

President, out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1967, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Scheme of Government Trading'."

DEMAND NO. LV—LOANS AND ADVANCES BY THE GOVERNMENT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,49,43,900 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1967, in respect of 'Loans and Advances by the Government'."

13.25 hrs.

KERALA APPROPRIATION
(No. 2) BILL* 1966

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Bhagat): On behalf of Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala for the services of the financial year 1966-67.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala for the services of the financial year 1966-67."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Bhagat: I introduce† the Bill. I beg to move:†

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain

sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala for the services of the financial year 1966-67, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala for the services of the financial year 1966-67, be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, we shall take up clause by clause consideration. The question is:

"That clauses 1 to 3, the Schedule, Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 to 3, the Schedule, Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri Bhagat: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

13.27 hrs.

PRODUCE CESS BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now we shall take up Produce Cess Bill.

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri C. Subramaniam): I beg to move:†

"That the Bill to provide for the imposition of cess on certain produce for the improvement and development of the methods of cultivation and marketing of such produce and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II, section 2, dated the 11-5-1966.

†Introduced/moved with the recommendation of the President.

‡Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

Sir, the Produce Cess Bill is primarily concerned with the realisation of cess levied on various agricultural produces, in particular, cotton, copra and oilseeds, with a view to financing the improvement and development of methods of cultivation and marketing of the related produce. As the House is aware, the commodity committees which have recently been abolished, were financed by the proceeds of the Indian Cotton Cess Act, 1923, Indian Lac Cess Act, 1930, Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944 and the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946. As part of the re-organisation of agricultural research in the country, it was decided that the research programmes should have a central coordination and direction and should, therefore, function under the aegis of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research.

The development, marketing and other functions of these committees such as there were, have been placed in the direct charge of the Department of Agriculture, assisted by the Development Councils formed for the purpose. Although the Commodity Committees have been abolished, it follows, the requirements of funds for research and development continues. In fact, we have ambitious programmes for the development of various commodities such as cotton, lac, coconut, oilseeds etc. It is against this background that the Produce Cess Bill is being moved to-day. Opportunity has been taken, through this Bill, to simplify the nature of cess levied on various items of produce and also to bring the cess in better relation to the presently prevailing prices of the commodities. It is significant that in many of these commodities which are covered by the Produce Cess Bill, the rates have remained unaltered from as early as 1946 to 1948. Considering the higher tempo of development and research expenditures, it has become necessary to adjust the rates upwards.

As I said, we have before us an ambitious programme of development of various commodities. I am aware

that in the earlier days, in many cases, the commodity committees had large unutilised balances. This is precisely one of the reasons why we had to decide to make a clean break and set up a different type of organisation. In our new programmes, we have decided to marry science and technology to our needs in the sphere of commodity production.

I shall briefly touch on the programme we have taken up in respect of some of the main commodities. The development programmes for jute which are being undertaken by Government aim at an ambitious programme of production of 73.3 lakhs bales in 1966-67. Similarly, a target of 18.62 lakhs bales has been agreed to for mesta. We have tripled the allocation of fertilisers for jute. We have also arranged for a foliar spray of urea for 4.15 lakh acres this year at the expense of the Central Government. A concerted programme has been organised for the production and supply of as much as 41,500 maunds of good seeds of jute.

A similar increased tempo is to be imparted to the groundnut programme. In the current year, it is expected that we would cover half a million acres under the special programme for groundnut production. This new programme is modelled on the success of the pilot project at Sangli in Maharashtra where supply of improved seeds, fertilisers and plant protection materials have been coordinated with the availability of credit. On a similar basis, 500,000 acres are being taken up in 1966-67; this will rise to 3.2 million acres by 1970-71. We are making available, specifically, for this purpose, adequate quantities of fertilisers, pesticides and improved seeds. We are also sponsoring the employment of adequate staff in the States. The programme is at present expected to cover the States of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, Mysore and Madras. It is not our intention to confine our emphasis to groundnut alone among oilseeds. An intensive

mustard growing programme is being organised over 200,000 acres in Uttar Pradesh. Similarly, a castor growing programme is being organised in Andhra Pradesh.

Turning to cotton, our attempt is primarily to increase the yield from the lands on which cotton is already being grown. Our target for the Fourth Plan is to cover nearly 5 million acres under the intensive programme. Production of foundation-seeds and the introduction of new varieties of cotton are in hand. During 1966-67, we propose to cover nearly 4.7 lakhs acres with adequate fertilisers and pesticides. The Indian Cotton Mills Federation has agreed to cover one lakh of acres with pesticides spray.

We cannot rest with transmitting to the farmer the results of research already done. We have to continue to refine and improve the new varieties which can give better yield and better quality products. I must pay compliments on this occasion to the dedication with which research workers of India in the field of agriculture are devoting themselves to the new task. There has been a tremendous excitement in the world of agricultural research in India and this is the surest augury of success that we have in the field of agriculture. But we cannot expect such enthusiasm to be sustained merely on empty promises. We have to create a new environment for research in the country. For too long we have treated agricultural science and related disciplines in a step-motherly fashion. The agricultural research worker is even today paid lower than his counterparts in the prestigious branches of industrial sciences. In fact, even now, the scales of pay of some of our leading scientific workers in the Central Institutes of agricultural research are lower than those drawn by similar workers in the CSIR. We cannot afford, except at great peril, to continue this neglect.

The reorganised Indian Council of Agricultural Research, under the leadership of the distinguished scientist

Dr. B. P. Pal, is trying to set right these conditions. I am hopeful that these efforts will yield early results. There is one general observation, however, which I would like to make. The attitude to agricultural science in the country as a whole is still not very healthy. If we take, for instance, a boy emerging from school, his first preference is to seek a career in engineering, medicine or may be in administration. Agriculture and agricultural research take the very last place. This has to be changed. I think that the suggestion to create an agricultural research service would go a long way to attract good and competent men into this new career. I would also hope that in the months to come, the Indian Council of Agricultural Research will start a bold recruitment programme even as the Atomic Energy Commission did at the time of its inception. I hope that the Council will recruit young and brilliant men from the colleges, on the basis, if need be, of stiff tests and put them through a necessary orientation programme to equip them to do research in the various fields of agriculture. No line of activity will be as rewarding to us over the years as the development and encouragement of talent for research in agriculture.

It is to finance these and related development activities that the Produce Cess Bill is intended. I have told the scientists in the field of agriculture that no worth-while programme of theirs for research will be allowed to suffer for want of finance. Research and development of agriculture are vital to the progress of India's economy and let it not be said that we in this Parliament were niggardly in giving them the funds which they needed for this.

With these few words, I commend this Bill for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the imposition of cess on certain

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

produce for the improvement and development of the methods of cultivation and marketing of such produce and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

There is an amendment tabled by Shri Yashpal Singh for reference of this Bill to a Select Committee. That is out of order because it is a dilatory motion. These levies are not being sought to be imposed for the first time, but the levies are already there, and power is being taken under this Act to collect them. This Bill has to be passed within 75 days. If the motion for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee is accepted, then this Bill would not be passed before 75 days. Therefore, the motion for reference to a Select Committee is dilatory and out of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Is cane cess also included in this?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is all mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

Two hours have been allotted for this Bill. So, hon. Members will try to be brief.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): You have just stated that the amendment of my hon. friend Shri Yashpal Singh is not to be moved . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That has been ruled out of order.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I want to raise a point of order in connection with that . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is that point of order?

Shri Shree Narayan Das: My point of order is this. This Bill is going to give some powers to the Central Government to increase the items in the Schedule. You have just stated

that the purpose of this Bill is only to continue the cesses that are already being levied, because the Acts that provide for such levies are going to lapse. But by clause 22 of this Bill . . .

Shri C. Subramaniam: I am moving an amendment to that. I have given notice of it already.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I say that under that clause, the scope of the Bill has been increased. Under this clause, Government are going to take powers to extend the application of this Act to new items and to some other new commodities. Therefore, I would submit that the amendment of my hon. friend Shri Yashpal Singh is quite in order. It may be circulated for eliciting opinion thereon.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may oppose the clause when it comes up.

Shri C. Subramaniam: The ruling has been given already. What is the use of the hon. Member contesting that ruling now?

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I am not contesting it . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When the clause is taken up, the hon. Member may oppose it.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Clause 22 can be considered separately.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस नीयत के साथ हमारे माननीय कृषि मंत्री ने इस बिल को पेश किया है उस नीयत का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ लेकिन कुछ समय में नहीं आता कि इतने टैक्सों की भरमार में किस तरीके से भारत के नागरिक जिंदा रह सकते हैं ? सिर्फ नीयत साफ़ होना ही जरूरी नहीं है बल्कि ऐक्शन भी तो साफ़ होना चाहिए । जब आप इस बात को समझ नहीं सके हैं कि घाज प्रोड्यूसर को कितना ज्यादा देना पड़ता है ऐसी हालत

में मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आया कि यह 60 पैसे या 70 पैसे का कोई इस तरीके का बंधन लगा देना और उस के लिए बिल पेश करना यह तो और भी ज्यादा कृषक के ऊपर अन्याय करना होगा। मेरी राय इस मामले में यह है कि जितने आपने ज्यादा बिल पास कर रखे हैं जितने ज्यादा आपके कानून है दंड संज्ञा है उनके रहते हुए इस नये बिल के लाने की जरूरत नहीं है। जहां तक एक तरफ सरकार यह कहती है कि प्रोडक्शन बढ़ नहीं रहा है वहां दूसरी तरफ वह यह भी कहती है कि प्रोडक्शन बढ़ता जा रहा है तो मेरी समझ में उसकी यह बात नहीं आती है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These committees are being dissolved. That is why this Bill is necessary.

श्री महापाल सिंह: वह तो हो गई लेकिन उन के बजाय जो नई कमेटी आप कायम करने जा रहे हैं और सस लगाने के अधिकार को आप अपने हाथ में लेना चाहते हैं तो यह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि किस तरीके से पैदावार बढ़ाने में इस से सहायता मिलेगी? कहा जाता है कि करप्शन बढ़ रहा है। करप्शन बढ़ने का कारण यह है कि प्राडक्शन नहीं हो रहा है। अगर प्राडक्शन बढ़ेगा, तो करप्शन खुद खत्म हो जायेगा। मेरी राय यह है कि इस मामले में जो 60 पैसे का बंधन रखा गया है, उस को वापस ले लिया जाये।

इस काम के लिए किसी कमेटी की इतनी ज्यादा जरूरत नहीं है, क्योंकि हर एक महकमे में डिप्टी मिनिस्टर, डायरेक्टर और दूसरे अफसरान मौजूद हैं। जब कोई नई कमेटी बनाई जाती है, तो नये नये टैक्स लग जाते हैं। इस लिये कमेटी से कोई फायदा नहीं होता है। ग्रेट ब्रिटेन का कायदा यह है कि अगर कोई सौ

रूपये की खेती की पैदावार करता है, तो सरकार उस को तीन सौ रूपये सबसिडी देती है। लेकिन यहां पर इस बात का कोई खयाल नहीं रखा गया है कि जो प्रोड्यूस करता है, जिस ने कस्टीबेट किया है, जिस ने दिन-रात एक कर के जमीन में पैदावार की है, उस को कुछ राहत मिले। इस लिए जरूरत इस बात की है कि इस बिल को वापस ले कर एक काम्प्रिहेंसिव बिल लाया जाये, जिस से काफ़्तकार को पैदा करने वाले को, राहत मिल सके।

कोई न कोई ऐसा रूस भी बनाया जाना चाहिए, जिस से टैक्स-इवेजन् न हो सके और कोई टैक्स का एक पैसा भी न चुरा सके। मैं इस बिल की कद्र करता हूं, लेकिन जो 60 पैसे का बंधन रखा गया है, उस का मैं विरोध करता हूं। मंत्री महोदय से मेरी विनती है कि वह सब से ज्यादा इस बात का खयाल रखें कि कस्टीबेट पर, प्रोड्यूसर पर, किसी तरह का कोई टैक्स न लगाया जाये। जो भी टैक्स हो, वह मिल-मालिकान पर हो। प्रोड्यूसर पर एक पैसा भी टैक्स न लगाया जाये।

Shri M. L. Jadhav (Malegaon): I rise to support the measure before the House. I have no complaint about the levy. I am happy that the Indian Central Cotton Committee has been abolished together with Oilseeds and other Committees which were not giving a good performance. At the same time, when some cess is levied and some tax collected, whether that money is being utilised for proper research and our research institute function properly should be seen to.

The hon. Minister was pleased to compliment the research workers. I would like to join him in that. At the same time, I feel that regarding cotton and groundnuts, the damage caused by insects and diseases is on

[Shri M. L. Jadhav]

the increase. Our scientists and research workers have not been in a position to check this. The cultivator has to suffer because his crop is not given proper protection. It is very necessary that our research should develop because new insects and new diseases are being noticed. We find that our cultivators are in no way inferior to their counterparts in the advanced countries in the production of superior quality cotton. If we give them incentives and protection, they will better their performance.

They should be given adequate credit, timely fertilisers and insurance for their crop. Crop insurance is a necessary measure which should be adopted. We find that only in Punjab and on a small scale the crop insurance scheme has been tried. It has not been introduced in other areas or other States. It is very necessary that crop insurance should be universally introduced and proper protection measures should be adopted and financed from out of the funds collected.

Another point is about prices. It is the Ministry of Agriculture which says that groundnuts and cotton should be produced. When one Ministry is in charge of production, another, the Ministry of Commerce, looks after the prices that the cultivator gets. We find that whenever the cultivator comes to the market, the prices are low and when the produce, comes in the hands of merchants or middlemen, the prices are high. There are some restrictions placed when the produce comes into the market and marketing is done which are indicated in the Bill, in clause 5. It is very necessary in the marketing process that the cultivator who produces the crop should get remunerative prices. In this, the cost of cultivation should be taken into account. Unfortunately, we have not worked out the cost of cultivation. So the cultivator suffers because he does not get an adequate and reasonable price for whatever he produces. So the marketing process, which is an important process, should

be looked into. The prices of groundnuts, cotton and so on should be such that the cultivator will be encouraged to produce these crops.

So I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the provisions of cl. 5(e), (k) and (l). These are three important measures which should be looked into properly, because if these are attended to properly, I am sure that instead of importing cotton worth crores of rupees from other countries, we can encourage our own cultivators to produce enough cotton in the country for our requirements.

We are lagging much behind in the matter of oilseeds, specially groundnuts. The prices of groundnut oil and other things have gone high because production is very low. If proper care is taken, if proper protection measures are afforded to the cultivator, who is in no way behind cultivators in the advanced countries, we can have very satisfactory results.

To sum up, our cultivators should be assured adequate credit, sufficient fertilisers supplied in time and adequate plant protection measures as well as remunerative prices. If these things are done, I am sure the measure that it brought forth will have success and nobody can object to the collection of the levy because it is taken from the cultivator. With these words, I support the Bill.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I welcome this Bill to some extent. But there are certain provisions in this Bill which require either amendment or reconsideration.

I know the history of this cess. It comes from UP where the millowners are not paying the cane cess which runs to the tune of crores of rupees, to the cane growers. I do not know whether the UP Government has taken any action in this regard because I was told that the case is already pending in the Allahabad High Court.

I would request the hon. Minister to tell us about the recovery of the cane cess in UP.

I have read the Bill and I find that the amount of cess arising out of oil-seeds or copra, the whole amount, is to be refunded to the millowners. I cannot understand why. What is the idea behind this? The whole idea of this cess is that somebody should be benefited. That somebody should be either the farmer, producer or the Government. Why should it go back to those who are earning fabulous profits? I am surprised to see the relevant clause in the Bill. If I have not understood it correctly, I would request the hon. Minister to let us know. If there is any such implication in this, it should be rectified.

Then I request him to kindly consider the lac industry. I have been to Chota Nagpur, to Palamu, Parulia, Singhbhum and Manbhum districts. What is happening? The cess is collected there and the whole industry is in the grip of a crisis. There is only one industry, the lac industry in the whole of Chota Nagpur. You know it is a poverty-stricken place. People are ill-clad, ill-fed, and there is chronic famine in some of the areas of Chota Nagpur. I would like to know from the Minister whether any steps have been taken by the Government to see that this industry is protected, is preserved, and is given financial aid so that the peasants of the area who have nothing else to grow practically in some of the mountainous areas are at least able to survive.

With these words, I would request the hon. Minister to kindly throw some light on these points.

Shri Maniyangadan (Kottayam): This Bill has been introduced and moved for consideration as a simple measure which is to continue the levy that was there in existence. According to me, it is not so simple as has been tried to be made out by the hon. Minister.

Of course, the object is collection of cess, and in this, I am constrained to ask: is the Government justified in continuing the cess, at least in increasing the cess?

The Minister mentioned the importance of research. I do admit that. I am particularly referring to coconut. There is a levy imposed on copra. It was there formerly also under the Coconut Committee Act, but it has been increased from 49 to 75 paise. For so many years there was research, but no considerable improvement has been brought about in the coconut plantations, in the coconut industry. When the resolution for dissolving the commodity committees was moved, I also agreed that it was good that there was co-ordination in research work. That is good, but in his opening speech, the Minister referred not to coconut but to some other commodities only. Whatever that be, I believe it will be done. What I am submitting is that the diseases which we find in coconut trees, the root disease, the leaf disease, all these are so rampant in Kerala that as the years go on, we find the areas under coconut plantation is decreasing. That is the most important area of coconut plantation in India and there the diseases are spreading like anything. The coconut plantation is reaching a stage where no cultivator will go in for it, that is the position.

If that be the situation, in spite of the work of so many years, I submit that there is no justification for increasing the levy and realizing money. Of course, it also comes from the producers. Coconut Committee was there, they were adopting so many measures for development of coconut plantations. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is stated there is a Development Council established. It is true, but this Development Council is only an advisory body like all Development Councils. They have no functions, they have no responsibilities. But under the Coconut Committee Act, the cess collected was at the disposal of the Committee. If an increase in the cess has to be made

[Shri Maniyangadan]

by the Government, it had to be done in consultation with the Coconut Committee. That was what section 9 of the Act provided. But here the cess is collected from copra and various other commodities, and the amount is with the Government just like any other amount, and the Government may, if it pleases them, utilise that amount or a portion of that amount for developing this. And what is the main thing? The main thing is only research. Not that research is not important. Research is very important, let any amount be spent on it, but there are other items of developmental work which ought to be done. So many things were being done under the auspices of the Coconut Committee. Now I am afraid they will not be done by the Government. I request that this amount which is going into the revenues of the Government should not be utilised for other commodities alone. The amount that would have been available if there had been the Coconut Committee should be spent on coconut and coconut alone.

These Development Councils are absolutely no use. If we look at section 9 of the Central Coconut Committee Act and the present Clause 5 of the Bill, we find the difference. This Clause says that the:

"moneys received by the Central Government.....shall..... be utilised by the Central Government to meet the expenditure incurred in connection with measures which, in the opinion of that Government, are necessary or expedient to promote the improvement, development and marketing of produce."

And produce is defined in Claus 2(k):

"produce means any goods specified in the First Schedule or the Second Schedule".

Coming to cocoanut, it is only copra. So, the main intention is to promote

the improvement, development and marketing of copra, not the cocoanut plantation. It is completely denied. Of course, in the subsequent sub-clause of that Clause, mention is made regarding that. That I do not deny, but the main purpose, as can be seen from Clause 5, is not the improvement of cocoanut cultivators, while under the Coconut Committee Act it was just the other way about. In section 9 of that Act, the main importance was given to cocoanut plantation. I believe the Government, because it has got powers under the very same Clause, will look into that.

Regarding the increase in cess, of course, the Minister said that it was after the lapse of so many years since the rate was fixed. That is true, but in certain cases the increase has been four-fold. I do not know whether it was justified. Anyhow, I do not object to that.

Regarding cocoanut, I have also submitted a scheme for replanting, removing the present diseased and replanting just as rubber replanting is done by the Rubber Board. Then only cocoanut plantation in the country will improve.

Reference was made here to clause 22. It is a very objectionable thing. By Clause 22 Government takes power to declare that the provisions of this Act shall apply to a produce not included in the First Schedule or the Second Schedule. Any commodity can be brought within the Schedule and a cess levied, and all the provisions of this Act made applicable. My submission is that such wide powers being taken by the Government under the guise of continuing the levy system is really objectionable. I believed that if at any time Government feels that some commodity should be brought under the provisions of this Act, then

appropriate legislation must be brought forward. The Government should not be given such powers. I very strongly object to the powers that are being taken by the Government under Clause 22.

He said that in regard to that there was an amendment. There is an amendment moved by the Minister, but it is only restricting the quantum of cess. It says that the maximum rate of cess shall not exceed 1½ per cent of the value of the produce. That is the only amendment, but the powers are there. Regarding the quantum of cess, of course some restriction is imposed by the amendment moved by the Minister. But the power to include any commodity and to levy a cess that is really objectionable and I do not think in this legislation which is a simple measure this provision is justifiable.

14 hrs.

श्री ह० च० सोब (सिंहभूम) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय. इस बिल के उद्देश्यों में कहा गया है कि कपास, तिलहन वगैरह की खेती के सम्बन्ध में इस बिल के जरिये से सहायता मिलेगी और रिसर्च वगैरह करने में मदद मिलेगी। मैं सोच रहा था कि उद्देश्य तो अच्छा है। लेकिन एक चीज मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार के ध्यान में लाना चाहता हूँ। बिहार के दक्षिणी हिस्से में बिहार सरकार ने एक योजना बनाई है जिस के जरिये से वह कपास की अधिक खेती करवाना चाहती है। मैंने बिहार सरकार को कई बार कहा है, बिहार सरकार के मंत्रियों को कई बार कहा है कि कपास की खेती करने के बदले यदि वे ग्राउंडनट की खेती करने दें तो ज्यादा फायदा होगा। मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहां ग्राउंडनट की खेती हो सकती थी वहां कपास की क्यों खेती करवाई जाती है। वहां उस इलाके में एक और तो खाद्यान्न की बड़ी कमी है और दूसरे जो भी कपास उपजाने की कोशिश की जाती है या जो भी

कपास पैदा होती है, उसको बेचने व खपत का कोई इंतजाम नहीं है। इसलिये इस मौके पर मैं भारत सरकार के खाद्य मंत्री से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि बिहार सरकार को वह सलाह दें कि कपास की खेती करने के बजाय वहां वह ग्राउंडनट की खेती करवायें।

एक और चीज की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। इसका जिक्र अभी हमारे लायक दोस्त श्री बनर्जी ने किया है और यह है छोटा नागपुर में लैक की खेती के बारे में। रांची और सिंहभूम जिले में जहां से मैं जाता हूँ एक जमाना था, पालीस बरस पहले की बात है कि बड़े पैमाने पर लैक की खेती होती थी। लेकिन अब इस इंडियन लैक सैस कमेटी के बावजूद, सारे इसके जो रिसर्च प्रोग्राम हैं उनके बावजूद वहां लैक की खेती इस कदम बुरी अवस्था में पड़ गई है कि लोगों ने लैक की खेती करना करीब करीब छोड़ दिया है। किसान को दाम कुछ नहीं के बराबर मिलता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि खाद्य मंत्री जी इस बात को हमें बताये कि लैक सैस कमेटी के ही अनुसार जब कि 1964-65 में बीस लाख रुपये इस पर खर्च किये गये हैं और उस में 35 बड़े बड़े रिसर्च प्राक्सिस हैं, एम० एस० मीज० हैं, तो क्या कारण है कि इन सभी लोगों के बावजूद वहां लैक की खेती करना लोगों ने छोड़ दिया है। मरीज बिल्कुल मर गया है। फिर भी इतने सारे लोगों को वहां आपने पाल रखा है, इसका क्या मतलब है? इंडियन लैक सैस कमेटी को एक जिम्मेदार संस्था होना चाहिए। लेकिन आप देखें कि लैक की खेती करना ही वहां लोगों ने छोड़ दिया है। इतना होने के बावजूद भी 35 बड़े बड़े प्रक्सरों को पाल रखने का मतलब क्या है? इतना सारा खर्च करना सिवाय गैर जिम्मेदारी और मजाक के और कुछ नहीं हो सकता है। सरकारी रुपये का इतना बड़ा दुष्प्रयोग लायक और कोई नहीं हो सकता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि माननीय खाद्य मंत्री जी अविलम्ब इस ओर ध्यान दें।

[श्री ह० च० सोय]

यदि इससे कोई फायदा नहीं होता है तो इंडियन लैक सैस कमेटी की सारी एस्टेबलिशमेंट को अबिलम्ब बन्द कर दिया जाना चाहिये। खुद उन्होंने कहा है कि लैक के दाम इतने बढ़ गये हैं कि जो लैक की खेती करने वाले हैं, उसको उन्होंने हारवे ट करना छोड़ दिया है। मैं एक दो सैंटें आपको पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ। 1964-65 की रिपोर्ट है। इस में वे लोग कहते हैं :

"which was produced by natural infection and the Katki lac which was left unharvested."

वे खुद स्वीकार करते हैं कि लैक की खेती को हारवेस्ट करना ही छोड़ दिया है। यदि यह लैक कमेटी कुछ नहीं कर सकती है इतने सारे इंतजाम के बावजूद, इतने सारे एक्सपर्ट्स के बावजूद तो इस लैक कमेटी को अबिलम्ब खत्म कर दिया जाना चाहिए, बन्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए।

एक माननीय सदस्य : बन्द हो गई।

श्री ह० च० सोय : तब तो बड़ी अच्छी बात है।

बस मुझे इतना ही निवेदन करना था।

Shri Warlor (Trichur): Sir, I will be failing in my duty if I do not oppose this measure. At the time of the abolition of the commodity committees, we had actually told the Government that the abolition is not called for. It is not true that the cess amount is utilised only for research purposes but also for other purposes. At that time the committee had to function in a democratic way. Perhaps the democratic way may not be completely perfect but still it is a democratic way. Now, who is controlling this? We say that the Minister is controlling but in actual practice, it is the bureaucracy which is controlling.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Parliament is controlling.

Shri Warlor: Anyway, you know how much that control will extend over the day-to-day administration of these things. It may finally come to post-mortem examination. I do not deny that. But in actual practice, things cannot remain until the post mortem examination; there are things to be done then and there. These things are not called for. I am especially very much worked about the situation in the coconut plantations. Our mainstay is coconut. Coconut is not only responsible for copra making; coconut tree means the entire livelihood of ten lakhs of people and more. Now, the entire areas are to be scrapped of coconut trees because of the disease. When operations like the spraying of insecticides and pesticides and other things were taken up, the disease went from the leaves down to the roots. Now, it is still there; it affects the produce; it affects the content and the yield also. Each coconut is not producing as much oil or giving as much benefit to the cultivator as before. Simply because certain manipulations of the market price of edible coconut happen to be there the coconut plantations and the owners of these small plantations and coconut trees are just maintaining themselves. Otherwise, most of them will be completely ruined by this. Because of the copra import from Ceylon and other places, these people are getting something now. But that is not going to remain for ever. What we can depend upon is only the proper healthy growth of the coconut trees in wide areas of the sea coast. This has affected people who have no other resources at all. Coconut trees are growing only in the sandy beaches and not in fertile plains. If the coconut tree is not there, the last remaining resource of the people which they have to eat is the sea coast sand. Nothing more. It is necessary that the Government takes such measures as will protect the plantations thereby ensur-

ing the livelihood of the people. It is not only copra as such. There is the fibre; there are the leaves, trunks and all the different things coming from the coconut tree and they are useful to hundreds of thousands of families who thatch their roofs with coconut leaves. If the coconut leaves are not available, I do not know how they could thatch their roofs in the monsoon time. These are the problems which immediately affect the lives of hundreds of thousands of families. But the Government is so lethargic and lukewarm in initiating proper researches and find out remedies so that agriculture and coconut based industries could be protected in Kerala. When the committee was abolished, at least those expenses which the committee had been incurring on things other than research should have been reduced and so much relief should have been given to the producers of copra. When the expenses go down, as a corollary, the cess also must come down. But the Government is increasing the cess. How can you justify this that less functioning leads to more cess? It should be reduced from 75 P to 50 P.

The Minister said in his opening speech that it is a simple Bill. It is simple because it simply gets money for the Government. I say, it is not so simple; it is very difficult. In this democratic age, the Government took the unholy action of abolishing the Coconut Committee, which was doing good work and which was none of their creation. How can people sitting somewhere else understand the problems of coconut-growers? The Government has committed that sin. Why not reduce the cess as an atonement? Instead of increasing the cess, I demand more relief should be given to coconut-growers. More research should be made into the diseases which afflict the coconut trees and the result of the research must be applied to the plantations. Unless and until the Government does that, there is no justification for increasing

the cess. We from Kerala oppose this cess particularly on coconut.

Shri B. K. Das (Contai): Sir, as explained by the Minister, this is a consequential Bill. After the dissolution of the Commodity Committees, the cess that was formerly there is to be realised under the provisions of this Bill. The Financial Memorandum says that the amount that would be realised would be Rs. 143.50 lakhs and the expenditure would be about Rs. 297 lakhs in 1966-67. It is not clear how much of this will go for research work and how much for other works. The functions of the committees have now been bifurcated. The research work will be looked after by the ICAR, an autonomous body and the other developmental and marketing works, etc. will be done by the Agriculture Department itself. Of course, the aim is to do the developmental and research work in a more efficient way. So, it would have been better if we knew what percentage of it will be spent on research and what percentage on other works.

When this Bill was discussed, a question was asked why the research work done by the other committees under the Commerce Ministry like the Coffee Board, Silk Board, Coir Board, etc. has not yet been put under the ICAR. I do not know the progress in that regard. If the research done by all these committees under the Commerce Ministry as well as the Agriculture Ministry is put under ICAR under the reorganisation scheme, probably the whole thing might be better shaped.

We hope that the research work is being done in a better and more comprehensive way. In clause 5 so many items of research work and also developmental, marketing and other works have been included. We should be satisfied that all these works are going on according to the programme and there will be proper reorganisation of research work also

[Shri B. K. Das]

Development Councils have been started for all these commodities which are working in an advisory capacity. We do not know how they are functioning. Of course, I know they have begun to function. We should have an idea as to how they are working.

It has been pointed out already that under clause 22 Government has taken very wide powers to put under the schedule any other commodity on which cess can be imposed. I also feel that instead of taking powers under this Bill, it would have been better if as and when necessity arose, there would have been an amending Bill brought before the House, so that the pros and cons might be discussed in a fuller way. Of course, the notification will be placed on the Table of the House for 30 days. But generally it happens that proper attention is not paid to such notifications and the House is not in a position to discuss the pros and cons. So, I also feel it would have been better if on future occasions amending Bills would have been brought before the House, so that the House may have a fuller opportunity to discuss the Bill.

श्री सिहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने इस बिल को देखा और आखीर में जो आम्नेक्स ऐंड रीजन्स और फाइनेन्शियल मेमोरेण्डम दिया हुआ है उस को पढ़ा तो ऐसा लगा कि यह बिल आम्नेक्स ऐंड रीजन्स और फाइनेन्शियल मेमोरेण्डम की परिधि के बाहर है। एक और बात पर मुझे थोड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ। पता नहीं यह बिल पहले रहा है या नहीं रहा है, लेकिन क्लॉज 6 में प्राप ने लिखा है कि अगर प्राप तेल पर जो कि शेड्यूल 2 में है कोई एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगायेंगे तो वह मिलों को वापस हो जायेगी। अगर मैं सेक्शन 6 पढ़ूँ तो शायद प्राप को साफ हो जायेगा कि सेक्शन 6 के रहते हुए शेड्यूल 2 में दिये हुए तेलों पर, खोपरा पर या और प्रायलसीड्स के तेलों पर

प्राप कोई ड्यूटी लगायेंगे तो लगाने के बाद उन्हें वापस कर देंगे। इस के क्लॉज 8 और 9 को और मेमोरेण्डम को पढ़ने के बाद मुझे इस में सिवा हैरानी और परेशानी के कुछ नजर नहीं आता है। पता नहीं कि जो नियम पहले था उस में तेल पर लगी हुई ड्यूटी वापस होती थी या नहीं, लेकिन यह नई चीज जो हो रही है उस के मुताबिक मिलों पर ड्यूटी लगा कर उसे वापस कर दिया जायेगा। पता नहीं क्यों गवर्नमेंट इतनी मेहरबानी और सच्ची साथ-साथ कर रही है। क्लॉज 6 में है :

"There shall be refunded from out of the proceeds of cess levied and collected under this Act, on such conditions as may be prescribed, all sums collected as cess on the quantity of oils exported from India, if such oils have been extracted from oil-seed or copra crushed in a mill in India, irrespective of whether the oil-seed or copra is produced in, or imported into, India."

तो प्राप एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगायेंगे जो बाहर जायगा उसको रिटर्न करेंगे। उसमें हमेशा एक हिसाब-किताब का मामला चलता रहेगा। तो यह लगाया ही क्यों जाय ? क्योंकि अगर बाहर जाना है तो लगाना ही नहीं चाहिए। एक्साइज ड्यूटी जितनी प्राप लगा रहे हैं वह सब मिलों पर लगा रहे हैं। 2 सौ मन तेल उसने निकाला तो 2 सौ मन पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी ले लिए और फिर एक्सपोर्ट हुआ 50 मन या 60 मन तो फिर रिफण्ड हुआ। तो रिफण्ड और एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगाना यह इससे सिवाय हिसाब-किताब के और सिवाय गड़बड़ी के और कोई फायदा होने वाला नहीं है। इसलिए मैं प्रापका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि प्राप देख लें कि कहीं तक इस सेक्शन को लगाने से प्राप सहूलियत पैदा कर रहे हैं प्रोड्यूसर को या बाहर बेजने वाले को या अपने अधिकारियों को

कि कितने पर वह एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगावेंगे और कितने पर रिफंड करेंगे ?

दूसरी चीज जो आपने लिखी है कि जो चीज लिखी है उस में ही लगा रहे हैं। पर इसमें जो चीज लिखी नहीं है उसके लिए भी सेक्शन 22 में अधिकार आप ले रहे हैं। डेलीगेटेड पावर का राष्ट्र है, गवर्नमेंट को दिया जाता है मगर वह हमेशा कन्क्राइड होता है जो रूल मेक करें उस तक और उसको पार्लियामेंट में ले करते हैं। इसमें भी सेक्शन 20 में जो रूल बनायेंगे और 22 में जो अधिकार ले रहे हैं उसमें जो करेंगे, वह दोनों ले करेंगे। लेकिन जो अधिकार ले रहे हैं वह केवल रूल मेकिंग नहीं हैं। वह तो ड्यूटी लगाने का अधिकार है जो कि केवल पार्लियामेंट को है। कोई भी सेस लगाना या ड्यूटी लगाना, वह अधिकार केवल पार्लियामेंट को है। तो पार्लियामेंट से एक स्वीपिंग पावर आप ले रहे हैं कि जब चाहें जितना सेस चाहें सेस लगावें और उसकी कापी सभा पटल पर रख देंगे। अब जितनी कापियां सभा पटल पर रखी जाती हैं और जितनी विचार में आती हैं, दोनों में बड़ा अन्तर है। सभा पटल पर रखे हुए कागज पर तो शायद ही कभी कोई विचार करता हो, लेकिन जो बिल आता है उस पर तो सभी सदस्य विचार कर सकते हैं। अभी आपने कहा है कि कोई प्रोपोजिशन आपने दिया है, वह मालूम नहीं क्या है, लेकिन इस तरह की लेजिस्लेटिव पावर गवर्नमेंट को दे देना ठीक नहीं है। रूल मेकिंग पावर तो ठीक है लेकिन लेजिस्लेटिव पावर देना ठीक नहीं है। जो राष्ट्रपति को जनरल पावर है वह जनरल पावर आप लेना चाहते हैं। अगर आपका प्रोपोजिशन मालूम हो जाय जो आपने दिया है।

Shri C. Subramaniam: The amendment has been circulated.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Its circulation will not suffice the purpose. You are taking a general power to im-

pose tax, which power is only confined to the Parliament and not to the Government. Of course, the rules will be laid on the Table of the House, but it may escape the notice of hon. Members. Therefore, circulation will not help.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I said that the amendment which I intend moving has been circulated.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: What is the amendment? You will agree that this will give a general power to the Government to legislate. That means they are taking over the function of the Parliament in this respect. That will not be proper. Therefore, I feel that this clause has not been properly worded.

The third thing is, in clause 5 so many objects have been enumerated for which the amount collected will be utilised. But we have had a very bad experience in Uttar Pradesh in regard to the sugar cess. Cess was levied for the improvement of sugarcane, but all this cess money has been put into the Consolidated Fund of India and very little is spent on improvement. Here also you are putting this money in a common fund. How much of it will go towards the improvements laid down in clause 5 is difficult to understand. If you levy a cess for a certain purpose, at least keep it in a separate fund and do not put it in the Consolidated Fund of India. It is very difficult to take out money from the Consolidated Fund of India for this purpose. Therefore, my submission is, if you put this money in the Consolidated Fund of India you cannot achieve the improvements that you want to bring in. As I said, we had a very bad experience in Uttar Pradesh with regard to the sugar cess. The cess money is not employed on the purpose for which the cess is collected. Therefore, I feel that the provisions are not happily worded.

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I support the Bill. I welcome this measure.

[Shri K. C. Sharma]

When I look back I find that our agriculture, our production in the field of the primary necessities of life, dates back to something like 1320 in Europe. We had to break the hard ground. It is good that the hon. Minister has taken up the measure seriously and emphasised the necessity of research, the necessity of co-operation, the necessity of providing measures for better prices for the produce to the producer and so on. These are exactly the things that would induce and enable the producer to produce more and to produce better. (Interruption).

Things have changed. Everybody, even a school boy, if he is asked to do it, refuses because it is a difficult task, it is a difficult proposition. This plough, this wooden plough is 3000 years old. We are still sticking to it. Nowhere else in the world it is used. You sit in the Parliament, in the most modern institution and ask the farmer to go 3000 years back. It is an impossible proposition. Our farms, our fields, those that are in existence, are like those farms and fields that were in existence in 1320 in Europe. Agriculture, the main occupation of our people, the main support of our people, is as primitive as it was in 1320 in Europe. You sit in this most modern institution of Parliament talking fine English whereas the farmers holding two bighas of land are still as the farmers in Europe were in 1320, having no knowledge, having no facilities whatsoever and having no incentives. It is impossible to work like that. It is cruelty inflicted on them. It is the most inhuman attitude towards them. No life is worth living if there is no change. So I welcome this measure because it provides for scientific research, to give the farmers the know-how in the matter of production, to give incentives to the farmers to produce more and produce better. It will create in them the will to work and the will to work harder. It will provide for science and modern technology in the field of cultivation with

the institutions to be established and things will change. I wish things change speedily. I do not mind something irksome here and there provided the desired aim, the desired objective is achieved.

With these words, Sir, I heartily support the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will continue this debate tomorrow. We shall now take up the other business.

14.30 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: FAMINE CONDITIONS AND STARVATION DEATHS IN ORISSA

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now the House will take up discussion on the famine conditions and starvation deaths in Orissa. Shri Kishen Pattnayak:

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, before Shri Kishen Pattnayak speaks, it will be better if the hon. Minister, who had been to Orissa, makes a statement. We are told that he went simply to Bhubaneswar and that he could not go to Kalahandi because of rain. So, why should he not make a statement now so that it will be easier for us?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You will make a statement now or will you reply to the debate?

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri C. Subramaniam): I will reply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Mover can take 15 minutes and others 10 minutes each.

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने बैम्बर में स्पीकर
साहब से बात की थी और उन्होंने कहा था कि
20 मिनट देंगे तो यह बैम्बर में बात करने
की बात कोई इज्जत नहीं करते हैं ?