

[Mr. Speaker.]

Pondicherry is in India. On broader considerations, I will call a meeting of the leaders of parties in which the Finance Minister and Law Minister may participate. Do you want the meeting to be held today? Let us meet the day after tomorrow at 4.00 p.m.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : Tomorrow is a holiday.

MR. SPEAKER : The holidays have played havoc on him. If there were no holidays, there would have been no difficulty.

Now we pass on to the next business.

Re PROPOSED STRIKE BY GENERAL INSURANCE EMPLOYEES

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, I want your permission to make a submission.

MR. SPEAKER : Kindly give something in writing.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : This is about the proposed strike by the General Insurance Employees: they are going on strike from 8th April, 1974.

The General Insurance employees are agitated over the attitude of the Government who have not accepted the agreement reached between the All India General Insurance Employees' Association and the Corporation. You had allowed a question here, Sir, where the Finance Minister replied that negotiations were going on. I am told today that the negotiations have failed because of the rigid attitude of the Finance Ministry. The General Insurance Employees' Association have given a call and have also written a letter to the Finance Minister that, if no negotiated settlement is reached, they would be at liberty to go

on strike from the 8th April, 1974. This is purely a Central matter. The Finance Minister and the Deputy Minister are here. I am surprised that an agreement reached with the Corporation is not being accepted by the Finance Ministry. I would request you to ask the Finance Minister to make a statement on the 5th April, to avoid the impending strike. If the strike takes place, they will be solely responsible for that. On behalf of the Association, I request you, Sir, to ask the Finance Minister to make a statement. Otherwise, there will be an all India strike.

14.04 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE : PROCUREMENT AND PRICING POLICY OF WHEAT FOR 1974-75 SEASON

MR. SPEAKER : There is a motion by Shri B.V. Naik and Shri Madhu Limaye to raise a discussion on the statement made by the Minister of agriculture in the House on the 28th March, 1974, regarding the procurement and pricing policy of wheat for the 1974-75 season. The time allotted is five hours.

Shri B.V. Naik.

SHRI B.V. NAIK (Kanara) : The pricing policy for wheat and also the policy in regard to procurement which the Hon. Minister for Food and Agriculture has laid on the Table, after a considerable amount of experience which he has gained in the course of the last many years, while in brief it can be described as a sort of a realistic step may also be considered as a sort of a compromise with the realities that have been prevailing in this sub-continent.

And one of the hardest realities is the violence, the violent in the sub-continent which has erupted right from Gujarat to Maharashtra and many urban centres in the country.

14.06 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

While it is appreciable that many of the hon. Members of the Opposition will deal with this as a matter of triumph, justifiably so, because it is the triumph of the wholesaler in the country who for about 3000-5000 years has sucked the blood of the peasantry in this country, who has sucked the blood of the farmers in this country and to that extent, the extreme reactionary elements have a reason to bloat over their success to the extent that a compromise has been made. But, as in many other fields of natural progress, there will be periods in which a temporary retreat, a temporary going back on our proclaimed goals will only mean that we may be losing a few battles here and there but the victory in the ultimate war, the war on poverty, the war against exploitation in this country, will have to be achieved provided we bring into this operation an adequate amount of the political and the economic will which is the crying need of the hour today.

The most operative part of the policy document from the general to the specific is that it says that the trader will be brought back, he will be asked to procure anywhere from 5 to 6 million tonnes, he will be licensed, there will be stringent controls, there will be a watch over the movement of foodgrains and particularly in the surplus States, there will be a hike in the price that is to be paid to the farmer, there will also be a hike in the price or a revision in the price per quintal and it will be Rs. 125 and that the entire trade to be carried on by the trader, whether inside the State or in between the States, will be carried on under the direct supervision and control of the governmental machinery. In this behalf one of the handicaps has been that of the Ministry of Commerce which is dealing itself with this aspect of internal trade, is staffed with a skeleton staff. For the implementa-

tion of this Essential Commodities Act, modified as it is going to be, with stringent controls, greater penalties, greater fines, if it is staffed by such a skeletal staff, it may be difficult for New Delhi itself to administer this entire new programme. Either re-inforcement of the staff at the Centre or with the States, in the form of cells, to work as watchdogs of the Central Government, of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and of Commerce,—should be created in each one of the State Capitals, if not further down the line. This is my respectful submission. In respect of entire foodgrains, as per the rule of the thumb, we may produce near about 100 million tonnes each year. You may put it this way or that way. In this year we had expected 124 million tonnes which hope may not be completely fulfilled. But the reality of the situation is this. This country inevitably and always has been a net importer of foodgrains except for one year, that is 1971-72 when we procured 5.1 million tonnes and we distributed 5.109 million tonnes. In 1967-68 our production was 11 million tonnes and our procurement was 0.8 million tonnes. What we distributed during the year was 6.9 million tonnes or say, 7 million tonnes. I will not bother you with all the details, till the year 1973-74, when our procurement has been 4.5 millions and distribution 5.4 millions of tonnes. In other words it only means this, that we have been always a net importer of foodgrains and these foodgrains have been channelled through our public distribution system. By foodgrain here I mean wheat.

Only a couple of years back we were in a position to distribute something which we had procured ourselves and the principle commodity being wheat, the rest of the commodities being not strictly under control, we can take it, what is good enough for wheat is good enough for the rest of the grains in this country. So, now the question is: What does that bring us to? We

[Shri B.V. Naik]

started more than a year ago with total monopoly procurement and take over of the trade of wheat. We thought of going over to rice. But at the appropriate time when the rice crop was to come we were not able to find either our procurement machinery or the machinery for distribution and naturally we had to give it a go-by. Thereafter now we have been in a position to commission the trader once again. In this sub-continent we are faced always with the question of import versus internal production. In 1972, September, if I remember aright, our hon. Minister of State for Agriculture, Shri Annasaheb Shinde, a knowledgeable person, was very optimistic about our internal production.

He had gone on to say on the floor of this House that the Government does not think it fit to import any foodgrains this year. But, unfortunately, either climate, drought or other conditions compelled us to go in for it. We should really thank our northern neighbour, the U.S.S.R., for having given, without our asking for it, about 2 million tonnes of foodgrains.

While we do appreciate and while we would not like to label any section of the Indian society as anti-national or reactionary, if we have to take up the responsibility of feeding the millions in this country, I would like, more than on ideological considerations, technological considerations should weigh with our Ministry of Agriculture for import of food. The world's stock of foodgrains is limited, its location is also limited. We should be in a position to see which one of the enemy's we should choose to face. We have been dealing with the exploitative section, of which you are familiar with, for the last twenty-five years. Without parochial and patriotic sentiments, I would only say that we should meet this from whichever source it may come from. As regards the ventures of the Government's

taking over of stocks of the entire foodgrains, I would say that they will also have to see to it that this second line of defence or the third line of defence, is adequately guarded. In case, when the time comes, we should see that we are in a position to depend upon our own sources of supply wherever they may be or whoever it may be and from all over the world. Why I say is this. Optimistically the Ministry of Agriculture in Krishi Bhavan has good grounds to cover in taking the decision but, what about the support of the traders who have a long three thousand years' history of their own in this country? What do you think about the bankers, the indigenous money-lenders and absentee landlords which are essential things for the success of the wheat trade takeover. As I have said before, if Marx were to re-examine the conditions in India today, he would not have been biased in favour of urban socialism which has been the preference of most of the people in this country. He would have been a rural socialist. Therefore, I would say that we should not place all our eggs in one basket. Six million tonnes is the procurement from the internal traders in this country. My question is: suppose this pious hope does not materialise. What is the second line of defence? What is the alternative contingent plan?

Let us know the contingencies to which we look forward to without any inhibitions in that line. The entire question, when the hon. Minister was present, came up for discussion as early as on 8th October 1972 at the Gandhinagar Session of the A.I.C.C. What many of us in the past said privately and on the political platform we stand by it. This is only a stop-gap arrangement. We stand by it. What will be the possible challenge to the foodgrains distribution in this country? Though the figures may look rather higher, we may have to remember one thing that we have not less than 17 or

18 State Governments—the entire State's apparatus is at our disposal.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There are 21 and not 17 or 18 States.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : I am subject to correction. I remember it now. And I shall commit it to my memory.

In the circumstances, by the rule of thumb, this country need not reach the goals of nationalisation of the well-organised oligopolistic sector in our country, the big business houses, big firms, the oil cartels and others. The first charge of socialism of any brand of Indian socialism in this country will be to regulate, organise and socially control the competitive non-oligopolistic sector in this country. This is represented by these foodgrains traders, the small producers in respect of the essential commodities for the people in this country. That should account for abundant work and programming at least for the next many years. The principle charge on the socialist programmes in this country is this. What does that mean ? Statistical lies could be the worst lies that we can invent. There can be quotations of statistics, but many of our farm statistics are far from exact and far from real. There are about 56 crores of people in this country. Taking the urban non-farm-producing and non-growing population and the rural poor, approximately it will be a challenging task for the Food Ministry here as well as in the State Governments to feed about 25 to 28 crores of people. To feed them either under a monopoly system of procurement or to see to it that their bare necessities are met would mean a gigantic task. But when it is broken up, I repeat again what I said on the 8th October, 1972 at Gandhinagar, for brushing up our memory, a hundred thousand distribution points capable of distributing about 5 crore tonnes of foodgrains besides the other essen-

tial commodities; when it is broken up into a micro-economic scene, it will come to about 500 tonnes of foodgrains per year per distribution point or per outlet point; 500 tonnes per year with a working period of 250 days would come to approximately 20 tonnes per distribution point; 20 tonnes is hardly 200 quintals. After 26 or 27 years of administrative experience in free India, do we not have the expertise, the skill, the ability as well as the will to create such points all over the country to serve a population of about 5,000 people, 5000 people per point and 100,000 points would mean 50-60 crores of people. Can we not find out such a system of distribution points each of which in the course of a day's working for 8 to 10 hours is capable of distributing not more than 20 tonnes per day or 200 quintals per day ? I think that with the unemployment problem in our country, with the unemployed graduates in our country who are going abegging for jobs, their number being not lakhs but nearly in millions, it is possible for us with the available expertise, without any import, without any import of any technology or without even any import of ideology to be in a position to fashion out such a distribution system and this distribution system shall work as the bulwark of the Indian socialist society that we are going to build.

Time and again, as was stated by one of our friends, the right of the right and the left of the left, the urban socialists and the right reactionaries have been very much satisfied thinking that this is the ultimate thing, and that step No. 2 would come to a reversal of the entire State trading in foodgrains. I do not think that we would be reversing but this is only a technical concession.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Tactical concession.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : I am glad that I am corrected. I have the humility to accept it and say that it is a tactical concession.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Would he say strategic retreat ?

SHRI B. V. NAIK : It has been my good fortune to say that we should be in a position when the time comes to call a spade a spade.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : It is one step forward and two steps backward.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : That was Lenin in the reverse.

As regards the rate of Rs. 105 that has been given to the farmer in this country, time and again it has been our endeavour to find out the ultimate economic basis of the pricing of wheat or of rice or of the levy rates that we are imposing on rice or other commodities like sorghum.

What is the basis ? We have always been told that it is a remunerative price to the grower and a reasonable price to the consumers. We can indulge with the cleverness at our command and at the command of Krishi Bhavan in this tautological exercise, playing with the words. What is a reasonable price to the consumer ? One rupee, Rs. 1 50, Rs. 2 per kilo ? There is no such basis as what we call a reasonable reason. Similarly, remunerative price—what is remunerative ? The basic thing with which the Indian farmer or the farmer anywhere or any producer anywhere in this wide world will be satisfied will be when he is told that out of a rupee which the consumer pays for his produce, as much as possible, 80, 85, 90 per cent will go to him, to the man who sweats, labours and produces that particular commodity. Any realistic basis for fixation of the price has to rest on this basic principle. We are not going to debate on the overhead costs of the FCI

or the various agencies procuring, storing, warehousing, distributing and take it and transporting it to the consumer. We are only concerned with this that the Government should come out after a detailed study as to what portion of the consumer rupee will go to the farmer. Any producer, whether he be a producer of food or fish or for that matter any produce, will be interested in the maximisation of his net return on his production enterprise. This is an elementary economic precept based on the marginalistic school, not based on the theory of value, nor based at all on Marxism or neo-Marxism. Unless and until we accept it, no price would be good enough to the farmer.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : No reference should be made to Marx, because he is not here to defend himself.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is winding up; let him.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : There are a few mini-Marxs here who will defend him.

By and large, it is now fashionable to see to it that whenever a particular line of action is taken on the basis of free thought, that a person is labelled either as a radical, ultra-radical, neo-socialist, quasi-socialist, crypto-communist, communist, kulak-lobbyist or coca-cola lobbyist and so on.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : You have said it.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : On the basis of free thought, the Government, by and large, leaving a few stray instances in this country, has received a fair treatment from the farmers of this country. Many of them, particularly, the middle and small farmers, the working farmers—I am not going to say about the absentee landlords—

have dutifully paid their levy and have dutifully carried out the work assigned to them. But unfortunately today, we see that the agricultural, productive population has been relegated to the role of a Cinderella. I hope that this country, the ruling party as well as this House which is part of the whole political system in this country, the whole political class in this country, which is being questioned, will appreciate where the roots of Indian democracy are and which are the roots of Indian democracy which need to be strengthened. I am quite sure that detailed thought will be given to this entire question of pricing, procurement, distribution and outlet points. First and foremost, let us not commit the same mistake which we did. I was one who advocated taking over this trade in very very non dubious terms.

I had stated it even in the party meeting. Let us not commit a mistake in the Krishi Bhavan once again of putting the plough before the bullocks. Let us have a sense of priority and fashion a perfect fool proof, distributive apparatus consisting of a 100,000 outlet points in this country and see to it, if not today, at least tomorrow, we will make a success of this wholesale trade in foodgrains.

SHRI INDRAJIT GURJIA (Ahmednagar)
What will they distribute through those outlets?

SHRI B. V. NAIK: This is an old story. If you will permit me, I would like to say that this point had also been made by Mr. Subramaniam—'What do we distribute?' The first question which I would like to pose is, have the existing outlet points or has the existing distribution machinery distributed even what it had procured properly? No. Therefore, I am saying, have a perfect distributive system, and then if you have a channel, you will know how to find water to flow through it.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (Palghat)
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the food situation that we find today I think, is not due to natural calamities or global calamities but basically it is the result of the policies being pursued by this Government. Only two years back, the Government declared in this House that we have become self-sufficient in food and we have stopped all imports. Last year, it declared that in order to keep the public distribution system running, it has decided to take over the wholesale trade in foodgrains. This promise was made last year but suddenly on the 28th March the Minister of Agriculture made a statement in this House that the Government have decided to give up the policy of State trading in foodgrains. He stated that despite the good kharif crop the psychology of shortage prevailing in the country has unfortunately encouraged to allow the wholesale dealers in both the sectors public and the private—to be given the authority of wholesale trading. He further stated that it has been decided to allow the wholesale dealers to operate under a system of licensing and control. According to his statement in the surplus States like Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan etc. 50 per cent levy will be imposed on foodgrains. The traders will have to give it to the Government at a fixed price and the traders will be allowed to sell the remaining 50 per cent within the State and outside at a price which they like. That is the most important thing. They will be allowed to trade inside and outside the State—inside the State anyway—at a price at which they like to sell.

The Minister also announced that there will be an increase in the purchase price of wheat in the 1974-75 marketing season, to Rs. 105, and the Central issue price of wheat would be Rs. 125 per quintal as against Rs. 93 prevalent at present. This policy, I say, is nothing but a surrender.

before the landlords and the traders and the profiteers both in respect of procurement and prices.

This policy is further going to increase the price of wheat by more than 35 per cent even in the public distribution system, leading to a further reduction in the salaries of employees as well as wage-earners. This will have a disastrous effect on the rural areas where the agricultural labourers and other poor people will be left to the mercy of the landlords and the traders.

One month back, discussing the price policy on foodgrains, the *Economic Survey* stated that it will inevitably reduce the effectiveness of the system of public distribution in protecting the vulnerable sections of society whose paying capacity is bound to be severely limited. Pushing the procurement price too high will certainly affect the vulnerable sections of society. This was what was said in the *Economic Survey* which was presented to the House a month back.

What is the result of this new policy? As far as vulnerable sections are concerned, the prices will go up. They will not be able to get it. There will be scarcity. And the vulnerable sections of the society whom the Government want to protect are not protected. It is only the traders and profiteers who are protected at the cost of vulnerable sections.

There are two aspects to the question : production is one; making available the surplus is the other. In both these fronts Government has miserably failed. We have said in this House times without number that the energies of the poor peasants and agricultural labour should be mobilised and for that purpose land reforms must be implemented; only then production will increase. Unless the energies of landless peasants and tillers of the soil

are mobilised production will not increase. I have no time to give details but I know that in many States land reforms had not been implemented. Even where they are supposed to be implemented, the land above the ceiling had not gone to landless tillers. If they have a little land, they would use all their energy so that they may produce more to the benefit of both the country and themselves.

When Government speaks about the technical aspects of agricultural development, there are two aspects involved : irrigation and fertilisers. After 27 years of Independence the total irrigated area in our country is 22 per cent of the cultivated area, which includes all categories. If there is oil shortage, power shortage, etc. it affects production. The national average per hectare yield of wheat is 83 per cent of world average and it is less than fifty per cent of the yield in Europe. As for power, yesterday, we heard an answer to a question by which we were told that there was no hope of increasing power supply to the cultivators. We were also told that it was impossible to import more fertilisers due to the difficult foreign exchange position. With no power and no fertiliser, how are we going to increase production? With regard to irrigation, yesterday we were told that many irrigation projects which will provide irrigation to vast areas are half-complete. In some case work has not even begun. Take Rajasthan Canal for example. If completed it will bring more water and irrigation facilities and more can be produced. In the matter of implementation of land reforms mobilising the energy of the tillers and the landless labourers or production of fertilisers or provision of irrigation facilities or supply of power, there is no hope of increased supply, I only want to say that by its new policy, Government has refused even to procure the marketable surplus, out of the

present production. But, on the contrary, Government is asking the people to reduce consumption which is already very low and they do not bother to arrange supply of foodgrains even to the 40% of the population, which the Government calls low income groups, and in regard to whom, Government say that their living standards should be raised. The Government plan is to maintain the present distribution system and that also with the reduced supply. This covers 16 million of the population where statutory rationing has been introduced and another 39 million where only informal rationing is said to be there. But, due to scarcity, rations, are not available. In many places, this is the position.

The next thing that I would like to point out is this. Government talks of fighting the reactionary forces. But when it comes to actual practice, it is the Government which comes in defence of the vested interests. Why is it that the Government has given up the policy of procurement? Are these hoarders and traders not reactionary forces? In the name of fighting violence, in the name of law and order, we see what had happened in Gujarat, Bihar and other places. Is it not a violent act, that those lakhs and lakhs of people who produce wheat and rice are deprived of what they have and this is stored by a handful of people who do not sometimes give what they have and even when they give, they take more price? Is it not a violent act, when people are starved and killed? What they have produced with their own sweat and labour is not given to them, and as a punishment, they are asked to starve and die. We have seen how people were shot and killed. Sir, late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said that black-marketeers should be hanged. I do not say they must be hanged, because they will not be hanged. Why is it that the Government is not forcing the landlords to sell their surplus grain, and if they do not,

why does not the Government use their machinery to see that surplus stocks are taken?

Sir, Government is talking of cooperation, I would like to say, people are ready to cooperate and they are ready to show the places where stocks are hoarded. I may give an example. When people show the places where stocks are hoarded and when they sometimes take the hoarded stocks and distribute them to the people, at the price fixed by the Government, they are arrested and punished. Neither the Government is able to take over the stocks nor they seek the cooperation of the people. As a result of this policy, the Government is openly legalising profiteering and black-marketing. By its new policy, Government is giving a honourable place to the hoarders and profiteers, pleasing those people and making the common people starve.

Sir, so far as the present food policy is concerned, the poorer sections will be hard hit. The common peasant will be forced to sell his stocks at the minimum price. The small farmers who have something, will have to sell them or else they will not be able to purchase other commodities. They will be forced to sell their stocks at the minimum price. The stocks will be hoarded by the big traders. You say that traders will give 50% to the Government and the remaining 50% will be sold by them outside. Who will decide this 50%? Instead of 50%, 5 or 10% will be given and the rest will be sold in the black-market. What is the reality? You say prices are controlled. But, when a poor man goes to the bazar and says 'give me commodities at controlled prices', the shop-keeper says 'who controlled it? It is the Government; go to the Government shop and get it'. This is the answer. Whenever there is control, two things happen. One, things are not available in the market. Unless you get something for distribution, control

of things will never be a reality. So, as far as the Government is concerned, there is no reason why this policy should be reversed unless they want to help the traders and profiteers. No action is taken against the hoarders. There is no machinery for dehoarding and helping the poorer sections of people in this country. So far as the present food policy is concerned, the poorer sections will be hard hit. The poor peasants will be worst hit. For the consumers, there will be a rise of more than 35% in the price of wheat, which will consequently lead to wage cuts, rise in price index and inflationary pressure. The people living in the countryside will not get wheat at less than Rs 200. You have already secretly assured the traders to sell at Rs. 150 per quintal. That means they will sell it at a price still higher. After parting with 50% of their purchases, they are not going to oblige the Government or the public. They are not going to fulfil this obligation of giving 50% for Government quota.

As the mover said, the present policy had been welcomed by the monopolists, landlords and profiteers. It had been opposed by all the left and democratic parties in the country. If paper reports are correct, we understand that the Congress General Secretary, Shri Chandrajit Yadav, also has opposed this. All sections of people have opposed this policy. Only the traders, profiteers and monopolists are very glad. What will be the result? There is no use of complaining that violence, Gujarat and Bihar are being repeated. A hungry man is an angry man. Due to this policy, if they do not get wheat or rice, if what is in the bazar is out of their reach, there will be a revolt in this country. Shortages are going to come because you have left everything—purchase and distribution—in the hands of the traders and monopolists. Whatever you may say about law and order, people

will go and forcibly take away whatever is available. There will be disorder and chaos.

My request to the Government is this : Please think about the reversal of this policy. Take firm dehoarding steps. Take a compulsory levy from those who have more than 10 acres of land. If they do not give, take the help of the people through the panchayati and other organisations. See that the Government tries to avert the disaster which is in store not only for the Government but the country as a whole. If the Government thinks of realities, I think they will reverse this policy. They are now thinking that they will get enough wheat, but the reality is that the leniency shown to the traders and monopolists has not yielded anything but disaster. Please think over it again and change the Policy.

SHRI B R BHAGAT (Shahabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir the policy on food procurement announced by the Minister of Agriculture last week, has naturally aroused sharp reactions of various kinds. Even in our own party the reactions are mixed, because it is a very vital matter. In a country like ours food constitutes a large portion of the budget for a large number of people and in fact the production and distribution of food constitute the sheet anchor of our economic policy.

Last year when an important institutional and social change was adopted by the take-over of the wholesale trade in wheat controlling not only the commanding heights but the entire sector, it was a very big step forward and it was a progressive measure that the Government had undertaken. The fact that this year the Government had to modify some of the provisions of this basic policy has naturally caused surprise to some, shock to others and delight to certain sections of the people.

It is a fact that the policy adopted last year was defeated by a combination of the exploitative sections and the wholesalers who were debarred from the region of economic operation, as also a small section of the affluent farmers. This year we noticed the phenomenon of higher and higher production and lower and lower market availability with the result that a serious crisis developed in the management of the food economy.

The take-over of wholesale trade in foodgrains was a policy adopted by our party first in Ahmedabad and then in the open session in Bhdhannagar. This year we had the expectation of a bumper crop in wheat and the Food Ministry expected the production to go upto 30 to 35 million tonnes. So, it was thought that the production being quite good, this is an year in which they would be eliminating the risks of non-cooperation by farmers and sabotage by vested interests, and that they would be able to procure a sizeable quantity for public distribution. So, a target of 81 million was fixed for procurement.

But, in the intervening period the picture changed completely. In most of the States which expected a higher yield, because of the early setting in of the summer, hot winds and shrivelling of the crop, it was realised that the wheat production is not going to be of that order. So, instead of a climate of surplus production, easy availability and realisation of the target, they found a climate of shortages developing, and this climate of shortages was being exploited by vested interests. Some of the opposition parties were also opposed to this move. They went and asked the farmers not to sell wheat to the Government. At the same time, they went to the consumers and told them that they were not getting wheat because of the defect of the public distribution system. So we witnessed opposition not only from the

vested interests but also political parties which exhibited a high degree of irresponsibility, if not dishonesty. They exploited the climate of food shortages for their political ends. And in a system of parliamentary democracy, with all the compulsions of elections and vote-getting, it was difficult to operate the wholesale trade in foodgrains in that context. Perhaps this was the compelling reason for introducing this modification. I will plead with my leftist friends not to describe this as a retreat or shameful surrender or withdrawal.

SHRI INDRA JIT GUPTA. A pragmatic surrender.

SHRI B R BHAGAT. Unless you change the political system, you cannot have the same system of procurement as you had last year. The wholesale trade in foodgrains is an instrument, a progressive instrument, a socialist instrument, an important instrument. I agree, because it involves a large operation. Ultimately, we have to go in for it in the coming years when the whole climate changes. I entirely agree with my hon. friend, Shri A. K. Gopalan. The basic thing is that our food production is not rising because of the technological factors, because of lack of technological research and lack of inputs, non-availability of fertilisers. Unless there is reinforcement, the same seed produces less and less, the productivity goes down. The social factors are also there. Land reforms have not been introduced; there are marginal farmers and small farmers. So, this climate should change. There should be a breakthrough in agricultural production. If we had produced as we had planned, namely, 129 million tonnes of foodgrains our wholesale trade in foodgrains would have been a grand success, even if we had purchased 114 million tonnes as we expect this year, it would have been

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]
a reasonable success. But the point is that we are operating in a climate of shortages. In a situation like this, we faced the U.P. elections. We know what our friends were saying. Our leftist friends said that we were not attacking the hoarders. I shall come to that point later on.

Now we have brought back the wholesalers whose role last year was not very happy, who tried to defeat it. We have put our trust in them. Some may say that it is a bold step, it is a courageous step. But I would say that it can be a risky step also because this year the picture is going to be even more difficult than last year. We may have about four million tonnes of rice as a result of procurement; the last year's backlog and import from Soviet Union may give us 3 million tonnes. That would come to 7 million tonnes. There seems to be some understanding; the other day the wholesale traders' association denied it; but it seems to me that there is an understanding that they will give 5 million tonnes. Then we will be having barely 12 million tonnes. We must have a little comfortable position. 12 million tonnes will be required to maintain in the distribution system. And what are the elements of new policy? I agree that the elements of the new policy are the same as those of the old one. The elements of the new policy are to increase market availability, secondly, to give a higher price to the producer so that the market availability is more and there is more incentive to produce. The idea is that there may be higher procurement so that the public distribution system is maintained and finally, the higher price is given to the producer so that the procurement is there and hoarding and black-marketing is minimised, if not altogether eliminated. Exactly, these were the elements of the policy that we introduced. The change we have made is that we are trying

to take the help of the wholesaler. That is the only change. Therefore, I would say that we are operating the policy with a changed instrument. It may be it is a compulsion of the political system because when we go in the country, what was the situation that we faced? If food is not distributed somewhere, the entire Government is to be blamed. And there are political parties which resorted to violence and said that the Government was not distributing food. We took the entire responsibility in the wholesale trade take-over. We took the entire responsibility of meeting the people's requirements whether there were fair price shops or not and whether there was a public distribution agency system or not. Therefore this rationalisation now made will insulate us politically when we say that we will make the wholesaler who is skilled in the trade to operate, we will supervise them, then there will be people's supervision by people's committees and others so that the government may not come directly in confrontation with the people. Therefore, with all this flexibility, I believe in the Government's contention that there is no change in the basic policy. If at all there is any change, as I said, it is only a tactical change and I believe they will go back to the old policy and that they will be able to refashion a system, an administrative system when they are able to create the social and economic committees in the rural areas and in the urban areas so that they get the co-operation of the people and the efforts to defeat this policy by the hoarders and others are eliminated and thirdly, when they are able to have a workable system, the co-operation of the former in it will be at the maximum level.
15 hrs.

The point is: I must say that the Government has taken a big risk because the crux of the whole policy is that they must procure at least five million tonnes, if not more. They are aware of this and,

therefore, in this policy they are not depending merely on the wholesaler. It is a good thing that they have simultaneously brought into operation the public agency system, the Food Corporation and the co-operative sector which will also procure directly from the farmers. In this respect there has been a very welcome declaration by the Punjab Government which is the biggest surplus State. They say that they are prepared to purchase and procure it directly as they were doing last year. Last year, I believe, they have been given Rs. 85-90. I think the two States of Haryana and Punjab would have been able to procure—at least that was their claim at that time—about 10 million tonnes. The Punjab Government is willing to procure foodgrains and I do not know why the Punjab Government is not being allowed. In that State they have introduced a public agency. Let them have the dominance and the commanding heights. We have introduced a mixed economy. In this system, let the public agency have the commanding heights so that if we at any time realise that the wholesalers have not come out with the wheat they have kept somewhere with the hoarders and others, despite the fact that they have drawn a big scheme of supervision and control and they have taken more powers under the Essential Commodities Act for recourse to greater penalties and punishments like rigorous imprisonment and various other things—these are only negative powers and what I say is an entirely positive step—to eliminate altogether the risk, if at that time this wholesaler system is not working the other operation must be able to come up, because we must have at least 5 million tonnes of wheat. Otherwise we will be in very serious difficulties and we will not be able to maintain the price system.

Finally, one more point we have to take care of. In what way not only we have to keep our public agencies and the adminis-

trative system and the State agencies to be streamlined so as to be more efficient, in what way people's co-operation is to be involved—these are matters to be immediately attended to. One of the reasons for the failure last year was that we were not able to involve the people. This policy says that people's co-operation will be sought and people's committees will supervise. The Government should come forward as to in what effective manner they should take the co-operation of all progressive parties, the farmers, the house wives and youth and others. They should see in what effective manner they could man these committees, in what effective way they could superintendent and control the entire operation, so that we will be able to make a success of it. Despite the higher price given to the grower, despite the issue price being raised from Rs. 91 to 125, what has happened with regard to the subsidy is this and I think it is all right if we are able to take care of the subsidy. The Finance Minister provided for Rs. 100 crores. Our fear was that the subsidy may go up, thereby making a big deficit, which will lead to more spiral of inflation. This is most inequitous and every student of economics knows that inflation hits weaker sections more. So, even though price to the consumer will be raised, the fact that deficit financing to the extent, will be curtailed is a good step. An important point here is this. Because the whole thing is operating in a spiral of inflation, whatever steps are taken to curtail inflation are good steps in the right direction.

Regarding vulnerability, I wish to submit that the public distribution system should not be shrunk. Even if we have to import a couple of million tonnes, you can increase your availability, but for God's sake, don't shrink our distribution system. There are vulnerable section in the urban areas, rural area, industrial workers, etc. There are large deficit States for instance like Maharashtra,

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

Bihar and others. The people are poorer; you should not leave them to mercy of the wholesalers and higher price; they just can not afford it. The vulnerable section of society in the rural as well as the urban sections and industrial workers must be protected. This is my respectful submission. Thank you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I really feel as though this debate resembles the operation of locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. I don't see the practical utility of the *post-mortem*. It would have been better if the Government had a little more good sense, before they proceeded with such a radical change, to have consultation with the other parties in this House. They do not bother about these things nowadays.

Now, Sir, the take-over of wholesale trade, when it was first announced last year, was doomed from the very outset, from the very beginning, because it rested on the proposition of the Government that this wholesale takeover was going to operate not on the basis of the marketable surplus but only on the basis of the marketed surplus. From the very beginning they made it quite clear to the wholesaler and the big producers and everybody that only on those amounts of grain which you are condescending to bring to the market—only on that—the Government will operate its procurement policy. To that portion of it which is not produced in the mandis and in the market and is concealed and hoarded, we will turn a blind eye. From the very beginning this was there, I don't know whether it can be called a loophole because this is a fundamental pre-condition for any successful takeover. This pre-condition was given up from the very beginning and this betrays a total lack of serious will on the part of the Government to carry this out.

In 1972, the ruling party adopted this policy at its Gandhinagar session putting

it forward as one of the basic planks of the economic policies and planning.

In 1973, they said that they were going to implement it. But, in 1974, they have given it up. This is the road which has been traversed from 1972 to 1974. Particularly, I charge this Government with surrendering to a combined pincer pressures from the two sides—one of the pincers operates abroad. The World Bank, in its famous report, which was conveniently leaked out by somebody— we do not know, was the subject-matter of the discussion in this House a few days ago. In this notorious Report, the World Bank claims to give advice to India. And one of the factors was that India should be prepared to import anything from two to four million tonnes of foodgrains in 1974-75. This was their advice, wherefrom is it to be imported? What is the location of the source? How it will be obtained and on what terms and conditions and at what price? That we do not know. And the World Bank did not bother about these little details. Their advice to the Government of India is this. If you want to control the food front, you must be prepared to import two to four million tonnes of foodgrains which is another way of saying 'don't rely on internal procurement but you look up for imports from abroad'. I find that only a week ago, our Commerce Minister, Prof. D.P. Chattopadhyaya who was sent to Colombo to attend the session of the ECAFE— Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East—has been reported as urging in that meeting for the building up of regional and international buffer stocks of food to help stabilise the prices. He suggested that ECAFE should enlist the assistance of the World Bank finance this sector. There is a method in all these matters. On behalf of Government of India our representative said to the ECAFE countries at Colombo which echoes in a different way the same thing 'Yes, stocks should be built

up; in order to do that, do not rely on the internal procurement but go to the World Bank also'. So, this is one pressure that worked. The other pressure is the internal pressure. The All India Foodgrains Dealers Association—Federation of all India Foodgrains Dealers—a year ago, I remember, were demonstrating in the streets of Delhi here when it was announced that the wholesale trade of wheat is to be taken over by Government. They demonstrated in the streets of Delhi against it with black flags and all that. They did it a few days before the Communist Party brought a few lakhs of people here to support this. And a few days before that, they portently came in luxurious cars and descended from their vehicles and marched in the sun for a few hours, threatening the Government that if they take over the wholesale trade, they will declare a permanent strike in all the mandis. Now, Sir, I find on the 29th of this month—a few days ago—a press report has appeared in which the Federation of All-India Foodgrains Traders' Association threw a suggestion to Government. Firstly they said that they cannot give any guarantee for any firm quantity of foodgrains deliveries to Government. This fifty per cent of the grains or whatever they buy, will be handed over to the Government under the scheme. But, before the ink is dried on the paper, the Federation of Foodgrains Dealers had made it clear that even this guaranteed supply of five or six million tonnes of grains they are not in a position to guarantee.

They have made it quite clear

"These estimates are based on crop expectations. The crop situation may change because of unforeseen factors. How are we expected to make good the difference or what penalties or compensation can be given or fixed."

So, they are making it quite clear that they are in no position to guarantee even

this 5 to 6 million tonnes of foodgrains on which Government are depending

Secondly, they have said something which Government are faithfully echoing now, namely that the public distribution system should be reduced in its scope of activities and in the extent of its activities. It is their suggestion that only what are called the vulnerable sections should be covered by the public distribution system and secondly that too should be only in the deficit States, otherwise it should be scrapped, that is, they want to keep a skeleton of the public distribution system only in the deficit States and take care only of what is yet to be defined as the vulnerable sections as the Government says. In other words, the open market has to become the major field of operations to which the people are being told to take recourse. Thirdly, the foodgrains dealers' association have estimated a price of Rs 150 per quintal in the wholesale markets on the expectation that the prices in the mandis will be around Rs 110 to 115. This is what has appeared in the press as part of their statement.

The hon. Minister Shri F. A. Ahmed said here the other day that they would be allowed to sell in the free market or in the open market within the prescribed ceiling. In the statement made here on the floor of the House, that ceiling has not been mentioned. Later on, we were told that it would be Rs 125. So, they can buy at Rs 105 and sell, according to the Government, up to Rs 125 in the open market. But the foodgrains dealers' association says in its statement that they expect that it will be up to Rs 150, which means Rs. 150 per quintal or Rs 1.50 per kg. So, they have also demanded withdrawal of all levies on traders. They have suggested that there should be no levy on traders and the increase which was made in the sales tax last year should be withdrawn. So they

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

have got a very conscious programme all along the line. So, it is my suggestion that they have done this under pressure from the World Bank from abroad, because they have in mind the question of giving up procurement at home and, therefore, having to resort to imports from abroad, and secondly under the pressure of these wholesalers who, Mr. Bhagat has just now said, are going to be enlisted as our new instruments for feeding the people, that is, the people who are the biggest hoarders and speculators; these people have mounted their pressure at home, as I have shown by spelling out the components of their programme. This is the result now. It is not surprising that a paper like *The Statesman* has commented as it has done. I went through all the papers to see whether they could not be accused of being communist newspapers or leftist newspapers because there was a lot of talk going on that only leftists and communists were opposing this decision of the Government. Of course, at one extreme is *The Statesman*. Of course, I am not surprised at the headline which *The Statesman* has given namely 'A sensibler retreat'. Some are calling it pragmatic retreat; others are calling it tactical retreat, panicky retreat, a retreat in disarray and so on. These are the various headings which have been given, and I have no time to read them all out. But one big exception is *The Statesman* which says 'A sensible retreat', and it is hailed by all the trading circles and hailed by all the rich farmers in the countryside and not the poorer and small farmers. Of course, *The Statesman* for once has said:

"The credit for this must go to the Prime Minister. It is a sobering thought that had she taken as much interest in the original decision as she seems to have done in reversing it, the country could have been saved this painful and costly experiment."

1520

Even *The Statesman* is not able to deny the fact that we are in for a fresh spurt of inflation as a result of the sharp rise which will take place in the consumer price of wheat and other foodgrains. Even they are alarmed. They say—if I may quote again:—

"The elimination of the wheat subsidy will not make a significant difference to the size of the Centre's budgetary deficit"—

in spite of what Shri Bhagat said just now —

"Because the gain on the subsidy will be more than offset by the loss on account of higher dearness allowance payments".

Because the cost of living index will automatically reflect the rise in the issue price.

"Further, since the take over of the wholesale trade was abandoned"—

They say abandoned not just modified . .

SHRI A. K. M. ISHAQUE (Basirhat) : That is what *The Statesman* says.

SHRI INDERJIT GUPTA : I am coming to the pro-Congress papers afterwards.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE) : There has been an official pronouncement, on the floor of the House. What is the necessity to refer to what interpretation outside agencies put on it?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : They represent certain well-defined interests. We know who they represent in this.

SHRI A. K. M. ISHAQUE : Does *The Statesman* deserve so much attention ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : My question is—you can reply to it at the end—whether

the saving on the subsidy on the one hand will or will not increase the cost of living index? If it will, whether your employees will not demand more DA? If they do, Shri Chavan will have to find the money to pay them the DA? If so, will not recourse be had to inflation or not?

Some people are asking; why are you quoting *The Statesman*? May I quote from one or two papers which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called anti-Congress or Opposition papers? They are all Congress papers. Take the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*.

SHRI K. P UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Why not quote *March of the Nation*?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: His views are too well-known.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): My views are too well-known. I do not hide them.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: "The Union Food Minister seems to think that a psychology of shortage resulting in hoarding at all levels is responsible for the present crisis. If this is a fact, is it not the Government's duty to convince the people that there is no shortage?"

If ration-card holders get 'due slips' instead of rice and wheat and sugar, who is responsible for creating a psychology of shortage? Now a days in Calcutta, instead of rations you are given 'due slips' with this written on it 'Come again after a few days. Just now there is no grain; but it is to your credit.' Who has created the psychology of shortage? I do not understand this modern economic theory that when there is a bumper crop and easy availability of grains, then only Government must go for procurement and distri-

bution and when there is a shortage and fluctuations take place—there is shortage from time to time—then we must give up this policy. This is turning it upside down and making it stand on its head. The whole idea of procurement and an effective distribution system is precisely because shortages occur from time to time and you do not want people to be thrown at the mercy of the free market and the hoarders. If there is a bumper crop and there is plenty of foodgrains going round, you would require it less. But I do not follow this idea that because there is shortage and the psychology of shortage, therefore, we must give up this.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Why less?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Then *The National Herald*: I do not think it is an anti-Congress paper. What does it write?

"Firmness on the part of policy makers and greater efficiency on the part of officials would have produced better results. The enthusiasm of Congressmen and Ministers shown at the time of the takeover soon waned. Most Chief Ministers did not want to assume additional responsibility. Officials turned out to be either corrupt or inefficient. The mighty FCI was not equal to its task. Even some Congressmen found it advantageous to have secret links with traders and farmers. It is a sad thought that a good policy has failed on account of the incompetence of the administrative machinery and the insincerity of some Congress leaders".

The Hindustan Standard writes editorially:

"It is a panicky withdrawal in confusion under heavy pressure from the rural rich and the resourceful merchants".

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

It speaks of a powerful support received from the strong farm lobby in the ruling party. "The Government has made a total surrender to the agricultural vested interests, less because of the strength of the assault from outside than because of the efficacy of subversion from within." So, this is a cross-section, certainly, of opinion in the country.

So, I would like to ask, what is the machinery going to be for "controlling" the wholesale traders from, firstly, buying direct from the producers instead of buying from the mandis. Can you prevent it? Can you prevent the wholesale traders from going direct to the producer and buying where there is no check, no control? (Interruptions) I ask this question because they are supposed to give up 50 per cent to the Government. Now, if they are to buy at Rs. 105 and can sell up to Rs. 125 in the open market, and they themselves have said that it will be Rs. 150—then, they can pay more than Rs. 105 and still make profits. While the Government agency offer Rs. 105; what is there to prevent them from offering Rs. 110 and still making a huge profit in the free market? Where will the Government get its supplies from? How will it buy? What is the controlling machinery, I would like to know.

What is there to prevent them, as they themselves said, from charging more than Rs. 125 in the open market? Why have no procurement targets been fixed for the States. It means that the FCI is now being reduced to the status of a godown-keeper. The FCI's job in future will be the job of a godown-keeper, looking after some godowns, waiting for the wholesalers to condescend to come and deliver some grains to them which they will keep stored in the godowns.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Even that is dangerous.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It has no other functions as far as I can make out.

I only want to say in the end that the truth of the matter is—it is an unpalatable truth but nevertheless the truth—that defeat was inherent in the scheme from the very beginning because the will was lacking. The point is that the will was lacking from the beginning. There was half-heartedness, corruption and sabotage from inside which doomed this operation take-over.

After all, there is well-known economist who I think is respected by the Government also; he does a lot of work for the Government—Dr. K. N. Raj. Dr. Raj delivered a series of lectures early in March, before this latest decision of the Government was known, at the University of Bangalore on the subject of planning and prices in India. In that, he makes certain, points clear. If I may just quote :

"It is, however, not for lack of instruments in the technical sense that progress in the required direction is now so slow. It is basically due to the present balance of social and economic power in the countryside."

This is another way of saying what Mr. D. P. Dhar has said two days ago in Parliament. The trouble is that we have not been able to fashion a political instrument capable of carrying out these economic decisions and plans. This is another polite way of saying that the ruling party, the Congress party, has not got the will, the political will, to carry out such radical reforms. Dr. Raj says:

"This is why proposals for land reform have been practically shelved and one hears references to them only in muted tones. This is why even the moderate proposals of the Agricultural Prices Commission are either not accepted or are

so distorted in the process of implementation as to serve totally different purposes. This is also why the proposal for a mildly progressive Agricultural Holdings Tax has been in effect ditched "

It is the same thing all along the line. It is not an isolated factor. It is this powerful socio-economic force which is operating, not allowing taxation on agricultural holdings, not allowing the wholesale take-over to be implemented, and it is this factor which has brought about this catastrophe.

I will end with the dismal note with which Dr. K. N. Raj also has ended.

"Such equivocation and evasion of responsibility at almost to all levels, and ambivalence on vital issues, offer no hope of a reasonably smooth transition to a more civilised economic and social system. In fact, it is becoming increasingly clear that it is little use economists and others spending time trying to work out more 'concrete' and more 'practical' proposals because the solutions to most of these problems are not only inter-related but require for their implementation the support of forces that can emerge only through social and political progresses."

That is what has happened, and that is why this surrender has taken place. I would end by warning the Government that they are taking the fires of inflation and food shortage and encouraging the hoarders and profiteers and if we are still here after another year we will see that we have been brought to the brink of catastrophe. The result will be that not more talk of government take-over will be there. You will be provoking the people to take over food stocks. May be in some places it will burst out in anarchic forms. But people's take-over will come on the agenda, not Government take-over any more. People trusted you to do it and you failed them. It does

not behave the Minister to say here and seek an alibi by suggesting that this matter had the approval of the National Food Advisory Council, the Consultative Committee of Parliament and the Conference of Chief Ministers. The Conference of Chief Ministers—yes, I know the majority of them were pressing you to do this. But we have a member on the National Food Advisory Council and he advises me that no such approval was given. The Consultative Committee never gave approval for this. Do not pass on the sins of the Chief Ministers to other non-official members of these bodies. (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI F. A. AHMED): I am sorry to say that approval has not been mentioned here.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: It says here it has been suggested the policy for the seventies in all its aspects was considered and after careful consideration it has now been decided. "What does this mean?" (Interruptions) Now that they have decided to go in for this policy let them answer my questions. What is the mechanism by which they propose to ensure that the wholesalers will cooperate with them?

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati): With a sense of unhappiness I am approaching this debate. The fact that the wholesalers have been brought back into the wholesale trade does not comfort me and I am confident that it does not comfort most of the Members of the House. It does not give any comfort either to Mr. F. A. Ahmed and to Mr. Shinde or to Mr. Maurya. We strongly believe that in a country like ours with millions of ill-fed and underfed people living below the poverty line where a handful of traders want to secure benefits by artificial manoeuvring of prices and stocks to the great misery of poverty stricken millions,

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]
we cannot afford to permit the free play of
the market mechanism in essential foodgrains

15.34 hours.

SHRI VASANT SATHE [*in the Chair*]

If we want to obviate the miseries of the people by control and dominance over the surplus available in the market, it is not only essential but also imperative that the ultimate aim of the Government must be to fashion its policies in such a way that control is assumed not only over wheat or rice but also over two or three other commodities which are essential for the consumption of the common man in general. It is with this objective that our party took that decision and the Government followed suit.

Now the question is : has the Government made a total retreat or has it abandoned the policy? Opinions will differ. I feel that it is not a total abandonment. I feel that because of compelling economic circumstances there had been modifications. At the same time I want to place before the Government with all the earnestness at my command that they should search their hearts and find out in the light of the last one year's experience why this modification has become necessary, and in the immediate future to remove all these shortcomings and once again go back to the policy of wheat trade take-over. After all, Sir, Mr. Indrajit Gupta's contention or Mr. Gopalan's contention that there has been an absolute retreat, whatever may be the qualifications, I think, will be a sweeping generalisation and will be far from true. We should not forget one fact, in this context. Today, Government has the commitment to take-over or acquire dominion over the surplus stocks. This

is a commitment which our party has made to the people and which our Government has made to the people. But, the Government has also a greater commitment to fulfil, and that is, to make food-stuffs available, reasonable quantities of food-stuffs available, at reasonable prices. When the two commitments conflict with each other, it may be the Government is compelled to take some steps, is compelled to make some minor adjustments in order to fulfil the second commitment and this is what exactly the Government has done in this particular case.

It may be that at a given point of time, due to various political and economic forces, it is found that a particular policy, however laudable it may be, has failed to fulfil the basic objectives or it has failed to make available to the people sufficient quantities of food at reasonable prices, the Government may have to modify its policies. I am strongly of the view that food is a subject in which, no party or no group or no individual has a right to play politics. It is a subject in which the Government cannot either stick to a rigid or doctrinaire attitude. Let us make a review of what had happened during last year, after the take-over of wheat trade. The purpose of the policy was to ensure a remunerative price to the grower, a reasonable price to the consumer, the improvement in the availability of foodgrains in the market and price stabilisation and elimination of price distortions and hoarding. It has been said by many of the right reaction that the take-over policy has failed. Sir, I am not one who can accept such a view. To a great extent, it was successful. Of course, the success was not to the desired extent, because various political and economic forces played their part. It would have been a greater success, if persons like Mr. Pijoo Mody would not have been there and if

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]

they had not tried to put obstacles in implementation of Government's policies.

Sir, we should also take into account the fact that the policy of wheat trade take-over failed, to a great extent, because the administrative machinery was not toned up and it was not geared up to the challenging task. In this context, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, when you have taken up a new policy, taking a great risk, as Mr. Bhagat has said, what toning up of the administrative machinery you have done and what is your immediate programme to see that the policy which you see taken up, ultimately succeeds. As I said, looking back, during last year, we have that procurement was much below the expected targets, resulting in shortages, distortion of prices, and this has aggravated the present price spiral and added to the misery of the people. In such a situation, I can appreciate that the Government had to modify, to a certain extent, its stand and had to bring in wholesalers. As I said earlier, I approach this subject with a sense of unhappiness and I think many Members on this side of the House will be happy to see a situation, where, Government will be able to do away with these wholesalers and where the Government is capable of creating conditions, wherein, at least these compulsions can be removed.

Sir, Government expects that by raising the procurement price to Rs. 105 per quintal, the present shortages, or the psychology of shortages, as has been described, will, to some extent, be minimised because persons will be discouraged from hoarding when they find that the price that is offered to them is very remunerative. It is precisely with this in view, Government has fixed the procurement price at Rs. 105 per quintal and has also given some scope for adjustments to private traders. This will give

incentives to the growers to dispose of their stocks and secondly, will help in the removal of climate of shortages. In this context, I would like to have a categorical reply from the hon. Food Minister as to how does he propose to ensure that the price of wheat does not go beyond a certain level so that it does not affect the vulnerable sections of the population. That is a basic question about which all of us are agitated and I hope the Minister will try to give some satisfactory reply to that.

As I said, economic compulsions have compelled the Government to take up the present policy. Yet, if we want to clear the food front, we shall have to revert back to the taking over of the wheat trade in the immediate future. I urge upon the Government to do some heart-searching and find out the loopholes because of which our avowed and declared policy has failed and to plug them. Government has still a duty to provide food to the vulnerable sections through the public distribution system. I wish to warn the Government that if there be any failure in fulfilling this obligation neither our party nor our people will condone it.

To a great extent, last year's policy could not be a total success because the administrative system was not at all tuned up to meet the challenging task. Even this new policy can succeed only if the administration is geared up to the task. I would like to know positively what step Government propose to take to tune up the administrative system. I would request the minister to make it plain to the administrative staff and the heads of administration that they shall have to pay the penalty if the haze in the food front is not cleared up because of this development.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI
(Calcutta—South) : Sir, the recent procurement and price policy announced by the

(Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsî)

Food Minister has allowed the political parties to make serious criticisms on behalf of and against it. When I consider that ideology leads sometimes to romanticism, I feel what the Government had done perhaps was not totally against our policy and ideology. But when I consider the ideology sometimes based on reality, I feel what the Government did today is due to the compulsions of the present situation. In general, if we carefully analyse the policy of our Government and our party, there is an ideological retreat over the announced policy of the Government. This retreat is perhaps because the ideological approach towards the food policy by the Congress Party was not timed up by the Government administration as well as the section for which this food policy is to be implemented. I do feel that this sort of dissatisfaction, which is prevailing in many young ideological or intellectual progressive politicians today will not continue next year if the Government can check in time the faults due to which they could not make a success of the take-over policy last year.

I hope the hon. Minister, while he replies to the debate, will supplement the declaration of policy which he had made and make some of the points clear.

If the Government really want that a psychological atmosphere has to be created among the growers, it cannot be done by merely increasing the prices. It can be done only by solving the problems which are continuing for the last two decades. So, Government must do the following three things. They should immediately call a meeting of the Chief Ministers and explain to them the problems. If they cannot take over the wholesale trade in rice or wheat, what prevents the States from implementing the land reforms proposed by the Congress Party from time to time? Secondly, they can create a proper psy-

chology in the minds of the growers, not by increasing the prices but by setting up a tribunal to dispose of the litigation cases pending against the peasants for the last two decades, as mentioned in our party manifesto and declared policy of the Government. Thirdly, they should enquire through the Chief Ministers in how many State the agricultural labour legislation had been implemented. In those States where it had not yet been implemented, it should be done immediately. It is the implementation of these suggestions, and not an increase in prices, which will create a real psychological atmosphere among the growers and peasants. Because, if you increase the price, the benefit does not go to the peasants; it goes to the wholesalers and the middlemen. That has been our experience for the last two years. So, Government must supplement their food policy with the implementation of these three suggestions by the Central and State Governments.

When the Government announced the take-over of the wholesale trade in wheat, there were processions and demonstrations by the foodgrain dealers all over the country. During the UP elections, if I am not mistaken, the leader of wholesale dealers, one Shri Bishambar Dayal, announced publicly that he will support those parties and candidates who will oppose the take-over of trade in foodgrains and other essential commodities in which there is wholesale trade at present. In the election meetings in U.P. and Orissa we have criticised those people as anti-people forces which were against democracy and progress.

If the Government are fully convinced that this policy is being sabotaged by the hoarders and blackmarketeers, what prevents them from taking rigorous action against them? Why was the Essential Commodities Act not amended to

give effect to this? Why did you not enact some legislation to provide for death sentence for hoarders? You can create a proper atmosphere for the success of public distribution only if you create terror among the hoarders and wholesale traders who are sabotaging the policy of the Government.

I do appreciate some of the arguments of my hon. friend, Shri Gopalan. In an atmosphere of shortages, the people want the basic necessities to be supplied to them at controlled prices. I agree with him there. But I cannot agree with him when he says that his party cannot support the policies of the Government. It is true that there has been a retreat from the progressive policies by the Government in the recent announcement. But progressive policies can be implemented only through the support and involvement of the left democratic forces. I can understand a political party like the Jan Sangh's opposing our policy or criticising our policy. But this party CPM did not show the courage to go against the traders, that their food-grains should be deposited with the Government, should be procured by the Government in all parts of the country. I know personally what happened in our State. I do not understand their philosophy; I do not know what politics they are playing. One rupee a kilo of rice is the demand of the Communist party (Marxists) in some states. They do not consider the actual figure fixed for the peasant to sell the paddy. The price of paddy per quintal is rupees 73, and they demand one-rupee-a-kilo-of-rice. That means, the price of paddy per quintal would have to be decreased from Rs. 73 to Rs. 43. How can they give relief to peasants if they say one thing in the interest of the urban people and another thing to the rural people? The double standard should be avoided. They should be realistic in their demand. I hope better senses would

prevail on the Communist party (Marxists), considering the present situation in the country and the progressive policies that we have undertaken.

We admit that we have our shortcomings. We know there are difficulties in the present situation. There is no denying the fact that they are not sabotaged from outside but they are sabotaged from within also. There are officials in the Food Ministry and in the Food Corporation of India—it is said that it is Full Corruption of India—who every time, under some pretext, sabotage the entire prospects. I would say that the challenge against the hoarders cannot be met by a political decision in the Parliament; that political decision should have to be politically oriented among the administration; otherwise, this Government cannot function effectively in the interest of the people.

The policy of the Government is that 50 per cent of the entire procurement will be given by the wholesale traders. I do not agree with this view because I have my own experience and I hope that the Food Minister will bear me out. In my State we have not taken over rice, but we had decided that the millowners would give 40 per cent of the total procurement to us. But what was the result? They could not give even 15 per cent. They say that they would not sell at such a low price. If the motive of the right reactionaries is not only to topple the Government but also to threaten the democracy itself, if the wholesale traders make a conspiracy that even what was purchased from the peasants would not be shown on record—because there is no compulsion of the Government—what will be the position of the government? What will be the position of the consumers who like to buy foodgrains through the public distribution system?

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsif]

Another suggestion that I want to make to the Government is this. Let us assume that you will get from them what you expect. I agree that we have our shortcomings. There is scarcity. People will get less than what they got on the earlier occasion. I agree that we cannot claim as much as what we were claiming in 1971. But our demand is that we should get through the public distribution system as much as we can. You distributed 11.4 million tonnes through public distribution system. It is not a matter of joke; the credit for that should go to the Government. We appreciate the Government for that. Why should the Government not come forward once again? Why should they depend on the open market? Open market is the game of hoarders. Their game is not to listen to what Mr. F. A. Ahmed is telling, what the Government is saying. Their entire game is to work against the people, against the democratic institution. In Ahmedabad city you know who played this disastrous game. It was the hoarders, and they were claiming that they would make the Government change their decisions in other aspects also. If that is so, Government must be alert about the situation, what is going on outside. I do believe that this is in no way helping the present situation. Government may come forward with new decisions on many other aspects. How is our Internal Trade wing functioning? There is an internal trade wing in the Ministry of Commerce which is supposed to look after supply of essential commodities. But there is no guarantee of the public distribution system at all now a days. As Mr. Naik said in the beginning, in every State there should be an Internal Trade Ministry, there should be a public distribution department, to look after the distribution of essential commodities—as much as they can. Without doing, that, if the Government believe

that, with the announcement of this policy, people will withdraw their demand from the public distribution system and will go to the open market to get cheap food, I would say that they are mistaken; I would not agree with them here. The attitude of the wholesaler is not helpful. They are anti-people. We must admit it and my feeling is that the Government in spite of this decision can create and give some relief to the people if they are sincere in their purpose and if the administration should be tightened. I think the Essential Commodities Act is to be change, State legislations should be brought out for death sentence to hoarders. You cannot stop the hoarding by the Police because the police are in league with the hoarders. Only a popular movement involving popular progressive forces is the only way for stopping hoarding.

I know, Sir. In my own little capacity I personally had conducted de-hoarding operations with my hundred boys and brought out foodgrains from godowns and other essential commodities worth Rs. 4 crores in the Calcutta city. I was an eye-witness to that. We gave the advice to the Police, 'You go to that place, you will get the commodities'. The Police went, but there are many limitations of the Act. They collected, they sealed them, they took it somewhere and produced it in the court. But people got annoyed. But we went and without burning a shop or a godown we were able to bring out the hoarded materials into the market and gave it to the police to sell it in the market. Then people were happy. This sort of an environment has to be created. It is not that the Police can do it alone. It is not that we should depend upon the administration and the Government. Unless we think it seriously in this nature, we cannot meet the situation.

I believe we are not going back on our progressive policies. We are not going back

and if at all the Government want to consider, let them think not once or twice or thrice but several times whether the damage is done by elements from inside or from outside organized reactionaries and whether there are a little bit arrangements within the administration itself. The Government must open their eyes on both the fronts. When the Government want to take up the cause of the people, it is not the people outside but it is the anti-people forces within the Government itself that want to sabotage the whole thing and the Government must take steps in that light.

I am sorry today in this House those forces who went to garland in disguise the foodgrain dealers when they were in the front of procession, were not in majority in the Parliament today in the opposition. They are out. I know they are celebrating. Perhaps they also feel that even this policy of 50% levy which the Government will impose on them they will be sabotaged.

I would like to draw your attention to one statement, a peculiar statement, the Food Secretary, Mr. G.G.L. Joneja has made. He explained that a limited manoeuvrability has been provided to the wholesalers in the new policy. Sir, it is this statement of the Food Secretary—what reaction and what impact it will create on the people? If this statement comes from the Secretary, that we have allowed, that we have provided arrangements to the wholesalers to manoeuvre the thing, to do the things as they like, what implication will there be? What audacity has the Secretary got to make such a statement? Is it some arrangement with the hoarders? I would like to know. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Munsal

SHRI PILOO MODY : Why should you correct? I will correct. It is not your job.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI : I hope you will understand my position.

The Food Minister should be careful about this and the Ministry should be careful about this. This sort of statement does not help the situation. He is playing in the hands of the right reactionary forces and the hoarders. To-day the food situation is not the issue of the Government, it is the people's issue. We shall look at it at the national perspective and the national direction. My whole feeling is let the democratic forces of this country and those who really believe in progressive action, let them not create opportunistic arrangements against this government at the moment and think of toppling it. They should be sensible enough to understand the problems within the Government and the problems outside the Government.

I am sorry to know—I have read in the newspapers—that some leftist parties are going to unite tomorrow or the day after to make a strategy as to how they can launch a campaign against the Government. Why cannot they create a strategy and create an atmosphere so that the Government can function in a manner in which the Government is encouraged to feel that there are friends outside also who can implement this policy. If this position is taken by the combined leftist forces, I will consider them less progressive and more opportunistic. Left opportunism is also as dangerous as the right reactionaries. I feel they will not fall a prey to the left opportunists. I also hope that the Government will be much more realistic within one year to understand and to analyse the entire system of the administration though for the time being, it may be a psychological or ideological retreat at the moment.

16 hrs.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : It did the heart lot of good but the ears a lot of damage to listen to the two previous speakers. I do not know in what state of

[Shri Piloo Modi]

mind they must be. It is quite evident that one cannot honour them by calling them right reactionaries and one cannot glorify them by calling them left adventurists. And I am at a loss of words what to call them but whatever we call them it will have to be some form of neutrality, a neutrality particularly on a subject on which they have had to eat massive doses of crow and if you have eaten crow you will realise that it is not a very pleasant thing to eat. I pity them because what their intelligence did not tell them to do circumstances have forced them to do. It is really a divorce of intelligence from reality which has landed the ruling party in this unholy mess of having to drag to some body else's tune and to sing to somebody else's piping if I may make my metaphor. And therefore I think that although one would have welcomed this move, it is such a small hesitant move, such a move without much thinking or rationale, but it is a move in the right direction, because all other directions were exhausted. The fact of the matter is that they have neither believed in socialism nor have they believed in the market economy. They have only believed in pressures and when pressures were accompanied by kicks they believed in them a little more. And for all these years my friends of the CPI and their friends have been kicking them, and whipping them and pushing them and throwing them, putting words in their mouth, putting thoughts in their heads and some-times a little food in their bellies. And it is with this idea that this old cart which is the congress party has been moving hesitantly backwards. What have they done to the economy of the country ? What have they done to the food distribution of this country ? What have they done to the food production of the country ? I think history will have to really serve the severest verdict on them.

Nevertheless when they find, as I said before, that all these avenues are exhausted,

and they have to think in terms of trying something new, they have to move by force of compulsion, by historical imperatives, in the right direction. But even moving in the right direction they are incapable of doing by the volition of their own intelligence. It is something on which they would have to be pushed further I am not capable of pushing them, nor do I want to push them; let them realise it the hard way that if they want the economy of this country to function, they will have to find mentors in India and not abroad. If you cannot find them, keep looking for them, but keep looking for them in India and not abroad. (*Interruptions*). It is overt here; it is covert there; that is why I keep on looking that side.

They have been pushed under the glee that I see in their eyes; I only see a touch of guilt in the eyes. Listening to the ideologies in this debate, I entirely agree with Shri Gopalan, with Shri Indrajit Gupta and with the Government that they have done everything. What sort of non-sense is this ? Whom are you fooling ? This year only the wholesalers have been brought in; next year, the retailers will also have to be brought in. As somebody said, after all, the Food Corporation of India has become a big godown I do not even trust this godown of the Food Corporation of India. They have been godowning for a long time the grains. Where does the food go ? It certainly does not go to the people. Everybody is calling this experiment as a menu-mental folly of the takeover of the wheat trade. Who has been benefited ultimately ? It has benefited the politicians; it has benefited the bureaucrats; it has benefited the smugglers and hoarders.

The people of Maharashtra and Gujarat in the course of last year alone, paid Rs. 50 crores more for their wheat and rice because of the zonal system. This little empire got only this much. The Chief Ministers of States themselves have allowed

[Shri Pillo Mody]

to create this system for themselves so that they manipulate the food in their own areas. And because of the zonal system, the people of Gujarat and Maharashtra had to pay Rs. 50 crores more for their basic food. Who is benefited? Does the Government benefit? Does Shri Ahmed benefit? I am not talking in terms of an individual when I mentioned him. Did the Government benefit or the consumers benefit? Did the retailers benefit? Did the wholesalers benefit? Did the growers benefit? Did the producers benefit? No, Sir. It is only those who smuggled these goods across our international boundaries within India who are benefited. They did it with the connivance of the officials, with the connivance of the railways, with the connivance of the octroi and municipal authorities and with the connivance of every single policeman in the area. How do you think that food is going out? You can get any amount of Amul in the Persian Gulf if you cannot get it over here; you can get any amount of rice in the Persian Gulf—*basmati* good rice—if you cannot get it here. Are you suggesting that this take-over of the foodgrains was a great virtue and a heroic act? Who was the Hero of the Soviet award? What is all this non-sense that I have been hearing in this debate? How is it that this has been done in a half-hearted manner by Government? The Government has done this intelligent thing after ten years. The only intelligent thing done by them is the zonal system of foodgrains. This is a half-intelligent thing—not full-intelligent thing. Why? That is because the people like the speakers over here from your side—I mean friends from the Congress side and the Communist side—have been telling that just as this is the fashion these days that these young kids put on tight-trousers with loose shoes, they have to do this thing. And

7 LSS/74—10

with his much intelligence, socialist becomes fashionable, communism becomes fashionable, and if somebody says 'Take over wheat' therefore they take over wheat, and if somebody says 'Take over this or that' they do so. After all, there is a rationale behind human action and that rationale can only be dictated by intelligence and not by slogans.

Therefore, although I cannot compliment them on having received enlightenment, I must nevertheless congratulate them on the fact that by mistake they have strayed on the right course. I hope that they will make more such mistakes, from your point of view, from Shri Priya Rajan Das Munsi's point of view, from Shri Unnikrishnan's point of view, from Shri Sat Pal Kapur's point of view, from Shri Goswami's point of view, and from Shri D.P. Dhar's point of view. If they make more mistakes, it may be that the people of this country will be happier.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Chattrapur) : Mr. Chairman Sir, the food policy announced by the Food Minister last week is criticised by the Opposition as a retreat or as a surrender. Some hon. Members even went to the extent of saying that it was an abandonment of the policy enunciated and followed by the Government in the previous year. Neither Mr. Gopalan nor Mr. Indrajit Gupta nor Mr. Pillo Mody has any improvements to suggest to the policy announced by the Food Minister. I well appreciate their criticisms and they have good intentions, but they have not offered any idea whereby the policy announced can be improved upon. They only want to show that Government have done a wrong thing and that they are more progressive and what Government have done is a retreat or a going back on their earlier policy. A responsible government has to be responsive to public criticism. When a Government finds that the policy

enunciated by it earlier has not yielded the results expected from it, certainly is it not open to them to review its policy and make such adjustments as are necessary to make it more successful ?

What have Government done this year? They have not abandoned wholesale trade take-over in foodgrains. They have not abolished the different agencies which existed last year to procure wheat and rice. In addition, they have only added the wholesale dealers. What is the role to be played by them ? They are also one of the many procurement agencies or purchasing agencies on behalf of the Government.

I believe they have been introduced now for two reasons. Firstly, last year, they had been thrown out of their jobs. Secondly, the price offered last year was not very attractive, and it was only Rs. 76 per quintal, whereas the producers knew that Government were importing from abroad at a very high price, and naturally, the marketed supply was not as much as Government expected. Further, last year was a lean year and therefore procurement was not very heavy and Government could not procure eight million tonnes which they wanted to procure. Therefore, they have brought in the wholesale dealers.

The question has been asked : What control do Government have on the operations of the wholesale dealer ? Let us not forget that the wholesale dealers, when they enter the market, enter so on a licence given to them under the Foodgrains Control Order or whatever other order there may be. There is a licence, and their operations are scrutinised every day by the Civil Supplies Departments of the State Governments; their accounts are also to be audited. Not only do they procure under a licence, but even the storage is also to be licensed. On any given day they cannot procure more than a certain quantity prescribed in

the licence. On any given day, they cannot store any quantity beyond what is prescribed in the licence. Therefore, that is a sufficient safeguard to see that the wholesalers do not play any mischief either in the procurement or in the matter of storage. Then, the question has been asked how one could be sure that they would give 50 per cent of their procurement. As I have said already, the quantity procured is known to the Civil Supplies Departments. Supposing a trader procures 100 quintals a day, he is bound to give 50 quintals to the Government. So, that is known immediately. Therefore, the apprehensions which are entertained are not warranted, and the wholesalers certainly will have to function within certain limitations and under certain constraints.

The Foodgrains Control Order will be very rigid, and they have to operate within the framework of the conditions of the licence issued under that order.

Therefore, I do not see any reason why we should apprehend at this stage that the wholesalers will play mischief.

It is also said that they are reactionary forces, and why should they be brought into these market operations ? We have to tame the reactionary forces also. We have to discipline them. They have been working havoc outside when they were out of their jobs. Therefore, they have to be brought in. We control them by certain conditions, by supervision under the Foodgrains Control Order. It is not open to them to do any mischief as some members apprehend.

Government has not given up its basic objective. It has not abandoned the policy in regard to wholesale trade in foodgrains. What has been done is to effect a slight modification or adjustment in the operations of the scheme. They have introduced one more element into this scheme.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You mean to say that it is wholesale trade taken over through the wholesale traders themselves.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO : I do not say that; some people say that. I say that the wholesalers are one of the procurement agencies of Government. There are public agencies, there are co-operative marketing societies who will procure. In addition, the wholesalers will also operate as procurement agents of Government. It is only a modification or addition to the list of agents. It is not wholesale surrender, as some members have put it. This was found to be necessary and Government have done it. They have not done it on their own. They have consulted the Chief Ministers. The Chief Ministers have a responsible part to play in these operations not only in procurement but also in distribution. Their views have also been taken into account. It is easy to name a policy sitting in Delhi. But the difficulties of those who have to implement it have also to be taken into account. Taking an overall picture, Government have taken recourse to this modification.

The policy of takeover of wholesale trade in foodgrains has not been given up. It will continue to be Government policy. If Government had abandoned it, then it would have been open to the Opposition to criticise it as having retreated from an earlier policy commitment. But that is not the case. I would say that Government should not only continue with this policy in regard to wholesale trade in foodgrains but also in respect of other essential commodities. They should strengthen the public distribution system. One reason why the policy did not meet with much success was that there was no in-built machinery for procurement and distribution. They have to do that now. We must strengthen the distribution system so that whatever is procured reaches the vulnerable

sections of society so that the scheme can be a success.

Therefore, I do not see any reason why this criticism has been launched by the Opposition parties. It is to make political capital out of it just to show the public that they are more progressive. I do not think anyone of them is more progressive than Government. But progressiveism has to be coupled with practicalism.

There are sufficient checks to prevent mischief. Government will have to be watchful and be on the alert to see that no mischief is done by any trader or anyone for that matter. The officers of Government incharge of supervision of these operations should be more watchful to see that mischief is not done. Government should strengthen the public distribution system so that not only foodgrains but other essential commodities also are supplied to the vulnerable sections of society.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal) : The policy statement made by the hon. Food Minister is before us for discussion. Unfortunately, politics or political ideologies have been injected into the discussion so as to mislead the people. Some Opposition parties have developed a tendency to find fault with any measure brought forward by Government.

I remember a colleague of mine in the Madras Legislative Assembly who used to ask in every supplementary question, "If so, why so ?" and "If not, why not ?" This is the type of criticism that is being levelled here. It is the responsibility of the Government to feed nearly 570 million people of our country. When we look back to the performance of the Government all these years, we have to commend the performance that has been shown by the Government. Previously, we were reinforced by

the PL 480 imports. We had sufficient buffer-stock in the country, but now the PL 480 had disappeared. There is not much of a buffer-stock, but in spite of the depletion of the buffer-stocks by way of PL 480, by having internal procurement the Government was able to feed the people which itself is a commendable and praiseworthy duty of the Government.

At the same time, my congratulations go to the vast millions of farmers in our country who have maximised the production in spite of several difficulties that they are facing today in the matter of getting inputs at a proper price. Instead of congratulating them, we do not say a word about the difficulties that are being faced by the agriculturists today. Not a word has been said by the leader of the CPI who does not believe in the agrarian strength that a country should get. He always think of certain urban populations and their difficulties.

Another important factor in this whole problem is the part that has to be played by the various agencies involved in the successful procurement and distribution system. Firstly, it is the role played by the Chief Ministers. Secondly, it is the effective functioning of the bureaucratic machinery; thirdly, it is the popular response or the public involvement in making the distribution system a successful one. Lastly, it is the co-ordinating ability of the Central Government sitting in Delhi.

Unfortunately, a tendency has been developed by the Chief Ministers of surplus States not to part with their surpluses and send them to the deficit areas where there is need. The Chief Ministers of surplus States are afraid to face the public in the matter of internal procurement. Though there is a surplus in some pockets, they do not want to procure the surplus available in their own States, but every time they depend upon the Central Government.

(*Interruptions*) I include here some marginal States like my friend's. These are the factors. Also, there is the bureaucratic machinery that has been charged with the distribution system. The less said about it the better. Public response is also not to the mark. These are the important factors that will go for the successful distribution.

Another factor is about the change in the policy that has been brought forward. There is nothing wrong if the Government feels that the policy that has been hitherto pursued was not able to meet the aspirations and demands of the people, and that it requires certain modifications. It is the primary duty of the Government to feed the people and in pursuance of that duty they have to make certain modifications, of course, within the framework of the policy and the commitments that they have made to the people.

Nothing drastically has gone wrong here. The procurement systems are available. The public distribution is available. On the other hand, the co-operatives are also brought into the picture. The co-operatives are not manned by bureaucrats. They are manned by socio-economists, by public workers who give of their best in the co-operative institutions.

They can compete with the wholesalers if they so desire. They can discharge their patriotic duty by helping the cooperative institutions in this task of procurement and distribution. The wholesalers are being asked to function under certain limitations. They cannot go and fleece the consumers; nor can they go and extract at an unreasonable price from the growers. If that agency goes wrong, there are other agencies which can do these things.

We have been crying hoarse that we should dispense with PL-480 imports. We have been repeating that this country should

achieve self-reliance. Unfortunately we did not take steps to encourage the farmer. Today he is in need of chemical fertilisers, it is not there; water is not there and electricity is not there. He cannot produce more. It is only the Indian farmer who has faced up to the challenge. He was able to revolutionise agriculture. The per acre yield of wheat or rice has gone up tremendously. He has done everything to maximise production, feed himself and also the country, but you have failed him at the time when he requires fertilisers or water. The only answer to this challenge is to maximise production. In order to do that we have to take certain steps. Speedy implementation of land reforms is one step. We should provide the wherewithal to small and marginal farmers so that they can produce more. There should be stringent laws on adulteration. If a man commits a murder he can be executed, but a person who adulterates food-stuffs and commits hundred murders goes scot free under the judicial system. This should be changed.

We have not taken over all the food-grains. We have taken over only wheat. It might be 26 million tonnes out of a total quantity of 60 or 66 million tonnes produced in the country. They have not taken over rice or coarse grains. They are left in the free market.

You should not allow the State Governments to shut themselves up in ivory towers. There must be free movement between one area and another. The entire rice zone in the South should be made a single zone and there should be no barrier to free movement. In Andhra Pradesh rice could not move from one district to another and there was a lot of corruption and prices varied tremendously. When the new Chief Minister took charge, he abolished that system and there is now free movement

of rice in Andhra Pradesh. This had a very salutary effect. The neighbouring State Governments should cooperate with each other. The Madras Government should not encourage smuggling from Andhra Pradesh or Andhra Pradesh should not encourage smuggling of fertilisers from Maharashtra or M. P. There is dearth of chemical fertilisers in Andhra Pradesh. There is no balanced distribution. A farmer from Andhra Pradesh can go to Maharashtra and buy fertilisers at lesser blackmarket price than what he may have to pay in Andhra Pradesh for fertilisers in blackmarket. You must link up this procurement or levy with the supply of chemical fertilisers. Now, we are facing a very difficult situation. We should see that the production programme is undertaken on a war footing. This is my sincere suggestion to the Government. They should also see that the new policy which they have adopted is implemented sincerely and honestly. The administrative machinery has to be geared up, more effective steps have to be taken and they must involve more public institutions. Public involvement must be there and Government should not remain aloof from the main-stream of public life. If it happens, the distribution system or the procurement system will not work. By these barriers between State and State, there is great disparity in prices. For instance, between the price of wheat in surplus States like Rajasthan, Haryana and Punjab and that in deficit States like Maharashtra, there is great variance. It may be Rs. 50-60 per quintal. How do you allow it to happen? After all, India must be treated as one and we must be able to provide foodgrains, whether it is wheat or rice or anything, at reasonable prices whether one lives in Punjab or in Maharashtra.

I whole-heartedly endorse the new policy announced by the Government

[Shri Venkata Subbaiah]

and I suggest that Government should see to it that the Chief Ministers, the cooperative institutions and the public agencies are involved in this and they should also see to it that this new policy is made successful. If it is not made successful, then, we may have to face disastrous consequences.

SHRI RANABAHADUR SINGH (Sidhi) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are discussing the wheat policy again. Once upon a time, a man with his son was taking a donkey across a bridge, the by-standers started laughing and said that both of them were walking when the donkey was without a rider. When one person got on to the donkey, they again laughed and said that only one person got on to the donkey. When both of them got on to the donkey, they still laughed and said that both of them were riding on the poor donkey. Finally, when both of them started to carry the donkey on their shoulders, the donkey fell into the river and was lost.

So, whatever may be the policy, there are always people to criticise it. What is required today is to divorce food from politics. This is one sector wherein we cannot experiment, and for that, Sir, I respectfully submit that our leaders must show statesmanship when we are dealing with food. Statesmanship, today, has been experimented with in many ways. When food is the matter under consideration, one basic factor which must not be lost sight of is the fact that whatever may be the policy framed by the Government, the implementation machinery must be wide, and strong enough to implement it. When I say this, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that when you talk of a levy on farmers, you must take it for granted and that for each farmer, there must be at least two or three policemen to take the levy out, which by itself,

is an impossibility in this country. The farmers will out-number the policemen, at the present moment, by more than 50, and so, you should not frame a policy which cannot be implemented. The only force that the statesmen, at the present moment, can use, when they lack the force of police, is the force of economics. It is only when recourse is taken to punitive action, and economic forces are disregarded, that Amul and Basmati rice are sold at cheaper rates in the Gulf states and we go without it. Then, when we talk about traders—I hold no brief for them they belong to this county; they are also nationals of this country and conceding the fact that they do take recourse to measures which are not in the interest of the country, the only method by which the traders can be tamed and brought in line with the policies of the Government, is to make use of the economic forces to bring the traders around. No other punitive action will help in this matter.

I was rather surprised when Mr. Indrajit Gupta said that once the Government blunders in this field, it will be the people who shall take the matter into their hands. This is a threat which has a very grave consequence. It is a threat which at this juncture should be firmly gripped and used. Today whatever policies are framed and implemented by Government, they seem to hang in the air because the total implementation machinery belongs to the officials. In order to obviate the possibility of the people rising up, this is the time when the Government in utmost statesmanship should involve the people themselves as regards the food policy. The only one catchword I suggest in this connection is consensus. Whatever the failings of the people, they have been because our people are not used to this western method of majority rule. Even today in our villages, consensus has a hallowed place.

If a consensus is used to implement the food policies at the village level—whether it is the consumer committee for each mohalla or gram panchayats that are given this responsibility we shall have a different performance in this field.

Regarding the offer of Rs. 105 per quintal made this year, this is too late and too little. Rs. 105 last year would have been most welcome and it would have meant maximisation of our production, not this year. Much water has flowed down the bridges of the Jumna and Rs. 105 falls short again. Hypothetically speaking, if the Government had taken more courage and announced a higher price, there might have been a buoyancy of production on the fields, similar to the one witnessed in 1969. I want to remind you that it was in 1967 and 1968 when wheat prices rose to Rs. 160 a quintal that there was a certain buoyancy in the production in the farmers' fields and we got a production which we still envy as a target. It would have been fitting if a courageous step had been taken while fixing the prices. What we have as food policy today is not going to remain tomorrow. I happen to be a farmer and an M.P. I had a sorry experience with the Agricultural Prices Commission where we, the representatives of farmers were told that we could only offer our own opinions, without having the benefit of knowing what the opinions are going to court for. It was a one-way discussion. This year one factor has to be taken note of by all the countries which are facing food shortage. It is high time we noted this factor right away. This year the world is going to have the biggest wheat crop in history. I wonder if this matter has found the attention due to it. With this factor in view, I plead that the Government should not rest on any matter of prestige in entering the international market, if the prices of the wheat that are available, due to this

bumper production, are economic enough to help us to build a buffer stock.

I also feel it an honour to bring to this House a message from a person from my constituency, a person who lives in the fastness of the Madhya Pradesh forests. This village consists of only three huts. He is six feet six inches tall and he wears only a loin cloth. When he visited me last month, his story was sordid indeed. He receives two kilos of foodgrains per month if he walks 20 miles to the fairprice shops, whereas only three years ago there was a baniya in his village who had kept him alive even during the drought of 1967. When I told him that our Government has almost made up its mind not to import foodgrains, he said would you take my message to the Government that I want to live, whether the prestige of the Government remains or not? Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I want to make an announcement. The hon. Minister will reply to the debate at 6.15 p. m. So, I would request hon. Members to stick to the time limit in order to enable the Chair to accommodate more hon. Members.

SHRI B. R. SHUKLA (Bhraich) : Mr. Chairman, at the very outset, I congratulate the Government for making a bold departure from the policy adopted earlier of taking over the wholesale trade in wheat. I am glad to note that they have not taken it as a prestige issue. It is wrong to say that the Government have surrendered to the monopolists, hoarders and blackmarketeers or the big farmers. If it is a surrender, it is a surrender to sanity, reality and reason in the best national interest and the interest of the people.

The basic mistake last year was the fixation of unremunerative prices for wheat because of which we had to face tremendous difficulties and there has been all

[Shri B. R. Shukla]
 along bungling throughout the whole country. We, the members of the ruling party, repeatedly impressed upon the Government to raise the procurement price of wheat. But we do not know what reasons, or unreasons, prevailed with those who were responsible for handling the policy on foodgrains, the prices were not changed.

Now, socialism cannot be brought about piecemeal, though our party stands committed to mixed economy. We cannot regulate the price of one commodity in complete isolation, after leaving the prices of commodities free in other spheres. If the price of wheat has to be fixed, then the prices of industrial goods, fertilizer, cloth, kerosene, electricity, they will also have to be determined simultaneously. Our policy want not successful because we wanted to introduce wholesale trade only in one commodity. If we are not prepared to regulate the prices of other commodities which are essential for everyday use, then let us make a departure by not taking over the wholesale trade in wheat. So, to that extent, this policy is a welcome one.

We stand by the exploited, by the vulnerable sections of society. I think everybody in this House stands for the amelioration of the exploited, the weak and the vulnerable section of society. Now by introducing the policy of wholesale trade in wheat, have we improved their lot? The rickshaw-wala is not getting ration from the ration shop; the railway labourer does not get the ration from the ration shop. Only the black-marketeer is prospering. The middle-men are prospering. For their benefit we had not introduced this policy. Now we have replaced the wholesale traders by another class of bureaucrats who themselves indulge in exploiting the situation. Let us not turn the whole nation into a nation of dis-

honest persons. Let us create an atmosphere where honest persons can prosper without detriment to the weaker sections of the society.

Bajra is available at Rs. 150 per quintal. the price of wheat was fixed at Rs. 86 in the beginning and was then raised to Rs. 95. Can there be a more cruel stroke on the peasantry than this? The whole economy has turned topsy-turvy. Therefore, this policy which has been reversed should certainly be welcome to all. By allowing 50 per cent of the commodities purchased by the wholesaler to be sold at any rate he likes, I would submit, the economic forces would take care of themselves. There is nothing new in this. When late Shri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai was the Food Minister, he had taken bold measures. Food was not a rationed commodity at that time and Heavens did not fall. I can say with confidence that there is no scarcity of foodgrains in the country. Even today the tenants have got wheat in their stock, but they did not come forward with their stock because Government was not prepared to pay the remunerative price, otherwise, the market would have been flooded with foodgrains and there would have been no scarcity of foodgrains to any section of consumers.

Now there is one danger. People who belong to the vulnerable section of the society may suffer for some time by not getting the foodgrains at a price within their means. For that I would suggest that the Government should supply them at cheap rates; it should go in for even subsidising such sections, if necessary.

I read some statements coming from two leaders belonging to Jan Sangh—one was Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta of Delhi and the other, Shri L. K. Advani. They have said that they are going to hold a demonstration against fixation of higher prices for wheat

Mr. Vajpayee, when U.P. elections were going on, said that the price of wheat should be fixed at Rs. 105 per quintal. Now when the Government has fixed the price at Rs. 105 per quintal, his colleagues are coming out with a different version. They want to hunt with the hound and run with the hare. They want to take political advantage of every decision which this Government makes. There is no use of listening to whatever they say. If we say, retain the wholesale trade, they will say, no, if we say, let everything be free, they will say, no, it should be subject to statutory rationing. They are prepared to say anything at any time. If we say it is day, they will say it is night; if we say it is night, they will say, it is day. That is their attitude.

So far as our leftist friends are concerned, they seem to be worried about weaker sections of society. They say that the Government is reactionary. They say Government is influenced by hoarders, by black-marketeers, by big farmers, by so called kulaks, etc. I have to ask one question. They talk so much for locomen who move the wheels of industry and transport, they plead so much for them. But if a little peasant retains a bit of foodgrains for use before the next harvest, so that he may not starve, you want to paint him as a traitor, anti-national, anti-patriotic and reactionary and so on. I say, India is a country of tenants, peasants and middle class people. We have got the system of democracy. And if democracy is to be maintained, then, the tenants' position should not be jeopardised. Government has got massive majority. They can very well say that tenants who do not sell the foodgrains would be sent to jail or prosecuted. But what is the use of it? If a microscopic section of labourers can hold the society to ransom, do you think that the small peasants cannot keep a little thing for himself till the time of the next harvest? He is responsible for producing essential food

commodities. Since they cannot pressurise the Government, you call them reactionaries. Nobody is prepared to listen to them even if they speak out something sensible, something reasonable, something in their own enlightened interest.

Government deserves our congratulations. Of course, infallibility is the monopoly of Mr. Piloo Modi who has said that last year our policy was a foolish one, it was an unwise one etc. I do not share that view. We could not ignore the political set up in this country. After all, Food and Agriculture is a subject in the concurrent list. Its implementation depends upon State machinery. We can't dictate terms to the State machinery. If the instruments of implementation are not sharp enough the policy would fail. We have to give proper shape to our policy. But we cannot say that the policy itself was wrong.

If the climate did not suit at that time, we had made a departure. Let us experiment with it. After all, in a developing country, chances get changed and one has to adjust himself according to the circumstances.

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI (Dharapuram) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the wholesale trade takeover by Government and its going back on it is nothing but a political stunt. Just for the sake of U.P. and Orissa elections, that has been introduced. And after the election was over, that has been given up. Even the friends of the ruling party do not seem to have appreciated this decision. There is absolute starvation death which is also subject to exploitation by Government. The Government is ever ready, as usual, to find a scapegoat for this. States are lethargic in regard to procurement of foodgrains. There is mass discontent among the people. An unwise decision taken by the Central Government was forced upon the Tamil Nadu

[Shri C T Dhandapani]

Government Excepting Tamil Nadu Government, all the other States are ruled by the Congress Party. The FCI organisation is there under the control of Central Government. What action has the Central Government taken against the State Governments or vested interests in the party or in the society who did not co-operate with the procurement of foodgrains? Proceedings of the Congress Parliamentary Party would show that the former Chairman of the FCI is being criminally prosecuted for working against the FCI. Nationalisation itself happens to be a failure because of the shortcomings of this Government. And the people of this country have lost faith in the nationalisation programmes whether it is nationalisation of the banking industries, coal industries or any other industries. The performance of the public sector undertakings has proved that the Government are not delivering the goods to the public. This is the position.

I want to ask one question from Government. What steps are the Government going to take in all these things? The leaders at the centre very often give promises that the prices will not go up. This was the promise given by our Prime Minister also. No action has been taken so far in this regard. Take for example France. They introduced virtually a system of price freeze in a number of food articles to suit their regulation. There was a strict control on the profit margin for the essential commodities. I want the Government to tell us whether they would see that the prices are regulated and that they are strictly controlled.

About stocks, they have been telling us that we have had enough stocks and we need not import wheat from other countries. The hon. Minister for Food, Shri Ahmed has said on 9th August, 1972 which has been reported in the Economic Times as follows

No Food Import

"Union Food and Agriculture Minister Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed today ruled out import of foodgrains to meet any shortfalls in production as a result of drought situation this year."

Mr Ahmed said at a press conference that the 9.5 million tonnes of buffer stock and the department's stock of foodgrains would be sufficient not only to meet any apprehended shortage but will have a carry-over margin of 1.5 million tonnes for the next year. Besides the late arrival of monsoon had improved the kharif prospects.

Then the Prime Minister also said on 1st May 1973 at Kanpur that there would be no imports. The report says

Prime Minister denies reports of imports

The Prime Minister Mr. Indira Gandhi today described as false and misleading press reports that India would import 7 million tonnes of foodgrains.

The Minister of State Mr. Shinde also said in Bangalore in Shri K. Lakkappa's State that there would be no import of food in 1972. After four months, he said in Poona on 11th December, 1972 that 'Ships are coming next month carrying wheat'.

17 hrs

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur) what was wrong in it?

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI I am coming to that point presently. The Prime Minister denied the fact that they were going to import wheat. At the same time, a report in the *Indian Express* of July 25th said 'Government decide to import 6.5 million tonnes of food'. I am stating all this and quoting all these things just to show that Government themselves did not know

the stock that they were having in their godowns for distribution to the public.

Even the USSR which experienced one of the worst droughts in 1972 and had a bumper harvest last year had purchased a large quantity of wheat which helped it to bolster the wheat supplies. Argentina had offered a large quantity of wheat which we could have purchased. The report says:

"Argentina has offered to supply regular quantity of wheat, provided India is prepared to sign a long-term agreement for about four years."

At that time, the Central Government were very reluctant to do so. Had we entered into an agreement with them, we would not have paid more price for the wheat which we are importing from abroad, and secondly the people in certain States would not have starved. I accuse this Government of deliberately discarding the offer made by Argentina and wasting the Government money and actually starving the people in certain States.

Now, I would like to say something about my own State Tamil Nadu. As far as we are concerned, we grow more paddy. We offer some paddy to the neighbouring States. We used to send it to Gujarat, West Bengal, Maharashtra and other States and we used to directly despatch to those States and we have received congratulatory letters from them. But the Central Government has curbed it. They do not want the Tamil Nadu Government to have direct dealing with other States. We are short of certain commodities. For instance, we need electricity from the Kerala State and we need pulses also, and we have to purchase them directly from them. On the contrary, we are prepared to give them paddy. We had made an offer to the Kerala Government asking for water in exchange for paddy. That offer still stands.

That has been prohibited by the Central Government. At the same time, the West Bengal Government is being permitted to import rice from Nepal. I do not know how this is possible. The West Bengal Government will purchase rice from Nepal through private agents. The Reserve Bank has agreed to sanction the necessary funds. This has appeared in the *Hindustan Standard* of 12-1-74. Business between one State in the country and another country is being permitted, but within the country itself, trade between two States is not permitted. I do not understand this logic.

Before the takeover of this trade, the Government of Tamil Nadu were getting 35,000 tonnes of wheat a month. The demand was much more. After this so-called progressive measure, the allotment was reduced to 9,000 tonnes. Those who have been habituated to wheat and wheat products have been deprived of this essential item of food. The policy which Government have introduced has been gracefully taken back. The policy was evolved by Government not for the common masses but for political gain, just to please some people within their party and the parties with whom they are allied now.

Another unwise decision taken by the Central Government without consulting the concerned States was this. The Food Ministry issued a dictatorial order sitting in Delhi like the Nawabs and Padshas of the Moghul period, that is lifting the restriction on movement of coarse grains. In order to make coarse grains available to some States, they dired up availability in other making these States famine areas leaving the people to starve. This is neither a wise nor a rational policy.

I want to ask Government : have you made any assessment of the requirement of each State ? I have no objection to one State having a surplus diverting it to a

[Shri C. T. Dhandapani]
neighbouring State through the FCI. But the system which you have introduced arbitrarily will not help the States. It will only lead to national disaster. The principle which the Government of India have evolved with regard to single-State zones for wheat and rice should be followed for coarse grains as well. In the case of wheat, Government have declared a policy of collecting 50 per cent levy. But the very same Central Government, the very same Food Ministry, has refused to comply with the request of a State Government to collect levy of coarse grains in order to feed the poor and vulnerable sections of its people. The entire coarse grain trade has been handed over to the traders. The people of Tamil Nadu are at the mercy of the wholesale traders.

Another demand was put forth in the matter of groundnut and groundnut oil. Nowadays the price of edible oil is exorbitant and the common people cannot afford it. They want cheaper oil. But just to help the big monopoly houses like Tatas and Birlas for manufacturing soaps and other toilet items, the Central Government refused permission to the Government of Tamil Nadu to put a levy on groundnut and groundnut oil. We are demanding this to ensure availability of these commodities to the poorer sections of our people at reasonable rates. But this demand was not conceded. I do not know for whom the Ministry and Government are functioning here.

Shri Venkatasubbaiah was also saying that there must be a single zone for the whole of the South in regard to rice. We strongly oppose it. If this is introduced in the South certainly the reaction will be very bad; the repercussions will be very bad, and the consequences will be very bad.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I feel

relieved that I am not weighed down by any measure of heaviness, nor do I suffer from any compunction of conscience when I rise to participate in this debate. No sense of sentimentalism is crippling me either, because, according to me, this is not a subject for sentimentalism. This is a subject for our evaluation on a factual basis.

There are two methods by which we can approach this subject. One is the theoretical point of view and the other is the practical point of view. Theoretically, if you had taken the position that the whole sale take-over was a fundamentally far-reaching and basic and revolutionary step, then any dilution in that step will certainly disappoint persons who are taking up that position. On the other hand, if you approach this step of wholesale take-over as a step induced by practical considerations to face a particular situation, the only yardstick by which this modification is to be judged is by the consideration as to whether this modification will alter the situation.

I am not one of those who has ever held the view that the step of wholesale take-over as announced by the Government was a revolutionary step. After all, what is revolutionary about it? There is no change in the production relationship; there is no change in the relationship in the agricultural field. Trade relationships are allowed to continue at least to the extent of retail trade. The wholesaler is allowed to operate in all other areas; and even with respect to foodgrains, out of the 100 million tonnes of foodgrains that have to be produced in this country, the area to be covered was only to the extent of 24 million tonnes, which is about 25 per cent. With respect to that 25 per cent, we say that the wholesaler shall not operate and the quantum fixed was eight million tonnes. To the extent of eight million tonnes of wheat, for

a particular class of wholesale operators, we said you shall not operate there. I am unable to find any basic revolution in this step. Absolutely none at all. It has, of course, a practical side. As against the eight million tonnes which is fixed as a target, we achieved 4.5 million tonnes. The shortfall is to the extent of 3.5 million tonnes. My friends on the other side, and some of my friends on this side also, some openly and others inadvertently or covertly, were postulating that this is a surrender to the wholesale trader. My friend Shri Piloo Mody was supporting it by saying that "we have won and you have lost" as if this is a victory for the wholesalers. I refuse to contribute to that position.

What exactly is the essence on which we operated? We wanted voluntary surrender of foodgrains by the agriculturists of this country at a price level which was lower than the price level operating in the market. We said there will be no wholesale available to you and therefore you will have to surrender the grains to us at a price lower than the price prevailing in the market, and we said that you can sell it either to the retailer or to us. Therefore, the question was we were confronting not purely the wholesale trader but we were confronting the vast masses of cultivators in this country, demanding and creating a situation where we thought they could be compelled to hand over foodgrains to us at a lower price, Rs. 70 or Rs. 80 or Rs. 90 or whatever it is, when the ruling price was far higher. We failed to get the entire quantity. According to me, it is a miracle that we got 4.5 million tonnes by this voluntary operation.

Here they say that we have completely failed. I do not understand how we have failed. We must find out how exactly the agriculturists could be induced to hand over the foodgrains to us. We are removing

the total ban on the wholesaler. The retailer was there already operating. What was necessary is to create an atmosphere in this country where under the vast masses of agriculturists would be made feel that at least tomorrow they will have to hand over the grains to us. That psychological situation had to be created by political action. In the creation of the political atmosphere who contributed what? There, I place the Opposition completely in the dock. The Jan Sangh, the Swatantra and the wholesalers were trying to create an atmosphere in this country whereunder they made the agriculturists feel that if only they could hold back they would be able to get a higher price. I can understand that. The CPI (M) joined them. The CPI started anti-hoarding campaign. The strategy of the other parties also was to create tension whereby the Government would be compelled to give up its policy with the result the wholesalers would succeed. In that strategy all the friends were cooperating with each other in creating a tense situation in the country. If, therefore, we have not been able to induce the agriculturists to hand over the entire stuff to us, it was because of the opposition parties who from their own point of view combined to create an atmosphere whereby the agriculturist was induced to hold back the grain.

Let us look at it in another way. The Agricultural Prices Commission's Report says that 20 million acres of land are under wheat cultivation. Assuming that there are about 12 to 15 million holdings under wheat cultivation and each agriculturist withholds half a quintal of wheat what would have happened? The total wheat that—would have escaped from the hands of the FCI would have been five million tonnes; no hoarding is necessary for that; no smuggling is necessary for that. This wholesale operation, intuitively resorted to

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

by the agriculturists running into millions, would have had the effect of depriving the FCI to the extent of 3.5 million tonnes. It will, therefore, be wrong to characterise it as a total failure. It has succeeded to a certain extent.

We are facing a new situation. Production is not as high as we thought. Imports are not available. Here I wish to refer to what my friend Mr. Indrajit Gupta was saying. He says that if we import from somewhere it is bad, but if the same stuff comes via somewhere else it is absolutely good. That sort of approach is wrong.

Let us not be ashamed of our achievements which are really grand. In 1947, the population was 30 crores. Then we were importing to the tune of 40 lakhs of tonnes of foodgrains. Today the population is 60 crores. In 1972 the imports were to the tune of four lakhs of tonnes. Only with imported stuff we can feed 30 crores in 1947 and today 60 crores are being fed with our indigenous stuff. This is a heartening picture and this shows that there is a real achievement by the Government in relation to its agricultural and distribution policies.

Today, the change-over is not so material at all. We say that the wholesalers can also operate under certain restraints. This is all we are saying. Now, Sir, a sort of adjustment is being made. May I ask, in Soviet Russia, in 1917 or 1918, did you not resort to a particular step? Did you not resort to a new economic policy? Did you not resort to a 'tax on the farmer' policy? Did you not give up that policy? Did you not re-introduce the same thing? Did you jump on to the position of collective farming and all that? This is absolutely necessary because we are dealing with the question of foodgrains. When we have to feed sixty crores of people, whether Government should take-over or they should permit

other people also to operate in the field, is the real question. There are wholesalers. This is a mixed economy. This is not a completely State economy. This is not a monopolistic cooperative economy either. This is a mixed economy. There are traders and they assist us to a certain extent they can assist. What we should do is to put them under certain restraints and under certain regulations. It is only by trial and error that we can succeed. This is the only possible thing. In taking over wheat trade, I do not agree that we had taken a revolutionary step and in giving it up, in modifying the take-over policy, I do not agree that there is any surrender to the monopolists or to the profiteers. It is against a hard situation that we took this step. The practical result was, to the extent that we expected, we could not procure. We are resorting to some other step, to achieve greater procurement so that we are able to hold a buffer stock. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The test is whether, without import, you will be able to make available the maximum to the masses in this country and whether this invidious, sinful distinction between State and State surplus and deficit will end whereunder, in Kerala I have to pay Rs 5 per Kg., whereas across the border in Tamil Nadu, my friend is to pay only Rs 1.50 per Kg. If this is so, national integration is not going to be achieved. Therefore, equalisation has got to be effected. If this will contribute to that then of course it is a step in the right direction and I welcome this step.

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह (बनारस) : न्यायविधि महोदय साहब हम एक मजदूर विषय पर बड़ा विचार कर रहे हैं। इस में राजकीयि कावा से सम्बन्धता है देश की सम्बन्धार्थों से बढ़ाती करना होगा। जो कस्तूरिकला है उसको लेकर हम को बसना होगा। साम्यविक्रमा के कार्य में हमें सोचना होगा। साथ ही एक साथ पहले सरकार ने मजदूरों के व्यापार का सरकारीकरण किया

था। धातु जल्ने नई नीति निर्धारण की है। एक साल पहले अधिग्रहण के समय जो घोषणा की गई थी उस में मुख्य रूप से चार बातें कही गई थी। ये बुनियादी बातें थीं। पहली यह कही गई थी कि बिना योग्य अनाज पर सरकारी नियंत्रण हो जिसके मद्देनाज़ी तथा उसके परिणामस्वरूप कीमतों और अनाज उपलब्ध होने के संबंध में होने वाले कृत्रिम उनाज चढ़ाव को समाप्त किया जा सके। दूसरी बात यह कही गई थी कि उत्पादकों से लाभदायक दरों पर अनाज खरीदना जिससे उन्हें उत्पादन बढ़ाने का मौका मिले तथा सरकारी एजेंसियों को अनाज बेचने के लिये प्रोत्साहित किया जा सके। तीसरी बात यह कही गई थी कि धान अनाज विश्वकर्मा मंत्र के दुर्बल वर्ग को उचित मूल्य पर अन्न उपलब्ध हो सके और चौथी बात यह कही गई थी कि अनावश्यक बिचौलियों की भूमिका को समाप्त करके थोक व्यापार को समता बनाया जा सके तथा व्यवस्था में सुधार लाया जा सके।

धातु जब सरकार ने नई नीति घोषणा की है उस में भी अनेक समझ में चार बातें ही हमारे सामने आती हैं। पहली बात यह है कि किसान को प्रोत्साहन मूल्य मिल सके। दूसरे अभावग्रस्त राज्यों में सुविधापूर्वक गेह पहुँचाया जा सके। तीसरे समाचारी बन्द हो और देश में गेहूँ के भावों में अन्तर को समाप्त किया जा सके, मिटाया जा सके और चौथे सरकार को बिना मन्दा कं फेयर प्राइस की दुकानों में गेहूँ पहुँचाने के लिये उपयुक्त गेहूँ उपलब्ध हो सके।

लेकिन जिस बात से मैं डरता हूँ उसको मैं कष्ट देना चाहता हूँ। मेरे डर की भी चार ही बातें हैं जो मुख्य हैं। पहली बात यह है कि पचास प्रतिशत जो धान कहते हैं कि होल्सेस पर धातुको जमा करके देना, मैं डरता हूँ कि उसका हिमाज किम तरह से ठीक से रह सकेगा। किस तरह से उस को धातु बैंक करेगे और किम तरह पना लघुवर्गों कि वह पचास प्रतिशत धातुको इमानदारी से दे देगा। दूसरे सप्लाय इंस्पीक्टर जो हैं, जो धातुके सरकारी अधिकारी हैं वे उसको बैंक करने जायेंगे तो उनकी इमानदारी पर भी मुझे सन्देह है कि वे ठीक ढंग से सरकार के पक्ष में काम करेंगे या होल्सेस के पक्ष में काम करेंगे। हमें जो कष्ट अनुभव हुआ है उसके आधार पर यह बात कह रहा हूँ। तीसरे सरकार को आशुतिवा जो गेहूँ बेचना मैं डरता हूँ कि कहीं वह ऐसा न हो कि समा

पड़ा हो बटिया किम का हो और अच्छा वह अपने पास रख ले जिस को वह अधिक दायों पर लोगों को बेच सके। ऐसा होगा तो धातुकी राजन की दुकानों पर से गेहूँ लेने वाले लोग कहेंगे कि इन को बटिया गेहूँ मिल रहा है। चौथी बात यह है कि जिन उद्देश्यों को ले कर धातुने नई नीति घोषित की है कहीं उनका भी फिर से धातुको कोई कष्ट अनुभव न हो जाए और उन उद्देश्यों पर पानी न पिए जाए जिन को लेकर धातु चले हैं।

मैं बड़े ही अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार की कमी भी यह न सोचें कि उनकी जवाबदेही समाप्त हो गई है। कृपि मन्त्री जो ने पिछले दिनों आकाशवाणी के माध्यम से इतरण्य से कहा था कि वे मोच रहे हैं कि राजन की दुकानों में कम धातु वाले लोगों को ही गेहूँ दिया जाए, एक सीमा तक वालों को तो दिया जाए लेकिन जो उस सीमा के बाहर हो वे खुले बाजार से गेहूँ या अन्न खरीदें। यह एक अच्छी व्यवस्था होगी। मैं इसका स्वागत करना हूँ। बल्कि मैं तो कहना चाहता हूँ कि पांच मी रुपये तक पाने वाले जो कर्मचारी हैं, पांच मी तक जिन की धातु है और जिन की संख्या बहुत अधिक है गेहूँ लोगों को तो धातु राजन की दुकानों में व और बाकी लोगों को धातु खुले बाजार से खरीदने के लिये बड़े धीर जिन भाव में वे बाज़े खरीदें।

वर्तमान परिस्थिति बहुत विषम है। कई प्रकार के अनुभव सरकार को हो चुके हैं। सरकार के प्रति अन्न बिनी बात की सबसे बड़ी शिकायत किसी को रही है, सदन को रही है और सदन को रही है तो पूरे देश को रहा है वह यह है कि सरकार ने जिनकी दूकान उसको दिखानी चाहिये थी नहीं दिखायी। एच सी धाई ने गोल्डमान होने रहे, अनाज के मामले में सरकारी अधिकारियों द्वारा अपने अधिकारों का दुरुपयोग होता रहा और उन सब की बर्बाद सदन में होती रही है और उस सारी चीज को कितनी गंभीरता से लेना चाहिये था उसनी गंभीरता से सरकार ने नहीं लिया। उम्मी का यह गंभीरता है कि सरकार को नई नीति घोषित करनी पड़ी है।

समापित महोदय, जिन जनता ने मुझे यहाँ चुन कर भेजा है उन में से 90 प्रतिशत किसान हैं और वे मोच हैं जिन की जीविका खेतों से चलती है। उनकी और से मैं एक बात धातुको बचक्य कहना चाहता हूँ। धातुने 31 सारीख को रेडियो इतरण्य में यह कहा था

[श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह]

कि औद्योगिक क्षेत्रों में तो धातु होने लेकिन दूसरों में नहीं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि औद्योगिक क्षेत्रों को लोच धरकर खाना खाते हैं तो ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के लोग हवा पीकर जीते हैं। धातु अपनी जवाबदेही से मुक्त न मानें। औद्योगिक क्षेत्रों में धातु देते हैं तो ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में भी जहा पर कमी नहीं भी है वहाँ भी धातुको देना पड़ेगा। ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों की हालत बदतर है, खराब है। वहाँ भी धातुको बितरण की व्यवस्था करनी होगी।

मैं यह भी समझता हूँ कि धातु का उत्पादन उतना कम नहीं हुआ है। जितना धातु सोचने है, जितना धातुकी धातु का प्रभाव दिखाई देना है उतना प्रभाव नहीं है। बितरण व्यवस्था में गड़बड़ी के कारण धातुकी की स्थिति पैदा हुई है। इसलिये हुई है क्योंकि हम ठीक ढंग से उतना कंट्रोल नहीं कर सके हैं, इसलिये हुई है कि अनाजों के प्रति हमने पूरी सख्ती नहीं बरती, उतनी तरीके से अनाजग्रस्त क्षेत्रों के वास्ते धातु की उपलब्धि नहीं की और मुनाफाखोरा की मुनाफाखोरी की प्रवृत्ति को बन्द नहीं कर सके हैं। इसलिये हम को इस प्रकार की अनौपचारिक अनाजों में देखने को मिलती है कि सरकार ने घुटने टेक दिए हैं। कई अनाजों में लिखा है कि सरकार ने व्यापारियों के सामने घुटने टेक दिये। मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि सरकार ने जनता की आवाज को सुन कर अपनी नीति में कोई सी तस्वीर की है। लेकिन हम के साथ ही सरकार को यह भी साफ कर देना चाहिये कि अगर मुनाफाखोर, अनाजों और काना बाजार करते वाले इन परिवर्तन से नाजायज लाभ उठाते हैं, तो सरकार फिर से गेहूँ के व्यापार में अपनी एकाधिकार कौशल करेगी। जब तक सरकार की गंगी तलवार उन लोगों की गर्दन पर नहीं लटकती, तब तक वे लोग ठीक रास्ते पर नहीं रहेंगे।

हम पांचवीं पंच-वर्षीय योजना के प्राथम को प्राइमल लेप देने जा रहे हैं। पांचवीं पंच-वर्षीय योजना का जो प्राथम हमारे सामने आया है, उसमें स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि गाँवों के निम्नतम 30 प्रतिशत लोगों की प्रति-व्यक्ति प्रति-माह खपत 22.40 रुपये से बढ़ा कर 36.64 रुपये कर दी जावे। सरकार यह वृद्धि कैसे करेगी? मैं समझता हूँ कि कृषि के माध्यम से

ऐसा किया जा सकता है। पांचवीं योजना के कहा गया है कि गेहूँ की पैदावार का सकल बर्तमान से 4.1 प्रतिशत वृद्धि का निश्चय किया गया है। इस लिये सरकार को उत्पादन में वृद्धि की ओर भी बराबर सावधानी बरतनी होगी, ताकि समाज का वह कमजोर वर्ग—किसान को मैं कमजोर वर्ग मानता हूँ, क्योंकि उस की संगठित आवाज दिल्ली तक नहीं पहुँच पाती है, अब कि दूसरे लोगों की पहुँच पाती है,

समस्यति महोदय: क्या मेरी आवाज माफ़ीय सदस्य तक पहुँच रही है या नहीं? अब वह समाप्त करें।

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह: जब सरकार ने इस नई नीति की घोषणा की, उस दिन से भाव कुछ मरने लगे हुए हैं। समाप्ति महोदय, स्वयं धातु के क्षेत्र, मुजफ्फरपुर, का यह समाचार है

'कौट प्राइम कम्प डाउन वार्ड स्पोज टैन एट मुजफ्फरपुर'

अन में मैं सरकार से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह उन लोगों पर सावधानी और सख्ती से नजर रखे, जो इस नई नीति का इम्प्लीमेंट करने जा रहे हैं और वह यह भी स्पष्ट कर दे कि अगर कोई गड़बड़ी हुई, तो वह गेहूँ के व्यापार को अपने एकाधिकार में ले लेंगे।

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Chairman, to my mind nothing could be a greater treat to the hon. Members of this House than to hear the observations that have been made by the members of the ruling party today on this subject. It is obvious how easily and perfectly they can perform *Shirshasan*. We on this side of the House cannot claim to perform *Shirshasan* in the same manner!

If some hon. Members on this side of the House had advanced the same arguments when this scheme was going to be adopted, then they would have been called, and in fact they were called, as reactionaries and what not. They exhausted

all the epithets their own lexicon. Now the apprehended crisis has come. And none except the incredibly credulous or abjectly psychopantic could expect that this scheme was going to succeed. This has, therefore, proved to be mis-adventure and it has ended in a smoke, in a fiasco.

We would have been happy if this scheme had succeeded, because we do not want to play politics with food. In a totalitarian system there can be politics without food but in democracy there must be food without politics.

What I want to ask to other side is this. Are you prepared to free food from politics? If you want to be do that, than of course, the people would be happy.

We all are as much concerned, Mr. Chairman, that the breakdown in the public distribution system has to be prevented at all costs. The breakdown would spell great miseries, unspeakable miseries, to the people who number at least 150 to 160 million—the people who depend on public distribution system.

The so-called take-over, which my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta, was lamenting, was not a take-over at all. Was it a take-over if you had a limited objective of procuring a particular quantity of food-grains? That is a semantic perversion; that is a linguistic violence, to call it a wheat take-over. It was, indeed, not a wheat take-over it was a step with a very limited objective of procuring a particular quantity of foodgrains. And yet the hon. members on that side, and some hon. members on this side also, trumpeted this measure as a great progressive measure. What did the Soviet Union say when the Burmese Government had taken over food quite a few years back without adequate preparation? They had said that the Burmese Government had launched a kind of mis-adventure and, therefore, it had resulted in a great deal of misery to the

people. Anything which is tried to be done without adequate preparation is indeed a kind of adventurism, and it was that which this Government had taken recourse to. Yet, the hon. members of the Communist Party of India thought, that it was a progressive step even though they knew in their heart of hearts that the Government did not have the capacity to put their scheme through, that this party could put this scheme through. Now they know, because they happen to be a cadre-based party, that this party has no cadre to work in the fields. Do they not know the state of organisation of this party? The kind of organisation that this party has is a motley crowd which only believes in augmenting the heat-waves of the words as a substitute for progressivism. Yet, the Communist Party of India thought that this was the Party which could be expected to put this scheme through. Did they not realise that, under a democratic system, there are certain constraints on coercive methods to and one could not take recourse to them. All these factors, they knew perfectly well. And yet they pretended that this scheme was going to succeed.

I would like to submit to this House that the so-called take-over has not failed; it was, in fact, a very limited objective, a very moderate objective, of procurement of a particular quantity of wheat, and even that has failed. One of the main reasons for a failure of this kind is the kind of sloganism or pseudo-radicalism that is flourishing in this mutual admiration society which the ruling party has formed with the Communist Party of India. Now we find a strange kind of phenomenon. (*Interruptions*). I have told you that I would have been happy if they had made it a success. I do not make a theology of anything. Those who make theology are traditionalists. I do not believe them to be democratic socialist at all. What is the kind of thing that we find now? The Prime-Minister tries to get a certificate of progressivism and socialism from the Communist

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]
Party and the C.P.I. takes a certificate from the Prime Minister of India as being the only democratic party which believes in Socialism and does not believe in violence. Did not the Prime Minister say the other day at Bhubaneswar that that is the only party in the Opposition ?

So, the certificate is being exchanged between the two.

AN HON. MEMBER : That is why you should not involve in violent activity.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : We will never do that.

I have always held this view and told this House earlier that the Prime Minister of India can be trusted to declain like Lenin and perform like Maharani Gayatri Devi. That is the kind of leadership that is being provided to the country in the matter of socialism.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : The Hon. Member's remarks are very uncharitable to Maharani Gayatri Devi, another Hon. Member of this House.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : One really does not know whether the Prime Minister involved herself in the task of policy-formulation. When it comes to nationalisation of coal it is said that it was the late Mr. Mohan Kumaramangalam who was responsible for it. When it comes to the take-over of wheat, it is said that it was Mr. D. P. Dhar the Planning Minister who was responsible. When it comes to devaluation had it been said that it was Mr. C. Subramaniam who was responsible. Thus it is suggested that the Prime Minister all the while keeps an open mind. I really do not know how this can be done. And the real source of many of these troubles is this that where Nehru feared to tread, the present Prime Minister rushes in Nehru at the

height of his own political power and that of his party did not embark upon certain schemes, but the present Prime Minister takes up those schemes, without going into the practical aspects.

And, so far as wheat scheme is concerned, failure was built-in in it from the very beginning. None of the Chief Ministers except the Punjab Chief Minister agreed. The Chief Minister of Punjab believed in it. The Chief Minister of Punjab had very organised market and he alone probably believed in it and no other Chief Minister took any part in it. And the story goes and I put it to the hon. Minister of Food. The story goes that he did not believe in the scheme and he perhaps had also an open mind like his boss, the Prime Minister, on this subject. And even now you find that there are so many kinds of contradictory statement. The hon. Member, Mr. Chandrajit Yadav, who happens to be the General-Secretary of the ruling party has said that it has failed miserably and the policy of the party was not implemented. The hon. Minister of Finance said a few days back that there was no question of two-tier pricing in wheat as in the case of sugar. But what has happened now ? It would be a three-tier price system as Mr. Madhu Limya says. The hon. Minister of Planning Shri D.P. Dhar, said at an Economists Conference that the public distribution system required to be strengthened.

What does the hon. Minister of Food say ? He says that the public distribution system requires to be pruned and that is what the hon. Minister, said just now. In no case should it not be pruned to the disadvantage of the rural masses. But what you want to do is to restrict it to certain cities and industrial areas. If that is going to happen, that is going to be a matter of great distress for the rural people.

There are certain features of the scheme which do not give us much hopes that this

scheme would succeed. Let us take the question of licensing of the traders. There would only be a great deal of corruption in the matter of licensing of the traders. This point has been made by so many members. How are you going to impose a levy of 50% on everyone of the wholesale traders? There are many loopholes. It appears now that the prices are going to reach a new high and the situation may take a more serious turn. I have a feeling—this is based on facts—that the prices of food by 1974 end are going to be increased to the extent of 40%. That is because the issue price is going to be increased from Rs. 87 to Rs. 125. The pivotal thing in the whole price structure is going to be affected adversely. It has been claimed probably by many hon. Members—that is very much in the minds of the hon. Members—that there would not be any need for a subsidy. It had been rightly pointed out by often that this was going to be off-set by the payment of D.A. to government employees. You have to strike a balance somewhere. How that balance is going to be of definite advantage to our financial system is yet to be seen.

One really does not know what is the rationale behind fixation of prices at a level of Rs. 105. This has not been disclosed to us by Government so far. Why should it not be more than Rs. 105? Why should it not be less than Rs. 105? The Agricultural Prices Commission has recommended a price range from Rs. 90 to 100. How has the Government come to this figure? On the basis of the present day situation, it seems that they expect about five million tonnes of grains during rabi season from the wholesale traders. But our information is that earlier the wholesale traders had promised 6.5 million tonnes. Why has this been scaled down from the wholesale traders? We really do not know whether it is for a consideration. That is a matter of great concern to us.

The whole question is this. We have to secure about 12 million tonnes of food-grains to feed the public distribution system. If the House assumes that we have to have 12 million tonnes of foodgrains to feed our public distribution system, it appears to me, that on the basis of this figure, it may not be possible to do so. This year the rabi production I am afraid is going to be only 60% of what it was during the last year. It would not be any more than this. Last year, the wheat production was of the order of 24.92 million tonnes. I fear it may not cross the twenty million mark this time. This is indeed a very unhappy prospect.

Apart from the fall in production this year, the price to be paid to the producers might also affect the arrival of crops in the market. And this is, for the first time, in our experience of many years, that no floor price has been fixed for the producers. If no floor price is fixed for the producer, one really does not know whether the producer is going to take to production with added vigour and enthusiasm. Similarly, it appears to me, that there is going to be no ceiling price either. Wheat is going to sell at Rs. 200 or Rs. 190 per quintal, and one does not know really how much, but it is within the range of possibility, as I see it, that probably it would be much more than Rs. 150 which Government are assuring just now.

There is a third factor which might militate against the expectation and that is because of the zonal restrictions, that seem to prevail at the moment, and it may be difficult for the wholesale trader to procure the quantity which Government are now assuring.

I would like to make a suggestion about what ought to be done about it. To my mind, the more realistic course was not to depend upon the quantity that the whole-

[Shri Shyamandan Mishra]
 sale trader would be specks to collect but to suppose levies on every market and every wholesale trader particular quantity could be laid down for procurement by Government. Let them not leave it to them and let them not leave it to their inspector to calculate what is 50 per cent of what has arrived. The 50 per cent that they arrive at is an uncertain quantity. One really does not know what it is going to be. If they want that 12 million tonnes have to be procured, then let them distribute it over all the mandis and all the wholesale traders and make a firm and perfect calculation about it and ask them to deliver the prescribed quantity. Probably they would cooperate with Government.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : Calculate on what basis ?

SHRI SHYAMANANDAN MISHRA. They have got all the facts and data. This will eliminate uncertainty. This will also eliminate corruption. And we shall all co-operate with Government because it will eliminate corruption. Their inspector might create another kind of havoc, although he would be going about in the name of supervision.

My final suggestion would be no in no case, whether the agency which sells to the consumer is a private or a public agency, the price charged from the consumer should exceed by more than 12 per cent. But what Government are seeking to do is something unconscionable, because they want to add 25 per cent by way of expenditure on marketing operations.

समाप्त महोदय . माननीय सदस्यों की मुद्रिका के लिये मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ—इस विषय के लिये जो समय निर्दिष्ट हुआ था वह अब समाप्त-समय है, सभी सभ्य महोदय को उम्मीद थी देना है .

श्री मधु लिये (बाका) . कल उवाच है .

समाप्त महोदय : नहीं, निचम के मुताबिक बात ही बात होना । मैं बंद अनुमति करना चाहता हूँ कि कश्चित् दल के सदस्य जिन की संख्या ज्यादा है वे अधिक से अधिक सात मिनट समय लें ।

श्री इन्दुजीत मुखर्जी यह बहुत कम तक चलेगी ?

समाप्त महोदय करीब करीब सात बजे तक ।

श्री लक्ष्मण शर्मा (नागौर) . माननीय केमर-मैन साहब, इस साल मँगू का अभाव किस तरह से हो, किस कीमता पर मँगू बिकना क्या जब सरकारी गादामों में, इस फसल का व्यापार किस तरह से चले—इस सब नीतियों को लेकर कृषि मंत्री जी ने जो भाषण दिया, उन के बारे में बहुत से विरोधी पक्ष के लोगो ने कहा कि हम लोगो से पूछे बिना, मन्साह लिये बिना उन्होंने भाषण दे दिया है । इस लिये हम इस पर यहाँ चर्चा करते । उन्होंने चर्चा के लिये बहुत जोर दिया और यह चर्चा यहाँ हो गई । इस से बहुत सी बातों की सफाई हो जायेगी, उन को अपनी बात बताने का मौका मिल गया । लेकिन जो नीति निर्धारण की गई है, देश की स्थिति का देखते हुए वह एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण नीति है और देश के धान के उत्पादन को देखते हुए मैं समझता हूँ कि एक अच्छा रास्ता है । किसान को उन के उत्पादन की विनीयम कीमत क्या दी जाय—यह नीति भी सभी दो-तीन साल पहले तय हुई थी । पिछले साल यह गारंटी भी सोचा गया कि विरोधियों को हटा दें, मीठा बरतारण कर से, कम्प्यूटर सीधा प्रोड्यूसर से खरीद कर रास्ता भी पिछले साल बनाया गया और इस सदन के बहुत से माननीय सदस्य यह मानते हैं कि यह बड़ा अच्छा काम हुआ । लेकिन यहाँ एक बात है—वे सब इमानदारी से काम करने, किसानों की वास्तविक दाय दिला देते, कम्प्यूटर और प्रोड्यूसर के बीच का जो वास्तव था, वह हट जाय तो मुझे बहुत खुशी होगी, लेकिन हुआ क्या ? इन की बातों और इन के करने में क्या फर्क है । बहुत से लोग तो कहते हैं सरकार से रहते ही वास्तविकता का मौका मिलता है तो दो-तीन फीसदी के हानने का कर सरकार लगा जाती है । इन की धारणा किसानों के दाय जाने का नीति निकल जाय तो वास्तविकता है कि सरकार ने बहुत कम दाय दिये हैं । मैं कम्प्यूटर आदर्श की कल्पना करता हूँ—अक्टोबर 76 तक

का बहुत कम धाम दे कर गेहूँ ले रही है, अच्छा होता कि सरकार 100 रुपये देती, इस से ज्यादा गेहूँ इकट्ठा हो सकता था....

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता 100 रुपये किसी ने नहीं कहा।

श्री माधुराम मिर्चा प्राप ने 100 रुपये कहा है, कई दफा कहा है—पिछले साल में। अगर 100 रुपये देते तो 46 लाख टन गेहूँ आ जाता।

श्री इन्द्रहाक सम्मन्नी (अमरगोटा) किमी न कहा।

श्री माधुराम मिर्चा प्राप क्या नाम म्नुवाने है, मैंने झूठ नहीं कहा है।

श्री इन्द्रहाक सम्मन्नी किम कम्पानिन्ट ने क्या है ?

श्री माधुराम मिर्चा प्राप के बहुत ने कम्पानिन्टो ने कहा है, नहीं कहा है। जब हम प्राप ने मिला की तरह धान करने हैं तो मुझे कहा है कि किमान को ज्यादा धाम देने, 100 रुपये धान तो धान ज्यादा मिल जाना, प्रापने 76 रुपये दिये हैं इस मिये धान कम धाम, प्रापने भाव फिलम करने में धनती की है। वे लोग बर्हा जा कर प्रचार करने है कि भाव कम फिलम हुआ है, धनते खाल भाव ठीक करावने। इस धाम म दे दो, ऐसा प्रचार करने कोई नहीं गया। ये सब राजनीतिक खिलाफो है, हर बात को राजनीतिक लाभ को दृष्टि से देखते हैं। कोई यह नहीं कहता कि इन में इन्पुट डार्को, धनती के साथ मेहनत करो जिस में ज्यादा उत्पादन हो, सब धाम की धान करने हैं, किमानो की बात करने हैं, कम्पुमर की धान करने हैं। इन का उद्देश्य है कि छोटे धीरे सबे किमान को लहावा, सब से भेद पैदा करो, जिस से इन का राजनीतिक मिषका बनता रहे।

श्री मिर्चा साहब कह रहे थे कि सरकार का बिजना अनुमान है इन का 60 परसेंट पैदा होगा।

श्री अश्वथ सम्मन् मिश्र : जी हाँ।

श्री माधुराम मिर्चा : जी नहीं। प्राप का क्या धाम है। मैं पूरे हिन्दुस्तान में दूकता हूँ और कलम को

देखता हूँ। पिछले साल के मुकामते इस साल गेहूँ 4 मिलियन टन ज्यादा पैदा होगा। मैं साफ बात कहता हूँ और प्रैक्टिकली धारों से देखा है, मोच-ममस कर धान करता हूँ, हवा में धान नहीं करता हूँ। प्राप ने पूछा कि 105 रुपये कैसे कर दिया ? मैं प्राप की बनलाना हूँ—हम ने इस पर काफी मनाह की, पानिपानेंट के मेम्बरों से भी मिन, दूमरी में भी धान की, किमी ने 90 कहा, किमी ने 85 कहा, किमी ने 100 कहा, किसी ने 105 कहा, किमी ने 107 कहा, सब किम की धान की मुने। हम ने मारे हालाल को देखा, किमानों को खर्च को देखा, डोजन को दिक्कत का देखा, दूमरी दिक्कतों को देखा, उन के बाद यह सोचा कि 105 रुपये देये तो उन को दिक्कतें कम हो सकती हैं। पिछले साल लोगो ने 175 और 200 रुपये तक गेहूँ खरीदा—इन सब बातों को देखने दृष्ट यह सोचा कि इस भाव में किसान अगर सीधा भी बेचता तो उन्ने दिक्कत नहीं होगी, महाजन को किमान में मीठा खरीद कर प्राप मरकार को दे देगा।

इसमें किसानों का भी काम चल जाएगा। दोनों के मिये रागो खुने हैं। सरकार ने यह भी सोचा है कि जो वे लोग ले उसका प्राप ने ले और बाकी बाधा के बाजार में बेचें। यह बहुत अच्छी नीति है। सब यह कहा जाता है कि कम लेये, रोज रोज का तिसाब कैसे रखेये—

18 Hrs.

श्री अश्वथ सम्मन् मिश्र उमका विकल्प हमने दिया है।

श्री माधुराम मिर्चा - विकल्प वह कुछ बिकर नहीं है। काम तो इनको करना है, प्रापको तो बात ही करनी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो काम इन्होंने किया है प्रैक्टिकल है, वाजिब है। इससे किमान भी खुल हूँ, दूमरी भी खुल हूँ। साबो लोगो ने मैं पिछले पांच दिनों में धूमा हूँ। धनम धनम मैंने उन से बात की है। बर्ानों से मिला हूँ, कम्पुमर से मिला हूँ, किमानो से मिला हूँ, व्यापारियों से मिला हूँ। सब लोग खुल हूँ। सबन में, प्राप मने ही कुछ भावण दे दे लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार की इस नीति के जरिये उसको छ सात मिलियन टन गेहूँ मिल जाएगा। करीब 15-16 मिलियन टन का बावण का स्टाक भी उनके पास रहेगा। वह

[श्री नाथूराम मिर्चा]

10-12 मिलियन टन का इस तरह से वितरण कर लेगी। वितरण का जहा तक संबंध है सब को वितरण हम नहीं कर सकेंगे। घ्राप जो गरीब हैं इनको दें, शामीन इलाको मे भी शहरों मे भी। जिन की घ्रापवनी एक सीमा से अधिक हो वह जकूरी नहीं है कि उनको घ्राप राशन की दुकानो से राशन दे। मवा सी रुपये जो घ्रापने वाम फिक्स किया है, वह बहुत सोच समझ कर किया है। बहुत ज्यादा सबमिडी देना भी ठीक नहीं है। वेज के रिस्तिमिस लिमिटिड हैं। इनको घ्राप देस के प्रोडक्शनके कामो मे लगाए। इस वामने यह जो 125 रुपये का भाव मुकररें घ्रापने किया है यह बिल्कुल बाजिब है, मारट प्रैक्टिकल है। लोगोने दो दो रुपये किलो ले कर खया है। उनको घ्राप सवा रुपया किलो देगे और बघा बघाया 8-10 किलो घ्राप दे देगे, जितने घ्राप की उनको घ्रापवय-वना है, दे देगे तो लोग घ्रापकी तारीफ करेंगे, उनको मन्तोय होगा, मजदूरों को गरीब किसानों को और जिन की घ्रापवनी कम है सब को सतोय हागा। घ्रापने बहुत अच्छी नीति घ्रापनाई है। यह वामबाब हागी। इससे किसान, मजदूर, बाबू सब को सतोय हागा। यह जो राम्ना है यह परमलिट नहीं है —

सत्तावर्ति सहोबब अब घ्राप भी सताप करे।

श्री नाथूराम मिर्चा घ्राप वाम भी घ्रापली वार नव इस तरह का झगडा नहीं करेंगे जैसे अब कर रहे हैं। घ्राप हागमाज ले कर न चने, खानी राजनीति का न देखें, कुछ प्राबलम को तल होने दे, यहाँ मेरी घ्राप स विलन घ्रापना है।

SHRI A K.M. ISHAQUE (Basirhat)
Mr Chairman, Sir, I wish the policy, now announced, a success. It is nothing but complementary to the old policy. Before I discuss the point issue, I would like to inform the House about the reaction of the docile rural people. The rural people have a feeling that they are being robbed, being cheated by the city people, the urban population, by the sophisticated urban population. They say that their products are bought cheap by the city people, while the city people produce little. They say that the village people are working under duress whereas the city population is not

under duress. They say that the law of putting a ceiling on properties has been enforced in the rural areas but till now the ceiling laws have not been introduced and enforced in the city areas. Their further grievance is that the Government does not ensure the supply of infrastructure for agriculture.

The Government does not undertake any obligation to supply fertilisers or provide irrigation facilities, but it is very keen to get their produce at a price fixed by the Government. Therefore, they have a feeling that they are being robbed by the sophisticated urban population. Their grievance is that their produce is being taken out from the rural areas and city people are being fed. There are cities in this country which are statutory rationing areas and it is obligatory on the part of the Government to feed them, but the Government has not taken any responsibility of feeding rural people who produce. The Government should take this feeling in the rural areas into consideration.

As the situation stands today. We have got a sellers market in India and our food policy is oriented on that. Government should see that the food policy is conditioned by the production of foodgrains. Japan was a deficit country in food. It is a densely populated country. It became a surplus country. How? They did not meet out stepmotherly treatment to the peasantry in Japan; they gave them a very remunerative price. The Government of Japan purchased all the products of the peasantry and gave heavy subsidy to them. That gave a great incentive to production and the country has now become surplus. We could have also done this in this country. We could have produced more fertilisers in the country and we could have made provisions for more areas to be brought under irrigation. Our people have learnt the art of producing

high yielding varieties of grains. We have made progress. Since Independence our production has gone up by 220 per cent. This production could be enhanced further, if incentives are given to the people and if the necessary infra-structure is created in the villages.

The charge is that the Government is on the retreat. Where from? When the policy was announced last time, the Government had a limited purpose. The Government never took the responsibility of feeding the entire population of the country. Government took the responsibility of feeding only the vulnerable sections and the weaker sections of the society. Government policy left the free market to operate. In the new policy that has been announced now, there has been no retreat from that stand. Government has declared unambiguously that the Government will feed the vulnerable, the poor and the weaker sections of the society. The aim is there. Only the strategy has been changed. The *modus operandi* that was accepted by the Government previously somehow or other forced the foodgrains to go underground. Now, the problem before the Government is, how to bring these foodgrains out of the black-market. Food has gone underground; Government has to bring them out. This is the only concern at the present moment. Government has been utilising the traders who were operating in the market. I do not have any recommendation for them. But, they are the necessary evils; you cannot avoid them.

In Maharashtra, we had food riots, only last year, after the take over. If the take-over policy was such a revolutionary step, if the take-over policy was helpful, how is it that the prices of foodgrains went up, as high as Rs. 10 per KG in Maharashtra and how is it that there were food riots? Any Government is worth the name, if it

reacts to the feelings of the people to an announced policy. It is nice, Government has taken the feelings of the people into consideration. So long as this Government takes the feelings of the people into consideration, it will be helpful.

Sir, I would like to make two or three suggestions to the Government before I resume my seat. They have now allowed the traditional machinery, the trading community to operate. They have been asked to hand-over 50% of their stocks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you want to make all the three suggestions, kindly mention only the points.

SHRI A.K.M. ISHAQUE: I will mention only the points. I will not go beside the point.

I do not have any objection to the Government utilising their traditional channels. But, my question is, how do we ensure that they hand-over 50% of their stocks? If the market system that obtains in Punjab and Haryana was available in other parts of the country also, Government, perhaps, would not have been in a difficult situation. I would like the Government to assure us that they will obtain 50% of the stocks from these wholesale traders. Sir, I would suggest that there should be contractual agreements between the Government and these wholesale traders and if there is any breach of these contracts, these wholesalers should be punished very stringently and laws should be framed in such a way that they can be dealt with firmly in case of breach of these agreements.

Sir, nobody knows what would be the attitude of these wholesalers and nobody knows what will happen a month or two months hence. But, the symptoms are already there. Only a fortnight ago, wheat was selling in Delhi at Rs. 2.50 per Kg.

[Shri A.K. M. Ishaque]

This is not from statistics, this is our own experience from the Delhi market. Yesterday, it was selling at Rs 1.75 per Kg. The announcement of the policy has influenced the prices in the market so heavily. But I am not sure whether this trend will continue. I am not sure either whether other trends will also start operating. But if the price is an index then I am hopeful that the policy now enunciated by the Government may carry us out of the difficult situation. I wish the policy every success and I would ask the Government to pursue this policy whole-heartedly and make it a success.

श्री मधु सिन्घे (बाका) मन्त्रालय महादय, मुझे लगता है कि जो वर्तमान माहौल है उसमें सरकारी व्यापार व खरीदोपार और अनुसूचित वर्गों के बीच निजी व्यापार व मुद्रासाधारण बिल्कुल मरनाहिन है। ऐसी हालत में पिछले वर्ष जिन नीति का अपनाया गया उससे मूल्य कई उम्मीद नहीं थी। आज जब कि नई कमान आ रही है अगर गेहूँ का दाम कहीं दस रुपये या 10-12 रुपये मिल जाता है तो माननीय सदस्यों का बहुत ज्यादा आकांक्षी नहीं होना चाहिए। अभी पूरा साल बीतने वाला है। इसलिए नई नीति में भी मुझे कई उम्मीद नहीं है।

इस सदन में माधना के बारे में सरकारी व्यापार बनाम निजी व्यापार के बारे में बड़े जोर-जोर से बहस हुई है, लेकिन उद्देश्यों की दृष्टि से हम लोगो न बहुत कम की है। बेरी गय में तीन प्रधान उद्देश्यों का हमें अपनी आख नीति के जरिये हासिल करना चाहिए। पहला उद्देश्य तो यह है कि उत्पादकों का उन की फसल का उचित दाम मिल और उन की पैदावार को बढ़ाने के लिए खाद, बीज, फीटनासक दवायें और पानी आदि जो चीजें आवश्यक हैं, वे भी उन को उचित दाम पर मिलें, ताकि वेस अनाज के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर बन सकें।

दूसरा उद्देश्य यह है कि मजदूर और श्रमिक इलाकों की शरीर कमान को सन्तुष्ट अनाज मिले। तृतीय श्रमिक जनता पर जोर देना चाहना है, क्योंकि कमान अंजी बढ़ाव उन को मूल्य जाया करते हैं। जहाँ तक श्रमिक इलाकों का समाज है, केवल कर्षण एक ही धुर्ती का

अपवाद छोड़कर श्रमिक इलाकों में करीब करीब सरकारी वितरण व्यवस्था एक वर्ग के समाप्त हो चुकी है।

तीसरा उद्देश्य यह है कि विभिन्न फसलों के दामों के बीच, और खेती-माल के दाम और कारखानों की चीजों के दामों के बीच में एक समन्वय और सतुल्यता हो। अगर सरकार इन तीन उद्देश्यों को पूरा नहीं करेगी, तो कोई भी आख नीति सफल नहीं हो पायेगी।

सरकार को यह बतलाना करना है कि उस ने विगत साल जिन नीति का अपनाया, उस में वह पूर्णतया असफल रही? लेकिन सरकार ने इस असफलता के कारणों की खोज नहीं की। सरकार ने अनाज प्राप्त करने के बारे में लक्ष्य बनाये थे, लेकिन पंजाब और हरियाणा का छाड़ कर और बिनी भा राज्य न उन व से 60 प्रतिशत लक्ष्य भी हासिल नहीं किया है। अहा तक बिहार का लक्ष्य है उस का 6 लाख टन का लक्ष्य था, लेकिन उस न 50 000 टन गन्ना भी हासिल नहीं किया। इसी तरह मध्य प्रदेश, उत्तर प्रदेश और राजस्थान में भी सरकार पूर्णतया असफल रही। अभी हालत में सरकार को इस असफलता के कारणों की खोज करनी चाहिए थी।

आज सरकार का व्यापारिया का 105 रुपये प्रति-क्विंटल देने के लिए तैयार हो गई है। लेकिन हम पूरे साल भर कहने रहें कि कामगारों का सरकार कम से कम 90 रुपये प्रति-क्विंटल—और अगर संभव हो, तो 100 रुपये प्रति-क्विंटल दे, लेकिन सरकार ने ऐसा नहीं किया। अगर यह दाम किसानों को दिया जाता, और जिन बड़े बड़े खेतीदारों के पास अनिश्चित अनाज है, उन के साथ छोटी खेती की जानी—एक छोटी उचित दाम दिये जाते और दूसरी और बाड़ी खेती की जाती—, तो मेरा क्या कहूँ कि सरकार का अनाज हासिल करने का जो लक्ष्य था, उस से अधिक मिल जाता। लेकिन सरकार ने यह एक बहुत बड़ी भूल की और आज उस को थोके व्यापारियों को 105 रुपये प्रति क्विंटल देने के लिए बाध्य होना पड़ा है। इसमें से कितना कामगारों को मिलने वाला है, इसके बारे में भी मेरे मन में सन्देह है।

गेहूँ पैदा करने वाले जो समन्वित राज्य हैं, सरकार उन से भी अनाज नहीं लेजने देनी। उच्च की खेती का

होया कि उन राशियों में गेहूँ के दाम नीचे चले जायेंगे । और काश्तकारों को 105 रुपये नहीं मिलेगा । अगर नहीं मिलेगा तो उनके बारे में आप क्या करने वाले हैं ? यह आप अपने भाषण में हम लोगों को बता दें कि क्या सरकार स्वयं यह जिम्मेदारी लेगी कि अगर काश्तकारों को यह नहीं मिलेगा तो हम लोग 105 रुपये फूड कारपोरेशन या श्री ग्रीन मरचाए हैं उन के मार्फत उनको देने ? बिगत साल 76 रुपये क्विंटल दाम निर्धारित किया गया था और मुझे याद आता है कि श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने उत्तर प्रदेश के अपने दौरे में हिमाचल में यह कहा था कि अगर 76 रुपये क्विंटल आप माला देने के लिए तैयार नहीं होंगे तो हम विदेशों में माला माला भ्रमणों के लिए तैयार हो जायेंगे । अब आपने स्वयं कहा है कि विदेशों में गत वर्ष 1973 में आपने 41 लाख टन माला भ्रमणों का क्या 76 रुपये क्विंटल से कम दाम दे कर आप न यह अनाज भ्रमणों का ? ना हम तरह की जो धमकी किसानों को दी गई उस का क्या मतलब है ?

मैं उत्पादन की चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ जिस की ओर बहुत कम ध्यान गया है । आप अगर बिगत कुछ वर्षों के आंकड़े देखेंगे तो आप को पता चलेगा कि 1966-67 से 1970-71 तक पाच वर्षों में गेहूँ की पैदावार बढ़ती गई । यानी औसत अगर प्रति वर्ष का निकाला जाय तो हर साल 20 प्रतिशत से भी अधिक उत्पादन में वृद्धि हुई । फिर क्या बात है कि 1970-71 के बाद गेहूँ के उत्पादन में कुछ की स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई ? जब तक इस की जड़ में नहीं जायेंगे तब तक इस मामले की चर्चा नहीं होने वाली है । मेरी राय है कि 70-71 के बाद एक ओर सरकारों की धीमा के दाम लगातार बढ़ते चले गए, किसानों के इन्फ्लेशन में धीमा वाली धीमा के दाम लगातार बढ़ते गए और एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्ट्स कमीशन में जो अहरी किसान के साथ बैठें हैं उन्होंने इन बातों पर विचार नहीं किया । तीन बार साल तक आप ने गेहूँ की खरीदने का दाम बिल्कुल नहीं बढ़ाया । उस का मतलब यह हुआ कि धीरे धीरे उत्पादन की वृद्धि में कुछ की स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई ।

अब आप आवाज की तरफ देखें । 1966 में लगभग 1 करोड़ टन से भी अधिक अनाज आप लोगों में भ्रमणों का और 1972 तक वह कम होता गया, तब तक हर साल

टन आप ने भ्रमणों का । लेकिन आप की इन गलत नीतियों का एकदम अंतर 1973 में पहा जबकि आप को 41 लाख टन अनाज बाहर से भ्रमणों का पहा श्री ग्रीन मरचा से 20 लाख टन कर्जा लेना पहा ।

श्री कृष्णचंद्रन शर्मा अहमदाबाद : जो कम से आया है वह भी 41 लाख टन में ही है ।

श्री मधु सिन्हा : आप के बक्तव्य में तो यह साफ नहीं होता है । आप ने कहा कि 41 लाख टन आप ने भ्रमणों और 20 लाख टन कम से कर्जा लिया । अब आप उस को साफ करिए ।

तो सरकार की जो नई नीति है इस नीति के बारे में मेरे मन में कई संदेह उत्पन्न हो जाते हैं । एक तो इस बक्त राजधानी की कोई बात नहीं बनाई गई बल्कि खास मंत्री ने यह कहा है कि जहां तक मार्गदर्शन बितरण का माला है हम अपनी जिम्मेदारी को जितना हो सके घटाने का प्रयास करेंगे, यह मंत्री महोदय का बक्तव्य है । अगर वर्तमान जो स्थिति है उस के अर्थों में आप करेंगे ना मैं आप से कहना चाहता

कि इस तरह अपनी जिम्मेदारी को घटाने का आप प्रयास करेंगे तो जा खेतिहर मजदूर और भूमिहीन लोग हैं उन के ऊपर क्या होने वाली है यह आप बरा विचार कीजिए । और एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो भी विवरण पढ़ाते रहेंगे उस में भ्रमणों की इनकी तेजी से बढ़ रही है कि जिस को कोई हद नहीं । जैसा कि मैंने पिछले अक्टूबर को अपने प्रस्ताव पर बोलते हुए कहा, दो तीन महीने पहले मैंने यह कहा था कि ये जो सप्लाय इंस्पेक्टर हैं ये लोग गेहूँ के एक बोरे पर 5 रुपये घुस लेते थे, आटे की बोरी पर इस रुपये भ्रमण लेते थे, चीनी और केरोसीन पर 15 रुपये लेते थे और दो तीन महीने के अंदर स्थिति यह हो गई कि अब इस रुपये गेहूँ के बोरे पर ले रहे हैं, 25 रुपये चीनी के ऊपर ले रहे हैं और एक डम केरोसीन के ऊपर 25 रुपये ले रहे हैं । ये लोक पकड़े गए हैं किसी तरह की जांच नहीं हुई । मुझे ऐसा लगता है, चाहे आप सरकारों की अपनी व्यवस्था को सुद्ध करने का काम नहीं करेंगे, भ्रमणों के ऊपर नियंत्रण नहीं रखेंगे तब तक कोई भी

[श्री मधु सिन्घे]

प्रणाली आपकी नहीं चलने वाली है चाहे लाख प्रयोग आप कीजिए। इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय से बुनियादी तौर पर धनील करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो घूसखोरी का सिलसिला ऊपर के नीचे तक चलता है उसका वह क्या इलाज करने जा रहे हैं? इसमें यह कहा गया है कि सरप्लस में से गेहूँ बाहर भेजने के लिए परमिट दिया जाएगा और जब किसी ने कहा कि इसमें बड़ी घूसखोरी होगी तो कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि इसमें घूसखोरी की क्या गुवाइज है? तो मैं आप से बिगन साल की एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। महाराष्ट्र कोऑपरेटिव फेडरेशन के लोग पञ्जाब में गेहूँ खरीदने के लिए गए थे और वह काब्रिस दल के ही हैं। उन के अध्यक्ष ने कहा कि मुख्य मंत्री के इन्हें गिर्द घूमने वाले जो लोग हैं उन लोगों ने एक क्विंटल के रीट 15 रुपये उन में मांगा था। ता इस साल जो थोक व्यापारी अपनाज बेचेंगे... (अध्यक्ष) मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि यह आप के दल के लोगों ने मुझ से कहा है। आप के दल के लोग झूठ बोलते हैं तो बान भसग है। . . . (अध्यक्ष) . . .

एक सामग्रीय सचस्य . आपन लो, झूठ बान क्यों बोलन हो?

श्री मधु सिन्घे - अब आप नाम जानना चाहते हैं तो जिनसे माहब को मैं बना दगा। क्या जिनसे माहब इस की जानकारी नहीं रखते हैं? . . . (अध्यक्ष) आप इस तरह की बान मत कीजिए। मैं सोच समझ कर बोला करता हूँ। . . . (अध्यक्ष)

सचस्यति महोदय . कृपया आपन में बात न करे।

श्री मधु सिन्घे : नाम से सचता हूँ मैं लेकिन मैं नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ। अगर आप चाहते हैं तो जिनसे माहब का बना दूंगा।

मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपनाज भी बाहर जाएगा इस तरह से उस के ऊपर घुस लेने की प्रक्रिया चलनी। इसलिए मेरा यह सुझाव है कि यह प्रयोग करने से बाह्र अग में आप इसी तरीके पर पहुँचेंगे कि मेरी के अलावा आप के पास कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है। मेरी के बारे में मेरी यह सखीय है कि प्राधा आप खुले बाजार में हीलसेजर को बेचने की छूट देने हैं तो आप कामकारा को देने के लिए क्यों नहीं तैयार हैं? अगर

आप ऐसी नीति बनते हैं तो वह एकड़ तक आप किसानों और कामकारों की बिल्कुल माफ कर दीजिए और जो इन गिने सरप्लस कार्गें हैं, वह या पन्नाह प्रतिशत से अधिक नहीं होंगे उन से आप कहिए कि 50 प्रतिशत यह जो नया काम निर्धारित किया है उस काम पर वह वे और बाकी खुले बाजार में बेचें। खुले से मतलब है प्रान्तबन्दी, जिलाबन्दी इत्यादि को खरम कर देना और किसान को पूरी छूट दे देना कि खुले बाजार में वह अपना अपनाज बेचें। प्राध जो थोक व्यापारियों को छूट दे रहे हैं वह कामकारों को देने में क्या तकलीफ है? यदि इस तरह की व्यवस्था आप करेंगे तो कुछ काम आप को जरूर करने पड़ेंगे जिन में एक काम यह करना जरूरी हो जाएगा कि विभिन्न राज्यों जैसे पञ्जाब, हरयाणा, उत्तर प्रदेश या बिहार इन में जो बड़े कामकार हैं जो सीलिंग के कानून में नहीं माने गए हैं ऐसे लोगों के ऊपर मेरी लगाने का काम आप का करना पड़ेगा। अगर नहीं करेंगे तो नतीजा यह होगा कि बिहार जैसे राज्य में 38 प्रतिशत आबादी भूमिहीन की और खेतीहर मजदूरों की है, मैं अगर बानों की बान नहीं कर रहा हूँ, वे साथ भूखे मर जाएंगे। लगभग 700 अनापात में 26, 28, 27 प्रतिशत तक विभिन्न राज्यों में हैं। तो मेरा यह सुझाव है कि जो भी नाम हो वह उत्पादकों को हो। बीच में आप की नई नीति क फलस्वरूप पहले नीकरबारी क साथ मीज मन्नी करते थे अब आप थोक व्यापारियों को छूट देने वाले हैं। इस से कामकारों को कौन सा लाभ होने वाला है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता।

दुसरी बान—कामकारों के लिए मैंने यह कहा है कि आप अपनी कर नीति के बारे में पुनर्निर्धार कीजिए। मिर्चा माहब ने उस दिन मेरी राय से अपना विरोध प्रकट किया, जिसकी के दामो के बारे में और निचवाई के बावो के बारे में। लेकिन मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि बीवाई से मही तक किसान का जो माल आता है उस में कपासों सकट किसान के ऊपर आ सकने हैं जिस के फलस्वरूप अच्छी फसल जो आप को खड़ी दिखाई पड़ती है, कई बीजें उसमें हो सकती हैं, कीड़े मत सकते हैं या और तरह से यह खरम हो सकती है, इसलिए इनपुट के ऊपर कर लगाने की भी आप की नीति है उस में आप बुनियादी, परिवर्तन कीजिए और सामग्री के ऊपर कर लगाने की नीति आप अपनाइए। इस में किसानों का अभाव होगा।

और उस के साथ फसल इंफोरेन्स की पालिसी को भी यदि धार्य कहा देंगे तो पूरे देश में हृदित शान्ति ही जायगी। धरर यह करने की धार की तैयारी नहीं है तो.....

श्री लालू राय मिश्रा : किमान पकानिखा नहीं है, इन धिये उभ का साभ नहीं उठा सकता ।

श्री लालू मिश्रये श्री एक सिद्धान्त की बात कह रहा हू । इनपुट्स के ऊपर कर लगाने की नीति से उत्पादन पर प्रतिकूल धरर पड़ेगा । धरर धार इस को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं है तो न मानिये । लेकिन धरर धरना अनुभव यह है धरर धरे क्षेत्र के किसान भी यही कहते हैं कि मिश्राई के ऊपर, खाद के ऊपर, बिजली व ऊपर धरनाप-धरनाप कर लगाने रहेंगे तो उत्पादन के लिये धर को कोई प्रोत्साहन मिलने वाला नहीं है ।

धरमदनी के धारे में कोई नीति बनाये, केन्द्रीय वर कम हों, धरकमरे के जुधम वरम हों, यदि इन सब बातों के लिये धार संघटना चाहते हैं तो जब तक इन मरठ के धनिवासी परिवर्तन नहीं होंगे, धरर के उद्देश्या की पूर्ति नहीं होगी । एक धरर उत्पादक का प्रोत्साहन देना है, पदाधार में मुक्त को धर-मनिधर बनाना है, धररी धोर में 2-3-10 प्रतिशत की जो धरबादी है, जो बिल्कुल धरमहाय है, जिन के पाम धार रगना नहीं है, मिश्रय इस के कि सरकारी दुकानों से धरना धररी—धरमान धरकस्था में इन की मिश्रय धरर न्याया धररग हानि वाली है ।

श्री फिर कहना चाहना है—यदि बेरोजगारी की समस्या का धार समाधान करना चाहते हैं तो नधा-कथित धरिधरीकरण की नीति में कुछ होने वाला नहीं है । बल्कि धररी का विकास हाना तो धरिधरीकरण भी सफल होंगा धरर बेकारी की समस्या भी हल हो जायगी

श्री ० लालू (धरमई-धरिधर) : माननीय सधापनि जी, मैं कृषि मंत्री जी तथा केन्द्रीय मंत्रिमंडल को बधाई देने के लिये धररा हुआ हूं । मैं यह भी बताना चाहना हूं कि केन्द्रीय सरकार की धररनीति पर इस प्रस्ताव के उद्देश्ये जो धररी बधा पर हो रही है, मैं ऐसा धररता हू कि उस में इस इस धरर की उधाया धरर करने कि देश में यह धररसंघना जो धरर धररीधने के धीय नहीं है, जिसे हम धरररधन धररकम धरर संसाधनी कहते हैं,

उसे किस प्रकार से सल्ले धरर पर धरर धरर प्रमाण में धरर सामगी मिले—इन धरर की धररी हमें यहा पर करनी चाहिये थी ।

सधापति जी, पिछले धरर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह निर्णय लिया कि धरक-धररधर धरने वाले धररधरियों को इस धररधर से धररर ररर कर हम स्वय धररना धररर धररीद कर धरने धररधर को धर ने कि हमें विदेशों से धरर न मगाना पड़े धरर हम धररी धररना को पूरे प्रमाण में मगना तथा धररधर धरर दे सकें । इस कल्पना का उभ समय मभ ने स्वागत किया था, लेकिन हमारे जनसध के धररया ने धरर उन के कुछ धररर के साधियों ने, धरर पर इस नीति से धरर लगनी थी, जिन्हें हम धरक-धररधरों कहते हैं, उन्होंने इस का धरर विरोध किया । धरर भी जो नीति हमारे सामने धररई है—उभने पिछली धररना में कुछ ज्यादा धररर नहीं पडा है—जहां पहले फूड कारपोरेशन के धररधरों के धरर, राज्य सरकारों की एजेन्सीज के धरर, धररधररिधर के धरर हम धरर ना कर धरने धररधरों को धरर करने थे, बधा उस में धरर धरक-धररधरियों को भी मिला लिया है । लेकिन पिछले धररी का धररमभ यह कहना है कि जो कुछ हम धररर में धरर चाहते थे, वह नहीं हो सका । इस का धररर क्या है ? इस का मभ में बधा कारण ना यह था कि किमानों को धररना धररया गेहू का धररीधने के धरर देना चाहिये था, उनना धरर धररन नहीं दिया । धररधर धरर हम ठीक धररने पर धररये धरर 105 रुपये देने का नय किया । उभ धररन 86 रुपये में गेहू धररीधना चाहत थे, जिन पर किमान देने को कौसे तैयार होना । धरर हम 105 रुपया देने की धरर कर रहे हैं, धररधर होना कि यह धररीधने के धरर 107 या 110 रुपया रररने, यह तो कैलकुलेशन की धरर है । फिर भी मंत्री मधन ने जो नय किया है, मैं ऐसा मानना हू कि किमानों को इस धरर में देने में धररनाधानी नहीं होगी ।

धररर कारण धरर न धररने का यह था कि किमानों धरर धररना में एक माधकामाजी-धरर-धररिधर धरर ही नहीं थी—इसको धरर करने की धरररधरी केन्द्रीय मंत्रिमंडल, धरर धरर कृषि मंत्रालय की थी, उभ को इस माधकालोत्री को धरर करने का धरररर करना चाहिये था । धरर की नीति के धररना यह साधकालोत्री धरर धररिधर धरर होगी ।

[डा० कॅलाश]

तीसरा कारण यह था—हम ने यह तथ किया था कि हम इम्पोर्ट नहीं करेंगे। मैं इम्पोर्ट गुना जी से या जो हमारे हमारे साथी यहाँ बैठे हुए हैं उन से पूछला हूँ—रशिया ने कितना इम्पोर्ट किया, बाहना कितना इम्पोर्ट कर रहा है और अगर इस इम्पोर्ट करने तो उससे कितना फॉरेन एक्सचेंज में नुकसान होगा। यदि हम नेल्फ-सफिसेन्ट बन कर, देश का उत्पादन बढ़ा कर, इतना घनाज पैदा कर के, कि देश को निम्ना सके तब गेभी बोधना करते कि घनाज इम्पोर्ट नहीं करेंगे—तब तो ठीक था, लेकिन बाल गेभी नहीं थी। हमने भी माइक्रानाजी घाफ शोटिंग फेली।

चौथा कारण यह था कि हमारे यहाँ जो सरगमम स्टेट्स थी उन्होंने प्रोपयारमेन्ट पूरा नहीं किया। हमारी तरफ जो डेकॉमिट स्टेट्स थी, उन्होंने इतना ज्यादा नैट माया जो आयद उन की आयवयकना में बड़ी अधिक था, डेड गुना या बो गुना ज्यादा माया, उधर सरगमम स्टेट्स ने पूरा प्रोपयोर कर के नहीं दिया, जिस का परिभाव यह हुआ कि जिनका घनाज हम इकट्ठा करना चाहते थे, वह नहीं कर पाये। देश में हाइड्रोजन हुआ, ब्लैक मार्केट हुआ। हमारे कुछ विद्यार्थिया ने या कुछ साधियों ने कुछ स्थानों पर जाकर गेभे घन्न की बाहर निकालने का प्रयत्न किया, पाच करोड़ रुपये का घनाज उन्होंने यदि बाहर निकाल भी लिया, तो भी हमसे मजदूरी का समाधान तो नहीं हुआ, नहीं हो सकेगा। यह हाइड्रोजन और ब्लैक मार्केटिंग जब तक कमी रहेगी देश से जानेवाला नहीं है इस के लिये तो आवश्यक कदम यही है कि देश का उत्पादन बढ़े—उत्पादन जब बढ़ सकता है जबकि किसानों को सुनायिब फायदा या सुल्य लिये।

एक बहुत जरूरी बात यह है कि हमें स्टेट्स में डिस्ट्रिबुशन माना होगा। घाय जो पालिसी यहाँ घोषित करने हैं उनका पालन स्टेट्स को करना चाहिये। जो सरगमम स्टेट्स हैं उन को पूरा प्रोपयोरमेन्ट करके देना होगा। हमारे बीच-आपारी घाय बहुत बरमान है। हम में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि बिना प्रकार हम देश से प्रेम करते हैं, वे बीच-आपारी भी करते हैं, लेकिन जल्द यह है कि मैं देश के साथ माघ क्षम से भी प्रेम करने हैं, इन लिये वे आयद देश वा जनता से बोझा बरने हैं, दबा करती है। हमें उन के अन्दर फिर यह भावना पैदा करनी होगी,

उन को बताना होगा कि देश हित में वे अितलत मास फिसालो से मैं सके उस का पचास परसेन्ट सरकार को अवश्य दे। एक सीधी सी बात है—अगर हम चौर को चौर कहना मुक कर देंगे तो आयद इतने ज्यादा चौर पैदा होंगे, हमें उन के अन्दर एक विश्वास मवा देश प्रेम की भावना पैदा करनी होगी। यह ठीक है कि चौर का विश्वास नहीं किया जाता, लेकिन आज कम तो हम जेलो में भी रिफार्म कर रहे हैं तो फिर इन्हें भी रिफार्म करने की कोसिज क्यों न करे।

मेरी प्रार्थना है कि मंत्री महोदय इन तीन-चार प्रश्नों के उत्तर दें—घाय का पिछले मास में कितना उत्पादन हुआ, उस उत्पादन के हिसाब से कितना प्रोपयोरमेन्ट हुआ, वह पूरा हुआ या नहीं? हमारे मास भर पहले जब घायने प्रोपयोरमेन्ट की जो पालिसी अक्लियार की थी, तो गेहू का मार्केट में कितना एराइजवन होता था और पालिसी के बाद कितना एराइजवन हुआ? इस से पता लग जायगा कि उत्पादन ज्यादा होने हुए भी एराइजवन कम हुआ।

तीसरे—ब्रता से व्यापारी बारीयें और जहा बेचने उस पर स्ट्रिक्ट बिजिलेंस ररेगा या नहीं? इन के लिये घायने मजबूत इन्फ्राम किया है या नहीं।

चौथे—क्या घाय नियुपिल्ट बिजिलेंस कमेटी बनायेंगे या नहीं। क्या हर डिस्ट्रिक्ट में वे नियुपिल्ट बिजिलेंस कमेटी बनायेंगे य. नहीं। क्या घाय इन को अक्लियार यह देंगे कि उन व्यापारियों को जिन को यह कमेटी चौर माननी है, उन पर ध्यान रखे—इन तरह से वह चौर नहीं रह पायेंगे या जेब जायेंगे।

पाँचवें—घायकी ईजू प्राइस क्या होगी? क्या व्यापारियों को 150 या 200 में बेचने की इजाजत देगे

मैं चाहता हूँ कि घाय इन प्रश्नों के जवाब दें। हमारे माननीय श्री मन्त्रालयों माह्व ने जो सुझाव लिये हैं—इन्फुटल नस्ते घाम में देने चाहिये, जिन्से हर वर्ष गेहू के घाम न बढ़ाने पड़ें। उनकी आनकमी पर इन्फुटल टैक्स लगायेंगे, ईन्फुटल टैक्स लगायेंगे, लेकिन उन को उत्पादन के माधुन नस्ते घायों पर दीज्ये, तब ही आयद ऐसी आता की वा लकनी है कि कन्स्यूमर को ज्यादा पैसा न देना पड़े और सरकार को भी कड़ी-कड़ी कीमतें

विचारित न करनी पड़े, क्योंकि इन्फ्लेटन के दाम बढ़ गये। बाबा है मन्नी जी मेरे हथ प्रश्नों का उत्तर देंगे।

श्री बरबारा सिंह (होशियारपुर) : हमने जो मिस्टम पिछले साल अपनाया था उस वकन भी हम गवर्नमेंट के नोटिस में जाए थे और उनको कहा था कि अपनी मशीनरी को सैट करो, हमने खदमान बाकी है। लेकिन कुछ ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। नतीजा हमारे सामने है। आज भी मैं कहना हू कि खदमान बहुत है अब भी उन मिस्टम को आपने अपनाया है। इन से पहले से बाबा बेहतर था। मैं जानना हू कि आज आपने 105 रुपये कीमत मुकदर की है। मेरे दोस्त कहते हैं कि इतनी क्यो मुकदर की है। मैं उनको जलाना चाहता हू कि एग्जिकलचर पर डिमांड जब आगयी उस वकन हम बनागये कि क्या 105 रुपये मुकदर की है। अब दखना यह है कि क्या हम 125 रुपये पर दे पायेंगे। आपने फट दे दी है कि पचाम परमेंट से आपने पाम रखेगे, उस को जहा नुक करना चाहे लाइसेंस ले कर नुक कर सकेंगे, उस पर किसी का कंट्रोल तो नहीं है। किम भाव पर उनको उन्होंने बेचना है यह उनको खुद नय करना है। उन्होंने खुद ही कहा है कि 150 तक बेचेंगे। आप नोट कर कि 150 से ऊपर कीमत जागगी। उनका कारण है। डा० कैवास ने कहा है कि उनको हमें चोर नहीं ममसना चाहिये। लेकिन हमारा तर्जुबा तलख है। उसी की बिना पर मैं यह कह रहा हू। इन बास्ते आप मेहरबानी करके सामो की रोकथाम करें। इस में हम आपके साथ है और साथ रहेंगे।

आप बेचे कि पचाम में डीजल के लिए दो बा और तीन फरमान मन्नी लाइन लगती है, कैन के साथ कैन जुड़ा होता है लेकिन फिर भी उनको डीजल नहीं भिज पाता है। बाबा बांटा होने के करीब है। उनको डीजल नहीं भिज रहा है। उसके बारे में आपकी कुछ धी करला होगा। हो सकता है कि डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन प्वाइंट पर कुछ बढबढ हो। उनको भी आपकी सुदस्त करना होगा। लेकिन बहुत कम डीजल उनको भिजा है। पंचायत आपकी नेह्रू देने के लिए तैयार है। हम देंगे। पंचायत ने कहा है कि हम प्रोक्वोरमेंट कर सकते हैं। लेकिन यहू के कोई अबाध नहीं। उसने कहा है कि .2 मिलियन टन देंगे। पिछली बार 2.7 दिया

था। आज भी देने का तैयार है। यह हम को करना है। एक० सी० आई० के बगीर दे दें। क्यो आपने तीस हजार से पचाम हजार आदमी बहा खडे कर दिए हैं। उनके हैंडलिंग वार्जिज धरार तीस रुपये है तो इनका मतलब यह हुआ कि आपको गहू को सबमिटाइड करके 125 रुपये क भाव पर देना पड़ेगा। 150 तक बेचने की आपने उनको पहले से ही छूट दे दी है। अभी इंडजीत गुन जी ने कहा है कि उन लोगो ने स्टेटमेंट दे दिया है कि वकन आने पर उनके म्नाजिक हम सोचेंगे कि आया भाव ऊपर जाए या नीचे जाए या स्टैटिक रहे। यह खतरनाक चीज है। आज ही उन्होंने वारिय आपको दे दी है प्राइसिम बढ़ाने के लिए। हम डिमिस्सिड सीलजर्ब के तौर पर काम करेंगे। आप पीपुल्स कमेटीज बनाएँ। हम देखेंगे कि कौन बडा जमीदार उन में मिल कर काम करता है।

अब आप कीमतों का ले। उत्तर प्रदेश में आज 180 रुपये का भाव है। अब इनका मतलब आप समझ ले। आपने 150 रुपये में बीन देगा ? व्यापारी 105 में नहीं खरीदेगा। वहा गाव से जा कर उनको कहूंगा कि 110 रुपये का भाव हम आपको देने हैं यह सो सारी बीमल, अपने पास ही रखे रहा मार्ग स्टोक और जब हम को जन्मन पड़ेगी आप मे ले जायेंगे। ऐसी सूरत में पचाम परसेट आपने पाम आ पाएगा, यह आपको देखना हाया। अब पचाम परसेट देने के जराय क्या हो सकता है, इस पर आपका विचार करना होगा। मैं बातें होने वाली है। आपका वा डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन सिस्टम है उनका आप चुम्न करे। जो इन्वम टैकम पे करता है उनके पाम गुजाराह है उसका आप खुनी मार्किट में खरीदत ले सकने है। (व्यवधान) ट्रेडर्स के हक में बोलने वाले बोले। हमें किमान के हक में तो बोलने बे दे। वह सारा दिन मेहनत कर के देश को खिलाना है, चुन पसीना एक करता है। व्यापारी जाकर किसान को कहेगा कि मैं 110 में लेता हू चुन स्टोक को अपने पास रखो। अब वह धरार पचाम कीमती जो उसको आपन मे बेचनी है वह 125 में भी बेचे तो भी उसको बचत है और 150 में बेचे तो बहुत ही ज्यादा बचत है। इस बास्ते धरार आप अपने डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन सिस्टम को ठीक करे तब ठी काम हो सकता है बर्दा नहीं। फसल अच्छी है इन बार। आपके पास खनाय आपा। लेकिन जिस

[श्री हरबारा सिंह]

हम से धाय छाया करते हैं कि आपके पान धाएया उस हग से नही धाएया। क्यो न कीओपेटिव सोसाइटीज, मार्किटिंग सोसाइटीज बनीरह। खरीदों, ट्रेडिंग के रहम पर क्यो निर्भर किया जाए ? इससे बात नही बनेगी।

मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि गजब जो सहूलियतें चाहना है वह धाय उसका दे। धायने उनके लिए टारगेट किन्म किया है। उनको वह प्रचीब करके धायको बिखा देगा। टारगेट वह पूरे कर देगा।

मैं यह भी कहता हूँ कि नेबर का जो याव में है उसका भी धायको ध्यान करना चाहिये।

सम्बन्ध में धाय देखें कि नेबर को किन्म मात्र पर धनात्र मिलेगा। 150 रुपये से ऊपर के धाय पर मिलेगा। सबसे धान कर 175 या 200 तक जाएगा। धाय धगर उनका 175 में भी देगे तो धकेले धायके द्वारा दिए गए राजन में उनका घेट नही भरेगा। हम बान्ने जो नूपहोन्त्र हैं उनको येने धायके मानने रख दिया है। जो पारिविधी धायने नय की है उसकी कामयाबी के लिए हम काम करेगे, हम में कोई दा राये नही है। पीपल्स बमेट्रीए बना कर धाय उनसे कहें कि वे वाच एड बाईं का काम करे। धायने किमान जो डा इमेन्टिव दिया है उनके लिए हम धायके सजकर हैं। उनको 10 रुपये मिल गए हैं लेकिन चाक ध्यापारी का 15 रुपये मिल गए हैं। यह जो हिमाब है यह हमारी समझ में नही धाया है। धायको बिजिनेट रहने की जरूरत है। यह जो नैशनल प्राइमिस इ इमने पार पाने का धाय को भी गान्ना निकाले उस पर धाय पूरी तरह में तहें धिल से धमल करे ताकि धायको जितना धनात्र चाहिये मिल सके।

श्री महावीरक सिंह शास्त्र (कामगज) : मन्षापनि महादय, चाख नीति के संबन्ध में मंत्री महादय ने पिछले मन्षाह जो घोषणा की उसको मैंने सुना। क्यो इस नीति के पक्ष तथा निपक्ष में जो तर्क दिए गए, जो समा-सोचना और धासोचना के रूप में माननीय मन्षाओं ने धयने बिचार व्यक्त किए, उनको भी मैंने सुना। कामकीम पार्टी के लोगों ने कहा है कि हमारी चाख नीति सफल रही है। मैं उन में पूछना चाहता हूँ कि धगर धायको चाख नीति सफल रही है तो उनमें परिबर्तन माने के लिए धायको बाध्य क्यो होना पड़ा, क्यों पिछले साख की

नीति निर्धारित की गई थी, उनको धायकी बदलना पड़ा ? मैं समझता हूँ कि जो नीति निर्धारित की गई थी वह असफल सिद्ध हुई है। उसके फलस्वरूप सरकार को यह कथम उठाना पड़ा है। मुहम्मद मुफलक बायलाह ने भी इसी तरह धपनी नीति में परिबर्तन किया था। वह पहले धपनी राजधानी की दिल्ली के दीनताबाद ले गया, धीर बाद में उन ने फिर दिल्ली में ही धपनी राजधानी को रखा। इसके कारण कुछ इतिहासकारों ने उन को एक पाषाण बादशाह की उपाधि दी। मैं नही जानता कि हम तथा-कथित सफल नीति के कारण इतिहासकार हम सरकार को क्या उपाधि प्रदान करेंगे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा देश एक महान देश है, यह एक कृषि-प्रधान देश है, लेकिन धपनी स्वतन्त्रता के 26वें वर्ष में भी हम धपनी चाख नीति में सफल नही हुए हैं, यह हमारे लिए एक दुर्भाग्य की बात है।

पिछले वर्ष मेंहू का भाव 76 रुपये प्रति-क्विन्टन रखा गया और उन क ध्यापार का सरकारी-करण किया गया। जब वह नीति फेल हुई, तो आज मेंहू के मुख्य में बाईं की जा रही है। कार्तकार ने 105 रुपये प्रति-क्विन्टन के हिमाब से खरीदा जायेगा और उपमाकलाधा का 125 रुपये प्रति-क्विन्टन पर बितरित किया जायेगा। हमें हम पर कोई धापति नही है कि हमारे देश का किमान धाधिक से धाधिक कायदा उठायें, क्योंकि हमारे देश की 80 फीसदी जनता देशान में रहती है और केवल 20 प्रतिशत लोग गहरो में रहते हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि देशान के लोगों को धाधिक में धाधिक लाभ पहुंचना चाहिये।

लेकिन क्या सरकार ने धनुभव किया है कि पिछले वर्ष उनने धपनी जिस नीति की निर्धारित किया और मेंहू करीबने के लिए माइसेंस दे कर बिचौलिये पैदा किये, उन के संबन्ध में किन्ता अष्टाधार कौसा धीर किन्ती धनियमिततायें बरती गई ? मैंने देखा है कि जब किलात मार्केट में मेंहू लाजा है, तो वीएचटी इन्वीन्टर कहता है कि हम हम को पान नही करेंगे, लेकिन अब किलात उस मेंहू की पांच उनमें कम पर मेंहू के लिए तीवार हो जाता है, तो नही इन्वीन्टर उस मेंहू को पान कर देता है। नतीजा यह होता है कि अन्तर धी भाष निरिबध करती है, किलात का भाव उस के पांच रुपये

कम पर खरीदा जाता है और बायो में उम धन्न का नाम सरकारी तन्त्र और पूंजीपति व्यापारियों को होता है। एक तरफ यह सरकार समाजवाद का नारा बघानी है और जनतन्त्र की बुझाई देनी है और दूसरी तरफ यह पूंजीपतियों को छुटाचार करने के लिए न्योता देती है।

क्या सरकार ने ऐसी कोई नीति निर्धारित की है कि उम ने वे जो विधायियों पैदा किये हैं, उन को खत्म किया जाये और एक ठोपी व्यवस्था की जाये कि सरकार डाक्टरेट किमानो से खरीद करे और उपभोक्ताओं को कम से कम रेट पर गेहूँ बितारित करे ?

मन्त्री महोदय ने नई बिनरण प्रणाली के बारे में कहा है कि सरकार ने केवल महरो के लिए बिनरण की व्यवस्था की है। जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा है हमारी 80 कीसदी जनता देहाती क्षेत्र में रहती है। क्या उम गरीब जनता को दूध में रहन का अधिकार नहीं है ? क्या उसका भोजन और बस्त्र की आवश्यकता नहीं है ? अगर सरकार अपने उद्देश्य पर कायम रहती, तो उम का ध्यान सब से पहले देहाती जनता की धार जाना चाहिए था। लेकिन उम ने ऐसा नहीं किया। इस का मतलब यह है कि सरकार पूंजीपतियों के हाथ में खेलती है, लेकिन इस का आरोप बिरोधी पार्टियों पर बघानी है। अगर ऐसा न होगा, तो सबसे पहले देहाती जनता के भोजन की आवश्यकता को सामने रख कर बिनरण प्रणाली निर्धारित की जाती। प्रत्येक प्रवेज में ग्राम सभायें और एं-आपरेटिव सोसायटियां खादि कई एंजैन्सिया हैं। क्या सरकार उनके द्वारा बिनरण की व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकती थी। बूकि इस सरकार का उद्देश्य गरीब जनता को राहत देना नहीं है, बल्कि पूंजीपतियों को फायदा पहुंचाना है, इस लिए साइबैस उन्हीं लोगों को बिये जावेंगे, जो अभी खलित होंगे।

क्या सरकार ने कोई ऐसा प्रावधान किया है कि किसी व्यापारी से वास्तव में कितनी खरीद की है और क्या उम का पचास कीसदी सरकार की दिया है या नहीं। कहीं ऐसा की नहीं होवे या यद्वा है कि व्यापारी जो खरीद करे, वे उम का उमत्त बेका-बोका बना कर सरकार को केवल एक परसेंट दे दें और उम को पचास प्रतिशत बचावें?

सरकार ने इस के लिए क्या उपाय किये हैं कि जो सरकारी मशीनरी काम करती है, वह छुटाचार न कर सके ?

ग्राज उपभोक्ताओं, व्यापारियों और किसानों के मन में भ्रान्नाभाव का डर बैठ गया है। क्या उस तम को दूर करने के लिए सरकार ने कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था की है, जिस से लोग उम डर से मुक्त हो और समझें कि हमारे पास इतना धन्नागार है कि हम को धन्न सुबिधा से मिल सकता है गवन अफवाहे न पने और धन्न के भाव में वृद्धि न हो ?

त्रिन व्यापारियों का सरकार लाइसेंस देती है, उनके छुटाचार को रोकने के लिए क्या सरकार ने कोई कारगर कदम उठाये हैं, जिस से जमाखोरी न हो, और त्रिनता धन्न धायें, उम का बाजार में चलन बना रहे और महगाई न बढ़ सके ?

क्या सरकार किमानो के संबंध में कोई मध्य निर्धारित किया है कि प्रत्येक किमान अपने निर्वाह के लिये कम से कम और अधिक में अधिक किम सीमा तक गल्ला रख सकता है ?

क्या सरकार ने इस बात की तरफ भी ध्यान दिया है कि किमान जिन बीजों के धारापर पर अपनी उपज को बढा सकता है, जैसे खाद, पानी और बिजली इत्यादि, वे उसको सामानो के माथ और उचित दाम पर उपलब्ध हो सकें ?

धन्न में मैं दो पकिनयां कह कर बैठना चाहता हूँ। मंग मुन्नाब यह है कि "खाद पर भिखी नहीं, तो कम्पोस्ट गोबर की बनाओ। बन् से अडार घूने, तो बेकफन मुँदें जनाओ। तेल सफट छा गया और बिजली की कमी खाद नीति खेल है, सरकार का मानम मननाओ"।

समावृति महोदय : अभी कावेस दम के चार बस्ता और हैं। बी पेटेल, बी वैन्यली, श्री चिरजीव सा और श्री बन्दिक्का प्रसाद। मैं उन से अनुरोध करता हूँ कि वे कृपया केवल चार चार बिन्ट का समय ले। इस के धनामा मेरे पास और कोई नाम नहीं है। मैं समय की पाबन्दी का सक्ती से पालना करना चाहता हूँ।

19 थर.

श्री महदर लाल पटेल (मेहसाना) : सभापति महोदय, वेक में जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई उस के बारे में कोई ज्यादा बर्बा करने की जरूरत नहीं है। हम जानते

[श्री अटल बिरला बोलते हैं]

है कि जब भी कोई पालिसी सरकार बनाती है तो पालिसी बनाने वाले घोषित हैं कि इस पालिसी से जनता को काफी फायदा होगा। पालिसी बनाने वालों को पहले यह देखना और समझना चाहिए कि जनता को इसके फायदा होगा या नुकसान होगा। शोक व्यापार की पालिसी बनाने के बाद देखें वे जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई वह सारी बातें भी दोहराना नहीं चाहना। लेकिन उस पालिसी को बनाने के बाद देखें जो विकल्पों पैदा हुई या खान कर के किताबों को और कन्स्यूमर्स को भी जो विकल्पों पैदा हुई उस के बारे में भी हमें सोचना जरूरी है। शोक व्यापार को हाथ में लेने के बाद जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई उस में बिजो को दोष नहीं देना चाहिए क्योंकि शुरु में जब यह शोक व्यापार हमने हाथ में लिया तो प्रोक्योरमेंट का सबाल हमारे समक्ष मौजूद था। हम 85 के भाव में प्रोक्योरमेंट करना चाहते थे। उधर एक तरफ कोर्स बाजरा 150 रुपये के भाव में बिक रहा था। यह बात एक छोटा बच्चा भी समझ सकता है कि जब कोर्स ग्रेन-बाजरा 140 और 150 के भाव में बिक रहा है या किमान अपना गैर 85 के भाव में प्रोक्योरमेंट में कैसे देगा? यह एक समस्या की बात है। देखें जब भी कोई पालिसी हम बनाते हैं तो किमान को अपने सामने रखना आवश्यक है क्योंकि हमारे देश में 80 प्रतिशत लोग देहातों में रहते हैं और खेती से अच्छे से सगे हुए हैं। जब भी कोई फूड पालिसी हम बनाते हैं तो उस पालिसी से फायदा होगा या नुकसान होगा यह बात भी समझना जरूरी है। यहां बैठने वाले सब जनता के प्रतिनिधि हैं। इसलिए जब भी कोई कानून या पालिसी हम बनाते हैं और उस पालिसी को अवर इम्प्लीमेंट करना है तो उसे इम्प्लीमेंट करने के बाद उसका फायदा जनता पर क्या अवर होगा, फायदा जनता को फायदा होगा या नुकसान होगा इन सारी बातों को नजर में रखना जरूरी है। लेकिन हम सारी बातें अपने सामने रखते नहीं हैं और उस का परिचायक क्या जाना है यह भी हम देख चुके हैं। . . (अव्यक्त) . . मैं समझता हूँ कि जब भी कोई कटौती जाती है तो हमारे जैसे छोटे लोगों के ऊपर जाती है, इसलिए टाइन की कटौती भी हमारे ऊपर आ गई है।

मैं यह मानना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में जो खेती का अन्त करके जाने लोग हैं उन के बारे में ऐसी मास्यदा

लोगों की हो जाती है कि खेती का अन्त करने वाले सब मानदार हो गए हैं, खेती का अन्त करने वाले सब बड़े हो गए हैं और सभी ऐसे वाले हो गए हैं। जो लोग ऐसी मास्यदा रखते हैं उनसे मेरी प्रार्थना है कि वे लोग कभी देहात में जा कर देखें। मैं नहीं जानता हूँ वे कभी देहात जाते हैं या नहीं। देहाती लोगों के मत से और किसानों के मत से हम सब यहां आ कर बैठे हैं लेकिन कभनसीभी हमारी है कि यहां धाने के बाव हम किमान को और देहाती लोगों को भूल जाते हैं। सभापति महोदय भी मेरे अ्याल से देहात से आये हैं। उन्हें पता है देहात में आज किसानों की हालत क्या है? अगर किमान के पास आज कोई इन्फ्लेक्शन होता तो वह खेती का अन्त छोड़ देता। उस में क्या क्या विकल्प हैं और जो लोग उस में सगे हैं उन की हालत कैसी है उस पर विचार करने की हमारे पास सुझाव नहीं है। इसलिए सबी महोदय को मैं भी धन्यवाद तो इसलिए देता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो नई पालिसी बनाई है, मेरे अ्याल में उसमें किसानों को थोड़ा बहुत फायदा फायदा होने वाला है और कन्स्यूमर्स को भी अत्यंत कुछ फायदा होगा हमने कोई अन्वेष नहीं है। यहां कई लोगों ने इन के बारे में कुछ कहा बनाई है। लेकिन मैं तो समझता हूँ कि जब भी कोई पालिसी बनाते हैं तो उन में हम सुधार नहीं कर सकते ऐसी बात नहीं हो सकती। हम पालिसी बना सकते हैं, बना कर उन में सुधार भी कर सकते हैं। अगर हम ऐसा समझे कि जो पालिसी हमने बनाई है उससे जनता का फायदा नहीं है तो इन्फ्लेक्शन के साथ उस पालिसी को हम छोड़ दे सकते हैं और दूसरी पालिसी बना सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को जो नई पालिसी उन्होंने बनाई है और पिछली पालिसी में जो सुधार किया है उसके लिए काफ़ीकारों की ओर से और कन्स्यूमर्स की ओर से भी धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

श्री अतिरिक्त मंत्री (महाराष्ट्र) : सभापति महोदय, काबू नीति की परब मेरे विचार से इन पांच बातों पर निर्भर करती है कि किसानों को लाभदायक मूल्य मिलना है या नहीं, खरीदने वाले लोगों की भी उचित मूल्य पर प्राप्ति होता है, या नहीं, बाजार में अभाव पर्याप्त मात्रा में जाता है या नहीं, उत्पादकों और सुकायाउत्पादों पर अंशुदा सपला है या नहीं और मूल्य में अस्थिरता जाती है या नहीं, इन पांच बातों से अवर हम देखें तो हमारी समझ में आता है कि दरअसल इन नीतियों से वे पांच बातें हम लोगों की प्राप्ति हो रही हैं और इसलिए इन

संजी महोदय को धारणा देते हैं कि वर्तमान स्थिति में सर्वोत्तम खाद्य नीति की घोषणा की है।

अब मैं आप को यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे दोस्त को कहते हैं कि पारसाण हमने गेहूँ के शोक व्यापार के राष्ट्रीयकरण का एगाम किया था उस से हम पीछे हट गए हैं तो हम पीछे ध्वस्त हटते हैं इस माने में जैसे किसी लड़ाई में जब कोई सेना सकट और खतरे की जगह पर पहुँच जाती है तो वह पीछे हट कर अपनी पोजीशन सुदृढ़ करके फिर हार करती है, हमारी सरकार उसी तरह से अपनी पोजीशन ले रही है ताकि आगे फिर हम हम नीति को दृढ़ता से लेकर चलें और हम को सफल करें। यत वर्ष की जो हमारी मूल्य नीति थी उस में जो असफलता की बात कही जाती है उसे भी बहुत बढ़ा चढ़ा कर लागू मान कर रहे हैं। दरम्यान हमारी नीति असफल हुई हम बजट से कि हम ने यत वर्ष गेहूँ की कम कीमत निर्धारण की थी और दूसरी वर्षाधिक कमी इस बात की थी कि हमारी प्रस्तावित व्यवस्था सुदृढ़ नहीं थी और हम महत्वपूर्ण कार्यों के लिये पूंज व पैसा नहीं थी। साथ ही मैं जो हमारे जनसंघ ने भाई से से शोक जा कर बिरास करने से और जो बड़े बड़े व्यापारी लोग से कह तो करते हैं। इन सारी बातों का लेकर हमारी जो भी असफलता हुई उस के बावजूद जो हमें सफलता मिली वह अत्यधिक है।

अब मुझे हम में एक सवाल है जिस का जिक्र मैं करना चाहता हूँ कि जिन बड़े बड़े व्यापारियों का सजी महोदय ने फिर से साइलेंट बैक सीमित रूप में काम करने का मौका दिया है उसका उपयोग से लोग कहाँ तक ईमानदारी से कर पाएँगे? इस पर ज्यादा निगरानी रखने की जरूरत है और जैसे कि हमारे कई मित्रों ने कहा है, मैं भी समझता हूँ कि जिस स्तर पर, प्रबन्ध स्तर पर और राज्य स्तर पर हम को वीपुल कमेटी, मार्गजलिक समिति बनानी चाहिए जिसका अध्यक्ष कोई गैर-सरकारी सदस्य हो। संजी अपने ही सरकारी आबनी रहे और इस समिति को द्वारा अधिकार मिलना चाहिए कि वह इन चीजों को डीक से जानबीन करे, तथा देखे कि कहीं हमने कोई गुराँस ही नहीं है, कोई व्यवधान तो उपस्थित नहीं हो रहा है।

अभावति थी, अब मैं कुछ सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। अब के पहली बात जो यह है कि प्रस्ताव की जो डीपी-उपरी नीति है उससे यह कमी सफल नहीं होगा। इस 7 LSE/74-12

लिये प्रस्ताव को चुस्त बनाने की आवश्यकता है। भले ही व्यापक पैमाने पर इसके पुनर्गठन और परिवर्तन की ही आवश्यकता क्यों न पड़े।

दूसरे—खाद्य निगम के द्वारा आप जो गेहूँ खरीदते हैं, उस पर व्यवस्था अच्छी बहुत ज्यादा पड़ता है, इस वर्ष को कम करना चाहिये। शोक व्यापारी जो खरीद करते हैं उस पर कितना अच्छा पड़ता है और आप का निगम जो खरीद करता है उस पर कितना अच्छा पड़ता है इन दोनों की तुलना कर के देखना चाहिये कि आप के यहाँ अच्छा क्यों ज्यादा पड़ता है और इस पर नियन्त्रण करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

तीसरे—विनयन प्रणाली का टॉम बनाएँ।

चौथी और अन्तिम बात—जो बहुत आवश्यक है—यह है कि हमारे खाद्य सजी जो हम शोक पर ऐसी व्यवस्था कर दें कि जितने हमारे मिलित बेरोजगार कर बैठे हुए हैं उन को कोअपरेटिव मासाइटी बन और उन सोसायटी के अध्यक्ष से गेहूँ का खरीद करायें। मेरा अनुमान है कि ऐसी व्यवस्था में प्रामाणिक सफलता मिलेगी और हमारे लोगों को रोजगार भी मिलेगा।

अन्तिम बात मैं बिहार के संबंध में कहना चाहता हूँ—हमारा प्रदेस एक डेफिन्ट प्रदेस है, जहाँ भी लेबी लगाने की बात की जा रही है। ऐसा होना चाहिये, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि—हमारे भाई मधु लिये जो ने जैसा कहा है—आप ऐसी व्यवस्था करें कि कम से कम हम एकड जमीनवालों पर लेबी न लयें। यदि उन के पास भी उन की आवश्यकता से अधिक धन्य है, तो वह ले लिया जा सकता है और राष्ट्र हित में लोग अतिरिक्त वे भी होंगे। किन्तु हर एक दो एकड वाले जमीन वाले को जा लेबी के लिए नोटिस दे दिया जाता है, उनसे सिर्फ एक आसक ही फैल जाता है। साथ कुछ नहीं होता। अतः इस परिपाटी के तो दुरुस्त बन्द कर दिया जाना चाहिये।

इन सबों के साथ मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

श्री अन्तिक प्रसाद (बलिया) सभापति महोदय, सजी हमारे जनसंघ के साथी कह रहे थे कि हमारी खाद्य नीति सफल नहीं रही है, मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता। सरकार ने गेहूँ का शोक व्यापार किसानों की मदद के लिये अपने हाथ में लिया था, विपक्षियों को बीच में से हटाने

[श्री चन्द्रिका प्रसाद]

के लिये किया था, 8 मिलियन टन का टारगेट था, जिम में से साढ़े चार मिलियन टन वसूल भी हुआ, जब कि इस काम में प्रदेश अधिकारियों की हमारे साथ निष्ठा नहीं थी, हमारी विरोधी पार्टियों के भाई हमारी इस नीति के विरुद्ध प्रचार कर रहे थे, ताकि हमारी नीति फेल हो जाए। बिहार की प्रतिक्रियावादी शक्तियां इस प्रकार का वातावरण पैदा कर रही थीं जिसमें अशांति फैले, हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी की इमेज कम हो, ऐसी स्थिति में भी हमारे गरीब किसानों ने साढ़े चार मिलियन टन अनाज दिया—यह हमारी सफलता का सूचक है। हम असफल नहीं हुए हैं, लेकिन हमें पूर्ण सफलता नहीं मिली—यह दूसरी बात है।

देश में ऐसे पिछड़े अंचलों में जहां दो प्रदेशों की सीमायें मिलती हैं, उन गांवों में खाद्य स्थिति बहुत खराब रही। क्योंकि प्रदेश सरकारों ने उन क्षेत्रों में प्रतिबन्ध लगा रखा था, उनका अनुमान था कि जो अन्न वाइंडर के क्षेत्रों में जायगा, वह दूसरे क्षेत्र में स्मगल हो जाएगा, इस कारण उन क्षेत्रों को पर्याप्त अनाज नहीं भेजा गया और उन को बहुत महंगे दामों पर अनाज खरीदना पड़ा। मैं विशेष कर उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी क्षेत्र बलिया की ओर आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करता हूँ—मेरा क्षेत्र गंगा और घाघरा के कटान का क्षेत्र है जो दूसरी ओर बिहार राज्य से घिरा हुआ है। उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार वहां काफी अनाज नहीं भेजती थी, उसी तरह से बिहार सरकार भी वहां अनाज नहीं भेजती थी, जिसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि जो गल्ला आरा में 2 रुपये किलो बिकता था, वह सिन्हा घाट में चार रुपये किलो बिकता था। इसी तरह से बलिया में जो गल्ला दो रुपये किलो बिक रहा था, वह कोखा, कोखा-नारायणपुर, रानीगंज बेरिया में बहुत ऊंचे दामों पर बिक रहा था। इस तरह के प्रतिबन्ध में सरकार को ढील डालनी चाहिये। वहां पर इस तरह की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये—जैसे आप ने मोटे अनाज में इन्टरस्टेट छूट दी हुई है, उसी तरह से बाकी अनाज के लिये भी छूट नहीं देनी चाहिये। यदि ऐसा न हो सके तो कम से कम दोनों प्रदेशों की सरहद पर रहने वाली जनता के लिये प्री-मूवमेन्ट की छूट होनी चाहिये, उन का एक जोन बना दिया जाय। जो गरीब आप की नीतियों में विश्वास करता है, जब भी उस को चुनौती दी जाती है तो आप का साथ देता है, उस को

यदि भोजन न मिले तो इस का उसके मन पर क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा, आप स्वयं अनुमान लगा सकते हैं।

हमारे मंत्री जी ने अपने आकाशवाणी के इन्टरव्यू में कहा है कि वे औद्योगिक क्षेत्रों में ही गल्ला दे पायेंगे। मैं उन से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ—हम कमिटेड हैं विशेषकर हरिजनों के लिये, बीकर-सैवशन्ज के लिये, उन उपेक्षित और पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों के लिये जहां हमेशा सूखे से तबाही छाई रहती है, जहां अतिवृष्टि और अनावृष्टि होती है, उन को हमें नहीं छोड़ना चाहिये, इन गरीबों के लिये राशन की पर्याप्त व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये क्योंकि यह अभाव ग्रस्त क्षेत्र है।

अब मैं एक महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दा देना चाहता हूँ—आप ने गल्ले का भाव 105 रुपये घोषित किया है, लेकिन ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये कि जो व्यापारी गल्ला खरीदे वह प्रतिदिन घोषित करे कि उस ने कितना गल्ला खरीदा है और किम स्थान पर वह गल्ला रखा जायगा। उसके गोदामों की पूरी जानकारी सरकार के पास होनी चाहिये। सब से पहले तो वह उस अनाज को सरकारी गोदामों में रखे, उस के बाद यदि बच जाय तो अपने गोदाम में रखे, जिस की जानकारी सरकार के पास होनी चाहिये ताकि 50 प्रतिशत की जो लैबी उस अनाज पर लगानी है, उसमें कोई बेइमानी न हो सके। इस में सख्ती से कार्यवाही करनी चाहिये।

नागेश प्रसाद यादव (सीतामढ़ी) : सभापति महोदय, मैं अपने खाद्य मंत्री जी की जो नीति है जो व्यापार नीति है, उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने देश के व्यापारी वर्ग को अन्न खरीदने की जो छूट दी है, वह कितने मन अन्न प्रतिदिन के हिसाब से खरीदेगा और उस की घोषणा कैसे होगी? मान लीजिये कोई व्यापारी 1 हजार मन खरीदता है, तो जो सप्लाय के इंस्पेक्टर उस की बगल में बैठ कर रसगुल्ला खाते हैं, वे उस को 50 मन लिख देंगे। क्या इस के लिये आप ने कुछ विचार किया है? देश के व्यापारी जितना अन्न खरीद कर आप को बता देंगे, क्या उस को सत्य मानेंगे? यदि इस तरह से सत्य मान लेंगे तो देश की स्थिति इस साल गत वर्ष से भी ज्यादा खराब हो जायगी और जनता को गल्ला 170 और 180 रुपये किलो के भाव से मिलेगा। यदि व्यवस्था ठीक नहीं होगी तो

गत वर्ष से भी अधिक भंयकर स्थिति इस वर्ष होगी। मेरा निवेदन है कि व्यापारी लोग जो भी खरीदें उस पर प्रतिबन्ध होना चाहिये। दिन भर में जो माल खरीदें, हर रोज शाम को उन के गोदाम में जो ताला लगे उसकी दो कुजियां होनी चाहिये, एक कुंजी व्यापारी अपने पास रखे और दूसरी कुंजी डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट के पास जमा करा दे। सप्लाई इंस्पेक्टर के पास कुंजी नहीं रहनी चाहिये, बैंक के लाकर में रखी जाय या डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट के पास रखी जाय।

इसके अतिरिक्त जिस किसान से गेहूं खरीदा जाय, उसको एक रसीद दी जानी चाहिये, जिस पर किसान का नाम, ग्राम का नाम, पोस्ट-ऑफिस का नाम माल का वजन तथा किसान के हस्ताक्षर उस रसीद पर हों। उस रसीद के बारे में समय समय पर मंडल-अधिकारी या जिलाधीश जांच-पड़ताल करें। अगर इस तरह की व्यवस्था आप करें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि व्यापारियों पर नियंत्रण रखा जा सकेगा तथा स्थिति में काफ़ी सुधार हो सकता है।

मभापति जी, मैं कल सीतामढ़ी से आया हूँ, तीन दिन पहले सीतामढ़ी ज़िले के करीब 500 गांवों में इतनी भंयकर बारिश हुई है, आंधी आई है, ओले पड़े हैं, जिस के परिणाम स्वरूप किसानों का जितना गल्ला वहां पड़ा था, सब नष्ट हो गया है। इतना भंयकर तूफान था कि वृक्ष के छिलके उड़ गए, आम का मोजरा बरबाद हो गया, इस तरह से हज़ारों गांवों की खेती बरबाद हो गई, किसानों के पास एक छंटांक अन्न भी नहीं रह गया है। वहां अभी भी लगातार बारिश हो रही है, जिस के कारण खेती में पानी लग गया है। किसानों की जो भी खिसारी, चना, मसूरी खलिहानों में पड़ी थी, उस में अंकुर पड़ गया है। किसानों का जो गेहूं खेत में पड़ा था, जिस की कटाई नहीं हो सकी थी, वह सब ओला पड़ने से नष्ट हो गया। मेरा निवेदन है कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट से आप रिपोर्ट मंगाएं। जहां जहां ओले पड़े हैं वहां वहां कम से कम आप बिहार के कोटे में नहीं, बल्कि स्पेशल कोटा में सीतामढ़ी, मुजफ्फरपुर, चम्पारन, इन तीन जिलों में गेहूं आदि की व्यवस्था करें। सैकड़ों मील में वहां ओले पड़े हैं। वहां की आबादी को, सैट परसैट लोगों को आप गेहूं आदि की जो भी सहायता करना चाहते हैं करें ताकि किसान और गरीब लोग जो हैं, उनके प्राणों की रक्षा हो सके।

आपने कहा है कि जहां बड़े बड़े कारखाने हैं उन्हीं के मजदूरों के लिए आप अन्न की व्यवस्था करेंगे। मैं कहता हूँ कि जो करीब किमान है गांव में, जो अन्न पैदा करता है, हलवाहा है, जो गेहूं लगाते हैं, दौनी करते हैं या इस तरह के दूसरे लोग हैं उनकी तरफ भी आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिये और उनके लिये भी आपको अन्न की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये।

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI F. A. AHMED) : Mr. Chairman, Sir I welcome this opportunity which has been provided by this honourable House to discuss this statement which I made the other day before the hon. Members.

I welcome this opportunity for two reasons; Firstly, it gives me an opportunity of removing some misgivings which are entertained by the hon. Members. It will also give me at the same time an opportunity to clarify some of the details of this statement which I have before this House.

Before doing that, I would like to make a few observations, and these are that some of the hon. Members have expressed views that, so far as the matter of food is concerned, it has to be treated as a national problem. I do agree with those hon. Members who have suggested that so far as this problem is concerned, let us have a national outlook and let us not bring politics into it, and let us try to see how we can overcome the difficulties with we are faced, how we can make food available to our people at a reasonable price and how we can help in the increased production of foodgrains and cereals and other commodities so that we may not have to face this kind of difficulty in the future.

The second thing which I would like to point out is this. I think the time has come when we should be clear in our mind that this is not because of pre-conceived ideas or ideologies that we have placed a

[SHRI F.A. AHMED]

certain policy before this House and before the country last year. We thought that the policy of take-over would help us in having an effective control over the surplus so that there may be no scope for speculators on the one hand and there may be no distortion of prices on the other hand, and it may be possible for us to provide the foodgrains which are the essential commodities for the existence of our people at a reasonable price to our people and particularly the vulnerable sections. That was the main objective or idea underlying this policy. So far as procurement is concerned, that was a procedure in order to implement that particular policy. And today when some people say that we have reversed our policy or that we have surrendered our policy, I do not agree with such a view. Of course, so far as my friend Mr. Mishra is concerned and so far as my friend Mr. Madhu Limaye is concerned they did not expect much good out of the policy which we had initiated last year and they also did not expect any good out of the policy which we have enunciated this time but they have not told us what is the better policy which can serve the objective which we have placed before ourselves.

Now, Sir, I would like to point out one thing. There is no question of surrender and there is no question of reversal in our policy. I can reiterate and emphasise that so far as this Government and our party are concerned, we accept the socialist path as the proper path for the purpose of development and progress of this country. We are very clear about this. We shall pursue this path. May be that we may have to change to the emphasis from time to time; may be, we may have to change the direction from time to time. But, we hope that the goal that we have set before ourselves will be achieved in the long run.

Now, the question before us is this. Why did the policy which we had placed before the House and was accepted by it was not a success? I can give you a number-of reasons for this. One of the main reasons why the policy had failed is this. The very hon. Members who are now criticising us had created such a psychology in the country and, on the basis of which, it was not possible for us to obtain foodgrains from the cultivators.

I would like my hon. friends to realise one thing. This was the policy placed before the country by us. Also I accept the suggestions given by the hon. Members. But, this cannot be implemented through our bureaucracies; that can be implemented through the people of our country. Dictatorial form of Government would only give a good-bye to democracy. And if we have to say good-bye to democracy, to freedom of expression, to freedom of thought and to freedom of action, then only they will make that policy a success. The other method is by persuasion we have to make that policy a success. We have accepted the democratic method of persuasion to see to it that the policy is accepted by our people. The only way to make that policy a success is to run cooperatives effectively at the lowest level not for the purpose of obtaining surplus foodgrains or other grains from the cultivators but also for the purpose of providing the necessary inputs, necessary articles which the cultivators require to boost up the production. Until it is possible for us to set up cooperative societies at the lowest village levels, it may not be possible for us to persuade a large number of people to accept the policy which can yield results after it has been practised and after it has been accepted. What I want the hon. Members to do is this. Are the Members of the Opposition prepared to go to the villages with our workers to see that such cooperatives are established in this country?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
Do you want us to go to the people?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : What I want my hon. friend, Shri Mishra to remember is this. So far as food is concerned, let us not have politics in that. Let us all try to see if we can have a programme in which all parties can be combined together and make that progress a success through which only we can make the socialist method of living a success. In a democratic set up, this thing has got to be considered.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
They talk of cooperation only on the floor of the House. They never seek cooperation. That is only for public consumption.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : Is it a matter for collective bargaining?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Some of the hon. Members made a reference to the fact that today we were in this plight because there had been no improvement and no development so far as production was concerned. I think that they are obvious of the facts and they are blind to the facts and figures in our country when they say so. I must give credit to Mr. Madhu Limaye because he said that in the course of the last five or six years wheat production had doubled from about 15 to 16 million tonnes to about 26 to 27 million tonnes. He was prepared to accept it, but he said that during the past few years there had been no progress and no improvement so far as even wheat production was concerned. I would only like to remind him that we had achieved the target to 106 million tonnes of foodgrains in 1970-71, and at that time, our wheat production was a little over 23 million tonnes. But even in 1971-72 when the total food production had come down to a little over 105 million tonnes, our wheat production had gone to about 28 million

tonnes. In 1972-73, wheat production came down from 26 million tonnes to about 25 million tonnes or 24.9 million tonnes. But may I say that I would not be wrong in saying that that was not the correct figure of production? The reason is this that because we had adopted this policy of take-over of wheat trade, everyone was anxious to play down the figures. The cultivator, thinking that he would have to pay levy, was showing less and less figures. My hon. friend says that this year the production will go down to about 20 million tonnes. This is the kind of thing which has been doing the greatest damage to our country.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
May I say a word here? These people were saying last year, in spite of our stress on the fact that they were not going to have 30 million tonnes, that they would certainly be able to achieve the target. After having spent Rs. 150 crores, what have they achieved? If they exaggerate the figure, they are not doing a disservice to the country but when we say realistically that they would not be able to achieve more than this, then we are doing a disservice to the country! Is that the way to go about the task? Am I going to take a certificate from him? It is a peculiar kind of thing that he should say that we are doing disservice to the country. This is my realistic estimate, and this is my judgement. Why should he find fault with it?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Let him have patience.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
The Members of his party had advanced strange arguments; they had decried our arguments as those of the reactionaries earlier. Similar of arguments have been advanced by hon. Minister.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : May I submit that the hon. Member has said his say and

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]
I did not interrupt him then, and now he should allow me to go on?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
He must not impute motives to us.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patna) : But the hon. Minister should not attribute motives. That is the point.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
Let him stick to his figure; I stick to my figure. I have given an example of how the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Food Minister were stressing last year that they would be able to achieve 30 million tonnes; they had spent Rs. 150 crores on the crash programme but they could not go beyond 24.9 million tonnes. What happened last year?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : The hon. Member should have the patience to permit me to complete my statement. I was trying to point out that so far as 1973-74 was concerned, we had placed the estimate before this House that we were likely to achieve a production of about 113 to 114 million tonnes of foodgrains, out of which we had indicated that our production target for kharif was 67 million tonnes, and I may tell the House that we have achieved more or less the target which we had placed before the House so far as rice is concerned.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
No, that is wrong.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : So far as rice production is concerned, it is a bumper crop, and we have never had such a good rice crop as we had this year. We had fixed a target of 40 million tonnes of rice during the kharif season and we have achieved that. I hope that during the rabi also we shall be able to achieve the target of rice. We have a target of 45 million tonnes of rice for the whole year.

It is true there has been some shortfall so far as the production of maize is concerned. But that has more or less not interfered with the target which we had fixed for the kharif.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
Lack of winter rains will not affect rabi production? Lack of power will not affect it?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : So far as rabi is concerned, we had fixed a target of about 47 or 48 million tonnes of foodgrains in which we had fixed a target of about 30 million tonnes of wheat. That was based on the fact that more area under wheat was brought under cultivation in the wheat-producing areas and that more high-yielding varieties of seed were sown in the areas concerned. So we hope it will be possible for us to increase it. But it is a fact that so far as the winter rainfall is concerned, we did not have winter rain and because of the shortage of fertiliser the production will be brought down to some extent.

At the same time, I would like to tell the hon. member that I am hoping that nothing will turn out so bad. So far as the present condition is concerned, this year we are free from the rust which had affected a big area of wheat last year.

Also this year there is no hot wind. On account of such wind, the grains get shrivelled. The hon. member may say what he likes. But this is the position.

Yesterday I had occasion to pass through Haryana and a portion of Rajasthan and I saw that the crop was in very good shape. Within a few days, it will be harvested there.

I am not a prophet like him, but I hope it will be possible for us, if not to achieve our target, at least to achieve a production

which will not be less than what we had last year. I think it will be very wrong for anyone to say anything which will tend to create a psychology of shortage or to say that there is going to be less production...

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : This is the psychology of complacency.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : a production of 20 million tons.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : This is more dreadful than that. Please do not play politics with food. You are playing politics with food.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : We are not.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : You will be responsible for starvation of vast millions of people by having this kind of complacency (*Interruptions*).

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : You have had your say. Why do you interrupt like this? We have had a five-hour debate.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Why do you say that we are creating a psychology of shortage?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Why are you not prepared to accept facts? You have created hell in the country by this kind of psychology of shortage.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : We know our duty. We know what you have done to the people. The people know it.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : While they come here, they say something and they do the opposite thing elsewhere in order to see that the problems and the difficulties with which we are faced are not overcome.

Some hon. members on this side have very rightly pointed out that apart from the policy or the ideology, we have to see from the practical aspect how we can increase

production of foodgrains, particularly cereals in our country. So far as that matter is concerned, a large number of suggestions have been made by hon. members. Some of these have been given by members of the Opposition also. They have suggested that implementation of land reforms is a must. They have said that so far as cases pending against cultivators are concerned, they have to be disposed of as early as possible. Then so far as labour legislation is concerned, it should be done. These are some of the various suggestions which have been made by hon. members. I shall take them up with the hon. Chief Ministers who will be coming here. In fact, I have already written to them to see that these are implemented as early as possible. At the same time, they have also stressed that the requirements in order to increase production have also to be provided to the cultivators. Out of these requirements, the immediate requirements are the provision of the facility of water, chemical fertilisers, good seeds, pesticides and so on.

I would like to point out that it is wrong for hon. Members to feel that there has been no progress or no development in our country. So far as the provision of irrigation is concerned, apart from what is being provided through major and medium irrigation schemes, we have been laying stress on the provision of facilities through minor irrigation. I can tell the House that every year we are providing minor irrigation to nearly one million hectares of land. We hope that this speed will be improved in the next fifth five year Plan also. It is true that though we have been doing this, because of the constraints of power, we have not been able to take the maximum benefit out of this. Now, as hon. Members may have heard, the Minister of Irrigation and Power has said that very early it will be possible for them to provide two million

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

kw of power, and I hope when this is available to the States, they may be able to get the maximum advantage out of this.

So far as fertilisers are concerned, it is true that today I have not been able to meet the requirements of the States. I entirely share the anxiety and the view of the hon. Members that had I been able to provide more chemical fertilisers, I would have got at least 10 times more foodgrains to feed the population of the country. But there are difficulties which have to be considered in this direction. So far as we are concerned, we have provided a capacity to manufacture about 22 lakh tonnes of fertilisers in our country. Last year, we were able to get only about 13 lakh or at the most 14 lakh tonnes of fertilisers. Unfortunately, we were not able to work our units to their maximum capacity, and that was due to two main reasons. One was the shortage of power and the other was the strike in a number of factories. If these two things are removed, and when there is a provision for increasing the capacity from 22 lakh tonnes to 28 lakh tonnes in the next year, I hope it will be possible for us to get more fertilisers within our own country and then we will be able to supply them. Even that is not sufficient.

Hon. Members must realise that when I asked for estimates from the various States, so far as the requirements of fertilisers are concerned during the ensuing kharif season, the estimate that was given to us comes to about 40 lakh tonnes; it is only for kharif; it does not take into account the rabi of 1974-75; it only takes into account the kharif of 1974-75. According to the estimates submitted by the States, they want about 40 lakh tonnes. So, I would like to point out that with the facilities and improvements which they have been providing by giving them better quality of seeds, irrigation facilities and so on, there is more and more demand for chemical

fertilisers. It is not possible for a Government, by magic, to improve the production by doubling or trebling it, which is the quantity required by our country. Therefore, we have to realise these difficulties and limitations and constraints. So, I am asking all the Chief Ministers to hold meetings at various levels, suggesting that they should have a combination of chemical and organic fertilisers so that it may be possible for us to meet the country's requirements as much as we can. We have also asked them to see that they should depend not only on the cowdung and other wastages in the rural areas but the leaves and other things in the neighbouring forest areas have also to be collected and utilised for the purpose of compost fertilisers.

At the same time we have to ask them to use more and more weedicides so that whatever fertiliser is provided is used for the growth of the plant and is not taken up by the weed. Some hon. Members suggested that the best method of making food available is to put a levy on the producer. I should not like to trouble the house with details about every State. I should like to place before this house the position in respect of three important wheat growing States, namely, Punjab, Haryana and U.P. You will realise that the objective that we have before us will not be achieved even if we put a levy on the producer. In Punjab the number of holdings is 13 lakhs. The irrigated area under these holdings is 21 lakh hectares. The number of holdings with less than one hectare is 7.3 lakhs. The wheat area under these holdings is 3.3 lakh hectares. The remaining holdings on which levy can be imposed is 5.7 lakhs. The wheat area under these holdings is 17.7 hectares. The wheat area to be exempted from levy per holding is one lakh hectares. The total comes to 5.7 hectares. The balance is 12 lakh hectares. If you take one tonne

per hectare you will be able to collect by way of levy 12 lakh tonnes, That is from irrigated area. From the unirrigated area we have worked out and we find that we will be able to get 0.5 lakh tonnes. So from both irrigated and unirrigated area in Punjab we get 12.5 lakh tonnes as levy. We have worked out similar figures for Haryana and that comes to 6.6 lakh tonnes. From U. P. the figure is 7.8 lakh tonnes. Therefore, if you really talk on the basis of levy we would be obtaining much less than what we did last year. It is easy to give suggestions, but these suggestions have to be examined having regard to the facts and figures; if you find that this is a good way of doing it, there can be no objection to our doing so.

We have tried the levy system last year in Bihar and M. P. The poor peasant was chased and the rich peasants were left out.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Who was responsible for this?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Everybody including yourself is responsible. In order to impose levies, you have to use coercion. For the purpose of coercion, you have to use various whom you call corrupt, this and that. To what extent it can succeed is a matter which has to be considered.

We spent a good deal of time in discussing this matter what the pros and cons will be. Unfortunately my hon. friend was not present in the Consultative Committee of Parliament.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : I am not a member of that Committee and one can be a member of only one Committee. But you have constituted an excellent body—the National Advisory Committee on Food where we did not happen to be represented. There are some privy councillors on that.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Therefore, I had the benefit of advice given to me, suggestions given to me, by a number of Members of Parliament both from this House as well as from the other House and we discussed various matters. But, I would like to point out one thing. These are something, some telling facts, which held up the decision, to adopt a particular policy.

After we took over the wheat trade, last year, between May 1973 and January 1974, there was a rise of Rs. 65-100 per quintal, so far as the price of wheat was concerned. It varied from place to place. So far as Punjab and Haryana were concerned, the price of wheat, in January 1974, was between Rs. 100 to Rs. 105. In UP, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, it was between Rs. 125 to Rs. 150. In deficit States like Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bihar, it ranged from Rs. 210 to Rs. 250. What I would like to point out is this. While in 1973, the difference in price in Punjab and Maharashtra was only Rs. 31, in January 1974, there was a difference of Rs. 153. Similarly, in Gujarat while the difference was only Rs. 77 in February 1973, in January 1974, the difference in price in these two States was Rs. 115. Similarly, so far as the difference in price in Karnal and Bihar is concerned, it was only Rs. 4 in February 1973, whereas, in January 1974, there was a difference of Rs. 180. These facts are so glaring.

Now, the hon. Member has said that by adopting this particular policy, the price will increase and this will have its effect on dearness allowance etc. I would like the hon. Member to remember that so far as the index is concerned, it is not based only on the price of wheat or coarse grains which we give through the fair price shops, but, it also depends on the prices at which these things are available in the open market and the average of the two is taken. If

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]
we are able to reduce this, big difference, not only on humanitarian grounds but also on grounds of economics, it will be possible for us to bring down the index and there will be no question of dearness allowance and other things going up.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
The average of what has been taken in fixing the price at Rs. 105 per quintal?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I will come to that.

In regard to the point made by the hon. Member that by increasing the price of wheat supplied through the public distribution system, there will be an increase in dearness allowance and so on, my feeling is that that will not be the result. Secondly, the hon. Member has asked what are the criteria which we took into account when fixing the price at Rs. 105 per quintal. I would like to point out that apart from the suggestions which were given to us in these several meetings—Consultative Committee meetings, Chief Ministers' Conference and the Conference to which my friend had some objection—we also had some basis. You know that, last year, our procurement price was Rs. 76 and if we add to that Rs. 4 which was given by way of bonus and so on, it will come to about Rs. 80. In fixing the price, so far as the procurement of rice was concerned, we gave a rise of about 33½%.

Giving the same rise that we had given in the case of rice i.e. 33½%, it works out to Rs. 105. So, it is not only on account of one fact but on account of the opinions expressed by a large number of people that we arrived at this figure.

Mr. Limaya was under a misapprehension when he said that this is the price we are giving to wholesale traders. That is wrong. This is the price we have fixed as our purchasing price from the growers. I would

like to assure the growers that we will not allow the prices to go down to less than Rs. 105. So far as the cultivator is concerned, this is the price at which Government is going to purchase from the growers. If any trader offers less to any grower, he need not sell it to him; he can come to us and we shall purchase the entire quantity at Rs. 105

Regarding flexibility, it is very difficult for the FCI to purchase at Rs. 102, 103, 104 etc. We have allowed the wholesale dealers to have some flexibility in purchasing from the growers. We are giving that flexibility to public bodies like cooperatives which will have to take a licence like a wholesale trader. This important aspect has not been considered by many members. While we are introducing wholesale traders, we have not completely lost sight of cooperatives, who will be made effective for making purchases by giving them the same facilities as we are giving to the wholesale dealers.

When we say that he will have to give 50 per cent of what he purchases to us at Rs. 105, members rightly ask, what is the control we shall have over him? So far as Punjab, Haryana and to a great extent UP are concerned, they have a regulated market. The deals, whether they are done by the Food Corporation or by the co-operatives or by private dealers, are registered net in one place but in three places. The system is, as soon as he purchases in the market, half of it he will have to hand over to us. Our people will be there to check. The price he is paying and the quantity he purchases will be recorded. Half of that quantity he will have to hand over to us immediately to be taken to the Food Corporation. I am taking up with the Chief Ministers the question of setting up non-official committees not only at these centres but also at the borders, so that there may not be any smuggling.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Consisting of your own popular partymen? 20 hrs.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I can tell Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra that we are very large-hearted; if he is prepared to accept our policies and if he is prepared to co-operate with us, I shall recommend to all the Chief Ministers and Food Ministers to see that the assistance and cooperation of all those who accept our policies are taken in order to see that this is effective.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Why do you not take a firm commitment from these organized markets, from each wholesale-trader that he will deliver a particular quantity, so that you are able to attain the figure of 12 million tonnes or so, both rabi and Kharif ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : It is wrong for any one to believe that we have come to any understanding or agreement with the grain dealers. That is a wrong impression which has been created. But I would like to point out that this is our policy; we want to provide them with an opportunity to have transaction in a fair way by which they can also earn their livelihood, they can also have something as incentive to do the work; at the same time they should also do this work with a view to helping the people and the Government. I would also like to point out that, if I find that this arrangement has failed or is likely to result in hoarding and so on, I shall not waste my time and shall immediately change our policy and also take proper action against the grain dealers. I would like to give this warning to them. I have no objection if they are prepared to give us according to our policy. I would like to trust them. Let them prove themselves worthy of our trust, and we shall not be wanting in giving them the necessary assistance.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : I am asking you to take a firm commitment from them, may be on weekly basis or monthly basis. There should be a firm commitment from them. Do not leave it to your inspectors. What they are going to collect every day is an uncertain factor.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I am asking them that, whatever they collect, they should hand over 50 per cent of that.

SHRI NATWARLAL PATEL : If they purchase from the farmers directly, we will not be able to keep our eyes open. I would request the hon. Minister to ensure that no trader is allowed to purchase directly from the farmers. If they purchase directly from the farmers, it will be impossible for us to check. They should purchase from mandis. They should not be allowed to purchase from the farmers directly.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : As I pointed out, so far as States are concerned, the transaction is done in a regulated manner. But I also realise that there may be a possibility of some having transactions with the growers direct. Therefore, we are fixing the quantity which they can stock at a particular time, and that quantity will include the stock in their godown, their stock in the purchasing centre and the transaction which they make with the growers, and we shall take the assistance of the non-official committees to see that they do not indulge in having an arrangement with the growers which will defeat this very policy.

श्री लक्ष्मण कन्नूर (पटियाला) : पंजाब में 1971 के होलसेल डीलर को एकीकृत कर दिया गया था। वहां पर कोऑपरेटिव, मार्केट, एच० सी० पार्टी, कच्चा लड़किया प्रोक्योरमेंट करते हैं। क्या पंजाब ने कहा है कि हम होलसेलर सिस्टम को रियाज्ज नहीं करना चाहते हैं? यदि हां तो क्या आप उसको देखा करते

[श्री सतपाल कन्नूर]

के लिये मजबूर करेंगे ? इसके बारे में आपका क्या कहना है ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I have said that today I am not going to distribute something to someone who does not exist or who are not there. If some one comes and asks for a licence that will have to be done in consultation with the State Governments.

श्री सतपाल कन्नूर पंजाब में 105 रुपये की क्विंटल पर होलसेलर से आप खरीदेंगे और पचास परसेंट उनसे आप लेंगे। इसमें बड़ा बहुत बड़ा हंगामा होगा। वहाँ के लोग होलसेलर को किसी भी कीमत पर टालनेट करने को तैयार नहीं है। ऐसी हालत में जो सप्लायमेंट आप होलसेलर को देना चाहते हैं वे आप को प्रोडिक्ट्स या पब्लिक एजेंसीज को क्यों नहीं देते हैं ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Have I not said that I have introduced an element here that whatever facilities we want to give to wholesale dealers will be available to cooperatives?

Actually, I shall be the happiest person if today the cooperatives can undertake that responsibility and discharge that responsibility.

And, so far as the issue price is concerned, I had made it quite clear. Our policy had been to provide as much subsidy as possible. There was a difference of about 10 04 12 rupees between the issue price and procurement price. Now we have calculated that it works to about Rs. 26 or Rs. 27 or Rs. 28; we are increasing it only upto Rs. 25. Some Members said, why cannot you increase the subsidy. This matter has been considered by us. Now, if we increase the subsidy it will have the effect of increasing deficit financing in this country. So, you will know that this is the lesser of the two evils which we have selected. There will be less pressure on our public distribution system also. When the difference between

these two is less many people would like to go to the open market instead of queuing up here and there will be less pressure thereby. We really want that it should help the vulnerable sections of society. So, that aspect will be kept by us.

SHRI PARIPOORNANAD PAJNULI (Tehri-Garhwal) : Some hon. Member raised the question as to what will happen if the dealer keeps better quality of wheat with himself and gives the inferior quality to the Government. What check has the Government in respect of such a situation?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : That is what I have been telling. Whenever purchase is made immediately half of that he gives. This is what happens. We are not taking it from the dealer, we are taking it from the cultivator.

श्री बालेन्द्र प्रसाद बाबू : नीतामकी, मोतीहारी आदि के बारे में मैंने कहा है कि वहाँ पर घोलें पड़े हैं। वहाँ आप क्या सहायता करने जा रहे हैं। वहाँ पर आप अपनी ओर लिये गेहूँ क्यों नहीं भेजते हैं और दूसरे तरीके से उनकी सहायता क्यों नहीं करते हैं।

आप पंजाब, हरियाणा आदि में जाते हैं। वहाँ पर खन कर आप लिबनि का अध्ययन क्यों नहीं करते हैं ? वहाँ खनने का आप प्रोग्राम क्यों नहीं बनाते हैं ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I shall immediately contact the State Government and whatever assistance is called for we shall see that it is given.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Does the Government contemplate enforcing any ceiling price? Or may we take it that sky is the limit so far as the ceiling price is concerned? Instead of sending detachments of army and companies of central reserve force to Bihar, would you think of sending more of foodgrains to Bihar?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I think the hon. Member will realise that during the last month and this month as well we have increased the supply of foodgrains to Bihar more than what was done in the month of January. He must also realise that in about a few days' time, some wheat will also be coming out and there should be no difficulty so far as availability of foodgrains to Bihar is concerned. I hope he will also help the Government to see that those people who are hoarding the stocks should also bring out the stocks.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : What about the ceiling price? May I take it that sky is the limit for it?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Some Members have mentioned the ceiling price at Rs. 150 or so. We have not fixed any ceiling price. I can tell the hon. Member that we will not allow them to take any undue advantage of it. That depends on the price at which they will give us.

श्री चिरंजीव झा सभापति महोदय, सरकार इस संबंध में को-ऑपरेटिव्स को अधिकार देने जा रही है। यह ही ठीक है। लेकिन क्या सभी महोदय को-ऑपरेटिव डिपार्टमेंट को बड़ा आवेक देने कि बाज गावों में जो विधिगत बेकार है, यदि वे को-ऑपरेटिव सोसायटी बनाना चाहते हैं, तो उनके बारे में जल्दी कार्यवाही की जावे ?

श्री किशोर सिंह (मुमुक्षु) : सभापति महोदय, गई स्कीम के अन्तर्गत किसी भी सरप्लस स्टेट से किसी डेफिसिट स्टेट में गेहूँ ले जाने के लिए होल्डसेलर्ज को परमिट

के आधार पर इजाजत देने का विचार है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर किसी सरप्लस स्टेट का कास्टकार किसी डेफिसिट स्टेट में गेहूँ ले जाना चाहे, तो उससे पचास परसेंट लेबी लेने के बाद क्या उस को ऐसा करने की इजाजत दे दी जायेगी। सरकार ने लेबी लेने के बाद होपमेन्स को 150 रुपये प्रति-क्विंटल के हिसाब से बेचने की इजाजत दी है। क्या सरकार डेफिसिट स्टेट्स में भी 150 रुपये प्रति-क्विंटल के हिसाब से बेचने देगी, या उस से भी अधिक भाव पर बेचने की इजाजत देगी ?

श्री कृष्णचंद्र प्रसाद शर्मा : जहाँ तक डेफिसिट स्टेट्स का मामला है, वहाँ जो भी गेहूँ खरीदा जायेगा और बिमके जगिये भी खरीदा जायेगा, उस को उस स्टेट से बाहर ले जाने की इजाजत नहीं होगी। जहाँ तक सरप्लस स्टेट्स का मामला है, वहाँ हम देखेंगे कि उन के पास कितना गेहूँ है और हमें कौन कौन सी स्टेट्स में बेचने की जरूरत है। हम उन को उम्मीद लिहाज से परमिट देगे कि वे इतना गेहूँ महाराष्ट्र में ले जायें और इतना बेस्ट बगाम में ले जायें और हम उन की कीमत भी तय कर देगे और उम्मीद कीमत पर देना पड़ेगा।

श्री बरबगरा सिंह श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र ने इनकी इनटररॉन्ड की है। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उन ने तयामुन करने के लिए कहा गया है, तो क्या वह तयामुन करेंगे या नहीं।

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : ये लोग इतना महबोग मागने के काबिल नहीं हैं।

20.19 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, April 5, 1974/Chaitra 15, 1896 (Saka).