

Mr. Speaker: The result of the Division is: Ayes 293; Noes nil. The 'Ayes' have it; the 'Ayes' have it.

The motion is carried and the Constitution (Fourteenth Amendment) Bill, 1962 as amended, is passed by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

17.34 hrs.

FOOD PRODUCTION*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the half-hour discussion regarding food production.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Jammu and Kashmir): Without any doubt, in my opinion, there is double talk on the food front. Recently, the Planning Minister while expressing his view regarding the performance of the Third Five Year Plan regarding agriculture, had made certain remarks which have been reported in the press. I quote:

"Mr. Nanda who had an informal chat with newsmen candidly admitted shortcomings and regretted that even after ten years of planning, the country had to depend on food imports. Referring to only a million increase in food-grains last year, the Minister suggested that if more fertilisers are required to achieve self-sufficiency, it must be produced anyhow."

After this statement, the Minister of Food and Agriculture—to be more specific, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture—while talking about the very same subject expressed one hundred per cent. confidence on the food front. He had clearly stated that the targets set in the Third Five Year Plan would be achieved. In that very statement, going further he said that these would be achieved provided the supply of

fertilisers is to the tune required in the Third Plan and the minor irrigation schemes are implemented to the tune provided in the Third Plan; he also said 'if nature is kind to us'.

In my opinion, if after 15 years of scientific agriculture in this country—everybody says that today in India we have scientific agriculture—we have still to depend upon Nature's kindness as far as our achievement in the food production is concerned, it is not a very desirable situation. We have seen over the last two or three years that generally for every year we have set a target of increase in food production of 5 per cent. But during the last two or three years, we have achieved only a little more than 1 per cent. Looking to that experience, I do not know how still we are clinging to that target of 5 per cent. increase every year. I think the Planning Minister's statement is, to some extent, more realistic than the rosy picture being painted by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

I do agree that to achieve the target fully the supply of fertilisers, irrigation and other things are the first requirement. Right at the beginning of the Third Plan, why was it not taken into consideration either by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture or by the Planning Commission that since we are short in supply of fertilisers and we have not been able to implement the minor irrigation schemes to the extent we wanted, we would not be able to reach the target which we have set before us? Why were all these things not taken into consideration and adequate steps were not taken to see that these defects and deficiencies in the planning of agriculture are removed? By the time the deficiency in the supply of fertilizers is overcome, by the time all the minor irrigation schemes are implemented, and if nature is also kind to us, by that time, I think, it may be that the Third Five Year Plan will be over. So, I think, the whole approach, of stating that during the Third Plan period

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]

we would have a total increase of 25 per cent. in food production over what we had at the end of the Second Five Year Plan, has been entirely confused. I would appeal very earnestly to the Minister of Food and Agriculture, that whatever difficulties he is facing to implement the schemes for the development of agriculture for the purpose of increasing food production, whatever differences of opinion he may have with the Planning Commission or the Planning Minister, or if he is not getting the required finances for his schemes or if he is not satisfied with the way the question of fertilizers is being handled in this country, he should put them before this House taking it into confidence. This House would always go with him to see that the difficulties are removed.

The production and supply of fertilizers, as far as I understand, is the responsibility of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. If the fertilizers are not made available to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, then, how can the nation hold the Ministry of Food and Agriculture responsible for not achieving the target set before the country?

It is high time that we look thoroughly into it and see where there is lack of coordination, whether it is at the higher level or whether it is at the lower level. In my opinion, the very example of the two conflicting statements of the Planning Minister and the reaction of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture is a good example of lack of coordination even at the higher level. The responsibility of the Planning Commission is not only to fix the targets but it has also to take the realistic factors into consideration and then set the targets before the various Ministries.

As far as the efforts that are made in general for the increase in food production are concerned, I think, even at the lower level there is a good deal of confusion and lack of coordination. Fertilizers, good seed and irrigation water are the three basic re-

quisites for increased food production. The distribution of seed is handled by the Ministry of Community Development and its supply is the responsibility of the Seed Multiplication Farms which are under the State Governments. The Central Minister says that during the coming one or two years, we are going to have a certain amount of seed testing laboratories. We are going to have a seed multiplication corporation and to have a seed multiplication programme. How is it that the Centre is expecting to achieve the targets when, at the lower level even, there is absolute confusion? How can the Minister at the Centre say that all his plans will be carried out?

I would only say that the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture should sit together once again and review the targets set before the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and take a realistic view. If we are not in a position to achieve increase in food production every year to the extent of 5 per cent. or 4 per cent., in my opinion, there is no need to deceive the nation and to say that the nation will be able to achieve the target and become self-sufficient by the end of the Third Five Year Plan. We should only say that we may be able to achieve, with the existing resources at our disposal, increase to the extent of 1 per cent. or 2 per cent. I think under those psychological conditions, the nation will not blame the Ministry and it will think twice before doing so. The nation will feel that we would have to put more efforts to achieve more than the targets set before us.

With these few words, I would ask the hon. Minister for Food and Agriculture to clear this confusion which has been created by the statement of the Planning Minister and by the statement of the Minister of State for Food and Agriculture.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): May I put a question, Sir? The sole object of keeping the Minister without Portfolio is to get co-ordination

between the several Ministries. Now, the complaint has been that there is no co-ordination between the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and the Ministry of Planning. May I know through the hon. Minister what co-ordination he is doing and how far he has succeeded in bringing co-ordination between these Ministries to see that the food target is achieved?

श्री विश्वाम प्रसाद (लालगंज) : सभा-पति महोदय, यह डिस्कशन ७ अगस्त, १९६२ के स्टार्ड क्वेश्चन नं० ८५ पर है। इस सिलसिले में मैं कुछ थोड़ा सा कहना चाहता हूँ। मिनिस्टर साहब ने जवाब दिया था कि ३५ लाख मीट्रिक टन गल्ला हर साल बांटा जायेगा, और उतनी कमी हमारे फूड प्रोडक्शन में होगी। ३५ लाख टन के माने हैं ३.५ मिलियन टन। अगर हम इस को ५ से गुणा कर दें तो थर्ड फाइव इअर प्लान में करीब १७.५ मिलियन टन की कमी होती है। जिस रेट से हमारे यहां पापुलेशन बढ़ रही है उसके हिसाब से हमारे यहां थर्ड फाइव इअर प्लान के आखिर में ३५ मिलियन एक्स्ट्रा पापुलेशन हो जायेगी क्योंकि एक वर्ष में लगभग ६ मिलियन पापुलेशन बढ़ती है। अगर हम एक आदमी को एक साल में १।४ टन गल्ला खिलायें तो हमें करीब ६ मिलियन टन गल्ले की आवश्यकता और पड़ेगी।

एक भारतीय सदस्य : कोई मरेंगे भी या नहीं ?

श्री विश्वाम प्रसाद : उनके मरने के बाद भी हम को ६ मिलियन टन और गल्ले की आवश्यकता होगी। इस तरह से हमारे यहां १७.५ मिलियन टन और ६ मिलियन टन को मिला कर कुल २६.५ मिलियन टन अघिक गल्ले की आवश्यकता तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना के आखिर में होगी, हमारा टार्गेट १०० मिलियन टन का है और हम ७६ मिलियन टन इस समय पैदा कर रहे हैं। इस तरह से यहां पर भी हम तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना

पैदा करेंगे। इस तरह अगर हम २६.५ मिलियन टन में से २१ टन घटा दें तो भी हम को थर्ड फाइव इअर प्लान के आखिर में ५.५ मिलियन टन की कमी रहेगी।

सभापति महोदय : आप सवाल पूछिये, बहस का अवसर नहीं है।

श्री विश्वाम प्रसाद : सवाल पूछने के पहले मैं थोड़ी सी बात बतला रहा था। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से आप प्लानिंग कर रहे हैं, अगर उसी तरह चलता रहा तो मेरा यह विश्वास है कि हमारे यहां ५.५ मिलियन टन की शार्टेज ऐग्रीकल्चर के सिलसिले में फूड प्रोडक्शन में रहेगी।

दूसरी बात इस प्रश्न के सिलसिले में यह है कि तारकित प्रश्न के (ख) भाग में पूछा गया था कि हम को सन् १९६२-६३ में कितना गेहूं मंगाने की आवश्यकता होगी। माननीय मन्त्री जी ने उत्तर में कहा था कि इसका बतलाना जनहित में नहीं होगा। इसी तरह से आस्ट्रेलिया और अमरीका के गेहूं के दामों में क्या फर्क है इसके उत्तर में भी माननीय मन्त्री जी ने कहा कि उसका बतलाना जनहित में नहीं होगा। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में सिर्फ एक सिम्पल सा सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। क्या यह कोई ऐटम बम्ब का रहस्य है या कोई लड़ाई का कलू है जिस के बतलाने में मुश्किल हो सकती है ? मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि आप इन प्वाइंट्स को क्लियर करने की कोशिश करेंगे। जहां तक ऐग्रीकल्चर को बढ़ाने की बात है, प्लानिंग को सक्सेसफुल बनाने की बात है, आप को माइनर इर्रिगेशन के ऊपर भी ध्यान देना पड़ेगा वना ऐग्रीकल्चर इसी तरह से पिछड़ा रहेगा, और किसान लोग बराबर भूखों मरते रहेंगे।

Shri B. K. Das (Contai): There have been devastating floods and also locust menace. May I know whether there has been any change contemplated in our import programme and what is the calculated deficit according to the present situation?

Shri Iqbal Singh (Ferozepur): The Food Ministry deals with the largest number of people in the whole country. We may not have achieved the targets. But, what steps have been taken so far by this Ministry to associate the actual peasants at the district level and the State level and all-India so that they could explain their difficulties to the Ministry and in this way increase production? Opinion may be sought through other Ministries but their opinion may not be the opinion of the actual peasants. This is the difficulty. May I know what steps have been taken by this Ministry for taking the opinion of the peasants in regard to agricultural production and agricultural purposes at different levels?

श्री विभूति मिश्र (मोतिहारी) : सभा-पति महोदय, अनाज, जो कि नकद आमदनी का जरिया है, विविध इंडिविडुअल किसान पैदा करता है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्रदेशों के एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर, सेंटर के एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर, इरिगेशन मिनिस्टर, कम्पनिटी डेवेलोपमेंट मिनिस्टर, कामर्स एंड इंडस्ट्रीज मिनिस्टर जितने भी मिनिस्टर हैं, वे सब मिल कर इंडिविडुअल किसान को, जो कि इंडिविडुअल प्लाट में अनाज पैदा करने वाला है, कौन सी इमदाद देते हैं ताकि बावजूद मौसमों की अच्छाई और खराबी के वह अपने उस प्लाट में अनाज, चाहे वह नकदी हो, चाहे जिसी हो, पैदा करे। क्या माननीय मंत्री बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि सरकार किसान को क्या इन्सेन्टिव देती है ?

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : अगर मिनिस्टर साहब के दिल में यह बात पैदा हो जाय कि घी दूध का इन्तजाम करने से बल्ले का खर्च आधा रह जायेगा और अगर हिन्दुस्तान की कैंटल वैल्यू को बढ़ाया जाये, गाय-भैंसों को बढ़ाया जाय, तो यह खाद्य समस्या एग्न साल में हल हो सकती है, वर्ना सरकार करोड़ों घरों को रुपये खर्च करती

रहेगी, लेकिन खाद्य समस्या फिर भी हल नहीं होगी। अगर माननीय सदस्य फूड मिनिस्टर को घी-दूध मिलता है, तो वह एक रोटी से पेट भर लेते हैं और चूँकि मुझे घी-दूध नहीं मिलता है, इस लिए मुझको छः रोटियां खानी पड़ती हैं।

हमारी सरकार को यह बात सोच लेनी चाहिए कि खाद्य समस्या को हल करने के लिए कैंटल वैल्यू को इम्प्रूव करना चाहिये और ट्रैक्टरों को कानून खत्म कर देना चाहिये। ट्रैक्टरों के आने से हमारे सामने तीन दिक्कतें पैदा हो गई हैं। पहली दिक्कत यह है कि अब खाद बिल्कुल पैदा नहीं होती। जो मवेशी खाद पैदा करते थे, वे बिल्कुल खत्म हो गये हैं। आर्टिफिशियल फर्टिलाइजर वगैरह फसल बढ़ा देते हैं, लेकिन वह जमीन को कमजोर करते हैं। अब सरसों, चने और तिल का पैदा होना बिल्कुल बन्द हो गया है। जैसे शराब पीने से आदमी का जोश एक दम उमड़ आता है, लेकिन अन्दर से वह खोखला हो जाता है, उसी तरह से फर्टिलाइजर से सब से बड़ी दिक्कत यह हुई है कि जमीनें कम पैदावार देने लगी हैं। फसल साल, दो साल, चार साल तक बढ़ जाती है, लेकिन उसके बाद जमीनें बेकार हो जाती हैं।

मैं माननीय मिनिस्टर साहब से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि देश में घी-दूध बढ़े और खाद्य का उत्पादन बढ़े, क्या इसके लिये वह ये तीन बातें मानने लिये तैयार हैं पहली यह कि ट्रैक्टरों को कानून खत्म किया जाये दूसरी यह कि गाय-भैंसों को बढ़ाया जाये और तीसरी यह कि लोगों को यह तालीम दी जाये कि बि मोर यू ईट, दि सूनर यू बिल डाई—जितना ज्यादा तुम खाओगे, उतना जल्दी मरोगे। मैंने शेर के शिकार को देखा है कि दस दस दिन तक शेर कोई चीज नहीं खाता है, लेकिन फिर भी उसकी एनर्जी बनी रहती है। भगवान ने जो शक्ति हमको दी हुई है, जिससे हमारी विद्या और बुद्धि बढ़ती है, प्रतिभा बढ़ती है और खूबसूरती

बढ़ती है, उन्न बढ़ती है, वह सारी शक्ति खाना हम करने में लगी रहती है। इसलिए कम खाने के लिए लोगों को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाये और इसके बारे में लिट्टेड्यर तैयार किया जाये, ट्रेडिज को खत्म किया जाये और कंट्रोल वैल्यू को बढ़ाया जाये। क्या मिनिस्टर साहब ये सुझाव मानने को तैयार हैं ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil): I am very glad indeed that my young friend, Shri Inder Malhotra has raised this question. For a long time, we have had no debate on food production. The omission was so significant that even the Minister was, thinking that something is wrong, because the people never think of these problems. My friend, Shri Malhotra, who is an agricultural scientists, is very much interested in agriculture and his mind is directed towards scientific development and improvement of Indian agriculture. He has found this occasion, saying there is some difference of opinion between the two hon. Ministers. Until I really came to this discussion, I did not know who the Minister concerned was. (*Interruption*).

I am not contradicting my hon. friend. I am only saying, one is the Minister of Planning and another is the Minister of Agriculture. I am glad I am not that Minister.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: Whatever he says are your words.

Shri S. K. Patil: I agree he says it on behalf of Government and the entire Government is committed by whatever he has said.

I am going to say that there is really no difference of opinion among the Ministers. This is the way of putting things. I shall explain it. I am not merely suggesting it in order to score a debating point. The House has every right to ask. Its mind should be exercised as to what is going to happen in the near future so far as our food problem is concerned.

It has been quoted here that we expected an increase of something like 5 to 6 per cent. in our agricultural production every year. If it is only 1 per cent. or a little more than that, it is not the expected increase and therefore, naturally there is an apprehension that we may not be able to achieve our target.

The House knows very well that the target aimed at the end of the Second Five Year Plan was 80 million tons, including foodgrains, pulses and other things because we take these things together. That target was reached and over-reached in five years. You would have seen that in five years we did not reach that target by a continuous process of, say, 3 per cent. every year. In one year it was 10 to 12 per cent. down, because there is a cycle of four to five years. It always occurs in agriculture because it depends upon nature.

Now, from 80 million tons, we are going to 100 million tons. It is simple mathematics. It is 25 per cent. more, and if it is 25 per cent. more, it must be spread over five years which comes to 5 per cent. every year. It is a compound ratio, because if you calculate the percentage of increase on the 5 per cent. increase in the previous year also, it will come to less than 5 per cent. Therefore, for a safety margin we have kept it at 6 per cent. These percentages have no meaning, except that, by and large, at the end of the Third Five Year Plan we must somehow or the other reach the target of 100 million tons.

Now, the Planning Minister, when ever he speaks, looks at the entire thing, and not only at agriculture. It was pointed out to him that we expected 6 per cent. increase whereas our achievement has been a little lower. But the question that was put to him was in a different context,

[Shri S. K. Patil]

namely, that the *per capita income* of India has not increased commensurate with the expectations that we had. In answering that, naturally he should have emphasised this point. When I speak I do not speak with any preconceived notions. On the spur of the moment, I give an explanation, because it is not a long-drawn argument over which I am speaking. Similarly, on the spur of the moment, he said that the *per capita income* did not show or register that rise which was expected because, among other things, agricultural income also—because it predominantly comes in—did not register that increase and, therefore, to that extent the *per capita income* was also less.

There is nothing wrong in saying so, because—left to me I would have said 100 years—for the coming 25 years at least the most predominant portion of our national income is going to be from agriculture because 70 per cent. of our people depend upon agriculture. They depend upon it in the sense that they meet their complete life out of it. They get a little less than what they need. But dependence on agriculture on such a large scale by a large number of people is there. More than half the national income of our country is from agriculture. Therefore, when agriculture does not register that particular expectation, there is a likelihood of the national income to that extent showing a little reduction. Therefore, in saying that he has not said anything which I would regard as something against agriculture etc.

18 hrs.

Then, he was asked whether he was really stinting anything to the Agriculture Ministry in the matter of money for fertilisers, money for minor and major irrigation schemes and other things. He said that if it is necessary money must be found for minor irrigation and other works, because otherwise the target of 100

million tons cannot be reached. He positively said that money could be found, whether it is in the Third Five-Year Plan or not. I am absolutely certain, so far as the requirements of minor irrigation are concerned, and along with it other things also—the mentioned minor irrigation, because that is the most important thing; so also fertilizers—if the money provided in the Third Plan is not adequate and we want more money, rest assured that the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the Minister of Food and Agriculture are competent enough to get that money, whether it is included in the Third Plan or not. But more money alone does not solve that question. I will tell you something here. I shall share my fears with you. It is said here that if we get a little more fertilizer, then we shall have more production. It is true, in spite of the feelings of the Member opposite, because he does not like the fertilizers or any modern thing, because he thinks that the soil will get fatigued when the fertilizer is applied. And he gave an appropriate example. If you give wine to a man and he feels a little exhilarated, for the time being, that does not show his real strength. I do not know from where he got that example, but since it comes from him, it must be very right. But I do not know whether that experience is personal or borrowed.

Shri Yashpal Singh: I am a student of *gurukul*.

Shri S. K. Patil: It is true. We are all students, but not of that type of inspiration where the body gets excited.

Anyhow, there was a feeling like that. I am not an expert in it but for the last two or three years I am trying to understand things, trying to learn things, trying to see that fertilizer is being applied not only in this country but in other countries also, wherever I go. I try to examine the pattern of crops wherever I go and find out what relation the fertilizer

bears to the crop production. While the fertilizer which we have got in our country, organic fertilizers of the green manner, as it is called, is very good, it does not go very far. While it has to be used hundred per cent, because everybody must not depend upon nitrogenous fertilizers and chemical fertilizers, any conception that by applying the chemical fertilizers to a land, the land gets fatigued, or gets exhausted, or does not respond to agriculture is a superstitious opinion not borne out by the scientific developments anywhere in the world, because there have been countries which have made a myth of their agriculture, viz. the United States. Here I can give you the example of the United States and USSR, and I can tell you the same conditions existed in the United States and USSR, viz. large lands which can respond to mechanical appliances, because they have got miles and miles of land which can make use of tractors, which we cannot do here in this country whether they are available or not.

If in the science of agriculture you merely talk of the mechanisation of agriculture, Russia is slightly more mechanised than the United States. In spite of that, the production per acre in Russia is miserably low; no comparison at all with the United States; it is as good or as bad as in India; nothing more. Why? It is not because any politics enters into the field. Land is the only nice thing that does not recognize politics. It wants water and fertilizer, but surely does not want any ism or any politics whatsoever. Why is it so? When you consider that, you will find that Russia did not apply fertilizers till today. Now they are making efforts to apply fertilizers to their land. Fertilizer makes a tremendous amount of difference to the land.

I am merely saying that all these things are very necessary. But, at the same time, merely if somebody gives me fertilizers, perhaps, he has a million tons of fertilizers and he

says "take it as a gift", it is useless to me because so long as the agriculturist or the farmer has not learnt how to use that fertilizer, it cannot be used. The use of fertilizer is a science in itself and every farmer has got to be initiated into the technique of the use of fertilizers. In our country those farmers who have learnt how to use fertilizers, namely, the farmers in Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and other States down below, they have learnt it so well that not only do they consume their quota of fertilizers but they adopt all manner of means, whether they are fair or even sometimes foul—I hope nobody from Andhra is present here now—to get more fertilizers, for which I compliment them, and they even go out of their way and buy fertilizers in the black market because they understand the value of fertilizers. Who are those who sell it in the black market? It is those who do not understand what fertiliser means and how it can be used. Therefore you could see how the knowledge of fertilisers is very necessary indeed. Therefore this habit of fertilisation of the land must evolve with the farmer. It must go deep into him. He must understand what is to be done about it.

My hon. friend, Shri Malhotra, referred to nature. Nature is a thing about which no science in 15 years, even in 1500 years, could do anything. Even today, in spite of the colossal improvements that have been made possible in the United States of America, you do not know how much the agriculture of the United States of America depends upon the rains, the monsoon and the land. I shall give you a little example of what difference it makes.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: Not entirely.

Shri S. K. Patil: Not entirely. You are right. But it does to a large extent because it is a small country—I mean in population—of 180 million against our 440 million and the land under the plough is just the same, that

[Shri S. K. Patil]

is, 350 million acres. But they have got irrigation. We have got even more irrigation than they. India has got the largest irrigation in the whole world, even more than the United States of America, but our need is more. But even they depend largely upon the rains.

Last year when I asked for some cotton from the United States because long staple cotton is a necessity to us, the Secretary who was here luckily—my opposite number in that Government—although he was very much willing to help us in that said, "This year our crop is not good". I asked him, "Why?" and he said, "Because the season, the rains and the nature are not so good." Even a country which is really so mechanical has got to depend upon it. But this year when I opened the papers the other day I read that they have got about 15 to 16 million bales of cotton. I was very glad to see that they have got a little more. It makes a difference sometimes of a million or two million bales. Sometimes it does happen. Therefore, this factor is something over which the Ministry has no control.

May I ask what is happening in the country today? There are floods in the eastern parts of UP and Bihar and even in Assam. There are floods, but sometimes they are devastating floods. Floods, no doubt, are not an altogether unmixed disaster. Sometimes they also bring the fertilising agents along with them and they are useful. But it all depends upon when they come and whether there is a chance afterwards for the crops to grow. But these are things beyond the control of the Minister of Agriculture or anybody for that matter. These things will happen and we have got to insure ourselves against that by irrigation and things of that description.

Having said that, I have got to make one very important point. Very often we feel superstitiously that India is always going to be short in

food. That superstition has stuck into our minds for a long time. Somehow or the other we cannot get out of it. My efforts for the last three years have been to create confidence in the country, because confidence goes a long way. It is a fertiliser of the brain. Just as the land requires fertilisers, we also require a little fertiliser for our brain. So, do not be despondent while you warn. We must be warned again and again just as my hon. friend has done. Without a warning we do not know where we are going. Yet, we must develop confidence in ourselves that we are going to be self-sufficient. We are on the road to self-sufficiency. Do you know what is happening in India today? We seem to be very happy having enough of crops and food. Normally, everywhere in the world, what you call the progressive world, if they produce one ton of grain it is enough for a population of ten for a whole year. That is the general proportion. Now our 80 million tons according to that must really cater for a population of 800 million, which one day it will be, but it has not been our good luck to have that much just now. Therefore, our food, even what we are producing today, by the standards of Europe and America, is good enough for 800 million people and which 440 million people are eating and sometimes eating too much and then finding that there is nothing left.

That brings me to the question which the hon. Member, Shri Yashpal Singh, raised. It is a very important question, namely, that we must not only depend upon grain because too much eating of grain is not good for health. Therefore we must go to more healthy and more nutritious diet, not by buying it in the market but by producing in our land by the process of mixed farming, animal husbandry and by having more and more cattle wealth that is looked after well so that we shall get the dairy products, milk and ghee. You can quite understand what milk and

ghee can do when you look at the hon. Member opposite who has really propounded the cause of milk and ghee.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: He never use other fertilisers.

Shri S. K. Patil: Therefore these are the things that have got to be used.

The Ministry is very alert indeed. I can promise to everybody that there is nothing that the Ministry is not doing very seriously in this regard. We have got to create confidence. I cannot go on saying to everybody, look here, our standards have fallen down, we are not going to meet it, we are not going to meet it. The result will be, so much of chaos and confusion would be created in the country. Having lost confidence, even the little that we are doing will not be appreciated. Remember, agriculture is not a mere machine like industry. Here are 60 million families on whom the fate of agriculture depends. Therefore, even village-wise planning or even family-wise planning just as my hon. friend Shri Bibhuti Mishra is suggesting is a good thing. You cannot expect that any Government will take something and give it to the farmer, here it is, you do this. It is nowhere done in this world. What is given is the opportunity to the farmer. If he wants credit, credit is given. If he wants other things, fertilisers, plant food and so on, they are given.

Therefore, I do not want to go into those questions. I merely say, let us not be pessimistic. There is no reason whatsoever to be pessimistic in this country. This country is, industrially, agriculturally, sound enough. Our farmer is shrewd enough. He understands, he is responsive to the modern techniques that we are suggesting to him. The more and more we take him into our confidence, and we go into his confidence, this mutual process of adjusting our confidence will create an atmosphere and really we

will be able to solve the problem in five years. There will be no difficulty whatsoever.

Some questions were asked, I have said about fertilisers and irrigation. Even with the best of irrigation and the largest asset that we have got today, we have got 57 million acres under irrigation as against 325 or 350 million acres. About 25 per cent of the land is irrigated. That is the highest ratio. We have never got more irrigated land. I am talking of perennial irrigation: not irrigation of the seasonal kind. We have got to depend upon nature.

Shri Sinhasan Singh suggested, why not co-ordinate in the Ministry, etc. Let us not complicate matters, simple as they are, with having more machinery introduced for co-ordination, each one trying to do some calculation on paper. Let us have a little more calculation on the land. That would help us much more than having figures tallied and going round from table to table. Where it is necessary to have co-ordination, I am quite sure the Government is competent and ready with machinery for co-ordination also.

My hon. friend Shri Vishram Prasad talked about population that is growing. Unfortunately, I have no power to reduce it. He is right. I do not know if there is anything that we can usefully do. In other countries they do. When Japan wanted to reduce population, they have done it wonderfully well. What a determined nation can do when they are face to face with danger, if anywhere you can see it, you have got to see what these nearly 100 million people of Japan have done in a small country and regulated the population in the way they wanted. That is something that speaks volumes of the determination of the nation when it wants to live and wants to progress. If my hon. friend suggests something of that description, I shall go all out to help him. But, I will tell him that I am not responsible for all this increase of popu-

[Shri S. K. Patil]

lation that he is talking about and the 3½ million tons of food that is really necessary.

Association of peasants is a point that Shri Iqbal Singh raised. It is a very good point. Until that is done, there is no assured future for agriculture. That means, that you must go down into the planning in the village. I cannot do it. The village man, the panchayat, instead of fighting among themselves as to who should be the Chairman or what should happen, should do it. They must really give attention to this. Not that it would immediately happen. We must create an atmosphere, this Parliament must create an atmosphere by which these things would go into the villages and they should feel that they are also responsible, more responsible because they are on the spot, so that, their association could be secured.

I have already referred to ghee and milk referred to by my hon. friend. Therefore, there is nothing really that should cause us anxiety. If hon. Members, from time to time, bring motions like this and try to understand and try to help me, as my hon. friend Shri Inder J. Malhotra has done, we understand that these are the difficulties. I shall refer to locusts and I have finished. Locusts is a problem, which is also like nature. I

do not know wherefrom they come, uninvited. We have not sent any invitation at all. They come from somewhere, they go somewhere and create a lot of havoc and perhaps crores of rupees worth of excellent crops are spoiled. We are doing everything possible. But more than that, we must have all those fighting instruments ready with us. We are not well equipped with them now. I am trying to see whether, if not by exchange at least by barter or by some other process we can get those planes; it is not just one plane that we require, but we require dozens of them; we require at least ten or twelve to begin with in order that wherever such a swarm comes, we can go at once and save that territory from the complete devastation which sometimes these uninvited guests of ours do.

Therefore, by and large, I should say that the future, as far as Indian agriculture is concerned, is very good indeed, and given confidence and endeavour which this House will always give, I am quite certain that we need not be anxious that our future is going to be bleak.

18.16 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, September 5, 1962/Bhadra 14, 1884 (Saka).