

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.]

(3) Consideration and return of the following Bills, as passed by Lok Sabha:—

The Legal Tender (Inscribed Notes) Bill, 1964,

The Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1964,

The High Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Amendment Bill, 1964.

(4) Consideration and passing of the following Bills, as passed by Lok Sabha:—

The Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1964.

The Kerala State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, 1964.

(5) Consideration and return of the Direct Taxes (Amendment) Bill, 1964, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(6) Consideration and passing of the State Bank of India (Amendment) Bill, 1964, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(7) Discussion on the Resolution approving the Proclamation issued by the President under Article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Kerala on Wednesday, the 30th September, after disposal of Questions.

RESOLUTION RE. APPOINTMENT OF A PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE TO ENQUIRE INTO AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATIVES AND SUGGEST MEASURES FOR STRENGTHENING THEM—continued.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Varma, now you may take three more minutes and finish your speech.

श्री सी० एल० वर्मा : मैं यह कह रहा था कि बोगस को-ऑपरेटिव सोसाइटीज क्यों बहती हैं जैसा कि मैंने पहले कहा

कि वे या तो इन्कम टैक्स इबेड करने के लिये या लैंड सीलिंग से बचने के लिये या जो सब्सिडी मिलती है उसको हासिल करने के लिये बनती हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सब्सिडी वाला सिस्टम जो है, यह बिल्कुल गलत है, इससे न सोसाइटीज को फायदा होता है और न लोगों को फायदा होता है, बल्कि चन्द आदमी इसका फायदा उठा करके और इसको इधर उधर करके खत्म कर देते हैं। इसके अलावा अगर किसी डेली-गेशन या किसी डेपुटेशन को दूसरे मुल्को में जाना हो, तो जब तक किसी सोसाइटी की नुमायन्दगी आपके पास न हो, आपका काम नहीं चल सकता है। इसलिये लोग कोई सोसाइटी बना लेते हैं और उसकी नुमायन्दगी हासिल करके दूसरे मुल्को में चले जाते हैं और वहाँ सैर सपाटा करके वापस आ जाते हैं। मैंने खुद देखा है कि एग्रीकल्चरल फार्मिंग के सिलसिले में बहुत में अमेरिका जाते हैं, लेकिन वहाँ से वापस आ कर वे एग्रीकल्चर फार्मिंग नहीं चलाते हैं। खुद मेरी स्टेट से बहुत से गये और वापस आकर या तो कहीं नौकर हो गये हैं या अपने घर में ही उन्होंने कोई छोटा मोटा काम कर लिया है। इस तरह जिस काम के लिये उनको भेजा गया था, उससे न मुल्क का फायदा हुआ और न इलाके का फायदा हुआ।

आखिर में मेरा महज यह कहना है कि अगर इस एक्ट में कुछ रद्दोबदल हो जाय, तो जो इस वक्त कमियाँ बतलाई जाती हैं को-ऑपरेटिव सोसाइटीयों के अन्दर, वे दूर हो जायेंगी और अगर हम चाहते हैं कि अच्छी को-ऑपरेटिव सोसाइटीयाँ बनें और वे अपना काम अच्छी तरह से कर के मुल्क का फायदा कर सकें, तो इसके अलावा और हमारे पास कोई चारा नहीं है।

आपका बहुत बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The
House stands adjourned till 2 30 P.M.

The House then adjourned
for lunch at one minute past
one of the clock

The House reassembled after Lunch
at half-past two of the clock THE
VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHAR-
GAVA) in the Chair

श्री गिरिराज फ़िरोज़ कपूर (मध्य प्रदेश) उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं वैसे तो इस प्रस्ताव पर बोलने का कुछ इरादा नहीं रखता था, मगर हमारे कुछ मित्रों ने जो बातें कही, तो मजबूरी से मुझे इस पर बोलने के लिए यहाँ पर खड़ा होना पड़ा।

सहकारिता शब्द बड़ा अच्छा है और सिद्धान्त भी बड़ा अच्छा है कि सब को मिल-जुल कर काम करना चाहिए मगर देखने में क्या आता है। देश में जो बहुत पढ़े-लिखे काबिल कहलाते हैं, जिनके बहुत बड़े बड़े दल हैं, वे भी मिल कर काम नहीं कर रहे, प्रान्तों का हाल देखिये, वहाँ पर भी मिल कर काम नहीं हो रहा है और सेक्टर का हाल देखिये तो यहाँ भी मिल कर काम नहीं हो रहा है। तो फिर सहकारिता के नाम पर विशेषकर देश में सहकारी खेती करवाना और देश में अन्न के मकट के होते हुए भी उसका खयाल न करना कदा तक उचित है। अगर, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप इस पर खयाल करेंगे तो पायेंगे कि इस गलत नीति ने किसान के मन में एक शका पैदा कर दी है कि इस ज़मीन पर आज नहीं तो कल, कल नहीं तो परसों मेरा हक नहीं रहने वाला है, यह मुझ से छिन्ने वाली है, इस पर मेहनत क्यों करूँ। इसका असर यह हुआ कि जब ज़मीन पर मेहनत हुई नहीं, तो उतनी अच्छी फसल जिनकी कि मेहनत करके कोई दे सकता था, देश को मिली नहीं। फिर आप यह देखें कि जो सोसाइटीज बनती हैं, वह किन आदिमियों

की बनती हैं। क्या वह वाकई उन लोगों की बनती हैं, जिनको सोसाइटी की ज़रूरत है? अगर सरकार को सोसाइटी बनानी है, सहकारी खेती करनी है, तो लाखों एकड़ ज़मीन देश में ऐसी पड़ी हुई है जो बिबज़र है, उस पर वह सहकारी खेती करे और उसके लिए लोगों की सोसाइटी बनाये। मगर जो अपनी ज़मीन को आज से नहीं, बल्कि अपने दादा-परदादा के समय से प्यार करते चले आये हैं, जिन्होंने खून पसीना एक करके उसको सीचा है, उनसे तो न छिन्ने, जो देना न चाहें उनसे तो न ले; और जो देना चाहें, करना चाहें उनकी सोसाइटी बनाये—कहाँ तक इसके सिद्धान्तों पर अमल हो रहा है, इस पर विचार करना चाहिए।

दूसरी जो सबसे बड़ी गलती हो रही है वह आप देखें। आज देश में अन्न कहाँ छिपा हुआ है? अगर आप इन सहकारी मन्त्रियों की तर्फ़ ध्यान देंगे, तो मैं आपको बताऊंगा कि गाँव गाँव में क्या हो रहा है, गाँव में लोगों को रुपया उधार दिलवाया जाता है। मान लीजिये कि एक किसान को मन् १९६० में एक हजार रुपया दिलवाया गया और जब फसल आती है तो उसके पास रुपया देने को नहीं होता, तो उसी गाँव में कुछ मयाने ऐसे पैदा हो गये हैं, जो एक खास किस्म का लिबास पहनते हैं, एक खास किस्म का कपड़ा पहनते हैं, एक खास किस्म का नाम नेतागिरी का रखते हैं, वह लोग उससे कहते हैं कि अगर भाई रुपया नहीं दोगे, तो आगे तुमको रुपया उधार नहीं मिलेगा, इसलिये यह एक हजार रुपया हम तुमको देते हैं, हफ्ते डेढ़ हफ्ते में एक हजार की जगह डेढ़ हजार रुपया उसी बैंक से फिर कर्ज़ दिलवा देंगे मगर दो सौ रुपया हम लेंगे, तो इस तरह से उस किसान को वह एक हजार रुपया देते हैं और टाइम पर उसे बैंक में जमा करवा देते हैं, उस टाइम पर यह मालूम पड़ता है, कि इसने गल्ला बहुत पैदा किया है और दिखाने के लिए गवर्नमेन्ट को गलत आकड़े दिए जाते हैं कि इतना गल्ला

[श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर]

पैदा हुआ है। फिर जब उसको डेढ़ हजार रुपया मिलता है तो दो सौ रुपया उनके पास चला जाता है, और तीन सौ रुपया उसके पास रह जाता है, जिससे वह अपना और कर्ज वगैरह अदा करता है और फिर ६ महीने के बाद वही हालत हो जाती है। अगर आकड़ों को आप देखें तो मन् १९६० में जिन लोगों को एक हजार रुपया दिलाया गया था उन्हीं को अधिकशत, ८० प्रतिशत उन्हीं लोगों को—आज पांच हजार रुपया तक दिलवाया गया है और न वह पहले अपने घर से, अपनी कमाई से, अपनी खेती करके एक हजार रुपया बीटाए थे और न आज पांच हजार रुपया बीटाने की सामर्थ्य रखते हैं, इस तरह से देश में दिन पर दिन गल्ले की समस्या बढ़ती हुई चली जा रही है।

हमारे एक मित्र ने यहाँ पर कहा कि यह तो एक राजनैतिक स्टेट है, खास कर जनसंघ का उन्होंने नाम लिया, स्वतन्त्र पार्टी का भी लिया, लेकिन उसके बारे में तो मैं कुछ कहता नहीं मगर उन्होंने जन संघ का भी नाम लिया कि ये लोग अपना राजनैतिक उद्देश्य पूरा करने के लिये गांव के लोगों को भड़का रहे हैं कि सहकारी खेती में शरीक न हो, क्योंकि गांव वाले बेपड़े-लिखे लोग होते हैं। उनके शब्द अगर वैसे ही आपके सामने रखू तो उन्होंने यह फर्माया था “कि गांव के अन्दर जो रहने वाले हैं, उनमें बुद्धि नहीं होती।” जरा आप विचार कीजिये कि जिस देश की ८० फी सदी जनता गांव में रहती हो उसके लिए इस सभा में यह कह दिया जाये कि गांव में रहने वालों में बुद्धि ही नहीं होती, तो यह एक अनुचित बात है। आगे वह कहते “अपना हित समझ कर

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र (उड़ीसा) किसी कॉलिंग पार्टी के मेम्बर ने कहा होगा।

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : आप अगर चाहेंगे तो मैं नाम भी ले लूंगा, मगर मैं किसी

व्यक्ति का नाम लेना उचित नहीं समझता।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : यहाँ बोला गया है।

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : वह रिकार्ड में है, आप पढ़ेंगे तो मालूम हो जायेगा।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : मगर आपको नाम लेने में क्या हर्ज है?

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : श्री चन्द्र-शेखर।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैंने तो यह नहीं कहा था।

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : मैं आपको कोट करता हूँ।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : मैंने यह कहा था कि उनको बुद्धि नहीं है, अपना स्वार्थ समझने की।

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : मैं कोट करता हूँ। श्री चन्द्रशेखर साहब ने कहा “कि कृषि के क्षेत्र में सहकारी आन्दोलन सफल इसलिए नहीं हो रहा है कि जो गांव के अन्दर रहने वाले हैं, उसमें बुद्धि नहीं है, अपना हित समझने की उनमें शक्ति नहीं है”। यह भी कि अपना हित समझने की उनमें शक्ति नहीं है? अरे, हित अनहित पशु पक्षी जानें, एक पक्षी भी, एक पशु भी समझता है कि मेरा किस चीज में हित है, किसमें अनहित है, तो मनुष्य होते हुए भी उन पर यह लाठन लगा देना कि इस देश का मनुष्य, ८० फीसदी, ऐसा है, जो अपना हित या अनहित नहीं जानता। वह भेड़ हैं कि जो जिस तरह से चाहेहाक कर ले जाये? मैं यह कहूंगा कि वह महाशय उसमें अपना पोलिटिकल या कुछ और साधन डूढ़ कर गुम-राह कर रहे हैं।

आखिर, यह सहकारी खेती आई कहा से? एक देश में एक लेनिन नाम का तानाशाह

पैदा हुआ था, उसने यह समझा कि इस देश को किसी तरह से अपने कब्जे में करो, यहां की जनता को अपने कब्जे में किसी तरह से करो। उन्होंने एक आन्दोलन चलाया कि दुनिया का मजदूर-किसान एक हो जाये और जब वह आन्दोलन चला, तो दुनिया के मजदूर-किसान को मिलाया और उनसे कहा कि ये राजा-महाराजा जो हैं, ये तुम्हारा खून चूसते हैं, इनको खत्म करो, इनको भ्रमल कर दो, जब राजा-महाराजा भ्रमल हुए तो फिर उन्होंने कहा कि देखो भाई अब अपना राज्य आने वाला है, यहा जो ये जमींदार हैं इनको खत्म करो और फिर उन्होंने मजदूर-किसान को मिला कर जमींदारों को खत्म कराया और जब जमींदार खत्म हो गए, तो उन्होंने वर्ग-विद्वेष फैलाना शुरू किया। उन्होंने किसानों से कहा कि यहा पर जो पूँजीपति किसान है, ये बड़े खतरनाक है, इसलिये खेतिहर किसान को, हलधर किसान को, गरीब किसान को मिल जाना चाहिए और इन पूँजीपति किसानों को खत्म कर देना चाहिए। बेचारे वहा के लोग उन बातों में आ गए; क्योंकि यह सब्जबाग दिखाया गया कि अगर सहकारी खेती हो जायेगी, तो तुम लोगों को बड़ा आराम होगा, तुम्हारे मकान अच्छे अच्छे बन जायेंगे, तुम्हारे गांव में सड़कें बन जायेंगी, तुम लोगों को आठ घंटे काम करना होगा और तुम को रात-दिन कोई चिन्ता नहीं करनी पड़ेगी, लोगों को विश्वास आया, मगर हुआ क्या? उनको भी खत्म कर दिया। आपस में झगड़े शुरू हो गए और जब सह-कारिता के अन्दर आपस में झगड़े शुरू हुए तो तानाशाह ने कहा कि हमने तो तुम्हारे फायदे के लिए यह सब किया था, लेकिन चूँकि तुम लोग आपस में झगड़ते हो, आपस में इस तरह की तकरार करते हो, जिससे कि देश में अन्न की कमी होती है, इसलिये आज से सहकारी खेती, सरकारी हो रही है। तो मैं यह कहता हूँ कि यह सहकार का नारा खेती के अन्दर केवल अपने हाथ में जनता के वोटों को लेने के लिए है; क्योंकि

उसके ऊपर एक अधिकारी, फिर उसके ऊपर एक दूसरा अधिकारी और फिर उसके ऊपर एक तीसरा अधिकारी होगा, यानी पूरे समाज को किसी न किसी तरह से अपने चंगुल में कर लिया जायेगा। दिल्ली वाले अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। दिल्ली वालों को दूध मिलता था, लेकिन जब से यह दूध की स्कीम सरकार के हाथ में आई है, तब से वह दूध नसीब नहीं होता है। हम लोगों को भी वह टोण्ड दूध मिलता है। मुझे खबर नहीं माँ का दूध सुना था, बकरी का दूध सुना था, गाय का दूध सुना था, भैंस का दूध सुना था। यह टोण्ड दूध क्या बला है? उसमें कुछ है या नहीं है। इस सरकार का, मुझे मुआफ करे, रवैया एक हो गया है। इसी तरफ स्वतंत्रता के बाद एक भाई जिनके पास बहुत पैसा था गांव से शहर में आ गए। शहर में आए—पैसा बहुत था—बगला बना लिया। एक रोज दोस्तों से कहने लगे भाई शहर में हर बात का तो बहुत सुख है, मगर दूध अच्छा पीने को नहीं मिलता। उनके दोस्तों ने राय दी कि भाई एक नौकर रख लो, तुम्हें अच्छा दूध पिला देगा। नौकर रख लिया गया। मुनीम में कह दिया, एक रुपया इसको दे दो, यह हमारे लिये अच्छा दूध ले आया करेगा। पहला रुपया नौकर के हाथ में आया, तो उसने कहा : महंगाई बहुत अधिक है, तनख्वाह कम है, कोई तनख्वाह बढ़ाने के लिये तैयार नहीं होता। राजनैतिक स्टण्ट करना चाहते हैं, यहा बैठे लोग भी चाहते हैं कि हमारी तनख्वाह बड़े, मगर इस हाऊस में उसका भी विरोध नहीं होता है। और इस तरह से अपने अपने साधनों को पूरा करने के लिये सत्य की तरफ नहीं देखा जाता। वह नौकर कहता है, साहब मेरी गुजर नहीं होती।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबोर प्रसाद भार्गव) : कपूर साहब आप रिजोल्यूशन में बहक गए हैं।

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : जी हां, इसी प्रस्ताव पर बोल रहा हूँ। यह प्रस्ताव क्या है यह समझ में इसी से आया। जब इस गवर्नमेंट की नीति समझ में आएगी। इसलिये उपमहाध्यक्ष महोदय से मैं कहता हूँ, भाइयों मैं कहता हूँ कि ज़रा सब के साथ धुन लीजिए। तो उन्होंने कहा १४ आने का पहल ही राज़ दूध ले आओ, दो आने का पानी मिलाओ, असली चीज़ अगर ख़िला दी जाये, तो उसका टेस्ट जो है, वह मालूम हो जायेगा। तो पहले रोज़ दो आने का पानी मिलाया। चार-पाच रोज़ के बाद सेठ ने दोस्तों से कहा कि साहब नौकर भी रख लिया मगर क्या करूँ, दूध तो वैसा ही पीने को मिलता है। उन्होंने कहा गवर्नमेंट की तरफ़ देखो, एक के ऊपर एक रखती है, एक कमेटी के ऊपर दूसरी रखती है, अरे, एक इसके ऊपर जमादार रख ला, अच्छा दूध पिलावेगा। जमादार रख लिया। जमादार ने कहा क्यों भाई क्या गड़बड़ है? उसने कहा अन्नदाता, महंगाई बहुत है, चौदह आने का दूध लाता है दो आने का पानी मिलाता है। वह बोला "तुम बटे ईमानदार मालूम पड़ते हो, हमें भी ऐसे आदमियों की जरूरत है, आज से दूध बारह आने का आएगा—दो आने तुम्हारे और दो आने हमारे, मगर देखो, होशियार रहना, ईमानदारी से काम करना, बेईमानी से काम न करना। वह जो दूध आता था हलवाई ने यहाँ से जब से हम सरकार ने सेल्स टैक्स लगाया है, तब से हलवाई भी दो आने का पानी दूध में मिलाने लगा है, चौदह आने का दूध तुम लाते थे, तो उसमें रुपये में दो आने का पानी मिला रहता था, दो आने का तुम मिलाते थे, सेठ को बारह आने का दूध मिलता था। अब भैंस के सामने जाकर दुहा के ले आओ। तुम भी ईमानदार, हम भी ईमानदार और सेठ भी जैसा पहले था वैसा ही रहेगा, कोई फर्क उसके पीने में नहीं पड़ेगा। दो-चार रोज़, उपमहाध्यक्ष महो-

दय, उसने दूध पिया। उसके बाद उनको बही शिकायत हुई कि उनकी दूध अच्छा नहीं मिला। मित्रा न कहा गवर्नमेंट की तरफ़ देखो एक के ऊपर एक रखती है, उनके ऊपर इन्स्पेक्टर रख ला और अगर आप इन्स्पेक्टर रख लेंगे, तो दो आदमी गड़बड़ कर सकते हैं, ज्यादा आदमी गड़बड़ नहीं करेंगे—भंडाफोड़ हो जायेगा। इन्स्पेक्टर रख लिया गया। इन्स्पेक्टर ने कहा क्या गड़बड़ी है? उन्होंने कहा "अन्नदाता, झूठ नहीं बोलेंगे दो आने मैं लेता हूँ, दो आने जमादार साहब लेते हैं, सेठ को रुपये में बारह आने का दूध पिलाया जाता है।" बोले "तुम लोग बड़े ईमानदार, मन्ने आदमी मालूम पड़ने हो। मगर आज से दूध आठ आने का आएगा, दो दो आने तुम्हारे और चार आने मेरे। (Time Bell rings) दो मिनट और। बही मुद्दत के बाद आज बोलने का मौका मिला है। तो आठ आने का दूध आया। उन्होंने शाम को एक पुडिया अगरोट की आठ आने के पानी में धोल के मिला दी। दूध पीकर सेठ बोले कि देखो भाई, गवर्नमेंट का लोग क्रिटिसिज़्म करने है, गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी एक है—एक पर एक रखते हुए चली जाती है। आज ही इन्स्पेक्टर साहब आए—आहा, क्या ही बढ़िया दूध हमें पीने को मिला है। मगर चार पाच राज़ दूध अगरोट मिला हुआ पिया, तो कब्ज शुरू हो गया, भूख लगी नहीं। बहुत घबरा कर फिर बही शिकायत की। उन्होंने कहा : "गवर्नमेंट को देखो, एक के ऊपर एक रखती है, एक सैनिटरी सॉकिल इसके ऊपर रख लो, एक सैनिटरी सॉकिल रखा जायेगा, तो बड़ देख दाख़ कर—गाय की नसल, क्या खाती है, ठीक है या नहीं—तब दूध लाएगा।" वह भी रख लिया गया। उन्होंने भी कहा कि क्या गड़बड़ी हो रही है। जवाब मिला "अन्नदाता, हम झूठ नहीं बोलेंगे, दो आने मैं लेता हूँ, दो आने जमादार साहब लेते हैं, ४ आने इन्स्पेक्टर साहब लेते हैं, ८ आने का दूध

सेठ को मिलता है ।” बोले : “तुम लोग बड़े सच्चे, ईमानदार आदमी हो, हमें ऐसे ही आदमियों की जरूरत है, मगर आज से चार आने का दूध आएगा ।” और शाम को वे दो पुड़िया ले आए, एक बड़ी अरारोट की दूसरी छोटी सनाय की और बारह आने के पानी में मिलाया, सेठ को पिलाया । “आज दूध कुछ हल्का है, उसमें सनाय की खसबू है—सेठ बोला लोग वाकई गवर्नमेंट का फिजूल किटिसिज्म करने हैं—देखते जहाँ कैसा सुशुबदार दूध पीने को मिल रहा है, अगर मुबह कब्ज भी दूर हो जाये तो बड़ा अच्छा होगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सनाय से कब्ज दूर हो गई, मगर दो-चार रोज जब सनाय पी, तो दस्त शुरू हो गये । फिर उनको सलाह दी गई कि हर डिपार्टमेंट में एक मोस्ट एक्सपर्ट, जिसको आज की भाषा में मंत्री कहा जाता है—अरे, गवर्नमेंट हर डिपार्टमेंट में रखती है, तुम भी रख लो ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : अब मंत्री की बात फिर कभी कह दीजिएगा । टाइम हो गया है ।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : अभी तो इशारा मिल गया है ।

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : देखिए, बबराम्बे नहीं, कोई बुरी बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ, अच्छी बात है । अगर उसे समझ लिया गया, तो शासन सभल जायेगा । तो वह मोस्ट एक्सपर्ट भी आ गये । उन्होंने पूछा, “क्या गड़बड़ है ?” उन्होंने कहा, “हुजूर, आप तो हमारे मालिक हैं, अन्नदाता है, आप से कुछ नहीं छिपाऊंगा, दो आता मैं खाता हूँ, वो आने जमादार खाते हैं, चार आने इन्स्पेक्टर साहब खाते हैं, चार आने सैनिटरी सिकल साहब खाते हैं, चार आने का दूध सेठ को मिलता है ।” बोले, “तुम लोग बड़े नालायक हो, सेठ को चार आने का दूध दे रहे हो ?

अगर सेठ को चार आने का दूध देते जाओगे तो सेठ मोटा हो जायेगा । आज से दूध बन्द ।” “है जी, दूध बन्द ? और हमारी नौकरी है, तो इसी की है ।” बोले, “इस सेठ को दूध पीने को न मिले और तुम नौकरी से नहीं निकलो तारीफ इसमें है ।” शाम को सेठ चिल्लाया, “दूध दो, दूध दो ।” भाग कर गए मन्त्री के पास । उन्होंने कहा, “सो जायेगा, कब तक चिल्लायेगा, चिल्लाने की भी कोई हद हुआ करती है ।” सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वह मो गया । उन्होंने थोड़ी सी मलाई लाकर उसकी मूछों पर लगा दी । मुबह सेठ जी बिगड़ उठे । मंत्री महोदय गए और कहा, “आप तो हमारे मालिक हैं, हम तो आपके नौकर हैं, आप फिजूल चिल्ला रहे हैं, यह तो भगवान की बड़ी कृपा थी, जो मैंने आपके स्टाफ में से किसी को दूध पिलाने को नहीं कहा—मैंने ही तो कल आपको दूध पिलाया है ।” बोले, “क्या बकते हो, तुमने पिलाया था, मैं पीने वाला क्या बूढ़ बोल रहा हूँ ।” उन्होंने कहा, “हुजूर आप एक काम करिये, यह शीशा देखिये ।” उन्होंने शीशा देखा और कहा “हां, मलाई है ।” उन्होंने कहा, “हुजूर गलती हो गई होगी, गिलास टेढ़ा हो गया होगा, इसकी जो मजा है, दे दीजिए, लेकिन दूध तो आपने पिया है ।” सेठ बोले, अब कैसे कह सकता हूँ नहीं पिया है ।” उन्होंने कहा अब आप ऐसे ही पियेंगे और आपको मालूम नहीं पड़ेगा ।

वही हालत आज देश में हो रही है अन्न बहुत है, पहले से भी ज्यादा है, कोई फिक्र की बात नहीं है, हमारे पास कोई कमी नहीं है और जनता मरती चली जा रही है और आप अपनी गलत नीति को सोच समझ कर ठीक करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हो रहे हैं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : अब तो टाइम नहीं दिया जा सकता ।

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : मैं आखिरी बात कह कर बैठ जाता हूँ । अगर देश को संभालना है तो देश की संस्कृति की तरफ देखा जाय कि इस देश में किस तरह से अन्न पैदा होता था और किस तरह से इस देश में दूध की नदिया बहती थी । हमें विदेशों से शिक्षा नहीं लेनी चाहिये क्योंकि भारत का किसान बहुत समझदार है, पढ़े लिखों से ज्यादा अच्छा काम अपनी जमीन पर करता है और इस देश को सम्पन्न बना सकता है । प्रस्तावित कमेटी की जरूरत नहीं ।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : यह सही नहीं है जो माननीय कपूर जी ने कहा, मैंने अपनी स्पीच में कहा था . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा आउट ऑफ कन्टेस्ट कहा । मेरी सपीच का यह मतलब था कि Jan Sangh and the Swatantra Party are the agents of vested interests in the country, while the masses are ignorant to understand their own economic interests.

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : हिन्दी में लिखा हुआ है और आप अंग्रेजी में बोल रहे हैं ।

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Kumari Shanta Vasisht.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Is he going to the Congress?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I have called another speaker.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi): Mr. Vice-Chairman, regarding the co-operative movement I am not one of those who have very much experience of the co-operative movement and as such I am not one of the co-operators. But I do believe in the principle of the co-operative movement and the principle of co-operation and I do realise that in the state of our country as it is today the co-operative movement has to be built up so as to help a large section of those people who are not able to improve their lot, improve their standard of living or their economic position. I think that in a country like ours, in a backward country particularly, the co-operative movement is very necessary. In the advanced countries also, in Europe as well as in America, the co-operative movement has its own place and it has received good recognition and acceptance in that society in those countries. In America, which is a capitalist country and which is very proud of its private enterprise for some justifiable reasons, not all but some at least, I have seen of their cooperatives. I have seen very successful co-operative housing schemes in America. I have seen co-operative stores in America run by the people. Even the student community there have set up their own co-operative housing societies. Various co-operatives of that country are not even registered sometimes. I have seen quite a few of the students of a university who were making use of the co-operative housing. Even young teenagers make use of the facilities. They plan it themselves, build them up and rent out rooms. All the students who want to stay there can stay on a certain rental and have certain facilities for food, etc. All those students who wanted to make use of it were allowed to do it. It was a sort of internal arrangement and all those students who wanted to make use of the co-operative housing could do so, like boarders anywhere else, as we in our schools, colleges and universities do here in India. So, I am glad to say that even there in the capitalist country, the co-operative housing or co-

operative stores or various other co-operative societies are doing very well. Some of them are not even registered. They are functioning on the basis of 'no profit, no loss'. The students get together, set up co-operative housing and it has worked very well.

I do understand that education is one of the things necessary, but it seems to be a very conservative view to take. So long as the people are not educated, are we to suspend the co-operative movement till people get education and are able to look after their affairs and manage their own affairs? A large number of training schemes are going on to train men for co-operative societies, as presidents of co-operative societies, members of Cooperative societies and so on. Even a large number of uneducated and illiterate people are trained and helped to become co-operators. I think it is a very serious matter and a very grave matter as to how to help the uneducated people, the backward section and other sections of our community, to make use of their co-operative efforts, even if they are not very well educated. I must say that I have seen here in Delhi co-operative societies with 800 members, with 900 members, who are very ordinary, very poor or small people. They were a sort of landless labourers who were used by the contractors to work in certain agricultural areas. They formed a co-operative society. They had their own small piece of land to cultivate vegetables or whatever they wanted to cultivate. Their living standards improved. They were able to get two square meals a day. Their children were going to school. They were able to earn some money. This I have seen going on for the last at least fifteen years. This particular co-operative society has 800 to 900 members, with very small peasants and cultivators, who were originally landless labourers. They are cultivators today, able to stand on their own feet, able to eke out their own living and making their things as well as they can. It has helped them to improve their

living or their standard of living and their conditions. To that extent I do appreciate the co-operative movement very much.

I think that it is necessary that the various sections of people who are not rich enough to set up private business or set up other things and who may not have enough resources of their own, should pool their resources, their means and other facilities they have, so as to have co-operative farming, so that they can use the same pair of bullocks and other facilities. They can save money. You can buy through one agency your requirements of improved seeds, implements, manure, fertilisers, etc. Thereby everybody can get a share of it. I think the co-operatives have come under criticism very much. They have faced a lot of music. The co-operative movement was started long ago, a couple of decades ago, but it has really not got established at any stage. I should say even up till now. The Congress passed the policy resolution that they wanted to develop the co-operative sector. I think it is in the interests of the private sector to see that the co-operative sector is able to establish itself and be able to serve the community in India.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN in the Chair].

We must help those people who are somewhat backward or those who are not very well off, or those who do not have the means to do very well otherwise, those who cannot afford to get into the various professions, those who do not get training, or who do not have enough money to establish themselves in other jobs, professions and so on. So, the standard of living of these vast masses of our people, for whom we are anxious, should be raised. It is a problem for our country. It is a social problem. It is an economic problem. It is a political problem. It is a problem of education. It is a problem of better standard of living for them. I think it is our duty to see that they

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht]
are given all means and facilities and all that. The atmosphere should be there and the facilities should be there to see that all those sections of people who cannot be helped in various other ways are covered by co-operatives so as to give them a better standard of living and better education, better economic conditions and all that goes with it. Therefore, it is important from their point of view that all such people are covered, people who are not educated, who do not have large pieces of land or money otherwise or such training that they can become engineers or doctors. They are not so rich that they can set up their industries, nor do they have any other facilities. So, the vast masses of people who are left out of various types of benefits thereby should be covered by the co-operative movement and co-operative societies. It is necessary for raising their standard of living and all that goes with that that the co-operative movement should succeed here. Firstly, it should get established here. Here it is not even tolerated and it will not be tolerated for some time to come. Why I say that it is in the interests of the private sector that they should allow the co-operative movement to be established, is this. The private sector generally has in it people who are somewhat better off, who have facilities, who have money. There also, sometimes in various fields they are leaders, whether it is industries, whether it is industrialisation or even charitable work or other types of work. It is in their interests to see that the entire population of India is able to live in decency. They should have the minimum things essential for life and they should have a better standard of living. There can never be any peace in a society if some sections of the people remain very much behind, if they are tormented and troubled by floods and famines and if they suffer from conditions of destitution. Therefore, when masses of people are suffering from these hardships, it is necessary that we must find some ways of helping them. Otherwise,

there will be a great imbalance in society and people will not tolerate it, that certain sections should remain extremely prosperous, while certain others do not have even two square meals a day.

3 P.M.

Therefore, it is necessary that these people are helped thereby. There is a tremendous amount of attack on the co-operative movement. There is very little sympathy for it. Even the various officers and people who are connected with the co-operative movement sometimes are very good, they are simple people, sometimes they have come out of villages, they have got some education, they want to do their work in the cooperatives. Just as basic education has lacked the workers who had faith in basic education, so also the co-operative movement has lacked workers and officers who had faith in the co-operative movement. Therefore, today it is the responsibility of the Ministry, it is the responsibility of the Co-operative Ministry and their officers and the entire governmental set-up to nurse this child which has to find its own feet. They cannot strangle it, they cannot neglect it or ignore it because, if we want to help a large section of the people, the co-operative movement must be given its due. It must be supported, it must be nurtured and nourished, and I think that becomes the responsibility of the Ministry, and they have to do quite a bit to help the co-operative movement to grow. I know a large number of people, some of them very poor, who took loans for various things from the Co-operative Department; but as it happens with very many poor people for some reason or other, due to flood or something, their machinery got damaged, their looms got damaged, and various things they had set up got damaged, and so on, and they were not able to pay or return the loan. Then the warrants came that this man must return the money or he would be prosecuted. That was the thing. So the fact remains that at least 20 to 30 per cent, of the population in India is in this condition. As has been repeated

again and again in this House and the other House, I have also pointed out a number of times that the farmers or the poor people or even the labourers are so poor that they have not the money to buy or to replace a bullock or to buy better implements for agriculture. They have not got the money to buy improved seed or fertiliser. They are not credit-worthy, as they say. Their ability to take credit is very very little. If they take money, they may not be able to pay back. What I am pointing out is this that in India there are at least 10 to 20 per cent people in the minimum who are not able to take credit; they have not got the means to return the credit. It is a very serious problem as to how the Government is going to help those people who do not have their own means. Nevertheless they are a part of our society, and how are we going to help them so that they can improve their lot? The cooperative movement can do that. It is a means which can help the people who have no other way otherwise ordinarily of being helped.

There has been unfortunately a good deal of attack on the co-operative societies, on the co-operative movement, and repeatedly on certain people connected with the co-operative movement in Delhi. I think we are using sometimes very strict standards when we condemn the co-operative movement. When a large number of foodgrain dealers had been hoarding foodgrains or were having excess of stocks or they were selling foodgrains without licence or they were selling them without having licence for the particular premises where they were stored—such cases came up—the Government merely gave them a warning and let them off, so that nobody heard of those cases further. In Delhi itself there were a large number of cases, 30 to 40 foodgrain dealers, who were selling foodgrains without licence. They were selling foodgrains without having the permit for those particular premises in which they were keeping them. They were having excess of

stocks when their records showed otherwise and various types of irregularities. Those things were all admitted by the Delhi Administration in the Home Minister's Advisory Committee. The hon. Home Minister was very much displeased as to how they had only given a warning in these 37 cases and let them off, and he said that action should be taken against all these people against whom there were serious charges. But the administrative machinery is very casual about it. But at the same time they would take one year to check the various things and an entire hullabaloo went on about the Co-operative Stores and all they had done—what a criminal thing it was, how badly things were done, and so on. I am sorry to say they took about eleven months to sort out these things about the Stores, about the gur scandal as our friends would like to say. The President of the Society is blamed, whereas the Attorney General and the legal advisers of the Law Ministry had cleared him; nevertheless our Members went on saying those things. But what about the foodgrain dealers to whom warning was administered? That is my question. Let the public know as to who are the defaulters; let the foodgrain people know as to who are the defaulters. Secondly, they raided the foodgrain people here. Within 24 hours they were able to find out what their records were, how much their stocks were, whether the stocks were according to the books and so on and so forth. At that time they could check up the entire records and papers of all the foodgrains dealers in Delhi within 24 hours. But one store about which all things had been cleared by the Law Ministry and the Attorney General, that thing could not be sorted out by them for the last ten months or so. I cannot understand these double standards.

Then I would say that there are various private enterprises in the country. Many of them are under enquiry. Even the organisation and industry of the President of the Federation of Chambers of Commerce and

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht]

Industry in India are under investigation by the police for a long time. But none of the newspapers and none of the party Members say anything about it, except probably one or two persons like Shri Bhupesh Gupta or Shri Arora who would once in a way ask a question as to what was happening in that investigation as far as these private businesses were concerned. But if the private industry can make mistakes and is not to be harassed and persecuted, why should that sort of persecution follow a person who is trying to run the co-operative movement?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Your time is up.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Only two minutes.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In respect of the Society there was a public man who was involved.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: I would like to give you some information about the public man also. I have known the President for the last 18 years. I can say with humility that this person has done very great service to the co-operative movement and to the people of Delhi. He has given his energy, his money and his resources to serve the people of Delhi. Being a pioneer I think he has to be persecuted, he has to be blamed, and he has to face a lot of music which is the share of all those who start new things, who get into new situations, who want to start new movements which are not always popular. I think all those who are pioneers in various things have to face a certain amount of music. There are those people also who are not born with the right connections, who are not born with a silver spoon in their mouth. If they are born with a little larger landed property, they would be better off, would be better accepted by our society also. But I must say, having known these people functioning for the last 18 years in their public capacity, that

a great service has been done to the co-operative movement by the President of the this particular store. If people in charge of various things, such as a cashier or a person in charge of buying or selling of something else, if those people make mistakes on the spot in a very large establishment of 50 or 100 people, you cannot blame the President for all those things done. At the same time it is people on the spot who make mistakes and who are definitely responsible for all the mistakes they make. But the fact remains and probably sometimes it will be acknowledged that great service was rendered to the co-operative movement not only in Delhi but the whole of India by Chowdhury Brahm Prakash in his mission and in his desire to build up the co-operative movement. The co-operative movement is facing its birth pangs today. It has to go a long way. It has not even got a start today. I think it is a serious situation and, as I said earlier also, to build up the co-operative movement is not a joke. It is a question of dealing with hundreds and thousands of people. You have dishonest people in industry, you have dishonest people in Government departments, you have dishonest people in all walks of life. (Interruption) I am sorry to say you have not taken to task all those people. Not a word has been said in this House about the lockers where thousands and lakhs of rupees were found. Even recently both the Houses were paying tributes to certain highly-placed people. But when they found in the lockers Rs. 2 lakhs worth of securities and Rs. 76,000 in cash, not a word has been mentioned here as to how the money came.

(Interruption)

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Your time is up.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Not a single voice was raised about that person, as to how a very high dignitary of this country did come to collect Rs. 2 lakhs worth of securities in his

lockers and Rs. 76,000. After all, it is a serious matter. None of the Opposition Members who are . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): All right. Now . . .

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: They did not seem to bother about it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Who was it?

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I believe that we are at the fag end of this debate and it is not necessary for me or for anyone else to make any lengthy speech. There are just a few observations that I should venture to make.

I have often had the pleasure of agreeing with my hon. friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, but in his speech on this particular Resolution, I am afraid he gave a very wrong direction to the House by speaking about collectivisation and co-operation in the same breath. In fact, the two things are entirely different. Co-operation means something voluntary; collectivisation means something compulsory, and that is a very vital difference. In collectivisation compulsion comes in, in a definite shape, as for example, in Russia and China. But since co-operation is voluntary, it is something to be welcomed.

Well, Sir, I believe in the great utility of co-operation for the simple reason that small amounts or small plots, when they are pooled together, can produce more than each one of these simple plots can do by itself. Well, I happen to be a member of a co-operative housing society and it is a very happy experience in Bombay particularly that huge buildings are coming up now owned by co-operative societies. They are worth lakhs and lakhs of rupees. Now, it would be impossible for most people to build those buildings at this heavy cost but it is possible for middle-class people like myself to put in a small capital and

venture to put up a new building. I think it is a proposition very advantageous to small investors and very beneficial in solving the housing problem in a city like Bombay. And I believe that the principle of co-operation applies much more to agricultural holdings. We all know that many of the holdings are very small and the agriculturists are very poor. They are not able to make use of the latest methods, they are not able to invest anything to improve their plots. Now, if small plots can be pooled together under a co-operative society, there is not the slightest doubt that all the people who join that society will benefit.

Some time ago, I had the privilege, at the invitation of the hon. Minister of Community Development and Co-operation, along with some M.Ps., to visit some of these co-operative farming societies. Several such we visited in the district of Dhulia in my State of Maharashtra. It was a very happy experience. We were very happy to note that large farms had come into being owned by several small agriculturists, and they were able to produce more, they were able to put in more capital, they were able to put in more cattle, they were able to build up dairying, they were able to develop very fine and fertile crops. And these farming societies in Dhulia were extremely successful.

Well, Sir, it is a common experience that co-operative societies in our country have not been quite a success. The reason is not that there is anything wrong with the principle of co-operation as such, the reason is that the movement has got, in several cases, into wrong, dishonest hands. Now, I know how much the Minister of Community Development and Co-operation is anxious to develop co-operation. He has been writing to the universities and he has been writing to the UGC to introduce co-operation as an independent subject in the university courses. It may be that the universities have not found it possible to

accept his proposition but they are all willing to encourage the study of co-operation even if it be one paper in an examination. And I can well imagine how heart-breaking it must have been to such a Minister to admit from a public platform that nearly 50 per cent of our co-operative societies are bogus. It is a very humiliating thing, a very heart-rending thing. Now, the point is how to solve this, that is, the main problem. Nothing can be done unless we are sure of entrusting co-operation into honest hands. I have listened with very great care to what my friend, Kumari Shanta Vasisht had to say. Well, assuming that private capitalists are dishonest.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: I did not say that.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Even assuming that, you said that many of them were wrong and that enquiries were being conducted into their affairs. You said it. Assuming that it is so, is it any justification for the leaders of co-operative movement to be dishonest? Or even assuming that a particular co-operator has taken a very leading part in starting the co-operative movement in some particular place, does it entitle him to become dishonest later on and become involved in public transactions involving losses? That is a very very serious matter. That is the sort of (*Interruptions*).... thing which brings co-operators into disrepute. (*Interruptions*) Therefore, it is that I support the motion. There may be a Parliamentary Committee appointed or the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation may set up some other machinery but the main thing is to see that blackguards do not get into the co-operative movement. That is the main problem. The co-operative banks must not be in a position to lend money . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): It is very difficult to weed them out.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: That is the main problem and I hope that the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation with its usual vigour will be able to solve that problem and that co-operation will be successful.

श्री उद्धवराव साहंभराव पाटिल (महाराष्ट्र) : यह जो प्रस्ताव है इसमें कृषि सहकारी संस्थाओं की जांच करने और सहकार आन्दोलन को बढ़ाने के लिए क्या सुझाव, क्या सिफारिशें हो सकती हैं उसके लिए एक कमेटी गठित करने की मांग है। यह देखना जरूरी है कि १९५६-६० से आज तक हुकूमत की जानिब से या बाज अफराद की जानिब से कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग के लिए जो कोशिश की गई है—यह दूसरी बात है कि उसूलन, आन प्रिंसिपल, यह किसी को तसलीम हो या न हो—लेकिन जो चन्द सोसाइटियां वजूद में आई हैं उन सोसाइटियों का काम किस तरह से किया जाता है, यह देखना बहुत जरूरी है। दो तरह से इन सोसाइटीज का इस्तेमाल किया जाता है। एक तो यह है कि जो दौलतमंद किसान हैं उन्होंने मीलिंग एक्ट से बचने के लिए अपने खानदान के एक एक मेम्बर को एक जगह कर के सोसाइटी बना ली है। १९५६-६० में बम्बई असेम्बली में बजट के मौके पर वित्त मंत्री ने अपनी तकीरी में कहा था कि वह हर विलेज में कृषि-सोसाइटी बनायेंगे और वहां पंचायत होगी, यही रेवेन्यू का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन होगा और इन सोसाइटीज का पूरा एकानामिक एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन होगा। उस वक्त मैंने यही कहा था कि जहां अनईवेन होल्डिंग है, जहां ५०० एकड़ और १०० एकड़ से लेकर आधा एकड़ जमीन किसानों के पास है वहां अगर प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाया भी जायगा तो आधा एकड़ वाले का एक क्विंटल बहुत है और १०० एकड़ वाले का २०० क्विंटल बढ़ जाता है। यानी, फिर गरीबी और दौलतमन्दी दोनों के बढ़ने के ज्यादा इमकानात होते हैं। दूसरी चीज

यह हैं कि टेनेन्सी ऐक्ट से बचने के लिए लगानदारों को हुकूक से दस्तबर्दार करने के लिये भी अगर सोसाइटीज बनाई जायें तो टेनेन्ट्स के हुकूक वहा से हटाये जाते हैं। औरंगाबाद में भी एक शुगर की कोऑपरेटिव फ़ैक्टरी बनाई गई थी जिसके खानदान में एक हजार एकड़ के करीब ज़मीन थी और सोसाइटी बनते ही वहा के टेनेन्ट्स बाहर निकाले गये। जैसा कि मैंने कहा, सीलिंग ऐक्ट से भी सरप्लस लैंड को छिपाना है तो अच्छा ज़रिया है कि कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी बनाई जाय और वह काश्त का मक़्मद कह कर बनाई जाय। ऐसी कितनी सोसाइटीज हैं जिन्होंने कानूनों से बचने के लिये सिर्फ़ अपने खानदान के लोगों को एक जगह करके कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी या फ़ार्मिंग बना ली। इन सब बातों की जाच होना निहायत ज़रूरी है।

दूसरी चीज़ यह है कि इन सोसाइटियों में ऐसे किसान नहीं रहते जिनका खेती से सीधा वास्ता है। जिनके नाम खेन हैं लेकिन जो दूसरा कारोबार करते हैं, वक़ालत करते हैं, डाक्टर करते हैं उनके लिये यह सोसाइटी बड़ा अच्छा ज़रिया है, वह एक तरह की मैनेजिरियल एजेंसी हो जाती है। वह एजेंसी गाव के लेवर से खेती का काम सूती है। अगर वे एबसेन्ट भी रहते हैं तो भी उनको खुद ब खुद खेती के उत्पादन से आसानी के साथ फायदा मिल जाता है। यही वज़ह है कि चार पांच साल में दौलतमद किसानों ने कोऑपरेटिव फ़ार्मिंग एग्ज़िकलचरल परपज के लिये बना ली हैं, यह आप को ज्यादा नज़र आयेगा। लेकिन असल में जिन आदमियों को सोसाइटी बनाने की ज़रूरत है वे लोग सोसाइटी की तरफ़ नहीं पहुँच पाते हैं। उनका ज्यादातर वास्ता क्रेडिट सोसाइटी से पड़ता है क्योंकि उनको कर्ज़ लेने की ज़रूरत पड़ती रहती है। लेकिन कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी से जो काश्त होती है उसमें ज्यादातर ८० फी सदी सोसाइ-

टिया ऐसी है जो महज़ कानून से बचने के लिये बनी है। ऐसे दौलतमद किसानों को गवर्नमेंट से बहुत फायदा हुआ है।

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

हुकूमत की तरफ़ से इस बात की कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि ऐसे किसान जिनको बैल खरीदने के लिये, औज़ार खरीदने के लिये, खेती में पैसा डालने की क़ूबत नहीं है उन्हीं लोगों के लिये सोसाइटी बनाई जाय और ऐसा होना निहायत ज़रूरी है। इस लिये इस प्रस्ताव पर मैं सिर्फ़ इतना ही कहूँगा कि इस प्रस्ताव में सोसाइटियों के बारे में जाच करने की ज़रूरत है क्योंकि सीलिंग ऐक्ट का इन्टेंशन ख़त्म करने के लिये, टेनेन्सी के कानूनों को दूर रखने के लिये दौलतमद किसानों ने उन सोसाइटियों पर अपना हिस्सा कर लिया है और अपने खानदान की सोसाइटी बनाकर हुकूमत का पैसा उसमें इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं। मैं इस खयाल का हूँ कि सोसाइटी सिर्फ़ गरीब किसानों के लिये बनाई जाय, मैं तो कहूँगा कि उनको अलहिदा रखना चाहिये। ज़मीन जो हुकूमत की हो वह ले ले और गरीब किसानों की जो ज़मीन है वह उनके पास रहनी चाहिये, चाहे उनकी रज़ामदी से ही सही। अगर उन लोगों की आप सोसाइटी बनाकर बता दें कि सोसाइटी में आने के बाद उनकी आमदनी बढ़ेगी तो चाहे दुनिया कितनी ही उसकी मुख़लिफ़त करे वे उससे दूर नहीं रहेंगे। असल में जिन किसानों के लिये सोसाइटी की ज़रूरत है वह किसान ऐसे लोगों पर विश्वास रखते हैं, जैसे कि किसी को व्यापारियों पर विश्वास होता है, किसी को गाव के मुखिया पर विश्वास होता है, और इनको डर होता है कि अगर ज़मीन सोसाइटी को गई तो सरकार की हो जायगी और इसलिये यह लागू कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी को पसंद नहीं करते। लेकिन जिन किसानों के पास खेती करने के वास्ते दीगर औज़ार नहीं हैं उनके लिये सोसाइटी होना निहायत

[उद्धवराव साहेबराव पाटिल]

जरूरी है जिससे वे कुछ अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ा सकते हैं।

जैसा कि सोसाइटीज के बारे में कहा गया है उनमें बुराईयां जरूर आई हैं। अगर हम राष्ट्र की नीति यह मान लें कि पंचायत में या सोसाइटीज में जो भी अधिकारी हो वह चाहे छोटा हो या बड़ा हो लेकिन हरदिल अजीज हो, उसको लिया जाय। इसके अलावा रूलिंग पार्टी की जानिब से मैं कई मिसालें दे सकता हूँ कि फ़लों केस पर डिफाल्केशन हुआ तो उस आदमी को बचाने के लिये कोशिश की जाती है जिसकी वजह से बदनामी होती जा रही है। अगर हम तय कर लें कि अगर किसी आदमी ने सोसाइटी में डिफाल्केशन किया है तो यह हमारे राष्ट्र का गुनाह है, सामाजिक गुनाह है और उसको हटाने के लिये हम सब के सब कोशिश करें। मैं जानता हूँ, ऐसी सोसाइटीज हैं जो हमारी जानिब से चलायी जाती हैं जहाँ किसानों को आज तक पैसा नहीं मिला और उनकी जमीनें साहूकारों ने छीन ली हैं। अगर सोसाइटी के पास रुपया न हो तो साहूकारों के पास जाने के सिवाय किसान के पास और कोई चारा नहीं है। मैं तो यह कहता हूँ कि जो बसफीसदी पैसा सोसाइटी की ओर से किसानों को दिया जा रहा है वह 100 फी सदी देना चाहिये जिसका उसको खेती करने के लिये जरूरत है। यह बात सही है कि सोसाइटी की तरफ गड़बड़ जरूर होती है। किसान को सोसाइटी के नाम पर लूटा जाता है, १००० रु० देकर २०० रु० सूद लिया जाता है। इसलिये मैं सरकार से कहूँगा कि सोसाइटी के नाम पर, खास कर जो कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी एग्रिकलचरल परपज के लिये बनाई गई है उसके नाम पर दौलतमंद किसानों ने कानूनों से बचने के लिये जो कुछ किया है उसके बारे में जांच होना मैं निहारत जरूरी समझता हूँ। दूसरे, सोसाइटी की जमानत में जो टेनेन्ट्स हैं उनमें से कितनों को निकाला

Agricultural Co-operatives

गया है। तीसरे, जेनुइन पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिये कितनी सोसाइटीज किसानों की हैं। इनको ज्यादा सहूलियतें दी जाय और जरूर देनी चाहियें। यह जो प्रस्ताव आया है मैं इसको सपोर्ट करता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि हुकूमत इसको मान लेगी।

SHRIMATI NANDINI SATPATHY (Orissa): Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to speak a few words in support of this Resolution which is before the House. We have discussed in both the Houses the food situation in the country for seven days or more. During that debate many hon. Members have stressed the permanent side of the solution of this food situation. It has been seen from the history of the last two decades that in Asia, Africa and Latin America, unless most of the cultivators are given a sense of personal participation in the land, production is sure to lag. This will ultimately lead to the undermining of democracy and there will be no security for anyone.

Madam, in 1935, the Congress Party passed a resolution in which it was stated that there was only one fundamental method of improving village life, namely the introduction of a system of peasant proprietorship under which the tiller of the soil is himself the owner of it. Madam, I am sorry to say that we have not progressed very far in this line. The problem of land is connected with the problem of increase in production. As long as the land remains in the hands of very few people, we cannot expect labour to work with their heart and mind. A man with 30,000 or 40,000 acres of land cannot obviously think of forming a co-operative with the people having one or two acres of land. We see ex-Rulers having thousands of acres of land. They also enjoy the privy purse as well as all the facilities as a free citizen of this country. It is very difficult for the poor peasant to form any co-operative with these big

land-owners. I am bringing this point to make it clear that as long as we have not made a clear policy on the ownership of the land, there will be little result of our talk about co-operatives. Here in India the feudalistic holdings of land are as dangerous as State ownership of the land. The collective farms in Russia do not seem to yield very good results. Even now 40 per cent, of the Russian labour force is engaged in agriculture, still, Russia has had to import 10 million tons of foodgrains in 1964 to meet the deficit of the country. But in Japan things are different. Now the rural Japan produces more wheat and rice per acre than any nation in the world. It is a very strange thing, Japan being such a small country, but we can see that there the Government took a very firm step and bought up nearly one-third of all the cultivated lands which had been in the hands of the big land-owners and the absentee landlords. Then this land was re-sold to the small farmers on very easy terms and this distribution of land has had a very good effect. The farmers began to realise that they have their right to the land that they cultivated. This brought the feeling of self-respect, hope and confidence. But along with this redistribution of land some other factors were there which contributed to the success of their agriculture. The new owners were provided with sufficient credit and all other services. Storage was available readily and fair prices to the producers were assured. In India co-operative farming is not a very new concept. Here without knowing the modern meaning and definition of this co-operative farming, the farmers used to help each other with improved seeds and sometimes with implements. They also sometimes worked together to prevent water-logging and wild life menace. There was also mutual aid at the time of harvesting, weeding and other farm operations. It was a common practice here but unfortunately these practices are not in vogue now.

I have already mentioned that both the feudalistic holding and State holding of land are bad for India. We should lay down certain principles for co-operative farming. In India it should be organised on a purely voluntary basis but this should be done after proper distribution of the lands because it is quite necessary that the small farmers will constitute the bulk of the members of these co-operative societies and the main activity of the farm should be cultivation through labour-intensive methods. While trying for the maximum utilisation of local resources, stress must be laid on modern equipments. Again fertilisers, insecticides and facilities for proper irrigation should be made available to the farmers. Over and above, it should be borne in mind that good working conditions and better human relations should be created while forming co-operatives.

Another most important thing is that most of the time the co-operatives feel that the pooled resources of the members are not adequate for financing their schemes. So timely and sufficient financial aid should be given to them. Taking all these things into consideration, we will have to see about another important side of our co-operative farming and that is the education of the farmers. Now we are having these agricultural universities in the country. The students coming out of these universities or colleges should be so trained that they can go to the villages to help in forming co-operatives or educate the farmers in this respect. I think some such scheme should be formulated very early.

Lastly I would again like to stress that unless land, the very basis of production, is more equitably shared, incomes will continue to be inequitable and as the necessary sense of participation will be lacking, agricultural production will lag and all sorts of discontent will steadily arise.

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI S. K. DEY): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am very happy and grateful to this House that there has been this opportunity given to the Ministry during these two days of discussions to hear the views of the representatives in the Parliament as to the working of what my friend, Shri Reddy, who moved this Resolution, called the vital people's movement. A people's movement can grow with the initiative of the people themselves or when it forms part of a national plan and a national policy of the State, it can be promoted and progressed with State assistance. It is quite obvious that you cannot have a people's movement unless the representatives of the people at different levels take an effective part in the shaping of it. The Mover of the Resolution has asked for a special committee of the Parliament to study all aspects of the co-operative movement, to find out what is happening and I suppose it was intended, on the basis of this study, to give advice to the Ministry as to how it should go ahead promoting and building up this movement on healthy foundations.

I would like to give to this House a very brief analysis as to what has really happened during the past 10 or 15 years in the co-operative movement in the country, what has happened on the part of the people, what has happened quantitatively, what has happened qualitatively, what the Government has really tried to do and even where the Government has failed to do certain things. I would try without any mental reservations whatsoever to place before the House this view point so that in the future when the Government wishes to go firmly ahead taking certain corrective actions, it can have behind it the full mandate of the Parliament which the Ministry represents. If we look at the quantitative aspect of the co-operative movement, we would see that during the past 13 to 14 years, say, from 1950-51 we have had very significant progress.

We had in 1950-51 a membership in agricultural credit societies of 44 lakhs. By 1962-63 we had a membership of 227 lakhs. We had 7 per cent of rural families covered in 1950-51; by 1962-63 it had gone up to 31 per cent and at the end of the Third Five Year Plan it is expected to be near about 40. The membership per society was 45 in 1950-51; it came to 106 in 1962-63. The share capital was Rs. 7.6 crores in 1950-51 and in 1962-63 it came to Rs. 80.2 crores. Deposits rose from 4.3 crores to Rs. 22 crores. Loans rose from Rs. 22.9 crores to Rs. 259.8 crores, the two periods taken into consideration being 1950-51 and 1962-63 in all these cases, and it is expected, according to the estimates that we can now make, that the loans would have reached about Rs. 290 crores by 1963-64, and at the end of the Third Five Year Plan we expect them to reach about Rs. 400 crores. Average loans advanced per member rose from Rs. 44 to Rs. 114 per member. The same thing happened in land mortgage banks. The number of primary banks we had in 1950-51 was 286 and it rose to 563 in 1962-63. We had 5 Central Land Mortgage Banks in 1950-51 and the number came to 18 in 1962-63.

Next come sugar co-operatives. We do not have any record to show the existence of any co-operative sugar factory in 1950-51, but in 1955-56 our records show that there were 3 co-operative sugar factories, and in 1963-64 the number was 48. From 1.4 per cent participation in the production of sugar in the year 1955-56 the figure went up to 24.7 per cent last year, and in the same period the production went up from 0.3 lakh tons to 5.92 lakh tons. Now this is particularly in the sector of co-operative sugar factories. I believe we have put up a record which you can put before the whole world as something of which we can feel legitimately proud.

The same trend of progress with some variation in the tempo is being maintained almost in all sectors of the co-operative movement. The only ex-

ception has been in the sector of marketing of foodgrains in the co-operative sector. Now, while the processing of sugar progressed ahead the marketing of foodgrains did not, because the vast number of rice mills in the country were in the hands of the private traders. Madam, it would appear that during the past year from the beginning a crisis was brewing in the matter of food, the worst phase of which we have been experiencing during recent weeks. We got the Registrars and the representatives of the co-operative movement in the States together and we all joined for a discussion as to how we can link up the operation of co-operation from the producer up to the consumer and thus build up a common link from credit right up to consumption by the consumer. Certain decisions have been taken, plans have been drawn up, and I have no doubt whatsoever that, even in the year 1964-65 as a result of the many steps that we have taken we shall be able to show significant progress in the co-operative marketing of foodgrains. Madam, the House is aware of the steps taken by Government in building up a consumer sector in co-operation particularly for helping in the distribution of essential commodities including food to the urban population. This programme under Central Government sponsorship was initiated about a year and a half ago. We have 222 wholesale stores and 3,700 retail stores, which are now in position in varying degrees of efficiency and volume of operation. We have no doubt whatsoever that this movement will gradually grow. There never is any intention that the consumer co-operative sector should acquire a monopoly in the distribution of essential commodities. Indeed the very *raison d'être* of the co-operative movement is that it will prevent a monopoly in any sector of the economy. What the Government has been attempting to do to build up a democratic socialistic structure in the country is to promote a mixed economy, and in that mixed economy the intention is that the private sector also will

have a place a place of honour. The same also will apply to the public sector and in between the public and the private sectors there will be the growing co-operative sector. The intention is that the co-operative sector will try to combine the initiative of the private entrepreneur and the organisational strength of the public sector without losing the character of cohesiveness between the members of the institution, whichever it is. Now it has throughout been the effort of the Government to see that co-operation grows as a part of the national objective of a mixed economy and a socialist pattern of society and that co-operatives, whether it is in agriculture, industry, transport, housing, women's activities, labour and indeed in every section of the economy, that cooperatives have a share so that it will prevent the growth of monopoly either in the private sector or in the public sector. When I mentioned about the consumer sector and the growth of this particular activity to help relieve the distress of people in the matter of essential supplies, when I mentioned this as a close link-up of the movement from the producer to the consumer, our intention was that we should have a significant share of the business, not a monopoly by any means. If we can achieve over the years, in two or three years, about 20 to 25 per cent share in the consumer trade we have no doubt whatsoever that it will tilt the balance in favour of integrity, honesty and competence in dealing with the distribution of primary products for the benefit of the consumer as well as of the producer.

I mentioned some statistics about the agricultural sector. I am quite sure that it would be of interest to this House to hear something of what has happened in the other associated sectors of our economy. Labour construction societies which did not exist previously numbered as many as 3,409 in 1962-63, and they have executed works worth about Rs 5 crores. It is expected

ed that there will be a big boost given to them in the future, and once the labour cooperative societies come into prominence, they will be able to give the much needed relief to the weaker sections of the community, whether urban or rural. We had no rickshaw-pullers' cooperative societies, but now we have 87 of them and their gross income is Rs. 2 lakhs. It is a very small sector, but it is growing. Dairy cooperatives we had 5,000 in the year 1962-63 and there has been further expansion and in 1962-63 products worth Rs. 10 crores have been distributed. Fisheries co-operative societies have risen in number to 2,000 from 656 in the year 1955-56 and the daily sales in 1962-63 amounted to Rs. 233 lakhs as against Rs. 40 lakhs in 1955-56. Of primary weavers' societies we have 12,500 with a membership of 13 lakhs and the value of the sales in the year 1962-63 was Rs. 48 crores as against Rs. 38 crores in 1955-56. There were none in the earlier years. This has been a growth which has taken place during the past 15 years, practically from scratch. There were 30 spinning mills in 1962-63 with a membership totalling up to 7,378 and the value of the finished goods was Rs. 347 lakhs. We have 2,378 women's cooperatives of which practically there was none some 15 years back. These women's cooperatives have distributed products worth about Rs. 15.8 lakhs. Then there are primary housing societies and transport societies and others. I am mentioning all this in order to give an indication to this House of the considerable progress that has taken place quantitatively in almost all sectors of co-operation during these years.

On the qualitative side I cannot say that there has not been some deterioration in certain places. But where the cooperative movement was strong and had a sound foundation, as for instance in the States of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Madras, and to some extent in part of Andhra, the cooperative movement has forged ahead at an enormous pace. Now new horizons are

being opened and I would invite friends from this House any time at their convenience, to visit any of the four districts in Maharashtra, of Sangli, Satara, Kolhapur and Ahmadnagar, where a revolution has taken place in the countryside in the matter of marketing and processing and associated activities in the cooperative field. Where the cooperative movement did not have a foundation and the Government tried artificially to push the movement forward, I am sorry to say, we have not succeeded in imparting to those States the real character of the cooperative movement and again I am very unhappy to say that considerable amount of spurious development has taken place. Perhaps it was inevitable that it should happen, because if it is to be a people's movement and has to be based on the people's leadership, if that leadership is not there and the Government goes ahead giving liberal assistance, particularly in terms of money and other facilities, it is inevitable that such offers of assistance should tend, in the first impulse, to attract undesirable people to the fold of the cooperative movement, not necessarily for promoting cooperation but for promoting cooperation of a different kind among themselves for different purposes.

Ever since a Ministry at the Centre was created, Madam Deputy Chairman, we have attempted from the very beginning to take counsel on the one hand with the representatives in Parliament who have had experience in cooperation, who are interested in the growth of the cooperative movement and on the other hand, with people who have a knowledge of the co-operative movement outside Parliament and outside the Government, cooperative leaders in the Universities and in the field of actual cooperation in the forward States and even in the backward States where there are leaders struggling on their own, despite the odds against them. Many committees had been appointed ever since the Ministry was created and I think it will be quite appropriate to make some mention of

some of them because without this it will be difficult for this House to appreciate the reaction of Government to the Resolution that has been moved here.

We established a Working Group on behalf of the Agriculture Ministry, with the Agriculture Secretary as Chairman in the year 1959, to work out the implications of the Policy Resolution of the National Development Council in 1959, which wanted to give a new shape to the whole cooperative movement in the country. Soon after this, Shri Vaikunthlal Vithalbhai Mehta, one of the most outstanding leaders of cooperation in any part of the world judged from any standard, despite his other preoccupations and despite his rather indifferent health, took upon himself the Herculean job of going from State to State and studying the entire cooperative credit structure and he produced what may be considered almost the Bible on co-operative credit, in the year 1960. That went into every aspect of the cooperative credit structure and in fact, the State Governments since then, have been in the process of implementing those recommendations. There were next a committee under Shri Nijalینگappa on cooperative farming in 1959-60, the Saraiya Committee on cooperative processing in 1960-61 and a committee on Cooperatives and Panchayats under the chairmanship of Shri S. D. Misra and a committee on co-operative training, again under the chairmanship of Shri S. D. Misra. There has been a Committee on Taccavi Loans, 4 P.M. 1962, under the Chairmanship of Shri B. P. Patel, a Committee on Co-operative Administration, again under the Chairmanship of Shri V. L. Mehta, 1962. Besides these, there have been study teams at official level set up by the National Co-operative Development Corporation on co-operative marketing of jute in West Bengal, wheat in Rajasthan and paddy in Andhra Pradesh. There have been working groups appointed by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture which

have completed their studies by now, on the subject of animal husbandry and dairying and another one on the subject of fisheries. At present, there are several working groups and study teams working on various other problems appointed by the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation. There is a Committee on Co-operative Marketing under the Chairmanship of Prof. Dantwala of Bombay. There is a Committee on non-genuine societies and vested interests in co-operation under the Chairmanship of Shri Ramniwas Mirdha, the Speaker of the Rajasthan Assembly. There is a Committee of Direction under the Chairmanship of Prof. Gadgil for co-operative farming. There is a working group on co-operative credit in intensive agricultural development districts with Shri N. P. Chatterji, Joint Secretary in the Ministry as Chairman. Then there is the National Co-operative Farming Advisory Board. The National Co-operative Development Corporation has set up quite a number of other working groups and they are studying concurrently many of the outstanding problems in the co-operative sector. Now, I would like to mention that Parliament Members who have shown interest in cooperation and have proved willing to be able to spare the time for the purpose have always been associated in a certain number with every one practically of the study groups and working groups. We had Dr. Ram Subhag Singh on co-operative farming, Shri S. D. Misra, Shri Jagannath Pahadia on co-operative training, Shri Chintaman Panigrahi, Shri H. C. Mathur on co-operation and panchayats. We have had thirty Members of Parliament going out studying co-operative farming and making a report which has since been printed and I believe has already been supplied to the Parliament Library. In the National Co-operative Farming Advisory Board we have Shri Kesava Rao, Shri M. K. Firodia, Shri Indrajit Malhotra, and Shri Braham Prakash. In the Dantwala Committee we have Dr. P. R. Deshmukh and in the Mirdha Commit-

a Parliamentary Committee

[Shri S. K. Dey]

tee we have Mr. Digamber Singh. We have, on the functional committee on credit, Shri M. K. Firodia. We have Mr. Venkatasubbiah on the functional committee on processing. We have Shrimati Savitri Nigam on the functional committee on consumers. I have taken the time of the House—and hope I have not bored the House—by mentioning all these names and counting out these numbers only because I wanted to impress upon this House the enormous representation we have given throughout to co-operative opinion both within and outside Parliament in all the thinking that has been done in the Ministry and on the basis of which policy decisions have been taken. As this House is aware, Madam, we have achieved a considerable degree of de-officialisation of the movement during the past few years. I am very happy to say that there is not one single Minister, Deputy Minister, Parliament Secretary, Speaker or Deputy Speaker anywhere as an office-bearer in the co-operative movement either in the Centre or in the States. The State Governments are taking in hand the necessary legislative measures and in almost every State either legislation has been enacted or is in the process of enactment for ensuring that officials are not there in the co-operative movement unless it be that they are sent there as members of the Board of Directors representing the Government to safeguard the interests of the Government finances provided to the co-operative undertakings. As I mentioned, there has been a considerable degree of synthesis of the agricultural co-operative movement with the co-operative movement in allied sectors of the economy in the country. We realise that by simply asking Government representatives, whether they are Government officials or Ministers, Deputy Ministers and others from the co-operative movement, we cannot make this movement progress. Indeed, it may create a vacuum, a very serious vacuum, in the movement to the ultimate peril of the movement itself unless we can

Agricultural Co-operatives

build up substitute leadership in the place of the officials and the Ministers and others who have heretofore been working as office-bearers. Therein comes the idea of building up unions of States apex organisations of the co-operative movement and then a National Federation. Almost in every State we have today a State Apex Bank, State Apex Marketing Society, State Co-operative Union and other functional organisations. We have also a National Federation on Co-operation; there is the Functional Marketing Federation; there is the National Co-operative Sugar Syndicate; there is the National Co-operative Union. There will soon be a National Co-operative Consumers' Federation. There will also be, sooner or later, a National Co-operative Federation. We are also trying, as was mentioned by Prof. Wadia, to introduce education and training through the Universities, colleges and schools. Co-operative institutions are being set up for dealing with the requirements of students and through experience of office bearership of these societies and supplemented by the instructions they receive on the subject of co-operation, they are trying to grow as co-operators. The training system in the whole movement has been extended and is being deepened to cope up with the requirement of the new leadership that the co-operative movement calls for. With all those improvements that have taken place, the efforts that are being made, the steps that have been already taken and which are in progress, I am quite sure, Madam, you will appreciate that if we are to appoint a new Committee of the Parliament to go practically *de novo* into the whole question of agricultural co-operation, it is bound to put the clock back for the simple reason that it is not what needs to be done that we require to know. It is to see that what we do know is implemented with speed. It is implementation of policies which have been accepted as sound and profound and infallible that is holding up matters, not the lack of knowledge of what

a Parliamentary Committee

Agricultural Co-operation

needs to be done. You only give an opportunity to the Government agency. This is the character of Government agency everywhere in the world, and much more so. Madam, in our own, which is still to grow as a Government responsive to a growing democracy that when a Committee is appointed, almost all thinking goes into cold storage. And particularly when a Committee of Parliament such as the one envisaged by my friend, Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy, is set up, almost everyone in the country will come forward and say, 'let us wait before we sanction any more money or undertake any more schemes until the Report of the Parliamentary Committee is ready.' We are at a very strategic point of time, if I may say so, in the history of the co-operative movement. The Fourth Five Year Plan is on the anvil and we are trying to implement some of the decisions which we have taken following the recommendations of the various working groups. And some of the working groups today are working on some very vital and strategic problems connected with the co-operative movement. The next eighteen months will be quite crucial; they will really determine whether the co-operative movement is to forge ahead as envisaged as an effective instrument for bringing in democratic socialism, as a balancing force between the public sector on the one hand and the private sector on the other and growing in health with high acceleration. If, during this period, we appoint a team, it is my very humble view which I wish to submit for the consideration of this House that instead of achieving any good which it might have done otherwise earlier, it may do very serious injury. I would suggest that the Estimates Committee of Parliament may be asked either this year or the next year to make a study of the co-operative movement in agriculture in particular in which this House has been interested. The Estimates Committee takes up the study of different aspects of governmental functioning and I am sure if they take this up, the

purpose that my hon friend, Mr. Sri Rama Reddy, has in view and which has been shared by many hon. Members in this House will be fully covered.

Madam, I am very grateful to this House for giving us an opportunity to hear the views of, what I may call if I may, my Principals as to what they think of the cooperative movement, how we should proceed and what they think are the failings for which correctives are indicated.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN in the Chair)]

I am quite certain that we have benefited considerably from the discussion that has taken place and I am once again thankful to the House for this. Again I would request my friend, Mr. Sri Rama Reddy, to withdraw the Resolution on the assurance that the Government will see that what he has in view will be served through the various other methods which are already under way and which we can put into action without, at the same time, creating a situation in which action may be held up and that is more important than anything else today.

Thank you.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am indeed very grateful to all the participants in the discussion on the Resolution which I have moved and it is indeed very gratifying that everyone of the Members who spoke in the House spoke in support of my Resolution including even the hon. Minister. I should think he also spoke in support of the Resolution though he did not want a Committee of this kind to be appointed for going into the working of the various agricultural co-operatives. I would like to recall to the Minister that when these co-operative societies were thought of in the year 1959 or 1960 we thought that the co-operative society in the village was going to be a counterpart of the Planning Commission that was sitting at the top in Delhi. This aspect of the

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

question, I am sorry to say, has been completely disappointing to the co-operators. Secondly, we expected that there would be a co-operative society for every village, just as there was going to be a panchayat for every village or a group of villages. We had promised a school, a co-operative society and a panchayat for every village or a group of villages. These were the three cardinal institutions which we had promised to every village in order to make every village a small republic in this country but so far we have failed in this respect. Even according to the Minister, out of two lakhs or so of agricultural co-operative societies more than 50,000 are spurious and many did not seem to be functioning. This is a very disappointing state of affairs and it is in the Ministers's own interests to see that a Committee of this kind is appointed. I was feeling quite happy as he was speaking but I was disappointed when he came to his last sentence because all the while he was speaking in support of the contentions raised in the discussion.

Similarly under the Third Five Year Plan an agro-industrial base was to be created but we are not seeing anything of that kind happening anywhere in the country. He had no statistics to give to show how far agro-industrial development was taking place through co-operation. Of course his Department is the biggest so far as these principles are concerned but was it the best? Even according to him it was not the best. The weaker sections of the community stand completely neglected today and I wonder if he can think of any other agency through which the weaker sections of the community can be helped. He has not spoken anything about the weaker sections of the community.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He had limited time at his disposal.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: My complaint was, and the complaint of every Member of this House was, that there was nothing wrong with the principles that have been enunciated. In the book, the principles were excellent indeed but the implementation aspect was not as satisfactory as it ought to have been. Supposing at the initial stage itself good traditions are not built up, then what will happen later? Once it becomes a big giant, probably the Minister will find himself completely helpless to rectify the matter. So I wanted the responsibility to be taken up by Parliament itself. Now, the hon. Minister is a very valiant person, a very bold person. He is able to take decisions boldly and also act upon his decisions. It is all true but in advising me to withdraw this Resolution of mine, I would like to remind him that he has taken upon himself a very onerous responsibility of running the entire co-operative movement and putting it on an even keel very soon. Otherwise his responsibilities will become very much greater because he has been forced to give such promises because of the advice he has tendered to me to withdraw the Resolution.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): He has promised to resign if the cooperative movement is not made to run properly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Now in view of this assurance

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: In spite of the fact that there have been enormous failures in the implementation of the various decisions—there may be a number of study groups, and all that—since he has taken upon himself the responsibility, which otherwise Parliament would have taken, I would like to withdraw my Resolution and I wish him all success.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.