

1789 *Resolution' re:*
mobilising public

[RAJYA SABHA] *enthusiasm and support* 1790
for 2nd Five Year Plan

[Shri K. D. Malaviya.] located at the intermediate stage between the oilfield; and Farauni in addition to having a refinery at Barauni. Government have already appointed consultants to undertake the pipeline survey from the oilfields to the refinery sites and also for the refinery project studies. The sizes, actual locations and the patterns of production to be adopted for the two refineries now proposed to be established in the public sector will be determined after receipt and examination of the project reports. The first of the two refineries is likely to be located somewhere in Assam and it is possible that this refinery will be on stream within about three years, from now.

**PRIVATE MEMBER'S RESOLUTION
REGARDING MOBILISING PUBLIC
ENTHUSIASM AND SUPPORT FOR
THE SECOND FIVE YEAR PLAN—**

continued

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): Mr" Chairman, this Resolution that has been moved by my hon. friend, Prof. Malkani, in this House today gives us an opportunity to speak about certain aspects of our Plan which so far have not been, in our opinion, fully discussed or brought to light. We have been discussing the targets of the Plan, the resources for the Plan, the foreign exchange required for the Plan and such other matters, but the question of organising the people to achieve the targets of the Plan, to see that waste is avoided, to see that maximum efforts bring forth the maximum results, the other aspects of the Plan and the functioning of the Plan have not been discussed thoroughly and these could be discussed today when this Resolution is under discussion.

Sir, it is a tragic reality that lack of organisation—and I should add lack of co-ordination—between the various wings of economic activity in our country is leading to very serious

difficulties. May I draw your attention, and through you the attention of the House, to one single fact? We are having so many projects. The labour project is there; the contractors to mobilise the labour are there, and the Government administration is there. Now, Sir, there is a tendency to depend on the administration, on the bureaucracy, on the officials for the entire execution of the schemes. Even in projects of public sector it is the administration and the contractor who are playing the major role, in fact the main role. The labourers in a public project like Nagarjunasagar or Bhakra-Nagal or any other project feel that they are just employees of the concern. The atmosphere created is not one that one should really have co-operative endeavour in building a national project. May I suggest, Sir, that we should organise a certain committee or a Project Committee which should include not only the representatives of the labour, not only the representatives of the administration in charge of the project, but which should also represent the people of that locality or of that district. That would, I think, create the necessary enthusiasm in that area and a sense of responsibility and cooperation in the labour concerned and the people at large in the locality will all be interested in implementing the target concerning that project and they will all be interested in seeing that waste is avoided and the maximum output is put in in order to get the best results in the least time and with the least amount expended.

Sir, May I also draw your attention to such projects as the community projects? I think during the last session I had an opportunity in the debate on the Appropriation Bill to say something about the difficulty in the community project areas. Now, Sir, you have taken a decision that the activities of the Social Welfare Board will be more or less confined to the areas of community development and national extension service. At the village level and at the level where

community development and social welfare. If activities are going on, they are together. There is a sort of co-ordination. But you do not find that at all levels. Is there any co-ordination between the various departments of the State Governments? For example, there is the Co-operative Department; there is the Revenue Department; there is the Forest Department; there is the Agriculture Department; there is the Labour Department and there is the Small Scale and Cottage Industries Department. Now, Sir, the community development work is done in a particular area and the national extension service work is done in a particular area. Well, a co-operative society is organised or is sought to be organised, but the organisation of a co-operative society and getting the necessary funds for that society is itself a very tedious job. Rural cooperative credit societies are organised for getting the credit supplied by the Reserve Bank. But to what extent has the farmer or the organiser of that co-operative society to draw attendance on the officers concerned in order to get funds or to get the benefits of the schemes which were otherwise promulgated? For example the Forest Department does not cooperate. In a particular area any dam or shrub becomes a forest and it cannot be cleared for the simple reason that the Forest Department does not know anything as to what the community development department is doing. Sir, we have the Irrigation Department. Minor irrigation is the job of that department. In the community development areas people have become newly conscious, and they are also co-operating with the community development authorities for the development of certain things. But does the Irrigation Department of the State Government concerned move with the same speed, or at least with half the speed, with which the people there are moving? The Agriculture Department does not co-operate. Its technical wing does not co-operate. So, Sir, this is a very serious problem. We have decided on a Plan; we have decided on certain activities and cer-

tain targets, and we have also decided on certain resources. But when the organisation is lacking, when the co-ordination is lacking, when the necessary business-like approach towards our problems is lacking, obviously the Plan suffers. Whatever the targets may be there, they are not achieved and our resources are thus wasted. So, Sir, this is a very serious question and there is no doubt about it.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Therefore, Sir, there is an absolute necessity for organising such committees to enlist the co-operation of various sections so that we could create and generate the necessary enthusiasm of the people in this national endeavour. There should be certain co-operative efforts of all the sections concerned.

Sir, we have organised the Bharat Sewak Samaj. I have nothing to say about it. But our Government is thinking more in terms of Bharat Sadhu Samaj, thus wasting lot of time. I do not know if these Sadhus with their slogan of 'Alakh Niranjana' can ever bring about our projects. I do not know to what extent it is possible. I can understand mobilisation of industrialists with their accumulated capital. I can understand mobilisation of labour. But I cannot understand mobilisation of Sadhus and all the paraphernalia that they possess.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan):
For spiritual salvation.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Government is wasting lot of time. (*Interruption.*) Let them go on with their own moral re-armament. We are more interested in the economic re-armament of our country. Let us carry on with this business that we have taken up in our hands. Therefore, Sir, this question of organisation has to be taken up seriously. I am sorry I may not agree . . .

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): What about the district boards?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Yes, the district boards are there. They must be given more authority and more power. Their co-operation has to be enlisted. They are a very good instrument of public co-operation in this matter, and there is no doubt about it. (Interruption) Sometimes, they are not being elected at all. In my unfortunate State, District Board elections are not to be held at all. Sir, I am glad that Mr. Bisht has provoked me to certain things to which I was just going to refer. But before doing that, I might submit that I am not in agreement with the suggestion made by my friend, Dr. Thomas, that our labour here is lazy, and they are not getting up early etc. I do **not agree with** him for the simple reason that in spite of no incentive, in spite of so much of red-tapism, in spite of the rising cost, and in spite of lack of recreation in the places where projects are being undertaken, our workers are working very hard. That throws a flood of light on the capacity and the potentiality of our labour. Take for example the vast areas in the Nagarjunasagar area. Labour from all over the area has been mobilized there. Though proper water arrangements are not there, and health arrangements are not proper, still the workers are working there suffering from all sorts of troubles. You must understand the capacity of our labour to sacrifice by living away from their families and working in the midst of difficulties. So I think the idea that there is something wrong with our labour or even with our traditions is wrong. My only contention is that in the days of hostile **British bureaucracy**, we did not depend on the bureaucracy. We organised the people for so much work. I want to know, after having attained freedom, after having got full control over that bureaucracy, why is it that you are not able to mould the bureaucracy in the new spirit of democracy and cooperative endeavour with the people? Why is it that you are failing to organise the people? Because, the wrong is with our administrators, the fault is with them. They have forgot-

ten the tradition of not depending on hostile bureaucracy and to organise the people themselves. They have forgotten it. They have given up this attitude and after having come to power, instead of remoulding this bureaucracy into a new democratic spirit, instead of mobilizing the people for attaining these targets, they are depending on the same age-old bureaucracy. That is the whole defect. Why not we remould it? Why cannot we enlist the co-operation of the people for the national Plan? The local bodies that my friend Shri Bisht suggested, will be very important instruments in mobilising the people but the whole difficulty is that the entire attitude towards these local bodies, I am afraid, is hostile. There are supersessions of Panchayats, not allowing District Boards to be formed at all or having nominated District Boards, even municipalities and **Town** Committees. The whole attitude towards these local bodies has to be very seriously revised and examined. Let us have duly elected local bodies with due responsibility on them. You are talking of minor irrigation. **The** Panchayats in a village would be able to mobilise the entire peasantry for repairing the particular tank which benefits them directly but our minor Irrigation Department will not move because they want the whole system of contractors, they must mobilize labour, bulldozers and all the machinery. We talk of having more and more labour intensive programmes because we have to save foreign exchange in the matter of purchase of machinery. If that is the position, if one has to have more and more labour intensive programme, then one must mobilize more and more people. Then it is the job of the administrators to organise the people. We have to organise the people. It will be the job of these local bodies who will do it with credit.

Sir, we do feel that Prof. Malkani's Resolution has given an opportunity to this House to throw light on these particular aspects of our Planning in this country which so far have **not**

1795 Resolution re:
mobilising public

[6 DEC. 1957] *enthusiasm and support* 1796
for 2nd Five Year Plan

been given due consideration and thought.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Resolution is important in this way that it is brought at a crucial period of difficulty for the Plan. Now I will offer my remarks on three points, as regards industrial production and targets, agricultural production and targets and the co-operation of the student community which is most essential for the Plan. Now with regard to the industrial sector, I am quite confident that 90 per cent, of the target will be fulfilled. What is the reason? In spite of all the difficulties, the industrial and commercial community is fully prepared to meet the needs of the country and they think that whatever is allotted to them, they must try to fulfil and it shows that they have greater ability and greater power to fulfil if more is allocated to them which I think is denied to them and is reserved for the public sector. That does not matter. But even this development which is envisaged for the private sector would be retarded owing to the difficulties that have been created during the last 12 months by various acts of the Government. First of all I want to point out some of them. Take the Wealth Tax on companies. It is a new tax that is levied in no part of the world except in two small countries. Now we are going in an academic and theoretical manner in the matter of finances of the country. I say that the companies should be considered as corporate bodies and whatever is left with them in reserves is for development. When this tax was levied, I told this House and I again point out, that the company should be exempted from such tax for such funds as are employed for industrial development of the country, for land, building and machinery. Any economist or financier or any man who has the grip of finances and economy and the development and the need for industrial enthusiasm and initiative will have to admit that this is necessary. If people-

ple want to invest for industrial production, why tax them? They are not taking away anything with them. They are adding to the production and they are making all efforts to have additional production. So I say, unless and until this tax is removed, there will be a lull in the development climate of industrial development.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Will you also include private limited companies?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: They should not be taxed to the extent that they employ their funds for capital and machinery. If a private limited company is fully employing its funds for land, building and machinery for industrial development, that should be exempted, whether it is private limited company or otherwise. I mean to the extent that those funds are employed for land, building and machinery they should be exempted. For the rest, for working capital etc. you may tax. I don't deny that. But whatever is invested for production should not be taxed. The difference should be properly understood. That is the point I am making. It is very much against the principle of any development, industrial or economic.

I then come to the expenditure tax. It is not going to bring any big revenue. You have levied it at a rate that cannot be justified. Prof Kaldor has made the recommendation that income-tax and super-tax should be upto the maximum extent of 45 per cent, and then you can levy Wealth and Expenditure taxes. If we had followed that suggestion, I would have agreed to these taxes but by keeping the income tax and super-tax at this highest level, I think you have practically wiped off the whole industrial enthusiasm and initiative in the country. I think we shall have to be alive to this situation, if we want to achieve our target in the public sector. Then there is compulsory deposits system under which funds which are lying with them, the companies have to deposit with the Government. You can levy tax on reserves which are not employed on industrial development-

[Shri C. P. Parikh.] merit. There are so many ways of taxing companies but don't tax them for industrial growth and development. You are asking for deposits from those who are debtors. That is the position. That is not a good thing.

Then as regards labour, we have one legislation that even if a company is making financial losses, which it cannot bear and on which account the company will have to go into liquidation, even then we have to give layoff and retrenchment benefits for a long period. That would amount to half the wages they draw at present. As a matter of fact, I know that in the textile industry at present about a hundred out of four hundred mills are making a loss. But they cannot close their mills. They are making a loss to the extent of Rs. 25,000 per month on an average; but if they close, then they would have to pay Rs. 50,000 a month to pay the idle labour, because they cannot sell their goods. They cannot sell their goods at a little lower than the price of production even. They cannot sell it unless it be at a heavy loss. I think this law also is creating difficulties. Therefore, what I say is, if we want to develop our industries to meet the requirements of this ambitious Plan, then we shall have to revise our views in respect of conducting industrial enterprises in a manner that is suited to our Plan.

We want foreign aid and we are asking for foreign aid. I can say that foreign aid to the extent of Rs. 500 crores can come for the private sector to help the development of certain industries, because the investors in these foreign countries have greater reliance on the private sector's capacity of development than on that of the public sector. At the State to State level there are negotiations for the bigger enterprises. But for smaller concerns, of say Rs. 2 or Rs. 5 crores, foreigners are willing to invest in this country, if there is Indian collaboration and such foreign aid to the extent of the smaller requirements

of the Plan can come and it can amount to as much as Rs. 500 crores. But Indians cannot raise the corresponding capital in this country because of an unfavourable climate prevailing now in the country. That fact should not be lost sight of. We must be realistic in the matter of industrial investment.

We have to organise our exports. How are we to meet our liabilities as regards our imports unless we adopt measures of a radical nature to encourage our exports? I have not the time now to explain what those measures are. Anyhow it must be seen that we increase our exports to the extent of 25 per cent. That is the only way to get the imports we need. There is no golden way of getting our imports into this country. We should export to the extent of 25 per cent, more and we have to organise measures in order to achieve this objective. Only then can we make progress. We are denied foreign aid or foreign aid does not come in. That is because those who want to invest in this country do not know what is the policy of our Government. It is not, in their opinion, very clearly defined. We know it has been defined. But what I want to point out here is that it has been represented in other countries that our leanings are towards Communism. Why is there this misrepresentation? We detest Communism to the maximum degree. But we have not expressed it formally. We do not like Communism, especially on one account, that is because there is element of violence and denial of individual liberty and the denial of individual expression of opinion. That is the main reason why we Indians will detest Communism. Other reasons also may be there. This suppression of individual liberty and the suppression of liberty of association, this country will never accept.

Next I come to the question of agricultural production. Without better agricultural production we can make no progress. We are talking much about the agriculturist's lot. We talk

1799 Resolution re:
mobilising public

[6 DEC. 1957] *enthusiasm and support* 1800
for 2nd Five Year Plan

of helping the cultivators and we profess loud sympathy and there is tall talk. But there is very little of action. The Rural Credit Survey Report is of closely typed 600 pages. I have gone through all their recommendations and I feel if these recommendations are implemented in full, our agricultural production will go up by 30 per cent. It talks of 11he yield per acre. It talks of measures for seed distribution. It talks of improving the agriculturist's position. It talks of giving additional employment through cottage industries. It talks of marketing of the agricultural products. It talks of giving employment through the Ambar Charkha. It talks of maximum and minimum prices to be assured to the cultivator. It also talks of supplying raw materials and stores to the cultivators at cheaper cost. But there is no agency to attend to these things.

At present the cultivator while buying his goods is being exploited to the extent of 20 to 30 per cent. While selling his goods also he is being exploited to the extent of 30 per cent. How can the cultivator stand this? Unless we establish co-operative societies on the lines recommended in the Rural Credit Survey Report and give ample funds by contributing to these co-operative societies even to the extent of 90 per cent, as suggested in that report, the lot of the cultivator cannot improve. It is no use leaving it all to the cultivator because he is in a miserable position. Unless we assist the cultivators by finance, we will not be able to succeed. But unfortunately we are not alive to this situation.

I. was very glad to hear the ex-Minister Shri M. C. Shah say yesterday that he was a layman in finance and economics. He said that in all humility, but I think he said it in understanding also. I do consider him to be a layman in full finance and economics even after his experience of five years as a Minister, because to be an adept in one's own department practical experience is necessary. If Mr. Shah had this practical experi-

85 RSD—2.

ence, he would not have been a layman. But he had not the necessary practical experience and therefore he admitted and admitted frankly that he is a layman. I can say, Sir, that so many of our Ministers manning some of the important and key departments are still laymen in their own departments and the sooner they understand that, the better.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Pradesh):
You say they were laymen?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: They were and they are. And owing to absence of the practical experience there is centralisation of power. The Ministers do not want to part with their power. There are some 4,000 elected representatives of the people in the Centre and all the States. But the Ministers do not want to part with their power by consulting even these elected representatives. They concentrate the power in the officials and they are unwilling to part with power in favour of persons who can contribute their experience without asking for power. Mr. Malkani has rightly stated that non-official element is not associated with these efforts and as long as this non-official element is not associated with our efforts, we shall not make a great progress. We have an ambitious plan and we have to fulfil it. We have got the capacity to fulfil it and we have got the capacity to make the necessary sacrifices. But for that we have to create the proper mass enthusiasm. That has to be evoked and this can be evoked only by the representatives of the people. I think many workers and persons of repute are side-tracked at present. They should select Ministers with better knowledge. What is the use of flattery? Certain people will never flatter because they know their service to the country is more important than the service of the Ministers. That they know.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Efficiency is at a discount, is it?

1801 Resolution re:
mobilising public

[RAJYA SABHA] enthusiasm and support 1802
for 2nd Five Year Plan

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: It is at a discount.

Now I come to the subject of students. The student community is very important. But practically we have not looked at it, nor have we looked at the wants of the student community. There are a number of graduates, technical graduates and postgraduates. What payment are we making to them? What opportunities are we able to offer to them? What amount of resentment will there be in them if opportunities are denied to them and they see much less competent persons enjoying greater benefits? That is the position. Therefore, I want to make the suggestion that technical training should be properly utilised and rewarded to the maximum degree. Those who are post-graduates, graduates and graduates with technical training should be employed by Government in factories which are carrying on industries. These graduates should be imposed on these concerns. There are about a thousand factories which can absorb these graduates, these technical graduates. I think if these graduates are not finding employment anywhere in the country, then they should be absorbed in these factories especially when these concerns are making profits. These graduates should be made to join those concerns or they must be imposed on these concerns on a graded scale of salary so that the employers do not dislodge them. I know, Sir, that the heads of many departments of some of these factories are much less clever than these graduates. Technical training facilities should be provided in the country. The progress of our education is lagging to a large extent. How can we finish this Plan unless we have a manpower suitable for it? There is a limited admission to technical colleges. People are denied admission in the technical colleges and engineering colleges.

Now, Sir, the last point is with regard to administration. There is a great dissatisfaction on this account

that the letters and the complaints which are addressed to the Ministries are not replied to even after 12 months in spite of three reminders. If this defect could be rectified, a lot of public resentment and discontent would go. I think every letter must be acknowledged within a period of a week and a thorough reply should be given within a period of three months.

पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। विरोध इस लिये कर रहा हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव में कोई बात निश्चित रूप से नहीं बताई गई है कि सरकार क्या करे। गोल मोल शब्दों में यह बता दिया गया है कि प्लान को सफल बनाने के लिये यह आवश्यक है कि सरकार जनता में प्रत्येक लेवल पर, हर स्तर पर उत्साह पैदा करे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : इस में क्या मत भेद है ?

पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री : मुनिये तब आप को पता चलेगा।

“तासौ मुनिर्यस्य मतं न भिन्नम् ”

बातचीत के बाद, विवाद के बाद, तथ्य निकलता है। बड़ा भारी विरोध इस में है। जब इस प्रस्ताव को हम इस रूप में रखते हैं तो एक कल्पना हमारे मन में बैठ जाती है कि जनता में उत्साह नहीं है और सरकार ने प्लान को चरितार्थ करने के लिए जो योजनाएँ बनाई हैं वे न सफल हैं और न उन के सफल होने की कोई सम्भावना है, जब तक इस प्रस्ताव में बतलाई गई चेतावनी को कार्यान्वित न किया जाय।

जिन लोगों ने पिछले प्लान यानी प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना के परिणाम का देखा है वे यह कह सकते हैं कि सरकार

ने जो कदम उठाये उन से ही वह योजना सफल हुई। उसकी सफलता पर विदेशों से आये लोग चकित हुए हैं। अभी जब उस दिन श्री बुल्गानिन और खुश्चेव यहां आये थे तो उन्हें यह सारा भारत एक कारखाने की शक्ल में नज़र आया था। तो इस बात को देखकर हम यह नहीं कह सकते हैं कि सरकार की कार्य-वाहियों में कोई त्रुटि होने से, कोई खामी होने से इस तरह के परिणाम प्राप्त हुए हैं। जिस तरह से और जिस मशीनरी से सरकार इस काम को कर रही है वह एक उचित मशीनरी है और उसके द्वारा वह काम चलाया जा रहा है। अगर इस प्रस्ताव में कोई बात इस तरह की कही जाती कि हमको यह करना चाहिये, वह करना चाहिये तो वह विचार के योग्य बात होती। अगर मेरे माननीय मित्र श्री मलकानी इस सभा से यह कहते, जैसा कि महात्मा गांधी जी डिग्लिटी आफ लेबर के आधार पर कहते थे कि एक सप्ताह में एक दिन गलियों की सफाई को निकालिये, झाड़ू और फावड़ा अपने कंधों पर रख कर इस काम को करिये, या जिस तरह महात्मा गांधी जी हरिजन-उद्धार के काम के बारे में कहते थे, अगर उसी तरह की बात मेरे माननीय मित्र मलकानी जी के इस प्रस्ताव में होती तो वह एक डिग्लिटीफाइड बात होती। इस प्रस्ताव के बारे में अपने एक मित्र श्री पारिख जी की बात सुन रहा था—प्राइवेट टैक्स, टैक्स, वैल्यू टैक्स, यह टैक्स, वह टैक्स, यह सब उन्होंने इस प्रस्ताव पर सुनाया। ऐसा मालूम होता है कि पेन्डोर के बाक्स से ये सब चीजें निकल आईं। लेकिन प्रस्ताव में इस तरह की कोई चेतावनी नहीं दी गई है कि गवर्नमेंट को क्या चीज करनी चाहिये। प्रस्ताव या रेजुलेशन का मतलब होता है डेफिनिट कोर्स आफ एक्शन बताना और जो मतभेद की बातें होती हैं वह भी बताना। उसमें

कोई निश्चित बात बतलाई जाती है और तभी उसका नाम प्रस्ताव होता है। यह कह देना कि सरकार को यह करना चाहिये और वह करना चाहिये एक सुन्दर बात मालूम होती है। लेकिन यह तो एक ऊंचे स्तर पर और आसमान से बात करना हुआ। अगर उन्होंने प्रस्ताव में सरकार को काम करने के बारे में राय दी होती, कोई नया तरीका बतलाया होता तो बात समझ में आ सकती थी। मगर उन्होंने तो जो खामियां देखीं वे सब बतला दीं। इस प्रस्ताव को रख कर वे सरकार को जो चेतावनी दे रहे हैं उससे तो वे ऐसी गुम-राही पैदा करने वाली बात कर रहे हैं जिस से भोली भाली जनता इसका गलत अर्थ समझ सकती है। हमारे गौड़ साहब इस समय चले गये हैं, नहीं तो मैं अकलमंदी की बात बतलाता जो साधु समाज के संगठन में है। उन्होंने साधु समाज संगठन के बारे में जो बात कही उसमें उन्हें बहुत बड़ी खामियां नज़र आती हैं। वे किसी भी आर्गनाइजेशन का चाहे वह भली भी हो विरोध स्वरूप विरोध करते हैं। अकलमंदी की बात तो यह है कि यह देखा जाय कि किसी चीज का उपयोग किस तरह से किया जाता है। जिस तरह से सूखी पत्तियों को भाड़ में डाल कर उनसे अनाज भूनने का काम हम यहां लेते हैं, लेकिन नारवे के आदमी उससे कागज बनाते हैं जिस तरह से टूटे टूटे शीशों को गला कर अच्छे कांच के नये गिलास बनाये जाते हैं। इसी तरह से जो अकलमंद हैं, समझदार आदमी है, वे गई गुजरी हुई चीजों का भी अच्छी तरह से इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं। जिस तरह से सूखे पत्तों द्वारा हम कागज जैसी सुन्दर चीज बना लेते हैं उसी तरह से हम अगर अकलमंदी से काम लें तो साधु समाज संगठन से भी अपनी योजनाओं के लिये बहुत काम ले सकते हैं। जब आप इस तरह की बात करते हैं तो सारी योजना में, सारे प्लान में अगर आप उसके साहित्य को

[पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री]

पढ़िये तो आपको मिलेगा कि हमारे राज-नीतिक, सामाजिक, और आर्थिक जीवन का कौन सा स्तर है जिसके ऊपर योजना में विचार नहीं किया गया है। क्या सरकार विद्यार्थियों, नागरिकों में इस तरह का प्रचार नहीं कर रही है। सरकार यूथ फेस्टिवल कर रही है जिस में विद्यार्थियों में योजना के बारे में प्रचार हो। देश में ऐसा कौन सा वर्ग रह गया है जिसकी तरफ सरकार की उपेक्षा है। मैं आप से पूछता हूँ कि नान आफिशियल एजेंसी से आप किस तरह से काम कर सकेंगे? अगर कहीं पर जमीन की आवश्यकता होगी तो हमें लैंड एक्वायर करनी होगी, उसके लिए हमको सरकारी कर्मचारियों की आवश्यकता पड़ेगी। नहर चलाने के लिये जमीन की आवश्यकता है, वहाँ पर भी उनकी जरूरत पड़ेगी। इंजीनियरों के बिना नहर नहीं बन सकती पुल नहीं बन सकते हैं, सड़क नहीं बन सकती हैं। तो इस तरह के सब कामों के लिए हमें सरकारी कर्मचारियों की आवश्यकता होगी। जो कुछ भी हम करेंगे वह सरकारी स्तर पर होगा। क्या हम चाहते हैं कि सरकार अलग बैठ जाय। हमारे मित्र मलकानी साहब के प्रस्ताव का हल एक यह हो सकता है कि हम कंस-क्रिप्शन करे। हम फोर्स ले कर इन सब योजनाओं को पूरा करे। हमने देखा कि यू.एस.ए. में विद्यार्थियों ने एक बड़ी नदी का कोर्स बदल दिया और एक बड़ा भारी डेम बना दिया। और वहाँ पर एक बड़ा सुन्दर बिजली घर चलने लगा। यह हमने देखा। यह सब हो सकता है। हमारे विद्यार्थी भी काम कर रहे हैं। जब मैं पी० सी० सी० का प्रेजिडेंट था तो नैनीताल में हम लोगों ने विद्यार्थियों की मदद से सड़क बनवाई और कई तरह के कार्य किये। सरकार की दृष्टि हर तरफ है और वह

योजना को चला रही है। फिर इस प्रस्ताव को लेकर हम सरकारी कार्यवाहियों पर एक बुद्धि भेद पैदा करते हैं और एक संकुचित दृष्टि पैदा करते हैं कि यह असफल सरकार है, कुछ काम नहीं कर रही है। इस तरह की बातें इस प्रस्ताव से पैदा होती हैं। इस लिए मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ। नहीं तो हम बजट के जमाने में, प्रेजिडेंट एंड्रेस के समय, जब बहस होती है उस समय हम सरकार की वृत्तियों और खामियों की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित कर सकते हैं। मगर इस प्रस्ताव का सब से बड़ा दोष यह है कि यह ऊँची भावना का उद्घोष करता है कि यह होना चाहिये, वह होना चाहिये। लेकिन इस में यह नहीं बतलाया गया है कि योजना को किस तरह से कार्यान्वित किया जाना चाहिये, इस दिशा में कोई चेतावनी या दिशा प्रदर्शन नहीं किया गया है। इस लिये यह प्रस्ताव सर्वथा एक गोल मोल चीज है और अक्सरेट करने लायक नहीं है। श्री मलकानी साहब मेरे बड़े पुराने मित्र हैं, उन के दिल में चिन्ता है, उन में फायर है, आग है कि कैसे हमारा देश आगे बढ़े, इसलिये कोई संदेह नहीं कि देश को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये उत्साह (इंयुजिएज्म) में उनका जो डिस्केशन है वह पीछे हट जाता है, जो इंयुजिएज्म है वह आगे बढ़ जाता है। जहाँ डिस्केशन के ऊपर हमारा इंयुजिएज्म अधिकार कर ले वहाँ पर काम बनने के मुकाबिले में बिगड़ता ज्यादा है। इससे सरकार ज्यादा एक्सपोज हो जाती है। प्रस्ताव में कोई रास्ता नहीं बतलाया गया है और न कोई चेतावनी दी गई है, यह तो बुद्धि भेद पैदा करता है। प्रस्ताव में जो यह शब्द है "आर्गनाइज दी पीपुल ऐट लेविल्स", इस शब्द के माने क्या हैं? यह तो लाजिकल बात नहीं है, यह तो एक तर्कहीन बात हो जाती है। हर लेवल में, हर आदमी को, पूरा जनता को, ओबलाइज करना, ये शब्द तो ऐसे हैं जिन्हें अनवसायी हेल्थभास कहा जा

सफ़ता है। प्रस्ताव में डायरेक्टिव होना चाहिये था। अगर प्रस्ताव में इस तरह की बात स्पष्ट की जाती, तो हम कह सकते कि प्रस्ताव स्पष्ट है, किन्तु इसमें तो कोई बात भी स्पष्ट नहीं है। अतः यह प्रस्ताव निरर्थक मालूम पड़ता है। अगर आप यह कहें कि जनता के ऊपर सरकार जबर-दस्ती काम लाद दे और यह कहे कि सप्ताह में एक दिन झाड़ू लेकर नगर की नालियों और सड़कों की सफ़ाई करनी होगी, तो यह एक तरह से तानाशाही हो जायेगी। इस तरह की बात तो सरकार ला सकती है मगर वह जनता से इस तरह की बेगार नहीं ले सकती है जब कि उसने बेगार को दूर करने के लिये कानून बनाया है। तो फिर किस तरह से यह जनता आर्गनाइज होगी। ये सब बात इस प्रस्ताव से स्पष्ट नहीं होनी हैं और प्रस्ताव बिल्कुल बेकार है, गोल मोल है। यह भावनाएं ऊंची रखता है लेकिन उन भावनाओं को चरितार्थ करने के लिए कोई पत्र प्रदर्शन नहीं है, इसलिये यह प्रस्ताव फेंक देने लायक है और अस्वीकार होना चाहिये।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Resolution standing in the name of Mr. H. P. Saksena was moved in his characteristic way by Professor Malkani this morning. The other aspects of the Plan have been discussed in this House many times but the one particular aspect of public co-operation which this Resolution seeks to bring in the forefront has evoked new thoughts and the discussion that we have had today has been very profitable in one way. We have had the views of the industrialists, labour leaders and other sections of thought. All are of opinion that in order to make the Plan a success public co-operation is essential. In his speech just now concluded, Shri Algu Raiji Shastri has taken a very different view and it is not understood why such a non-controversial Resolution as the one before the House should

have excited him into making a speech of the kind which he delivered. From the very start, as soon as the Plan was undertaken by the Government some seven years ago, the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Centre as well as in the various States have been stressing the point that if the Plan has to succeed, the co-operation of the public and every section of the public is essential and that merely on the efforts of the Government alone this Plan will not succeed. This Resolution before the House today stresses the same point of view. We heard this morning that the Panchayats and the district boards—in fact the co-operation of the local bodies—can mobilise public co-operation. We also heard about the youth movement being mobilised and so on and so forth. So far as the local bodies are concerned, Sir, I feel that they can play a very big part in this line only if they are properly elected. Prof. Malkani laid very great stress on panchayats and some of the other speakers also spoke at length about the district boards and the part they could play in evoking public co-operation. I know that in many of the States the people composing the panchayats or the district boards are nominated. Of course, conditions vary from State to State but the point is that the district boards and some times even the panchayats cannot command the respect of the people. In my own State particularly, and I think it is the same in other States also, I know that the panchayats are composed mainly on the basis of communities. In a village, the panches are selected from the community which is in a majority. In such circumstances, if works like these are given to the panchayats, the people will not have any faith that justice and fair-play will be meted out to them. Similarly, Sir, the district boards cannot command any respect whatsoever from the public. Therefore, in theory we can say that the Panchayats and district boards can play a very big part in mobilising public co-operation but in practice in the States if the panchayats and district boards are given

1809 *Resolution re:*
mobilising public

[RAJYA SABHA] *enthusiasm and support* 1810
for 2nd Five Year Plan

[Shri Jaswant Singh.] funds or are put in charge of the works under the Five Year Plan, whatever little co-operation there is on the part of the people will be withdrawn. That unfortunately has been our experience. Therefore, Sir, first of all, the Central Government and the State Governments have to see that the panchayats and the district boards are made representative of public opinion, that they are composed and elected in such a manner that people will have confidence in them. Only when such conditions are created will public opinion be favourably inclined and this will go a long way in making this Five Year Plan a success. My reading of the situation is a bit different. All these things are very necessary. Our Prime Minister, wherever he goes, appeals for public co-operation and mass enthusiasm for the Plan but it is all right so far as the theory is concerned but in practice, the position is very different and unless Government, in distributing the funds and in distributing the industries to the various States, takes an impartial attitude, public co-operation would not be forthcoming in spite of the efforts of Government on these lines. Sir, we got independence some ten years ago and soon after that, Government undertook the planning. What has been our experience? Our experience is this that while in theory the Prime Minister and the other Ministers have been clamouring for public co-operation, in actual practice, what has happened is something different. Have the Government tried to see that the States which are backward, where the living standards of the people are very low, are given a fair deal by the Government?

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): What do you mean by Government?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Have they been fair to the States which are backward? Have they been fail in distributing industries, in distributing funds

and in removing the disparity that exists from State to State? That is what I meant. At the time when the first Five Year Plan was launched, the States in our vast country were at various stages of development. Some were very progressive, some very industrialised; in some States agriculture and irrigation were at an advanced stage while there were States which were very backward. Now, what did the Government do? At the time of the launching of this first Plan, whichever State was most clamorous, whichever State had got more power, whichever State could use its influence, got the lion's share in respect of industrialisation, agriculture, construction of dams, hydro-electric power stations and so on and so forth. Did all the States get an equal share in this huge amount of money that went round in the first Five Year Plan? Sir, take the case of Rajasthan. Unfortunately, the Congress Government in Rajasthan was not very strong. They did not have much pull with the Central Government. What did they get? Even when equal conditions existed in regard to several matters, the claim of Rajasthan was completely overlooked because other powerful States intervened and brought to bear upon the Centre their influence and pressure.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Why do you say that? U.P. got nothing.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: U.P. may be one of the unfortunate States. In other respects also, if we are to see the figures of the money that has been allotted either in the first Plan or in the second Plan, I do not think U.P. has got much ground for grouse as some of the other States have. You now want the co-operation and the enthusiasm of the people of Rajasthan to make the Plan a success. As far as that is concerned, are you justified in expecting the people to have this enthusiasm? How can we say that the country is one and they should be so selfless as not to care for their own affairs? I am sorry to say that such

sacrifices cannot be expected at this stage.

Now, Sir, Rajasthan was one of the States which was very backward, industrially and in other respects also. What did they get in the First Five Year Plan? What enthusiasm and cooperation can be expected from the people in such circumstances when they see other States nearby already very rich, also industrially developed? Even then because of the influence they bring to bear on the Government they get more money and they could spend further. Look at the prosperity next door and the conditions of near starvation in Rajasthan. Now there was in the First Five Year Plan the proposal to open fertilizer factories in different parts of the country. Nearly 10,000 people would have got work if a fertilizer factory could have been opened in Rajasthan. The conditions in Rajasthan were no less favourable. In fact the raw material that was available in Rajasthan was of a much better type than in the places where the factory was opened.

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will try to wind up in two minutes, Sir. What I want to submit is this, Sir, that these regional disparities are very serious impediments in inviting co-operation and help from the people. Not only are there regional disparities but also in the same State there is disparity in the districts and divisions. It is because of various factors and when people see that one district is prosperous while the other district is starving we cannot expect enthusiasm from the people and co-operation from the people in making the Plan a success. Therefore, Sir, in winding up I will say that the youth movement, cooperation from the panchayats, cooperation from the district Boards and all the other things are very necessary, but according to me the most necessary thing in inviting the enthus-

iasm and co-operation from the public is this, that the Central Government has to be fair to all the States, and not only have they to be fair but also where conditions exist equally or even where the conditions are a little less favourable as in the backward areas, they have to be given more help than has so far been given, and if this is forthcoming and this is being done, co-operation will be forthcoming in abundance from the people and there will be all round enthusiasm for this Plan.

Thank you.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) :

मा० डिपुटी चैयरमैन महोदय, अभी इस सदन में प्रोफेसर मलकानी जी ने द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना को अच्छी तरह सम्पादित करने के लिये तथा उसके लक्ष्य की पूर्ति के लिये जनता के सहयोग और सहायता लेने के विषय में प्रस्ताव जो पेश किया है मैं उसका तहेदिल से समर्थन करता हूँ क्योंकि यह जानी हुई बात है कि जब गवर्नमेंट ने समाजवाद का लक्ष्य सामने रखा है तब उस समाजवाद की स्थापना के लिए जब तक हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजना ठीक तरह से सफली भूत नहीं होती तब तक हम उसे सिद्ध नहीं कर सकते। इस दृष्टि से यह प्रस्ताव बहुत ही उपयुक्त और समयोचित है। हालांकि अलगूराय शास्त्री जी ने इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करते हुए कहा कि इस में कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है या कोई चीज नहीं कही गई है कि जिससे यह बात प्रकट होती है कि यह प्रस्ताव लाना जरूरी है लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि हमारी प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना पूरी हुई और कोई पांच वर्ष का समय उसमें लगा और उसके बाद द्वितीय पंच वर्षीय योजना चल रही है और उनके अनुसार जो कार्य सारे हिन्दुस्तान में हुआ है उसकी तुलना आप रूस और चीन से करें तो आपको मालूम

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

होगा कि वहां भी इस तरह की योजनाएं एक के बाद एक आती हैं लेकिन वहां योजना के साथ सरकार भी चलती है और उसके साथ जनता भी चलती है। हमारे देश में योजना को चलाने के लिए काफी संगठन (आर्गनाइजेशन) हो रहा है। भारत सेवक समाज का सहयोग मिल रहा है, गवर्नमेंट की सारी मशीनरी लगी हुई है, और जितनी भी देश के अन्दर पार्टियां हैं, इंडियन नेशनल कांग्रेस से लेकर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, पी० एम० पी० आदि, ये तमाम पार्टियां कहती हैं कि हम इस योजना की पूर्ति के लिये, इसके लक्ष्य की सिद्धि के लिए काम कर रहे हैं, लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि यहां पर यह सिर्फ सरकार की चीज़ रह गई है और जनता से इसका कोई सरोकार नहीं है। जैसा कि हमारे और पूर्ववक्ताओं ने भी कहा है और जैसा कि पहले भी कहा जा चुका है जब तक हमारी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना और इसके बाद आने वाली योजनाओं के कार्य संचालन में जनता का सहयोग नहीं रहेगा और जनता में उत्साह नहीं आयेगा तब तक मैं समझता हूं कि इस देश की जो गरीबी है, बेकारी है, और भी तरह तरह की समस्याएं हैं, उनका समाधान नहीं हो सकता है। हमारे बहुत से लोग प्रतिनिधि बन कर रुन और चीन गए हैं और उन्होंने वहां जाकर यह देखा है कि सिर्फ ठेकेदार और लेबर या मजदूर से ही नहीं, सरकार से ही नहीं, बल्कि जनता से भी सहयोग हर प्रकार के प्रोजेक्ट को पूरा करने में मिलता है। हमारे यहां भारत सेवक समाज इसी उद्देश्य से बनाया गया है और उस में तमाम हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी पार्टियां हैं या गैर पार्टियों के लोग हैं, या स्वतंत्र विचार

के लोग हैं, सब को उसमें लिये जाने की कोशिश हो रही है और स्वयं भारत सेवक समाज इस दिशा में प्रयत्न शील है। लेकिन भारत सेवक समाज को जिस मुस्ती दी और जोश व खरोश के साथ हमारी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना को जनता के बीच ले जाकर उसमें उत्साह जगाकर और उनकी मदद लेकर उसको कामयाब बनाना चाहिये था, मैं समझता हूं उस के इस प्रयास में अभी कमी है।

हमारे साथी डा० राजबहादुर गोड़ ने कहा कि सब कुछ तो हो रहा है लेकिन इन साधुओं की ओर से क्या हो रहा है? मैं समझता हूं, ये ५६ लाख साधु जो देश में हैं, गांजा पीते हैं, बैठे रहते हैं, माल पृथा खाते हैं इन में राजनैतिक चेतना के साथ वर्ग चेतना लाने की की जरूरत है पंचवर्षीय योजना को सफलीभूत करने के लिए आपको आदमी नहीं मिलते हैं, लेबर नहीं मिलता है, इसलिए ये ५६ लाख, साधु आज हिन्दुस्तान में बेकार बैठे हैं इनके संगठन (आर्गनाइजेशन) का यदि आपको कोऑपरेशन मिले तो मैं समझता हूं कि तमाम पोलिटिकल पार्टिज को अलग रख दीजिए, ये ५६ लाख साधु ज्यादा से ज्यादा काम करके हमारी योजना को कामयाब कर के दिखा सकते हैं। हमारे देश में इन साधुओं का समाज में बड़ा असर है, बल्कि बड़े बड़े पोलिटिकल लीडरों का इतना असर नहीं है जितना इन साधुओं का है जो धभूति लगाकर इधर उधर जाते हैं। इनका ज्यादा असर होता है। इसलिए हमारे प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर ने साधुओं का

सहयोग लेने की जो युक्ति को है उसकी हमें नहीं उड़ानी चाहिये, मजाक नहीं उड़ाना चाहिये बल्कि उसके तथ्य में जाना चाहिये। अभी अलगूराय शास्त्री जी ने कहा भी कि हम लोग भी उनको बतायें कि उन्हें हमारी योजना में किस तरह सहायता करनी चाहिये। सरकार का भी कर्तव्य है कि जो उस के नेशन प्लानिंग डिपार्टमेंट और इंफार्मेशन डिपार्टमेंट हैं, कोशिश करे कि किस से हम सहयोग लें। तो मैं आप से कह रहा था कि भारत सेवक समाज के ढंग पर आपको साधुओं को भी संगठित करना चाहिये। जो लोग कहते हैं कि भारत सेवक समाज में सब पार्टियों के लोग नहीं जाते हैं और यह खास कांग्रेस की है तो यह बात गलत है। भारत सेवक समाज हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी पार्टियाँ हैं, सबको है। इसके साथ साथ हिन्दुस्तान की अलग, अलग पार्टियों के जो यूथ आर्गनाइजेशन हैं चाहे कांग्रेस पार्टी के हों चाहे प्रजा समाजवादी पार्टी के, उनको भी भारत सेवक समाज के साथ लगाया जाय। मैं यह जानता हूँ कि इस योजना के खिलाफ भी हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में, हमारे इस हाउस में, हमारी पार्टी में आस्टीन के साँप बैठे हुए हैं और जब से यह योजना बनी तब से इसके काम में रुकावट डालने की कोशिश करते हैं। कुछ लोग खासकर जो कंपिटेलिस्ट हैं वे नहीं चाहते कि यह कामयाब हो और इसके विरुद्ध तरह तरह की बातें सामने रखते हैं।

इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि जब तक जनता का सहयोग हमें उस तरह से नहीं मिलता जिस तरह रूस में या चीन में लिया गया है तब तक हम ठीक से प्रगति नहीं कर सकेंगे। भारत सेवक समाज, लोक सेवक समाज को, यूथ कांग्रेस को, डिमोक्रेटिक यूथ लीग और समाजवादी युवक सभा, इन

तमाम संगठनों को एक साथ लेकर हमें उसी तरह से लड़ाई लड़नी होगी जिस तरह हमने आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी थी। आज हमें पूर्ण सन्यावह (टोटल मोबिलाइजेशन) की व्यवस्था से लड़ाई लड़नी है अभी इस सेकेंड फाइव इयर प्लान को पूरा करने के बाद जब तक हम तीसरी, चौथी, पाँचवी, छठी इसी प्रकार की योजना को नहीं पूरा करेंगे तब तक समाजवाद की स्थापना नहीं होगी, क्योंकि आपने रूस में भी देखा कि किस तरह से वहाँ इन्कलाब हुआ, क्रांति हुई और उसके बाद छः बार उनकी पंचवर्षीय योजना बनी और तब जाकर ४० वर्ष में वहाँ समाजवाद की स्थापना हुई। शुरू में रूस में भी वही हालत थी, लोगों को रोटी खाने को नहीं मिलनी थी, बड़ी बड़ी तकलीफें थीं। इसलिए हमें अभी अवीर नहीं होना है कि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है। कल इस हाउस में रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया बिल की तरमीम की बहस के सिलसिले में हमारी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के ऊपर बुरी तरह से प्रहार शुरू हुआ था। कहा गया है कि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है और हमारे उद्योगपति बिरला के नेतृत्व में अमरीका चले गये थे भीख मांगने और इस तरह इस दश की हमारी जो सरकार है उसकी भी वे खिल्लो उड़ाते हैं और कहते हैं कि हमारी सरकार की कोई "भद्" नहीं है उद्योगपतियों को जो यह छूट दी गई है यह नहीं दी जानी चाहिये। सरकार हमारे उद्योगपतियों को छूट दिये जाती है और वे सब जगह जाकर तरह तरह की बातें करते हैं जो कि नहीं होना चाहिये क्योंकि इससे मुल्क को धोका हो सकता है क्योंकि विदेशियों के व्यापार की वजह से ही यह देश गुलाम हुआ। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहता हूँ कि यह प्रस्ताव बहुत मौजू तथा सुनियोजित है। अगर यह प्रस्ताव स्वीकार कर लिया जाता है तो हमारे जेनों हाउसों के जितने

[श्री शील भद्र धार्जी]

मेम्बर हैं उनके और राज्य विधान सभा, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, पंचायत और म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड के मेम्बरों के सहयोग से इस चीज का प्रचार किया जाना चाहिये कि बगैर जनता के सहयोग के हमारा देश उन्नति नहीं कर सकता है। जो हमारे किसान और मजदूर हैं, देश में जितनी भी पार्टियां हैं जो द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के प्रति सहानुभूति रखती हैं अगर उन्होंने इस योजना में सहयोग दिया तो सब को लाभ पहुंचेगा। लेकिन मैं देखता हूं कि बहुत सी संस्थायें प्लान के प्रति मौखिक सहानुभूति तो रखती हैं मगर अपनी गुप्त मीटिंग्स में दूसरी तरह की बातें करती हैं। जिस तरह से हमारे देश के उद्योगपति बात अच्छी करते हैं मगर चाहते हैं कि यह प्लान फेल हो जाये और नेहरू जी का सरकार फेल हो जाय ताकि दुनिया को यह दिखला सकें कि वे द्वितीय योजना को पूर्ण करने में सफल नहीं हो सके इसलिये उनकी सरकार फेल हो गई। इसलिये मैं यह कहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान में जितनी भी संस्थायें हैं, चाहे वह भारत सेवक समाज हो, यूथ संगठन हो या और कोई संस्था हो, जब तक द्वितीय योजना के लिये जन आन्दोलन शुरू नहीं करतीं तब तक हमारी यह योजना सफली-भूत नहीं हो सकती। हमें जनता को बतलाना चाहिये कि तुम्हारी गरीबी और बेकारी तब तक दूर नहीं हो सकती जब तक द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना पूरी नहीं हो जाती है। देश में समाजवाद की स्थापना तब तक नहीं हो सकती है जब तक कि हम इस योजना को पूरी नहीं करते। इसलिये नेशनल प्लानिंग डिपार्टमेंट के मिनिस्टर महोदय को और हमारे भूचना विभाग को इस बात के लिये जनता में जाना जरूरी है कि बगैर उनके सहयोग से यह योजना पूरी नहीं हो सकती। अतः प्रचार के लिये इस विभाग को सक्रिय होना पड़ेगा। यह प्रस्ताव उपयुक्त है और प्लानिंग के मिनिस्टर महोदय को इसे स्वीकार करने में कोई उज्र नहीं होना चाहिये।

जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में कहा कि आज यह देखा जा रहा है कि देश में जो भी कार्य हो रहा है उसमें जनता का सहयोग नहीं है। जनता काम करने के लिये तैयार है मगर सरकार की ओर से ही इसमें कमी हो रही है। बिहार में जनता ने कोसी प्रोजेक्ट में जिस तरह की सहायता दी है उससे जन सहयोग का आभास होता है। लेकिन आज देखने में यह आता है कि देश में जितना भी निर्माण का कार्य हो रहा है उसमें जनता का कोई वास्ता नहीं है। यह कहा जाता है कि इन प्रोजेक्टों को पूरा करने के लिये रुपये की कमी है। अगर जनता और हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी भी पार्टियां हैं, उनका सहयोग मिल गया, उन सबने इस योजना को पूरा करने का बीड़ा उठा लिया तो हमारी यह योजना पूरी हो सकती है। उद्योगपति और कुछ और आस्तीन के सांप हैं जिनके द्वारा यह कहा जा रहा है कि देश के रिसोर्सेस बहुत कम हैं, इस प्लान को ४८ सौ करोड़ से ३३ सौ करोड़ रुपये तक कर देना चाहिये। बाहर से रुपया नहीं मिल रहा है और देश को चारों तरफ से कैपिटलिस्टों ने घेर रखा है। मेरा उन लोगों से यह आग्रह है रूस ने भी अकेले अपनी योजना को बगैर किसी बाहरी मदद पूरा किया और वह कामयाब बना। उसने जितने भी लक्ष्य थे उनकी पूर्ति को और देश में समाजवाद की स्थापना की। इसी तरह से हमारे देश में जितने रिसोर्सेज हैं उन्हें काम में लाना चाहिये। छोटी बचत आन्दोलन और नेशनल सेविंग्स सर्टिफिकेट द्वारा हमें धन इकट्ठा करना चाहिये। इसके लिये आन्दोलन की बात उठती है। हमारे दोनों सदनों में करीब ७५० सदस्य हैं, अगर वे देश में एक एक घर में जा कर इस चीज का प्रचार करें तो हमें करोड़ों रुपया प्राप्त हो सकता है। इस काम के लिये सब पार्टियों का सहयोग होना चाहिये और उन सब को इस काम का बीड़ा उठाना चाहिये। अगर हमने यह कार्य किया तो हमें बाहर की सहायता की आवश्यकता नहीं होगी। अगर हमने

इस काम के लिये पूर्ण सन्यावह (टोटल मोबिलिजेशन) किया तो मुझे पूर्ण आशा है कि हम देश के अन्दर ही काफी रुपया प्राप्त कर लेंगे।

इसके साथ ही साथ हमारे देश में जो बड़े जमींदार और राजा महाराजा हैं उनके पास अब भी काफी रुपया पड़ा है। बहुत सा ज़ेवर उनका छिपा पड़ा हुआ है, उनके नुमाइन्दे यहां पर बैठे हुये हैं, फारेन इन्वेस्टमेंट को कंफिसकेट कर लेना चाहिये। उद्योगपतियों के जो कल कारखाने हैं उन्हें सरकार नेशनलाइज कर ले और जो उचित मुआवज़ा है वह दे दे। देश में इस समय सरकारी कर्मचारियों की कमी है। जो राष्ट्रीयकरण द्वारा कल कारखानों को चला सकें इसलिये इन कल कारखानों को सरकार अपने कब्जे में जब कर लेगी तो इतने मालदारों और उद्योगपतियों को ही उन कारखानों के जनरल मैनेजर के रूप में रख सकती है और दो चार हजार रुपया तनख्वाह भी दे सकती है। इसी तरह से योजना को पूरा करने के लिये, देश की भलाई के लिये हमें जितनी भी दिक्कतों का सामना करना पड़े, सब को, चाहे वह किसान हो, विद्यार्थी हो, नौजवान हो, गरीब हो, अमीर हो, टोटल मोबिलिजेशन करके, समान रूप से सामना करना चाहिये ताकि हमारी द्वितीय योजना पूरी हो सके। लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि जिस रूप में हमारा यह काम अभी चल रहा है उससे हमारी योजना पूरी नहीं हो सकती है। इसमें कमी जो है वह जनता के सहयोग की कमी है। बगैर जनता को साथ लिये हुये हम कामयाब नहीं हो सकते हैं। जनता को साथ लेना ही नहीं है, उसमें उत्साह भी पैदा करना है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव की तहदिल से तार्किक करता हूं और उम्मीद करता हूं कि हमारे प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर महोदय इस प्रस्ताव को अवश्य स्वीकार करेंगे।

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXPENDITURE OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT (EXCLUDING RAILWAYS) IN THE YEAR 1957-58

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to lay on the Table a statement showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants for Expenditure of the Central Government (excluding Railways) in the year 1957-58. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-425/57.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE COAL BEARING AREAS (ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT) AMENDMENT BILL, 1957

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Amendment Bill, 1957, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 5th December, 1957."

I lay the Bill on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI) in the Chair.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S RESOLUTION REGARDING MOBILISING PUBLIC ENTHUSIASM AND SUPPORT FOR THE SECOND FIVE YEAR PLAN— continued

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण (मुम्बई) :
भादरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इस प्रस्ताव के