

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna]

the Rajghat Samadhi Act, 1951, the Members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, one member from amongst themselves to serve as a member of the Rajghat Samadhi Committee vice Her Highness Maharani Vijaya Raje Scindia of Gwalior resigned from the membership of the Rajghat Samadhi Committee."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That in pursuance of subsection (1) (d) of section 4 of the Rajghat Samadhi Act, 1951, the member of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, one member from amongst themselves to serve as a member of the Rajghat Samadhi Committee vice Her Highness Maharani Vijaya Raje Scindia of Gwalior resigned from the membership of the Rajghat Samadhi Committee."

The motion was adopted.

12.17 hrs.

FOOD CORPORATIONS BILL—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri C. Subramaniam on the 20th November, 1964, namely:—

"That the Bill to provide for the establishment of Food Corporation for the purpose of trading in foodgrains and other food-stuffs and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto, be taken into consideration."

Out of 5 hours allotted, 35 minutes have already been taken and 4 hours and 25 minutes remain. Shri Dandekar may continue his speech.

Shri N. Dandekar (Gonda): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was on the subject of

my apprehensions concerning the possible development of the Food Corporation into a monopoly body occupying a position in the foodgrains trade to the detriment of the interests of the producers on the one hand and of the consumers on the other. I want to develop this theme about monopoly a little further.

One speaks of two possible types of monopolies— a quasi-monopoly, which is merely a "monopoly situation" or an absolute monopoly. A monopoly situation is one where one concern controls more than 30 to 40 per cent of the input supplies of the particular product produced, or 30 to 40 per cent of the trading in that particular commodity. An absolute monopoly, roughly speaking, is one where one particular concern controls 80 per cent or more of the input of a commodity into the industry or trade, or controls over 80 per cent of the trading in that commodity. Ordinarily monopoly situations are achieved by smart buying or selling or by appropriate price incentives on the one hand as regards buying and by low prices as regards selling. In the present case, if that was all that was intended, namely, that the Food Corporation would be giving not merely minimum but remunerative prices to the producers on the one hand and would be giving to the consumers foodgrains in adequate quantities at reasonable prices, as for instance, only the sort of margin which the Government now consider adequate between the buying price and the selling price, there cannot be much objection, because on the whole in a policy of that kind, the producer will benefit and the consumer will not be hurt.

But in the present case, my apprehensions are about absolute monopoly; and they are founded upon three major threats to the trade and to the producer. The first major threat is compulsory procurement on behalf of the Food Corporation. This will set up a procurement monopoly in favour of the Food

Corporation whereafter it is anybody's guess as to that sort of price the producer will get. I think one can reasonably anticipate that with procurement monopoly in favour of the Food Corporation, the possibilities are, indeed the probability is, that the producer would be squeezed down to whatever price he is compulsorily given and must take, because there will be only one monopolist buyer.

As I said earlier, if it was a question of there being no apprehensions of any kind as regards remunerative prices to the producer and reasonable prices to the consumer, one would not be particularly worried. But these threats of which I am speaking and the first threat to which I referred, namely, that of compulsory procurement, do lead me very strongly to suspect that what is intended is monopoly procurement in favour of the State Trading Corporation with the consequences to which I have just referred. The second threat is that of monopoly in favour of the Corporation in the matter of movement of foodgrains from one State to another and from district to district.

Shri Banga (Cittoor): By rail and road.

Shri N. Dandekar: There have been remarks and observations by the Food Minister in the course of the food debate as well as, as I shall presently show, in the White Paper, which lead one to apprehend that there is intended here a considerable monopoly in movement with the result that the State Food Corporation, together with its satellite Corporations in the States, will probably be, the only body which will be entitled to all major movements in foodgrains.

Thirdly—it was specifically mentioned at one time or another—there is the proposed monopoly of rail transport. It is ridiculous to suppose that this Foodgrains Corporation is intended merely as a corrective on a com-

petitive basis to the foodgrains trade and at the same time to suggest that movement by rail would be a monopoly of the State Food Corporation.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): What provision of the Bill is the hon. Member referring to?

Shri N. Dandekar: I shall be most grateful if I am not interrupted. I am new to this House.

Mr. Speaker: I am also interested to know how much more time the hon. Member would like to take. He has already taken 17 minutes yesterday.

Shri N. Dandekar: Sir, I would like to have ten minutes more.

Mr. Speaker: Would it not be too much? He should try to finish it earlier.

Shri N. Dandekar: The consequences of all this in terms of the sort of price-squeeze to which the producer will be subjected and the kind of price-rise to which the consumer will be subjected in terms of profiteering by the State Food Corporation are obvious enough, but what is not so obvious is the consequence which this may well have upon the growing of food in this country. I think by this time the Members are aware of the serious situation as regards foodgrains productions which developed in consequence of monopoly in foodgrains trade in all the countries where this has been tried. It had to be abandoned in Yugoslavia, it had to be abandoned in Poland and Hungary, and it had, at any rate partially, to be abandoned in Russia. In China, although not abandoned, the consequences on the Food supplies in that country are well known.

Many hon. Members have asked where do I get these apprehensions from? In the first place, our experience of the State Trading Corporation and other types of State corporations does not inspire confidence. State trading in cement was intended for the benefit of the consumer. But, at

[Shri N. Dandeker]

any rate for the first five years of which I had to study the figures when I presented the case of Cement Industry before the Tariff Commission, I showed that the State Trading Corporation had made colossal profit in cement consequence of the fact that it had monopoly in it. There is the example also of the effect of the State Trading Corporation intrusion into the manganese ore trade. It acquired a monopoly in the matter of export of manganese ore. It thought it was a tremendous organisation which could dictate terms to foreign countries with the result that, after a few years of the State Trading Corporation's intervention in the manganese trade, the manganese export trade of this country has been completely ruined. There is also the example of the State Penicillin factory—the Hindustan Antibiotics. That is a Corporation which has been heavily profiteering in penicillin.

Shri Ranga: There is the fertiliser factory also.

Shri N. Dandeker: I can give many other examples. The first point I wish to make is that my reasons for these apprehensions are based upon the actual facts of life as evidenced by the activities of certain State corporations.

The second reason is the almost certain competitive incompetence of State trading in foodgrains. This Food Corporation with a capital of Rs. 100 crores is presumably intended to handle trade which over the year would be of the value of Rs. 3,000 crores. If there are in this country 500,000 villages, I imagine there are at least 50,000 market towns and market villages. This State Trading Corporation is expected to have enormous staff, numerous agencies, large office personnel and enormous working resources with which to make advances, to make purchases to do sorting, grading and storing, to do distribution through agents or directly with its own retail shops. I am certain, having some

knowledge of the native extent and magnitude of operations involved, the number of persons involved, the number of transactions and the Stages of transactions involved and in particular the problems that are involved in agricultural credit lending to the producers on crop expectations that this Corporation will find itself with enormous amounts of outstanding dues, enormous amounts of bad debts, with the enormous tangle of distribution and purchase. It will be in a state of total confusion. And I fear this precisely because of the inability of a State Corporation of this kind to engage in trade of this kind without making a complete mess of it; and precisely because the Government never admit their mistakes—quite contrary to the motto *Satyameva Jayate*. I wish I knew Sanskrit so that I could put down the motto of Government in Sanskrit that "Government never make mistakes" In the result they will find that the only way of overcoming and remedying the complete state of confusion will be, of course, to confer monopolistic powers to the Corporation in this trade.

It is not as if I have been saying these things by drawing on my imagination. I would like to read one or two extracts from the Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to this Bill. In the first paragraph it is stated:

"...to set up a State Agency for the purpose of undertaking trading in foodgrains in a commercial manner but within the framework of an overall Government policy."

I have indicated the kind of overall Government policy that has been attempted in State trading in cement, State trading in manganese, State manufacturing and trading in penicillin, State manufacturing and trading in fertilizers and so on. Then it goes on to say:

"Only by such a measure it will be possible to effectively implement any policy of ensuring that the primary producer obtains the minimum price....."

Not an adequate price; not a remunerative price but the minimum price. I insist that the producer should get a remunerative price, a price which not merely covers the cost of production at the subsistence level but gives him a return adequate in terms of the existing general price level of the things that he wants to buy from the market and the liabilities he has to pay like debts, tax and so on. But the object of the Bill is only to ensure that the primary producer obtains 'the minimum price'. It goes on to say:

"...that the primary producer obtains the minimum price that may be announced from time to time and to protect the consumer from the vagaries of speculative trade."

There is no attempt here to protect the consumer from the vagaries of monopolistic trade. Another sentence in the next paragraph says:

"The Corporation will be the first organised attempt to take up State trading in foodstuffs on an appreciable scale. The Agency will also be used to build up gradually buffer stocks."

I said yesterday in regard to buffer stocks how difficult it is going to be to build up buffer stocks out of internal production when internal production is already inadequate for the normal consumption of this country. So, if this Corporation is going to have to build up buffer stocks you can well imagine the kind of monopolistic position that it must necessarily occupy.

Paragraph 4 of the Statement of Objects and Reasons says:

"The Corporation will be encouraged to function generally as

an autonomous organisation working on commercial lines."

But in the very next sentence it says:

"It is expected to secure for itself a strategic and commanding position in the foodgrains trade of the country."

Now I would like to read from the White Paper on foodgrains policy because that is even more clear as to the real intentions of the Government. I am reading from Paragraph 36 of the White Paper:

"The Government have, therefore, decided to set up the Foodgrains Trading Corporation to function strictly on commercial lines to purchase, store and sell foodgrains."

This is the usual kind of subterfuge that is invariably adopted, by saying "to function strictly on commercial lines."

But the next sentence reads:—

"This Corporation, which will be on a statutory basis, will be equipped with sufficient financial resources. It will be armed with adequate powers to secure grain from producers and traders".

It says, "adequate powers", not just commercial purchasing. Then, it says "It will be armed". I wish, they had used the word "invested"; but they have got accustomed to military language. It says:—

"It will be armed with adequate powers to secure grain from producers and traders who have surplus stocks. It will also be given other powers as are necessary to obtain a commanding position in the trade."

Shri Ranga: Another Government.

Shri N. Dandeker: As if this is not enough, it goes on to say in paragraph 37:—

“Government do not, however, consider that it is practicable to introduce at this stage.”

I was expressing my apprehension as regards the next stage. It says:

“Government do not, however, consider that it is practicable to introduce at this stage complete State trading throughout the country. The complete elimination of trade, statutory rationing in urban areas, controlled distribution in rural areas and monopoly procurement of foodgrains with its logical concomitants of village, district and State ban on movements presupposes an adequate reserve foodgrains at Government's disposal.”

The Bill empowers the Corporation to build up buffer stocks, as they call them. When you read this paragraph as I have just now been reading, the only limitation to this tremendous intention, the intention of a complete monopoly, is that adequate reserves of foodgrains have first to be at the disposal of this Corporation. I do not think that there can be any doubt as to what precisely are the intentions of the Government in this respect.

If with an adequate price for the producer and a fair price for the consumer we had, above all, an institutional set-up whereby the foodgrains production in this country could be stimulated by appropriate price policy, purchase policy and distribution policy, one would have had no quarrel at all; but the objects and reasons of the Bill and the general statement of policy are such that if this Corporation succeeds, of which I have very grave doubt,—I think, this Corporation is going to be tied up in an awful mess within two or three years' time;—but whether it succeeds or fails, the real objectives of Government, parti-

cularly if it fails, will inevitably be to convert it into a monopoly of procurement, movement transport distribution and sale of foodgrains.

I, therefore, oppose this Bill in principle. However, if this Bill were to be passed into law, then in order to secure certain remedial corrections that might perhaps allay some of the doubts and fears, I have proposed certain amendments which I shall move in due course.

Mr. Speaker: Before I call upon the next hon. Member to speak, I have to bring to the notice of the House that I have so far received 26 names of hon. Members who are desirous of speaking and the names of others might be coming up. According to the time allotted, we ought to conclude all the stages of this Bill today. There are so many amendments also to the clauses; so, we ought to limit the time for general discussion and for the clauses.

Shri Ranga: It is within your discretion to extend the time by one hour. Since you are good enough to say that the whole of this day will be taken up by this, if you are good enough to give us one more hour and expect the House to sit till 6 o'clock, it would satisfy everybody.

Mr. Speaker: If the House agrees, I have no objection.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Then we shall sit up to 6 o'clock.

Shri Ranga: We will like to have some time for the third reading also.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ajit Prasad Jain. Ordinarily, hon. Members should take about 15 minutes.

Shri A. P. Jain: I will take less than 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Also, it is desired by certain hon. Members that they should

know when the general discussion would conclude so that if voting is required they might be present. Should we set apart two hours for discussion on clauses?

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): No; one hour is enough. One hour is enough for third reading.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Ranga: 1½ hours at least. It is an important Bill.

Shri Nambiar: Yes, 4½ hours and 1½ hours respectively.

Mr. Speaker: So, we should conclude this discussion by 4 o'clock. How long is the hon. Minister likely to take?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri C. Subramaniam): About half an hour to 45 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I shall call the hon. Minister at 3-30. Shri Jain.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): The Minister may be called at 4 o'clock. That will be better.

Mr. Speaker: On this point the House had desired like that and I have adjusted that.

Shri A. P. Jain: Mr. Speaker, Sir as I rise to speak on this Bill, I am reminded of what the hon. Food Minister said immediately after taking over the charge of the Department. He said: "Either I will end profiteering or profiteering will break me." These were bold words and I very much appreciated them. After that, there was some rethinking in the Government, and a moratorium was given to the trade to behave. Unfortunately, it did not bear any fruit and the traders have landed us into the present sorry state of affairs. I do not mean to say that the responsibility is entirely that of the trade. Others are also responsible. Both the Central Government and the State Governments cannot escape their res-

ponsibility. None-the-less, it is a fact that today almost everybody agrees, except my friends of the Swatantra Party, that the trade cannot escape its responsibility for bringing about the present state of affairs. They also agree that now we have reached a situation when we have to find out an alternative. If I had any proposals to make for keeping the distributive machinery of private trade as it is and yet to improve the state of affairs, I may not have given cent per cent support to the Bill. Yet as the things stand, we have no alternative except to undertake State trading and to undertake State trading on a big and effective scale.

There has been some dispute as to whether the Corporation should undertake monopoly State trading or whether it should undertake only partial State trading. I am not a doctrinaire and I do not very much appreciate a doctrinaire approach in the matter of food. Food is entirely a pragmatic matter and I believe that the Food Minister will try to carry the business of the Food Trading Corporation only to the extent that it may introduce sanity in the trade. If necessary, he will have to undertake monopoly trading. But that is not quite essential. It will all depend upon how the circumstances develop.

Now, this year, according to all estimates, we have a bumper crop of rice. I have toured about in the villages and old men have told me that in the whole of their lives they did not come across such a good crop of rice as we have this year. What is happening? The prices are still high, the availability is low and there is any amount of trouble on the food front. The southern zone consisting of the four States of Andhra, Tamil Nad, Mysore and Kerala, had been a safe zone since it was formed in 1956. It was formed during my time. I might have experienced food difficulties in other parts of the country and yet I felt a certain amount of confidence about the southern zone. It had served the

[Shri A. P. Jain]

country well during my time, during the administration of my successor, Mr. S. K. Patil and also during the time of Mr. Swaran Singh. I was very unhappy when I found that the southern zone which has served so well had been disturbed and instead of there being free movement in the southern zone between these four States, each of these States has been created into a separate zone which, I think, is primarily responsible for the present plight in the State of Kerala. I hope, Sir, we will take lessons, and one of the lessons which we at present have to take is that the trade must be controlled; it must be effectively controlled in a manner so that it may not make speculative profits.

The hon. Member who has preceded me referred to the objects of this Bill. I particularly welcome the two objects of the Bill namely, first assuring minimum prices to the farmer. I hope the minimum price is going to be the remunerative price . . .

Shri Ranga: Has it ever been that?

Shri A. P. Jain: . . . and is not going to be the marginal price which has been paid in the past. This is a policy which the hon. Minister has accepted. I welcome it, and I hope it will be put into practice. The other part of it, namely, to protect the consumer from the vagaries of speculative trade is another welcome feature of it.

We have to see how these two objects can be achieved. In the latter part of the Statement of Objects and Reasons it has been said that the Corporation will acquire a strategic and commanding position in the foodgrain trade. This is necessary. But let us examine what are the provisions of the law and whether they will enable the Corporation to occupy a strategic and commanding position in the foodgrain trade. There is a peculiar feature of this country: India has been suffering from child mortality, many children die soon after birth. This Corporation, before it acquire the

strategic and commanding position, will have to undergo a severe competition from the trade, and we have to find out whether adequate provisions have been made to withstand the effects of that competition.

I remember at one time the hon. the Food Minister said that the price for foodgrains payable to the producer—which will of course be remunerative prices—will be announced before the arrival of the crop in the market, and the Food Trading Corporation will have the right to acquire foodgrains from the private traders at a price comparable to the pre-announced harvest price. But I do not find any provision in this Bill for that. In fact, that was one of the effective proposals which would have enabled this Corporation to occupy a commanding position, namely, that if a trader tries to raise price or indulge in profiteering, the Corporation would come in and acquire foodgrains from the private trade at prices comparable to the pre-announced price.

Shri Ranga: They are being given power to acquire from peasants also compulsorily.

Shri A. P. Jain: Don't be in a hurry, Mr. Ranga; have a little patience and learn to listen.

Now, Sir, I do not find any provision about it in this Bill, and I do not quite understand how the hon. Minister is going to achieve his objection.

At another time he made another proposal, namely, that the Corporation will have monopoly of the movement of the foodgrains by train. That proposal is also not to be found here. May I enquire from the Food Minister as to how he is going to achieve this object? If, after all, a Corporation is to acquire a commanding position, it must be given certain weapons which may give him that position. I am afraid the Bill, as it is, does not make provision for those things and the

Minister may not succeed in attaining any of the objectives.

What is the alternative left to the Corporation? If it is to work on commercial principles, whether it buys in the market, from the merchants, or from the farmer, it will have to buy at competitive prices. There is nothing in the Bill which goes to show that there will be any regulation of the prices at these stages. If the Corporation is to go in for competitive purchases, well, things will not improve. Therefore, I would like the hon. Minister to tell us how he is going to achieve twice objective of remunerative prices to the farmer and reasonable prices for the consumer.

Then, we have got certain organisations, non-governmental and semi-governmental, which are already in the trade. For instance, we have got the marketing co-operative societies. What is going to be the relationship of the Food Corporation with the marketing co-operative societies? I would like to the hon. Minister to give a comprehensive and complete picture. Then, there are about 80,000 fair price shops; those shops are private shops, and yet they are controlled and regulated by Government. They are licensed by Government. What will be the fate of these fair price shops after the setting up of the corporations? Will there be different and competitive agencies, or will it be the Food corporation which will undertake all the distribution? These are some of the important problems with which the Food Corporations will have to deal in its teething stage.

There is a whole history of zones. At present, it is the policy of the Government—I do not agree to that policy—that each State should be treated as a zone; it is the State which decides what its surplus is and how much it should be sent to other States or hand over to the Food Ministry at the Centre. As it happens, the voters of the Chief Minister and the voters of the local Assembly are men living

in that State and not men who live in the neighbouring deficit State. The result is that both the Chief Minister and his colleagues and the Assembly and everybody these take care of their voters and naturally they like to feed their people well and give over to other States only the surplus left over after meeting full requirements of their State. This is not something new which I am saying. The hon. Minister knows that there such things have happened in the past. I am referring to the creation of free movement zone consisting of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat, which was once announced by the hon. Minister with a feeling of triumph. Within a couple of days only, certain difficulties arose, and the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh came to Delhi. He was totally opposed to the free zone, with the result that all these three States were created into three zones. The Madhya Pradesh Government promised to send about 20,000 tons of rice in a month's time to Maharashtra and Gujarat, but not one ton of rice was sent there. The same difficulty has arisen in the south. The States of Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nad promised to send certain quantities to Kerala, but those quantities were not sent and the result was the great disaster which happened in the State of Kerala.

I would like to know what is going to be the pattern of the inter-State trade or movement of foodgrains in the future. Will it be only handled by the State or will it be handled by the Corporation? What will be the equations or relations between the Corporation and States?

I do not think that the Corporation can be given the right to acquire foodgrains. It will be the State Governments which will have that right. If the State Government is going to acquire and it becomes the judge of what it has to acquire and what it has not to acquire, then I am afraid that the food corporation will be a helpless tool in the hands of States.

[Shri A. P. Jain]

I understand that according to the present thinking, the Food Ministry at the Centre wants the State Governments to procure 18 lakhs tons of rice, and these 18 lakhs tons have been distributed among the different States for procurement. I know that some of the States like Punjab which have surplus rice and which do not eat that rice will certainly procure and hand it over the surplus to the Centre, but there are other States like Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Tamil Nad which have a history of their own and which have failed to keep up their commitments. I would like to submit that if this food corporation is to run on commercial lines, then it must have some sources of supply. For otherwise, if certain commitments are not fulfilled, the Corporation will break down, whether profiteering well end, I do not know.

Then imported foodgrains. At present, they are being distributed through fair price shops. I am sorry I was not present in the House yesterday, but from reports of the Food Minister's speech I saw in the papers, I find that ultimately imported foodgrains will also be handed over to the Corporation. May I understand that after the creation of Corporation, for sometime at any rate the present system of distributing of imported foodgrains continue? We are importing in 1965 5 lakh tonnes of rice from abroad; the internal procurement is estimated to be 18 lakh tonnes—it may be that or it may be much less. But if these two categories of rice are to be distributed through two agencies, the internally procurement through the Corporation and the imported rice through fair price shops, the multiplicity of agencies may give rise to trouble and further complications in our distributive machinery.

I find another weakness in this Bill. It is that State Governments are at no stage associated with the Corporation. If you want to fix responsibility on those Governments, you must

also give them a right to have a say in the matter. If State Governments are to be divorced from the working of the Corporation and at the same time loaded with responsibility of procuring foodgrains for the Corporation, I am afraid that there is a possibility of conflict. I wish the Food Minister would give a little more thought as to how he can place responsibility upon State Government and at the same time give them the right of having a say in the running of the Corporation.

Another important point arises. Is the Corporation going to undertake distributive work in the surplus States or is it going to do that work only in the deficit State? If it is going to do the former, there is no reason why the States should not have considerable say in the working of the Corporation within the State. Similarly in the case of the deficit States, they must have effective voice in the running of the Corporation. Food is a matter of supreme importance for the States and if you isolate the States from the working of the Corporation, I am afraid that you will strike against difficulties which may break the Corporation.

There are only two other small points I want to touch upon. The financial year prescribed for the working of the Corporation is April to March. The agricultural year in India is the fasli year which ends on the 30th June. Now all the crops come into the market before the rains. The agricultural year synchronises with seasonal cycle. So I would very earnestly suggest to the Food Minister that instead of making the accounts of the Corporation correspond to the financial year, he should make it tally with the fasli year. For agricultural purposes the fasli year has existed since time immemorial. So we must not alter that pattern.

As regards the headquarters of the Corporation, I am very unhappy that it is to be located at Madras, Madras is in one corner of the country. I do

not mind the Food Corporation having its headquarters in Hyderabad.

Shri Ranga: It is the only sensible thing he has done. Does the hon. Member want that everything should be in Delhi?

Shri A. P. Jain: I am not pleading for Delhi. I say it must be in a central place.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ranga was saying that it is the only sensible thing the Minister has done!

Shri A. P. Jain: I question his test of sensibility.

You may have it at a place like Bombay which is a big port and which receives large supplies from abroad, or you may have it at a central place like Hyderabad so that the headquarters may not be thrown into one isolated place. I am not aware of the reasons for selecting Madras as the headquarters of the Corporation.

I am thankful to you for giving me a few more minutes than I really deserved. I hope the suggestions I have made will be considered.

Shri M. K. Kumaran (Chirampil): I wholeheartedly support this Bill even though there are certain defects and shortcomings in it.

The other day we were discussing the food crisis in Kerala. We know that the vacillating policy of the Government has brought the country to the brink of a disaster. We are glad that the Government have now woken up to the situation and have brought this Bill before the House for state trading in foodgrains.

We heard the Swatantra Party spokesman speak on behalf of the producers and merchants in this country.

Shri Ranga: Consumers also.

Shri M. K. Kumaran: I am very sorry that he had not even a single word in support of the poor consumers of this country.

Shri Ranga: Question.

Shri M. K. Kumaran: I did not hear a single word.

Shri Ranga: He is sitting here.

Shri M. K. Kumaran: I know what are the sentiments of Shri Ranga. He is always sympathetic to the "poor kisans" who sell the grains in the black market.

Shri Ranga: Question.

Shri M. K. Kumaran: This country knows whom the Swatantra Party upholds. So I am not going to waste my time on Rangaji and his party.

As has been stated in this House, the food situation in the country has been brought to its present crisis by hoarders, speculators and profiteers. So if we want to meet the food crisis in this country and protect the interests of the consumers, Government should have full control over the food situation. This Bill is not enough to cope with the situation as has been stated by Shri Jain. There are many shortcomings in this Bill, there are many weaknesses also in it.

The Corporation should be enabled to have a commanding and strategic position in the food trade of the country. Otherwise the situation that has developed in Kerala will repeat itself in other places also. If the Corporation does not have a commanding position, surplus States like Andhra will create trouble for it. Even the other day while speaking on the adjournment motion on the Kerala food crisis, Rangaji was referring to long queues even in a surplus State like Andhra.

Shri Ranga: Yes.

Shri M. K. Kumaran: Why is it so? There are enough foodgrains there. It is because Rangaji's men are hoarding foodgrains.

Shri Ranga: It is because of controls.

Shri M. K. Kumaran: They are not willing to sell it in the open market; they are hoarding for more profits.

Shri Ranga: The kisan is never a hoarder.

Shri M. K. Kumaran: If the Corporation does not have a commanding position in the trade and if we cannot stop this speculation and hoarding in the trade, the situation in Kerala will repeat all over India.

13 hrs.

Shri A. P. Jain was saying that the State Governments also should be given a place in the working of the Corporation. That is a very reasonable and necessary suggestion. If the State Governments are not a party to the working of the Corporation, all sorts of difficulties will crop up.

Take for example the case of surplus States. They will say that their production is such and their necessity is such that they cannot part with so much grain. So, the Corporation will not be able to procure enough grains from the surplus areas without the fullest co-operation of the State Governments.

As **Shri Jain** has said, the voters are there in the surplus areas, and so the Chief Minister's eye will be always on the voters. And among the voters there are Rangaji's supporters who will also create trouble for the Corporation and the Chief Minister there. So, it is a very important thing that we should have the co-operation of the State Governments in the working of the Corporation. So, there should be provision for giving a very active part to the State Governments in the working of the Corporation.

The food situation in Kerala is a warning to the whole nation. The food crisis in Kerala has shown that we cannot leave the food trade like this. If we allow the speculators and profiteers like this, then our country will see more famines, more food crises and

more troubles ahead. The enquiry commission on the Bengal famine has given so many reasons for the crisis and the famine and death of millions of people there, and they apportioned blame equally between the British Government and our own people who were speculators, hoarders and profiteers.

13.02 hrs.

[**SHRI THIRUMALA RAO** in the Chair]

So, that is happening even now in our country. This cannot be allowed. So, the Government of India should be aware of this situation, and they should deal with the speculators and traders very firmly.

I remember the Food Minister, **Shri Subramaniam**, on taking charge of the Ministry, said in Coimbatore, his home town, that either he would break the profiteers or he would be broken by the profiteers. I tell him that he should beware of the profiteers. They can break him, he may not be able to break them.

His colleague, **Shri T. T. Krishnamachari**, said a few years ago in this House that there were man-eaters at large, and we should beware of them. Now, actually man-eaters are at large, they are eating men, our innocent people, they are eating away the food of our people, and they are going to fatten on the death of millions of our people. So, these man-eaters should be held in check. Otherwise, they will eat up the whole people including the Ministers. This is my warning to **Shri Subramaniam**. If he does not want to be eaten up by the man-eaters, he should control them, he must deal with them very firmly.

We are thankful to **Shri Subramaniam** for his kind words for the people of Kerala when he took part in the debate on the adjournment motion, but I am very sorry we did not hear the sympathetic voice of the Prime Minister in this House. I am sure that if

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru were alive, he would have intervened in the debate and said a few words about the suffering people of Kerala, but we did not hear that voice here. We are very sorry that Shri Subramaniam was left alone to speak for the Government.

Shri C. Subramaniam: May I say that I express the sentiments of the Government, particularly the sentiments of the Prime Minister?

Shri M. K. Kumaran: We are glad.

He said in the other House that he had failed in Kerala, and that if he repeated that failure once more, he would pay the political price. He can pay the political price and go away, but the Prime Minister cannot go away, like that. That is why I said the Prime Minister did not say a few words here.

So, I request the Government and the Prime Minister to intervene and reassure the people of Kerala and the people of this country that this kind of thing will not be repeated. If it happens another time, then it will be the responsibility of the Government to resign and go away. We do not want the resignation of a particular Minister, we want the resignation of the whole Ministry if anything like that which happened in Kerala happens again.

With these few words, I support this Bill. I request the Minister to plug the loopholes in the Bill, and strengthen the hands of the Corporation to deal with the speculators, hoarders and profiteers in this country.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी बाई (विकारावाद) :

सभापति महोदय, यह जो फूड कारपोरेशन बन रहा है यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण चीज है मैं इसी के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहती हूँ। एग्रिकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन होने पर, धान और गेहूँ के उत्पादन के होने पर कारपोरेशन को जरूरत पड़ती है, इसलिये हमारे मिनिस्टर

साहब को यह सोचना चाहिये कि आज देश में किसानों की हालत कैसी है और वे किस तरह से ज्यादा प्रोडक्शन कर सकेंगे। वे इस बात को तो सोचने नहीं हैं और फूड कारपोरेशन बनाने जा रहे हैं।

यह कारपोरेशन बहुत जरूरी है और इसको होना चाहिये, लेकिन मैं बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि इस कारपोरेशन में किस तरह के लोग रहेंगे। इसमें जो डाइरेक्टर्स होंगे या चेअरमैन होंगे वे व्यापार करने वाले होंगे, किसानों का कोई प्रतिनिधि वहाँ पर नहीं होगा जिसकी वहाँ पर बहुत ज्यादा जरूरत होगी। खाना जब तैयार होता है तब उसको परसने वाले लोग सामने आते हैं। खाना बनाने वाले लोग कम होते हैं परसने वाले ज्यादा होते हैं। अगर किचन में दो तीन बावर्ची खाना बनाते हैं तो परसने वाले कम से कम 10 या 15 होते हैं। लेकिन मैं सोचती हूँ कि परसने वाले ज्यादा होने से मुश्किल बढ़ती है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं कुछ सुझाव देना चाहती हूँ। इस सम्बन्ध में श्री विभूति मिश्र जी ने भी कुछ अमेंडमेंट्स दिये हैं।

बिल के आब्जट्स एंड रीजन्स में बताया गया है कि इस कारपोरेशन की मंशा है ज्यादा पैदावार करना। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में भी बोलूंगी। मेरी स्टेट जो आन्ध्र प्रदेश है वह एक सरप्लस स्टेट है, लेकिन अगर वहाँ पर किसानों को ज्यादा सुविधायें दी जायें तो पैदावार और ज्यादा हो सकती है और इस तरह से आपका कारपोरेशन भी ज्यादा अच्छी तरह काम कर सकेगा। इस कारपोरेशन में एक तो फाइनेन्स का रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव होगा, एक कारपोरेशन वालों का रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव होगा और एक फूड का रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव होगा। इसमें छः और लोग भी होंगे, लेकिन उन छः आदमियों में से कोई ऐसा नहीं है कि जो कि किसानों को रिप्रेजेन्ट करता हो और उनमें से किसी को मालूम नहीं कि खेती को कैसे बढ़ाया जाये। मेरा सुझाव है कि उन छः लोगों में से कम से कम चार लोग ऐसे

[श्रीमती लक्ष्मीबाई]

होने चाहियें जो कि खेती करना जानते हों और उनको इसका अनुभव हो ।

मैं नहीं कहती कि आप जो डाइरेक्टर्स ख रहे हैं वह अच्छे नहीं हैं, लेकिन कारपोरेशन किस तरह से काम करते हैं इस को मैं जानती हूँ । ओल्ड हैदराबाद में कारपोरेशन था, वह बहुत अच्छा चलता था लेकिन कहीं कहीं पर जब अनाज खराब होता था तो वह उसकी परवाह नहीं करता था । हजारों बोरियां अनाज खराब हो जाता था और किसान लोगों का बड़ा नुकसान होता था । इसलिये इस कारपोरेशन में ऐसे लोगों को रखा जाये जिनको किसानों से हमदर्दी हो । अगर वहां पर कोई फिर्तन होगा तो वह धान और गेहूँ को प्राणों से भी प्यारा मान कर रखेगा और उसकी हिफाजत करेगा । किसानों को वहां पर रखने से आपका भी इस तरह से काफी फायदा होगा । आपको मालूम है कि अगर गायों को अच्छा खाना न दिया जाये तो दूध नहीं होता । इसी तरह से अगर आप किसानों को सहायित नहीं देंगे तो वे पैदावार नहीं बढ़ा सकेंगे । अगर अन्न की पैदावार नहीं बढ़ेगी तो आपका कारपोरेशन यहां बैठा बैठा क्या करेगा । यह आपका कारपोरेशन खाली व्यापार करेगा मैं कोई व्यापार के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, लेकिन यही कहना चाहती हूँ कि वहां पर ऐसे तजुबेकार आदमियों को रखा जाये जिनको खेती का ज्ञान हो ।

मैं अन्न मंत्री को यह सुझाव भी देना चाहती हूँ कि आपकी उपज आज बढ़ रही है, लेकिन लोग भी बढ़ रहे हैं । यह देश बहुत बड़ा है । हमेशा कहीं न कहीं अकाल आता रहता है, वर्षा होती रहती है, फलड आता रहता है । जब भी कहीं ज्यादा बरसात हो जाती है लोगों को बड़ा कष्ट होता है । आज हमें मनुष्यों को ही नहीं खिलाना है, जानवरों को भी खिलाना है । आजकल

मुर्गीपालन बहुत हो रहा है । अगर मुर्गी पालन को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाना है तो मुर्गियों को भी खिलाना पड़ेगा । इसमें अनाज बहुत लगता है । इसके अलावा और भी बहुत से जानवरों को अनाज खिलाना पड़ता है ।

मैं सरप्लस स्टेटों के बारे में बोल रही थी, जैसे महाराष्ट्र है । वहां शुगर केन की कौश क्राप ज्यादा पैदा की जाती है । दूसरे कुछ राज्यों में भी कौश क्राप ज्यादा पैदा की जाती हैं । इसमें पैसा ज्यादा मिलता है । लेकिन चावल या धान उगाने में लोगों को मेहनत भी ज्यादा करनी पड़ती है और पैसा भी ज्यादा खर्च होता है । इसलिए उनको अधिक कठिनाई होती है । इसलिए मेरा विनम्र निवेदन है कि जहां के किसान अनाज ज्यादा उगाते हैं वहां उनकी तरफ ज्यादा तवज्जह दी जाए और उनको ज्यादा फॅमिलिटीज दी जाएं ।

स्टेट कारपोरेशन बनाने का भी सुझाव है लेकिन उनमें भी किसानों के प्रतिनिधि लेने के बारे में आपने एक शब्द भी नहीं कहा है । बिना किसानों के प्रतिनिधित्व के ये कारपोरेशन बेकार होंगे और इनके काम में बहुत मुश्किल पड़ेगी । मेरा सुझाव है कि हम को ऐसी व्यवस्था रखनी चाहिए कि राज्यों के कारपोरेशन्स में भी 50 परसेंट किसानों के प्रतिनिधि रखे जायें ।

जो सैल्फ सफिशेंट स्टेट्स हैं उनको कारपोरेशन्स में ज्यादा पैसा देना होगा । ऐसा करने में भी आपको दिक्कत पेश आवेगी । कारपोरेशन में जो बड़े बड़े नौकर होंगे उन पर कर-डॉन रुपया खर्च करना पड़ेगा और मुसोबत पड़ेगी ।

मैं अन्न के बारे में यह सुझाव देना चाहती हूँ कि जो पुरानी देशी रियासतें हैं जैसे हैदराबाद, भोपाल, जयपुर आदि । इनमें बहुत

समय से लोग पिछड़े हुए हैं। इन इनाकों में किसानों को ज्यादा फसिलिटीज देने से उनकी ताकत बढ़ेगी। आपको यह नोट करना चाहिए कि जो निगलैक्टेड प्लेसेज हैं, जहां जमीन ज्यादा है और लोग ज्यादा हैं और जहां कोई उद्योग नहीं है, अगर उन क्षेत्रों के लोगों को केन्द्रीय सरकार की ओर ज्यादा सुविधाएं दी जाएं, उनको ढावड़ी खोदने के लिए रुपया दिया जाए और बिजली के पम्प लगाने को एग्रीकल्चर विभाग द्वारा रुपया दिया जाए तो उन इलाकों से आपको ज्यादा अन्न मिल सकता है।

कारपोरेशन के लोकेशन के बारे में केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी तरफ से निर्णय नहीं करना चाहिए, उसको राज्य सरकारों से मशविरा करके उनके लोकेशन के बारे में न करना चाहिए कि इसको हैदराबाद में रखा जाए, या बंजाग में रखा जाए या विजयवाड़ा में रखा जाए। इसके लिए सरकार को इसमें अमेंडमेंट लाना चाहिए।

आज एक्स फूड मिनिस्टर श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन ने कहा कि मद्रास में कारपोरेशन रखने की जरूरत नहीं है। वह कोई सेंट्रल जगह नहीं है। इसके लिए सबसे ज्यादा मौजूद आन्ध्र प्रदेश रहेगा। वह सर्प्लस स्टेट भी है। वहां लोगों को तकलीफ हो रही है। गांव वालों को चावल नहीं मिलता। आपके हुकम से हम अपना चावल केरल, मैसूर या अन्य जगहों पर भेज देते हैं। अपनी जरूरत के वक्त तो आप हम से काम लेते हैं, लेकिन हमारी ताकत बढ़ाने के लिए कोई कोशिश नहीं करते। मेरा सुझाव है कि यह कारपोरेशन आन्ध्र प्रदेश में बनाया जाए।

श्री काशीराम गुप्त (अलवर)
तेलंगाना में बनाया जाए।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी बाई : तेलंगाना में हो, लेकिन वहां उपज ज्यादा नहीं है। कहीं रखिए। हम इतने कम दिल वाले नहीं हैं।

आप हमारे यहां से धान ले रहे हैं। लेकिन आपको हमारे लोगों के लिए भी, जो कि गेहूं खाते हैं, इन्तिजाम पंजाब से या और जगहों से करना उतना ही जरूरी है। हमारे यहां तेलंगाना में और हैदराबाद वगैरह जगहों पर लोग दिल्ली की तरह की गेहूं खाते हैं। उनको बहुत दिक्कत हो रही है। तो मेरा सुझाव है कि जिस तरह आप आन्ध्र प्रदेश से चावल ले रहे हैं इसी तरह पंजाब से और दूसरे राज्यों से वहां के लोगों की जरूरत के लिए गेहूं का भी इन्तिजाम करें। यह आप की जिम्मेदारी है। आपको हमारी दिक्कत की ओर भी ध्यान रखना चाहिए।

स्टेट कारपोरेशन के वास्ते आपने दस करोड़ रुपया रखा है। इतने कम रुपए से यह कारपोरेशन नहीं बन सकता। जो सर्प्लस स्टेट्स हैं उनके लिए कारपोरेशन बनाने के लिए सेंटर को ज्यादा रुपए रखना चाहिए ताकि उनकी ताकत ज्यादा हो सके।

मैं आखिर में फिर कहना चाहती हूं कि स्टेट कारपोरेशन्स में किसानों की तादाद 50 परसेंट जरूर होनी चाहिए तभी ब्रे चल सकेंगे। यही मेरे सुझाव हैं।

श्री विभूति मिश्र (मोतिहारी) : चेयरमैन साहब, इस बिल में जो हमारी सरकार की तरफ से पेश किया गया है, इसमें खामियां बहुत हैं, लेकिन इन सब खामियों के बावजूद भी मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूं।

सर्वप्रथम मैं इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में एक खास बात की ओर अपने खाद्य और कृषि मन्त्री जी का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूं। जिस संस्था की ओर से हम लोग यहां गवर्नमेंट पर कब्जा किए हुए हैं और राज्यों में कब्जा किए हुए हैं, उस संस्था ने कहा है कि किसानों को इंटीग्रेटेड रेम्युनेरेटिव प्राइस दी जाए। इस बिल में उसकी कहीं गुंजाइश नहीं है।

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

दूसरी बात उस संस्था ने यह भी कही है कि जी भी संस्था बने प्राइस फिक्सेशन की या किसी और चीज के लिए, उसमें किसान के प्रतिनिधि रहने चाहिए। इसके लिए भी इस बिल में कुछ नहीं कहा गया है। तो ये दो बातें इस बिल में नहीं हैं। अगर आज हमारी संस्था हम से कह दे कि हम केन्द्रीय सरकार से और राज्य सरकारों से इस्तीफा देकर चले जाएं, तो हम बैसा करेंगे। इसलिए जो फैसले उस संस्था ने किए हैं उनको कार्यान्वित करने के लिए इस बिल में गुंजाइश होनी चाहिए। इसलिए मेरा पहला सुझाव है कि इसकी गुंजाइश इसमें करने के लिए कुछ अमेंडमेंट लाया जाए।

इस बिल का नाम फूड कारपोरेशन बिल रखा गया है क्योंकि आज हमारे सामने फूड की मुसीबत है। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हम जो किसानों से जूट आदि अन्य चीजों पैदा करते हैं उनकी बिक्री और खरीद के लिए सरकार ने क्या तरीका रखा है। जितना आज फूड पर ध्यान दिया जा रहा है उतना इन अन्य चीजों पर नहीं दिया जा रहा। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल का नाम "फूड कारपोरेशन बिल" के बजाय "एग्रो-कल्चुरल प्रोड्यूस कारपोरेशन बिल" रखा जाए ताकि इसमें सभी चीजों की गुंजाइश हो, और इसकी सख्त जरूरत है। अगर सरकार आज इस मामले में चुप हो जाती है तो इन अन्य चीजों का समावेश इसमें कभी नहीं होगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस काम को पूरे तौर पर करे, टुकड़ा टुकड़ा करके न करे। टुकड़े टुकड़े में काम करने से लोगों को दिक्कत होती है। पहले एक बिल आया था कि किसानों को कर्जा दिया जाएगा। वह बिल पास किया गया। अब यह बिल आया है, तो इस प्रकार टुकड़ा टुकड़ा काम करने से लोगों को दिक्कत होती है। इसलिए मैं फूड और एग्रोकल्चर मिनिस्टर से कहना चाहता हूँ कि

एक ऐसा बिल लावें जिस का सम्बन्ध किसानों द्वारा पैदा की जाने वाली सभी चीजों से हो। जिससे किसानों का भला होगा।

हमारे खाद्य और कृषि मन्त्री कहते हैं कि वे खुद भी किसान हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह किसान का दर्द समझते होंगे।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे इस बात से कोई ऐतराज नहीं है कि मद्रास में हैडक्वार्टर रखा जाए। लेकिन एक बात की ओर ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। इसमें छोटे छोटे किसानों को दिक्कत होगी, जिनको पता नहीं कि मद्रास कौनसी गाड़ी से जाना होगा। इसलिए हैडक्वार्टर ऐसी जगह होना चाहिए जहां जाने में किसानों को आसानी हो। शहर वाले तो कहीं भी चले जा सकते हैं लेकिन किसान को पूछने बताने में बड़ी दिक्कत होगी। मान लीजिए कि कोई नेपाल की तराई का रहने वाला किसान है, उसको मद्रास जाने में कितनी दिक्कत होगी। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह हैडक्वार्टर किसी सेंट्रल जगह पर रखा जाए जहां किसान आसानी से जा सके। अगर शहर में किसान जाएगा तो शहर वाले उसको नोच खाएंगे। यह बात गांधी जी ने भी लिखी है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि इस कारपोरेशन में किसानों का प्रतिनिधित्व रहना चाहिए। हम देखते हैं कि इसमें वही जा रहे हैं जो कोट बूट पहनने वाले हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो इसमें चादर, धोती और टोपी पहनने वाले किसान रहे। हमने तो गुन्टूर में देखा कि वहां के लोग तो एक छोटी सी धोती पहनते हैं। अगर इसमें किसान होंगे तो वे सब बात जानते होंगे और उनको पता रहेगा कि किसान के अनाज का भाव किस तरह से तै किया जाना चाहिए। लेकिन किसानों की कहीं गुंजाइश नहीं है। मैंने प्रधान मन्त्री जी से एक रोज कहा था कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि किसानों का एक अलग संग-

ठन आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० के आधार पर बनाया जाय जो रहे तो कांग्रेस के साथ लेकिन वह संगठन अलग से सरकार के सामने अपनी मांगें और दिक्कतें पेश करे। यह खेद का विषय है कि किसान जिनकी कि तादाद 80 फ़ीसदी है उनकी कोई सुनवाई नहीं होती है। इसलिए मैं आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० के आधार पर किसानों का एक अलग संगठन बनाना चाहता हूँ जो कि अलग रहते हुए भी रहेगा कांग्रेस में ही। लेकिन प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने कहा है कि नहीं जैसे है वैसे रहने दिया जाय। अलग संगठन आप क्यों बनाना चाहते हैं? किसानों को हित की जो भी बात आप कहते हैं उसको मैं माने लेता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा कि देखिये हमने आपकी इंटिग्रेटेड प्राइस की बात मान ली। आपने किसानों के प्राइस फिक्सेशन कमीशन में प्रतिनिधित्व देने की बात कही उसको भी मैंने मान लिया और आगे भी जो आप किसानों के हित के लिए कहेंगे उसे मैं मानूँगा और उन्होंने कहा कि इसमें किसानों का प्रतिनिधित्व जरूर रहेगा। किसानों को प्रतिनिधित्व देने के हेतु मैंने अपना एक अमंडमेंट भी दिया है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो इसमें लाभ होगा उस रुपये के बारे में कहीं नहीं लिखा गया है कि लाभ होगा तो हम क्या करेंगे...

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : लिखा है सरकार वापस ले लेगी।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : सरकार काहं को वापिस लेगी? हम वापिस लेंगे। 260 मैम्बर्स जिधर होंगे उधर ही सरकार होगी।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा (बाढ़) जो प्राफिट होगा वह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के पास जायेगा।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : देवी जी जरा धीरज धर कर मुझे बोलने दें। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि 1519(Ai) LSD—5.

उस रुपये का 75 फ़ीसदी किसानों के हित में खर्च हो। इस बारे में मैंने अपना अमंडमेंट भी दिया है। मैंने अपने अमंडमेंट में लिखा था कि यह पैसा विलेज्ड में खर्च किया जाय जिसको कि गलती से उन्होंने बैलीज लिख दिया है बहरहाल उसका सुधार तो हो ही जायेगा। इसमें जो प्राफिट होगा उस प्राफिट का 75 फ़ीसदी मैं चाहता हूँ कि किसानों के डेवलपमेंट के लिए और उनकी भलाई के ऊपर खर्च हो। जैसा कि श्रीमती लक्ष्मी बाई ने कहा कि खाना बनाने वाले तीन आदमी होते हैं लेकिन आज परोसने वाले ज्यादा होते हैं। हमने खाना तो काफ़ी बनाया नहीं लेकिन परोसने वाले इतने ज्यादा लोग आ गये। इसीलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस मुनाफ़े का 75 फ़ीसदी रुपया किसानों की उन्नति और विकास में खर्च किया जाय।

श्री रामेश्वर टांटिया (सीकर) : अगर घाटा हो जाय तो कौन देगा?

श्री विभूति मिश्र : अगर घाटा होगा तो सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट देगी।

मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि जो रुपया किसानों को दिया जाय वह फ़्री ऑफ़ इंटरैस्ट दिया जाय। उनसे सूद न लिया जाय। मैंने इसके लिए एक अमंडमेंट भी दिया है कि किसानों को जो रुपया दिया जाय वह फ़्री ऑफ़ इंटरैस्ट दिया जाय ताकि किसान लोग अपने रुपये का ठीक तरीक़े से इस्तमाल कर सकें। सूद लेने से किसानों को दिक्कत है।

रिजर्व बैंक चाहे रिजर्व बैंक से कोई एयोराइज्ड संस्था, हो, चाहे बैंक हो, वही किसानों की कारपोरेशन को लोन दे चाहे किसानों को पैसा दे क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि रिजर्व बैंक किसानों के हित में काम करने वाला है और वह किसानों के लिए हमदर्दी और दर्द रखता है।

इसके अलावा मेरा एक सुझाव यह भी है कि इस बिल में यह पब्लिक इंटरैस्ट लिखा

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

गया है तो पब्लिक इंटरैस्ट में तो सब आ जाते हैं और मेरा ख्याल है कि पब्लिक इंटरैस्ट का जहां मामला आता है वहां यह शहर वाले हम गरीब किसानों को नोच कर खा जाते हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक इंटरैस्ट के साथ किसान इंटरैस्ट यह शब्द भी इसमें जोड़ दिये जायें। श्री प्यारेलाल ने गांधीजी के सम्बन्ध में जो किताब लिखी है उसमें उन्होंने गांधीजी के बारे में यह लिखा है कि गांधी जी कहते थे कि किसानों को शहर वाले नोच कर खाना चाहते हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक इंटरैस्ट के साथ किसान इंटरैस्ट भी जोड़ा जाय।

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: What about the consumers' interest?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Do not disturb his trend of the argument.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : सभापति महोदय, मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस तरह की टोकाटोकी को मद्देनजर रखते हुए मेरा समय काटा न जाय।

8 नवम्बर की हमारी सरकार की तरफ से जो योजना नामक पत्रिका निकली है उसमें पेज 20 पर लिखा हुआ है :—

“The prices are set by a Price Committee composed of Members of Parliament, representatives of consumers and producers and people of professional standing.”

पेज 20-21 पर जो आर्टिकल है **हाऊ जापान कन्ट्रोल्ल्स फूड ट्रेड**, उसके लेखक श्री मंगल चन्द जैन हैं। उन्होंने उसमें बड़े विस्तार से जापानीज एग्रिकल्चर और कैसे वह अपने गल्ले के व्यापार को नियंत्रित करता है, लिखा है। उन्होंने बतलाया है कि जापान में कैसे फूड प्राइसेज फिक्स की जाती हैं।

दूसरी जगह जैन साहब यह लिखते हैं :—

“The sale price of rice is lower than the purchase price, and this has reduced the dependence on black market. If, no doubt, involves Government in considerable financial loss. Administrative expenses come to 15 per cent of consumer's price.”

उन्होंने बतलाया है कि इसके कारण एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ऐक्सपेंसेज कंज्यूमर्स प्राइस के पन्द्रह परसेंट तक आ जाते हैं।

आगे चल कर वह यह लिखते हैं :—

“The prices of wheat and barley are set by a parity formula, the purpose being to compensate farmers for rise in prices of goods which they buy generally.”

वहां की सरकार द्वारा उन आवश्यक चीजों के बढ़े हुए दामों को ध्यान में रख कर एक पैरिटी फारमूला के आधार पर गेहूं और बारली की प्राइसेज फिक्स की जाती हैं। अभी एक सवाल के जवाब में मंत्री जी ने बतलाया कि एक एडहाक कमेटी ने प्राइसेज सेट कर दीं और हमने धान बेचा, चावल बेचा और गेहूं और दूसरी सारी और चीजें बेचीं। यह तो ठीक है कि एक मुकर्ररा कीमत पर खाद्य पदार्थ बेचे लेकिन उसी के साथ हमारे यहां इस बात का खयाल नहीं किया जाता है कि किसानों की आवश्यकता की चीजें, हल, खाद, बीज और कपड़ा आदि भी उसे मुनासिब दाम पर मुलभ किये जायें लेकिन वहां जापान में इस बात का खयाल रक्खा जाता है। इसी कारण हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह सुझाव मंजूर किया।

इसके अलावा मैं आपको यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इसी लेख में लेखक ने बतलाया है कि सालाना खाद्यान्न की स्टॉक ट्रेडिंग में

लौस होने की मूरत में सरकार द्वारा पैसा प्रोवाइड किया जाता है। उसमें यह लिखा हुआ है :—

“Annually sums are provided by the Government to meet the losses in state trading in rice, wheat, barley, beans, sugar etc.”

जैसा कि श्री टाटिया ने पूछा था कि घाटा हो तो कहां से आयेगा तो मैं उनको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि उसे सरकार अपने बजट में से पूरा करती है। जापान में ऐसा ही होता है। इसके अलावा उसमें यह भी लिखा है :—

“Besides governmental assistance in the form of financial capital, tools and implements, establishment of a secure and stable market through price support is an essential condition for increasing production.”

वहां की सरकार पैदावार बढ़ाने के हेतु किसानों को उनकी आवश्यकता का सामान मुनासिब कीमत पर दिलवाती है। ऐसी ही व्यवस्था यहां पर भी होनी चाहिए। जब सरकार उनको इतनी चीजें मुनासिब कीमत पर सुलभ करती है तब जाकर सरकार किसानों से उनकी उपज लेती है। उनसे पैदावार बढ़ाने की अपेक्षा करती है।

सभापति महोदय, अब आप ही सोचिये कि दिन भर हम अपनी भैंस को खिलायें तो कुछ भी नहीं और शाम को बाल्टी लेकर उसे दुहने लग जायें तो उसमें दूध कहां से आयेगा ? पहले किसान को मजबूत कीजिये उसको तगड़ा बनाइये तब आपको हक हासिल होगा कि उसे यह कहिये कि वह हमें इतना पैदा कर के दे। किसान के लिए तो है ही नहीं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल में काफी खामियां हैं। जरूरत इस की थी कि किसानों को अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये इसमें बतलाया जाता कि उनको क्या क्या प्रोत्साहन

सरकार देने जा रही है। खाली वह तो भैंस को दुह कर दूध निकालना चाहते हैं लेकिन उनको यह नहीं मालूम कि वह भैंस जिसे कि खाने को दिन भर न मिले वह दूध कैसे दे पायेगी। हालांकि इस मौजूदा बिल में कई खामियां हैं लेकिन उन तमाम खामियों के बावजूद मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और मैं अपने फूड ऐंड एग्रीकल्चरल मिनिस्टर साहब से कहता हूँ कि वे मेहरबानी करके किसानों के हित में ध्यान रखें और तदनुसार इस बिल में आवश्यक सुधार करें या फिर कोई दूसरा ही नये सिरे से बिल लायें ताकि हमारे देश में खाद्यान्न की पैदावार बढ़ सके। चाहे हमारी आबादी क्यों न बढ़ती चली जाये लेकिन मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि अगर किसानों को समुचित प्रोत्साहन मिले, उनकी आवश्यकता का तमाम सामान उनको मुनासिब कीमत पर सुलभ कराया जाय तो वह पैदावार बढ़ा कर दिखा सकते हैं।

डा० राज, जो कि दिल्ली युनिवर्सिटी के एक एकोनामिस्ट हैं उन्होंने इस सम्बन्ध में लिखा है कि यह सरकार का कसूर नहीं है किसानों का कसूर नहीं है लेकिन यह कसूर उस मशीनरी का है जोकि हमारे पास इस समय मौजूद है। उस हमारी डिफेक्टिव मशीनरी की वजह से हमारे देश में पैदावार नहीं बढ़ी। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे फूड मिनिस्टर साहब ने उस लेख को पढ़ा होगा डा० राज हिन्दुस्तान के माने हुए एक बड़े एकोनामिस्ट हैं मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार अपनी मशीनरी को दुरुस्त करें और उसके बाद इस कामको चलायें। बस मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

Mr. Chairman: Before I call the next speaker, I want to make it plain that the list of Members who want to speak is a very big one. Almost everybody is anxious to speak on this subject. We have to make certain adjustments among ourselves. I have to see that every State gets at least

[Mr. Chairman]

one speaker to express its views on this question. Afterwards, (*Interruption*)—do not interrupt me—there are several parties which should get their representation. Therefore, that has to be carefully looked into and arranged. Members are very anxious. But if there is some delay in my calling them, they should have a little patience. That is all my request. The Speaker said he is anxious to accommodate almost everybody who is anxious to speak on this subject. (*Interruption*).

Shri S. S. More (Poona): This difficulty would not have arisen if the Bill had been referred to the Select Committee, because there are so many lacunae which could not be removed here.

Mr. Chairman: That is not a relevant point which should be raised now. It should have been mentioned at the proper time. (*Interruption*) Order, order. If the Members themselves imposed a voluntary cut and finish their speech within ten minutes, that would be good.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (Raiganj): It is better that the time should be ten minutes for each Member. Otherwise, many Members will go disappointed.

Dr. M. S. Aney: (Nagpur): What about hon. Members who are not attached to any party?

Mr. Chairman: He is a party by himself! If the arguments get repetitive, I will ask the Speakers not to repeat the points already made.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): If an hon. Member is making new points, it should be left to your discretion to allow more time for him.

Mr. Chairman: Yes; the Chair has always got that discretion. Shri Kashi Ram Gupta.

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : सभापति महोदय, इस बिल की आवश्यकता के बारे में तो किसी को भी ऐतराज नहीं हो सकता है, किन्तु हमारा जो मन्तव्य है, वह इस बिल से पूरा होता है या नहीं, इसी बात पर मुझे मुख्यतया चर्चा करनी है। जो महानुभाव मुझ से पहले बोले हैं, उन्होंने बतलाया है कि इस बिल में क्या क्या खामियां हैं। माननीय सदस्य, श्री विभूति मिश्र से मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस बात को भूल गए कि यह सारा काम किस उद्देश्य को दृष्टि में रख कर किया जा रहा है और इस लिए उपभोक्ता के हित को देखना भी उतना ही जरूरी है, जितना कि किसान के हित को देखना और यही इस बिल का सही मंशा होना चाहिए।

हम अभी भी इस बात में उलझे हुए हैं कि यह बिल किस काम के लिए लाया जा रहा है और इस कार्पोरेशन का पहला काम क्या होना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूं कि इस कार्पोरेशन का पहला काम यह है कि अनाज की कमी को बाहर से अनाज मंगा कर पूरा करते हुए और अपने देश के भीतर से अनाज लेते हुए पांच लाख से अधिक की आबादी वाले शहरों में अनाज उपलब्ध किया जाये। हम देखते हैं कि इस में और बहुत सी बातें जोड़ी गई हैं, जिस का परिणाम यह होगा कि आगे चल कर उलझनें पैदा होंगी। हमें अपने मन में पहली बात यह रखनी है कि इन बड़े शहरों में अनाज की जो कमी है, उसको कैसे पूरा करना है और वहां पर खुराक पहुंचाने की व्यवस्था कैसे करनी है। वर्तमान अवस्था में बाकी जगहों को खुला छोड़ देना लाजिमी हो जाता है। अगर ऐसा नहीं किया गया, तो बहुत सी उलझनें पैदा हो जायेंगी।

इस बिल में राज्यों की कार्पोरेशन का जो प्रावधान किया गया है, मैं उस का विरोध करता हूं। मैं समझता हूं कि केवल केन्द्रीय

व्यवस्था ही ठीक रह सकती है और इस लिए राज्यों की भ्रमण व्यवस्था बनाने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। जब खाद्य मंत्री स्वयं कहते हैं कि स्टेट्स ने एक नैरो आउटलुक-संकुचित दृष्टिकोण-अपना लिया है, तो फिर संकुचित दृष्टिकोण अपनाने के लिए उनको दूसरा हथियार देना वाजिब नहीं है। इस लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि केवल एक केन्द्र की कार्पोरेशन होनी चाहिए, जिस के जरिये से यह सब काम होना चाहिए। उस कार्पोरेशन की आगे ब्रांचिज और मैनेजमेंट होगा, जिन का जिक्र इस बिल में किया गया है। मैं खाद्य मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूँगा कि फिल-हाल स्टेट कार्पोरेशन की कोई जरूरत नहीं है और अगर उन को कायम किया जायेगा, तो हमारे रास्ते में रुकावटें खड़ी होंगी। इस लिए स्टेट कार्पोरेशन को हटा देना चाहिए और केवल मेट्रल गवर्नमेंट की एक कार्पोरेशन होनी चाहिए।

खाद्य मंत्री महोदय समय समय पर कहते रहे हैं कि रेल-ट्रांसपोर्ट की मानोपली इस कार्पोरेशन की होगी, लेकिन इस बिल में इस आशय का कोई प्रावधान नहीं रखा गया है। मंत्री महोदय एक तरफ तो मानोपली की बात कहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ रेल-ट्रांसपोर्ट की मानोपली की कोई चर्चा नहीं करते हैं। इस अवस्था में व्यापारी लोगों से कैसे काम्पि-टीशन किया जायेगा ?

इस बिल में कहा गया है कि इस कार्पोरेशन का कार्य कामर्शल लाइन्स पर किया जायेगा। उस के लिए जरूरी है कि क्या खर्च होगा, कितने प्रतिशत मुनाफा रखा जायेगा, इन सब बातों की जानकारी दी जाये। अगर ऐसा न किया जायेगा, तो कहीं वही स्थिति उत्पन्न न हो जाये जैसे कि राज्य सरकारों ने अपनी मोटरों चलाई और किराया आगे से बढ़ा दिया। हो सकता है कि कार्पोरेशन का खर्च इतना बढ़ा दिया जाये कि उपभोक्ता को अनाज और भी महंगे भाव पर मिले और सरकार को भी नुकसान हो।

इस बिल में एक ऐसी खास बात लिखी गई है, जिस से ऐसा मालूम होता है कि गवर्नमेंट व्यापारी का मुकाबला करने जा रही है। इस बिल में यह व्यवस्था की गई है कि हम प्रोन्नर से एग््रीमेंट, इकरारनामा, कर के पैसा देंगे। मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि इस की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। बल्कि आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जो कोई भी व्यापारी प्रोन्नर को पैसा देता है उस को रोका जाये, क्योंकि इस बिल का मंशा ही यह है कि जो व्यापारी आदि किसान को मार्केट बैल्यु का पूरा फायदा नहीं उठाने देते, उन को रोका जाये। इस लिए व्यापारी जिस गलत काम को कर रहे हैं, उस को रोकना चाहिए, न कि सरकार को स्वयं ही वह काम करना चाहिए।

हम को-आपरेटिव सोसाइटीज को रुपया देते हैं, फ्रटिलाइजर के लिए रुपया उधार देते हैं, बीज के लिए रुपया देते हैं, मीडियम लोन देते हैं। यह सब होते हुए इस बात की क्या आवश्यकता पड़ी है कि हम प्रोन्नर से एग््रीमेंट करें और उन को मनी एडवांस करें। उस का नतीजा यह होगा कि इन्फ्लेशन बढ़ेगा। वह रुपया और कामों में खर्च कर देगा और हमारा असली मंशा लुप्त हो जायेगा। इस प्रकार की बातें इस बिल में नहीं आनी चाहिए।

इस बिल में कहा गया है कि कार्पोरेशन गवर्नमेंट सिक्क्यूरिटीज में भी रुपया इन्वेस्ट कर सकती है। यह बड़े आश्चर्य की बात है। यह रुपया फ्ल्यूड (रोज काम में आने वाला) होना चाहिए, कारोबार में लगाया जाना चाहिए। इस को गवर्नमेंट सिक्क्यूरिटीज में लगाने का क्या सवाल है ? सिक्क्यूरिटीज में गवर्नमेंट से चार परसेंट मिलता है। उन में रुपया लगाने का प्रश्न ही नहीं पैदा होता। है। कार्पोरेशन बैंकों से जो रुपया उधार लेगा, उस के लिए उस को ज्यादा दर देना पड़ेगा। इस लिए मैं नहीं समझता कि कार्पोरेशन के रुपये को गवर्नमेंट सिक्क्यूरिटीज में लगाने की कोई जरूरत है।

[श्री काशी राम गुप्त]

माननीय सदस्य, श्री विभूति मिश्र, ने कहा कि मुनाफा किसानों के हित में लगाया जाये। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में किसानों और उपभोक्ताओं के हित अलग अलग नहीं हैं। जितना रुपया मिलेगा, वह इस काम में लगाया जायेगा और वह लगेगा।

इस बारे में मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि कार्पोरेशन को उस हद में रहना चाहिए, जहाँ उस की जरूरत है। उस को इधर उधर की बातों में नहीं फंसना चाहिए, वर्ना करोड़ों रुपये इधर-उधर खर्च हो जायेंगे। इस सम्बन्ध में प्राथमिकतायें तय करनी पड़ेंगी कि रुपये को पहले किन कामों में लगाना है। जिन वेयरहाउसिज और गोडाउन्ज से काम लेना है, उन का किराया तय हो जायेगा। लेकिन यह सब होते हुए भी इस रुपये को ऐसी जगह नहीं लगाना चाहिए, जहाँ वह बर्ध जाये।

जहाँ तक बफ़र स्टॉक का सम्बन्ध है, यह भी देखना चाहिए कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि पुराना स्टॉक पड़ा रह जाये और नया स्टॉक बांट दिया जाये। बफ़र स्टॉक का उद्देश्य यह है कि देश की आवश्यकता के लिए एक निश्चित स्टॉक रखना है, लेकिन उस की अदला-बदली करनी पड़ेगी और इस बारे में एक व्यावहारिक दृष्टि को अपनाना पड़ेगा।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि जो छः डायरेक्टर रखे जायेंगे, वे किसान होने चाहिएं। मैं समझता हूँ कि दो किसान और दो उपभोक्ता डायरेक्टरों में होने चाहिएं, क्योंकि यह किसानों और उपभोक्ताओं दोनों का प्रश्न है। किसान का इस लिए प्रश्न है कि उस को वाजिब कीमत मिले और उपभोक्ता का इस लिए प्रश्न है कि उस के लिए ही तो यह सारा झगड़ा किया जा

रहा है। अगर उपभोक्ता का प्रश्न न होता, तो इस कार्पोरेशन का प्रश्न ही न पैदा होता। अगर मुनाफाखोरी समाप्त करने का प्रश्न न होता, तो इस कार्पोरेशन का सवाल ही पैदा न होता।

यह भी निश्चित रूप से देखना चाहिए कि राजनीतिक दलों का इस काम से सम्बन्ध न हो, वर्ना परिणाम यह होगा कि कांग्रेस का राज इस में घुसेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो स्टेट्स कार्पोरेशन बनाई जा रही हैं, वे बिल्कुल राजनीतिक दृष्टि से बनाई जा रही हैं। वास्तव में उन की आवश्यकता नहीं है। सब जानते हैं कि केन्द्र के हाथ में यह काम रहने से रूलिंग पार्टी का दखल उतना नहीं होता है, जितना कि राज्य सरकारों के हाथ में रहने से होता है। इसलिए राज्य सरकारों के हाथ में यह हथियार देने से बाद में झगड़े होंगे कि हम जोन से बाहर नहीं जायेंगे और जोन से बाहर व्यापार केन्द्रीय सरकार की कार्पोरेशन के द्वारा होगा। इस प्रकार बहुत उलझनें पैदा होंगी।

इस बिल में जो खामियां हैं मुझ से पहले बोलने वाले साथियों ने उनकी ओर इशारा किया है। मैंने भी कुछ खामियां बताई हैं। इनको दूर किया जाना चाहिये। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के साथी आम तौर से डागमैटिक या आइडियोलोजिकल वे में सोचने के आदी हैं लेकिन इस वक्त वे इस तरह नहीं सोचते हैं। अगर इसको ठीक तरह से चलाना है, आवश्यकताओं के आधार पर चलाना है, मुचारू रूप से चलाना है तो जो खामियां बताई गई हैं, उनको दूर किया जाना चाहिये।

अन्त में मैं एक ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल में स्थान का नाम क्यों लिख दिया गया है। स्थान का चुनाव बाद में किया जा सकता था। मद्रास का नाम जो खास तौर से लिख दिया गया, यह क्यों लिख

दिया गया है, इस चीज को उन्हें हमें तफसील में बतलाना चाहिये। खास तौर से इस शहर के नाम को लिखने की आवश्यकता क्यों हुई, यह हमें बताया जाना चाहिये। आज चावल का सवाल है तो कल गेहूँ का सवाल भी पैदा हो सकता है, गेहूँ शहरों में ही दिया जाएगा...

श्री हिममतीसहका (गोड्डा) : कहीं तो इसको स्थापित करना ही होगा।

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : यही मैं कह रहा हूँ कि इसका चुनाव करने में क्या दृष्टिकोण रखा गया है, उस स्थान की उपयोगिता क्या है, यह बतलाना आवश्यक है। इसको नहीं बताया गया है। खाद्य मंत्री इसको बतलाने की कृपा करें, यही मेरा निवेदन है।

Mr. Chairman: I take it that it is the wish of the House that time for speeches should be limited to 10 minutes.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Sir, I object to that. There are groups on this side who have not been represented so far. Certain groups having been already given a certain amount of time, it would not be proper to cut down the time limit just at this time.

Mr. Chairman: It is not a question of unanimity about these matters. There seems to be a consensus of opinion on this.

Shri Umanath: There is no question of unanimity; I am not raising my objection from that angle. This question was raised by the hon. Speaker earlier and it was decided to extend the time by an hour so as to accommodate all hon. Members giving them at least 15 minutes each. I kept quiet at that time because I thought I would get at least 15 minutes. I am the only speaker from my group on this important subject and we want our view point also to be felt in this House.

Mr. Chairman: Which is his group?

Shri Umanath: Communist Group No. 2.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : आप जो दस मिनट का प्रतिबन्ध लगाना चाहते हैं इस पर हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। इस में हम इतना ही संशोधन करना चाहते हैं कि मुस्तलिफ दलों के जो प्रमुख वक्ता हैं, उन को जो समय दिया जाय वह अधिक दिया जाय। बाकियों के लिए दस मिनट कर दें तो उस में हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है।

Mr. Chairman: I have understood him. I am trying to accommodate all those who are desirous of participating in this debate. Therefore, if hon. Members agree to take only ten minutes each I will be able to accommodate all.

Shri Khadilkar: I have already suggested that there are speaker who just go on repeating the arguments. This is an important measure because it is a new policy altogether which is being implemented. Therefore, on this issue, if some new point is being made you should give a little latitude to the speaker and exercise your discretion.

Shri Umanath: Members of the Congress Party can say that ten minutes will be sufficient because they have many Members to speak. But I am the only person who will speak on behalf of my group and if I get only ten minutes how can I put forward our view point?

Mr. Chairman: That will be taken into consideration while exercising my discretion. Many hon. Members are urging the same arguments. I do not want to tell them, but they should also exercise their discretion in this matter.

Some hon. Members rose—

Shri P. R. Patel (Patna): Sir, nobody has spoken from Gujarat.

Mr. Chairman: Gujarat is still there; it has not gone anywhere.

Shri Khadilkar: Sir, I was submitting just now that it is for the first time that this Government is trying to lay down an all-India policy. Of course, I have my own misgivings because since he assumed office, the present Food Minister, Shri Subramaniam, has in unmistakable terms clearly stated, time and again, his intention, but what I find is that every time he has been defeated and he has to surrender to several pressures. There is another reason why I say this. On this occasion, when we are trying to understand and support a measure which is going to be a long-term measure, which is going to be the foundation of a policy in this regard, what has happened in the past must be recalled. On this occasion, I am trying to refer to some of the authorities who have given thought to it. There were some committees and nothing happened. The Food Ministry functioned more or less on the basis of a fire brigade. If there is an emergency it would run. It appears that it was not their responsibility to have any long-term policy.

Mr. Chairman: But where is the water for the fire brigade?

Shri Khadilkar: Sometimes there is no water. If there is no supply or buffer-stock built up, it means there is no water. When the critical situation in Kerala developed, the Minister had to own the responsibility for it because he was perhaps the most helpless figure in this House attacked from all sides. He recognised there was fire and he had no remedy because there was no water—that is buffer-stock. Sir, I entirely endorse your remarks.

Apart from it, I was saying that this *ad hoc* policy regarding food so far pursued by this Government has landed us in much difficulty. Let us try to understand what our former Finance Minister has got to say about it. Shri C. D. Deshmukh who deli-

vered the Dadabhai Memorial Lectures in Bombay has succinctly summed up the position regarding this Government's food policy, control and other things. In the limited time at my disposal I will just refer to a few sentences. He has stated:

"Nearer home, we should now be able to see the inter-connection of controls, prices and planning. It is clear that in the decontrol experiment of 1947-48,.....".

He is taking a resume of economic policies with particular reference to food policy, and that is more important and pertinent to the point at issue—

"...more weight was attached to what were, essentially, non-economic factors than to the opinion of economists. Even if we make allowances for the imperfections of statistical and other data at that time, the ultimate decision showed an over-intrusion of non-economic considerations or wrong economic pressures. Subsequently, the realisation that controls are a concomitant part of planned economic development at the take-off stage has been slow in being duly accepted: this has to a certain extent prevented the consolidation of controls in a continuous and rationalised form, e.g., price control plus price support in foodgrains, as an integral part of the planning organisation."

As I said, he is trying to evolve an integrated national policy,—price control, distribution control and overall control—so that the inflationary pressure will not act as a chronic threat to the life of the common people in this country. Then he says:

"This type of permanent organisation which would make counterpoise adjustments in periods of drastic price changes will also have an eminently beneficent effect on production, for it would

be another element assuring the cultivator the stability of his living conditions."

Then he has referred to several committees and said:

"...it would be cheaper in the long run to have something of a system rather than *ad hoc*, temporary and shifting measures."

The tragedy of the situation is, let this House understand, that there have been these *ad hoc* and shifting measures from Minister to Minister. If failure is there it is nobody's responsibility, one fine morning he resigns and gets away free from past mistakes that he has committed. Then the next man comes in. Then he is removed, for whatever reasons it may be, and a third man comes in. Thus, the shift in policy is continued throughout this period. That is the first plea which I want to make while commending this measure. Because, he has stated in his statement, which I fully endorse, that it is expected to secure for itself a strategic and a commanding position in the foodgrains trade. It is a tall claim, I have no doubt, but if Government stands firm I am positive in my mind that the people of this country will stand behind them. But what are the forces which are likely to stand in the way and try to interrupt this policy? Firstly, the Chief Ministers of States. Secondly, a new alliance that has been forged in the countryside between the trader and the rich peasantry.

Shri Alvares (Panjim): In the Congress Party

Shri Khadilkar: To whichever party they might belong, it does not matter. I am speaking of a class of people. This alliance is going to wage a war against this policy. They will frustrate the efforts of this Corporation by building up a sizable organisation which will have overall control over the trade.

I was surprised to hear the speech of Shri Dandekar. He is afraid of monopoly. But how could he imagine that we are thinking in terms of monopoly in this business. In order to understand the vastness and magnitude of the problem we must remember that about Rs. 3,000 crores worth of foodgrains are produced in the country out of which the marketable surplus is about Rs. 1,500 crores. The Corporation is, a very small organisation with a capital of Rs. 100 crores. Further, it aims at not only purchase and distribution but also giving some help to the producer. As there are other agencies to do that. I do not know why these multifarious activities have been taken over by this Corporation. Its activities ought to have been confined to one area or one problem. To begin with, it would operate in the Southern zone. Now, take the Krishna-Godavari delta from which, Sir, you are coming. So, Sir, you know the background. This Krishna-Godavari delta is a sort of granary in the South. The people living in that area will be exercising a monopolistic influence on the activities of this Corporation. Even in the Southern zone they will try to create difficulties for the network of the Corporation. Therefore, if he wants to have overall control over the distributive trade, as the former Minister, Shri A. P. Jain and some other hon. Members have asked, in what way is this Corporation going to operate. Is it going to enter into the market as a monopoly purchaser? It is impossible because, as I said, Rs. 1,500 crores worth of grain is offered for sale and so even if you utilize the entire Rs. 100 crores you are not going to have a monopolistic or commanding position.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri D. R. Chavan): Rs. 100 crores is only the share capital.

Shri Khadilkar: I know, I am coming to that. What I am driving at is this. If you want to have a monopoly in the market today, let us

[Shri Khadilkar]

examine what is happening. There is a bumper crop now, and the grains are coming to the market. Yet, the price has not come down even by one paisa. Let any hon. Member of this House tell me whether the price has come down even by one paisa even though there is a bumper crop. No. Why? Because, it is being purchased already. The financiers with black money at the back are operating in the market. I am sure that by the 1st of January half the surplus or even more than half the surplus will be mopped up by these people.

It is true that you have issued an order, statutorily fixing the prices. But is it not a fact that there is resistance to purchase from the peasantry itself, particularly the rich peasants who have become conscious of their rights? They have started resistance and they are bargaining. They have acquired the speculative acumen of the merchant community. Therefore, those who shout for the farmers, my hon. friends like Shri Patel, let them realise that the farmer now has entrenched his position with the full backing of the former trader and speculator. That is the picture of our economy.

Shri S. S. More: Why should he slander the whole farmer community?

Shri Khadilkar: It may appear unpalatable to many but that is the unfortunate position.

Shri P. R. Patel: Now the exploiter class want to take advantage of the agriculturists.

Mr. Chairman: Probably Shri Khadilkar is making an objective assessment. I do not think he is slandering anybody.

Shri P. R. Patel: He is slandering the agriculturists.

Shri Khadilkar: I am not abusing anybody; I am stating facts.

Shri P. R. Patel: What facts?

Shri Khadilkar: They are provoked because they have a guilty mind.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni): Shri Khadilkar has just now said that some Members are provoked because they have a guilty mind. What does he mean by that?

Mr. Chairman: That you have to elicit from him.

Shri Khadilkar: Shri C. D. Deshmukh, our former Finance Minister, says in his summing up:

"The case for State trading particularly in an economically retarded country like India can be made quite strongly. For, such an institutional organisation—if it works well—".

and it is a big "if":

"can check inflationary increases in prices by destroying the foundation.....".

It lays down certain fundamental principles. I am not worried about this Bill. It will be passed. But we must endorse this as the basis of our policy and we must make advance from this. That is why I am quoting this. It says:

"by destroying the foundation to speculation in basic commodities; at the same time, it would be able to tap commercial profits at source and provide resources for national development. Something along these lines may be evolved through the growth of co-operatives, but in the short-term, when the need for rapid development is urgent, the evolution may be too slow and a more vigorous participation of the State may prove necessary."

If we bear in mind this summing up, I would like to pose a question. Are

the Food Ministry and the Finance Ministry fully co-operating in this? Otherwise, this will not succeed. I am just putting it quite frankly. Otherwise, this measure will never succeed. Secondly, the bureaucracy entrenched in this department, to my mind at least some elements of it are affected by all the malpractices, tendencies, corrupting influences and so on. Have you mobilised their support for this policy? If you have not, you are bound to fail and if you fail the whole superstructure of this policy would completely collapse and you will be forced to go back to the old hand to mouth policy regarding food. So, I would like to give this Ministry a warning on this occasion.

I fully endorse the Bill. As it is a big Corporation, I only want a provision that the annual accounts of the Corporation will be placed on the Table of the House.

Shri D. R. Chavan: It is already there in the Bill.

Shri Khadilkar: Perhaps I have missed it.

Shri P. R. Patel: Perhaps you have not read the Bill.

Shri Khadilkar: I never speak on a subject until I study it.

If we examine the accounts of the Corporation we can see whether it is functioning well or not. But the main question is this. There is a struggle in this country; we are at cross purposes during a period of crisis. The Minister should have the full backing of his Cabinet, not half-hearted shilly-shallying co-operation so that he can over-rule the Chief Ministers of States who want to have their dictates prevail by perverting or twisting the policy laid down by the Centre. Such a determination on his part will be a condition precedent for the success of this policy.

14 hrs.

Another condition is there, as Shri Dandekar has said. He has a good deal of experience. In this country, with all this planning there is rise in prices of general commodities, particularly of foodgrains which is the basic thing in life. How are you going to check it? If this is not checked.....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Khadilkar: I shall finish within two minutes.

Mr. Chairman: He is going far beyond the purport of this Bill. He cannot go the whole gamut of the price structure and all those things just now.

Shri Khadilkar: I shall omit the price factor though it is a vital factor. I leave it to them. But I have to say one final thing. There are people in this country and in this House who have not taken kindly to all these measures. They will find fault with it. As they are not monopoly purchasers—they are not thinking in terms of monopoly procurement; they are afraid—and are entering into the market along with the other commercial purchasers, the speculators, the financiers and the blackmarketers, with all these they are likely to be defeated. Therefore, in this effort they must not be deterred. Whatever happens, they will go ahead, use all the machinery at their command and make it a success so that it will lay down the foundation of our long-term food policy with a superstructure which will be impregnable.

Shri A. S. Alva (Mangalore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I support the Bill. I take exception to some of the remarks that have been made by Shri Khadilkar. In the first place, he was really uncharitable in accusing the ryots. The producers are really the backbone of the country. As a matter

[Shri A. S. Alva]

of fact, the effort of the Government itself is to see that as far as possible a fair and remunerative price is given to the ryots, that is, the actual producers. There is nothing wrong in that.

The second argument of Shri Khadilkar was that they were in league with the merchants, specially the rich producers. That also is not correct. Evidently he does not know the conditions that are obtaining in the villages. I also belong to the agricultural class and I know that even the rich agriculturist, as a matter of fact, is really hard put to meet his expenses. It is very difficult with the land legislation to have big surplus. I wish Shri Khadilkar will listen to some of my arguments.

An Hon. Member: He is going away.

Shri Khadilkar: I am not going away.

Shri A. S. Alva: Further, he appears to think that the Food Ministry is opposed to the Finance Ministry and that there is a lot of difference of opinion. I do not know from where he is getting all this information. This Bill has been brought forward by the Government, that is to say, the entire Government. It is working as a Cabinet system of government. As such, there is nothing to say that there is difference of opinion in respect of this Bill.

Again, Shri Khadilkar said that this Corporation which is entering into the trade will itself become a black-marketer and do similar things. But he forgets that clause 6, sub-clause (2) says:—

“The board of directors, in discharging its functions, shall act on business principles having regard to public interest and shall be guided by such instructions as

questions of policy as may be given to it by the Central Government.”

So, it will be an honest trader entering into the trade in the public interest and also reflecting the policy of the Central Government.

Shri Dandekar wanted to say that this Corporation might ultimately get a monopoly. My submission in this regard is that there is nothing precluding the ordinary trader in his business.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : माननीय सदस्य कह रहे हैं कि ईमानदार व्यापारी होंगे जो जनता के हित का तथा कृषकों के हितों का ध्यान रखेंगे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि ये ईमानदार व्यापारी कहां से लाए जायेंगे जोकि अब तक नहीं हैं ?

सभापति महोदय : क्या आप अंग्रेजी समझ सकते हैं या आप ट्रांसलेशन सुन रहे हैं ?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : थोड़ी समझ भी लेता हूँ कि वह क्या बोल रहे हैं।

Shri A. S. Alva: You will see that we have got an example. When we discussed the food situation in Kerala, we had the sorry spectacle to note that the trade was not playing its part properly. If the Government enters this trade with an idea of seeing that there is movement of rice etc., in the entire country and that people do not experience great difficulty, we will realise that it is all the more necessary that the Government, instead of giving general instructions, should enter into the trade through this Corporation.

Shri Jain made the point that the Corporation must have power to have monopoly of rail movement from State to State and such other exclusive facilities. As a matter of fact, under the

Essential Commodities Act the Government has got ample powers. I can exercise that power to see that whenever food stocks are cornered by some persons they can give directions in the matter. In the White Paper and in other statements that the Food Minister made, he clearly said that wholesalers who enter into the trade should not be given the monopoly of cornering the stocks. For that purpose, he said, the railway wagons will be made use of only by the Food Corporation to move the foodgrains from place to place. Also, power should be given to the Food Corporation to take away the rice etc., either from the wholesalers or from the producers or retailers at the prices fixed. If there is a wholesaler who has a large stock and is going to sell it at a particular rate fixed by the Government and if the Government takes away the stock giving the fixed price, I do not think that there should be any objection or complaint by him unless he wants to see that it goes to the blackmarket or unless he wants to profiteer. So, nobody can take exception to the way in which the Food Corporation is entering into the market.

Then, Shrimati Laxmibai said that the cultivators also should be represented in the directorate. There is nothing that prohibits the Government from seeing that such people, either ryots or those who know the conditions of the ryots, are also made as directors. There are six other directors which, of course, are to be appointed by the Government.

Then a provision is incorporated in the Bill in respect of the advisory committees. These advisory committees are absolutely necessary to give proper advice. There must be experts to give proper advice in the matter of distribution of foodgrains and in the matter of purchase under local conditions. Their advice should also be taken into account.

Another thing that I may submit for the Ministry's consideration is that they must give wide scope for the Food Corporation so as to act in the interest of the trade and the public and to reflect the policy of Government. Of course, it is said that the policy is controlled by the Government and that, ultimately, it is for the Government to say whether any question is a matter of policy or not. These things should be viewed not from the bureaucratic standpoint but really from that of the interest of the public. It must be sympathetic.

It is a good thing that this Food Corporation is also given powers to see that proper incentives are given to cultivators for production, sale of grains and other things and also for distribution of the necessary fertilisers and making them available to the cultivators. This is a very wholesome provision. In the matter of distribution of fertilisers we know that it is not really reaching the cultivators. So, if the Food Corporation also takes into account equitable distribution of fertilisers to the cultivators, that also is a very good thing.

It has been said that the headquarters of this Food Corporation will be at Madras. In the Bill itself it is said, "at Madras or any other place". Of course, Government has a right to change it. But I feel, why Madras has been chosen is that in the southern States, specially in Mysore and Kerala, there is shortage of foodgrains and they thought that at this stage it is better if the headquarters is in the South for seeing that foodgrains are moving properly and they can give personal directions. But actually there is no difficulty for them to establish their offices at other places and even ultimately to change headquarters to some other place. There is nothing to take exception for the location of the headquarters at Madras.

[Shri A. S. Alva]

Then there is one other thing which also I would like to submit. The Corporation must see that the cooperatives and the merchants are not thrown out of employment because there are merchants and merchants and we cannot brand every merchant as a profiteer. There are a good number of merchants who are doing their business honestly. They are also very much interested in their fellowmen and the public also. This Corporation must take advantage of the cooperatives, the marketing societies and also other traders and appoint them as agents either for procuring or selling or doing other things so that they are also not thrown out of employment. As I said, I am sure the Government will make necessary rules or give directions under the Essential Commodities Act to see that whenever the trade is not behaving properly the Government procures the foodgrains and other essential things from the traders and others. As a matter of fact, the object of the Corporation is really laudable. Even if the Government does monopoly trading, there is nothing wrong because, after all, it is not as though it is any individual who is making any profit. Everything is ploughed back to the public exchequer.

It is also stated that the accounts will be audited just like any other Government company and then the report will also be placed before the House. All the rules etc., will also be placed on the Table of the House. As such, there is ample opportunity for Parliament itself to discuss these matters.

Something has been said that the State Government does not come into the picture. I am sure, whenever the State Corporations are also established, this Corporation will certainly take the advice of the State Governments—of course, under the overall control of the Central Government.

I fully support this Bill. It is coming very timely and I am sure that though the present sanction is Rs. 100 crores, its purchases and turnover will be much more than that. It will actually be a watch-dog on the trade and I am sure this will be a good corrective for the trade itself and the normal trade will go on properly. With these words, I support the Bill.

श्री यु० सि० चौधरी (महेन्द्रगढ़): है सभापति महोदय, यह फुड कारपोरेशन बनाने का जो बिल है इस के ऊपर काफी चर्चा भरे से पूर्व वक्ता कर चुके हैं। उस के बारे में एक दम सीधे शब्दों में यह कहना कि इस बिल में किसान वर्ग की भलाई का हेतु है, या आज जो अनाज के भावों को तय करने का प्रश्न है और जोकि इस समय देश के सामने सब से विकट समस्या बनी हुई है उस का कोई सीधा साधा और स्पष्ट हल निकल आयेगा ऐसा तो कम से कम इस सारे बिल को पढ़ने के बाद नहीं लगता।

बिल का पहला ही पन्ना खोलें। असल प्रश्न हमारे सामने जो यह सारे का सारा मामला है वह यह आता है कि अनाज की पैदावार बढ़े। पैदावार बढ़ने के बाद खाद्यान्न का देश के विभिन्न भागों के अन्दर जो वितरण हो, वितरण की जो व्यवस्था हो वह इतनी सुन्दर हो कि सब को अनाज सुलभ हो जाये और किसी के भी द्वारा जमाखोरी न की जा सके। आजकल यह आम इलजाम लगाया जाता है कि लोगों ने अपने घरों के अन्दर गल्ला जमा कर लिया है, व्यापारियों ने अनाज होर्ड कर लिया है और ऐसा कर के वे मनमाने ढंग से अनाज की कीमतों को बढ़ाते चले जा रहे हैं और इस प्रकार सरकार के काबू के अन्दर यह सारी की सारी समस्या नहीं आती है। इस के बारे में हमारे अनेकों सूत्रों द्वारा और अभी इती सदन् के अन्दर बहुत सारे वक्ताओं ने यह कहा है कि इस

सारे मामले के अन्दर, किसानों का, जोकि उत्पादक है जोकि इस का आधार है और जिस ने कि इस सारी की सारी व्यवस्था को सुचारू रूप से चलाना है उस का बिलकुल ध्यान नहीं रक्खा गया है। लेकिन इस के विपरीत एक वक्ता ऐसे भी रहे, श्री खाडिलकर जोकि जोश के अन्दर आ कर यह भी कह गये कि इस बिल से ऐसी स्थिति मालूम पड़ती है कि जब इस को लागू किया जायगा तो तीन आदमी ऐसे आ कर खड़े हो जायेंगे, एक मुख्य मंत्री, दूसरे बड़े व्यापारी, बड़े व्यापारी शब्द, यह मैं अपनी तरफ से प्रयोग कर रहा हूँ उन्होंने केवल व्यापारी शब्द का ही प्रयोग किया था और तीसरे किसान

एक माननीय सदस्य : बड़े किसान कहा था।

श्री यू० सि० चौधरी : जी नहीं, बड़े किसान उन्होंने बिलकुल नहीं कहा था। उन्होंने केवल किसान का शब्द ही इस्तेमाल किया था। अब बड़े किसान की भी आजकल क्या परिभाषा है मुझे तो कुछ समझ में नहीं आता है। इसी दौरान उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि आज जो किसान हैं उन की स्थिति ऐसी है कि वह इस सारे के सारे मामले के अन्दर सांठगांठ कर रहे हैं और वे ही इस सारी की सारी बात के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं और यही कारण है कि किसान के जो भाव हैं वह नीचे वाली स्थिति के ऊपर नहीं आने पाते। उन की यह बात सुन कर मुझे बड़ी हैरानी हुई। मुझे पता नहीं कि खाडिलकर साहब कौन से प्रान्त से आते हैं लेकिन मैं जोकि पंजाब से आता हूँ और पंजाब के किसान के बारे में यह तय बात है कि वह अन्य प्रांतों के किसानों के मुकाबले सामान्यतः हर एक दृष्टिकोण से जमीन के हिसाब से, उत्पादन के हिसाब से और जहाँ तक मेहनत करने का प्रश्न है, इन सब चीजों में पंजाब का किसान दूसरे प्रांतों के किसानों से बेहतर है। पता नहीं किस तरीके से और किस सज्जन की किताब का हवाला दे रहे थे

एक माननीय सदस्य : श्री सी० डी० देशमुख ने लिखा है।

श्री यू० सि० चौधरी : ठीक है भले ही वे हमारे पहले वित्त मंत्री रह चुके हों लेकिन मैं इस बात को हरगिज़ मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ कि जो कुछ कि उन्होंने उन को कोट करते हुए फरमाया है। मैं नहीं कह सकता कि किस सन्दर्भ के अन्दर वह सारी चीज आई होगी कि किसान ही सारी बात के लिए जिम्मेदार है ?

जहाँ तक मुख्य मंत्री का सवाल है मुख्य मंत्री तो एक राजनीतिक आदमी हैं और उन का राजनीतिक स्वार्थ होता है। उस के वास्ते तो टुकूमत अपने आप जिम्मेदार होगी और उस का कानून अपने आप जिम्मेदार होगा। लेकिन जहाँ तक किसानों का व्यापारियों से सांठगांठ करने का प्रश्न है एक सीधा सादा प्रश्न सारे देश और सदन के सामने है कि वह कौन सा ऐसा निहित स्वार्थ है जिस की कि वजह से किसान व्यापारियों के साथ कीमतों के सम्बन्ध में एक सांठगांठ कर रहे हैं ? मैं नहीं जानता कि उन्होंने यह कैसे कह दिया कि वे भी भावों को चढ़ाने के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं। यह कितनी अनहोनी और उत्तरदायित्व से रहित बात कांग्रेस के एक मेम्बर ने आज हमारे सामने कही है। मुझे खुशी है कि उन की इस बात का विरोध स्वयं कई कांग्रेसी मेम्बरों ने डट कर किया है। यह बात हरगिज़ किसी भी मेम्बर को खुश करने वाली नहीं है।

जैसा मैंने पहले कहा जब हम इस बिल का पहला ही पृष्ठ खोलते हैं तो उस के जो दो उद्देश्य हैं उत्पादन बढ़ाने और उस के बाद वितरण की समस्या को हल करना, जिन को कि लेकर यह सारे का सारा बिल हमारे सामने लाया जा रहा है, इसे शुरू से ले कर आखिर तक 45 पन्ने तक आप चले जाइये जहाँ कि उन्होंने क्लॉजिज़ को बांटा है, कहीं भी कोई ऐसी बात इस सारे के सारे फूड कारपोरेशन

[श्री यु० सि० चौधरी]

बिल में नहीं दिखलन्दी दे रही है कि इस कानून के माध्यम से किसानों का हित कैसे सुरक्षित होगा। यह भी उस में पता नहीं चलता कि जो उपभोक्ता हैं उन का इस के द्वारा कैसे हित सुरक्षित होगा। इस में तो केवल वह जाल जो सरकारी दफ्तरों के अन्दर बैठ कर बनाया जाता है कि उस का मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर कौन होगा, उस का चेअरमैन कौन होगा, उस की क्या अवधि होगी और उस को कैसे हटाया जा सकता है और उस को कैसे रखा जा सकता है यह सब दिया हुआ है। उस में यह भी बतलाया गया है कि वह कब रिटायर होगा और उस को कहां से पेंशन मिलेगी, आदि, आदि। आम बातें जो इस प्रकार की कारपोरेशन्स के सम्बन्ध में अक्सर आया करती हैं उस का लम्बा चौड़ा चिट्ठा यहां पर भी दे दिया गया है। लेकिन कोई ठोस बात कि किस प्रकार से इस सारे सिलसिले को आगे चलायेंगे और अपनी समस्याओं को हल करेंगे मेरे खयाल में उस सम्बन्ध में एक भी वाक्य इस के अन्दर नहीं आया है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार के बिल के अन्दर, चाहे इस को आधार मान कर जो नियम और उपनियम बनने वाले हैं वह इस के अन्दर सारे के सारे नहीं आ सकते हैं। कम से कम उन सिद्धान्तों और नियमों की तरफ कुछ इशारा तो होना चाहिये, जिन को आधार मान कर इस कारपोरेशन ने आगे चल कर काम करना है। जब यह कारपोरेशन एक व्यापारी की तरह से मंडी में आयेगी, तो उस के सामने जो सीधे-सादे प्रश्न और समस्यायें आयेंगे, उन का क्या हल होगा? उदाहरण के लिए इस कारपोरेशन के पास कौन सी एजेन्सी या कौन सा साधन है, जिस के द्वारा यह अनाज खरीदेगी? क्या यह सीधे किसानों से अनाज खरीदेगी, या जब किसान अपना अनाज व्यापारियों को बेच देंगे, तो यह कारपोरेशन उन व्यापारियों से सारा अनाज इकट्ठा करेगी? कई छोटी छोटी बातें हैं,

जो सदियों से किसानों के सामने विकट प्रश्न बन कर खड़ी हुई हैं। यह कारपोरेशन उन प्रश्नों का समाधान कैसे करेगी? बीच का आदमी सदा से किसान के रास्ते में रोड़ा बना हुआ है, जोकि किसान को लूटता है, उस का शोषण करता है। जब किसान के घर से अनाज निकलता है, तो उस का भाव अंठ, नौ या दस रुपये मन होता है, लेकिन उस के एक दो महीने बाद जब वही अनाज व्यापारियों के यहां से बिकता है, तो उस के भाव दुगने हो जाते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल के द्वारा, या इस के अधीन बनाए जाने वाले नियमों, उपनियमों के द्वारा इस समस्या का क्या हल निकाला जा रहा है, उस का एक प्रतिशत अंश भी इस बिल में नहीं दिखलाया गया है।

इस संदर्भ में, इस भूमिका में, अगर कोई माननीय सदस्य अंग्रेजी की कतई किताब उठा कर और किसी बड़ आदमी का नाम ले कर यह कहता है कि किसान भी भावों को बढ़ाने का जिम्मेदार है और वह भी इस प्रकार के गुट में शामिल है, तो इस से बड़ा दुर्भाग्य इस देश के लिए और कोई नहीं हो सकता है। मैं कह सकता हूँ कि अगर इस प्रकार के विचार रखने वाले लोग रहेंगे, अगर किसान के प्रति इस प्रकार की भावना रखी जायेगी, तो चाहे फिर कितनी ही योजनायें बनाई जायें, चाहे पचासों इस प्रकार के बिल पार्लियामेंट और विधान सभाओं से पास कराये जायें, इस देश में अनाज की समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती है। इस मनोवृत्ति का परिणाम यह होगा कि किसान कभी भी ईमानदारी से काम करने के लिए प्रेरित नहीं होगा। आखिर क्या गर्ज पड़ी है किसान को ज्यादा अनाज पैदा करने की? अगर शहरों में रहने वाले चार पांच प्रतिशत लोग भूखे मरते हैं, तो मरें, किसान की बला से। अगर सत्तारूढ़ दल के सदस्यों की यही भावना

रही कि किसी पुस्तक की दो चार लाइनें क्लॉट कर के कह दिया कि किसान भाव बढ़ाने का जिम्मेदार है, तो फिर यह सरकार किसानों का सहयोग प्राप्त नहीं कर सकती है और इस देश की अन्न समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती है। आखिर इस देश में किसानों की आबादी अस्सी प्रतिशत है। शायद एक-आध ऐसा आदमी उन की नज़र में आ गया होगा, जिस के आधार पर उन्होंने सब किसानों के बारे में इस प्रकार के विचार प्रकट कर दिये।

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : किताब में यह नहीं लिखा है। माननीय सदस्य ने अपनी तरफ से कहा है।

श्री यु० सी० चौधरी : माननीय सदस्य ने इस बात पर काफ़ी बल दिया है। गांवों में और छोटी छोटी मंडियों में जो छोटे छोटे व्यापारी बैठे रहते हैं, सारा अपराध उनके सिर पर मढ़ना कोई बहुत अधिक मतलब सिद्ध करने वाली बात नहीं है। किन्तु प्रश्न यह है कि ऐसे कितने किसान हैं, जिनका बड़े बड़े व्यापारियों से सम्पर्क और सम्बन्ध रहता है? एक सामान्य किसान उन तक कैसे पहुंच सकता है? एक सामान्य किसान उस गुट या षड्यंत्र में शामिल है, जो कि भाव बढ़ाने का जिम्मेदार है, यह बात टर्गिज ममझ में आने वाली नहीं है।

यह कारपोरेशन किस तरह से किसानों से सम्पर्क तथा सम्बन्ध स्थापित करके अपना काम करेगा, इस बिल में इसका बिल्कुल कोई जिक्र नहीं है। मुझ से पहले बोलने वाले कृष्ण वक्ताओं ने काफ़ी जोरदार शब्दों में कहा है कि जब तक डाइरेक्टरों में, काम करने वाले सबसे बड़े बोर्ड में, किसानों के प्रतिनिधि नहीं होंगे, इस समस्या के क्रियात्मक पहलू, प्रैक्टिकल बातों, किसानों और देहातों की हानत को समझने वाले आदमी नहीं होंगे,

तब तक इस कारपोरेशन का वही परिणाम होगा, जो कि अक्सर सरकारी कारपोरेशनों का हुआ करता है। कितने ही अन्य सरकारी कारपोरेशन हमारे सामने हैं। आखिर यह कोई पहली सरकारी कारपोरेशन नहीं है। सरकार उन कारपोरेशनों के माध्यम से मुनाफ़ा-खोरी के ढंग से काम करती है। लाइफ़ इन्शोरेंस कारपोरेशन और स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन आदि का यही हाल है। हम सब जानते हैं कि जयपुर और दिल्ली के कुछ आदमियों पर यह इल्जाम लगाया गया कि उन लोगों ने गुड़ से पैसा कमाया, जिससे कारपोरेशन या को-ऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी को कोई फ़ायदा नहीं हुआ, बल्कि उन लोगों ने अपने मुनाफ़े और आमदनी के लिए ये सब सौदे किये।

तो यह कारपोरेशन क्या करेगी? वही करेगी, जो कि शहरों के, मंडियों के बड़े व्यापारी करते हैं, जो अग्राऊ सौदे और सट्टे-बाजी करते हैं, जिससे सारा अनाज उनके कब्जे में आ जाता है और वे अनाज की कीमतें मनचाहे ढंग से बढ़ाते हैं। यह कारपोरेशन भी वही काम करेगी। अगर कारपोरेशन को सही स्थिति का पता नहीं होगा, अगर वह पैदा करने वाले और खरीदने वाले के स्वार्थों का खयाल नहीं रखेगी और अगर वह उनके प्रतिनिधियों को अपने साथ शामिल नहीं करेगी—और शामिल करने से कोई बाहर से लाने का मतलब नहीं है, बल्कि इस बिल में एम्बेडमेंट करके शामिल करना है, क्योंकि माननीय सदस्य, श्री मिश्र, ने यह एम्बेडमेंट दिया है कि किसानों के प्रतिनिधियों को बोर्ड में शामिल किया जाय—, तब तक मुझे इस बात में संशय और सन्देह रहेगा कि यह कारपोरेशन सही तौर पर काम कर सकेगी।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बारे में भी अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं कि केन्द्र द्वारा नियमित कारपोरेशन का प्रान्तीय सरकारों से क्या सम्बन्ध हो और उसने किस तरह से प्रान्तीय सरकारों के साथ ताल मेल कर के

[श्री यु० सि० चौधरी]

काम करना है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्र की सीमार्यो बहुत छोटी हैं और उसके पास प्रान्तों से बहुत छोटा इलाका है। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि केन्द्र ही पूरे तौर पर हावी रहे और कुछ ने कहा कि प्रान्तीय सरकारें भी इसमें आय। लेकिन ये दोनों बातें चरम सीमा पर पहुंचने वाली हैं और दोनों बातों में ही अतिशयोक्ति है। मैं व्यक्तिगत रूप से नहीं समझ सकता कि प्रान्तीय सरकारों के साथ मिले बिना, उनके साथ किसी न किसी नुक्ते पर मेल-मिलाप न करके, उनको इस मामले में विश्वास में न लेकर यह समस्या कैसे हल होगी। केवल यह कहने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है कि राज्यों के मुख्य मंत्री भी उस सांठ-गांठ में मिल जायेंगे। उसका इलाज क्या है? और फिर इस बात का भी क्या सबूत है कि केन्द्र का खाद्य-मंत्री उस सांठ-गांठ में नहीं मिलेगा? केन्द्र के मंत्री भी सांठ-गांठ कर सकते हैं।

इस बिल के उद्देश्य में कहा गया है कि अगर आवश्यकता हुई, तो प्रान्तीय सरकारों से सहयोग प्राप्त करेंगे। मेरा विचार है कि यह आवश्यक होगा कि प्रान्तीय सरकारों से किसी न किसी नुक्ते पर कुछ न कुछ सहयोग करके, सारी स्थिति को समझते हुए, इस समस्या का हल निकाला जाये।

यहां पर कुछ बेकार की चर्चा भी छेड़ी गई है और वह एक ऐसे आदमी ने छेड़ी है, जो बड़ा दम-खम भर कर कहता है कि हम बड़े असम्प्रदायवादी हैं। उन्हीं की यह रिपोर्ट निकली थी कि साम्प्रदायिक पार्टियों पर बैन लगा दिया जाये। अपने आपको इस प्रकार असाम्प्रदायिक कहने वाले आदमी कहते हैं कि मद्रास में इस कार्पोरेशन का आफिस नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि मद्रास में क्यों नहीं होना चाहिए। अगर मद्रास में यह आफिस बनता है, तो उससे क्या क्यामत आती है?

इस बात की पुष्टि करते हुए एक अन्य माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि मद्रास में किसान कैसे जायेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि या तो उन्हींने इस बिल को पढ़ा नहीं है और या उन को इस बिल के उद्देश्यों का पता नहीं है। एक सामान्य किसान को मद्रास जाने की जरूरत नहीं है। अगर दिल्ली में भी कार्पोरेशन का आफिस बन जाता है तो एक सामान्य किसान दिल्ली में भी कैसे आ सकेगा? इसके अलावा दिल्ली में आफिस बनाने पर मद्रास का किसान कह सकता है कि मैं दिल्ली कैसे जा सकता हूँ। यह एक बेकार और वाहियात बात है, जो कि साम्प्रदायिकता से भरी हुई है। यह उस आदमी पर लांछन है, जो कहता है कि साम्प्रदायिक पार्टियों पर बैन लगाना चाहिये। जो व्यक्ति इस प्रकार अराष्ट्रीय बातें कह कर सारे समाज को गदला करता है, कांग्रेस हाई कमांड उसके खिलाफ कोई न कोई एक्शन ले, क्योंकि उसने इतनी सुन्दर बहस को एक गन्दा रूप दे दिया है।

कार्पोरेशन का आफिस मद्रास में ही होना चाहिए। बल्कि अगर उससे भी आगे कन्या-कुमारी में यह आफिस बनाने की आवश्यकता हो, तो वहां यह आफिस बनाया जाये, क्योंकि वह भी हमारे देश का हिस्सा है। हमें अपने आपको मूल बातों तक ही सीमित रखना चाहिए कि इस बिल से हमें कौन से लाभ और अलाभ हो रहे हैं।

मुझ इस बात का पूरा शक है, नञ्चे प्रतिशत शक है कि यह बिल केवल काग्रजी बातों तक ही सीमित रह जायेगा और किसान-वर्ग को डायरेक्टर, मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर, सेक्रेटरी और दुनिया भर के लम्बे चौड़े दफ्तर और चपरासी में लेकर बड़े अफसर तक के चक्कर में डाल दिया जायेगा, जिससे किसानों को कुछ नहीं मिलना है। किसानों

फिर मंडी में व्यापारी को तलाश करेगा, उससे कर्जा लेगा और उसको अनाज बेचेगा। यह कार्पोरेशन और उसके डायरेक्टर और मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर बैठे रहेंगे। दो तीन महीने के बाद टोटा दिखा कर सुब्रह्मण्यम् साहब एक किताब की तरह कार्पोरेशन को बन्द करके अपने घर चले जायेंगे।

Shri P. R. Patel: I support the Bill and I wish that it may achieve the objects that have been enumerated. The Bill is in the interests of increased agricultural production. It seeks to benefit the consumers. It seeks also to guarantee minimum price to the agriculturists.

Shri S. S. More: Where does it say so?

Shri P. R. Patel: It seeks to guarantee minimum price to the producer, and to protect the consumers' interests from the vagaries of speculative trade. It is a very unhappy thing that even though we have accepted the principle of giving remunerative prices to the agriculturist, the Bill fails to mention this in its provisions. I think that it would have been a very good thing if that fact had been mentioned in the Bill.

Another thing that I am afraid of is that our Minister of Food and Agriculture rather hesitates to form an agricultural prices commission.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Hesitates?

Shri P. R. Patel: He takes time. To remove any doubts, I wish that at the earliest possible time he would nominate the agricultural prices commission. At the same time, I would remind him of the promise that was made by the Prime Minister to the nation that in this commission, the representatives of the agriculturists also will be included.

14.32 hrs.

[Dr. SAROJINI MAHISHI in the Chair]

I hope that the hon. Minister will implement that promise, because then he will get the support of the agricultural community in the task that he has taken up. That task is a very big one. I know the difficulties in the way. The hon. Minister wanted to remove the zones as early as possible, and he wanted free inter-State movement of foodgrains. But some States, and some Chief Ministers opposed it, and, therefore he could not do so. I wish that he should be put in a position from where he may dictate or rather his words should become so powerful that the States will have to abide by what he says and remove the zonal restrictions. But it seems that there is a quarrel or tension between the Centre and the States and that each State looks to the interests of its own people and not to the interests of the whole country. If that is the position, then I would ask him whether the food corporation will be a success.

After all, the food corporation shall have to depend upon the States, and if the States are going to behave in this manner, then will the food corporation be able to succeed? I have got my own doubts on this point. So, I hope the hon. Minister will consider this matter.

In this Bill we find that there is going to be a board of directors, then there will be a board of management, and so many other boards and advisers. There is nothing in this Bill which would prevent representatives of the agriculturists from being on those boards. But has the Minister put these things clearly? Has he provided that at least one half of the members of the board will be representatives of agriculturists? If he had gone so, I think that that would have created a very good impression. I hope that he will give an assurance that at least one half of the members of the board would be drawn from the representatives of agriculturists.

Shri K. N. Tiwary (Bagaha): Does not my hon. friend feel that this Bill should go to a Select Committee so that it may emerge as a comprehensive Bill?

Shri P. E. Patel: There are some persons in the country, and educated persons too, who feel that agriculturists have the capacity to hoard foodgrains and they are in conspiracy with the traders. It is a wrong impression. Sir, I come from the agricultural community, and I know that there would be only half a percent or even less than that in the agricultural community who would be in a position to keep back some of the produce. Even if they are in a position to do so, what is wrong in that? But unfortunately, some educated people in the country have started abusing the agriculturist. It has become more or less a fashion nowadays.

Those in the administration think that the people outside the administration are rogues and profiteers and blackmarketeers, while those outside say that those in the administration are corrupt and immoral. So, there is a fight going on between the two. So long as they do not have trust in each other, no good scheme will be able to succeed.

I have been quarrelling with some friends of mine who are Ministers in the States on this point. Generally in the course of talks, they say that the people are not trustworthy, they are profiteers and they help the profiteers and they do this thing and that thing. I used to tell 'your father and mother are outside the Ministry. Why do you abuse them? Therefore, I would submit that we trust you and you trust us. If the hon. Minister trusts the agricultural community in the country I think he will be a successful Minister in the Ministry of Agriculture.

I know that this Ministry has become the grave of so many, and the reason is this that the man at the top is a nice man, but those behind him, those officers sitting there are the per-

sons who put the man in the wrong box.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: They have been behaving like this since the very beginning.

Shri P. E. Patel: It is a bureaucratic mind that they have, and therefore, we wanted popular Ministries, and we fought for the freedom of the country. Otherwise, there were Ministers even then and there were the officers also, but we wanted, a popular Ministry everywhere.

Shri Alvares: On a point of order. Is it proper to point to the officers in the box and say that they have been grave-diggers?

Mr. Chairman: He may refer to them in general but not make any special reference to the officers in the gallery.

Shri P. E. Patel: What I am submitting is this. Let us first understand the farmers and their difficulties, and then they will try to help us.

Shri Koya (Kozhikode): When they were ruling we were better off.

Shri P. E. Patel: In this whole Bill is there any clause which puts responsibility on anybody, whether director or adviser or anybody else, to look to the requirements of the agriculturists? One of the primary objects of this Bill is to increase agricultural production, but there is nothing in this Bill which puts responsibility on anybody or any servant of the corporation to look to the requirements of the agriculturists. This is a funny thing. This Bill is called the Food Corporations Bill, but that very clause is found wanting.

Another thing in this Bill is that it is said that it will undertake trade in foodgrains in a commercial manner. This is a vague term, commercial manner. Business or commercial firms

make profits. I want a clear-cut assurance that the profits of this Corporation—I mean the gross profits, not the net profits—will not exceed 6 per cent. That is if you buy a thing for Rs. 6, it must reach the consumer at Rs. 6-6-0. That would be the state trading benefiting the consumer. But looking to the large number of directors, advisers and others, if whatever is earned is consumed by a large army of servants of the Corporation and no profit is shown, how will the consumers be benefited?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : इससे जो थोड़े बहुत पढ़े लिखे बेकार लोग हैं उनको भी कुछ सहायता मिल जायेगी ।

Shri P. R. Patel: How will the farmer be benefited? Let Government consider this point. Let us go to the people and say that we are not for profit; if we buy a thing for Rs. 6, we will sell it to the consumer at Rs. 6-6-0, so that the profit will not be more than one anna to a rupee. Then we can compete with the merchant community and in that way set an example.

Then I shall come to clause 40. It is a very funny clause. It says that the servants of the Corporation shall not be held responsible for or liable for anything done in good faith. There is such a clause in the Civil Procedure Code. This inheritance is from the British Crown that the King can do no wrong and so the servants of the king can do no wrong.

I say that this principle is out of date. It is not favoured by the judiciary. In England, there were some changes in that principle. In India also, the Supreme Court opined very recently rejecting this principle. But we are incorporating this clause in this Bill in respect of the employees of the Corporation. I think this is too much. I hope Government will reconsider this matter.

Shri Karuthiruman (Gobichettipalayam): I support the Food Corporations Bill. But for the fact of this Bill coming up, the farmers would not have got the price that is prevailing. Had it not been for the formation of this Corporation, the traders would have taken advantage of the situation and the price fixed would not have been advantageous to the producer. We wish for the successful functioning of the Food Corporation.

There are two vital things in connection with this matter. First, who are involved in this? The farmers. Then there is the method of purchase of the grains. First of all, the producers should be given a fair price. The statement of objects and reasons says that this measure is intended to ensure a minimum price to the producer, which minimum price may be fixed from time to time. This is confusing. An agricultural commission has been appointed. I am sorry that therein only the consumers' interests are represented. Not even a single farmer is represented there.

Shri C. Subramaniam: It has not yet been formed.

Shri Karuthiruman: They have fixed the prices, the *ad hoc* prices. Now at least I take it that the Minister will take care of the aspect of producers' representation there.

They announced a set of prices in August. That is the price then prevailing. The price prevailing in the market should be the price fixed for the producer. But within two months of fixing one price, they changed the price. Unless the farmer is guaranteed a fixed price, how can we expect him to increase the production. They said in August that the price would be Rs 40—44 per quintal of paddy. But in November, they revised it, reducing it by Rs. 5 per quintal. How can the farmers have security in these circumstances? If even in the course of one month or

[Shri Karuthiruman]

two, the price that has been fixed is reduced, can the farmers feel secure? In September, a farmer was entitled to Rs. 44 per quintal. If he gives delivery now, he would have to pay a penalty of Rs. 5 per quintal. For having kept the paddy, allowing for shrinkage also, now he has been penalised to the extent of Rs. 5 per quintal.

I congratulate Government on the fair price fixed. But I can not say it is a remunerative price for the producer. We have five year plans. At least, let remunerative prices be fixed for the producers on a five year basis. Unless this is done, it is quite impossible for them to produce more. If farmers are subjected to this sort of uncertainty about prices, that within two months the price announced is reduced by Rs. 5 per quintal, they will not produce more of food crops; they may switch over to cash crops. They cannot feel secure in these circumstances.

Then again, has the cost of cultivation been brought down? The way in which the price policy is applied makes the farmers feel that they are not given a fair deal. It is impossible for them to increase production in such circumstances.

The Food Corporation will undertake state trading in foodgrains. It will run on commercial principles also. Officials will be involved in the matter of procurement of grains. Here I want to say one thing from previous experience, that procurement through officials is not proper and will not be fair. The available surplus will be taken over by the Corporation. What is the available surplus? The officer goes and decides on the basis of his whims and fancies what is the available surplus. So one quantity may be procured from one farmer; a less quantity may be taken from another.

If you want to increase production, the procurement system should be

based on the levy principle, that is, per acre of crop.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) :
सभापति महोदय, हाउस में कोरम नहीं है ।

Mr. Chairman: The bell is being rung—Now there is quorum. The hon. Member may proceed.

Shri Karuthiruman: If it is based on the levy system, immediately after the harvest, the Corporation can enter the field and procure. So the system of procurement should be based on the levy system, to begin with.

The surplus available should be through two channels—one through the Food Corporation and another through free trade. If procurement is entrusted to the present officials, I do not think they will do a good job of it. We have had bitter experience of it in the past and even recently. There is a saying in Tirukkural:

*Velodu niran idu enradu polum
Kolodu niran iravu.*

Procurement through officials is like begging of alms by a man with a spear in his hand on the highway. Only because of fear of the spear some people might give, but the real culprits escape and will indulge in blackmarketing. That is why the system of procurement should be on an equitable basis. If a man owns one acre, let him give one bag, if he owns two acres, let him give two bags, if he owns ten acres, let him give ten bags. If anybody gives more than that, a bonus of Rs. 5 per quintal of paddy or rice should be given by the Corporation. If you give such encouragement, the big farmers who hold their stocks will come out and deliver the goods to the Corporation. Let them fix the target for each village or district on this basis and

let them procure, then there will be no trouble.

If paddy or rice is not stored properly and processed properly, it becomes very unhealthy for consumption. If you entrust it to the officials, they will not be interested in doing this storing and processing properly. That is why traders are able to give good rice.

If the Corporation enters into procurement, it should be able to give the money on the spot and be able to take delivery within 24 hours. In Tanjore, for instance, when I was there, 3,000 bags of rice were offered by a gentleman, but they have not been taken delivery by the procurement official. In some places they complain they do not get delivery, but in places where delivery is given, they do not take delivery.

We should see that the Bill is worked to the benefit of the producer and the consumer. Even the retail trade may be taken over by the Corporation, so that there may not be any malpractices in the retail trade. A remunerative and fair price should be assured to the producer. The levy system of procurement should be the policy of the Government and the retail trade should also be taken over by them.

Shri Umanath: This Bill is brought forward under much fanfare by the ruling party as if something big is coming about. The Swatantra Party also is reinforcing this attempt of the ruling party by picturing the Bill as something really serious and big.

It is our assessment that this Bill shows that even after starvation deaths, this Government is not prepared to bring about any radical change in its ruinous food policy followed so far.

In the statement of objects and reasons, the Government has made it clear that the formation of this Corporation is only a step towards implementation of Government's policy.

Hence, a precise appraisal of the food policy of the Government, with particular reference to recent developments, would clear the line along which the Corporation would function.

Referring to the recurring food crisis and soaring prices, the *Economic Weekly Special Number of July, 1964* writes:

"Investigations made by experienced political workers...bring one inevitably to the conclusion that the present hyper-inflation is essentially the result of the grip on food supplies, of the large landholders and the bigger wholesale traders."

So, to ensure availability of food at reasonable prices, any policy must break this grip of landlords and wholesalers. And yet, for the past 17 years, our Government policy has been one of trying to solve the problem of food, without destroying the basic economic positions of the landlords, and without attacking the strategic positions of wholesalers and speculators in the food trade. In fact, the Government was placing its main reliance on these very classes for the success of its food policy. The reliance was by conviction.

The development of the last two years has turned the search-light on this shameless reliance. During the September crisis, Shri Subramaniam admitted that the landlords and wholesalers have withheld stocks. He said:

"I say boldly and categorically that some of the big producers are holding on to the stocks in collusion with the dealers."

Was not the Government forewarned that this would happen? They were forewarned by us during the March debate itself. Yet, brushing aside this warning, what did Shri Swaran Singh, the then Food Minister, say in this House:

"This year we have been extremely lucky in the matter of rice."

[Shri Umanath]

production... I am quite clear in my mind that now that the actual effect of all this additional production is felt, both in rural side as well as in the markets, the supplies will increase and also the prices will not have a tendency to harden."

What was it that made the Government so certain of the rice coming into the market? It was their deep faith in the landlords and wholesale dealers.

Symptoms of the present catastrophic hoarding and skyrocketing prices were noticed by the Government even in March. Referring to those trends, what did Shri Swaran Singh say? He said:

"It is quite natural for the growers to think that the prices in later months might increase and might increase disproportionately and if there is some reluctance on the part of the growers in bringing their produce to the market, that is understandable. That need not be grudged."

This is not only a policy of reliance on the hoarders and speculators, but also one of ensuring market supplies by paying a premium on hoarding.

Did Shri Subramaniam, who made this great discovery of collusion between landlords and wholesalers give up this faith in the hoarders and speculators? No. He also, in his turn, reiterated his faith in them when he said in September, referring to West Bengal:

"We are hoping that at least during the Pooja days... some of it at least would be unloaded."

Referring to police action against hoarders, Shri Subramaniam said in the same September debate:

"It is an impossible task, even for a totalitarian Government,

much more for a democratic Government. That is why the Prime Minister made an appeal that the stocks should come out. What is wrong there? As a matter of fact, some people have responded in bringing out the stocks."

Armed with this confidence in the landlords and wholesalers, he declared later in the debate:

"The prospect of Kharif crop is quite good. Therefore, the situation is bound to ease. We have turned the corner... and after a long journey we have sighted the shore, even though we have not alighted on the shore."

After these assurances, what did we see? On the shores of Kerala we saw men, women and children dying of starvation and epidemics; on the shores of Tamilnad and Andhra, we saw women and children swooning in the queues.

Even after seeing these starvation deaths and epidemics, does the Government give up its confidence in the hoarders? Shri Subramaniam tells us in his statement to this House on Tuesday:

"The rice crop in the Southern Rice Zone is reported to be very good this year, and it is expected that adequate supplies of rice will soon become available."

This Government will never give up their faith and reliance on the landlords and wholesalers. Their faith in them is so ingrained in their blood that this Government will rather sink than give up this faith.

Shri Shinkre: This is not Swantantra Party's Government.

Shri Umanath: That we have yet to see.

Shri Nambiar: In practice, it is worse than that.

Shri Umanath: Seventeen years of this trial and experiment of trying to solve the food problem by retaining the landlords and wholesalers in the trade having heaped this tragedy on our millions, what is left now is to really prevent them from operating in the market. And yet, this proposed Corporation is intended to be a last ditch battle by the Government to desist from the inevitable, namely the complete take-over of the foodgrains trade.

In the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill, the Government does not say that the Corporation will be placed in a strategic and commanding position in the foodgrains trade. The relevant portion, para 4, reads:

"It is expected to secure for itself a strategic and commanding position in the foodgrains trade."

Mark the word "expected". They are not certain. They only expect. This is just one of those umpteen expectations of the Government which have totally failed in the past 17 year, on the food front.

15 hrs.

Let us work out this scheme, and presently we will understand why the Government only expects. According to the scheme of this Bill, the Corporation will be in the market, alongside and in competition with the private traders. Now, the biggest marketable surplus will have to come from the big landlords.

They are the ones who have the unlimited capacity to hold. They will hold on to the stock till a high price of their choice becomes available. Then there is the stock from the poor and middle peasants. Government says that since the Corporation would offer them loans they will sell it to the Corporation. I submit that the loan procedure will be so cumbersome, degrading and involving bribery that peasants will resign themselves to the

rural money lender and wholesaler, from whom they could get loans straightaway on the spot. This way their stocks will also be cornered. Then the Government is left with the choice of competing with the wholesalers by offering a fair price to the peasants. What this competition would imply is made very clear by Mr. Gadgil in the *Eastern Economist* of 26-9-1964.

"If the Corporation is limited in its activities to a given level of prices, the trader can by offering a somewhat higher price, divert all supplies away from the Corporation."

This same point is confirmed in an article in the *AICC Economic Review* dated 25 10 1964:

"The Corporation, it may be pointed out, is expected to make procurement at prices previously determined by the Government. But it is quite likely that to private traders may try to outbid it by offering higher prices to the producers. They may thus be able to mop up a sizable amount of marketed surplus, the Corporation getting only inadequate quantities."

But here the Government will say that the Corporation would be empowered to call upon any wholesaler to handover to the corporation, their stocks of foodgrains as well as previously declared prices. But what its result will be is made out by the same issue of *AICC Economic Review*:

"But experience shows that by and large, the officials of the corporation may, despite the stocks of wholesalers which may go underground or detect the understatement of food stocks by the traders."

And we will again see the sight of seemingly innocent Shri Subramaniam telling this House that police action and DIR will be ineffective where the operation involves thousands of villages. After spending

[Shri Umanath]

crores of rupees on this corporation the country will continue to be where it is today.

Therefore, Sir, the country has no other go than the total removal of these landlords and wholesalers from operation of the markets and take over of foodgrains trade. The Government says that they accept state trading in foodgrains in principle and that they want time to build up the machinery and that this is the first step; as though if they had time they would have built up the machinery.

No, Sir. In 1957 the Asoka Mehta Committee declared 'socialisation of foodgrains trade' as the only way out and this was accepted by this Parliament. In 1958 again, the Nagpur meeting of the AICC proclaimed 'State monopoly in foodgrains trade' as the way out. Thus they had seven long years to build this machinery and they did not bother to build it. This is a flimsy pretext to deceive the gullible. If the Government means business they can introduce State trading in foodgrains here and now. Let them ban wholesale private trade in foodgrains. Then the marketable stocks are bound to come to the Government for sale. Secondly, let them open a chain of rural banks at cultivation centres where the peasants can sell their produce direct. Thirdly, Madam, in addition to the existing warehousing godowns, let all other private godowns hitherto used by private traders for storing of foodgrains be requisitioned by the Government for the purpose. The question of ensuring the mopping up of marketable surplus can then be successfully solved. But Mr. Subramaniam seems to have recently trotted out the theory that total State trading in foodgrains would require Rs. 3,000 crores for investment which no Government could afford. This is again trying to deceive the gullible.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Where did he get the statement from?

Shri Umanath: It is from a recent meeting.

Shri Nambiar: Is he contradicting it? It is well and good then.

Shri Umanath: The entire value of the country's 80 million tons of foodgrains would come to only Rs. 3,000 crores. Of this, only a third constitutes marketable surplus. Seasons being different even this third will have to be purchased at different times. February to June will be the period when there will be the biggest draw on money for these purchases. But since, along with buying there will be selling as well, there will be turnover in money. Further the banks can advance loans to Government against these stocks which they used to do before to the private traders. Thus the question of machinery and finance does not stand in the way of take over of foodgrains trade. What is it that really stands in the way and which the Government is hiding from the people? *The Economic Weekly* July special number of 1964 referring to the composition of the ruling party in Kerala, Andhra and Madras has put it sharply:

"It will be extremely difficult for the government and the ruling party to do much about the soaring food-prices... The extent to which the wholesale traders and the large land-lords control the State, district and village level Congress party machine should on no account be underestimate... Some sections among these classes show predilections for the Swantantra Party but as yet the bulk has remained loyal to the Congress... Somehow any touching of their interests, any prodding of them to give up their familiar avocations appears almost like treason or even suicide to very influential sectors of Congress leadership at the State and grass root level."

It is this alliance by the leadership of the ruling party with landlords and hoarders that stands in the way of take over of foodgrains. This alliance explains the so-called resistance by the State Governments and the Centre's refusal to compel the State Governments. The artificial picture drawn by Shri Subramaniam and Mrs. Indira Gandhi of the Opposition having colluded with these forces is meant to cover up this real collusion within their party. An effective blow against this alliance alone will ensure the taking over of foodgrains trade. The ruling party will not deal that blow. The people of Kerala, Madras, Andhra and Mysore who are presently writhing under this agony and millions of people facing similar threat throughout the country will deal that blow. And let the Government be certain that their Defence of India Rules will cease to defend this unholy alliance.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Madam..

Shri Nath Pai: There is a precedent established about calling spokesman and whenever we asked for any preference it was cited, I think, very correctly. Mr. Alvares happens to be the spokesman of our Group which is the third. When is he to be called? There should be some definite procedure so that we may not come to be called at very unknown time.

Mr. Chairman: I think his name is there in the list.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): That is all right. I am not asking that. I am not asking for any favours.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Madam Chairman, I admire the speaker who preceded me how he has quoted Bible chapter and verse; he repeated quotations from the Ministers chapter and verse...

Shri Umanath: It is the AICC *Economic Review*.

Shri Nambiar: We are showing the contradictions within the ruling party and showing you how you are not doing things which are actually wanted. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: He has given repeated quotations from the speeches of the Ministers about what advice they have given from time to time. I only wish to say that a great deal of things that had happened could have been avoided had they followed the advice of the Minister whom they quote now with the same sincerity in practice. It reminds me of a Character in a Shakesperean drama, who said "I abuse you because you have given me the language." (*Interruptions.*) In any case my friend here questioned why the Government was hesitant in putting into practice some of the principles that he says they had adumbrated. The cause of the hesitation lies in the activities pursued by my friends over there. I know that in Bengal when the Government tries to maintain food prices at a certain level, my friends will go into the villages and teach the farmers not to sell paddy below Rs. 12 a maund and in the towns urge the people to demand rice at Rs. 16 a maund.

Shri Nambiar: We challenge that statement.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: I am glad that you have challenged me. But this has been put on record so many times and I wonder why, when you quoted so many things from this side, this particular thing has escaped your notice. It is also on record that in the towns those friends carry on processions teaching the people to demand from the Government that they should get rice at Rs. 16 a maund.

15.10 hrs.

[SHRI SONAVANE in the Chair]

An Hon. Member: What was the Government doing then?

Dr. Ranen Sen (Calcutta East): You are making a wrong statement here. The price that was demanded by the Opposition for the consumers was Rs. 22 and not Rs. 16. Why mislead the House?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. If he is not yielding hon. Members cannot go on like this.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: When they go on telling things in their own way, they would certainly not like that others would give them what they had done in their own coin! I can quite appreciate that. I would request them to accept what I stated in the same spirit in which I accepted what they stated about this.

Shri Nambiar: But facts must be facts.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Facts must be facts. But even if the persons who were concerned with the facts deny them, they are facts.

Dr. Ranen Sen: I come from West Bengal and I deny them.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Facts come from West Bengal and say they are the facts. This is a matter of opinion and it will have to remain at that. So far as this Bill is concerned, madam, I support this Bill. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Chairman: It is all just the same: madam or Sir.

Shri Umanath: This is another example for not saying the facts! (*Interruption*).

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: I quite appreciate the interruption by Shri Umanath. But the reporters there will tell him that he has repeatedly used the word 'Sir' while Dr. Sarojini Mahishi was sitting in the Chair. Let him ask the reporters; they will give him the quotation from his own speech.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member is losing time.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: I support this Bill. I only wish that the situation were not such that Government had to spend their energy to resort to such a measure. Their hands are already full with very complicated administrative measures, and it is difficult for them to divert their energies to take up such a measure. But there are certain sections in society which have created a situation which has compelled the Government to go in for such a measure. We have got to support it and the Bill should be accepted and passed by the House.

So far as the Bill is concerned, I should say that the Bill should have been a little more carefully scrutinised before it was introduced. Parts of it appear to me to be not very carefully drafted. I have put in certain amendments. There are other amendments which might be coming in. Some of these might be pointed out. I have put in an amendment to the effect that in clause 7(e) six other directors should be non-officials, because out of the 12 directors, six have already been made officials. Therefore, at least the other six should be non-officials. It is not mentioned here that the six should be non-officials. If the hon. Minister refers to clause 14(c), he will find that there is a reference that at least one of the directors in the executive should be a non-official. In the original clause 7, there is nowhere provided that there must be some non-official. That, I believe, might be due to an oversight.

When the Bill refers to the Chairman, it says that no salary is to be provided for him, but in clause 8, the Chairman is included among the salaried officials. It says: "except in the case of chairman or the managing director if he is a salaried official of the Food Corporation of India." Such provisions provided in the Bill would require scrutiny, and I believe the

hon. Minister himself must scrutinise them and amend them in the places where they are necessary.

While I support the Bill, I should utter only two words of caution. The success of the Bill will depend on the conduct of the officials. In fact, the people are between the officials and the business community. That is their position. When rationing is introduced, the newspapers become full with complaints against the conduct of rationing and the conduct of officials involved in it. When rationing is abolished, these are again filled with complaints against the conduct of business people trying to exact and overexact from the people. So, between the two, the people have to choose their way. The Minister has got to pay great care to this aspect of the matter, namely, that the official machinery conducts itself properly in order to ensure the success of this measure.

There is another point that I should make. I request the Minister to see that there is no waste. In the days of rationing there has been so much waste that if an account were made of the amount of foodgrains wasted, it would amount to a very big sum. So, great care should be taken to see that in the storage of food and the distribution of food, wastage is avoided in any case. I utter these two notes of caution so that the Bill, when translated into law, may prove a success. In the situation that we live, this Bill is necessary and must be agreed to.

Shri Alvares: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the difficulty about this otherwise necessary and welcome measure is that it has been forced upon Government by a number of circumstances. The deteriorating food situation in the last six months, particularly the situation in Kerala, has compelled the Government to resort to a measure which, normally in an era of advanced planning, should have come much earlier. This Bill should have really

come, following upon the recommendations of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee presided over by Shri Asoka Mehta, now the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. But when Government had no intention at all of implementing those recommendations, it is not unnatural that it never thought of bringing such a measure hitherto which, had it been done, would have enabled us to avoid the holocaust that took place during the last six months in this country.

It is, therefore, I think, because of this form of compulsion, there are some very serious contradiction both in the matter of policy and organisation. At the very outset, we find that the policy of this Food Corporation is circumscribed by the Chief Ministers' Conference which took place about three days ago, whereby the food zones are still maintained and the surplus is to be procured by the State machinery. It is obvious that two parallel purchasing machineries cannot exist. If the States are permitted to make their own purchases, then the only objective or the purpose of this Food Corporation will be one of distribution. The Food Minister, while introducing this Bill, said that one of the purposes would be to purchase. I think that the main purpose of this Food Corporation will be the purchase of foodgrains and for very good reasons.

It has been the experience of planning in underdeveloped countries that market prices are depressed in order that the industry may prosper and industrial profits may satisfy the investors as well as provide sinews for reinvestment over again. I hope that in any socialist planning this concept will be given up—it is not quite fundamental in socialist planning—and if the Food Corporation will set about its purpose of purchasing foodgrains in a manner that the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee had suggested, the agriculture industry will be put in a sound footing and I am sure that this country will prosper and proceed on a planned basis in a

[Shri Alvares]

much more successful way than it had done before. The essence of this Food Corporation must be purchase. It has happened in advanced countries. Even in America, where we talk about a free economy, the major portion of the foodgrains' purchase is guaranteed by the Government on the basis of crop planning. Considering the affluence of the American economy, there could have been no other reason why the Government should insist that those crops that the Government think necessary to protect should be able to enjoy the protection of price support. It is precisely because of this incentive that 9 per cent of the American people grow all the food and are able to feed in addition a large part of the hungry world.

In this country, there is necessity to make a beginning of price supports. The issue of price supports has been talked about for so long. The purpose of the Food Corporation is to purchase food from the grower and distribute it. If these two purposes are kept in mind, the intermediates are secondary. The Food Corporation must make it its business to purchase food at a fair and remunerative price. Only then it can supply some incentives directly to the agriculturists and try to bring up his status on a par at least in an equitable manner to that of the industrialist in this country. For too long have the agriculturists been the beasts of burden to bear the backlog of the economy and as a result, we know that social development has suffered to such an extent. If social development, which is the essence of planning, has to proceed apace, then it is necessary that the agricultural sector of our economy must be given a face-lift. This can only be done if the agricultural sector receives the patronage of the Food Corporation. Therefore it could be a contradiction in terms if there were surplus State zones or if the States would be able to purchase the surplus themselves

and then pass them on to the Food Corporation. There cannot be parallel purchasing agencies. If, as provided in the Bill, this Food Corporation is an autonomous concern, but it will be guided by the policies that the Central Government may lay down, then it is obvious that if it is the policy of the Central Government to bring about a reformation of the agricultural economy and if, just as the industrial economy of this country has a uniformity of prices and development, the agricultural economy also must develop similarly, then there cannot be two parallel purchasing agencies in this country, because they will vie with each other. The speculative trade and the Food Corporation's purchasing machinery cannot vie with each other in the bazaar. They must give place to one another. Therefore, it is proper that if the Food Corporation has to exist, it must be monopoly procurement at all costs. By monopoly procurement, we do not mean that the Food Corporation or the officials will go about and purchase things as they like. Therefore, I have an objection to the term commercial lines as made out in this Bill.

Commercial lines in normal parlance should be buying at the lowest rate and selling at the highest rate. If the Food Corporation is to work on these traditional commercial lines, surely it cannot do justice to the economy. The Corporation should not buy at the cheapest possible price in the agricultural sector.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude in two minutes.

Shri Alvares: I am the only spokesman from my party and I may be given 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry it is not possible. There are so many other Members who want to participate.

Shri Alvares: The Food Corporation must buy at a price which

guarantees a fair return to the agriculturist, to the grower, and the price at which it sells to the consumer must also be a certain percentage of the cost price and not on the basis on which the speculative trade has made unwelcome history in the past six months. Therefore, this phraseology of 'commercial transaction' which is used in an otherwise very welcome measure must be eliminated from this and the Food Corporation must be able to make its purchases on the basis of a firm agricultural production.

Mr. Chairman: He should conclude now.

Shri Alvares: I am concluding. There are two other points I want to make. One is regarding distribution. I do not think it is necessary that the Food Corporation should enter into the village retail trade. I think with the commanding position that the Food Corporation is going to assume, it would be necessary and quite adequate if the distribution of food at taluk level is done and the normal retail trade built up by the common man in the villages be left intact. Therefore, I feel that if this suggestion is accepted, there is no danger of speculation at the village level upsetting the economy.

Lastly, in the matter of distribution, it is necessary to see that there are no excesses. We have had two examples of distribution excesses, one of gur distribution by the Delhi Co-operative Society and another recent one of Mr. Arya in Rajasthan. I am sure the House is aware that this Rajasthan co-operative society made a profit of Rs. 1.25 crores in the distribution of gur supplied by the Central Government. I hope that the Food Corporation will take note of this and be strict about all these things.

While moving the Bill, the Minister used the phrases of Napoleon and Lenin. He has talked of strategic and commanding positions in the manner

of Napoleon and Lenin. I am sure if the determination of Napoleon and the ambition of Lenin guide this Corporation, it will become a success.

Mr. Chairman: Many hon. Members are anxious to speak and they are farmers of repute and experience. If the House cooperates by sitting a little longer, I would request the Minister to reply a little later and give opportunities to some more Members. If hon. Members confine their remarks to 5 minutes each, it will be better.

Shri Alvares: It is impossible. Even in 15 minutes, it is difficult to do justice, because it is an important Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Then the House will have to sit a little longer.

Shri C. Subramaniam: We cannot sit endlessly; there should be a limit.

Shri Nambiar: We have decided to sit till 6 o'clock already.

Mr. Chairman: I am anxious to give some time to these hon. Members. So, I shall be glad if hon. Members conclude their speech in five minutes each.

Shri Umanath: We have already decided that the House will sit up to six o'clock. On that basis the hon. Minister was to have replied at 3.30. If you give more time to hon. Members, it will mean that the House will have to sit beyond six o'clock.

Mr. Chairman: That is why I was ascertaining the wish of the House. If the hon. Members whom I will be calling from now on will take only five minutes each I will be able to accommodate five or six more hon. Members.

Shri C. Subramaniam: You can give another 15 minutes, but not extend it indefinitely.

Mr. Chairman: Those who are not able to finish their remarks in five minutes, let them not speak.

श्री वे० शि० पाटिल (यवतमाल) : सभापति महोदय, अगर इस बिल के स्टेटमेंट आफ आब्जेक्ट्स ऐंड रीजन्स को देखा जाये तो उसमें साफ दिया गया है कि इस बिल का उद्देश्य क्या है। किसानों के हित की कोई बात इस बिल में नहीं है, अगर कोई ऐसी बात कहे तो वह गलत होगा।

“...any policy of ensuring that the primary producer obtains the minimum price that may be announced from time to time and to protect the consumer from the vagaries of speculative trade.”

किसानों को समय समय पर घोषित किये जाने वाले निम्नतम मूल्य अर्थात् मिनिमम प्राइस दिलाने का आश्वासन देना और उभोक्ता को खाद्य पदार्थों के सट्टेबाजी से संरक्षण प्रदान करना, यही इस खाद्य निगम का उद्देश्य है। इस बिल वि० ३० जैकट। इसलिये इस बिल में जो प्राविजन्स इस सम्बन्ध में दिये गये हैं मैं उनका स्वागत करता हूँ।

अगर इस बिल के क्लॉज 28, 29 और 30 को देखा जाये तो देहात में जो किसान रहता है उसके लिये जो दिक्कतें आती हैं उनके बारे में भी बड़ा अच्छा प्राविजन किया गया है। उसमें निगम खाद्य उत्पादन के लिये किसी ऐसे ऋण की गारन्टी कर सकेगा जिसका भुगतान पांच वर्षों में किया जा सके। किसानों को पांच वर्षों के लिये ऋण दिये जाने का प्राविजन किया गया है।

इसके बाद दूसरे प्राविजन को भी देखिये।

“Purchase of foodgrains after harvest.” This is very important.

देहातों में किसान लोग कई लोगों से ऋण लेते हैं और अपना काम चलाते हैं। फसल के बाद उनकी उपज खरीदने के लिये ठेके करने, खाद्य पदार्थों का व्यापार करने

और अगर जरूरी समझे तो दूसरे खाद्य पदार्थों का व्यापार करने के सम्बन्ध में भी प्राविजन इसमें दिया हुआ है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस जगह पर फूडग्रैन्स इन्क्लूडिंग प्रायल सीड्स होना चाहिये।

इसके बाद क्लॉज 30 में जो फंक्शन्स आफ दि कारपोरेशन दिए हुए हैं उनमें लिखा हुआ है कि कृषि उपज को बढ़ाने के लिये भी कोशिश की जायेगी। यह सब से महत्व की बात है। आज तक यह होता था कि कृषि की उपज के भाव स्थिर रखने की कोशिश की जाती थी लेकिन अब उपज को बढ़ाने के लिये भी कारपोरेशन काम करेगा। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि अब तक जो हुआ वह हुआ लेकिन अब यहां पर मिनिमम प्राइस जो है वह ऐसी रक्खी जायेगी जिससे किसानों को लाभ हो।

इस बिल को रखते समय माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने एक अपेक्षा की है। वह अपेक्षा यह है कि फार्मर और कारपोरेशन का डायरेक्ट सम्बन्ध आये। इसी को देख कर हमारे माननीय सदस्य श्री खाडिलकर को रंज होता है। वह नहीं चाहते कि फार्मर और कारपोरेशन का कहीं सम्बन्ध आये। अब तक यह होता था कि किसान लोग क्रेडिटर के पास जाते थे, साहूकार के पास जाते थे, जो हमको लूटते थे उनके पास जाते थे, लेकिन कभी भी फार्मर और कारपोरेशन का डायरेक्ट सम्बन्ध नहीं आया। अब तक हम क्या देखते थे कि हारवेस्ट के वक्त उपज के भाव गिर जाते थे। उसको कायम रखा जाना चाहिये और इसके लिये जो प्राविजन्स इसमें किये गये हैं वह बहुत अच्छे हैं। मिनिमम प्राइस के बारे में क्या अपेक्षा की गई है यह बिल काश्तकारों के लिये और किसानों के लिये कितने महत्व का है, मैं उसे पढ़ देता हूँ।

“... the Corporation is expected to play in protecting the

interests of particularly the producer, who should realise that, very soon, he will have an office or agent of the Corporation to go to where he can get the minimum price which has been assured to him."

10 सितम्बर, 1964 को जो फूड सिचुएशन इन दि कंट्री के बारे में मोशन मूव हुआ था और जिसको संसद ने माना है उस में फूड मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो कहा था मैं वह भी बतला देता हूँ।

"All these can yield results only when the farmer has the feeling that by the use of all these factors he will be benefited. It is here that a remunerative price is of basic importance. That is why in the Review I have stated that in no country there has been a break-through in agricultural production without this basic remunerative price incentive to the farmer. If we have failed anywhere in the formulation of our policy I am prepared to say that we failed in adopting a cheap grain policy, because we wanted a cheap grain policy. And as long as we stick to that cheap grain policy—it might for the benefit of the urban consumer or the industrial labour consumer, whatever it might be—as long as we stick to that we will continue to be subsistence agriculturists traditional agriculturists, and there can be no real break-through. That is the experience of every country in the world today. Therefore, that is going to be the basic policy of the Government."

यह प्रामिज दी गई थी। हाउस ने यह बात मान ली थी कि काश्तकार को रेमुनरेटिव प्राइस दी जायेगी। मेरी रिक्वेस्ट यह है कि अगर इस बिल में यह प्राविजन न हो सके तो कम से कम मंत्री महोदय को यह बतलाना चाहिये कि 10 सितम्बर के बाद जो एग्रिकल्चर प्राइस कमिशन बिठाया गया है उस के 1519 (A) LSD—7.

जरूरे से काश्तकार को रेमुनरेटिव प्राइस दी जायेगी। मैं डिपार्टमेंट से और मिनिस्टर महोदय से रिक्वेस्ट करता हूँ कि कम से कम काश्तकारों को रेमुनरेटिव प्राइस मिलेगी ऐसा आश्वासन अपने भाषण में उनको देना चाहिये।

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): Sir, it is a matter of great satisfaction that the Government has come forward to set up a State trading Corporation in foodgrains. It is high time that we took up this question in its proper perspective. We can no longer leave this question to the whims and fancies of big landlords or big profiteers, this question of procurement and distribution of the vital needs of the society. Therefore, while I welcome this step, I have my own doubts as to how this food Corporation is going to procure and distribute foodgrains and how it is going to control the prices which should be the prime responsibility and object of this governmental corporation. We would like to see in practice how it is going to work. I want to impress upon the Minister one point. If the Government is taking over procurement and distribution, it should be on a complete basis. There should be no competition between the private trader and the Government in the matter of procurement. Either they should take over the whole distribution in their own hand or they should leave it to the private trade. There should be no half-hearted measures. Otherwise, the profiteers will enter the field and I am sure they will beat the Government or wreck the entire object of this Corporation.

The main weakness in the Government's food policy all these years has been that there has been no consistent or well-defined policy. Apart from fixing targets and altering them later, apart from some short-term campaigns, apart from the introduction of

[Shri Sezhiyan]

the Japanese or other methods of cultivation there has been no well-defined or consistent food policy. Production targets, procurement schemes, buffer stocks, zones, minimum price, remunerative price, fair price, all these have been tried in various permutations and combinations and still we are left with a food problem which is threatening which has developed into a crisis and to become a catastrophe in the Southern States. The Government have failed to have a well-defined long term policy and that is why they have landed them and the country in a mess.

Not only the Government do not have a well-defined policy but they have been complacent during times of surplus with the result they could not manage the situation when a crisis or catastrophe faced the country. The previous Ministers who headed this Ministry were not having any well-defined or consistent policy during their tenure.

In 1961, when Shri S. K. Patil was the Food Minister, he said in Parliament:

"If my policies succeed, I shall not import foodgrains after three years".

This is what he said in 1961 and in 1964 we are still having the problem of importing foodgrains. In the year 1962, while replying to the budget debate he said:

"I have said that it shall be my proud day when at the end of four years I would be able to say that India does not want to import anything from anywhere and that we are standing on our own legs. That is the self-sufficiency we are trying to achieve".

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude. His time is over.

Shri Sezhiyan: In that case, I will sit down now itself.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Aney. He will have only five minutes.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I will sit down the moment you ring the bell.

I congratulate the House for having got a Minister who has at last come forth with a Bill of this nature. This Bill is the result of certain circumstances. In fact, the basis of the Bill is a confession of failure on the part of Government to bring the trading community to some reasonable frame of mind during all these years. Having failed in that direction, they have got nothing else left in their hands except having recourse to the only weapon they have in their armoury, namely, legislation.

It is good they have come with a legislation to set up a foodgrains Corporation. But they would be facing one great difficulty in this matter, in my opinion. The object of this Bill is to have a new food policy. But the food policy consists of two aspects—production and distribution.

This Bill deals only with the policy of distribution, leaving the policy of production in the hands of somebody else. As we know, the policy of production is more or less a State subject. Therefore, the State Governments have got to do something so that the farmers will produce more. Then, it will be necessary for the Minister to distribute it in a proper way so that the farmer may get a remunerative price and the customer is also not charged a high price. We have to get over the antagonism between the two.

The whole idea of the hon. Minister in framing this Bill is to keep it a commercial corporation. I believe he is right in doing that. Many of my friends have said many things about this. If the Foodgrains Corporation is to do its work properly, it must

work in a commercial spirit. Commercial spirit does not necessarily mean disregarding the interests of the farmer or the consumer. It can look after the interests of both. The commercial spirit requires that it should be free from all political influence. The main thing to be kept in mind while forming this Corporation as well as the State Corporations is to keep them away, at a distance, from what may be called political influence.

Then there is another thing. Unless the Food Minister gets the co-operation of the States, it will be difficult for him to work this policy. Therefore, it is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons:

"It is necessary that the Corporation should work with the active and continued co-operation of State Governments and their machinery. The Bill, therefore, provides for the setting up of Boards of Management or State Food Corporations, as the case may be, to secure such co-operation and participation in a practical and effective way".

Unless he gets that co-operation, it would be difficult for him to implement his policy. Therefore, while forming these State Corporations, some kind of representation can be given to the States so that the interests of the States may be properly safeguarded.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude now. His time is up.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I wanted to refer to many other problems which are important but since I have given my promise that I will sit down the moment you ring your bell, I will abide by it.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi (Dharwar North): The food crisis and the soaring prices in the country have paralysed the whole country, as it were. Big queues extending to miles

and the services of revenue and other officers being utilized in the country for regulating the distribution of foodgrains have to a great extent reflected the weakness that we have in the food situation. The weakness in the food situation does not only reflect upon our internal matters but it may go to the extent of creating a situation in the international field which may not be to our liking. Anyway, greater attention should have been concentrated on production of more food.

Twelve per cent of the people are engaged in agriculture in America, 13 per cent in Australia and 14 per cent in Japan. Yet, they are able to produce food not only for themselves but they are able to produce surplus food for export to other countries. But a country like ours, having 71 per cent of the population engaged in agriculture is suffering from the effects of a food shortage. During all these years neither has our productivity of land increased nor cost of production gone down. It is a great drag on our production. There is high cost of production and low productivity in the country. The increase in the area of cultivation during the First Plan was to the extent of 2.18 per cent whereas the increase in productivity was only to the extent of 1.5 per cent. So, greater attention ought to have been paid towards increasing irrigational facilities and thereby encouraging agriculture.

Now, at this juncture when there is shortage of food and people are unable to pay the soaring prices, we have adopted this measure; as there is no other alternative, we have resorted to State trading in foodgrains. While on State trading, if I may bring in an analogy, it may not be desirable on our part to dig a well when the building is on fire. I do not know whether this is considered as a long-term policy. Because, in case there is surplus of food produc-

[Dr. Sarojini Mahishi]

tion in the country, I do not know what purpose this Corporation will be able to serve. But during a period of shortage, when the country needs a buffer stock, when the country needs proper distribution and regularisation of the distribution of food-grains, this is quite essential.

Referring mainly to the Bill, I would like to point out that directors are to be nominated by the Central Government. The Central Government may nominate all officials as directors. Therefore provision should be made for the appointment of non-officials also as directors.

Clauses 39 and 40 which clothe the directors to a very great extent with indemnities may not be so much desirable because, after all, it is the public sector and we want the directors and whole body to be responsible and to use their powers in a very discriminating way. Therefore, whatever the loss incurred by the Corporation because of negligence, indifference etc. of the directors should not be ignored; at the same time, everything done in good faith must be properly examined also.

The Food Corporation which is meant for giving a fair price to the producer as also for safeguarding the interest of the consumer should properly restrict itself to this particular duty of encouraging the agriculturists, the producers. The floor price and the ceiling prices are fixed.

Shri Narindra Singh Mahida (Anand): On a point of order, Sir. In the first session of the Third Lok Sabha the hon. Speaker had given instructions to us that normally Members should not approach the Chair. The hon. Deputy-Speaker and the Chairman also agreed that we should maintain the dignity of the House. But I find that hon. Members are going and having conversation with the Chair for extension of time.

Mr. Chairman: Those are the instructions of the hon. Speaker and hon. Members are generally observing them.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I am sorry to say that these rules should be applicable equally to the hon. Members of the Opposition also. There should not be the monopoly of the Opposition to do anything and ask the Congress Members not to do it.

Mr. Chairman: I addressed this to hon. Members on all sides.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi: The floor and ceiling prices are fixed and wholesale and retail prices are also fixed. But I may bring to your notice that the prices fixed, specially for paddy, were not so very remunerative as a result of which paddy did not come to the market at all. This condition is still prevailing in many parts of the country.

I would like to conclude by referring to the monopoly of rail transport which was formerly thought of being resorted to by the Ministry. I think, the Minister has made a statement with reference to this. He has said that the Corporation is unlikely to have a monopoly of foodgrains' movement by rail as was indicated earlier but will have the power to ban movement from critical areas. Therefore that will be restricted only to the extent of the critical areas. I wish to draw the attention of the Food Minister also to the statement given by the Federation of All-India Foodgrains Dealers' Associations. It says:—

"Confusion, mixing up of issues and political as well as ideological pulls seems to lead the Government to contemplate new measures that, it is feared,

would worsen the situation further”.

If this is the feeling created in the country, I would like the hon. Minister to see that such feelings are not created and that proper working is resorted to by this Corporation.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Ismail. He will be the last speaker. Then the hon. Minister will be called.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I was asked to wait since the morning. All the Chairmen have been coming and going. May I request, the hon. Minister, through you, that he could give me five minutes?

Shri Nambiar: We are prepared to sit till 6.05. We are prepared to sit for five minutes more for the hon. lady Member.

Mr. Chairman Hon. Members will remember that I had made the suggestion that if hon. Members are prepared to stay a little beyond 6 o'clock I would be able to give some time to some more hon. Members. But that suggestion was not accepted.

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): We are ready.

Shri Nath Pai: For the sake of the charming lady we will sit a little longer.

Shri Nambiar: We will sit for whatever time is given to the lady Member.

Shri Muhammad Ismail (Manjeri): The Food Corporation measure before the House is the outcome of the food crisis that was witnessed in several parts of the country, particularly in Kerala and Madras. Two days ago the Government said that they made all possible arrangements for meeting the crisis but the arrangements did not work. I do not know how this Corporation, which they are bringing forward, is going to work when such is the situation.

First of all, it has taken years and years to come to a decision over such a step as they are taking today in spite of the recommendations made by more than one inquiry committee which they have appointed. I do not know whether the Government have analysed the reasons as to how the crisis came about. In Kerala all of a step as they are taking today in of bumper harvest that we were expecting in a few days' time, the crisis came upon the people. There was scarcity of rice in Kerala. The Government knew all along that Kerala is a State which is permanently deficit in rice. It cannot extend the area of its cultivation. There can only be intensive cultivation so far as rice is concerned. On the other hand, it is producing articles which are of valuable use to other parts of the country and also which are earners of a considerable amount of foreign exchange. That being so the Government ought to have taken special care of that State so far as foodgrains are concerned. But such an attention does not seem to have been paid to that State.

Now, the Government assured the State that there would not be any repetition of such a situation only two or three days ago, but even now the situation persists. It continues and rice is scarce there. Not only the price of rice has become fabulous in that State, the prices of other food another article of staple food of the very high. The price of tapioca, another article of staple food of the State, is three times the price which was ruling only a few weeks ago. Under these circumstances, I do not know what the Government is going to do and how this Corporation is going to set right things in that State.

Things are not much better in the neighbouring State, Madras. In Madras, it was said that the harvest was going to be better but all of a sudden we find hundreds and thousands of people standing in queues one and two furlongs long

[Shri Mohammed Ismail]

for five, six or twelve hours a day for getting two or three pounds of rice. They were all along complaining about the high price of rice, but they were reduced to such a position that they were prepared to pay any price for any quantity of rice that was available.

When that was the situation, what was going on the other spheres? In Tanjore people were prepared to sell rice at Rs. 20 for a particular quantity. The same quantity of rice was selling for Rs. 38 in another part of the same state, that is in Erode Coimbatore District. They did not have paddy even at that price. Then, there were hundreds of bags rotting at certain railway stations in the Tanjore District and there was no effort on the part of Government to move them to their destination so much so that a large quantity of rice germinated at the railway station being exposed to the rains.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Muhammad Ismail: Are my five minutes over so soon?

Mr. Chairman: He may take one minute more.

Shri Muhammad Ismail: That is the situation.

Then, while this crisis and emergency was there, there was the policy of go-slow on account of which ships which were laden with rice for the peoples could not be unloaded. These were the situations which the Government had not been able to meet and they have not told us how this Corporation is going to meet all that. The Corporation is a Government affairs; it is going to be manned by Government officials. By the mere change of name are they going to change the whole situation? I fail to understand that.

Mr. Chairman: Please conclude. Your time is over.

16 hrs.

Shri Muhammad Ismail: All right.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister.

Shri Nath Pai: What happened to the appeal made by the lady hon. Member?

Shri Nambiar: She can speak at the second reading stage of the Bill.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Minister is agreeable, I have no objection. *(Interruption).*

Shri C. Subramaniam: I obey the Chair. There is no question of my choice.

Sir, I should thank the hon. Members for the general support which has been given to this measure apart from the criticisms and suggestions with regard to some details.

In approaching this problem of food in our country, we have also to recognise the magnitude of the problem. We have not only to feed the existing population but we have also to make arrangements to feed the population which is fast increasing. If we talk in terms of population just now and population by 1970, perhaps by 1970 we will have to feed the population of more than 500 millions. Between now and 1970, we will have at least 75 millions more new mouths to feed and, therefore, we cannot afford to take a complacent attitude. From every point of view, I do not think anybody will be in a position to give an assurance that in the near future we are going to reach the state of self-sufficiency. We will have to function in a situation where we will not be producing enough to meet all

the needs of the community. Under those circumstances, till we are in a position to produce enough, we will have to depend upon imports—ideology or no ideology. Wherever it is possible for us to get this commodity we will have to get it. But I do realise that while we may have to depend upon the imports, every effort will have to be made to improve production.

16.05 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

This will have to be kept in mind. That is why in formulating food policy I attach great importance to what I call the remunerative and incentive price to the farmer and that is the basic policy of the Government that without this remunerative and incentive price to the farmer, whatever else we might do there can be no increased production.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: What about the integrated price?

Shri C. Subramaniam: Do not bring in all sorts of terms, integrated or disintegrated, parity price and all that. You can use any number of phrases. But what I am interested in is.....

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: The term 'integrated price' is accepted by the AICC which is our supreme organisation.

Shri C. Subramaniam: The resolution of the AICC has no place in Parliament.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: When we elect a leader, it is on that basis.

Shri Umanath: That is inside the party office, not here.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever might influence the hon. Member or other Members of any organisation, they can take up individual attitudes here and the Parliament is not to be guided by any organisation.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: It is on that basis, we come here elected.

Mr. Speaker: I have to deal with Members here.

Shri P. R. Patel: I want to know from the hon. Member what is the difference between the term 'integrated price' and 'remunerative and incentive price'? Is it much more

Sir, while we are all naturally concerned and exercised over the present situation, I do hope and trust, apart from devoting our mind to the problems of distribution, we will also be exercised about the problems of production because ultimately distribution depends upon production. I hope and trust there will be a new atmosphere, new vitality, new vigour, in the community as a whole so that the situation of deficit will ease and the deficit will be reduced as much as possible. And I hope and trust, apart from other things and the criticisms made—of course we are bound to make criticisms when there are failures and when people do not get food—this will also infuse in us the spirit to meet the challenges of production also apart from distribution and it is from that aspect we have to formulate our food policy. If we do anything which is likely to interrupt production, interfere with production or inhibit production, then this policy would be a failure ultimately and it would lead to much greater disaster. Therefore, our approach should be not merely a negative approach of distributing whatever we have now at the most convenient price but we have to keep in account that our policy is such that it will encourage more and more production and more and more production can come about only when the farmer in the field is in a position to produce more and more.

[Shri P. R. Patel]

than the remunerative and incentive price?

Mr. Speaker: Probably both are Members of one organisation. They might decide it there.

An Hon. Member: Well said.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Therefore, we are committed to this policy of remunerative and incentive price to the farmer and I am glad that a step has been taken in that direction. I am not prepared to say that the step is complete in the sense it would give full satisfaction to the farmer. That is why the fixation of the price was only done in an *ad hoc* manner and as quickly as possible so that some more attractive price will be available to the farmer even during this harvest season. For the purpose of fixing this remunerative and incentive price, we are committed to the appointment of an Agricultural Prices Committee. There is absolutely no hesitation with regard to this. The Agricultural Prices Committee will be appointed and I hope and trust that the body will do justice to the farmer and will do justice to the community so that there will be an incentive for greater and greater production. This is the basic policy. (*Interruption*).

Now, having provided this remunerative and incentive price, what do we do with the consumer? Do we owe our duty to the consumer or not? Or shall we leave the consumer to his own fate? And that is why, when we fix a remunerative and incentive price for the farmer, it also becomes necessary to guarantee to the consumer that he will be getting his supply at a price indicated as the maximum price and not more than that. It is on that basis, we have fixed the price for the producer and the consumer in the various States. It is easy enough to fix these two prices, the producer price and the consumer price.

Now, the question arises how do we implement this policy? I am sure even the Swatantra Member would not say, "I am not agreeable to this." When I put it this way, I am sure it will be acceptable to the Swatantra Member also. If this policy has got to be implemented, how do we implement it? Can it be implemented leaving it to the free trade to which the Swatantra Party is committed to unfortunately? Can it be left to the free trade to implement this? Can we expect the free trade to pay to the producer this remunerative and incentive price? No. It is because the philosophy of the free trade is to purchase at the lowest price possible and sell it at the highest price; it is to create conditions in which they will be able to get it at the lowest price and to create conditions in which they will be able to sell at the highest price. And we cannot blame them. That is the philosophy of trade. And the higher the profit the more successful is the trader. Therefore we cannot blame the trade in this matter. But can we allow this to happen in the community that let us leave it to free trade and free market conditions to operate—let the trader buy at whatever price from the farmer and later on sell at whatever price he can get from the consumer? That we have tried also. That would result as in Kerala and in other results we have tried.

Therefore, it becomes necessary that we should have some machinery to control this. Merely statutory control is not enough, because we did have statutory controls. We should have economic instruments for the purpose of controlling this. And that economic instrument is this Corporation which is now being brought into existence. Therefore it is from this aspect, I am sure, the hon. Member Mr. Dandekar would look at this Corporation and not as a monster which is coming to devour the trade or the producer or the community as a whole. Sometimes we miss the

point. We think that the people exist for the trade. We fail to realise that trade exists for the people. That is really the problem which faces the Swatantra Party. Everytime they think that somebody is supreme. But there are other people. Different interests also have to be safeguarded. Therefore it has got to be a balanced approach, and it is in that balanced approach that these controls and regulations become necessary. From one point of view they would like to have freedom; but that freedom itself becomes an obsession and a burden to other people. Then, when they go to the other people and when they apply the Swatantra philosophy they will, I am sure, come to the conclusion that the other section of the community also will have to be safeguarded. It is only a one-sided approach which leads the Swatantra Party to all these contradictions and confusions with regard to the philosophy and the programme which they are thinking of. Sir, I am sorry to say this, because they have some leaders for whom I have some respect.

Shri Nambiar: For a long time.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Therefore, now it is with reference to this that we have to find out how this Corporation will function for the purpose of implementing this policy, enforcing this policy of this remunerative incentive price to the farmer and the maximum price to the consumer. And there is no doubt in my mind that unless this Corporation has a commanding position it is not possible—Mr. Dandekar may object to the phrase used, because they think that they are all army terms. They are all English terms and they are being used as army terms or civilian terms or economic terms or scientific terms according to the necessity for using those terms. Therefore, simply because we say “strategic place” or “commanding role” it does not mean that we are putting the army in charge of this Corporation. Absolutely no. That is why to ensure this we say it is only a com-

mercial organisation. It is not a military organisation which I am bringing in. Therefore, unless it has that commanding position in the trade, it will not be possible for it to fulfil the role which it is expected to fulfil.

It is from that aspect it has to be seen. Many hon. Members made criticism saying “we do not find any power for the Corporation either to requisition or to have monopoly of movement” or various other powers which become necessary for the purpose of functioning in this effective way. I would respectfully submit it is not in this Bill. This Bill creates an organisation for the purpose of implementing the Government's policy. The powers to be given either to this Corporation or to any other authority for that purpose are contained in other Acts. We have got the Essential Commodities Act, we have got the Defence of India Rules now. It might be during the emergency. But there are powers for the purpose of arming—not a military term, it is a legal term—arming the authorities or arming the individuals either for the purpose of requisitioning or for the purpose of giving monopoly of movement and various other things. Therefore, when you create a statutory corporation for the purpose of carrying on a trade, you do not give powers, all these overriding powers, in the statute itself to the Corporation. To the extent necessary it will be given those powers under the relevant Acts; and to that extent Government becomes responsible in conferring those powers. So that, we are responsible to Parliament and every time we take a decision either about responsible in conferring those powers, whatever we give there, we become responsible to Parliament. Parliament has already given the powers to the Government and they are exercising it to the best of their ability. Therefore, those powers will have to be provided later on under the relevant Acts, and I am sure Government will not hesitate to clothe—if ‘arming’ is a very dangerous term—in clothing this Corporation

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

with the necessary powers for this purpose. And it will be done.

It is from that point of view we have got to see how best, with these powers, the Corporation also should function in such a way that it really functions as a friend of the producer and also as a real friend of the consumer. No atmosphere should be created wherein it would be felt—as used to be felt when the officials were procuring the stocks from the producers or the farmers in the post-war years, during the ration time—that this is another instrument of oppression of the farmers. That atmosphere should never be created. On the other hand I want this Corporation to function, while even clothed with these powers, in such a way that the farmer would feel that here is a real friend of the farmers who would protect the interests of the farmer in various ways. For that purpose also powers have been enacted and functions have been enacted in the Bill. And therefore it is that we do not make mention in this Bill itself about the powers with which it will have to be clothed later on by the Government on an *ad hoc* basis for the purpose of discharging these various functions.

If looked at from that point of view, I am sure hon. Members would realise that this Corporation will not be an ineffective organisation without powers. On the other hand it will have sufficient powers to deal with the situation.

Then the question arose whether we should have a monopoly for this Corporation either at the wholesale level or at any other level, or whether the trade also should be allowed to function along with this Corporation. Sir, this is a matter in which I do not want to take a view now. As a matter of fact it will depend upon how the private trade functions. If in spite of this the trade functions in such a way as to force us to resort to a system of monopoly procurement, I may give this assurance to

the House that we will not hesitate to do it at the earliest possible moment. But what is important is that we have to build up the organisation even if it becomes necessary. This organisation will be adequate to deal with the situation. The trader now thinks when I talk of monopoly procurement or monopoly distribution that I do not have the organisation. If I use the machinery of the State bureaucracy they know that Government would become unpopular, and the thing also will not be done in an efficient way. That is why it becomes necessary to have this alternative machinery which will be available for the purpose of purchase, processing and distribution and various other things.

And once this gets into position, and once it gets itself organised in the proper way, if it is necessary we can keep the private trade, and if we think it is not necessary we can throw it away. But particularly in a thing like food, you cannot destroy the existing channels of supply without creating alternative channels of supply. That is what I would like the Communist Members to realise. But I do not know, their philosophy is to destroy everything and to have chaos.....

Shri Nambiar: No, no.

Shri Umanath: Your philosophy is to drive people to starvation deaths. And still you are trying to defend it.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I know. Under their philosophy and system, instead of one starvation death which is being quoted, it would have been millions of starvation deaths. I have absolutely no doubt about it, and that has been the case elsewhere.

Shri Umanath: So you derive great satisfaction in the existing starvation deaths.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I know the communist philosophy and how far under that philosophy agriculture has

prospered. We are seeing it for the last forty or fifty years. What is the use of their preaching their philosophy with regard to agricultural production?

Sir, I am not concerned with ideology now. I am concerned with what would yield results. Therefore, let us take a pragmatic view in these things. It is no use having ideologies and slogans in this matter. What is important is what is practical and what approach would yield results, and that is my main approach. And I am sure that if we make that approach, it would fit in with the ideology all right. But if merely on the basis of ideology and slogans we do not have results, that is the surest way to failure and to damn the ideology also. Therefore, let us not damn State trading or any other regulatory system of distribution by taking it up without sufficient preparation and without sufficient organisation and thereby creating difficulties for the people and also giving room to the Swatantra Party to say that 'This is State trading, and this is regulated distribution, and, therefore, do not have it'. As a matter of fact, the Communist Party in a way helps the Swatantra Party to damn State trading and regulated or controlled distribution, by their haste, by their pressures, in fact, not only by their pressures, but ultimately because of their ulterior motives to create chaos in this country.

Shri Nambiar: No; that is not at all correct. Please do not be carried away by these thoughts.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I know, and I wish that it were not possible for me to be carried away like that, but history has taught us that lesson unfortunately in many places.

Therefore, with reference to that, we have got to see whether even with the Food Corporation coming into existence, we can immediately

take up monopoly procurement all over the country. That is the surest way to make this corporation a failure immediately. That is why it will have to be slowly built up step by step so that within the shortest possible time we build up sufficient strength and sufficient organisational pattern which would function in such a way as even to meet a very difficult situation. That is my objective. Therefore, this is a warning to the private trade also.

Some people ask me 'What is the role of private trade in this?' The role of private trade depends upon how they behave in this interim period. It is not a mere threat now. It would have been a mere threat if I had not brought this organisation into existence. Therefore, it became necessary to bring it into existence. Some hon. Members have mentioned that it has been due to compulsion of circumstances. Yet, it is due to compulsion of circumstances and due to the behaviour of the private trade, which has necessitated the bringing into existence of this organisation as quickly as possible. In my own view, this should have been brought into existence much earlier. I agree with many Members that this Bill should have been brought forward before this House perhaps five years earlier or even ten years earlier.

Shri Nambiar: That was exactly what the Communists had been saying. They wanted it five years before. Now at least, after five years, the hon. Minister has realised the necessity.

Shri C. Subramaniam: It is not Communists alone, but even Congress Members have said it. After all, we learn by experience, and let us at least learn by experience.

Therefore, it is from this aspect that we are going to see how the functioning of the corporation can be made a success. I have purposely used the words that this should function as a commercial organisation as

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

distinct from a Government organisation. What is involved in this is business and trading, and not governmental functioning or administration. Therefore, if we stick to governmental rules, and government procedures and government controls, this organisation can never make a success of its functions. That is why it should function as a commercial organisation. From the very beginning, it is our idea to make this organisation begin and build up and function in a way which would give it strength and efficiency to function and to deliver the goods as far as purchasing, processing, storage and distribution of foodgrains etc. are concerned.

It is from that point of view also that we are trying to recruit the various officers concerned. I am sure hon. Members would have known that I have not gone in for a government official to be the chairman of this organisation. I have gone outside, and I have taken—it may be from the private sector that I have taken him—a young and dynamic officer who has been the managing director of a bank and who had made a success of it even during the short period that he was in charge of it. In the same way, when we select the officers for this organisation, I am not looking into the man's efficiency as merely an administrative officer, but I am also looking into his aptitude to function in a commercial organisation like this. I am glad to say that we have selected a managing director—he might be an official, but still—who has got the capacity and the adaptability to function as the managing director of a commercial and business organisation. From this point of view, I can assure this House that we have made a very good beginning. It is from this angle that we are trying to recruit the various officers and various persons who will have to man this organisation. It is not merely a question of manning this organisation, but we also want to have the organisational pattern in

such a way that it would lead to business efficiency. Therefore, even from the very beginning, we are having the Indian Institute of Management, Calcutta, as the consultants for the building up of this organisation, so that the organisation may be built up in the most efficient way and in the most businesslike way possible. Therefore, I can assure this House that this is not going to be a flabby organisation with hundreds and thousands of officers just drawing salaries but not doing anything.

If what I conceive comes into effect this is going to be a businesslike organisation and with all the efficiency of, if anything a little better efficiency than that if, the most efficient private organisation or any other public organisation. I am prepared to have this corporation judged with reference to any organisation in the private sector about which they are boasting of so much. That is the standard that I am setting up for this organisation. I have no doubt in my mind that it is possible and it should be possible. Therefore, it is not a question of public sector or private sector. It is a question of the pattern of organisation; it is a question of the procedures; it is a question of the approach. Ultimately, it is a question of the persons who are manning this organisation. These are the important things. From that point of view, I hope and trust that we shall be able to make a success of this organisation.

Then, the question was put 'If it is a commercial organisation, are you going to be motivated by the profit motive?'. I am not going to say that this corporation is for the purpose of making profits. But certainly what is available to private trade, I suppose, will be available to the corporation also. Now, I have fixed the producers' price and also the consumers' price. I suppose it will not be the argument of anybody here that once the corporation is there, they

should have different set of prices, either at the producers' level or at the consumers' level. If private trade is entitled to sell at the maximum consumers' price which we have fixed, taking into account all the margins which are required for this purpose, for processing, transport, storage and various other incidental charges, naturally that margin should be available to the corporation also, and I am prepared to be judged on the basis of whether within this margin the corporation will be able to make a profit or not. If it makes, I suppose, a profit within this margin, then that is due to the efficiency of the corporation. Private trade is now grumbling that the margins fixed are not adequate for them. I do not accept it; because they have got accustomed to the speculative profit margins, of not five or six per cent, but 20 or 25 per cent. and sometimes even 100 per cent., the reasonable margins which are provided for in fixing these prices looks inadequate for them. But I am going to prove, and I think the corporation is going to prove to private trade that functioning within this margin, they can make adequate profits. Therefore, I hope that Shri Dandekar would not object if operating within these margins, the corporation makes a profit, and then say 'No, no, this is a profit; the corporation is profiteering; it is having monopoly and so on'. Unfortunately, Shri Dandekar is afraid of this monopoly. Monopoly is not in this Bill in any event. This only relates to an organisation or a corporation which is being brought into existence under a statute. Monopoly will have to be given by Government, if it becomes necessary, as I have already stated, under the Essential Commodities Act or the Defence of India Rules or any other enactment which may bring that about. This Bill by itself does not give any monopoly to the corporation as such. Therefore he need not object to it. My hon. friend might object to the policy of the Government and say that we may give powers to the corporation later on to

have certain monopolies; I hope it may not be necessary, but from seeing things, from seeing what has happened during the last six months and during the last four or five years, I am afraid that unless we resort to the powers under the Essential Commodities Act and under the Defence of India Rules and unless we provide some of these powers either directly to the corporation or through Government officials indirectly to the corporation, perhaps, it may not be possible to bring the trade under control.

Shri D. S. Patil: There has been monopoly procurement of jowar in Maharashtra.

Shri C. Subramaniam: As I was saying, that is one aspect of it.

With regard to movement also, hon. Members referred to the policy recently evolved under which every State has been constituted into a zone, and made some criticisms about it. I do agree I am not quite happy about it. But under the present circumstances, there was absolutely no other alternative.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Question.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Because either you should allow free movement to the free trade. . .

Shri M. R. Masani: Quite right.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I know immediately Shri Masani and Shri Dandekar would agree. But what happened to the free movement I allowed for six months? How did it function in the southern zone? In Kerala, instead of having to purchase the goods at Rs. 60 or less per quintal, it was selling at Rs. 110 and Rs. 120. That is free trade! Certainly, such a thing will not be allowed to happen. Unfortunately, we have to make this arrangement of State to State movement, and any transition from one set of arrangements to another set of arrangements

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

leads to difficulties. That is really the position in Kerala.

Therefore, if it is a question of monopoly, as far as I am concerned, I am not approaching it from any ideology, but for practical functioning, for the purpose of controlling the situation, if some monopoly had to be given to the Corporation, I will not hesitate to do so. On the other hand, I would unhesitatingly give those powers to the Corporation. It is not because of any ideological considerations; it is not because I am opposing the Swatantra Party's ideology; it is just a practical approach to have things done. Because it is not merely a question of administering this price policy; that is one aspect of it; but there is the second aspect of equitable distribution of the existing goods throughout the country for the whole community which we have to keep in view. If we do that, I have no doubt in my mind that if an objective view is taken, shorn of ideologies to which we get ourselves stuck, even Shri Dandekar and Shri Masani and my hon. friend, Shri Ranga, would say ultimately, 'Yes, it is the correct policy; inevitably we have got to do it'.

An Hon. Member: He will never say that.

Shri Nambiar: By his silence, he is approving that.

Shri Ranga: No, no.

Shri C. Subramaniam: The hon. Member is provoking him.

Shri Ranga: When was it that free movement was allowed between Andhra and Kerala in regard to foodgrains and for how long? I understood that it was only in the last two months it was allowed.

Shri C. Subramaniam: For two months, it was allowed.

Shri Ranga: But earlier he said six months.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Six months from June to November, we have seen the functioning of it.

Shri Ranga: No, no, only two months. In that period, you brought about all these changes and created all this trouble.

Shri C. Subramaniam: With regard to some of the details, about which some mention was made, particularly with reference to location of the headquarters at Madras, unfortunately I happen to belong to Madras and perhaps hon. Members have a suspicion in their minds that it is because of that circumstance that I have selected Madras (*Interruptions*). We have got to consider it from the point of view of convenience.

Mr. Speaker: Members did not say that Madras was chosen because the Minister comes from there, but because Shri Ranga comes from there!

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Shri B. S. Murthy): He comes from Andhra.

Shri C. Subramaniam: We have to consider the situation which the Corporation will have to face immediately on coming into existence.

The main procurement or purchase the Corporation will be called upon to do is rice. This Corporation is intended to deal, as far as foodgrains are concerned, with wheat and rice. As far as wheat is concerned, I am sure hon. Members are aware that it may not be necessary to procure wheat as such because we are getting 5-6 million tonnes, in any event 4½ million tonnes of imported wheat. We are bound to do it for at least the next two three years. Therefore, for the purpose of influencing the market, for the purpose of distribution in scarcity areas, it should be possible for us to manage with the imported wheat. But immediately as far as rice is concerned, for the purpose of keeping a buffer stock, for the purpose of meeting the

needs of scarcity areas, it will have to be purchased indigenously, within India. The main areas are Andhra, Madras in the southern zone; in the north, Punjab is a separate category by itself, because they do not consume rice and we are able to get Punjab rice without any effort; then we have Madhya Pradesh and Orissa.

As far as Andhra and Madras are concerned, I do agree I could have selected Hyderabad. But from Hyderabad, movement to the surplus areas where paddy is produced, that is, the Circars, is much more difficult. As a matter of fact, it is by this reorganisation that this pattern has come about, that Hyderabad has got the Circars. But from Madras, movement either to Tanjore and South Arcot, which are the surplus areas, or to Nellore and the Circars which are on the coast, is easy; it is the easiest for movement and for approaches also. After consulting the officers as to which will be the best location, we decided this. As a matter of fact, I had at one time had in mind, at least on political considerations, Hyderabad as the headquarters. But they advised that it would be taking a faulty step. That is why Madras was chosen. Otherwise, I could have located it in Madhya Pradesh or Orissa, but they are far removed. As a matter of fact, Andhra is the main area from where we will have to get the surplus. It is with reference to that that I have selected this.

We have also made provision that later on, if it becomes necessary, it can be shifted to any other place. Therefore, for convenience of operation, Madras has been chosen. There need not be any suspicion that it has been done on any other consideration.

In addition to that, I considered Vijayawada also, being the centre of that place, but I was advised that office functioning from that place would be difficult, and various other connections, air connections and communications would be much better

available in Madras than in any other place.

Shri S. S. More: What about Bombay?

Shri C. Subramaniam: Bombay is the largest consuming area. There is no question of any production or procurement there. I will only have to distribute there what I get from other areas. Bombay should be the last to be chosen for location; also considering the crowded condition and the difficulty of office buildings, it would be a colossal mistake to locate it there.

Shri Nambiar: Papers can be distributed!

Shri C. Subramaniam: Another point made was regarding the association of States with this Corporation. I have very much in mind their association and their co-operation because without the co-operation of State Governments, nothing can be done with regard to the functioning of this Corporation. But how do we achieve it? By giving representation to all the States so that instead of coming to a harmonious decision, various State conflicts will also come into existence? This Corporation will have to function as an all-India commercial organisation, not as a representative of State Governments or States interests. That is why after a good deal of consideration and discussion, we came to the conclusion, that we should confine the Corporation to the Centre alone. But it may be necessary for the purpose of operation to have branches. Just as the State Bank has its branches, we may have to have branches in certain areas or regions or States. That has been provided for. There State Governments also may send their representatives. Or it may be an area which is completely deficit. Therefore, it may not be necessary to have any connection with any other State. Therefore, a State by itself may like to have a State Corporation. That also we have provided for, but as a subsidiary of the Corporation of India.

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

That is how the pattern has been worked out.

Therefore, I have no doubt in my mind that the States will extend their full co-operation. Without that Co-operation this Corporation with all the powers we are giving to it, with all the financial strength which we are giving to it, will not be able to function. I am sure that not only in the interest of the States but in the interest of the country as a whole, this will be forthcoming, because if there be chaos in one part of the country, it spreads to other parts also. Therefore, after having seen what happens whenever there is a food debacle, I am sure State Governments would take a more realistic view and give their unstinted co-operation to the Corporation.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: Unless there is a demarcation line of the sphere of the State corporations, there will be a conflict between the Centre and the States.

Shri C. Subramaniam: The State corporation will function within the particular State, as a subsidiary of the Corporation of India.

Then, the question was raised with regard to parallel agencies. The State procurement agencies are only meant as an interim measure till the Corporation comes into existence. After the Corporation comes into existence, there will be only one agency, that of the Corporation, which will function for the purpose of these purchases. The State procurement agencies will get merged in the Corporation. It is in that way that the procurement agency also is being set up in the various States.

These are the main points which we have to deal with, and I am sure on these there will be general agreement.

Many amendments have been given notice of to the various clauses, and I shall deal with them at the appro-

priate time. I have tried to find out whether I should respond to the two amendments that have been moved, one for the purpose of eliciting public opinion, and the other for reference to a Select Committee. Taking into account the situation in the country, I am sure the hon. Member who has moved the amendment for eliciting public opinion will withdraw it. After all, it is not for the first time that the corporation idea has come out. This has been before the country, if anything, for the last four, five years, more particularly during the last six months, and various points of view have already been expressed, and there is, therefore, absolutely no necessity to circulate the Bill for eliciting public opinion.

With regard to the motion for reference to a Select Committee, I have gone through the amendments which have been tabled and the points which have been made, and I am emboldened to say that it is not necessary for the purpose of considering these various amendments to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.

Dr. M. S. Aney: In view of the shortage of time given to the speakers, they could not make out the points which would have to be properly considered in the Select Committee. That is the difficulty.

Shri C. Subramaniam: But we have some experience of setting up corporations, and we have taken advantage of that experience also. Therefore, respectfully submit that we shall consider these amendments at the appropriate stage. I am sorry I am unable to accept the motion for reference to a Select Committee.

Shri Ranga: Before you put the motion, may I ascertain clarification on one or two small points? In regard Amendment No. 10 by Shri Bibhu Mishra, Secretary of the Congress Party, what is the attitude of my hon. friend?

Mr. Speaker: That would be seen when we come to that clause.

Shri Ranga: That would help us determine the attitude we should take over the voting.

Shri C. Subramaniam: This is with reference to the producer and the consumer. Even if you put in kisan interests, then you should add the consumer interests also. Kisan and consumer make up the public. Therefore, I do not see how it will improve matters.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: The hon. Minister mentioned about the Price Fixation Committee. What will

be its composition, and will farmers be represented in it?

Shri C. Subramaniam: This is a matter which has already been dealt with. The Prime Minister has spoken about it, I have spoken about it. When it comes to the formation of the Agricultural Prices Commission, that will be kept in mind.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 20th February, 1965." (3)

The Lok Sabha divided.

[Division No. 2]

AYES

[16.48 hrs.

Basant Kunwari, Shrimati
Bheel, Shri P.H.
Dandekar, Shri N.
Gulshan, Shri

Kachhavaia, Shri
Kapoor Singh, Shri
Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
Masani, Shri M.R.

Ranga, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Solanki, Shri

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Akkamma Devi, Shrimati
Aney, Dr. M.S.
Ankineedu, Shri
Arad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Balmiki, Shri
Bhargava, Shri M. B.
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Boroob, Shri P. C.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Chandriki, Shri
Chavan, Shri D.R.
Das, Shri B. K.
Deshmukh, Shri B.D.
Dey, Shri S. K.
Durai, Shri Kasinatha Rao
Dubeey, Shri R. G.
Dyaperumal, Shri
Edhi, Shri V. B.
Egpte, Shri Kashi Ram
Eatingka, Shri
Egail, Shri M.
Egav, Shri Tulshidas
Eg, Shri Yogendra
Egshi, Shri J. P.
Egble, Shri
Egpen, Shri
Egadikar, Shri
Egipa Shankar, Shri

Lalit Sen, Shri
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Lonikar, Shri
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Mallick, Shri
Mandal, Shri Yamune Prasad
Maniyangadan, Shri
Mantri, Shri
Matcharaju, Shri
Mehrotra, Shri Brij Bihari
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mohanty, Shri Gokulananda
Mohain, Shri
More, Shri S. S.
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Murti, Shri M. S.
Muthiah, Shri
Nambiar, Shri
Nigam, Shrimati Savitri
Niranjan Lal, Shri
Oza, Shri
Patel, Shri P. R.
Patil, Shri D. S.
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patil, Shri T. A.
Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
Raju, Shri D. B.
Ram Sewak, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri

Rane, Shri
Reddiar, Shri
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Saha, Dr. S. K.
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Saryabham Devi, Shrimati
Sen, Shri P. G.
Seshiyar, Shri
Sharma, Shri K.C.
Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Shinkre, Shri M. P.
Siddanajappa, Shri
Siddiah, Shri
Singh, Shri D. N.
Singha, Shri G. K.
Sonavane, Shri
Subramaniam, Shri C.
Sumat Prasad, Shri
Surya Prasad, Shri
Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
Tiway, Shri D. N.
Tombi, Shri
Ulkey, Shri
Umanath, Shri
Valvi, Shri
Venkatasubbiah, Shri P.
Wediya, Shri
Wanik, Shri Balkrishna

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is:

Ayes 11; Noes 88.

The motion was negatived.

श्री वसवन्त (थाना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी मशीन खराब है।

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Dr. M. S. Aney, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, Shri Ramchandra Vithal Bade, Shri Mani Ram Bagri, Shri Bibhuti Mishra, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, Sardar Kapur Singh, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, Shri Harish Chandra Mathur, Shri B. P. Maurya, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, Shri Ananda Nambiar, Shri Nath Pai, Dr. Sarojini Mahishi, Shri Diwan Chand Sharma, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, Shri Krishnapal Singh, Shri Surendra Pal Singh, Shri C. Subramaniam, and Shri Yashpal Singh, with instructions to report by the 30th November, 1964." (1)

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the establishment of Food Corporations for the purpose of trading in food-grains and other foodstuffs and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 3 and 4 were added to the Bill.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: Sir, I have an amendment to clause 4.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 4 has gone long ago. I am putting clause 5 now.

The question is:

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: We take up clause 6 now.

Clause 6—(Management).

Shri N. Dandekar (Gonda): I beg to move my amendment No. 11:—
Page 3,—

after line 2, insert—

"Provided however that the Central Government shall not issue any such instruction as may require the Corporation or as may have the effect of requiring the Corporation to perform its functions under section 13 on a monopoly basis." (11)

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 2, line 40,—

for "public interest" substitute—

"public and Kisan interests" (10).

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा संशोधन यह है कि शब्द "पब्लिक इन्ट्रेस्ट" के स्थान पर शब्द "पब्लिक एण्ड किसान इंट्रेस्ट्स" रख दिये जायें। मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा है कि अगर शब्द "किसान" जोड़ा जायेगा, तो फिर "कंज्यूमर" भी जोड़ना पड़ेगा। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि "पब्लिक" में सब आ जाते हैं। लेकिन मेरा निवेदन यह है कि चूंकि यह कार्पोरेशन किसान से माल लेगी, इस लिए उसके बोर्ड में किसान का इन्ट्रेस्ट जरूर रिप्रेजेंट होना चाहिए। जैसा कि आप जानते हैं, इस देश में अस्सी

फ़ीसदी किसान हैं। इसलिए इस क्लॉज में "किसान" शब्द जोड़ने से किसान-वर्ग की रक्षा हो जाती है।

Shri Ranga: Sir, I am all in favour of this amendment, No. 10. I had already made this suggestion to the Minister. In his usual fashion he has brushed it aside by giving the fictitious argument that the word 'public' would comprehend everybody including the consumers and producers. I am sorry to have to say that I cannot agree with him. If Government are really keen in convincing our peasants that their interests are not likely to be jeopardised by the establishment of this corporation, it is essential they must accept this amendment which is crucial and testing and which, I am glad, my hon. friend Mr. Bibhuti Mishra who takes a lot of interests in kisan's problems, has moved. I have no objection to mention the word 'consumers' interests' because it would mean the kisans, consumers and the general public. The Government considers itself to be the custodian of the interests of the general public and it wants through this and various other measures also in the interest of the general public to see that the whole of the nation is properly fed and clothed and so on. They say that the word 'public' is comprehensive enough and if Government are quite satisfied with it, they need not mention consumers specially and especially because Government is generally expected to consider the interests of the consumers and place their interests also foremost before all the other interests. When it comes to kisans and peasants and poor peasants, within inverted commas, as suggested by one of our communist friends—he was good enough to say that I stand for them—landed peasants as well as landless, if Government is really keen about their profession that this corporation is brought into existence as much in the interest of the peasants as in the interests of the consumers and not at all in the interest of the Government and their bureaucracy, surely they should make haste to ac-

cept this amendment from my hon. friend who has a very important position in their party. But somehow they have chosen not to do so. I would like my friend Shri Subramaniam to think about it again as he would lose nothing but would gain a lot in commending this Bill and also the corporation to the kisans, in assuring the kisans that this corporation is not likely to work, in times to come against the interests of the peasants but would on the other hand result in their benefit and welfare and protection as against the much maligned traders and the bureaucracy also. In that case, they should be quite willing to accept this amendment.

Let us look at it from another point of view. Who really need most the protection as between these three groups, consumers, traders and merchants, and peasants. I consider that the peasants are the most in need of protection because as we generally know the Government is very keen to look to the interests of the consumers. That has been so till now. My hon. friend wants to see that they are going to look after peasants just as well. The traders have been able to look after themselves. It is said of the traders that they had done a lot of harm to peasants and consumers and that in many cases it had happened so in the past. True, although they do discharge a very useful social duty and function in making producers' produce available to the consumers. So, everybody has recommended this, not to speak of the socialisation of grain trade, to the Government in the past and in the present also, especially in the interests of the peasants. Why should the Government now be hesitant about the specifically stating that it is intended, this corporation is intended and would take into consideration these people. Sub-clause 2(b) reads that the board of directors in discharging its functions shall act on business principles having regard to the public interests—here we suggested, having regard to the public and kisan interests—and shall be guided by such instructions on questions of

[Shri Ranga]

policy as may be given to it by the Central Government. If they are to fulfil even a part of the most essential ground that had been advanced by all types of people, all political parties in the country in favour of having this Corporation or a much bigger corporation with greater powers, it should be for the benefit of the peasants. So, I suggest to my hon. friend that in the interests of our general social economy and harmony we should accept this amendment. If he does not accept this amendment I can only say to him that there it would justify all the objections that would be raised all over the country, now as well as in future, that this corporation is being brought into existence as has been the case in the past with regard to FAO and various other things although it is in the name of "in the interests of everybody," but in practice, it is in the interests of those people who stand to be benefited by suppressing, by controlling, and by subverting the interests and welfare of the peasant.

17 hrs.

Shri Nambiar: I would like to add a few words. The purpose of the acceptance of the amendment looks to be very genuine as was put by Shri Ranga, but the point is, who is the kisan. How is he to be selected? I have got my own genuine fear that in the name of selecting the kisan, the big landlord or the maharajah's representative will be brought in, and he will not be at all in the field of agriculture. He will be a landlord sitting high in his estate, in the third storey of his bungalow, and eating on the labours of the poor people and he will still say that he is a kisan. I do not want any such confusion to be brought into this. Let the trade be started in public interest. Public interest covers the interests of the kisan. If the real kisan who actually tills the soil can be brought into this Corporation by any means, I will welcome it, but the process that Shri Ranga suggests, I

feel that he does not want the real kisan to come but in the name of the kisan, the others will come and exploit as they have always been doing. Therefore, against this background, I do not think that it is acceptable.

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): I suggest that instead of the word "kisan", the word "producer" may be inserted.

Shri Khadilkar: Some of us have, though we disagree with the philosophy of the Swatantra Party, regard for their knowledge of economics and connotation of economic terms. But when Shri Ranga pleaded that the term 'kisan' should be inserted in this clause, I felt that he has shown a little lack of understanding. I have to say it unfortunately. So far as the economic terminology is concerned, as another hon. Member questioned it, I might ask what he means by kisan? Is not the kisan a consumer? As was mentioned, there are about 30 per cent landless labourers. They are producers in the sense that labour helps production. They are not owners. Therefore, my humble submission is that the term public interest is a very comprehensive one. It includes producers and consumers.

I would also like to raise another objection. Because Shri Ranga is sitting by the side of the Communists, he has been infected with some class ideology; that is how it appears to me. Otherwise, in the countryside now he would not have thrown this apple of discord by saying to the people, "Oh, here is the only man perhaps in the whole House who is looking after the interests of the kisan."

An Hon. Member: The amendment is by your party.

Shri Khadilkar: May be. What I say is, the original wording as it is includes the interests of the consumer as well as the producer. While replying to the debate, the Minister said

that he is not unmindful of the interests of the peasantry which is employed on land so far as other goods are concerned. He has made it clear time and again, because there are other interests as consumers' interests, and the consumers' interests need to be protected. He has made it clear, and therefore, this need not be accepted.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Nominated—Jammu and Kashmir): I only want to say this. It will be very unfortunate if we force the Minister to give out this impression that ultimately the Corporation will be functioning only in the interests of the consumer and not in the interests of the kisan and the producer. I only appeal to the hon. Minister that if he is not prepared to accept this amendment, at least he should make it categorically clear that this Corporation will be functioning not only in the interests of the consumer but in the interests of the producer and more especially of the kisans.

Shri J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar): I am not against the interest of the cultivator or of the public, but I would like to make a small suggestion. I would say that instead of public interest, let us put in the words 'national interests'. That includes the ultimate object of the measure, and it will cover the interests of the people in the country. I suggest that the term 'national interests' may be inserted.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Sir, Ordinarily, I would not have risen to speak but I want to bring to the pointed attention of the hon. Minister that this terminology, "public interest", as it occurs in some other Acts, has been interpreted by our high courts and by the Supreme Court in a slightly different way; particularly with regard to the acquisition of land, this term "public interest" has been interpreted to cover only some acts of the State or accommodation for the State. Therefore, this wording "public interest" does not exactly connote and convey the meaning "interests of

the producers." No doubt, in the context of the Food Corporation, it will cover the consumers, producers and others. I agree; but if it is to be made very specific that the interests of the producers or the peasants are to be protected—the Minister has very rightly emphasised that he wishes that this Corporation should be the friend of the peasant—then, the interpretation by the courts may be the same.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Suppose I accept this wording: "...having regard to the interests of the producers and the consumers and shall be guided...." etc.

Shri Nambiar: Very good.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I move:

Page 2, line 40,
for "public interest" substitute
"the interests of the producer
and consumer." (53).

Mr. Speaker: In view of what the Minister has suggested, amendment No. 10 is not pressed by the hon. Member. Amendment No. 53 moved by the Minister is acceptable to the House. The question is:

Page 2, line 40,
for "public interest" substitute
"the interests of the producer
and consumer." (53).

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put amendment No. 11 to the vote.

*Amendment No. 11 was put and
negatived.*

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 6, as amended,
stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 7.—(Board of directors)

Mr. Speaker: The amendments may be moved.

Shri Bibbuti Mishra: I beg to move:

Page 3, line 11,—

for "food" substitute—

"agricultural produce". (12).

Shri D. D. Mantri (Bhir): I beg to move:

Page 3,—

for line 18, substitute—

"(e) six directors—

(i) three representing agricultural producers,

(ii) one from Planning Commission, and

(iii) two others."

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central South): I beg to move:

Page 3, line 18,—

add at the end—

"two of whom shall be whole-time directors with experience of not less than ten years in commercial banking or wholesale trade in foodgrains". (14).

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: I beg to move:

Page 3, line 18,—

add at the end—

"who shall be non-officials". (15).

Page 3, line 23,—

after "duties" insert—

"and shall be subject to such terms and conditions of service" (16).

Shr V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central South): We have a provision for a Board of Directors consisting of 12 persons. Six of them are to be officials and six others may or may not be officials. There is also the provision that in these six officials, three representatives—one for the Ministry of Finance, the second from the Ministry of Food and the third from the Ministry of Co-operation, will be included. That, I feel, is a sound principle for selection. My amendment amounts to this. There should be two whole-time directors in addition to the managing director and the chairman of the Board.

Mr. Speaker: Two whole-time directors with an experience of not less than 10 years.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: Yes. the idea is that these two other whole-time directors should be associated with the managing director so that the three of them can function as a sort of Troika.

Under the LIC Act, there is a provision that provides for one or more managing directors. I do not know how many of them have been so far appointed. But what is important is that the provision is there for more than one managing director to be appointed. I am convinced that the work of the Food Corporation is going to be infinitely more difficult than that of the LIC. The responsibilities of the Food Corporation will be tremendous. I therefore, feel that the addition of two whole-time directors in the Board would be helpful. There is nothing wrong in also having the qualifications of these whole-time directors specified in the Bill itself.

श्री द्वारका दास मंत्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी क्लॉज 6 के अमेंडमेंट के सिलसिले में बोलते हुए मन्त्री महोदय ने बतलाया कि कंज्यूमर्स ऐंड प्रोड्यूसर्स के इंटररेस्ट्स का ध्यान रखा जायेगा।

इसलिये उनके इंटरैस्ट को देखने के लिये मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर्स की तादाद 11 दी हुई है उनमें इस प्रकार का संशोधन हो जाना चाहिये कि तीन प्रतिनिधि उत्पादकों के रहें ताकि वे उत्पादकों के इंटरैस्ट को भी देख सकें

Mr. Speaker: 3 from producers, one from the Planning Commission and two others?

श्री द्वारका दास मन्त्री : जी हां । इसमें एक रिप्रेजेंटेटिव प्लैनिंग कमीशन का भी होगा । यह इसलिये मालूम होता है कि प्लैनिंग कमीशन भी इस में इन टच रहे और दूसरे मामलात में भी जिनका ध्यान हमें इस सारे क्षेत्र में रखना है प्लैनिंग कमीशन उनको देखते हुए इस कारपोरेशन के काम में मदद दे सके । प्रोड्यूसर्स के प्रतिनिधि भी रहें, बाकी जो कंज्यूमर्स हैं उनके रिप्रेजेंटेटिव तो रहते ही हैं गवर्नमेंट जैसे चाहे उनको भी रख सकती है ।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि अगर फूड का मतलब मांस, मछली, मुर्गी अण्डा आदि है तब तो मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है, लेकिन अगर फूड का मतलब केवल अनाज से है, क्योंकि इस बिल को देखने से पता चलता है कि हर जगह मतलब अनाज से ही है, तो सब जगह फूड की जगह एग््री-कल्चरल प्रोड्यूस कर दिया जाये ।

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: The Board as indicated in clause 7 does not give any idea as to whether there would be any non-official at all. In fact, if the Government wants, they may make the entire board composed of officials. That is why I have suggested that the words "who shall be non-officials" shall be added. That will equally balance the number of directors—6 officials and 6 non-officials.

Then, sub-clause (3) (b) says:

"receive such salary and allowances as the board of directors may, with the approval of the Central Government fix".

I want to make it clear by inserting,

"and shall be subject to such terms and conditions of service."

That should be stated in that part of the clause.

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव (नांदेड़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो श्री विभूति मिश्र का और श्री द्वारका दास मन्त्री का अमेंडमेंट है मैं उसको सपोर्ट करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ । उसको सपोर्ट करते हुए मुझे यह कहना है कि जैसा अभी मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि वह प्रोड्यूसर्स एंड कंज्यूमर्स के इंटरैस्ट को वाच करने के लिये हैं, वैसे ही जो छः डाइरेक्टर्स हैं उनके लिये जो लिखा है कि :

"three representatives of agricultural producers."

यह धारणा बराबर है । क्योंकि आजकल जो समस्या उत्पन्न हुई है वह प्रोड्यूस कम हुई है इसलिये उत्पन्न हुई है, फूड प्राब्लेम जो पैदा हुई है वह इसलिये हुई है । अगर फूड प्रोड्यूस करने वालों के रिप्रेजेंटेटिव इसमें न होंगे तो फूड प्रोडक्शन की उन्नति हो सकेगी ऐसा नहीं मालूम होता । इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि जो लोग फूड प्रोड्यूस करते हैं, जो देहात के रहने वाले हैं, उनके इंटरैस्ट के लिये झगड़ने वाले लोग जो हों वह इनमें से कम से कम तीन होने चाहिये ।

Shri Sonavane: Sir, I rise to support the amendment of Mr. Mantri and to stress that the producers should be represented because on the board of directors, there is not a single person who represents the agriculturists. Who would put forward their practical difficulties? Therefore, it is highly essential that this amendment should be accepted by the Minister.

श्री दे० शि० पाटिल : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं नं० 12 का जो अमेंडमेंट श्री विभूति मिश्र का है उसके सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ कि

[श्री दे० शि० पाटिल]

इस बिल का जो प्रिम्बल है उसमें इसका स्कोप दिया हुआ है।

"purchase of foodgrains, trading in foodgrains and other food-stuffs."

इसलिये एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस के शब्द इसमें नहीं आ सकते। मैं केवल इस की ओर आपका का ध्यान दिवाना चाहता हूँ।

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: I support the amendment of Mr. Mantri. It is very necessary that the farmers' or producers' point of view should be properly represented.

Shri Banga: I wish to add my word of support to the plea that there should be adequate representation to the producers even in this inadequate provision that is made here.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Sir, in making the proposal here for six directors without any qualification, it was not the intention of the Government not to have producers or any other interests represented. They wanted to have it flexible, so that all the interests could be represented. I can give this assurance that all the interests involved would be properly represented. Instead of tying ourselves to a specific formula, we wanted to make it flexible. With this assurance that the producers' section will be properly represented, and their interests will be properly safeguarded, I hope they will not press this amendment.

In the same way, it is not necessary that all the six of them may be non-officials. We may have to bring in somebody from the State Bank or some other organisation, who might be officials. As I already stated, there would be non-officials and there would be representation for the producers' interests. All that will be kept in mind.

With regard to the amendment seeking to add "subject to such terms

and conditions of service," I may point out that sub-clause (4) provides for that: It says:

"...and the other terms and conditions of appointment of the directors of the Corporation shall, subject to the provisions of sub-section (3) be such as may be prescribed."

So, we have provided for that.

I have not ruled out whole-time directors. But I have had some experience of having whole-time directors in another Corporation. Therefore, I would like to see how it functions and take decisions later on. But there is nothing to prevent having whole-time directors. I shall certainly have in mind the point of view put forth by Shri Gandhi.

I, therefore, respectfully submit that none of the amendments is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put all the amendments to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 12 to 16 were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Clause 8—Disqualification for office of director

Mr. Speaker: Are there any amendments to this clause?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Regarding to clause 8 (c) I want to say a word. It is said here:

"If he is or has been convicted of any offence which in the opinion of the Central Government involves moral turpitude; or"

There are many legislations in which the question of moral turpitude is brought in in order to disqualify person from holding certain posts or offices. It is there, I believe, in the Constitution also. But there it is left unqualified. It is said here: "moral turpitude in the opinion of the Government". Does it depend on the Central Government to determine which is moral turpitude and which is not? I believe it is a matter for the court to decide. I think this will lead to some confusion in the working of this clause.

Mr. Speaker: Somebody has to point it out to the court. Subsequently they may throw it out and say whether he has been guilty of moral turpitude or not.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: In all the legislations "moral turpitude" has been left unqualified.

Mr. Speaker: There also it is in the hands of the appointing authority.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Here it is said: "in the opinion of the Central Government."

Dr. M. S. Aney: Instead of saying: "in the opinion of the Central Government" I would like to suggest "any offence involving moral turpitude."

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): "Moral turpitude" is a substantive conception and not a subjunctive conception. Therefore, moral turpitude stands by itself. No opinion of the Government is necessary.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Somebody will have to decide and give his opinion. Supposing a person is committed for a political offence, is it moral turpitude? Certainly not. In that case we have all committed the sin of moral turpitude. This is the terminology used in all legislations and I think this should remain as it is.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 8 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 8 was added to the Bill.

Clause 9 Removal and resignation of directors)

Mr. Speaker: What are the amendments that hon. Members want to move to this clause?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Sir, I beg to move:

(i), Page 4 line 17.—

after "9", insert—

"(1) A director who is or has become subject to any disqualification mentioned in section 8 shall be deemed to have vacated his office." (18).

(ii) Page 4,—

omit lines 23 and 24 (19).

Here you will see that the Board of Directors may remove any director from office if he is or has become subject to any disqualifications mentioned in section 8. As against that I have put in that a director who is or has become subject to any disqualification mentioned in section 8 shall be deemed to have vacated his office. It is left to the choice of the Board of Directors. So even if under section 8(c) a person becomes guilty of moral turpitude the Board of Directors has the option to retain him under 9(a). This option should not be left with the Board of Directors. This makes a discrimination between the Managing Director and other directors. If you go through 9(1) you will find that it is said there:

"The Central Government may, at any time after consultation with the Corporation, remove the managing director

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya]

from office after giving him a reasonable opportunity of showing cause against the proposed removal."

Here the question of disqualification does not come in. So, in the case of the Managing Director even if he incurs disqualification he may continue if the Central Government chooses to retain him.

Mr. Speaker: The Managing Director is also a director.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: They have made a distinction here.

Mr. Speaker: In the other case if they want to remove they might ask for an explanation.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Without these disqualifications he can be removed.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Here the Managing Director is excluded. It is said:

"The Board of Directors may remove any other director..".

So the removal of the Managing Director is made separate from the removal of other directors. He may continue to remain even if he incurs disqualification under 8(c) if only the Central Government chooses to retain him. The other directors will be subject to the Board's discretion. That is why I have suggested this amendment saying that a director who is or has become subject to any disqualification mentioned in section 8 shall be deemed to have vacated his office.

Other consequential changes should also be carried on.

श्री द्वारका दास मन्त्री : मेरे अमेंडमेंट का मंशा यह है कि डाइरेक्टर का ठेके के मामले में या ट्रांसपोर्ट के मामले में ऐसा इंटरैस्ट न रहे कि वह कारपोरेशन से नाजायज फायदा

उठा सके। और अगर वह ऐसा करता है तो उसको हटाया जाना चाहिए।

Shri C. Subramaniam: May I point out, Sir, that the word "other" has been removed according to the corrigendum issued.

Mr. Speaker: Then I think Shri Bhattacharyya will not press his amendment.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Even if the word "other" is removed, the option of the Board to retain any of the directors found guilty under section 8(c) remains with the Board.

Shri D. D. Mantri: I beg to move.

Page 4,—

after line 27, insert—

"(c) has directly or indirectly taken pecuniary benefit in contract on behalf of Corporation or is related with any of the officials or employees of the Corporation."

श्री द्वारका दास मन्त्री दूसरे कारपोरेशन को अपने कर्मचारियों को नामिनेट करने का या नौकर रखने का अधिकार दिया गया है क्लाज 12 में। मेरे अमेंडमेंट के दूसरे हिस्से का मंशा यह है कि डाइरेक्टर अपने सम्बन्धियों को कारपोरेशन में नौकर न लगा ले। और अगर उसके सम्बन्धी कारपोरेशन में नौकर हैं तो वह डाइरेक्टर न रहे। यही मेरे अमेंडमेंट का मतलब है।

Shri C. Subramaniam: I am sorry the amendments are not necessary. I have already pointed out that the word "other" is not there. Under section 8 a person shall be disqualified if he is found guilty. Therefore, the Board of Directors have no option. Once it comes to their notice, for formalising the records, they

have to remove him from office. That is provided in section 9.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: That is all the more reason why the vacation of office should be automatic.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put amendments 18, 19 and 20 to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 18, 19 and 20 were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 9 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 9 was added to the Bill.

Clause 10 was added to the Bill.

Clause 11—(*Advisory Committees*)

Mr. Speaker: What are the amendments?

Shri S. S. More: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 5, line 8,—

after "such persons" insert—

"representing the interests of the consumers and producers" (23)

The amendment is clear. Even supposing the Board of Directors is completely bureaucratised, at least in the Advisory Board there should be representation of the consumer and the producer. If advice is to be properly tendered from the interests of the consumer and the producer their representatives should be on the Advisory Board.

Shri D. S. Patil: Sir, I beg to move:

(i) Page 5, line 6,—

after "Government may" insert—

"in consultation with the Corporation," (21).

(ii) Page 5, line 11,—

after "Corporation" insert—

"or a State Government, regarding fixation of producers price, and shall keep a regular check on the cost of production of foodgrains from season to season and" (25)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, अमेंडमेंट नम्बर 21 देने के मेरे दो कारण हैं। इसमें एडवाइजरी कमेटी बनाने का प्रावजन है और इसमें यह भी कहा गया है :

"It shall be the duty of any such Advisory Committee to advise the Central Government or the Corporation..."

इसका अर्थ यह है कि अगर एडवाइजरी कमेटी से राय मांगी जाएगी तो उसे गवर्नमेंट को और कारपोरेशन को भी राय देनी पड़ेगी।

दूसरे इसमें यह दिया गया है :

"The expenses in relation to the Advisory Committees shall be met by the Corporation."

अर्थात् इस एडवाइजरी कमेटी का खर्चा कारपोरेशन को देना पड़ेगा। इसलिए स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को कारपोरेशन से सलाह करने के बाद इस कमेटी का नियुक्त करना चाहिए। इसीलिए मैंने यह अमेंडमेंट दिया है।

यह अमेंडमेंट बहुत महत्व का है।

Shri Tulshidas Jadhav: I want to speak on amendments Nos. 22 and 23.

Mr. Speaker: 22 has not been moved.

Shri S. S. More: They are identical.

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव : बहरहाल दोनों एक से हैं। श्री डी० एस० पाटिल और श्री एस० एस० मोरे के अमेंडमेंट्स का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ जिन्होंने कि मांगकी है कि एडवाइजरी किये

[श्री तुलशीदास जघाव]

टीज में ऐसे व्यक्ति रखे जायं जोकि प्रोड्यूसर्स और कंज्यूमर्स के इंटरैस्ट को रिप्रजेंट करते हों। इसी तरह से अभी एक श्री द्वारकादास मन्त्री का अमेन्डमेंट था जिसके लिए कि मन्त्री महोदय ने उत्तर दे दिया कि वह उसे ख्याल में रखेंगे लेकिन उसे इस बिल में इंस्टॉल करने की जरूरत नहीं है। अब मौजूदा 22 और 23 नम्बर के अमेन्डमेंट्स को सपोर्ट करते हुए मुझे यह कहना है कि जब कोई कमेटी बनाते हैं चाहे वह पार्लियामेंट में हो या असेम्बली में हो तो सम्बन्धित मिनिस्टर ने क्या कहा है इसे कोई नहीं देखता है बल्कि कानून की बडिंग्स को देखते हैं और उसी से वह चलते हैं। इसी तरह से मिनिस्टर यहां हाउस में कुछ कह दें और वह कानून के अन्दर शामिल न की जाये तो कोई उससे बंधा नहीं रहता है। इसीलिए यह आवश्यक है कि जब कोई ऐक्ट बनाया जाय तो उसमें ठीक प्रकार से बडिंग्स रखी जायं और उसी हालत में कानून बनाने वाले बंधे हुए रहते हैं।

मेरा ऐसा कहने का एक दूसरा कारण यह भी है कि मिनिस्टर्स बदलते रहते हैं और हो सकता है कि इन मिनिस्टर्स ने कुछ कह दिया और उनकी जगह दूसरा मिनिस्टर आ गया तो वह यह देखने के लिए तैयार नहीं होता है कि पिछले मिनिस्टर ने क्या कहा। इसलिए जब कोई कानून आदि बनाना होता है तो वह स्पष्ट होना चाहिए।

अभी हमने देखा कि यू० पी० लेजिस्लेचर और इलाहाबाद हाईकोर्ट के मामले में सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने अपना जजमेंट दिया। अपना जजमेंट देते समय उसने यह ध्यान नहीं रखा कि संविधान के निर्माता डा० अम्बेडकर का सम्बन्धित धाराओं से क्या मन्तव्य था और उन्होंने उनके बारे में अपने क्या विचार संविधान परिषद् में प्रकट किये थे। उसने तो जो संविधान में धाराएं लिखित रूप में मौजूद हैं उन्हीं के आधार पर अपना जजमेंट दिया।

इसलिए भी यह जरूरी हो जाता है कि जब कोई कानून बनाने की बात पेश हो तो उसकी शब्दावली स्पष्ट होनी चाहिए। इस नाते मेरा सुझाव यह है कि श्री एम० एम० मोंगे ने जो अमेन्डमेंट दिया है उसे मन्त्री महोदय को स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिए।

Mr. Speaker: Judges are less fallible than politicians, he must understand.

श्री तुलशीदास जघाव : इसीलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर महोदय बिल की सम्बन्धित धारा में यह अमेन्डमेंट स्वीकार करके उसे स्पष्ट बना दें क्योंकि ऐसा न हो कि वह अग्रज चले जाय और दूसरा उन की जगह पर आ जाय तो वह उसने पीछे हट जाय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मौजूदा फूड मिनिस्टर कहीं नहीं जाने वे अपनी जगह पर ही रहेंगे लेकिन अगर दूसरे आते भी हैं तो वह भी उनके ऐड्योरेसेज का खयाल रखेंगे। आखिर को हाउस में दिये गये ऐड्योरेसेज गवर्नमेंट के ऐड्योरेसेज है और यहां पर ऐड्योरेसेज कमेटी भी बैठी हुई है और इसलिए उनको दरगुजर नहीं किया जा सकता है।

Mr. Speaker: Now we should hurry up.

Shri Sonavane: Sir, the acceptance of the amendment of Shri More would be in conformity with the spirit of the amendment accepted by the hon. Minister in clause 3. Therefore, I think it would be in the fitness of things for him to accept this.

Shri C. Subramaniam: If I may be permitted to explain. I am accepting amendment No. 21.

Then, coming to amendment No. 22 "persons representing the interest of

producers and consumers", this advisory committee may be for a technical purpose—to consider for the purpose of protection what chemical should be used and so on. The advisory committees are for various purposes. You cannot have a producers' or consumers' interest in a scientific committee. Whenever the question of the interests of producers and consumers come in, naturally they would be in it. But that does not mean that in every advisory committee they should be represented. Therefore, I am not prepared to accept it.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 5, line 6,—

after "Government may" insert—

"in consultation with the Corporation." (21).

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I will now put amendment Nos. 23 and 25 to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 25 were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 11, as amended, stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

Clause 11, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 12 was added to the Bill.

Clause 13—(Functions of Corporation)

Shri N. Dandekar: I beg to move:

(i) Page 5, line 35,—

add at the end—

"but not on a monopoly basis".

(ii) Page 6, line 3,—

after "foodstuffs" insert—

"but not on a monopoly basis"

(iii) Page 6, line 6,—

add at the end—

"but not on a monopoly basis".

I have nothing much to say beyond what I said in the general debate on the Bill except that this is to clarify the Government's intention. As the Minister himself stated, at present there is no intention of having a monopoly position for the Corporation, but if later on it became necessary for the Corporation to function on a monopoly basis, Government would be free to do so. My proposal at present in these amendments is to specifically say so. If, later on, Government find it necessary, which I hope they will not, to get the Corporation to function on a monopoly basis, I am sure Government have powers to come along with amendments to the Act to delete these particular qualifications. These are purely clarificatory amendments to make it clear that there is no present intention to operate it on a monopoly basis.

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

Page 5,—

after line 39, insert,—

"(b) collect data regarding cost of production and cost of living of agriculturists.

(c) fix remunerative prices for the producers;

(d) sanction rewards to peasants who produce more foodgrains per acre than the average yield in the area;

(e) supply to the producer fertilizers and other requirements at reasonable prices;

[Shri S. S. More]

(f) fix reasonable prices of food-grains to be sold to consumers;". (32)

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: I want to move amendment No. 27 which reads:

Page 5, lines 34 and 35,—

for "foodgrains and other food-stuffs",

substitute "agricultural produce" (27).

Shri C. Subramaniam: It has already been voted down as amendment No. 12. It is consequential.

Mr. Speaker: Then it is barred.

Shri D. S. Patil: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 33,—

after "purchase", insert—

"giving incentive price to farmers,". (26)

श्री दे० शि० पाटिल : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा अमेंडमेंट नम्बर 26, क्लॉज नम्बर 13 पर है जो कि फंक्शंस ऑफ कारपोरेशन के बारे में है। उसमें कहा गया है कि यह कारपोरेशन की प्राइमरी ड्यूटी होगी कि वह परचेज अण्डरटेक करे। मैंने चाहा है कि परचेज शब्द के बाद यह जोड़ दिया जाय "गिविंग इंसेंटिव प्राइस टु फार्मर्स"। पिछले सेशन में इस सदन ने फूड पालिसी जो एंडाण्ट की है, यह मोशन जो एंडाण्ट किया है उसमें इंसेंटिव प्राइस फार्मर्स को देने की बात तय हो गई है। लेकिन एक साल यह जो प्राइस रहने वाली है यह जो डिक्लेयर्ड रेट्स रहेंगे जिस के लिए ऐडहोक कमेटी मुकर्रर की गई है और ऐडहोक रेट्स भी मुकर्रर किये गये हैं, ऐडहोक रेट्स से यह परचेज होने वाले हैं। जैसा कि स्टार्ड क्वैश्चन नम्बर 27 डेटेड 17-11-64 के ऊपर यह जवाब दिया गया है :—

"The main recommendations of the Committee related to fixation of producers prices for paddy, wheat, jowar, bajra, maize and gram for 1964-65 season and also the fixation of maximum prices of rice at the wholesale and retail levels. The statement indicating the action taken so far by Government on the recommendations is placed on the Table of the Sabha."

अब इसमें जो रेट्स दिये हैं वह 62, 63 और और 64 के जो रेट्स हैं उनमें कम से कम डेढ़ गुने का फर्क है। इसलिए मेरा सुझाव यह है कि संसद ने जो प्रोडक्शन प्राइस के बारे में नाति एंडाण्ट की है और जैसा कि फूड मिनिस्टर ने अपनी स्पीच में कबूल किया कि रैमुनरेटिव प्राइस काश्तकारों को दी जानी चाहिए और उसके बगैर पैदावार नहीं बढ़ सकती है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो परचेज होने वाली है वह डिक्लेयर्ड प्राइस न्यूनतम है उस रेट से परचेज न होनी चाहिए। हारवैस्ट के मौक़े पर जब बाजार में गल्ले के दाम कम हो जाया करते हैं उस वक़्त किसानों को प्राइस सपोर्ट गवर्नमेंट द्वारा दिया जाता है और उस वक़्त किसानों को फायदा देने के लिए यह पालिसी चल रही है। यह पालिसी कई साल से चल रही है। पालिसी टू गिव स्पॉर्ट टू दी किसान इन दो हारवै ट, यह तो हमेशा रहती है, उसके दामों का उतार चढ़ाव न हो, इसको स्पॉर्ट देने की पालिसी तो रहती है। लेकिन जो रेट घोषित किये गए हैं इन रेट्स से किसान का जो कास्ट ऑफ प्रोडक्शन होता है, वह भी नहीं निकल सकता है। समय नहीं है, नहीं तो मैं आपके सामने इसके कई उदाहरण रख सकता था। ये जो रेट्स फिक्स आपने किए हैं, इनसे किसान का कास्ट ऑफ प्रोडक्शन भी नहीं निकल सकता है। इस वास्ते मेरा सुझाव यह है कि जो परचेजिज किये जायें, वे परचेजिज जो अमेंडमेंट मैंने दिया है, उसको ध्यान में रख कर इन्सेंटिव प्राइस देकर किये जाने चाहिये।

Shri S. S. More: Among the functions of the Corporation the promotion of production of foodgrains and other things is the most essential function. By saying "by such means as it thinks fit" everything is left in a vague manner. I have tried to comprehend by what means the promotion could be sought and secured. Therefore I am giving it a more concrete and definite form.

Shri Himatsingka: Clause 13 provides for functions of the Corporation. How those functions are carried out by purchases at cheap rates or at high rates ought not to be introduced here. Certain functions, such as, storage, purchases etc., have been defined. They need not be qualified.

I also support the suggestion that the Corporation should devote a part of its attention to promote the production of foodgrains. After all, all the trouble that we are going through is due to short production. Unless foodgrains are produced, we may have any number of Food Corporations, that will not help. Therefore, we must give our attention to production.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मेरी अमेंडमेंट नम्बर 33 है। इसमें मैंने कहा है कि जहां पर मिल शब्द पेज 6 पर आता है, उसके आगे ज्यूट मिलज, आयल मिलज जोड़ दिये जायें। अगर आप समझते हैं ज्यूट मिलज प्रासेसिंग इंडस्ट्री में नहीं आती हैं तो आयल मिलज तो प्रासेसिंग इण्डस्ट्री में आती ही हैं। मिनिस्टर साहब को आयल मिलज की बात तो मान ही लेनी चाहिये अगर ज्यूट मिलज की बात को न मानें तो।

Shri Sonavane: I would support amendment No. 26 moved by Shri D. S. Patil regarding giving of incentive price. I have heard the Food Minister very intently and he said that he would appoint a price committee and that all the factors of production will be taken into account. But he has

not stated anything about when he would appoint it, by what time that committee would complete its labours and by what time the Government would introduce them. Therefore it would take five to ten years. Meanwhile, all these ad hoc prices fixed by the Government would continue. Therefore, I feel that this is the opportune time that this provision contained in amendment No. 26 is included. Meanwhile the Minister would expedite the appointment of the Committee and its working.

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव : जो अमेंडमेंट पाटिल साहब की है नम्बर 32 उसकी मैं तारीफ करता हूँ। काश्तकार से अनाज लिया जाएगा और मोल बेचा जायेगा तथा स्टोर किया जाएगा, यही इस बिल में उद्दिश्य है। इसमें कहीं भी इन्सेंटिव जिसको कहते हैं, उसका जिक्र नहीं है। परचेज करने में आज जो दिक्कतें आती हैं, उसी की वजह यह है कि हमारा जो प्रोडक्शन है, वह नहीं बढ़ता है। समाज में जितनी भी चीजें पैदा होती हैं, देश में जितनी भी चीजें पैदा होती हैं, जितनी भी क्लासिस पैदा करने वाली हैं, उन सब चीजों के बारे में यह देख लिया जाता है कि प्रोडक्शन का कितना खर्चा आया है और उसको देख कर ही उस चीज को बेचा जाता है। स्पिनिंग एण्ड वीविंग मिलज में जो चीज तैयार होती है, कपड़ा आदि तैयार होता है और बाहर जाता है, तब उस कपड़े पर जो स्टाम्प लगाई जाती है, उसको लगाने से पहले यह देख लिया जाता है कि उस कपड़े की कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन कितनी बैठती है और उसके हिसाब से ही यह स्टाम्प लगाई जाती है। लेकिन काश्तकार जो चीज पैदा करता है, उस चीज को पैदा करने में उसका कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन क्या है, इसका कोई ध्यान नहीं रखा जाता है। अब तो मौनोपोली परचेज होने वाला है और मौनोपोली परचेज में काश्तकार के सामने कोई दूसरा उपाय नहीं रह जाता है, उसको अपना माल जो कीमत फिक्स की जाती

[श्री तुलशीदास जाधव]

है, उसी पर बेचना पड़ता है। अन्यत्र कहीं भी उसको बेचने का मौका नहीं होता है।

आज आप देखें काश्तकार का यह हाल है कि उसकी जमीन पर सीलिंग हो गया है। इस वास्ते भी यह जरूरी है कि मोरे साहब ने जो अमेंडमेंट दी है नम्बर 32 उसमें जो कुछ लिखा गया है, उसको ध्यान में रख कर, उस पर अमल करने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये। काश्तकार ही एक ऐसी क्लास है जिसकी तरफ हम कभी भी नहीं देखते हैं, यह नहीं देखते हैं कि उसकी हालत क्या है और प्रोडक्शन कास्ट उसकी क्या बैठती है। उसको बाजार में दूसरी चीजें भी खरीदनी होती हैं और उन चीजों की कितनी कीमत उसको अदा करनी होती है, यह भी हम ध्यान में नहीं रखते हैं। उसके साथ धोखा नहीं होना चाहिये। इंसेटिव प्राइस उसको देना जरूरी है और यह भी देखना जरूरी है कि उसकी कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन क्या है। वह कैश क्रॉप्स बनाता है, कैश क्रॉप्स का उत्पादन करता है। आपने यह भी देखा होगा कि कुएं आदि की जितनी भी उसको सहूलियतें दी जाती हैं, उन सब का उपयोग वह कैश क्रॉप्स के उत्पादन में करता है। इस वास्ते जहां तक फडस्टप्स का सम्बन्ध है, उसको अगर इंसेटिव दिया जाएगा तभी अधिक वृद्धि पैदा कर सकेगा। इसलिए जो अमेंडमेंट दिया गया है, उसको स्वीकार कर लिया जाना चाहिये। वह एक बहुत अच्छा अमेंडमेंट है।

Shri Ranga: I am all in favour of this amendment.

Shri C. Subramaniam: As far as amendments Nos. 26, 29 and 32 are concerned, I am afraid, they are irrelevant, that is, as far as the functions of the Food Corporation are concerned.

The fixing of the price will have to be done by the Agricultural Prices Commission. As regards what the

incentive and remunerative price is, the Government should take the responsibility of fixing it and it should not be left to the sweet will and pleasure of the Corporation to fix the producers' as also the consumers' price. They themselves fix the rate of profit which they will be entitled to get.

Shri Sonavane: When will it be appointed?

Shri C. Subramaniam: It has already been announced that by January the Agricultural Prices Commission will be appointed and by the next harvest season, that is the next *khariif* crop, the recommendations of the Agricultural Prices Commission will come into effect. This has been announced for the umpteenth time and if the hon. Member has not followed it, I am sorry for it.

With regard to monopoly, there is no question of any monopoly under this Act. We have to pass orders under the Essential Commodities Act and the Defence of India Rules. In effect the hon. Member wants to curtail the powers of Government under those Acts. It is actually amending those Acts with regard to the power that is given to the Government. Therefore, I am sorry, it will not be acceptable to me, that is, **Shri Dandekar's** amendment.

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव : 15 नवम्बर से काश्तकार किसी को भी अनाज नहीं बेच सकता है, सरकार को ही उसे बेचना होगा। अगर कोई लेने वाला भी हो, तो उसकी भी सजा हो सकती है।

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

17.48 hrs.

श्री हुकम चन्द कल्लुबाय : एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, अग्र्यज्ञ महोदय। क्या यह बिल

बिना कोरम के ही पास होगा ? बहुत महत्व का यह बिल है ।

Mr. Speaker: If there is no quorum, the bill might be rung.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इधर कोरम की घंटी बज रही है, उधर विभूति मिश्र जी बाहर जा रहे हैं ।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : एक मिनट में आ रहा हूँ ।

Shri S. S. More: When the House is in session, no committee should meet.

Mr. Speaker: Ordinarily, that is desired and even if some committee is meeting, they must adjourn and come to the House. Since the bell began to ring, two Members have gone out and none has come in.

Shri Ranga: Government Whips are working in their own way.

Shri Rane (Buldana): I have requested the Chairman, Estimates Committee through a Member that he should adjourn the meeting.

Shri Ranga: Is it not a fact that Government Whips are paid something extra?

Mr. Speaker: They are not paid anything extra.

Shri Rane: They are not paid anything extra.

Shri Ranga: There are, I think, certain privileges given to them over and above whatever is given to an ordinary Member of the House. Is it not so?

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाय : अध्यक्ष महोदय, चार मिनट हो गये हैं घंटी बजते हुए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उस वक्त हमें इत्तला मिलेगी जबकि घंटी बजनी बन्द हो जायेगी ।

Shri Ranga: Why not we postpone it to Monday?

Mr. Speaker: Let us also go home then. The House stands adjourned to meet again on Monday at 11 o' Clock.

17:52 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, November 23, 1964/Agrahayana 2, 1886 (Saka).