अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने उस दिन माननीय सदस्या को इजाजत दे दी थी। मैं आज इजाजत नहीं दूंगा। —श्री चित्त बसु।

(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे लिख कर दीजिए। काम को चलने दीजिए।

(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें। हर बात की एक हद होती है। आप सीमा का उल्लंघन न करें।

(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राइसिज के बारे में इतना इम्पार्टेंट मसला आ रहा है। उसको इस तरीके से दबाया जा रहा है। यह अच्छी बात नहीं है। —श्री मूलचन्द डागा।

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA (Pali): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture...

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पहला नाम श्री चित्त बसु का है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने उन्हें कितनी बार बुलाया है। वह नहीं बोलते हैं, तो मैं क्या करूं' श्री डागा बैठ जायें।—श्री चित्त बसु।

12.19 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

AGRICULTURAL PRICES COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS *re.* PROCUREMENT PRICE OF PADDY

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

'Recommendation of the Agricultural Prices Commission regarding procurement price of paddy and the reaction of the Union Government thereto in the light of views expressed by Chief Ministers of various States.'

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL RECONSTRUCTION (SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO): In May, 1980, the Commission had submitted its Report on price policy for kharif cereals for 1980-81 season. In this Report, the Commission had recommended that the prices of paddy and other kharif cereals might be retained at Rs. 95 per quintal. Some time later in June, 1980, Government of India made an announcement about the increase in the prices of fertilizers and while doing so, the A.P.C. was asked to rework its price recommendations. This was necessary because at the time of announcing increase in the prices of fertilizer and diesel oil Government had decided that the farmers would be compensated for increase in their cost. It was envisaged by Government that appropriate increases in procurement/support prices may be effected from the kharif 1980-81 season itself. Accordingly, the Agricultural Prices Commission submitted a supplementary report on price policy for kharif cereals for 1980-81. After taking into account the likely effect of the rise in the prices of fertilizer and diesel and the quantities and values of diesel and fertilizers used by cultivators on different kharif crops, the Commission recommended a procurement price of Rs. 100 per quintal for paddy.

In order to hold discussions with the State Governments on the price policy for kharif cereals a Conference of State Chief Ministers was convened by us on 27th July, 1980 in New Delhi. All the States except Tripura were represented either by Chief Ministers accompanied by Ministers of Agriculture or Food or by the

Minister of Food, Civil Supplies, Agriculture, Revenue etc. Most of the Chief Ministers and other Ministers representing the State Governments expressed the view that the procurement price of Rs. 100 per quintal of paddy recommended by the APC was inadequate. Many of them suggested that the farmers should be compensated for the risk of serious crop losses due to natural calamities which occur every few years. To provide a reasonable margin of profit over and above the actual cost of production the Government should fix the procurement price at a level higher than that recommended by APC. The suggested procurement prices were indicated mostly in the range of Rs. 105 to Rs. 140 per quintal.

The General procedure adopted by the Central Government in regard to final decisions on procurement prices is that the recommendations made by APC and the views expressed by the State Governments and Planning Commission and other concerned Central Ministries are placed before the Cabinet for decision. Ministry of Agriculture would now prepare a draft note on price policy for kharif cereals to obtain the decision of the Cabinet.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, the problem has several aspects. I would only refer to a few so that the hon. Minister can understand the gravity of the situation, the essence of the problem. The parity between the prices of agricultural produce and industrial goods not only does not exist but the gap between the two continues to widen every year possibly.

To illustrate, I would only quote the figures. The price index of manufactured articles was 171 as against that of agricultural produce at 150 in 1975-76; in 1976-77, the index of manufactured articles rose to 175 and that of the agricultural produce to 157. Sir, you would agree with me that this leaves a gap which does not only exist but every successive year, has also gone on increasing. This is one aspect of the parity of prices between the agricultural produce and the industrial goods. There is another aspect of the problem. That is the aspect of cost of cultivation. The price fixed by the APC does not reflect, you will agree with me, correctly the cost of production or the cost of cultivation of agricultural produce. To illustrate my point, I would only mention two facts; I would refer to certain recommendations or conclusions. First, the APC has calculated the cost of cultivation for paddy in Tamil Nadu at Rs. 92/- per quintal whereas the State Government of Tamil Nadu has worked out this figure and they have come to the conclusion that the cost of cultivation is Rs. 124/- per quintal. Therefore, the APC does not take into account the actual cost of cultivation of paddy. My second example is in regard to jute. APC has worked out the cost of cultivation of jute per quintal at Rs. 145 to Rs. 150 and they have fixed Rs. 100/- per quintal as the support price whereas the Government of West Bengal has worked out this figure and came to the conclusion that the cost of cultivation of jute per quintal is not less than Rs. 300/-. So, Sir, calculation of cost of cultivation of agricultural produce is an important aspect which Government should take into account.

Now, I would like to refer to procurement aspect. The small and marginal farmers have no holding capacity and, as such, they are not able to take advantage of the increased price. On the other hand the rich farmers take advantage of the increased price and on account of their increased holding power they manipulate market price and reap enormous profit. Therefore, the question of monopoly procurement of foodgrains arises in this context. Since it is a Call Attention motion and not a debate I would not like to dilate further on this aspect and would like to put certain specific questions. My first question is: Whether the Government would evolve such a suitable price mechanism as may ensure price parity between agricultural produce and industrial goods?

Secondly, whether the Government would take steps to see that the cost of cultivation of the agricultural produce is properly reflected in the fixation of support and procurement price fixed by the APC so as to ensure reasonable profit with the coverage of risk elements, that is, natural calamities, etc?

And thirdly, whether the Government would embark upon the programme of monopoly procurement of foodgrains so as to ensure further expansion of the public distribution system and successful implementation of the national rural employment scheme launched by the Government and ensure the support price for the poor and marginal farmers from whom these foodgrains are purchased?

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: Sir, the hon. Member, Shri Chitta Basu has raised four points which I should like to answer. He has stated that a suitable price mechanism for bringing about parity between agricultural produce and non-agricultural, manufactured, items should be evolved. As you know, soon after this Government came to power, the terms of reference of the Agricultural Prices Commission were changed, amended, and the most important step that the Government took was that the APC was directed to take into account the terms of trade between agricultural and non-agricultural sectors. That was with a view to bringing about some sort of parity between prices in the two sectors. I agree that it has not been possible to achieve parity completely. But we are keeping that in view and that is the specific directive to the APC that they will take this into consideration, that they will take it into account. No doubt the hon. Member has mentioned some figures. But I am not sure about the figures of the wholesale price index. But it is a fact that the price index for manufactured items has risen speedily and to a greater extent than the price index of agricultural produce and particularly food items. The other important change that was made in the working of the Agricultural Prices Commission and its procedures was to permit the APC to have its own research organisation. Formerly they were dependent upon the data supplied by the various universities and other bodies and organisations. They could only review the information gathered from various places. But now they can even themselves conduct research in this field and that makes them more independent so that they can go into the realities and not depend upon only the figures and estimates for cost of production supplied by the universities and other bodies which are not under the APC.

He had said that in Tamil Nadu—calculation about cost of production—is 124 or so. I am not sure whether the Government has put it as 124. But my information is that the figures from Tamil Nadu were supplied by the Agricultural University in Coimbatore and the APC takes into consideration the data supplied by the Agricultural University in Tamil Nadu. The State Government's estimates and calculations are not taken into consideration. For that matter we have a system of consulting the State Government through the Chief Ministers. That we have done only the other day, that is, on Sunday. (*Interruptions*). 130 he said, 125 he says. It can be much more.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: APC considers it as 92.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: I will only admit one thing that the figures as regards cost of production varies from State to State and zone to zone and even from district to district and we cannot fix up prices for different places. We have taken into account the average. We have to strike a balance because we have to fix one procurement price for the entire country and so far as know, the cost of production from Andhra Pradesh has been considered by APC to be the mean figure, the average figure. They have tried to strike a balance. In 1978-79, the figures from Andhra Pradesh was 88.36 as the cost of cultiva-

tion for paddy. It may be higher in certain places, I do not deny that; it may even be lesser in some places where the yield is larger as in Punjab and other places. Even in Tamil Nadu the yield may be heavier and the cost of production may be less in some places. This price recommendation by the Agricultural Prices Commission was made on the basis of data collected from all over the country and everything is taken into consideration.

AN. HON. MEMBER: What about jute?

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: We are not discussing jute; you can table a separate motion to discuss that. It is only for paddy, let us not widen the scope of discussion.

One very pertinent point raised by some of the Chief Ministers in the conference, the other day, was that they seemed to agree that all factors that come into play for production towards making the cost of production, are taken into account by the PAC, but the risk factor is not taken into account. This is what my friend, Shri Chitta Basu also has stated. I am not very sure about that, but I agree to the extent that the risk factor should also be taken to be an important factor because it is not always the same yield that a farmer gets. Natural calamities, disasters do take place from time to time. We shall think over it and see what can be done in this respect or even ask the APC whether they have taken this into account or they have completely ignored it so far.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a very common factor.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: Yes, Sir; you know more about farming than most of us.

Another point raised by Shri Chitta Basu is to suggest monopoly procurement for foodgrains. He seems to be blowing hot and cold in the same breath. On the one hand, he tries to champion the cause of the farmers and on the other hand, he wants them to be completely ignored so far as their interests are concerned. We have decided that the whole country will be one zone and movement of foodgrains will be free throughout the country. This is to benefit the farmer. The procurement price is the very minimum price which is decided on the recommendations of the Agricultural Prices Commission, on a recommendatory body, and which should be paid to the farmer to insure him against any loss in cultivation. This is a sort of insurance only. If the farmer gets a higher price without selling it to Government agencies, he is fully at liberty to do so. If he wants to sell outside the State, there is no restriction. Monopoly procurement would only meant that the farmer will be subjected to conditions where he may have to resort to distress sale if there is no purchaser except the Government agency. He can certainly be put to loss. Therefore, this suggestion is not in the interest of the farmer, it may be in the interest of the consumer who may be more dear to Mr. Chitta Basu.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: You are entitled to have your opinion.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: It is not only my opinion, it is also the opinion of the West Bengal Government. In the Chief Ministers' Confereince, West Bengal Government was represented by the Food Minister. And he categorically refused to agree to any increase in procurement price, over and above what was recommended by the APC. And there, our friend is advocating a higher price for the farmers. The West Bengal Government's view is that nothing over and above Rs. 100/- should be paid to the farmer, whereas the other Chief Ministers are asking for higher prices. But this was the view of your Government, Mr. Basu; and here you are championing the cause of the farmers. I am happy that at least in some places you want to do that—and that

is in this House. At the same time, West Bengal Government was not in favour of any increase in the issue price.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: That is true.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: Then we have to link the question of issue price with the payment of higher prices to farmers. We cannot go on meeting the huge costs on subsidy in our distribution system for foodgrains. As you know, it comes to Rs. 600 crores. The subsidy on wheat is about Rs. 33 per quintal. On rice, it is about Rs. 26 per quintal. Some of the Chief Ministers very strongly pleaded for the farmers margin of profit being at least to the extent of 50 per cent of what the consumer is getting in the form of subsidy from the Government of India. That was one view. But we have also to think whether, while recommending higher prices for the farmer, we should not also try to reduce the subsidy on issue of foodgrains through our public distribution system, so that the Government is in a position to pay a little higher price to the farmer. There should be a dialogue on this also. You cannot shut out one side and keep on talking only about the other side, and want Government to meet the expenditure on issue prices and on paying higher prices to the farmers. Government has to look to both the sides. The needs of consumers have to be looked into, and the farmers' interests have to be protected. So, I am not in favour of monopoly procurement of any produce of the farmers. That will seriously hit their interests. That proposition is unacceptable.

श्री मूलचन्द डागा (पाली) : अध्यक्ष जी, यह अवसर कम मिलता है कि आप किसान हैं और हमारे उत्तर देने वाले मंत्री जी किसान हैं और मैं एक बात यह कहना चाहता हूं आज भी दुनिया में जो किसान है, वह कर्ज में पैदा होता है, कर्ज में जिन्दा रहता है और कर्ज में ही मरता है। 30 साल से हम इन के बारे में बातें करते आ रहे हैं लेकिन मैं एक बात कहता हूं कि राजा जी ने एक बार यह कहा था :

"If we aim at raising the standard of living of the country as a whole, it is obvious that we should consider the case of the largest section, which is also the poorest in the country, viz. those whose livelihood is agriculture. 70% of our population lives by agriculture. It follows from this stark reality that we cannot raise the standard of living in our country, unless we raise the prices of farm produce. It is by increasing the self-earned purchasing power of the 70% of population can we truly raise the general standard of living in villages."

70 प्रतिशत जो काश्त पर निर्भर करता है, 50 प्रतिशत आप को राष्ट्रीय आय देता है और 50 प्रतिशत आप को निर्यात में मदद देता है, उस काश्तकार को आप देते क्या हैं, यह आप सोचिये। मेरे कुछ प्रश्न हैं, जो मैं पूछना चाहता हूं।

पहला प्रश्न मेरा यह है कि यह ए०पी०सी बोडी क्या है ? एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइसेज कमीशन के अन्दर उन काश्तकारों के रेप्रेजन्टेटिव्ज कौन हैं ? क्या वे हैं जो बरसात से, अकाल से और बाढ़ से पीड़ित हैं ? उन बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए और काश्तकारों की हालत को जानते हुए, उस में काश्तकारों को रेप्रेजेन्ट करते हैं। कितने सालों से हम बराबर यह प्रश्न उठा रहे हैं। कि आज भी जो चीज हम किसान पैदा करते हैं उनका मूल्य क्या मिलता है और जो चीज बाजार में उनको लेनी पड़ती हैं उनका मूल्य क्या है। जो लेटेस्ट डेटा मेरे पास है, वह मैं आपके सामने पेश कर रहा हूं।

एग्रीकल्चरल कमोडिटीज का प्राइस इंडेक्स 199.0 है और नान एग्रीकल्चरल कमोडिटीज की प्राइस इंडेक्स 274.0 है।

फूड आर्टिकल्स का 196.6 और फर्टिलाइजर्स का 237.8 है।

फूड ग्रेंस का 203.1 है, इंसेक्टिसाइड्स का 317.6 है।

आयल सीड्स का 213.5 है और केरोसीन का 272.8 है।

फ्रुट्स का 203.6 है और फुटवियर का 253.7 है।

राक्रोटन का 163.5 है और युर्टेसिल्स का 248.3 है।

रा तोबाक्रू का 156.7 है और एग्री है, कल्चरल कोवड़ा का 296.7 है।

हिन्दुस्तान में जो यह पेरिटी है वह इस तरह से काम करती है। गांवों में किसान गरीब हैं। वह आरगेनाइज्ड सेक्टर में नहीं हैं। अभी अभी मुख्यमंत्रियों ने अपने अपने स्टेमेंट दिये। उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा कि 150 रु० क़ीमत होनी चाहिए। आपके हरियाणा के मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा कि 115 रु० होनी चाहिए और ज्यादा से ज्यादा इसे 150 तक बढ़ानी चाहिए। आप अपनी प्राइस जो फक्स करते हैं हैं वह कहां से और कैसे फिक्स करते हैं? आप ग्रामों का विकास करना चाहते हैं लेकिन उनकी हालत खराब हो रही है। उनकी फसल का बीमा नहीं हो रहा है। उस समय आपका यह कहना है कि एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइसिज कमीशन ने जो सोचा है वह ठीक है

हिन्दुस्तान की 75 प्रतिशत जनता गांवों में रहती है। वह आज दु:खी है, गरीब है। वे लोग नहीं सकते हैं। गांवों के पढ़ने वाले लोग चपड़ासी या क्लर्क तक बन सकते हैं और शहरों में पढ़ने वाले कलेक्टर और कमिश्नर बन सकते हैं। मंत्री जी को इधर भी देखना होगा, उधर भी देखना होगा। 75 प्रतिशत जनता जो गांवों में रहती है उधर आप देखना नहीं चाहते, 20 प्रतिशत लोगों की तरफ देखना चाहते हैं।

मैं जानना चाहता कि एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइसिस कमीशन ने किस आधार पर ये प्राइसिस फिक्स किये हैं? उसका कोई साइंटिफिक आधार है या नहीं? किसान, उसकी औरत, उसका लड़का, उसकी छोटी लड़की सभी लोग खेत में लगे रहते हैं। वे आठ घंटे नहीं काम करते हैं, 12 घन्टे काम नहीं करते हैं वे गरीब भूखे, बरसात में काम करते हैं और दिनबरात काम करते हैं। इस एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइसिस कमीशन का कम्पोजिशन क्या है। इसमें कौन-कौन मेम्बर्स हैं? क्या उसमें हमारे किसानों के प्रतिनिधि भी हैं? उसमें उनकी संख्या ज्यादा होनी चाहिए।

किस तरीके से ये क़ीमतें निर्धारित की जाती हैं, यह आप बताइये? इन क़ीमतों को फिक्स करने का करने का आपने क्या वैज्ञानिक तरीका निकाला है? एक तरफ आप कहते हैं कि सपोर्टिंग प्राइस हम देते हैं। दूसरी तरफ आपने श्वेतपत्र में लिखा है कि हम किसान को रेम्यूनेरेटिव प्राइस देंगे। सपोर्टिंग प्राइस देते देते हम किसान को जिंदा रखना चाहते हैं, उसे आराम से नहीं रखना चाहते हैं। आराम जो है वह शहरों वालों के लिए है। शहर वाले लोग ही आराम की जिंदगी बितायें। किसान मेहनत करे और केवल जिंदा रहे। क्या यही उसका आधार है? इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इस एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइसिस कमीशन में कितने मेम्बर हैं, उनमें कितने किसानों के प्रतिनिधि हैं? वे किस तरह से क़ीमत तय करते हैं? जो बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश और राजस्थान के मुख्य मंत्रियों ने क़ीमतें मांगी हैं वे क्या हैं और जो आप 95 रुपये और 100 रुपये क़ीमत लेकर के आये हैं वह किस आधार पर लेकर आये हैं? जब आप

हरियाणा में मुख्य मंत्री थे उस समय आपने क्या प्राइस दी थी ? इसको आप बता दें । आज भाव बढ़ गए हैं । उनके आधार पर दे दें कीमत तो मैं मान लूंगा कि आज भी आप वही राव बीरेन्द्र सिंह जी हैं और आप में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं आया है।

श्री बीरेन्द्र सिंह राव । माननीय सदस्य ने किसानों के बारे में बहुत वजाहत के साथ उनकी तकलीफों को ब्यान किया है और उनके काज की बहुत अच्छी वकालत की है । मैं उनका मशकूर हूं क्योंकि मेरे भी विचार वही हैं जो उनके हैं और आपके विचार भी किसानों के बारे में वही हैं, इसको सब जानते हैं ।

पहला उन्होंने ए० पी० सी० के कम्पोजीशन के बारे में सवाल किया और जानना चाहा कि उसके कौन कौन मेम्बर हैं । जो चेयरमैन हैं वह मि० कहलों हैं जो पंजाब एग्रिकल्चरल यूनिवर्सिटी, लुधयाना के अन्दर प्रोफेसर थे । वहां से यहां आए हैं । एग्रिकल्चर के एक्सपर्ट हैं । किसान भी हैं । दूसरे मेम्बर भी किसानों के एक रिप्रिजेंटेटिव हैं चौ० रणधीर सिंह । वह पहले भी मेम्बर थे । किसान नेता भी हैं । हमारी कांग्रेस पार्टी का ए आई सी सी में एक किसान सैल है जिस के वह अध्यक्ष भी हैं । किसानों से उनकी हमदर्दी है और किसान परिवार से भी वह ताल्लुक रखते हैं । एक स्टेटिस्टिक्स का मेम्बर होता है । यह इसका कम्पोजीशन है । मैं समझता हूं इस में किसान ही है । और किसान तो इस में एक भी नजर नहीं आता है । इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट भी कोई नहीं है ।

डागा जी ने परिटी के मुताल्लिक कहा है । उन्होंने बताया है कि प्राइस इंडेक्स मुख्तलिफ चीजों का एग्रिकल्चर के अन्दर कौन कौन सी प्राड्यूस का कितना है और मैनुफक्चर्ड चीजों का कितना है । इस में शक नहीं है कि मैनुफैक्चर्ड चीजों का प्राइस इंडेक्स काफी ऊंचा जाता है । इसको मैंने पहले माना है । शायद उनकी कास्ट प्राइस भी जब कैलकुलेट की जाती है तो उस में बहुत सी चीजों आ जाती हैं जो खेतीबाड़ी के काम में शामिल नहीं होती हैं । मसलन कोई कम्पनी होती है और वह अपना कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन बताती है तो उसके एग्जैक्टिव की तनख्वाह बहुत ज्यादा होती है, वे लोग बड़े बड़े होटलों में ठहरते हैं, इधर उधर दौरे भी दुनिया के कर आते हैं, उनका एडवर्टिजमेंटस के ऊपर भी बहुत ज्यादा खर्चा होता है और यह सब कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन में कैलकुलेट हो जाता है । किसान बचारा ये सब चीजें कहां से लाएगा, किस को तनख्वाह के ऊपर रखेगा ? इस वजह से कुछ फर्क हो जाता है । इसलिए पैरिटी हम इस में पैदा करने में अभी तक कामयाब नहीं हो सके हैं । लेकिन जैसा मैंने कहा नजरिया सरकार का वही है जो मेम्बर साहिबान चाहते हैं ।

कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन में किसान की लेबर शुमार होती है या नहीं यह भी उन्होंने पूछा है । वह होती है इस में उनको शक है । लेकिन यह तो सब से पहली चीज है । किसान के कितने आदमी मेहनत करते हैं, उसके परिवार के जितने भी आदमी होते हैं वे सारे सामने रखे जाते हैं, उसका भी जायजा लिया जाता है, बीज, खाद, पानी, बिजली, .हर के रेटस, ट्रांसपोर्ट का खर्चा, कितना सूद उसको देना पड़ता है, उसका क्या इनवैस्टमेंट होता है, ये सब चीजें उस में शुमार होती हैं । इसी के बेसिस पर कास्ट आफ कल्टीवेशन लगाई जाती है । इस वास्ते इस में उनको कोई शक नहीं होना चाहिये ।

माननीय सदस्य ने पूछा है रिकोमेंडेशंज क्या क्या थीं चीफ मिनिस्टर्ज की । वैसे तो ये सब अखबारों में आ गई थीं लेकिन अगर माननीय सदस्य सारी डिटेल्ज जानना चाहते हैं तो मैं पढ़ देता हूं स्पीकर साहब आपकी इजाजत से ।

श्री मूल चन्द डागा (पाली) : बताइये ।

श्री बीरेन्द्र पाटिल : आंध्र प्रदेश ने पैडी के लिए 130 रुपये की मांग की है। बिहार ने 105 रुपये, हरियाणा ने 115 रुपये पैडी के लिए और 150 रुपये मोटे अनाज—कोर्स ग्रेन—के लिए, कर्नाटक ने 130 रुपये पैडी के लिए और 125 रुपये मोटे अनाज के लिए, मध्य प्रदेश ने 120 रुपये पैडी के लिए और 117 रुपये कोर्स ग्रेन—मक्की, बाजरा, जवार—के लिए, उड़ीसा ने 115 रुपये, पंजाब ने 110 रुपये, राजस्थान ने 105 और 110 रुपये के बीच में, तमिलनाडु ने 130 रुपये और उत्तर प्रदेश ने 140 रुपये की मांग की है । वैस्ट बंगाल ने कहा है कि 100 रुपये से ऊपर एक पाई भी नहीं देनी चाहिए । केरल ने कहा है कि कुछ इनक्रीज करना चाहिए । उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि मुनासिब हद तक कुछ इनक्रीज इस्यू प्राइस की भी की जा सकती है, ताकि सरकार किसानों को और ज्यादा देने के काबिल हो सके ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : हरियाणा की प्राइस को देस मान कर चले ।

श्री बीरेन्द्र सिंह राव : यह फैसला तो कैबिनेट के हाथ में होता है । मैं अपनी राय कुछ भी जाहिर नहीं कर सकता हूं । जाहिर करने वाले फिनांस मिनिस्टर साहब सामने बैठे हुए हैं । देखना पड़ता है कि पैले में कितनी गुंजाइश है । मैं अपना पर्सनल रीएक्शन नहीं दे सकता हूं । इस मामले में कोई एक इंडिविजुअल मिनिस्टर अपनी राय जाहिर नहीं कर सकता है । सब चीजों को देख कर गवर्नमेंट का डिसिजन कैबिनेट में होना है । जो माननीय सदस्यों के विचार है और चीफ मिनिस्टर्ज कांफरेंस में जो विचार आये है, मैं सिर्फ उन सब को कैबिनेट के सामने मेश करने का जिम्मेदार हूं, और मेरी अपनी जो नाचीज सलाह होगी, वह मैं दे सकता हूं ।

मेरी जिम्मेदारी तो सब के लिए बराबर है । एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्ट्री भी मेरी जिम्मेदारी है—उसमें पैदा करने का काम है । फूड मिनिस्ट्री भी मेरी जिम्मेदारी है—उसमें लोगों को सस्ता दिलाने का काम है । ये दोनों जिम्मेदारियां निभानी पड़ती हैं ।

तामिलनाड़ की तरफ से बाज दफा एक बात कही जाती है। कुछ मेम्बर्स की तरफ से चर्चा चलती है चीफ मिनिस्टर्ज कांफरेंस में भी स्टेट के रिप्रेजेंटेटिव्ज ने यह ख्याल जाहिर किया कि नार्थ में तो गेहूं ज्यादा पैदा होता है और सदर्न स्टेट्स में पैडी ज्यादा पैदा होती है : यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है। मैं साफ करना चाहूंगा कि यह खयाल कतअन भुला दें कि सिर्फ साउथ पैडी ग्रोइंग है और नार्थ व्हीट ग्रोइंग है। नार्थ में पैडी साउथ से ज्यादा पैदा होती है। जो गेहूं पैदा करने वाली स्टेट्स है उनमें भी पैडी बहुत ज्यादा पैदा होती है। जितनी टोंटल पैडी हम हिन्दुस्तान में प्रोडयुर करते है, उस में नार्दन स्टेट्स का हिस्सा 75 परसेंट है। गेहूं सारे का सारा इधर

मिलता है। शायद हाउस यह जानने में इन्ट्रेस्टिड होगा कि 58 लाख टन गेहूं की प्रोक्युरमेंट हुई है, जिसमें से सिर्फ पंजाब ने 42 लाख, टन सेन्ट्रल पूल के लिये दिया है और हरियाणा ने 10 लाख टन दिया है। बहुत सी स्टेट्स ने, जिनसे हमें ज्यादा उम्मीद थी, बहुत कम दिया है, और किसी किसी ने बिल्कुल कुछ नहीं दिया उत्तर प्रदेश ने 6 लाख टन दिया है—हरियाणा का आधा, जबकि उत्तर प्रदेश इतना बड़ी स्टेट् है कि अगर वहा ठीक तरह से पैदावार है और मेहनत की जाये और सरकार इस तरफ ध्यान दें, तो पंजाब और हरियाणा दोनों से ज्यादा अकेला उत्तर प्रदेश दे सकता है। उत्तर प्रदेश में इरिगेटिड एरिया, जो खेती के लिये बहुत जरूरी है, सारे हिन्दुस्तान के इरिगेटिड एरिया, का 24 फीसदी है—एक-चौथाई एरिया उत्तर प्रदेश में है। बिहार में भी काफी है पंजाब के बराबर है। तो ये ऐसी स्टेट्स है जिन में बहुत हमें उम्मीदें है। यहां पैदावार हम बढ़ाना चाहते है ताकि हमारे सारे मसले और समस्याएं खत्म हो जायें। तो पैडी और गेहूं के अंदर कोई भेदभाव नहीं है और हमारे विभाग के अंदर और न कभी रखा गया है। जहां गेहूं की पैदावार को हम बढ़ना चाहते हैं वहां पैडी के मामले में भी पूरा भाव देना चाहते हैं। इस मे भी हम ढ़ील नहीं देना चाहते हैं।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Sir, I would raise certain issues which the hon. Speaker had raised on 31st March, 1980 while delivering the convocation address at Ludhiana in the Punjab University. He said that the entire question of prices has to be viewed in the context of a more comprehensive policy. He had suggested that the impact of direct and indirect taxes has to be taken note of, the cost of production, the cost of various inputs like fertilisers and tractors, diesel, etc. have to be taken note of. You, Sir, had also referred to the research on post-harvest technology. In time of calamity, you had strongly pleaded for crop insurance. Lastly, the most important aspect you referred to was that in order that the problem of procurement prices should not come up over and over again and there should not be too many fluctuations. Once and for all the Government should make up its mind as to what is going to be the allowable margin of profit for the agriculturists and for the traders. Once that is fixed, in that case it will be possible for you to tackle this problem of prices in a comprehensive and adequate manner and on a sound footing. These are the problems to which not only I have called your attention, but the hon. Speaker has called the country's attention. I would like to know what would be the Government's attitude towards these problems. I would like to have a specific answer. It is learnt from the newspaper reports that in the course of the last three months, about 11 fertiliser manufacturing units have been closed down and this creates a new constraint on production. The problem of inputs is created. The diesel prices have gone up. The prices of fertilisers have gone up. As a result, the cost of production has also gone up. Mr. Daga had asked a categorical question to which no answer has been given, namely, whether it be the APC or the Cabinet of the present Government, what is the concrete formula that you propose to evolve—of course, the parameters will be flexible and broad enough, but what will be the flexible formula that you would like to evolve on the basis of which the procurement prices will be fixed.

When the procurement prices are raised, it is very necessary that the gains should percolate down. It is here that you must make up your mind. While you try to increase the procurement prices, you must be able to direct as to what portion of it will be accrued to the agricultural labour-

ers who are working on the lands. That is a very important point from the point of view of agricultural labour. From the point of view of the agriculturists, there is one more aspect with which the Tamilnadu and Maharashtra Governments are keenly connected. These two State Governments have taken some radical decisions, namely, as far as the small farmers and small landowners holding below five acres are concerned, their loans are to be written off. I learn that there is some resistance to this from the Reserve Bank of India. We would like to know whether these constraints on the small farmers will be removed, because merely increasing the procurement prices are not sufficient. There are other allied problems which have also to be tackled. I would like to know how exactly those problems will be tackled.

As far as the agriculturist is concerned, there are three incentives. These incentives are to be offered at a particular point of time. In order that the agriculturists should be able to concentrate on those commodities like paddy and others which are absolutely essential for the population of the country, it is necessary that incentives should be known to them sufficiently in advance. Therefore, sufficiently in advance before the sowing season it should be the custom of the Cabinet to announce the procurement price of different agricultural produce. That will act as an incentive to the farmer for he will be able to concentrate on certain commodities. Otherwise, there will be diversification of agriculture and that will be at the cost of the interest of the country.

Going through the report of the newspapers, it seems—perhaps, there may not be a unanimity—there is a consensus among the Chief Ministers of various States that there should be no restriction at all on the free movement of the foodgrains in different States. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister is willing to commit himself to the policy of not imposing any rigorous restrictions for the free movement of foodgrains in different parts of the country.

There are two more points. As far as the cost of production is concerned, because the fertiliser prices have gone up and the diesel price has also gone up, a number of difficulties have been created. It is possible here that the Finance Minister as well as the Minister for Agriculture jointly chalk out a plan strategy and see to it that certain commodities are exported in a big way to accumulate foreign exchange reserves. Those foreign exchange reserves are utilised for the imported fertilisers. Since it is a fact that today we are not self-sufficient in fertilisers we will be requiring to have import of fertilisers. For that foreign exchange will be required and, therefore, we will have to concentrate on exporting certain commodities, try to mop up the foreign exchange reserves and utilise that foreign exchange to import the fertilisers that are required by the farmers. If these fertilisers and other inputs are available to the agriculturists in an abundant measure and at a proper price, in that case, it will be possible for you to see that 135 million tonnes, that is the target that you have fixed up for food production, is fulfilled.

I would not have repeated the question but a definite answer has not come. That question has been raised by Shri Chitta Basu and also by Shri Daga. That is the question of parity between the prices of agricultural produce and industrial goods.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): And the salaries and allowances given to the servants.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It does not relate to that.

I can realise the difficulties of the Finance Minister and the Minister for Agriculture that mechanical parity between the prices of agricultural produce and industrial goods might not be possible. But as a first step, will you introduce measures to see that a

fair balance between the prices of agricultural produce and industrial goods is established? That will go a long way from the point of view of consumers because consumers are not only in the urban areas but farmers and the rural population themselves are also the consumers. They also want certain industrial goods. Therefore, if some sort of a balance is restored between the two—ultimately the parity is established—that will go a long way.

I would like to have specific answer to various querries that I have raised.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: Prof. Madhu Dandavate has asked a few questions. I will reply to them all.

He has questioned the method of calculating the cost of production. He has also said that there are wide fluctuations in the prices of agricultural produce obtainable in the market. At present, we are concerned with the procurement prices to be fixed for the kharif crop. But there is no denying the fact that there are wide fluctuations from year to year, from month to month, in the prices of agricultural produce, and that is not good for the farm sector. We are trying to reduce the fluctuations to the minimum possible level, and that can only be done by adopting a long-term policy and seriously pursuing it. That is our policy and we are doing it.

The question of parity is very important. As I have already said, this is the policy of the Government and our friend, the Finance Minister, is very kindly supporting me fully in this. He is a friend of the farmers and it is only with his liberal help that we can do something for the farmers.

On the question of supply of fertilizers at the block level also he has so liberally and generously agreed to the proposal that came from the hon. Members in this House and within 24 hours an announcement was made. This is our objective and this is our aim. Ultimately, we hope to be able to achieve this to some appreciable extent. I cannot assure the House that this would be fully done, but this is the policy we are pursuing and we shall certainly make some advance in this direction.

Some fertilizer units are reported to be closed. You know the conditions obtaining now. We are afraid that we may not be able to achieve our targets in fertilizer production. The indigenous production was of the order of 29 lakh tonnes in 1978-79 and in 1979-80. Because of certain constraints like availability of raw materials and other things, we may fall short of this target.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: 11 units have been closed down.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: I do not have any definite information on the subject, because the subject does not belong to the Agriculture Ministry; it comes under the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals. Fertilizer is one of the subjects under that Ministry. I will find out and let the hon. Member know the full details later on, or write to him.

We have been successful in getting some fertilizer from outside. Both DAP and potash are imported from outside quite substantially. We were able to contract for 8 lakh tonnes of DAP from abroad and we hope that all of it will be here in time. Some ships have started arriving. We are trying to meet the requirements of fertilizer. The requirements of the States have been determined in individual meetings and we are trying to see that they get their allotted supply within time. Whatever we have is already put in place in the various States so that they get distributed to the farmers.

13.14 hrs.

(MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*)

The hon. Member has mentioned about the observations of the hon. Speaker in a meeting. We certainly take into consideration fully all that

our leaders say. It is known that the hon. Speaker from time to time has been advocating the cause of farmers and he is deeply interested in their welfare. He is also the Chairman of the Bharat Krishak Samaj.

The margin of profit should certainly be fixed for farm produce. The APC tries to do exactly that. While recommending the prices, the margin of profit is kept in view. But I am not in a position to say whether it is what it should be, whether it is less or it is more than it should be. But that is one principle that is kept in view, that is one objective that there should be a fair margin of profit while recommending prices and the Cabinet also takes that into consideration. If the hon. Member wants to know, as far as my information goes, the margin of profit now for farm produce is somewhere between 1.5 per cent and 2 per cent. We try to ensure that. That is at least available

PROF. N. G. RANGA: How did you work it out?

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: On total investment and everything, all the capital including land. It should be considered small if you take into account all the total capital assets.

Prof. Malhu Dandavate suggested that the procurement prices should be announced in advance. We try to do it, but I would not be so sure that announcement of prices in advance would give us much benefit. The pattern of cultivation has to be kept in view. Of course, we are in favour of diversification, but diversification in agriculture according to our needs. We cannot ignore foodgrains. We also want to increase production of pulses, we also want to reduce our imports of edible oils. So, we want to increase production of oilseeds also. Keeping all that in view, if the balance goes in favour of one particular produce and we announce the prices in advance before the sowing season, then there is a danger that some of the land which is under cultivation of a particular crop may be switched over to some other crop and our entire pattern may be disturbed. Therefore, we want to keep things continued as naturally and smoothly as possible without creating or upsetting the existing pattern which the farmers take up. The farmers know their job, they know what is beneficial to them, they know for what particular crops the climatic conditions are most suitable, and they cultivate according to that, taking all these factors into account. So, we would not like that because of incentive prices becoming available for one particular crop, another crop should suffer in the country. But we certainly always try to announce the procurement prices as much in advance as possible of the harvest season because the farmer should know that this is what their produce will bring in the market, the Government is committed to purchase at that rate and if they like, they can contract for it, they can sell it outside, they can plan their strategy accordingly.

He has asked me for an assurance that there will be no restrictions on movement of foodgrains throughout the entire country. This is the decision of the Government so far. This is our policy and this was adopted after full consideration several years back. I do not think there is much possibility of any change and certainly we shall keep the hon. Member's views in mind when deciding upon this, but this has also to be a part of the decision of the Cabinet on procurement prices.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: What about agricultural labour?

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: Yes, agricultural labour is also very well looked after.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: My question was, when better procurement price is offered, in that case part of that must percolate down to the agricultural labourer who is in a very bad state. Otherwise, the gains will

be taken only by the agriculturist who cultivates.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: You know that there is the Minimum Wages Act for agricultural labour and that there is talk of amending that Act also.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): It is observed more by violation.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: The State Governments have greater responsibility in that respect, but whatever can be done is being done. You know that even in sugarcane, if the factories make additional profit over and above what was estimated, 50 per cent of it goes back to the farmer, and if the farmer gets better prices, naturally the agricultural labourer's position will also improve. So, this is all part of the same strategy.

Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu are reported to have moved for remission of farmers' loans. I am not in a position to say what the facts are, but from reports that I have heard, Tamil Nadu wanted the Central Government to take all the burden upon itself. I do not know if my friend Shri Venkataraman is in a position to say that all States can remit the loans of farmers and the Central Government will meet the burden

Maharashtra is also reported to be thinking on these lines, but perhaps they want to do it on their own, from their own exchequer. That is a different matter, but the implications of this I do not know, and I would not like to go into it. It is for the Finance Minister to consider it and the Reserve Bank to advise him.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Maharashtra is not going to be a burden on the Centre.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: Then we will see what the other implications are, but we have already announced in the Rajya Sabha the other day that there is no proper assessment of the burden of indebtedness on the farmers and also agricultural labour. We would like to know the correct position. For that we want to conduct a national survey and after that we shall know whether the economic condition of the farmers has really improved during the last few years, or this is just an impression existing in the minds of the people in large cities that the farmers have become rich and that their conditions have vastly improved. We want to know particularly about the small farmers, because I do not know if any big farmers are left, they may be only one or two per cent of the total. So, in respect of the large number of small farmers who come up to 90 to 98 per cent in various States, we want to know how much they are under debt, the facilities that they have been getting in the way of postponment of recoveries, remissions and other things, their total burden now and how it can be lightened. We can only know all these things afterwards once we know the correct position.

We are trying to increase our export potential in agriculture. Of course, so far also we have not done badly. The exports from agriculture are of the order of about Rs. 1100 crores annually now. And that does not include plantation crops like tea and coffee. That would come to much more. But by 1984-85 we want to double it. Our target is to go to Rs. 2300 crores And in addition to that also, as I said, tea and coffee might be another Rs. 700 or Rs. 800 crores. That way, agriculture is playing its role in the economy of this country, and anything that is done for the betterment of the conditions of the farmer will be in the over-all interests of the entire nation. We are convinced of that.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): The question of having a scientific basis or a scientific formula, according to which the procurement prices can be fixed, remains still unanswred. There is the hundred rupees price suggested by the Agricultural

(Shri G. M. Banatwala)

Prices Commission. The various rates suggest prices ranging from from Rs. 105 to 140. This is the phenomenon that we have. I must, therefore, specifically ask the Governmet as to what efforts are being made in order to evolve and have a scientific formula for the fixation or determination of the procurement prices of paddy and other agricultural produce. We are told by the hon. Minister that in determining the cost of cultivation of paddy, all the various ingredient items and their costs are taken into consideration. But I fail to understand that if the Agricultural Prices Commission really takes into consideration the cost of all the inputs and every essential ingredient that goes to make up the cost of cultivation, then, how is it that the Commission recommended the continuation of a *status quo* in its first report. Rs. 95 was the procurement price earlier and this time also the Agricultural Prices Commission first recommended that the same price should be continued. Then in the intervening period, am I to understand that there was absolutely not a single paise increase in the cost of cultivation, to have such a fantastic recommendation from the Agricultural Prices Commission? Indeed, I have nothing to say against the Government There was a rise in the cost of fertiliser and diesel oil and then the Government asked the Agricultural Prices Commission to revise and re-work out and thereafter the Commision came with a suggestion to have the procurement price at Rs. 100.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You must first ascertain whether the Members of the Agricultural Prices Commission are rice eaters.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: Otherwise, they should be given representation. Both of us like rice very much more than wheat. I was saying that the basis upon which the Agricultural Prices Commission tries to work out the cost of production has also been challenged. Here the Minister has told us that the Agricultural Prices Commission took into confidence and asked for the data from the Universities. Take the case of Tamil Nadu. We were told that some University or institution there was asked to submit the necessary data. But the Tamil Nadu Government makes an allegation that the estimates of Agricutural Prices Commission are based on sample surveys. Further the Tamil Nadu Government, I understand, makes the allegation that those estimates were based on sample surveys of hardly ten out of ten lakh farms, covering an area of just 500 hectares out of 25 lakh hectares. Therefore, I will have to ask the Government to explain as to how this entire mechanism works on the basis of which the Agricultural Prices Commission tries to determine the procurement prices, even of paddy; and how is it that though the cost of poduction has been considerably increasing, the Agricultural Prices Commission, first suggested, as far as the price of paddy is concerned the continuance of the *status quo* and no change whatsoever. Later on, of course, as a result of the Government drawing the attention to the increase in the cost of fertiliser and diesel, they have submitted the revised rate. Therefore, I would like to ask, request, urge, implore and beseech the Government that it should now take the House into confidence and tell us as to what efforts are being made to have a scientific formula. I understand, at present, it is not there. But some effort has to made. I am the fourth person rising on the Calling Attention and asking the same question. Hitherto no proper reply has been given. I hope, now, the fifth person who rises will not have to repeat this question of a scientific basis and a scientific formula.

As regards the question about issue prices, the hon. Minister says that if the procurement price is to be raised, the issue prices have also to be raised. I would like to know the

reaction of the Government to the fact that raising the issue prices will add further to the inflation. I would also ask the reaction of the Government to the fact that there will not be any need to raise the issue prices because the current releases are out of the stored stock which is already there. In the case of paddy, the stocks stored are greater than those in the case of wheat. So, if the current releases are to be from the stocks already stored to a large extent, I want to know whether some relief can be expected on that particular basis.

Then, the hon. Minister himself told us the difference in the subsidy as far as wheat and rice are concerned. He just now told us that in the case of wheat, the subsidy is Rs. 33 per quintal and in the case of rice, the subsidy is Rs. 26 per quintal. Why this difference? Why not, therefore have a grater subsidy, removing this particular difference in the subsidy, in the case of rice.

About the Agricultural prices Commission, there is a suggestion to give the Agricultural Prices Commission a statutory basis, let it be a creation of the Act of Parliament, and it is said that that would help in its proper functioning and would make it more effective. I would like to have the reaction of the Government to this suggestion of giving statutory status to the Agricultural Prices Commission.

Finally, different States have suggested different prices. Will the hon. Minister for Agriculture tell us, if a particular State desires to give a higher procurement price than what is accepted by the Government, will that State be allowed to do so? Will there be any objection from the Governmet to any State wanting to give a higher price in the case of procurement of paddy.

He has told us that he will take all the suggestions to the Cabinet. By what time are we to expect a decision? He has also told us

जब मैं ये सारी बातें कैबिनेट के सामने रखूंगा तो अपनी राय भी रख दूंगा । आपकी राय क्या होगी वह क्या हम को आप बतायेंगे?

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: The Hon. Member has talked about the cost of production not being calculated on some scientific basis. I do not know what scientific basis there can be. If the present basis for calculating all these things by the APC, which is an expert body, is not scientific, if statistics, knowledge of agricultural conditions on the farm and knowledge of economics in the farm sector can be called scientific, then the Commission is a scientific body.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: It is not, Sir.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: I do not know what chemical formula you want...

PROF. N. G. RANGA: It is an *ad hoc* body. With great difficulty we were able to get one representative of the agriculturists on this body. What is the use of saying that the Chairman is Kisan born and is a Kisan minded person? It is not scientific; it is not expert; it is not peasant-minded.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a bureaucrats' Committee.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: It is not that. We wanted agricultural labour to be represented on it, but not a word about it!

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: The First Report of the APC on paddy prices, recommending *status quo* being maintained, has been questioned by the Hon. Member. He would agree that it is the first time that Government themselves thought that, after increasing the price of fertilizers, we should ask the APC to review its Report and take into consideration this additional burden on the farmer. This shows the concern of this Government for the farmer. This was never done before. But if

(Shri Birendra Singh Rao)

we make the APC a statutory body, as suggested by the Hon. Member, the Government can do nothing in this respect after that...

PROF. N. G. RANGA: That is the difficulty, Mr. Banatwalla.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: I do not know what sort of a friend farmers have in Mr. Banatwalla. On the one hand, he is trying to advocate their cause on the other hand, he likes the necks of the farmers to be handed over to a body which is, so, far, only recommendatory and has no responsibility to Parliament as farmers' representative...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It is a statutory body.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: It is not a statutory body; it is only a recommendatory body, and that is how we plan to keep it, in the farmers' interest, of course.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The last point contradicts the question of Mr. Banatwalla.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: I cannot understand the reasoning of Mr. Banatwalla when he says that the issue price should not be raised simply because the Government is holding huge stocks and whatever is being issued would be out of the stocks which have already been stored. I would only suggest that he should apply some scientific formula to his thinking also because, after all, interest has to be paid on investments, damage is also caused to the stores, rent has to be paid or storage, then staff has to be maintained, and the things once stored, are not like the clothes in his box where he does not have to spend anythng on it; in this case, if you don't spend on certain chemicals to keep them safe from worms, perhaps you would be ruining them. These things have to be taken into account. Whatever we have in store also has to be maintained, and there is recurring expenditure all the time. Therefore, I don't think this is a very reasonable argument that he has advanced. Now, he has asked for time to be specified as to the decision that we shall take. It certainly will be before the harvest comes in, but it is not in my hands to say when the Prim Minister would be able to fix a meeting. All I can say is that we shall compile a note for the Cabinet at the earliest, but we have to ascertain the views of other concerned Ministries also. Finance Ministry very much comes into it, and the views of Finance Ministry and those of the Planning Commission...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It always comes in.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: The views of the Planning Commission, the Finance Ministry and the views of the Civil Supplies Ministry have to be obtained and they have to be included in the Agriculture Ministry's recommendations to the Cabinet. My views will only be put in the note for the Cabinet; I cannot disclose them here. So it is useless to ask me to express my opinion. Whatever the considered opinion of my Ministry, of course after consideration of the views expressed here and by the Chief Ministers, and the recommendations of the APC and of my colleages in the other Ministries,—they will be based on all these things—it will go before the cabinet, and the decision taken will be the decision of the Government as a whole and not any particular Ministry's decision.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That means prices will be fixed on the eve of procurement.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: Not on the eve of procurement. Procurement starts sometime in October-Novermber; this will be much before that. So, this is all I think I need mention in this connection.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALA: I had asked whether a particular State will be allowed larger procurement, at a higher price.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: Yes, this is another question he had raised. I am not in a position to reply off-hand, but if a State wants to give some bonus or additional money for procurement, I don't think we shall object to it provided that the State does not ask us to pay for taking over that stock from the Government into the Central Pool. They should take the responsibility of procuring it, storing it and distributing it; then we should have no objection, to my mind—unless, of course, my friend who is sitting there thinks there are other implications. But it will not be possble for a State; it is a heavy responsibility. This procurement price is for the Central Pool, and whatever a State pays for procurement is disbursed by the Central Government through the FCI—all the charges that are incurred in the 'Mandis', on transport etc., if whatever the State procures is for the Central Pool. But for whatever the State wants to procure for itself, there could be no objection if it wants to pay additional amounts out of its own funds, but it should also think of the complications that would arise. The foodgrains purchased or procured at a higher price by the State Government will have to be distributed at the same price at which our foodgrains supplied to the State under the public distribution system are to be distributed. So, if the States are prepared for that, they might write to us and we shall see what can be done in this regard.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA (Amritsar): The Punjab Government paid Rs. 5/- per quintal as bonus to the farmer. They paid extra.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: But then, if the Punjab Government passes that on to the Central Pool we shall not disburse that amount.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA: We have raised your procurement by 42 lakh tons because we paid Rs. 5/- per quintal extra.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO: Yes, some State Governments are procuring, but I do not know which State Mr. Banatwalla has in view because, except for Punjab and Haryana, they have done very little. (*Interruptions*). They are all deficit States. West Bengal is deficit, and Madhya Pradesh and even Bihar and U.P. are being fed from the Central Pool. As I have already stated, certain States have not done anything in this respect. I have to point out very painfully that, in spite of the Prime Minister's directive that the fullest possible efforts should be made to procure foodgrains for at least two months' requirement of a State, nothing has been done. Now, Punjab and Haryana have given nearly all the wheat—about 52 lakh tons out of a total of 58 lakh tons—but U.P. has given only five lakh tons, and a large State like Madhya Pradesh has given eight tons only. Rajasthan has given, I think, about 15,000 or 16,000 tonnes only. And I must praise Jammu & Kashmir; a small State like Jammu & Kashmir has procured about 25,000 tonnes for the Central Pool, while it is not a wheat-producing State. It all depends upon the efforts of the State Governments, and we shall request them to see that as much paddy and wheat as possible are procured for the Central Pool, so that we can meet the demands of all the States on an equitable basis and nobody goes without food in the country.

श्री राम विलास पासवान (हाजीपुर). उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी तक जो सरकार की नीति रही है उसके कारण आपने देखा है कि महाराष्ट्र तमिलनाड, कर्नाटक में व्यापक पैमाने पर किसानों के द्वारा आन्दोलन शुरू हो गये हैं और हिंसक घटनाय घट रही है तथा प्रति दिन किसान मारे जा रहे है

[श्री राम विलास पासवान]

अभी मैं आंकड़े देख रहा था, चार साल के आंकड़े मिले है कि कितने खाद्य पदार्थ बाहर से मंगाये गये। 1974 में 4,63,04,30,000 रु० के खाद्य पदार्थ मंगाये गये जिनकी मात्रा थी 48,74,400 मी० टन। 1975 में 10,57,89,70,000 रु० का आयात किया गया और मात्रा थी 74,60,700 मी० टन। 1976 में 9,82,23,50,000 का आयात किया गया और मात्रा थी 65,14,800 मी० टन। 1977 में आयात हुआ 78,15,60,000 रु० का और मात्रा थी 65,54,600। मी० टन।

ए०पी०सी० की जो रिपोर्ट है वह जिस ढंग से तैयार की जाती है वह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती, मैं रंगा साहब से कहूंगा कि वे भी जरा इसको देख लें कि यह किस ढंग से तैयार की जाती है। मैंने इसमें बहुत जानने कोशिश की कि नान एग्रीकल्चरल गुड्स और एग्रीकल्चरल गुड्स इन दोनों की प्राइसेज में ताल मेल रखकर कोई तुलनात्मक दृष्टिकोण अपनाया जाता है या नहीं लेकिन वैसी कोई बात नहीं है। मंत्री जी ने ठीक ही कहा है कि सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि जब इंडस्ट्रियल गुड्स की कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन की खोज की जायेगी तो उसमें बड़े बड़े गेस्ट हाउस भी आयेंगे, विदेश भ्रमण भी आयेगा और ऐसी बहुत सारी चीजें आयेंगी। मैं देख रहा था कि रूस में 31 प्रतिशत लोग कृषि पर निर्भर करते हैं, जापान में 20 प्रतिशत लोग कृषि पर निर्भर हैं, अमरीका में 4 परसेंट लोग कृषि पर निर्भर है, इंगलैण्ड में डेढ़ परसेंट लोग कृषि पर निर्भर हैं जबकि हमारे यहां 70 प्रतिशत से अधिक लोग कृषि पर निर्भर करते हैं।

यदि वर्ष 1970–71 में मूल्य सूचकांक 100 मान लिया जाये तो 14–6–1980 तक कृषि पदार्थों के मूल्यों में 199 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई और गैर कृषि पदार्थों के मूल्यों में 274 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है। जहां तक खाद का मामला है, मैं अभी मंत्री महोदय का स्टेटमेन्ट पढ़ रहा था, मैं समझता हूं जब कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन निकालते होंगे तो 28–30 किलो प्रति हेक्टर खाद का औसत देते होंगे जबकि जापान में 300 किलो प्रति हेक्टर खाद डाली जाती है। हमारे देश में 240 किलो खाद डाली जानी चाहिये लेकिन चूंकि हमारे किसान गरीब हैं, कर्जे से दबे हैं, उनको खाद मिल नहीं पाती है इसलिये 28–30 किलो प्रति हेक्टर ही डालते हैं।

सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि आप जो कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन निकालते हैं, तो उसमें जो फसल बाढ़ में या सूखाड़ में नष्ट हो जाती है, उसको कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन में डालते है? नहीं डालते है। सबसे बड़ी चीज यह होनी चाहिये, राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण की दृष्टि से, हम कितनी पैदावार बढ़ा पाते हैं। आज क्या है, जब किसान किसी चीज को पैदा करेगा, तो उस पैदा की हुई चीज का भाव उसको मिट्टी के बराबर मिलेगा। पहले हम लोगों के विरुद्ध आरोप लगाया जाता था कि आपने प्याज का दाम बढा दिया और इसको लेकर पूरे हिन्दुस्तान में हल्ला किया जाता था। आपने प्याज का दाम तो कम कर दिया, लेकिन और दूसरी चीजों का दाम बढ़ा दिया। पहले नारा लगता था "जात पर न पात पर, इन्दिराजी की बात पर", लेकिन आज क्या है "चीनी मिले आठ पर, डीजल मिले सात पर और मुर्दा जाये घाट पर"।

मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूं कि नारे से काम नहीं चलता है। मैं यह कहता हूं कि आपके पास कोई निश्चित योजना होनी चाहिये। जब किसान किसी चीज को पैदा करता है, तो उसके दाम उसको मिट्टी के भाव में मिलते हैं, लेकिन

जब वह उसको खरीदने जाता है तो उसको सोने के भाव में खरीदना पड़ता है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि यदि 10 एकड़ जमीन की कीमत एक लाख रु० है और यदि यह एक लाख रु० वह बैंक में जमा कर देता है, तो वह पांच पीढ़ी तक खा सकता है। लेकिन आज दस एकड़ की पैदावार में भी किसान को गुजर करना बड़ा मुश्किल हो जाता है। आपके जो गवर्नमेंट के फार्म है, उसमें क्या आप कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन निकालते है ? मंत्री जी जब जवाब देंगे तो बतायेंगे कि प्रति एकड़ में कितना कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन है ? फिर भी आप घाटे में चल रहे हैं।

(व्यवधान)**

मैं आपसे कह रहा था कि किसान की जो वास्तविक स्थिति है, उस वास्तविक स्थिति का सर्वेक्षण कराया जाना चाहिये कि किसान कितने कर्जे में दबे रहते हैं। आज जो किसान की माली हालत है, वह कितनी बदतर हो गई है, इस पर हम लोगों को गम्भीरतापूर्वक सोचना चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अन्य चीजों में नहीं जाऊंगा, मैं पैडी के मामले में धान के मामले में, जो एक मुख्य प्रश्न है, उसके संबंध में कहना चाहता हूं; हमारे देश में 1970–71 में धान की खेती होती थी 3 करोड़ 74 लाख 13 हजार हेक्टर में लेकिन 1977–78 में 3 करोड 94 लाख 29 हजार हेक्टर में खेती हुई। उत्पादन 1970–71 में 4 करोड़ 8 लाख 5 हजार टन हुआ और 1977–78 में 4 करोड़ 77 लाख 78 हजार टन उत्पादन हुआ। पैदावार 1970–71 में 1 हजार 91 किलो ग्राम प्रति हैक्टर और 1977–78 में 1 हजार 215 किलो ग्राम प्रति हेक्टर हुई।

मैं आपकी एग्रीकल्चर प्राइस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को देख रहा था, उस के अनुसार 1978–79 में चावल की पैदावार-पर-हैक्टर पंजाब में 2938 किलोग्राम है, हरियाणा में 2714 किलोग्राम, तामिलनाडु में 2251 किलोग्राम, कर्नाटक में 2151 किलोग्राम, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में 1827 किलोग्राम, केरल में 1540 किलोग्राम, महाराष्ट्र में 1435 किलोग्राम, गुजरात में 1163 किलोग्राम, उत्तर प्रदेश में 1157 किलोग्राम बिहार में 996 किलोग्राम, आसाम में 934 किलोग्राम और मध्य प्रदेश में 736 किलोग्राम है।

आप की प्रोक्योरमेंट प्राइस जो पैडी की रही है उस को देखिये 1965–66 में 38 रुपये 42 पैसे से शुरू हुई। 1966–67 में 42 रुपये 53 पैसे हो गई, 1967–68 में 50 रुपये 10 पैसे, 1968–69 में 51 रुपये 27 पैसे, 1969–70 में 52 रुपये 44 पैसे, 1970–71 में 53 रुपये 30 पैसे, 1971–72 में 53 रुपये 14 पैसे, 1972–73 में 54 रुपये 18 पैसे, 1973–74 में 70 रुपये, 1974–75 में 74 रुपये, 1975–76 तथा 1976–77 में भी 74 रुपये रही। लेकिन 1977–78 में 77 रुपये हो गई। 1978–79 में 85 रुपये 1979–80 में 95 रुपये और अब 1980–81 के लिये आप ने 100 रुपये घोषित की है।

जिस रफ्तार से दाम बढे है 1965–66 में 38 रुपये 42 पैसे से 1980–81 में 100 रुपये किये गये हैं, इस के मुकाबले में जो चीजे किसान उपयोग करता है, जैसे यूरिया, डीजल, इन के दाम कितने बढे हैं। आप देखेंगे कि इन चीजों के दाम बहुत ज्यादा बढें हैं। इन दोनों का मुकाबला करने से ऐसा लगता है कि किसान जो चीजें मार्केट में खरीदता है, जिन पर वह

**Not recorded.

[श्री रामविलास पासवान]

निर्भर करता है उन के दाम "खरहे" की चाल से बढ़े हैं, जब कि किसान की पैदावार के दाम, चावल के दाम कछुए की चाल से बढ़े है। अगर आप किसान को जिन्दा रखना चाहते हैं तो इस रफ्तार से तो किसान जिन्दा रहने वाला नहीं है।

मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हू--- आप ने शायद इसी सदन मे कहा था, मुझे ठीक से याद नहीं है, कि आप कोई ऐसी पालिसी लाने वाले हैं जिस से किसान के फसल बोनें से पहले ही उसकी मूल्य नीति निर्धारित कर देंगे। धान का इतना पैसा मिलेगा, गेंहू का इतना पैसा मिलेगा--- उसके फसल बोने से पहले ही आप प्राइस नीति का ऐलान कर देंगे। आप उस नीति को कब से शुरू करने वाले है ? साथ ही यदि किसान की फसल, चाहे फ्लड के कारण हो, ड्राउट के कारण हो या किसी अन्य प्राकृतिक विपत्ति के कारण हो, खत्म हो जाय, तो सरकार को उस का दायित्व अपने ऊपर लेना चाहिये। जिस तरह से आप फैक्ट्रियों के बारे मे करते हैं, उसी तरह से क्या फसलों के बीमे की कोई योजना आप के पास है या नहीं ?

किसानों का मल्य पर कोई नियन्त्रण नहीं है। नियन्त्रण किस का होता है ? व्यापारियों का होता है। इसके लिये क्या सरकार बड़े बड़े गोदामों की व्यवस्था करेगी, जैसे दिल्ली में बड़े बड़े मकान खोज कर या स्टेट्स में भी बड़े बड़े मकान खोज कर उन में किसानों की उपज को रखेगी, उन पर नियन्त्रण किसानों का रहेगा, किसान जब चाहेगा उस को बेचेगा, जब उसका मुनाफा नहीं मिलेगा, नहीं बेचेगा---क्या इस तरह की कोई योजना बनायेंगे ? ....

आचार्य भगवान देव (अजमेर) : बहुत टाइम हो गया।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : ठीक है, इतना ही जबाब दिलवा दीजिये।

श्री वीरेन्द्र सिंह राव : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, पैडी की कीमतों के मुताल्लिक जो सवाल उठाया गया है, मैं श्री रामविलास पासवान जी से कहना चाहता हू, पैडी की प्राइस काफी हद तक बढाई गई है। सन 1976-77 में धान की कीमत 74 रुपये थी जैसा उन्होंने खुद बतलाया है। लेकिन उस के तीन साल बाद 1979-80 में 95 रुपये कर दी गई। एग्रीकल्चर प्राइस कमीशन ने उस वक्त 90 रुपये के लिये रिकमेण्डेशन की थी, लेकिन सरकार ने उस रिपोर्ट को नहीं माना और 5 रुपया ज्यादा बढाया। इस तरह से आप देखेंगे कि तीन सालो के अन्दर 29 परसेंट की वृद्धि हुई यानी 29 परसेंट पैडी का भाव बढ़ा, लेकिन इस के मुकाबले मे गेहूं का भाव उस हिसाब से नहीं बढा, उसमे केवल 10 परसेंन्ट बढा, यानी तीन सालों मे गेहूं का भाव 105 रुपये से 115 रुपये हुआ, जब कि धान का भाव 74 से 95 रुपये पर आया। और यही वजह थी कि जो पहली रिपोर्ट एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइसेज कमीशन ने दी जिस का जिक्र श्री बनातवाला ने किया कि उन्होंने जो 95 रुपये की रिकमेंडेशन की है, उस मे कोई फर्क नहीं है, वह उस से पहले की रिपोर्ट थी जबकि फर्टीलाइजर और डीजल की कीमतें बढी। इस वास्ते ए० पी० सी० ने 95 रुपये फिर रिकमेंड किया और पिछले साल जो 85 रुपये था उस को एकदम बढ़ा कर 95 रुपये कर दिया यानी 10 रूपये का इस

में इजाफा कर दिया । ए० पी० सी० का यह अनुमान था कि उन को पहले ही ज्यादा मिल चुका है, इसलिए और ज्यादा बढ़ाने की गुंजाइश नहीं है उन की निगाह में, लेकिन जब कीमतें बढ़ीं, तो दोबारा उन का रिव्यू करने के लिए कहा और उन्होंने 100 रुपये की रिकमेंडेशन की ।

14 hrs.

अब जहां तक पैडी की ईल्ड का सवाल है, जैसा कि मैं कह रहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान में वाकई में पैडी की ईल्ड बहुत कम है । सारे आंकड़े तो मैं नहीं दे सकूंगा लेकिन बहुत से सूबों में कुछ ईल्ड ज्यादा है जैसे पंजाब में ज्यादा है, तमिलनाडु में काफी अच्छी ईल्ड होती है, आंध्र में वहीं कहां अच्छी ईल्ड होती है लेकिन पैडी की जो ईल्ड है, वह 900 किलोग्राम पर हैक्टेयर कहीं पर है और कहीं कहीं पर 3600-3900 किलोग्राम पर हैक्टेयर के करीब ईल्ड है । अलग-अलग प्रान्तों में अलग-अलग ईल्ड है लेकिन जो एवरेज आता है वह 1200-1300 पर हैक्टेयर है जोकि बहुत कम है और इस को हम बढ़ाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं और नई वेराइटीज भी आ रही हैं आई० सी० ए० आर० की तरफ से और उन से हमारी ईल्ड में काफी बढ़ोत्तरी हुई है और हमारी पैडी की किस्मों को बाहर के मुल्कों में, साऊथ ईस्ट एशिया में और दूसरे कन्ट्रीज में वहां के लोगों ने अपनाया है और बहुत अच्छी वेरायटी जैसे 'जया' उन्होंने निकाली है ।

यह जो प्रश्न किया गया कि बोने से पहले कीमत हम बतला दें, इसका मैं पहले भी जवाब दे चुका हूं मधु दंडवते जी के प्रश्न के उत्तर में । इस में हमें काफी कठिनाई होती है । बोने से पहले हम इस को नहीं बताना चाहते हैं लोगों को कि कौन सी चीज की तरफ ज्यादा झुकाव होना चाहिए क्योंकि अगर पहले ही इस को बतला दें, तो दूसरी फसल को नुकसान हो सकता है । तो बहुत सोच-समझ कर सरकार ने यह पालिसी अपनाई है और इस में किसान का इन्ट्रेस्ट और नेशन का इन्ट्रेस्ट ध्यान में रखा है । एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस किस किस्म की होनी चाहिए और किस हद तक डाईवर्शन होना चाहिए, मैं डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब इस हाउस को यकीन दिलाता हूं, कि इन सारी बातों का हम ध्यान रखते हैं और किसानों को नुकसान नहीं होने पावे, यह सरकार की नीति है, और उस को पूरा पूरा मुआविजा मिले । जैसा कि मैं पहले बता चुका हूं कि जहां कहीं हमें नुकसान होते नजर आता है, गवर्नमेंट कदम उठाती है ।

आप ने प्याज का जिक्र किया । प्याज की कीमत पहली सरकार के जमाने में क्या थी और आप यह भी जानते हैं कि पिछली सरकार के जमाने में आलू भी सड़ा था लेकिन अब आलू का दाम बहुत अच्छा चल रहा है । हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत सारी जगहों पर उस का अच्छा दाम मिल रहा है । आप बिहार के अन्दर पटना में देखिये, फरुखाबाद में, बंगलौर में, पंजाब में जहां भी आलू प्रोड्यूस करने वाले इलाके है, उन के अन्दर आलू का भाव मार्च और अप्रैल से बढ़ता ही चला गया और अब एक जगह ठहर गया है । पिछले साल आलू सड़ गया था और 15 रुपये पर बैग बिका । इस बार जब हमने प्याज की कीमतें गिरती देखी, महाराष्ट्र के दो तीन जिलों में जैसे नासिक के आसपास और गुजरात में ज्यों ही हम ने देखा कि प्याज की कीमत 25 रुपये प्रति क्विंटल से नीचे जा रही हैं, तो फौरन हम ने नेफेड से कहा कि प्याज की खरीद शुरू

[श्री बीरेन्द्र सिंह राव––जारी]

कर दो और उन को कीमत भी बता दी कि 45 रुपये से 60 रुपये के बीच में इस को खरीदो। एवरेज 55 रुपये क्विंटल आया और करीब 2 लाख क्विंटल प्याज खरीदी गई और किसान को नुकसान नहीं होने दिया। अब इस के भाव ठहर गये हैं। इसके लिये हम ने 30 रुपये क्विंटल नेफेड को सब्सीडी दी और किसानों की मदद के लिये 6 करोड़ रुपये प्याज पर सब्सीडी के तौर पर नेफेड को दिये हैं। तो इस तरफ हमारा पूरा-पूरा ध्यान है।

हम चाह रहे हैं कि हर चीज की पैदावार बढ़े और पैदावार ज्यादा होकर किसान का माल ज्यादा से ज्यादा एक्सपोर्ट हो। एक्सपोर्ट के मामले में भी हम बहुत लिबरल हैं। हम जानते हैं कि अपने देश के अन्दर किस चीज की कितनी खपत है, उसके अलावा जितनी पैदावार किसान की होगी, यदि वह एक्सपोर्ट होगी तो उससे किसान को फायदा होगा और फिर वह किसान के लिये इन्सैन्टिव होगा।

हम आइन्दा के लिये 1984–85 तक 2300 करोड़ तक की फूडग्रेन एक्सपोर्ट करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। यह हमने टारगेट मुकर्रर किया है। पेडी की पैदावार का भी टारगेट मुकर्रर किया है। इस बार हम 55 मिलीयन टन पेडी करेंगे पहले से ज्यादा करेंगे। आपने ठीक कहा कि ड्राउट की वजह से इसकी पैदावार पीछे काफी घट गयी थी। हम गेहूं की और पेडी की पैदावार बढ़ा रहे हैं। 1978–79 में यह 131 मिलियन टन के करीब फडग्रेन की पैदावार चली गयी थी। इस साल हम पीछे हैं। अगले साल का हमारा टारगेट फूडग्रेन पैदा करने का 135 मिलिय टन टन का है और उसको अचीव करने की हम पूरी कोशिश कर रहे हैं। हम यह जानते है कि जब किसान को फायदा होगा तो वह अधिक पैदावार करेगा।

श्री राम विलास पासवान: फसल बीमे का मैंने क्वेश्चन किया था।

श्री बीरेन्द्र सिंह राव: फसल बीमे के कुछ पाइलट प्रोजेक्ट चल रहे हैं। वे कुछ स्टेट जैसे गुजरात है, तमिलनाडु है वेस्ट बंगाल है उनमें चल रहे हैं। लेकिन जैसे आप इंसानी जिन्दगी का बीमा कराते है, उस तरह से नहीं है, जो किसान को कर्जा मिलता है उस रकम का बीमा होता है। अगर किसान की पैदावार उतनी नहीं हुई तो उसको मुआवजा मिलेगा। जनरल इन्श्योरेंस कम्पनी को मिलजुल कर के प्रिमियम तय करना पड़ता है। उसमें स्टेट गवर्नामेंट और सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट का 25–25 फीसदी हिस्सा होता है और 50 फीसदी किसानों को देना पड़ता है। लेकिन वह किसी किसी फसल के लिये किसी-किसी इलाके में पाइलट प्रोजेक्ट हैं और कुछ स्टेट्स के अदर है। हम चाहते है कि क्राप इंश्योरेंस की पालिसी जो हमारी है उसको स्टेट्स अपनायें। यह गवर्नमेंट बनने के बाद मैंने हर चीफ मिनिस्टर को लिखा है क्राप इंश्योरेंस को अपनाने के लिये आप स्कीम्स बनाइये और हम बातचीत कीजिये। जनरल इंश्योरेंस कम्पनी को हमने कहा है कि हर स्टेट से बात करे के जो स्टेट इन्टरस्टेड हो उनके लिये आप क्राप इंश्योरेंस स्कीम तैयार कीजिये। इस तरफ हमारा ध्यान है। अगर स्टेट की इसमें सहानुभूति हो और वे दिलचस्पी लें तो यह चल सकती है।

SHRI A. T. PATIL (Kolaba): Sir, I have a point of order. I would invite your attention to Rule 197 (2) where it is stated as:

"(2) There shall be no debate on such statement at the time it is made, but each member in whose name the item stands in the list of business may, with the permission of the Speaker, ask a question: ..."

(Interruptions)

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: Sir, the Calling Attention is over. How can he raise a point of order on that? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A. T. PATIL: Let me submit my point of order first.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Calling Attention is over. Now, we are going to the next item.

SHRI A. T. PATIL: I ask your permission to raise a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You cannot raise a point of order now. I am not giving permission to raise your point of order in between the two items. Calling attention is over and we are going to the next item. There is a vacuum now. How can you raise a point of order?

SHRI A. T. PATIL: Rule 376 says that a point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment, and then there is a proviso:

> "Provided that the Speaker may permit a member to raise a point of order during the interval between the termination of one item of business and the commencement of another if it relates to maintenance of order..."

I am talking about the maintenance of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Provided the Speaker permits and I am not permitting you.

---

v4.10 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

(i) Reported difficulties of Agro-Service Centres

SHRI PRATAP BHANU SHARMA (Vidisha): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the scheme of Agro-Service Centres by entrepreneurs was started with laudable intentions, for providing self-employment to unemployed engineers, agricultural graduates and diploma holders and to provide modern farm service facilities to the agriculturists. The pride of place was given in the scheme to custom hiring of tractors. But due to various factors, the least of which was not the escalation in the price of tractors after the formulation of self employment scheme, custom hiring of tractors has ceased to be quite remunerative and as a result many of these Agro-Service Centres have been lying on the brink of insolvency, while some of them have already wound up their activities.

Over 5000 Agro-Service Centres have been started all over the country, under this scheme, and many of them are in a bad way due to the inherent defects of this scheme. Unless there is large scale diversification of these units, the scheme of self-employment to engineering graduates and diploma holders may fail significantly.

In the half-a-million jobs programme a seed capital of as much as Rs. 50,000/- was provided to each co-operative Agro-Service Centre. Concessions by way of subsidies are also extended to small farmers and marginal farmers. Similar concessions and seed capital should be provided to the Agro-Service entrepreneurs. A sustained attempt must be made to diversify the activities of the Agro-Service Centres.

These Agro-Service Centres should be closely associated with the various National State level developmental agencies such as SFDA, MFDA, IADP, Hill Development Scheme etc. They may be entrusted with the work of providing the inputs needed in these schemes such as seeds, pesticides, agricultural inputs. Even piece-work jobs in the developmental schemes may be entrusted to these centres.

Commercial and cooperative banking institutions which channelise financial assistance to the farmers must be encouraged to use the service of the Agro-entrepreneurs in extending their assistance in kind.