीं रहता है। वह कुछ न कुछ खाता ही है। अगर वह कुछ न कुछ खाता है और अब तक बंकार है तो इस का मतलब है कि वह सांसायटी पर किसी न किसी रूप में एक बोझ है एक

लायबिलिटी हैं। सिर्फ यह है कि हमारी लीनिंग इस तरीके की नहीं है कि जो काम करने वाले हैं उन के गुजर की जो चीजें हैं हम उसे अच्छी तरह से इकट्ठा कर सकें। यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि वह खायें भी और काम भी न करें।

मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी लीनिंग का यह काम है कि हम इस तरीके से साँचें और यह अनुभव करें कि जो आदमी देश के अन्दर रहता है और खाना खाता है वह जरूर कुछ न कुछ काम करे और उस के लिये एम्प्लायमेंट देना जाय। यह ठीक है कि वह एक थ्योरेटिकल चीज है, लेकिन थ्योरी को प्रैक्टिस के अन्दर हम ला सकते हैं अगर हम नई दिशा में साँचें और पुरानी ही दिशा में न सोचते रहें। इसीलिये मैं चाहता था जैसा कि मैं ने अभी कहा कि जब हम ने एक नई दिशा और एक नया मार्ग कायम किया तो हमारे सोचने के तरीके के अन्दर भी अन्तर आना चाहिये और नई दिशा में हमें सोचना चाहिये। पुराने ढाँचे के अन्दर जिस तरह से हमारी सोचने की आदत रही है जब तक हम उस से निकलेंगे नहीं, तब तक हम नई दिशा में नहीं सोच सकेंगे और तब तक हमारी तरक्की रुकी रहेगी और उस के अन्दर हमारे रास्ते में काफी दिक्कतें पैदा होंगी।

Pandit S. C. Mishra: It was only yesterday that the Lion of India roared in this hall. Not only did it roar but, if I may be permitted to say so, it lashed its tail furiously and we were told at our own peril to beware lest we minimise the efforts of the Indian people. Sir, evidently, the meaning was that whatever is being done by Panditji or his associates is the doing of the Indian people. I won't have much quarrel on that point. But then, this morning, I saw another report in the papers. There was a bye-election, right in Allahabad and the results that were announced showed that the votes for the wicked people, the PSP were 30,000 and only 17,000 for the Congress. I have no quarrel. I only say that it came from Allahabad and right on the wake of what had been roared in this hall. I only say

now that the lionine voice and the voice of the people do not seem to be identical, (Interruption). Do they? If you really want to interrupt me please be clear so that I may reply something.

That is what I am saying. I do not say that you will not be ruling India for another 70 years. You may be. This one bye-election or that does not show anything. But, surely, to say that anybody who differs on this point or that will be declared a traitor is too much. Good God! What is this?

Recently there had been some Gurudwara elections in Punjab in the northern part of India. Except two or three people, two or three Congress nominees who came by some arrangement, not one who had been labelled with the Congress label or associated with the Congress could enter, out of 89. We know what is happening in the south. We have seen now what is happening even in the heart of India. Therefore, I say, there are two sides to every picture. One side is that on which our Kautilya and our Burrah Mihir are posing. They are trying to show by statistics that everything is O.K., and progressive. What is the other side? I may be an interested party, these friends may be interested parties our interest may be in decrying you. But what is it that the people are saying? Go to the people. On the first or second of this month, I do not exactly remember the date, probably it was on the third, I was again at Allahabad junction somehow. In the morning when I got up from the train there was one set of people crying, 'Private enterprise not to be nationalised' and then immediately after what happened? The next cry was 'Complete socialism the goal of India.' I said, what is this. Then I had to buy both sets of papers to find out what the matter was. I wanted to know which of them was right and which was wrong. I found both of them had been said in one voice by our leader, by your leader. All over India the feeling is this. I declare it before our Planning Minister and our Finance Minister. You rightly say that nothing

[Pandit S. C. Mishra]

will be nationalised. I say socialism is the goal of your economic policy. According to your own version, take out from it the nationalisation of private property or private means of production. Then, let my hon. friends just consider what remains of their socialism.

Dr. Meghnad Saha irritates you very much. I am sorry it is a poor Gandhian method (*Interruption*). You can trample upon arguments, you can trample upon the logic of the arguments that we advance but to trample upon the name or the body or soul of a man who advances logic, I would only say, is not very high Gandhian method. He said that ingenious methods and institutions have been developed in this country to take out public money and put it into private hands. Is that wrong? Is that a mistake? I say that you are not nationalising private money and private resources, and you are not nationalising private means of production. You can reply before the public and the whole world. All sorts of public money are being taken out and put into private hands. What are these corporations? There are so many of them. At a certain stage in Europe, there were little principalities and the whole map of mid-Europe was dotted by principalities. Our Cabinet and our Ministers here are creating small principalities which they wish to remain outside the direct control even of Parliament and to be private principalities. I say this is a queer method of bringing socialism—not nationalising anything and going on taxing and taxing the poor people, and whatever comes out of that, again sending to augment private coffers. Therefore, it is a very queer sort of socialism that you are bringing into this country.

One word about the capitalists. They are your friends, but go and ask them. You had given an assurance that for ten years nothing will be nationalised, but they do not feel secure. Everywhere and outside India what do they say about the people of India from the great capitalist to the smallest private culti-

vator? Their feeling is that nothing shall be nationalised and yet nothing is secure. The position in India is that nobody, not even the agriculturist nor the capitalist, is secure, and nobody knows which is the way to proceed. If Pandit Nehru has done anything at all, I say he has done one thing and that is that he has completely blotted out private initiative, and this is where your Government has succeeded in doing something. At this moment, be he the highest or be he the lowest, he cannot take any initiative for progress in any direction. If you think that the *Bataidars* are your friends, come with me I will take you round and you will see for yourself what they feel. You say that you will give them some right. They do not get the right, and in the hope of getting some right, they are trampled under foot.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: How has the food production gone up?

Pandit S. C. Mishra: I think it was only one week earlier that the newspapers brought out that in Assam the agriculturists are refusing to harvest their standing paddy crop unless the Government comes out and gives them a guarantee of some minimum prices. Perhaps my namesake might have come across it.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Your namesake!

Pandit S. C. Mishra: Yes. He is my namesake. I have a very high esteem for my friend, the Finance Minister, but it will be a very harsh thing to say to my esteemed friend that if he is not the enemy of the peasant class, he is very nearly so. All these three years, the agricultural prices have gone down and down and the prices of other commodities have gone up and up—because of the duty, prices of shoes and all other things, except what the peasant produces, have increased. It is not 15 or 20 per cent. fall, but it is 100 per cent fall as everybody knows. For example paddy, which was selling at about Rs. 16 per maund is selling at nearly Rs. 8 per maund, and our

great friend will not raise his finger on behalf of the peasant. Let them be crushed. Therefore, I make one request. I do not say that you are doing nothing. I did not think that you were such weak people that unless praise came from us you will wither away. I thought you were a bit strong. If you do something, posterity will come and thank you. Here you come and invite criticism and you should be manly people to hear criticism, to welcome criticism and to correct yourselves if there be any truth in it. I do not say you are not doing great things, but I say that the valley projects that you have taken up could have been done in three years by Wavel.

I do not minimise your works; you are doing many things. But you should not be satisfied with that, but you must attempt more and correct your picture from both sides. Do not think you are infallible people and that whatever you do is correct. Examine from the other angle also.

श्री एस० एन० दास : आज प्लान की प्रगति के प्रतिवेदन पर जो बहस इस सदन में हो रही है उसके सम्बन्ध में मुझे कुछ आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मैं भी अपने विचार यहां रखूं। चूंकि बहुत समय हो गया था इस वास्ते मुझे कुछ निराशा सी हो गई थी कि आज शायद मुझे बोलने का मौका न दिया जाये और मैं न अपने कागज पत्र भी सम्माल लिये थे।

Mr. Chairman: Somebody had to be called last.

श्री एस० एन० दास : I am not complaining about it.

आर्थिक समस्या पर जो दो दिन इस सदन में विचार हुआ और उसके सिलसिले में पंच वर्षीय योजना की प्रगति के सम्बन्ध में जो प्रतिवेदन हमारे सामने रखा गया है उसके बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि पिछले तीन वर्षों में इस योजना के अनुसार देश की आर्थिक दशा में और दूसरी दिशाओं में कुछ भी परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है। ऐसा नहीं कहा जा सकता है। इस प्लान की सफलता एक इसी बात में है कि हम ने सारे देश को प्लान-माहिद

बना दिया है और गिरते और सम्भलते, गलत और सही तरीकों से कठिनाइयों का मुकाबला करते हुए हम आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। इस बात में कोई संदेह नहीं है कि जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने जब यह योजना बनाई थी उस वक्त उनके सामने हिन्दुस्तान का सच्चा चित्र नहीं था। हिन्दुस्तान का सच्चा चित्र जानने वाले, मेरे मित्र मुझे माफ करेंगे क्योंकि उनमें बड़े बड़े देश के संवक हैं, जहां तक मेरा ख्याल है एक मात्र महात्मा गांधी थे। वही यह जानते थे कि हिन्दुस्तान कहाँ बसता है। वही यह जानते थे कि हिन्दुस्तान गांवों में बसता है। अगर यह योजना हिन्दुस्तान के पांच लाख गांवों को सामने रख कर के बनायी गयी होती तो जो दृश्य हम आज देख रहे हैं बेकारी का, बीमारी का और गरीबी का, वह न दिखायी देता।

कहा गया कि हम समाजवाद चाहते हैं लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि कहना यह चाहिये कि हम ग्रामवाद चाहते हैं। हमारे संबन्धान में भी कहा गया है कि हमारे यहां गांवों का विशेष महत्व है। महात्मा गांधी ने कहा था कि जब तक हिन्दुस्तान के सात लाख गांव सात-लाख-प्रजातंत्र नहीं हो जायेंगे तब तक हिन्दुस्तान का उद्धार नहीं होगा। लेकिन मुझे यह कहने में कोई संकोच नहीं है कि इस प्लान में जो आर्थिक, औद्योगिक, व्यापारिक और सामाजिक विकास के काम किये गये हैं उनमें हिन्दुस्तान के गांवों की समस्या को तो छोड़ा तक नहीं गया है। अगर इस दिशा में सामुदायिक योजनाओं और राष्ट्रीय विकास संस्थाओं द्वारा कुछ करने का प्रयत्न किया भी गया है तो वह समुद्र में तैरते बराबर है। इसलिये हमारी शिकायत वित्त-मंत्री से रही है और योजना मंत्री से भी है और हमारी उनसे प्रार्थना है कि वह अब भी आंख खोल कर असली भारत की ओर देखें। मैं ने अखबारों में पढ़ा है और मुझे यह देख कर खूबसी हुई कि अब योजना कमिशन ने कहा है कि आगे जो भी योजना बनायी जायगी वह गांवों से प्रारम्भ होगी। यह शुभ चिन्ह है कि योजना मंत्री ने यह बात देश के सामने रख दी है।

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

बहुत समय नहीं हैं, इसलिये मैं जब और बातों को छोड़कर एक ही विषय पर ज्यादा जोर देना चाहता हूँ। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस योजना समीक्षण ने, योजना मंत्री ने और हमारी सरकार ने गांवों की उपेक्षा का है, और उसका प्रमाण यह है कि जहाँ एक ओर उन्होंने कुछ नौदियों को बांधने की योजना के लिये अरबों रुपये खर्च किया है वहाँ उन्होंने गांवों के लिये एक छोट्टा सा परन्तु अत्यन्त आवश्यक कार्य नहीं किया है जिससे उत्पादन में जल्द में जल्द वृद्धि होती और करोड़ों किसानों की एक भारी कठिनाई दूर होती। वह यह है कि उन्होंने यह प्रबन्ध नहीं किया है कि हिन्दुस्तान के गांवों के छोट्टे छोट्टे किसानों की और दस्तकारों को अपने कामों को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये आसानी से, और कम व्याज पर बिना तरद्दुद ऋण मिल सके।

योजना में कहा गया है कि हमारा उद्देश्य यह है कि हमारा देश में कोओपरेटिव कामनवैलथ की स्थापना हो। मैं इस सहकारी कामनवैलथ का अनुवाद 'सहकारी सर्वोदय' के रूप में करता हूँ। सहकारी का अर्थ तो यह है कि जिस सर्वसाधारण मितकर करें। और कामनवैलथ का अर्थ सबों का कल्याण अर्थात् सर्वोदय है। यह कहा गया है कि हमारे मुल्क की समस्याओं का समाधान तब तक नहीं हो सकता जब तक कि हम सहकारिता को राष्ट्र के जीवन में नहीं बढ़ायेंगे, लेकिन अगर कोई सहकारिता के कार्यों को देखे, उसके संगठन का देखे और राज्य सरकारों और केंद्रीय सरकार से उसके सम्बन्धों को देखे तो उसे निराशा ही होगी। यह बात सही है कि गांवों में कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज की संख्या में कुछ वृद्धि हो गयी है लेकिन हम गांव के रहने वाले हैं हम जानते हैं कि हमारे देश की आर्थिक समस्या का हल करने में इन सोसाइटीज ने कितना भाग लिया है। मैं मानता हूँ कि इन कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज का उद्देश्य खराब नहीं है। लेकिन जो उनके चलाने वाले लोग हैं, चाहे वे सरकारी आदमी हों या गांवों के रहने

वाले लोग हों, उन्होंने इस उद्देश्य को ठीक से समझा नहीं है। खुशी की बात है कि अभी रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के द्वारा जो एक कमेटी बनायी गयी थी उसने सारा देश के देहाती क्षेत्र को आर्थिक अवस्था विशेषकर साख्त (credit) और ऋण-व्यवस्था का सर्वे किया है और उन्होंने अपनी रिपोर्ट देश के सामने रखी है। जहाँ तक संग्रह ख्याल है उस रिपोर्ट में जो भी सिफारिशें की गयी हैं वे गांवों के हितों को सामने रख कर ही की गयी हैं। जैसा कि उस रोज वित्त मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि वह उस रिपोर्ट के कुछ मूलभूत सिद्धान्तों को मानते हैं, जैसे कि एक राज्य बैंक की स्थापना के सिद्धान्त को। परन्तु उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि उस पर पूर्ण तौर पर अमल करने में और सारा विवरण तय करने में उनको समय लगेगा। यह ठीक है पर ऐसा नहीं कि इन सिफारिशों को कार्यान्वित करने में अत्यधिक समय लग जाय। मुझे खुशी है कि पार्लियामेंट में और बाहर इस बात पर इतने दिनों तक जोर देने के बाद देहाती और खेती के लिये वित्त और साख्त सम्बन्धी यह रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने आयी है। मैं अपने वित्त मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि हमारे गांवों के छोट्टे छोट्टे दस्तकार और दस्तकार हमारे राष्ट्रशरीर की रीढ़ की हड्डी हैं। अगर उनको अपना काम चलाने के देने का प्रबन्ध शीघ्र नहीं किया जायगा तो यह हमारी रीढ़ की हड्डी टूट जायगी और देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था चकनाचूर हो जायगी। हिन्दु-लिये कम तरद्दुद से और कम सूद पर ऋण स्तान की सबसे बड़ी और जबरदस्त बीमारी गरीबी है। हमने अपने संविधान में डाइरेक्टिव प्रिन्सिपल्स आफ स्टेट पॉलिसी में उसकी दया रखी है। प्लानिंग समीक्षण वाले भी इस बात को स्वीकार करते हैं कि हमें गांवों की उन्नति करनी चाहिये और पुरानी गरीबी को हटाना चाहिये। जब यहाँ उद्योग सम्बन्धी नीति पर विचार किया गया था उस समय भी यह स्वीकार किया गया था। मंत्री जी भी इस की आवश्यकता को स्वीकार करते हैं किन्तु जब इसको अमल में लाने का अवसर आता है तो यह काम

पीछे पड़ जाता है और गांवों की समस्या इस नहीं होती है और बांधों की आर्थिक उन्नति नहीं हो पाती है। मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहूंगा। मैं केवल यही कहूंगा कि जो इस में आज सबसे पीछे हैं, जो बुरे हैं इन गांव वालों की और जल्दी से जल्दी ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये। हमको सहकारीता आन्दोलन को छोड़ें से छोड़ें गांवों तक पहुँचना चाहिये। सरिक खेती की और ग्रामीणों की उन्नति हो। हमको इस भरोसे नहीं रहना चाहिये कि जब दूसरी कमेटी बनेगी तो वह इस काम को करेगी। ऐसा करने से जो छोटी चीजें बँध और लग जायेंगी।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा। मुझे याद नहीं कि हमारा प्रधान मंत्री भी ने वह बात संसद में कही थी या बाहर कही थी परन्तु वह मुझे याद है कि विशेष प्रशिक्षण के विषय पर बोलते हुए उन्होंने कहा था कि हमारे अफसरों को विदेशों में ट्रेनिंग के लिये जाने की उत्तनी आवश्यकता नहीं है। उन्होंने आवेश के साथ कहा था कि हमारे अफसरों को प्रशिक्षण के लिये वर्षा जाना चाहिये, जिसका अर्थ यह है कि हमारे अफसरों को गांवों में जाना चाहिये और गांव वालों को समझना और उनके साथ काम करना चाहिये। वह सबसे महत्वपूर्ण ट्रेनिंग है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि पाँच वर्षीय योजना को सफल बनाने में जितना सहयोग हमको देना चाहिये था वह हमने नहीं दिया, लेकिन इस योजना को सफल बनाने के लिये जो सबसे बड़ी चीज थी वह नहीं की गयी। आज जो हमारे अफसर हैं मैं उनकी बिन्दा नहीं करता हूँ। मैं मानता हूँ कि वे लोग मेहनती हैं और उनमें से बहुत से लोग ईमानदार भी हैं, लेकिन मैं यह कहूंगा कि हमारे गांवों में जो गरीबी की समस्या है, जो बेकारी की समस्या है, उसको हल करने के लिये जिस सहानुभूति और उदारता की और मिलनसारि की भावना की आवश्यकता है उसकी उनमें काफी कमी रही है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था कि हमारे कर्मचारी कोट और टाई पहन कर जनता के साथ नहीं बैठ सकते हैं और उसके बीच अच्छी तरह से काम नहीं कर सकते हैं। मैं समझता

हूँ कि उन्होंने यह एक अच्छा मंत्र देना चाहा कि वे साधारण जनता से मिलकर काम करना सीखें। लेकिन मैं दूँगा कि हमारे अफसरों उस मंत्र को सुनते तो हैं लेकिन कार्य रूप में परिणत नहीं करते हैं। मतलब यह कि हमको इस योजना को पूरा करने के लिये सरकारी अफसरों और कर्मचारियों में ऊपर से नीचे तक, उनकी भावना में आमूल परिवर्तन लाना होगा। उनकी नियुक्ति, प्रशिक्षण आदि में इस बात पर काफी ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा। प्लानिंग कमीशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा था कि हम प्रशासन की नियुक्ति प्रशिक्षण और निरीक्षण सम्बन्धी नियमों को बदलेंगे, उनका पुनर्संगठन करेंगे। लेकिन जो रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने है उसमें मुझे इसके सम्बन्ध में कहीं भी जिक्र नहीं मिला है। हमारे योजना मंत्री भी इस बात को मानते हैं लेकिन हमको यह नहीं मालूम होता है कि हम सरकारी सेवा के प्रशिक्षण, नियुक्ति और निरीक्षण आदि के नियमों में परिवर्तन करने में कहाँ तक सफल हुए हैं।

दूसरी बात, सभापति महोदय, मैं औद्योगिक विकास के सम्बन्ध में प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पब्लिक सेक्टर के विषय में कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारे मित्र जो इस विषय में बोलें वे वह बाहर बोलें गये हैं। उन्होंने भी इस बात पर जोर दिया था। यह बात सही है कि यदि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में उत्पादन करने वाले को नफा नहीं होगा तो प्राइवेट सेक्टर काम ही क्यों करेगा। साथ ही नफे की प्रवृत्ति पर नियंत्रण रखना भी अधिक जरूरी है। बावजूद इस बात के कि हम लोग इस बात पर जोर देते आ रहे हैं पिछले पाँच वर्षों में हमने देखा है कि जब मौका आया है कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर अपना पूरा पूरा पार्ट जवाब करे और अपनी पूँजी के साथ विकास के काम में आगे आये, और बावजूद इसके कि उनको हमेशा कंसेशन दिया अर्थात् दी जाती रही है, प्राइवेट सेक्टर अपनी पूँजी को छिपाता रहा है और हमेशा उसी मुनाफे वाली भावना को लेकर औद्योगिक विकास के कार्यों में आगे आया है। मेरा ख्याल है कि अभी कुछ दिनों तक हमें प्राइवेट सेक्टर को अपने दश में काम का मौका देना है लेकिन

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

नके की जो प्रवृत्ति है उस पर सख्त नियंत्रण रखना है और साथ ही उनके अन्दर काम करने वाले व्यवस्थापक एजेंटों के कमीशन बगैरह तथा उनके कर्मचारियों के वेतन पर भी प्रतिबंध लगाना है। मैं इन शब्दों के साथ उम्मीद करता हूँ कि जो भी वाजना आगे बनेगी वह गांवों के अधिकतम कल्याण के आधार पर बनेगी और गांवों के अन्दर जाव जो गरीबी, बीमारी, और बेकारी आदि की समस्याएँ हैं उन्हें हल करने की अगली वाजना द्वारा पूरी कोशिश की जायेगी।

Mr. Chairman: I want to make an announcement. There is a slight change in the programme. The Delimitation Commission (Amendment) Bill will be taken up tomorrow just after the Question Hour, so that after its being passed it may be sent to the other House.

MESSAGE FROM THE RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of the Rajya Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1954, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 17th December, 1954, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill".

The Lok Sabha then, adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 23rd December, 1954.