

12 14 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume discussion on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation

Out of eight hours allotted for these Demands, 7 hours and 27 minutes now remain

The list of selected cut motions relating to these Demands has already been circulated to hon Members on the 11th April. Those cut motions may be moved, subject to their being otherwise admissible

Shri Vasudevan Nair was in possession of the House. He may continue his speech

Need to do away with regional disparity in allocation of funds to areas under Community Development programmes

Shri P. G. Deb: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100"

Need to consult Panchayats in regard to development works in Community Development Projects and National Extension Service Blocks

Shri P. G. Deb: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100"

Misuse of jeeps by National Extension Service and Community Development Blocks authorities

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development

Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100"

Failure of social education programme because of no follow-up activities

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move,

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100"

Role of the Block Development Officers and the Village-level workers

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100"

Absence of any provision in the Block budgets for maintaining and repairing the existing and old village roads

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100"

Bureaucratic and official outlook still dominating the various activities of the Block administration

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100."

Slow progress of minor irrigation programmes in National Extension Service and Community Development Blocks

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100"

Failure to encourage village and small-scale industries and industrial co-operative societies in National Extension Service and Community Development areas

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Present composition and functions of the Block Advisory Committees

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Defective working of the credit co-operative and other co-operative organisations

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Need for proper evaluation of the work done in NES and CD Blocks for increasing agricultural production

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Need for making full utilisation of all available local resources of improved seeds, manures and irrigation water

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Ser-

vice and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Slow progress in implementing the recommendations of the Study Team

Shri Panigrahi. I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Pattern of expenditure agreed to in the revised schematic budgets for stage I and stage II blocks

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Programme of village leader training adopted and put to practice by the Block Development Authorities

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move.

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Slow progress in implementing programmes relating to animal husbandry and fisheries in Block areas due to shortage of qualified technical personnel

Shri Panigrahi. I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Need to simplify law relating to co-operatives

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Failure in encouraging the labour contract co-operative societies in N.E.S. & C.D. Block areas

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for opening National Extension Service Blocks in Deogarh and Raurakhole sub-divisions in Orissa

Shri P. G. Deb: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Community Development Projects and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for opening an Oriental Training Centre at Angul, Orissa for training of Block Development Officers from this year

Shri P. G. Deb: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Community Development Projects and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100"

Failure to provide sufficient number of service co-operatives all over India

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to provide enough irrigation and minor irrigation schemes under the National Extension Service and Community Development Blocks

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to understand the real difficulties of the farmers in regard to co-operatives

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Problem of agricultural finance

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to implement the recommendations made by All India Rural Credit Survey

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100"

Misuse of government vehicles by National Extension Service and Community Development Blocks authorities

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to stop corruption in the Department

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Co-operation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Speaker: All these cut motions are before the House.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Thiruvalla): Last time I was referring to a report by the study group of the Agriculture Ministry on co-operative policy, and then I was trying to make out that the Government should give serious thought before finally adopting that report and implementing it.

I would like to say a few words on the hotly discussed topic of co-operative farming. The hon. Prime Minister in his introductory remarks stated that he believes that this policy of co-operative farming is, on the whole, accepted by the entire country. I feel that that statement is quite correct, but that does not mean that there is not opposition to this policy, that there is not very strong criticism of even the fundamental approach of this policy of co-operative farming.

Even yesterday I read a very long speech by Shri C. Rajagopalachari, when he was addressing a conference of agriculturists. He was criticising this policy and asking the Government to drop this policy. So, a lot of discussion is necessary on this issue even now and we have to thrash out many points.

Even in this very House we have got our friend Shri Masani who very strongly disagrees with this policy. He has moved a cut motion on this very Demand to discuss this policy of co-operative farming.

We feel that we have to create certain prerequisites before we launch upon this scheme of co-operative farming. I understand that all the resolutions passed by the Congress on this issue have made it very clear that we are going to have this co-operative farming only after three years, and during this period of three years we are going to have only service co-operatives. But apart from the service co-operatives, to me the most important pre-requisite necessary for successful co-operative farming is basic land reforms.

I know that the discussion of land reforms is not very relevant here. I cannot imagine successful co-operative farming without implementing the policy of ceiling on holdings of land because, retaining powerful landholders in the countryside you cannot have successful co-operative farming. The result will be that these co-operatives will turn out to be the pocket organisations of these powerful vested interests, the powerful landlords in the countryside, if we are not going to implement basic land reforms immediately.

I do not know how much we will succeed in the real implementation of the great proclamations that we have made on this issue. We have passed many resolutions, we have made many declarations. The Prime Minister often refers to that, but with the very many other statements made by very important people in the ruling party, I doubt very much whether we will be able to implement this policy.

I am reminded of the statement made by an hon. Minister of the Madras Government, the Revenue Minister himself, during the last debate in the Madras Assembly, that they will only go slow on this issue, that they will only introduce the Bill before 1st January, 1960, and that they will be very liberal in fixing the ceiling. He indicated that this may go up to 100 acres for one single individual, and that for the extra land they will be given very good compensation. All these statements he made on the floor of the Madras Assembly. And there are several other statements like that. So, we have got our apprehension about the real implementation of this policy.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Aurangabad): What is the compensation enumerated in the Kerala Agrarian Bill? Does the hon. Member know?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I have no time to go into those details, but I would like to tell the hon. Member

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

that it is five to sixteen times the fair rent.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: I may inform the hon. Member that it is 60 per cent of the market value.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I do not know the result of the Select Committee Report, as to what is the final decision, because I have not seen it, but in the draft Bill it was five to sixteen times of the fair rent.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: It has changed.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I do not know the latest position. In the draft Bill it was five to sixteen times of the fair rent.

Hon Member Shri Masani has on several occasions raised very important points objecting to this idea of co-operative farming. On several other occasions, I believe many hon. Members in this House have replied to him very effectively. So I do not want to go into the details of the problem. But I was astonished to find that in order to emphasise his case, he was quoting several people including the former Polish Prime Minister Mr. Gomulka, and I should say that the hon. Member has almost succeeded in creating an impression that the policies adopted by the Government led by Mr. Gomulka are policies almost against co-operative farming—at least he was able to create that impression. But I should say that he was depending on at least half quotations. I would place before him the latest report presented by Mr. Gomulka, who is First Secretary of the Polish United Workers Party, before their Party Congress on March 10, 1959. It is reported like this:

"Gomulka emphasised the importance of all-round strengthening of the socialist sector in agriculture through ensuring to the co-operative farms the condi-

tions in which they could quickly develop. While anxious to maintain the full voluntariness and to respect the will of the peasants, he said we shall indicate to the working peasants that the road to the constant growth of the well being and culture of the nation is connected with the prospect of the socialist transformation of the countryside".

He has left no doubt for others to feel that the Polish Government has gone back on this issue of co-operative farming. On the other hand, many governments and many parties in the world have come to the conclusion through experience and after mature thought that the only way of rapid development in the countryside, the only way of removing the inequalities between different sections in the countryside, the only effective way of liberating the large millions of peasants from the drudgery that they were being subjected to for the last so many generations is the way of co-operative farming, is the way of building up socialism in the countryside.

I can understand Shri M. R. Masani's opposition because he is against socialism. He is, I should say, the champion of non-co-operation in the countryside, because he knows that if there is going to be effective co-operative farming in the countryside, then the unhindered development of capitalism in the countryside cannot take place. That is the obvious result of co-operative farming in the countryside. The Prime Minister himself in his introductory remarks made it very clear that the policy of co-operative farming is closely linked up with the building of socialism in this country, and we need not be astonished to find Shri Masani, who is an open champion of the private sector in all the fields, coming forward and opposing co-operative farming.

Apart from the experience of Poland, we have got our own experience in our own country. I do not say that we have got a very large experience, but we have got our little experience. Before going into that, I would like Shri Masani to go through a very valuable article on the experience of co-operative farming in Bulgaria. It is a very small country. But their experiences are very rich. I would like to tell Shri Masani that they have succeeded in building up co-operatives, at the same time retaining private ownership on the individual plots of land. The article is by Stanko Todorov, a very important leader of the Bulgarian Government. He says

"Proceeding from the agrarian relations that had taken shape in Bulgaria, the Party came to the conclusion that co-operation with the peasants retaining private property in land was the most painless way of solving the agrarian problem."

Now they have succeeded in organising more than 90 per cent of the peasants in co-operative farming, the peasants retaining at the same time ownership rights on their land. When the income is divided among the members of the co-operatives, those peasants who have got ownership rights get part of the income as rent of the land. That is the system they have adopted. We need not go into details, but the point is that there is absolutely voluntary co-operation. The personal ownership right of the peasants on their land is retained, and co-operative farming is possible with the personal ownership of land and voluntary co-operation.

Now, what has happened to production? Shri Masani was trying to prove that perhaps in no country under the sun could they succeed in substantially increasing production through co-operative farming. I contest that statement. That statement is not correct. He has not taken pains to go

through the several examples which perhaps go against his point. That is a closed-door policy. He has to look to other experiences, not to experiences where there were failures, but to experiences where there were signal successes. This is what Mr. Stanko Todorov has to say about production:

"Volume of output has grown as a result of the development and strengthening of the co-operatives. In 1952, 2,041,000 tons of wheat were grown, the figure rose to 2,375,000 tons in 1957, of which 1,998,000 tons or 84 per cent were supplied by the producer co-operatives. During this period, maize production rose from 487,000 tons to 1,461,000 tons of which the producer co-operative, supplied 1,076,000 tons or 74 per cent."

Again, as a result of co-operative farming, they were able to reduce the production cost. Also, the purchasing power of the peasants was increased three-fold as a result of co-operative farming. All these experiences are there before us.

Now I come to the experience in our own State. I agree we have not developed co-operative farming on a large scale, but we have got certain co-operative societies engaged in farming.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. If the hon. Member wants that one more Member from his Party should be given a chance to speak, he must wind up now. Otherwise, I will allot him all that time. Let him decide with Shri Panigrahi.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I will be as brief as possible.

In one place, there are nearly 800 members in the society who own wet lands ranging from 30 cents to 30 acres in extent. The society's functions are limited to bunding, de-watering, distribution of seeds, manure and agricultural operations required for improved farming; all other agricultural

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

operations are done by the cultivators themselves on their own responsibility. As a result, it was possible to bring down the cultivation expenses by 50 per cent to what they had been before, and to increase production.

Then there is another case where the entire cultivation was carried on by the members of the society as a whole. There again the experience is that they were able to cut down the production costs by 25 per cent. and increase production also. These are all very small examples. I do not say that we have large co-operative farms. But we have got some experience of co-operative farming.

Then there is the experience of U.P. There is an article in the *Economic Review* of the A.I.C.C. giving some figures about the profits the co-operative societies have made. I do not want to go into details for want of time. But the point is that we have to boldly accept this policy and go forward. There is no meaning in spreading scare on this issue. I am really sorry that Members like Shri Masani are spreading scare on this issue. We know that our peasants have age-old traditions, and naturally there will be resistance to this kind of thing. I appeal to the Government to come forward with all kinds of help to these co-operative societies, because without such help, the co-operative societies cannot persuade the unwilling and vacillating peasants to come into these co-operative societies and take to this kind of farming. I feel this is the only way for our country to develop, increase production and liberate our millions of peasantry from age-old drudgery.

Now, there are all kinds of references to other kinds of co-operative societies. I would like particularly to mention a special kind of society, that is the Labour Contract society. A lot of experimental in this field is now going on in our State and I would like

the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation even to send a team and find out how the workers of the State and the people at large are benefiting from this kind of experiment.

What the Kerala Government has done is this. In all the N.E.S. blocks—I think in nearly 40 blocks—they have allowed labour contract societies to be formed. They are giving the contracts for works up to a limit of Rs. 25,000 to these societies. Not only that. Government knows that these societies cannot compete with the individual contractors who are, in many cases, very powerful. These societies have just started; and, so, they should be given all kinds of help by the Government within the limits, of course of the rules of Government. Government have given them 25 per cent as advance. When a contract is given, the co-operative bank is requested to give in advance 25 per cent of the amount because they do not have enough capital with them just now.

You will be very glad to learn that nearly 10,000 workers are organised in these co-operative societies and, during the last year, they have tackled contract works of nearly Rs. 25 lakhs. They are given contracts only up to Rs. 25,000 per single contract. As a result of this, in several cases, these workers could get more wage increase, say up to 50 per cent. In certain cases—not in all cases—the workers could even get bonus which they never used to get under the contractors. This is one kind of experiment that is going on.

I am so sorry that even against this good scheme, recommended by the Planning Commission, and the Prime Minister is always talking about this scheme in his speeches, even to this scheme, there is a lot of opposition. I do not understand why even some of the ex-Ministers come forward to plead with our Chief Minister that this scheme should be dropped and the contractors should be rehabilitated, that these contracts should be given

to them and all that. We will have to meet a lot of opposition in this field because the fundamental aim of the co-operative movement is to remove middlemen from the field. So, there will be opposition for this . .

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): Some other kind of middleman will come up.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: But, in spite of that we have to proceed with the bold experiment. There are pitfalls; there will be mistakes. But, in spite of all that, the co-operative movement is the only solution to many of our ills. I hope the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation will bestow serious thought on the development of various other co-operative societies like this labour contract society.

There are several other societies functioning in our State and in many other States of India. Government have given generous help always to all these societies. Otherwise, they will meet with failure in competition with middlemen who are very powerful in society. I would request Government to educate their own people, in their own camps, because there are many non-believers and vacillators. So, they have to take effective steps to have a very definite understanding on these problems. We have to go forward with this co-operation with full vigour and speed.

Shri M. B. Masani (Ranchi—East): Sir, speaking in the House on the 28th March, the Prime Minister welcomed the very useful discussion that was proceeding in this country on the subject of joint co-operative farming. And, although I was not here, I understand that he was good enough to say that the person most to be congratulated on fostering this controversy was my humble self. Encouraged by these kind words, I would like to take a few minutes of the time of the House to ask it to consider the picture as it has now evolved in the two months since this controversy started

in the course of the Debate on the Motion of Thanks to the President.

During these two months, many things have happened and many things have been said. While I would not like to bore the House with any repetition of the arguments that have now been fairly clearly stated on both sides of this vital controversy, I think, we have new material before us on one or two aspects to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. And, I would promise that I shall not repeat the arguments that have been clearly stated on both sides.

Now, the first question is as to the kind of public response there has been to the Nagpur Resolution in so far as joint farming is concerned. Let us make it clear that we are not discussing any ambiguous term like "co-operative farming" which covers many things. The point on which I am speaking is joint farming involving the pooling of land. In regard to any other form of co-operation, I think we are all at one, that we believe in the pooling of resources of peasants owning own farms. The controversy is in regard to the proposition that the peasants' farms should be obliterated and merged in large units collectively cultivated.

The Prime Minister in opening this discussion last week said that, apart from a few incorrigible persons who could not see the light when it existed, the whole country was behind joint farming. I do not know what observation to make on this statement. It takes one's breath away because it is so contrary to, and at variance with, the facts as are known to everyone of us in our own hearts and as they are stated in discussions in the Press and elsewhere. I wonder how many Members of this House could really put their hands to their hearts and say that, except for a few incorrigible persons, their constituents in the rural areas believe in pooling their land? However, since the statement is made, may I suggest that we cast our eyes

[Shri M. R. Masani]

around and see what the evidence is on this subject?

First of all, the *Times of India* News Service carried out a poll in the rural areas in Madras. It reported in the *Times of India* of April 1 that 200 rural families were interviewed in Madras State by the *Times of India* News Service and the answers given were—of course in regard to joint farming—104 out of the 200 were definitely opposed to their lands being pooled; 36 had no particular objection; 40 were in favour and 20 refused to comment. It would appear from this that the “incorrigible” few are the majority and those who follow the Prime Minister are in a hopeless minority.

Mr. B. G. Verghese is of the *Times of India* is one of the finest and most able and honest interpreters of public opinion in our country. He is a sound commentator. He went round the whole country recently, from one end to the other, and from time to time he reported on his experiences. Let us see what he found the public opinion to be in the countryside on this point. Mr. Verghese says:

“I have not detected any enthusiasm for joint co-operative farming in any part of the country. On the contrary, everywhere I went, I was told of experiments in joint cultivation that had failed and sometimes ended in litigation. The U.P. Terai has many such examples. Other examples are to be found in the gramdan villages of Koraput where the climate for co-operative farming is far more favourable than elsewhere.”

Any attempt to rush the country into joint cultivation, however voluntarily, may only arouse fear and antagonism towards the whole co-operative movement.”

Sir, I myself have attended two peasant conferences among the many

that are taking place in the country where the peasants' apprehensions about this proposition are being vociferously expressed. One was at Belgaum and the other was at Sonapat. And, all I can say is that with my own eyes and ears, I was able to see and hear the fierce resistance that exists in the hearts of our peasantry against any proposition whatsoever to take their farms away from them, and to obliterate the boundaries and to merge their farms in bigger co-operative farms, however well their right to property may be protected by being given a paper to show that this was the title-deed of what they once owned. I would like to suggest that the Prime Minister, who believes in scientific methods and claims that joint farming is scientific, may be a little more scientific on this point. Why not adopt the well-known international practice of having a poll on this subject? Why not invite Mr. Gallup to come to this country and take a cross sample of our peasantry or invite the Indian Institute of Public Opinion to carry out a survey in several States? So long as there is an independent and competent agency to test the opinion of our peasantry, let us ask our landed peasantry how many of them are prepared voluntarily to pool their farms and merge them in larger co-operative farms. I think that if this was done, our Prime Minister would have a very rude awakening indeed . . . (Interruptions).

An. Hon. Member: Without compulsion

Shri M. R. Masani: I am pointing out that if voluntary methods are to be tried out, then a voluntary poll should be taken, organised without any compulsion as my hon. friend quite rightly points out. People may be asked as to what is their view. The answer will give a very rude shock to the Prime Minister.

We have also another aspect. An indication of the climate in which this

so-called voluntary change will be carried out is also available in the two months that have passed. The Prime Minister in opening the discussion has said that so long as the Constitution is here, a democratic Constitution, these fears and apprehensions are unfounded. I am sorry; he said it on the 28th of March. On the 19th of February while replying to my original speech on this subject, the Prime Minister gave the House an assurance that no legislation would be introduced in so far as joint farming was concerned. That sentence appears twice in his speech and I must say many hon. Members, including myself, were a little reassured. But the following day I went to Bombay and I found from the *Times of India* of 21st February, 1959, two days later, that my own Chief Minister, Mr. Chavan, made a statement to the executive committee of the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee that the State Government would bring forward legislation on co-operative farming during the monsoon session of the State legislature. This kind of contradictory statements makes one wonder what to believe.

A climate of intimidation has been introduced on this subject. The Prime Minister himself has said at Alwar:

"A firm decision had been taken to introduce service co-operatives and co-operative farming and it had to be implemented in a firm way."

This kind of language is very far from saying that if the peasants themselves want to pool their lands, we will give them facilities to do so. 'A firm decision firmly carried out', if I may say so, is not quite the language of voluntary co-operation. The Prime Minister went on and was good enough to say that those who came in the way would be swept aside with the broomstick. I agree that the broomstick is not a very dangerous weapon and some of us are quite prepared to face it. But a broomstick is as violent as a sword, even if it does not do quite so

much damage; it is certainly less dignified to wield than a sword or some other more manly weapon. This kind of a language is not the language of voluntarism and non-violence. No doubt, quite justifiably, Shri C. Rajagopalachari, our elder statesman, has said only two days ago in Madras addressing one of these Agriculturists Conventions that the "threats"—I am using his language—that come from the Prime Minister to make the politicians and the people to submit to his plans, with remarks like 'if you do not agree with us, you get out of the party', smack of Hitlerism. He went on to say that if the politicians whose main profession was courage and boldness were affected by such threatening language, what would be the fate of agriculturists who depended so much on the Government? I think it is a very legitimate question that the elder statesman has asked.

The Prime Minister in his speech has said that he will not brook the opposition of a small minority in a village blocking the way of the majority who want to co-operativise the village. But if that is not coercion, I do not know what is—a minority dispossessed by the will of a majority. It is like saying to the depositors of a bank whose deposits are to be pooled that if a majority in the bank want to invest the funds in a particular way, and so the funds of the minority also must be invested in that particular way! That is very queer logic, and no bank would survive if the depositors are to be coerced in that manner.

My hon. friend over there has questioned my quoting of Gomulka. I notice that he was good enough not to question the quotations which I have more than once read before the House. I will not take the time of the House in repeating them. But let me say that even today the policy of the Gomulka Government is not to give any tax advantages to co-operative farms because by doing that a kind of discrimination would take place between peasant proprietors and co-operative farms.

Am. Hon. Member: That is not correct.

Shri M. B. Masani: It is perfectly correct. I ask him to go to his masters and mentors and find out what the facts are. It is perfectly true in Poland today there are no tax advantages for co-operatives *vis-a-vis* family farms. Only about a week or ten days ago, Professor Oscar Langer, the authorised academic representative of the Gomulka Government, was in Delhi and he addressed a meeting at Delhi University and he made the statement that in Poland agriculture belongs to the private sector and in this period there was no question of any change. Of course, Mr. Gomulka is a good communist and hopes that some day the people of Poland will go back on their present mood, but I can say that in Mr. Gomulka's life time, for the next five or ten years, Poland has turned its back on collective and co-operative farming.

The third thing I want to discuss is the Prime Minister's statement that the lesson from all over the world is that co-operative farming is more productive than peasant farming. Here again one can only wonder on what facts the Prime Minister comes to this amazing conclusion. The Prime Minister in a speech earlier had mentioned Canada as a shining example of what is achieved in the way of co-operative farming. In an earlier speech, I had taken the liberty of pointing out that in the State of Saskatchewan which is the only State where co-operative farming exists, the number of co-operative farms is 27 out of 103,000 farms. Neither the Prime Minister nor any of his advisers has contradicted that statement. But I am now in a position to read some conclusions from the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life in the State of Saskatchewan in Canada. I shall just read three sentences because time does not permit of any more. The Report points out that the advantages of co-operative farming "cannot make up for lack

of capital, poor drainage, ineffective management or internal dissension."

"Internal problems may stem from the individualistic values of the co-operative members themselves. Where a co-operative farm group has failed to meet the internal problems arising out of inter-personnel friction and divergent personal objectives among members, the effectiveness of group management has usually been seriously impaired."

It goes on to say:

"It does not follow that co-operative organization applied to a series of uneconomic units will transform them into profitable farm enterprises.... The level of capital investment per member is a vital factor in determining member income."

At another point the report says:

"It is clear that a number of co-operative farms in the past have experienced considerable difficulty—and in some cases have dissolved—because they were economically unsound. However, an efficient combination of land, labour and capital will not in itself guarantee success and happiness to the members. Recognition and understanding of the social aspects of co-operative farming, including the complexity of group management, are also essential before any co-operative farm can be considered established on a permanent basis."

Taking the world as a whole the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations has recently put out a very valuable survey called *Co-operatives and Land Use*, published under its official auspices. It is written by someone and the survey is made with a very sympathetic approach, trying to point out what little may have been achieved. I shall read a few sentences to show that the world picture is not very different from the Canadian picture. In the very first page of the introduction it says:

"It is a story covering a mixture of failure and success and of protracted and costly experimental changes. Thus the experience already gained should be very carefully pondered before any country adopts an agricultural policy calling for, and depending upon, quick or spectacular results from a switch-over to co-operative farms on a collective or individual basis."

The report makes many points. Let me give one or two samples of the kind of problems which have to be faced.

Mr. Speaker: What do they say of Russia?

Shri M. R. Masani. Since you ask me, Sir, perhaps if I can find out I shall come to Russia first of all. It is there, but I do not know if I can lay my hands on it right away.

Mr. Speaker: Or China?

Shri M. R. Masani. I think there was a sentence on Russia but I cannot locate it just now. I saw it only this morning and, time permitting, I shall refer to it. There is a passage where the report says that Russia is not the model for India in this regard because in Russia there was shortage of labour on the land and more of land and therefore, mechanisation was required. In India, on the other hand—because India is dealt with in this book—the problem is just the reverse: too many people on the land. Co-operative farming or collective farming would displace people and create a bigger surplus of unemployed people on the land.

That, Sir, is the purport.

An Hon. Member: Too many cattle also.

Shri M. R. Masani. True, too many cattle also. Here it is said—I have got it:—

"Mechanization, though it is often the most attractive, perhaps

the only attractive feature of co-operative farming in the eyes of the cultivator himself, and though it could undoubtedly increase food production, will do so only at the cost of making redundant very large numbers of those who now gain a living of some sort from the land. In Russia, this was no doubt desired, but industrial development in India has not reached the stage at which wholesale transfers from agriculture could be accepted."

Now, on the general problem as to whether co-operative farming is more productive than peasant farming, the answer is very decisive—I shall quote only two sentences.

"There is much evidence that the rural standard of living in countries extensively collectivized is below that of countries in similar latitudes where farming is individual."

At another point it says:

During the last half century, the rise in yields due to scientific and technological advance has been general, and has been more rapid in many countries in which individual farming is practised than in those which have gone in for massive collectivization."

Sir, for lack of time I shall leave it at that, but I do recommend to any hon. Member of this House who has an open mind and who is prepared to think again to read this report and to consider whether this facile generalization that the history of the world tells us that co-operative farming is more productive is at all warranted by the very mixed and very cautious result that will flow from a reading of this book.

Now, Sir, I can only refer, from our own country, to a report, which evidently has not been made available to us. I do not know much about it. The *Statesman* of 21st March referred to an unpublished report of Project

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Evaluation Officers of the Planning Commission which, for some reason, has not been made available to the Members of this House or to the public. It claims that after studying "23 most successful societies in India" "in 1955 they found that members of most of the societies formed by pooling land holdings do not work in the field themselves but employ paid labour." In other words, they were joint-stock owners like shareholders, but they were not actual tillers who have pooled their land. "Some of the societies formed by Government lands have not been successful but they continue to exist, because members have no right in the land allotted to their society." These are among the conclusions of this report of Project Evaluation Officers of the Planning Commission, and I would request

Mr Speaker: How did he get a copy of it?

Shri M. R. Masani: A summary of it was published in the *Statesman* of 21st March. It said that it was still a secret or restricted document. I suggest, Sir, that in the interest of good discussion on the subject, the Government may be good enough at least to lay a copy of the report on the Table of the House and to make it available to us.

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): I can say, Sir, that this report is already in the hands of hon. Members because just now one hon. Member has passed it on to me.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): That is an old one. He is referring to the latest one.

Shri S. N. Mishra: This is the report of 1956.

Shri Tyagi: That is an old one.

Shri M. R. Masani: I am quoting the *Statesman* of 21st March where it was said that it is still in restricted

circulation. Well, I do hope that all Members will be given a copy in case it has not been done. I, certainly, have not seen it.

An Hon. Member: It is in the library.

Shri M. R. Masani: I have not seen it. Finally, the Prime Minister said in his speech on the 28th March that "if you listen to Shri Masani, then you must be reconciled to poverty." I question very keenly that statement. This would suggest that unless land was co-operativised or collectivised, there was no hope of solution for our rural problems. May I say that this sudden awareness is rather disconcerting? For ten years after independence, our Food and Agriculture Ministry and our Community Development Ministry were all convinced that good progress could be made under the system of family farming. Suddenly since Nagpur, a kind of hysteria has developed that unless we co-operativise our land no solution is possible. This is a counsel of defeatism and the facts do not bear it out.

I had the pleasure of listening to a most reasonable speech, by contract, one where I agreed with every word, from the Prime Minister at the National Productivity Council two days back, where I was present as a member of the Governing Body. Shri Nehru himself told us how he had been to Allahabad to his own constituency and how he came back very thrilled. Why? Because he found that in his own constituency several ordinary farmers, small farmers with small holdings as he put it and not big holdings, were being given prizes for producing yields which were three to four times what they were only two years ago. He said, and we all were very glad to hear, that some enterprising farmers with small holdings were able to multiply their production three to four times.

If a few people in his own constituency are able to do it, why does the Prime Minister discount the possibilities of that with peasant proprietorship and family cultivation, given the water, given the seed, and given the know-how that a peasant is entitled to ask from our Government and the community? Why is he giving up the fight so easily and saying that nothing can be done? His own evidence shows that small farmers with three or four acres of land are able to multiply the crop three to four times. Surely, Sir, even if a fraction of our farmers were able to multiply three to four times their production, India's food production problem will be solved.

Shri Tyagi: He has never said so.

Shri M. R. Masani: I said that I listened to him. The Prime Minister made that speech at the National Productivity Council.

Shri Tyagi: He says that individuals cannot do that. What he says is that it is more economical.

Shri M. R. Masani: The Prime Minister's statement was. If you follow Shri Masani's advice of carrying on peasant proprietorship in this country as the normal form of ownership, then we must be reconciled permanently to poverty. What I am pointing out is that that statement is an entirely defeatist one and not true.

Sir, Government of India studies have been made outside Allahabad, in Muzaffarpur and Meerut. They show that, given certain facilities and incentives, the ordinary small farmers with family holdings are quite capable of doubling and trebling their yields. Similarly, if you go by what a very well known Congress leader, Mr. Charan Singh, has said, he points out that, after the abolition of zamindari in the United Provinces, production went up. The reason he points out is that the farmer felt that the

land had become his and his children's in perpetuity and it lightened and cheered his labours and expanded his horizon. The result was that production went up. Mr. Charan Singh rightly warns us that "if zamindari abolition is psychologically right, then co-operative farming is psychologically wrong", because it will take away that very incentive that is given to the peasant through owning his own farm.

Sir, I will not take more time of the House for reasons that you mentioned to my predecessor, because I would like an hon. Member behind me to get a chance.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot assure that.

Shri M. R. Masani: I can make it easy, if possible I shall, therefore, conclude by quoting a very wise remark of Shri Rajagopalachari. He, Sir, has put his finger on the spot when he points out that where the Prime Minister has gone wrong on this issue, where he has put himself against public opinion in this country is through too much impatience. The Prime Minister's expressed intention to see certain changes carried out in his own life-time is what Shri Rajagopalachari has challenged. He says

"We should drop the ambition to see things in our own time. It is enough if we see things taking shape and we may leave a great deal to those who come after us. Soonest achieved is soonest lost."

Shri Raghunath Shahu (Budaun): Mr. Speaker, Sir, speaking on these Demands relating to Community Development, I would like to emphasise at the very beginning that 1959 is not 1954. I am mentioning the year 1954 purposely because it was in 1954 that I moved a resolution here in this House that a Committee should be appointed to enquire into the working of the community development all over the country. Since then, much

[Shri Raghubar Sahai]

water has flowed down the bridge and a great many changes have taken place. I shall mention a few salient changes that have taken place.

It has now been recognised on all hands that undue haste should not be made in opening blocks all over the country. I am glad that a decision has been taken that the entire country would be covered by these blocks by the end of 1963 and not 1961 as was decided previously.

Already 2,405 blocks are working in this country. I am glad to find that the distinction between NES and CD has been done away with. Now, the scheme of things is that the entire Community Development work would be divided into two phases of five years each. In other words, the Community Development programme would be a continuous programme. Another valuable change that has taken place during this time is that training has been insisted upon for every kind of worker in this department, from the village level worker right up to the District Magistrate and also other responsible officers of the Ministry and everybody concerned who has to do anything with the working of the Community Development programme.

13 hrs.

In this connection, I am glad to find that recently a training camp was arranged for Members of Parliament also. I am also one of the few who attended that camp at Pattencheu. I am prepared to say that after that camp we found ourselves a little wiser because we came into contact with the village people, with high officials, with the working of the Panchayat Samiti and so many other things. But while all this kind of training has been insisted upon right from the level of the village level worker up to the District Magistrate and the highest officers, I am doubtful if this training has engendered

sufficient faith in the programme because I feel that unless and until the requisite faith has been engendered this programme cannot yield satisfactory results.

I am also glad to find that even foreigners coming from other countries have been benefited by the training at so many places in our country. The principle of democratic decentralisation has also been agreed upon. But it is for the States to implement it. A few minutes later I will revert to this subject again.

I am glad to find that the scope of the Ministry has been considerably enlarged. As you would find now, the panchayats and the co-operatives have been included in its fold. All this extension of work has created a lot of enthusiasm in the people and the people have begun to build hopes, but, at the same time, a critical faculty has also been created in the people who sometimes criticise about the working of this department, especially about the larger amounts of money that are being spent over it and which are not properly being utilised.

So far as the principle of democratic decentralisation is concerned, hon. Members would know that a number of chapters have been written on this subject in the Balwantray Mehta Committee's report. That principle has now been approved by the National Development Council and the States have been given full liberty to implement it. But I am sorry to find that every State in our country is not showing an equal amount of enthusiasm in the implementation so far as the democratic decentralisation principle goes. I am glad that in Andhra Pradesh we saw a lot of enthusiasm in going ahead with those recommendations, but there are so many other States in our country who are simply showing lukewarm interest.

Regarding the three primary institutions, namely, the co-operatives, the village panchayats and the primary

schools, they are the very foundation and the basis of this programme, and I would like to say a few words about them. With regard to village panchayats, it is now recognised in all hands that until and unless those village panchayats are enthused and activated we cannot show very satisfactory results in the Community Development work.

If you look at the fifth evaluation report we find that the village panchayats are in a deplorable state. They are torn with dissensions. They are not taking any interest in the development movement. Their policy of taxation is not being successfully implemented. Wherever they are imposing taxes they are doing it on extraneous considerations and they are not taking into consideration the paying capacity of those people. The way in which those taxes are being realised is again a very defective one. I feel that if we are anxious that the Community Development programme should be a success, very serious and sincere efforts should be made to activate the village panchayats. We would find that although village panchayats exist almost in every State, they differ from one State to the other in regard to jurisdiction in regard to resources, in regard to powers and in so many other aspects. It was at the time of the Delhi Panchayat Raj Bill, when it was before the House, that a proposal was made by me that that Bill may be referred to a Select Committee so that we might be able to produce a model Bill for the guidance of the entire country. It is very necessary that legislation on panchayats should be a model one so that every State can take some cue from it and can be benefited. I hope the present Ministry will look to it, because the demand has been made both from the members of the informal consultative committee in this Ministry as well as the standing committee of our party.

So far as co-operatives go, very great interest has been created in the country after the Nagpur resolution and we wish that the co-operatives

should be a success throughout. But we shall have to recognise that co-operatives at the present moment have got a bad odour and that bad odour exists because of the intimate association of the officials in regard to this movement and the official bungling. However, we should be determined to make co-operatives a success and see that the official bungling in the past does not come in the way. There is a demand in the country that the present laws relating to co-operatives which are hampering the success of the co-operatives should be changed to a very great extent. I understand that the Food and Agriculture Ministry constituted a committee and that committee has made certain recommendations. But those recommendations have also been criticised by a very responsible body. The time has come when this Ministry of Community Development should set up a responsible committee of their own to go into the laws, the rules and regulations regarding the working of the co-operatives and they should be so reformed, changed and amended as to make the functioning of the co-operatives a great success.

In regard to the entire movement of Community Development we find that our greatest drawback is that there is no proper evaluation and assessment at each and every stage which is necessary. The work has proceeded right from 1952 up to 1959. Seven or eight years have elapsed. But I am sorry to say that a proper assessment and evaluation of each and every block existing in the country has not been made. In the year 1954, when I moved a resolution, I pleaded that these blocks existing all over the country—and their number is being enlarged every year—should be classified according to their achievement. The hon. Prime Minister who is always anxious to make this movement a very great success in the country and who is carrying on a campaign from one end of the country to the other himself recognises that there are good blocks, that there are bad blocks and that there are ordinary blocks. Why not

[Shri Raghunath Sahai]
 classify them into good, bad and ordinary? We want to see that those which are classified as ordinary and bad should be specially looked into and there should be concentration on those blocks. They should be converted into good blocks within one or two years. So, the categorisation of these blocks should be made as early as possible.

I find from this report that a U.N. Mission team has been appointed for this evaluation work, which was recommended by the Balwantrai Committee. I am glad this team has been appointed and perhaps they will be able to produce a very valuable report. But I am surprised that for this work, a U.N. team should have been called and the work entrusted to them; our own people could have done that work as well. I do not want to cast any aspersions on them, but I wish that the work had been entrusted either to the Programme Evaluation Organisation or to another committee like the Balwantrai team, because Balwantrai himself did a very fine job, of which we all feel proud.

Coming to the subject of proper assessment and evaluation, I find that in blocks that were created in 1953, many things have been left undone. I am personally connected with a block in my own district Badaun in Usawan. It was inaugurated in 1953 and it finished its term in 1956, but I find that a good many important things have been left undone. Communications and irrigation projects had not been taken up. Tubewells that were constructed have not been energised for the purpose of irrigation. The Sot Nadi Bund project, which was taken up in 1953 and for which Rs. 25,000 were spent on survey alone, has gone to dogs. If I can quote these instances from my personal observations of a block of which I have intimate knowledge, I think many other hon. Members can also quote such illustrations. So, it is very necessary that all these blocks that were taken up from 1953 execute all the targets fixed for them and complete all the work entrusted to them.

Food production is a very important and vital point. I am glad that the Nagpur resolution has stressed joint co-operative farming. I have heard hon. Members speaking here against co-operative farming. I have no quarrel with them; they are free to entertain their own opinions. But co-operative farming is not a new thing in India. It has been satisfactorily worked. Mr. Masani just mentioned about one evaluation report copies of which had not been distributed. I have got with me another report of the Programme Evaluation Organisation issued in December, 1956. They studied the working of 22 farms all over the country—2 farms in every State. I have gone through the report from cover to cover and I can say that out of these 22 farms, more than half have produced satisfactory results, which are capable of further improvement also. Wherever defects have been found, they can be rectified. But there is one thing which has touched me greatly. Most of these farms about which mention has been made in this study are situated in community development blocks.

One complaint that was found to be uniform was that the authorities of the community development blocks did not evince any particular interest in the working of these farms. I think the hon. Minister will take special note of this. If we want that co-operative farming should be successful all over the country, if we want that the country should be covered with blocks by 1963, we should also see that the technical personnel placed at the disposal of these blocks take very sincere and great interest in the functioning of these co-operative farms.

Dr. M. S. Amey (Nagpur): What is likely to be the cost of the inspectorate itself in a scheme of this kind?

Shri Raghunath Sahai: I cannot off hand say what will be the cost of the inspectorate. But I can very well understand that the agricultural officer and the co-operative officer that have been given to these blocks and

regularly engaged by the department can be very well expected to function properly. Only supervision is needed; careful guidance is needed and we should see that they work properly and do their business in a very satisfactory manner. I do not think any additional cost will be necessary for this.

In this connection, I would also bring to the notice of the hon. Minister that while we are anxious that the lot of the villager should be improved and his standard of life should be raised, we are sorry to note that all these years, when the community development programme has been working, very little interest was taken in the improvement of the village industries. The Balwantrai report says that this is the weakest spot in the community development programme. We shall have to take particular care about it and see that this weak-spot does not remain as it is.

Regarding the role assigned to the social education officer, this subject was discussed in this House from time to time and many hon. Members could not possibly understand whether the social education officer has been performing a useful role in the community development set-up.

12-18 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I myself feel that there is some confusion of thought even in the mind of Government with regard to the role and control of this officer. In States like Assam, Bihar, Bombay, Kerala, Rajasthan and West Bengal, this officer has been placed under the education department. In Punjab and U.P., he has been placed under the development and panchayat department, while in M.P. he has been placed under the directorate of social welfare and panchayat raj. In Andhra, Kashmir, Madras and Mysore and in NEFA, he has been placed under the development department. From all these I find that the Government itself is labouring under a

difficulty to find out what role to assign to this particular officer. The whole matter should be looked into very carefully and if after investigation, we come to the conclusion that he is not performing a useful role, then the S.E.O. can be dispensed with.

Another point to which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister is the position of the B.D.O. Now, everybody recognizes that as the work of the Community Development is progressing, the role of the B.D.O. is getting more and more important. Because, it is on the B.D.O. and his farsightedness, his wisdom, his knowledge and his experience that the success or failure of the block depends. I myself feel that at the present moment many of the B.D.Os. do not come up to the necessary calibre. They do not possess all those qualifications that a smart, competent and qualified B.D.O. should possess. They should also be young men. It is recognized that they have received a certain amount of training. But that training alone is not sufficient for the very responsible work that is being entrusted to them. Personally, I would like to make the suggestion for the consideration of the Ministry that the B.D.Os. henceforth should be gazetted officers. They should be recruited in the same manner as all other P.C.S. officers, either in the executive or judiciary, are appointed. I would even suggest that for every P.C.S. officer, whether he is chosen for the executive or judicial line, especially for the executive line, a condition precedent should be made that he should work as B.D.O. for five years, because if we do that, they have first-hand knowledge of the villagers, of the work of the panchayat *samities* of the work of the block etc. and they will later on become very successful executive officers.

Lastly, I would like to bring my remarks to a close with a compliment to the hon. Minister of this Depart-

[Shri M. S. Aney]

ment, Shri S. K. Dey, for whom a well-deserved tribute was paid by the hon Prime Minister the other day. We are sorry that he is not here at present during the discussion of this Ministry. We all know that he was confined to the hospital but, thank God, he has now been discharged and he is well on his way to recovery. We wish that he should be restored to health as early as possible.

बी मोहन स्वयं (पीलीभीत) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट पर जो बहस चल रही है, उसको मैंने बहुत ध्यान से सुना है। कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट का मतलब है हिन्दुस्तान के ५,५८,००० गावों का उत्थान और वहाँ रहने वाले लोगों की तरक्की। हमारे देश की कुल आबादी में से ३१ करोड़ लोग गावों में रहते हैं और कुल आबादी का ८२ परसेंट गावों में रहता है। कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट का मतकमा सन् १९५८ में बना था और उस वक़्त वह सिर्फ कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट का काम करता था लेकिन अब उसमें पचायत और कोआपरेटिव्स भी शामिल कर दिये गये हैं। सब से पहले कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट में एन० ई० एस० ब्लाक्स और सी० डी० ब्लाक्स थे और पोस्ट इंटेंसिव ब्लाक्स की शक्ल में काम चलता था। लेकिन अब इंटेंसिव और पोस्ट इंटेंसिव, दो फ़सिम बना दिये गये हैं। पहला फ़ेज पाच माल के लिये और बारह लाख रुपया उम पर खर्च आता है और दूसरे फ़ेस पर पाच लाख रुपया। यह जो नई शक्ल बनी है, वह बलबन्त गय मेहता कमेटी की सिफारिशों के आधार पर बनी है। लेकिन मुझे दुःख है कि उस कमेटी की ओर जो सिफारिशें थी, उन पर अमल नहीं किया गया। विमाल के तीसरे पन्ने में बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि उसकी एक सिफारिश यह थी कि काम को डिस्ट्रिक्ट

कर दिया जाय। लेकिन अब हम वृक्ष से आखिर तक देखते हैं कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट कमेटी से ले कर के जिला परिषद् तक सारे का सारा काम डिस्ट्रिक्ट है। जो सूरत हाथ हम देखते हैं वह सारे का सारा आफिशियल पर आधारित देखते हैं और ऐसा लगता है कि सब की सब आफिशियल की जमायतें हैं। आप डिस्ट्रिक्ट कमेटी को देखें या आप प्राविशाल डिवेलपमेंट काउंसिल को देखें या आप जिला परिषद् को देखें, सभी जगहों पर आफिशियल ही आफिशियल नज़र आते हैं। जो जिला परिषद् है उसमें कलेक्टर उसका प्रेसिडेंट है। यह कलेक्टर एग्जिक्यूटिव के काम को भी चलाता है और साथ ही साथ इन सभी जिम्मेदारियों को भी निभाता है। एक कलेक्टर जिसको कि इतना ज्यादा काम करना पड़ता है, वह इन सारी जिम्मेदारियों को कैसे निभा सकता है। मैं ममन्नता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी डिस्ट्रिक्टाइजेशन की नहीं है और डिस्ट्रिक्टाइजेशन की है, डिस्ट्रिक्टाइजेशन पर वह विश्वास नहीं रखती है और अगर रखती है तो उसको अमल में लाना नहीं चाहती है। मैंने यू० पी० में डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड्स को देखा है, उनका पहले जो चेयरमैन होता था वह नान-आफिशियल होता था लेकिन अब उसका जो प्रेसिडेंट होता है, वह भी कलेक्टर ही होता है। इस तरह से, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो बलबन्त गय मेहता कमेटी की सिफारिशें थी, उस पर अमल नहीं हुआ है। उस कमेटी ने यह भी सिफारिश की थी कि पचायतों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा अखत्यारित दिये जायें लेकिन उनको भी कतई तौर पर कोई अखत्यारित नहीं दिये जा रहे हैं। तीसरी सिफारिश कमेटी की यह थी कि जो पचायत चुनी हैं उन्हीं के आधार पर ब्लाक ऐडवाइजरी कमेटीज बनें। लेकिन इन सभी चीजों के बारे में कुछ भी नहीं किया जा रहा है और न उन सिफारिशों की तरफ कोई तबज़ूह दी जा रही है।

यह बताया गया है कि ग्लास को कुल तादाय २४.०५ है और उनमें ३,०२,६४७ गांव कवर हो रहे हैं। कहा जाता है कि सन् १९६३ तक सब के सब गांव कवर हो जायेंगे। लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि जिस बीबी एपतार से बना जा रहा है, उससे पूरे के पूरे गांव जिल की तादाय ५.५८,००० के करीब है कैसे कवर हो जायेंगे।

कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट के पांच प्र: ग्राममिंटिव बतलाये गये हैं। पहले तो कहा गया है कि स्माल स्कूल इंडस्ट्रीज को फ़रोग दिया जाय, दूसरा फंक्शन यह बताया गया है कि कोओपरेटिव्स की तरफ़ की बांये, तीसरा पंचायतो की तरफ़ की बांये, चौथा गांवों में मोस ग्राम कम्युनिकेशन को डिवेलप किया जाये, पांचवा, एजुकेशन, हेल्थ और रिक्रियेशन के सावन गांवों में उपलब्ध किये जायें, हाउसिंग की व्यवस्था हो, एग्रिकल्चर की तरफ़ की हो, इत्यादि। मैं एक-एक चीज़ को लेकर उसके बारे में कुछ कहना चाहूंगा।

पहले यह कहा गया है कि स्माल स्कूल इंडस्ट्रीज को बढ़ावा दिया जाय। मैं देखता हूँ कि इस समय इस सम्बन्ध में देहातो में जो कुछ हो रहा है वह बहुत ही छोटे पैमाने पर ही रहा है। गांव के जो लोग खेती करते हैं उनके तीन चार महीने कम से कम ऐसे होते हैं, जिन महीनों में उनके पास करने को कुछ नहीं होता है, वे बेकार रहते हैं। इन स्माल स्कूल इंडस्ट्रीज के बारे में गवर्नमेंट की तरफ़ से कहा गया है कि कंब्स की कमी है। गवर्नमेंट ने रिपोर्ट के पेज १३ पर इस बात को स्वीकार किया है

"Therefore, the resources available for this sector are thoroughly inadequate to meet the requirements".

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक कंजमेंट्स चीज़ है कि कांटेज इंडस्ट्रीज और स्माल स्कूल

इंडस्ट्रीज को गांवों में फ़रोग दिया जाये। इसके लिये यह आवश्यक है कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा हमको इनके लिय रिस्पोसिबल बूझने होंगे। इस बास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस काम के लिये और अधिक रकमा दिया जायें।

इसके बाद कहा गया है कि कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज को बढ़ावा दिया जाय। इसके बारे में मैं बहुत से ब्यूज गुन रहा हूँ। रिपोर्ट में बताया गया है कि १,२७,१२५ कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज फंक्शन कर रही हैं और जो उनमें से ५७,८८,२४३ है। मैं आपको मिसाल के तौर पर बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में कुछ बुनकर लोगों की कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज हैं, बान बुनने वालों की हैं, लकड़ी का काम करने वालों की कुछ हैं, चमड़े का काम करने वालों की कुछ हैं, लेकिन उन सब की अच्छे तरीके से मदद नहीं की जा रही है। आफिशल्स का दबाव हर जगह पर होता है और इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि कोरप्शन होता है और अच्छी तरह से काम नहीं चल पाता है। इस बास्ते ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि उनकी तरफ़ की जाय, कुछ ऐसी शकल पैदा की जाय कि वे अच्छे तरीके से चल सकें।

खेती की कोओपरेटिव्स की बात भी चलती है। जहां तक इसके सम्बन्ध में मेरी पार्टी का ताल्लुक है वह कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज बनाने के हक में है। अलाहाबाद में हमारी पार्टी की जो कांफ़ेस हुई थी, उस में हमने उनको मान लिया था। यह कांफ़ेस कांफ़ेस के नागपुर अधिवेशन से बहुत पहले हुई थी और हमने इस चीज़ को बहुत पहले से माना हुआ है। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि जहां तक इम्प्लेमेंटेशन का ताल्लुक है गवर्नमेंट जल्दबाजी से काम ले रही है। यह ठीक नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि पहले कुछ माडल कोओपरेटिव्स बनाई जायें और यह उन्हीं

[श्री मोहन स्वल्प]

मोनों की बनाई जायें जो लोग एको करते हैं। मसानी साहब ने बताया है कि मद्रास में दो सी प्राथमिकों में से १०४ इस बीज के प्रमोटे हैं। लेकिन जो लोग पसन्द करते हैं, उनकी कोमोडिटिव सोसाइटीज बनें ताकि वे अच्छा तरह के बल सकें, अच्छा उसका इन्फ्लेक्शन हो धीरे धीरे ऐसा किया गया तो जो दूसरे लोग हैं उनके बिलों में उत्साह पैदा होगा और वे भी इस बीज को करना पसन्द करेंगे।

जहाँ तक सर्विस कोमोडिटिव्स का ताल्लुक है वे फोरन ही बन जानी चाहियें क्योंकि उससे बेजो को फ़रोह मिलेगा, जब रिपोर्ट्स किनी के पास अच्छे होंगे, मशीन अच्छी होंगी, अच्छे बेजो के धीज्जर होंगे, तो स्वाभाविक है कि बेजो की तरफ़ की अच्छी तरह से हो धीरे पैदावार बढ़े। सर्विस कोमोडिटिव्स का जहाँ तक ताल्लुक है, उसे जल्दी से जल्दी इम्प्लीमेंट किया जाय। लेकिन जहाँ तक ज्वायेंट कोमोडिटिव फ़ार्म्स का ताल्लुक है, वे धाप के द्वारा गवर्नमेंट से कहेंगा कि कुछ माडल सोसायटीज बनाने के बाद तब उन्हें बताया जाय। जल्दी में कोई हेस्टी कदम न उठाया जाय।

इसके बाद मैं पंचायतों के मुताल्लिक कहना चाहता हूँ। पंचायतों की कुल संख्या बताई जाती है १, लाख, २३ हजार, ६७० जो कि सन् १९५६ की रिपोर्ट में दी हुई है। सन् १९६०-६१ में उन की तादाद २ लाख, ४४ हजार, ४६४ तक हो जायगी कुल हिन्दू-स्तान में। पंचायतों की हालत यह है कि कहने के लिये तो सब कुछ है, पेपर पर सब कुछ है, लेकिन उन की जितनी दुरी दशा है उसे बल्काज में नहीं कहा जा सकता। गांवों में हर तरीके से सेंट्रलाइजेशन है। जैसे मैंने प्रार्थ किया था किशाल्टस का उन पर प्रभाव है। जो बी० पी० ओ० या इ० बी० पी० ओ० होते हैं वह एक किस्म से बेबा

दबाव पंचायतों पर डालते हैं। अच्छी धाय वाली पंचायतों की तादाद बहुत कम है। जैसे अगर धाय उन के कामों के लिये तो एक बहुत जम्बी बोड़ी लिस्ट है। स्कूल बनायें जायें, शफ़ाखाने बनाये जायें, सड़कें बनाई जायें।

श्री० रणवीर सिंह (रोहतक) : सबको पैसे से बनाई जा सकती है।

श्री मोहन स्वल्प . लेकिन जब मैं उन के कंड्स की तरफ़ देखता हूँ तो बहुत कम पंचायतें ऐसी हैं य० पी० का मुझे तज़र्बा है जो कि १००००० धाय रखन वाली होती है। ज्यादातर पंचायतें २०० या ३०००० के फ़ड वाली होती हैं। अक्सर अश्वदान की बात हुआ करती है। अश्वदान से कहीं सड़कें बना करती हैं? कैसे मजों की बात है कि अश्वदान से सड़कें बनाने की बात करते हैं। जब तक रुपया पंचायत के हाथ में न हो इस तरह के काम कैसे हो सकते हैं? पंचायतों को ग्रामदानी बढ़नी चाहिये तभी वह अच्छी तरह से काम करेंगी। मैंने दिल्ली पंचायत राज्य बिल पर बोलते हुये कहा था कि हमें गांवों की ग्रामदानी का एक चौथाई हिस्सा पंचायतों को देना चाहिये। असली पंचायतराज की स्थापना होनी चाहिये। जिला स्वतंत्र हो सूबा स्वतंत्र हो, सेंटर स्वतन्त्र हो। क्योंकि जब तक पंचायतों के पास पैसा नहीं होगा वह स्वतन्त्र ना होंगी, उस वक़्त तक काम कैसे हो सकता है। गांव की सगान बग़रह से जो ग्रामदानी हो उस का एक चौथाई पंचायतों को दिया जाय।

दूसरी चीज़ इस सिलसिले में जो मैं चाहता था वह थी तहसील पंचायत, बीसा कि बंगाल या हिमाचल प्रदेश में है। तहसील पंचायत हो जो कि ब्लाक का भी नियंत्रण करे। वह एक देवबाइबरी वाली

हो, पंचायतों को भी देते और ब्लाक्स को भी देते। जब तक इस तरीके से सहस्रीय पंचायत नहीं बनेगी तब तक हेरोबर्ड वे मे काम चलता रहेगा।

इसके बाद सवाल धाता है कम्यूनिकेशन का। गांवों के कम्यूनिकेशन को बेवेलप किया जाय। मैंने धर्ज किया था कि गांव के कम्यूनिकेशन हमारे अवदान पर आधारित हैं। लेकिन गांवों का जो सूरते हाल है, उनके कम्यूनिकेशन इतने खराब हैं कि वर्षा काल में गांवों से बाहर की बात तो दूर, एक गांव से दूसरे गांव में भी घाना जाना नामुमकिन है। कम्यूनिकेशन के नाम पर एक सिलवाड़ सा किया जा रहा है, उन के साथ मजक सा हो रहा है। गवर्नमेंट इस सिलसिले में तजकिया तो करती है लेकिन असल तौर से जो रुपया इस के लिये मिलना चाहिये वह गांवों को नहीं मिलता है। इसलिये मैं गवर्नमेंट से दख्वास्त करूंगा कि गांवों के भीन्स प्राक कम्यूनिकेशन को ज्यादा धक्का बनाया जाय। गांवों के ऊपर ही सारे मुल्क का इन्हेसार है। सारे मुल्क की तरक्की गांवों की तरक्की होने से ही हो सकती है।

इस के बाद हेल्थ, सैनिटेशन और रेफ्रिजेशन की बात धाती है। कहते हैं कि एगुकेशन हम बढ़ा रहे हैं और सन् १९६३ तक हम मुल्क में एगुकेशन बिस्कुल फ्री कर देंगे। लेकिन मैं देखता हूं कि उस की रफ्तार बहुत धीमी है। अभी तक, सिर्फ ५० पी० का मुझे तजर्बा है और जगहों पर मुझे भासूम नहीं क्या हो रहा है, वहां पर सिर्फ छुबे मसाल तक हम फ्री एगुकेशन कर पाये हैं। लेकिन कम्यूनैरी वह भी नहीं है। इसलिये एगुकेशन के सिलसिले में बेरी इस्तदुधा यह है कि हाई स्कूल तक फ्री और कम्यूनैरी एगुकेशन होनी चाहिये। इस के साथ ही साथ गांवों की तरफ करज

यूनिवर्सिटीज बनाई जायें। जो भी यूनिवर्सिटीज अब बनाई जायें वे ज्यादातर करज एरियाज की तरफ बनाई जायें और खेती की तरफ तबज्जह देने की बात हो।

श्री सत्येन्द्र नारायण सिंह (धीरगाबाद—बिहार) : पंचायत के भन्दर ?

श्री जोहन् स्वल्प : मैं पंचायत के भन्दर नहीं कह रहा हूं, देहाती इलाके में हों। इसमें बताया गया है कि एगुकेशन के लिये प्राफिसर्स रखे गये हैं। प्राज एगुकेशन का जो तरीका है, मैं उसके सिलसिले में धर्ज कर रहा था कि करज यूनिवर्सिटीज बनाई जायें देहाती इलाकों में। प्राज मैं देखता हूं कि स्कूल्स में, चाहे हायर सेकेण्डरी स्कूल्स हों या जूनियर हाई स्कूल्स हो, उन में खेती का काम सिखाने के लिये भेजे गये हैं एक्स्टेशन टीचर्स। वे एक्स्टेशन टीचर्स ऐसे हैं जो कि यह भी नहीं जानते हैं कि गेहूं का पीदा होता है या पेड़ होता है, या खेती किस तरह से होती है। ऐसे तो एक्स्टेशन टीचर्स हमारे लिये भेजे गये हैं। खेती की बात को सिखाने के लिये मैं चाहता हूं लोगों में करज सेन्स हो। खेती हिन्दुस्तान का सब से मुख्य पेसा है। इसलिये खेती के काम को जानने वाले प्राधमी उन जगहों पर भेजे जायें। हम सब अधिकतर किसान हैं। किसान इस को धक्की तरह से जानते हैं कि खेती कैसे होती है। किसान इसके बिषयज्ञ हैं। वे जानते हैं कि फसल कैसे बोई जाय, कौन जमीन किस किस की फसल के लिये कैसी है। लेकिन हम लोगों को इस बात को सिखाने के लिये वह लोग भेजे जाते हैं जो कि बाहर के होते हैं, जो यह तक नहीं जानते कि क्या काम किस तरह से होता है। मैं चाहूंगा कि खेती का फरोज देने के लिये एक्स्पर्ट्स भेजे जायें और खेती के लिये हम को सही तौर से सलाह दी जाय, सही तौर से हमारी एगुकेशन हो और खेती की तरक्की हो।

[श्री मोहन स्वल्प]

इस के बाद गेलो की बात आती है। रेफ़िणेशन के लिये गावों में रेडियो सेट दिये जाते हैं। लेकिन किसानों के पास वक्त कहाँ है रेफ़िणेशन के लिये। वह शुबह से शाम तक जमीन जोड़ें, हल चलायें मेहनत करें और शाम को जा कर रेडियो सुनें? उन को बहुत थोड़ा वक्त मिलता है। क्योंकि पंचायतों के पास फंड कम है इसलिये वह रेडियो एक घाघ महीने चलता है और उसके बाद खरम हो जाता है। उन की मुरम्मत के लिये भी उन के पास पैसा नहीं होता है। इस तरह के मजाक से कोई फायदा नहीं है। उससे देश का रुपया और बेस्ट होता है। रेफ़िणेशन के लिये सही तौर से लोगों को मौका दिया जाय। अगर यह धाप चाहते हैं तो उनके लिये पाइस बनवाइये जहाँ पर वह जा कर दो-चार मिनट बैठ सकें। इस तरह के मजाक से उन का रिफ़िणेशन नहीं हो सकता।

इसके बाद हार्जिसिंग की बात आती है। जिस वक्त वर्क्स हार्जिसिंग और सप्लाय मंत्रालय पर बहुत हो रही थी, उस वक्त मैंने भर्ज किया था कि इस बात से कोई फायदा नहीं है कि ५०० गावों को डेवेलप कर दिया जाय। ५०० गावों का ही डेवेलप कर देने से गावों की समस्या हल नहीं होगी। इसके लिये मैंने तीन सुझाव पेश किये थे। पहला सुझाव यह दिया था कि गावों में हर पाब, छः मील पर भट्टे बनाये जायें और जिस तरह से इन्स्ट्रियल हार्जिसिंग के लिये तकाबी दी जाती है, उसी तरह से भट्टों के लिये तकाबी दी जाय। उन के ईंटों से ही मजान बनाये जायें। खानी मजाक से काम नहीं चलेगा। दूस के लिये मैंने सुझाव पेश किया था कि हर जिले में एक माडेल बिलेज बनाया जाय ताकि उस माडेल बिलेज से प्रास-पास के गाव सबक ले सकें और उन में काम करने के लिये प्रोत्साहन पैदा हो।

दूसरी चीज मैंने कही थी कि गांव वालों को कर्ज देने का साध इन्तजाम किया जाय। आज हम देखते हैं कि गांव के लोग साहूकारों के फंद में फंसे हुये हैं। वह हुना, तिगुना और चौगुना सूद लेते हैं और उसके बाद उन्हें बरबाद कर देते हैं। जो तकाबी दी जाती है उसके लिये माफ़ूम इन्तजाम होना चाहिये। अगर फसल किसी तरह से बरबाद हो गई तो गभर्न-मेंट का जुता सवार हो जाता है कि "हम कुछ नहीं जानते, हमको रुपया दो।" जब तक किसान के साथ हमदर्दी का बर्ताब न हो, सलूलियतें न दी जायें, तब तक खाली कागजी बातें करने से कोई फायदा नहीं होता। इसके लिये कर्ज देने के लिये, तकाबी देने के लिये सही तौर से कदम उठाये जायें और किसानों को सलूलियत दी जाय। उनके लिये मार्कोटिंग की व्यवस्था हो, स्टोरेज की व्यवस्था हो, सस्ते बीज मिलें। आज बीज सही तौर से नहीं मिलते। मैं देखता हू कि आज कोआप-रेटिव की ओर से स्टोर कायम हुये हैं लेकिन उन में बहुत खराब बीज मिलता है। मैंने पंजाब के बीज के सिलसिले में जो कि रबी में बाटा गया था मिनिस्टर साहब से पूछा था। ५० पी० में बहुत खराब बीज दिया गया था, दूसरे सूबों की बात तो मैं नहीं जानता।

श्री० रणबीर सिंह पंजाब का बीज तो बहुत अच्छा होता है।

श्री मोहन स्वल्प अच्छा तो होता है लेकिन वहाँ से बहुत बराब बीज गया था। पंजाब से जो गेहूँ का बीज भेजा गया था वही हमको दिया गया था। मैं भर्ज कर रहा था कि कि हमारे लिये सस्ते बीज की व्यवस्था नहीं है उसकी सही व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये, मकानों की सही व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये, स्टोरेज की सही व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। किसानों के पास आज तो सिर्फ़ क्लॉपके हैं, उन्हीं में बीज रक्खा जाता है। कभी उनमें आज लग

जाती है, कभी बारिश से बरबाद हो जाता है। इसलिए स्टोरेज का एक सेंटर कम से कम हर ब्लॉक में हो तभी किसानों की हानि रुक सकती है।

इसके बाद एक बात मैं और बताना चाहता हूँ जो कि लीड और फर्टिलाइजर्स के बारे में है पेज ६५ पर फिगर्स दिये गये हैं। फर्टिलाइजर्स के बारे में हमारे यहां लम्बी-लम्बी बातें की जाती हैं लेकिन आज तक रिपोर्ट में नहीं बताया गया है कि फर्टिलाइजर्स का रेजल्ट क्या निकला, उससे कितना फायदा हुआ, कितनी परसेंट उपज बढ़ी। गवर्नमेंट की किसी भी रिपोर्ट में यह चीज नहीं बतलाई गई है।

दूसरी चीज जो मैं बताना चाहता था वह मिनिस्ट्री आफ कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट एंड कोऑपरेशन की रिपोर्ट के पेज १८ पर दर्ज है। उसमें बड़ी लम्बी चौड़ी बातें बताई गई हैं।

19,100 Mahila Samities are functioning in 2,278 reporting blocks upto September, 1958. This works out to an average of about 8.4 Samities per block. Their membership in 2,040 blocks was about 2.99 lakhs giving an average of 15.16 members per Samiti.

यह वास्तव में इन महिला समितियों द्वारा कुछ काम तो होता ही नहीं है। मैं वेबसाइट हूँ कि इन महिला समितियों में स्वीक डेवलपमेंट स्कीम्स में गवर्नमेंट और लोगों को, १६, २० साल से ज्यादा जिनकी उम्र नहीं होती और जिनको कि किसी भी काम का तजुर्बा नहीं होता उनको बड़ा रकबा जाता है। मैंने कई जगहों पर उनसे काम के बारे में पूछ-खाया की और मैंने पूछा कि वे लोग क्या काम करती हैं तो मुझे कोई काम की फीगर्स नहीं थी आ सकी और वे मुझे संतोषजनक उत्तर नहीं दे सकी

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय वे क्यों को नहीं बतलाती होंगी।

श्री मोहन स्वच्छम उनकी तनकबाह इतनी कम है कि वे अपने घरों में जाकर पूरे नहीं कर सकती और कोई गारंटीशन नहीं रख सकती। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसको एक तमाशा न बना कर ऐसी एजेंड औरत बहा पर इस काम के लिये रखी जायें जो कि समझदार हो और जिनको कि काम का तजुर्बा हो और मेरा सुझाव है कि इस फील्ड में जो सोशल वर्कर्स हैं उनको इस काम में लगाया जाय और मात्र जो यह एक तमाशा और मजाक सा बनाया जा रहा है इसको बन्द किया जाय। ऐसी व्यवस्था करने से ही औरतों का प्रोग्राम चल सकता है वरना नहीं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय माननीय सदस्य अब अपना भाषण समाप्त करने की कोशिश करें।

श्री मोहन स्वच्छम ५, ७ मिनट में और गुमा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं आप जल्दी अन्त करें।

श्री मोहन स्वच्छम . विलेज लेवल वर्कर की ट्रेनिंग के लिये केवल तीन दिन मुकर्रर किये हैं मानो तीन दिन के अन्दर सब कुछ उसको घोल कर पिला दिया जाता है अब तीन दिन का प्रोग्राम यह रहता है। फर्स्ट डे एग्जीक्यूटिव, डिप्टीजेज, रिमर्च, रिजिग्रेशन ४ घोवर्स। सेकंड डे पाउल्ट्री, फिशरी, कोऑपरेशन, पंचायत्स, रिजिग्रेशन, ४ घंटे का हुआ। तीसरे दिन वीटनरी, इरिग्रेशन यह तमाम होता है। तीन दिन में विलेज लेवल कीडर का घोल कर पिला देते हैं और एड-पट बना देते हैं और यह तीन दिन की ट्रेनिंग लेने के बाद उसमें यह उम्मीद की जाती है कि वह गांव वालों को डाइरेक्शंस दें। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ट्रेनिंग कम से कम ६ महीने की तो हो ताकि वह इन सम्मोक्ट्स के बारे में थोड़ा बहुत जान तो सकें। मैं समझता हूँ कि एग्जी-

[Shri S. A. Mehdi]

कम्पटर, फ़िशरी और पाउल्टरी आदि विषय ऐसे हैं जिनको कि अगर भादमी जिम्मेवी भर भी स्टडी करे तो थोड़ा है और वह सब भी इन चीजों का सही मानने में मास्टर नहीं कहा जा सकता। अब यह मज़ाक नहीं तो और क्या है कि इन बिलेज लेबिल लीडर को तीन दिन में ही इन सब चीजों का एक्सपर्ट बना देते हैं

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर जिन्दगी भर बढ़ता ही रहेगा तो फिर उन पर काम कब करेगा ?

श्री मोहन स्वल्प : मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि इस चीज को सीरियसली लिया जाय और इसका मज़ाक न बनाया जाय।

अब जहाँ तक सबसिडीज देने की बात है उसके लिये मेरा कहना यह है कि जो लोग डिजर्व करते हैं जो गरीब भादमी हैं उनको सबसिडी और तकावी भी मिलती है लेकिन जो भादमी मालदार और रिसोर्सफुल होते हैं उनको सबसिडी भी मिलती है और तकावी भी मिलती है। मायूसी और गरीब भादमी जो कि बाकई डिजर्व करते हैं उनका कोई पुर्सा हाल नहीं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसकी उचित व्यवस्था की जाय ताकि डिजर्विंग हैंड्स इससे महकूम न रह जायें।

अब इसके बाद एक और चीज मज़े की है। हर ब्लॉक में दस बिलेज लेबिल वर्कर्स होते हैं ६ या ७ ए० डी० पीछोज होते हैं और हर ए० डी० पीछोज अपनी-अपनी भलग हिदायतें देते हैं और बिलेज लीडर को कहते हैं कि यह करो और वह करो। उनमें कोई आपस में कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं है कि बिलेज लेबिल वर्कर कौन-कौन से काम करे। मैं चाहूँगा कि बिलेज लेबिल वर्कर को सही तौर से काम करने का मौका दिया जाय और ए० डी० पीछोज जो उन्हें हिदायतें दे रहे सही और माकूल हों।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब तो माननीय सदस्य को खरम कर ही देता चाहिये।

श्री मोहन स्वल्प : जी हाँ केवल दिल्ली के बारे में थोड़ा निवेदन करके मैं बैठ जाऊँगा। दिल्ली में भारत सेवाक समाज और ग्राम्य समाज सेवा सहकार समितिवा सामाजिक सेवा के क्षेत्र में इस समय काम कर रही है और वे भलग-भलग बतलाती हैं कि हमने यह काम कर लिया और हमने कलां काम कर लिया। मैं चाहूँगा कि जहाँ तक दिल्ली का तात्लुक है इन सामाजिक संस्थाओं में आपस में कोऑर्डिनेशन और कोऑपरेशन हो और उनका भलग-भलग कार्य क्षेत्र निश्चित कर दिया जाय ताकि डुप्ली-केशन न हो और काम ज्यादा से ज्यादा हो सके।

अन्त में मैं केवल यही कह कर समाप्त करूँगा कि अगर गावों की तरफ़ करनी है, तो कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट के काम को ठीक से चलाना है तो यह मज़ाक और खिलवाड़ से काम नहीं चलेगा बल्कि सही तौर से भमल करने से ही फ़ायदा हो सकेगा।

Shri S. A. Mehdi (Rampur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker. I thank you very much for allowing me to speak on this subject. I gather that during the previous few hours, all the speakers that have spoken, have spoken on co-operation, and with the inclusion of co-operative farming, the focus of discussion has mainly centred round this. This is not a new thing as the Prime Minister pointed out the other day. It is a step forward towards the development of the village and the village people. It is a step in a process that has started soon after the achievement of Independence. It is a continuous chain and co-operative farming is one of the steps to be taken.

I am not going to speak in detail about the merits of the thing. But, I would like to say only a few things about the introduction of co-operative farming and things like that. The introduction of co-operative farming would ultimately necessitate some use of machinery. Because, after the integration of these small holdings and after the formation of big holdings, definitely some small or big machinery and implements will be required. We have had a very sad experience of foreign machines and implements during the last few years ever since Independence. In the reclamation work, of course, we had a very sad experience of foreign machinery and I hope the Government along with the introduction of co-operative farming, will arrange for the production of agricultural machinery, and implements and parts and especially arrange for the repairing facilities of these machineries and other things fully or before introducing co-operative farming on a large scale.

Secondly, Sir, this approach will solve the problem of the unemployed in the countryside because by this approach large numbers of people could be utilised in mechanised units all over the country. Unless we provide such avenues of employment we will find that large number of people will be migrating to cities and urban areas. So, we should provide them alternate employment in our villages or very near the villages to avoid the problem of urbanisation.

I would like to deal with another point, namely, the need to give training facilities to our people engaged in co-operative farming. It is admitted on all hands that a lot of technical skill will be required to handle all these things. Therefore, the need to provide them necessary training facilities should always be kept in view.

In spite of all the speeches we have heard in this House against co-operative farming, I for one feel strongly that the villager today is far more ready to accept any progressive step which would be taken in this direc-

tion. Proper education at the village-level should be given and I am sure our villager will willingly accept co-operative farming without any difficulty whatsoever.

Thirdly, I wish to deal with the actual progress that has been made in respect of the programmes of the Community Development Ministry. It is my personal knowledge that whatever work this Ministry has done, it has done it very well. It is doing wonderful work. Whatever it has done, it has done it remarkably well. One great benefit of this Ministry, as the House is aware, is that this is the only co-ordinating agency at the village level of all the developmental activities. This is not a scheme which finds a place only on paper. This is a scheme in which the officers go to the individual villages and we find that they are doing really very good work. Obviously, the success of this experiment to a great extent depends upon the block officer or the block workers. Different blocks may have to do different kinds of work. Different blocks may have different programmes. All the same, it is quite true that an officer who is enthusiastic in his work, who infuses certain life into the work that he does, will be able to infuse the same spirit among the men who work under him and also among the villagers. The difficulty in our villages is that for six months in the year, the villages are inaccessible almost and nobody can go to some of our villages because of bad weather and things like that. After the harvest is over, the tax collectors and the revenue collectors go there. There are also other fair weather friends of the villagers. But, on the other hand, the Block Development Officers get into contact with the villagers all the year round. It is they who teach the villagers about the modern techniques of production and give them advice how to produce more and to have better yields.

I would like to refer to what I said last year, namely, that these blocks are concentrated near the cities or tahsil headquarters. The

[Shri S. A. Mehdi]

block that was judged to be the best in my State was only a few miles away from the district headquarters of Faizabad. Yet, it was adjudged as the best block in U.P. It is on the pucca road between Faizabad and Sultanpur. That block is doing very good work. But that is not the only block in that district. I know of five or six blocks also, two or three of them are shadow-blocks. Now, the villages which are in the remote areas in the countryside do not get the full benefit of this scheme. I think this situation will continue till 1963, till such time as all the villages are covered by this programme. We should develop communications so that all the villages will be able to benefit by this scheme. Unless this is done, the surplus population will shift from the tahsil to the district or to other town areas.

The work that has been done by these Community Development Blocks is very comprehensive. As my hon. friend, Shri Raghbir Sahai pointed out, with the inclusion of co-operatives, the three basic institutions of democratic decentralisation have come under this Ministry. The destiny of the villagers depends on the work that is done by this Ministry. The future of so many villagers lies in the hands of this ministry. All the important institutions of democratic decentralisation have come under its wings.

The Deputy Minister of Community Development and Co-operation (Shri B. S. Murthy): It is the other way about. The destiny of this Ministry lies in the people's hands.

Shri S. A. Mehdi: The only thing is that all the three important institutions intended to develop the villages are coming under the purview of this Ministry. That is what I was saying. What my hon. friend, the Deputy Minister referred to was the co-operation of the people. The co-operation of the people with these organisations will ultimately be responsible for the success of this work. But I am strongly of the view that the people

will definitely co-operate if the programmes that are being laid down by the Ministry are carried out efficiently and with proper organisation. I am saying this because the co-ordination of all the development work of all the Government departments is done by this Ministry.

14 hrs.

Take, for instance, minor irrigation. The Ministry is not directly concerned with minor irrigation, but it is responsible for helping the people and educating the people to utilise those facilities.

For instance, there was a tube-well dug in one of the villages. The villagers had requested the authorities to have the tube-well at a certain spot, but the authorities had said that since it was a technical matter and the villagers would not understand what things were involved, they preferred to have it near a pucca road and near an advantageous point. After the tube-well was dug, the channel was constructed, and the villagers were expecting water when the crop was ready and when the water was needed. But when water supply was started from the tube-well, it was found that the channel at the field end was higher and that at the tube-well end it was lower; so, the water could not reach the field, and there was such a complication.

The Ministry is definitely responsible for educating these people to utilise the resources that are given by the different departments of Government. At the same time, I am saying something in favour of the Ministry, the consciousness and the awakening of the village people, which is generated through this Ministry is the only deterrent to check the mal-administration or mal-practices in the other departments.

As far as the Ministry's work is concerned, it is very difficult to say that it is not doing much work. I am very glad to see that the development blocks are paying a lot of attention to

statistics. As far as my experience in statist c. goes, it is a very vital thing to collect all the basic statistics of the village. I consider the panchayat to be the competent institution to handle the village statistics. But the blocks have taken up the job of training certain people in collecting statistics and things like that and all the States have opened a statistical bureau. I hope that in the future these units will do all the necessary job, and will collect at least the basic statistics, because in the absence of these statistics no development work can be assessed, and no programme for the future can be chalked out, so, it is very important that these statistics may be collected by direct observation in the field and in the villages. My experience of the statistics of the villages is that they are absolutely made up at the tehsil level at the moment. This is the only organisation that can give a directly observed and correct statistical data, in order to enable us to have a proper planning for the future and also have a better assessment of the village. But it will take some time, and it needs a lot of training. I hope this training programme will be taken up not in the sketchy way in which it is being done at the moment but in a fuller way.

Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha I propose to confine my remarks to panchayats and co-operatives, because they are the symbols of the new political order and the new economic order. I believe that it is through these institutions that energy, initiative, enthusiasm and interest of the people can not only be created and stimulated but can also be channelised into useful purposes for development activities.

The House knows that panchayats have acquired lately an added importance, because, as the Prime Minister has stated, after the imposition of ceilings, whatever surplus land will be available will be left to the management of the panchayats. So, I think it is of interest to us if we really go

into the work of the panchayats, in order to make them really effective and successful.

My hon friend Shri Raghur Sahai has already referred to the report of the B G Mehta Committee and to the various recommendations made by them. I am not going to refer to those recommendations. The committee has said that the panchayats unfortunately have not been working successfully. My own experience is almost the same, and I want to place certain viewpoints for the consideration of Government, in order to remove those handicaps or difficulties which are at the moment hampering the successful working of the panchayats.

For instance, I shall take the question of elections. Although in a democratic institution, we cannot altogether do away with the system of elections yet since we are at the moment concerned with creating a co-operative spirit in the villages and to see that the village is not divided into factions it should be the anxiety of the Government officials, social workers and public workers, to see that some sort of convention or method is devised by which in the initial stages we could avoid elections and try to choose the best person on whom there is general agreement. For, what I have noticed is that whenever these elections take place there is naturally a division into two camps or sometimes into three camps, and largely based on caste considerations, the result is that after the elections they do not take it in the true democratic spirit, and those who belong to the vanquished camp do not forget their defeat and they continue to non-co-operate with those who have been charged with the responsibility of carrying on the panchayat work. So, the panchayat spirit has not really been inculcated among the villagers, and they have not understood the significance of these panchayats.

As regards the labour tax, to which my hon friend has made a reference,

[Shri S. A. Mehdi]

firstly, the Mukhiyas are very reluctant to impose labour tax. Even if the labour tax is assessed or imposed, the villagers are not coming forward to do voluntary work, because the system is a system of annual budgeting, and many of those persons feel that they are not going to be benefited by a particular work, and, therefore, they do not take any interest. So, my suggestion to Government is that a system should be evolved whereby, just as we are having Five Year Plans here likewise, they should also have a five-year plan or a three-year plan for the development of the entire villages, in regard to irrigation works, or road building, or paving of the streets and so on, so that every villager may feel that he is also going to be benefited. Priorities may be determined, and he must have the confidence that today this work is being done in this particular village, tomorrow it will be done in his village and that he will be also a beneficiary. That will create enthusiasm and interest.

Then I find that the mentality or the outlook of the officers has not changed, and this is hampering progress. They continue to look at it in the same old bureaucratic manner. For instance, they are not giving the mukhiyas proper respect and consideration. One of the S.D.Os. I know, while addressing a Panchayat Sammelan, made a declaration publicly that he was not going to give them any respect, and that most of them were goondas. That was the statement he made, and despite protests, he refused to withdraw his remarks.

Many of the mukhiyas say that whenever they go they are treated like chowkidars or tax collectors, and are not given even chairs to sit.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I ask the hon. Member what has happened to that officer after that remark, whether

the matter has been brought to the notice of the State Government?

Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha: Yes, I am coming to that. This matter was, of course, brought to the notice of the Panchayat Minister of my State. Secondly, I may inform the hon. Deputy Minister, that in another case....

An Hon. Member: But what happened to that officer?

Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha: I myself spoke to the Minister, but nothing has been done so far.

Shri Jhunjhunwala (Bhagalpur): When did this happen?

Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha: About four or five months ago.

These panchayats are asked to look after the construction of wells or other local works. The contract has to be given to a mukhiya in the name of the panchayat, but most of the mukhiyas are not coming forward to take up the contract because they know they have got to pay *salami* to the officer concerned, and they literally refuse to take up the contracts. In some places contractors are appointed by the officers concerned. In one case, the construction of the well entrusted to a contractor was constructed and the payment was made out. All this was done on paper. When a particular mukhiya brought it to the notice of the S.D.O. concerned, he flared up, made an inspection of the spot, and in the order sheet he recorded that no obstruction should be placed in the way of completing the well. But that order is passed three months after the full payment has been made, when on paper it was shown that the well had been constructed. And the mukhiya was called and told not to raise any voice against this kind of thing; otherwise, he would be fined. This matter was also taken up, and a report was made against the circle inspector who had given a chit. I also spoke to the

Commissioner concerned, but nothing has been done so far. Most of the mukhiyas come and express such grievances.

Then, we are going to saddle these panchayats with all sorts of responsibilities. We are asking them to manage village lands and all that. On the other hand, there is no attempt made by us to give them proper status, proper prestige, proper respectability, and to inculcate in them the real spirit in which they have to function.

I refer to this point particularly because just now Shri Vasudevan Nair said that one of his main anxieties was to remove middlemen so that unnecessary profit may not be grabbed by them, and that panchayats or co-operatives should take up the contracts. That is well and good. But sometimes ad hoc co-operative societies are formed only to take up contract work, and it is not enquired into whether they are genuine or not, or have been formed for ad hoc purposes. That way they cast a bad reflection upon the entire movement. So, it is of interest to us to see that this is set right.

Then, I would say that we must have a cadre of trained personnel, even for the purpose of successful working of the panchayats. Most of the mukhiyas are not educated, they do not know how to prepare the budget. For the preparation of the budget for which all the villagers have to collect, there is no quorum. People do not know what is the importance of this budget.

At one place I found that the budget had to be approved by the villagers and had been sent to the B.D.O. who has ultimately to approve it. In that particular police station, i.e. in Sahabganj, I went there, I found that the budget had been sent to the B.D.O. and was resting in his shelves for nine or twelve months, and had not been returned to the panchayat. How on earth is the panchayat to function then? That is the main question.

So, my suggestion to the Government is that if they are going to make the panchayat a success, they must re-orientate the outlook of the officers. I entirely and whole-heartedly support the view of my hon. friend Shri Raghbir Sahai, that even the higher officers, for instance the I.A.S. probationers, should be in the first instance appointed B.D.Os. I understand the Community Development Ministry once wrote to all the State Governments to try this experiment, but this has not been done. Formerly, when the I.C.S. officers were appointed probationers, they were appointed as cane inspectors, Deputy Collectors, Joint Magistrates and all that, and ultimately they used to become S.D.Os. and District Magistrates. Today, after a training of one year they are appointed S.D.Os. and they become District Magistrates within a span of four years, with the result that they lack proper experience and the proper spirit, not having had the advantage of coming into contact with the people. These are the points that my friends ought to take note of.

Now I come to co-operatives. There can be no two opinions about the need for having service co-operatives, because service co-operatives and joint farming are the two main planks of our policy at the moment. Much controversy has arisen over this, and the reason why quite a large number of persons are not feeling very much enthused, according to Shri Masani, by this may be the failures in our co-operative movement, and it will be of interest to us to examine the working of the co-operative societies and the co-operative movement and find out why it has failed.

According to me, there are three or four points which should be taken into consideration in this connection. Firstly, the co-operative movement has been largely officialised. The Prime Minister is also cognizant of the fact, and he has said that henceforward it should not flourish under official patronage; at the most, officials have to provide help and guidance,

[Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha]

but they should not be so much associated with it as to stultify its growth.

On the other hand, apart from the officials, public men who are associated with Government, holding posts of Ministers and all that, are also presidents of co-operative federations or chairmen of co-operative banks, and they do not have enough time to go into it, with the result that they consider it as a subsidiary activity.

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): Has it become a grazing ground for some?

Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha: I do not know. They are not considering it a grazing ground; they are considering it a pastime, you can call it.

Shri P. R. Patel: It is also a grazing ground.

Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha: That is not their main function, they are giving it just cursory attention, with the result that the movement has not caught the imagination of the people, and the failures which have resulted in this way have really created a scare among the people. So, in order to attract the people again to this fold, it is necessary that we create a cadre of trained personnel who have got the necessary philosophical outlook and who are trained in the co-operative ideology, so that they may go and make it a whole-time job. It should not be a subsidiary or a pastime activity.

Most of our top men never paid any attention to this subject. It is only recently after the Nagpur resolution that our top leaders are talking of this subject and exhorting the people to realise the importance of the co-operative movement. It is necessary that all of us go round and create the necessary climate.

Then, the failure of the co-operative societies has also been due to infrequent audit. Most of our co-operative

societies did not have any audit. The result is misappropriation and embezzlement of funds. You will be surprised to know that even of the State Co-operative Bank in my State, the balance sheet has been presented after four or five years to the shareholders. This is a very big drawback in the co-operative movement. So, it is necessary that we emphasize this point and see to it that proper audit is carried out, that unscrupulous people who creep into the movement and try to manipulate co-operative societies are not allowed to take advantage of this.

During the war years, there was a crop of co-operative societies. Because of the controls, most of the controlled commodities had to be distributed through co-operative societies. They were formed only for that purpose. When the controls ceased, the co-operative societies also came to an end. A few imaginative persons wanted to take advantage of the situation and took hold of the co-operative societies. They were the leaders of the co-operative societies. Then they quietly slipped away and the co-operative societies failed. The result is that we are blaming the co-operative movement. The people also are being blamed and it is said that this movement is not going to succeed. Now you find all sorts of controversies being raised over this issue.

Then I come to party politics. Those who are concerned with co-operative societies should have nothing to do with party politics. We should at least be honest to ourselves when we are dealing with such an important movement which has to do with the real shaping of the peoples destiny. We should not bring party politics into it. I am really sorry to say that even in educational institutions we are finding party politics today. So it is up to us to make a resolution in our minds not to import party politics or party considerations into the field of the co-operative movement. Then alone we can succeed.

I can cite one glaring instance in our State. A cane growers' co-operative society took over the administration and management of a sugar factory. That co-operative society made a profit of Rs 4 lakhs. But the following year at the time of the elections, three persons were killed on the spot and the co-operative society failed to function. The mill has again been taken over by a millowner. This is the result of importing party politics into co-operative enterprises. This shows to what extreme we are going. So we have to be very careful about it. I think the Government cannot do anything about it; it is for all of us concerned to make a resolution in our minds not to indulge in party politics nor be guided by party considerations in this matter.

I will say a word about joint co-operative farming. This morning I heard Shri M. R. Masani referring to a Gallup poll. He said that out of 200 persons who were interviewed by the *Times of India* 104 said 'no' to the co-operative farming idea. Then he said: 'Look here, the property sense is so strong that our individual peasants will not agree to pool their resources and lands'. My own feeling is that it is all a theoretical approach. When Acharya Vinoba Bhave started the land gift movement, nobody ever thought or believed that anybody was going to donate land. Today Vinoba has collected 40 lakh acres of land.

Shri P. R. Patel: How much of it is fertile?

Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha: I was coming to that. I concede that point. I am prepared to concede that say, 80 per cent of it is not fertile. Even then, the balance is there. What is the value of it? I have worked in the bhoodan movement. In Bihar Sharif, lands are valued at the rate of Rs. 20,000 per acre. There also people were coming forward to donate lands. They are potato growing areas.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: Rs. 20,000 per acre?

45 L.S.D.—6.

Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha: My hon. friend knows it. Acharya Vinoba Bhave got lands there also. Only in the hilly tracts and in the Chota Nagpur plateau in the State of Bihar could the lands donated be called not fit for cultivation at the moment. But what about the North Bihar lands? What about the lands given in Patna or Shahabad Districts? They are all fertile lands, culturable lands.

Then, what about the gramdan villages? 1100 villages have been donated. So what has happened to the property sense? My point is that if we create a proper climate and atmosphere, if we explain to the villagers what is in their interest, how they are going to be benefited by this kind of scheme, I have no doubt that the property sense, about which so much is made, will not stand in the way of joint co-operative farming. The Congress is proceeding very cautiously. It is a phased programme. For three years we are going to have service co-operatives. Thereafter, if the people realise the benefits of service co-operatives, then alone they will pool their resources and lands and undertake joint co-operative farming.

I have only one more point to make before I conclude. I have no time to explain the real difficulties which will beset co-operative farming. It has been asked: how are we going to distribute the profit? What will be the basis of distribution? For that purpose, the Government must devise a formula. They must say that those who pool their lands will, of course, get rent, but those who work on the land will get their wages. The norm of performance has to be fixed by Government. Division of the income or profit has to be related to participation in the work. Some sort of scheme has to be devised. It is for Government to do so. It is not a very difficult task. I am sure we will achieve it. With these words, I support the Demands of the Ministry and I feel we are going to have success in this respect.

Shri D. A. Katti (Chikodi): As has been put by the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation, to promote the socio-economic development of the people living in the villages by changing their outlook, by making themselves reliant, by arousing their energies and making them employ is the main task of community development programmes. This is not the task of any particular Ministry. To bring about revolutionary changes in the economic and social life of the people is the main function of a democratic government too.

To achieve this objective, community development programmes were started in 1952. Today 2409 CD Blocks are in operation, covering 3,02,947 villages with a population of more than 165 millions. The Ministry of Community Development might be taking it to be a big achievement; it might be taking great pride in this. But to me, this is not the matter of pride; what is important is whether through this struggle any tangible results have been brought about, whether there is any change in the life of the people, whether the people in these villages feel any relief, whether they have seen any light, any ray of hope. I am sure one who is conversant with the state of affairs in these villages will definitely say that no change—absolutely no change—is brought about. Take a village within a Block and one outside it and just compare. You will find no change at all. This is a challenge to the Ministry. Let them say what change they have brought about. The people are facing even now the same poverty, the same disease, same ignorance and same filth. There is absolutely no change. Therefore, the time has come to consider why this Ministry could not make any progress at all and there has been such a waste of money here.

The community development programme encompasses agriculture, animal husbandry, communications,

health, education, social education, co-operation and what not. Everything is there. But that is all a paper programme. What is it that is really being done? Visit any village within a block; you will find a school building here, some approach road there, and some wells which have been constructed with the help of the people, some community centres opened and some health centres have also been started.

Shri Ajit Singh (Bhatinda—Reserved)—Sch. Castes: Is that not a change?

Shri D. A. Katti: Some co-operative societies are formed which are not functioning. Shri S. K. Dey is not here. He toured my constituency and I was with him. He could only see there one new school building, one basic school, one approach road half constructed and one maternity home where there were no patients at all. This is what he could see (Interruption). He could see this there.

An Hon. Member: Something wrong with your constituency.

Shri D. A. Katti: I feel that this is the only tangible work that has been done. We shall consider afterwards the problem whether we can improve the life of the people in this way. But, I would like to ask here one important question. Why should these villagers alone be asked to contribute their share to the construction of the school buildings and the hospitals and wells etc.? The persons living in the cities are not asked to contribute their share for these things. It is surely injustice done to these people. Surely, it is the responsibility of the Government to do these things. The local boards were doing these in the best possible way. Why should a community development centre be required for this? The Community Development Ministry should do something else. It should improve the lot of the people and the lot of

those who are suffering through centuries, the lot of the landless agricultural labourers and those who are merely landless agricultural labourers. They form 50 per cent of the rural population. They are not having any land; whenever they get any work, they get 8 annas or 10 annas or 12 annas at the utmost per day. Their children are crying for a loaf of bread. They are living their lives in such a horrible situation.

Secondly, do they get any benefit from whatever is being done in the name of their development? For example, credit co-operative societies are there. Because they are not having any land they are not considered as solvent and loans are not given to them. Because they are illiterate they do not go to libraries and reading rooms; they do not get any benefit. Whatever is done to improve agriculture goes to those who are having lands. The benefits are denied to the landless people, who are 50 per cent. of the people in the villages. Whenever any development work is undertaken in the villages these poor people are forced to contribute labour. This is not what I am telling. This is what the Mehta Committee's report says. These landless agricultural labourers, especially these Scheduled Caste people are forced to render service. This is the only benefit they get. Therefore, I appeal that something should be done to improve the lot of these people.

According to me three things can be done to improve their lot. Co-operative farming preceded by land reform. The reclamation of waste lands; and thirdly, small-scale and village industries.

As regards cooperative farming, I have expressed the views of my party while speaking on the Grants of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. We believe in co-operative farming. We support it. But it must be preceded by land reform first. Without that co-operative farming will fail. That is what we feel. The object of land re-

form should be to discourage cultivation through hired labour; that is, to make tillers the owners. In that way it will be possible to make available 67 per cent of the area held by 17 per cent of the people.

Still the land is overcrowded. Another thing that can be done to minimise overcrowding on land is reclamation of waste land. There is waste land everywhere. According to my information, in West Khandesh district of Bombay State, the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribes people, who are 6 lakhs out of 11 lakhs, are trying to get the waste lands there. Thirty five lakhs of acres of waste land are lying fallow there. Out of this, 10 to 12 lakhs of land is culturable. There these people have formed co-operative societies. No Gram Sevak or Gram Sevika went there and told them to form co-operative societies. They have formed themselves voluntarily, of their own accord with the hope of getting land to feed their children. But they are denied these lands on the excuse that the lands are forest lands in some places and in some places they are required for grazing purposes. On lands which they say are forest lands, there are no trees at all. Somehow or other they want to deny these lands and facilities to these people.

Our Prime Minister unnecessarily jumps in the House and says vehemently that he will go from field to field. Let him go to West Khandesh and see what is being done. Let him see why 10 to 12 lakhs of acres of culturable land is lying vacant there and why that is not being given to the people who are voluntarily coming forward to cultivate those lands and to add to food production. What is the use of talking all humbug things here?

I am conversant with facts in the Bombay and Mysore States. They have prescribed certain limits—50 acres for 100 cattle—for grazing purposes. In a certain place called Jaina-

[Shri D. A. Katti]

pur in Belgaum district, where I have personally seen the things, there are only 425 cattle and the waste land is about 300 acres. According to this proportion, they can reserve only 200 acres of land for grazing purpose. And 100 acres ought to be given to the people there; but that is not being done. The Collector of the district says that that land is vested in the panchayat and cannot be given to the members of the Scheduled Castes who are landless agricultural labourers. If you want to encourage co-operative farming start here. That will minimise overcrowding on the land, will add to the food production and will help these poor people to live happily.

As regards small scale industries and village industries the Mehta Committee's Report says that it is the weakest spot. Only 2.5 per cent families have been benefited by the small scale and village industries even with generous assumption that part-time work is full time work and one man means the whole family. To improve the lot of these people, the starting of small scale industries and village industries will be of great use. But the Ministry has expressed its difficulties. They say that funds are not made available and that under the Second Plan the provision that was made for these industries has been cut down. Banks are not coming forward to finance these industries because some risk is involved there.

Secondly, the Ministry feels that there is the difficulty of marketing too. There is no market for the products. My suggestion is that the starting of small scale industries and village industries should be encouraged; if funds are not available, they should be made available. If funds are not made available for this purpose, the Ministry for Community Development can do nothing. In this behalf my suggestion is that Government should purchase the products and encourage these people. That can also be done. If it is not

possible for the Ministry of Community Development to do all these things, then, it is better that the great illusion of Community Development should be laid to rest; it is of no use; it is a colossal waste, therefore.

Now, about social education the social education is the most important aspect of the community development programme. Social education today is confined to the starting of reading rooms and libraries, to adult education and education through recreation and film shows. But, what is social education at all? Social education should aim at creating a homogeneous society. It should remove the social cleavages, it should create a sense of fraternity in the people and should create civic sense. It should create a community where the principle of one man—one value is respected and followed. It is not done here. Is there any community at all in this country? Take the picture of any village and you will find that different groups of castes are living together rather peacefully. There is no community. How can you develop that which is not there? First of all you should create a community and then you can develop. My suggestion is that the name 'community development' should be changed to 'village development'. It is not fit to be called a Community Development Ministry. There is no community at all. Social education should help the growth of the community.

In the name of education the people are asked to read some newspapers in the reading rooms, the papers where there is some news about Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and cinema stars and they listen to Late Mangeshkar on radio. Is this social education? Social education should help to create a community which has a common interest, a common cause. There must be some cementing force in the community. But today there are all kinds of disruptive forces; there is no community. Social educa-

tion should aim at creating such an ideal society which we are not having. That is the most important task but unfortunately, that is not taken into consideration.

Sometime back, while speaking on the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Gaikwad compared the lot of the Scheduled Castes to with the Negroes in South Africa. But that was treated as outrageous by the Home Minister. Unfortunately he has not perhaps properly understood the spirit behind Gaikwad's statement. He was not referring to the political inequality; he was referring to the social inequality. He was referring to the principle of one man, one value. There is no doubt the principle—one vote, one value is observed. That is there; but that is political equality. We do not deny that. But is the one man, one value observed here? Are all men equal here? Is not worth decided by birth here? He was referring to that. But that was misunderstood and it was treated as an outrageous speech embittering the feelings of other people. It is not correct. The Home Minister could have understood it in a better way.

Coming to the democratic decentralisation, there is a proposal made by Balwantray Mehta Committee that the district boards and the local boards should be abolished and the blocks should be entrusted with the responsibility of these boards. Why? It is not the local boards, but the blocks, that have failed. The local boards are doing their jobs as best as they can. Secondly, this would involve more expenditure on administration. In one district, there are about 10—12 community development blocks and naturally that will increase the cost of administration. I am not expecting any satisfactory service or results from these blocks. As a matter of fact, I am against decentralisation. People should be ripe for that. People in this country are not ripe. If we entrust things to the panchayats, what will happen? I come from a village; I know what the panchayats are

doing. There again the helpless and the landless people, the agriculturists will be subjected to the domination of some few persons. They will be forced to do all labour and work without any benefit. I am against decentralisation; as a matter of fact I say that there should be more centralisation. Today responsibility is divided. Now the Central Government simply finances the Plans and programmes; it is the responsibility of the State Government to execute these programmes.

Shri Raghunir Sahai: But this policy has been accepted by every State.

Shri D. A. Katti: The responsibility of execution is that of the State Government and when they fail, the Ministry here says that it is not its responsibility but that of the State Governments. The responsibility is divided. It should not be so. That is my feeling.

One more minute, Sir, and I shall finish. I shall refer to an instance regarding these co-operatives. I am not going into details. There is one co-operative society in Delhi which was started mostly by the Scheduled Caste people. It is known as Thakkar Bapa society. The Chairman of that society is misappropriating funds. Many complaints were made by the shareholders to the authorities concerned but no enquiry has been so far started. The matter has not at all been enquired into in spite of repeated allegations. I am told that some Congress person who is very influential there is behind that man and that is why enquiries are not starting. I request the Minister to look into this matter also and see that justice is done and money is not misappropriated.

बीबती उवा नेहक (सीतापुर)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मिनिस्टरी आफ कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट एंड कोऑपरेशन को जो उन्होंने काम किया है उसके लिये मुबारकबाद देती हूँ। मंत्रालय की रिपोर्ट को मैंने देखा है और मैं समझती हूँ कि जितना काम इस

[जीमती उपा मेहता]

लोक से धर्म में इस विनिस्त्री ने किया है उसना अधिक काम कोई दूसरी विनिस्त्री करके नहीं दिखा सकी है । मैं वे साहब को इसके लिये खास तौर से मुबारकबाद देना चाहती थी पर मुझे दुःख है कि वे इस अवसर पर भाग मीजब नहीं हैं लेकिन मैं धावा करती हूँ कि वे बहुत जल्दी अच्छे हो कर वहाँ पर आ जायेंगे । वे साहब इस विनिस्त्री की जान हैं

श्री अमराव सिंह : उनके डिप्टी साहब भी तो बहुत अच्छे हैं ।

जीमती उपा मेहता : जी हा, मैं डिप्टी साहब को भी इसके लिये मुबारकबाद देती हूँ और वह मुबारकबाद मैं इसलिये देती हूँ कि जब मैं देहातों में जाती हूँ तो मुझे देहातियों के चेहरों पर औरतों और मर्दों के चेहरों पर एक रीनक सी दिखाई पड़ती है । यह रीनक हमारे कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट की रीनक है । मुझे उनके चेहरों पर यह रीनक देख कर खुशी होती है । मैं वहाँ पर यह भी बतला दूँ कि हालाँकि मैं यहाँ पार्लियामेंट में आ गई हूँ लेकिन रचनात्मक कार्यों में मेरी बड़ी दिलचस्पी है और मेरी काफ़ी जिव्दगी देहातों में काम करते बीती है । जितनी मुझे ग्रामीणों को देख कर और उनके बीच रह कर खुशी होती है उतनी खुशी मुझे सहरियों को देख कर नहीं होती है । खासी रीनक ही गांव वालों के चेहरों पर नहीं पाई है बल्कि जब मैं पिछली बच्चा पार्लियामेंट का सेशन खत्म होने पर अपने निर्वाचन क्षेत्र के देहातों में गई तो मैंने उस रीनक के साथ उनको अपनी जगह पर अमदान करते हुये पाया । अमदान केवल दिखावटी अमदान ही नहीं था बल्कि मैंने देखा कि ग्रामीणों ने अमदान करके बीलों जम्मी सड़क बना ली है और दोनों तरफ ड्रेनेज की व्यवस्था रखी है । अब मुझे केन्द्रीय सरकार से और स्टेट बजट में से कहना है कि हमारे पास ज़रूरी को पक्का बनाने के साधन नहीं

हैं, कंकड़ आदि नहीं हैं जिससे कि सड़क पक्की बनायें । इसलिये देरा निवेदन है कि सरकार, वहाँ वहाँ अमदान से इस तरह की कच्ची सड़कें बनी हैं, वहाँ कंकड़ आदि डाल कर उन सड़कों को पक्की करे ताकि वर्षा में उनकी मेहनत बह न जाय और वह काम वर्षा के पहले पहले हो जाना चाहिये ।

अब मैं अपनी कास्टीट्यूटी में जाता कि मैं काम करती हूँ वहाँ पर एक गांजर गांव जो कि बहुत बैकवर्ड एरिया है वहाँ पर मैंने देखा कि बहुत से सैल्फहेल्प ग्रुप्स ने कितनी मेहनत से काम किया और वहाँ पर हमने किसी के एक पैसा भी नहीं मांगा और खुद अपने बूते पर काम किया । हमने अमदान किया और हम घर घर गये और हमने पैसा जमा किया क्योंकि हमको लड़कों के लिये एक सेकिंडरी स्कूल खोलना था गांजर में । वहाँ जमीन्दार भी थे जिनकी जमींदारी तो अब जा चुकी थी लेकिन उनके कुछ भाग थे जिनको वह उठाते थे और उनके पास कुछ जमीन थी जहाँ बाजार लगते थे । उन बाजारों से भी उनको आमदनी थी । आपको यह जान कर खुशी होगी कि हमने गांवों में से ४०,००० रुपया जमा किया, हम बाहर से एक पैसा भी नहीं लाये और उस रुपये से हमने वहाँ पर इमारत बनाई है और अगर कोई चाहे तो बन कर देख सकता है कि उसमें अच्छे पड़ रहे हैं ।

इसके अलावा हमने वहाँ पर २८ पुल बनाये हैं और हमने खुद इंजीनियरों को दिखाये जिन्होंने उनको पास किया । वहाँ पर कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट के अलावा बजट हमारी मदद कर रहे हैं और वह चाहते हैं कि हमने जो अलाक बनाया है उसका एक फ़िल्म बनाया जाये और शाबद वह जल्दी बन भी जायेगा । तब यह हासल है देहात की जिसकी बच्चा से देहात में काम करने वालों की जमीन होता है कि वहाँ पर व्यवस्था होगी ।

इस सिमलिके में धुसे एक बात यह कहती है कि आप देहाती के लिये बी भी स्कीम बनायें उसमें हमारा पहला फर्ज यह होना चाहिये कि हम उसे बनाने में देहातियों को भी अपने साथ लें और हम उस स्कीम को नीचे से बनायें। आज हालत यह है कि हम यहाँ बैठ कर कानूनों में बैठ कर देहाती के लिये प्रोत्साहन बनाते हैं और उनको ऊपर से नीचे भेजते हैं, इसलिये हमारे देहाती भाई उनको अपनाते नहीं हैं। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि आपकी स्कीम्स अपनाई जायें, अगर आप चाहते हैं कि देहात में फिर से जिवन्ती पावे, तो आपका धर्म है कि आप स्कीमों को नीचे से ऊपर ले जायें। देहाती को यह महसूस होना चाहिये कि उस स्कीम को बनाने में वह भी हिस्सेदार है। जब तक वह यह महसूस नहीं करेगा तब तक वह दिलचस्पी से उसमें काम भी नहीं कर सकते। इस बीच पर आपको गौर करना चाहिये।

धुसे बूझी है कि कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट के साथ साथ बड़ा पर और काम भी किया जा रहा है। हमारे कुछ भाइयों ने यहाँ पर सेविकाओं और सेवकों का जिक्र किया। किसी ने शिकायत की कि सेविकाओं की उम्र छोटी है। मैं नहीं समझती कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर औरतो के लिये बीस या पच्चीस वर्ष की उम्र छोटी कही जा सकती है। यहाँ पर बीस पच्चीस वर्ष की औरतो में काफी जिम्मेदारी होती है। यह कहना कि उनकी जिम्मेदारी नहीं है, वे अपनी झूठी नहीं जानती, यह बेकार की बात है। उनको तो वह ख़याल हम बड़ी उम्र की औरतो से रखना चाहिये कि वे बेकार हैं या नहीं। पुरुष यह नहीं बता सकते कि कोई बहुत बेकार है या नहीं।

मैंने यहाँ पर कहा है कि हमारे मिनिस्ट्री के लोग और वे सेविकाएँ सब मिल कर फार्म तैयार कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने अपने अपने फार्म बनाये हैं। कितने खुशख़बर हैं उनके वे फार्म।

वे मर्द और औरतें बराबर गांव वालों को समझाते हैं कि हमने इनमें कौन कौन सी खाद डाली है और क्या क्या किया है। तो वे इन फार्मों को डिबेलप कर रहे हैं और वह और लोगों को भी वह सब बातें बताते हैं। लेकिन यह सब देखने के बाद मुझे यह ख़याल आता है कि सवाल प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने का है। किस तरह से प्रोडक्शन बढ़े। मेरे ख़याल में प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने के लिये जरूरी है कि डिबेलपमेंट की स्कीम्स में काम करने वालों के साथ एग्रीकल्चर वालों का भी कोऑपरेशन होना चाहिये। हमारे कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट वालों के साथ सेंटर और स्टेट सब को मिल कर कोऑपरेट करना चाहिये तो शायद हमारे प्रोडक्शन में कुछ फर्क आ जाय।

जब मैं नेशनल एक्सटेंशन सर्विस की तरफ़ देखती हूँ तो मुझे यह महसूस होता है कि यह नीब है, जड़ है, जिस पर हमें कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट को तैयार करना है। मैं अफ़सरो से मिली। त्रिसिपल डिबेलपमेंट आफ़िसर से भी मिली, और लोगों से भी मिली। मैं देखा कि जितनी उनकी समझ है वह काम करते हैं। लेकिन इन समय हमारा फर्ज क्या है। आज बड़ी परेशानी हो रही है कि किस तरह से प्रोडक्शन बढ़े और कैसे हम काम करें, कैसे कोऑपरेशन होवे। तो मैं समझती हूँ कि केवल कहने से या लेक्चर देने से, या बैठ कर स्कीम लिखने से यह काम होने वाला नहीं है। अगर इस काम को आप करना चाहते हैं तो जरूरी है कि जाकर गांवों में खेतों को फावड़े से खोदा जाय। जब तक हम बड़ा आ कर यह काम नहीं करेंगे तब तक ज्यादा कामयाबी भी होने वाली नहीं है।

हम आज बड़ा सुबह से कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग के बारे में सुन रहे हैं। हमने मसानी साहब की स्पीच सुनी। मैं ईरत में थी कि वह इतने दावे के साथ कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग पर बोल रहे थे। उनकी सारी नालिश

[बीबीसी उमा रेड्ड]

कितारों की है या उन लोगों से उन्होंने सबक लिया है जिन्होंने शायद कभी वेहास की कल्पना भी नहीं देखी होगी। मैं चाहती हूँ कि हमारे मसानी साहब शहर के पास वाले वेहासों में नहीं पर कोई तीस मील दूर के वेहासों में जायें और वहाँ की हालत देखें तो शायद वह ऐसी बात नहीं करेंगे जैसी कि वे प्रायः कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने प्राइम मिनिस्टर के बारे में बहुत सी बातें कही कि उन्होंने यह कहा और वह नहीं कहा। मगर मैं उन बातों में नहीं जाना चाहती। लेकिन इन्हें मान्य हो जाना चाहिए कि तबतक देश का कल्याण होने वाला नहीं है जब तक कि कोप्रोपरेटिव फार्मिंग नहीं होगा। को-प्रोपरेटिव फार्मिंग तो प्रायः आ गया है, चाहे वह किसी को अच्छा लगे या न लगे। यह तो ऐसा जादू है कि जो प्रायः के सिर पर चढ़ कर बोलेगा, प्रायः माने या न माने। हम लोग तो इसका धरते से इन्तिजार कर रहे हैं। हम सुनते हैं कि लोहा बन रहा है, फीलाह बन रहा है, इंडस्ट्रियलाईजेशन हो रहा है। लेकिन हम कहते हैं कि लैंड रिफार्म कब प्रायःगा। अब जब वह दिन आया तो हम उसमें मुह मोड़ कर खड हो जायें तो यह बहुत गलत होगा। मैं प्रायःको बता द कि अगर प्रायः कोप्रोपरेटिव को कामयाब बनाना चाहते हैं तो प्रायः उन लोगों को लीजिये इस नये शिवाले को बनाने के लिए जो इस को समझते हों, जिनको इस पर विश्वास हो, जो हिम्मत से प्रायः माने वाले हों। अगर प्रायः ऐसे लोगों को इस काम में लेंगे तो प्रायःका शिवाला बन भी जायगा, लेकिन जो डरपोक हैं, जो तरह तरह का बहम करते हैं, जो प्रायः कदम रखने से चबराते हैं, व तो इस काम को कर ही नहीं सकते। उनको प्रायःको नहीं लेना चाहिए।

इस वक्त कोप्रोपरेटिव फार्मिंग पर बहस हो रही है, मैं कोप्रोपरेटिव फार्मिंग को नाथ लैंड समझती हूँ। मैं समझती हूँ

कि वह बहुत अच्छी चीज है जो हमको बहुत आसने से आगे की ओर हमारा प्रोब्लम भी हलसे खूब बढ़ेगा। जिस वक्त कोई परिवर्तन होता है, जिस वक्त समाज की नई सुरत पैदा करने की बात आती है तो वे सब दिक्कतें सामने आती हैं। लेकिन समाज वहीं काबिल और देश वहीं प्रगल्भ होता है जो समय के साथ परिवर्तन करता है। जो नेशन या जो कौन समय के अनुसार परिवर्तन नहीं करती है वह कौन या वह नेशन खत्म हो जाती है। इस वास्ते अधिक न कह कर मैं फिर मिनिस्टर साहब को बन्धबाव देना चाहती हूँ और जो डिमांड्स पेश की गई हैं उनका समर्थन करती हूँ और मैं चाहती हूँ कि यह कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट का जो काम है, यह जो प्रायःकट है, यह दिन दूनी रात जीतनी तरहकी करे। मैं चाहती हूँ कि मैं सारे देश को एक कम्युनिटी में बांध दूँ और अगर मेरे पास कोई मंत्र होता तो मैं मुद्दत हुए इन सब चीजों को करके प्रायः मानने रख देती।

15 मिन.

बी० बहा प्रकाश (दिल्ली सदर)

जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, इस वक्त जो कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट की डिमांड्स हाउस के सामने पेश हैं, इनका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह महकमा बहुत महत्व रखता है और हिन्दुस्तान के गांवों की तरहकी का दारोमदार इसी महकमे पर है। पिछले माई छः साल में इस मिनिस्ट्री ने या इस डिपार्टमेंट ने शानदार काम कर दिखाया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जिन गांवों में इस काम को शुरू किया गया है, वहाँ पर तरहकी का लाइट हाउस स्थापित कर दिया है और गांवों में एक जागृति पैदा हो गई है और एक नई चीज बनाने की एक नई ताकत पैदा हो गई है। यह ताकत पहले वहाँ रहने वालों में नहीं आई थी।

यह कहा जा सकता है कि बहुत बड़ा काम अभी तक नहीं हो पाया है, बहुत ज्यादा तरफ़ी अभी तक नहीं हो पाई है, अभी देहातों की शायद नहीं ख़ुशी है। इसका जवाब भी दिया जा सकता है, लेकिन मैं इसमें पड़ना नहीं चाहता हूँ। मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक ऐसी हवा इस देश में इस चीज़ ने पैदा कर दी है, एक ऐसी मशीनरी देहातों में फैला दी है जिस पर कि आइदा के देहात का समाजवाद स्थापित किया जा सकता है, मजदूरी के साथ इस ध्येय की ओर बढ़ा जा सकता है और एक नया गांव बनाया जा सकता है। यह अच्छा होता कि इस काम को दूसरे स्थान में ही सारे के सारे पांच लाख गांव में फैला दिया जाता। लेकिन इस साथ ही साथ हमें इस पर भी ध्यान देना होगा कि परसनेल की कमी है, ट्रेन्ड हेंड्स की कमी है और इस कमी को देखते हुए शायद स्तनी जल्दी इसे तमाम गांवों में फैलाना आसान काम नहीं था। अब मुझे उम्मीद है कि सन् १९६३ तक इस स्कीम को जो पांच लाख गांवों में फैलाने की योजना बनाई गई है, वह कामयाब होगी और इस ध्येय को हम प्राप्त कर सकेंगे।

मुझे ख़ुशी है कि कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट डिपार्टमेंट में, कोओपरेशन डिपार्टमेंट और पंचायत का डिपार्टमेंट भी शामिल कर दिया गया है। इससे एक तरह की एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव यूनिटी आएगी और परपक्ष की यूनिटी, मकसद की यूनिटी आएगी। मेरी बहुत दिनों के ही नहीं बल्कि कई सालों से यह राय खली आती है कि यह चीज़ होनी चाहिये और अब भी मेरी यह राय है कि ख़ाली इसी से हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता है, अभी कुछ और महकमे इसमें शामिल करने होंगे। हो सकता है कि मेरी राय पर कुछ माननीय सब्बों को इतराख हो लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि ख़ाली एक भाष डिपार्टमेंट इस डिपार्टमेंट के छंवर कर देने से काम चलने वाला नहीं है, कुछ और ज़रूरी महकमे खास तौर से आइदर

इरिगेशन का, सीब के तात्सुक रखने वाला और फर्टिलाइजर से तात्सुक रखने वाला महकमा इत्यादि हमें इस महकमे के सुपुर्व करने होंगे। यह ठीक है कि इस कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट के जरिये हम गांवों का सामूहिक विकास करने जा रहे हैं। लेकिन भाज सब से बड़ी किस चीज़ की ज़रूरत है? भाज ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि वहां पर भनाज की पैदावार बढ़ाने की तरफ़ हमारी तबज़्जह जाये, खेती की पैदावार बढ़ाने की तरफ़ हमारी तबज़्जह जाए। दूसरी ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि हम देखें कि किस तरह से यहा जो सरप्लस लेबर है, कैसे उसे मोबिलाइज़ किया जा सकता है। तीसरी ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि जो एक ज़बर्दस्त तबका है, जिसके पास खेती के साधन नहीं हैं, जिस में हरिजन और बैकवर्ड क्लासिस के आदमी आते हैं या लैंडलेस लेबर आती हैं या छोटे छोटे किसान आते हैं और जिन की तादाद बहुत ज्यादा है और उनको कुछ काम देने की ज़रूरत है, उनका किस तरह से उत्थान किया जा सकता है, उनको किस तरह से काम दिया जा सकता है।

इससे इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता है, कि बाबजूद साढ़े छः साल तक काम करने के अभी तक जो फायदा पहुंचा है वह बहुत कम परसेंटेज को पहुंचा है, गांवों में ज्यादातर लोगों को फायदा नहीं पहुंचा है। इस बास्ते ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि देखा जाए कि किस तरह से वह फायदा ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों को पहुंच सकता है, खास तौर पर गरीब लोगों को।

मैं इस बात से इतिफाक करता हूँ कि स्माल स्कैल इंडस्ट्रीज को तथा दूसरी काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज को तेज़ी के साथ बढ़ावा दिया जाए। इस सम्बन्ध में कोओपरेटिव फार्मिंग की बात की जाती है जिस पर कि मैं प्रागे चल कर कहूंगा। लेकिन यह ज़रूरी है कि कोओपरेटिव फार्मिंग में सब गांवों में स्कीमें पन्ध्री

[पी० बहू प्रकाश]

तर्ह से चल सकें, इसको बेसा जाए। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस कोऑपरेटिव कामिज के साथ साथ एबी इन्स्टीट्यूट भी ली जायें, दोनों एक दूसरे की कम्प्लीमेंटरी हों, एक दूसरे को सप्लिमेंट करें और अगर ऐसा किया गया तो जिस कोऑपरेटिव मैनेजमेंट का हवाला प्लानिंग कमिशन की रिपोर्ट में दिया गया है, उसमें हम कामयाब हो सकते हैं।

मैं समझता हूँ कि सब से पहले एग्रिकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन की तरफ ध्यान देने की प्राथमिकता है, जो सरपलस लेबर है, उसको मोबिलाइज करने की जरूरत है। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि यह हो तो ज्यादा आपको एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव इंटरेशन करना होगा, ज्यादा कोऑर्डिनेशन करना होगा। इसके लिए यह भी जरूरी है कि गांवों की जो एक्टिविटी है, प्लानिंग के एक्सीक्यूशन की, वह गांव इस सब का सेंटर बने। यह भी जरूरी बात है कि विलेज और ब्लाक लेवेल पर जो प्रोजेक्ट स्पेशलिस्ट है, वे पूरी तादाद में हों, और उनके अन्दर पूरा कोऑर्डिनेशन हो। आज थोड़ा बहुत कोऑर्डिनेशन स्थापित है ब्लाक डिबेलपमेंट आफिसर और विलेज लेवेल वर्कर और एग्रिकल्चर के एक्सटेंशन के बीच लेकिन जो दूसरे महकमे हैं, एग्जिल हसबैंडरी का, पंचायत का, सोशल एजुकेशन का, हेल्थ का, उनके बीच में और ब्लाक डिबेलपमेंट आफिसर के बीच में या आपके विलेज लेवेल वर्कर के बीच में पूरा कोऑर्डिनेशन डिबेलप नहीं हुआ है। इसका नतीजा यह है कि खेती की तरक्की का काम उस तेजी से नहीं चल पा रहा है, जिस तेजी के साथ हम चाहते हैं कि वह चले। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक लोगों को मोबिलाइज नहीं करेंगे, जब तक उनकी एग्रिकल्चरल इनकम बढ़ाने की तरफ आप ध्यान नहीं देंगे वरन्धारी से उनकी इनकम बढ़े। इस छोटे ध्यान नहीं देंगे, जब तक उसकी पूरी सफाई सब सब काम में नहीं लगेगी, तब तक यह काम

का जो प्रोद्योग है कम्प्यूनिटी डिबेलपमेंट का, वह बीमा पड़ जाएगा। आपकी रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि सबके बनाने का काम, कुएं बनाने का काम, बीपास बनाने का काम ज्यों ज्यों कम्प्यूनिटी डिबेलपमेंट की मुहूर्त बढ़ती जाती है, त्यों त्यों वह बीमा पड़ता जाता है, त्यों त्यों लेबर का, मनी का योग कम होता जा रहा है। सिवाइज जरूरत इस बात की है कि एक तो कांटेज इन्स्टीट्यूट पर और दूसरे एग्रिकल्चरल डिबेलपमेंट पर ज्यादा तबकाह दी जाए और उसके लिए यह जरूरी है कि पूरा कोऑर्डिनेशन हो। यह कोऑर्डिनेशन वाली विलेज लेवेल पर ही नहीं बल्कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट और प्राविशियल लेवेल पर भी पूरा होना चाहिये। अभी तक पूरी ग्रंजरस्टेडिंग पैदा नहीं हुई है। मैं जानता हूँ कि आप लोगों को फायदा पहुंचाना चाहते हैं, और लोगों को फायदा हुआ भी जरूर है। लेकिन यह भी प्रावश्यक है कि पंचायतें और को-प्रोड्रेशन प्राविसिज के अन्दर एक डायरेक्शन के अन्दर आ जाएं। इसी तरह से बीज, पानी और खाद ये तीनों डिपार्टमेंट भी, हालांकि इसमें एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव इम्प्लिकेशंस हैं, लेकिन फिर भी एक ही एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन उसके अन्दर होना चाहिये। अगर ऐसा नहीं किया गया तो तरक्की नहीं हो सकेगी।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो ब्लाक डिबेलपमेंट आफिसर है या विलेज लेवेल वर्कर है, उसकी जो क्वालिफिकेशन होनी चाहिये, जो हैसियत होनी चाहिये, वह हैसियत नहीं है, वह क्वालिफिकेशन उसमें नहीं है, रूरल बायस नहीं है, एग्रिकल्चरल बायस नहीं है। लोगों ही इस बायस से ज्यादातर बेगहरा हैं। इस बास्ते जब तक उनमें यह बायस न हो, तब तक वे अपनी तरह से काम नहीं कर सकते हैं। मेरी हमेशा से यह राय रही है और अब भी है और मैं इस बात को भी जानता हूँ कि इस मामले में मुझे हमेशा मात्र खानी पड़ी है लेकिन मैं अपने इस विचार में

कहूँ कि बिलने भी ब्लाक डिप्लेसमेंट प्राफ़िटर है या बिलने भी बिलेज लेबल बर्कर है ये बकर एग्जिकलचरन सेजुएट होने चाहियें या इनके पास एग्जिकलचर के सर्टिफिकेट्स होने चाहियें। मैं बहुत सी जगहों पर गया हूँ, बाहर के मुल्कों में भी जा कर मैने देखा है। मैने कहीं भी नहीं पाया कि जो हैड हो वह एग्जिकलचर सेजुएट न हो। वह सारे अपने सम्बन्ध मीटर के स्पेशलिस्ट होते हैं। मैने अमरीका में तो नहीं देखा है लेकिन इटली में देखा, स्वेडन में देखा, डेनमार्क में देखा, दूसरी भी कई जगहों पर देखा और पाया कि जो एग्जिकलचर सेजुएट्स हैं, अपने सम्बन्ध मीटर के स्पेशलिस्ट हैं (वही इसके हैड काम तोर से है) इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि इस की तरफ ध्यान देने की जरूरत है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो आप के बिलेज लेबल बर्कर हैं उन के पास काम बहुत ज्यादा है और पंचायत और कोआपरेशन उन के पास और धार रहा है। इसलिये वहां पर एक बिलेज लेबल बर्कर से काम नहीं चलेगा, वहां पर दो बिलेज लेबल बर्कर के कम नहीं होने चाहियें और उन में से एक कम से कम अपने सम्बन्ध मीटर का स्पेशलिस्ट हो। सायन कंजर्वेशन के लिये और एग्जिकलचर के लिये एक प्रसहृदा इस सम्बन्ध मीटर का स्पेशलिस्ट एक्सटेंशन प्राफ़िटर की तरह पर ब्लाक लेबल पर मुकदर किया जाना चाहिये।

अब मैं कोआपरेशन की तरफ आता हूँ। आज लोग बड़े कुछ हैं कि इस वक्त कोआपरेटिव फ़िफ़्टमेंट मि० के के सुपुर्द किया गया है। मि० के पर मुझे बहुत खरोसा है। उन में एक अक्वैलस प्राइडिफ़िकेशन और डायनमिज्म है। और हमें उम्मीद है कि जो जल्दया अब तक बहुत मुस्ती के बख़्त रहा है उस में अकर तेजी आवेगी। नागपुर रेजोल्यूशन ने सारे देश में एक सहर पैदा कर दी है। सन् १९९० में नवक कामू

ने श्री हिन्दुस्तान में एक हलचल पैदा की थी, सन् १९४२ ने भी, जो कि एक तरह का हलचल था, लोगों में हलचल पैदा की जिस से हुकूमत की जड़ें हिल गई थीं। आज इस नागपुर रेजोल्यूशन ने पाँचों में एक सहर का सा मचा दिया है। आज आप हिन्दुस्तान के किसी गांव में चले जाइये, किसान आप से सवाल करते हैं। मेरा अपना तजुर्बा है, मैने गाँवों का दौरा किया है। मसाली साहब इस वक्त नहीं हैं, उन्होंने कहा था कि दो तीन जस्तों में उन्होंने देखा, मुझे यह बेशक खुशी हुई है कि एक हजार किसानों के पाँच घंटों तक मुझ से जबर्बस्त बहस की इस प्रस्ताव पर, उस की हर चीज पर। उनके देतराफ़ क्या थे? उन के देतराफ़ यह थे कि साहब, कारपोरेशन के अफ़सर आरिगे और हमारी जमीन पर कब्जा कर लेंगे। अभी हम कर्ज लेते हैं तो हमारे साथ काफी गड़बड़ बह करते हैं। जो पटवारी है अगर उसे कोई कागज लिखना है तो पूरे ५० र० लेता है। यह लोग धार्ये और हमारी जमीनों पर कब्जा कर लेंगे, हमें कुछ नहीं देंगे। शहर से कुछ लोग धार्ये, लीडर धार्ये, खुद फायदा उठावेंगे, हमें कुछ नहीं दिलावेंगे। उन के दिमाग में यह डर है और इसलिये वह इसके खिलाफ़ बोलते हैं। लेकिन अब मैने उन के साथ बातचीत की, बहस की तो उन्होंने कबूल किया कि हाँ ठीक है, यह होना चाहिये। जो ३०० गांव के रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव पंचायत में आवे थे उन्होंने इस रेजोल्यूशन को जो नागपुर का रेजोल्यूशन है कोआपरेटिव फ़ार्मिंग के बारे में उस को कबूल किया। लेकिन ऐसे नहीं कबूल किया कि आपने रेजोल्यूशन देना कर बिना और वह पास हो गया। मैने आज तक अपनी पिछली २५ सालों की बिम्बनी में किसानों को इस तरीके से बहस करते कभी नहीं देखा जिस तरह से उन को करते देखा और मैं समझता हूँ कि कोआपरेटिव फ़ार्मिंग लोग कबूल करेंगे। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि लोग क्यों इस

[बी० बहा प्रकाश]

कल की लेते हैं कि उन बहुत सी कटौत में वहाँ पर कि इतना प्रोडक्शन है कोम्पारेटिव फार्मिंग नहीं है, फला जगह नहीं है, और है तो फला फला कटौत में है। मैंने इस चीज को कुछ स्टडी करने की कोशिश की, लेकिन थूँकि बहुत कम है इसलिये तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता। १०० सालों में एक कम्पिटेशन कैपिटलिस्ट कटौत में हुआ और कोम्पारेटिव और ऐग्रीकल्चर का एक रूप बहा भाया। आज बहा १५ या २० बीसवी ऐग्रीकल्चरिस्ट है। दूसरे मुल्को में भी ऐसा ही हुआ। बहा इन्स्टीज आई। अब हमारे यहाँ हिन्दुस्तान में जहा पर कि एबरेज होल्डिंग बहुत छोटी है, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस के भलाबा चारा ही क्या है कि हम कोम्पारेटिव फार्मिंग करे। ज्वायंट कोम्पारेटिव फार्मिंग के भलाबा इस देश के लिये दूसरा तरीका नहीं है जिस के जरिये आप कामयाब हो सकते हैं। आप क्यों कहते हैं कि यह नई चीज है? आप नई चीज को क्यों नहीं लेना चाहते हैं? आप ने ग्रहिसा से आजादी हासिल की और समाजवाद का एक नया तरीका निकाल रहे हैं। जब एक ही तरीका है तो आप उसे क्यों कबूल नहीं करते? अगर कोई कोम्पारेटिव फार्मिंग में नहीं जाना चाहते हैं तो वह रिज पेजेन्ट है, जो मिडल पेजेन्ट से ऊपर है। उन को छोड़ दीजिये क्योंकि वह इसके रास्ते में बड़े हैं, तो स्माल पेजेन्ट और मिडल पेजेन्ट उस के खिलाफ नहीं लड़े हैं वह मिडल क्लास पेजेन्ट आज कोम्पारेटिव के लिये क्यों नहीं आना चाहेंगे? नहीं आयेंगे तो क्या करेंगे। वह कौन सा मुल्क है वहाँ स्माल पेजेन्ट को आगे आने दिया गया हो? इसलिये एक आस्टिमम यूनिट कस्टिबेशन का इन मुल्क ने अपने यहा ग्लाने का कामून पास करके एक हद मुकर्र की है कि इस से कम होल्डिंग नहीं होगी। वह आस्टिमम मुकर्र होना चाहिये और उस के नीचे की सारी की सारी जमीन

कोम्पारेटिव फार्मिंग में ही जाय। अगर कोई नहीं वेता तो वह अपनी जमीन का कम्पेन्सेशन ले ले। इस तरह से आप एक बड़ी तादाद में जमीन को शामिल कर लेंगे कोम्पारेटिव में। लेकिन एक बात मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि हम ने एक नया काम अपने हाथ में लिया है। इस की जिम्मेदारी उन लोगों पर है जिनको इस पर पूरा विश्वास हो, खास तौर पर हमारी सरकारी मैशीनरी के ऊपर। हमारे मतानी साहब और दूसरे साथियो ने इस के खिलाफ जो प्रापे-गेशा किया है, शायद उस में राजनीतिक उद्देश्य ज्यादा हो बजाय मुल्क के फायदे के। इसलिये यह एक जबर्दस्त चैलेन्ज है और उस चैलेन्ज को सारी मिनिस्ट्री को और दूसरे लोगों को जो इस पर विश्वास करते हैं पूरे तरीके से कबल करना चाहिये। कोम्पारेटिव ला एक होना चाहिये। सन १९५६ में कोम्पारेटिव ला के लिये एक कमेटी बनाई गई। सन् १९५७ में उस की रिपोर्ट आई। अब उसे देखने का मौका मिला। आप कीजिये, उस को देखने से ऐसा मालूम होता है कि हम तमाम मूवमेंट को आक्सिडलाइज करना चाहते हैं। इस-लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोम्पारेटिव ला के लिये एक दूसरी कमेटी मुकर्र की जाय जो जितने कोम्पारेटिव ला है उन को मिला कर एक कोम्पारेटिव ला और रेगुलेशन का तैयार करे, ट्रेनिंग का एक प्रोग्राम बनाय और वह एक जबर्दस्त प्रोग्राम होना चाहिये क्योंकि जो प्रोग्राम चल रहा है उस से काम चलने वाला नहीं है। नैशनल डेवेलपमेंट काँसिल ने नवम्बर में अपना रेजोल्यूशन पास किया। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि छ महीने होने को आये लेकिन अभी तक इस सिलसिले में कोई रिपोर्ट नहीं आई। कोई तजवीज इस सिलसिले में सामने नहीं आई। अभी मैं रिपोर्ट पढ़ रहा था इन्स्टीज के मुतालिक। उसके लिये इन्स्टीज कोम्पारेटिव की एक स्कीम बनी है, यह

जैसे प्रत्यक्ष में पड़ा। अगर इस तरह की स्कीम बनी है, जैसी कि मैंने प्रत्यक्ष में पड़ा है तो, माफ़ कीजिये, इस तरीके से कोई कोआपरेटिव बन नहीं सकती। इस में एक नई थिंकिंग की जरूरत है, नये डायनमिज्म की जरूरत है। आज बहुत से लोगों ने, मेरे समेत, जिन्होंने २५ साल से कोआपरेटिव फ़ील्ड में काम किया है, उन के दिमाग़ डीले पड़ गये हैं। अगर हम को एक नया तजुर्बा करना है, अगर हमें एक नया कामनवेलथ बनाना है तो उस के लिये एक नये डायनमिज्म और नये थिंकिंग की जरूरत है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि जो कोआपरेशन मिनिस्ट्री है वह इस पर ज़रूर ध्यान देगी। हर जिले में और हर सूबे में, हर ग़ीजन और सेक्टर में एक कमेटी आफ़ डाइरेक्शन बननी चाहिये जो मैं समझता हूँ कि हर तीन महीने पर लेजिस्लेचर्स और पार्लियामेंट के सामने अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश कर कि पिछले तीन महीने में क्या हुआ है, इस कोआपरेशन के सिलसिले में मिनिस्ट्री के लेवेल पर और डिपार्टमेंट के लेवेल पर। इस के बग़ैर काम नहीं चलेगा। आज तो ऐसा लगता है कि जैसे हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर अकेले हैं जो जोर से इस तरफ़ बढ़त चले जा रहे हैं और हम व लिये लड़त जा रहे हैं। जिस तेज़ी से इस के लिये कदम उठान चाहिये वह अब तक इस के अन्दर नहीं उठाये गये हैं। मिनिस्ट्री ने अभी कई बातों की तरफ़ तबज़्जह नहीं दी है अब इस जा के बारे में कोई चीज़ सामने आनी चाहिये। एक-एक कमेटी आफ़ डाइरेक्शन सेंटर में और स्टेट में इस तरह की बननी चाहिये जो इस के बारे में जोकि एक स्ट्रोंग कोआपरेटिव सेंक्टर बनाये। आज जो प्राइवेट सेंक्टर और पब्लिक सेंक्टर हैं उन से ज्यादा ताकतवर और मजबूत कोआपरेटिव सेंक्टर तैयार होना चाहिये ताकि वह कम्पीट कर सकें प्राइवेट सेंक्टर से और पब्लिक सेंक्टर से और मजबूती से आगे जा सकें।

Shri Mahaganekar (Kolhapur)
 "This year we had the privilege to go

to Andhra State with the Study Group of M.P.s. and there we discussed many things like Community Development Projects, our Plan, our resources and so on. It was really a very nice step taken by the Andhra Government and I am not sorry that a very few members of this House have taken advantage of the Study Group at Pathancheru in Hyderabad. A question was also put about this Study camp and the Minister told us at that time that he wished that such camps would be held henceforth in every State in order to acquaint Members of this House with the progress made by Community Development Projects and so on

While discussing these subjects, various definitions were given to "Community Projects". While studying the programme of work at Pathancheru, in one of the pamphlets they have stated

"One of the definitions of Community Development is a 'process of social action in which the communities organise, plan and execute and, where necessary, supplement from outside sources' In a democratic set-up, responsibilities and powers are assumed by the elected representatives of the community, be it at the National, the State, the District, the Block or the Village level. The representatives have to be chosen from among those considered best to fulfil the responsibilities devolving upon them. And when they are chosen, whether as members of Panchayats, Block Development Committees, District Development Committees, the State Legislature or the Parliament, they have all one common object, namely, to assist and help, to the best of their ability, in the rapid development of the community of which they are the elected representatives. Functions and activities may vary, but the responsibility and the aim remain the same."

[Shri Mahagaonkar]

When I read these things I feel that I am the only elected representative of the people. My experience is that we do not get the same treatment at the State level. Unfortunately, all the suggestions are carried out on party basis. That is how things are looked upon.

In my State, in my constituency particularly, we have got district development boards. I do not understand why only members of the ruling party and only elected members are appointed as non-official members there. Now if you look at the set-up in the Bombay State for these development schemes, they have got a development board at the district level. I have referred to this last time also. Then they have got local boards, Bharat Sevak Samaj and other institutions. But there is no co-ordination between these institutions and each is having a different programme. Each organisation wants to work for its own ends. That is why we find there is little development in this respect.

So far as my constituency is concerned, I have seen from the papers that it has been selected by the Government of Bombay for the new slogan of the ruling party; I mean, co-operative farming. Kolhapur and West Khandesh are the two districts selected by the Bombay Government for the co-operative farming experiment. It is a good thing that the Bombay Government have selected my constituency. I congratulate the Bombay Government for their selection of my constituency where people have shown a remarkable sense of co-operation. We have got four sugar factories there out of which three are co-operative sugar factories. They were started this season and they have already shown remarkable progress.

At the same time, recently we have heard in this House the hon. Prime Minister and the rest of the leaders talking about service co-operatives. But about that I have got very bad experience in my constituency. And

on many occasions when I had opportunity to speak with the Minister of Community Development I have spoken to him about this. Not only have I spoken to him but I have given to him complaints in writing, but the only answer I have received is "The matter is under investigation" or "We will look into the matter at an early date".

Shri B. K. Galkwad (Nasik): "Investigation not over."

Shri Mahagaonkar: Yes, "Investigation not over". Some excuses are given.

Then, in the co-operative sugar mills Government representatives are appointed as directors. When I visited one of the sugar mills I was surprised to find that they treat the shareholders, the common shareholders, the village people, in a way which is most absurd. One of the officers while having a round in the factory addressed one of the shareholders like this: "Look here, gentleman, though this is a co-operative sugar mill, remember this is a Government sugar mill and Government can return your share capital any moment they like". According to him, you cannot, you are not entitled to, even move within the premises of the sugar factory. This sort of attitude on the part of the officials does create some sort of ill-feeling among the people who otherwise wish to co-operate.

We are told in another pamphlet that was given at Pathencheru:

"We have learnt why peoples' participation in the Development Programme is so very necessary. The Community Development Programme is a big programme of development that is being taken up in the blocks. It is trying to meet our needs, to improve our farming and our cattle wealth, to improve our village industries, to provide for better and more education to our children, to improve the sanitation of the

village, to provide better medical facilities to us, to look after the welfare of women and children, to improve the village communications and to provide to us better cultural life. It is we ourselves who have to bring about all these improvements. The Government can only help us and give us technical advice and provide us the materials which we do not have in the village."

Though we talk of principles and ideals, generally the experience is quite the opposite. I have on many occasions expressed my views on co-operation to the Minister of Community Development when I had opportunity to meet him and I was told by the Minister that he is very sorry that in spite of the decisions carried out by the consultative committees they remain just in the books or on paper only and they are never executed. One of the State officials told me one day that as it is only a consultative committee its decisions are not binding. On the contrary, the literature that has been passed on to the Members tells us that the decisions of these consultative committees are binding. In actual practice they are ignored in many respects

Recently when we visited the Pathancheru block in Andhra I was very glad to find that Andhra has made a little more progress than my own State. In Andhra they have got the block *samitis*. They have got the elected representatives who look after the blocks and execute their own plans. Normally, they prepare and execute their own plans. Here the revenue authorities or the block development officer just thrusts the plan on the villagers; the villagers never prepare their own plan. Then, there is always the bureaucratic method of functioning, because it is dealt with by a Government department. So, there is always delay, and people lose their initiative when there is delay on the part of the Government.

Here I would like as a member of my constituency, to invite the Minister to come to my constituency. There is one village there in the midst of a forest called Murkutt. There is not even a road to that village now. Very recently, some two years ago, in this area of Bhudhar-Gud Taluka of Kolhapur we have started a Community Project block. In this village without the help of the Government people have done work. They have constructed roads. They have done work worth about Rs. 1,20,000 without a single farthing from the Government. Not only that, they have built their own roads. They have built up their own school. They have built their own godown. They have distributed the land into three parts. There are about 60 families and these 60 families have distributed the entire agricultural land into two or three groups. At the end of the year these groups have their prize distribution and so on and so forth. I told the District Collector about the village, about the villagers and about their programme. I told the Collector that such people should not be neglected and that encouragement should be given to them. I think about four months back, our District Collector came to me and congratulated me for suggesting to him a visit to this place. He said, "It is really worthy that people have done very remarkable work. I have sanctioned for them Rs. 500 that was within my power." To such people who have distributed even their land and done the real work and who have shown as to how the community development should work, Government should pay more attention. I particularly invite the attention of this Ministry and ask the hon. Minister to visit this place if any time he comes to Bombay State on his regular visits.

As regards the co-operative societies, a very bad experience is there. In my constituency about 2,000 to 3,000 co-operatives are working today. There is another co-operative society

[Shri Mahagaonkar]

known as the Setkari Sahkari Sangh, which is one of the best societies, doing purchase and sale business on behalf of the farmers, the shareholders. It has done a remarkable work. But we generally find that the advantage of these small co-operatives that are in the villages is taken only by a few, who are big landholders or who are big cultivators. The Bombay Government's Tenancy Act is so defective that many of the tenants now are coming out as big landlords. In these days when we talk of co-operation, land reforms and co-operative farming, as my hon. friend, Shri Katti has said, unless there is land reform, unless the question of landless labour is solved and unless the land is given is to the tiller, I do not think this co-operative scheme will be a success. Before going into co-operatives, I urge and request this Ministry to create a feeling among the villagers so that they will believe in co-operative societies and in co-operation because of whatever has been put before them in the name of democracy and co-operation today. They have lost their faith in many of the societies. Big landholders have taken loans and now those societies are not functioning at all. People do not know where to go. When they come to the representatives of the people and when we try to make enquiries of the Government, we get the answer from the Government that the matter is still under investigation. They just try to support these people who have misused the funds of these societies. In one of these societies in my constituency, known as the Rashivada Village Co-operative Society, Radhaugri Taluk, Kolhapur where for the last two years the Society's books are with the Secretary while the President has gone out somewhere else, we are making enquiries of the Government, the Government says that they are trying to investigate into the matter. Even the matter has gone to court. I do not know what has happened. For two years the villagers are saying,

"We are unable to get loans. We are unable to get money." Under these circumstances, the Society is not functioning at all.

It is not only there. Even in the Capital, I have received a complaint just as my hon. friend, Shri Katti, has received one. There is one Rickshaw Pullers' Industrial Co-operative Society, Delhi. There people from Maharashtra also are shareholders. Their complaint is:—

"The Managing Committee of the Society has enrolled many non-licenced rikshaw pullers as its members and has allotted rikshaws to them;

Some of the allottees do not ply the rikshaws themselves but sublet it to others at exorbitant rates;

Many members of the Society owe large sums of money to the Society but no action is taken against them, as they are exploited for personal and political ends by the Secretary of the Society;

No balance-sheet has ever been distributed to us; no accounts have ever been given to us."

Such sort of defects have been shown. The matter is under consideration of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies. I appeal to the Ministry that they should look into this matter. Right in the Capital these things are happening, particularly when these people who have come from far off Maharashtra have started this business here. They thought that at least in the Capital they may get the support of Government. They have been deprived of their rights and their earnings. If this is the sort of societies and co-operative movement that is started, naturally people are bound to lose their faith in these societies. I therefore suggest that before going into co-operative farming first a survey should be made, there should be the implementation of ceilings and those ceilings should be on the basis

of income, income should be considered as income in the rural as well as in the urban sector and there should be some sort of equality between these two incomes. Unless you give a peasant sufficient income, he will not be able to maintain not only his family but it will be difficult for him even to educate his son, to educate his family and even to take part in the different activities which you call social and other activities.

I would like that other facilities should be made available to the kisans also who actually cultivate the land. In my constituency, before Independence, I know that they were using free water. Formerly, it was a State. They have got a dam there known as the Radhanagari Dam. After the dam was completed, Independence was achieved and the State was merged with the Union territory. Now it has come under the Bombay Government. All of a sudden the Government raised the irrigation charges to Rs. 200 per acre. Then there was an agitation of the farmers and the Government has now put the charge at Rs. 20 per acre. I say that in giving these irrigation facilities the lowest charge should be made and the facilities should be given to the kisans. Unless a charge in our agricultural movement is made, I do not think that our industries will flourish. That is the basic thing and I must say, particularly myself and the Party I belong to, that though I support this co-operative farming, first create the climate of co-operation, give loans to the landless and to the tillers, see that there is a ceiling, see that the water facilities and the loan facilities are given sufficiently to the kisan or to the person who is tilling the land and see that the Tenancy Act that has created ineffectiveness among the people does not create other big landholders. I would like that there should be a proportionate ceiling and there should be some bar that a tenant must cultivate a certain acreage of land. So, when we take

45 L.S.D.—7.

all these things into consideration then only it is possible that people will come forward and help in the programme. It is very good to talk about socialistic pattern of society. It is very good to talk about co-operation. But in practice things are quite different. If you want that people should believe, if at all.....

Shri B. K. Galkwad: Empty slogans.

Shri Mahagaonkar: Yes, that is true. They are empty slogans. But these will be the slogans of the ruling Party. During the last elections there was a slogan in my constituency that the Government has started giving loans to the tillers, that is, the Tenancy Act has been brought in force by the Government. Then, the Five Year Plan has been brought by the ruling Party. These will be the slogans and there will be next election stunts.

I will ask the people in authority to consider these things carefully and to create a real atmosphere for the development of the community at large and for the nation. I hope that due consideration will be given to all these matters

श्री० रत्नबीर सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझ से पहले बक्ता ने जो क्वाल जाहिर किये कि यह सारे खाली स्लोगन ही हैं, मैं उन से सहमत नहीं हूँ। देस में जितना काम हुआ है उसका कोई भन्दाजा नहीं है। अगर किसी भी प्रादमी से पूछा जाये कि क्या कुछ हुआ है तो मुश्किल हो जाता है उसको बताना कि उसके हल्के में, उसके गांव में या उसकी कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी में क्या कुछ बड़ा काम और छोटा काम हो रहा है। यह भन्दाजा है। मैं बजर-राज सिंह जी से पूछूंगा कि भगली बार वह

[बी० रणबीर सिंह]

जरा बतलाने की कृपा करे कि उनके हल्के में क्या कुछ किया गया है और क्या कुछ होने जा रहा है। हमारे जो बड़े बड़े प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं उनके बारे में सब कुछ माननीय सदस्यों को मालूम है और मैं कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं इतना अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में ७० प्रतिशत ऐसी आबादी है जिसका वास्ता खेती से है और उसकी जो आमदनी है वह सन् १९५१-५२ के अन्दर टोटल देश की आमदनी की ५० ४ परसेंटेंज थी। सन् १९५४-५५ में वह परसेंटेंज देश की आमदनी का ४६ २ ही रह गया। इस वास्ते जब ७० परसेंट आबादी का देश की आमदनी में परसेंटेंज केवल ४६ २ है, तो यह हमारा कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि हम उस परसेंटेंज को बढ़ावें। इसलिये भी यह आवश्यक है कि हम देश को आगे ले जाना चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि सब तबको की आमदनी ज्यादा से ज्यादा हो। हमारे एक साथी ने कहा कि यह खाली नारा मात्र नहीं है बल्कि ये जो सर्विस कोम्प्राइजिबल हम स्थापित करने जा रहे हैं, या ज्वायंट फामिंग को अपनाने जा रहे हैं या दूसरे काम करने जा रहे हैं, ये देहात की आमदनी को बढ़ाने का एक तरीका मात्र है।

हमारा जो ध्येय है वह बहुत बड़ा है। जब दूसरा प्लान बना था और जब उसको मजूर किया गया था तो उसके अनुसार, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कोम्प्राइजिबल क्रेडिट सोसाइटीज के मैनबर जो इस देश में सन् १९६१ तक बनने थे वे केवल १ करोड़ ५० लाख बनने थे। लेकिन आज हमने यह माना है कि तीन साल के अन्दर सारे देश में सर्विस कोम्प्राइजिबल सोसाइटीज बननी हैं, उनके मेम्बर साढ़े छ करोड़ बनाने हैं और जो तादाद दूसरे प्लान के अन्तर्गत होने तक वह कम से कम चार करोड़ होनी चाहिये। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि दूसरे प्लान के अन्दर जो तादाद हमने रखी है उस तादाद से यह दुगनी से ज्यादा है। इसका यह भी मतलब होता है कि हमारे

ऊपर दुगनी से भी ज्यादा जिम्मेवारी धा गई है। धाया इस जिम्मेवारी को पूरी तरह के महसूस किया जा रहा है या नहीं इसके बारे में मैं कोई अपनी ज्यादा राय नहीं रखता हूँ और मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं तो इतना ही अर्थ करना चाहता हूँ कि इस जिम्मेवारी को जल्दी से हम महसूस करें, उतना ही देश के लिए अच्छा होगा और साथ ही कांग्रेस पर जिन भाइयों ने दोष लगाये हैं, उसके लिए भी अच्छा होगा। जब दूसरा प्लान बना था उस वक़्त यह माना गया था कि लाखों साइज कोम्प्राइजिबल सोसाइटीज भी बनेंगी उनके अन्दर सरकार साक्षीदार बनेगी, उनकी पूँजी के अन्दर हिस्सेदार बनेगी। इतना ही नहीं बल्कि काम चलाने वाले जो परसनल हैं, उनके वर्किंग चार्जिज को भी सबसिडाइज करेगी। इसके अलावा यह भी कहा गया था कि जो कर्ज की निमित्त है, जो मैक्सिमम क्रेडिट लिमिट है, उनके लिए पूँजी का वह ग्रांट गुना रखी गई थी। हर एक लाख साइज कोम्प्राइजिबल सोसाइटी के लिए यह अदावा रखा गया था कि २०,००० के करीब उसका शेयर कैपिटल होगा और उसके अन्दर सरकार का हिस्सा दस और बारह या ग्रांट और बारह हजार के बीच में होना चाहिये। यह सरकार ने अदावा लगाया था। मुझे पता नहीं आया यह जो ध्येय हमने अपने सामने रखा था इसको प्राप्त करने का हमारा इरादा रहा है या नहीं रहा है। लेकिन मैं मानता हूँ कि यहाँ पर यह कह देना कि आने वाले तीन सालों के अन्दर हम सारे देश में कोम्प्राइजिबल बना देंगे आसान है। जिन साथियों को इसका तजुर्बा हुआ है वे जानते हैं कि किसी भी सोसाइटी का मेम्बर लोगों को बनाने में कितनी दिक्कत पेश आती है और कितनी मुश्किल से उनको राखी किया जा सकता है। यह मुश्किल और भी बढ़ जाती है जब उस चीज के पीछे कानून का या डबे का दबाव न हो। हमने और हमारी पार्टी ने इस नीति को अपनाया है कि हम सत्य और अहिंसा पर चलेंगे

इस बास्ते लोगों को इस तरह लाने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को और कांग्रेस पार्टी को कुछ उनको प्रलोभन भी देना होगा, उनको समझाना भी होगा और खाली इतना कह देने से कि सोसाइटी बना लो, काम चलने वाला नहीं है, इससे कुछ फायदा होने वाला नहीं है। इस बास्ते जो ध्येय हमने अपने सामने रखा है, यह देखना कि वह प्राप्त होता है या नहीं, हमारा फर्ज है और उसको प्राप्त करने के लिए हमें कुछ करने के लिए तैयार रहना चाहिये।

मेरा अपना भ्रन्दाज्ञा यह है कि हमारे वित्त मन्त्रालय को कम से कम सौ करोड़ या डेढ़ सौ करोड़ रुपया सोसाइटीयों का हिस्सेदार बनने के लिए निकालना चाहिये। इसके भलावा उसे कम से कम तीस करोड़ रुपया या पचास करोड़ रुपया वॉकिंग बजट को सबसिडाइज करने के लिए निकालना चाहिये। इस तरह से दो सौ करोड़ रुपये के करीब उसे अलग से रखना चाहिये। जो माननीय सदस्य यह समझते हैं कि दूसरे प्लान में अगर खर्चा बढ़ेगा तो और इनप्लेन होगी, उनका ऐसा भ्रन्दाज्ञा करना गलत है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं समझता हूँ कि आज हमारे देश की जनशक्ति और राजशक्ति का सारा दबाव एक ही तरफ है और वह अल्प बचत योजना को कामयाब बनाने की तरफ है। सौ करोड़ रुपया इकट्ठा करने के लिए हमको कम से कम एक साल के अन्दर पांच करोड़ रुपया सूद का देना होगा और इसके भलावा एक करोड़ रुपया कमीशन के तौर पर देना होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हम सर्विस कोऑपरेटिव के नारे को कामयाब करने की तरफ अपनी शक्ति लगायें और उनको कामयाब करने के लिए दिल खोल कर मदद दें तो कहीं ज्यादा फायदा हो सकता है। देश में मेरा भ्रन्दाज्ञा है डार्ड लाख या साढ़े तीन लाख सर्विस कोऑपरेटिव्स बनेंगे और उनके लिए कम से कम सौ रुपया लोगों

से पूँजी के रूप में प्राप्त होगा और इस पर हमें कोई सूद नहीं देना होगा। दूसरे सब्सों में यह कहा जा सकता है कि जो पांच करोड़ रुपया हमें सूद का देना पड़ता है, उसको हम बचा सकेंगे और इस के साथ ही साथ एक करोड़ रुपया जो कमीशन का देना पड़ेगा उसको बचा सकेंगे। मेरी खुशकिस्मती है कि वित्त मन्त्री महोदय भी यहाँ इस समय मौजूद हैं और मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि वह इस पर अवश्य गौर करेंगे। हमें विचार करना होगा कि जो इतना बड़ा ध्येय हमने अपने सामने रखा है उसको प्राप्त करने के लिये क्या कुछ हमको अपने पल्ले से देना होगा।

इस के साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी समझता हूँ कि कम से कम एक हजार करोड़ रुपया रिजर्व बैंक को शार्ट टर्म और मीडियम टर्म और लांग टर्म कर्जों के लिए खर्च करना होगा। आप चाहते हैं कि देश के अन्दर अनाज की पैदावार तथा खेती की पैदावार बड़े और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके लिए यह बहुत जरूरी है कि मीडियम टर्म लोन के लिए हम जो कर्ज देते हैं, उनकी राशि को बढ़ाये। इससे लोग अधिक कुछ बना सकेंगे, माइनर इरिगेशन की व्यवस्था कर सकेंगे और दूसरे काम करके देश की पैदावार को बढ़ा सकेंगे।

इस साल का कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट की रिपोर्ट को अगर आप देखें तो आपको ताज्जुब होगा कि पिछले साल के पहले छः महीनों के अन्दर जो माइनर इरिगेशन के लिए रुपया खर्च किया गया वह उस साल मुश्किल से एक चौथाई था जो कि खर्च करने का टारगेट रखा गया था। इतना भी खर्च नहीं हो सका। इसका मतलब यह है कि जो रुपया रखा गया था उसको हम अगर अप्रैल के महीने तक माइनर इरिगेशन के लिए सेक्शन कर देते और दे देते और माइनर इरिगेशन से पानी मिचने लग जाता तो दो फसलों को इससे फायदा पहुँच सकता था। लेकिन अगर हम छः महीने तक या आठ नौ महीने तक हाथ

[बी० रणबीर सिंह]

पर हाथ रख कर बैठे रहे और जो रुपया रखा गया उसको हम बांट नहीं सकें तो इसका मतलब यह है कि वो फसलों की भ्रामवनी है, उसका बाटा देश को और किसान को होता है और इस रुपये से बड़ी भ्रामवनी में कुछ और तालाब बन सकते थे। इस देश के अन्दर जो करल क्रेडिट सर्वे कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है उसमें सही तौर पर एक बात लिखी है कि देहात का काम चलाने के लिये देहात के तरीके से सोचने की बहुत जरूरत है। कई माथी हैं जिनका क्याल है कि मौजूदा डोलबन्दी को मिटा देने से देश के अन्दर लाखों करोड़ों मन भनाज पदा हो सकता है। उन्हें मालूम नहीं कि इस देश के अन्दर कई किसान कुओं से खेती करते हैं और नहरों के पानी से खेती करते हैं। आप को मालूम है कि कुओं से पानी देने के लिये, नहरों से पानी देने के लिये खेत में डोलबन्दी देने की निहायत जरूरत है। जो किसान बहुत पड़े लिखे नहीं हैं जब वह सुनते हैं कि हमारे देश के बड़े बड़े नेता समझते हैं कि डोलबन्दी हट जायेगी और उससे देश की पैदावार बढ़ जायेगी तो उनको बहुत ताज्जुब होता है। साथ ही जब वे यह देखते हैं कि देश के अन्दर ८० लाख एकड़ भूमि वाटर लॉगिंग से खराब हो गई और उसक लिये पंजाब से अगर ४ करोड़ रुपये वाटर लॉगिंग को ठीक करने के लिये खर्च कर दिया जाय तो उससे ३५ करोड़ रुपये की पैदावार बढ़ सकती है तो भी वह रुपया हर्बे देने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं और सरकार समझती है कि डोलबन्दी हटाने से पैदावार बढ़ सकती है। मैं मानता हूँ, कि देश के अन्दर जहां तक साक्षेदारी खेती करने की व्यवस्था है, उससे देश भ्रामे जायेगा और यह बहुत जरूरी है। इसलिये की कि चूंकि इस देश के अन्दर अन्दा-जन साढ़े तीन करोड़ एकड़ के करीब होल्डिंग्स हैं और उनकी खेती करने के लिये करीब ७ करोड़ बैल, घोड़े, खरबुर और गधे रखते हैं। जब मसाली साहब बोल रहे थे तो मैंने बीच में कहा था कि यह सही है कि इस देश

में जितनी हमारी खेती की भूमि है उसका हिसाब लगाते हुए लोगों की तादाद जो खेती पर मुन्हसर है वह बहुत बड़ी है। इसक साथ साथ जो डंगर हब खेती की भूमि के ऊपर डालते हैं उनकी तादाद भी बहुत बड़ी है। अगर वह ७ करोड़ की तादाद हमारे इस देश के अन्दर चल रही है तो उसे कम करना होगा मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारे यहां भीखतन एक एक होल्डिंग की जो भूमि है वह साढ़े सात एकड़ पड़ती है। तो अगर तीन, चार या पांच होल्डिंग्स को इकट्ठा कर दिया जाय और जो डंगर है उनकी तादाद चौलाई कर दी जाय और जो हजारों करोड़ों रुपये की पूजी बच सकती है खेती के लिये वह उन चौलाई से काम ले लिया जाय तो हम उनकी तादाद बहुत कम कर सकते हैं।

इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि जो गाय के नाम पर बुलाई देते हैं अगर उनके यहां गाय बच्चा देती हैं तो वह बछड़े को किस तरह से पालते हैं और बछिया हो जाय तो किस तरह से पाला जाता है। किस तरीके से बछिया को दूध की मेकदार कम कर दी जाती है। इसी तरह से अगर भैंस कटिया को जन्म देती है तो कटिया के दूध की मेकदार कितनी ज्यादा दी जाती है और कट्टा को जन्म दे तो कटरे को दूध की तादाद कितनी कम कर दी जाती है और उसे मारा जाता है, यह भी मैं जानता हूँ। प्राण हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जरूरत है कि गायें बड़ें, भैंसे बड़ें, उनको बढ़ाना निहायत जरूरी है तो यह भी लाजिमी है कि जो ड्राई फैंटल है उनकी तादाद हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर कम हो और इसको देखते हुए यह भी जरूरी है कि साक्षेदारी की खेती की जाय।

Shri R. S. Arumugam (Srivilliputhur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I feel happy to participate in this debate because every effort has been made by this department to acquaint the people

with the basic principles as well as aims and objectives of the Community Development movement and also the role to be played by the panchayats and village school teachers in the implementation of the programme.

I come to know that various literatures like Kurukshetra Yogana etc. are published in English by this Department. But I regret many of them are not available in the regional languages. As these booklets are found very useful in educating the masses, I request the Ministry to publish these in regional languages also.

I find, Sir, that Cinema trailers are provided in some blocks only. The educative value by this exhibition in villages is tremendous. Therefore, this is all the more important that each block should have a cinema trailer set of its own and this Ministry should see to it.

As I informed the House earlier, one of the three agencies, namely, village school teachers require short term training courses in the various facts of rural developments. Although a scheme of peripatetic training was introduced as mentioned in the report of 1958-59, this had not achieved its quick and desired result. A change of outlook in the village teachers is imminent for the fulfilment of the welfare programme. Sir, without waiting long, at least the teachers under training school, all over the country, may be imparted with this kind of training and thereby saving considerable amount of money, time and energy.

Again, Sir, the Block Development Committees are found to be turning out very good results. As we know, for the success of any scheme, the cooperation of women is an urgent need. In spite of the pious wish of this Ministry to give adequate representation for women in Block Development Committees, this is not implemented in many of the States. Therefore, I request that effective measures should be taken up so that

women members are nominated not only to the Block Development Committees but also to the panchayats, an another important agency for the fulfilment of this scheme.

In particular, Block Development Schemes contemplate increased agricultural production, better standards of living, and social uplift for all. Agriculture is given top priority and better way of doing cultivation is imparted to farmers who come to know that more production could be achieved by using improved seeds, fertilisers, green manuring, compost manuring and necessary irrigation facilities. But, Sir, very often it is learnt from the Planning Committee meetings of the State, District and Block levels that they are in shortage of improved seeds and fertilisers. I wish that the seed farms allotted to each block come into operation immediately.

16 hrs.

Before we reach self-sufficiency in fertilisers, let us concentrate on the use of green manuring and compost manuring. With this objective in view, recently, a special drive is being made by the Agriculture Minister in the Madras State to grow green manure. The condition in other States also may not be very different. So, this Ministry should see that a special campaign is organised through the community development blocks to develop green manure and also compost pits so as to produce more food-grains and also commercial crops. In this connection, I would like to stress the necessity of fixing a target for every village level worker.

During my tour of the various blocks in the districts of Ramnad and Tirunelveli, I found that there was a consistent complaint that the people who consumed electricity for irrigation were burdened with the levy of a minimum guarantee per horse power and an excessive rate per unit as compared with that in the industrial sector. This being a crucial

[Shri R. S. Arumugam]

period when a campaign for more food production is being undertaken throughout our country, Government should come forward to subsidise the expenses of the agriculturist in consuming electric current for food production in these development blocks.

There is also shortage of sprayers, dusters and inter-cultivators, and it is very difficult to get them in time. Government should manufacture these implements on a small-scale basis and supply them to the agriculturists at the subsidised rates through the community development blocks.

Coming to Mudukalathur taluk, a part of my constituency, I would like to say that two new blocks have been started there last year, taking into consideration the backward condition of that place. These blocks are predominantly inhabited by Harijans and other backward communities with little or no means. The poverty and backwardness of these villagers of Mudukalathur taluk do not permit them actually to participate in the full implementation of the programme. It is continuously a famine-stricken area, and as such these blocks must be treated with special consideration and concessions in the matter of people's contribution. All the minor irrigation works such as digging of wells, tube-wells, repairing of tanks, channels etc. must be speeded up in that area with the active co-operation of the block agencies.

It is very interesting to note that there are extension officers in the community development blocks for the promotion of village and small-scale industries and khadi production. These industries are expected to provide full-time work to the unemployed and under-employed, and supplement their income during the lean period. But I am sorry to inform the House that the Harijana have been neglected in this regard. I request the hon. Minister to kindly see that this downtrodden community

also takes to Ambar Charkha training, khadi spinning, small match industries and other cottage and small-scale industries.

I welcome the fact that this Ministry has taken over the subject of co-operation also. Co-operative movements are encouraged in the community development blocks. This is one of the three important agencies functioning in the villages towards the implementation of the block objectives. The present staff and the rules in regard to functioning are not co-operative enough. Such rules should be simplified so as to conduce to a smooth functioning of this movement.

As an experimental measure, this Ministry should see that in each block at least one or two joint co-operative farming units come into existence. They will produce more food at less cost. These are important and indispensable measures for increasing agricultural production.

Some people are objecting to co-operative farming. In my opinion, they are refusing to think of the nation as a whole. In this country, thousands and thousands of agricultural labourers and cultivating tenants are living in the villages with little or no means or are half-fed. It was Gandhiji's aspiration that the tiller of the land should be its owner. At least, now, should we not think of these poor victims and see that they get their share for ensuring a minimum standard of living? We can achieve this only by co-operative farming, though we may have to face some difficulties in the initial stages. I am glad to find that our beloved leader, the Prime Minister of our nation, has taken a keen interest in co-operative farming, which will make our country not only prosperous but also a democratic co-operative socialistic society very soon.

Shri Basappa (Tiptur): I have listened with very great interest to

the various speakers who have participated in this debate on the burning questions of co-operative farming and also the various other subjects connected with community development. I also listened to my hon. friend from my own State, Shri D. A. Katti, giving a very gloomy picture of the community development movement that is going on. I also come from that State, and I do not know what purpose it will serve to give such a gloomy picture of this whole thing. Though I agree with him in certain respects, yet I would say that in my State, things are not so bad as he wanted to depict them to be. Perhaps, the area from which he comes is probably not yet integrated properly with Mysore. You know, Sir, that the people are a little agitated in that border, and, therefore, the work may be hampered for want of people's co-operation there; because of this it should not be taken that the whole thing is bad.

I also listened to our great economist Shri M. R. Masani pleading that co-operation should be given up.

Shri M. B. Thakore (Patan): He is against co-operative farming. He is for co-operation.

Shri Basappa: I am coming to that. I know he was for co-operation. I do not know what makes him think that co-operative farming is bad when he admits that co-operation is good. This subject of co-operation has been partly discussed in this House already, and I am afraid my hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani is not perhaps aware of the great changes that are taking place in this country. Probably he looks at the surface and sees that there is a sort of agitation, but what we are doing in this country goes to the very roots. Of course, he said that there are other means of helping the poor peasants, but we have seen that 60 per cent of the small rural population depends upon

one or 1½ acres of land. So, if they join together, I think there is no harm. Merely giving a little help by way of manure, seeds or this and that will not help them. This 60 or 70 per cent of the rural population who are small landholders have to be brought together in some way or other, and what we are doing is only that. Therefore he should not think that we are hampering the peasantry.

Again, he must be aware of the great revolution that is going on in this country in order to help the poor people. This community development programme is designed to see that the rural population of this country is helped, and this movement is gaining ground, and even the world at large is looking at the experiment that we are making in this matter.

The rural population has to be revitalised, and their inertia, of which our Prime Minister speaks now and then, has to be removed. How can we do that? A democratic set-up has to be established. The Plan requires the enthusiasm of all the people of this country, not only of a few people of whom Shri Masani is thinking are going to help this country. He is criticising us in strong terms on the one hand; on the other, there are our Communist friends who say that we are not going fast enough in this matter. Both should realise that there are very many difficulties.

After all co-operation is a via media between the capitalists on the one hand and the theory of the Communists on the other, and if this is not going to help us, I do not know what else is going to help us.

Even as far back as 25 or 30 years ago, the Royal Commission on Agriculture, headed by Lord Linlithgow stated that if co-operation failed, it meant the failure of the hope of the

[Shri Basappa]

rural population. So, now, in spite of all kinds of criticism, we must help the movement in all ways possible. Instead of that, if we only criticise, I do not know what purpose will be served.

We have to go a little slow, I do admit, because the people have to be educated. Training is very necessary, the co-operative law has to be reformed. For all these reasons we have to go a little slow.

The other day Shri Vasudevan Nair took objection that the well-to-do people were not being brought in, but since this movement requires a lot of funds, quite a lot of training of the people, it is but natural that we have to go slow, and therefore in the next three years it has been proposed to have only service co-operatives. Of course, even these three years may not be sufficient, we may have to go a little slow. Anyhow, the whole idea must be a dynamic one, to see that we enthuse the people in all directions.

Then there is the problem of urbanisation. How are we going to develop this country unless urban people go back to the rural areas. Of course, I do understand that pressure on land should not be increased, but there must be a proper balance. Now people are coming to the towns, and unless we have community development we cannot see that this movement is reversed.

Then there is the other side of the picture, namely that effective participation of the people is not forthcoming. It is not the officials alone who are responsible for this. I know that it is official ridden, but when the people keep quiet, when the representatives of the people do not go and take a larger part in it, the responsibility must be laid at the doors of not only officials, but elsewhere also.

Government is doing something to see that this community development gains importance. The administration of the panchayats and the co-operative department have been brought under this Ministry. The Prime Minister is taking a lot of interest in this matter; as we have seen, the other day in the very opening of the discussion on these Demands he spoke showing how much he desires that this movement gains ground. He also paid a compliment to the Minister concerned and stated that most of this illness was due to overwork. Here, I also join my friends in wishing him speedy recovery, so that he may come back to this House.

What is necessary is not only revitalisation, but a broad outlook, not only in the formulation of the plans, but also in the implementation of the plans. I find that democratic decentralisation is not complete. We have yet to bestow more attention on this, because so long as there is an official chairman, there will be no enthusiasm among the people. In my State, still the officials are at the head of these blocks. So, this democratic decentralisation as contemplated by the Balvantray Mehta Committee should be given effect to as early as possible.

The movement is gaining ground as can be seen from the fact that nearly 56 per cent of the rural population is covered by it, and the people's contribution is also there to a certain extent though not on a large scale.

In regard to the growth of the movement, I find there is lethargy on the part of the local Government. Though it is in the portfolio of the Chief Minister, it is delegated to some one else. And the control of the Centre over what is happening in the State is also little.

We have all along been speaking as if it is a Government movement with people's participation. The

whole thing has to be changed. It should be made the people's movement with Government participation as has been pointed out.

I have attended a few meetings of the Block Development Councils, and I find that they bring in a few subjects, they finish very soon and go away. This is not the way to do things. With heart and soul they should sit together with the important people of the village, and thoroughly discuss the problems connected with their blocks. This is not being done. So, greater attention should be paid to this aspect.

I want to say a word or two about the location of block development headquarters. I have been insisting, and also writing that when a block headquarter is already situated in an important rural area, it should not be changed as stated in the Mehta Committee Report. After all, our idea is to help the rural population. But now the tendency is that even the Ministers sometimes want to have it transferred to their own headquarters. This is very wrong. I have a grievance relating to one of the blocks in my constituency, and I have brought it to the notice of the local Government also. A sum of Rs. 75,000 or Rs. 1 lakh has already been spent on this particular headquarters, and now a certain Minister does not like it. He inaugurates it himself. He likes it in the beginning. But afterwards, he does not like it and he wants to transfer it. This has been done in Tiruvekarai in Tumkur District in my constituency.

Shri Raghubir Sahai: It has been transferred to a rural area?

Shri Basappa: It has been transferred from a rural area where it was to the taluk headquarters. Shri B. K. Dev, the Minister, had given me an assurance in this respect, but still it has been transferred and the offices of the local headquarters have been given over to the police department or some other department.

This is what has happened. This shows that the local governments are very lethargic and are not doing things properly. So things will not improve unless they are properly controlled from this end.

There is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. After all, we want to see that the Scheduled Caste and backward people are helped. But we see in most of these block development areas that people who are already sufficiently well to do get the advantage. Greater attention is not being paid to the poorer section of the people for whom it is really meant. A thorough investigation should be undertaken into this matter also.

I can enumerate a number of handicaps and point out the wastage involved. But that will not help to solve our problem. After all, we are all here to see that this Ministry thrives and does some very good work. In the field of agriculture and in the field of education, the whole idea is to change the emphasis. The welfare aspect is not so much emphasised as the developmental and agricultural aspect. There is an acute food problem. Therefore, our main attention should be on agriculture. So far as minor irrigation is concerned, though a sum of Rs. 7 crores is spent by this Ministry, it is very very insufficient. Greater attention should be paid to restoration of tanks, particularly in my State.

Coming to small scale industries what we are aiming at is a sort of society where there are not only small industries but also agriculture. That should suit the people. But we find that the raw materials necessary for the small industries are rare and for that reason, the industries are not thriving well.

As regards the training aspect, of course, farmer leaders are being trained for one or two days. They come, have a little camp and go home. That is not sufficient. They should spend four or five days there and try

[Shri Basappa]

to see how best they—the rural folk—could have the training in the various subjects.

Shri P. R. Patel: Is it for political purposes?

Shri Basappa: So there is very great scope for community development and co-operation. We are happy that co-operation is also added here. It is a burning question of the day. I hope this will be taken seriously and implemented in the community development areas.

श्री बजर राज सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, नागपुर कांग्रेस ने तीन सालों में सेवा सहकार समितियों को बनाने और उसके बाद सहकारी खेती करने के बारे में जो प्रस्ताव पास किया है, मुझे भय है कि उस आन्दोलन के प्रति एक बहुत बड़ा खतरा भोल लेने की कोशिश की जा रही है। मैं यह इसलिए कहता हूँ कि सोशलिज्म या समाजवाद शब्द की जिस तरह से हत्या की है कांग्रेस पार्टी और कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट ने, मुझे भय है कि सहकारी खेती और सहकारी आन्दोलन की भी उसी तरह से हत्या न हो जाए। आज उसने देश में एक अजीब सी परिस्थिति पैदा कर दी है। एक तरफ तो नारा लगाया जाता है कि सहकारी खेती हमारा उद्देश्य बन गया है और तीन वर्षों में हम सर्विस कोऑपरेटिव्स स्थापित कर देंगे और दूसरी तरफ कुछ लोग, कुछ वर्ग, कुछ निहित स्वार्थ हैं जिन्हें खुली छूट दे दी गई है कि वे लगातार प्रचार इस बात का करते जायें कि हिन्दुस्तान में सहकारी खेती सफल नहीं हो सकती है।

हमारे मित्र मसानी साहब ने आंकड़े बे कर यह सिद्ध करने की कोशिश की है कि यह सहकारी खेती सफल नहीं हो सकती है और कहा है कि सहकारी खेती से दूसरे मुल्कों में उत्पादन घटा है। मेरा निवेदन है कि हिन्दुस्तान का मुकाबला किसी और देश से

हो नहीं सकता है। वह इसलिए नहीं हो सकता है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जिस कदर जमीनें हैं, जिस कदर आबादी है, उस कदर जमीन और आबादी किसी दूसरे मुल्क में नहीं है। मसानी साहब ने रूस के साथ हिन्दुस्तान का मुकाबला किया है। लेकिन अगर हम देखें कि हिन्दुस्तान में कितनी जमीन है और कितनी आबादी है और रूस में कितनी जमीन है और कितनी आबादी है तो यह स्पष्ट हो जायेगा वहाँ पर सहकारी खेती सफल हो या न हो और वह सहकारी खेती करे या न करे लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में क्यों इसकी जरूरत है, इस बात की तरफ शायद इस तरह की बात कहने वाले मित्र ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। रूस में सन् १९५१ की पापुलेशन के आंकड़े मेरे पास हैं। उन आंकड़ों में पता चलता है कि रूस में ४४८ सेंट के हिसाब से प्रति व्यक्ति खेती लायक जमीन बैठती है जब कि हिन्दुस्तान में सिर्फ ६७ सेंट जमीन पड़ती है प्रति व्यक्ति। रूस में ऐसी कुल जमीन ५६० करोड़ एकड़ है जब कि हिन्दुस्तान में केवल ८१ करोड़ एकड़। हिन्दुस्तान की आबादी करीब ४० करोड़ है जब कि रूस की आबादी इससे आधी है यानी बीस करोड़ ही। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि हमारे यहां के मुकाबले में रूस में जमीन प्रति व्यक्ति नौ गुना बैठती है। यदि हमारे यहां नौ खत्त इकट्ठे हो जायें तो रूस के एक खत्त के बराबर पड़ेंगे। हिन्दुस्तान में जमीन की जो स्थिति है उसको देखते हुए सहकारी खेती के आलावा कोई चारा नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान में जमीन काफ़ी नहीं है। सहकारी खेती को किस तरह से लाया जाता है, कितनी जल्दी लाया जाता है, इसे देखना अभी बाकी है। इसको किये बगैर समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकता है। जैसा मैंने पहले कहा है इसकी हत्या कांग्रेस पार्टी और कांग्रेस सरकार द्वारा हो सकती है। इस वास्ते मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो समाजवाद की बात करते हैं, उनके

पास समाजवाद की कोई डेफिनिशन नहीं है, कोई परिभाषा नहीं है कि किस तरह से वह आएगा ।

प्रश्नोत्तर काल में भ्रमसर माननीय मंत्री कह देते हैं कि ऊपर वालों की भ्रामवनी कम कर के समाजवाद नहीं आएगा, वह तो नीचे वालों की भ्रामवनी को बढ़ाने से ही आएगा । नीचे वालों की भ्रामदी बढन में कितने हजार साल लगेंगे, इसका कोई नक्शा उनके सामने नहीं है और न ही इसके बारे में कुछ बताया गया है । इस तरह से सहकारी खेती के सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब तक सहकारी खेती के सम्बन्ध में निश्चित रूप से कुछ कहा नहीं जाता है और यह भी नहीं बतलाया जाता है कि कितनी जमीन अधिक से अधिक कोई रख सकेगा, तब तक आप जितने चाहें नारे लगाते चले जायें, सहकारी खेती आ नहीं सकती है, आपको सफलता मिल नहीं सकती है । जो हमारे यहां प्रनाधिक जोते हैं, उनको आधिक बनाने की कोई कोशिश नहीं हो रही है । जिन लोगों के पास जमीन नहीं है, उनके लिए यह कहा जाए कि हम जमीन दे नहीं सकते हैं अभी...

पंडित डा० ना० तिवारी (केमरिया) :
नागपुर प्रस्ताव में सीलिंग लगाने की बात भी कही गई है और वह भी जल्दी लगेगी ।

श्री राज राव सिंह : समाजवाद के सिलसिले में और सीलिंग के विषय में हम बहुत देर से सुनते चले आ रहे हैं लेकिन अभी तक कुछ नहीं हुआ है और हो सकता है कि इसी तरह से सुनते चले जायें । इसी लिए मैं कहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी और कांग्रेस सरकार सहकारी खेती के आन्दोलन की हत्या करना चाहती है, इसको सफल बनाना नहीं चाहती है । अगर आप चाहते हैं कि यह सफल हो तो आपको साफ तौर पर कहना चाहिये कि जमीन पर सीलिंग यहां और अभी लगेगी, भ्रामवनी पर सीलिंग

यहां और अभी लगेगी, इसके भागे हम नहीं जा सकते हैं और अगर इसको हमने पोस्टपोन किया तो मुल्क उन्नति नहीं कर सकेगा । किस तरह से यह सीलिंग लग सकती है और क्या सीलिंग हो, चुक समय नहीं है, इस वास्ते मैं पूरी बात बही कह सकता हूँ । लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग इस तरह की बातें करते हैं कि सहकारी खेती अगर चालू हो गई तो ब्लडबैंड हो सकता है, खूनी क्रान्ति हो सकती है, उन भाइयों को मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि कोई खूनी क्रान्ति होने वाली नहीं है । खूनी क्रान्ति सम्भवतः गांधी के देश में किसी सूरत में कभी नहीं होगी । इसका कारण यह है कि हमारा देश अहिंसा में विश्वास करता है । हमारे बीच में राजनीतिक तथा दूसरे मतभेद हो सकते हैं, लेकिन किसी का खून बहाने की कोई बात नहीं उठ सकती है, कोई सवाल पैदा नहीं हो सकता है । इस तरह के लोगों के कहने से कि जमीन के मसले पर खूनी क्रान्ति हो सकती है और ऐसे लोगों द्वारा यह कहे जाने से जिनका सम्बन्ध कभी जमीन से नहीं रहा है और जो आज सहकारी खेती का विरोध करते हैं, कभी खूनी क्रान्ति नहीं हो सकती । वे इस लिये नहीं विरोध करते हैं कि किसानों से कोई उन का प्रेम है, इस लिये नहीं विरोध करते हैं कि उन का खेती से सम्बन्ध रहा है, इस लिये नहीं विरोध करते हैं कि वह पैदावार बढ़ाना चाहते हैं या धन का उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहते हैं जिस से विदेशों पर अपने मुल्क को निर्भर न करना पड़े । वह इस लिये विरोध करना चाहते हैं कि इस समय जो पूँजीवाद की जड़ें मजबूत हो रही हैं, जो पूँजी का एकाधिकार बढ़ता जा रहा है, उस में अगर कहीं सहकारी खेती शुरू हो गई तो कल जा कर पूँजी के क्षेत्र में भी यह सहकारिता आ सकती है और तब उन के लिये कोई चारा नहीं रहेगा । इस लिये उन्होंने अच्छा समझा कि इस वक्त गांव की उस जनता को जो समझती नहीं है, जो जागृत नहीं है, उसे भड़काया जाय और कहा जाय कि हम ने सोनीपत में जा कर देखा लिया, वहां

[बी बब राज सिंह]

उस की गांवों में देखा धीर कानों ने भी देखा कि वहां की जनता सहकारी खेती के खिलाफ है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सहकारी खेती जिस रूप में, जिस मशीनरी के जरिये आप चलाना चाहते हैं, वह भले ही असफल हो जाय, लेकिन देश की जड़ में सहकारी खेती है। लोगों के पास भौताधिक जमीन है, जब तक दो-दो बार-बार एकड़ खेतों के लिये एक-एक जोड़ी बैल की रखी जायेगी तब तक काम चलने वाला नहीं है। इस लिये उन के सामने कोई चारा नहीं है सिवा इस के कि वह खेती सहकारिता से करे धीर मिल कर करे। अगर आप देश के किसानों को मिलाना चाहते हैं, जिनकी भौताधिक जालें हैं उन को मिला कर सहकारी खेती करना चाहते हैं तो कभी देश के किसान इस के विरोध में नहीं जा सकते। आज हम देखते हैं कि लोग देहातों में पक्के कुएं बनाते हैं, उन पक्के कुओं को बनाने के लिये न सिर्फ उस गांव के बल्कि पास पास के गांवों के आदमी इकट्ठा हो कर श्रम करते हैं और एक दूसरे की मदद करते हैं। एक किसान के खेत में दूसरे खेत के किसान जा कर जोतते बोते हैं और उस के बाद दूसरे के यहां जा कर वह किसान जोतते बोते हैं। तो सहकारिता भी भावना हमारे यहां पहले से मौजूद है। इस का विरोध करने का तो सबाल ही नहीं है। लेकिन अगर कुछ लोग विरोध करते हैं तो केवल इसी लिये कि वे चाहते हैं कि वह लोग जो दबे हुए हैं, पिसे हुए हैं, उन को उन्नति का मौका न मिलने पाये।

इस का दूसरा पहलू भी है। यदि आप सहकारी खेती को बाबुओं के द्वारा सफल करवाना चाहते हैं, उसी तरह से जिस तरह से कि सामुदायिक विकास खंडों में हुआ, जिन में जा कर एक भ्रष्टा भ्रान्दोलन होना चाहिये था, जिस से जनता को ऊपर उठाना चाहिये था और वह काम सामुदायिक विकास खंडों द्वारा नहीं हुआ, १ या २ फीसदी

गांवों वालों को उस का फायदा भले ही हो गया हो, लेकिन आम जनता में उस के प्रति कोई भ्रष्टा भावना नहीं है। और वह केवल इसी लिये नहीं है कि आप के बी० डी० बी० सिर्फ जीप में सैर करते फिरते हैं, जो भी आप के बाबू हैं गांवों में जा कर भ्रष्टाजी किस्म का जीवन रहना चाहते हैं, भ्रष्टाजी या ऐसी भाषा का प्रयोग करना चाहते हैं जो कि गांव के लोग समझते नहीं, जिस से उन का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं, तो उस से गांव की जनता के अन्दर कोई इन्स्पिरेशन वह नहीं ला सकते, कोई उत्साह नहीं भर सकते। इसी तरह से अगर आप की कोऑपरेटिव खेती होती है, ऐसे लोगों के द्वारा जिन का गांव के जीवन के कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, जिन का खेती से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, जिन के सम्बन्ध में आप के सामने बेकारों को काम दिलाने की समस्या है, तो यह तो हो सकता है जैसे सामुदायिक विकास खंडों में हुआ कि इस के द्वारा बी० डी० बी० और दूसरे बाबुओं को कुछ काम दिला दिया गया, जैसे ही सहकारी खेती का नारा दे कर आप कुछ लोगों को काम दिला दें, लेकिन सहकारी खेती उस से सफल नहीं होगी। इस लिये आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम देखें कि सहकारी खेती को सफल बनाने के लिये मिनिस्ट्री गांवों के अन्दर बाबुओं की पल्टें न भेजने लगे। मुझे सहकारिता से कोई विरोध नहीं है। हम यह भी नहीं चाहते कि उन लोगों को काम न मिले, उन को काम मिलना चाहिये इस वास्ते कि वह काम करने लायक हैं। लेकिन जो लोग इस काम को करने के लायक नहीं हैं, वह इस काम को असफल बनाना चाहते हैं। जिन लोगों की जिन्दगी को गांवों की जिन्दगी से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है वह महसूस करते हैं कि हम उन लोगों से ऊंचे हैं। जब तक वे उन से मिलना नहीं चाहेंगे, उन में घुसना नहीं चाहेंगे, उन से साक्षात्कार नहीं करना चाहेंगे तब तक कोई भ्रान्दोलन आप का सफल नहीं हो सकता। सामुदायिक विकास खंडों

के सम्बन्ध में भी यही रहा है कि अगर वह कहीं असफल रहा है तो इस लिये असफल रहा है कि जो मशीनरी आप ने रखी है वह ठीक नहीं है, उस की भावना यह नहीं है कि वह जनता की सेवा करे, गांवों के आदमियों की असली रूप में सेवा वह कर सके, ऐसी भावना उस की नहीं है। इस बास्ते खतरा आया। इसी तरह से यदि आप सहकारिता की खेती के अन्दर करते हैं, उस के लिये आप ऐसे आदमियों की, बाबुओं की पल्टन भरती करते हैं, जिन का काम होगा लोगों पर अपना निष्पक्ष थोपना तो जरूर इस का विरोध होगा। आज अगर किसान इस के प्रति अपना विरोध प्रकट करते हैं तो यही समझ कर कि सहकारिता के जरिये जो कोऑपरेटिव सोसायटी के रजिस्ट्रार होंगे, जमीन उन की हो जायेगी और उन को उन के मातहतों के साथ काम करना होगा, या जो कोऑपरेटिव इन्स्पेक्टर होंगे उन के मातहत काम करना होगा। यदि इस प्रकार का वातावरण बनता जायेगा, इस तरह का वायुमंडल बनता जायेगा कि किसान यह सोचने लगे कि सहकारी खेती से उस का मुनाफा होगा, उस के ऊपर कोई चेंक नहीं होगा, उस के काम में कोई बाधा नहीं आयेगी, तो मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि कोई किसान सहकारिता का विरोध नहीं करेगा। लेकिन आज जो वातावरण बना हुआ है, जो वायुमंडल बना हुआ है वह साफ इस तरीके का है कि किसान यह सोचते हैं कि हमारे ऊपर बाहर से आने वाले आदमियों का दबाव है। यह केवल इसी लिये है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने जो कहा था उस की हत्या कर के वह देश से अपने दस बारह वर्षों के शासन काल में अष्टाचार को दूर नहीं कर सकी, रिश्वत को दूर नहीं कर सकी, फिर्कापरस्ती को दूर नहीं कर सकी। ऐसी हालत में किस तरह से यह कहा जा सकता है कि वह इस उद्देश्य को सफल बनायेगी। आज जो आप मशीनरी यहां रखने आ रहे हैं उस में फुनबापरस्ती होगी, पक्षपात होगा, अष्टाचार होगा। यह सोच कर किसान शायद इस में आये नहीं। इस लिये

अगर आप को सहकारी खेती को सफल बनाना है तो आप को नया वातावरण पैदा करना होगा, नई भूमि बनानी होगी, और नये लोग पैदा करने होंगे जिन के अन्दर उत्साह हो, जोश हो।

श्री ब० स० मूर्ति : नये लोग पैदा करने होंगे ?

श्री जवाहर लाल : हां, नये लोग। लेकिन मैं कहूंगा कि आप के हाथों से यह हो नहीं सकता। कांग्रेस पार्टी के हाथों से नये लोग पैदा नहीं हो सकते क्योंकि आप ने इस सब काम को असफल बना दिया है। जो भी काम आप अपने हाथ में लेते हैं उस में आप का उद्देश्य होता है कि देश को एक नारा दो, दुनिया की और अपने देश की जनता को बहकाओ कि हम यह करना चाहते हैं। समाजवाद का नारा आप ने लगाया। आज हिन्दुस्तान में कोई राजनीतिक पार्टी नहीं है जो समाजवाद के नारे बिना जी सकती हो। आप कहते हैं कि आप सोशलिस्ट सोसायटी बनाना चाहते हैं लेकिन आप गांवों व शहरों की बीच की खाई चौड़ी करना चाहते हैं। एक तरफ नर्क बने और दूसरी तरफ स्वर्ग नष्ट होता जाये, अगर आप इस तरह से कोऑपरेटिव खेती करना चाहते हैं अगर आप इस तरह से छोटे-छोटे आदमियों को इकट्ठा करना चाहते हैं तो गांवों के लोग जरूर सोचेंगे कि हमारी जमीन खली जा रही है। गांवों में जो बोझ से बड़े आदमी होंगे, वैसे वाले आदमी होंगे, जिन के पास ज्यादा पैसा होगा, वह खेती पर कब्जा कर लेंगे। वह बाबुओं को अपने पास रखेंगे और गलत हिसाब रखेंगे और इस प्रकार से सारे का सारा मामला गड़बड़ हो जायेगा।

इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि यदि आप को सहकारी खेती करनी है तो जरा अपनी तरफ भी देखिये, अपने दिल को भी टटोलिये और सोचिये कि केवल इस नाम पर कि आप क

[श्री ब्रज राज सिंह]

प्रबल बहुमत यहां पर है और आप की सारे देश में सरकारें बनी हुई हैं आप समझने लगे कि सारा देश आप के साथ है, तो इस से काम नहीं चलेगा। जो भी काम आप करना चाहेंगे वह चलने वाले बही होंगे। आज लोगो की कहने की हिम्मत होती है, मैं जानता हू कि वह गलत तरीके से बात करते हैं, कि गैलप पोल ले लो— किस बात का गैलप पोल आप चाहते हैं ? आज टाइम्स आफ इंडिया ने श्री वर्गीज साहब ने कह दिया तो उस से काम थोड़े ही चल सकता है। टाइम्स ऑफ इंडिया और वर्गीज साहब गांवो से अपना सम्बन्ध नहीं रख सकते और न इस तरह से गांव वाले अपना बोट दे सकते हैं। उन का गांवो से सम्बन्ध हो ही नहीं सकता। मैं जानता हू कि गांवो में क्या होता है। अगर आप भावनात्मक रूप से सहकारिता चलाना चाहते हैं तो बहा उस का विरोध नहीं हो सकता। आज गांवो में विरोध इस का केवल इस लिये होता है कि आज कांग्रेस में बही लोग जाते हैं जिन को भ्रष्ट माना जाता है, जिन को पक्षपातपूर्ण माना जाता है, जिन को माना जाता है कि वे देश को बरबाद करने वाले हैं, जो देश के अमीरो और गरीबो के बीच की खाई को और बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। इसलिये अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी किसी ऐसी चीज की तजवीज करती है तो उस का विरोध जनता करती है। और वही कारण है कि आज जनता आप की सहकारी खेती का विरोध कर रही है। यही कारण है कि आज जनता में इस के लिये आप जोश पैदा नहीं कर पाते हैं। जिन को देश नहीं प्यारा है, जिन को समाजवाद नहीं प्यारा है, जिन का देश की जनता से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, जिन के निहित स्वार्थ है, वह किसानो की मीटिंग कर के कहना चाहते हैं कि किसान सहकारी खेती का विरोध करना चाहते हैं। इस लिये आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम इस की जड़ में जायें, इस के मूल में जायें और देखें कि हमें किस बात की जरूरत है। अगर हम इस में प्रागे जाना चाहते हैं तो हम को चाहिये कि हम

कोऑपरेटिव मूवमेंट के सारे के सारे डाँचे को बचलें, बहा से बाबूगिरी को खत्म करें, भ्रष्टारों को खत्म करें। आज जो हमारे भ्रष्टार हैं वह बिना पैट कोट पहने गांवो में नहीं जा सकते। जब वे लोग देहातो में जाते हैं तो किसान सोचते हैं कि साहब आया हुआ है। आज हमारे देश में साहबो की सख्या बढ़ती जाती है। हर एक भ्रष्टार चाहें वह कोऑपरेटिव का भ्रष्टार हो या इन्स्पेक्टर-हो, चाहता है कि उस का चपरासी उसे साहब कहे। जब तक वह साहब नहीं कहेगा, तब तक उन लोगो का काम नहीं चलेगा। अगर आप साहबी जेहनियत से गांवो में सहकारी खेती को चलाना चाहते हैं, सामुदायिक विकास चलाना चाहते हैं, तो वह कभी सफल नहीं होगा। इसी लिये सामुदायिक विकास पर इतना खर्चा खर्च करने के बावजूद मैं कहना चाहता हू कि वह सफल नहीं हो रहा है। उस से १ या २ फीसदी भ्रादमियो को फायदा हो सकता है, लेकिन १ या २ फीसदी भ्रादमी हिन्दुस्तान की जनता नहीं है, १ या २ फीसदी भ्रादमियो से पूरा देश नहीं बनता है। पूरे देश को बनाने के लिए आप को सारी जनता में उत्साह पैदा करना होगा। वह आप के लोग कर नहीं पाते हैं और यही कारण है कि जो हमारी रिपोर्ट आती है वह भी कहती है कि लोगो में जोश नहीं है, उत्साह कम है। आज भी हमारे बी० डी० ओ० जा कर बात करते हैं कि हम भ्राकडे मेनिपुलेट करते हैं, भूटे भ्राकडे बनाते हैं कि इतना काम होना चाहिये था, और इतना श्रमदान हुआ। उन्होंने कहा कि जो श्रमदान हुआ वह १ लाख रु० का हुआ। यह १ लाख रु० का काम कैसे हुआ ? उस की कीमत बढ़ा कर बतलाई जाती है, काम के भ्राकडे तो कस होते हैं लेकिन उन की कीमत ज्यादा बताई जाती है। इस तरह से आप का कोई भ्रान्दोलन चल नहीं सकता है। हमारे मित्र श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश ने कहा कि सन् १९३० के नमक भ्रान्दोलन में देश में जिस तरह से जोश था, सन् १९४२ में

जब कि हम ने "भारत छोड़ो" का नारा लगाया था, उस से जितना जोश आया था, सम्भवतः उसी तरह का जोश इस नारे में भी आ सकता है। मैं जानता हूँ कि इस तरह के नारों से जोश आ सकता है, लेकिन यह मत भूल जाइये कि सन् १९३० में और सन् १९४२ में आपकी जो शक्त थी वह शक्त आज सन् १९५६ में नहीं है। आज आपकी शक्त खराब हो चुकी है। आपको हिन्दुस्तान की जनता जैसे कि वह आपको सन् १९३१ और सन् १९४२ में देखती थी आज नहीं देखती है। आज तो हिन्दुस्तान की जनता यह मानती है कि आप जनता के पोषक न बन कर उसके खून चूसने वाले बन गये हैं और उसको सताने वाले बन गये हैं और आपके शासन में भ्रष्टाचार का बोलबाला है। प्रशासन को जनता की भलाई के हेतु कार्य करना चाहिये और याद रखिये कि जब तक आप अपने कर्मचारियों में इस भावना को उद्यम न करेंगे और इस प्रशासनिक ढांचे में आमूल चूल परिवर्तन न करेंगे तब तक सफलता आपसे कोसों दूर रहेगी। लेकिन मुझे दुःख के साथ यह कहने पर बाध्य होना पड़ता है कि आज आपकी नीयत इस ढांचे को बदलने की नहीं है क्योंकि अगर वह नीयत होती तो सामुदायिक विकास मन्त्रालय और सहकार मन्त्रालय में हमें वही ढर्रा जैसे कि अन्य मिनिस्ट्रीज में दृष्टिगोचर होता है सेक्ट्रीज, अडर सेक्ट्रीज, डिप्टी सेक्ट्रीज, परसनल असिस्टेंट्स और टेलीफोन आदि का जोरशोर यहाँ नहीं दिखाई देता। लेकिन मुझे डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब ने कुछ उम्मीद बंधती है कि सम्भवतः वह उस ढांचे से अपने को बाहर रखेंगे क्योंकि जहाँ तक मैं समझता हूँ उन्होंने शायद कोठी में जाना अभी तक नहीं चाहा है लेकिन अगर उन्होंने भी कोठी में ट्रांसफर कर लिया तो तब तो उनसे भी कुछ उम्मीद नहीं की जा सकती कारण वह भी उसी ढांचे में शामिल हो जाते हैं।

देश में कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट और कोऑपरेशन का काम तभी सफल हो सकता है

जब कि हम देश में एक नया वातावरण पैदा करें, प्रशासनिक ढांचे में परिवर्तन करें और कर्मचारियों के मन में सच्ची सेवा की भावना जागृत करें।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि सहकारी खेती जल्दी से जल्दी सफल हो। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सामुदायिक विकास का काम ज्यादा से ज्यादा विस्तृत हो। वर्तमान हालत में तो सामुदायिक विकास का काम फेल हो चुका है और मैं यह भविष्यवाणी करने को तैयार हूँ कि मीजुदा शानल के कायम रहते सहकारी खेतों का काम कभी भी सफल नहीं होगा। सहकारी खेतों के बिना देश का उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ सकता और जब तक हमारी जोतें आर्थिक जोतें नहीं बनेंगी तब तक उत्पादन की दिशा में देश प्रगति नहीं कर सकेगा। आर्थिक जोतें बनाने के लिये हमें लोगों को इकट्ठा करना पड़ेगा लेकिन जिस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री किसानों को इकट्ठा करना चाहते हैं उस तरह वे इकट्ठा न होंगे। उन्होंने जो ५०० एकड़ की बात कही है मुझे यह कहने के लिये क्षमा किया जाय कि वास्तविकता से परे है। उन्होंने सारे देश का भ्रमण किया है, विदेशों का भ्रमण किया है और आनन्द-भवन में रंगरेलिया भी की है लेकिन जहाँ तक कि भारतीय खेतीबाड़ी का सम्बन्ध है उसमें उनका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रहा है और इसीलिये जब वे ५०० एकड़ की बात करने हैं तो मुझे तो उस से कोई आश्चर्य नहीं होता। ५०० एकड़ की बात करने से काम नहीं चलेगा। १०, २० और ३० किसानों की कोऑपरेटिव सामाइटिया बनाई जा सकती है। जो किसान लुब्ध के ऐसी छोटी-छोटी सहकारी समितिया बनाना चाहें वे बनायें और उन के जरिये काम हो। हमें यह सावधानी बर्तनी होगी कि कहीं उन सहकारी समितियों में पार्टीबन्दी पैदा न हो जाय और एक को गिराया जाय और एक को उठाया जाय। इसलिये यह जरूरी हो जाता है कि कोऑपरेटिव खेती को बढ़ाने

[श्री बजराम सिंह]

के लिये क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तनों को लाना पड़ेगा और तभी देश का भला हो सकेगा और देश में शांति का उत्पादन बढ़ सकेगा । मैं साथ ही सरकार को भी कहूंगा कि वह कोआपरेटिव क्षेत्रों को आगे बढ़ाये लेकिन वह तब तक आगे नहीं बढ़ेगी जब तक कि आप सीलिंग लगा कर जिन लोगों के पास फालतू जमीन है उन से वह जमीन ले कर उन लोगों को जमीन नहीं देंगे जिन के पास कोई जमीन नहीं है ।

श्री बहादुर (सर्वाई माधोपुर—रजित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आधुनिक, क्रान्ति मंत्रालय के प्रश्न प्रगति पर पर बढ़ रहे हैं और हम सब दिशाओं में तरक्की कर रहे हैं । इस का जीता जागता उदाहरण इस के बढ़ते हुए विकास कार्य और उस मुहकमे से है जिस को कि हम ने बहुत बड़े समय पहले एक विकास मंत्रालय के रूप में संगठित किया । कुछ दिन के बाद उस को पंचायतों का मुहकमा दिया गया और आज यह सहकारी मुहकमा भी इस में शामिल किया गया है । यह बहुत जरूरी था कि इन तीनों का एक कोआर्डिनेशन होता क्योंकि इन के बिना हम गांवों में देखते हैं कि तरह-तरह की एजेंसियां गांवों में एक ही काम के लिये लगी होती हैं चाहे वह शिक्षा का काम हो और चाहे स्वास्थ्य का । अब शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में हम देखते हैं कि कोई सरकारी स्कूल है, कोई जिला बोर्ड का स्कूल है तो कोई दूसरा प्राइवेट स्कूल है । यही हालत स्वास्थ्य के क्षेत्र में भी है । अगर इन में आपस में कोआर्डिनेशन और कोआपरेशन हो तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह तीनों मुहकमे जो एक साथ जुड़ गये हैं यह देश की प्रगति में अधिक योग दे सकेंगे । इस मंत्रालय का कार्य-क्षेत्र दिल्ली, बम्बई, कलकत्ता और मद्रास जैसी बड़े नगरों में न हो कर इस देश के हजारों और लाखों गांवों में फैला हुआ है और भारत बूँट एक कृषि प्रधान देश है गांवों का देश है इसलिये सच्चा हिन्दुस्तान

तो यहाँ के गांवों में ही बसता है । अब उन गांवों में इस मंत्रालय द्वारा क्या क्या विकास कार्य हो चुके हैं और क्या-क्या होने बाक़ी हैं और क्या-क्या इस समय हो रहे हैं, इन पर मैं ज्यादा प्रकाश नहीं डालूंगा । मैं बहुत बड़े समय में पंचायतों के बारे में अपनी राय प्रकट करूंगा और पंचायतों, सहकारिता और विकास के बारे में क्या कुछ कमियाँ हैं और उन के लिये क्या किया जा सकता है उस के बारे में प्रकाश डालूंगा ।

मैं इस से पहले कि और कुछ कहूँ श्री बलबन्त राय मेहता कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पर अपने विचार जाहिर करना चाहूँगा । बलबन्त राय मेहता कमेटी ने देश के अन्दर सत्ता का विकेन्द्रीकरण करने की बात कही है । गांवों की पंचायतों को अधिक से अधिक अधिकार मिलें । योजना गांव से बन कर आये, जिला स्तर से हो कर राज्य स्तर पर जाये और राज्य स्तर से केन्द्रीय स्तर पर जाये । मूलभूत सिद्धान्त की बात को बहुत पहले से शुरू होना चाहिये था ।

16.43 hrs.

[SRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN in the Chair]

जितनी जल्दी यह शुरू हो अच्छा है । लेकिन हमें यह देखना पड़ेगा कि क्या बलबन्त राय मेहता कमेटी ने जितनी भी बातें कही हैं उन सब से हमारी सहमति हो सकती है । अगर वे बातें अच्छी हैं तो यकीनी तौर पर उन से हमारी पूरी सहमति है । लेकिन उस के बारे में कुछ ऐसी बातें हैं जिन को कि मैं खर्च करना चाहता हूँ लेकिन वह मैं बाद में खर्च करूंगा । मुझे यह कहते हुए बड़ा दुःख होता है कि जितनी जल्दी हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार को और प्रांतीय सरकारों को करनी चाहिये थी उसनी जल्दी साधब नहीं पाई है । कुछ कठिनाइयाँ हो सकती हैं और स्वेचन बनने और प्रोत्साहन बनाने

में कुछ समय लग सकता है लेकिन हम देख रहे हैं कि जिन प्रान्तीय सरकारों को दिल-चस्पी थी वे इस काम में आगे बढ़ रही हैं। अभी कुछ दिन पहले आंध्र में पालियामेंट के मेम्बरों का एक कैम्प लगा था। वहां के सरकारी आदमियों से बातचीत करने से पता चलता था कि वह सरकार इस दिशा में आगे बढ़ने को काफ़ी चिंतित है। मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारे प्रान्त की सरकार अर्थात् राजस्थान सरकार ने भी एक प्रोग्राम बनाया है और इस बात को तय किया है कि जल्दी से जल्दी हमें बलबन्त राय मेहता कमेटी रिपोर्ट के अनुसार सत्ता का विकेन्द्रीकरण करना है। उन्होंने यह बात तय की है और उन का एक प्रोग्राम भी शुरू हुआ है। कुछ दिन पहले हम को राजस्थान सरकार से एक पत्र मिला था जिसमें कि सरकारी और गैर-सरकारी कर्मचारियों को जोकि विकास कार्य के अन्दर सहयोग करते हैं जोकि वहां की जान है उन को ट्रेनिंग दी जा रही है। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस तरह की शुरुआत सभी राज्यों में जल्दी से जल्दी होगी क्योंकि जितनी जल्दी हम सरकारी और गैर-सरकारी तबके को ट्रेनिंग दे सकेंगे उतनी ही जल्दी हम सहकार प्रोग्राम को पूरा कर सकेंगे उतना ही ज्यादा फायदा हमारे देहातियों को होगा और उतनी ही ज्यादा तरक्की हम किसान भाइयों, मजदूर भाइयों और पिछड़े तबके के लोगों की, जिन को कि हरिजन या आदिवासी कहते हैं, कर सकेंगे।

आज यह खेद का विषय है कि सरकार का ध्यान गांवों की ओर अभी भी उतना नहीं आ रहा है जितना कि उस का ध्यान शहरों की ओर जाता है। हम शहरों में बड़े-बड़े काम करते हैं, बड़ी-बड़ी सड़कें बनाते हैं, कॉलेज, यूनिवर्सिटियां और स्कूल खोलते हैं और बहुत बड़े-बड़े अस्पताल खोलते हैं। मैं उनकी जरूरत से इंकार नहीं करता, देश को उन की जरूरत है और वे जरूर कुलने चाहेंगे। लेकिन साथ ही साथ हमारे उन

गांवों की ओर भी सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिये और अब समय आ गया है जबकि उस को वह उपेक्षा अब दूर कर देना चाहिये। देश की आबादी का ७५ प्रतिशत गांवों में बसता है और अविलम्ब सरकार को उन की दशा सुधारने की ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये। हमें उन की शिक्षा, आर्थिक और स्वास्थ्य सम्बन्धी चीजों की ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये और उनकी हालत को बेहतर बनाना चाहिये। आज सरकार का ध्यान शहरों से हट कर गांवों के उन ऊबड़-खाबड़ रास्तों वाले गांवों की ओर जाना चाहिये और उन पिछड़े इलाकों की अर्थव्यवस्था सुधारने की ओर जान चाहिये। आज हमारे देश के सरकारी कर्मचारियों को यह बात भलीभांति समझ लेनी चाहिये कि यहां संसद में जो कुछ कार्यक्रम रखा जाता है और देश की उन्नति का जो यहां पर समय निश्चित किया जाता है उस तक हमारे लिये पहुंचना सभी सम्भव हो सकता है जबकि हम गांवों में बसने वाली ७५ प्रतिशत जनता को ऊपर उठावें, उनको आर्थिक शिक्षा और स्वास्थ्य सम्बन्धी सुविधायें प्रदान करें। यह सन्तोष का विषय है कि कुछ सरकारों ने इस तरह कदम बढ़ाया है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि दूसरी सरकारों को भी जल्दी से जल्दी इस दिशा में कदम बढ़ाना चाहिये।

मैं विकास कमेटी के बारे में थोड़ा अर्थ करना चाहता हूँ। उस का चुनाव न हो कर के पंचायतों के द्वारा विकास कमेटी बनेगी, यह अच्छी बात है। इस से गांवों में आपस में जो चुनाव सम्बन्धी झगड़ा हो जाया करता है वह नहीं होगा और मैं इस का स्वागत करता हूँ। लेकिन मुझे यह देखने को मिलता है कि पंचायतों और विकास कमेटियों में हरिजनों की सीटों के रिजर्वेशन की बात आपने कही है। बलबन्त राय मेहता कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में ऐसा करने की सिफारिश नहीं की गई है। उन्होंने कोआप्शन की बात कही है। रिजर्वेशन करने से मेरा मत इसलिये

[श्री पद्मावती]

नहीं खाता कि गावों में लोग, धीरे-धीरे जास कर हरिजन, इतने शिक्षित नहीं हैं कि वे अपना सही नुमायन्दा चुन कर भेज सकें। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हम पिछड़े हुए हैं, लेकिन हम को शिक्षा से वंचित रखा गया है। इसलिये गावों में शिक्षा का जल्दी से जल्दी प्रचार होना चाहिये और हरिजनों को विकास कमेटीयों और पंचायतों में कोभाष्ट करना चाहिये। अगर आपने हरिजनों की सीटों के लिये रिजर्वेशन रखा तो नतीजा यह होगा कि किसी एक खास बिरादरी के आदमी नुमायन्दे हो कर आ जायेंगे। मैं यह तो नहीं कहता कि इस तरह से दूसरी कम्युनिटियाँ अनरिजर्वेड रह जायेंगी लेकिन उनके नुमायन्दे इस तरह नहीं आ सकेंगे। सब को जो मौका मिलना चाहिये वह नहीं मिल पायेगा। मैं किसी खास बिरादरी का नहीं लेना चाहता। लेकिन यह होता है कि किसी खास मुहल्ले या गांव में एक खास बिरादरी बसी हुई है उस का आदमी आ जायेगा। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि रिजर्वेशन न रख कर कोभाष्टान रखा जाये। जिस को विकास कमेटी सब से अच्छा और उचित समझे उसे कोभाष्ट कर ले तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। इस में कुछ गलती हो सकती है, लेकिन यह मेरी व्यक्तिगत राय है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि विलेज लेवल वर्कर को विकास कमेटी का सेक्रेटरी बनाने की बात कही गई। मैं इस से सहमत नहीं हूँ। इवेल्यूएशन रिपोर्ट में बताया गया है कि आज देश में जो पंचायतें बनी हुई हैं उन में ६० प्रतिशत पंचायतों में पंच और सरपंच वे व्यक्ति हैं जिन के पास या तो भूमि है या जो गावों के सेठ हैं। तो हालत यह है कि पुराना लैंडलार्ड और पुराना कैपिटलिस्ट वर्ग आज पंचायतों पर कब्जा किया बैठा है। अगर विलेज लेवल वर्कर को विकास कमेटी का सेक्रेटरी बना दिया गया तो उस का परिणाम यह होगा कि वह विलेज लेवल

वर्कर नहीं रह जायेगा बल्कि वह सरपंच का सेक्रेटरी बन जायेगा और वह उस को वैसे नचायेगा वैसे बह नाचेगा। तो यह जरूरी है कि विलेज लेवल वर्कर को विकास कमेटी के सेक्रेटरी का दर्जा नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये। बल्कि मेरी तो यह राय है कि जो पंचायत का सेक्रेटरी है और जो कोभापरेटिव सोसायटी का सेक्रेटरी है उस को ट्रेनिंग दी जाये और अगर वह अपना पंचायत का और कोभापरेटिव सोसायटी का काम निष्पक्षता से करता है तो उसको विनेज लेविज वर्कर का दर्जा दिया जाये क्योंकि उस को अनेक क्षेत्रों में काम करना पड़ेगा, और उस को जो अनुभव होगा उस से बहुत लाभ हो सकेगा।

साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आपने जो शिक्षा और समाज शिक्षा को प्रलग-प्रलग कर रखा है इनको आपको मिला देना चाहिये। जिन बच्चों को आज शिक्षा दी जा रही है वे भी तो कल नागरिक बनने वाले हैं। इसलिये मेरा ख्याल है कि शिक्षा और सामाजिक शिक्षा को एक कर देना चाहिये और जो शिक्षक हैं उनको समाज शिक्षा की भी ट्रेनिंग दी जानी चाहिये, ताकि वे अपने फालतू समय में गावों में जा कर धयस्क अनपढ़े लोगों को बतलावें कि देश में क्या काम हो रहा है। इस काम के लिए उन शिक्षकों को थोड़ा बहुत एलाउन्स भी दिया जा सकता है। मेरा सुझाव है कि जितने भी स्कूल हैं और कालिज हैं प्रागे से उनमें सामाजिक शिक्षा का विषय कम्पलसरी होना चाहिये। गावों में भी जो स्कूल हैं उनमें भी यह विषय कम्पलसरी होना चाहिए। सरकार इस तरह ध्यान दे रही है और जल्दी कर रही है, लेकिन जितनी जल्दी हो सके इस काम को करना चाहिए। अगर शिक्षा और समाज शिक्षा को साथ मिला दिया जायेगा तो इसमें खर्चा भी बहुत बच जायेगा और यह काम सुचारु रूप से हो सकेगा।

इसलिए सरकार को इस ओर ध्यान देना चाहिए ।

आपने कहा है कि अगर रेवेन्यू का काम पंचायतों को दे दिया जाये तो भ्रष्टा होगा । मैं नहीं समझता कि इससे कुछ ठीक होगा । हम देखते हैं कि आज रेवेन्यू का मुहकमा सारे मुहकमों पर कब्जा किये बैठा है । आज गांवों में वैसे ही पटवारी सबसे बड़ा अफसर माना जाता है । वह जिसको चाहे बेदखल कर सकता है जिसको चाहे जमीन दे सकता है । तो मैं समझता हू कि इससे लाभ नहीं होगा ।

इसी तरह से न्याय पंचायतों का सवाल है । इनको भी अलग बनाना चाहिए । और जैसा कि बलवन्त राय मेहता कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है इनके लिए पंचों का पैनल होना चाहिये जिसमें से सबडिवीजनल आफिसर या कलक्टर जिसे उचित समझ इस काम के लिए चुन ले ।

ग्राम सेविकाओं के बारे में अभी एक समस्या ने कहा कि यह एतराज किया जाता है कि उनकी उम्र कम होती है और उनकी अनुभव नहीं होता । उन्होंने कहा कि ऐसा समझना ठीक नहीं है । पर मेरी राय में उनकी उम्र छोटी है और ज्यादा होनी चाहिए । मैं यह नहीं कहता कि वे अपनी ड्यूटी नहीं समझती या उनको अनुभव नहीं है । लेकिन मेरा अनुभव है कि जो बहिनें स्कूलों और कालिजों से ताजा-ताजा निकल कर आती हैं उनको गांवों में काम करने में कठिनाई प्रतीत होती है । इसलिये मेरा सुझाव है कि उन्हें पहले दूसरे मुहकमों में काम करने का मौका दिया जाये, उनको शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में, स्वास्थ्य के क्षेत्र में और दूसरे क्षेत्रों में काम करने का पहलू अवसर दिया जाये, उसके बाद जब उनको उन कामों का अनुभव प्राप्त हो जाये तो उनको गांवों में काम करने के लिये भेजा जाये तो वह ज्यादा उपयोगी सिद्ध होगी ।

आजकल जिला परिषद् का बेयरमैन कलक्टर होता है । मैं इसे ठीक नहीं समझता । इसका कारण यह है कि अगर कोई अफसर बेयरमैन बन कर बैठता है तो लोग समझते हैं कि अफसर राज कर रहा है और वे काम में पूरी दिलचस्पी नहीं लेते । अगर किसी नान आफिशियल को यह दरजा दिया जाये तो लोगों में ज्यादा दिलचस्पी पैदा हो सकती है । इसलिये मेरा सुझाव है कि इस दर्जे के लिए किसी नानआफिशियल को चुना जाये तो ज्यादा उचित होगा ।

जो हम गांवों में लोन देने हैं उसके बारे में मेहता कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि हरिजनो को केवल ७ परसेंट लोन मिले । यह बहुत गजब की बात है । गांवों में ज्यादा से ज्यादा हाउसिंग का काम हो और उसमें हरिजनो को केवल ७ प्रतिशत लोन मिले तो कोई जचने वाली बात नहीं है ।

मैं एक दो बातें कोआपरेटिव के बारे में भी अर्ज करना चाहता हू । सहकारिता के बारे में सदस्यों की अलग-अलग राय है । कुछ समझते हैं कि इससे लाभ होगा, कुछ सोचते हैं कि इससे लाभ नहीं होगा । वे कहते हैं कि देश की आज की परिस्थितियों में सहकारिता का काम नहीं सफल हो सकता । आपको विदित है कि हमारा देश कृषि प्रधान देश रहा है । और यहां पर हजारों वर्ष से सहकारिता की परम्परा चली आती है । हम देखते हैं कि अगर गांव में एक कुवा है और उससे चार आदमियों को पानी लेना है तो एक दिन एक आदमी के खेत को पानी दे दिया जाता है, दूसरे दिन दूसरे आदमी के खेत को पानी दे दिया जाता है और इस तरह सहकारिता के आधार पर सब के खेत सिंच जाते हैं । इसी तरह से अगर खेतों में खाद डालने का सवाल होता है तो सब लोगो की गाड़िया मिल एक-एक दिन एक आदमी के खेत में खाद डाल देती है फिर बारी-बारी से दूसरों के खेतों में सब मिल कर खाद डाल

[श्री पहाड़िया]

केते हैं। तो हम देखते हैं कि हमारे देश में सहकारिता की परम्परा तो पुराने समय से बसी आ रही है। हमें तो अब उसका केवल विकास करना है।

यह संका प्रकट की गयी है कि जब तक इसमें सरकारी भ्रष्टाचारों का हाथ रहेगा तब तक यह सफल होना मुश्किल है। मैं मानता हूँ कि अभी इस काम में सरकारी भ्रष्टाचारों का काफी हाथ है। इसीलिए तो हम एक बम सहकारिता को पूरे रूप में नहीं आ रहे हैं। पहले तो हम सेवा सहकारी समितियाँ बनाना चाहते हैं। इनके बनने से जो लोगों के मन में संका और डर है वह दूर हो जायेगा।

दूसरी बात मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मिकेनाइज्ड फार्मिंग के बारे में यहाँ संका उठायी गयी है। कुछ सदस्यों का स्पष्ट है कि यह उपयोगी होगी, तो कुछ समझते हैं कि इससे लाभ नहीं होगा। मेरा तो विचार यह है कि मिकेनाइज्ड फार्मिंग करना नितान्त आवश्यक नहीं है। जिन फार्मों को कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज चलायें अगर उनमें मिकेनाइज्ड फार्मिंग न करके देशी तरीके से भी खेती की जाये तो भी हम बहुत तरक्की कर सकते हैं। उससे भी पैदावार बढ़ेगी।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं एक निवेदन यह करना चाहता हूँ कि गांवों में उद्योगों को बढ़ावा देने की बात कही जाती है। लेकिन साथ ही साथ मुझे यह भी देखने को मिला कि पंचायतों से हमारे कुछ उद्योगों पर रोक लगा दी है, उदाहरण के लिए हमारा मुरवा मवेशियों को उठाने का काम था। अब पंचायत ने उस पर बैन लगा दी। इसका परिणाम यह होता है कि चमड़े और हाइड गांवों में सड़ रहे हैं और उनका उचित उपयोग नहीं हो पा रहा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ग्राम उद्योगों के लिए कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज बना कर उनको

मोन दिये जाने चाहियें और जो देश का बन बेकार जा रहा है उसको काम में लाना चाहिए।

इसके साथ-साथ मैं एक निवेदन यह करना चाहता हूँ कि ग्राम पंचायतों को कर लगाने का अधिकार दे रखा है। उसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि हमारे यहाँ पंचायत ने धाँक की रुई का ठेका दे रखा है। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ है कि वह काम ठीक से नहीं हो रहा है और माल अधिकार में उड़ जाता है। इससे नुकसान होता है।

तो मेरा सन्देश यह है कि जो गांवों के बच्चे हैं उनको सहायता दी जानी चाहिए।

Shri Ayyakkannu (Nagapattinam-Reserved-Sch. Castes): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is this Ministry that constantly reminds our rural population that we have established a welfare State in this Country. It is this Ministry that has brought a radical change in the outlook of our officers and also a thorough change in their attitude towards our village brethren and thereby established an unshakable confidence in the minds of our people and make them feel that they are the real sovereigns of this country.

17 hrs.

Again, Mr. Chairman, it is this Ministry which is constantly endeavouring to build up an ideal country, a country conceived by the father of our nation. As such, I am really thankful to you, Sir, for having given me an opportunity to speak on this most important Demand. As my time is very short, I would like to confine myself to co-operation only.

To my mind, it appears that co-operation is not a novel feature in this country. Even though it is not obviously known to us, the spirit of co-operation, of live and let live, of mutual help, has been in vogue in this country from time immemorial. It has been in existence at least from the time when the village community

came into existence. But, whatever it may be, it has been there, and all of us know it, I hope, from 1857, ever since the time when Frederic Nicholson submitted his thesis on co-operation. Since then, lakhs of co-operatives were functioning successfully in this country. But, to my surprise, suddenly some kind of protest is coming now. I think that was probably due to the fact that hitherto the beneficiaries of these societies were largely or mainly from the privileged or the rich classes. But when the Government has come forward and has conceived a plan to extend these facilities to the have-nots, to the impoverished farmers and the poor craftsmen, there is a lot of noise and hubbub, and there has been not only criticism but denunciation. It is not criticism but a great denunciation. But then one can understand this kind of denunciation when it affects them; only when it affects them, they make vociferous harangues against the scheme.

Now, I would like to say that it is after all not a new thing. Even in our Constitution, article 43 has laid down as follows:

"The State shall endeavour to secure, by suitable legislation or economic organisation, or in any other way, to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise, work, a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life and full enjoyment of leisure and social and cultural opportunities and, in particular, the State shall endeavour to promote cottage industries on an individual or co-operative basis in rural areas".

What are you going to do to solve this problem and how are you going to fulfil the guarantees given in the Constitution? When it is felt that co-operation will give a severe shock to the capitalist economy in this country, there is lot of protest. That is only my interpretation to the controversy that we are at present facing.

We listened this morning to the speech of Shri Masani. Shri Masani said that there is a tinge of Hitlerism in the attitude of our hon. Prime Minister. The very word is painful to everyone of us. Supposing there is a tinge of Hitlerism in the mind and outlook of our Prime Minister, we can imagine what will happen to the other friends? Is it possible for them to go and speak like that? Our Prime Minister is not of that type. He is the embodiment of our culture. He is the very quintessence of our civilization, a civilization which has preserved individual liberty and freedom of expression during all the vicissitudes of her fortune. That is not the case with our friend. He has only taken 'over-advantage' of that quality of our Prime Minister, and the freedom of expression guaranteed in the Constitution.

Now, I am not at all opposed to criticism. Criticism will always rectify a man, the mistakes of a man or the misdeeds of a man. I am for criticism. Without criticism no democracy can function properly or successfully. So I am for criticism. But when you want to express your view-point and criticise, in your enthusiasm to criticise, it is not at all desirable to cross the border-line of decency. My hon. friend Shri Masani is a learned friend of mine. I have always great regard for him, and in one sense I have regard for him as a teachers, because I have studied many of his books. One of his books 'our India' has attracted many youngsters like me, but when I learn that he has attacked our Prime Minister, I am completely delivered of the respect and regard I had for him so far.

In his Presidential Address at the first conference of the All-India Food-grain Dealers, Mr. Masani referred to the following remarks of the Prime Minister in regard to the fear expressed that co-operative farming would

[Shri Ayyakannu]

lead to forced labour, collectivization and communism:

"Well, if it leads to that, let it I am not frightened."

But our learned friend, Mr Masani, criticised and attacked the Prime Minister for making these remarks saying:

"It is a pity that such reckless and irresponsible words should fall from the lips of our Prime Minister"

This is the compliment that Mr. Masani has paid to our Prime Minister. We should remember that our Prime Minister is not only the Prime Minister of this country, but he is the captain of the liberation movement, he is the greatest thinker. I am very sorry he is not present here today.

So, I request the Ministry not to pay any heed to this thoughtless criticism, but to carry out co-operative farming with double vigour and enthusiasm, which my hon friend, Shri Murthy, is having abundantly. I am sorry the Minister is not here, he is also a devoted soul and a source of admiration to all the youngsters in this country.

Now, what are the salient benefits that are likely to be derived from these co-operative societies? To my mind, co-operative farming is the only way to consolidate all tiny and uneconomic holdings. Unless there is consolidation of small holdings, it is totally impossible for you to step up production, because you will not be in a position to improve the method of farming, you will not be in a position to apply scientific skill or to invest increased capital in the land. So, for stepping up production, this consolidation is essential.

Secondly, it will reduce the cost of production. It will also facilitate the poor farmers in getting loans, so that they may easily purchase fertilisers, good seeds, etc. It will also ensure to

them a minimum definite income. It will also benefit the agricultural labourers as well as the landowners. As the Prime Minister said, it will also bring about a social cohesion. It will promote the feeling of brotherhood, the community feeling. This will also, to a certain extent, deliver them from the economic thralldom in which they were held by the capitalist class in this country.

Against joint farming, two false allegations are made and I would like to repudiate them by taking some more time. The first allegation is that it will lead to slave labour.

Mr. Chairman: I will advise the hon Member to leave it to the hon Minister to defend, he has not got much time.

Shri Ayyakannu: Regarding the allegation that it will lead to forced labour, today all our officers, our intelligentsia, attend office from 10 to 5. They work in a team spirit, systematically and scientifically. Is that called forced labour? Again, in Malaya and Ceylon and other countries in the plantations so many labourers have been working as a team. Can it be called forced labour? If you say it is forced labour, I will just bring to the attention of the hon House the pathetic conditions that prevail today. I will just take the example of a lady who gives birth to a child. Even before the completion of one month the poor lady has to go to the field, work in the field in the hot sun from morning seven to six o'clock in the evening. Again, the poor lady has to go back and cook her food for her people and it will be 11 O'clock before she goes to bed. Again she has to wake up at 3 O'clock in the morning. That is the prevailing condition. It is really a pathetic condition. When I find this is the condition I venture to say without fear of contradiction it is better to have forced labour rather than this. This will not result in forced labour. When we want to give

employment, let us have it Why not we sacrifice the liberty to be idle? Why should we be idle?

Again, a remark was made in this House by Shri Masani that it will lead to bloodshed and civil war It is something horrible to think I am really surprised that a learned person like Shri Masani says that a revolution will take place Revolution or civil war or bloodshed, is to so easy to occur? Is it common in history? I have studied Edmund Burke and Bertrand Russel and I find that they have never occurred Again, I would refresh the memory of some people by quoting what Edmund Burke has said about bloodshed Edmund Burke has said that "the past should be gloomy, the present should be dark and the future should have no hope" Only under those circumstances could revolution or bloodshed take place This is the view of all Philosophers from Plato to Bertrand Russel. It is also the view of all historians from Thucydides to Tonyen Bee

The great Rousseau has said whether there is God or not, you create one God So also, whether there is benefit or not, you adopt co-operatives But I have no doubt in my mind that this will remove poverty in our country

Shri P. G. Deb (Angul) While moving my cut motions I would like to express my views on certain problems which, in my opinion, are of vital importance for the development of Community Projects and NES blocks in our country I recall the day when this scheme was launched—it was the 2nd of October 1952, the birthday of Mahatma Gandhi Now seven years have passed The First Five Year Plan is over after a good amount of expenditure to the extent of Rs 52.04 crores apart from other contributions. For the Second Plan-period the Government have allotted about Rs 200 crores for development work which is now going to be completed in a few years' time

Sir, one would naturally ask: has there been any beneficial change brought about in these villages at the cost of so many crores of rupees? The answer will be somewhat halting and otherwise No doubt this development work is a part and parcel of Government's whole development programme, on which depends the destinies of our independent India In improving the position of the down-trodden community, which cover an area of 5,80,000 villages of India, the Government have rightly fixed a target for covering every village through these development projects But what do we see at the practical field? The community development projects are at present is a great mismanaged warehouse. The type of works that we see are without the proper financial control and checking from the Centre, more so at the State level It has given chance to a section of the people to make hay while the sun shines I fail to understand how the Government is going to benefit the villager in particular, the way these things are being handled. In the villages we find that there is no enthusiastic feeling amongst the people to welcome these schemes The poor men are not yet convinced that this is going to be a good thing for them. If I may say so, the vast electorate the real masters of our country today are blissfully ignorant of and indifferent to what the Government are doing with regard to the community development projects. This is because the whole approach to my mind seems defective

Carl C Taylor, Ford Foundation Consultant on Community Development, has pointed out stating whether community development has become people's programme with Government assistance or the Government's programme with people's assistance This remark is quite justified Today we have the Government programme thrust on the villages without taking the people's programme into confidence Though the Government has lately realised this, still there seems to be no practical change at all, up

[Shri P. G. Deb]

till today, because the people are still thinking that these schemes are an imposition on them. Sir, I feel that the evolution of upgrading the masses should find the nucleus amongst the poorest of the poor and not from the top. The village level worker is often considered a Government agent. The Social Education Officer and the like are thought of as persons taking round visitors and higher authorities for sight-seeing and entertainments etcetera.

The greatest drawback, therefore, has been that most of these officers in community development have neither the theoretical knowledge of technical community development methods nor do they have practical experience in local community mobilisation. These are the two very important factors in my view. These men should be trained officers, with good administrative experience to cope with the co-ordinated administration. Today the majority of them are fresh from colleges or inexperienced people posted to these jobs. One should not forget that it is these people who hold the pivotal positions in the real administration of the country and hence much will depend on how their minds work. Sir, the key to success in an administration is to follow the dictum that "tents are mightier than the pen". More of touring, more of spot enquiries and more of checking are essential factors in an organisation like that of our community development. This is lacking, by far lacking and probably I may be perfectly right when I say so.

May I take this opportunity to refer here to a very recent statement made by the hon. Prime Minister a few days back while inaugurating the National Shipping Board at Vigyan Bhawan on the 10th April, 1959. He said in the course of his speech that planned advance and planned co-ordinated thinking are essential factors for successful implementation

of the planning schemes. I agree with the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister. That applies more so to this community development work. There is lack of co-ordinated administration, as I said before, at each block level, if you mark that very carefully. It is often seen that there is constant clash between the BDOs and the Government authorities. All these defects need to be nipped in the bud and duly rectified if the Government means real work. On the other hand, what do we see? We find—visualise for a moment, if we just think over for a moment—that all over the country the villagers are migrating into urban areas for want of better living. The Census report of the Government speaks for itself. In 1951, the urban population in India was 62 million. In 1958, it was over 70 million. Now, in 1959, I am sure, it has considerably gone up. This shows that there is a continuous flow of people from the village areas to the urban areas. Life in the village has lost its charm. This is a fact. If the Government had been achieving their aims and objects through the Community Development and N.E.S. Blocks, why should the villagers migrate to the urban areas, I ask. To obtain proper benefit, therefore, the Government should think of absorbing the rural population in the rural environment itself. This can be done and achieved only by making the rural areas attractive, remunerative and progressive, according to the choice of the people, which is the most important factor. Creation of confidence in them is essential. They should not be allowed to disintegrate. They are slowly disintegrating, in my opinion.

For all this, what is required is sincerity, and above all the right type of administrative care to satisfy the people? What is the picture that we find in our country? Let us analyse that. While the Government preaches a socialist pattern of society where the village man is the most important factor, we find that

the same old poor man—may not be old; old and young—the same poor man, backward, neglected, forsaken and exploited to the utmost.

Here, I may say in passing about my own State of Orissa. There, in an atmosphere of political feud which every one knows the common man is thrown to the walls. Nobody cares for him. Sir, in my mind, what strikes most is the dominance of political bias over these community development areas. This is my experience in Orissa. I do not know about other parts. Many Government servants are forced to lose their individuality for mere political considerations and act up to it. This has either directly or indirectly brought in nepotism, favouritism and above all, disparity in the allocation of works in these development programmes. This must be stopped if the Government means real business and the country's benefit at large.

Then, I come to another point. When we think of the United States, we find, 15 per cent of the U.S. population is producing enough food for that country. But, India, despite having a 85 per cent agricultural population, has not become self-sufficient in food up till now. We require the human quality to be improved. Probably because human quality improved in those parts of the world, things are better off and they are doing well. But, we require the human qualities to be improved. For that, what do we require? Therefore, it has been my opinion and I still hold that there is no long term process of educating the farmers or changing the psychology for the betterment of their life. I may point out that there is the least propaganda in the villages to change the outlook of the peasants. There is lack of publicity at the village level.

To overcome that, I would suggest that there should be continuous distribution of posters, pamphlets, bulletins, and advertisements in

regional languages in all the villages of the country. This should be one of the most important administrative works and, in my opinion, I hope the hon. Minister of Community Development will think over it and give it the topmost priority. If this is done, I believe, it will soon change the outlook of the villagers and give them incentive to venture into new schemes launched by the Government. Today with even all the schemes, whatever they are, launched by the Government, the villagers do not have that impetus to go and ask them for give other help to carry on.

It may be argued, of course, by some officers that the publicity, as suggested by me, will mean heavy expenditure and extra time taking on the part of the already busy officer at the district level. Because, Sir, the same thing was said in reply to my question in one of the meetings in my State while I was discussing over these issues. I would therefore suggest that Government should evolve special publicity organisations at each district level, under the direct control of the Central Government. The Central Government should have financial and administrative control. This will infuse enthusiasm into the minds of the people and will be helpful in the way of implementation of the Community Development Programmes.

We all know, Sir, that by the end of the Second Five-year Plan and the beginning of the Third Five-year Plan the amount of these schemes will increase by 100 per cent. I would therefore, like to suggest two measures to the Government. First, there should be a separate post of Development Commissioner at every district level to cope with the entire Community Development work. Secondly, in order to develop food production, and to make it a successful venture, Government should take the help of the retired Agricultural officers. They should utilise their

[Shri P. G. Deb]

experience and knowledge. Otherwise, I feel that this trained manpower is going on waste in time of need.

Besides this, I am sure the hon. Minister will bestow his attention to another aspect of the problem, namely, the problem of unemployment and under-employment. This problem has been neglected to a very great extent all along. We should minutely attend to the removal of unemployment and under-employment in the block areas. Sir, I expect that, in this direction, proper care should be taken by the Government to give employment to as many local people as possible as officers and the like in the different works at block-levels. This has not been done so far as Orissa is concerned. I hope this point will be taken into consideration.

17:27 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Lastly, Sir, I would like to conclude by telling this hon. House that by and large, the success of our Community Development Programmes will depend, with what sincerity of purpose the problems are tackled today, and that is, the Government thinking in terms of the next generation and not the next election.

Shri S. N. Mishra: Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the very outset, I perhaps owe a word to the House how I happened to be here in the present context. As the House knows, the hon. Minister for Community Development and Co-operation has been lying ill for some time. He is extremely sorry that it has not been possible for him to take part in these important discussions. Sir, presumably because I, in my own humble way, have been taking some interest in this subject of Co-operation and not because men in politics are supposed to be professors of miscellaneous knowledge that the Hon. Minister has

thought it fit to request me to co-operate with the Deputy Minister of Community Development, Shri B. S. Murthy, in dealing with this subject here.

I would be dealing with only one particular aspect of this Ministry under discussion, namely Co-operation. The hon. Prime Minister has considerably lightened my burden by making very important observations while submitting the Demands for Grants for this Ministry. He focussed his attention almost entirely on Co-operation. I am quite sure whatever points remain after I have spoken will be dealt with by my hon. friend, Shri B. S. Murthy when he winds up the debate tomorrow.

This subject of Co-operation has assumed great importance and prominence and I think quite deservedly, during the last few months. Particularly after the Nagpur resolution, there has been a ferment of ideas in this country and the stir of a new enthusiasm and determination to implement the programme of land reforms and to bring into being a new rural society. In the main, the idea of co-operative farming has been under active controversy for some time. We welcome this controversy that has followed in the wake of the Nagpur resolution. But this controversy has also led to some pathological reactions, and this House itself has witnessed to what extent these reactions can go.

The hon. Member belonging to the Socialist Party, Shri Braj Raj Singh, said that people were being allowed in this country to preach against co-operative farming. Our Government do not believe in gagging the mouths of people, however vehemently they might be opposed to the ideas which Government hold that the country wants. And, therefore, he would see the spectacle of persons strutting about the Stage

going from one end of the country to another with a good deal of crusading zeal, and he would find persons like Shri M R Masani alive and kicking

What has amused me most throughout this controversy is that it has got on the nerves of some honourable gentlemen in comfortable positions. Those who lie in the lilies of life and write sonnets to the moon have somehow tried to show how their hearts have been overflowing with the milk of human kindness for the sun-burnt peasants. It is all very good if all have their hearts overbrimming with sympathy and compassion for the poor peasants in the field, but they must remember that these peasants are cold-blooded realists and they are not going to be taken in by seductive slogans.

So, as I said, this controversy has got both healthy and unhealthy features. The unhealthy feature is that the real issues relating to co-operative farming are sought to be clouded in a smoke of prejudices, unnecessary politics and sectarian interests. It is nothing peculiar to this country that you find some persons going about, painting the most lurid picture of the Kalki avatar of collectivisation.

You would remember that only a few weeks ago in the State Legislature of Assam, one hon. Member dangled the picture of Kalki avatar and the hon. Speaker there was immensely interested in that portrait. Here, you find the word portrait of the Kalki avatar of collectivisation. This is nothing peculiar to this country. Even in those countries where co-operative or collective farming was introduced for the first time, there were people who said that there would be collective meals and collective wives, and even then these things went ahead.

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): Collective wives?

Shri S. N. Mishra: Yes, collective wives. Now, what is being said is that in the wake of co-operative farming, all kinds of compulsions and coercions are going to come. And they say that there would be complete negation of the democratic values and liberties for which the country stands. I do not quite understand why people in the country and particularly the hon. Members in this House should feel diffident about their strength as democratic citizens of a great country with a great constitution. I do not quite see why they should not feel confident of the political institutions or the traditions of the country. Anyhow, they have thought fit to raise all kinds of bogeys and ghosts.

This is again nothing peculiar in connection with this question of co-operative farming, because if you recall the history of one or two important occasions in our national life you would come to the conclusion that the crucial steps have always been confronted with misgivings and resistance.

Please for a moment call back to your mind the national struggle and the method of *satyagraha* that was adopted. Even at that time there were people in this country who used to advance arguments almost in the same terms as they are advancing at the present moment in the context of co-operative farming. They used to say that, in the first instance, *satyagraha* might not remain *satyagraha* that non-violence would degenerate into violence. And that is what you find being said even now. They say that this voluntariness and free choice are not going to remain, and this is going to be followed up by collectivisation. Then also it was being said that even if *satyagraha* did not degenerate into violence, it would not succeed against the mighty British imperialism. Now

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

again they say, if it remains voluntary, this movement would not succeed. This is a peculiar kind of argument. But on all crucial occasions in our national life there have been doubting Thomases who have tried to produce all kinds of arguments to try to frighten the people away.

Shri B. S. Murthy: You must be glad that there are only doubting Thomases, but not denying Peters!

Shri S. N. Mishra: Let us remember another important occasion in our national life. When planning was being introduced in this country I remember the same kind of arguments were being advanced against it. People who are supposed to be very learned and wise and all that said that there was no need for a planned co-operative effort. They used to ask: why not leave economic development to the wills and decisions of individuals? They used to point out the instances of the economic development of those countries which had got private enterprise. They said: look at the examples of these countries: private enterprise has worked miracles and wonders; why then do you people want to introduce planning in this country?

The same kind of thing is being said now: why not have peasant cultivation, family cultivation; why go in for co-operative farming? This reaction is, therefore nothing peculiar to the occasion.

"To my mind, this co-operative farming is going to determine whether the country is prepared for socialist advance or not. We who belong to the Government or to the Congress Party are absolutely clear in our minds that the country is prepared for a socialist advance, and therefore we are approaching this task with all hope, faith and confidence. We are approaching this task with confidence also because we find wonderful adaptability in the Indian people. Nowhere in the history of

the world will you find such wonderful adaptability as the Indian people possess. This is the genius of India, and I am quite sure that this genius of India is going to assert itself again in the context of this co-operative revolution, in the context of the establishment of co-operative democracy.

Sir, you will remember that we have accomplished the most fundamental revolutions in this country in the most peaceful and cheerful manner. We have absolutely no grievance against any class of people. All classes of people in the country have fallen in line with the social objective. Therefore, it has been aptly said by a journalist that in this country the revolution is spreading like an oil stain,—as smoothly and pervasively as an oil stain. I am quite sure that the next social and economic revolution is also going to spread like that.

Coming to the institutions at the village level, you would remember that the Prime Minister has repeatedly stressed that the village panchayat, the village co-operative and the village school constitute the foundation on which the edifice of the India of our dreams is going to be raised. In my opinion, we must not forget that this is the basic trinity of the social and economic development of our country. It is extremely important that we must set the pattern of social and economic life at the village level on sound lines. For, if we miss the bus at the village level, we would miss the bus all along. Therefore, it is extremely important that we must take care of the roots of our growth and prosperity that lie in the village.

This new programme, as embodied in the Nagpur Resolution and as has also been placed by the National Development Council in many ways similar, has been conceived as a step in that direction. This, as has been pointed out by the Prime Minister

and also by other hon. Members, is a programme for a new rural society on the basis of new organisation of production, new mode of production. Therefore, it is going to produce a new dynamism. When people speak of democracy being in danger, I would like to submit that nothing is going to make democracy vital and vibrant except these village co-operatives, village panchayats and the village schools. If we do not enable people to shoulder economic responsibilities at the village or other levels, please take it from me that we would be confronted with the same problem which a political scientist has described as the problem of anaemia at the extremities and apoplexy at the centre. So if we want to make a democracy a throbbing reality, it is extremely important that we must build up these institutions in the best manner possible.

Now I would like to invite the House to look upon co-operative farming in this perspective and also in now going to place before you. I am sorry that many people grow sometimes hysterical in their denunciation of co-operative farming. Shri M. R. Masani is not here and I do not think it is necessary for me to recall his ghost here for my psychological satisfaction. But even so, I think I would be doing less than justice to him if I do not take care of certain points mentioned by him. He has been acting as a spearhead of a particular section of opinion in the country and going about, as he said, from conference to conference with wonderful proselytising zeal. In my humble opinion, he belongs to that class of people who, though dead, would not lie down. I do not say 'dead' in the physical sense of the term; it is obvious that he is very much alive and kicking, and I would give him all my good wishes. But as some young friend was mentioning only a few minutes back, we are missing the Masani of old days. There has been a complete metamorphosis in him. Many a time he has been saying that human nature is human nature and

it is not going to change; the peasants are not going to change. The changes that have occurred in the hon. Member, Mr. Masani, give me hope that peasants are going to change and the change required in peasants is of a much lesser order than the change undergone by the hon. Member.

Again, I am reminded of another class of people. Mr. Masani, probably, thinks that he believes in democracy, in the liberal values and all that. I very much wish that were so. In my opinion those people who would neither advocate co-operation or collectivism belong to that group which we might call neither for God nor for the Devil. I do not know how to classify them. But this is a point with which I am confronted just now.

It was said in the morning to our great amusement and delight: if you feel confident that people are behind co-operative farming, as the Prime Minister said, why not go to the polls? I say that there is no doubt that we must go to the polls whenever there is need for doing so. From morning I have been sitting in this House and listening to the debate with rapt attention and his was the one lone voice against co-operative farming. If he is in a minority of one in this House, it is strange logic to say that he would be in the majority in the country. I find that there is almost near unanimity in this House.

This House is the greatest slice of the national mirror. All the progressive parties seem to be ranged behind—all the sizeable and significant political parties are behind—the co-operative farming idea. I do not speak of what they call the incipient brake party, or hold-up party or the stop-party. Now we are hearing that a brake party is necessary, a hold-up party is necessary and a stop party is necessary. I do not know whether we can do anything with that kind of incipient brake party. But, there is no significant political party in this country which is not behind this co-operative farming idea. So, the Prime

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

Minister was completely correct when he said that the country was behind this co-operative farming idea and that co-operative farming does represent the urge and aspirations of the Indian masses. This is not only a rhetorical flourish to say like that, this is a hard reality.

Mr Masani quoted one opinion poll. I do not know whether it can be called opinion poll or what. He quoted a Member of the Press. He also happens to be a dear friend of mine and I certainly think him to be one of the brightest men I have come across. But I do not know to what extent a whirlwind tour can indicate the opinion in the countryside—with all deference to the hon member who conducted this kind of poll. Even if in any particular area the opinion was like that, here was an authentic voice of the Indian peasant, Ch Brahm Prakash. I say he is the authentic voice of the Indian peasant and not Mr Masani. He said that 1,000 representative peasants collected at a particular place and after 5½ hours of discussion, gave full-throated support to the co-operative farming idea.

Having said all that, the House would certainly expect me to tell what is exactly the rationale behind it, the economic rationale, I mean. Many people are opposed to this idea on economic grounds, they also sometimes say it may be theoretically sound but it would not be administratively feasible. I am not one of those persons who would accept defeats, if the idea is sound, that it would not be translated into reality. But there are people who say like that. These people seem to miss how the rural society is being transformed out of all recognition. The fabric of the rural society is under severe strain at the present moment. Diverse kinds of political, social and economic influences are working and the village is no more the sleepy contented creature it used to be. Today it is like a Titan shaking his locks. We have

to take into account this Titan, take cognisance of this Titan, and do something to satisfy the urges and aspirations of the people. Under the impact of rapid population growth, and expansion of educational opportunities, under the impact of industrialisation, urbanisation, psychological demonstration, effects of the new goods and new way of life, the village is being transformed beyond recognition and the urges and aspirations of the village people now demand a new and larger equilibrium. How will this equilibrium be created is the question which this House has to grapple with and not to grapple with in a way which gives an impression of casualness. Many people say why not leave the peasants as they are? Give them some help, assistance, services and facilities, and allow the peasant farm to remain as it is. I do not quite understand this and I do not know whether they have had a taste of the peasant life. I come from the peasant stock and I am proud of it. What has this peasant farming done in the state of stagnation through which this country has passed all these years? I do concede there are virtues in peasant farming. But when the man-land ratio is so unfavourable and the holdings are atomised into tiny smithereens, I do not know how the peasant can make good in the present framework. This some of my hon friends want conveniently to slur over. Then, this peasant farming—what has it done particularly in the state of stagnant economy? Please dig up the history of the last 25-30 years. You would find that majority of 30 per cent of the agricultural labour came from the peasant families and, if this process is allowed to continue I have no doubt that in the next 25 years or so the percentage would go up from 30 to at least 50. This is a very terrible prospect to contemplate with any measure of equanimity. The landless in the village is not an integral part of the community, of the productive life of the village. He is not going to remain a spectator all the

time. He has to be integrated into the community and its economic life. Unless that is done through a co-operative framework, I do not know how this problem can be solved. Then, again, in the context of the peasant economy we have had to depend upon imports of foodgrains for so many years. We have had to depend upon the import of foodgrains. So, in whatever way you think you would come to the conclusion that we require not a minor increase in agricultural production but an upsurge in agricultural production. When people think of these services and facilities, they think in terms of a marginal or small increase. But my submission is that the situation admits of nothing less than an upsurge in agricultural production.

How can this upsurge be brought about? In my humble opinion there are only two ways of doing it. One way is to go in the full-blooded capitalistic way. Even if you leave aside the social considerations and try to put the clock back, I do not think that this capitalistic way would be desirable from the point of view of industrialisation. The capitalistic development in agriculture would require the widening of the technological base and, therefore, greater diversion of scarce capital resources from industrialisation to agriculture. This would also lead to unemployment.

Then, Sir, there would be the question of retaining all the reactionary institutions; and not only retaining the existing ones but also calling back to life the old ones which were demolished long ago. This is, Sir, something which cannot be done in the late 20th century. Shri Masani has been digging up the geological layers of thought of the 19th century. He wants to replace the 20th century by the 19th century. He is a crusader in favour of the 19th century idea.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Deputy Minister should try to conclude his speech now.

Shri S. N. Mishra: Sir, I would like to have some more time.

Mr. Speaker: I have given him half an hour.

Shri S. N. Mishra: Sir, I had submitted that I would be taking not less than 45 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: What about his colleague?

Shri S. N. Mishra: He would be taking care of the community development, the important aspects of community development and some subsidiary points, if necessary, in this connection.

Mr. Speaker: Non-official Members complain that they get no time and the Ministers—one, two, three—take much of the time. Very well, he will have 15 minutes more tomorrow.

Shri S. N. Mishra: Sir, if you could give me 10 minutes more today I need not carry over to the next day.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House willing to sit for 10 minutes more?

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): The time may be extended tomorrow.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakmada): Sir, he requires some more time, because he has to deal with the merits of co-operative farming.

Mr. Speaker: Why does the hon. Member want to help him? He himself wants only 15 minutes. Let us finish it today, because we have to finish the other Demands, otherwise we won't have time to discuss one or two Demands altogether. Therefore, all hon. Members are requested to continue in their seats. It is a very interesting debate.

Shri S. N. Mishra: Sir, I was submitting that there were only two ways of doing it, the full-blooded capitalistic way or the co-operative way. Now, when we have dismissed the capitalistic way, in my opinion, the co-operative way is the only way in which we can bring about increase in productivity in the village.

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

This has been questioned, and this morning also some doubts were expressed that wherever co-operative farming or collective farming has been tried it has not led to any increase in production. On the contrary, the contention was that it has led to a definite fall in production. But, Sir, I have got before me the experiences of foreign countries and the experiences in our country also. My friend, Shri Vasudevan Nair, took some pains to point out the developments in some of the countries. But I would like for the sake of clarity to refresh the memory of the House in respect of two or three countries which have been generally mentioned in this context.

18 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: I have been listening to the speeches of hon. Members and also the speech of the Minister. Evidently, hon. Members are anxious to know the details of co-operative farming. For instance, if all the lands are to come under a particular co-operative society or unit, what is the nature of the system going to be? There are peasant proprietors who are cultivating their own lands and there are too many landless labour classes. Therefore, how the work is to be distributed? If the labourer has got a land he can cultivate and use his own labour. Therefore, he need not go in search of employment. That is the first point. Secondly, about the produce, after all the expenditure, how the produce is to be shared?

These are all points which hon. Members would like to get clarification upon, and the doubts or difficulties should be removed. Generally saying, "No, no, this is not the 19th century but the 20th century" and all that may not carry conviction. What are the instances and what are the incidents of such a policy? We will assume that there are a thousand people in the village; only 500 have got land and they cultivate their land. The other 500 are engaged in some

other work, industrial or other. Now, who is to distribute this work? The man who has got land must be given the opportunity to work upon that land. The balance that remains may not be sufficient. These are all problems which must have been tackled by other countries. How are they going to be tackled? It is not as if it is understood by everybody. We have been seeing here that except perhaps one or two, the others may be wedded to the principle, but the point is, how it works in practice. These are the points which the hon. Minister may explain. That is what I thought was meant by Shri Thirumala Rao. After having listened for nearly half an hour, he said he wants to hear the Minister on co-operative farming. What the hon. Minister has been saying so far does not appear to relate to co-operative farming.

Shri Thirumala Rao: I may explain one thing. There is so much controversy going about day in and day out in all parts of the country, and the Government, as the instrument of power and who sponsored the policy, is expected to know and is expected to have worked out all the details. Every section of the House is in need of proper education about these things.

Mr. Speaker: How does it happen?

Shri S. N. Mishra: They would go on, but may I submit that I was also expected to take care of the points that have been raised during the course of the discussion. You seemed to be extremely interested—that was my impression—about the aspect of production, whether it has gone up or gone down. Therefore, I was trying to take care of the points. Otherwise, no Member expressed any desire about the details of co-operative farming. It has fallen to your own goodself to mention that. But no other Member has mentioned it. I am not expected, if I . . .

Mr. Speaker: Shri Thirumala Rao was the Chairman of the Committee

then. After having heard the hon. Minister for half an hour, he wants to hear the Minister on co-operative farming. Then, what he has been hearing so long was different.

Shri S. N. Mishra: Shri Thirumala Rao may have his own individual opinion. I have also got some impressions of the House as to how it has been reacting, to what I have been saying all the while. Shri Thirumala Rao is entitled to have his own opinion. But I know how the House has been reacting.

Now, experiences in other countries were referred to. It was said that nowhere had production gone up. I would quote what the Prime Minister of Poland said recently, particularly in respect of increase in production. He said that the results of their work are good and encouraging and on an average, better than the average results of the individual farms.

Another document in respect of Poland mentions that the crops of four cereals amounted in these co-operatives to 17.4 quintals per hectare; that is, 17.6 per cent. more than in individual farms. That is in respect of Poland.

In respect of Yugoslavia also, it has been mentioned in one of the documents which has been recently put out by the Yugoslavian Embassy here, that the Yugoslav people have found that although as compared to 1957, the average yields diminished due to unfavourable weather conditions in 1958, the yields in co-operative and State farms were higher than in 1957 because of the application of modern scientific methods. In the same way, in Bulgaria, I have certain figures which indicate that whereas the average yield for the whole country was 657 kilograms, the average yield for co-operative farms was 705 kilograms.

I have mentioned these examples of foreign countries only to correct any possible wrong impression that might be created. I do not want to stress that we should copy their methods or techniques. We will have to develop our own domestic experience through trial and error, and we must have a completely home-spun method and technique. What would interest you most is the experience in our own country. Recently a study was undertaken by Mr. Bimal Shah in Gujerat. Sometime back, when the Finance Minister was speaking, some sceptical references were made regarding co-operative societies in the Bombay State.

Dr. M. S. Anay: Is there quorum in the House?

Mr. Speaker: If there is no quorum the bell will be rung.

An Hon. Member: There will be nobody outside.

Shri S. N. Mishra: I can continue tomorrow, because I have had the misfortune of being called at the fag end

Mr. Speaker: Hon Ministers must hear what the others say. So, naturally, they come at the fag end of the debate, though not at the fag end of the day. Hon. Ministers belong to a particular party and they must have a sufficient number of Members attending the House. If the Opposition does not attend, possibly they would like to go home; but, the Government must have a sufficient number. The hon. Deputy Minister wanted me to stay and I stayed. But I cannot ensure quorum also. All right; the House will stand adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

12.08 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, April 15, 1959/Chaitra 25, 1881 (Saka).