

मौज करने वालों को आप यह मौका दे रहें हैं कि तुम वेल ले लो, एंटिसिपेटरी वेल ले लो, वारंट से गिरा-तार होने के पहले ही ले लो। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक जुर्म हम करने जा रहे हैं। जो नीतियाँ सरकार अपना रही है जो अपनाने का दावा करती है, उस सब को हम 438 के जरिये खत्म कर दे रहे हैं।

इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सदन इस पर गौर करे कि इस दफा को खत्म करना जरूरी है या नहीं? या रखना जरूरी है तो अपवाद कर दीजिये कि खून वाले या एकोनामिक नहीं आफ़ेस वाले जो जुर्म होंगे उन में यह एंटिसिपेटरी वेल नहीं मिलेगा। . . .

**श्री मूल चन्द्र डागा (पानी):** जब तक गुनाह साबित न हो जाय तब तक उस को गुनाह न मानें।

**श्री भोगेन्द्र झा :** एक दम सही बात है। इसीलिये मेरा आग्रह है कि सबों को जमानत मिल जाय। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ—डागा साहब रिश्मत कर के बोलेंगे कि साबित होने के पहले कोई गुनाहगार नहीं है, इसलिये सब को जमानत मिल जाय।

सभापति महोदय, इतने थोड़े समय में मैं पूरी बातें नहीं कह सकता हूँ लेकिन कुछ धाराओं के विषयों में कहना चाहता हूँ। एक बहुत बड़ा जुर्म यह होता है कि पुलिस की डायरी का जिन को अनुभव है वे सभी जानते हैं कि डायरी दो महीने बाद एक महीने के बाद, पन्द्रह दिन के बाद एक ही साथ लिख ली जाती है। पुलिस पहले से सोच लेती है, क्या लिखना है, घूस लेकर या किसी प्रभाव में आ कर डायरी लिखी जाती है, बयान लिखे जाते हैं और उसकी नकल नहीं दी जाती है। मेरा आग्रह है और मैंने प्रवर समिति में भी कहा था कि बयान देने के लिये 24 घंटा, 48 घंटा और यदि उस में भी सम्भव न हो तो 72 घंटा दे दीजिये और उस के बाद पैसा देकर वह उस की नकल ले सकें ऐसी व्यवस्था कीजिये। इस से डायरी समय पर

लिखी जायेगी और यह खतरा नहीं रहेगा कि दो तीन महीने बाद एक दिन बैठ कर 25 दिन की डायरी तैयार कर ली जाय। इस से सरकार की आमदनी भी बढ़ जायेगी और अपने खर्च पर महालय कापी ले सकेगा। मैं जानता हूँ कि पैसेवाले तो अब भी ले जाते हैं, हजार रुपये में, दो हजार रुपये में, डायरी बिकती है, लेकिन इस तरह से गरीब आदमी भी नकल ले सकेगा। जब संशोधनों पर विचार होगा, तब मैं बाकी बातें अर्ज करूँगा।

17.32 hrs.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, THE CHOYAL OF SIKKIM AND LEADERS OF POLITICAL PARTIES OF SIKKIM

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH): I beg to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the agreement between the Government of India, the Chogyal of Sikkim and the leaders of the political parties of Sikkim, signed on 8th May, 1975.

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE BILL.—contd.

SHRI DINESH JOARDER (Malda): May I know the time by which amendments will have to be given notice of?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can give them upto 12 O'clock tomorrow. Now we shall take up the next item of business.

17.51 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION  
 IMPLEMENTATION OF LAND REFORMS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon Mr. Samar Guha, I have to say this. Mr. Samar Guha has requested time for fifteen minutes. There are four more participants. I request him to be as brief as possible.

**श्री भोगेन्द्र झा (जयनगर):** सभापति महोदय, इस सवाल पर मैं अपना नाम नहीं दे सका हूँ, क्या इस समय कुछ प्रश्नों के लिये अनुमति देंगे।

**सभापति महोदय:** अनुमति इस लिये नहीं दे सकता कि इस पर पहले ही 9 नाम आये थे और 4 बैठते हुए हैं।

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा : यह राष्ट्रीय महत्व का सवाल है, प्राप अनुमति दे दें तो बड़ी कृपा होगी ।

समाप्ति महोदय : रूल्ड के तेहत चलना होगा, जिन चार लोगों के नाम बिलेट में आये हैं, उनको ही टाइम दिया जायेगा ।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Just a year before, this House has had furious discussions on land reforms, from the side of the Opposition, as well as Congress members. But after the conference of the Chief Ministers and the promise that was made at that time that by December 1973 land reforms would be completed and the surplus lands would be distributed among the landless labour, particularly the Scheduled Castes and Tribes, interestingly I find that this House has become benumbed in regard to implementation of those promises.

In reality, this promise or policy of the land-reform measures of the Government has proved to be a big fraud or a big hoax. These are two strong words. I am sure that the hon. Minister will agree with me that it has proved to be completely infructuous. The report submitted by the Task Force of the Planning Commission will bear testimony to this. This is what the Raj Committee as also the Task Force of the Planning Commission say:—

“the sad truth is that the crucial factor of effective political support, direction and control, has been so wanting” including “absence of political will”.

In another highly critical note, the Planning Commission's Task Force Report concluded :

“In no sphere of public activity in our country, since independence has a hiatus between the precept and practice, between policy—pronouncement and actual execution, has been as great as in the domain of land reform”.

Again, the hon. Minister in reply to a question pathetically reiterated some of the reasonings of the failure of land reform as enumerated in the Report of the Task Force. He said :

“The hurdles that have come up in the implementation of land reforms in the States related to

(i) want of participation of beneficiaries in the implementation of land reform;

(ii) absence of correct and upto date records of rights;

(iii) legal hurdles;

(iv) loopholes in legislations; and

(v) the lack of political will”.

I would like the hon. Minister to tell this House as to how has the lack of political will got anything to do with the land reform. The present Ruling Congress wields absolute administrative will of the people, both at the Centre and the States, more than expected by any democratic Government in any part of the world. The responsibility of failure of the implementation of land reforms, therefore, squarely lies with the Ruling Congress Party. I hope that the hon. Minister will admit that.

Unfortunately, the gravity of the land reform problems has not been seriously taken note of even by the Planning Commission. 81 per cent. of the people of our country live in the rural areas, 51 per cent of them live without minimum means of subsistence, euphemistically called living below poverty level. The future of economic development of our country, the issue of social justice to the titanic dimension of poverty of our people and the strategy of attack on poverty line are vitally linked with speedy implementation of land reform.

Unfortunately, even in the Approach Paper of the Fifth Plan, it seems that no special priority to the urgency of the problems of land reform has been given. I am sure that nobody gets the impression that any priority has been given by the Planning Commission. I shall quote what the Task Force of the Planning Commission has stated.

“The programme of land reforms has been viewed so far in isolation from the main stream of economic development. The main ingredients of the programme, like abolition of intermediary tenures, tenancy reforms and ceiling on agricultural holdings were treated as disjointed programmes and sought to be implemented as such.”

This Approach Paper has not taken into consideration the economic development of our country. Everything depends upon the land reform measures. The land reform measures have no doubt brought 20 million tenants into direct contact with Government, but the fate of the 27 million landless agriculture labour and the millions of share croppers remained practically unchanged. Ceiling laws proved to be a big fraud as most of the lands were transferred as benami land or recorded in the categories of exemptions of religious trust, orchard, farms, public institution, fisheries, etc. The Task Force Report says that the “lands are

transferred as property belonging to religious trusts or other persons fictitiously or collusively recorded." The result of all this is this that after the land reform measures were adopted by the States of Mysore, Orissa and Rajasthan, according to the Government's own statistics, not a single acre was found as surplus land. In Bihar only 700 acres of land was obtained as surplus. According to the Government figures, about 2.27 million acres of cultivable land was obtained so far as surplus out of which more than 50%, i.e., 1.15 millions remained undistributed. The Planning Minister, Shri Dhar, said that the available estimate of surplus land would be about five million acres but the latest Government figures given is that it will be only 3.52 million acres. This means only .1%—here I have made my own calculation—of the total land under cultivation has been obtained as surplus. If the total reported areas of land are taken into consideration, surplus land will be 1.1%. According to estimated figure, it will be only 3% in relation to land under cultivation and in relation to total reported area it will be only 4%. This means by sheer trickery of juxtaposition of benami ownership, 99.3% of land remained in the hands of the land-owning class mostly as benami land and according to estimated figure, it will amount to 97%. Does it not mean that the Land Ceiling Act has been proved to be either a hoax or a fraud?

Another trickery has been adopted in fixing the ceiling, by making discrimination between "assured irrigated land" and "non-assured irrigated land". In most of the States upto 54 acres of non-assured irrigated land can be retained by a family of five persons.

According to the report of the National Survey out of Rs. 2,000 crores in the third plan and Rs. 650 crores in the fourth plan upto 1971 allocated by the Finance Corporation of the Reserve Bank of India for the purpose of irrigation, 90% of this fund went to the private sector of the land owning class. Less than 5% of the land owning class constitute 62% of the agriculturists and control only 19% of the total land. Farmers class having arable land between 5 and 12.5 acres constitute 25% of the families and own 29% of the total land. The small and the middle farmers together constitute 86.5% but controlling only 48% of the arable land. Whereas land owners having lands above 12.5 acres constitute only 13.5%, these big farmer families control 51% of arable land. This means, out of Rs. 2,650 crores spent for irrigation by the Agricultural Finance Corporation during the third and fourth plan, about Rs. 1,400 crores had gone only to 13.5% of big farmer families. The present ceiling will only strengthen their position and help to concentrate agricultural income to 13.5% of the big farmers.

Unless betterment agricultural levy, as suggested by the Raj Committee and the Task Force Report is introduced, it will be futile to expect equitable distribution of agricultural wealth or removal of poverty. According to Government report, 82.9% of the small and middle farmers own land assets constituting only 39.7%. But 10.7% big farmers own 22.2% and 6.4% rich farmers own 38.1% of the land assets. According to the report of the Bureau of Labour and Employment, the number of agricultural labour is increasing.

Agriculture Labour :  
(Percentage)

	1950—55	1956-57	1963—65
With land	49.93	42.87	38.65
Without land	50.07	57.13	61.17

Land Reforms of West Bengal are considered as a model, but even there much less than 1% surplus land could be secured. Even more, 50% of the surplus remained undistributed. In 1961 agricultural figure of labour was 13.3% but now it is 25.7%.

Coming to the fate of sharecroppers, they have got some benefit but due to the absence of land records and litigation, their benefits have been in reality denied. In West Bengal alone about 45,000 cases have been started to oust the tenants and share croppers.

It can be easily imagined that regarding such case of litigation, the all-India figures will be fantastic.

Here, the Task Force Report says:

"There is nothing to prevent a determined group of landowners from adopting 'other methods' to throw out physically from the land the share-croppers. It has been found that very often the landowners short circuit the provisions of tenancy law... the share-croppers could not withstand for long the economic and social sanctions that were applied against them by the landowners.

In the Chief Ministers' Conference, it was decided:

"State Government set up non-official bodies at appropriate tenets and place competent officials organisation in order to administer the ceiling legislation."

What has actually happened? Everywhere, Congress Committees have been set up. They are covering benami landowners; they are covering rich and big landlords and distributing lands only to their own party proteges.

[Shri Samar Guha]

In the end, I want to ask some questions. I want to know from the Government whether they will implement the recommendations of the Raj Committee and the Task Force Report by taking measures:—

(i) to allocate special funds in the Fifth Plan for preparation of records of right;

(ii) to strictly implement ceiling laws and tenancy Act;

(iii) to extend necessary inputs to new assignees of surplus land;

(iv) to set up Land Reforms Organisation as a parallel body to Land Revenue Administration so that land reforms may not be one of the many functions of the Revenue Departments;

(v) to separate land reform measures from the scope of ordinary judiciary by setting up Special Land Tribunals to bring justice to the door of the people;

(vi) to amend the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution so that ceiling land could be kept outside the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts;

(vii) to take steps for distribution of surplus land vested in government within 12 months;

(viii) to give necessary supply of inputs to the poor cultivators by assuring security of the tenure;

(ix) to introduce betterment levy on big farmers;

(x) to set up special administrative cell in cooperation with all parties committee to unearth benami land and assure distribution of surplus land to poor tillers;

(xi) to change ceiling laws regarding "assured" and "non-assured" irrigated lands;

(xii) to provide legal aids to sharecroppers and tenants to fight litigations against them;

(xiii) to provide homestead land to all Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people;

(xiv) to enact deterrent laws against benami land holders; and

(xv) to give top priority in the Fifth Plan to integrate land reform measures with overall economic development programmes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri S. M. Banerjee—absent; Shri D. Deb—absent. Shri P. G. Mavalankar.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Firstly, I would like to ask whether the Government is earnest about the problem of land reforms. This is the basic question.

Secondly, have the Union Government and various State Governments evolved a rational pattern about land reforms?

Thirdly, has the Government carefully looked into the economics of the matter, particularly, what about the danger of fragmentation of land? What is the unit of the economically feasible and profitable land distribution?

Finally, with regard to the land ceiling legislation, I find, because of the fact that a lot of years have passed by, nothing significant has happened. Already, the landlords, big and small, have done their utmost to dodge the possible effects of this land reforms and land ceiling programme.

How is the Government going to tackle this problem of dodging and evasion of the desired objectives of land legislation . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Undoing the evasion or arresting the evasion?

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Arresting the evasion and setting the matter right. Already a lot of time has been wasted and nothing has been done.

Lastly, I would like to say that, in the answer given on 28th March 1973, it has been mentioned by the Minister that one of the hurdles is 'lack of political will'. This is really an admission on the part of the Government that they have not done their job to educate the people and enable the people to accept these reforms in the right spirit and in all its effects. My last word, therefore, is this. The Prime Minister and many of her colleagues, every now and then, both in the House and outside, talk about the will of the people and they say that the Opposition are coming in the way of the will of the people. I want to ask: what about this political will which, the Minister says, is lacking? Apart from the Opposition, what have the Government been doing to see that the will of the people is articulated in the right manner in time?

श्री भूख खख डाया (पानी) : सभापति महोदय, सब से पहले मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब भूमि सुधार की व्यवस्था प्रारम्भ की तो हिन्दुस्तान में कितनी जमीन घाय को मिलनी थी और आज तक उस के हिसाब से कितनी मिली। सिवाय महाराष्ट्र को छोड़ कर क्या मंत्री महोदय कभी खुद भूमि की आबंटन समिति में बैठे हैं? आज तक किसी अलाटमेंट

कमेटी में गये हैं, और कभी आपके सामने कोई भूमि का अलॉटमेंट हुआ है ?

Have you ever attended the meeting of the Allotment Committee? Was land allotted to farmers? Please let me know when and where you attended the meetings, leaving aside Maharashtra.

लैंड कल्टीवेशन की जिसनी जमीनें हैं इरी-ग्रेट एरिया के अन्दर तो लैंड कल्टीवेशन में कभी भूमि की अंशानुदान नहीं दी जाती। इसलिये मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि लैंड कल्टीवेशन के अन्दर जो भूमि है वह कितनी है और उस के अन्दर आप ने कितने लोगों को जमीन अलॉट की है ? जहाँ इरिगेशन के बांध बने हैं वहाँ पर कितने लोगों को जमीन दी है, और कितनी आप ने अलॉट कर दी है ? क्या वह भूमि अभी तक रखी हुई है ?

आप ने भूमि सुधार के मामले में किस राज्य में कितने अधिकारियों को सस्पेंड किया है नौकरी से, इस के आंकड़े दीजिये कि इतने अधिकारी नौकरी से बर्चित किये गये हैं जिन्होंने भूमि बांटने का काम नहीं किया हो, या भूमि अलॉट न की हो ? पटवारी, तहसीलदार, एस० डी० ओ० और कलेक्टर आदि कितने अधिकारियों को आप ने सस्पेंड किया है, किस को आप ने जिम्मेदार माना है कि उस आदमी ने ठीक काम नहीं किया, इसलिये इतने आदमियों को भूमि सुधार के मामले में सजा दी गयी ?

कितने आप के पुलिस में क्लेज हुए ? क्या आप ने भूमि अलॉट करने के बाद यह भी देखा कि उस पर फिर एन्क्रोचमेंट हो गया और वह भूमि उस के पास नहीं गयी ? मैं समझता हूँ कि 1950 में राजस्थान के अन्दर भूमि सुधार का कानून हम ने पास किया था, और मैं बराबर इन कमेटियों में रहा हूँ आज 1973 है, 23 सालों में इने गिने लोगों को भूमि मिली है, अधिकांश लोगों को नहीं मिल पायी, इस लिये मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ऐस कम्पें हैं। मंत्री जी केवल क्लेज की बातें करते हैं जिस से भेरे विस पर चोट लगती है। इन की कयनी करती में जमीन

आसमान का अन्तर है। आप बताइये कि भूमि अलॉटमेंट के मामले में किस तरह से आप की सीलिंग है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अलग अलग स्टेट्स में सीलिंग का कानून लागू है, राजस्थान में सीलिंग करने के बाद कितनी भूमि राजस्थान में मिली है ?

श्री समर गुहा : एक एकड़ भी नहीं मिली।

श्री बरबारा सिंह (होशियारपुर) : सैंडलेस टेनेन्ट्स और दूसरों को सरकार से कोई मदद मिलेगी कि नहीं ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI MOHAN DHARIA): The question of land reforms is a burning issue before the country. Several problems have been posed here and it is very difficult for me to deal with in the limited period with all the problems.

As I have stated in my reply on that day to the question, I have enumerated various reasons as to why it was not possible for us to implement the land reforms including land ceilings. It is true that one of the reasons I have stated is lack of political will. Let us not forget that this is a vast country and particularly, the subject that we are discussing to-day is a State subject. In spite of that, it was under the able leadership of the Prime Minister . . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: You are in power in all the States except in one.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: Under the able leadership of our Prime Minister, we brought together all the Chief Ministers. The guidelines were accepted and all the State Governments have been told to have their ceiling laws, amended ceiling laws or fresh ceiling laws implemented and also to see that the surplus land is distributed by December 1975. Naturally, when we are discussing here to-day on a premature date, this is not exactly the appropriate time to have a discussion but any way, I am sure this will help us in getting these things implemented and taking the feelings of the House to the Ministers and the Chief Ministers concerned.

By this time eleven States have already enacted fresh legislation and other States have either passed or formulated their Bills and some have actually sent their Bills for assent and that is how I have no doubt that within this period stipulated, that is by December 1975, not only the ceiling laws will be enacted but the State Governments will also see that they are properly implemented.

[Shri Mohan Dharia]

The House is well aware that absence of land records, inadequate protection to tenants and share-croppers, like that, there were several difficulties in our way. But the Zamindari system was abolished and the advantage is enjoyed by 20 million tenants in our country.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: One thing is necessary. Specific questions have been put and we want specific answers to those questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is coming to that.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: These are the replies to the questions raised by Shri Samar Guha mainly.

To say that is a great hoax, that it is a great fraud, when it was possible for us to give protection to nearly 20 million tenants because of the abolition of the Zamindari system—how can you say that it is a great fraud? . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Only direct contact between the Government and the tenant, but no land has been distributed, except the intermediary tenancy.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: when over three million tenants in the country would get proper protection and also direct ownership of the land to the tune of three million hectares in the country, to say that it is a fraud—I am not here to agree with that statement which was made on the floor of the House.

It is again said that there has not been any distribution of the surplus land. It is again not correct. Then the waste land of the Government to the tune of 5.7 million hectares has been distributed. Besides 5 million hectares of the surplus land . . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Again, I have not said . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please listen to him. You had your say.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: From the statistics given to me, I have said that uptill now in three States not a single surplus land has been distributed. Out of the cultivated land only .1% all over India is the surplus land. This is mathematical calculation and I say only .1% of the total land under cultivation you have got as surplus land

18 Hrs.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: The point is that when we think of this problem, what we have actually achieved, is the main thing. When you say it is a fraud it is a hoax, should we not try to understand the realities? Therefore, I am submitting that 5.7 million hectares of surplus land, from the Government land, has already been distributed and besides, .5 million acres of the surplus land had already been made available because of the earlier legislation.

As I said in the beginning, we are not happy with the pace in which these land ceiling laws and land reforms are being implemented by the State Governments. I do not want to hide anything at all. However, not to take into consideration all these facts and to say that it is a hoax or a fraud, is saying too much and I would not concede to the charge of the hon. Member. He has quoted from various reports from the Planning Commission. The Plan Documents themselves have categorically mentioned how we have been emphasising the importance of land reforms and land ceiling laws. He quoted from the Task Force Reports of the Planning Commission. We have prepared the guidelines and we have sent them on the 24th April to all the State Governments. We have requested the State Governments to see that adequate funds are made available especially in respect of those areas where, without such additional amounts, it will not be possible for them to cultivate the surplus lands made available. So, we have done all these things. Regarding the machinery, we have already suggested that there may be a special machinery for implementation of all these land laws and there may be separate Commissioners for the implementation of these land laws. This applies to the machinery at the district level and at the local level. All these disputes should be taken out of the jurisdiction of the civil courts—I say so, with due respect to the civil courts. There should be special tribunals to go into all these aspects and also to take care in seeing that the matters are not any further delayed.

Regarding homesteads to landless labourers, it is our policy to provide homesteads to landless labourers and during the Fifth Five-year Plan we are making the necessary allocations.

Regarding the Raj Committee's Report, hon. Members are aware of the recommendations of the Committee. They have to be implemented by the State Governments. We cannot forget the political difficulties that are being faced by every party. When they were in power, they could not do certain things; we can understand all these things. It is a pressing problem, it is a burning problem, and naturally, we are attaching the greatest importance to this problem, and we have urged upon the State Governments to expedite the implementation process as early as possible as have been stipulated in our guidelines.

Then my friend Mr. Mavalanker asked me a question whether the government is earnest. I must again say to the House that those old days are gone. The government is absolutely earnest and serious. When the government assures to the country the assurance of the governments is absolutely serious and earnest.

One more question asked by Mr. Mavalankar as to what happened to the fragmentation. We have requested the State governments to have programmes of land consolidation and see to it that the holding could be economic holdings. At the same time let us not forget the problem of those who are most backward and socially backward. Therefore, whenever surplus land is available priority should be given to landless labourers particularly belonging to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. If they are not given a piece of land it will never be possible for the weaker sections to stand on their own. At the same time in our guidelines we have told the State governments to take care of this problem of fragmentation. It is not merely distribution of land. Out of this distribution we have to make it more productive. Until and unless the holdings are economic they cannot be productive. Therefore, we have taken that care.

My friend Shri Daga has also raised several questions. He has asked how many meetings I have attended in other States? I have not attended any meeting as I am not in the habit of attending a meeting without invitation. Mr. Daga also raised the point as to how many officers have been suspended? I think Mr. Daga is justified in raising this point. If we want these things to be implemented we shall have to be hard against those who are to be the implementing authority.

Lastly, coming to the point of people's involvement we have been requesting these beneficiaries should have their associations. One major reason for their not getting the richer peasantry which was always organised and had domination everywhere but the landless labourers were most disorganised and naturally their undue advantage was taken.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Those who tried to organise the power section were dubbed as naxalites and agitators.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: It is not the question who is dubbed but are we serious to ourselves? If we are committed to this philosophy then why not we all take this responsibility of mobilising the weakest sections in society and see that justice is rendered. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let Shri Samar Guha not interrupt any more. It is past six O' clock already.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: We are ready to cooperate. Therefore, he cannot blame us.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: I would like to appeal to all the Members, and those who are the elected representatives of the people—to whatever parties they may belong is immaterial, they should be taken into confidence . . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: But all MPs are excluded from all committees in West Bengal at least. This has never happened during the last 25 years. I am ready to co-operate, but from all committees, the MPs are excluded, and it is only a Congress committee which is there.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: If there is any specific complaint, I am prepared to look into it, and I shall personally look into it. For I believe in democracy those who are elected by the people shall have to be involved at all levels. If there is any complaint, I am prepared to look into it.

I would like to appeal to hon. Members not to treat this problem as if it is the problem of just one political party. It is a national problem and it is a social problem. A solution of this problem can rebuild our whole Indian economy and new social structure and, therefore, I seek the cooperation of all sections in this matter.

18.10 Hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, May 10, 1973/Vaisakha 20, 1895 (Saka).*