

16.25 hrs.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
THROUGH PANCHAYAT RAJ BILL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up the next Bill of Shri Ranabahadur Singh.

Shri Ranabahadur Singh.

SHRI RANABAHADUR SINGH (Sidhi): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to provide for planning and development through various democratic and official agencies of Panchayat Raj, be taken into consideration "

Change is the fountainhead of all progress—the word carries with it the secret of renewal, of freshness of life itself. A thing that ceases to change stops living.

But the word has over the ages always drawn two separate sets of reactions from humanity. The prosperous, the mighty, the priesthood have invariably formed a formidable phalanx against its onslaught. But just as inexorably the iconoclast, the artist, the thinker, the Sanyasi—I use this word for want of an English one that would carry the same meaning, the loner, the Bohemian, the free and the brave formed the assault group.

16.26 hrs.

[SHRI NAWAL KISHORE SINHA in the Chair]

From the first group the word change draws sheer angst for the establishment is threatened. For the second group the word holds out the promise of dawn. Also because they have nothing to lose but their rags and chains. Again, they can think out a better pattern for the future for they hold no vested interest in the present.

And so our civilization has evolved. And so it shall go on changing.

Our present democratic system is the net result of an evolutionary process of exactly this nature. The founding principles of the Greek city state underlie the basic framework of our institutions just as the wheel has kept up with the changed modes of land transportation. But for the iconoclast, the thinker, the sanyasi, the loner, the free and the brave we may have been using the same wheels to drive our chariots instead of their taking the form of radial tyres on sleek Lincoln Continentals or Rolls Phantoms. Similarly, this class of people have applied themselves through the ages to look at the hallowed institutions of democracy. And with the clear-eyed vision undazed by the pomp and glory of power they have often seen through the silken screen that the mightiest of the mighty put up to cover the failings of their systems. And each time this happens democracy as a concept and freedom of humanity as living goal gets closer within the reach of the man on the street. It has been happening that way throughout the recorded history. It happened in Greece. It happened in Rome. It happened in London. It has happened in Washington and surprisingly it has happened in Moscow. The two latter happenings, being more recent ones, are more noteworthy. In the late thirties the hallowed concept of *laissez faire*, the very soul of capitalism not diluted by the New Deal, a happening which can be compared to its revolutionary influence on democracy only by the invention of brakes after the wheels. This happening put social brakes on *laissez faire* mellowed the inhuman aspects of capitalism made it more modern. In fact gave it a new lease of life. Then again in Moscow another happening that of Prof. Liebermans conception of providing incentive to the socialistic workers could be compared again to the advent of the internal combustion engine in the field of wheel transport. The possibility it opens up is immense to say the least not to say that the leviation of socialistic economy is now able to look forward to a more rosy future than the one that had befallen a similar

[Shri Ranabhadur Singh]

sized creature biologically the dinosaur.

It may be added here that though on the face of it both these recent happenings have taken place on the economic plane their repercussion has been directly felt in the institution frame work on the political level. It is also interesting to note that the seemingly parallel lines of capitalism and communism have tended to bend towards each other under the influence of these happenings.

When we look at our own state of affairs in the line of thinking we are faced by the sight of an arrangement which shows signs of stress at every joint. A situation which on the face of it demand a change for its better functioning. But as soon as the word change is conjured up before us the age old reactions to it occur with a rush. And the battle is joined. It is to my mind our good fortune that the climate of freedom has nurtured both sides of the army. Historically such sides have never been equal.

Historically again such friction has always produced energy that has powered change. This bill before you seeks to debate one possibility of such a change. Hopefully it envisions that point of the future where capitalism and communism can fuse together to produce a better world order. May be that point of fusion can be made more quickly and easily attainable by trying to broaden the pure functionalism of capitalism and communism by the enlivening influence of pure vedant. This exercise has extremely exciting possibilities. The centuries old concept of the greatest good of the greatest number has lost all relevance in context of modern society. The only concept that can be meaningful in the post atomic world is the greatest good of all. Nothing less holds out any hope.

The politics of the art of the possible has too many skeletons in the cupboard to retain credibility. The inherent and inviolable worth of each individual the core of vedantic belief is the only one generous enough to accommodate the aspirations of modern man.

The world have moved from the feudal society where one man's good was all that mattered. We are also now far ahead of the concept that the good of the majority electoral or functional has an overbearing sanctity over the minority. This concept is as outmoded as the feudal one. And our democratic institutions have naturally not kept pace. This bill is to invite the collective wisdom of this House and through the House the country as a whole to examine how our democratic processes could be brought up-to-date.

The imperatives of change nowhere in the world have such a pressing immediacy as in our country. It can be put off only at our national peril.

The freedom that was wrested from Whitehall at such great cost seems to have got lost in the corridors of Sachivalayas and the country has remained sleeping in our villages. The democracy that we cherish in our country it appeared has taken a restricted form. Our total political energy has so far been taken up solely in fighting to retain power. No effort, no time, no energy is left for tackling the basic problems that face the country. This bill seeks to remedy this lacuna, by providing meaningful power to the panchayat raj institutions on the basis of consensus, this problem can be tackled. By providing real power to the grass root institutions the middlemen and brokers of power that have grown up like weeds in this country shall have been abolished as effectively as the MISA is doing to the economic middlemen and smugglers.

No doubt these middlemen and smugglers of power who have developed a vested interest in retaining it shall reach sharply to such decentralisation. They shall undoubtedly draw inspiration from another celebrated status quoist Winston Churchill and say like him that they have not been put at the helm of affairs of the country to preside over the liquidation of the system as Churchill feared for the British Empire. But historical processes are inexorable. This new concept of greatest good of all through sovereign exercise of power by panchayati-raj institutions is the coming thing no rear guard action can stop.

The vested interest that call this an impossibility would do well to recollect that in 1890s it was a generally accepted notion that any person traveling over a speed of 20 m. p. h. of a running horse would not be able to live.

I therefore invite hon Members of this House and through them my countrymen to give this proposal the benefit of their considered judgment. As far as I am concerned, I sincerely feel that just as it was given to us as a country through the Grace of God to enunciate the policy of Panch Shree or to carry out a peaceful nuclear explosion we can very well evolve a system where the worn out concept of the greatest good of the greatest number is replaced by that of Greatest Good of All.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved.

That the Bill to provide for planning and development through various democratic and official agencies of Panchayat Raj, be taken into consideration".

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Shubaneswar): Sir, the purpose of the Bill, as it has been brought forward by the hon. Member is this. I really appreciate this Bill because this was the basis on which Gandhiji laid his foundation and laid stress on that. Perhaps many people who have not

seen Gandhiji or who have not read about him may now know what he was thinking of.

I appreciate the substance of this Bill. But, I find that the drafting of this Bill requires much improvement.

In 1942 if I just quote what Gandhiji was speaking about the Panchayati Raj Administration before launching the Quit India Movement was thus. I quote.

"Gandhiji had expounded the doctrine that 'power resides in the people', and that power when it comes will belong to the people of India and it will be for them to decide to whom it should be entrusted."

He had also said that "the centre of power now is in New Delhi or in Calcutta and Bombay, in the big cities I would have it distributed among seven lakh villages of India".

Again, in 1944, he further went on to say —

"Capitalists' money cannot serve the hungry millions at present. People must have real power."

Gandhiji had, therefore, given sufficient thought and, after 1942, perhaps, he had the greatest of foresight and he could see that freedom was coming.

Therefore, from 1942 onwards till the last day of his death, that is, January 30, 1948, he devoted all his time as how to build a strong base of democracy and the people's power and sovereignty in the seven lakhs of villages in India. What was his conception of Panchayat Raj, the people asked I am again quoting him. This was what he said—

"Democracy required that everyone, man or woman, should realise 'his or her own' responsibility. This was what was meant by panchayat raj. When panchayat raj is establi-

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]

shed public opinion will do what violence can never do. The present power of the zamindars, capitalists and the Rajas can hold sway only so long as the common people do not realise their own strength. If the people noncooperate with the evil of zamindari or capitalism, it must die of inanition. In the Panchayat Raj only the Panchayat will be obeyed and the Panchayats can only work through the law of their own making".

Gandhiji then intended the Panchayats to have law-making powers as instruments of social and economic transformation. Therefore, Gandhiji laid the greatest stress in his political and social philosophy on the sound, solid foundation of panchayats. It is unfortunate that people whom Gandhiji made men forget all this. Perhaps many people today do not read what Gandhiji had written about it. Today many economists who advocate planning for India, many intellectuals who have been trying to usher in socialism in this country...

MR CHAIRMAN: Both Indian and foreign

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI:
I am happy you added that.

I am grateful to them that on many occasions today they take the name of Gandhiji. They swear by his name. Therefore, it is only because we have forgotten Gandhiji that the country finds itself suffering from its present economic ills.

Therefore, it is important and timely that this Bill has tried to lay some emphasis on the ideals of panchayat raj and panchayat raj to be made the instrument of socialist planning and development. You, Sir, were the Chairman of the Backward Areas Development Committee. You were there. We thought that planning to be effective in this country should be self-re-

liant. We thought it must be in terms of district development planning boards. This Bill says that there should be district development councils.

We shall have to think over it; Government should give serious thought to it. I am quite sure that the Government of India also are thinking of district planning bodies so that they can formulate planning from the panchayat, block and district level. I find that this is also the thinking in some of the documents discussed with the Ministers and others. Therefore, as regards the two basic philosophies that Gandhiji advanced that the panchayat should be an instrument of social reform and of economic transformation of the society and villages in the country, we shall have to think more seriously about these two formulations at this critical period.

He has again said that the panchayat should be the solid base of people's democracy and sovereignty. This needs more emphasis at this stage and actual implementation. Some people had asked him what should be the basis of these panchayats so far as the village economy is concerned. He had given thought to that also. He envisaged that the economic basis of the panchayat must be cooperativisation, in agriculture, poultry development, in all kinds of village economic life. He further said that after the panchayat becomes the instrument of planning and administration in the country, a solid base of economic and political democracy would have been provided. Therefore, we find he gave full thought to this problem.

While further elucidating the question as to what he means by this economic base on which the panchayats should be formed, Gandhiji said:

"firstly, it means a wholesale Swadeshi mentality...."

I think it is most appropriate to this occasion—

“a determination to find all the necessities of life in India, and that through the labour and intellect of the villagers.

Secondly, that means a reversal of the existing process. Instead of half a dozen cities of India . . .”

He was here thinking of Britain—

“and Britain lives on the exploitation and ruin of 700,000 villages, the latter will be largely self-contained and will voluntarily serve the cities of India and even the outside world.”

Then, he said:

“Khadi mentality means decentralisation of the production and distribution of the necessities of life. Every village is to produce and use all its necessities and, in addition, to produce certain percentage of its contribution to the requirements of the cities.”

Therefore, the very basis of economic planning that Gandhiji had taught us has not really been followed by us. Today, we are trying to give to this country a 10-point, 12-point, 13-point or a 15-point programme to fight the economic ills of this country. But let us also build up self-reliant village communities along with these programmes. The net industrial production of this country in 1973-74 has gone down to just 0.4 per cent and I can vouchsafe here and now that in 1975-76, the industrial production will be going down to 0.2 per cent. It is a negative growth so far as our country is concerned during the last 27 years. Therefore, if we want to set right the economic ills of this country, it is not by having a grandiose kind of thinking, but only by faithfully implementing the Gandhian ideals and ideologies. Gandhiji formulated that only on the basis of a self-reliant economy in the villages that we can build up and achieve some good in the seven lakh villages in the country. There-

fore, the panchayat should be the basic, economic planning unit and let them decide what resources they have and what resources they can mobilise. We are in search of resources and we are trying to go to the USA and the USSR and we are going all over the world to borrow capital, but Gandhiji had said in his books, how many workers have been provided with employment; in the khadi and village industries, they had provided employment to three million people—spinners, weavers and cotton growers. How many people have been provided employment elsewhere? Therefore, today, I think the time has come when the Government should give serious thought to the fact that we shall have to plan our countryside, our seven lakh villages, and make the panchayat the instrument of planning. We must give the panchayats effective power. Gandhiji had said that the panchayats should be formed on the basis of being run by an elite, and that is the basic thought that he gave: who will guide the panchayats? These panchayats will be the battleground of emancipation of feudalism and capitalism. Today, these panchayats are not and could not be the battleground, on this ideological basis. Therefore, those people who obstructed the socialist growth have captured today many of our Zila Parishads and many of the panchayats. Therefore, the real objective of Gandhiji has not been fulfilled by the panchayats today. So, they need a great deal of tightening. The panchayat should form the basic unit for planning for emancipating the masses from economic exploitation.

The Government may not accept this Bill as it is. But I admire the spirit of Shri Ranabhadur Singh. He has quoted many things. But Gandhiji has thought of it long before. He has said that we in India should make the panchayats a lively and fitting institution for strengthening and broadening the base of people's power and for building a strong economic base.

Today, we feel the shortage of rice, wheat, edible oil, etc. There is nothing in the villages. Gandhiji had said

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]

that the panchayats should plan their cropping pattern; we must know how much of food, cereals, etc., we need; let us plan it. While making themselves self-reliant they should produce a surplus so that they may feed the cities. Therefore, he has given much thought to economic planning, making Panchayat the basis. I am happy after so many years we are thinking of an effective instrument for planned development at the grass root level. This Bill may not be accepted as it is, but I know the Government must give serious thought to this Bill because the present day economic difficulties cannot be solved by capitalist planning alone. Gandhiji had given an answer to the economic ills of the country. Therefore the Government should take into serious consideration this Bill and if possible recast it according to the ideals which Gandhiji propounded and then place it before the House. In that case I hope the hon. Member will not object to it. We can re-start the Panchayats in a new way so that they will fulfil the ideals and objectives of Gandhiji.

*SHRI M. KATHAMUTHU (Nagapattinam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to participate in the discussion on the Planning and Development through Panchayat Raj Bill, which has been introduced by my hon. friend Shri Rana Bahadur Singh

Sir, we are talking day in and day out that, after independence, democratic institutions like Panchayats and Panchayat Unions have taken deep roots in our country. We also hear the Government at the Centre and in the States making frequent statements that planning and development in our country have come to a critical stage, and the hon. Member who preceded me also referred to the need for transforming the economic thought content of our present day planning efforts. We find also that democratic institutions like the Panchayats and Panchayat

Unions have not played their legitimate role in the formulation and execution of the national plan. Even the District Development Council is no exception to this.

I will give you one or two concrete examples to prove my contention. Though all investment of Rs. 4,700 crores has been made so far in power development projects, out of 5 lakhs of villages in our country only 1.22 lakh villages have got electricity. Though a sum of Rs. 2,770 crores of rupees has been invested in major and medium irrigation projects, only 15 per cent of the farmers in our country have reaped the maximum benefits from them. This clearly shows that the planned development in our country has not been on an even keel. There has been wide gap between the planned efforts and the actual requirements of the people of our country. The economic situation that obtains now in our country also shows that all the planning is done at the apex of administration, which has not grasped the actual needs of the people at the lowest level. There has also been no effective co-ordination between various democratic institutions like the Panchayats, the Panchayat Unions and the District Development Council.

Sir, it is highly regrettable that the laws governing the day-to-day functioning of these democratic institutions vary from State to State and in consequence the democratic institution at the top cannot naturally comprehensively appreciate the needs of the people at the village level. In the State of Maharashtra, there was election to the civic bodies in the urban centres. In Tamil Nadu the Chairman of the Panchayat Union is elected by the people. Though the elected Chairman of the Panchayat Union can be a member of the District Development Council, yet the Collector of the District alone can be the Chairman of the District Development Council. I refer to this sordid fact cause of my eagerness to inform the House that only the

*The Original speech was delivered in Tamil.

bureaucrats in our country are getting more and more entrenched and that the democratic institutions have no powers whatsoever for the purpose of translating the aspirations of the people into concrete proposals. The hands of bureaucrats have become ubiquitous. Sir, the time has now come for modifying the laws, rules and regulations that hinder the progress of democratic decentralisation in our country; in other words, the laws of the country should be so modified as to give more powers to democratic institutions like the Panchayats, the Panchayat Unions, the District Development Councils etc. For example, the District Development Council should naturally be headed by an elected representative of the people and not by a bureaucrat. This Bill under discussion should be the pointer in this direction for the Government.

We have in our country the 5-tier democratic institutional set-up—Panchayats, Panchayat Unions, District Development Council, the State Legislature and the Lok Sabha. It is an obvious fact that there is no co-ordination between these democratic institutions in our country. In theory there is the provision that the State Legislature can enquire as to how far the Resolutions passed in the District Development Council are being implemented. But, in actual practice, nothing of this sort is being attempted. Even a petty requirement of a Panchayat cannot be realised without the express approval of the officials. I have no objection that the technical advice of an official is necessarily to be sought. But I cannot understand why it should be implemented only after he approves of it, especially when there is an elected, democratic institution there. This is what I call as the bureaucratisation of our democratic institutions.

Here, I would refer to the Five Year Plans that are being implemented. No doubt, there is widespread discussion about the aims and objectives of the Five Year Plan and also whether they reflect the aspirations and the needs of the people. But it has to be admitted that there is no people's participation

in the implementation of this Five Year Plan. The people of the country have also no say in indicating which schemes are to be implemented to fulfil their immediate needs on a priority basis. This only proves my contention that there is no co-ordination between various democratic institutions so far as the fulfilment of the aspirations of the people are concerned.

In conclusion, I would emphasise the need for clothing these democratic institutions with all the necessary legislative and executive powers; all the laws that hinder this process must be amended immediately. Only after this is done, the economic transformation and social transformation will become feasible propositions in our country. As this Bill can be a definite medium for this purpose, I extend my support to this legislation.

17.00 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Mavalankar. He wanted to go. So, I have called him.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am indeed grateful to you and the House for the courtesy and consideration shown to me.

I warmly congratulate my good friend, Shri Rana Bahadur Singh for piloting this very interesting and good measure, the Planning and Development through Panchayat Raj Bill. The fact of the matter is that this particular measure, coming as it does in the midst of Private Members' Business, is being discussed in the House with a thin attendance but it should not make us feel disappointed about either the subject-matter of the Bill or the general popular response to this kind of measure. In a way, of course, it is sad that popular interest and even popular representative interested in some of the basic issues concerning difficulties is not so deep and as fundamental on certain basic issues as it is on many of the frivolous issues that

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

need not really bother us as regards the development of our democracy. Anyway, I am very glad that Shri Rana Bahadur Singh has come out with this Bill.

Sir, I do not wish to take much time in talking about the details of the Bill. We can certainly make a point here or a point there and say that this particular provision could have been in this form or this provision should have been in that form. But I do not think we are really interested in discussing the details of the Bill. I think, what Shri Rana Bahadur Singh wants is to focus the attention of the entire nation through this honourable House to the great need of reversing the whole process. What is really important is that not only our car is going in the wrong direction but in the wrong direction with a terrible speed. Therefore, we would like to congratulate Shri Rana Bahadur Singh for at least telling us, "You may go with speed but you should go in the right direction." We ought to go with speed if we are to catch up with the developing countries of the world. There is a tremendous race between time on the one hand and developing countries of the world on the other hand. We also want to go ahead. But let us see whether we are going in the right direction. Therefore, I am very happy that he has given us a chance to voice some of the thoughts we have on the fundamental issues involved.

First of all, I wish to say that the whole idea of Panchayat Raj is really an institution which emphasises the great need of grass-root level democracy. Unless you start democratic involvement of the people from the very foundation, you cannot really build up a good, strong and solid democratic polity. The whole difficulty is that we have been following in many cases the Western model. I am not saying that the Western model is necessarily a wrong model or a bad model. But the whole difficulty is that,

because of our anxiety and enthusiasm to follow the Western model, we think that, by copying, we are doing something good. But, more often than not, it is not copying, but as my friend, Mr. Sequeira, says, it is aping. One of the great Gandhians who is still alive—he will be 90 years old on December, Achary Kaka Saheb Kalelkar, in one of his Gujarati articles—he was originally a Maharashtrian but domiciled in Gujarat for 50 or 60 years; he is a very good writer in Gujarati—has said that we in India are trying to copy the West in such a way that the more faithfully we try to copy the West, the more perverted is the print. And he gives the simile of blotting paper. The blotting paper gets the print, but it is exactly the reverse of what it ought to be.

Panchayati Raj and all that it stands for, all the ideals and ideas of Mahatma Gandhi and many other associates of Mahatma Gandhi, were thought of even before Mahatma Gandhi by the people of this country. The whole idea of Panchayati Raj—*Panch Mukh Parmeswar* as we say in Gujarati—is this. If the wise people of a particular village say something about the village, that is bound to be good. They are the people at the grassroot level, they know what is happening around them in the immediate neighbourhood, they know the conditions there. If you neglect these people, if you neglect the aspirations of these people, if you neglect the dreams and demands of all these people, then you are really neglecting all the localities, all the local units, in the country, in fact, you are neglecting the whole base. Can you ever think of an edifice of democracy without the proper base?

This bill really touches the fundamentals. It says that we must deal with the fundamentals, the base of democracy. We are in the midst of planning for a Welfare State as indeed many other countries in the world are doing. These Welfare

States have a large number of programmes and policies and even ideologies about how to achieve welfare. All these countries, call them socialist or communist, or even these countries which have any concern for social justice, which have any concern for creating an egalitarian society in their respective national community, are naturally thinking in terms of certain planning processes. After all, what does planning mean? Planning means that certain things must come first and certain other things can wait. We can afford to wait for certain luxuries, but we cannot afford to wait for certain essential conditions of life. Five-Star hotels may come after some years, but proper housing conditions for the poor people must come right now, today, not even tomorrow. These are the priorities. Therefore, planning is absolutely essential for a developing country, for a country which has a lot of poverty. The whole difficulty is that, because we accept planning, the philosophy that is immediately assumed is that we must also accept centralisation which planning involves. I think, we have to change this assumption. Because we need planning, we cannot say that we also need centralism or centralisation or the control mechanism that planning involves. Shri Rana Bahadur Singh very rightly and correctly says that planning is important, but centralism is avoidable. Indeed, he says that planning is necessary and, therefore, decentralisation is also equally necessary. Even the term 'decentralisation' is wrong because it assumes that there is a Centre and then you want to have decentralisation. Genuine planning will mean that you start with the local units, with the foundation, at the grassroot level and go upward in such a way that the whole process is organic, genuine and very healthy. Therefore, I feel that, if you want planning and welfare, it must not be through centralisation which has been unfortunately the danger not only in many socialist and communist

countries but even in our own country. We find that everything is to be decided in Delhi. Our country is very vast and if you allow everything to be decided in Delhi, then it will just not work. I am reminded here of a very interesting anecdote that I read in one of the books of a British political scientist, Ivor Jennings. Ivor Jennings had this anecdote to give. He was talking about the conditions in Britain. "Suppose people in a village want a particular well to be dug or a particular tube well to be constructed in a particular locality or a small village. Then what do you do? Do you go to London for permission? Do you go to London for all the plans to be submitted and passed?" Then Ivor Jennings says: "If that process is allowed, you will soon find that there will be more paper than water and more bureaucrats than consumers. You will not care for the consumers wanting to have water in that village; you will get bogged down with more papers and files, more bureaucracy in the White Hall of London, namely, the civil services."

Therefore, this is the difficulty. If you want planning to be meaningful and to be effective, then you must start from the decentralised level, from the smallest unit and I will say, from the grassroot level.

Another aspect is that if you start planning from the basic level, from the grassroot level, the advantage is that a large number of people—I will not say all the people because that would be too much—but at least a very large number of people of various localities will have the chance of participating in the whole process. After all, democracy is participation. JP always said that the present parliamentary democracy should be replaced by a participating democracy so that more people may be involved and participate. If you want participation of the people in democracy, I think then this planning from the grassroot level, through the pancha-

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

yatghars and through the kind of processes which my friend, Shri Rana Bahadur Singh suggested, will be meaningful and you will be able to get the initiative and involvement of a large number of people of this great and ancient land.

I will only end with two small points before I sit down. My friend, Shri Panigrahi has very rightly dealt in detail with Mahatma Gandhi and what he preached, he practised. I wonder—I am not that young to say that I never saw Mahatmaji, I never met or I never had any chance to hear him. It was my good fortune to meet him and hear him many times. While all these 27 years' of independence, many younger people might say, 'We have not seen or heard Mahatma Gandhi', I am one of that fortunate few young people who have been able to have the privilege of watching Mahatmaji from the close quarters....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do the younger people of the present days accept your claim of being very young?

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Fortunately my two young children above the age of 21 accept me as a young man and I have a lot of dialogue with my young children and that is the evidence that I am claiming to be a youngman.

What I was saying is that young people of this country to-day have not seen Mahatmaji, especially those who were born after the 30th January, 1948. But they may not see the body of Mahatmaji but they can see the immortal message of the Mahatma. That is more important. This Gandhian spirit—I will say Gandhi spirit—even that famous British historian, Arnold Toynbee, said - that the Western or British scholar steeply imbued in the knowledge of history, in one his recent books, says, talking to the young people in the whole world, as it were, that the only solution for the entire world

to get out of the many tragedies is to accept the Gandhi spirit and the Gandhi path. He elaborates it in very great detail and one of those details is the question of decentralisation and small units and I feel that when I say, 'Go back to Gandhi', that means go back to Gandhi so that we can go forward to a kind of India and the world that we want to live in.

Therefore, I feel if you want to go back to the village, that is going back to Gandhi. If you want decentralisation, that means going back to Gandhi. If you want to go back to the grass-root level, that is going back to Gandhi, not only Gandhi, going back to Socrates, going back to the Vedas and the Upanishads where the people in small localities had a meaningful participation in the affairs of the community.

Therefore, my appeal is that we are at the turn of the 20th century. The 19th century was supposed to be the century of nationalism. Our 20th century may be called the century of internationalism. I dare say that the 21st century may prove to be the century of localism. A century of localism may be aimed at in which there is participation by an individual. The whole difficulty to-day is individual feels lost. He is almost reduced to a small corpse in a colossal wheel—wheel of the establishment, of the State, of the gaint machinery. Whatever it is, the individual feels lost. If he feels lost, how they will form meaningful community which we can call co-operative. If we have to make a turn from 20th century to 21st century, then we must make a turn from highly centralised, highly concentrated, highly arbitrary power mechanism in establishment to highly decentralised, individualised, personalised but not for personal ego but for personal involvement, through which genuine democracy can be established in our country. It is from this larger angle also that I warmly welcome my good friend's Bill and I hope it will

receive the attention and care that it rightly deserves.

श्री मूल अन्व इगगा (पाली) : 1949 से जब हर लाल नेहरू ने राजस्थान में नागौर में लोकपाल बनाया था और कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान को बनाने का बीजान्त एक उनात को ही होना चाहिए 56 करोड़ लोग को प्राप्त होगा और वह सभी ही नकेगा जब लाग यह समझे कि हिन्दुस्तान का सजाने और सनाने का सना अधिकार है । लेकिन हुआ क्या ? बड़ी खूबी की बात है कि श्री राणा बहादुर सिंह जी ने हमें पचायती का राग को याद दिलाई है । लेकिन हुआ क्या है ? पचायती का चुनाव ही नहीं होता है । आप अपनी ही रिपोर्ट को देखें । राजस्थान में तो दस साल में चुनाव ही पचायती के नहीं हुए । 1965 का बाद नहीं हुए है । हिमाचल में भी 1965 में नहीं हुए है । केरल में 1963 में नहीं हुए है । गुजरात में 1968 में नहीं हुए है । इसमें पता चलना है कि गवर्नमेंट चिन्तनी सजा है पचायती के प्रति । कनाटक में 1968 में नहीं हुए है । दस दस और पन्द्रह साल तक ग्राम पचायती जिला परिषद और पचायत समितियों के चुनाव ही नहीं काए जाते हैं । हिन्दुस्तान में ग्राम पचायती की संख्या 2 लाख 22 हजार 64 है । अनाक की 4 हजार 96 है । पना परिषदों की 232 है । रिजल्ट क्या हुआ है ? रिजल्ट बह हुआ है कि गरीब ज्यादा गरीब हो गया है और धनीर ज्यादा धनीर, मालदार ज्यादा मालदार । श्री बलराम राय मेहना ने कहा था कि योजना का साधन और साध्य गरीब होगा, आखिरी पक्ष में जो व्यक्ति है वह होगा, वही इस समाज को सुधाने का साधन होगा और साध्य भी होगा । लेकिन वह नहीं रहा । सभी पचायती पर लगभग वही लोग हावी हो गए हैं जो या तो बड़े पूजोर्पत हैं या जो बड़े लैडलाई हैं । समाज का आखिरी धावनी नहीं आगे आ गया है । इन लोगों के ग्राम पचायती को, इन लोकतांत्रिक इकाइयों को कमाने का साधन बनाया, जिला परिषदों

और पचायत समितियों का काम ही का साधन बनाया । पचायती राज में हर बावदी को यह समझना चाहिये कि मेरे भी वही अधिकार है जो दूसरों के है, बड़ों के है लेकिन वह नहीं है । पाया और साधों के बच्चों का जो भारत बनना था वह नहीं बन पाया और जो चीजे बड़ा को उपलब्ध हैं वे उसको उपलब्ध नहीं हो पाई । कुछ एक लोगों में सत्ता का हउप लिया और पचायती को उसका साधन बनाया योजना कहा बनती है योजना भवन में बनती है ऊपर में बनती है नीचे में नहीं पचायत लेवल पर नहीं बनती है । अगर विभिन्न राज्याये पचायती और जिला परिषदा में बनती ता उन की सफलता की सम्भावना अधिक होती । आज पचायती का नाम क्या पावले ? आज भी गाव क पटवारी या पंचायत इन्स्पेक्टर या पुलिस का साधारण सिपाही पर पचायत या संपत्त का कोई नियंत्रण नहीं है । अगर संपत्त कभी तहसीलदार का पास जाता है तो उसका उचित आदर नहीं दिया जाता है । में चाहता हू कि पचायती सक्रियशाली हो । मगर वे सभी सक्रियशाली हो सकती है जब कि वर्तमान चुनाव प्रणाली में सुधार हो । इस समय कवल पजी वाले लोग ही पचायती में आ सकते हैं । इस के क्या कारण हैं ? 'कम्प्यूनिटी डेवलपमेंट एण्ड पचायती राज डाइजेस्ट' में कहा गया है .

1. The people have not been drawn sufficiently into the mainstream of national endeavour and, therefore, rural plans lack community drive
2. Planning is still centralised and administrative procedures and decision-making are not with the local people's institutions.
3. The drift is chiefly due to the ineptitude of those who have been directly or indirectly responsible for the running of the administrative machinery at various levels.

[श्री मूलचन्द्र डावा]

4. Self-help is one of the basic pre-requisites of sound strategy of development; but unfortunately its relevance has remained obscure and in this vital aspect, the planners, the governments and the political parties have failed to stress its importance sufficiently."

पहले कहा जाता था कि पंचायतो की स्थापना से गांव के आदमी स्व-सहायता-जोधा और मार-ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट ब्लॉक का जाल बिछा जायेगा। इस मंत्रालय में श्री शाहनवाज खा नये मंत्री आये हैं। वह देखें कि पंचायतो का खर्चा किस तरह होता है। वह कभी किसी पंचायत समिति का सरपंच चुनकर देकर। वहां हाथ यह है कि सरकारी आदमियों को तनखवाह दी जाती है, लेकिन उन के पास कोई काम नहीं है। वेटेरिनरी डाक्टर और हेल्थ इंस्पेक्टर वगैरह सब बैठे रहते हैं। प्रधान और बी० डी० ओ० में झगडा होता है।

श्री राणा बहादुर सिंह ने कहा है कि अगर ग्राम विकास कार्यों में लोगों को पूरा इनवाल्वमेंट चाहते हैं तो पंचायतो को पर्याप्त अधिकार दीजिए। लेकिन आप तो यह समझते हैं कि गरीब आदमी या छोटी श्रेणी का आदमी समझदार नहीं होता है। सत्ता की कुर्सी पर बैठा हुआ राजनैतिक व्यक्ति समझता है कि मित्र वही समझदार है।

सहायता नहीं, बल्कि आप की बात नहीं समझ पाया है। आप ने पंचायतो के मुताबिक कहा है कि वे सत्ता प्राप्त करने वालों का एक तरह से गढ़ बन गई है। दूसरी तरफ आप उनको अधिक अधिकार देने की बात कह रहे हैं। इन दोनों बातों का बेल कैसे बैठता है ?

श्री मूलचन्द्र डावा : श्री बलचन्तराय मेहता ने कहा था कि समाज का साधारण व्यक्ति ईमानदारी और सेवा के आधार पर पंचायतो में हिस्सा ले सकेगा। लेकिन पंचायतो में जो चुनाव-प्रणाली है, उस में केवल बड़ी लोग प्रधान या सरपंच बनते हैं, जिन के पास दौलत होती है। हालात यह हैं कि पंचायतो में दस पंद्रह साल तक चुनाव नहीं होते हैं। मैं चाहता हू कि पंचायतो की चुनाव-प्रणाली में भी सुधार किया जाये, ताकि पंचायतो में नई जागृति आये नया जीवन आये, वे अच्छी तरह से काम कर सकें और समाज की आखिरी पंक्ति का आदमी उस में भाग ले सके।

इस डाइजैस्ट में बातया गया है कि कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट प्रोग्राम से बड़े काम-कार को भीमनम 9 रुपये, छोटे काम-कार को 5-7.5 रुपये, गरीब को 4-07 रुपये और मजदूरों को निर्फ 3-11 रुपये का फायदा हुआ है। इन बीस माना में मालदार और मालदार हो गया है और गरीब और गरीब हो गया है, क्योंकि सरकार ने पंचायतो का कोई पाबन्ध नहीं दी है। और पंचायतो के रेवेन्यू क्या है ? सरकार ने उनको लड रेवेन्यू का कितना हिस्सा दिया है ? आज पंचायतो के पास न ता शक्ति है और न आमदनी के कोई साधन हैं। जब तक पंचायतो के पास शक्ति और साधन न हो, जब तक गांव के लोग यह न समझेंगे कि योजना उन की है और उस को क्रियान्वित करना उन का काम है तब तक योजना कैसे सफल होगी और देश कैसे आगे बढ़ेगा ? आखिर चन्द आदमी हिन्दुस्तान को नहीं बना सकते हैं। विकास के कामों में गांवों में रहने वाले 55 करोड़ आदमियों का इन्वाल्वमेंट होना चाहिए। जैसा कि इस किताब में कहा गया है, कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट प्रोग्राम को समाज के सभी वर्गों का इन्वाल्वमेंट पैदा कर के एक पीपल्स प्रोग्राम बनाया जाना चाहिए वह तभी हो सकता है, तब कि पंचायतो में एक नयापन पैदा किया जाये।

में इस किताब में से एक और ब्रॉडेशन देना चाहता हूँ ।

"The independence gave it an impetus and acted as a catalyser As a result, and as observed by Kipling, 'All India was at work in the fields, to the creaking of well wheels, the souting of ploughmen behind their cattle and clamour of crows' But the change was not adequate in the political, social and economic fields The country had not shaken off its stupor' 'The land of dreams and romance', as observed by Mark Twain, remained 'a wonderland of fabulous wealth, and fabulous poverty, of splendour and rags' "

हम ने यह नदी सोचा कि सामुदायिक विकास योजना का सफल बनाने के लिए ग्राम पंचायत राज में नई शक्ति लाने के लिए पंचायतों को ज्यादा शक्ति देनी चाहिए, योजना नीचे में बननी चाहिए और उस की क्रियान्विति में सब का हिस्सा होना चाहिए । योजना बनाने वाले गांवों के लोग होने चाहिए और उस को इम्प्लीमेंट करने वाले भी वही होने चाहिए । लेकिन आज स्थिति यह है कि वे न तो योजना बना सकते हैं और न ही उस की इम्प्लीमेंटेशन में उन का हाथ है ।

प्रगर ग्राम पंचायत समिति में प्रयाग और विकास अधिकारी की शक्ति का मुकाबला करे, तो ग्राम को ताज्जुब होगा । विनास अधिकारी अपने ग्राम को प्रशान से बहुत शक्तिशाली समझता है । हम तरह जनता का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले प्राधमियों का मूल्य और दर्जा कैसे बढ़ेगा ? लोकतन्त्र में जब तक छोटे छोटे व्यक्तियों का, जो समाज का काम करने वाले हैं, मूल्य नहीं बढ़ता है, तब तक देश गम नहीं बढ़ सकता है ।

आज ताकत का केन्द्रीकरण हो रहा है । हम विकेन्द्रीकरण में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं । हम पंचायत समितियों और जिला परिषदों को पूरे अधिकार नहीं देने हैं । जिला परिषदों में प्रमुख का कलेक्टर के नीचे काम करना पड़ता है । पंचायत समिति के नीचे सब डिवाइजनल आफिसर काम करे और पंचायत के नीचे वहा का पटवारी रेवेन्यू इम्पेक्टर और आज उन को कोई पावर नहीं है । रेवेन्यू का एक रेकाई देखने के लिए मरपच को अधिकार नहीं है । ग्राम मेहरबानी कर के बना दीजिए कि कहीं मरपच पटवारी का रेकाई देख सकता है ? एक उदाहरण बना दीजिए किसी ऐक्ट के अन्तर्ग रेवेन्यू इम्पेक्टर को कह दे मरपच कि तुम अपना रेवेन्यू रेकाई दिखाओ, वह कहेगा कि नहीं तुम्हें अधिकार नहीं है, वह तो मैं केवल तहसीलदार का दिखा सकता हूँ । हम तरह पंचायत को आज कोई अधिकार नहीं योजना बनाने का अधिकार नहीं । योजना की स्वीकृति उपर में हात है इसलिए तो म्यान इरीगेशन की योजनाएं जो बननी थी वह नहीं बन सकी, छोटे छोटे काम जो किए जाने थे, ही किए जा सके । छोटे छोटे बाध बनाए जाने थे नहीं बनाए जा सके । बड़े बड़े बाध बने लेकिन उस के पानी का उपयोग किन्तु किया ? बड़े बड़े काश्तकारों ने उस के पानी का उपयोग किया । छोटे छोटे बनने तो उस का उपयोग गरीब काश्तकार करते । इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन पंचायतों को ज्यादा अधिकार दिए जायें और इन को ज्यादा उपयोगी बनाया जाय ।

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA
 (Marmagoa) Mr Chairman, Sir, as our hon. friend was saying a little bit earlier, it is a question, in which direction the car is travelling and in what gear. If I may say so, it appears that our national car is going in the wrong direction, at the wrong speed. The national feet have left the

[Shri Erasmo de Sequeira]

ground, and lately we seem to have lost the steering wheel. That is why I think the Bill that our good friend, Shri Ranabhadur Singh, has brought forward is a very relevant Bill and a very well timed Bill, because it brings into focus our primary institution at popular level, in this country, and it also brings forward the need for one of the basic changes in approach that will have to be made in India, for progress to be meaningful to the millions of our fellow citizens.

In our Constitution, among the Directive Principles of State Policy, article 40 says:

"The State shall take steps to organise village panchayats and endow them with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government."

I think it is one of the greatest failures of this Government that in 27 years it has failed completely and totally to do so. This is why my party, the Bharatiya Lok Dal, says that the self-government institutions at the basic level, like the panchayats and the municipalities, must find a place, a recognition, in the Constitution itself, and not be left to the whims and fancies of the State legislatures and bureaucrats.

It is time that we realised that revenue must go directly where it is needed, and not accrue mainly to the Centre. It is time we realised that planning cannot be done totally from the top from the ivory tower and the computer, and that it must be done from the bottom of the rung.

I realise that the Indian bureaucratic empire may have to be torn apart, if you want to use that expression; but there is one question that must be asked. 27 years after freedom, how do you account for the fact that the district is still run by the Collectors, and not by the elected

representatives of the people, and the main functions of the Collectors, are still the same as the British handed over? And the British as you know, were interested in ruling this country and not in governing it. What is your explanation?

We must realise one thing: that power must reside with the people. This is an expression that the Father of the Nation gave to us, and it is an expression that we repeat *ad nauseam* but never follow, because at this point of time the power of the people has been abrogated almost entirely to the corridors of South Block in this city. Strangely enough, it has been abrogated in the name of *Garibi Hatao*.

Unless this power returns to where it should belong in a democracy, unless there is a wider participation of people at the basic levels, democracy can never be effective. Unless there is decentralisation, unless people dispersed throughout this country, and elected by the population of this country, have the right to take decisions and have the responsibility of making them, and have the means to carry them out, then progress in this country can never be a reality.

In this respect I want to recall one institution that exists in Goa from where I come, which is very relevant to-day, and that is the village community. I existed for thousands of years where land was owned collectively by the village, and it was framed collectively by the village. The village community made provision for people who otherwise would not come to the village such as Doctors, cobblers etc. Over the years it became what it was not supposed to be originally. Instead of revitalising the institution, the State Government of Goa, very strangely, has also destroyed it. This is something which this Government must look into as Goa is still a Union Territory, though I do not like it that way, and therefore it is the responsibility of this Government.

Until, the day when the Panchayats have a place in our Constitution, and

have their functions stated in the Constitution, until they are recognised, until the day when revenues accrue directly to the primary institutions, until the day when elected Members of the institutions have the constitutional power and responsibility of taking decisions on basic matters at the primary unit level, You can talk about progress until you are blue in the face, but all that it will mean, is that Delhi has got beautiful fountains but in the villages of India people starve.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI (Kokrajhar): This Bill is important in my opinion but I do not know whether I should support it or not in the form in which it has been brought by the Member from the opposition. I was connected with Panchayats for more than 10 years. I know very well Mahatma Gandhiji views about Panchayats. When the Panchayats were started they were started in that spirit but with the passage of time that spirit diminished. I visited Gujarat where Gandhiji was born and met leaders of various Parties. I also visited the various institutions established in the name of Mahatma Gandhi but I find them to be quite different. Even the Asharam life has been affected. Life at Sabarmati Asharam is quite different. I discussed this matter with the leaders, congressmen and the devoted workers. They admitted that the spirit of Gandhiji has been wiped out. Gandhiji wanted country should be developed through Panchayats. When Panchayats were established they were done with a view to develop the country through Community Development. At the beginning people were enthusiastic and participated in the Community Development works. I was fortunate enough to be appointed as the adviser to all the newly constituted Panchayats in Assam and I had the privilege of visiting all those panchayats. I found that people were enthusiastic and did not mind inconvenience, involved in the construction of roads etc. But by and by things have changed; the spirit has changed. We wanted the Secretary or Block Officers of the Development

Block to be persons imbued with the spirit of village development the men who knew the villages. It happened in such a way that persons who were appointed as Block Development Officers were from towns and cities.

Only the sons of big officers and the ICS or IPS are appointed to such posts. How do you expect the sons of those high officers, who have not even seen a village, to know the needs and aspirations of the village people? So, by and large, the spirit of Mahatma Gandhi started diminishing and after some time orders started coming from the Government above, directing the villages that you will do this or you will not do that, you have to do things according to the orders of the Government. So, the spirit is quite different now.

When I came to Parliament, I had an occasion to go and attend a meeting of the Planning Commission, some time when it was considering the problems of tribals. There I told the members bluntly that those who sit in ivory towers cannot understand the spirit of the villagers. In fact, there was some exchange of words with some members of the Planning Commission and the Planning Minister, Shri Dhar, had to intervene. It is really very unfortunate that these officials claim to know more than us about these villages. Yet, it is these people, who do not have any idea about these villages, about these tribal people, who talk of the development of tribal development blocks, are guiding the destiny of the country. When you take people of this kind in the administration, how is it possible to develop the country on the lines Mahatma Gandhi wanted? Mahatma Gandhi wanted the leadership to come from the village people, but it is not being done.

Now we have got about 504 tribal blocks. What was the purpose of constituting these blocks? The purpose was to develop the tribal people in areas which are inaccessible. I had the privilege of visiting these tribal blocks in

[Shri D. Basumatari]

various States in various capacities. When I visited those blocks some ten years back I found the tribals owning land in Orissa and other States. When I visited the very same blocks recently I found that those tribals have been rendered landless. This shows that the approach towards this problem so far has been negative.

Ministers are appointed to deal with this problem. Ministers come and Minister go. They have no time to see what is actually happening in these areas. They sit here in Parliament or in their rooms in the Secretariat. They are always surrounded by bureaucrats and they see problems only through files. They have no inside knowledge of what is really happening.

These words of mine are coming from my heart. I have gone from village to village. I know the conditions in the villages very well and I also know the feelings of the people there. I do not know whether the present Minister had ever been to a tribal village and whether he knows their problems.

Take my own case. I come from an interior village where I could go only by an elephant and or by ten to twelve bullock carts. Those areas have not yet been developed. Who is to blame for that? After the establishment of this concept of tribal development, the people in charge of it do not know what to do. Previously, they used to develop the areas on the basis of people's participation. Now the orders have to come from the Central Government, through the State Government, asking them to do or not to do particular things. The result is that the developmental works are implemented in a way quite different from what the people of the areas wanted.

My hon. friend from Goa was rightly saying that the car is going in

the wrong direction, not in the right direction. We are going in a wrong direction. I would request the new Minister in the Ministry of Agriculture—he is not new Minister but he is new to the Agriculture Ministry—to do something in the right direction.

One of the main objectives of the Bill is to develop agriculture through Panchayat Raj. Agriculture can only be developed by giving [water, irrigation facilities and everything. You will be surprised to know that even the granary areas are deprived of irrigation; they are deprived of everything. They have to depend on nature. I am speaking about Assam. In Assam, there is no irrigation provided by the Government. There is no scheme about electricity; there is no scheme about anything. They have to entirely depend on rains. If the rains come, they do agriculture and, if the rains do not come, they cannot do agriculture. So, the schemes should be such that every area, every State, gets the same share. If you see Punjab, Haryana, U.P. etc.—Orissa is a very undeveloped area—as against that the fate of the Assamese people is not at all to get irrigation. All these projects are being undertaken blindly, in a blind way, by the Ministers and the Secretaries through the files alone. I would, therefore, request the hon. Minister, though he may not be an agriculturist....

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION (SHRI SHAHNAWAZ KHAN): I am very much an agriculturist.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI: ...that he will try to change the mode of development of agriculture through Panchayat Raj.

I do not want to take more time because many other hon. Members want to speak on this Bill.

श्री रत्नाबतार शस्त्रोः (पटना) ।
सभापति जी, यह बिल बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है ।
इस की जो स्प्रिट है, उस से मैं पूरी तरह से
सहमत हूँ । यदि सरकार अभी इसे म्बोकार
करने को तैयार नहीं है तो कम से कम इस
आधार पर एक नया बिल बना कर इस मदन में
पेश कर नाकि देहातों का गवांणीण विकास
सम्भव हो सके ।

सभापति जी, इस समय जो व्यवस्था
देहातों के विकास की है—प्रखण्ड विनाम
समितियों के जर्गिये या जिला बोर्डों के जर्गिये
या जिला परिषदों के जर्गिये वह बहुत ही
असन्तोषजनक है । आजादी के 27 वर्षों के
बाद भी देहातों में नई रोजगारी ठीक से नहीं
पहुँच पाई है और खाम तोर में उन लोगों तक
जो गरीब हैं, जो अशिक्षित हैं जिन्हें हम
आमतौर से हरिजन और पिछड़ी जातियाँ के
लोग समझते हैं और बहुत से उलाका में तो
ऊँची जातियों तक विकास को रोजगारी नहीं
पहुँची है । एमं लाग जिन्हें देहात का
मुह नहीं देखा वे चुनाव के समय देहात में
जाते हैं और गरीबों का एक बार वाट हासिल
कर लेने के बाद फिर पांच साल तक उन की
खोज खबर नहीं रखते और उनके विकास की
बातें भूल जाते हैं । मुझे अनुभव है क्योंकि मैं
खंतिहर मजदूरों में काम करता हूँ । बिहार में
लगभग 25, 30 प्रतिशत एमं लोग हैं जिनके
पास कोई जमीन नहीं है, रहने के लिये झोपड़ी
नहीं, पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था नहीं, दवा-
दारू और शिक्षा की व्यवस्था नहीं है । और
रोजगार की बात तो भूल ही जाइये ।
शहर में तो कुछ लोगों को रोजगार मिल भी
जाता है, देहातों में उनकी भी व्यवस्था
नहीं है । और आवागमन की कितनी दिक्कत
है, इसका अनुभव तो सभापति जी आपको
स्वयं होगा । आज जो पचासतों की व्यवस्था
बना रखी गयी है उसमें सालों तक उनका
चुनाव नहीं होता, और अगर होता भी है तो
जाति और पैसों के बल पर, अष्टाचार और
भुजार्थी के बल पर ही सब काम होता है ।

बेचारे गरीबों को ठग कर के लोग मुखिया
बन जाते हैं । हमारे यहाँ गाता गाया जाता
है बिहार में कि मुखिया मुखिया बन गया ।
यानी जनता की मुखिया के लिए जो भी चीजें
सरकार द्वारा भेजी जाती हैं, उनको पैसों वाले
लोग ही खा जाते हैं और गरीब को कुछ नहीं
मिलता है । अगर अफमरो के पाम भी जाते हैं
तो वे भी उनकी वान नहीं मुनते हैं क्योंकि
गरीब उनको पैसा नहीं दे सकते । साधन
वाले लोग ही खाद, बीज और तमाम साधन
ल लेते हैं और पचासतों या अनाक डेवलपमेंट
के जर्गिये । इमलिये आज तक पचासतों के जर्गिये
देश में विकास का बहुत काम नहीं हुआ
है । धनी लोगों का ही विकास हुआ है ।
देहात में प्रखण्डों के जर्गिये पूजीवाद का विकास
हो रहा है और इसकी दोषी सरकार की नीति
है क्योंकि वह पूजीवाद, इजारेदारी को बढ़ावा
देती है और हमका अगर देहातों में जायगा ।
और उस नीति का कार्यान्वित करने वाले लोग
भी उनकी रटिकोण हैं । आज अगर
जमोन में लडाईं हमारे यहाँ गरीब लोग
लड़ते हैं तो जमींदार उन्हें गोलियाँ से मारते
हैं उनके मकान में जा दिये जाते हैं । जो लोग
अष्टाचार के खिलाफ लड़ने का दावा करते हैं
उन्हीं लोगों ने दरभंगा जिले में हरिजनों की
बगिनियों को जन्दा दिया । हमारे राक्षी में
आदिवासियों की जमीन को लडाईं की वजह
से धान की फसल जमींदारों द्वारा काटने
के खिलाफ आवाज उठाने पर हमारे दो
कम्प्युनिस्ट कार्यकर्ताओं को कत्ल कर दिया
गया और उनकी लाश बाँटी बाँटी काट डाली
गई । यही है स्वराज्य का अर्थ । और
ख़ास तौर से हरिजना और आदिवासियों के
लिये 27 वर्षों की आजादी का यही फल है ?
देहातों में आज भी सामन्ती व्यवस्था कायम
है । हमारे मूँबे में आज भी सामाजिक उत्पीडन
है । उनका खाट पर नहीं बैठने देते हैं, मवर्ण
लोगों के कुएँ पर हरिजना को पानी भरने का
अधिकार नहीं है । क्या यही स्वरूप है आजादी
का ? इस लिये जरूरत है इस तरह के
कानून बनाने की जिसमें बनिवादी व्यवस्था

[श्री रामावतार शास्त्री]

में परिवर्तन लाया जा सके। जब तक समाजवादी व्यवस्था सही माने में देश में नहीं आयेगी, तब तक जनतांत्रिक क्रान्ति देश में नहीं होगी और धींगामस्ती, नेताओं और अफसरों का भ्रष्टाचार तथा 420 की समाप्ति नहीं होगी तब तक देहातों में विकास का काम नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिये नये सिरे से ऐसा कानून लायें जिससे हम उनको आर्थिक तौर पर मजबूत कर सकें, खास तौर से गरीबों को।

आपकी जो वर्तमान व्यवस्था है डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड की या पंचायतों की या प्रखण्ड विकास कार्यालयों की उससे वह काम नहीं हो रहा है, बल्कि स्थिर स्वार्थ वाले लोग ही उसका फायदा उठा रहे हैं। इस बिल में बहुत सारी बातों को कहा गया है, उनकी तरफ आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिये। और सबसे पहले ध्यान देहातों में पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था की ओर जाना चाहिये। मकान सब को दीजिये, खास तौर से शेड्यूलड कास्ट और ट्राइव के लोगों के लिये मकान की व्यवस्था की जाय, उनकी शिक्षा की व्यवस्था कीजिये, उनके गांवों तक सड़क जा सके और देहातों में छोटे पैमाने पर उद्योग धंधे खोलिये ताकि रोजगार की व्यवस्था हो सके। और पुलिस का जो इस्तेमाल हो रहा है गरीबों को दवाने के लिये, बटाईदारों और किसानों को दवाने के लिये तथा जमींदारों के हक की हिफाजत करने के लिये, इसको रोकिये। ऐसा कानून आप लाइये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक की मोटी मोटी बातों का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI P. R. SHENOY (Udipi): I wholeheartedly welcome the spirit behind this Bill that has been introduced by Shri Ranabahadur Singh.

For the success of any plan, involvement of the people at various levels is absolutely necessary. It is not enough that we try to see and plan the future of India from the Yojana Bhavan. There must be plans at the State level and also at the district level and even at the village level. And the plan at the centre should be based on the plan at the lower levels.

As Shri Mavalankar said, we should not make the villagers to go to Delhi from the State headquarters or even to the district headquarters to get a well. In this connection, I am reminded of a small incident. The authorities in a State wanted to dig a well in a village. So, sitting at the headquarters of the State, they summoned some villagers and got their views regarding the location of the well in that village. After hearing them, there was some discussion and since there was a dispute regarding the location of the well, they decided that the well should be exactly at the centre of the village. So, they got hold of the map of the village and found out the latitude and the longitude to decide the exact point where it should be dug...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may continue on the next day. Now we adjourn to meet again on the 2nd December, 1974 at 11 a.m.

18 hrs /

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, December 2, 1974/Agrahayana 11, 1896 (Saka).