

of the Indian School of Mines, Dhanbad, till an Executive Board is constituted under the Rules and Regulations of the said School now converted into a Society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860".

*The motion was adopted*

12.25 Hrs.

**MOTION RE : FOOD SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY—Contd.**

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister has to reply to the food debate. Yesterday the discussion was over, the time allotted is also over. Now I request the Minister to reply.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : माननीय मंत्री जी के कुछ भी कहने से पूर्व आप हमें सुनिये इस दृष्टि से कि इस समय जो सदन के अन्दर घटना घटी है—

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह हो गया है ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : सदन का सदस्य होने के नाते आपको हमारी भावनाओं को इस प्रकार से दबाना नहीं चाहिये । जब आप इस प्रकार के भावनाओं को दबाते हैं तो उसी की प्रतिक्रिया दूसरे लोगों में फैलती है—\*\*\*

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS rose—

MR. SPEAKER : All that is over. Nothing is to be taken down.

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM) : Sir, the House has discussed the food situation in the country and many hon. Members have participated in the debate. The debate has been quite useful. I am glad that hon. Members have devoted more time to the production aspect,—to the development of agriculture and it is a heartening thing. I do not propose to take much time of the House so far as agriculture is concerned. What I propose to do is that I will circulate a small brochure, like the one on the food situation, giving details of what has

been done in agriculture and what is proposed to be done in the future by the State Governments. I am sending officials of the Ministry of Agriculture to all the State capitals to discuss with the State Governments about their future programme of agriculture, especially the high-yielding varieties and also their minor irrigation schemes, the requirements of fertilisers for the next crop, and I propose to circulate the details of what has been done in the various States in the field of agriculture and what is proposed to be done this year. If, after that, the Members feel that a discussion is necessary about agriculture, it will be appropriate and useful if we have a discussion on agriculture itself.

12.29 Hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Nobody has claimed and it will be wrong on my part to claim that the food problem has been solved.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order. Whispering is going on.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We are agitated.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If you are agitated, you would better withdraw and have a discussion outside; not in the House. The Food Minister is replying.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : Sir, I was saying that it will be wrong to say that the food problem has been solved. We will have to make continued efforts to reach the targets that we have fixed for self-sufficiency. But certainly the country should thank itself for having avoided a major catastrophe. With the failure of the monsoon for two consecutive years and the large-scale drought we had in vast areas in the country in several States, apprehension was expressed not only in this country but even by outsiders who visited this country that the situation was such that a major catastrophe may take place, but we have avoided that. I will take the first opportunity to praise the fortitude, the

[Shri Jagjiwan Ram]

forbearance and the high standard of morality of the people in the affected areas. It was their hard effort that has been responsible for successfully meeting the situation. The efforts of the State Governments and the Central Government and a large number of voluntary organisations of this country and other countries have contributed in a very large measure to enable us to face the situation. I cannot claim that we have been able to provide the people the requisite quantity of foodgrains, but certainly we can claim now that we have succeeded in providing sufficient foodgrains to avoid starvation deaths. That by itself is no mean achievement for any country and it can be very legitimately claimed that we have tided over a major crisis. During the course of the drought in several States, steps were taken for providing hard manual work, for the repairs of minor irrigation sources and for sinking a large number of *kucha* and *pucca* wells, tube-wells, lift irrigation, etc. That also has contributed to increased production. But there should be no complacency on that ground and the efforts that have been made should continue in spite of the hopeful monsoon that we have got this year.

The monsoon has been kind to us this year. We have a reasonable expectation of 92 to 95 million tonnes of food production this year. In certain parts of the country, October and November rains have been deficient. The north-east monsoon also has not been quite favourable. All this will have an unfavourable effect on the kharif crop, but the recent rains we have had in this part of the country will augment *rabi* production. Whatever shortfall might be there due to the deficient October and November rains will, I have no doubt, be compensated by the present rains and we will have a bumper *rabi* crop. There should be no pessimistic outlook but at the same time there should be no sense of complacency. We have to continue our efforts.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी (बेतिया) : हमारे  
जिले में भी सूखा है ।

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** In a large country like this, there would always be some pockets where crop conditions might not be as satisfactory as in other parts. That will happen in a large country. We will not have uniform rains all over the country, but on the whole the monsoon this year has been satisfactory taking the country as a whole and the crop conditions are good.

Having said that, I would say that procurement is very necessary. Some friends have suggested monopoly procurement and some have suggested nationalisation of wholesale trade in foodgrains. Others have said there should be no procurement and purchases be made at the open market price. They have also suggested that the entire foodgrain trade should be left to the private trade.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) :**  
Let us have social control.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** I am saying what the members have suggested. What we have done is to emphasise the necessity of maximisation of procurement this year and I am happy to tell the House that all the State Governments, whether they are surplus or deficit, have taken requisite and adequate steps for maximum procurement in their areas.

So far as the pattern of procurement is concerned, as I have informed the House on previous occasions, it is by and large left to the State Governments as to what method of procurement they think is the best according to the conditions in their States. That is what has been done. In some States they have monopoly purchase, in some they have producers levy system and in some others they have levy from the trade or the millers. But there is reasonable expectation that the targets that have been fixed for the various States will be reached by them.

Some hon. friends have pleaded for the removal of the zonal restrictions. Others have pleaded for its retention so that procurement can be maximised and

the foodgrains wholesale trade may be retained in the public sector. My approach so far as the zonal system is concerned is not as an article of faith, it is a strategy to meet a particular condition and as soon as that condition ceases to exist perhaps many of the controls and restrictions will become superfluous.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE :** After eleven o'clock in the night there are no zones, it all merges into one.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** His associates know more about that than I can know. I will not claim that there is no amount of illegal movement of foodgrains from one State to another. That will be a bold assertion on my part knowing the conditions in the country and the civic standard that we have.

**SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Dabhoi) :** Is it not the best time to remove the zonal restrictions when there is a bumper crop ?

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** People say this is the best time to remove because there is a bumper crop. We took that into consideration while examining this question in the Conference of the Chief Ministers. There is a general feeling, perhaps a mistaken one, that the deficit States are in favour of removal of zonal restrictions. That is not a fact. By and large, many of the State Governments are in favour of retaining the zonal restrictions. Even the deficit States are in favour of it. Except, of course, Gujarat which wants unconditional removal of all zones, even some of the deficit States which want to remove zonal restrictions want some conditional removal of these restrictions. They would like to be put in the same zone as Punjab but they will not like to be put in the same zone as Bihar. About Orissa Shri P. K. Deo was arguing. He was not in favour of retention of zones, but he said that the zone should be retained in Orissa. That is the position. As I said, I do not approach the question of zonal restrictions as a matter of principle, but certainly I would like to wait till the time when we have succeeded in building up an

adequate buffer-stock, nearly two to three million tons by the next kharif season, the difference between the price in the open market and the procurement price has narrowed down and there is a hopeful expectation of a good crop next kharif season. Then will be the time to reconsider and review this question of removal of zonal restrictions. As and when conditions improve relaxations in the existing restrictions will certainly be examined and implemented. But, as I have said, in the particular context in which we are at present, the responsibility of the Centre remains. I put a question to some of my friends who wanted the removal of the zonal restriction that if I remove all the zones whether the responsibility of the Central Government to supply foodgrains to the States would cease. They said "No, you will have to take that responsibility". Now, if I have to take the responsibility to some extent, I will have to see, the surplus States will have to see, under what conditions they can maximise procurement so that the available stock can be supplied in areas where it is required. Therefore I said that procurement has to be undertaken on a large scale and we have taken steps to procure through governmental agencies, through the Food Corporation and the agency of the State Governments.

The agriculturists will have to be ensured a reasonable price for their agricultural production. Much has been said about the Agricultural Prices Commission. That Commission has made some recommendations. I will not say that I am hundred per cent satisfied with the recommendations of the Commission, and that is why I revised them.

While fixing the price of any particular agricultural commodity our procedure is that we consult the State Governments. So far as the fixation of the prices of the kharif crops this year is concerned, I may inform the House that, by and large, we have accepted the recommendations of the State Governments. In the case of Madras we have accepted the recommendation of

[Shri Jagjiwan Ram]

the State Government. Some of the State Governments did not want to raise their prices, and rightly so, just like Orissa. The Chief Minister of Orissa was very reluctant to increase the procurement price over that of last year, and his reason was quite justifiable. He says that Orissa is a poor State, the purchasing capacity of the people in Orissa is low and if the procurement price is raised a large number of people in Orissa will have to purchase their foodgrains at a higher price which would put them to hardship. The same was the position in Madras. I am saying this because some Members have suggested that the prices, especially of paddy and rice, in those areas were on the low side. The Orissa Government approached us for some increase in their procurement rates and we agreed to that. Even so, they have not reached the point to which we have agreed. So, by and large, we go by the recommendations of the State Governments in fixing the procurement prices for the various agricultural commodities.

I am sure that the State Governments take into consideration the interest of the producers in their respective States. No government can afford to go against the interests of a very large section of the society, that section which is the mainstay of our economy. Therefore, I have a feeling that whatever procurement prices we fixed in the different States are quite reasonable incentive prices.

श्री विभूति मिश्र (मोतीचरारी) : तो जब स्टेट की प्राइस आप मानते हैं तो प्राइस कमीशन की यहाँ क्या जरूरत है ?

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : I have explained it. The Agricultural Prices Commission has to take an overall view of the whole country. But each State thinks about it in the context of that State. That is why I said that we do not necessarily accept all the recommendations of the Agricultural Prices Commission without any review or revision or amendment. But, somewhere, if one State Government demands some fantastically high price, we do come in

and say that we will not agree to it, because it will distort the price pattern, not only within the State itself but in the country also.

SHRI DEORAO PATIL (Yeotmal) : That is a wrong approach.

कन्ज्यूमर का हित देखकर अगर प्रोड्यूसर की प्राइस फिक्स करेंगे तो किसानों के हित की बात नहीं होगी ।

श्री जगजीवन राम : नहीं, यह बात हित की तो नहीं होगी,

But there is human nature. Please do not take it amiss, but if I have to sell a commodity I want a higher price; I do not look to the interest of the purchaser.

SHRI RUPNATH BRAHMA (Kokrajhar) : At the time of procurement the price goes much higher than the price fixed by Government. Is it not a fact ?

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : I am happy; but, at the same time it happens that even if the same person has again to purchase he wants to purchase at the lowest price. We should not forget this human psychology. If the farmer wants the moon, I have no quarrel with him but certainly I have to reconcile the interest of the producer and of the consumer.

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती (मेरठ) : बिला कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन जाने आप कैसे कर देंगे ?

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : He will be a very omniscient person who will claim to calculate the cost of production at present. We do not have the data. I would like to do that myself.

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती : तब तो बाजार के अन्दाज़ से मारते जाओ कभी कन्ज्यूमर के हक में कभी प्रोड्यूसर के हक में ।

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : I will give credit to the hon. Member that he is the only person who can think of the interest of the producers. But what I have said is that I have to reconcile

the interest of the producer and of consumer.

**श्री महाराज सिंह भारती :** मैंने यह नहीं कहा । प्रोड्यूसर कन्ज्यूमर दोनों का हित तभी देख सकते हैं जब मिलों की तरह से दोनों का कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन देख कर करें । अन्दाज़ से बाज़ार में खड़े होकर करते जायेंगे उससे तो नहीं होगा ।

**श्री जगजीवन राम :** जी नहीं । वह तो कर सकते हैं । लेकिन मैंने यही कहा कि हमारे पास कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन (उत्पादन की लागत) का पूरा डाटा (व्योरा) नहीं है ।

Unfortunately, we do not have the full data about the cost of production of all agricultural commodities.

**श्री महाराज सिंह भारती :** क्यों ? सरकारी फार्म चल रहे हैं वहां कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन उनका देख लें ?

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** I wish it was as simple as the hon. Member presumes it to be. It is not so simple.

**श्री देवराव पाटिल :** कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन के बारे में कोई मशीनरी तो फिक्स कर सकते हैं ?

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** If the hon. House will remember, I have myself said that. My intention is to relate the fixation of prices of agricultural commodities taking into consideration the cost of production. But what I was saying was that as in the case of industries, in agriculture it is not as simple and it will take some time before we have reliable data so that we can say that it has accurately been taken into consideration. Roughly it is taken into consideration but I will not claim that any very accurate cost of production element is taken into account while calculating the prices of agricultural commodities. That is what I was saying. But, as I have said, I am quite sure that the prices that have been fixed are

quite reasonable and good prices. At the same time one has to reconcile the interest of the producer and of the consumer. While doing so you should not forget that a large percentage of the producers are themselves consumers. We always forget that aspect.

**SHRI K. N. TIWARY :** Cent per cent.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** I am talking only of the foodgrains. Majority of our producers of foodgrains have themselves to purchase because most of them are marginal producers. They do not produce for their requirement of the whole year and they have to purchase to meet their demand. But they have to sell their foodgrains even though their production may be for their six months', nine months' or ten months' requirement and have again to purchase.

**श्री श्रीम प्रकाश त्यागी (मुरादाबाद) :** उनको ज्यादा कीमत पर खरीदना पड़ता है मार्केट से । आप फिक्स्ड प्राइस पर उनसे लेते हैं और किसान को मार्केट से फसल के बाद ज्यादा कीमत पर लेना पड़ता है । आप दोनों पर कंट्रोल नहीं करते । प्रोक्योरमेंट पर कंट्रोल करते हैं कि इतने लेंगे और जब उसका खरीदने का टाइम आता है तो उसे ज्यादा कीमत पर लेना पड़ता है ।

**श्री जगजीवन राम :** जी हां । ऐसा होता है ।

**श्री श्रीम प्रकाश त्यागी :** क्यों ऐसा इन्तजाम किया जाता है ?

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** I do not know whether the State Governments do not take the step. My hon. friend comes from Maharashtra, presumably. Perhaps, the Maharashtra Government has a large distribution system even in the rural areas.

**श्री बसवंत (भिवंडी) :** वह तो केन्द्र सरकार का नाम लेते हैं कि केन्द्र सरकार इजाजत नहीं देती है ।

**श्री जगजीवन राम :** किस बात के लिए ?

श्री बसवंत : किसान को उचित मूल्य देने के बारे में केन्द्रीय सरकार हमको इजाजत नहीं देती है, यह राज्य सरकार कहती है।

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : That is what I have said. So far as Maharashtra Government is concerned, we have accepted all their recommendations. If the hon. Member has not followed.. (Interruption).

AN HON. MEMBER : Monopoly procurement.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : That, the hon. Member can take up with his State Government. I have not asked the State Government to do anything. When he fails to make his presence felt there, he thinks that he can raise his voice here. He may take this up with the Maharashtra Government and may not raise it here. As I have said, what should be the method of procurement has been left to the State Governments. I will say that the Maharashtra Government has done fairly well in this matter and they have managed their food situation very efficiently. But even if the hon. Member has got any grievance on that point, this is not the forum; he should take it up with the Maharashtra Government.

One thing more that I have done is that the farmers should be ensured that even when there is large scale production, the prices will not be permitted to fall. Though we have fixed the procurement price and the support price, I have taken a decision that I will not permit the prices to fall below the procurement price, and I will purchase the entire quantity that may be offered at the procurement prices, so that the question of support price will not arise.

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती : यह हमेशा के लिये है या इसी साल के लिये है ?

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : I can say this for this season and even for the next season also.

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : How are you going to implement your ideas ?

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : We have set up an agency. I may inform the House that, long before the harvest, I wrote to all the Chief Ministers to locate the areas where due to transport difficulty and the other things, prices are likely to go down, and take necessary steps and make arrangements so that the prices are not allowed to fall down. Whenever one or two instances came from Madhya Pradesh, from Bastar and tribal areas, immediately the Food Corporation people were sent there to purchase at the procurement price. But in such a large country, I will not say that there may not be one distant place where for a few days the traders may do that. But as soon as it came to notice... (Interruptions).

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती : पंजाब में 14 रु० मन मक्का बिक गई।

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : I do not think that it has happened in Punjab.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur) : He does not know anything about Punjab.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : I do not think that it will happen in Punjab at least.

Wherever it is, I support the system which the State Government thinks that it is the most effective system of procurement in that State. That is what I have said. I am making this clear in order to assure the farmers of this country that I will not permit the prices to fall below the procurement prices.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी (पूना) : आप मोनोपोली प्रोक्योरमेंट को सपोर्ट करेंगे, न ?

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : Yes.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : पाटिल साहब यही कह रहे थे कि वहां मोनोपोली प्रोक्योरमेंट है।

श्री देवराव पाटिल : इसके लिए जो प्राइस आपने फिक्स की है, वह प्रोक्योरमेन्ट प्राइस है।

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : That is what I am saying.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : लेकिन दूसरी जगह ऐसा नहीं है।

श्री देवराव पाटिल : मेरा खयाल है कि मिनिमम प्राइस, सपोर्ट, प्राइस प्रोक्योरमेन्ट प्राइस इनमें फर्क होना चाहिये।

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : There is. We have the support price which is different. That is what I have said.. (Interruptions).

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi) : What is this dialogue going on? We would like to hear the Minister.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let the hon. Minister conclude and then, if some clarification is necessary on certain points, they can be raised.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : The difficulty with my hon. friend is that, though he feels oppressed by the system of the Maharashtra Government, he has not got the courage to go and tell the Maharashtra Government.

श्री देवराव पाटिल : वहां तो हम करते हैं, लेकिन वे आपका नाम लेते हैं। महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेन्ट कहती है कि हमको सैन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट इजाजत नहीं देती, हम तो इस पक्ष में हैं कि प्रोक्योरमेन्ट प्राइस बढ़ा दें, लेकिन सैन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट नहीं मानती।

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : Again, the hon'ble Member is not telling the whole truth. Though there is monopoly procurement, certain quantities are still left with the farmers which they can sell, and they are doing that.

Then comes the question of distribution. On that point we have different systems in the various States, and when there was a difficult situation, rationing was introduced in certain areas. We

have large scale public distribution system even in the rural areas. But this year, I have no doubt, with this hopeful aspect of a good harvest, many of the fair price shops in the rural areas will not be necessary. Looking at the figures of offtake for the month of November and early December, I find that in many of the drought-affected areas, the offtake has gone down and that was bound to happen.

We have been supplying foodgrains to different areas, but not necessarily, the grain that is most required in that State. For example, take Bihar or Eastern U.P. Well, the Bihar people are rice-eaters, but in a year of drought, there was no choice and whatever food-grain was available was supplied. Some friend complained that milo was supplied in large quantities. It was, and it was purposely supplied in larger quantities because it was the cheapest grain. Sometimes we had difficulties in supplying milo, but we did that because we knew that large number of people who were engaged in hard manual work and who were earning a Rupee or Rs. 1.50 a day could subsist only if you provided them the cheapest foodgrain. With that intention, milo was provided in larger quantities.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA : Let the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs take to milo.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : Last year, and this year especially in the drought-affected areas the rice situation was very difficult. Friends from Kerala and Bengal had complained. That complaint is quite justified because it was not possible to supply the requisite quantity of rice. Some friend compared the figures of 1965, 1966 and 1967. Naturally in 1965 larger quantity of rice was supplied not only to Kerala and West Bengal but even to other areas where we supplied rice. But that went down progressively in 1966 and 1967 because the availability of rice in the country was very small, and even in the world market we could not get in time the quantity that we tried to purchase. But, wherever there was shortfall in the rice supply, that short-

[Shri Jagjiwan Ram]

age was made good by the supply of wheat. I have told this in the House more than once.

So far as Kerala was concerned, there was shortfall in the supply of rice and whatever shortfall was there in rice, adequate stock of wheat was maintained in Kerala so that the shortfall could be made good by the supply of wheat. This was done. I do not mean to say that people are not put to hardship when one has to change one's food habits, but when we are forced in such a situation and when that particular foodgrain is not available, well, we have to take the foodgrain that we have. That is why I have quoted the example of Bihar. The staple food of the people there is rice, but, during the last one or two years we have not supplied even one ounce of rice.

DR. MAITREYEE BASU (Darjeeling) : In some places of Bengal, there was no wheat even when people had changed their food habits.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now it is 1 O'clock. You may resume your speech after lunch.

I would like to announce that after the Food Minister's reply, the Prime Minister will make a statement regarding the Fourth Plan.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for lunch till fourteen of the clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch at three minutes past Fourteen of the Clock*

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

MOTION RE : FOOD SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY—*contd.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture may now resume his reply to the debate on the food situation.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : I was telling about the rice difficulty last year and this year.

Figures had been quoted to indicate that there was some political discrimination. As you know, after the last general elections, in many of the States, the political complexion has changed and we have at present Congress Governments and also non-Congress Governments. I was perhaps the first Food Minister who had to deal with State Government of various complexions, both Congress and non-Congress. From my own experience, I would say that in the matter of foodgrains, at the Chief Ministers' conference or at any other stage politics had never been brought in. We have tried to tackle the food problem as a national problem and in the matter of supply also, no political consideration has ever been brought in, because it will be too mean a tactics to employ food for political purposes.

As I was saying, the rice situation was difficult and rice supplies went on decreasing as compared to 1965 and 1966. Some figures were given in respect of Kerala. I would like to give some figures. Though I have been trying to avoid quoting statistics in other matters, here I just want to show to the House that it was not only in respect of non-Congress Governments or Congress Governments, but the rice situation being difficult, the supply to all the State Governments to whom rice was supplied has gone down.

		(In' 000 tonnes)
Kerala :	1965	910
	1966	802
	1967(upto October)	465
Bihar :	1965	42
	1966	5.2
	1967	nil
Gujarat :	1965	199.8
	1966	52.4
	196	26.3

श्री जोगेन्द्र झा (जयनगर) : सन् 1967 में बिहार में कांग्रेस की सरकार बदल गयी इसके अलावा बिहार ने और कौन सा कसूर किया कि बिहार को सन् 67 में एक छटाक चावल भी नहीं दिया गया। अब यह राजनीतिक पक्षपात नहीं तो क्या है ?



श्री जगजीवन राम : इसलिए नहीं दिया जा सका क्योंकि चावल नहीं था बाकी माननीय सदस्य के दिमाग में तो सिर्फ एक ही बात रहेगी। फीगर देखिये। गुजरात में मैं तो सरकार नहीं बदल गई थी लेकिन वहां भी राइस की सप्लाई काफी कम हुई है।

		(In '000 tonnes)
Maharashtra	1965	335.6
	1966	187.5
	1967	107.3
Mysore	1965	12.3
	1966	26.5
	1967	19
West Bengal	1965	206
	1966	191
	1967 (up to October)	136.9

I have given these figures only to show to the House that the rice situation being difficult, if shorter supplies have been made, they have been made to all State Governments without consideration of whether there was a Congress Government or a non-Congress Government in office in the State concerned.

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा : लेकिन एक भी छटांक चावल नहीं दिया गया है, उसमें सिर्फ बिहार है।

श्री जगजीवन राम : माननीय सदस्य ने शायद फ़ालों नहीं किया। मने खद बिहार के बारे में बतलाया है कि सन् 1965 में 42 हजार टन राइस दिया गया, सन् 1966 में 5.2 हजार टन सप्लाई किया गया जब कि वहां कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट थी और 1967 में कुछ नहीं दिया जा सका।

If even after this, friends are not convinced, I fail to convince them.

About Kerala, I said that whenever there was short supply of rice, wheat has been supplied in adequate quantities and the offtake of wheat has increased.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peer-made) : Because there is no other go. That is not a solution of the problem.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : It is not a solution. But whenever friends from Kerala say that the food supply has been less...

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : Rice supply.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : I want to tell the House that when there is no rice...

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : We challenge that statement.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : ...we cannot supply rice.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : Of course, we are not anxious to spend our foreign exchange in importing rice. But when Government gave a solemn promise to the State Government to supply rice, and that State is 50 per cent deficit, is it not a fact that several proposals were brought to the notice of the Central Government by the State Government wherein it was promised that rice could be supplied from the international market?

In the beginning Government used to say all these were bogus offers, but I myself received a letter from the hon. Minister about one particular proposal where it is said that there is rice, they can supply the rice, but the prices are high, so we cannot purchase that rice, we have other offers from the international market at lesser price. I should like to know why the Central Government did not take the Kerala Government into confidence, why did they not consult with the Kerala Government and ask them whether they are prepared to pay that higher price, because we are in the ditch, because we are in a corner, not because we can afford to pay, but the Kerala Government is prepared to pay a slightly higher price both in the internal and the international market, but the Central Government refused to have any such consultation, they did not take the Kerala Government into confidence, they always write giving some excuse or other, either that it is a bogus offer or that the prices are high or that they have other offers, but the rice is not given. In such a difficult situation, is it not proper on the part of the Central Government at least to purchase some rice from outside even at a higher rate, so that our people are given at least 6 oz. of rice ration?

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** I was myself coming to that. In respect of every offer that came to us whether from the Kerala Chief Minister Food Minister, or directly to us, we made enquiries, and I remember to have written in great detail to the Kerala Chief Minister and Food Minister about all the offers that were sent to us through them. In certain cases where the offers came and we made enquiries, the prices quoted were higher than the other offers we had at that time, and therefore we could not justify purchasing at a higher price. It was not a question of consulting the Kerala Government, but deciding, with our own finance, that when we had a lower offer, we had to go in for that. In the international market when they knew that India was in the world market for purchases, all sorts of speculative offers were made to us, and sometimes the rice was not there, and sometimes the prices were very exorbitant. I will admit that the action was not taken at the beginning of the season. When we have to go to the international market, it is advantageous to go in January or February. As a matter of fact, we started our enquiries, I remember, when I took over,—I got some foreign exchange sanctioned—in April. By that time there was world shortage of rice, the requisite quantities were not available. Sometimes we entered into an agreement with them, and the parties failed, and on the basis of those contracts we sometimes assured the Kerala Government that we would be supplying such and such quantities, and sometimes that did not materialise, sometimes the ships did not come in time, that difficulty has been there. But, as I was mentioning, there was no lack of effort on our part.

Another question is : why don't you permit the Kerala Government to purchase from the adjoining States? The Chief Minister has had experience, and that at times added to my difficulty. The Chief Minister of Kerala approaching the Chief Minister of Madras or the Chief Minister of Andhra and receiving a negative reply from them, and then coming to me...

**SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR :** They want a little more price.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** If you can get the rice, and if I am assured that you will get the rice, I have no objection. They have been saying, and you say, that it is a question of price. I say it is not a question of price. Whenever there is any question of price, we settle among ourselves, but the question is that it adds to my difficulty. Once a Chief Minister has said no to another Chief Minister, then if I approach him, it becomes very delicate and embarrassing for him, and that has been my experience on two occasions. Therefore I said, and I have written to all the Chief Ministers, that bilateral agreements will cause difficulties, because none of the State Government have been the complete picture of the whole country. But I have admitted that we have not been in a position to supply the requisite quantity of rice, and I do not mean to say that it has not caused difficulty to the people of Kerala. If they are accustomed to taking rice, quickly switching over to wheat is not possible, it takes some time. But the Kerala people have taken to wheat in an increasing measure as is proved by the off-take of rice that has taken place there.

**SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR :** Wheat.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** The off-take of wheat; and the supply we supplied has been 3.36 lakhs, larger. In 1965, we supplied 3.36 lakhs; in 1966, it was 3.2 lakhs and in 1967, because there was a shortage of rice there, up to October, the supply has been 4.09 lakh tonnes. From the very beginning I have been saying that nobody will claim that we have solved the food problem. We have a difficult situation yet and as the situation improves we try to increase the supply to the States. In this context, some hon. Member mentioned that again when the Government of West Bengal failed and another government was formed, we have increased the supply. We have not done that. As a matter of fact, I have not increased the quota of West Bengal. Whatever I increased, I increased when the previous government was there.

**SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR :** Now, you are giving it.

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा : डा० पी० सी० घोष के आते ही सौ ग्राम चावल का राशन बढ़ गया। लेकिन केरल में अभी तक भी नहीं बढ़ा है।

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** You will have a little patience; you want to try to project your own reflexes everywhere.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) :** We lost our government only because we were patient!

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** Whatever allocation was made, was made when the previous government was there. As a matter of fact, when Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee returned from his conference in Gwalior or Indore or Bhopal, he came and told me that rice was available in Madhya Pradesh and asked whether we will allot it. I had made that allocation, but because the milling was late the rice which was moving did not reach there when Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee was there; it reached there when that government had fallen, (*Inter-ruption*). You can have your own interpretation. I have no quarrel with that. It is an irony of fate; those people who bring politics in everything think that everybody acts in the same way I cannot help it; we cannot help it. I said we are in a difficult situation. Now the crops are hopeful and if people procure in a larger measure—I cannot say that during this season it will be completely solved. No. We have still shortages. After two years of this difficult situation, there will be a general tendency, and anybody who has some experience of our rural areas, of the farming community, knows that there will be a normal, natural, usual tendency on the part of the former to retain for himself something more than the normal. That is the usual practice. Therefore, the market availability as compared to production will be less. In the same way, the pipeline of the trade is completely dry. And therefore it was thought that, as I had said at the very beginning, we will have to build

a sizeable buffer-stock. For that purpose, a certain quantity of import becomes necessary. As the House is aware we thought of 7.5 million tonnes of import, and hon. Members have noticed the announcement, in the press, of the US Government. We have not officially received the communication yet. But I wanted to inform the House that they have agreed to give 3.5 million tonnes of foodgrains for the first half of next year. The agreement has not yet been concluded. The intention is to divert a major portion of that to the buffer-stock and put at least one million tonnes from our own procurement during the kharif season in the buffer-stock so that by next year, the next kharif season, we can build up a buffer-stock of three million tonnes.

I do not want to speak much about the production side. But some hon. Members spoke about land reforms. I attach great importance to land reforms from the production aspect. But hon. Members are aware that according to our Constitution land is a State subject and whatever land reform has to be done, has to be by the State Governments. In the first Chief Ministers' conference, I myself raised this question and I have followed it up by examining the appraisal done by the Planning Commission about land reforms in various States and their implementation. I have written to all the Chief Ministers pointing out what further steps they should take in the matter of fresh legislation or implementation of legislation they have already passed. I request hon. Members to see that, wherever their parties are represented in the Governments, those Governments also expeditiously undertake land reform measures. I can assure the House that in any rational land reform measure, they will receive the fullest cooperation and support from the Centre. At least the minimum that should be done immediately is to ensure fixity of tenure to the cultivators.

\*  
श्री भोगेन्द्र झा : बिहार सरकार यही तो कर रही है और उसी पर आप बिहार सरकार को पलटने की योजना बना रहे हैं।

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : Let the Bihar Government go ahead. But their misfortune is, they will not have any impediment from the Centre, but they will have impediment from their own bed-fellows. That they are having there. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : During the 20 years of Congress rule, you did not do anything to give fixity of tenure to the cultivators.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : Mr. Namboodiripad is there now.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : Mr. Namboodiripad brought forward legislation in 1957. Your Government tried to sabotage it. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : The only remedy is to smile away such things and that is what I am trying to do. As I said, I have written to all the Chief Ministers to proceed with the implementation of their legislative programme they have undertaken and wherever shortcomings are noticed to understand further legislation. More than that I cannot do.

So far as nationalisation of the whole-sale foodgrain trade is concerned, as I said on previous occasions, the Central Government have made a beginning by establishing the Food Corporation. It is for the State Governments...

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा : अगर सब कुछ राज्य सरकारों ने ही करना है, तो फिर केन्द्र किस लिए है ?

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : I can only give some information here. I cannot give the understanding of the Constitution to members who refuse to understand it. If the hon. member sees the Constitution, he will know that the Bihar Government can undertake the complete foodgrain trade in its own hand. They will receive the fullest cooperation from the Central Government. But again they will have difficulty, because they have their Jan Sangh partners there. (*Interruptions*). As I said, we have made a beginning. I

personally want the Food Corporation to explain its activities in all the States, so that at least the supply of foodgrains from one State to another is on government to government account. That is what we are doing at present.

About production aspect I have not much to say. I have said about land reform. So far as fertiliser and minor irrigation are concerned there is not much difference between that side or this side. As I have said, I want to circulate among the Members brochure giving details of what has been done and what is proposed to be done. I emphasise the importance of compost manure, sullage and everything.

AN HON. MEMBER : Minus water.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : Whatever is possible for increasing that should be done and we have taken certain steps in this matter.

A revolution in our agriculture is forthcoming by the application of the achievements of science and technology and the readiness with which our farmers have taken to it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Through the back door or the front door ?

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM : The general impression was that Indian farmers are conservative, they do not readily adopt new strategy and new methods. This idea has been belied by our farmers who have very enthusiastically and readily taken to these new methods. The new varieties of very high-yielding seeds, application of fertilisers, insecticides and pesticides etc., have been very readily accepted by them. It is very encouraging. Uptil now our agriculture has been more or less on the subsistence level. With the new strategy, with the application of science and technology and the continuing research by our scientists agriculture can be and is becoming a paying proposition, and this is the method by which we will achieve self-sufficiency in our food requirements.

AN HON. MEMBER : In ten years.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** If all the friends cooperate certainly we can achieve it much earlier.

**SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR :** What is the deadline fixed by the Government ?

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** I think the hon. Member has gone through the brochure circulated.

**SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur) .** What is the final estimate ? Some people say it is 92 million tons, some others say it is 95 million tons.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** I have already spoken about that.

At the same time we will have to take care of our cash crops also. Some of the cash crops are necessary for some of the very important industries like cotton, jute, sugar and groundnut. We have to take care that in all these sectors also our production is in adequate quantity. That is what we are doing. The result so far as cotton and jute is concerned has been very encouraging. This year the groundnut crop also has been very good.

This leads me to the question of sugarcane. The sugar industry has had a chequered career, so to say. Especially in North India the sugar industry has been in very bad array. The main reason for that is that adequate steps have not been taken for the development of sugarcane. Though sugarcane cess was imposed long ago, a sizable portion of revenue accruing from that was not spent for the purpose for which it was meant. It was not spent for the development of sugarcane with the result that in comparison to the yield per acre either in Maharashtra or in South India or even in the matter of sucrose content, North India is far behind Maharashtra or South India. So, a permanent solution to this problem will be to encourage the development of sugarcane. That is a long term plan. Unless that is done, the sugar industry, especially in north India will be faced with great difficulties. Last year we faced a special difficulty. The

production fell down very steeply. This year also the acreage under sugarcane cultivation went down substantially in Bihar and U.P. though in Maharashtra and South India it was better than what it was in north India. But a major portion of the production of sugar comes from the northern part of the country.

An apprehension was expressed that due to the fall in acreage and also the drought at the time when sugarcane was cultivated, if the present trend continues, the production of sugar may fall down further steeply. We have spent much time considering what to do. The choice was, either to continue the control as it was or completely de-control. An overwhelming opinion was in favour of complete de-control. Both these methods were full of risk and danger. I was very apprehensive of taking any step of complete de-control. With the continuation of control, it was apprehended, even if the prices of sugarcane were increased, the production may not go beyond 15 lakhs to 16 lakhs tons. The House could imagine what a situation we would have been faced with in that contingency. I was very much afraid of complete de-control. The reasons are obvious; I need not elaborate them. Therefore, it was thought better to have some method by which we can levy a certain portion of the sugar produced to sell it at a controlled rate, and leave the balance for free sale by the sugar factories, as we have been doing in the matter of foodgrains.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE :** Now sugar is selling at Rs. 5.50 to 8 per kilo. By partial de-control you have only legalised the blackmarket rate.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** I have not finished yet and I am interrupted.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE :** But we are already finished by the high prices.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** This sort of interruption is not going to help anybody. It will only take away the time of the House without getting any satisfactory reply.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** That is what I am saying. The question was whether we should fix a minimum price of Rs. 6 per maund for sugarcane. We thought that it was not desirable to fix such a price. We thought we will fix a minimum price of Rs. 2.75 so that we can take 60% as levy sugar at a price calculated on the basis of cane price of Rs. 2.75 and leave the balance 40 per cent with the mill owners so that it will enable the sugar factories to pay a higher price for the sugarcane. I am happy to say that nowhere in the country, except in Maharashtra where the co-operatives have entered into an agreement, or in Madras where the growers have entered into an agreement with the factory-owners, is sugarcane being supplied at a price which is less than Rs. 4 per maund and in many places it is Rs. 15 to 16 per quintal. It was one of the intentions of this step that the growers should get a higher price and the factories should be placed in a position where they can offer higher price than the minimum price. If they offer a higher price than the minimum price and we take away 60% of the sugar at the price calculated on the basis of the minimum price, unless they are enabled to sell 40 per cent at a higher price than the controlled price, they will not be in a position to offer higher prices to the sugarcane growers.

The expectation was that under this arrangement we will be in a position to produce at least as much as we did produce last year. I am a little apprehensive now. We did not think that there will be such a stiff competition from the gur industry. Now many of the factories, though they have started, have not received the adequate quantity of sugarcane. But this is one experiment we are trying. I will not say that this was an ideal solution. But we will have to give a reasonable time to it. As I said, I have still expectations that by the end of January or beginning of February the prices will fall down in the open market. But we will have to give it a trial. That is all what I have to say.

Again I will say that nobody can claim that we have solved the food prob-

lem, but we can say that we are on the road. The monsoon has been good, but that should not lead us to complacency. Efforts will have to be continued by the new strategy of high-yielding variety of seeds, by increasing irrigation facilities and by providing larger inputs and credit to the farmers. Here I want to inform the House that I have taken certain action to increase the credit availability of the land development banks and the co-operative societies so that greater credit may be available to the farmers for tubewells, inputs, fertilisers, high-yielding varieties of seeds and other things.

Again I will appeal to the House that food is a national problem. All of us will have to put our shoulders to it to solve it so that in the not too distant future we can stop all imports and become self-sufficient in the matter of food.

**श्री एस० एन० जोशी :** (पूना) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक क्लेरिफिकेशन चाहता हूँ।

**श्री शारदानन्द** (सीतापुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भी एक स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ...

**श्री तुलसीदास जाधव** (वाराणसी) : एक क्लेरिफिकेशन मैं चाहता हूँ.....

**श्री हुकमचन्द कछवाय :** (उज्जैन) श्री शारदानन्द के भाषण का उत्तर नहीं आया, इसलिए वह पूछना चाहते हैं।

**श्री शारदानन्द :** इसीलिए मैं भाषण के बीच में नहीं उठा था.....

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Please resume your seats. There were a lot of interruptions. Instead of taking recourse to interruption only one Member has written to me that he wants some clarification. I will permit him only and none else. Shri Joshi.

**श्री एस० एम० जोशी :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मन्त्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहूंगा क्योंकि मन्त्री महोदय सहकार के श्री मन्त्री हैं तो मेरी यह जानकारी है कि जो 40 प्रतिशत चीनी खूली रखी हुई है उस को बेचने का काम वह हमारे कन्ज्यूमर्स कोआपरेटिव स्टोर्स हैं या सस्ते गल्ले की दुकानें हैं या राशनिंग शाप्स हैं उन को नहीं दिया जाता है और बिलकुल ऐसे ही प्राइवेट सैक्टर को यह दिया है तो उसके बारे में क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार बतायेंगे ? जहां तक मेरी मालूमात हैं बम्बई में ऐसा है कि जो सस्ते गल्ले की दुकानें हैं, कन्ज्यूमर्स कोआपरेटिव स्टोर्स वगैरह हैं उन को यह 40 प्रतिशत चीनी बेचने का अधिकार नहीं है तो उन को क्यों बंचित किया गया है ?

और दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि महाराष्ट्र में स्टेट फार्मिंग कारपोरेशन बना हुआ है और स्टेट फार्मिंग कारपोरेशन को अपना गन्ना चीनी कारखानों के जो मालिक हैं उन को बेचना पड़ता है, मजबूरन बेचना पड़ता है कानून के कारण। वह जो मालिक हैं वह स्टेट फार्मिंग कारपोरेशन की तरफ से 80 या 87 रुपये टन पर लेना चाहते हैं जबकि बाजार में 140 से 130 में बिकता है। उस का कारण यह बताया जाता है कि सेंट्रल हुकूमत की तरफ से गन्ने के दाम जो फिक्स किए गए हैं उसी दाम पर हम को बेचना चाहिए। तो इस के बारे में स्टेट फार्मिंग कारपोरेशन को कुछ मदद दिलाने के लिए हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार कोई कोशिश करेगी ?

**श्री जगजीवन राम :** जहां तक कोआपरेटिव और फेयर प्राइस शाप्स की बात है वहां पर तो यही समझा गया कि दोनों तरह की चीनी रहेंगी तो कुछ गड़बड़ हो सकता है। इसलिए स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को लिखा गया लेकिन उस मामले में यह नहीं है कि किसी कोआपरेटिव को न दिया जाय। ऐसी बात नहीं है। वह तो स्टेट गवर्नमेंट चाहे तो दे सकती है।

**श्री एस० एम० जोशी :** वह बाकायदा हिसाब किताब रखेंगे।

**श्री जगजीवन राम :** जहां तक कोआपरेटिव का है वह तो गड़बड़ नहीं करेंगे लेकिन दूसरे फेयर प्राइस शाप वाले गड़बड़ कर सकते हैं। दोनों उन को देने पर उस में गड़बड़ हो सकती है। लेकिन स्टेट गवर्नमेंट चाहे तो कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज को दे सकती है और मैं उन के सामने यह बात रखूंगा।

जहां तक स्टेट फार्मिंग की बात है वहां पर वह जो शुरू शुरू में एग्जीमेंट हुआ था वह वही था कि मिनिमम प्राइस जो फिक्स होगी उसी पर सप्लाइ करना होगा। तो जैसे मैंने हाउस को बताया था कि मिनिमम प्राइस जो फिक्स किया वह तो नोमिनल था। इसलिए फैक्ट्री वालों का कहना कि इसी प्राइस पर स्टेट फार्म सप्लाय करे यह बिलकुल गलत था, नामुनासिब था और अनजस्ट था। लेकिन खुशी की बात है कि महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेंट में और फैक्ट्री वालों में सप्लाय के मामले पर एग्जीमेंट हो गया है।

**श्री शारदानन्द :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक स्पष्टीकरण मैं चाहता हूँ।

**MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** You have not written to me. If I allow you, there will be several others.

**श्री शारदानन्द :** केवल एक स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ।

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** All right; just one question.

**श्री शारदानन्द :** मैं मंत्री जी से यह स्पष्टीकरण चाहूंगा कि कल इधर बैठनेवाले तथा उधर बैठनेवाले लोगों ने यह शंका व्यक्त की थी कि हमारे प्लानिंग कमीशन के डिप्टी चेयरमैन ने काश्तकारों के ऊपर एग्जीक्यूटिव टैक्स लादने की बात कही है। उस के सम्बन्ध में आपने कोई स्पष्टीकरण नहीं किया, इस सम्बन्ध में स्पष्टीकरण दीजिए।

(M.)

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** I missed that. I may inform the House that, even before the National Development Council met, there was a food debate in the other House. in Rajya Sabha, and there, this question was raised and I have categorically said that any proposal for income-tax levy on ordinary farmers will be impractical and unworkable.

**श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,\*

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** This is not a question. This will not go on record. This has nothing to do with the food problem.

**SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) :** This must be expunged from record. It has no foundation; it is absolutely unfounded.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** The opportunity provided to them is being misused. I have already said that nothing will go on record.

**श्री क० ना० तिवारी :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर यह रिकार्ड से एक्सर्ज नही होगा, तो हम इन के खिलाफ प्रिवलेज का मोशन लायेंगे।

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** If it has not been recorded.....

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I have already said that. It is not going on record. It has nothing to do with the food debate it is outside its purview.

**MR. BHOGENDRA JHA :** His question should be about the food problem; he should not raise any extraneous matter.

**श्री भोगेन्द्र झा :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने अपने भाषण में इस बात पर जोर दिया था एक-खेतीहरों का खास तबका है, जो बेजमीन और बेघर है, पहले भी सरकार उन के लिए जैनरसली अनुदान दिया करती थी और अक्सर वह रुपया वापस आ जाता करता

\*Not recorded.

(M.)

था, लेकिन इस बार अनुदान में से वह रकम काट दी गई है; क्या सरकार उस रकम को और बढ़ा कर देने का विचार कर रही है ? इस समय बिहार में जो सरकार है, वह इस बात पर आमादा है कि एक भी पैसा हम वापस न जाने देंगे, वे पैसे को पूरा खर्च करने के लिये तैयार हैं। दूसरे-मुखे कल ही खाद्य मन्त्री की ओर से जवाब मिला है। सहयोगी समितियों के बारे में खेतीहर मजदूरों को जो सुविधाएं दी जाती हैं—उन समितियों की संख्या कितनी है और इन को बढ़ाने के लिए सरकार क्या विचार कर रही है, जिन की तादाद देश भर में एक तिहाई से ज्यादा है। हमें उत्तर मिला है कि हम खबर इकट्ठी कर रहे हैं, बाद में उस को सदन के सामने रखेंगे। सरकार इन के सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कर रही है। 10 साल हुए इस की शुद्घात हुई थी लेकिन अभी तक इन के पास पूरी खबर नहीं है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इन बेघर और बेजमीन खेतीहर मजदूरों के लिये सरकार क्या कदम उठाने जा रही है ? . . . .

**श्री रणवीर सिंह :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, स्पीच शुरू हो गई है।

**श्री भोगेन्द्र झा :** तीसरी बात में यह जानना चाहना हूँ कि आपने श्री अजय मुखर्जी से जो फाजिल चावल भेजने के लिये वायदा किया था, वह वहां पी० सी० घोष के समय में पहुंचा, इस में विलम्ब किस कारण से हुआ, क्या इस को आप सदन के सामने रखेंगे, जिस से हम जान सकें कि इस में राजनीति नहीं थी ?

**श्री जगजीवन राम :** जो समझना चाहें वे तो अभी भी समझ गए होंगे, लेकिन जो न समझना चाहें, उन को मैं समझ नहीं दे सकता, जवाब ही दे सकता हूँ। मैंने यह बताया था— इस को सदन के सामने रखने का सवाल नहीं है, दो व्यक्तियों में बातें होती हैं तो उस की हर वक्त लिखा पढ़ी नहीं हो सकती है, बातें हुआ करती हैं, जिनको



विश्वास और भरोसा होता है, वे बातें करते हैं— इस को मैं सदन में क्या रखूंगा।

**श्री भोगेन्द्र झा :** भेजने में विलम्ब क्यों हुआ ?

**श्री जगजीवन राम :** भेजने में विलम्ब बिलकुल नहीं हुआ। पहुंचने में जो विलम्ब होता है, वह उन के वक्त में भी होता था और इन के वक्त में भी होता है। जो नवम्बर में पहुंचना था, वह दिसम्बर में पहुंचा है— इस में राजनीति का सवाल कहां है? जहां तक कोआपरेटिव का सवाल है—वह प्रदेशों का करना है, उसकी पूरी जानकारी हम को इस वक्त नहीं है, बाद में बता सकेंगे—

**श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) :** अभी मन्त्री महोदय ने बताया कि इन्होंने बिहार को एक छटांक भी चावल नहीं दिया, लेकिन इन्होंने वायदा किया था कि 2 लाख 25 हजार टन गेहूं हर महीने बिहार को देंगे। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इन्होंने जो वायदा किया था, यदि उतना गल्ला बिहार को नहीं दिया तो उस का क्या कारण है? दूसरे, जो बकाया गल्ला है, जो अभी तक बिहार को नहीं दिया है, क्या वे उस को अब आगे देने के लिए तैयार हैं ?

**श्री जगजीवन राम :** सदस्य महोदय ने ऐसा प्रश्न उठाया है, जिसका जवाब सदन में कई बार दिया जा चुका है। मैं तो समझता था कि कोई नई बात उन के दिमाग में होगी। बात यह है कि बिहार में जो गल्ला हम ने सप्लाई किया है—पहले वह वह की स्टाक पोजीशन को देखें कि क्या है, तब वहां समझे कि सप्लाई करने की जरूरत है या नहीं है।

**श्री काशीनाथ पाण्डेय (पदरौना) :** पश्चिमी यू० पी० की चीनी मिलों में इस समय सब से ज्यादा प्राइस गन्ने की दी जा रही है, उस के बावजूद भी यह आशा है कि दिसम्बर के अन्त तक गन्ना न मिलने की वजह से फैंक्ट्रियां बन्द हो जाएंगी, ऐसी स्थिति में आप जनवरी में क्या विचार करेंगे ?

**श्री जगजीवन राम :** उस वक्त फिर देखा जायगा।

**SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV and SHRI SHEO NARAIN** rose.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Yesterday I could not accommodate Mr. Pandey and others. Therefore, I have permitted them to put a question each. Now you had participated, as also Shri Sheo Narain. So I cannot permit you.

**SHRI RANDHIR SINGH :** Mr. Bhogendra Jha has also participated. Why did you allow him ?

**SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV** rose.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** I cannot allow you. There is no limit. If I permit you, I have to allow Mr. Sheo Narain also.

**श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप एक इस तरफ के सदस्य को सवाल पूछने दीजिए और एक उस तरफ के सदस्य को पूछने दीजिए, आप उधर के लोगों को ही मौका दिये जा रहे हैं . . . .

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Now, Mr. Prem Chand Verma, please resume your seat. In this matter if you are going to bring pressure, nothing will happen. Nobody will get opportunity.

**SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV** rose.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Mr. Jadhav, please resume your seat. I am now going to put the motion to vote.

I shall now put the substitute motion No. 1 of Shri Ram Sewak Yadav to vote.

*Substitute motion No. 1 was put and negatived.*

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I shall now put substitute motion No. 6 by Shri Ramavatar Shastri to the vote of the House.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

*Substitute motion No. 6 was put and negatived.*

SHRI DEORAO Patil : I would beg leave of the House to withdraw substitute motion No. 3.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his substitute motion ?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

*Substitute motion No. 3 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall now put substitute motion No. 7 by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta to the vote of the House.

*Substitute motion No. 7 was put and negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall now put substitute motion No. 8 by Shri B. S. Sharma to the vote of the House.

*Substitute motion No. 8 was put and negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall now put substitute motion No. 9 by Shri Shiva Chandra Jha to the vote of the House.

*Substitute motion No. 9 was put and negatived.*

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : I would seek leave of the House to withdraw substitute motion No. 13.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his substitute motion ?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

*Substitute motion No. 13 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

14.51 HOURS

### STATEMENT RE. FOURTH PLAN

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, the hon. Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : I wanted to make a statement regarding the Fourth Plan and allied matters. Shall I read it out or shall I lay it on the Table of the House ? I am at the disposal of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Is it a long one ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It is about 4 pages.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : To save time, she might lay it on the Table of the House.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : किस बारे में है ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Before adjourning the House at 1 p.m. I had already made an announcement that there would be a statement by the Prime Minister in the afternoon regarding the Fourth Five Year Plan and allied matters. Now, it may be laid on the Table of the House. Let hon. Members study it . . .

श्री हुकमचन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह आज की कार्यसूची में नहीं है। यह महत्वपूर्ण वक्तव्य है और इसे कार्यसूची में पहले आना चाहिए था।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I know the procedure.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North-East) : I do not object to her laying it on the Table of the House. Since, however, it relates to the Plan, as you have said, and it is a matter of very great importance, the House should surely discuss the matter. The Prime