

I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications:

- (i) The Central Sales Tax (Registration and Turnover Amendment Rules, 1963 published in Notification No. GSR 401 dated the 9th March 1963, under sub-section (2) of section 13 of the Central Sales Tax Act, 1956. [Placed in Library, See No. Lt-1016|63].
- (ii) Notification No. GSR 404 dated the 9th March, 1963, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 [Placed in Library, See No. LT-1017|63]

12.13 hrs.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following Messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:

- (1) 'In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation Bill, 1963, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 13th March, 1963, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill.'
- (2) 'In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1963, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 16th

March, 1963, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations to make and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill.'

12.14 hrs.

RE: POINT OF PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati): Mr. Speaker, before you take up the next item, may I rise on a point of personal explanation and make a few observations? As you know, the Public Accounts Committee has made certain observations against me and the Bharat Krishak Samaj. Since the Committee did not call us to give our views before these observations were made against us, I was trying to deal with Shri Tyagi, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, because I was prepared to make certain clarifications. But, yesterday, in the course of this debate, one hon. Member, Shri Inder J. Malhotra, referred to this matter and said that the Government should explain the whole situation.

Mr. Speaker: If his explanation can be just limited to two or three minutes, I am prepared to give him that opportunity at this moment. But if he wants to take a longer time then he should find some other opportunity. I will provide him an opportunity later on.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I will take 30 to 40 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Then he should ask for a short duration discussion. He might give notice of that.

12.16 hrs.

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS—Contd. MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE— Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion and vot-

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Mr. Speaker]

ing on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): What is the time left?

Mr. Speaker: Very little; only one hour and ten minutes. But I propose to extend it a little more in order to accommodate three or four members just now. I would request them to take as little time as possible. Ten minutes should be the ordinary rule.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I think it is too little. Anyhow, I will be as brief as possible within the short time at my disposal.

The Ministry of Food and Agriculture is supposed to discharge the most responsible duty because in an emergency it is next to defence. But when we look at its achievements, either in the past or in the present, I do not think the Ministers can comfort themselves by saying that the position is comfortable. The situation is such that it is really creating a sense of concern. It is not my opinion. Even the Planning Commission has said in so many words that the rate of progress or increase in agricultural production in this country has been very, very slow. It is a document given to us by the Planning Commission as recently as 12th March this year.

We have always been told that food is a necessity and that we should deal with this problem on a war footing. Actually, when war came, it was seen that the Ministry completely failed in its duty and the Government has not even thought of removing the administrative bottlenecks at this time. When I say this, I do not say that the hon. Ministers are not able or that I question the ability of the hon. Ministers. So far as the composition of the present Ministry is concerned, it is probably the most able team. Both the urban and the rural interests are combined.

I also feel that the hon. Minister, Shri Patil, who unfortunately is not present here, is a man of great drive and energy. But I find that there is no policy whatsoever.

It is too much to expect from this Government that it will have a definite policy in any matter specially in the agricultural sector. It has been neglected all through although we talk loudly about it. I want to know what the Government is going to propose for giving incentive to the agriculturists so that agricultural production might increase in this country. We should give incentives just as we have given incentives to industry if we really want that agricultural production should go up.

I also want to know as to what has prevented this Government from having a Price Stabilisation Board for which a recommendation was made by the Foodgrains Inquiry Committee as late as 1957. This was a committee constituted by the Government to recommend steps for facilitating agricultural production and other things. What has prevented this Government from doing that? They come some time or the other and make some announcement about price which never reaches the real agriculturists.

Although they say that the price position is very stable, today it has been admitted by the Planning Commission itself that in March, 1963 prices of foodgrains have gone up as compared to last year. I know for a fact that in Orissa prices of foodgrains have gone up like anything. This alone shows that there is no fixed price policy.

As far as the supply position is concerned, Shri Patil with great persuasive effort has been able to dump into this country as much as 16 to 17 million tons of foodgrains from America. Probably, he will get more.

That is the only comfortable position and achievement that he wants to show, namely, that so far as supply is concerned, we are completely satisfied because America is there to come to our rescue when we are in difficulty.

What happens is this. Because of the policy of procurement, States which are surplus and which could give foodgrains to other States have been converted into deficit States and instead of eating their own rice, they are to depend on the rice to be supplied by America for their own consumption. This is the policy which this Ministry is following. It is not a question of pumping more money. Sometimes when this question comes up, the hon. Prime Minister makes a statement and says, "Increase production by 35 per cent". The National Development Council met some time back and said "Give more money for minor irrigation" without taking into account as to what the real performance has been and whether the money that had been provided earlier has been spent.

Where is the bottleneck? Merely giving more money will not solve the problem. It is really a question of organisation and administration. Has this Ministry or the Government itself ever thought as to what the real bottleneck is in regard to the implementation of the projects or schemes approved by the Planning Commission or by the Ministry from year to year? I would say that there is no assessment as such. As we find in this House—and you must have observed it several times—that the Food Ministry, the Community Development Ministry and the Irrigation and Power Ministry seem to depend more on the States and the areas concerned, the district administration etc., for the execution of their schemes. The work of the Food and Agriculture Ministry seems to be divided among three Ministries at least: Irrigation and Power and Community Development. Why not in

this emergency we co-ordinate or why not take Irrigation from the Irrigation and Power Ministry and that part of Agricultural work from the Community Development Ministry and make it a consolidated Ministry which can look into all these aspects of the problem more thoroughly and satisfactorily? Otherwise, we will find it difficult in this country. The Minister often comes and says, we are doing our job, it is some other Ministry that is standing in the way. That is how things are done in this country. I do not think that the Ministry has tackled this problem satisfactorily.

I want to put it to the Minister, is he satisfied with his own performance. I want to put it to the Minister, is he justified in asking this House to give more money to the Ministry and again coming forward to this House saying that there have been shortfalls because this has not been executed in the State and lower levels. What is the machinery that they have developed? They requested the States to have a co-ordination committee, let the Chief Minister preside over the co-ordination committee, let there be some such committee to look after the administration. I ask, is that the method by which you want to tackle this very important problem in this country.

I do not want you, Sir to ring the bell. I am concluding my speech by saying this. I am only giving a quotation from the Prime Minister's speech made in this House as early as August, 1960 and I want a reply from my friend. He said:

"Every one knows that unless we are self-sufficient in agriculture we cannot have the wherewithal to advance in industries. If we have to import food then we are doomed so far as progress is concerned. We cannot import both food and machinery, we just cannot get on."

From 1960 to 1963, we are importing more and more. Can we get on? Or,

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

are we stagnating? Whatever it is, the Ministry has only comforted itself by saying this. This is what they have said in the Report. There has been no shortfall so far as agricultural production is concerned. Compared to 1961 in 1962-63 it has been more or less maintained—how—because of the development projects that they have introduced. That means they cannot make any progress. It is a stable position. By hook or crook by some means, by some persuasive methods, by taking help from foreign countries, they have been just maintaining the status quo. Therefore it is high time that in this emergency, some serious thinking should be made about a change in the entire administrative set up and also to see—I am not going into the policy or plans as such—even whatever plans there are, however defective they may be, they are implemented. They are not implemented because of lack of co-ordination and proper administration.

Shri D. D. Puri (Kaithal): Mr. Speaker, a very rosy and sanguine picture of the sugar industry in Maharashtra was presented by an hon. Member on the floor of the House yesterday. I do not want to refer to the Rama Rajya that seems to prevail there in regard to sugar industry. What I am concerned with is the observation made by the hon. Member when he said that the Government were now trying to lump together the cane growers of Maharashtra and other southern parts and the cane growers in the north. The result would be that the efficient units would have to drag on with non-efficient units and both would suffer. I beg leave to put in a word on behalf of the inefficient drags.

The pattern of sugarcane cultivation in Maharashtra is that a large number of factories own farms covering 5 to 10 thousand acres. The pattern of cultivation in the north is, 3 million cane growers are depending upon about approximately 1 acre each of

cane to derive their sustenance. Secondly, this very efficient industry in Maharashtra produce sugar at Rs. 7 or 8 per quintal cheaper and they sell it at Rs. 7 per quintal dearer than the sugar industry does in the north, and as a result, the profits of an average sugar factory in Maharashtra when compared to the profits of a sugar factory in the northern region of the same capacity are eight to ten times.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): You are confirming the Maharashtra efficiency?

Shri D. D. Puri: I am only making my submission. I leave hon. Members to draw their own conclusions. These profits, part of them unearned on account of the freight advantage, give the wherewithal to the factories to provide manure and other cane developmental facilities to the cane-growers, whereas up in the north—and I speak for the Punjab, UP and Bihar—the State Governments have collected crores of rupees as cane cess or as purchase tax as it is now called. It was levied in the name of cane development, but only a trickle, not even ten per cent of the money so raised has actually found its way to the cane development itself.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): What about excise duty?

Shri D. D. Puri: My hon. friend may kindly bear with me. I have only ten minutes at my disposal and I have got to cover a lot of points.

And yet the cane grower growing one acre of cane in the north, with the State Government taking all the money as cess and hardly spending any money at all on cane development is being compared with the cane-grower in Maharashtra where in the first instance, a large part of the cane is grown by the factories themselves, and secondly, the cane is grown on farms of 5000 to 10,000

acres where you have all the where-withal for cane development.

Shri Nath Pai: But what is the yield of cane per acre and what is the sugar yield per ton of cane? Will my hon. friend tell those figures also in Maharashtra?

Shri D. D. Puri: I shall give those figures. but I would submit that for a proper assessment of the sugar yield per acre you have to take a five-year cycle. In Maharashtra, the age of the cane crop is eighteen months or more, but in the north the age of the cane crop is barely half of that duration. Therefore, you have to go into it deeper than merely the average yields for one single year. Then you have to take into account the ratooning, and then you have to take into account the period for which the land has to lie fallow etc. I have given some of these factors

We do not grudge all the profits made by the industry in Maharashtra and in other places. There was a time when the sugar industry in the north made a little bit and in Maharashtra they made a great deal more. That did not matter. Good luck to them. They can make even more in the hereafter. But now a stage has been reached when the industry in the north—and when I say 'Industry' I include the cane-grower in it—is actually incurring losses, and now, the cane-grower in the north and the industry in the north are being told that they are inefficient, and they are being cast aside so as not to create a drag on the more efficient industry in Maharashtra which produces sugar at Rs. 7 or Rs. 8 per quintal cheaper and sells it at Rs. 7 per quintal dearer than they do in the north.

Another suggestion has been made that the export of sugar should be confined to factories near the coast, which means the State of Maharashtra. To start with, Maharashtra is a sugar deficit area and consistently for the last ten or fifteen or twenty years, sugar has been sold

there at a price higher than that at which it is sold here. It is a deficit area, and now you want even that sugar to be pushed out for export and by so doing you want to create sugar famine conditions in Maharashtra so that the cane-grower and the industry may be able to reach even larger projects.

Having made this very brief observation in regard to what was stated yesterday I now turn my attention to the national picture. Taking the country as a whole, I shall not go into the controversial figures in regard to what the sugar production this year is going to be because the market is extremely temperamental and speculators start flying kites at the lightest pretext; I would only say that there is no difference of opinion and we all acknowledge that for the season 1963-64 we need between 3 and 3-1/2 million tons, that is, between 30 and 35 lakhs tons of sugar both to meet internal consumption and also to enable us to honour our commitments for export.

I welcome the steps announced by Government, they are going to have intensive cultivation of 4,000 acres around each factory; they are going to have pilot projects etc. etc. I entirely agree with all that. But the question is: are these pilot projects calculated to give any results in the 1963-64 and 1964-65 season? These long-term projects will certainly bring in very useful results over the long-term. But what we are immediately concerned with is the 1963-64 and 1964-65 seasons in respect of which we have already undertaken export commitments. I do wish that the hon. Minister, when he makes a statement, will deal specifically with the 1963-64 problem. My own suggestion is that the price of cane should be raised. There is absolutely no escape from it. Let us not forget that in 1947-48 the price of cane was Rs. 2 a maund and in 1950-51 and 1951-52 it was Rs. 1.75 a maund. Today we do not like to play with prices too often. But if we want

[Shri D. D. Puri]

30—35 lakh tons sugar next year, this is the only step that is likely to give us that result, apart from praying for good weather. There is nothing else we can do except to raise the price, maintaining the present linkage of the price to recovery.

I will only say one word in regard to this linkage. It is only logical and correct that the cane should fetch a price depending upon the sugar it carries because in the final analysis it is the sugar in the cane that is sought to be sold; all the rest is trash. Therefore, I suggest that the present price linkage to recovery should be maintained, but the entire price level should be raised. A declaration should be made to this effect as soon as possible so that it may have effect on sowings for the next year.

Apart from this, there is of course the question of incentives. Incentives may have to be provided for an early start as well as for the overall production. If all these steps are taken right now, the grower may still catch time and put in some additional acres under sugarcane.

A great deal has been mentioned about the 10 per cent cut. It is very easy to be wise after the event. But what were the circumstances at the time when the cut was imposed? The country had produced 30 lakh tons of sugar. Internal consumption had not yet reached 20 lakh tons. There was a surplus of 10 lakh tons on hand. The export perspective at that time was extremely bleak because the world price of sugar was around Rs. 10 a maund. Therefore, we were able to export barely about 50,000 tons. A stage had been reached when Rs. 75 crores was tied up in stocks that sugar factories were carrying. The factories were running late in the months of June, July etc. which was bringing about hardship to everyone.

Therefore, it was considered at that time that possibly the only way to sustain the economics of the sugar industry was to impose a cut. But soon circumstances started changing somewhat; the cut in actual practice has not brought about, according to my calculations, any shrinkage in production. It did create a certain amount of psychological fear in some States and that might have had some effect. But in actual practice, there was no curtailment of production on account of the cut.

As I said, it is very easy to be wise after the event. Take the global picture. Nobody knew last year that the international price of sugar today would be more than double the international price of last year. The last United Nations Sugar conference broke up and the agreement had to be suspended because Cuba wanted a quota very much in excess of what the conference was prepared to offer. How could the Cubans know that they would not be able to produce even the sugar quota that was offered to them? All over the world, sugar production is much shorter than expected a year earlier. This is a global phenomenon. There have been lots of crop failures. This year the shrinkage in production is attributable not so much to shrinkage in area but to the yield per acre having gone down in North India. Therefore, we should not attach too much importance to this 10 per cent.

The over-all picture of sugar is that a few years ago we imported 18 lakh tons and now, barring brief vicissitudes ups and downs which every agricultural commodity is exposed to, we are well established in the export market, exporting 4 to 5 lakh tons every year. The internal consumption of sugar which was between 10 and 11 lakh tons at the time of independence is now more than 26 lakh tons. Taking all these things toge-

ther and making due allowance for the ups and downs attaching to an agricultural commodity, the way the sugar policy has been worked out is nothing to be ashamed of, and the Government and the Ministry may well be proud of their record.

Thank you.

Shri P. Kunhan (Palghat): I thank you for giving me an opportunity to participate in this debate on the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. As the time available is very short, I shall not repeat the points, but I will concentrate on the problem of production of foodgrains.

During the first two years of the Third Plan, production has remained static. Foodgrains production was 79.7 million tons at the end of the Second Plan. It came down to 78.6 million tons during the next year, and this year's prospect is none too good.

However, the most alarming feature of agricultural production is the static position in productivity. During the 12 years from 1949-50 to 1960-61, the per acre yield has advanced by a mere 1.54 per cent. It is clear that if we are to achieve self-sufficiency in agriculture, the per acre yield has to go up in a big way, but we have failed miserably in this respect. At this rate it is clear that the Third Plan target in agricultural production will not be achieved.

The progress in agricultural programmes is also very disappointing. It seems that none of the Third Plan agricultural programmes is progressing as stipulated. The gap between the irrigation potential of major and medium projects and the actual utilisation is as large as 4 million acres. The total potential of these irrigation projects rose to only 13.79 million acres in 1961-62 from 12.1 million acres at the end of the Second Plan. And the actual utilisation recorded only a small gain to 10.47 million acres from 9.15 million acres during the same period. Against the raised Plan

target of 19.2 million acres of minor irrigation, the actual achievement in the first two years of the Plan will be only 5 million acres.

In the case of soil conservation, the achievement in the first two years will be only 2.8 million acres against the revised Plan target of 16.5 million acres. The anticipated achievement in respect of dry farming during the same period is 5.2 million acres against the revised target of 50 million acres.

The Third Plan envisaged an increase of 148 million acres in the area under improved seeds of goodgrains. The total area likely to be brought under improved seeds by the end of 1963-64 is merely 41 million acres. The programme for improved agricultural implements on which largely depends improved farming practices, too has not made much headway, barring of few isolated areas. Still ninety per cent of the cultivation in our country is carried by the ancient method. Against the plan target of ten lakh tons of nitrogenous fertilisers, the actual quantity despatched during the first nine months of the current year amounted only to 2.37 lakh tons.

The programme in respect of rural and urban compost scheme and green manuring is also not progressing satisfactorily. It is expected that by the end of 1963-64 the third year of the Third Plan, only 40 and 52 per cent of the compost and green manuring targets will be reached.

The programme of co-operatives is also lagging behind. Against the target of 37.3 million membership of the service co-operatives, the present membership is only 22.8 million. This is only 3.8 million increase over the membership at the end of the Second Plan. Against the target of short and medium credit of Rs. 530 crores, the loans advanced in 1961-62 amounted to only Rs. 236 crores. Similarly, for long term credit, against the target of Rs. 150 crores, loans outstanding in June 1962

[Shri P. Kunhan]

amounted to only Rs. 45 crores. The programme for rural godowns is also lagging behind. As against the Third Plan target of 9199 godowns, only 1350 were built during 1961-62 and 1185 are expected to be completed during the current year. The target for 1963-64 is 1111. Thus the achievement in the first three years of the Plan will only be 40 per cent of the five year target.

It will thus be seen that in every respect the agricultural programmes are lagging behind. At this rate it is clear that the production target of the Third Plan cannot be achieved. The consequence of this failure in agricultural production is catastrophic. Already we are dangerously dependent on American charity for feeding our people and even in clothing them. We have to import huge quantities of wheat, cotton, milk powder, etc. From August 1956 to October 1962, India received U.S. farm commodities in huge quantities 16 million tons (metric tonnes) of wheat; 590,000 tons of fodder grains, 787,000 tons of rice, 13 lakh bales of cotton. The market value of these supplies including shipping costs comes to nearly 1100 crores of rupees. And we will continue to import foodgrains during the coming years at the rate of about four million tons annually. How depressing is this state of affairs?

The question naturally arises: what is wrong with our agriculture? Why are we failing to solve this all-embracing problem? The key factor in agricultural development is the peasant. The basic and fundamental weakness of our agricultural policy is that the Government has ignored or side tracked the peasant. All the so-called land reforms have not basically altered the status of the peasant.

Here I wish to point out the instance of the Kerala Agrarian Relations Act. After the Kerala High Court and the Supreme Court invalidated certain portions of the Act, the Kerala Government, through out the

entire legislation. As a result thousands of peasants have suffered great losses. They have lost all faith in legislation. About a lakh of peasants had gone to the land tribunals and each one had spent about 500 or 600 rupees on their application for reduction of rents. And some 17,000 got reduction of rent. Some ten thousand tenants had deposited money to get the ownership of the land they tilled. But now all the money spent and all the gains have been wiped out. The Planning Commission and the Central Government promised to amend the Constitution to validate the Act. Till now nothing has been done. This is the attitude of the Congress to the peasants. How can agricultural production increase? I do not want to go deeper. I shall conclude by requesting the Government to bring the amendment to the Constitution to validate the gains of the peasants.

श्री मरंडी (राजमहल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय,

जब हमारा देश आजाद हुआ, उस के बाद भी हम ने खाने पीने की चीजें तथा अन्न बाहर से मंगाया। इस समस्या को हल करने के लिये हमारी सरकार ने पंच वर्षीय योजनायें बनाई। पंचवर्षीय योजनायें इस लिये बनाई कि हमारे देश में सब प्रकार से उन्नति हो। पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना खत्म हुई, दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना खत्म हुई, अब तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना चल रही है। किन्तु हमारे देश की स्थिति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ। सरकारी रिपोर्टों में हमेशा दिखाया जाता है कि हमारे यहां अन्न के उत्पादन में वृद्धि हो रही है। लेकिन वह वृद्धि केवल सरकारी रिपोर्ट में हुई है। यह बड़े दुःख की बात है कि दस या बारह वर्ष पहले हमारी सरकार जो भी खाने पीने की चीजें बाहर से मंगवाती थी, वह आज भी मंगवा रही है। मले ही रिपोर्टों में में अन्न की वृद्धि हुई हो लेकिन हमारे देश में आज भी अन्न विदेशों से मंगवाया जाता है। फिर अगर वृद्धि हुई भी है

अन्न में तो वह केवल शहरों के लिये हुई है या सरकारी रिपोर्ट में हुई है ।

हमारा संथाल परगना भारत में सब से पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका है । वहां पर अधिकांश आदिवासी रहते हैं । वहां पर आदिवासियों की कृषि में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है । आदिवासी दिन प्रति दिन गरीब होते जा रहे हैं । इसका असली कारण यह है कि वहां पर महाजनों का शोषण चलता है । जब तक हमारे आदिवासियों के बीच में से महाजनों का शोषण खत्म नहीं किया जाता तब तक हमारे प्रदेश की कभी उन्नति नहीं हो सकती । मैं पहले भी भी इस महाजनों के शोषण के सम्बन्ध में इस हाउस में बोल चुका हूँ मगर वह भी अमृतक ज्यों का त्यों चल रहा है । संथाल परगना ऐक्ट जो है वह महज पास कर दिया गया है, उसको ठीक तरह से लागू नहीं किया गया है । जब तक, वहां के किसानों को महाजनों के शोषण से नहीं बचाया जाता, तब तक वे किसी भी प्रकार से आगे नहीं बढ़ सकते । जब किसानों की फसल तैयार होती है तो महाजन वहां आ जाते हैं और सारी फसलें ले जाते हैं । इसके अलावा जो आदिवासियों के मवेशी हैं, उनको भी वे सारे के सारे लूट ले जाते हैं । यह हमारे संथाल परगना के आदिवासियों की सब से बड़ी समस्या है ।

मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहूंगा कि वे जरा हमारे संथाल परगना को ठीक से देखें । अफसरों की बात है कि आजादी के बाद से आज तक संथाल परगना डिस्ट्रिक्ट में एक भी मिनिस्टर नहीं पहुंचा है । हमारे एग्रीकल्चर और फूड मिनिस्टर भी आज तक नहीं पहुंचे हैं । मैं उन से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि वे आकर हमारे यहां संथाल परगना को देखें कि वहां पर किसी भी तरह अन्न की कोई वृद्धि हुई है या नहीं । मैं मंत्री महोदय जी से निवेदन हूँ । नहीं करूंगा लिख कर

भी दूंगा कि वे हमारे दृष्टिकोण से आकर देखें कि वहां पर अन्न की वृद्धि हुई है या नहीं । आज जितने हमारे भाई लोग हैं उन को खाने को अन्न नहीं मिलता है, पहनने को वस्त्र नहीं मिलती रहा है, रहने के लिए मकान नहीं है । यह कितने दुःख की बात है । आजादी मिलने के पहले हम गरीब आदिवासी लोग आशा करते थे कि स्वराज्य आने पर हमारे भी दिन फिर पिछे और हमारी स्थिति भी किसानों जैसी हो जाएगी लेकिन आज भी हमारी स्थिति ज्यों की त्यों है । हम जो आशा करते थे वह पूरी नहीं हुई । गरीब और गरीब होते जा रहे हैं । मेरा अनुरोध है कि आदिवासियों को महाजनों से बचाने के लिए सब से पहले सरकार को बतल करना चाहिये ।

खेती की उन्नति सिंचाई की व्यवस्था पर निर्भर करती है । हमारी सरकार ने हमारे यहां के लिए सिंचाई की कुछ योजना बनायी है लेकिन उस से सिंचाई का काम अच्छी तरह नहीं होता । हमारा एक और तो महाजन शोषण करते हैं और दूसरी ओर सरकार के कर्मचारी और अफसर लोग जनता का शोषण कर रहे हैं । सिंचाई के लिए आप जो रुपया देते हैं उसका कुछ भाग अफसर ले लेते हैं कुछ दूसरे ले लेते हैं, हमारे पास कुछ नहीं पहुंचता । आपको यह मुन कर ताज्जुब होगा कि आपने जो वहां के लिए सिंचाई की योजना बनाई है वह नहीं के बराबर है । एक बूंद पानी मिलना मुश्किल है । इसलिये मेरा मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन है कि हमारे संथाल परगना की ओर विशेष ध्यान दें । हम बहुत पिछड़े हुए हैं, हमको भी आगे बढ़ाना चाहिए । आज देश में डिमा-क्रेंसी है और इस डिमाक्रेंसी में सब को आगे बढ़ने का मौका मिलना चाहिये । आपको हमें भी आगे बढ़ाना चाहिए । मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि संथाल परगना में अभी तक कोई तरक्की नहीं हुई है । हमारे अन्दर स्टेमीना काफी है । मैं मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन

[श्री मरंजी]

करूंगा कि हमको कुछ सुविचारों दे दें तो हम काफी उन्नति कर सकते हैं।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि मेरे क्षेत्र में सिंचाई की ग्रीडियम सकीमें चलायी जाएं। हमारे जो नाले और नालियां हैं उन पर बांध बनाए जायें हमारे इलाके की सिंचाई के लिए ५० प्रतिशत खपया ब्लाक द्वारा दिया जाता है वहां पर पहुंचते ही पहुंचते उसका भाषा भी नहीं रहता। अफसर लोग आषा खा जाते हैं। हमारे यहां कुंवे नहीं बनाए जाते। यही हमारी शिकायत है।

फसल के टाइम में बनिया लोग आते हैं और खस्ते दाम पर हमारा अनाज ले जाते हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि सरकार कुछ ऐसी व्यवस्था कर दे कि जब हमारी फसल तैयार हो तो उसको सरकार ले ले और जब महंगी हो तो सरकार किसानों को दे दे। ऐसा करने से जनता का फायदा होगा।

हमारे भारत में ६० प्रतिशत जमीन पर खेती होती है, बाकी ४० पर सेंट जमीन पर खेती नहीं होती। हमारा ख्याल है कि इस ओर भी ध्यान दिया जाये। अगर नई जमीन तोड़ कर खेती में लायी जाये तो उपज बढ़ सकती है। मेरा सुझाव है कि जो पड़ती जमीन पड़ी है उसको आदिवासियों और हरिजनों को दिया जाये, तो हम लोग काफी उपज कर सकते हैं।

भारत में समुद्र के किनारे ऐसे बहुत से स्थान हैं जहां मछली पकड़ी जाती है। हमारे मछली पकड़ने वाले गरीब हैं, व पुराने तरह की नावों से मछली पकड़ते हैं। हमारा अनुरोध है कि उनको सरकारी मदद दी जायें। जानी बाहिये ताकि व नए तरीके की मशीन वाली नावों से मछली पकड़ सकें।

Shri K. C. Pant (Naini Tal): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants under the Ministry

of Food and Agriculture. When we look back at the increase in agricultural production in the first and second Plans we find that agricultural production has definitely forged ahead. But we also find that the progress has not been very even and no consistent, stable trend has so far been established. Substantial gains have been registered during the first Plan but the second Plan was not successful to the same extent. In fact, ever since 1960-61, the rate of growth has not kept pace with the requirements of our national economy. This is disappointing, but I do not think we should be unduly alarmed over it, because we have to accept that so long as irrigation covers only a little more than one-fifth of the area under cultivation, we cannot altogether insulate our agriculture from the vagaries of the weather.

12:56 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Apart from the quantitative aspect, we have to try to make a qualitative assessment of the progress made by our agriculture in the last 15 years. If we take individual commodities, we find that the pattern of growth in different parts of the country has not been very uniform. For instance, wheat production has gone up in Punjab but is stable in Uttar Pradesh. Rice production has gone up in Orissa, Madras and Punjab but the growth in other parts of the country has not been so noticeable. Then there is cotton. Cotton production continues to be a gamble on the monsoon. It is true that we have established the cultivation of finer staple cotton in the canal areas of Punjab, but because this cultivation is in a particular area, it is all the more vulnerable to local factors. The position would be much better if we could disperse fine staple cultivation all over the country. Then there is jute. Jute production continues also to be subject to wide fluctuations. It seems un-

fair to criticise jute production when it is doing so well, but we cannot altogether overlook the qualitative aspect. Sir, even in a bumper year, we have been obliged to import jute croppings from Pakistan to supplement our own. This is hardly a happy position, and I hope it will not continue for long.

As far as sugarcane is concerned, it has been dealt with sufficiently in the House and I do not want to say anything about it except to welcome the proposal to raise cane yield in northern India through the package programme. As far as this package programme is concerned, I for one strongly support the concept on which it is based. It grows out of a technoeconomic approach to the problem of agricultural productivity. We can see from page 9 of the report supplied by the Ministry that the result achieved by this programme in the short span of one or two years in the selected districts has been very striking if not spectacular. It shows what can be achieved when organisation, capital and technique make a combined and co-ordinated onslaught on an economic problem. It is logical to expect that if the same kind of co-ordinated were extended to non-package districts equally good results would follow.

But here we encounter a serious difficulty. Many hon. Members have referred to it, namely, that a multiplicity of agencies is looking after the different accessories of agriculture, like irrigation, fertilisers, seeds, etc. Attempts are, no doubt, being made to co-ordinate their efforts. But one continues to hear complaints that the farmers do not get credit in time, that there is a time-lag between the supply and utilisation of irrigation facilities and so on. Then there is the question of relationship between the Centre and the States. In this connection, I would like to quote from a recent speech by Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, the predecessor of the present Food Minister. Speaking last month at the Uttar Pradesh Agricultural University, he said:

"The Indian agriculture suffers from many infirmities which are not so much at the policy level as in implementation. There exists considerable confusion about the responsibilities of the Centre and the States. The Centre holds the States guilty of shortfalls in the implementation of the agricultural schemes, but not unoften the States are known to hit back and throw the responsibility on the Centre. In most of the States, agriculture has failed to receive due importance."

These remarks, in my opinion, pinpoint one of the fundamental problems of Indian agriculture and deserve the most careful attention.

13 hrs.

Another problem of fundamental importance to which I would like to refer is that of fertilisers. We are woefully short not only of chemical fertilisers but, in spite of our huge cattle wealth, of organic fertilisers also. In a country like ours, cattle waste is the most natural source of organic matter, but unfortunately the bulk of this valuable material is being burnt as fuel for cooking purposes at the moment. The manurial value of cow-dung as a source of humus to the soil is widely known, but what is perhaps not so widely known is the value of the plant nutrients it contains. A committee appointed by the Government of India to go into this question some years ago came out with an estimate that 200 million tons of cow dung were being burnt each year. This may be a conservative estimate. Last year the hon. Member, Shri Chatterji, came out with a figure of 400 million tons. The committee went on to calculate that 200 million tons of cow-dung contain about 4.25 million tons of the three main plant nutrients in term of nitrogen, P₂O₅ and 2O, of which at least 2.55 million tons are in forms available to plants. I would like the House to

[Shri K. C. Pant]

take particular note of these figures. If we calculate the loss of available nutrients and organic matter in terms of money, the total comes, on a conservative estimate, to the staggering figure of Rs. 550 crores. This is the order of the annual loss. Obviously, this is a colossal national loss, which we should try our best to check.

However, the question arises as to what the farmer can use as fuel, if not cow-dung. It cannot be coal. The Finance Minister has seen to it that it will not be kerosene. The only alternative is wood. But in a way that is also a problem. So, this is really a baffling problem. But we are fortunate in having a dynamic and resourceful Minister for Food and Agriculture and I hope he will accept the challenge of the situation and do something about it. I also hope he will give us an inkling of the working of his mind on this important subject.

I turn to chemical fertilisers. I am sorry to say that we produce only 25 per cent of our requirements and we are importing another 25 per cent, thus leaving 50 per cent of the demand uncovered. I beg to submit that this is a basic lacuna in our agricultural planning and programme. The second point is that certain areas like the delta regions of Andhra and Orissa use a lot of fertilisers, while other areas like U.P. and Bihar do not. Why is it so? It is mainly because the kisan in U.P. and Bihar has not been sufficiently educated in the utility of fertilisers. I will give you a concrete instance. When it was planned to produce nitrochalk at Nangal, the idea was to utilise it in U.P., Punjab and Rajasthan. But when the fertiliser was actually produced, these States did not take it and it had to be sent all the way to the south. This would hardly have happened if the farmer in these States had been educated beforehand on the merits of nitrochalk, which, I may submit is any day a better fertiliser than am-

monium sulphate. So, the point I am trying to make is that much more vigorous efforts need to be made to educate the farmer everywhere on the relative merits of different chemical fertilisers and also on the need of balanced crop nutrition based on soil analysis.

I would now like to say something about the border areas in U.P. which I have visited recently. The army there is facing the problem of transporting hundreds of tons of agricultural products for its own requirements over hundreds of miles. I can understand this kind of thing happening in a place like Ladakh, which is not kind to vegetation. But in U.P. the potential is already there; it is only a question of developing the resources fully. I will, therefore, request the Agriculture Minister to take the lead in developing horticulture, vegetable gardening, poultry farming, pasture-land etc., in this area, so that at least in the middle sector, the army can live off the land. This would be a signal contribution to the defence effort. Sir, I appreciate that this cannot be done in the usual course and extraordinary steps may have to be taken. Land is very scarce in this area. I would, therefore, request the Government to consider leasing out forest land to village communities for the development of orchards. I do not for a moment suggest that the total area under forest should be reduced, but only that part of that land should be allowed to come under fruit trees. I would go further and suggest that in all future afforestation programmes, the value of the forest should be the guiding factor.

Shri Basappa (Tiptur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it has been rightly said that a strong agricultural base is the pre-requisite of national security and defence. There are several other reasons also why a strong agricultural base is necessary. We have been saying that hundreds of crores of rupees are spent every years over im-

porting foodgrains, as a result of which a lot of foreign exchange is spent. So, at least in order to save this foreign exchange, we must have a strong agricultural base.

We are passing through critical times. Our exports must be increased and from that point of view also, we must have greater agricultural production. Even the industries that we have in this country require a lot of agricultural raw materials. More than all these, during the emergency, our country has to show to the world that a democratic set-up can equally produce more in this country. So, judging from these points of view, although the Minister who spoke yesterday was very optimistic about the picture, still looking at the stagnant agriculture, we can only say that the productivity is very low. It has been stated that the rise in productivity is only 1.4 per cent. There may be more agricultural lands brought under cultivation as a result of which they can show some improvement, but the productivity as such has not very much improved; it is only 1.4 per cent.

Yesterday Mr. Thomas was saying that the position was very comfortable and our dynamic Minister, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, gave a record of the incentives that we are giving to have more yield per acre. Today I expect our more dynamic and optimistic Minister, Mr. Patil, to say in clear terms how we are advancing. But I am not able to understand in the face of all this, how certain statements made by other Ministers vary in this direction. In the Presidential Address, it has been stated:

"Agriculture, which is the most important sector of our economy has undergone material developments and agricultural production has increased considerably."

But as seen from one of the papers sent to us by the Planning Commission, there is not much advance in our overall production. They have given some figures also. From 1949-50 to 3100(Ai) LSD—4.

1960-61, it has risen at the rate of 3.84 per cent, which is very low compared to the 6 per cent we have in view. There are other statements made by other Ministers also.

The Food and Agriculture Minister may say that our production is not very unsatisfactory. Considering all these, such discrepancies will give an impression that there is a sort of complacency in the mind of the Minister. This complacency will not help us much. We are proud of the achievements, particularly after the Minister has taken over charge, but still the goal we have to reach, i.e. self-sufficiency, has not been reached. The other day, Mr. Malhotra struck a discordant note regarding the results that we may achieve. Therefore, we must try to understand where the fault lies and where exactly we have gone wrong. We have been hearing in this House the Centre accusing the States and *vice versa*. There is absolute lack of coordination between one Ministry and another. Even in the discussions of the Planning Commission, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh would attribute our shortage to some other thing. The Community Development Ministry may refer to the States. Shri Nanda may say that our administrative machinery has to be geared up. All these things are there. Therefore, we should try to understand correctly where the fault lies. Our farmers are efficient people. It has been stated that our farmers are in no way backward or primitive. We are also spending crores of rupees. In the First Plan we spent Rs. 800 crores, in the Second Plan Rs. 1200 crores and in the Third Plan we are advancing a lot of money. Therefore, the time has come when this organisational machinery must be looked into carefully.

The Community Development Ministry holds some responsibility. The Agriculture Ministry holds some responsibility. Who exactly is responsible is still to be understood, espe-

[Shri Basappa]

cially when we take the point of view of credit. They are distributing Rs. 240 crores. The Ministry which is really responsible is not at the helm of affairs for distributing this amount.

The whole House was obsessed yesterday with the question that a reasonable and remunerative price should be given. That is absent now. Of course that reasonable price should satisfy the consumer as well as the producer. But now-a-days we see a trend in the direction of a producer-oriented price policy. It is a good thing in order to reach self-sufficiency.

An Hon. Member: What should be done?

Shri Basappa: The hon. Minister knows about it. He has been emphasising that point, but he has not taken a decision. I wish he takes a decision quickly. I do not know why he is hesitating in the matter. How we are to go from pillar to post in order to get the required materials has been already narrated by Dr Ram Subhag Singh, and I do not want at this stage to go into those things. He has taken up a challenge so far as the utilisation of the water resources in our country is concerned. Four million acres of land can be irrigated if the water resources remaining unutilised in the country are made use of. Sometimes our Minister says that if a project is given to him he can show how the water could be made use of.

Sir, it is said that more minor irrigation to the extent of 50 per cent will be done in the coming years. It is a good feature. Certain States like Mysore deserve more minor irrigation facilities. I know about the irrigation potential in my own State. There are rivers flowing through several States, and the agriculture potential of those States in the Krishna Basin is very much more. For what reason disputes are there, we do not know. There are certain disputes, no doubt, but the Government,

with the help of other Ministers also, should see that these disputes are resolved very quickly so that there is a balanced agricultural development in the country.

I would like to emphasise this point about the question a balanced development of agriculture. I do not like the idea of certain parts of the country with 40 inches of rain and 30 per cent of irrigation producing more and giving it to the other backward areas. After all, where is the purchasing power with the poor people to go and buy their requirements from other areas. Therefore, every part of the country should be developed. I do not say that other big projects should be given up. But when a river flows in a particular direction the lands which are adjacent to that river do not get any water because the whole water is taken to the delta region to provide irrigation facilities there. I do not say that water should not be given for irrigation facilities there but the primary needs of the Krishna Basin must be dealt with first, and if there is extra water let that be given to other areas. Certain basic principles on which these things should be decided have to be framed; otherwise, the agriculture potential in those areas will not be improved. Our Minister sometimes, not knowing these things, says certain things which may prove to be at the cost of some of the backward areas and potentialities available in other areas. In areas where there is 5 per cent irrigation and 47 per cent of the contribution by rivers, they are not getting any benefit whereas other areas are being benefited. Our Minister should see that there is a balanced development of agriculture in this country.

Sir, this is not the time when I can dwell at length on this subject. You can understand the feelings of the various States in this matter. The Minister in charge should help the

concerned Ministers to see that there is a balanced development of agriculture. That is the only way of achieving socialism and bringing justice in this country.

श्री उटिया (शहडोल) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका इस बात के लिये बड़ा आभारी हूँ कि आप ने मुझे इस बहस में भाग लेने के लिये समय दिया है।

खाद्य और कृषि अनुदान मांगों पर दो दिनों से इस सदन में विचार हो रहा है। मेरा मत है कि देश की अस्सी प्रतिशत जनता याने किसान का इस विभाग से संबंध है और कोई भी इस बात को आसानी से समझ सकता है कि उस किसान को राहत पहुँचाने में यह विभाग सफल नहीं रहा है। कम से कम मेरे इलाके के पिछड़े हुए भागों में मैं देखता हूँ कि किसान और भी गरीब हो जा रहा है। इस सदन में बैठने वाले माननीय सदस्यगण चाहे वे किसी भी दल के हों पंजाब या पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश के किसान कर शक्ल को अपने दिमाग से निकाल कर मध्य प्रदेश, दक्षिणी बिहार आदि क्षेत्रों के गरीब और पिछड़े किसानों को जा कर देखें तो उन्हें उनका दर्द मालूम होगा। साहूकारों का जुल्म कई पीढ़ियों से किसान का शोषण करता आया है और वह आज भी जारी है। सहकारी समितियों या सहकारी बैंकों से मेरे यहां के किसानों को जो मदद मिलती है वह सिर्फ ऐसे लोग पाते हैं जो चुनाव में कांग्रेस का काम करते हैं या कांग्रेसी नेताओं से जिन की यारी है। बहुत से ऐसे मामले भी पकड़ में आते हैं जिन से पता चलता है कि कर्जा या दूसरी मदद दिलाने वाले भारी मात्रा में दलाली ले लेते हैं। इन बीच के पंडों की अगर पूजा नहीं की जाती है तो किसान मारा जाता है और उसे मदद नहीं मिलती है। सहकारी बैंकों में या समितियों में न तो अधिकार मिले हैं और न उनकी सुनवाई होती है

और न ही उनको जागृत करने का प्रयत्न किया गया है। सत्तारुढ़ दल भी आज उनके शोषण करता है। मेरे प्रदेश के बारे में सा जानते हैं कि वह मुख्यतः पहाड़ी है। मध्य भारत या अन्य स्थानों में जहाँ सुविधायें हैं, सिंचई के बड़े बड़े साधन तैयार हो गए हैं परन्तु बहुत बड़ा भाग ऐसा भी है जहाँ सिंचाई के छोट छोट साधनों के निर्माण पर ध्यान दिया जाना जरूरी है। स सिलसिले में आज तक मुझे ऐसा कोई प्रयत्न नजर नहीं आया कि जिसकी प्रशंसा की जा सके। मैं शासन से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह मेरे क्षेत्र में लघु सिंचाई योजनाओं की व्यवस्था कराये।

बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने मंहगाई की चर्चा की है और मेरा ख्याल है कि स्वयं शासक दल के लोग भी इस बात से सहमत होंगे कि रोजमर्रा की चीजों के बढ़े रहे दामों से किसान भी परेशान हैं। अभी कल ही इस विभाग के मंत्रियों ने अनाज के मूल्य पर नियंत्रण रखने की बात कही थी। अनाज का दाम एक निश्चित सीमा से ज्यादा न बढ़ यह अच्छी बात है, परन्तु साबुन, शक्कर, तेल गुड़, कपड़ा आदि जैसी चीजें किसान के काम की भी होती हैं जिन्हें वह रोज खरीदता है, काम में लाता है। फिर जब इन के भी दाम बढ़ेंगे तो किसान कितनी तकलीफ उठायेंगा, इसको भी आपको देख लेना चाहिये। यदि शासन अनाज का दाम नहीं बढ़ने देना चाहता जोकि वाजिब भी है तो क्या यह भी वाजिब न होगा कि दूसरी आवश्यक चीजों के दाम भी बढ़ने से रोके।

अन्त में मैं इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि पहाड़ी इलाकों के पिछड़े हुए लोगों की जो असुविधायें हैं, उन असुविधाओं को दूर करने का प्रयत्न शासन की ओर से किया जाना चाहिये। इन असुविधाओं को सुविधाजनक बनाने के लिय अगर सरकार कोशिश करे तो बहुत बेहतर होगा।

श्री शिव नारायण : (वांसी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आज खाद्य और कृषि मंत्रालय के अनुदान का समर्थन करने के लिये उपस्थित हुआ हूँ। यह वर्ष का विषय है कि आज हमारा ऐग्रिकल्चर विभाग एक डाक्टर के हाथ में है, लेकिन मैं उन से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज ऐग्रिकल्चर में प्राप्ति क्यों नहीं हो रही है? उन के यहाँ एक बड़ी फौज है, अफसरों की जो मैशिनरी है, उस फौज को खतरा है। उन के सामने खतरे की घंटी बजती रहती है क्योंकि चौदह और पन्द्रह वर्ष की सर्बिस वालों को भी अभी तक परमानेंट नहीं किया गया। वे घबराते हैं कि अगर उन को हटा दिया गया तो वे कहाँ जाएंगे। मैं यहीं पर एक मिसाल दे दूँ। इस हाउस में मारे एक आनरेबल मेम्बर है जो कि इस डिपार्टमेंट में ऐग्रिकल्चर आफिस रहे हैं। वे मेरे जिले में रहे हैं। आप को देखना चाहिये कि क्यों आप के आफिसमें ठीक तरह से काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। हमारे डा० राम सुभग सिंह को इस पर बड़ा डीपली थिक करना चाहिये। यह जो बड़ी फौज हमारे सामने बैठी हुई है उस पर यह मंत्रालय भरोसा करे और उन को परमानेंट करे ताकि वे समझें...

खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री (श्री स० का० पाटिल) : अब उन्हें कैसे परमानेंट करें?

श्री शिव नारायण : माननीय सदस्य को छाड़िये, जा लाग आफिशल गैलरी में बैठे हैं उन को देखिये।

हिन्दुस्तान में जो भी खेती की जमीन है उस में से एक चौथाई को सिंचाई प्राप्त होती है और तीन चौथाई जमीन बिना पानी के रह जाती है। हर साल करोड़ों मन पानी बह जाता है, उस का कोई कंट्रोल नहीं है। मैं अपने फूड मिनिस्टर से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वे इस की ओर ध्यान

क्यों नहीं देते? आज चीन ने इतनी बड़ी बड़ी नदियों को रोका है। आप भी घाघरा गंडक, गंगा आदि बड़ी बड़ी नदियों के पानी को रोकने का इन्तजाम कीजिये। रिज-वायर बनाइये और पानी को कंट्रोल कीजिये। अभी क्वेश्चन अवर में बड़ा शोर मूल था कि पीने का पानी नहीं है, डाइ एरिया है। अगर यह पानी आप रोक दें तो बड़ा उपकार हो। मुझे याद है जब मैं यू० पी० में मेम्बर था तो प्रो० शिव्वन लाल सक्सेना ने प्वाइंट आउट किया था कि जब मैं बजट पर बोलूँ तो इस को बतलाऊँ कि हर साल सोलह जिलों से ८० करोड़ रु० का नुक्सान फ्लड्स से होता है। अगर आप फ्लड कंट्रोल करा दें तो पैदावार बढ़ जाय।

श्री बे० शि० पाटिल (यवतमाल) : यही तो दिक्कत है कृषि मंत्रालय की।

श्री शिव नारायण : आप क्यों जवाब देते हैं, जवाब हमारे पाटिल साहब देंगे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरजमीन की मिट्टी दुनिया की सब जमीनों से अच्छी है। मैं ने क्यूबा में देखा, वहाँ बड़े मोटे मोटे गन्ने हो रहे हैं लेकिन हमारे लोग क्या करते हैं? पतले पतले गन्ने पैदा करते हैं। मैं अपने डाक्टरों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस का कोई इलाज बतलावें। मैं दावे से कहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के किसान से आप जितना लेते हैं अगर उसका चार आना आप कर दें तो हम आप को देंगे गेहूँ। आप अगर एक रुपया लेते हैं तो उस में से एक पैसा भी वापस नहीं देते। आप जो भी मालगुजारी लेते हैं अगर उसका चौथई वापस कर दें तो हम यहाँ पर राम राज्य ला देंगे, हम आप की प्राब्लेम को हल कर देंगे। यह मेरा कहना नहीं है। लखनऊ यूनिवर्सिटी के एक पोस्ट ग्रेजुएट का कहना है, जो कि बड़ा विद्वान है, कि अगर हम को चार आना वापस हो जाये तो यहाँ पर राम राज्य आ सकता है।

यहां बड़ी फार्मिंग की बात का जिक्र हुआ। इस के बड़े ढोल पांटे जा रहे। लेकिन मैं दावे से यह कहता हूँ कि छोटे खेती वाले लोग अच्छी पैदावार कर सकते हैं। मिसाल के तौर पर मैं बतलाऊँ। हमारे गांव के जमादार हैं राजा राम सुभग सिंह। मैं असाफी हूँ। लेकिन जो मैं दस बोघे खेत में पैदा करता हूँ वह पचास बोघे में उतना पैदा नहीं कर सकते। यह तो मैं मिसाल के तौर पर कहता हूँ। मुझे गांवों का प्रैक्टिकल एक्सपेरिंस है। मैं एक किसान का बेटा हूँ और अपने हाथ खेती करता हूँ। मैं खुद खेत जोतता हूँ। हमारे हाफिज जी यहाँ पर नहीं हैं। जब कोसिल में रुद्रपुर यूनिवर्सिटी का बिल चल रहा था तब उस में ६ डाक्टर्स अप्वाइंट हुए। मैंने उन से पूछा कि क्या आप जानते हैं कि अकड़ी, मूतनी, अगवासी आदि क्या हैं? अगर आप बतला दें तो जानें : एक भी नहीं बतला सक। हाफिज जी ने भी कहा कि यह क्या कह रहा है ?

खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (डा० राम सुभग सिंह) : मैं बतला दूंगा।

श्री शिव नारायण : आप तो बतला ही देंगे क्योंकि आप किसान हैं। इसलिये मैं आप के आश्रय कह रहा हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट फ्लड कंट्रोल स्कैम को चलाये। जो रिस्कर्न स्कालर्स हैं ऐग्रिकल्चर हि कंवेइप चीज को प्रैक्टिकल शेष में गांवों में नहीं पहुंचा पाते। आप इस को गांवों में पहुंचाइये और किसानों को बतलाइये। मैं तो मनु महाराज को मानता हूँ। मनु के जमाने में डिवाजन आफ वर्क था। खेती करने वाले को टापमोस्ट ग्रैजुएट की ट्रेनिंग दी जाती थी। लेकिन अब इस का उल्टा होता है। एम० एस० सी० पास करके जो लोग आज आ रहे हैं, डाक्टर्स आ रहे हैं,

जब तक पढ़ते पढ़ाते रहते हैं तो तब तक तो ठीक रहता है लेकिन वह मिट्टी के पास नहीं जाते हैं। मिट्टी को छाना भी गुनाह समझते हैं। वे खाली फाइल का काम करते हैं, कागज पर दस्तखत मारते रहते हैं। प्रैक्टिकल काम नहीं करते। पहले आप उन को सम्भालिये। अगर वह नहीं सम्भलते तो उन को छोड़ दीजिये। चमार के बेटे को ट्रेनिंग दीजिये, कुर्मी के बेटे को ट्रेनिंग दीजिये। पंडित से कह दीजिये कि वह प्रोफेसरी करे, वह संस्कृत व पढ़ाये। (Interruption).

बाबु साहब जो बोल रहे हैं वह मिलिटरी के एक्सपर्ट हैं, उन को फौज में भेज दिया जाय। लेकिन वह खेती नहीं कर सकते हैं। खेती करने वाले ही खेती कर सकते हैं। इस देश के लोग जो चार वर्णों में बंटे हुये थे वह गलत नहीं था। लेकिन अब हर एक आदमी हर जगह पर मिल गया है। आप ने खिचड़ी बना दी। पन्द्रह वर्षों तक आप सोते रहे। आज जो चीन का हमला हम पर हुआ वह उसी लापरवाही का प्रतिफल है। अगर आप ने ध्यान दिया होता तो यहां अनाज की कमी न होती। मैं अपने फूड मिनिस्टर की तारीफ करता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस इमर्जेंसी पीरियड में बाजार को कंट्रोल किया हुआ है। इस में जरा भी गलत बात नहीं है और न कोई खाली तारीफ की बात है। कल श्री टामस का स्टेटमेंट मैंने सुना। गल्ले की कोई महंगाई आज देश में नहीं है। और चीजों के दाम भले ही बढ़ जायें, आप ब्लैड के दाम बढ़ा दीजिये, साबुन के दाम बढ़ा दीजिये, फ़ीनी के बढ़ा दीजिये, लेकिन गेहूं, चावल और मोटे अनाज को सस्ता रखिये। किरासिन आयल के दाम आप कम कीजिये।

इस हाउस में वजट पर जब वहस हो रही थी तो सुपर प्राफिट्स चैक्स के खिलाफ लोगों ने नारा लगाया। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो आमदनी आती है

[श्री शिव नारायण]

वह किस के घर से आती है ? वह किसान के घर से आती है, जब वह अपना गल्ला बेचने आता है तो सेठों के यहां धर्मादा खुले होते हैं। जब किसान एक गाड़ी भेली लाता है तो कहा जाता है कि चार सेर यहां डालो, दस सेर वहां डालो। इस तरह के धर्मादा खाते खुले हुये हैं। उस में आखिर किस का पैसा है। मैं गवर्नमेंट से पूछना चाहता हूं कि वह उस की चेकिंग क्यों नहीं करती ? उन धर्मादों से उन बड़े बड़े लोगों के बिजिनेस चलते हैं। वह सब किसान के घर से जाता है। आज देश का किसान आप के सामने बोल रहा है, वह अपना दिल खोल कर बोल रहा है। कोई किताब से नहीं पढ़ रहा है, प्रैक्टिकल एक्सपीरिऐंस से बोल रहा है। भारत में जितने मन्दिर, मस्जिद वगैरह हैं सब किसानों की रीढ़ पर मौजूद है।

‘गरीबों के लिये मिले रोटी तों
मेरी जान हाजिर है।’

यह नारा लगाया था यहां के लोगों ने और इसी पार्लियामेंट हाउस के अन्दर बम मारा था भगत सिंह, राजगुरु और मुखदेव हैं। वह दिन मुझे याद है। मैं चाहता हूं कि आज हमारी सरकार इस पर अमल करने की कोशिश करे। उस की एक रेवोल्यूशन लाना चाहिये। अगर आप गरीबों को उठायेगे नहीं तो देश का कल्याण होने वाला नहीं है।

इस के बाद मैं माइनर इरिगेशन के सम्बन्ध में डा० राम सुभग सिंह से कहना चाहता हूं कि वे किसानों से ५० परसेंट लेते हैं लेकिन उन के दफ्तरों में बड़ी गड़बड़ी होती है और पूरा पैसा पहुंच नहीं पाता है। अगर ५० परसेंट आप के पास पहुंच जाय तो सिंचाई का इन्तजाम ठीक हो जाये। जो गरीब हरिजन दो या चार बीघे वाले हैं उन को समय पर बीज मिल जाय तो अच्छा

है। आज उन को बीज ठीक से नहीं मिलता है। मैं तो कहना चाहता हूं कि शुरू में एक साल तो बीज दिया गया लेकिन दूसरे साल नहीं दिया गया। इस तरह से किसानों को हैरास किया जाता है और तंग किया जाता है। मैं चाहता हूं कि अफसरान इस को नोट कर लें। इस की जांच करें कि किस तरह से काम होता है। आप किसानों को सुविधा दीजिये, उन को बीज दीजिये, पानी समय पर मिल जाय, जो कि आज कल नहीं हो रहा है। हम को २५ परसेंट सूद पर बीज दिया जाता है लेकिन जब हम से वापस लेते हैं तो बीज छांट छांट कर लेते हैं। मैं चाहता हूं कि बीज ठीक से सप्लाई हो और पानी भी समय पर दिया जाय। आप उन को पैसा दो देते हैं लेकिन और हेल्फ भी जो होती है वह समय पर दे दी जाय तो बड़ा कल्याण हो सकता है इस देश का। किसान तो वैसे ही ढीला है, अगर आप भी ढील करेंगे तो काम चलने वाला नहीं है। यहां पर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि देश का किसान अब भी आप के पढ़े लिखे ऐग्रिकल्चरिस्ट्स से ज्यादा चतुर और होशियार है और ज्यादा पैदावार कर सकता है। आप देश में जापानी खेती का नारा लगाते थे। मैं धान की खेती के इलाके से यहां आता हूं। नेपाल की तराई में इतना फर्टिक्लास चावल होता है कि अगर यहां बनाया जाय तो सारा हाउस महक उठे।

यहां पर मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि आप चीजों की प्राइस को कंट्रोल कीजिये। हिस्ट्री का रेकार्ड बतलाता है कि अलाउद्दीन के जमाने में ३६० पर एक सिपाही रक्खा जाता था लेकिन हर चीज के दाम मुकर्रर थे। आप भी गल्ले की प्राइस को फिक्स कर दीजिये कि सन् १९६२ से ले कर सन् १९६७ तक यह प्राइस रहेगी, चाहे वह किसी के ऊपर भी पड़े। चाहे वह गरीब पर पड़े या राजा

पर पड़े। हम मेहनत भी करेंगे। लेकिन आप तो यह करते हैं कि हम से १० रु० में अनाज को लेते हैं और कल फिर हम को वही चावल ३० रु० मन में देते हैं। उड़ीसा की मिसाल मौजूद है। कहां आप का ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है, कहां गवर्नमेंट है, कौन है इस को चेक करने वाला।

इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने फूड मिनिस्टर साहब को बधाई देता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि यह मिनिस्ट्री फले और फूले। यह हमारे देश के लिये अन्नदाता बने। यह हम को अन्न दे और किसानों को भी सुखी बनाये।

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. I congratulate the hon. Minister for the miraculous success in keeping the prices under control. But my only humble request to him would be that this price control or holding of the price line should not be at the cost of the cultivators. Cultivators should be assured their due share in the production of foodgrains which is the most vital aspect of defence preparations these days.

While I support these Demands, I wish to draw your kind attention to the fact that while going through the Report of the Ministry of Agriculture I found that it was very similar to what I used to present to the College Union as Secretary, having only the rosy pictures with the view that the report is not going to be criticized anywhere. I do not find in it anything which would help constructive criticism.

While going through this Report I find that there is a remarkable statement in this Report, namely, that the production of groundnut has remarkably increased. What is the remarkable increase? It did not increase even by an ounce as per the statement

given in the Report. The production of groundnut in 1960-61 was 2.1 million tons and now it is 2.1 million tons in 1961-62. Still, we are faced with the statement that there is a remarkable increase in groundnut production.

Similarly, we find in the Report that our Mechanised Testing Centre has tested one tractor. So, a centre had tested as much as one tractor! How many lakhs of centres does our Ministry propose to establish in order to test the various agricultural machineries which we have?—Very few?

I further wish to lay stress on the fact that a senior Member from Maharashtra of Shri More's calibre and thinking, seems to have touched the hornet's nest. He has been subjected to so much of criticism from all quarters for his sole sin of having put the case of Maharashtra's sugar industry. The Maharashtra sugar industry never boasts of any sort of efficiency. It only humbly wishes to submit that this industry has so far survived in spite of so much of sacrifice on the part of the cultivators. But what we find today is the fact that the Directorate of Sugar which is under the hon. Minister of Agriculture has become a veritable net of manipulation at the hands of the All India Sugar Mills' Association which happens to be represented on this floor by my hon. friend, Shri D. D. Puri. When he said that he represents the inefficient sector, I wished to congratulate him for the efficiency he has shown, namely, that today the Maharashtra sugar industry is expected to bear Rs. 8 or Rs. 9 per quintal of transport charges from Northern India sugar factories to port for the purpose of export, while we know that this very House has given permission to the Ministry to make good the losses which the sugar industry would suffer because of the difference in the international price and the cost of production out of the yield from excise duty which is imposed upon sugar. Today we find that the inter-

[Shri Shivaja Rao S. Deshmukh]

national price is more or less at the same level at which our cost of production is. Even then we are supposed to pay Rs. 8 or Rs. 9 per quintal by way of freight charges. At least this equilibrium should be removed. When the private sugar mills flourish in the protected market and when they make good their losses on sugar export from and out of the excise duty, even in spite of that we see that the sugar industry is burdened with the cost of freight. Our only request is that it will be more sensible to ask the Southern factories which are situated nearer the ports of export to export. That will save a great amount of haulage for which we are over-taxing our railways; it will save the national exchequer valuable amount of taxation and, further, it may help the sugar industry in Maharashtra. It may or may not help. We do not say that the Maharashtra sugar industry should flourish at the cost of the cultivators in the North. The cultivators in the North should definitely get more price for their sugarcane. If they are likely to get a better price for sugarcane at the cost of cultivators in the South, the Southern cultivators would be too glad to bear even that burden. But we find here that the Indian Sugar Mills' Association which is a private body and which goes to create private capital sits over the chest of co-operative sugar industry in Maharashtra and expects that the sugar industry as a whole should bear Rs. 8 or Rs. 9 per quintal for freight. I think, this state of affairs that the community as a whole should suffer should not be allowed to continue. (Interruption).

Shri D. D. Puri rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: May I request the hon. Member to bear with me for a minute more? This state of affairs should be remedied immediately.

We export raw crystal sugar. In the case of raw crystal sugar it is a plain truth that Maharashtra sugar industry has done remarkably well. They can improve upon their performance if only the hon. Minister of Agriculture comes to their help. What we find today is that the Maharashtra sugar industry is singled out and is expected to support the private sugar interests. We have accepted the principle of mixed economy in this country. We do not grudge the private industry prospering and profiting. But our only request is that they should not prosper and profit at the cost of the co-operative sugar industry.

What happens in Maharashtra is that for establishing a sugar industry, it takes Rs. 1,80,00,000. That means more on capital and more on depreciation. Still, my hon. friend says that the cost of sugar in Maharashtra is less. We pay Rs. 240 by way of irrigation alone while our cultivator friends in the North can manage with only Rs. 20 or Rs. 40 on account of irrigation charges. Then our Government takes so much for cane cess; there is comparatively less cane cess in the North. Even then we are faced with the argument that the cost of production of sugar in Maharashtra is less while the profit margin is more. In fact, on the basis of the cost structure alone, the cost of sugar in Maharashtra has always been more because the cost of production of sugar has been more. When the cost of production continues to be at that high level, under this rosy picture of equalisation of prices how can the sugar industry in Maharashtra prosper if the cost to the consumer is going to be less and if Maharashtra is to be removed from avenues of export? I submit that the hon. Minister of agriculture with all his resourcefulness and kindness because of the fact that he represents Maharashtra will not think that he will be doing a regional service if he goes to the

succour of the sugar industry in Maharashtra.

Shri S. K. Patil: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the House that during the last eight hours yesterday and today it has brought many features and problems of agriculture under sharp focus and has given me some insight as to what is wrong about our agriculture which requires immediate cure. My hon. colleagues, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, who luckily has been given the title of Raja just now, and Shri Thomas, have given a picture both of agriculture and food and I am not going in to all those details on this occasion. I wish to address myself to a very few important and salient points of our agriculture and the food and agriculture policy of this country which the Government intends pursuing in the immediate future.

One thing that has been repeated by many hon. speakers is that agricultural production in this country during the last three years has almost been stationary. Therefore they find fault with it—very naturally so—and say that something must be radically wrong about agriculture, because it does not move.

Then, there are in this country planners, technicians, economist and statisticians, each having his own way of expression. They also come and give a picture of agriculture which—I do not say that they are wrong—ultimately ends in depressing the farmer, if I may say so, and in creating conditions in this country which they themselves do not want to be created.

This House must realise one thing. Sometimes we call agriculture an industry and very often I say that we must industrialise our agriculture. By that I only mean that modern techniques etc. have got to be brought in and the economics which is very necessary in industry has to be introduced into agriculture. But there the comparison ends. Agri-

culture cannot be compared to industry in the sense that in an industry or in a factory given raw material and human effort you can exactly tell to a point of precision as to what is going to be the product. Therefore, year after year, if you increase these factors, you exactly know what progress is going to be registered. If any planner anywhere in this country or outside imagines that agriculture, even now or after a thousand years is going to behave like an industry and he gives you a graduated increase year after year, I may very respectfully submit that he is in a fools paradise. It has never happened ever since agriculture has been in this world, modern or before. What I am saying is this. I am not saying that agriculture should not register progress. But agricultural progress is of a different type. I shall quote some figures which will astound you to see to what variation in some of the countries, even more protected than ourselves, takes place year after year. Our agriculture is a cycle of five years out of which 2 to 3 years are not bad, not good, one year extremely good and one year perhaps subnormal. Therefore, you must take, when you talk of the increases, a five years period so that you could know whether during that period in totality agriculture has registered any progress or not. Now, our Third Plan started in a particular year, just as it started in April, 1961, and therefore, in that year agriculture did not make that progress because the planners always do this. It is a simple mathematics. I am a bit student of mathematics and I know how to work figures. It is this that if 40 per cent rise is going to be in five years period, how much in each year? We say, 8 per cent or 6 per cent, whatever it is and when that 6 per cent does not come, immediately agriculture is under hammer. That is a very wrong way of looking at things because agriculture does not behave in that fashion. But one thing that one must mark about Indian agriculture is that the last three years, which were not

[Shri S. K. Patil]

good years, which were the years in a cycle, were really bad years. But it is a matter of greatest satisfaction and supreme satisfaction to me, as the Minister of Agriculture, that the base has not gone below 80 million tons. You could see here that in these fluctuations during the last ten years or twelve years, we have risen from 54 million to 80 million tons. In 1960-61, it was 80 million tons and in 1961-62, a little less, 79 million tons. This year it might be a little more. But the production of 80 million tons now gives us immense satisfaction. I am not merely saying so in order to defend my Ministry. Whereas agriculture used to slide down, was low in a bad year, whenever it did slide down even during this period of the cycle, it did not go below 80 million tons. And I may expect that when the spurt comes, that spurt will be so big. So, you need not be surprised if it jumps from 80 million tons to 95 million tons in a year because agriculture does that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is only wishful thinking.

Shri S. K. Patil: It is not wishful thinking. I am quoting the figures. I may submit, this is not so only in our country but it is so in other agricultural countries in the world. If a prophet like my friend really becomes true, and if that happens, it would be a tragedy. I can tell you that I am just suggesting that agriculture even today, as it was hundred years ago, is largely dependent at least 50 per cent to 90 per cent upon the vagaries of weather. My hon. friend comes from Orissa. Now, Orissa is a State which for 9 years out of 10 years gives rice to India. I am grateful to him and if he takes the credit, I give him because he belongs to that State.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am only sorry that you have made such a position that we are getting American rice, whereas our own rice goes to other place.

Shri S. K. Patil: I may give him his own rice also. But for one year if Orissa is bad, as it is today, it is bad luck. Therefore, I say to Orissa that because for 9 years out of 10 years, you give us your rice, you give us our food, it is my duty to come to your help to any extent to which I could go so that you are kept up, the morale agriculturists and farmers in Orissa is kept up. That is exactly what we shall try to do.

Now, during twelve years, as I was pointing out, the agricultural production has increased from 54 million tons to 80 million tons and that is a rise, somewhere about 3.3 per cent per annum worked over a long period and that has been quoted here. The agricultural commodities were decontrolled in 1952-53, as you know. Between 1952-53 and 1961-62, the national income at constant prices from the agricultural sector has increased by 27.4 per cent while the agricultural population has increased by 20 per cent. Clearly, therefore, the per capita income of the agriculturists has gone up by 5.7 per cent. Now, as I was pointing out, sometimes these variations going up and down are tremendous in this country than in other countries. I shall tell you how they behave in other countries. You have known in our country that once the agricultural production went to 74 million tons from 65 or 66 million tons—a sudden rise of 10 per cent or 15 per cent, as the case may be. Sometimes, because nature was so very congenial and helpful such a miracle can happen. It has happened during the last 30 to 40 years. Consistently, our statistics show that one year out of five years is a great year and that really equalises and gives us the higher yield spread over in a period of five years.

Now, even in countries where agriculture is mechanised and fertiliser and other inputs are used in abundance, agricultural production has shown large fluctuations, sometimes

larger than those in India. In India, out of nearly 350 million acres, the culturable land which is under the plough in this country, not more than 57 million acres are under perennial irrigation. Therefore, this works out to somewhere about 18 per cent. But that is also the largest percentage. As I have always told this House, in the matter of irrigation, whether it is a minor irrigation or a major irrigation, India leads the whole world. We have got more irrigation than even the United States of America. But even there, in the United States of America, as against 60 to 70 million tons of their requirements, they produce somewhere about 160 million tons, more than double. There also the fluctuations are very big indeed. In the USA, cereal production went up by 15.5 per cent in 1958-59. I am not talking of the ancient past; it is three or four years ago. It went up by 15.5 per cent in one year over the previous year and declined to 12.6 per cent in 1961-62.

13.49 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

So, the curve always goes up. In one year it went up by 15.5 per cent over the previous year and in the next year, subsequent to the next year, it declined by 12.6 per cent. In Australia, it went down to 26 per cent in 1957-58; went up by 118 per cent in 1958-59. I am merely quoting the figures to tell you—not because a rosy picture that I am painting before you—that wherever you go, agriculture has been behaving in the same manner and I am expecting that whatever we might do—criticisms sometimes help; there is no doubt—you do not compare conditions in India to conditions in either Japan or the United States of America. (*Interruptions*). In those countries and here the difference is this. When you make some development or develop some strain of sugarcane or wheat or anything, it takes in the United States

not even 24 hours to make that strain known to the entire agricultural community. Mr. John or Mr. Smith has produced a potato of abnormal size by giving a particular type of treatment. Immediately, Mr. John or Mr. Smit comes on the television and he says, here I am, I did this and I got this. Within 12 months, you will find hundreds and thousands of people copying that example. That would come in this country. Not so quick. It will take time. Therefore, we have got to approach 60 million families of farmers in this country, steeped in ignorance. I am not talking of ignorance in agriculture. They are not. Many of them do not read newspapers and what progress is done elsewhere. When you deal with an immobile mass of people of that dimension, you can quite understand what a difficult task it is, however clever the Ministry may be or may not be, to carry these things to them and to convince them. Besides, they have got their orthodox methods; they have got their superstitions. Of all things, the most difficult thing to deal with is orthodoxy and superstition. You have got to go through it, plod through it. Because, after all, it is the farmer who has got to produce. Luckily the Minister does not produce anything; nor do my colleagues produce anything. We produce speeches in this House. Surely, if 60 million families of farmers have got to produce, naturally, your scheme must be such that is acceptable to the 60 million families of farmers, that reaches them in time, convinces them in time and gives them the protection that is necessary. It does take time. If the methods that we are employing are wrong, then surely, you have every right to criticise. I am not saying that you cannot criticise. Surely not. I criticise them. I criticise myself. If the farmer does not get into his own, all the effort that we are making is useless.

People call this country a predominantly agricultural country. It is a trite expression. I would go further and say, the predominance of agricul-

[Shri S. K. Patil]

ture in our national economy, even after 100 years, may not be the same; it will no doubt go down; dwindle, But surely, agriculture shall be predominant for the simple reason that as I have said, during the last 11 years of our Plans, you have spent—I do not know how many thousands of crores—at least Rs. 1000 crores on non-agricultural production, whether it is industry, whether it is electricity or any other thing that you have got. After spending all that money, reliance of 70 per cent of our population—how much has it gone down? After spending all the money during the last 11 years, from 70 per cent, it has gone down to 69 per cent. That means, it has not made any significant dent. When it is the position that 70 per cent of our people depend upon agriculture, whether they live by agriculture or half live by agriculture, agriculture is the only thing they have. To reduce that from 70 per cent to 69 per cent, as much as at least Rs. 1000 crores if not more on industry, etc. have got to be spent.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): How many years?

Shri S. K. Patil: Eleven years. Modern industry is not labour intensive industry. Therefore you will find that it is of a higher technical nature and that means less man power. The result is what I am telling. Therefore, our national economy, not now, not before, even after 100 years, is going to be largely dependent on the progress of agriculture that this country will be able to make. That is why, it is not in this emergency alone, but even in ordinary time, agriculture must be regarded as the main feature of India's national economy and as much attention, as much labour and as much money that can be bestowed upon it, has got to be done. Otherwise, there is no future for this country.

Shri Bade (Khargone): I have got one question. Why has the yield per acre not increased?

Shri S. K. Patil: Some speakers pointed out that whatever progress has been registered, is by throwing more land under agriculture. In this House I have heard very different types of arguments. I do not blame anybody. Possibly I might twist an argument in my favour wherever I want. Sometimes they say, Oh, there is so much waste land, why is it not brought under agriculture. If I brought it in. Then, "why was it brought; we find that more land has been brought in and agriculture has increased: otherwise not." In India, not now, but for all time to come, there is no land for agriculture. Even more, if any land is available, I shall rather use it for forests and not for agriculture. If there is total destruction or diminution of forests, agriculture can never make any progress. In our country, forests should be somewhere about 50 per cent at least. It has gone down to 20 per cent; sometimes from 18 to 23 per cent: I do not know what is the correct figure. If there is any possibility of utilising more land for forests, I as Minister, and I think even the Minister directly in charge of Forests Dr. Ram Subhag Singh,—we are of the opinion that more land should be given to forests in order to stabilise the condition of agriculture and no land should be taken away. Therefore, the total availability for agriculture is very limited, indeed. That, as I said, is 350 or 375 million acres in this country. That also, as I have very often pointed out in this House, India is the country which uses as much as 40 per cent or 45 per cent of its land surface for agriculture. It is not done by any other country in this vast world. Next to us is Indonesia; they use available surface to the tune of 40 or 45 per cent. Let us not expect that there will be any extensive agriculture by bringing larger areas under it. Our only remedy is to have inten-

sive agriculture. That means, the per acre yield must increase: 20 per cent or 40 per cent or even double. In another 30 or 40 years, it might be even treble.

We can do that. That is a very useful thing. Because our agriculture is backward, we have got a lot of leeway to make. If I tell in America or England that you must produce 10 per cent more wheat, they cannot. Why? Because, the optimum has been reached. On their land, with the modern techniques and everything, the optimum has been reached. Therefore if I ask them to increase 10 per cent or 20 per cent, they cannot, unless they have got more land. When we wanted more rice from the U.S.A. many other countries also wanted, the U. S. A. increased the area under rice by 10 per cent. Luckily they have got area which we have not got. Therefore, to us, there is no other remedy except, as I said, intensive agriculture which we propose to do and which we are doing. As it is, foodgrains occupy somewhere about 280 million acres out of the culturable land in India; oilseeds about 33.4 million, cotton 18.9 million, jute 1.75 and sugarcane—mark it, I am going to take up sugarcane, that is the point which I am going to mainly deal with in my speech—5.8 million acres. It came down a little and may come down—5 or 6 million acres out of the total acreage. Therefore, in this acreage, we have got to have the maximum. We can have it. There is really no trouble about it.

One or two speakers made a very significant observation during the course of the debate yesterday and I want to support those observations and tell the policy of the Government of India. They said, hitherto, agriculture and agricultural policy, whether under British Raj or under our own Raj, have been consumer dominated, consumer oriented and not farmer-oriented, much less farmer-dominated. We have no farmers' lobby in this House. When you go to the U.S.A., in the American Con-

gress every second man you meet in the lobby belongs to the farmers' lobby. They are so powerful. Even President Kennedy or his entire organisation cannot do anything if the Farmers lobby does not accept it. If you want to sell anything or buy anything from them, it is this lobby that we have got to satisfy first. Because, the farmers' interests are guaranteed there. In the European Economic Community, I do not know whether everybody has seen that picture that has now come as to how they behave. The whole agricultural policy has been brought up to a level that it has been raised or reduced to electronics. They even take the help of electronics to guard the interests of the farmer. I shall illustrate and you will understand of what help electronics is. The farmers bring the produce whether it is potato or whether it is any other thing to the market. The market is a very well kept market. There are gadgets kept there. Everybody comes. They bring what they have brought, whether it is potato or vegetable or onions, rice or any other thing. Immediately the calls are given, because there are auctions as to what the man should have. As soon as you press the button it will be registered on a board. Then the man may say that the price is not enough; then, he presses another button. Then the man gives some higher call. Like that it goes on until the last call comes, and that is the price at which the thing has got to be sold, and if that price is not remunerative to the agriculturist or the farmer, the secretary of the farmers' union presses a button that nullifies the entire auction and throws out the whole thing, so that no farmer can be duped out of his legitimate income. On the next morning, another auction can be held, and they will do it there, because they have got the stamina to do these things. What I am telling the House, therefore, is this. This is what I call the farmer-oriented agricultural economy of this country. And if I am the Minister in charge of Food and Agri-

[Shri S. K. Patil]

culture, I place this before the House, that this agricultural economy shall be farmer-oriented economy in this country and not consumer-oriented economy. But what is generally happening now is this.

14 hrs.

An Hon. Member: Will your Cabinet agree to it or not?

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: The Cabinet must agree to this policy.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): If we agree, the Cabinet will also agree.

Shri S. K. Patil: What happens just now is this. The moment the price has gone up or gone down a little, there is such a furore everywhere in this country. And who tells this that the price has gone up? It is the newspapers. Where are the newspapers published and issued. Not even in the small towns but in the big cities? Where do the M.P.s function for their work of this kind? I am not criticising anybody. They also function in the big cities. Therefore, the moment the price goes up a little or comes down, irrespective of the fact whether it has gone up or come down because of the middleman or because the farmer has been given a little more, without any consideration whatsoever, it is said that the consumers' interests have got to be maintained. I would submit that 70 per cent of the population of this country depends on agriculture. They do not go and buy any agricultural products; they make them themselves. Therefore, it is the other 30 per cent who come into the picture; it used to be 30 per cent, but the last census has shown that the population in the cities is only 18 per cent and not 30 per cent. If, therefore, it is said that having this 18 per cent population remaining in the cities in mind, we must base our prices, in such a way that they are really good to them but they may be good or may not be good to the farmer, then I would sub-

mit that this Government is not going to pursue that policy....

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav rose—

Shri S. K. Patil: My hon. friend had enough interruptions before. He need not interrupt me now.

If between the producers' end and the consumers' end, there are any obstructions in the funnel where actually some middlemen has gone and taken more price, then surely you can sit upon your Minister, and it is my duty to see that that does not happen, whatever comes. In that eventuality, even if controlled rationing or whatever else becomes necessary, I would not be averse to it, but if in encouraging the farmer, I and you and the Parliament give them a higher price as a result of which the consumers' price is going to increase, then you have got to put up with that increase because that is the only thing which the economy can bear.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Unanimously agreed.

Shri S. K. Patil: Therefore, this is the policy, and, therefore, the farmers have got to be given the incentive prices. The farmer does not work without the incentive prices.

Mr. Speaker: I am jealous of the hon. Minister's attention towards that side.

Shri Tyagi: It is the farmers whom he is addressing.

Shri S. K. Patil: I am sorry; I shall correct my mistake. Without incentives, the farmer will not work, and particularly our farmer will not work without incentives, because he does not know this modern economics because it becomes difficult for him to know all these things.

I shall illustrate what I mean by modern economics. If a farmer is

getting Rs. 100 on an acre, whether in wheat or rice or in whatever else he cultivates, if he has to spend Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 per acre on fertiliser and other things such as plant food and so on and so forth, and if I tell him that 'By putting in Rs. 300, you will get Rs. 400', then, he will say 'One has to put in Rs. 300 first before one can get Rs. 400?', and that economics becomes unintelligible to our farmer because he is a poor man. It is not unintelligible to the farmer in in the U.S.A. or Russia or Japan, because he knows that if he puts in Rs. 300 he will get Rs. 400, and, therefore, he knows that he will get about 33 per cent or more profit on it, but our farmer does not know it. Therefore, we must have patience with our farmers, because we have got to tell him, we have got to coach him, and we have got to give him more credit and so on.

All these package programmes, or intensive cultivation, as we call it, in all these 40 districts which we have chosen now in this emergency, in all these one hundred districts which we have chosen for millets etc., all these pilot programmes etc. are an insurance just to tell the farmer that 'If you behave in this manner' these are the results that are likely to accrue. But that is not done overnight. The farmer must be convinced first. Otherwise, it could not be done. We must convince him that out of his agriculture, not only will he get enough food, but he will get enough money with which he can buy his clothes, educate his children, and have the other things that he requires such as a radio or even a television set when the Information and Broadcasting Minister will bring it. All these things will be at his disposal by doing these things. There is no need for any distinction between agriculture and industry in this regard. The American millionaires are there in the industry, and the American farmers are also millionaires. It does not make any difference really whether one does agriculture or one does industry.

Therefore, we have got to have patience with our agriculturists or farmers and do everything in order to give them incentives. Hon. Members criticise that Rs. 13 for wheat and Rs. 14 to 18 for rice is not an incentive price. That is why I have not called it an incentive price. I have humbly chosen a word for this, and I have called it the minimum price. And I have always expected that the prices must rule higher than that. I can tell you that even where procurement is made for Rs. 13 or 14, the price at which the farmer sells the rest of the produce—because only 20 or 40 per cent comes under procurement—is somewhere about four or five rupees higher. And I want him to have it higher. I do not want procurement, and if possible, I want to do without it. During this year, barring only Orissa—and there too procurement has been kept by Orissa—in other places, I have not kept any compulsory procurement anywhere in India. I have only kept voluntary procurement. If we can get anything, it is well and good. But otherwise it does not make any difference to me. By procurement if I get something, and I have got to give the consumer the same thing back again out of my stock, then it is better than that stock remains with the farmers themselves.

Therefore, you can see here that unless incentives are given to the farmers, the farmers will not really produce up to the expectation of all of us and even up to their own expectations. Therefore, we are doing everything in our power to see that this procurement should come to us.

Before I go to sugar which will be the last item, I may say one thing. Many hon. Members have really asked and in fact, some hon. Member said a little while ago 'Oh, we are eating American wheat', as if the taking of American wheat has resulted in some indigestion in the stomach.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Our economy is having indigestion.

Shri S. K. Patil: This House will realise that five or six years back, when there was not enough wheat in this country, and when there was not enough rice in this country, and when prices were rocketing up time and again, they used to say 'Why do you not build up a buffer stock or why do you not stock-pile?'. I used to tell them 'if the commodity is not enough for us, then I am going to build a buffer stock or I am going to stock-pile', and, therefore, with the permission and the sanction of Government and of this House and of everybody else, I went and signed the grain agreement. I wanted a respite period of four or five years during which period I could build up my agriculture, and during which period, every day, I did not want to move from pillar to post, and I wanted to have comparative peace for my development. That was why this famous grain agreement was entered into with the USA.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That is a good job, but that is the only good job you have done.

Shri S. K. Patil: If I may say so, it was because we had built a stock-pile and had these 70 million tons, that not only were we able to keep ourselves out of difficulty for the last four years, but even the price-line has been maintained, and 90 per cent of the credit for that goes to the stock-pile which we have got.

Then, the Members sometimes ask this question, because they find this from our books that last year only Rs. 200 crores worth of foodgrains were brought and they think that last year was a deficit. When you enter into an agreement for four years, naturally, sometimes, you bring more and sometimes you bring less. But it

is for the stock-pile and not for your immediate requirements; of course, part of it is for immediate requirements, but mostly it is for stock-pile. Therefore, that particular deal that was signed by me when I was there in the USA has really helped us tremendously. It has helped us to stand on our legs and given us a feeling of confidence and given a sense of confidence to the farmer also that it is not going to be used against him but it will be used in order to protect him so that he would be able to stand on his own legs, and increase the agricultural production of this country. Therefore, the figures of 200 or 100 etc. do not count. If my hon. friends will tell me 'It does not matter; we shall eat a little less, and the country will eat a little less, but let us have nothing from outside imported into our country', I shall just give them one illustration.

In the production of rice, we are almost at the topmost. I do not know the figures of China, because they do not publish any statistics anywhere. But, barring China, India is the largest producer of rice in the whole wide world. We produce somewhere about 34—35 million tons of rice. What is our requirement of rice? The same. We do not want anything more. We are self-sufficient in rice. But if one or two lakhs of tons of rice do not come from Burma or elsewhere, what happens to the prices? This has become a psychological matter. Last year, against our 34 or 35 million tons whole production, we had less than 5 lakh tons from outside. It is just about one per cent or a little more or less. But for that one per cent, the matter has become so psychological that if you do not bring it at the appointed time, surely prices go up. Therefore, it is not for my pleasure that I am bringing it. If it was really a question of rice only, I should not be importing, because we

have enough rice and we shall be producing more. May be after two or three years it may be given to me to come to the House and say that we have stopped bringing rice from outside because we are bound to be self-sufficient in rice sooner than we expect.

So far as wheat is concerned, we shall be self-sufficient. Just now we are diverting wheat to rice-eating people because they should not suffer, the rice eating areas. Otherwise, wheat production has increased enormously under Indian conditions. From 8 or 9 million, we have come to 12½ million. This we have been able to do. Of course, our expectations can be high and it could be said that we have not done according to our expectations. But barring that, so far as the performance in agriculture is concerned, I do not think under the conditions under which we operate we have done badly at all.

Now, I come to sugarcane. Sugar being sweet, I have kept it as the last subject of my speech. There are many hon. Members from UP and Bihar who have spoken. I do not blame them because naturally they are their constituents and they have got to deal with them. Sometimes, if they become my constituents also, I have also to do the same. Therefore, I do not blame them because I can go into their shoes and think about this matter as they think about it. Therefore, I have no quarrel with them.

They will come and tell me that 8 years ago in the time of my illustrious predecessor, Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, we imported as much as 14 lakh tons of sugar from outside because sugar was not available in sufficient quantities here. We must have spent—I do not know—about Rs. 35 crores in foreign exchange. But in those days foreign exchange could be had because we had our sterling balances lying abroad. If anybody tells me now that our Finance Minister is going to give 14 nP for importing sugar, I do not think any hon.

Member in this House will believe it.

Therefore, I tried to give incentives as soon as I took over; within one month of my taking over of the Ministry, I increased the prices. I gave some kind of incentive even to the factories because they have also to be partners in this. What was the result? Are you not proud of this fact that notwithstanding anything that might happen today, the deficit sugar economy of this country has been for all times turned into a surplus economy? We are really proud that we shall be sending sugar out to the tune of 5 lakhs tons every year and get in return much needed foreign exchange.

When we say that we want to be prosperous, how are we going to do it? Not by sending industrial goods to industrial countries. Therefore, I think more than a thousand or two thousand crores of rupees worth of foreign exchange which we need must be earned after ten years by our agricultural economy by exporting our goods. Remember what was the position one year back and what is the position now. We had a stock of 14 lakh tons on hand, a huge quantity of sugar accumulated everywhere. Bank advances had gone to a point about Rs. 30 crores beyond what we expected, to nearly Rs. 130 crores. Sugar is also a perishable commodity. You cannot keep it for five or ten years. They were anxious days for us as to what to do. Under those circumstances, we thought that the acreage that had gone up must be brought back and by intensive cultivation we shall develop and not by spreading the acreage. Therefore, to compare those conditions with those of today would not be correct. Luckily we find that the international price has gone higher, to £54 from £23, that is, more than double or 2½ times. But this is merely swelling, not the normal health. Sugar production everywhere in the world was less this year than last year. This was particularly so in Cuba and, therefore, this has happened. Could anybody have foreseen the year ago that

[Shri S. K. Patil]

production this year would be less; therefore, let us keep our sugar so that we would get £54. There was a debate in this House and we were asked as to why we sold sugar to Pakistan at the rate of £24.

Therefore, at a time like that, in order to save the sugar industry from a collapse—from which there would be no come-back—we had to adopt some measures and that was why we did it. Then we linked up the price of cane with the sucrose content. Those who oppose it do not oppose the linking; but they want that the farmer should get the same as he was getting before. Not to link the price of cane with the sucrose content would have been something very uneconomic and unheard of; nowhere in the world is that done. What we pay is for the sugar and not for the stick that holds some sugar. Therefore, it has got to be done.

But the point is that people naturally thought that those people who may suffer should not suffer. The sugar position is constantly under review and I can assure my hon. friends that I am watching the trends, trying to find out what the trends are going to be. I will try to judge them. My hon. friend, Shri D. D. Puri, made a contribution. He knows it exactly because the wearer knows where the shoe pinches. He knows when it will sell and when it will not. I wish there were some prophets who could have told me that this year production was going to be so low. If that was possible, I would also have indulged in that pastime. But if I do any such thing, I create conditions in the market which are not very healthy. Therefore, we must not go on talking like that. I have got a million tons of sugar with me. I have got the whole future of the sugar industry with me. Whatever happened in this year is not the criterion. But the next year is mine. I know what to do, where incentives should be given, in what directions they should be channelled by which I get not only 27 or 25 lakhs of tons but,

as I said, 3 million tons at the end of the next year. Everything that goes in that direction, the Government is pledged to do. We shall do that. If it means that some kind of incentive price is to be given to sugarcane, I will give it, when it becomes necessary. I have got to work it out. I should see what is reasonable. Whatever I give I should not take back because that will produce an adverse psychological effect. If you give Rs. 13 or Rs. 14 for wheat, you cannot bring it down. You cannot tell him, 'Now you have got better per acre yield; so it should be less'. He will not consent to that.

Therefore, while doing so, I must take jolly good precaution to see that what I give to him, in no circumstances I take back from him. Therefore, I am doing other things. First, in order that sugarcane is developed, I am compelling the State Governments to bring back the money wholly taken by them in their revenue—whether it is cess or purchase tax—into it. In UP, they have a scheme involving a crore of rupees only in order to see that sugarcane is developed. We are giving them 1/3rd grant. We shall go on increasing it in UP, in Punjab and in Bihar, wherever it is necessary. In Maharashtra, it is not necessary. Therefore, it is not being done there. Otherwise, it can be done there also.

On the one side, sugarcane should be developed. On the other, I so manage the sugar policy that there will be some positive incentives. People here tell me that people have suffered. Who has suffered? Where has the sugarcane gone? Sugarcane has more profitably gone to gur. It is not the producer of sugarcane who has suffered. The sufferer is me, the Government, because sugar prices fluctuate and naturally I will have to find sugar from somewhere. Therefore, so far as the producer is concerned, the sugarcane grower is con-

earned, he has not suffered. I do not want him to suffer. I am not angry with him. I am going to shape the policy in a manner that if any incentives are necessary, apart from the help to production that I am giving, those incentives will be given. But they will be linked to the sucrose content. We will see that they will get more than what they got before so that diversion from gur to sugar becomes possible. This year it was not possible, because nature was also against us, because the season was bad and most of the crop was ratoon crop. Therefore, it could not be done. I cannot give you the exact figure or the nature of those incentives, but I stand committed to this that the sugar economy of India is going to be a surplus economy. I am trying to raise the Third Plan target of 3.5 million tons to 4 million tons. It is necessary because internal consumption is also going up. At the same time, a target of at least $\frac{1}{2}$ million tons is going to be for export, no matter what the price is. Today the prices are very favourable, and they are not likely to fall immediately to the level of £23, because the world market has also got some resilience. Therefore, for a year or two the prices will not slump to the position from which they had gone up.

All this has to be borne in mind. I am quite sure that after this explanation, the Members will not find fault with me. I was rather intrigued when some Member began by giving me *Ganga jal*, and another said that was the type of thing you gave when a man was going to be no more. Our agriculture is going to stand for all time and will go on drinking *Ganga jal* as much as you like. We are not hitting the farmer as my hon. friend Shri Bibhuti Mishra says. That is not going to happen in this Ministry. I have got a Minister of Agriculture whose grass roots are in agriculture, who is not a Raja as described by some hon. Member.

My hon. friend says that if I get 32 lakh tons this year or the next, he

will have a Satyanarayana puja. I am a believer and a very strong believer, there is nothing wrong in it, because it is a very sweet type of thing. I shall go to wherever my hon. friend does his Satyanarayana puja so that the triumph of the agriculturist, the sugarcane grower is celebrated in a manner that is good for him and everybody.

Having said that, I once again repeat that so far as the agricultural position in this country is concerned, it is not merely saying so, but it has been satisfactory, it has been comfortable. It has stood the stress of the emergency during the last four months. The trade and everyone has behaved. In the first and second world wars prices shot up in Europe and everywhere. But during this emergency, acute as it was in October and November, not only did the prices not shoot up in this country, they went down to a certain extent, and the morale was kept up. There has been no difficulty so far as the agricultural front was concerned. You can be sure that whenever an opportunity comes—I call it an opportunity, because in order to protect your country, you have to make sacrifices—the farmer will play a most dominant role.

With these words, I commend the Demands of my Ministry to the acceptance of the House.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): What about desert reclamation and soil conservation?

Shri S. K. Patil: We have got a plan for desert reclamation according to which we are working. The main plan really speaking relates to Madhya Pradesh where we have got ravines, and also to Rajasthan. But in Madhya Pradesh it is a big thing. This is not a problem that can be tackled easily and immediately. We are tackling it bit by bit, because if I have got so much of agricultural grant, I have got to see how best I can utilise it, but I agree with my

[Shri S. K. Patil]

hon. friend that unless the soil is conserved and consolidated, our agriculture is going to suffer. That is very much under our consideration.

Mr. Speaker: I now put the cut motions to the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 41, 42 43, 44, 45, 46, 127, 128 and 129 relating to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture."

The motion was adopted.

(The motions of Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced below—Ed.)

DEMAND No. 41—MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 75,50,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

DEMAND No. 42—AGRICULTURE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,93,17,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Agriculture'."

DEMAND No. 43—AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,74,10,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Agricultural Research'."

DEMAND No. 44—ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 88,71,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Animal Husbandry'."

DEMAND No. 45—FOREST

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 97,64,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Forest'."

DEMAND No. 46—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 29,14,62,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

DEMAND No. 127—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON FORESTS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,10,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the

31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Forests'."

DEMAND No. 128—PURCHASE OF FOOD-GRAINS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,27,57,36,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Purchase of Foodgrains'."

DEMAND No. 129—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 60,27,48,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 65 to 67 and 132 relating to the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting for which 5 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating which of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMAND No. 65—MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16.12,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of pay-

ment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Ministry of Information and Broadcasting'."

DEMAND No. 66—BROADCASTING

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,15,06,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Broadcasting'."

DEMAND No. 67—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,63,57,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting'."

DEMAND No. 132—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,72,75,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting'."

The demands are now before the House.

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting has a very important role to play particularly during the period