

That relates to the resolution regarding the inclusion of English in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. We are making a consistent effort in that direction so that we may ultimately get it included. I was hoping that you would please bear in mind that we would like at least 2½ hours for this very interesting subject. Now the Leader of the House is here and I think on at least two occasions he has suggested that English should be included in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Member has himself said that there is no likelihood of it being taken up today. Therefore, he can try his luck again in the Committee when it is taken up there.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): May I suggest that the time allotted for the resolution on co-operative farming may be extended in view of the interest evinced on it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But that is not in this Report. That has already been decided. We will take up this question now. So, the question is

“That this House agrees with the Thirty-ninth Report of the Committee on Private Members’ Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 26th March, 1958.”

The motion was adopted

15.34 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE CO-OPERATIVE FARMING—contd

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): The time allotted for the resolution on co-operative farming is only 2½ hours. In view of the number of amendments given notice of by the hon Members and in view of the fact that there is a serious controversy going on on this question, may I request you to extend the time so that all shades of opinion may be represented in this debate?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If I were to take into consideration the amendments that have been given notice of and the names that I have received, I am afraid even ten hours will not be enough.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): As my hon friend has suggested, let this matter be discussed from all angles in this House. So, today we can discuss it for 2½ hours and the next time we can discuss it for another 2½ hours.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There will be another difficulty. The next resolution, in whose name it stands, he might have objection that he would lose his chance as he shall have to try his luck again in the ballot.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): The next resolution happens to be in my name. I shall be satisfied if I get an opportunity to speak. As long as that is done I am perfectly agreeable to the time for this resolution being extended.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If that be the condition then there will only be 13 minutes. So, I can extend it by 12 minutes.

Shri Khadilkar: It would not be doing justice to the matter under consideration.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have no objection if the House sits longer.

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): We can sit half an hour more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If we take the whole day, Shri Nayar shall have to try his luck again next time.

Shri Khadilkar: We can request Shri Nayar whether it cannot be postponed.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I would agree if I am given an opportunity to move my resolution. My resolution has come second in the ballot after so much of effort on my part.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then he does not agree.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I want an opportunity just to move this resolution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am asking him if he agrees to his resolution being carried to the next day. In that case he shall have to try his luck next time again.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I agree provided I get an opportunity to move my resolution. If I do not move it then I shall have to try my luck in the ballot again.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot avoid it. He shall have to go to the ballot if it is to be taken up next time. That cannot be helped. The House will now resume further discussion of the following resolution moved by Shri U. C. Patnaik on the 13th March, 1959:—

“This House recommends that the question of introducing co-operative farming be given top priority in the programme of land reforms and agricultural development in the country.”

Out of 2½ hours allotted for the discussion of the Resolutions, 13 minutes have already been taken up and 2 hours and 17 minutes now remain for further discussion today. The only alternative now is for the House to sit longer. Shri Patnaik may now continue his speech.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह (सहसराम) :
सात बजे तक ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : यह हाउस की मरजी पर है, वह जब तक बैठना चाहे, बैठ सकता है ।

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker. . .

Shri Achar (Mangalore): On a point of order. I submit that this Resolution cannot be discussed or taken up in this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let it be moved first. Let the hon. Member finish his speech. Then it can be taken up.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: In January 1959 the Nagpur Congress session passed certain resolutions, there was

a furor in the country, there were some who were very much in favour of the resolution, there were some who were bitterly against it, and there has been a lengthy controversy throughout the country ever since.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Just a second. I shall not be able to give the hon. Member more than 30 minutes. That would be the utmost, I should warn him beforehand, so that he should try to conclude within that time. He took 13 minutes last time and 17 minutes now remain.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I did not take 13 minutes that day. According to the Report itself it is about 11 minutes or so. Anyway, I would not like to waste my time over that minute or two.

As a result of these controversies, and as a result of this Private Members' Resolution in this House, there has been a lot of discussion, so many valuable opinions were given out from various sources and, in this House itself, a number of amendments have been brought, which express divergent shades of opinion and various points of view. From all these opinions and from those discussions, certain thoughts emerge, and I would request Government to examine them carefully and to adopt a future policy, a policy which will be the basis of our new nation-building and of our agricultural re-organisation. If necessary, I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister and the Cabinet that they should have a very small parliamentary committee, with the aid of technical experts, to examine this question to consider why things have not been moving fast according to our expectations of those days, and to suggest what steps we can take with a view to accelerate the speed of work and to gear up the administrative machinery.

The two important points that have emerged are the suggestions that on a country-wide scale, we should have

service co-operatives or agricultural mutual aid State-aided co-operatives. Then there is the other suggestion that in Gram Dan villages, in Bho-dan areas, in the Dandakaranya area, for instance, in Chilka-reclaimed area, in the areas of all these big projects where lot of land reclamation has been or is being done, there should be an attempt to try the various systems that have been tried and found successful in different countries so that they will serve as a demonstration to our public and our agriculturists. They would also serve as experimental stations to help our staff, official and non-official, and get trained in the various types of co-operative organisations that have been tried elsewhere and now experimented in our country.

Then there is also another valuable suggestion. It goes on to say that our co-operative machinery, official as well as non-official, should be re-orientated and should be geared up for the envisaged re-organisation of our country and that there should be proper training of our staff, that is, the official staff, the non-official staff and the part-paid managerial staff.

There has also been a proposal that our co-operative laws should be made easier and attractive. They should enthuse the country instead of being an obstacle in the attempt for co-operation. Our co-operative laws should facilitate co-operative organisations throughout. Side by side, there should be laws on consolidation of holdings, fixation of ceilings, fixation of floors, arrangement for re-distribution of the surplus land and so on.

There have also been suggestions that we should take to industries based upon agriculture, silviculture, horticulture, pisciculture and the like to help the co-operative organisation, to help the country to accelerate the production drive and at the same time to absorb the surplus agricultural labour which will be available after all these new experiments are tried.

Then there is the real desire of the whole country that the co-operative organisation that is envisaged should be a real co-operative organisation—a living force which will inspire the whole country, bring the public and the officials together, bring the various departments together and prepare the departments for the heavy work of national re-organisation that is now envisaged.

If time permits, I will give a brief synopsis of each view point that is now before the country. Firstly, about service co-operatives I may submit that we have about 5½ lakh villages and we would be requiring at least about three to four lakh service co-operatives—in some cases a co-operative for one village, in some cases for a group of villages and in some cases for part of a village. Of course, we have to bear in mind that the smaller the group the greater is the chance of cohesion. They will provide easier agricultural credit, agricultural requirements, marketing facilities and facilities to increase agricultural output, eliminate avoidable expenditure, provide facilities for the use of modern equipment, improved techniques and better cultivation methods, better seeds and fertilisers, conservation of organic manures, livestock breeding and minor irrigation works—very important items of agricultural co-operation.

All this could be done through these service co-operatives. It is not that this mutual aid was not known to this country. Those of us who come from rural parts know that it has been the usual practice in rural areas. What we have now to do, is to modernise and systematise the ancient practice, to give it State-aid and other facilities, mobilise the human and land resources of this country for accelerating the food production drive. In these service co-operatives we can ensure that adequate wages are provided for agricultural labour.

Then, enforcement of consolidation of holdings and all laws relating to

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

agriculture can be done through these. It has been suggested that we be not content with only service co-operatives throughout the country. Side by side, we should have colonisation in important places, particularly in Government lands and reclaimed waste areas, like Dandakaranya, Chilka and other areas, where reclamations are going on. We should try ex-service-men settlements, refugee settlements, settlements of enthusiastic young-men inspired by the spirit of adventure if they would like to go and settle down there. We can reclaim all these areas and have these settlements, and the different types of agricultural co-operatives. It will be an advantage because there will be no difficulty in establishing these settlements. They do not involve detraction of ownership rights. They do not involve expropriation in any way, but at the same time every individual gets more land, some new land, some acquisition, some accretion in which he can be satisfied with any type of co-operative. Let it be the collective or the undivided type. Let it be the individual or the divided type. Let it be the mixture of both the types or let us evolve any other system in this country. But then let us try to do co-operative farming of any of these advanced types in all these villages.

Government has missed the bus all these years. The AICC has always had, as its rallying point, social and economic re-organisation. The Economic Committee passed a resolution. Then the Agrarian Sub-Committee gave its report. All this took place in 1948-49 and still we have not been trying agricultural co-operatives anywhere. Suddenly, we come and say that the whole country will be covered with agricultural co-operatives, thereby giving rise to so much of controversy and dissension.

Have you tried it when the zamindaries were abolished? There was a lot of land coming at your disposal. States were merged. A lot of land

came in your possession. *Inams* were liquidated and a lot of land came under Government Control. You have not tried it. You have not been trying it in any of these areas which are under Government. Therefore, I say that if you want to give the people the knowledge of rural co-operative work of the advanced type as in Germany, Norway, Ireland, Italy and other countries or still more advanced type as you have in Israel, China and elsewhere going up to the Commune stage, you have got to give the people the experience.

As an hon. Member has just pointed out and as the hon. Law Minister pointed out a few days ago when hon. Member, Shri Bhadauria, brought forward a Bill—he took all the trouble to formulate a Bill for co-operatives and the hon. Law Minister got up and opposed even the introduction—and just as my hon. friend there has opposed discussion of this thing on the ground that this is not a Central subject, this is a State subject. For co-operation you are giving crores of rupees. Yet it is a State subject! For agriculture you are giving crores of rupees. It is also a State subject. For fisheries you are giving crores of rupees. It, too, is a State subject. This mania, differentiation, according to our Constitution, between State and Central subjects in the Schedules is really something which has got to be thought over and, if necessary, liquidated rather than perpetrated and allowed to stand in the way of our national progress.

Then, Sir, during the last ten years you find that some *banjar* lands are going fallow. Areas which have been reclaimed by means of tractors are getting into individual hands and yet you are talking about co-operative farming, joint farming and all that stuff. I would say this: Try new methods of agricultural co-operation, joint farming, collective farming and all that on the reclaimed lands. For the whole country, you must have service co-operatives. I would further

suggest that we must try to approach the problem in a realistic manner

I would like this House to consider some of those shortcomings which have stood in the way of our co-operative progress and which has also stood in the way of our agricultural development, and which are also facing us towards the end of our Second Five-Year Plan also, when we are depending upon import of food-grains for our sustenance. We would like the House to examine the snags in the organisation. If possible, we should rectify that. That is the first point that I would submit for the consideration of the House.

Secondly, Sir, I would say that our Indian farmer is hard working. In spite of the fragmentation of holdings that we have, in spite of the fact that their holdings are scattered tiny bits here and there our farmers are trying to make maximum use of their lands. By self-employment, by his unceasing attachment to his land, he is somehow, going on. We have now to see how we can improve his lot by adopting the modern methods of cultivation. It has been our ideology to help his lot during the years of freedom, after freedom and uptill now. In spite of the decision of the ruling party on the organisational side to have co-operative organisations for agricultural development, after the reports of Kumarappa Committee and others, what do you find now? You find that you have got only 966 Joint-farming societies, 391 Collective-farming societies, and 668 better-farming and tenant-farming societies. It is practically admitted on all sides that many of them are not functioning well. It is true that some of them are doing well, but it is a fact that many of them are not doing well. I would not like to deal with this at length, except to say this. There has been a recent report in the Press that some Punjab Government Officer was deputed to enquire about some of these matters and that his report was that there has been some bungling in the co-operative organisation. I think

it is called Roy Chowdhury report. I could see only a small press cutting. We have not been able to get at the original report.

I would like to pass on now to other connected reports. There is a book on Co-operative Farming brought out by the Planning Commission in 1956. It is called "Studies in Co-operative Farming" brought out in December, 1956. It mentions about twenty-two model co-operative farms set up by the Planning Commission and it is not a very happy report, nor does it show that co-operative farming has been a great success. There is another book by Sir Malcolm Darling, K.C.S.I. who has been the ex-Co-operative Registrar of the Punjab State. He has come on the invitation of the Planning Commission and has given us a report on the Co-operative farming envisaged under our Five-Year Plan. Sir Malcolm Darling's report of 1967 contains a very stringent criticism of our co-operative capacity and even in respect of credit facilities on the agricultural side, he has not been very hopeful. The reason is this. In British days, the Britishers were never thinking in terms of Co-operative farming. They were all thinking in terms of Credit Societies, with the result that you had 1,79,000 Credit Societies in this country and very few Co-operatives and even those Co-operatives were not functioning well. In England, they do not believe in Co-operative farming. The result is, the more of Malcolm Darlings that you import to give you reports, the less will be the result. The approach of Malcolm Darling or his understudy who are still in the country is very unhelpful. They think in terms of Credit Co-operatives only. We have got to think in other terms. In January, 1959 a team of the C.P.A. has reported only on the Credit Societies. On the other hand, I would like to refer to one or two things, especially to the report of the Indian Delegation to China. Some of the officers have done it and it is quiet all right and it corroborates what we,

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

Members of Parliament, saw in China and reproduced in our report. This gives us hope that in the bureaucratic frame work, too, there are some who believe in agricultural Co-operation.

There is also another article which I would like to mention in this connection. It is entitled "Studies in Indian Agricultural Economics" published by the Indian Society of Agricultural Economics. It is an interesting reading. Some of these are also there, to prove that people are thinking already in those terms. Shri Shriraman Narayan, an ex-colleague of ours here, who is on the Planning Commission, representing agricultural side, has also been writing articles on the subject. But in spite of that, we have not been able to make any progress. We have not made any headway. Why should it be so? Necessary legislations have not been framed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I would require two or three minutes more, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member does not appreciate the pressure that is put upon my head.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: There was a Committee to report on Co-operative Law. That Committee has reported, but then, that Committee did not have any non-official on its personnel and therefore it has not been able to achieve much.

From all these facts, Sir, we have to draw some lessons. First, legislation has to be enacted, not by us, but by the States, but at our instance, because the Planning Commission and the Government of India are giving a lot of financial aid to the States. Legislation has, therefore, to be completed as early as possible. Then, we should have adequate and qualified staff for the purpose. The House will remember the success of agricultural co-operatives in countries like Denmark, Norway, Ireland and Italy.

They have opened agriculture-cum-co-operative schools for adults, rural schools for women and all that. The Government of India and the Reserve Bank have started a Training Course, but it is very small. It is meant only for Credit Societies. There is no emphasis on agricultural co-operatives. Then, the All-India Co-operative Union, of which one of the hon. Ministers of another Ministry is the President, has got a short-term course training for non-officials. They could train only a few non-officials and we understand that although a Minister is in charge of the organisation, the Government of India have withdrawn the Grant for this year. We should have proper training. The number of trained personnel should be increased. Assistance of Universities and educational bodies should be taken. Adult education in Co-operation and Agricultural production and marketing should be taken up. Training should be given to officers in charge of these Blocks. Then, Sir, we have to think in terms of the machinery.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have also to think about the time.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I have just a few more words to say. I will take up only two or three minutes, because it is an important subject.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore, there are so many hon. Members who are anxious to speak. That is all the more reason why he should take less time. This is a very important subject and almost every Member who is present in the House desires to speak.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I will take only two minutes, Sir.

Regarding the machinery for working out the scheme, the services of the village school-masters could be utilised. The Lok Sahayak Sena could be utilised for mutual aid schemes. The Gram Sahayak Camps could be utilised. The services of the

University students during vacations could also be utilised.

Then, I would say a word about mechanisation, and this will be my last point. We are thinking in terms of mechanisation and tractorisation. But I would only like to give just one word of warning, that is, before we think of mechanisation and tractorisation on a very large scale, let us think of the tractors, trucks and jeeps that we shall have to import and the amount of foreign currency that would be involved; and till Komatzus and MAN perform their agreements, let us try to go a little slow. There is also the difficulty of spare parts, import of fuel, suitability of land for deep ploughing and so on. One major point about mechanisation or rather tractorisation is this. What shall we do with our beef calves in our country? We do not eat beef and a result of tractorisation may be that we shall have to either export the beef or these calves.

16 hrs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the hon. Member should conclude, because he said that this was the last point.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Now, I conclude. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House recommends that the question of introducing co-operative farming be given top priority in the programme of land reforms and agricultural development in the country".

Shri Achar: I beg to submit that this resolution will come within the mischief of entry 14 and entry 32 of the Seventh Schedule of our Constitution. If you analyse the resolution, you will find that the pith and essence of it is that co-operative farming be given top priority in the programme of land reforms and agricultural development in the country. So, there can be no doubt that the

intention of the resolution is, and the wording is also very clear on this point, land reforms and development of agriculture. That is the pith and essence of the resolution. And that will affect development of agriculture. There can be no doubt about it. If we look at entry 14 of List II of the Seventh Schedule, we find it reads thus:

"Agriculture, including agricultural education and research, protection against pests and prevention of plant diseases."

Let alone the method of farming; even education, research, protection against pests and prevention of plant diseases indirectly affect agriculture as contemplated in entry 14. Certainly, about development of agriculture, there can be no doubt at all that it comes within the scope of this State List.

Again, if we look at entry 32 of the II Schedule, we find that it reads:

"Incorporation, regulation and winding up of corporations, other than those specified in List I and universities; unincorporated trading, literary, scientific, religious and other societies and associations; co-operative societies."

So, that is also clearly a State subject. In fact, this point was taken up on an earlier occasion when an amendment to the co-operative law was brought forward, and that objection was upheld.

Therefore, I submit that so far as this resolution is concerned, there can be no doubt that it will affect agriculture; moreover, the resolution also specifically refers to co-operative farming and agricultural development. So, this will come within the mischief of the entries that I have mentioned.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have heard the hon. Member. I wish I could have agreed with him. I would have rather liked it very much because that would save me a lot of worry

[Mr Deputy-Speaker]

and other inconvenience that I am feeling as to how to select the speakers

But my difficulty is that all these Schedules and these Lists were formed under article 246 of the Constitution which reads thus

"(1) Notwithstanding anything in clauses (2) and (3), Parliament has exclusive power to make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List I in the Seventh Schedule "

and similarly, there are provisions with regard to the other lists. The power that the legislature has got is to enact legislation. We are not enacting legislation on those subjects. Then, we have instituted our Planning Commission also, and the development of agriculture and all those schemes that we are formulating have been entrusted to the Planning Commission. Therefore, the discussion of this resolution or even the passing of it is not prohibited under the entries in the List that the hon Member has referred to.

I am very sorry that I cannot agree with him. Now, we take up the amendments that have been tabled to this resolution.

The first amendment is in the name of Shri P R Patel. Does the hon Member want to move it?

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): Yes, I want to move it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think that would be out of order, because he goes much beyond the scope of the resolution. He says

"This House feels that the present urgent need is the increase of food production with other agricultural production and hence nothing may be done which may disturb the present attachment of farmers to lands and the present family holding system. This House

apprehends loss in production in disturbing the present system."

Perhaps, the hon Member seeks to have a chance to speak, and we shall see if he can get it.

Shri D R Chavan's amendment also would share the same fate, because he also says

"This House is further of opinion that no haste be made to disturb the present pattern of individual cultivation unless sufficient experience is gained after first trying the co-operative farming on the surplus and reclaimed lands."

Then, there is an amendment in the name of Shri Shree Narayan Das

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhangha): I am moving it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, this is moved. Then, there is an amendment in the name of Shri N. B Maiti.

Shri N. B. Maiti (Ghata): I am moving it.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: Then, there is an amendment in the name of Shri M C Jam. This also would be out of order. For, he says:

"Steps be taken to simplify co-operative laws and rules and to train adequate administrative and non-official personnel.

(e) Adequate steps be taken to counteract the poisonous propaganda carried on by vested interests even against the principle of co-operative farming."

Shri Raghunbir Sahai (Budaun): May I draw your attention to amendment No 2?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall draw his attention to it, but he has to wait for a little. Amendment No. 7 is in the name of Dr Ram Subhag Singh.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I am moving it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, this is moved. The next one is in the name of Shri Ranga. The hon Member is absent. So, it goes by default. The next one is in the name of Shri Mohammed Imam.

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug) : I am moving it.

Shri R. C. Sharma (Gwahar) : I am moving my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As for Shri Vajpayee's amendment, that is also beyond the scope of the resolution; so, I am afraid it would share the same fate.

Shri Jhulan Sinha (Siwan) : I am moving my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, there are amendments in the name of Shri Bibhuti Mishra.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra (Bagaha) : I am moving.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, both are moved.

Shri Raghbir Sahal : I move my amendment No 2.

Shrimati Ila Palchondhuri (Nabadwip) : I move my amendment No 16.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not yet circulated, I think.

An Hon Member: She has got a copy of it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I come to Shri Raghbir Sahal's amendment.

Shri Raghbir Sahal : I am moving it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is not a substitute resolution, but this seeks to add to the original resolution. As for Sardar A S Saigal's amendment, the hon Member is not here. So, that could not be moved.

Shri Raghbir Sahal : I beg to move. That in the Resolution,—

add at the end—

"and should be taken up first in Gramdan villages and newly

reclaimed agricultural colonies as an experimental measure."

Shri Shree Narayan Das : I beg to move.

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely

"This House is of opinion that the Central Government along with various State Governments should adopt suitable measures for the establishment of Service Co-operatives in the next three years throughout the country and thus creating an atmosphere of co-operation in which formation and development of joint co-operative farming by the people themselves may facilitated."

Shri N. B. Maiti : I beg to move.

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely

"This House is of opinion that the future agrarian pattern should be that of co-operative joint farming, in which the land will be pooled for joint cultivation, the farmers continuing to retain their property rights, and getting a share from the net produce in proportion to their land. Further, those who actually work on the land, whether they own the land or not, will get a share in proportion to the work put in by them on the joint farm.

As a first step, prior to the institution of joint farming, service co-operatives should be organised throughout the country. This stage should be completed within a period of three years. Even within this period, however, wherever possible and generally agreed to by the farmers, joint cultivation may be started."

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh : I beg to move.

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely

"This House recommends that during the next three years every

(Dr. Ram Subhag Singh)

possible effort should be made to organise Service Cooperatives all over the country and to develop the spirit of co-operation in general so that Co-operative Farms may be set up voluntarily by the people concerned wherever conditions are mature."

Shri Mohammed Imam: I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that a Committee be appointed to assess and investigate if suitable conditions exist in the country for starting co-operative farming throughout the country, the effect it will have on the economy of the peasant, production of food and its financial implications to the Government. This House is further of opinion that joint co-operative farming be tried in the first instance on Government lands and on lands acquired through Bhoodan Movement."

Shri B. C. Sharma: I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House recommends that during the next three years every possible effort be made to organise Service Cooperatives all over the country and, in general, to promote the spirit of cooperation in agriculture, so that co-operative farms may be set up voluntarily by the people and for this purpose immediate steps be taken:

(a) to train up adequate cadres of official and non-official personnel for agricultural co-operatives;

(b) to start joint co-operative farms in Gramdan villages, Bhoodan area, reclaimed government lands, Dandakaranya and other projects; and

(c) to complete legislation regarding ceiling on land by the end of 1959."

Shri Jhulan Sinha: I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House is of opinion that in the present state of our agricultural economy co-operative farming is the most practical way of production of more food and for accelerating the pace of attainment of socialistic order in the country. The House, therefore, recommends that prompt steps be taken to prepare the ground for the establishment of co-operative farming in the country by expediting the formation of service co-operatives and fixation of ceiling on land holding."

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that top-most priority be given by Government to the principle of Co-operative farming in the development of agriculture and programme of land reforms, but considers it essential that prior to undertaking farming on a co-operative basis, the basic principles of and benefits accruing from such farming should be made known to farmers within some stipulated period and in the meanwhile appropriate education to farmers be given so that they may make the co-operative farming a success;

This House is further of opinion that Government should frame necessary laws in respect of co-operative farming."

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House recommends to the Government that the Government should organise Co-operative Societies in the country promptly

and steadily during the ensuing three years and introduce them in order to create the spirit of co-operation in the country and thereafter to introduce the co-operative farming at places where the atmosphere for co-operative farming is ripe. In the meantime the Government should provide for imparting suitable education to the farmers in order to make Co-operative farming a success and suitable legislation regarding co-operative farming be formulated."

Shrimati Ha Palchandhuri: I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that the Government of India should take steps:

(1) to bring in suitable legislation in order that co-operative farming may be introduced in the country without delay;

(2) to frame such simple rules under the legislation that the cultivators will not feel any difficulty in joining co-operative farms and be attracted to them; and

(3) to give due consideration in the legislation as regards establishment of small-scale industries and marketing facilities."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, all these amendments as well as the original resolution are before the House. Now, I call upon Shri Nagi Reddy. But there is one thing in regard to the time-limit that is to be placed on speeches. It will be ten minutes. But then whoever has the floor goes on speaking and says he will have another five minutes; that would make it difficult for me. I shall have to enforce this time-limit strictly. Hon. Members should themselves exercise that discipline.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): Will those who are not movers of amendments also get some time?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, surely; and those who have moved may not get necessarily!

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): May I suggest that the time for such an important matter is too short?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No further time should be wasted now. Shri Nagi Reddy. He begins at 4-10.

Shri Nagi Reddy: A great debate is taking place not only here, but all over the country, regarding our aims and the path that we should adopt for our future progress. The debate has begun rather late, but I am glad that it has begun at least now.

All those organisations which have been silent so far regarding certain progressive aspects of our developing economy have begun to raise their voice against everything that is progressive, and they are trying to water down, or to take back, whatever is to be achieved in our country.

For the first time an open cry has been brought out, and I should say a war cry has been given, that if this policy were to be pursued with any vehemence, then there will be bloodshed, or there will be civil war and so on and so forth.

In attacking this policy of land reforms, the policy of ceilings and co-operative farming, they are trying to adopt all methods that are possible. For example, tradition is being brought in to play its role. The peasants are being roused on the basis of the past tradition in which they have been living, and they are being told that they will not have that in future. The peasants are illiterate and not experienced enough in the growing new economic and productive trends that are taking place in the world. This backwardness of the peasantry is being taken advantage of to rouse a kind of revolt in the country against either the land reforms or the question of co-operative farming, in whatever form it may be. Lastly, they have

[Shri Nagi Reddy]

begun to quote even Gandhiji against co-operative farming. That is the whole fun of the matter.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): He is a national heritage. Everybody quotes him or misquotes him.

Shri Nagi Reddy: Yes, and the devils quote him most.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: The question is what the devil is.

Shri Nagi Reddy: Today every kind of advantage is being taken to somehow or other nullify the new trend that is now developing in the country, and we are told that the smaller the farm the greater the production. This is the new economic theory that is being paraded even by those who believe in monopoly control of the largest industrial enterprises in our country. Monopoly control of the largest enterprises is essential for the greater profits of the monopolists, and there that is genuine democracy; and the smallness of the farm is essential for the sake of keeping society as it is, as otherwise, once we begin to change the agricultural pattern in our country, naturally the change will have to develop in the course of history the biggest change, namely the socialisation of industry itself, if not now, some time later. Therefore it is that the ruling party in its resolution has placed before the country the idea of socialism and a socialist society, and it is towards that end that we are expected to progress.

We must think as to how we should change our land relations in our country. Co-operative farming is good, but co-operative farming is of different types. Quite naturally, there is primary farming which is not joint co-operative farming or collective farming of the biggest type. There is no doubt about that. We cannot progress without first beginning with the A B C of our foundations. We must have a very strong foundation to progress towards co-operative farming, and towards that end, the first pre-condition for anything important to be

achieved, is land reforms. Therefore it is that we are told in the Nagpur Resolution that by the end of this year, 1959, the State should come forward with the Bills for ceilings and the whole of the surplus land should be pooled so that we can progress to the next stage.

There are people who oppose the ceilings themselves. As a matter of fact, in his opposition to ceilings, the expert of the Forum of Free Enterprise, Shri Masani, speaking here last time on co-operative farming, said that there were not more than 14 per cent of the landless labourers in our country, and all the rest were peasants. I thought he must have taken his statistics from a very important Government document. But I find that the Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee has given us a detailed account as to what the state of affairs in our country is. It says that 68.9 per cent of the cultivators own less than 15 per cent of the land, and every one who owns, for example, half an acre or one acre, cannot be called a peasant for the simple reason that his main income, the income on which he mainly depends, is the income which he gets from wage-earning. Therefore, when we calculate the actual number of agricultural labourers in our country, we should be able to see the actualities, and the real actuality in our country today is that even after the abolition of the zamindaris, even after the abolition of the princedoms, less than 4.5 per cent of the cultivators own more than 34.4 per cent of the cultivated land. That is the fact of the matter.

Until we change this pattern of society, until land reforms take priority over anything else, and until the surplus land is distributed to the landless poor, to talk of co-operative farming in the sense of changing the pattern of our society is useless, and I do not think co-operative farming will be a real success. Therefore, we should lay our foundations strong, but we are told that smaller farms will be created out of this. If Shri Masani is really true to the ideology for which he stands on land policy, he must have been one of the few who would stand for the division of land because the smaller the farm, the greater the production. Somehow or other, when it came to the question of division of land, he is completely opposed to it. He is opposed to ceiling. The Communist Party believes in larger farms and mechanisation of production, but why does even such a party talk of land distribution? The simple reason is that unless we create a kind of enthusiasm, a kind of enthusiastic atmosphere in the villages through this measure of social justice, there is no possibility of creating co-operation for further progress. Co-operation can be created on the basis of enthusiasm, on the basis of even self-interest. Therefore, co-operatives, to be successful, must play the role of democracy.

Today, what do we find? Quite a number of co-operative societies are not functioning in the interests of the peasant, in the interests of the agricultural labourer, for the simple reason that most of these co-operative societies or organisations are manned by landlords, by money-lenders in the village and traders who have a grip over the whole of the village economy and the village peasants. If we think of co-operative farming in this pattern or condition of society, I am sure that, however good our intentions, they will not yield good results.

It is for this reason that we believe that the first, major important task of the Government is to see that land

reforms are put through as early as possible and surplus lands distributed to landless labour.

Last time, we were told that co-operative farming had failed in all countries. The name of even Mr Gomulka—whom Shri M R Masani quotes quite often—has been brought in and it was said that he has been against co-operative farming. Here is his address to the 8th Plenary Session of the Communist Party of Poland on October 20, 1956. He says

This great social idea of transforming the production relations in the countryside requires not only State assistance in its implementation. It also requires a great amount of explanatory work and clarification to popularise the importance of co-operative farming. In order to build co-operative farms, we need creative and progressive thinking, which is the monopoly of no party and no single man."

Therefore, it is not that he is against co-operative farming. It is that certain pre-conditions should be created, both material and mental, for the proper growth of co-operative farms.

Again, in October 1958, when directions were given to the Party workers, it was said

"The quick and lasting growth of agricultural production, the application of modern technique, the many-fold raise of labour productivity, are possible only on big, compact farms. Such is the way of advance throughout the world."

Whether we like it or not, whether one wishes it or not, that is the way history is going to progress. He says this happens in a capitalist society by taking the form of large agricultural farms in the hands of landlords to the detriment of the small landholders, whereas in a socialist

[Shri Nagi Reddy]

society, it should take a different form. That form is—

"Our way lies in the voluntary joining of peasant land to co-operative farms, husbanding them in various forms, according to peasants' will and adapted to local conditions and needs".

So we see now how people try to quote in their own interests, to save their own property or their own profits even persons in places where they are trying to adopt forms and methods. Of course, in a capitalist democracy they do not believe in giving out the true facts of life as they are from different countries. I should only say that this deceit is not going to bamboozle people who have come to think in terms of land reforms, co-operative farming and future progress.

As the bell has been rung, I would only say one thing, and that is, that simply because the ruling party has accepted co-operative farming and land legislation, to think it should be smooth running is a very dangerous idea. Of course, we all know people like Shri Ranga and Shri M. R. Masani, depend on a certain amount of acceptance of their thought by certain big sections within the ruling party. That, I think is the danger now facing the country as a whole. A warning has been given in one of the articles in the *Economic Weekly*:

"A great day has come, but the fear whether it will happen or not has been expressed".

It is said:

"The unanimous vote on the Nagpur Resolution should not delude anyone into the belief that the august assembly that adopted it were all thirsting for its implementation. There are indications of considerable open opposition. There was widespread mental reservation."

Then it says:

"If left to themselves, some State Governments may just refuse to enact the necessary legislation, or if they are enacted, most of them will have enough loopholes for the landlords to escape".

Therefore, I appeal to the Government to think in terms of reality, in terms of land reform and land distribution and then begin in a slow progress from the first stage of co-operation to the higher stage of co-operative farming, in between trying to develop the necessary cadre that is essential and also trying to build up the people's role that is most essential to implement either land reforms or co-operative farming.

Dr. Ram Subbag Singh: I am glad that my hon. friend, Shri U. C. Patnaik, has focussed the attention of the House on one of the most burning topics of the day. I appreciate the idea contained in his Resolution as modified by our amendment. The amendment which stands in the names of several of my colleagues and of myself reads:

"This House recommends that during the next three years every possible effort should be made to organise service co-operatives all over the country and to develop the spirit of co-operation in general so that co-operative farms may be set up voluntarily by the people concerned wherever conditions are mature".

We have heard enough quotations from foreign countries and I do not want to tire the patience of the House by quoting any more authority. I simply want to take our friends to the conditions which exist in our own rural areas. There are three aspects to our amendment. The first is that during the coming three years, service co-operatives should be organised throughout the country and a climate of co-operation should be created among the peasants so that co-operative farming may be organised voluntarily wherever conditions are

mature.

But the chief aim of all these is that we want to change our family pattern of farming into co-operative farming. Everyone of us knows how this idea originated. This idea originated because of the slow progress in our agricultural production, or rather due to the severe fall in production in 1957-58. The fall was to the tune of over 6 million tons. Agricultural production went up only by 18.4 per cent over the figure of 1949-50.

Apart from this fall in production, this idea also got force due to rise in prices. Even today during Question Hour, my hon. friend, Shri A. M. Thomas, said that they have fixed the price of gram in Rajasthan at Rs. 10.50, but they are not in a position to put any check on the price of gram or dal in Delhi or anywhere else. The same commodity is selling at Rs. 30 or so in other markets. Dal is selling at a still higher prices.

Therefore, because of these, people started thinking that we should make some change in our agricultural pattern—due to fall in production and rise in prices. Also because of the maldistribution of our commodities, it was thought that we should also change the distributing agency. So the idea of co-operative farming and of State trading in foodgrains came into being. I am sorry that though these two ideas came into being long ago, they have not yet received any push, and the idea of State trading is still in embryo—the scheme has not yet been finalised.

Besides, the growth of our population is very rapid. Every year our population is increasing by about 6 million. So we have to import large quantities of foodgrains from foreign countries. Even last year, we had to import about 3.17 million tons which cost us over Rs. 120 crores. All these things are happening not because of the fault of the peasants. Just like Shri Patnaik I would like to give some credit to our peasants because it is they who have succeeded in increasing our agricultural production,

whatever may be the quantum of increase. I would also like to repudiate the insinuation made against them that they are not of a co-operative mind, because those who say that they are not trained in the spirit of co-operation have not studied the mind of the farmers.

After having seen this state of affairs about production, prices, population and import of foodgrains, I would like to say something about the condition of agriculture in our country. As was pointed out, our farm sizes are very small and about 59.1 per cent of our farms are below 5 acres. Only 1.4 per cent of our farms are above 50 acres. So, much of the time and energy of the farmers are wasted in taking their bullocks or agricultural implements and other things to the farms and again bringing them back to their villages. This wastage can be avoided if consolidation of holdings is effected. Though some State Governments like Bombay, Punjab and also U.P. and some others have undertaken this measure, still they have not been successful in making any rapid advance and only about 15 million or 16 million acres of land have been consolidated. This is a very small percentage. Despite this, the pressure on land is increasing every day not only because of increase of population but also because of elimination of cottage industry in the rural areas.

For instance, people who used to live in mud houses or thatched or tiled houses and persons who were carrying on the business of tile-making etc. are being compelled, due to an increase in the standard of life or due to certain other conditions or due to increase in technology and machines, to take to some sort of farming which may be good or bad. But, now, the only source of their livelihood is to depend upon farms. Therefore, despite consolidation, due to increasing pressure on land, the holdings are becoming more uneconomic and smaller.

If we go to the villages and see them, we will find that at least the small cultivators do their harvesting

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

work or threshing operations—even ploughing and levelling—on co-operative lines because they cannot afford to have a good number of bullocks etc. Apart from that, it is inherent in their system that they should work on co-operative lines. The fault is ours because our departments have not studied the co-operative form of work which exists among our villagers. Had they studied it, the present problems would not have arisen.

Now, the point is that until and unless we increase the fertility of the soil the farmers would be nowhere and the country also would be nowhere. It would not be possible for the farmer to increase the fertility of the soil without proper manuring, irrigation and other things. And, these things, canals and fertiliser factories cannot be constructed or built by the farmers. They will have to depend on big investment or better organisation and that can only be possible if Government or some better organisations come to their rescue.

Therefore, I think, if they are organised on a co-operative basis that problem could be solved. But, for getting them organised on this basis, it is necessary that a climate of co-operation should be created; and that could be created only when no individual is left to have large means of production, because, by having larger means of production, one is in a position to exploit another man's labour. In order to avoid that, ceiling is necessary. It is also necessary that we should end this exploitation not only there but everywhere. The ceiling should be put on means of production and also on the means of distribution by State activity such as State trading. But the challenge is not so much to the farmers today because as I said they are already to some extent having some sort of co-operation. The only thing required is to encourage them. But the challenge is before the Government because a better organisation is needed—a better organisation with membership of persons who are

known for their honesty and integrity and efficiency. Without efficiency, it may not be possible to cut much ice and the Government should also make up its mind that once we formulate any policy, we must have a firm determination to implement it.

श्री बाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं श्री पटनायक के प्रस्ताव का विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ. . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : इसीलिए तो मैंने आपको बुलाया है।

श्री बाजपेयी : मेरा निवेदन यह है कि देश की भाज की परिस्थिति में सहकारी खेती न तो व्यवहारिक है और न बांछनीय है। यदि यह कहा जाय कि सहकारी खेती का उद्देश्य उत्पादन में वृद्धि करना है तो मेरा निवेदन है कि इस बात को तो सभी स्वीकार करेंगे कि परिवर्तन के काल में उत्पादन घटेगा और उसके परिणामस्वरूप जो कठिनाइयाँ उत्पन्न होंगी, शायद उनका सामना हम ठीक तरीके से नहीं कर सकेंगे।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि हमारे देश में कृषि की भूमि कम है और जन संख्या अधिक है। स्पष्ट है कि यदि हमें कृषि का उत्पादन बढ़ाना है तो हमें कम से कम जमीन में अधिक से अधिक पैदा करने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये अभी तक का अनुभव यह है कि जिस मात्रा में किसान की खेती बढ़ती जाती है उस किसान की नजर में उस खेती के एक एकड़ की कीमत उतनी ही कम होती जाती है। अगर हम घनी खेती करना चाहते हैं जिसके कि बिना देश की खाद्य समस्या का कोई हल नहीं है तो घनी खेती का एक ही धर्म है कि हम ऐसे बड़े फार्म बनाने को निरुत्साहित करें जिनकी कि पूरी तरह से देखभाल नहीं की जा सकती।

अगर हम बड़े पैमाने पर खेती करेंगे तो हमें खेती का यंत्रीकरण करना पड़ेगा। अभी हमारे एक कम्युनिस्ट दोस्त ने यंत्रीकरण

की बकालत की है, यन्त्रीकरण, यिर्कना-इन्वेषण की बकालत की है। मेरा निवेदन है कि खेती का यन्त्रीकरण करने से हम कुछ लोगों को जो कि आज कृषि पर निर्भर करते हैं, उनको हम कृषि से अलग कर देंगे। प्रश्न यह है कि उन्हें फिर कहा खपाया जायगा ?

श्री ७० राम सुभग सिंह कह रहे थे कि सरकार ने कुटीर उद्योगों की धीरे ध्यान नहीं दिया। मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर आप सहकारी खेती करेंगे तो गांधी में बेकारी बढेगी। अगर उन कामों से निकले हुए लोगों को गृह उद्योगों में खपाने की आपकी कोई योजना हो जो कि अभी तक दिखाई नहीं देती तो मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि सहकारी खेती बेकारी की समस्या को उभर करने में सहायक होगी।

तीसरी बात। खेती का यन्त्रीकरण हमारे देश में आज की परिस्थिति में, जबकि हम विदेशों से बड़ी मात्रा में माल का आयात कर रहे हैं, शायद ठीक नहीं होगा। बैल की जगह ट्रैक्टर का प्रयोग अनुप्य को तो बेकार बनायेगा ही, अगर साथ में जमीन की उत्पादन क्षमता को भी कम करता जायेगा। उत्तर प्रदेश के राजस्व मंत्री चौधरी चरण सिंह जी ने एक पुस्तक लिखी है कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग के बारे में। उस में उन्होंने यह आकड़ दे कर सिद्ध किया है कि बैल की तुलना में अगर ट्रैक्टर से खेती होगी तो धीरे धीरे जमीन की उत्पादन क्षमता कम होती जायेगी। फिर ट्रैक्टर बनाने का सवाल है, वह काहे से चलेंगे। मेरा निवेदन है कि हम ट्रैक्टर और बैल की उपयोगिता पर विचार करें। ट्रैक्टर तेल पीता है और धुआ निकालता है। तेल हमारे देश में पैदा नहीं होता, धुएं का हमारे पास कोई उपयोग नहीं है। और बैल घास खाता है, गोबर करता है। ये दो धार्मिक चक्र हैं, ट्रैक्टर, धुआं, और घास, बैल और गोबर हमारी जो पुरानी अर्थ

व्यवस्था है वह एक दूसरे पर निर्भर है। घास हमारे यहाँ अपने आप पैदा होती है, उसे खा कर बैल खेती करता है, फिर गोबर करता है। फिर उस से घास पैदा होती है जिसे बैल खाता है और खेती करता है। इस तरह से घास, बैल और गोबर एक ही जर्जर की तीन कड़ियाँ हैं। और ट्रैक्टर ? तेल है ईरान में, ट्रैक्टर है हिन्युस्तान में और धुआं है आसमान में। तीनों के बीच में कोई सगति नहीं है। तो मेरा निवेदन है कि खेती का यन्त्रीकरण भारत के हित में नहीं है। हमें उस को निरस्त/रहित करना चाहिये। लेकिन सहकारी खेती में यन्त्रीकरण अनिवार्य है।

एक और आपत्ति की बात है। ये सहकारी समितियाँ कौन बनायेगा। अभी तक हमारे देश में कर्जा देने के लिये सहकारी समितियों का जो अनुभव है वह अच्छा नहीं है। यह तो ठीक है कि कर्ज के लिये, खाद के लिये हम सेवा सहकार समितियाँ बनाये। मेरा उस से विरोध नहीं है। लेकिन उस सम्बन्ध में भी अभी तक जो काम हुआ है उसे सतोषजनक नहीं कहा जा सकता और अगर हम भूमि को मिलायेंगे, भूमि को मिला कर खेती करने की बात करेंगे, तो उस कार्य के लिये जो सेवा सहकार समितियाँ बनेंगी, धीरे धीरे उन पर नौकरशाही का प्रभाव बढ़ता जायेगा, धीरे धीरे वे सरकार के नियंत्रण में आती जायेंगी और सहकारी खेती के द्वारा भारत का किसान, जो अपना स्वतंत्र पेशा करता है, वह किसी सरकार का नौकर नहीं है, न किसी पूँजीपति का गुलाम, वह किसान जो सरकारी मशीन का एक पुरजा बन जायेगा।

अब यह कहा जाता है कि सहकारी खेती में शामिल होने के लिये किसानों से जबरदस्ती नहीं की जायेगी। मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर आप जबरदस्ती नहीं करेंगे तो किसान सहकारी खेती में शामिल नहीं होगा। इसलिये ईमानदारी का तकाजा तो यह है कि आप खुले खुले शब्दों में कहें कि हमें

[श्री बाजपेयी]

जबरदस्ती करनी पड़ेगी, और मैं कहना चाहता - कि योजना आयोग ने पहले से ही अपनी रिपोर्ट में लिखा रखा है कि शासन की ओर से प्राप्त होने वाली सुविधाएँ सहकारी खेती को ही मिलनी चाहिये। जो किसान सहकारी खेती में शामिल नहीं होगा, उस किसान को प्राप ऋण नहीं देंगे, पानी नहीं देंगे, बीज नहीं देंगे, उस के मार्ग में धनेको कठिनाइया उत्पन्न करेंगे और उसे विवश हो कर सहकारी खेती में शामिल होना पड़ेगा। और कांग्रेस की भूमि सुधार समिति ने भी इस बात को लिखा हुआ है कि यदि स्वयं स्फूर्त प्रयत्नों का कोई दृश्य परिणाम नहीं निकला तो धनिवार्यता की पद्धति अपनायी पड़ेगी। दुनिया के किसी देश में सहकारी खेती

एक माननीय सवस्य : यह कौन सी रिपोर्ट में लिखा है ?

श्री बाजपेयी : कांग्रेस की लैड रिफार्म कमेटी ने लिखा है। प्राप उस की रिपोर्ट पढ़ लें। मैं प्राप को दे सकता हूँ।

दुनिया के किसी देश में सहकारी खेती बिना सरकार, दबाव के सफल नहीं हुई है। और हम इस बात को नहीं भूल सकते कि हमारा देश एक लोकतन्त्री देश है। यहाँ बिरोधी दल है, समाचार पत्र है, उन की प्रालोचनार्थें होंगी।

चीन का उदाहरण दिया जाता है। चीन में तानाशाही है, वहाँ विनायकवाद है। वहाँ बिरोध के लिये कोई स्थान नहीं है। प्राप जो सहकारी खेती का समर्थन करते हैं, वही बैठमेट लैबी के खिलाफ हिन्दुस्तान में आन्दोलन करते हैं, और यह सारे आन्दोलन प्राप को भुगतने पड़ेंगे। सहकारी खेती को सफल करने के लिये वैसा शासनतंत्र चाहिये वह शासनतंत्र प्राप हमारे पास नहीं है। जो चकबन्दी गाँवों में

हुई है प्राप उस का अध्ययन करें। चकबन्दी प्रणाली बीज है। सब उस का सिद्धान्तः समर्थन करते हैं। उस के सम्बन्ध में कोई बिरोध नहीं है। अगर चकबन्दी में भी कितना प्रष्टाचार हुआ है। किसानों के मन में वह कितनी अनिश्चितता उत्पन्न करेगा। अगर प्राप विचार करें तो प्राप को कुछ कल्पना हो सकती है कि सहकारी खेती को कार्यन्वित करने में हमें कितनी कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ेगा।

मैं भ्रन्त में यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वस्तुतः सहकारी खेती का उद्देश्य क्या है। कभी कहा जाता है कि सहकारी खेती का उद्देश्य उत्पादन बढ़ाना है, और कभी कहा जाता है कि कम्युनिज्म प्रा रहा है, उसे रोकने के लिये हम सहकारी खेती करना चाहते हैं।

एक माननीय सवस्य : यह कौन कहता है ?

श्री बाजपेयी : मैं नहीं समझता कि कम्युनिज्म के तरीको को अपना कर हम कम्युनिज्म को कैसे रोक सकते हैं।

एक माननीय सवस्य : प्रलवार में यह द्वाप है कि धर्म मंत्री या वित्त मंत्री ने ऐसा कहा है।

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): It has been wrongly reported. That is all I can say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That has been wrongly reported.

श्री बाजपेयी : अगर वह गलत रिपोर्ट है तो मुझे खुशी है।

Shri Morarji Desai: I only said that some people say that this is so. I said, "No." I also said that democracy does not depend entirely on co-operative farming or co-operative things. But co-operation must be certainly there

to strengthen democracy, and democracy can be guaranteed only by co-operation. That is all that I said.

श्री बाबूजी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने आप से विवेकन किया कि सहकारी खेती के परिणामस्वरूप हमारे देश में लोकतन्त्र की जड़ें कमजोर होंगी। गांवों में एक भ्रष्टाचार उत्पन्न होगा, बंकारी में वृद्धि होगी और किसान अपनी मेहनत से कम से कम जमीन में अधिक से अधिक फलान पैदा करने की उस की प्रेरणा नष्ट हो जायेगी। जमीन का हमारे किसान के साथ बड़ा गहरा सम्बन्ध है। भारत का किसान अपनी जान दे देगा मगर जमीन नहीं देगा, और अगर आप जबरवस्ती सहकारी खेती थोपना चाहेंगे, तो उस के परिणाम भ्रष्टाचार नहीं होंगे, इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ।

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my friend Shri Patnaik in his resolution wants to give top priority to co-operative farming in the programme of land reforms and agricultural development of the country I am afraid that co-operative farming cannot be taken out of its context of land reforms Land reforms occupy a special and significant place in our planned economy, because they provide the social, economic and institutional framework for agricultural development and because of the influence they exert on the vast majority of population The ambitious programme for industrial development envisaged in the second Plan also depend to a large extent on the surpluses to be created by the Indian agriculture to meet the steadily increasing claims both on raw materials and food production Against this background, the objectives of land reforms are two-fold. Firstly, to remove such impediments upon agricultural production as arise from the character of the agrarian structure, and secondly, to create conditions for evolving as speedily as possible an

agrarian economy with high levels of efficiency and productivity.

The two vital decisions contained in the Nagpur Congress resolution are, a ceiling on land holdings and co-operative joint farming That resolution took into account the fact that millions of landless people and holders of uneconomic holdings cannot be rehabilitated on an individual basis Therefore, the obvious alternative was co-operative joint farming

Co-operation, like any other institutional organisation, must first of all have a definite purpose and meet the developmental needs They must also adapt themselves to the economic, social and political situations, temperamental and ideological characteristics of the people

While co-operative joint farming is a new technique of tackling economic development, which brings about a social change, the resolution has proceeded on a very cautious and flexible basis The most important part of the Nagpur resolution is the second part which says

“As a first step prior to the institution of joint co-operative farming, service co-operatives should be organised throughout the country This stage might be reached within a period of three years Even within this period, however whenever possible and generally agreed to by the farmers, joint cultivation may be started.”

Therefore, it is a cautious and flexible approach and it is not possible to rush through co-operative joint farming at the outset.

The present food situation in the country calls for immediate action If the programme of organising service co-operatives is started in every village in right earnest, it will go a long way towards increasing the agricultural production in the country While there is controversy in the country about joint co-operative farming, all sections are agreed that service co-operatives play a vital role

[Shri Jaganatha Rao]

in augmenting agricultural production in the country. The Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee in 1949 and the Planning Commission also recommended that experiments in co-operative farming should be started. However, much progress has not been made, and this fact has been taken into consideration when the Nagpur Congress resolution was passed. The Planning Commission wanted that at least 3,000 co-operative societies should be formed. Much progress not having been made, the resolution proceeded on a cautious basis and said that as a first step, service co-operatives should be introduced in every village, so that people will get accustomed to this and ultimately, they will agree to co-operative joint farming.

This programme of service co-operatives should be accepted by all sections of thought. Those who believe in co-operative joint farming must agree to this because it is a first step in that direction. Those who are opposed to joint co-operative farming should also agree, because the service co-operatives will result in increased agricultural production and also in raising the standard of the people, and eliminating unemployment.

Co-operative joint farming is only the means or the first step, because under the first and second Plans, the ultimate objective laid down is co-operative village management. So, to create this climate and feeling amongst the villagers, we should go in a phased manner. Then, we can be sure of quick results. Even the Planning Commission expressed the view that during the transition period leading to the ultimate goal of co-operative village management, in every village lands will be managed in three different ways: there will be some individual farmers cultivating their lands; groups of farmers pooling their lands into co-operative farming units; some lands belonging to the village community; and lands available for settlement of landless people. During this transition period, there

will be an individual sector, a voluntary co-operative sector and a community sector in every village. This ultimately will lead to the establishment of village co-operative management.

The Planning Commission undertook a study of the working of the various co-operative farms in India and from their report you find that defects like lack of spirit of co-operation amongst the members of co-operative farming societies led to the co-operatives being run more or less in a bureaucratic manner like the joint-stock companies. Again if there is a member owning 2 acres of land and another owning 1 acre, the member who owns 2 acres does not like that the man owning only 1 acre should get the same benefit, because that 1 acre is not as fertile as his 2 acres of land. Similarly, a man who owns one acre of land thinks that by introducing improved seeds and intensive methods of cultivation he can produce much more, or as much as the one owning two acres of land. Then, we find that in the villages the landless labour will get a share without owning any share in the land. But then there are several complexes which have to be removed. People have to be educated. We must raise the educational and cultural level of the people. We must also give them considerable experience so that they can get accustomed to this co-operative way of life. To make these co-operatives successful we must create a cohesive force and sustaining faith in them.

The objections raised by some sections of the people to joint co-operative farming are more or less ideological. It is said that introduction of co-operative joint farming is the backdoor method of ushering in communism. They are entirely mistaken. It is a purely voluntary affair. We find that according to the 1951 census 70 per cent of the population live on agriculture, out of whom 19 per cent are landless and 48 per cent own lands ranging

from 1 to 4 acres Now the uneconomic holdings can take advantage of the services of the co-operatives They will help them a great deal

It is also said that co-operatives in the Eastern European countries have resulted in poor production They are again mistaken In those countries it is collective farming where the individual has no freedom Further, in those countries collective farming is resorted to so that they can raise maximum capital for industries and gam of industrial labour, whereas the main objective of co-operative joint farming here is to increase the agricultural production and also to raise the rural welfare of the people

So, this being the background, I am afraid the analogy which is relied upon by the opponents to this co-operative joint farming is not correct This is a purely voluntary affair and people who are capable of cultivating their lands up to a certain standard are left out for the present The hon Member, Shri Ranga, has referred to peasant proprietors They can stay out Nobody compels them to join

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order Why should there be so much of incoherent voices when we are discussing co-operation?

Shri Jaganatha Rao: So, my submission is that co-operative joint farming here is purely voluntary without any measure of force or coercion To create the proper climate in the country, in the masses, that co-operative joint farming is to their advantage, the Nagpur Resolution says that it should be introduced in a phased manner Therefore, the Resolution of my hon friend, Shri Patnaik, which seeks to give top priority to it, I submit, is not feasible, and so I oppose that resolution On the other hand, the amendment of Dr Ram Subhag Singh meets the need of the hour

Shri P. B. Patel: Mr Deputy-Speaker, it has been stated by my hon friend, Dr Ram Subhag Singh,

that we are resorting to co-operative farming because we want mass production, because the prices are soaring high and because there is much burden on land But if we go through the statistics, in our country in 1955-56 the cultivable waste lands are 5 42 crores of acres, and fallow lands are 5 97 crore acres That means that 11 crore acres which can be cultivated are not cultivated Whose fault is this? It is not for me to say But we have not given full care to cultivation and agriculturists at large of the country

17 hrs.

I would quote another figure The total crop area in 1955-56 was 36 33 crore acres Out of this only 31 98 crore acres were under cultivation That means that about 5 crore acres were not cultivated even though that was under the crop area

Then, another argument is put forward that there are so many labourers in the rural area What to do with them? The general idea is to give them land That idea is, land to the landless I would give some figures for that also In our country owner-cultivators are 167 3 million, tenant-cultivators are 31 6 million and cultivating labourers are 44 8 million, that is about 12 6 per cent of the whole population I would ask a question, that is, whether farming requires any labour or not? If a factory requires labour, farming also requires labour and if we eliminate labour then how farming is going to be done? That is also a measure to be considered But I do not go into it

Then, another point has been put forward and that is that it is only the co-operatives that will give more yield As the time is very short I would read some passages First, I would read a passage from the Report of the Indian Delegation to China on Agrarian Co-operatives I read a passage on page 9 of the Report In villages in China, so highly spoken of, the Report says

"There was no source of pure water supply in the villages Many

[Shri P R Patel]

wells were flush with the ground and the water supply was contaminated."

This is the condition of the villagers in China, with high ideals and whatever talks we may hear today! Then it further states

"Every family in the co-operative had been allotted a small plot of land close to their house for vegetable cultivation. If there was no suitable land near the house, a piece of land in the fields close to the village site was given. This appeared to be the general system in all the co-operatives. These plots were very carefully and intensively cultivated and it was a treat to see many of them growing a rich crop of vegetables."

What does it show? It shows one thing. It shows that individual farming yields more. This shows another thing, that, if there is attachment to land, naturally that also helps in more production. However, I would say to hon. Members that we cannot just imitate China. I will leave it to our friends here to think over that. We have to follow democratic methods and we should follow the best thing that could be done in this country.

Then, I would like to refer to a small passage from the Report of the Indian Co-operative Delegation to USSR and Czechoslovakia. It states as follows on page 35

"Private plots are available even on State farms. In certain instances the private income is as high as 50 per cent of the total income of a person from the collective."

If a man joins the Collective farming and whatever he gets for all the labour from a plot allotted to him, he gets 50 per cent of the income that he gets from this Collective farm. It has been stated here that whatever is produced there in private farms is

allowed to be sold at whatever price they can obtain, while here our policy is quite the reverse. We do not like that farmers should get more. But in Russia, whatever yields they could sell in the market after giving to the State its fixed share at a fixed price and they can fetch any price and there is no limit. We are talking of ceiling here. We do not say that farmers should get more from the yields.

Then, I would like to refer to the experience of Yugoslavia. I would only read a few lines about this because I have very little time at my disposal. There is an article written by Pasko Romac, a Communist—I think a well-informed Communist than any of my hon. friends sitting here in this House (*Interruptions*). They also introduced co-operative farming. The result was that the yield went down instead of getting more. The experience of Yugoslavia will help us because it shows to us that Co-operative farming does not increase production but, on the contrary, it decreases production. So, they gave over lands to individuals. That created initiative in the farmers. That helps to achieve more and more production. I will only read one line from the article. It will help us.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: Only two minutes more.

Shri P. R. Patel: I will read a few lines only from this article by Pasko Romac. He says

"Production, as a matter of fact, greatly fell and did not leave any surplus for marketing. The society invested large funds in these co-operatives, but they did not bring results."

So, a more elastic system has to be found which would appeal more to increasing production. In 1953, the Yugoslav Government passed the regulation on the reorganisation of the peasants' working co-operatives. The basis of this regulation was that peasants were free to remain in or leave

the peasants' working co-operatives. The result of the passing of this regulation was that the majority of the co-operatives disintegrated, since the peasants withdrew their membership from the co-operatives. The land was returned to the peasants, and they began again to work as individual producers. So, this is the experience of a satellite country of Russia. I would just read out a line about the experience of Poland. Very recently, there was a meeting of the third Congress of the Polish United Workers' Communist Party at Warsaw. Their experience is as follows:

"The party and Government will not act on the advice of those dogmatists who would like to speed up the development of co-operative farming with the help of administrative measures, without taking into account the degree of consciousness of the peasant masses or the need to protect the country from a regression in agricultural production similar to that which we experienced between 1951 and 1953."

And the result was

"The Polish communists will continue to place their main hopes upon the so-called 'middle peasant' who owns less than the fixed limit of 20 hectares (approximately 50 acres)."

So, they also bade good-bye to co-operative farming and turned to individual farming, or family farming.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Member should conclude now.

Shri P. E. Patel: I would not take more than a minute. It is said that production increases because of co-operative farming. But I would submit that this is not a correct statement. I would just read out a line from the book *Indian Agriculture in Brief* published by the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India. There, at page 34, we find....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He might just give the reference only.

Shri P. E. Patel: At page 36 of the book, we find that in China the paddy yield per acre was 2,387 lbs, while in U.S.A. it was 3,030 lbs; in Russia, it was 1,918 lbs. So, you will be pleased to see from this that the production in America is more than what it is in Russia and in China or in other countries.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): The temperature is different.

Shri P. E. Patel: That is so in wheat, maize and other things also.

17 13 hrs

[MR SPEAKER in the Chair]

So, so far as the figures etc. are concerned, they show clearly whether co-operation will increase production or not. But certainly there is one thing, that is, that it will kill democracy, I have no doubt regarding this.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should like to express my gratification at the fact that the hon. Member has brought this resolution before this House. I should like to express also my peculiar satisfaction that this subject of co-operation and co-operative farming has met, to a small extent, with rather aggressive and virulent opposition from some people, some Members in this House and some people outside, because it would have been a pity if a move of this kind should have been quietly and unthinkingly accepted without considering all the consequences of it. Therefore, the person most to be congratulated is the hon. Member who is not here.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I am here.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, I was not referring to the hon. Member Shri Patnaik, but to another hon. Member who is not here, and who had opposed this idea with a wealth of rhetorical

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

vituperation which is perhaps unparalleled in this House.

I welcome this because we want this subject to be understood, to be treated as a live subject as it is, and not accepted as many things are willy nilly and then allowed to be passed by.

I must confess, though, that I have not been quite able to understand still, in spite of the strength of language used sometimes on the other side, the rationale or the logic or the reasonableness or the science of the opposition to this. I can understand, of course, an unreasoned passion, prejudice, a difficulty to comprehend something which you are not used to, apprehension, fear of everything new. That, of course, one always has to meet with whenever there is any kind of step forward, but the attempt to argue and reason about this has not been understood by me because in spite of every effort I have not followed that argument.

What are we after? You can put it in any way you like. We are after, well, broadly speaking, raising the standards of our people, increasing our production, organising or reorganising our agrarian economy, so that it can yield better results and bring better results for the people indulging in it and for the country. We are after having higher forms of social organisation; we are after having a social organisation which helps in realising the social objectives that we have in view. There are so many ways of approaching this question. These are positive approaches. Let us examine the negative approach, and it is only the negative approach that applies to hon. Members who oppose this idea.

The negative approach is: do not do it, it is dangerous, people will not like it, there will be trouble; and sometimes, it is even said that it will lessen, lower production. Well, of course, if any step that we take lessens production, not suddenly but basically,

then it is a wrong step. It is not a matter for argument. If anything is done which basically lowers our production, yield per acre, it is a wrong step, because, obviously, we are aiming at higher production, and one reason, among others, why we commend the co-operative method is to increase production. If one wants to argue on that subject, one should argue on the basis of facts, figures etc., and present a scientific argument. There is no good my making a statement, and an hon. Member contradicting that statement.

Nevertheless, I want this House to consider for a minute the negative aspects of it. If we do not do it, then what do we do about our agrarian economy and agriculture—that is, if we leave it in the small tiny patches, tiny holdings, the poor farmers struggling hard to eke out a poor subsistence, some a little better, some a little worse, but all really on a level of just eking out their subsistence; a bad harvest comes and they are knocked on the head.

Now, it is conceivable that with a great deal of help from the State, or otherwise, the yield might go up a little—by better seeds, better this, better that, slightly better techniques, although hon. Member Shri Vajpayee does not seem to like any better techniques because that might be mechanisation. If you use a better plough, it may be mechanisation. I do not know at what stage mechanisation comes in.

Shri Vajpayee: I am opposed to tractors, to the use of tractors.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I see. I do not know if the hon. Member is opposed to a big tractor or a small tractor, or all tractors. 'Tractor' is a vague word. There are tractors almost as big as half the size of this House; there are tractors as small as a tiny car—just an overgrown plough is a tractor.

So I am not entering into that argument. But it is worth considering what all this leads to. What is the negative aspect? Leaving things as they are, I submit, leads to the inevitable conclusion that you want to petrify the poverty of the peasants and the poverty of this country. I say there is no escape from that conclusion, leaving things as they are. Of course, it may be that this process may take a little longer for them to go under, but most of them live at the verge.

Therefore, the first thing that we have to decide is that we cannot leave things as they are. Or, if you like to put it this way, we are just not going to admit or accept the fact of Indian poverty continuing or the poverty of our agricultural classes continuing. And if Shri Masani's views are accepted, whatever may happen to the cities or industries—they may advance or not—one thing is certain, that the Indian peasant remains poor and becomes poorer and poorer, with his small patch of land, and he just never gets out of this morass of poverty.

Now that is a conclusion which, I am quite certain, nobody will thinkingly accept; they may unthinkingly—some hon Members apparently do—but thinkingly they will not accept, because we all want progress.

Now, therefore, the negative aspect has to be ruled out. The positive aspect has to be put there, the positive aspect of increasing our food production, of reforming our agrarian economy and all that. How? Now, I do not mean to say that there is only one particular way of doing it—I mean one rigid way—although the broad approach may be more or less the same.

Also consider this. While we may compare conditions in Russia or China or Yugoslavia or Poland or America and we should profit by them—I see absolutely no reason why we should not profit by something that has been

done in America or China or Russia or Poland or Yugoslavia—I just do not understand this kind of apprehension and fear that we may do something that has been done in China and that may lead us to perdition. I do not accept the basic philosophy, if I may use the word, of China at present; it is up to them to do what they like, and it is up to me to do what I like, as I do not accept the basic philosophy of any other countries. But I do accept the fact that if a country does something well, I should profit by it and learn from it and copy it, if necessary, whether it is America or China or Russia or Poland or any other country.

But having said that, it is also equally important to remember that anything that we do should fit in with conditions in India. We have to evolve our own policies, profiting by the experience of the rest of the world. Again, in evolving our policies, there is a major consideration, that is, however good some kind of social progress might be, ultimately social progress comes from certain objective conditions existing in that area, in that country where we are doing that. The best of theoretical approaches will not fit in if the objective conditions are not ready for it. All these factors have to be borne in mind.

Now, I have not a shadow of doubt—I say so with respect to those who may disagree with me—that co-operatives are the right approach, that co-operative farming is the right objective to aim at. The only criticism that might be a valid criticism—I do not say it is—is, how far our objective conditions in all the parts of India are suited for that at the present moment? Might be. Or one may say—and rightly say—'You cannot have this kind of thing which requires a good deal of training, without any trained persons to do it; you cannot simply pass a law and expect things to happen'. Now, these are right approaches and right criticisms which we can answer or remedy or do away

(Shri Jawaharlal Nehru)

with by training people or by creating those objective conditions. That is a different matter. That is the scientific approach to the problem. It is not good enough just to say that co-operative farming or co-operatives are unsuited or something new or something against the genius of the Indian people, something against the lack of genius of the Indian farmer—call it whatever you like—and, therefore, you must not have them. That, of course, has no meaning. That is an unscientific approach. And, if you accept that, you accept remaining sunk in poverty all the time because you can never go ahead without doing something new.

On the other hand, it would not be correct to say that co-operative farming is good and, therefore, have it everywhere tomorrow, because, that, I think, is difficult. I agree with Shri Patnaik that it would not be practicable for me to say something which I cannot do. In doing that I have to prepare the ground, I have to prepare the people's minds, I have to win them over.

And, there is the question—I think Shri Vajpayee referred to it with some force of voluntariness or not. That too is an odd question. It is an odd question so long as our Constitution, as it is today, remains in this country. If the Constitution is broken down and changed, I do not know what will happen. I cannot guarantee then. But, so long as the Constitution is here,—a democratic Constitution,—these fears and apprehensions are unfounded. But, I would go further than that. It is difficult—I would say almost impossible in Indian conditions, certainly impossible, elsewhere it is hardly possible—to bring about this kind of change-over over a wide country by methods of compulsion. You cannot. You can pass a law in a sense; but you have to get people to work that law and get people in hundreds and millions to work that law. Otherwise, you do not succeed

even if you are prepared to have a measure of compulsion.

And yet it seems to me quite absurd to say that one farmer can hold up the whole village and can prevent that whole village from going ahead. I do not accept that position. I want to make it perfectly clear. If you accept that position there will be no law passed by this Parliament or by a village panchayat or by the village co-operative; it is impossible. If the village co-operative wants to do something and one man says, 'No, I veto it', the village co-operative becomes helpless. No co-operative can function like that, no panchayat can function like that, no legislature can function. Democracy does not mean that each person can hold up the rest of the community. So, fundamentally, this thing can only come by a widespread general acceptance of it, some enthusiastic acceptance of it, if you like, rather passive acceptance, but acceptance.

Then again Shri Vajpayee talked about pressures being exercised and among them, I believe, he mentioned—Oh, you stop water and this and that. I want to make it perfectly clear that if we consider a policy a right policy, we shall give every incentive in favour of that policy. Not a question of pressure. Yes, it would be a wrong pressure to cut off water. I do not mean that kind of thing, but, of course, other incentives just as today we give or try to give incentives to the good farmer who grows more and give prizes or awards and take him for Bharat darshan or a tour all round, whatever you like. That is a different matter. We give him incentives. For a right policy we have to do it. Are we to give incentives for sloth for the lazy farmer, the bad farmer, the backward farmer or to a person who just refuses to change even though the world may change? Surely, we are going to give incentives.

Shri P. B. Patel: Will it not be discrimination if some preference is given to one type of farmer?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It will be discrimination. We will exercise this discrimination every time for better work. Discrimination is given to the better worker by better wages. He produces more and we give him better wages. Discrimination is allowed to the better farmer because, of course, he produces more. That is a type of incentive that you do always give. In fact, I should like that type of discrimination somehow to be applied to all our factories and farms and plants and even government services. But, it is difficult in government service because in government service everything goes by time-scale and time-scale rather suppresses

I put it to this House that we had rather slightly lost ourselves in thinking about these questions, if I may say so, in a rather wrong way. I say so with all respect. What has Yugoslavia done? What has some other country done? We ask whether this is democracy or not. Of course we should profit by what Yugoslavia, Russia, China or America or England or Germany has done. That is a different matter. We are trying to measure these questions by yardsticks which really may be useful occasionally, but which have no great relevance today. We ought to consider the conditions in India. We have to consider how to achieve our objective. What is the best way? When I say conditions in India, it means not only the agricultural conditions but the people of India too—the farmer and everything comes into the picture. I have no doubt theoretically—let us take the theoretical part of it—co-operation, co-operative working is good in every single department of human activity, except perhaps high artistic effort vocationally and that is a different thing. Even there co-operation is good. But I can understand the individual creative artist. You cannot produce a book by co-operation. The individual writer writes a book or a

poem or whatever it may be. Leaving such artistic activity, in every other activity, co-operation is the better method. There can be no doubt about it in theory. You may raise difficulties that in practice people may not accept it. Let us meet that point. But it is a better way of life and in fact it is an inevitable way of life when you live in crowded communities. It is all right that in a sparsely populated country, people have large farms living apart from each other. If you go to the Vedic age, when there was much more land than the people presumably the land tenure system was then suited to that time when there was vast land and forest area in a relatively small population. You cannot create conditions of the Vedic age in terms of the population in India today. It was one hundred times less or more than one hundred times less than today and it grows apace. The problem has changed. Because the problem has changed you cannot, even for that reason, apply the old methods of dealing with it. There is no other way. I say with some confidence that there is no other way except the co-operative way. Now, co-operation can be of many types. There are the service co-operatives and they too can be of many types. There is the joint cultivation type and they too are of several types.

Now again, there was the old idea of the separate farm. There is nothing bad in it but it is good enough only when the people are few and the land is much. Or else, you conceive of the landlord system or the jagirdari system where a person has a big farm and can profit by it and large numbers are held as serfs in that farm. If you reject that, as you must, the alternative is, if you have too many people and too little land to give each of them an adequate quantity of land, what are you to do?—a little square or patch of land to each individual living a terribly hard life and getting hardly anything at the end of it and the population increasing and making that problem more and more difficult.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

'There is no solution that way That is accepted

The solution lies only in two ways. One is co-operation and ultimately co-operative farming and the second is drawing people away from the land into industries—whether that industry is big, middle or small is another matter. A fact which is rather unique in the history of our country and which no doubt many hon. Members of this House know is the ratio of agricultural and urban population in India and how it has varied. In every country of Europe, so far as I know, in most of the industrialised countries of Europe throughout the 19th century, the urban population went up. By 'urban' I mean particularly, the population engaged in industry. It went up and up. The agricultural population went down somewhere to 50-60% somewhere somewhere 40-60% and so on. In America, of course, the agricultural population is much less. Proportionately India is one of the very few countries—I do not know the figures relating to other countries—where throughout the 19th century and right up to a part of the 20th century the rural population went up and up at the cost of the urban population where in spite of the fact that great cities like Calcutta and Bombay were built up the total urban population went down and down.

What does that mean? Lack of opportunities of work, lack of industrial activities, and everybody for lack of that falling back on the land and becoming a burden on the land. The land was not empty. The land was full, and more and more people came. That is the basic cause of India's poverty the burden on land. So we have to take away people and give them occupation. By 'taking away' I do not mean bring them to Calcutta or Bombay and leave them there, but have industrial activities there, whether it be small industry, big industry, cottage industry, whatever you like. That is one aspect of it.

The other aspect is the co-operative approach to land problem. I submit, Sir, this is the logical, scientific and reasonable approach to it. Further, apart from that, it helps you in the other objective you have; that is to say, we have to raise primarily the production from land. Now, it goes without much argument—surely, it should be obvious—that, given other things being equal, with better technique, with better methods, production is more. That is the lesson all over the world that you can learn from it. To say that primitive tools or bad technique will give you more seems to be on the face of it contradictory.

Now, better techniques cannot be utilised on small patches of land. It is difficult. It is possible for a big farmer with a very big farm of hundreds and hundreds of acres to use better techniques. When you are not having that you have to come back to small farms, small holdings. You cannot utilise better techniques there. I am not for a moment talking about tractors. Not that I am opposed to tractors but I do not think that tractor, in present conditions in India can be used on a mass scale. It may be used and it should be used. I am not thinking of tractors but I am thinking nevertheless in terms of better tools and better techniques. They cannot be utilised on small patches of land. First of all, the small, poor agriculturist has no resources at all. Secondly, he has no mental training background to do it. He just can't do it. Therefore, in order to use these techniques you have to have larger areas.

For my part I do not want the area to be too large for other reasons not connected with this, although a larger area will give more production. I have no doubt, for instance, if I may say so, that a State farm of 1000 acres, 10,000 acres or 20,000 acres will yield good results.

Shri P. R. Patel: In Rajasthan they failed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru In Rajasthan? I am grateful to the hon Member for reminding me In Rajasthan the most wonderful results are being achieved today—amazing results I am going to see it in the next week. In about four days time I am visiting that place. They only had 5000 acres, and the crops there, I am told by people who have seen them, are just astonishing. A normally 4 ft high crop is 10 ft high there.

Shri P. R. Patel: This information was given in the Assembly there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Crops do not grow in the Assembly, crops grow in the fields.

But I say, I do not recommend that. I am not recommending that, except that I think, we should have State farms—few or more is a different matter. We are not suggesting that as the normal pattern of agricultural economy, not because it does not produce more but because there are other human factors involved and many things which we do not accept. But I do think where possible, without disturbance to the people there, state farms can be created, they should be created—a few such farms—for a variety of reasons, for greater experimentation and greater production which will come to the States, I can not say as a reserve, but to meet a contingency. But that is by the way. We are aiming at an agrarian economy by having small farms co-operatively organised on the village basis, because I would rather that the area was not too big, for, I do not think co-operation functions successfully if it is too big. Co-operation is essentially the idea of a big family becoming bigger and bigger.

And here, may I, with all respect put an aspect before this House, and especially before the hon Member Shri Vajpayee? What is a large Hindu family except a co-operative? A large Hindu family indulging in joint cultivation, what is it except a co-operative for that area? It is. It functions

now. Just enlarge that idea of joint farming and make the whole village into a family. It is just a slight enlargement of that idea. There is nothing novel about it, nothing very revolutionary about it.

I do not want that to go beyond a village or two villages if you like, because, otherwise, that very intimate factor is lost, the knowledge of each other. Strangers come in and people do not know one another. Then two things may happen. One is, the official may come in there and I want, as far as possible, not to have official intrusion. Secondly, a few clever people in that group of big villages may become bosses there and may exploit others. Of course, there is always that danger in every democratic institution. But there it is. But in a small village where people know each other, the sense of knowledge of almost family relationship is still there. Therefore, they know who the knaves are and who the good people are. More or less they can pull together and quarrel together and still carry on. This is the idea. That is, a village, or maybe two villages if one village is too small a unit will form a co-operative unit, and these units forming ten to 12 units, will become a union of co-operatives for economic purposes and for various things. A small unit may not be capable of producing results or may not be wholly viable. But the union is viable. It can help them. That is the approach to this question, and if they can undertake joint cultivation, well and good. They can do so tomorrow well and good. But I do not ask them to do so because I realise good as joint cultivation is, you grow into it. It cannot be imposed. You have to learn it and learn the psychology of it, and learn the practice of it.

So far as practice is concerned, I think it is of the utmost importance that from now onwards we should train people large numbers of people; it will never succeed unless they are trained co operators and training means, the Central Government and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the State Governments and the Community Development movement, all should undertake this task in its various stages and degrees. First, there should be some—not too many but a fairly limited number—high-class, trained people who are really experts in it, and whom we train. We may have special classes, in our agricultural colleges, rural institutes and other places. That is to say, every State should have a handful of people, with complete knowledge and experience. The next stage is, people of a good deal of experience, not with that much standard, but still. The next stage is of course the Panchs and the Surpanchs who should be given some training in it by the co-operatives, by the Community Development movement, etc., so, that there should be a large base of some training, a little higher base of more adequate training and the top with really very high-class training. That is essential.

The other part which, I said, is the psychological part, grows and will grow if they start in two ways. If they start with service co-operatives and work it, and work it to a success, the next step is the smaller step for them. It is not I who decide or Parliament that decides. The service co-operative decides. They decide it. I do not come into the picture at all. If they want some help from us, we should try to give it. They will decide it ultimately by their own experience in the service co-operatives as well as by seeing how they are functioning in the joint cultivation areas. The farmer goes more by example than by theory. These are the stages that I see.

I accept, I am convinced that for a variety of reasons joint cultivation is desirable for greater production, greater cohesion and a progressive removal of class distinctions. It is an important thing. This is the psychological part of it. You change gradually, not suddenly, the whole social fabric of the village in that way. A co-operative functioning like this, a

panchayat and all these village organisations, should build up the real democratic basis of our society. Whether you look at it from this larger framework of going towards a social structure which is more in consonance with the ideals which you are aiming at, more in consonance with real democracy as well as a more productive structure and gradually leading up to raising the peasantry and the farmers to a higher level of life, whichever way you look at it, it is desirable. My saying so does not mean that it is simple and easy. It means each step following the other, it means hard work, millions of people being approached. It means also not too rigid an approach. A broad outlook may be clear enough, but in its application, it should not be rigid.

I am not an expert, but in a huge country like India, I do not like any rigid approach which must apply to every bit of India. Sometimes the approach you may make to a wheat-growing area may not be the same as the approach to a rice-growing area. Conditions are different and the approach will have to be adapted to the conditions. Let not the approach be too rigid. It should be flexible and, inevitably, there will have to be stages. The first stage, broadly speaking, is the service co-operatives, multi-service cooperatives. There too, I do not wish to be rigid about it. The next stage is joint cultivation societies, not suddenly overnight all over the country, gradually, the service co-operatives will become joint cultivation societies. There will be a period when you can see both functioning and there will be better experience.

In theory, I would submit to the House, there can be no doubt that joint cultivation is better, more profitable and better from the social point of view, from the point of view of greater production and bringing higher techniques. A fair amount of land that is often wasted today in boundaries and other things can be cultivated and that raises the income of that area.

Of course, the House will remember that we have said that the ownership of the land will continue. Some people say that this is either a ruse or even if we mean it, we will not be able to stick by it. I do not know; how can I say about the future? This concept of ownership is a peculiar concept which has changed throughout the ages. The House knows Acharya Vinoba Bhave thinks there should be no ownership of land at all. There it is; I respect it and I should be very happy indeed if that was so. But I do not think it can be so today. I do not reject it at all, but I do not think it is feasible today and therefore, I do not press for it. But this idea of ownership itself is an incorporeal thing, almost an invisible thing. Suppose there is a very big zamindari and a limited liability company with shares. The man owns 10 per cent of the land. But he cannot say, "this particular bit of land is mine". He owns 10 per cent of the larger area; the ownership is solid enough. He gets the dividends, or whatever it is. So, ownership remains and ownership tends to become that. Today land of course, is only terribly important in countries which are industrially backward. It is somewhat important everywhere, but it is more important in industrially backward communities. But wherever industry goes ahead ownership becomes scrips and shares, ownership becomes credit, an invisible thing. A man with credit can raise almost any amount to start industries, do this and that and sometimes to bamboozle people; but that is a different matter. The whole concept of ownership is changing and yet we are sticking to ownership by sitting on a square yard of land and being proud that "this square yard is mine and nobody can take it". Even there it goes, as communal life goes—not "communal" in the Indian sense of the word, limited sense. In the cities there used to be roads privately owned, bridges privately owned, all kinds of things. Now a road has become a public, municipal property, a bridge has become municipal or public property, public utilities

and so on. Railways and so many things have become public property. The idea of private ownership changes and the public and the individual benefit by it. So, this changing society changes its ideals about these basic forms of ownership. That will happen. One should not be afraid of it. In fact, one should welcome that, provided it leads to the objectives that we are aiming at.

Of course, all this that I have said just now has really no relation to this petty, limited problem of cultivation or joint cultivation. That is a limited problem and that can be justified, quite apart from other social approaches. I have said this because I find a certain note, even on those who approve of this a certain note, some times of apology, sometimes of apprehension "Oh, let us experiment, let us see what happens". I just don't understand it. Experiment what with? We have been experimenting on land for the last 20,000 years or 10,000 or whatever the period may be. Land is a place where experiments have been taking place more than on anything else; modern industry is a new thing. Land has been experimented upon by everyone for thousands of years. And does anybody imagine that the starting of co-operatives or joint cultivation is a dangerous experiment which may lead to all kinds of harmful consequences? I just don't understand this business. Of course, we have experimented with various forms; all social forms are experimented, experimented in the sense from one to a higher form. The object is that we should not remain where we remain and, worse still, to go down. Well, it is experimenting in the wrong direction.

So, I submit that in whatever way you look at this problem, you are driven to this conclusion that our future lies in a co-operative approach, I would add, a co-operative approach not in the land only but in the industry also. For the moment, we are dealing with land. The co-operative approach has to be prepared for,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

worked for, trained for. We start, if we go by stages, rapid stages I hope, but, nevertheless, stages. And that is why I would myself venture to support the amendment put forward by my colleague Dr. Ram Subhag Singh. Not that I have any objection to the main Resolution. Only I want to make it a practical approach. I should like the main Resolution if it could be effected as rapidly as possible. I shall welcome it. But, for the moment, a practical approach is given in Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's resolution.

One thing more Shri Patnaik said something about a Parliamentary committee or commission being appointed to study this question. I do not know; I do not myself understand how that will be profitable at this stage. Maybe, at some stage it will be useful. We are studying it in all manner of fields—the Planning Commission studies it, the All India Congress Committee has got rather high power sub-committees studying it and in a sense, the Co-operative Movement, of course, is studying it. And many Members of Parliament have their own committees, Party committees and others. Certainly, let us study it in that informal way. But I do not think it will be any good for a formal committee to study it and try to find out as to what has happened and, if I may refer to Shri Patnaik's speech, what Mr. Darling said some time ago. It is totally immaterial as to what Darling said or did not say or did or did not do—Darling's work is of the past which is of no interest to me—or what faults we committed in the past. Of course, we have committed faults during the British time and during the subsequent time. The past is all right where it is. Let it remain there. We have to do with the present and more so with the future.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: About ceiling, whether land on which co-operation is to begin will be carved out from bigger landholders? About ceilings,

he has himself given in the Second Planning Commission's Report that certain types of land will be exempted from ceilings, that is, plantations, big farms, sugarcane companies farms and all these farms will be exempted.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not quite understood the hon. Member's question except that I have heard the word 'ceiling' several times.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: The Report of the Second Planning Commission has exempted certain lands from ceilings. They are big orchards, farms, sugarcane farms etc.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot answer that at length here. I accept entirely the proposal to have ceilings on land. In fact, all this is rather correlated. Ceiling, co-operatives, state trading are all correlated and should be looked at as a common picture. State trading will be completely successful with co-operatives. Without that, it will succeed in some measure but not that completely.

The hon. Member referred to the Second Plan and to some exemptions of ceiling. I cannot say yes or no to a question like that. There may be some exemptions. One has to examine them. The exemption may change from time to time. The whole idea of exemption gave there was that we were so anxious so that food production might not suffer and we did not wish to touch real good farms which were producing a lot for the time being. It is a temporary phase.

Shri U C Patnaik: May I know from the hon. Prime Minister as to what are his reactions to the proposal made by some hon. Members in their amendments that side by side with service co-operatives in Government lands, reclaimed lands and *bhoodan* lands higher types of co-operative farming be tried urgently and immediately?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Sir. Wherever they can be tried they should be tried. Undoubtedly, in new lands reclaimed we might try it. In bhoodan lands certainly it should be tried. In fact, wherever possible, it should be tried.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: As the hon Prime Minister has commended amendment No 7, may I draw his attention to another amendment which incorporates the same thing with some additional suggestions, namely, the amendment by Shri Radha Charan Sharma and Shri Pahadia and another hon friend. The first paragraph is the same as that of amendment No 7 but it has added a few other valuable suggestions which are now accepted by the hon Prime Minister. What are his reactions to amendment No 10? I would personally agree to that amendment because it has some additional concrete suggestion.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have just read amendment No 10. There are some parts in it to which I would not like to commit myself. For instance, the part about training adequate cadres of officials is all right, start co-operative farms in Gramdan villages—I think it should be a right thing but it is not for me to say, it is for Acharya Vinoba to say as to what is going to happen to Gramdan villages, it is not right for me, Dandakaranya is a very special place for refugees and to say start co-operatives there, well there are jungles there, there is no land and it will not be feasible. Therefore, as drafted, I am afraid, I cannot accept it although in the main I agree with it.

Mr Speaker: May I call upon the hon. Member who moved the Resolution to reply?

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad)
We have agreed to sit up to 7 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: Who has agreed? We have not agreed. I understand there

was a suggestion but there has been no decision. Again and again, it has been our experience that even in cases of important subjects coming up, hon Members refused to speak and refused to be in their benches, except for one or two hon Members who spoke. That has been the experience.

An Hon. Member: Today we have sufficient Members in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Mr Patnaik may speak.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the House and to the Members of the Treasury Benches and to the Leader of the House for the interest that they have evinced in this subject and also for the weight that they have attached to it. It is really a welcome thing, Sir that, the Nagpur Resolution which has evoked so much of controversy in this land, has now been reoriented in this House in a very realistic manner which will be acceptable to the whole country. As regards the amendments that have been given, I agree with the hon Leader of the House that amendment No 7 given by Dr Ram Subhag Singh to the House is the least controversial and it could be accepted by everybody. I personally would have gone a little further to agree to (a), (b) and (c) of amendment No 10, because they gave certain positive suggestions—not merely a sort of general thesis—but positive suggestions for improving the organisation, because, today, the most important thing is to improve the organisation in such a manner that it inures the benefit of co-operatives and to the development of agriculture. As the Prime Minister has stated, they are all very good suggestions but he would not commit himself to any of them. I would personally suggest that he might consider at least giving directives to the Ministries and the State Governments about the points raised in (a), (b) and (c) of Amendment No 10. This may be communicated for acceptance, along with other

[Shri U C Patnaik]

suggestions made on the floor of the House, so that the new experiment may be crowned with success

I am very happy to agree to amendment No 7. I hope the whole country will try to make this experiment a success. I hope that Government also will try to have the co-operation of one and all, co-operation of the departments *inter se*, co-operation between the Centre and the States, and between the Government and the public, so that ultimately this great movement will be a great success. I will only add, Sir, that we will try to do this with the least possible foreign assistance. We will do it by pooling our national resources—human as well as material—so that Co-operative farming becomes a success, with the help of one and all. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I shall put Dr Ram Subhag Singh's amendment to the vote of the House.

The Question is

"That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely—

This House recommends that during the next three years every possible effort should be made to organise Service Co-operatives all over the country and to develop the spirit of co-operation in general so that Co-operative Farms may be set up voluntarily by the people concerned wherever conditions are mature."

The motion was adopted

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is carried. All the other amendments are barred. Now, Mr V P Nayar

18 05 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT TO ENQUIRE INTO MALAPRACTICES IN FOREIGN EXCHANGE.

Shri V P Nayar (Quilon) I beg to move

"This House is of opinion that in view of undisclosed foreign exchange held by various industrialists and others, a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament be appointed to enquire into and report on the measures which ought to be taken with a view to effectively eradicate malpractices in foreign exchange."

Mr Speaker: Resolution moved

"This House is of opinion that in view of undisclosed foreign exchange held by various industrialists and others, a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament be appointed to enquire into and report on the measures which ought to be taken with a view to effectively eradicate malpractices in foreign exchange."

The hon Member may continue on the next day

18.06 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the clock on Monday, March 30, 1959/Chaitra 9, 1881 (Saka)