

[Shri Anand Chand.] doing now presupposes to my mind two things. One is that we can make a similar provision today. If we are passing something we can make a similar provision today and secondly that our powers are so plenary that we can make it not only for today but for any past time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : You will have to stop here for the day, because we have got another motion. On Monday you can continue. '

3 P.M.

MOTION REGARDING THE FIFTH EVALUATION REPORT ON THE WORKING OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND N.E.S. BLOCKS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : Now we take up the motion relating to the Fifth Evaluation Report on the Community Development and N.E.S. Blocks. Mr. Prasad Rao will move the motion.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I move:

"That the Fifth Evaluation Report on the working of Community Development and N.E.S. Blocks, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 27th November, 1958, be taken into consideration."

Sir, it is more than six years since this programme of Community Development and National Extension Services was inaugurated. Sir, this programme was inaugurated with very high hopes and very pious wishes. It started with the battle-cry of "Destination Man" and was to fulfil the "Operation Silent Revolution" covering all phases of the life of our rural people, economic, political, social and spiritual. Six years is sufficient time for us to evaluate the successes and failures of this move. Perhaps no other aspect of the Government's programme in the Five Year Plan has

been given such high-pressure puou-city as this aspect of the programme. Every visiting dignitary has been taken to some of the nearby community blocks and paeans of praise were sung upon the silent revolution that was supposed to be going on in the country. Of course, after six years of this revolution, this Report comes. I have to say that after all their ballyhoo it comes rather as an anticlimax. It is only recently that the Mysore Government has appointed the Gorwala Commission to go into the administration. Of course, this Commission was not primarily asked to go into the Community Development programme as such, but it has gone through this programme also and it is not a very flattering report or flattering picture that he has to give of it I do not mean that all that Mr. Gorwala says' should be taken at its face value. But he is one of the administrators on whom their praises were showered from the benches opposite, as one of the ablest of administrators and he has said like this:

"Opinion in Mysore is almost unanimous about the failure of the Community Development and National Extension projects. Except in those professionally obliged to defend them, it is difficult to find a single person who has anything particularly favourable to say about them. That the scheme has failed is clear from a consideration of results."

| Sir, this is nothing very flattering or j praise-worthy about this scheme. And j further on he says:

"The most productive side of the movement is the paper side. Masses of papers move from the Gram Sewaks onwards, up and down. There are plenty of meetings, seminars, and camps. New quarters and offices spring up outside taluka towns generally, and many of the latter are decorated with beautiful pictograms and charts, all depicting the achievements which exist very largely in the imagination of their creator."

I do not mean to say that everything j that is said or every observation he has made is totally correct. But still I have to say that in spite of his past association with the British Government, and in spite of some of his out-moded ideas about the running of the administration and about his opinions as far as people's participation is concerned, still, as an objective report of his, this does not give much credit to the Community Projects Administration.

Be that as it may, let me come to the Evaluation Report itself. Mr. Vice-Chairman, this programme is primarily intended to create a new man, to fight out lethargy and stagnation that were there in the rural side as a result of the economic slavery that is being undergone by the majority of our population. This was thought of as a regenerating process, not so much as targets and other things but it is primarily intended to create a basis for our India to go forward. And nothing short of this has been claimed by the other side. So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am not judging this programme of Community Development by the physical targets that have been achieved. How far has it succeeded in creating that climate in which our people would feel that they should pull themselves up by their own boot-straps? So far as the element of people's co-operation and efforts in this programme is concerned, what we see is nothing very bright. I can quote from the summary itself where it is said:

"The value of people's participation in works programmes works out to an average of Re. 1 per person per year in case of N.E.S. blocks and Rs. 1-8 in case of CD. Blocks."

And then **it is said:**

"In the case of both CD. and N.E.S. blocks, the value of people's participation declines as the block period moves towards its end. This is contrary to what one would expect to happen. The peopled par-

ticipation should grow progressively as the years pass, and the educational effort of the staff and the radiational influence of the work done produce their effect. But our data tell a different story, and it would seem that the educational effort and the radiational influence have not been effective enough."

So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, after six years, after such strenuous efforts, after spending crores of rupees this is the result. In our Second Plan we had already allocated Rs. 200 crores for this programme and not a single pie of it has been pruned off. After all this, we find that the people's co-operation instead of increasing is on the decrease. Why? That is the major question. Here it is said that people are interested only in building, roads or in building schools only and once these are built, there is no more interest in these things. Am I to understand, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the people's enthusiasm that is supposed to have been generated is only for that particular thing, for the building of that road or that school? It is difficult to believe. Once the spirit of regeneration is there, certainly it must pervade all activities and it must grow from step to step. Here, as far as the Evaluation Report is concerned, the people's enthusiasm and co-operation instead of increasing is decreasing. Why? Is it because the objective is incorrect? Certainly not. I think this very objective of the community development programme is a very laudable thing but the difficulty is that it has been started at the wrong end. We are seeing what is happening in our neighbouring country, China. Of course, some of the friends may not like all that is happening there but, even then, according to the statement of our Minister for Agriculture, most stupendous progress has been achieved as far as the people's co-operation is concerned.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): It is compulsory there but here it is voluntary.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I am coming to that. I shall give an answer to my hon. friend who says that it is compulsory there but where in tht^ world, by any stretch of imagination, has any enthusiasm and energy been generated by compulsion? We have not seen such a thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : It can't all be compulsion.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: By compulsion, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you can never hope to create that energy and enthusiasm. **You** can never hope to complete a project like the Huai River project within eighty days. We have **known of serfdoms** and compulsory slave states; we have known of dictatorships but nowhere did any dictatorship or any authoritarian Government based merely on power create that amount of energy and enthusiasm amongst millions of people and help complete a project in eighty days and, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that has been testified to by no less a person than Mr. Kanwar Sain, who was the Chairman of the Central Water and Power Commission. It is said to be one **of the tenth** wonders of the world. Leave it as it may be, the progress that has been made there in agricultural production is very enormous. From 160 million metric tons, they have come up to 350 million metric tons and this could never have been possible without the willing and free co-operation of the peasantry. In this connection, I quote no other person than our Minister for Agriculture, Dr. P. S. Deshmukh, who said that because of the free conditions existing there, because of the peasant there feeling that the land is his own, that he is producing not for the landlord but for himself, this much of production has been achieved, that production has gone up to such heights.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Does my hon. friend know that the things have been altered there, that the land is owned by the commune and not by the peasant himself?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I am coui-I ing to that.

While we find in the case of our neighbour next door the enthusiasm going up like that, we find the same | enthusiasm going down here in our ^l country, in India. Enthusiasm, energy j and such things cannot be command-ⁱ ed, Mr. Vice-Chairman, by force. I t leave it at that.

The question is, why, after about j 6| years of this kind of thing, we are unable to generate that enthusiasm here. We are also unable to sustain that enthusiasm. Of course, there was some hope, some enthus- i iasm, some expectation that something would come out of these I National Extension schemes and Community Development projects, but that hope has been gradually fading away. Why? This is a question which we must face and answer squarely, Mr. Vice-Chairman. In the Evaluation Report itself, it has been made clear that most of the benefits that are accruing from these schemes are j accruing not to the large mass of agricultural labour and the cultivating tenants, the people who do not own j property in the villages but to a small section of big landlords in the villages. This is so because we are unable to create a taste in that section of the people for the development of the village that that section is not very enthusiastic about it and is unable to co-operate wholeheartedly in this pro- i gramme. I need not go very far but I should like to quote from the Evaluation Report itself, to prove that in most of the measures that are being undertaken by the Community Development programme, the benefit mostly accrues to the land-owning class. It is not a figment of imagination coming from any Communist but is a statement in the Report itself:

"... those belonging to cultL- vating or land-owning castes and those who have some education are | preferred for panchayat member ship. . nearly 90 per cent are

«n

land-owners; the majority in all centres belong to high or rather the locally dominant land-owning or cultivating castes." This is from the Evaluation Report itself. This is how the panchayats are constituted, of people, of very big landholders, who have been dominating the peasants for centuries. If the peasants find such men there at the helm of affairs, could we ever expect them to generate that enthusiasm and that confidence so that they can rise to such heights? Certainly not. Even the benefits, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is said here, mostly go to the landowning classes and not to the backward people or to the landless people. Here it says: "People with small holdings seem to have lesser part in the running of the panchayats—and co-operative societies too—than those with bigger holdings". That is how most of the benefits go to a small section having big holdings. Not only that, Sir, in backward and hilly areas also where it is supposed to be more effective, where it is supposed to be directed, as was the directive in the Second Five Year Plan, it is not effective. In particular, it is said that the staff and the programme have not been adjusted to the requirements of the particular areas which come under the programme, especially in the tribal and hilly areas. It is said that it is not effective. Actually, the benefit of these programmes are not reaching those strata of the population where they are needed most and they are not reaching those areas where they are needed most. That is exactly the reason, Mr. Vice-Chairman, why the people's co-operation is not increasing but is actually on the decrease. This is why I say, before schools, before roads and other things, the first thing is that we should create a taste in the development of the village amongst the large mass of people in the rural parts, that is, amongst the agricultural labourers, the tenants and the poor peasants. Had we undertaken a big land reform programme, had we completed it by this time, certain

the enthusiasm would have been much greater. This is not my opinion only. This is the opinion also of Mr. Taylor who, by no stretch of imagination, could be called a communist.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIR AM AN: A fellow traveller.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: This is what he says: Of course, he was here to help the Community Projects Administration for one year:

"In such a social order democracy is indivisible. It is useless to attempt to have democratic thinking and practices at the top unless there is also democracy at the bottom, and it is impossible successfully to develop democracy at the bottom if feudalism exists at the top".

This is what even Taylor says, who is by no means a Communist, who was not at all enthusiastic about land reforms in the beginning, but he has said after coming and seeing that a real beginning could be made only after a thorough-going land reform programme is adopted. That is why I say that we have made a wrong beginning.

Then, Sir, coming to the other point, the matters of implementation are not too happy to invite the co-operation of the people. It has been agreed on all hands that it is only by the democratic process that we can regenerate our rural masses and create the necessary enthusiasm. It has been agreed by the Community Project administration and by the hon. Minister, Mr. Dey, himself that only through the democratic process, through democratisation, that real community development could take place. It has been given out in the earlier evaluation reports also that Panchayats should be given as big a hand as possible as far as this development is concerned. And the next thing is that these Block Advisory Committees and Zilla Parishads should be democratically elected. In spite of all these recommendations, what is happening? At the Mount Abu Conference it was given

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.]
 out that not more than five or six States would accept the full recommendations of adoption of these Block Panchayat Samities and Zilla Parishads. The other States have not yet decided as far as this programme is concerned. Even among these States, Andhra Pradesh is supposed to be the first State in implementing this programme of Block Panchayat Samities and decentralisation of this programme. What is the picture where democratisation is supposed to have taken place? Mr. Vice-Chairman, a wonderful democratic method of nomination is adopted as far as these Block Panchayats are concerned. These are exactly intended not to be so. Still, Andhra Pradesh which is supposed to be the harbinger of Block Panchayats is the first State to constitute these Block Panchayats by this nomination method. Anyway, nomination and officialdom do not constitute a proper atmosphere for the growth of people's initiative.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Are you referring to recent legislation?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I have seen the recent legislation. I am also referring to the recent practice.

In April 1955 Evaluation Report it is stated: "non-official auxiliary created by officials and maintained as formal channels for official acts is a pretence which has nothing to commend itself. This lesson now seems to have received almost universal acceptance". ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P.N. SAPRU): You have only five minutes left. You have to conclude at 3.30.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: What I mean to say is that these Block Panchayat Samities are nominated and devoid of any democratic content.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): I hope you know that in the U.P. the Panchayat Act is there.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: My hon. friend may give the experience of U.P. when he speaks. But here I say, Mr.

Vice-Chairman, that these so-called district development and planning bodies are constituted also in our place. In my own district, it is the Communist Party that constitutes the majority, because for that district there is only one Lok Sabha seat and a Communist is returned to that seat. Naturally in the composition of the district planning body also we expect a fair representation for them if a really democratic method is adopted-But here I find that, except for one Member of the Lok Sabha and another member of the State Legislature, also elected on the Communist ticket, the rest are all in one way or other defeated candidates. Perhaps this may be the democratic method of unleashing the people's enthusiasm. This may be the concept of our Andhra Pradesh Government. I do not think that my hon. friend would by any stretch of imagination accept that, but perhaps that is the process that has been adopted by the directive of the Central administration. If that is the method that is adopted, it is no wonder, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the necessary co-operation or enthusiasm of the people is not forthcoming. Even I myself had asked the District Collector to be co-opted as a member of this body. It was only after prolonged correspondence, after showing the letter of my hon. friend Shri S. K. Dey stating that I should be co-opted, after six months of procrastination and consultation between the District Collector and the local Congress bosses, that I was at last taken as one of the *ex-officio* members. That is so far as democratisation of these Block Panchayats is concerned.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): My congratulations to you.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Thank you very much. There are other friends who are not so fortunate as myself. Correspondence is still going on regarding their being taken on it.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: In the U.P., Dr. Z. A. Ahmad is a member of the Zilla Parishad.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: There are a few other matters which I want to bring to your notice. I have stated the reasons why this thing is not progressing well. -I have stated that they have started at the wrong end. The second thing is that wrong methods have been used, and the thing is that in the selection of personnel also I do not think correct methods are being pursued. Everyone agrees that for purposes of this social development it is not a routine bureaucrat we want but one who is fired with enthusiasm, who is fired with a zeal that something must be done to the people. That type of person we want. Here we find exactly it has been recommended that a routine bureaucrat should not be entrusted with such a responsibility. All the previous Evaluation Reports also state that the revenue officials who are looked upon by the people as a source of oppression should not be associated with these activities. I do not know what the practice is in other States, but unfortunately as far as Andhra Pradesh is concerned the practice is it is the tahsildars **and** deputy tahsildars and people of that ilk who are being entrusted with this. These are not the people who can command the confidence of the people. I do not mind this work being given to any person who is fired with the zeal for it. Certainly there are so many Sarvodaya workers who are really competent to do this work. There are so many Bhoodan workers. I can at any moment prefer a Bhoodan worker or a Sarvodaya worker or a Ramakrishna Mission worker to this bureaucrat who is not trained, whose training and disposition is not for developing the people's co-operation or enthusiasm. Then, as far as the selections of Gram Sevaks and others are concerned, of course I have no time to go into the Evaluation Report itself. It says that the original concepts are not pursued. How can a villager respect a mere matriculate who is given six months' training and asked to come and teach these hoary peasants? You say that he is trained in agriculture. Why should matriculation be prescribed as a minimum

qualification for them? Experienced peasants who are imparted some technical knowledge could any day prove better than these raw recruits. . have nothing against them. They | are susceptible to new ideas, there is ! no doubt about that. But if you put them in places where they are not meant to be, they are a failure. I know how these Gram Sevaks are being teased by many of the elderly villagers who are much more experienced. So, I say that the personnel that is intended to carry out the whole of this Community Development and Extension work is not properly chosen.

Finally I want to say that too much has been attempted to be done in this regard. The Community Project administration has become a state within a state. I do not know, but I think that except Police and Intelligence, everything else is coming under this. There is animal husbandry; there is agriculture. Now I think cooperation is under this. Then there is transport and communications and there is also education and so on and so forth. Several other conceivable .. .

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras):
Wireless radio.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Yes, wireless. They have not got it now. But the day is not too far off when some of the enthusiastic B. D. Os **may** demand a wireless set. But radio is certainly there. All these things are too much now. We say that a sort of diarchy is coming up. The District Agricultural Officer is there. Here is the Extension Officer. He has to serve two masters—the B. D. O. and the District Agricultural Officer. This sort of thing—taking up everything on the head of the C.P.A., not concentrating on a few things only—is neither conducive nor proper to give the best desired results. Then you may rightly ask me, "It is very good. But what is it that should be immediately done?" I think we have allotted nearly two hundred crores and much of it has already been spent. If the programme

[Shri V. .Prasad nao.] of Community Development is to succeed, then people—real people, representatives, that is, elected representatives—should be associated with this programme. Not only must they be associated with this, but they must also be given full charge of these things. I think, instead of a number of B.D.Os., if we had entrusted the work to a really, genuinely elected committee, then certainly things would have been far better than now. In my concluding reply, I think I will be able to give positive suggestions which should be adopted if this programme is not slumped, but should succeed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPHU): Motion moved:

"That the Fifth Evaluation Report on the working of Community Development and N.E.S. Blocks laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 27th November, 1958, be taken into consideration."

We have about eleven speakers so far who have expressed a desire to speak.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): We can sit up to 5.30 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): We will decide about it at 5.00 P.M. But I suggest that Members should not take more than ten minutes each.

श्री नती सावित्री निगम (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
 उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट की पांचवाँ इन्वैल्युएशन रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने विचाराधीन है उस पर बधाई देने और हार्दिक पहिचाने की श्रीमन्, मेरी इच्छा होती है किन्तु जब ईसाक और सफाई का तकाजा होता है, आग्रह होता है तब इच्छा न होने के बावजूद यह कहना पड़ता है कि सबसे पहले इन्वैल्युएशन कमेटी के सदस्यों की योग्यता, परिश्रम और विद्वता के लिए उन्हें बधाई देना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं एक बात साफ कर

देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो भी आलोचना की है उस आलोचना में 'मा' को जो ममता और जो ममत्व होना चाहिये, एक सुधार की जो इच्छा होनी चाहिये वह उतनी अधिक नजर नहीं आती जितनी कि होनी चाहिये। श्रीमन्, इसके अतिरिक्त मैं यह भी कहूँगा कि जो कुछ उन्होंने सुझाव दिये हैं उनमें से कुछ सुझाव अवश्य मानने के काबिल हैं। अगर वे सुझाव किसी हद तक मान लिये जायेंगे तो बहुत हद तक कम्युनिटी ब्लाक्स मजबूत बनेंगे और शक्तिवान बन जायेंगे। इसके अतिरिक्त कम्युनिटी ब्लाक मंत्रालय के जो मंत्री श्री एस० के० डे हैं उनको भी मैं हार्दिक बधाई देती हूँ। उन्होंने सबसे बड़ी बात जो की है वह यह की है कि वे सारे सुझाव जो बड़े उपयोगी सुझाव हैं उनको बिना किसी मीनमेख के बड़ी उदारता के साथ, विशाल हृदयता के साथ उन्होंने स्वीकार कर लिया। श्रीमन्, सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि उन्होंने उस आलोचना की कड़वाहट को और उन तमाम सुझावों के बण्डल को जो पेश किये गये हैं, बिना बोझ के बर्दाश्त और सब को स्वीकार करने का चेष्टा की। श्रीमन्, रूढ़ा को कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट के विषय में मेरे विचार पहले से मान्य हैं। कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट देश के गांव गांव में लोगों में एक रचनात्मक क्रांति लाने का एक महत्वपूर्ण एवं एकमात्र साधन है। इसमें किसी की दो रायें नहीं हो सकती हैं।

श्रीमन्, जब हमारी भारतमाता ग्राम-वासिनी है, जिसमें पांच लाख गांवों में करोड़ों निवासी रहते हैं और अगर हमें उन ग्रामवासियों की सामाजिक उन्नति करनी है, अगर उनके जीवन के ँचे का पुनर्गठन करना है, एक चौमुन्नी स्वोदय क्रांति लाना है तो हमारे देश में उसके लिये कम्युनिटी ब्लाक्स का ही एकमात्र माध्यम है और उनसे बढ़कर दूसरा कोई माध्यम नहीं हो सकता है, ऐसा मेरा मानना है। मेरा यह तात्पर्य नहीं है

कि कम्युनिटी डिपार्टमेंट के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में किसी तरह की कोई त्रुटि नहीं है या कोई मुद्धार की आवश्यकता नहीं है या कि वह बिल्कुल परफेक्ट है। हर जगह हर सान और हर योजना में परिवर्तन, परिवर्धन और संशोधन करने की हमेशा आवश्यकता और पूरी गुंजायश रहती है, यह बात मान कर हमें चलना पड़ेगा। श्रीमन् हमें देश में जो एक और क्रान्ति लानी है उसके लिये हमने एक योजना बनाई है और वह योजना ऐसी है जिसे शायद हमारे गांव के रहने वाले करोड़ों नरनारी जो २०० वर्ष से लगातार ब्रिटिश डोमिनेशन में, दासत्व में पिसते रहे हैं जिसके कारण हमारे गांव गांव का आर्थिक िचा एकदम टूट गया है। तो ऐसे लोग जो अज्ञानता व गरीबी के ग्रंथकार में भटक रहे हैं उनको हम इस तरह की कामना करने वालों का पूरा सहयोग क्या मिल सकेगा? क्या हम इस तरह पब्लिक कोप्रेशन पा सकेंगे? जनता के ऊपर दोष देकर क्या कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट का काम पूरा हो जायेगा? इसलिये इस प्रकार की कल्पना करना बिल्कुल गलत है। कोई ईमानदार आदमी इस तरह की आलोचना करना कभी पसन्द नहीं करेगा।

श्रीमन् साधारण आलोचकों को, मुमकिन है, यह सन्नता जो कम्युनिटी ब्लाकों द्वारा देश में हो रही है, न दिखाई पड़ती हो क्योंकि साधारण आदमी के पास न इतना अवकाश ही रहता है और न योग्यता ही रहती है। वह तो एक विशेष आदर्श को लेकर हम चले हैं। जहां कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का कार्य चल रहा है वहां के सारे नर-नारियों की आर्थिक स्थिति में, उनकी सामाजिक स्थिति में, उनकी लियकत और योग्यता में जब तक परिवर्तन न दिवायी देगा तब तक साधारण आदमी यही कहेगा कि कुछ नहीं हो रहा है, यह बिल्कुल बेकार है। ये जो बे शारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के अिकारी हैं चाहे कितनी ईमानदारी, कितनी सफलता

से काम क्यों न करें लेकिन जो एक बड़ा आदर्श लेकर वे चलते हैं उनको साधारण आदमी नहीं सोच सकता है, यह मानी हुई बात है। इस कार्य को करने में टाइम लगेगा, समय लगेगा और धीरे धीरे वह चीज जो २०० वर्षों से बरवाद हो रही थी उसको हम : सात वर्ष में उम्मीद करें कि हो जाय यह नामुमकिन बात है। श्री प्रसाद राव और हमारे अपोजीशन वाले भाइयों का तो यह धर्म और पेशा बुराई करना हो गया है और वह किसी चीज की जब भी बुराई करते हैं तो बिना सोचे समझे और बिना हृदय में कोई सहानुभूति लाये हुए। इसलिये श्रीमन्, मैं कहूँ कि उन्होंने बेचारे इवैल्युएशन कमेटी के मेम्बरों के साथ भी बड़ी बे साफी कर दी है। यदि इवैल्युएशन कमेटी के मेम्बर यहां पर बैठे होते तो वे स्वयं बड़े दुःखी होते। हमारे भाई ने किस से उनके मुँह में डाल कर हर क चीज को ट्रिबुट किया और गलत बातें कहीं। जहां उन्होंने आलोचना एक बुराई की दृष्टि से की उसको तो उन्होंने एक्सप्लेन करके बढ़ाया लेकिन जहां उन्होंने प्रगंवा के रूप में पत्रों के पत्रों रंगे हैं कि बड़ा ही बंडरफुन, महत्वपूर्ण काम किया है वहां उन्होंने कोई भी जिक्र नहीं किया।

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: If I said all those things what will be left for you?

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : श्रीमन्, वही पैराग्राफ उन्होंने जानबूझकर पढ़े हैं जो कि क ही प्रगंवा से दूसरे को गिराना, यह भी अनुचित है। माना सर्वोदय और भुदान के कार्यकर्ता अच्छे हैं लेकिन उनका उदाहरण देकर सारे अधिकारियों को निकम्मा कहना बहुत ही अनुचित है। मैं उन अधिकारियों, उन लोगों को जो ब्लाकों में बी० डी० ओज० का काम करते हैं उनको जानती हूँ। जिसमें त्याग है, लगन है, काम करने की क्षमता है और जो मुझे बड़े बड़े देशसेवक और देशभक्तों में और बहूतों में नजर नहीं आती। इस

[श्रीमती सावित्री निगम]

कार की आलोचना करके हम एक प्रकार उन अधिकारियों का उत्साह ही ठंडा करते हैं।

श्रीमन्, श्री साद राव जी ने यहां पर चीन के गुप्तगान घाते हुए कहा कि वहां पर लोग किस तरह से काम करते हैं। उन्हें मानुस होना चाहिये कि अभी हाल में पंडित जी ने वहां के बारे में कहा था कि वहां के लोगों को बेयोनट की तक पर फैंटरियों में काम करने के लिये भेजा जाता है और उनकी स्थिति ऐसी हो जाती है कि वे काम करते करते सो जाते हैं। वे लोग मीन के पथ से काम करते हैं। श्रीमन्, ईश्वर न करे कि वह दिन हमारे देश में आये। अगर स तरह का नीति हम अपनायेंगे तो वह दिन हमारे देश के लिये बड़ा ही दु ग्मिपूर्ण होगा और पतन करने वाला दिन होगा। हमारा तो अहिंसा का पथ है। चाहे हम धीरे धीरे चनें तो भी वह उत्तम और योग्य है। इस तरह को उत्साह भंग करने वाली आलोचना से जो बेचारे गांवों में जा करके काम कर रहे हैं उनको बत ही नुकसान पंचता है। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम लोग, जो यहां आलोचक बन कर बैठ जाते हैं, उन बेचारे कार्यकर्ताओं के साथ कंधे से कंधा मिला कर काम करें। कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट मिनिस्टर ने सारे एम० पी० से सहयोग का अपील की थी। मैं अपील के मेम्बरों से पूना चाहती कि उनकी उस अपील पर, जो पत्थर का दिल भी पिघला देने वाली थी, कितने मेम्बरों ने काम किया। किन किन ब्लॉक में काम किया और किन किन डेवलपमेंट ब्लॉक आफिसरों को सहयोग दिया। ऐसे व्यक्तियों ही आलोचना को हमें सुनना ही नहीं चाहिये।

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि वे बेचारे अधिकार जो शहर में तमाम सुविधाओं के आदी होते हैं, जो क्रांति के अग्रदूत बन कर जाते हैं उनको एक महान क्रांति लाने के लिये तरह तरह की

कठिनाईयों का सामना करना पड़ता है। उनकी जो कठिनाइयां हैं, उनकी जो दिक्कतें हैं उनको दूर करने को हम लोग कोशिश करें।

यह ठीक है कि कानून के सुधार की अत्यंत आवश्यकता है। इसीलिये वैनुएशन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट बनी और इवैलुएशन कमेटी ने जो सुझाव दिये, मुझे विश्वास है कि वे सुझाव माने जा रहे हैं। जो मजुंट आबू में कांफेंस ई थी और उसी की रिपोर्ट हम लोगों के पास गयी थी, उसको हम लोगों ने पढ़ा होता तो हम यह कहते कि इन प्रकार के डिस्कशन की मांग करना प्रिम्पेरियोर है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ten minutes each.

SHRIMATI SAVTTRY DEVI NIGAM: Please give me two or three minutes more, Sir. There are two or three very important points that I have to make.

श्रीमन्, जो जो परिवर्तन किये गये हैं जैसे सी० डी० एंड एन० ई० एस० ब्लॉक का एकीकरण, तीन वर्ष के स्थान पर पांच वर्ष का समय कर देना आदि, वे सब बहुत उपयोगी हैं। सके साथ साथ इम्प्रूव्ड ऐग्रीकल्चरल प्रैक्टिसेज को पापुलेराइज कराने का काम है वह भी बहुत उपयोगी है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने यह कहना है कि जो फार्म डिमांड्रेजेशन करने का निश्चय किया गया है, उसको जल्दी से जल्दी कार्यान्वित किया जाय।

श्रीमन्, एक बात और कहना चाहती और वह सुघरे हुये बीज के विषय में है, रजिस्टर्ड बीज फार्म बनाने के विषय में है। स सम्बन्ध में कहीं अन्तर् होगा यदि पंचायतों को ही यह अधिकार दिया जाय कि वे इस प्रकार के कामों में पूरा पूरा सहयोग दें क्योंकि उनके पास बहुत सी सुविधाएँ भी रहती हैं।

श्रीमन्, आर्गेनिक और ग्रीन मैन्डोर के बारे में मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान दिलाना

चाहती हूँ। आर्गेनिक मैन्योर के प्रोडक्शन के लिये गांवों में जब तक एक कार्यकर्ता अलग से सिर्फ़ सी काम के लिये नहीं रखा जायगा, तब तक इसमें सकलता नहीं मिल पायेगी। गांवों में छप्रावृत और दूसरी ऐसी कुरीतियाँ हैं जिनके कारण स तरह का मँभोर इकठ्ठा नहीं हो पाता है। इसके अलावा गोबर के गैस प्लांट को पपुलेराइज़ करना पड़ेगा तब हम गोबर की बसूत कर सकेंगे . . .

श्री उपसभापति : तीन मिनट हो गये।

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : अच्छी बात है। धन्यवाद।

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am glad to have an opportunity to take part in the discussion of the Evaluation Report on the Working of Community Development and N.E.S. Blocks.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: You can speak for twenty minutes; we don't mind it.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: There are some features of this Report which are very pleasing. One is glad to know that schools existed in about two-thirds of the villages that were visited. It is also very pleasing to know that in about 93% of these villages the schools were used by all communities. Again, Sir, it is gratifying that the data that have been collected about these villages show that the benefit of the activity is of common interest, like approach roads or paved lanes and they have been shared by the Harijans and the other backward communities along with people belonging to the higher strata of society. It seems that there is no basis for the suggestion that the Harijans or the landless labourers are forced to contribute labour or to bear a disproportionately large share of the burden. These and perhaps some other points noted in the Report show that, every effort is being made to spread education and to see that the benefits of the development works

carried out in the community development and the national extension service areas reach all sections of the community

But there are at the same time some very disturbing features of the Report and I draw attention to them because at least during the last three years the complaints that have been mentioned in the Fifth Evaluation Report have been more or less of the same kind in the previous two Reports.

Now it would interest the House to know what is the extent of the expenditure *per capita* in the community development and the national extension service blocks, and it will be even of greater interest to hon. Members to know to what extent the participation and co-operation of the villagers has been secured in the development of these areas. **Here** the Report says:

"As a result partly of under-budgeting and even more of shortfall in expenditure, the annual expenditure *per capita* is Rs. 1.4 in the case of N.E.S. Blocks and Rs. 2.0 in the case of CD. blocks. These figures are 70% and 55% respectively of the expenditure figures envisaged in the block pattern."

It means, Sir, that the expenditure provided for when the budget was framed has not been incurred. This is a point that requires some explanation. Is it due to understaffing of these blocks, or is it due to the paucity of funds or to the inadequacy of the specialist personnel or to any other reason?

Now, Sir, I take the question of the co-operation of the people. The report says:

"The value of people's participation in works programmes works out to an average of Re. 1 per person in the case of the N.E.S. blocks and Rs. 1.8 in the case of the CD. Blocks."

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.] It is further stated:

"In the case of both CD. and N.E.S. blocks the value of people's participation declines as the block period moves towards its end."

Now one would have expected, Sir, that in the normal course of things people would be slow to take an interest in the beginning but that the work done by them would develop their interest and that by the time the plan period came to an end they would become much more keenly interested than they would at the commencement of the plan and would be much more ready to offer their cooperation in carrying it out fully. But the Report shows that the progress is in the reverse direction. I have seen only a few Community Development Projects, and therefore I cannot venture to give my opinion here. But it seems, Sir, from what the Report, says that the work is carried on in such a way as to make the villager feel that he is really not concerned with the work that is being carried on, Perhaps, he comes to think that it is the duty of the ma-boap Government to do everything, or perhaps he is used to doing things only in the presence of certain more important district officers. In any case, Sir, it ought to be our effort to see that the villager realises that whatever is being done is for his own benefit and he should, therefore, be ready, whenever any project has been carried out, to come forward and say that whether help is coming from outside or not, so far as he is able to assist, he will do the best he can for the development of his own village.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): But that depends on the civic sense, which is lacking.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: This is exactly what I am driving at. It is the civic sense of the villager that has to be developed. He has to be made to feel that whatever is being done is for his own good and that it is his moral duty to come forward and help

in the completion of what is being done.

Sir, I do not want to give any examples, but I should like to say a word about the agricultural programme before I come to close my remarks. Now it has been said here that while stress has been laid on the agricultural programme, both in the Community Development and N.E.S. Blocks, yet these Blocks are suffering from shortage both of seed and fertilisers. Now, Sir, it is surprising that though it is realised in theory that our plans can succeed only in proportion as our agricultural programme succeeds, an all-out effort has not been made to provide the Blocks with the means necessary for increasing the yield of agriculture, which are so indispensable for agricultural development. Now, Sir, if we fail even in these Blocks, where else can we hope to succeed? We have our officers here who are charged with the task of looking after certain areas and yet the result is^ disappointing. It may be said, Sir, that Government, for no fault of its own, is unable to supply these things in adequate quantities. Then I suggest, Sir, that the work should be concentrated in smaller areas so that it may yield such results as to make people living in other areas offer their help for their development.

Sir, I shall make no quotations, because I want to close my remarks very soon. But I should like to refer to the conclusions which have been stated in Chapter VI of the Report before us. I said just now, Sir, that if there is shortage of seed and fertilisers, then it is obvious that for achieving the best results the work should be concentrated in smaller areas. The Report says much the same thing. It says that the study shows that, the average Block is 25 per cent, larger than the programme's norm in terms of population, and that the large Blocks do not have proportionately larger personnel and finance. It is on the whole having shorter Blocks. But where the Blocks

have to be larger, in order to fit in with the present administrative divisions, the Committee recommends that the Block personnel and finance should be proportionately increased in such cases. Again, Sir, to guard against wastage of effort, the Report recommends that the Blocks should be increased in number only as the supply of personnel increases.

There is one more point to which I should like to refer in this connection, and that is with regard to the status of the Block Development Officer. The Report very rightly lays stress on this point and says that the status of the Block Development Officer and his qualifications should be higher than they are at present. Unless you have this, the checking will not be very reliable. You appoint a committee to evaluate the work that has been done, but that committee will have to depend on the statistics collected by the Block Development Officers and their assistants. And the Committee says that checking on the spot is at present extremely inadequate. Most of the checking is done at the desk of the Block Development Officer, and not on the spot in villages. It goes further to say that the figures are known to be inflated by Gram Sevak sometimes at the instance of certain specialists. I do not want to go on with that story further. I have referred to these things in order to show how much effort has to be made in order to make our Community Development and N.E.S. work successful. We have to concentrate our effort, in view of the shortage of indispensable material, for getting that material and for getting men of such status as can be fully trusted by us. Now, Sir, in order to have really a proper organisation and in order to see that the officers concerned with these development blocks work, I think it is necessary that the Collector should be invited to take a personal interest in these areas. Relieve the Collector of his other duties and entrust him with the work to be done in connection with development, *i.e.*, planning work. This is at pre-

sent far more important than the routine administrative work in the States. If you do this, I think you will be able to achieve much greater success than it has been done so far. My hon. friend, Shri Prasad Rao, regarded it as a disadvantage that education, co-operation, transport and communications, should all come under the same officer. I personally think, Sir, that it is in the interest of the villagers that all these things should be looked to by the same set of officers. And if you have the Collector of a District as the head of this organisation in his District and charge him with the special duty of seeing that the community development and national extension service work is carried out in accordance with the programme, I am sure that much better results will be achieved than have been achieved so far.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I welcome this occasion to participate in this debate. As the House knows, Sir, great expectations have been raised in the minds of people with regard to this movement, and we ourselves regard it as an important element in the Five Year Plan of development. Indeed, we have gone so far as to say that this is the dynamo of the whole development programme of the country. So it is but fitting that we should debate it but within the short time at our disposal we cannot go into all aspects of the problem. The debate could be divided into two parts. We could concentrate on the larger aspects, the basic principles, the philosophy of the movement and secondly we could suggest improvements in the methods, in the techniques, in the organisational side of the movement. The hon. mover of the Resolution began with a bang by saying that the movement had failed completely and I am sorry to say, ended in a whimper. He concluded by saying that representation should be given to Opposition Parties in the Block Development Council. I expected more substantial and constructive suggestions from the hon. Member. He is

[Shri N. M. Lingam.] free to quote from any scripture, whatever it is worth to substantiate his stand that the movement has failed but I must point out that Mr. Gorwala, however eminent he might have been or may be, in his own field, is not competent to give a verdict as to the movement in the country as a whole. The Evaluation Report which we are seized of has a more comprehensive survey as the basis for its findings. So it is but proper that we should have a proper . . .

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Mr. Gorwala was an administrator and so he has the administrator's mind.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Thank you. We give the devil its due but we have to, at the same time, recognise that we are dealing with a far more important report, a series of reports which give us the picture of the state of the movement in the country. It is a limb of the Planning Commission itself and it is to their credit that they have given an objective picture of what is taking place. The report does not present a rosy picture of the achievements of the Community Development programme. They point out the faults wherever they occur and they suggest remedies. Coming to the specific points raised by Mr. Prasad Rao, it is true that the movement has as its basic objective, the regeneration of the village and to do that they have to rouse the people, they have to see that their enthusiasm is at a high pitch, and is harnessed to all developmental activities and he has quoted the report in substantiation of his stand that that enthusiasm is receding after the block allotment has been spent. That is to be expected. In a hopelessly backward country we cannot maintain the enthusiasm of the people at a sustained level in the initial stages. It is as an incentive to the people to work in a better way that we have first concentrated on the amenities side of the villages. We are providing roads, hospitals, buildings, youth clubs. All

I these are necessary. They are basic amenities and the next stage will be the developmental side and if there is a hiatus between the amenities side and the developmental side, it is to be expected in a backward economy. It is not only through the working of this movement only that we can lift the villager from his moribund condition. He has been suffering, as the House knows, for several centuries. He has become a next door neighbour to brute. So it is not by a few *mantras* that we can raise his level. The concerted effort by all Departments, by all agencies is necessary. What these programmes precisely aim at is to bring the impact of all the Departments of the Government to bear upon the villager. We may have made mistakes, we may have not started properly but still anyone who has studied seriously the progress of the movement will understand that we are going along the right path. We had the Councils to advise the Blocks and then after 3 or 4 years the Committee on Plan Projects appointed a Committee or team called the Balwantray team and we have their report. They have recommended democratisation and decentralisation. Now at this stage when the enthusiasm of the villager is waning, we have the new phase where the Block Samities will come into operation. Here the block staff will be responsible to the Block Samity and what is the Samity? They are representatives of the Panchayats and Co-operatives and all important sections of people. So they are really democratised and they don't act as bureaucrats. At the block level, all the functionaries of the Departments are responsible to the Block Committees and at the district level there are district development boards and the officers are responsible to that committee. So at various levels decentralisation is ensured and when this is properly achieved, it is natural to expect that the officialdom will come into greater contact with the villagers, and attend to their daily problems and discharge their duties properly. I am not saying that then

is no room for improvements. We have to streamline wherever it is necessary, cut out wastage and see that the new set up is properly integrated into the administrative structure.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The co-operatives themselves are in a very backward condition.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: True, it is not as a result of the community development programmes. We are trying to improve.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: That has nothing to do at present. I wish that they take them up.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: The co-operatives have been in a hopeless state till now and the community development programme is trying to give a new life to them and to press them into the service of the community development programme.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): Do you mean to say that the community development authorities can improve irrespective of what the State Co-operative Department does?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: The Government Co-operative Department is not divorced from what is happening in the community development programmes. That is what he has not understood, I say. Hitherto they have been working in an ivory tower. The contact with the people was not effective. Now it is sought to bring all officers of the Department at the district level and block levels into close co-operation with the community blocks. They are to be made responsible to the committees set up at these levels. So we are making the maximum use of the entire hierarchy of officials. That is the process and the other process as I said just now is to make the Panchayats more democratic. The whole programme is to be made a people's movement and to that end the best way is to make the panchayats more democratic, give them more resources, give them more

powers and responsibilities. In this way we hope to sustain the enthusiasm of the people; and as to finance, the proposals are that the allotments at the disposal of the block will form part of the Panchayat's finance. And the Conference of Local Self-Government Ministers that met recently have made far-reaching recommendations. They have recommended to the States that more percentage of land revenue should be given to Panchayats. More power should be given to them and more responsibilities should be given and the Centre has also agreed to meet the cost of training the Panches and Sarpanches throughout the country. It is a grand programme and with this training and with the implementation of the recommendation of the Conference of the Local Self-Gov-ernment Ministers by the States, it is natural to hope that Panchayats will be live-bodies geared to village regeneration.

I will not go into my friend's remark as to what is happening in China. Our methods are different entirely and I will be simply wasting the time of the House by making my comments on what is taking place in China. So I shall just ignore or omit that. All that I wish to say is that our method is planning by democratic process. We want the individual to grow, to flower into his fullest (*Interruptions*) and as the time is short, I shall ignore the interruptions. We have constantly before our minds the dignity of the individual, the flowering of his latent faculties and his asset as a citizen of the country. When that is our objective, our methods naturally change. With that as a fundamental of our planning, we will have no truck with my hon. friends from the other side with regard to methods.

With regard to the composition of the committees also steps are being taken to see that they are as representative as possible and it is a pity that the hon. the mover has not kept himself abreast of the steps that are

taking place to make this really democratic.

(Time bell rings)

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I thank Shri Prasad Rao for raising this discussion on this Report in this House and I also agree with him regarding many of the points he raised by way of criticism of this Report. But I do not fully share his indictment of the Department and of the Report itself. I welcome this Report, not only for its modest achievements but also for its frankness, for the frank admission of the faults and failures on the part of the Department after these six year* of the implementation of this scheme. It appears that these blocks have multiplied very rapidly and they have come to more than 2,000 at present. But as the Report itself says, the results have not been commensurate with the physical expansion. The main object of the project is to enthuse the people in collective self-development. As defined very precisely on page 2:

"The concept of Welfare State implies not only conscious effort by the State to promote the people's welfare, but also active participation by the people themselves in the framing and execution of the programme for advance. This is the central purpose of democratic decentralisation, which has been recently recommended by the COPP Team."

Sir, our Party has been pleading for democratic decentralisation from the very inception and I congratulate the Department for having accepted this ideal as its main objective. But according to their own admission, they have miserably fallen short of that objective. I do not want to quote anything further than what has been quoted by the mover himself. Dealing with the people's participation it has been said that:

"The value of people's participation in works programmes works out

to an average of Re. 1 per person per year in case of N.E.S. blocks and Rs. 1-8 in case of CD. Blocks."

and further;

"the value of people's participation declines as the block period moves towards its end."

And this, as they truly say, is contrary to what one would expect to happen. Why does it happen? The answer is also available in the Report. It is on page 17 where we find it stated:

"Households with small holdings seem to have a lesser part in the running of the panchayats and a smaller share of the benefits of co-operative societies than those with bigger holdings."

And it is also stated that the position of the president is always occupied by members belonging to the dominant castes and land-owning households.

As regards the landless people—the Harijans—I find the draftsmen of the Report have coined a very euphemistic phrase. They do not refer to them as the "under-dogs" that would be too hard a word, probably, or the "exploited" people. So they have coined a very nice phrase—"the under-privileged people". But the word "privilege" so far as I understand, means something above the ordinary rights, some special right above the ordinary ones enjoyed by the common people. But here the so-called "under-privileged" are people who have even less than the rights of the common people.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Poverty is privilege.

DR. A. N. BOSE: I fail to understand this meaning of the phrase. Anyway, I congratulate the draftsmen for having sugar-coated the thing and for avoiding words like the "underdog" or the oppressed flock. Among these people there are the landless labourers, there are the Harijans and the so-called untouchables. It is

pleasing to find that in many places they have been sharing common wells and common schools. But it is rather strange to find that even now there are separate schools for them and separate wells. So it is not difficult to understand why these people are lukewarm about the block development schemes.

We are told that Harijans have not derived adequate benefits from the loan assistance available from the block or other development sources. Of the total loans advanced for the villages, only 7 per cent has been received by Harijans and 16 per cent by other backward classes. And again, the Harijans and backward classes and other landless labourers rely upon other occupations and they have not participated in the benefits of these programmes. So this is the story that these observations give and they bring us to the root of the problem.

The problem is one of disparity in the distribution of land. The only remedy is the equalization of land. The land must be given to the tillers. Any co-operative effort can succeed only on the basis of equal partnership. You can hardly expect co-operatives to grow with such gross disparities in landed property.

Sir, a large slice of the rural agricultural population is either totally landless or they live on uneconomic holdings. In view of this, the finding of this Report is not to be wondered at. It is assured on page 30 that every possible attempt should be made to bring in the poorer sections of the rural populations within the field of the co-operative movement, that the policy of linking loans to credit-worthy purposes rather than to credit-worthy persons should be put into practice *more* effectively. It is also admitted that the benefits of the cooperative credit societies go mostly to the "larger cultivators in the villages, who also play the dominant part in the pancha-yats".

Sir, I fail to understand this distinction between the credit-worthy persons and the credit-worthy purposes. After all, the purposes are thought out and executed by the persons and no worthy purpose can be thought out or executed by persons who are not credit-worthy. So make the persons credit-worthy and then you can have credit-worthy purposes. (*Time bell rings.*) Another thing lacking here is . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time is over.

DR. A. N. BOSE: Sir, I am the only man from this group to speak.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What am I to do? There is no time.

DR. A. N. BOSE: Another lacuna in the whole thing is the official approach. I understand that the Department has to work through officials, there is no escape, but still we might improve. This is clear from the method of enquiry itself. It appears from page 4 that the whole enquiry was conducted through discussions and interviews with officers, with specialists, with Gram Sevikas, etc., and then only the information was checked up by personal knowledge of work done in the blocks through visit to the villages. I think the enquiry should have gone the other way about. First, the data should have been collected; the result of work ought to have been seen from actual visit to the villages, from the report of the villagers themselves and then, that might be compared with information obtained from the officials. Sir, it is mentioned in the Report itself that the B.D.Os. and the agriculture specialists are often out of the villages. I know that from my personal experience. There is a block in the area of my residence; it is about 12 miles away from Calcutta. The officer does not stay there but stays in Calcutta and visits the spot from time to time.

The panchayats, Sir, present a sad picture, without resources, without power and without responsibility, as

[Dr. A. N. Bose.]

frankly admitted in the Report. Whatever resources are there are only on paper; whatever powers are there are also on paper only and the *de facto* control is in the hands of the administration. Sir, on the other hand, new and numerous functions have been allotted to them. While there is lack of power, of responsibility and of resources, there is no lack of functions. I do not grudge that. You can give them more functions; I would even like to give them law and order and they would run it much better than our police but, at the same time, give them more resources so that they can have more self-confidence.

Sir, the main handicap of these panchayats is official control. It is stated here that in many of the panchayats the whip hand is held by the secretary who is a Government nominee; in many other cases, in the case of many States, he is a Government officer. It is mentioned in pages 31 and 32 of the Report—and I am sure no one in the Opposition could have improved upon it—"Panchayats in many States cannot, on their own, incur expenditure except of a minor character. Their power in other directions is also circumscribed. Our study shows that this has dampened the enthusiasm and thwarted the initiative of the panchayat members and given to the villagers the impression that the panchayat is merely an instrument of the higher Government. Democracy with too many safeguards tends to degenerate into bureaucracy". Sir, this thing has got to be looked into.

Before I close, I share my own experience with our friends since the mover of the Motion has spoken about his own experience with regard to membership of the Block Advisory Committee. I have been receiving frequent invitations at ceremonial functions from the block to which I personally belong but so far, my cooperation has not been sought nor have I been enlisted as a member

of the Block Advisory Committee. However, I do not grudge that. I doubt very much whether I could myself be helpful.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You become a member automatically.

DR. R. B. GOUR: In some States, the Members of the Rajya Sabha are not included; they take only the Members of the Lok Sabha.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All Members of Parliament.

DR. A. N. BOSE: I have not seen the Gorwala Report on Mysore, but it seems to be remarkably in agreement with what an expert in Community Development in West Bengal wrote in one of his notes. He said that these community development projects are like paper flowers stuck up in the soil. That is a correct description of the whole project. Some work has been done; nobody denies that but the credit is to go to the officers and it has not been due to the spontaneous and collective co-operation of the villagers themselves. Sir, the only remedy is redistribution of land, to give a means of living to all. That forms part of a wider and more fundamental policy. I think Government should address themselves to that task. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is the House prepared to sit half an hour more?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister wants half an hour for reply. How much time will you take Mr. Prasad Rao?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Prasad Rao has gone out.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only about thirty minutes are left for the other speakers. It will be only five minutes for each Member.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Dr. Ahmad gave his name; he cannot finish in five minutes. He should be given ten minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Prasad Rao agrees, he can take five minutes more.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is not the way, Sir. What do you mean by Mr. Prasad Rao giving?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. What do you mean by "That is not the way"? I am afraid that is not the way you should address the Chair. I am prepared to extend the time by half an hour and you say that "That is not the way". That is not the way to address the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is not the way to shift about his time, other's time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to share the time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anybody can give his time.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: How can everybody give his time?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Everybody has to sacrifice.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Five o'clock is the time when the House disperses.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am extending the time by half an hour and the hon. Member says that "That is not the way".

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You said that his time should be taken.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But you have to adjust, by mutual arrangement

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There may be others too.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have no objection. I am appealing to everyone.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is what I want you to do.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Malkani, five minutes only.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I want ten minutes, Sir, not five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only five minutes each.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Then I withdraw my name, Sir.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: I also withdraw my name, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In that case, we may not speak. Always we find that whenever we bring in a resolution or a motion, no matter what it is, we are given five minutes each. Why?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am treating everybody equally. The time has already been extended.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can extend it a little more.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: In the begin-ning fifteen minutes were allowed. I do not want to speak now in five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Channa Reddy.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Community Development programme is undoubtedly one of the most important programmes upon which free India has embarked.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am calling up the Minister at 4:50. You can take ten minutes or fifteen minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This should not have been contingent upon the Minister being called.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am telling you the time available. I think hon. Members should co-operate with me. I have no objection and you can take the full half an hour but I am calling the Minister at 4-50 and I will give ten minutes to Mr. Prasad Rao.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY: Sir, this programme aims at the reconstruction of rural India. It is designed to ameliorate the situation of the community by the active participation of the people but here on this side we are not claiming that this programme as was expected before, is a complete success. We are not accustomed to claim perfection. We admit that it is partly successful but to say that it is a complete failure would be too much even for Mr. Gorwala.

Mr. Prasad Rao and his friends should appreciate the spirit with which we are proceeding in such problems. The appointment of the Evaluation Committee and bringing that Report for discussion in this House itself shows how open-minded we are. We want to learn by the method of trial and error and proceed in this matter till we achieve complete success.

As regards the administrative setup in the block development area, let me submit, Sir, that the administrative machinery is not completely favourable to the circumstances in which this programme has to be carried out. The B.D.Os., as stated in the Report itself, are the key-functionaries in the blocks. The Committee has rightly suggested that this officer must be a man of high calibre and higher qualifications but my submission is that besides this, he must be a man having entirely a different background, different from what the other officers have. If he is also habituated to roam about in jeep cars, as the other officers do, then it will not be possible to implement this sort of programme and also get the co-operation of the people successfully. Therefore, the hon. Minister should consider this point which is an

important one and should see that the officer is not only a man of high calibre and high qualifications but that he is an officer who has faith in democratic set-ups, faith in the rural reconstruction and faith in the capacity of the rural people. Moreover, he should have faith in social justice. A man of this background will certainly be beneficial for this programme.

Regarding the agricultural extension work—I must make it clear here that I am intimately connected with the developmental activities of one Block and have got enough knowledge of several Blocks—the extension work, as it is pointed out in the report itself, is only an extension of the agricultural work. No other extension work is being carried on at present. Even in this agricultural extension work also, the distribution of fertilisers, the distribution of improved seeds, etc., is not made adequately to cater to the needs of the cultivators of that area. I will quote one example about my own Block. This Rabi campaign was carried on quite vigorously. Batches went round the villages and persuaded the kisans to adopt all modern methods. But when the question of supplying superphosphate came, the B.D.O. was unable to supply because stocks were not there. (*Time bell rings*). Two minutes more.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Sir, I suggest that the sitting may be extended till 5-30 even though it is ten minutes for each.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have already extended.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY: Then, Sir, just when this superphosphate was brought, there were untimely rains and it could not be distributed to the cultivators right at the time of sowing. Such difficulties are very common. Therefore, the fertilisers and other improved seeds must be made available at the right time as far as possible at the door of the kisan.

Then only such extension programmes will be implemented successfully and well.

I will not say anything about other matters, but only I want to submit something about these Block Samities in Andhra Pradesh. In accordance with the recommendations of the Balvantray Mehta Committee, Andhra Pradesh Government was the first to implement these recommendations. But to say that all Block Samities were nominated is not wholly correct. Wherever there is a Gram Panchayat its president has been taken and where there are no Gram Panchayats, in such villages nominations have been made by the Collector. This is roughly the constitution of the Block Samity. It is not entirely nominated.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, in the introductory chapter of the report it has been mentioned that democratic decentralisation is one of the main purposes and to that effect a lot of things have been done. But I would like to say that this necessity for democratic decentralisation is in fact a later realisation. In the beginning the methods which were being pursued were one of imposition. The authorities never cared to consult the people while framing any scheme, and in fact they imposed it upon them, and at the time of implementation they were rather being dictated to extend their support.

When these methods did not work satisfactorily and when it was seen that in a number of schemes there were colossal wastage and useless expenditure, Government possibly thought it better to devise some means for democratic decentralisation. I feel that the underlying reason for this realisation is just to shift the blame and the consequences of a failure on the people rather than a genuine desire to secure their active participation. However, I am not against it, and I am rather happy about it better late than never.

But I submit that all steps should be taken in the proper direction for actual democratic decentralisation, and if that is done in a proper manner, I am sure that active participation of the people must be forthcoming. I can also boldly say that when the people's participation is secured, schemes can be implemented with less expenditure, without wastage, and quite efficiently. At present it is the thoughtless way of expenditure by the authorities, the colossal wastage and unnecessary expenditure and whimsicalness of the implementing authorities which fail to inspire the people, and as a result their zeal wanes. It is only foolishness to try to find fault with the people for their waning zeal, and I agree with the observation in the report at page 21, which reads as follows:

"The process of providing even the most elementary facilities in health, education, communication, etc. had just begun, and there can be no question of rural people not wanting these facilities in an increasing measure and not contributing to them to the extent of their capacity, provided proper extension methods are adopted and the contributions demanded from them are within their capacity."

The report rightly stresses upon the important task to be performed by Panchayats. But to enable the Panchayats to perform their task properly, my submission is that they should be properly constituted and invested with adequate powers and scope to perform it. I am sorry to say that the election of the Panchayat body is not fairly done always, and there is even interference by the Government officials. In one such election in my district, it was found that from one ward in fact only 69 people cast their votes. Then the presiding officer got into the polling house, brought out the ballot boxes, and at the time of counting it was found that there were 82 ballot papers. As a result, one of the candidates who was counting the number of voters protested and made a representation to the District

[Shri Harihar Patel.] Collector and also to the State Government, but to no effect. A reply was communicated to him from the Collector that the Collector was satisfied that the election was conducted fairly. But in connection with that Panchayat election there was also a criminal case, and in that case it was proved that 13 votes were cast in the names of persons who were either dead or who had left that village and gone over to other places. In such matters if a representation is made and if a reply is given in that manner without an enquiry, I think it is too much to hope for co-operation and participation by the people.

So, my submission is that if the Government are in fact anxious to enlist the people's participation, they must also take measures for fair methods of election in Panchayats. Government should not be blind to these things happening there. In the implementation of the schemes also, there should be directions issued from the Government from time to time to consult the people. I would like to give an instance about an irrigation tank in my district. Now the site on which this tank is belongs to one village, and the lands of another village are going to be benefited and an outlet is being sought to be made over some lands belonging to another village, and that too quite unnecessarily. The man to whom these lands belong—lands which are going to be submerged as a result of this excavation of an outlet from that tank—protested and said that there were also other ways by which an outlet could be dug without doing any damage to his lands. But I am sorry to say that neither an enquiry nor any communication has yet been made to him, and the matter is held up.

My submission is that the report should also go into such practical reasons which are hindering real progress in implementation of the schemes and not always rely on statistics and theories and on some discussion with the officials and others.

Sir, with these words I conclude my speech.

SHRI N. B. MALKANI: Sir, we, Members of Parliament, receive a number of reports—a flood of them. We read only a few; we cannot read all. But if there is one report which I have read with great interest and zest, it is this small wisp of a report. It is only 50 pages or less. I have read it, not once, but three times. It is always readable. There are a number of reports, if I may say so, about the Education Ministry which I have received. But I close them with a sense of sadness and disappointment. When I read this and finish it, I do it with a note of hope. I feel that here is some hope and that something is being done. I have been connected with the Community Projects since its very inception. I have seen a number of projects in a number of States and I have seen things growing from period to period, from year to year. I have seen an organisation growing from year to year. I have seen a programme growing from year to year. And if I may say so, I have seen a number of changes during that period and a broader vision and a broader horizon is before us within that period. I cannot say the same of any other Ministry. It is the only Ministry which works with faith and it is the Ministry to which I go with hope. I have gone there with criticism—I believe, constructive, healthy criticism—as healthy, I believe, as in this booklet. This book is, if I may put it in a different way, like a picture by Rembrandt which has many shades. It has dark shades, but there are streaks of light also, and when the figure comes out, it is a very beautiful picture. It may be that my friend sees it as a Rembrandt picture. But as I see it, it is a Raphael's picture and brighter than that. If I may say so, it is a beautiful picture. The shades are there. What the hon. Member said is, correct; what Dr. Kunzru said is correct. But I see that the light is much more than the shade. You too see a picture, but a dark one. I see a

picture, it is a brighter picture. A picture must be shade as well as light. To my mind, it must have both. You see the dark side. I see the bright side.

Sir, I know that so far as this organisation is concerned, it is a very ambitious organisation which my friend the Minister contemplates. He wants to cover the whole of India and expand the responsibility of the organisation to the very roots—the grass-roots—of the village. There is no other organisation today like that. If there is anything big we want to do or Panditji wants to do, we judge the work of the Community Projects. Did we hear of it before? Did anybody think of it before? Gandhiji talked of the gram. He hardly talked of the gram sevak, which terms have become very common. He hardly talked of the gram sahayak or sahyogi. It is a new word coined and given to us. Sir you will very soon hear about the gram sabha coming into existence under the auspices of this Ministry—under the healthy, refreshing and bracing auspices of this Ministry. The gram sabha did not exist before. It is new to us. But the organisation is yet weak; But I hope the weakling will become strong. The weak link is this. There are also now Extension Officers and they are very weak to my mind. The service is there, but the quality is weak. Co-ordination is lacking between the gram sevak and the Extension Officer. Extension Officers are neither specialists nor social workers. The Extension Officer must be a fine, harmonious combination of both. He must be slightly specialist and more a social worker. But he is neither. The duality, to my mind, is poor. The quality of the gram sevak is better, but it is not quite good yet. This is the weak spot. But I say that with confidence. I know that the Minister will listen to me. He has listened to me often; sometimes, he has not; sometimes, he has rejected me. But often he has listened to me. When I feel like saying something, I go to him. If

I go to him, it is because this young Minister—much younger to me—is very dynamic and full of faith. And I have seen the young Minister growing himself. He is not the same man as he was seven years before. He is growing like his Department, if I may say so—a developing Department and a developing Minister.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: A potential one here.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Yes, Sir. But you are like Miss Mayo. You see only drains. I see no drains. You see only dark; I do not see like that. I see in him a young, dynamic personality.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is quite handsome; not the Community Projects.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: "Handsome is that handsome does." I have seen not only his organisation, but his programme growing. Today, we want this programme in a big way. We talk of agriculture. Where do we go to? Of course, my friend will go to China. I do not go to China. I go to my friend there. I do not even go to the Food Ministry. It is too vast, too big, too complicated, too departmentalised. This is my feeling and I am afraid to enter the portals of the Food Ministry. But about this Ministry, I immediately go there. It is easily accessible. The Ministry runs after me and I run after the Ministry and do not get lost in the maze of this place. Here the Ministry runs after me. I have never seen a Ministry running after me as this Ministry does. Sometimes, it overdoes it; but it does it.

Sir, if we want to improve our agriculture, rather extend and intensify it, we come to this Ministry. But even that is not much to me. Today, it is going through a bigger phase than that. My friend, Dr. Kunzru, put the right finger on the right—and weak—spot. What about the initiative of the people? Where is the public enthusiasm? Sir, Shri Prasad Rao

[Shri N. R. Malkani.] also put the finger there. It pained me; it hurt me. It is true that initiative is lacking; that enthusiasm is lacking and that self-help is lacking. They are not there. But the programme is getting on well. I remember the Minister saying to me three years before at the Amritsar Congress, in a private conference, "Malkani, I am afraid of bureaucratisation in my Department." He said so, I remember, He immediately woke up to the danger. It was a warning. And he has been trying to face that warning. Today he is trying to step up things. Today he is speaking in terms of pan-chayat. It is rightly given to him. This is the only way for it. When the panchayat grows, that enthusiasm, that initiative which is lacking will come back to us. That is, to my mind, the only hope.

To my mind, Sir, a good thing has been done in the Plan—the Community Projects. Bigger things are happening outside—the Gramdan, the Bhoodan and so on. They are all much bigger now. If there is a Ministry which can understand, respond, absorb and assimilate this movement, it is this Ministry. Not only has it taken the shock of that movement, but it has absorbed it. This is the Ministry which has deliberately called the Bhoodan workers together. Last year, it deliberately went into conference with the Gramdan workers. It is working in the Gramdan villages, not only absorbing the shock but also going in for a great upheaval. This Ministry alone can do so. No other Ministry can do it. To my mind, the greatest compliment I can pay to this Ministry is this. It is growing to such an extent that it is going to be a medium of a revolutionary idea. Something good and big is going to happen. I think it will come through the Community Projects not through the Home Ministry or the Food Ministry or any other Ministry. China is a big State. It is a big challenge, as Mr. Prasad Rao said. But it is also a big peril. I do not want to talk on

foreign affairs now. It is not only a challenge, but it is also a big peril.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanan Nair.

श्री पा० ना० राज रोज (मुम्बई) :
श्रीमान्, मैंने भी अपना नाम बोलने के लिये
दिया था। मुझे भी पांच मिनट मिलने
चाहिये। कम्प्यूनिटी ब्लाकस की रिपोर्ट में
जो बातें हरिजनों के संबंध में आई हैं और
कांस्टीट्यूशन के खिलाफ जो बातें हो रही
हैं उनके संबंध में मुझे सदन के सामने कुछ
कहना है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called Mr. Narayanan Nair.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am sure it would interest the Members of the House to know how in Kerala the Government is handling these community development projects and the national extension services. There as elsewhere we have had the experience of these projects and the extension services for over five years in certain areas and for a lesser period in other areas. We had our own seminars and our own attempts to assess and evaluate the working of these institutions, but I have no time to refer to these things.

Now, Sir, there is consensus of opinion that there is a wide gulf between the avowed objects of these projects and programmes and the actual achievements—everybody is agreed on that—the Evaluation Report has referred to that, and it is also agreed that there is positive need for a thorough reorientation of not only the expenditure pattern of the projects but also the methods of work, the organisational set-up, the technique of administration and all that. Now, Sir, within this very limited time which I have, I will just make mention of what the Government in Kerala are doing about these things.

Now the main point that has been brought out in this debate is the question of the actual participation of the masses of the people in these activities. Mention has been made that this enthusiasm is dwindling.

Now, Sir, the democratic spirit is there, the urge is there, the enthusiasm of the people is there, but what has been lacking is that there has been no proper canalisation of this democratic spirit, this urge of the people for constructive purposes. Of course attempts have been made to draw in directly or indirectly, somewhere or other, such of the panchayats as are existing in the community project areas. But that has been on an *ad hoc* basis. Organically these panchayats, such as they are, even they have not been actually drawn into the process of the functioning of these institutions. Now, Sir, the Kerala Government, the thing that they have done, in order to enable the masses of the people to actually participate in these things, to enable them to play their part in the creation of a democratic spirit in their own villages is that they have set about reforming the entire administrative structure.

Now I have not got the time and also I do not want to go into the whole question how, under the foreign rule, a certain administrative set-up was there. Now, Sir, there are certain guiding principles which underlie the reforms which have been introduced by the Kerala Government. Firstly, decentralization, that is, delegating more and more power and authority to the lower levels consistent, of course, with the need for centralization in respect of major policies. The second thing is, Sir, associating the people with these popularly elected bodies at the village level, to begin with, at the sub-district level, and so on, that is, democratisation. And not only that. What do you find in the villages now? The Revenue Department is functioning under General Administration, as an arm of the Government and further, the Education

Department, Engineering, Health, everything have their own departmental officials down to the village level. There was so much of diffusion of responsibility; there is absolutely no co-ordination.

Now, Sir, we were told that these community projects and these national extension services are more a pattern of administration. But what do you find? You find they function as separate departments, that is, the community development department and the other Government departments functioning independently of one another and also independently of the panchayats generally. This sort of diffusion of responsibility is the main weakness of the whole thing, Sir.

Now the Kerala Government propose that there must be an integrated social structure and an administrative unit at the village level with ample powers and with ample financial resources. If only I have the time I can dilate on this in detail. Not only for developmental works, not only for the community projects but also for others, the panchayats which are envisaged following the report of the Administrative Reforms Committee there, they will have their own mandatory functions. They will discharge the functions that are legitimately the functions of local self-government institutions. But more than that, Sir, these panchayats at the lower level will act as the agents of the Government in relation to developmental activities. And more than that they will have advisory functions also in respect of these things. Now the block development funds will be canalised through panchayats. Now every developmental activity at the panchayat level, at the village level will be routed through these panchayats, which will be absolutely elected on the basis of adult franchise.

And now about funds, Sir. Reference has been made to that. Perhaps Members know that in Kerala we have simplified the system of basic

[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.] land revenue. Now the proposal is to allot 50% of the land revenue to these panchayats—they will do the collection themselves. And even the balance of 50%, Sir, will go back to these panchayats on the basis of a distributive system. I have no time to go into what other resources this Kerala Government are placing at their disposal.

Then about democratisation and co-ordination, action is being taken there. Steps are there being suggested, Sir, to improve the morale of the officials engaged, and the people to increase their social purposiveness to the good of the community as a whole, and the underlying thing is the canalisation of the democratic spirit for constructive purposes.

SHRI B. P. BASAPPA SHETTY (Mysore): We want to know whether the scheme is a success in Kerala, or a failure. We want to know how the scheme is being worked out in Kerala and with what success.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Sir, five years' experience shows that there is a wide gulf between objectives and achievements. Now we are trying to solve it. We are trying our level best to see that the achievements approximate the objectives. An earnest attempt is being made by the Kerala Government there, Sir, in pursuance of the Directive Principles of the Constitution. In pursuance of the suggestions made in the Five Year Plan we are making an honest attempt to see if anything good can result from out of these things, and we have found from experience that unless there is democratisation at the village level and upwards. Unless there is actual co-ordination between the workers of the departments, unless adequate funds and authority are given to these democratic bodies at the village level and unless that element of social purposiveness is instilled into the functionaries who are put in charge of these institutions, nothing good can come out. Now, Sir, that

is one aspect of it and that at the village level. Then again there is the sub-district level. Dr. Kunzru mentioned that if the Collector of the District is made in charge of the whole thing, it will be an improvement. Well, Sir, the Collector that way is made responsible, but then we go a step further—necessarily we have to go a step further because even the Collector at the district level and the Tahsildar or the Development Officer at the sub-district level, unless they work in conjunction with and under the guidance of the elected democratic bodies, Sir, we do not think that the results of these things will be any the permanent or lasting. Again I have not got the time to go into what proposals we are actually making to make these democratic bodies what they should be and for the co-ordination of the various functionaries in the whole thing. The main point is every fund offered by the Government, the block development fund or other resources meant for the lower levels will be channelled through the properly constituted democratic bodies and the functionaries of these community development projects and the functionaries of these national extension services will work under the operational control of these democratically elected bodies at the various levels. That is the principle there.

Now again, Sir, apart from these structural changes, which are absolutely called for, there is so much of rigid uniformity about the pattern of the national extension service. That there is some sort of rigid uniformity is also mentioned in the Evaluation Reports several times. Conditions differ certainly as between State and State, between different areas in the State also. Now if I had the time I would have gone a little further into the results of the enquiry which the Kerala Government have made, but I have not got the time. Again, Sir, there is need for reorientation, as I said in the case of the pattern. Now I we have done something to approxi-

mate this pattern more closely to the conditions obtaining in Kerala. 5 P.M. The question of density of population is there. Sir, so far as amenities like education and social services are concerned, they may be peculiar to Kerala. There is a heavy food deficit there. So, the underlying principle behind the revision of that pattern is that there must be more emphasis laid on the productive and economic content of these programmes and projects. For example, Sir, for headquarters' personnel 17 per cent, is there. It is an all-India pattern. We have made it clear that under no account that must be exceeded. But the other important change that we have brought about is this. Ours is a deficit State and agricultural development calls for our maximum effort. Within certain limitations the Government there have given a directive that 42 per cent, of the funds would be there for what they call the intensive study for five years and post-intensive study for another five years. Sir, 42 per cent, of that must be given for agricultural expansion, for animal husbandry, for co-operation, for irrigation and reclamation of land. Under no account can this be varied. Now, Sir, there are certain other things also as to how the peasants and agriculturists can be helped in regard to supply of manure, green manure and seeds. Well, Sir, we are working out a detailed programme. I am mentioning all these things because we are working under a general social set-up, and within certain limitations we are making earnest efforts in that direction. And I am informed that the representatives of the Ministry of Community Development had some occasion to go there, participate in some discussions there and have some first-hand knowledge about all these things.

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (SHRI S. K. DEY) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am very grateful to this House for giving me this opportunity of talking on the subject of Community Development, 100 R.S.D.—7.

because I do not generally have that opportunity during Question Hours. I am grateful particularly to my friend, Mr. Prasad Rao, for having moved this motion and also for some of the criticisms that he has made. Some of the criticisms that have been made on the other side of the House have been answered by this side of the House, thus leaving very little for me to say, so far as the actual criticisms are concerned.

[THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU)
in the Chair.]

Sir, Mr. Prasad Rao opened his talk with a statement on the Gorwala Report. I do not know Mr. Gorwala personally, but I have heard a good bit about his eminence in the past. So when I was told at Mysore, immediately on my arrival there, that there was a report written by Mr. Gorwala, I looked forward to reading that report, because I thought I could get some light. I have always been looking to every nook and corner of India for some light which can ease burden. Well, the Report of Mr. Gorwala is confined to three pages so far as community development is concerned. It started with certain conclusions, and I thought perhaps it would give me some reasons for arriving at those conclusions, but no reasons were given there. And what was the conclusion that had been arrived at? The conclusion was that we should not have an expensive machinery for community development and we should transfer the entire responsibility for administering the programme to the existing agency of Government, which is what we have been struggling for the past eleven years or so. What is the community development administration at the block level? You have a Block Development Officer. That is the only new functionary. All the other extension officers are technical officers supposed to represent their department for the people. Is it enough to have one agricultural officer at the level of the district? We know that one agricultural officer even at

[Shri S. K. Dey.] the level of 60,000 or 70,000 people is not quite enough, but even that we cannot provide. And that is precisely what has been specified in our block programme—an agricultural officer, an animal husbandry officer, a cooperative officer, and now a panchayat officer, an industries officer and a public health officer. Is it too much? Now, Sir, he wants that we should abolish all these functionaries. I do not know how in that case we are going to develop our agriculture and other subjects, and help our people. At the village level we have provided Gram Sevaks. And through them the entire Government has to function. Till the community development programme came, Sir, we had departments of Government running parallel, which often clashed with each other, thus adding to the confusion of the village people. So, we provided one Gram Sevak at the level of 10 villages and we made it mandatory for all departments to function through this functionary alone. There is only one functionary at the level of 10 or 12 villages with a population of 6,000 to 7,000. Is it too big a staff?

Sir, he wants us to go back to the old order and hand over powers to the Mamlatdar, Patwari or the Patel who can wield some big rod and get the people to do whatever the Government wants them to do. He has shown complete distrust of the panchayat. Sir, this Parliament created the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission created a Committee on Planned Projects. The Committee on Planned Projects appointed a study team and that study team was headed by no less a person than Shri Balvant-ray Mehta, an eminent Parliamentarian, a student of administration, who has worked as Chairman of the Estimates Committee. This committee went all over India for about one year, slogged in the dust and sand and the rains and cold, and it went from village to village, searching for light, and analysing data, and it came to the conclusion that this programme

cannot survive unless there is democratic decentralisation. Shri Gorwala suggests that this is only a myth. He makes fun of it. His only thesis is that we should go back to the British rule or we <title></title>commit *hara-kiri*. Well, as a Minister, I am not prepared to do either of the two things. Would the Government of India or any one in this House or the other House follow either of those two courses? No. We are following the courses that have been recommended, time after time, by the Evaluation Committee which was appointed by the Government of India themselves. No other programme, Sir, in the whole world that I know of, has been subjected to continuing evaluation, to which this programme has been subjected throughout, since it was born. It is like a child who is born today and tomorrow you ask as to why that child has not grown in height, why it has not been able to take care of itself and why it has not been able to earn its living. Sir, here we are dealing with human beings who have been subjected to a terrific pressure of neglect and exploitation for hundreds of years. I am expected to put life into these people through an official organisation, and I am expected to work miracles in the course of five or six years. I realise that five years or six years is a fairly long period, but in the history of a nation, which is waking up after 2,000 years, this period of five or six years is not even a beginning.— We are still at the beginning of our programme.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, 2,000 years ago we had Lord Buddha, we were not slaves.

SHRI S. K. DEY: That was 2,500 years ago, if I may correct the hon. Member.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That may be so. Maybe 2,500 years ago.

SHRI S. K. DEY: Now I would like to tell this House and I know they

would be interested in some of the steps that we have taken in response to the criticisms that have been made by the evaluation agency and by the Balwantray Study Team and particularly the recommendations they have made. We are now trying to organise our training programme very effectively for all workers in the community projects. Previously we were training only Gram Sewaks. They were trained for 6 months. We increased it to one year and six months. Now we have increased it to two years. The extension officers never had any training in community development programmes as such nor did they have any opportunity of working together with the Block Development Officers as a part of a team, when under training. They just got employed and were asked to do a job. We have tried to reorganise our entire training programmes and the Block Development Officers and Extension Officers are all being trained together. There has been an expansion programme now in action, for this block level officers' training; we have also started a training centre for the training of top officers at Mussourie. It has already run three courses and we have in this collectors and senior officers from the States and also some Members of the State Legislature, also sometimes some Members from Parliament who are prepared to go there and participate in these instructions—'give and take.' We have gone ahead and tried to revise the programme. We have now made a five year first stage programme to be followed by a five-year second stage programme. We have asked the States to treat the block budget as an entirely flexible budget which they should adjust according to the circumstances of the area. WB have asked the State Governments to see that the funds meant for local works should be administered entirely through Panchayats. We know Panchayats by themselves are not -in a position to develop that self-reliance overnight and that sense of responsibility. Therefore we have asked the State Governments to take

up Gram Sahayak training for Sar-panches and this is a programme that is soon going to begin. We have asked the State Governments to think in terms of a training programme for Block Development Committee Members. The Block Development Committee today consists of Members of Parliament from the area, the Member in the State Legislature from the area whoever he is and to whichever Party he may belong, the elected Sarpanches from the area and the representatives of the Co-operative societies. If there is any State in which this elective principle is not being adhered to, I would be most happy to have particulars about it and I would certainly apply such correctives as I possibly can. I know there are ways of getting all these errors in action corrected and it is for this that I come to Members of Parliament to be partners in this enterprise and to let me know where wrong things are being done, contrary to the terms of reference which we have agreed to. We know that agricultural programme must go ahead. We know that it is not possible for one Gram Sewak to take care of 10 villages and 6,000 people. Therefore we have started the Gram Sahayak camps. Good cultivators from every village are picked up in a Gram Sewak circle of 10 villages. They undergo in a camp discussions on improved practices of agriculture between themselves, also they have demonstrations from the Agriculture Department representatives and others. They also work up a plan which they are to follow. They go back and try to enlist the participation of other weaker members of their farming community so that the entire farming community can move together. I completely agree with Mr. Prasad Rao that land reform is the essential pre-requisite for bringing about democracy at the village level, also for bringing about increased production. The Government is taking measures. The Central Government is very earnest, as the hon. Member knows, about enforcing land reforms as early as possible. Every day in

the press there is something about it indicating the views of the Central Government.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: That never comes into practice.

SHRI S. K. DEY: The views of the Central Government will be of no avail unless these views are implemented in practice. How will the Central Government implement these view/s except through the enlightened public opinion at the ground level?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The only increased harvest we are having is the harvest of official views.

SHRI S. K. DEY: I am not talking here of official views. I am talking of official policies which must be explained to the common masses of the people who must understand if our measures are to be effective. Even where there is legislation enacted by the State Government appropriately, even those legislations are not being implemented at the ground level because the common masses of people do not know what the import of the legislation is. I have seen it in many parts of the country. That is why it is necessary that the village people must be educated first as to what the intentions of the Government are, what the meaning of the legislation is and so on. I also know that unless there is decentralisation of powers to statutory bodies of Government, this democracy is in danger. The hon. Member and all the Members who have spoken on this subject know what pains we have been taking for the past one year to see that this recommendation of the Balwantray Study Team is implemented in the States. Already there are two States which have enacted the legislation. One is the Andhra State and another is the Madras State. About the Andhra State, legislation is still on the anvil but they have already implemented in anticipation of the legislation, in 20 blocks as a pilot measure, So far as

Madras is concerned, they have already enacted the legislation. Now it has been mentioned there that in Andhra State quite a number of Members-in these Block Panchayat Samities are nominated by the State Government. I myself objected to it when I heard about it. Now it has been explained by the State Government that in many of the areas where these Block Panchayat Samities are functioning, they do not have legally constituted Panchayats. They have ad hoc bodies from which they have to select representatives. That is why there is this nomination for the time being. In the meantime a very highly dynamic person who has had experience of the community projects programme has been appointed, as Inspector General of Panchayats and has been deputed to cover the whole State with Panchayats so that in the future there can only be elected people. The same measure is being attempted to be followed in all the States. Wherever there are difficulties, if hon. Members of this House would be kind enough to bring these to our notice, certainly we would do everything that we humanly can to see that the State Government corrects the situation.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : असुस्थता अभी तक कायम है और अभी तक ६ गांवों में अलग अलग स्कूल कायम हैं। डेवलपमेंट वर्गर्स की बात आपने की लेकिन लेबर के ऊपर जो कई प्रकार के अन्याय होते हैं इसके ऊपर आपने कुछ नहीं कहा। मुझे बोलने का मौका नहीं मिला। ६ गांवों में अलग अलग स्कूल हैं। कानून पास हुआ है और कांस्टीट्यूशन में भी इसके बारे में है लेकिन अभी भी हरिजन है और असुस्थता कायम है। आप छुवा करके अपने अफसरों को बता दीजिये कि यह ठीक नहीं है।

SHRI S. K. DEY: It is not the Community Development Officers that can do everything about it. Untouchabi-Jity and all these questions have to

he an indivisible question and it requires an all-out effort by everybody concerned but even there I think this evaluation report has said that in the large number of villages that they have studied, they have not found any sign of untouchability. The schools are open to all members of the community, the drinking-water wells are open, the roads are open and there is no particular discriminatory penalisation that is being made.

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ: Some six schools are there separately. It is mentioned in the report.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: In 93 per cent, of the schools, there is no discrimination.

SHRI S. K. DEY: I cannot expect perfection overnight. In fact if the country had been so perfect overnight, it would be a very dangerous situation,

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : वह कानून तो पास हुआ है ?

SHRI S. K. DEY: Laws have been passed and the laws are broken every day. The laws can be honoured only by enlightened public opinion and the objective of the community development programme is to create that enlightened mass opinion but it cannot do it by itself alone. You have only a few people working as Government servants at the Block level. That is why it is necessary to have representatives of the public associated with it. Some time ago I made an appeal to all the hon. Members of both Houses here and I have since received active assistance from quite a substantial number of Members who have been going to the Blocks. If hon. Members find any divergence between our professions and practice, of a gross nature, let me know. In every single case of that nature, we have been able to take some action and the action has led to very satisfactory results. We have the consultative committee

at the Centre, and it is a most effective body and we have there the active participation of all members, at least twice in every session. There was a certain amount of resistance on the part of the State Governments to create the consultative committees in the States. But now all the States have formed these consultative committees.

SARDAR RAGHUBIR SINGH PANJHAZARI (Punjab): What about the Punjab?

SHRI S. K. DEY: The Punjab was the last State to do it and I have received a message a few days back that they have ultimately formed a consultative committee and they are in the process of issuing the letter. I am very sorry for this long delay.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Kerala): Why don't you ask the respective States to include the representatives from each political party so that all the political parties could work together?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are there.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO: No, I go as an M.P. I want the representatives of the political parties to be there.

SHRI S. K. DEY: I may mention here that as far as I know, in every State the selection of the members has been made on the basis of the representation of the political parties in the State Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI S. K. DEY: That is what has happened in every State and if there is any departure from it, I shall be most happy to know and I shall be most grateful to the hon. Member who provides me with this information.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO: In the State there may be a very powerful party which may not have representation in the Assembly. Can't you ask them to send a member to the Consultative committee?

SHRI S. K. DEY: I am very sorry, if a very powerful political party is not represented in the State Legislature, there must be something fundamentally wrong. Certainly I cannot ask the State Legislature to see that that powerful party is represented on the consultative committee. That will be a dangerous thing.

At the Centre also, as hon. Members may know, all the consultative committee members are automatically *ex-officio* members of the State consultative committees. And from their reports I find that the States are deeply appreciative of the contribution that these consultative committees have already made in spite of the misgivings with which they started. I say, therefore, Parliamentary Members also are members of the State Consultative Committees and they make a significant contribution to the programme.

Sir, I have no doubt that we shall continue to be responsive to them and we shall try to implement whatever we possibly can. I cannot say in 20 minutes all we are trying to do. Possibly we have already placed in the Parliamentary library a statement giving the actions we have actually taken on the recommendations of the Balvantray team and also on the recommendations of the Evaluation Team. And if hon. Members come to know where the State Governments are failing to implement an agreed decision, I shall be most grateful to receive that information and advice from them and see what can be done. Sir, that is all I want to say. I am sorry it has not been possible for me to cover all the points within this short period.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just one question only. Sir, in the various evaluation reports there are . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Mr. Prasad Rao will have no time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In these reports adverse comments have been made. Have these been tabulated by the Government in order to find a remedy?

SHRI S. K. DEY: They have been very carefully examined and action is being taken on every adverse criticism. But the effect of that action naturally is not uniform in all parts of the country in all the States. It is bound to be so, in the varying conditions of India.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am glad to hear the spirited reply that the hon. Minister has given, but I wish he had concretely replied to some of the points that were raised from this side of the House. Of course, I think this is not an occasion for the hon. Minister for vituperation against the person who has produced this Report. May be it is wrong or may be it is correct. That is an entirely different matter. Anyway, coming to the matter of democratic decentralisation, we should have been very glad if there is really any democracy and if there is really any decentralisation. But unfortunately today the practice is that in the name of democratic decentralisation, there is in fact neither democracy nor decentralisation. That is the point that I wanted to stress. In the Balvantray Report about which the hon. Minister said so much, it is stated that the Collector should be the chairman of the elected body and his P.A. should be the secretary of the committee. Is this committee to be presided over by the Revenue Divisional Officer who, it has been pointed out in the Report is the symbol of an oppressive machinery? And how is it then going to generate the necessary confidence of the people and how is it going to unleash their enthusiasm? Is it the sort of democracy that we want to implement? Sir, we know that even in the past the local boards did tremendous work. I know Sir, that Work has been done. Never has it been said from our side that nothing

has been done. But the only point is that everything that comes under the sun, including even the rising of the sun in the east and its setting in the west, should not be attributed to the C.P.A. That would not be correct. Take agricultural production. I want the hon. Minister to give us the comparative figures and tell us what is the percentage of extra increase in the C.P.A. areas over and above that in other areas? Take for instance the delta districts. Certainly increased production is there. Whether there is the C.P.A. or no C.P.A. that increase is there because of so many other factors that have come up, the price structure and so many other things.

Then come to the subject of education. It is not correct for the C.P.A. to claim that because of the existence of the C.P.A. this education has increased. I know in our country, especially in the post-war period there is a great urge for education and in the wake of our independence certainly more people want to get this education. I may point out that in one district only as many as 55 high schools were started between the years 1947 and 1951 under the local boards, when there was no C.P.A. or anything of that sort. Here, in the name of Community Projects and Community Development Projects, if there is really democracy, certainly we will be the first people who would welcome it and participate in it heart and soul. But unfortunately that is not happening and that is our criticism. Here is this question of decentralisation. How can you bring in decentralisation when it is under the Collector and how is that conducive to decentralisation? I don't understand it. The Panchayats should be there. The real power should be given to the Pan-chayat Boards. The hon. Minister says that there are laws. Sir, I am reminded that under the constitution of the erstwhile Hyderabad State under the Nizam there was a statutory provision saying that no begar or forced labour should be extracted from the people. Of course that

firm as it was called was there, of the Nizam. But in actual practice, under the police action and much later even, this forced labour was being extracted. Shri Srikant himself has testified that there was this forced labour. So it is not a question of having statutes that we are talking of. We are talking of the practical realities.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Time is nearly over.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I will conclude in a minute. Sir. The question is not whether there is a statute or not. The question is whether that statute is being implemented. What is it that is happening in practice? It is not that fine sermons were not taught. It is not a question of giving fine sermons. The question is whether those fine things were implemented. When these things filter down to the masses, it is found that actually only a small strata, the rich peasantry in the villages reap all the benefits that are there. This is our basic complaint. In spite of all this tall talk, the real masses do not get it. That is not happening. What I surmise is that it is the proverbial mountain in labour producing only the mouse. Only this mouse is produced. In spite of all this ballyhoo publicity very little has come out of it all. They try to draw a rosy picture. I wish all that the hon. Membrs Shri Malkani said were true. Unfortunately the realities are different and all that is not true. Mr. Lingam also said very much being done, but actually there is very little in practice. He asked for concrete suggestions. Certainly we can make them. Let it be on a democratic basis. Let all the powers be given not to the Collector, but to a completely elected body, the district board, directly elected. Why should there be any indirect election. I do not understand.

Let there be directly elected pan-chayat boards; let there be directly-elected block boards and also district

planning and development boards— not these things—and all moneys be given to such bodies. Let all the officers, the Extension officers, the Block Development Officers, whoever they are, work under these elected boards. Then, certainly, things would be far better than they are now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): It is half past five now.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman. . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I am sorry to interrupt.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: . . . for having given me this 'opportunity to reply.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE INDIAN TARIFF AMENDMENT) BILL 1958

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message

received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha: —

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a Copy of the Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill, 1958, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 18th December, 1958. "

"The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India".

I lay the Bill on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow, the 19th instant.

The House then adjourned at thirtyone minutes past live of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 19th December, 1958.