

RAJYA SABHA

*Friday, the 26th August, 1960/the 4th
Bhadra, 1882 (Saka)*

The House met at eleven of the clock
MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

RESOLUTION *RE* APPOINTMENT OF
PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE
FOR ENQUIRING INTO THE SLOW
PROGRESS OF THE CO-OPERATIVE
MOVEMENT—*continued*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Subba Rao,
you have eight minutes more.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Kerala):
Eight minutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You took seven
minutes the other day.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO: Mr. Chairman,
the other day when the House adjourned,
I was referring to certain impediments
coming in the way of the proper
expansion of the co-operative movement.
Before enumerating certain of the
difficulties that are there, I would like to
bring to the notice of the House certain
facts and figures which were quoted and
also certain observations made by certain
Members.

My friend, Mr. Gurupada Swamy,
legitimately complained that the Mem-
bers of the Congress and the Government
were trying to paint a rosy picture, and it
was objected to by my friend, Mrs.
Yashoda Reddy, and we were told that it
was not only a rosy picture, but it was
actually rose itself spreading its
fragrance. I would like to refer to the
facts and figures given by my friend Mr.
Misra, and would like to explode that
myth. We were told that we had 1,80,000
co-operative societies and that out of
these, 1,18,000 made a profit of about
Rs. 3-38 crores. When we talk about
lakhs and crores, it looks really very
impressive but if we analyse the profit
per society, it comes on an average to
only Rs. 286 per year. While few
societies catering 494 RSD.—1.

io the needs of the well-to-do people, the
land-owners and the wealthy peasants
and having a share-capital of more than
Rs. 1 lakh would have earned a profit of
more than Rs. 1,000 per year, actually
many of the societies would have made a
very nominal profit. Then we were told
that out of these 1,80,000 societies, only
34,000 societies worked at a loss. That
means that 19 per cent, of the societies
worked at a loss. And on an average one
society in every five worked at a loss.
And 30,000 societies were just working
on a basis of no profit and no loss. That
means, one in every six societies was
working on a no profit no loss basis. I do
not think it is a very rosy picture. Now,
18 million members were given loans
which totalled Rs. 190 crores. Roughly it
comes to about Rs. 100 per member. I
would like to know how many members
out of these 18 million got more than Rs.
500 to Rs. 1,000 per head and what the
percentage of the credit given to them is
to the total credit of Rs. 190 crores. I also
want to know the percentage of the credit
given to the poorer sections of the
members who were given less than Rs.
50. Then only we will have a better
picture of it.

Then, Sir, the distribution of loans in
the different States is uneven, and that
has been referred to in the Report for
1959-60 itself. It has been reported
that—

"Although there has been a signi-
ficant increase in the quantum of credit
supplied by co-operatives in recent
years, the State-wise distribution of
loans continues to be uneven as on
30th June, 1958. Madras, Bombay and
Andhra Pradesh alone accounted for
slightly over 50 per cent, of the total
advanced."

That means, many of the societies in the
other States are really giving less than
the average. In Kerala, it is only Rs. 38
per year per head; in West Bengal, it is
only Rs. 46 and in Bihar, it is only Rs. 18
per head, and we cannot take any great
credit for the acceleration of the co-
operative movement.

[Dr. A. Subba Rao.]

Again, he said that out of 1,600 joint co-operative farming societies, 800 societies were working well. What about the other 800 societies? Fifty per cent, of the joint co-operative farming societies are not working properly and they are working at a loss. Is it a great credit? I may remind my friend—she is not here now—that this is not a real rose, but this is an artificial rose made of paper and cloth, with a sprinkling of rose-water over it. It is just to deceive the people. This is the actual picture. Now, what are the limitations? That point has been gone into well in all these Reports made by the different working groups. But in spite of all the best efforts of the Ministry, why is it that we are not progressing sufficiently? That is the question. That is why we want a Committee of Parliament to go into this question and make certain recommendations so that the movement will be accelerated and we can achieve the desired results.

I was referring to the limitation of membership in the societies. This has been referred to in pages 52 and 53 of the Report. I do not want to go into the details. It has been said there:

"In many States, the village societies are not open to all the people in the village and quite often, they are the close preserve of a few well-to-do people who take full advantage of the assistance and the facilities provided by the Government and yet are not prepared to open their door to the weaker sections of the community."

So, when a proper attempt is made to expand the benefits of these societies to the underprivileged people of that village, then the vested interests come in the way. And how can we prevent it? Of course, the solution is also given that a right of appeal must be there. And it was the Kerala Government, the Communist Government, which wanted to relax this law and it gave the right of appeal to every citizen of that particular village, if refused admission into the co-operative society.

So, there are so many other defects. I am sorry I could not make some more suggestions for want of time. But anyway, a Committee of Parliamentarians who can actually go and rally the people and get their confidence is absolutely necessary. Members of the House should also be taken into confidence and therefore, the necessity for a Committee arises. I hope that they will agree to constituting that Committee so that we can go ahead with our work.

SHRI MAHESWAR NAIK (Orissa):
Mr. Chairman, the Resolution as it stands looks very innocent but when one goes into it and its implications a little deeper, a lot of things beyond the scope of the Resolution come to light. In the garb of simple words, it seeks the constitution of a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament to go into the slow progress of the cooperative movement. By implication, the Resolution signifies that there is no satisfactory progress or that there is no progress nearer any success. So far as the statistical aspects of the progress of the movement are concerned, I need not go into the details because my friend, Mr. Deokinandan Narayan, who spoke at the opening stage of this debate, has given ample proof that the movement is not slow. What I am pained to find here—particularly in the opening speech of the mover of the Resolution—is that not only he has made accusations against the progress of the co-operative movement, but he has hurled a lot of sarcastic remarks against the Government as well as the party in power in the usual way that his party is accustomed to do. Sir, this particular Resolution is sought to be made the vehicle of political tirades against the Government. He has accused the Government of nepotism, favouritism and patronage.

Sir, the co-operative movement has been in existence in India long before these political parties came into being. Co-operatives have got a major role to play in the establishment of a welfare State in the country. Facilities, whether they are in the shape of loans,

in the shape of subsidies or in some other shape, which are intended to be given to the general masses of our country can be given only through these co-operatives or the other agencies advocated in our Plan. Only through them we will be able to bring the message of welfare to the great mass of our people.

Sir, if these facilities are to be brought to the doors of the people, it must be through some agencies, be it co-operatives be it the Social Welfare Board or be it any other agency. But our friends opposite grudge that; if these facilities are distributed through these agencies, that is termed as advocating favouritism and nepotism. I for one cannot accept this accusation.

The whole trouble with our friends is that they labour under a misapprehension; the party in power does not like to join hands with them in fishing in troubled waters. As for example . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): By yourself you can create enough troubles.

SHRI MAHESWAR NAIK: You have had your own say. Let me have my own say.

Sir, everybody knows that so far as the Indian border is concerned the Communist Party in particular has been meted out with scant respect in the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, have we moved the Resolution for the setting up of co-operatives on our borders? We have not.

SHRI MAHESWAR NAIK: Now, they want to fish in more troubled waters, as only a day or two back they had sought to canalise their activities in some other channel. They want that their view-point, so far as the Sino-Indian border dispute is concerned, should be brought to the notice of the people at large through

the medium of students' organisations. They now want to approach students through whom to propagate their own ideologies. Sir, it is high time that the country beware of such activities. I do not like to go into more details on that point.

Coming to the merits of the Resolution, I find that they want the establishment of a Committee to enquire into and report on the causes for the slow progress of the co-operative movement in the country. Not only in regard to this matter but, as their usual custom is, elsewhere also they do not want one to be left to oneself in respect of following a particular method to earn a living in the country. We have experience of lots of committees and commissions and all that. Here, in the co-operative field also, I think, we have already several committees whose experience, whose knowledge and whose view-points have been adequately embodied in their reports submitted to the Central as well as State Governments.

Recently, Sir Malcolm Darling has given a very comprehensive report on the co-operative movement. There were study teams which submitted their reports in 1957. Then came the follow-ups of the Rural Credit Survey of 1957-58 and 1958-59. To add to these piles of documents, there are reports by Working Groups on Cooperative Farming, 1959 and of the Expert Committee on Co-operative Credit, 1960. In view of the already existing useful expert findings given in respect of the co-operative movement being brought into a proper channel of activities, I do not find the necessity at all for a Committee of this nature consisting mostly of laymen.

Sir, it has been stated that the co-operative movement has made very slow progress, hence the necessity of this Committee. I have here certain figures which speak of not only the strides in progress it has made, but also they go to show that in certain spheres of its activities co-operatives

[Shri Maheswar Naik] have made progress gear all the machinery at its disposal for far beyond the targets fixed by the Second the speedy growth of co-operatives in Five Year Plan. For example, in the case of those States. Therefore, Sir, I would urge supply of agricultural credit, the figure is Rs. upon the Ministry of Cooperation to go 190 crores so far as short-term and medium-term into the reasons as to why this kind of term loans are concerned. Besides, Rs. backwardness in those States is 33 crores of loans are proposed to be persisting and to afford some special advanced under long-term loans against the facilities so that those States might come target of Rs. 200 crores set out in the up to the level of the other States. Second Five Year Plan for short-term and Thank you, Sir.

medium-term loans and of Rs. 25 crores under long-term loans. This is an achievement by no means small. The membership of the primaries of the co-operative societies has gone up to 14.9 million as against a target of 15 million. In 1960-61 it is expected to reach 17 million. Sir, this is exceeding the target by about two millions. Sir, the number of co-operative farming societies, in respect of which my friend, the sponsor, wants to make a lot of capital, has gone up to 3,690 and there are farming societies where lands have been pooled, which number 1,600 and over and above that, Sir, there are so many better farming co-operative societies which are manned on the basis of individual cultivation. Sir, the Plan expenditure has also gone up to Rs. 42-83 crores as against the Plan provision of Rs. 52 crores. If the total provision of Rs. 52 crores has not been completely spent, in my opinion, it is because of the fact that the Co-operative Departments in the States have not indulged themselves in reckless spending. Nonetheless, Sir, I hope that it will not be too long to fulfil our desired objectives.

This, however, brings me to a very vital point which I want to make here. This is in respect of the four eastern States of Orissa, West Bengal, Assam and Bihar. These four States seem to be a little less advanced so far as the co-operative movement is concerned. Many States like Punjab, Madras, U.P. and Bombay are advancing like anything in the matter of co-operatives, whereas these eastern States are lagging far behind, in spite of the fact that the Government is putting into

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
माननीय सभापति महोदय, यह जो प्रस्ताव श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने एक समिति नियुक्त करने के लिए रखा है, सिद्धांततः मैं इसके विरोध में हूँ, इस लिए नहीं कि जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा और जो उनके दिमाग में है कि कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटियों में कुछ खराबियाँ हैं बिलकुल गलत है, बल्कि ख़ास तौर से इस वजह से कि कमेटियाँ और कमिशन नियुक्त करने का आजकल एक फैशन सा हो गया है। हर एक जगह हम यह देखते हैं कि अगर कोई जरा सी घटना हो जाय तो फौरन यह मांग होती है कि एक कमेटी मुकर्रर करो, एक कमिशन मुकर्रर करो। फिर वह कमिशन नियुक्त होता है, काम करता है, काफी वक्त लगाता है और उसमें भी अगर विभिन्न मत के, अलग अलग राय के, भिन्न भिन्न राजनीतिक खयाल के लोग शामिल हो जाय तो उनमें पहले वही पर रस्साकशी होती है और जो गवाहियाँ देने वाले आते हैं उनमें भी रस्साकशी हो जाती है क्योंकि राजनीतिक पार्टियों का अलग अलग विचार होता है और वे गवाहों पर असर डालती हैं। साथ ही साथ जो नियुक्त देने वाले होते हैं उनके नियुक्तियों पर भी असर पड़ता है। जब रिपोर्ट आती है तो उसमें नोट्स आफ डिमेंट होते हैं, फिर यह कहा जाता है कि उसपर बहस करो, और इस तरह फिर वही पुराना दौर जारी हो जाता है। इस लिए मेरा निश्चित मत यह है कि अगर किसी काम को बिगाड़ना हो,

न करना ही, तो एक कमेटी नियुक्त कर दी जाये और फिर वह काम महीनों नहीं, सानों तक टल जायेगा और उसमें कुछ नहीं होगा। इस लिए यह जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया है कि एक कमेटी मुकर्रर की जाये जो सहकारिता आन्दोलन में जितने दुर्गुण और नुकस या गये हैं उनकी जांच करे, इससे अगर रोग का ठीक निदान हो सकता और निराकरण हो सकता तो मुझे क्या हर एक आदमी को बड़ी खुशी होती लेकिन यह होने का नहीं है, बल्कि मेरा खयाल यह है कि इससे यह रोग और ज्यादा बढ़ जायेगा और सिधाय एक दूसरे पर कीचड़ उछालने के और कुछ नहीं होगा।

दूसरी मेरी राय यह है कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसकी भावना यह है कि गवर्नमेंट एक कमेटी नियुक्त करे, गवर्नमेंट ही उस पर विचार करे, और गवर्नमेंट ही सब बुराइयों को दूर करने के लिए कदम उठाये। अब अगर हम इस प्रस्ताव को मान लेते हैं और गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर इसका तमाम भार छोड़ देते हैं तो यह असूलन बिलकुल गलत होगा। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी यह कहा है कि कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटियां स्वतंत्र होनी चाहियें, उनमें गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से इंटरफिरेंस नहीं होनी चाहिये। हमेशा से सहकारिता का काम स्वच्छा के आधार पर बढ़ा है, अपने आप वाल्व हुआ है, ऊपर से थोपा नहीं गया है। लेकिन यहां इस प्रस्ताव की यही मंशा हो सकती है कि हम गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में ज्यादा से ज्यादा शक्ति बढ़ाते जायें जो कि अिद्धांततः भलत है। मुझे बड़ी खुशी होगी यदि ऐसा समय आ जाये जब लोगों में इतना अनुशासन आ जाये और उनमें सेल्फ हेल्प की भावना इतनी उत्पन्न हो जाये कि सरकारी महकमों की आवश्यकता ही न पड़े। सरकारों

महकमों की क्या जरूरत है? सरकारी महकमों बनते हैं। ऊपर से रुपया पैसा दिया जाता है और मैं समझता हूँ कि कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटियों में इसी वजह से बुराइयां आई हैं। जब ऊपर से पंडित जी कहते हैं कि कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटियां होनी चाहियें, तो नीचे वाले भी कहने लगते हैं कि कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटियां जरूर बननी चाहियें। केन्द्र से हमारे मंत्री जी अपना आदेश और सलाह राज्यों को भेज दें और फिर वहां से नीचे के अफसरों को आदेश मिल जायेंगे। इस प्रकार होभा यह कि अन्धाधुन्ध तरीके से कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटियां बनने लगेंगी क्योंकि लोग यह कहेंगे कि जब पंडित जी जैसे लोग यह चाहते हैं कि सहकारिता आन्दोलन बढ़े तो हमें भी पीछे नहीं रहना चाहिये। इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि बहुत सी सोसाइटियां बाँग यह देखे हुये बना दी जायेंगी कि वे चल सकती हैं या नहीं और बहुत सी जगह बिलकुल बनावटी सोसाइटियां बन जायेंगी। जो होशियार आदमी हैं, जो चलाक किस्म के आदमी हैं वे यह सोचेंगे कि हमको ऊपर से पैसा मिलेगा, सरकार हमारी मदद करेगी, इस लिए कुछ नकली, नामनिहाद कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटियां बना लें और जो ऊपर से पैसा आयेगा उसको किसी भी तरीके से हजम कर जायेंगे और अपने काम में लगा लेंगे। इस लिए सरकार के ऊपर इतनी निर्भरता आतक है और यही चीज नुकसान पहुंचा रही है और जिस चीज के निराकरण के लिए भूपेश गुप्त जी ने यह प्रस्ताव रखा है उसकी जड़ में भी यही चीज है।

कोऑपरेशन एक ऐसी भावना है जो प्राकृतिक रूप से इवाल्ब हुई है और अनन्त काल से उसका विकास अपने आप हुआ है। जिस को प्रिमिटिव

[श्री नवाबसिंह रोहान]
 स्टैंज कहते हैं, जब कि इंसान जगलों में
 चमता था, उसकी आवश्यकता नहीं
 मिलने की, काम का बंटवारा करने को
 इस लिए उसने आपस में मिलना सोचा।
 एक आदमी शिकार मार कर खाता
 था दूसरा आदमी पकाता था और ऐसे
 सहयोग की भावना आई। इसी प्रकार
 सहयोग की भावना आगे बढ़ती गई,
 उसका विकास होता गया। इसलिए
 सहयोग की जो भावना है यह इवाल्फ
 होनी चाहिये नीचे से, यह नहीं कि
 ऊपर से थाप देनी चाहिये। अगर
 ऊपर से हुकम हो गया कि सर्विस
 कोऑपरेटिव बननी चाहिये तो ऐसा
 ही होगी जैसा हम देख रहे हैं कि अंधाधुंध
 बनी हुई हैं और बन रही हैं, चाहे
 चले या न चले। इसलिए इस बात का
 हमें ध्यान रखना चाहिये। जैसा कि
 प्रस्ताव में सुझाव दिया गया है कि
 पन्द्रह आदमियों की एक कमेटी बने तो
 में समझता हूँ उससे उतना लाभ नहीं
 होगा जितना कि इससे होगा कि हमारे
 ये पन्द्रह सदस्य अपने यहां कोऑपरेटिव
 सोसाइटियां बनाने लग जायें और लोगों
 को शिक्षा देने लग जायें कि इस तरीके
 से बनाओ, जहां खराबियां हों उन्हें दूर
 करने में लग जायें। इससे अधिक फायदा
 हो सकेगा बनिस्वत इसके कि यह कमेटी
 बने, इतना खर्चा हो और व्यर्थ में समय
 बर्बाद हो।

मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि श्री भूपेश
 गुप्त कोऑपरेटिवज में जो कामियां हैं
 उनमें सुधार लाना चाहते हैं। मैं यह
 समझता हूँ कि वे और उनकी पार्टी
 के आदमी और उनके मित्र लोग जो
 पार्टी से बाहर हों, उन सब का यह फर्ज
 है कि यहां गवर्नमेंट के जरिये यह काम
 न कराके खुद ही उसको करने के लिये
 जूट पड़ें और जहां जहां जो खराबियां

हों उनको दूर करके सुधार करें। मेरे
 खयाल से जो उपाय उन्होंने सुझाया है
 खराबियों को दूर करने का वह उससे
 भी ज्यादा खराब है। जिस मर्ज के
 लिये आप दवा दे रहे हैं वह दवा ऐसी
 है कि देखने में तो मालूम पड़ता है कि
 वह दवा है लेकिन उससे कहीं ज्यादा
 हानि हो सकती है, उससे बिल्कुल
 प्राणान्त भी हो सकता है। इसलिए
 मैं और ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ।
 हां, यह अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ, जैसे
 मैंने प्रार्थना की थी, श्री भूपेश गुप्त
 से भी और सबसे, कि हम सब लोग
 मिलें और उन तमाम नुस्सों को निकालें।
 साथ ही साथ माननीय मंत्री जी से भी
 मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि कोऑपरेटिव
 सोसाइटियों का बिल्कुल नैचुरल ढंग से,
 प्राकृतिक ढंग से इवैल्युएशन होने दिया
 जाये। उनको बनाने से पहले आप
 जो कुछ कर सकते हैं इसमें—पब्लिक
 ओपीनियन को एजुकेट कर सकते हैं,
 लोगों के दिनागों को इसके मुआफिक
 बना सकते हैं—वह सब कीजिएगा,
 लेकिन अगर आप यह चाहें कि केवल
 रुपये पैसे की मदद दे कर कोऑपरेटिव
 की जड़ें मजबूत हो जायेंगी तो यह कभी
 नहीं हो सकेगा। अगर बगैर सोचे
 समझे उनको पैसा दे दिया गया तो
 उसका दुरुपयोग भी हो सकता है।
 कोऑपरेटिव के मानी ही यह है कि जहां
 कहीं भी नीचे से अपने आप ही, स्वतः
 स्वेच्छा से, लोग आपस में मिलें और
 सबकी भलाई के लिए काम करें—
 प्रत्येक व्यक्ति समाज की भलाई के
 लिये हो और समाज प्रत्येक व्यक्ति की भलाई
 के लिये हो। यह सिद्धान्त है जो प्रेरणा
 का। लेकिन यहां जो हम देख रहे हैं
 उसमें सभी लोग स्वेच्छा से थोड़े ही
 मिलते हैं। कहीं कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी
 बनानी है तो कोऑपरेटिव आफिसर
 साहब गये और गांव वालों से कह दिया

कि तुम भी सहयोग दोगे, ये भी दंगे, वह भी दंगे । कहीं इस तरीके से जल्दी में यह चीज हो सकती है । यह तो कोऑपरेटिव के सिद्धान्त के ऊपर कुठाराघात है । भले ही इसको आप दिखा देंगे कि हमारी यह प्रगति हो गई लेकिन मजबूती नहीं आयेगी जब तक लोगों के दिलों में इसकी मजबूती न हो, जब तक वह सिद्धान्त जड़ न पकड़े । लोग समझते हैं कोऑपरेटिव बनने से हमारा फायदा हो जायेगा, रुपया मिल जायेगा, कर्जा मिल जायेगा इसलिये बना देते हैं, लेकिन फिर वह चल नहीं सकता । इसलिये वह चीज जिसको हम ह्यूमेन फैक्टर कहते हैं इसमें बहुत ज्यादा काम करता है । अगर कहीं अच्छे लोग हों, समझदार लोग हों, ठीक ढंग से लोगों को बातें बताते हों, समझाते हों, वहां तो ये अच्छी तरह चल जाती है, जैसा कि बम्बई में हो रहा है, गुजरात में और मद्रास में हो रहा है । वहां अधिकतर सोसाइटीज बहुत अच्छे तरीके से चल रही हैं, लोगों का भी बड़ा अच्छा सहयोग मिल रहा है और बड़ा उपकारी कार्य कर रही हैं । लेकिन बहुत से स्थान ऐसे भी मिलेंगे जहां बड़ी खराबियां नजर आ रही हैं । स्वयं मेरे ही राज्य में बहुत सी खराबियां हो रही हैं, कोई ठिकाना नहीं है । ग्राम तीर से गांव वाले यह कहते हैं कि ये कोऑपरेटिव नहीं है सापरेटिव है, यानी पैसा खा जाती है । नतीजा यह होता है कोऑपरेटिव के विचार को नुकसान उठाना पड़ता है । वहां पर लोन देने के लिये सुपरवाइजर सुकरंर हैं और वह क्या करते हैं कि किसान जब रुपया लेता है तो उसे दस रुपया शेयर पर सी रुपया मिल जाता है । जब वह दस रुपया शेयर मनी देता है तो सुपरवाइजर बीस रुपया तीस रुपया की रसीद काट देता है और उस

वेपड़ेलिखे किसान को मालूम नहीं होता है । उसके मानी यह होते हैं कि किसान दो सी या तीन सी रुपया लेने का हकदार होगया लेकिन यहां किसान को सी रुपये ही दिये जाते हैं और दो सी रुपया वे अपनी जेब में रख लेते हैं । जब किसान के पास डिमान्ड जाती है तब उसे हकीकत मालूम पड़ती है कि २०० रु० कहां से मेरे ऊपर चढ़ गए । ऐसी मिसालें भी मौजूद हैं जहां सुपरवाइजर ने इसी तरीके से जाली दस्तखत बना बना कर और अंगूठे लगाकर दूसरों के नाम से कर्जे ले लिये । एक जगह किसी ग्रेजुएट के नाम कर्जा लिखा दिया है और उसके नाम के आगे थम्ब इम्प्रेशन लगा दिया गया है ग्रेजुएट का ।

तो इस तरीके की तमाम चीजें हो रही हैं और उनमें सुधार होने की आवश्यकता है । अगर गवर्नमेंट के किये से कोई चीज हो सकती है तो करे । लेकिन गवर्नमेंट का, हमारा और आपका यह फर्क है कि हम जनता को, जैसा कि मैंने कहा, इतना मजबूत बनायें, पब्लिक प्रोपीनियन इस तरीके की क्रिएट करें कि इस तरीके की चीजें न होने पायें । हम एक विरोध कर दें इसके विरुद्ध क्योंकि यही नहीं कि यह खतरा है कि उसमें रुपया यहां से वहां जा रहा है, उसका दुरुपयोग हो रहा है, बल्कि यह भी है कि यह संस्था, यह इंस्टीट्यूशन हमेशा के लिये बदनाम हो जायेगा । क्या कारण है कि लोग कहते हैं कोऑपरेटिव में रुपया खा जाते हैं । हमारे अधिकारों की हरकतों की वजह से इस तरीके की चीजें हो रही हैं । जब हम एग्जिलन्स में भी कोऑपरेटिव्स को लाना चाहते हैं इतने बड़े पैमाने पर तो हमें चाहिए कि हम उसका शुद्धीकरण करें । यह दूसरी बात है कि हमारा काम करने का ढंग अलग अलग हो किन्तु इस भावना से ता तभी लोग सहमत होंगे कि जहां जहां हमें खराबियां नजर आयें हम उनको दूर करें । श्री भोपाल गुप्त समझते

[श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान]
होगे उनको ही खराबियां दी जाती हैं। खराबियां बूझनी हों तो कई एक में भी दिखा सकता हूँ। हर जगह कुछ न कुछ खराबियां मिल जायेंगी और फिर हमें पग पग पर कमेटी मुकरंर करनी पड़ेगी और वायद दुनिया में कोई महकमा ही नहीं दिखायी देगा और सब कमेटी ही कमेटी चारों तरफ दी जाती पड़ेगी।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह (राजस्थान) : वह भी पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी।

श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान : हर एक जगह कमेटी बन सकती है।

इसलिये मैं ज्यादा न कह कर अपनी बातें समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I saw Shri Bhupesh Gupta speaking while moving his Resolution. I was wondering how fantastically able he was in pushing up his own ideas. Could it be that he had not cared to look into the facts and figures of the progress that has been made not only in the Second Five Year Plan but in the one previous to that? It could not be. But what made him do or what made him picture the progress of the movement in such depressing terms, I do not know. The other day our Prime Minister was telling us here that some of the political parties in India, especially their leaders and their minds, are so much twisted that they are not able to see the progress and examine that for the sake of the country which we are supposed to or which we profess to serve. How could Mr. Gupta expect us to swallow such a big lie?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Don't swallow.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Anyway, I invite his attention to see how the progress has been kept up. In

the First Plan we started with only Rs. 23 crores of credit and according to him, it is about Rs. 200 crores. Is it a mean progress? It has gone up by 10 times and still my friend does not admit that it is progress. In 1951 we had only one lakh five thousand co-operative societies whereas in 1960-61 the figure is two lakhs, and yet he refused to give credit to the movement. In 1951 the membership was 4.4 millions whereas in 1960-61 it is estimated to be 17 million. I do not know why the sense of proportion of the hon. mover of this Resolution is so dull that he is not able to see the improvement. Take other aspects. The figure in respect of godowns was 403 then and it is now 4109; there were only 187 marketing societies then and we have already got 1679. Thirty-three per cent, of the entire agricultural population is covered by this movement, and 25 per cent, of the entire rural population is covered by the movement, and yet to say that the movement has not made any progress is something very astonishing indeed. I do not know what progress means, according to him. Does 'progress' mean something else to the Communist Member, I do not know. Of course, it is said that they do not believe in progress. They only believe in revolution, annihilation, regimentation and complete totalitarianism.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: At the moment we believe in Private Members' Resolution!

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: That is the thing which is being blown up in this House. If that is what he means, then certainly we have not made progress that way. Just take a look round the world and see how this movement has grown. This movement has been progressing in the last one century. This is a process of construction, laying brick over brick, cemented properly, allowing time for setting in. It is a process of building; it is not a process of annihilation, where everything that is opposed to

one's own ideas is put an end to. We believe in a democratic process; we believe in the process of persuasion; we believe in discussion. We have made progress in the co-operative sphere and the progress is not less than five times in many cases, and there are cases where it is ten times. I should think that the co-operative departments both at the Centre and in the States ought to be congratulated for this.

The hon. Member wants a committee to go into this question. I do not want any more committees. Plenty of committees have gone into the questions ever since this movement was started in 1904. I believe it was a Central subject till 1919. There was the report called the Maclagan Committee Report; then came the Royal Commission on Agriculture. It was then said that if co-operation failed then the last hope of rural India would fail. Then came the Gadgil Committee which did excellent work so far as rural credit was concerned. A new policy in respect of co-operation was enunciated in 1958 which is a landmark in respect of this movement. Till 1958, credit was given only to those people who were creditworthy; it was in that year that it was said that credit should be linked to production, so much so that not a single man in this country would go without the facilities of credit for purpose of greater production. It has often been said that, especially after the new co-operative policy enunciated by the National Development Council in 1958, this movement has assumed *Viswaroopam* Right from the lowest man in this great movement up to the top man in the structure, everybody will be brought in within the folds of this movement, and it will not happen just overnight in the way the mover of this Resolution wants it to be. It is a process, as I said before, of evolving a structure, carrying all the forty crores of people with us. and in this process, I want the greatest credit to be paid to the co-operative departments both at the Centre and

in the States for the great part played by them.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before this House has been moved by Mr. Bnupesh Gupta. On the face of it, Sir, it looks harmless, but I feel that its implications are far and wide. This has been brought before us on the assumption that there has been slow progress in this movement. The mover desires a committee to be set up to go into the causes of this slow progress of this movement having regard to the recommendations contained in the Second Five Year Plan relating to the development of co-operation. This assumption itself is baseless. It is necessary for us to assess as to how much progress has been made in regard to the co-operative movement, what measures have been taken by the Government and what steps are still being taken by the Government for the advancement of its activities! The speakers who have spoken before me have elaborately given facts and figures relating to the physical targets achieved. In some cases, they have exceeded. Sir, it is evident that the figure of 15.3 million was set as the target to be achieved at the end of the Second Five Year Plan, as far as membership goes. Let us now go into the figures for the various periods. In 1956-57, we have on the rolls 9.2 millions; in 1957-58, it was 10.2 millions; in 1958-59, it was 11.9 million, and by the end of the Second Plan, we hope to reach the figure of 17 million. This shows that we are going far ahead of the targets or the objectives mentioned in the Second Five Year Plan. Similar is the case in respect of short-term and medium-term agricultural credit. In the year 1958-59, it was Rs. 125.4 crores, and for 1959-60, the estimate is Rs. 155 crores. Now, this shows how far the Government has been going for stepping up this agricultural co-operative movement. So is the case of the large-size societies and primary marketing societies. Sir, this Resolution is not necessary and I oppose it on another ground also. Recently, a working

[Shri J. H. Joshi.] group on farming has been set up under the Chairmanship of Mr. S. Nijalingappa; also another Committee has been set up under the Chairmanship of Mr. Vaikunthlal Mehta. This shows that the work is going on satisfactorily and so the Resolution is absolutely unnecessary.

Sir, what is the meaning behind this Resolution? We believe in co-operative movement. For us, that is, India which is an under-developed country, co-operative is the only course open for us, if we have to fight the evils of capitalism and if we have to keep at bay the dangers of communism. Therefore, the Government knows it fully well that co-operation is a blessing to this country. If my friend, the mover of the Resolution, were to visit my part of the country he could see that the cultivators have come out of their ignorance and their superstition. Their economic condition has improved and a large part of the business in foodgrains, in ground-nut, in cotton and other things has been taken over almost entirely by the farmers and cultivators. They have set up marketing and other types of societies and they feel that co-operation is really a blessing to them. Sir, our cultivator class is by and large a conservative class. So long as they do not feel that a particular activity or a particular programme is advantageous to them, they will not take it up but now, as I have stated, they have known the benefits and advantages and therefore they are taking to it.

Sir, there may be cases where the progress has been slow in some quarter; and the cause is absolute ignorance. And the followers of the principles to which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta subscribes are also to a little extent responsible for this slow progress. I may cite one instance. The Government supplies agricultural credit to the farmers. Now, there is a district in our side where the agriculturists

have not paid back for the last seven or eight years although the harvest was good and the years also were good. What is the reason? The comrades of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta approach those persons and they say, 'Don't pay. Why should you pay? You are poor; poorer than the Government'. The Government is rich and you need not pay.' This is the sort of propaganda which is being carried on by the friends . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where?

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ (Maharashtra): Gujarat.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI: ... of Mr Bhupesh Gupta. This co-operative movement is a movement which we view from a particular angle while Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and his colleagues view it from another aspect. They feel that in the circumstances in which they are placed, this is a method by which they can strengthen the roots of Communism in this country.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): Has it roots?

SHRI J. H. JOSHI: They feel that. Therefore, I feel that this Resolution is not necessary. It is useless and it is only meant to censure the Government in the eyes of the people and to show that the Government is very slow in accelerating the speed of this co-operative movement.

Sir, there are some shortcomings in this movement and there are causes for it. Firstly, we are not experienced. We have not got trained staff but the House knows that the Government has set up training courses at some centres. There is a training school at Poona for the training of senior class officers. Then there are training schools at other places also—five or six places—for the training of junior and other cadres. So, that way we are progressing in that direction.

Then, Sir, there are some bad elements that enter into this co-operative movement for the sake of self-interest because there are money matters involved in it. Those who want to take undue advantage of this enter these co-operatives to serve their own interests. Therefore, it is necessary that there should be internal checks and constant and continued supervision over the accounts and working of these co-operatives. There should be regular audit. Sometimes we hear about misappropriation of the funds of these co-operatives. But more than that what is essential is to check the misapplication of the funds. What happens is this. Persons who have got these funds in their hands carry on their private business and they misapply these funds of the co-operatives for their own personal ends. If there is, as I stated before, constant vigilance on the part of the Government and if they had District Supervisory Boards, this could be stopped. These are the steps which the Government should take in order that these cooperative societies may be purged clean so that no bad elements may take undue advantage of the funds at their disposal. Thank you.

12 NOON

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION (SHRI S. K. DEY) : Mr. Chairman, I must at the very outset confess that I liked neither the look of the Resolution, nor the substance of it, nor can I under any conditions approve of the proposal. Before I proceed further to explain why I feel this way, I should like to relate, if I can have the indulgence of the House, a simple anecdote, which came my way only this morning. I planted about twentyfive *papaya* seedlings in my compound here in New Delhi. I am very fond of them. Everyday I was anxious to see how the *papaya* seedlings were progressing. I was so impatient that every alternate day I was trying to manure them. Only this morning I discovered

that, because of over-manuring and over-attention, half the plants had died out, had disintegrated.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope the same fate is not there in the co-operatives.

SHRI S. K. DEY: I am coming to his question. Now, if we are thinking of co-operation for human beings, who we wish may grow in co-operation as free human beings, we have to deal with them as organisms which follow their own laws. Neither over-care, nor under-care is going to help them. In this connection I think that the points made by my friend, Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan, just a few minutes ago, were very relevant. If we wanted to develop co-operatives as a mode of business, to be conducted by Government, controlled by Government, directed by Government and checked by Government, there could be nothing better than this house appointing a committee and dictating the policy to the Government for implementation, which the Government can order the people to carry out. If, on the other hand, it is a question of letting the people grow in co-operation then we have to consider very carefully to what extent the people will be in a position to assimilate the assistance that the Government offers and to benefit from that assistance.

Now, Sir, there have been a lot of statistics discussed regarding the quantitative achievement under the co-operative programme during the Second Five Year Plan. I would not like to inflict further statistics on this House. I am quite sure that from all the data that have been quoted, this House would be convinced that if quantitative achievement were the criterion, the co-operative movement in the country has done better, on the whole, than we actually targeted for. However, if it is to be a human movement, the qualitative aspect of the movement has to acquire greater importance.

[Shri S. K. Dey.]

I am very grateful that this Resolution was moved, even though I disapprove of the Resolution. I say this because we have been having discussions on the Community Development Programme all these years. I am very grateful to Parliament, as also to the public, for the enormous interest that has been shown in the Community Development Programme, even though sometimes overmuch attention and overmuch impatience do tend to lead to the results which I just described about my papaya plants, which I experienced this morning. Now, for the first time, this Resolution has given to the Ministry of Co-operation an opportunity to discuss the various aspects of cooperation and I welcome this opportunity. I am very happy about it and I am very grateful to the mover of the Resolution for giving me this opportunity and also for giving this House, I am quite sure, the opportunity for discussing all aspects of this question.

Now, I would not discuss statistics. I would like to say, briefly, what the Ministry is trying to do to promote the co-operative movement. There are naturally in a programme of this nature various stages of planning. In the short-term planning we have tried to attach very high importance to expansion of credit, and as the House will have appreciated, we have done almost as much as we planned for at the beginning of the Second Five Year Plan. We set the target of converting the village co-operative from a mere money-lending organisation to a multi-purpose co-operative which will look after, or at least attempt to look after, the entire requirements of the villagers, be it in the matter of distribution of seeds, of fertilisers, of insecticides, of iron and steel, of kerosene, of cement, or other requisites of the farmer. I am quite sure the House will be happy to know that almost all the States have taken the decision; some States have already implemented and others are in the process of implementing the

procedure for handling all the requirements of the cultivator through the co-operatives, rather than through Government departments. That way, it will help the farmer to get his requirements quicker, easier, and, at the same time, it will also help the co-operative to grow into a bigger institution, a richer institution, looking after the varied aspects of the life of the people, rather than looking after mere financial requirements as a money-lender. We have, then, taken steps for strengthening the Government staff as also the staff of the non-official organisations dealing with cooperation for giving proper supervision to the primary co-operative societies and also for more prompt audit of accounts of co-operatives. There are many other matters that have been taken care of, but these may be enough so far as the broad aspects under short-term planning are concerned.

Under medium-term planning, we have tried to take up training with very great emphasis. The House will appreciate that it is not enough that we discuss about the objectives of co-operatives in Parliament. It is not enough that we understand them in our Ministry or even in the State departments. If co-operation is to grow as a mode of life, dealing with the economic activities of the village people, in particular, it is necessary that a proper understanding of cooperation should travel all along the line up to the village. For this purpose, there has been considerable expansion of training facilities all along the line, for both officials as well as non-officials, as also by peripatetic parties, for the purpose of conducting training of members in co-operation. In the Third Five Year Plan we are hoping that if everything goes well, we should be in a position to establish permanent institutions all over the country for the training of the people and some of their leaders. Similarly, we are trying to bring about relaxation of official control. The House must appreciate that unlike Community Development which

started only eight years ago, and which has been under the continual check of a democratic, independent and alert Government, Co-operation has grown in India over the past fifty years, and that it started in a colonial age. We had first-rate, outstanding co operators. We also had a good number of sycophants of the colonial rulers. In that way co-operation grew as a jumble of excellent work of martyrdom by some and of very profane and sordid work of co-exploitation by many others.

Now, it is only during the past few years that a deliberate effort is being made to bring about what we call, some amount of rationalisation in the co-operative movement, as the Parliament desires, that it should be a self-reliant and self-regulated movement of the people. There is a tremendous demand everywhere by many people and many organisations that Government should have nothing to do whatsoever with the co-operative societies, that they should have no control. Very fine. But at the same time it is very peculiar, very intriguing that there is an equally persistent and loud demand that Government should supply all the financial assistance and practically everything that the cooperative societies require. These two things do not go together. Besides, there can be no vacuums in the control of a movement like co-operation. There should be control either by the Government or by the people's organisations, and people's organisations do not grow overnight. Besides, they can grow only when the base is sound. If the higher tiers of the organisations are to be in health, the base too must be in health. There is wide variation in the character of the co-operative movement from State to State. While in some States is forging ahead almost as fast as in any country in the world, in some other States it is still in the primitive stage. Certainly we cannot try to have the same principles applied to co-operatives in all the States. Besides, it is not possible at^{so} for the Government

to relax all control when an enormous amount of money given by Government, by the Reserve Bank, by the others and the public is involved in investment and in business transactions concerning the co-operatives. There has to be some organisation exercising the control. Now, Government is exercising this control, and I am very unhappy that the Government should continue to exercise this control. We want very fast relaxation, as fast as we can bring it about, but, as I said, there can be no vacuum in a system of this nature. The control can be relaxed only to the extent that there are corresponding organisations of co-operatives which are prepared to exercise this control. As the first step in this direction we took a decision some time ago that Ministers who exercise a considerable amount of power in our Government today, whether they are at the Centre or in the States, must not be anywhere holding a key office in a co-operative organisation. I am very unhappy to report to this House that in the Central organisations, wherever Ministers were functioning in key positions, they have stepped down. Similarly, the process has travelled in the States, and We hope that before long there will be no Minister holding any office in a co-operative organisation. In the same way we have asked the State Governments that officials must be removed from the helm of co-operative organisations. But, again, I must inform this House that, while I am myself as impatient as the House obviously is that there should be very early relaxation of official control, I cannot, consistently, with honesty of my conscience, ask all States to do this overnight. Some States can withdraw officials from the co-operative movement with impunity because organisations of co-operatives there have grown to a stage where they can be entrusted with the responsibilities now being exercised to a considerable extent by Government. In other States what little is being done will be completely disintegrated if officials are removed from there. Even then we are trying to insist on the State

[Shri S. K. Dey.] Governments that it is better to entrust the movement to non-official leaders even if it means greater risks, because it is only by committing errors, if need be, that people will learn, and we should be prepared to underwrite such risks.

Regarding simplification of laws and procedures; States have taken steps in the right direction. But again, I must bring to the attention of the House the fact that, if by legal measures or administrative measures things could be achieved, this country would have been sitting on the top of the world, because there is hardly a country in the world which during the last thirteen years had enacted, as far as I know, the number of legislations that this country had. Legislations can be effective only if there are enlightened people and people's organisations to take advantage of them. Therefore, whatever relaxation is being attempted through the easing of administrative procedures and relaxation of laws can be effective only to the extent that there are enlightened people and educated people with initiative in the co-operative movement to take advantage of it for the community and not for themselves.

On co-operative farming, we had appointed a Committee and the Committee has made its recommendations. These recommendations have been examined by the State Ministers. They are now being examined in the Government of India, and very shortly, within a month or perhaps even sooner, we should be able to take a decision both on the question of cooperative farming as also on the question of co-operative credit with regard to which we appointed a very high power Committee. When these recommendations begin to be implemented, which, I may assure the House, will be before the end of September at the latest, so far as this Ministry is concerned we will see the beginning of a new life both in the credit structure of the country as also in the

co-operative farming programme. Now with regard to co-operative farming, we propose to do it not in the way some countries have done by forcing the people directly or indirectly into the co-operative societies and communes and other institutions. We wish to make it an entirely voluntary movement of the people. If it is to be so, it is essential that we ourselves understand what we need to do. Therefore, we have to move about it with a certain degree of circumspection. It is also necessary that there is proper understanding not merely in Parliament or in the States but also all along the line up to the village level so that people understand what is meant by co-operative farming. I assure the House, and we should be able to exchange notes on this, that when we meet next, in the next session, they will be pleased with the decisions the Government has taken on this behalf; and I am quite sure that they will be appreciative of the reasons for the delay in implementing co-operative farming as a countrywide programme which the country expected of us.

In spite of the absence of any particular decision, the country is going ahead. It is not stopping. It is going ahead on its own pattern following up the co-operative farming programme. Statistics have been quoted in this behalf.

Now, on the long-term perspective, I mentioned earlier that co-operation had to be a law of life. If it has to be so, it is necessary that it percolates into every fibre of our society. How do we do this? We must begin with co-operation from the children and therefore we have already taken steps to introduce co-operation as a subject in schools, colleges and universities. We have not merely introduced cooperation in the curriculum, but are also trying to see that there are practices introduced in co-operation in the educational institutions. Therefore, we are taking steps to see that schools introduce co-operative stores to be

managed by the school children. We are doing the same thing in the colleges and the universities. In all the training centres run under the Community Development Programme, we are making efforts to see that co-operative stores, co-operative farms, service co-operatives and others are introduced for giving facilities for practice to the participants in those training centres. We are trying also to see that co-operation begins to expand from the limited sector of agriculture to the other sectors. If we are to have a socialistic pattern of society, it is absolutely essential that co-operation becomes the law of life in every sector of our economy, that co-operation grows to be a balancing factor between the fast expanding public sector on the one hand and the private sector on the other—a socialist society of India in which there should be room for the public sector, the private sector as also the co-operative sector. The co-operative sector must play a very predominant role. Government, therefore, is at the moment examining how best to develop cooperation in that context. I cannot say what we propose to do. To arrive at decisions in this matter, it may be necessary to examine this matter at expert level. We shall try to do so. We are trying simultaneously to build up federations of co-operatives from the ground up to the national level. There will be a federation of co-operative banks; there will be a federation of marketing societies and there will be federations of the various types of processing societies, of the various types of industrial societies and of the co-operative unions for training and educational purposes. We are also trying to see how best cooperatives can be linked up with panchayats so that the *panchayati raj* system in which so much of faith is being placed by the nation can move forward both economically and socially, the panchayats looking after the social and administrative aspects of the question and the co-operatives looking after the economic aspect of the question.

There were certain questions that were raised by my friends the other >> day and also today. I would very briefly deal with some of these. It was said that money found its way to the richer sections and that the weaker sections were not benefited. I plead that this is, to a considerable degree, correct but this situation cannot be corrected by issuing a mandate from the Centre. We have already taken a decision that in regard to the expansion of credit which we visualize will take place in the Third Five Year Plan, there will be a link-up of the procedures for giving assistance to the weaker sections of the community. Whatever decisions are taken, they will be placed before the House. I would join in the appeal that was made by my friend, Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan, and would request the Members who are thinking of a committee which will go into this question, to go into the countryside and tell the people what the decisions of the Government are. I am quite sure that friends in the opposition will give credit for this to the Congress Party. The Congress Party, as a party, never intended that co-operative assistance should be monopolised by a few members of the political party. Misbehaving members are not confined to one political party alone they exist in all the political parties. And the Congress, as a party, has never intended that any member should take illicit and undue advantage of the facilities offered under co-operation. I would request hon. Members to bring this to the attention of the people in their constituencies and if there is any misbehaviour, bring it to the attention of the State Governments who are wedded to the formula that co-operatives are for the entire community. We are also taking measures to see that the underprivileged sections of the community are not denied the facilities or are not kept away.

I have already dealt with the question of law.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO: Is the law being changed?

SHRI S. K. DEY: It is being changed -* in all the States. Some States have already done so. Some others are in the process of doing it.

My friend, Shri Sudhir Ghosh, mentioned that there should be a statutory organisation. Well, we have built up a Co-operative Development Board which takes care of the assistance to, and the supervision of, the co-operative organisations in the country. The Ministry deals only with broad policies and interprets the mandate of Parliament to the Board and to the country. The actual work of giving assistance to the States and the co-operatives is handled by the Co-operative Development Board.

Propaganda and publicity must be done to enlighten the public. Shri Bhupesh Gupta, Shri Gurupada Swamy, Shri Lingam and Shri Deo-kinandan Narayan, all of them, mentioned that this should be done. There can be no two opinions about that. But mere propaganda will not do. There has to be a well-organised educational and training programme. We have planned for it in the Third Five Year Plan, and we shall make the entire scheme available to all Members of the House and I would beseech them for their assistance to ensure that the programme of education percolates into every single family.

It was said that politics was being imported into the co-operative societies. I have already dealt with it. The Party does not want it; the Government does not want it. And if any member misbehaves, there must be remedies available locally; and if local remedies do not work, I should be most grateful if hon. Members bring such cases to the attention of the Ministry, and we shall try to do whatever we possibly can.

Mention was made about the need for establishing industrial co-operatives. Considerable expansion has taken place in that field during the Second Five Year Plan, and it will be

accelerated further during the Third Five Year Plan.

Once again let me repeat. We can accelerate the process; we cannot hustle the process, if the results are to endure. We are dealing with human beings who are living organisms, who are not robots and who are not intended to be reduced to the level of robots. There should also be close inter-relation between the *panchayats* and the co-operatives.

It was mentioned that women's co-operatives should be set up. I am very happy to say that the All India Handicrafts Board and the Central Social Welfare Board have programmes for these. At the end of 1958, there were 1,126 women's co-operatives with 48,000 members.

Before I close, I would like the indulgence of the House again in regard to one other matter. What we are trying to do—for the first time I should say—is to see that the sludge that has accumulated over the past fifty years in the movement is dislodged from the place from where it is spreading the infection and is made adequate use of elsewhere. This means that we are going to make efforts to dislodge many of the vested interests which have been thriving by cheating the people by false promises, by adulteration, by underweighing goods and by many other methods.

It means that if the co-operative marketing societies thrive, the service co-operatives thrive, the credit societies thrive, the traders money-lenders and others who are thriving on many spurious methods of exploiting the people will be dislodged from their vantage position. It is not going to be so easy because such people are not alone, they are a part of a countrywide movement for keeping the country static, holding the country from moving ahead. They are *not going to give* in easily and they will make every effort to dislodge even the Ministry, not to speak of the Minister.

Sir, we have not had much talk on the subject of co-operation. We have been having plenty of talk on the subject of community development lately, particularly since this Ministry took over the responsibility for promoting service co-operatives, promoting cooperative farming, promoting co-operative marketing and eventually State-trading from co-operative marketing. Now, we have been subjected to a considerable amount of vendetta in many places, and in future, I have no doubt, this vendetta will extend also to the field of cooperation. I welcome it because the more the opposition the more is the proof that the movement is succeeding and the more I shall have the incentive of fighting.

Now, these vested interests have their own ways of functioning through direct or indirect channel?. They are entrenched in visible places and invisible places, in expected quarters and unexpected quarters. It is very difficult to fight them. There will be, I have no doubt, great onslaughts on us in future.

We have been asked to be a *vakil* for the rural people. The rural people, as compared with the urban people, are the under-privileged section of India's population, and when you come to the rural population, to the under-privileged sections of the community in the rural areas, the uafcil is at a still greater disadvantage. The Ministry as the *rakil* may be subjected even to murderous assaults. I am, of course, using figurative language. I would like the House to appreciate the coming storms and give the Ministry its support so that it is successful in weathering the storms and in piloting the ship ashore.

I know my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, and I share in common many of the traits of character if he permits me this liberty. I hope he will appreciate that every effort shall be made by this Ministry to see that justice is done to the people for whom the cooperative movement is intended. I 494 RSD—2.

would like him to withdraw the Resolution. I would not like to turn it down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, just now the hon. Minister has passionately expressed some very refined sentiments. I do share his sentiments and they are welcome to us because in the Congress regime even good sentiments are a scarce commodity. At the same time I should like to point out to you here what we expect of the Government specially is not merely formation of certain noble ideals or expression of certain fine, excellent sentiments. What we expect of the Treasury Benches and the Minister-in-charge is action, deeds. We judge the Government not by what they feel but by what they do and in this respect naturally I wanted to submit to the House that the performance, as far as co-operatives are concerned, has not been what it should have been, and that is why I said the progress has been slow.

I am very glad that a large number of Members from both sides of the House, especially from the opposite side of the House, spoke on this matter. Whether they agreed with me or they did not agree with me, I express my gratefulness to them for the simple reason that there have been very good exchanges of opinions on the subject. That was one of my intentions in bringing forward this Resolution. But it seems that some hon. Members opposite, belonging to the Congress Party, are living in the past. They are not alert; they are sleeping. They seem to take comfort from the fact that everything is well and good, that certain statistics are there readily available before them which they can exhibit in order to show progress and success. But here, as the hon. Minister spoke, it is not merely a question of statistics; it is something more than that. But it seems the hon. Members

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] opposite, belonging to his party, have not yet understood that behind these statistics there are certain other things which we must go into. I cannot compete with those honourable gentlemen opposite who want to feel happy about everything. I do not want to detract them from their happiness if they feel that the cooperative movement is going on very fine in the country. But it seemed to me, when the hon. Minister spoke, that he was not quite happy with the kind of happiness that was exhibited by some hon. Members sitting on his side of the House. But even complacency is a vice which one requires time to cultivate, and once it is cultivated, it is very difficult for any one, most certainly not by speeches, to remove it.

I do realise that it is not an easy task in a country like ours to get on with the co-operatives. That is why I do not speak in a spirit of accusation against the Ministry as such. I was trying to focus the public attention, the attention of Parliament and, above all, the attention of the Government on some of the yawning problems crying for solution. So many co-operatives have come into existence, I agree, but I should have liked the Members opposite also to give me the number of those which have closed down in this very period when we are supposed to grow. I do not think that it has been as bad as the *papaya* trees in the Prime Minister's backyard. It may not be as bad as that, but it is also true ...

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION (SHRI B. S. MURTHY) : Not the Prime Minister but the Co-operation Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whatever it is. You go there and you know what it is like. I am anxious that it should come, may be from the Prime Minister's house to the Cooperation Minister's house. I do not

know what is the kind of humour here. Sometimes I do not understand how the Prime Minister comes here, perhaps for purposes of misplaced alliteration—*papaya* and Prime Minister. Now leave alone that thing for the present.

Now, there has been growth and even so the target has not been reached. I have got before me the Ministry's report. It was targeted that 20 million members should be there by the end of the Second Five Year Plan and the biggest claim that has been made is of 17 million members. Of course, the number of cooperative organisations has increased in this period, I do not deny. But my criticism is that the progress has been slow, not only in matters of setting up new co-operatives but also in their development. That is why I say the development has been slow.

I do not know if the hon. Members opposite remember a particular resolution they passed in a way at Nagpur some two years ago in which the promise was made that in the course of two years or three years there would be 2 to 3 lakh co-operatives. It was a very tall announcement coming from an august assembly and from taller personalities of the Congress Party. I ask in all humility, what has happened to it? Was it passed to be forgotten a year after? Is it like the *mantram* of the blackmarketeers which they remember in-the morning and forget in the stock-exchanges? It is not like that. It is a resolution, I believe, for implementation. If it has not been implemented, naturally the Government and the Congress Party, specially the Government under the control of the Congress Party, owe an explanation, to the country.

Sir, I do not think any hon. Member despite the statistical jugglery has given a satisfactory explanation as to why there should be so much deficit on that account. Sir, the reasons are deep-seated. First of all, however

much we may talk here in Parliament or in bigger councils elsewhere with co-operators and others, we cannot bring about a radical orientation in the field of co-operation until and unless we go to the root of the problem.

In this connection I must come to the agrarian problem. I know that is not the function of the hon. Minister; that is not his portfolio. But unless the land question is tackled, land reforms are made, unless land is given to the tiller of the soil— specially the poor peasants and the agricultural labourers—co-operatives cannot develop either in their human aspect or even numerically in the countryside of India. That is the point. I think this is more or less admitted and accepted by many Members opposite and also by those who are experts in the matter of cooperatives. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister said that there were certain vested interests. Others did not even say that. And he said that there were those elements in all the parties and it was not the intention of the Con-grass Party to make over these cooperatives to the vested interests. I do not say that it is his intention nor the intention of the mighty High Command of the Congress Party, but it is the intention of those people who man the Congress machinery in the countryside that co-operatives should be in their hands, and these people invariably are the village rich landlords and profiteers. They are the little leaders of the Congress Party. He may forget that, but I doubt whether our opposite numbers in the Lok Sabha will forget that, because these people are also the election managers of the Congress Party. So, they manage these co-operatives and the vested interests remain there economically entrenched in their life, politically patronised, sustained and fostered by the party in power, with the result that co-operatives are corrupted by these anti-social and exploiting elements in the villages of our country. It requires a mighty

fight. Here I may say that it requires a fight led by a personality like the Prime Minister. But after all, Sir, the Prime Minister is also interested in winning elections and in seeing his party there, so that the Treasury Benches are filled with so many hands and so few of us are here on this side. Naturally, he also cannot do very much. But that is one problem. You have to be up and doing against the

vested interests in the countryside. I think that laws and regulations and also the administration of funds should be so arranged that they become weaker and weaker. I think the Department can do something about it. Of course, I know that even the Central Government cannot do very much, because much of it belongs to the State Governments, but the Central Government can certainly give leadership in this matter. They can call conferences and meetings and make suggestions; they can lay down certain policies and ask them to implement those policies; they can also send their officers to the States to see how those policies are being implemented; they can also rescue some of the State Ministers from the clutches of the village Ian

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF LAB-
OUR (SHRI ABID ALI): Kerala Com-
munist's?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, it is very important that leadership should come from them. For corruption, Sir, do not blame everybody; it is something like the British saying 'Indians are bad.' Do not blame everybody. It is not everybody who is to blame. Blame those who are really blame-worthy in this context and it is those people whom I have mentioned who are really blame-worthy. They have to be isolated; they have to be exposed; they have to be weeded out and they have to be put completely outside the pale of cooperation and co-operative organisations. Well, Sir, I do realise that it is not a matter for laws to set right I agree with him to some extent.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] But laws should be invoked and sanctions of law should be invoked and also certain regulations should be made. I can tell you, Sir, that I come from West Bengal. It is a very fortunate State in some ways because the Congress is having a tough time there. But then it is also an unfortunate State in some other ways, because there is lot of corruption indulged in by the Congress Party. There, Sir, the laws, the regulations and the administration have become the greatest enemies of the co-operative movement. I talked to the people there and I told them 'Go and meet the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, the officials and the Minister with your schemes and plans.' They went there and came back downcast and they said that they never would go again there. Once you talk to them, you come to the conclusion that whatever else may happen, co-operation will

not grow and it is a pointless effort and a fruitless pursuit to go to them. Therefore, Sir, that matter has also to be looked into by the hon. Minister.

Then, Sir, it has been stated that officials are being remo

ved. This is a good news that you are removing them. But I would like to know how many of them are still there. Remove them quickly. I think, Sir, if we take correct measures, many people will come forward to serve on the co-operatives. But these people introduce an element of bureaucracy, an element of non-persuasion rather than of Persuasion in the administration of co-operatives, and they are always hand and glove with the village rich. I cannot think of a magistrate in the countryside without the landlord being on his side. They move together when they go to the countryside.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Landlordism is being abolished.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You think that it is being abolished. That is the trouble with you. When things are

not abolished, you think they are abolished; when you havn't got anything, you think that you have got something. He is trying to abolish them; some of them have gone, but others are still there, and if you begin to count them, they will be in overwhelming numbers. That is also very important.

Then, Sir, he informed us that the Ministers were not there any more. I know the capacity of doing mischief on the part of Ministers, but I do not blame them. There are only 15 Ministers as against two lakh co-operatives. Anyway, whether they are there or they are not there, that is not the main point. If good Ministers are there, it is good; if bad Ministers are there, they should not be there. I understand that point. But the main point is to save these co-operatives from the bureaucratic elements and finances should be provided. Yes, money goes into wrong channels, but who takes it there and who are

those people? They are not invisible as Mr. Dey thinks. To him they are not visible, they are Pimpernels! But I can tell him that they are not Pimpernels; they are tangible creatures wearing certain tangible badges of a certain tangible political party and they are carrying this money to a particular place and fulfilling certain things, and anybody can see them. Even the man in the street can recognise who is taking that money into certain wrong channels and defalcating it. Action should be taken against them. It is therefore that I say that if he has wrong glasses and if he cannot see what is visible to others, then I would suggest that the Congress Party should provide him with a right pair of glasses so that he can see things clearly. Then, Sir with regard to those officials at different levels I do not wish to blame them, but they do not seem to be always aware of their great responsibility. I know Mr. Dey is a very clever go-getter. Sometimes I have not been able to move him; he is a go-getter. And I wonder how many people can

*«. w.»kj«

move him. For instance, Sir, in Bur-dwan certain co-operative farms went out of existence because after the co-operatives had been* forred. income-tax and all other kinds of taxes were imposed; they thought it better to close the shop than to foot the bill. Sir, the matter was brought to their notice, and he must have read it also. But nothing has so far come out. We usually write to him, because writing to Ministers is a common practice today, =>nd people have started writing to U* because th^v think that we write to the Ministers concerned. But the trouble is that nothing comes out of those voluminous writings. Only the Postal Department of Dr. Subbarayan gains in the bargain. Therefore, Sir, I think that this matter should be discussed amongst themselves and certain bold and courageous steps with vision and perspective and bearing in mind the rights of the people, not of the rich people, should be taken. I do not know how I can withdraw my Resolution until and unless he assures me that some of the suggestions that have been made he will properly look into and make a statement about all that is done and allow that statement to be debated in the House during the next session. If that assurance I get, I am prepared to withdraw the Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What do you do with the Resolution?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have already told you about it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of 15 members representing both Houses of Parliament be appointed by Government to enquire into and report on the causes for the slow progress of the co-operative movement in the country having regard to the recommendations contained in the Second Five Year Plan relating to the development of co-operation."

The motion, was negatived.

Primate Sectors

RESOLUTION RE BANNING OF STRIKES BY WORKERS IN THE PUBLIC AND THE PRIVATE SECTORS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Tumpalliwar.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, this is a Resolution on banning the strikes. It is being moved by a Member of the party of the Treasury Benches opposite. Last time, a Resolution of this type came and it was not moved and I do not know whether it indicates the Government policy or whether the Congress Party has decided to sponsor this idea of banning the strikes on the floor of this House. If that is so, then let us know it from the Leader of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not know what they are going to do.

SHRI M. D. TUMPALLIWAR (Maharashtra): Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:

"This House is of opinion that with a view to enabling the successful implementation of the Five Year Plans, strikes by workers, both in the public and the private sectors, should be banned by law."

Sir, when I gave notice of this Resolution, the picture that was before my mind was somewhat awful. From every corner, there were threats of strike in the public sector as well as in the private sector.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a Fascist Resolution that you are moving.

SHRI M. D. TUMPALLIWAR: I do not regard it as a Fascist or capitalist or communist Resolution. I regard it as a social Resolution which aims at achieving peace and prosperity in the society.

In the beginning, I may tell th* House that as I am sponsoring this