

Mr. Chairman: I asked the hon. Member kindly to enlighten me. He gave his opinion then. And, I asked other Members and the hon. Minister of Labour and I asked for other opinions. Nobody stood up and I, therefore, gave my ruling. Now, no question arises. The ruling may be right or wrong but it is a ruling.

RESOLUTION RE IMBALANCE IN
PRICE STRUCTURE

Shri Amjad Ali (Goalpara-Garo Hills): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that in order to obviate the imbalance created in the price structure of the country by the fall in prices of agricultural commodities and industrial raw materials and the absence....."

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): On a point of order, Sir. I have no desire to curtail or stop any discussion. We always welcome discussions on any questions relating to our Ministries. Yet, I think it is a little too close on the debate on the Food and Agriculture Ministry's Demands, especially when there have been more than one cut motions referring to this price question. I would, therefore, like to have your ruling whether we have not during the course of the very day, not only of the session, but on this very day, discussed substantially the same question and a very comprehensive statement has been made by my senior colleague the Food and Agriculture Minister. Here also, even if I am called upon to make a statement, it will substantially be the same almost in every detail as has been made before the House and on which a debate has taken place and the cut motions have been rejected. I think, therefore, that so far as this Resolution is concerned, the same sort of objection as in the case of the previous one should prevail.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Some of the cut motions to the De-

mands of the Food and Agriculture Ministry....

Mr. Chairman: First of all, let us know what the Mover has to say.

Shri Amjad Ali: The contents of my Resolution would amply show that the cut motions which were going to be moved....

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Which have been moved and nagated.

Shri Amjad Ali: Is it the contention of the hon. Minister that they substantially raise the same point?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: My contention is that the cut motions raised substantially the same, if not almost identical, issues as are being raised or can be raised under this Resolution.

Shri A. M. Thomas: For instance cut motion 380...

Mr. Chairman: Let me hear, first of all, the Mover of the Resolution, if he has got to say anything. If he has not got anything to say, I will ask other Members also.

I do not think he has anything to say.

Sardar Lal Singh (Ferozepur-Ludhiana): I would beg the hon. Minister kindly to allow the discussion to proceed because I am certain that there are many Members who would like to stress certain views. Undoubtedly, the matter was discussed sometime ago, but because this Resolution was on the agenda and we knew that there would be time to discuss this particular subject of prices, we did not like to say very much during the discussion on the Demands. So, if this subject is pursued now, Members will have an opportunity to stress their views. I would earnestly request the hon. Minister to allow discussion as something good is bound to come out of it.

An Hon. Member: It is not for the Minister to allow but for the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: The question is not whether it is desirable to consider ~~this~~ or whether this point was fully discussed at the time when the Demands for Grants were made and discussed. The question is, whether substantially the same question was discussed and a decision taken by the House then and whether we should allow it to be discussed now.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Sir, you will note that I would also like to have the matter further discussed, as stated by my hon. friend, Sardar Lal Singh. But, the rule stands in the way. Cut motion No. 380 referred to the stabilisation of agricultural prices. Then, cut motion 432 referred to the problem of agricultural prices *vis-a-vis* the prices of industrial goods.

Shri S. N. Das: (Darbhanga Central): I would like to know whether they were moved.

Mr. Chairman: Let the hon. Member finish; there is no hurry.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Cut motion No. 603 also related to the policy towards the agricultural produce and 620 related to inadequate measures to check the fall of agricultural prices. These were the cut motions.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Mr. Thomas was referring to a cut motion which was not actually moved.

Mr. Chairman: May I know whether there was even a single cut motion on this subject.

Shri K. K. Basu: My contention is this. If you take the over-all discussion of the Food and Agriculture Ministry there might have been some discussion; but this Resolution is much more specific and it wants to pin down Government to a definite policy.

Mr. Chairman: I want to know if there was any specific cut motion relating to this imbalance which is mentioned here. If there was any cut motion I take it the matter was discussed and decided. I would, therefore, like the hon. Minister to find out from

the cut motions if any of the cut motions discussed yesterday relates to this matter.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar—Rewari): If you will permit me to say, the matter is not only about imbalance in the price structure of the agricultural commodities. This Resolution makes a definite suggestion for a policy of price support. We should therefore find out whether there was any cut motion suggesting that the demands be rejected because Government have not given price support to agricultural commodities. If that specific suggestion was not in any of the cut motions, I think the discussion of the Resolution will have to be permitted.

Mr. Chairman: That is why I want to find out from hon. Members whether there was any specific cut motion relating to this matter. Of course, generally, the whole question was discussed and the hon. Minister replied to this part of the debate in great detail. But that is not the point at issue.

I would again point out to this House that this Resolution refers to two specific matters. The Resolution reads:

"This House is of opinion that in order to obviate the imbalance created in the price structure in the country by the fall in prices of agricultural commodities and industrial raw materials and the absence of a similar decline in the prices of imported and manufactured goods and to give adequate relief to the primary producers of agricultural goods, Government should embark upon a policy of price support in respect of such agricultural commodities and industrial raw materials."

Even if the House would have discussed the fall in prices of agricultural commodities, it is open to it to discuss the subject of fall in the prices of industrial raw materials.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghotal): May I be permitted to make a submission. Rule 229(xi) of our Rules of procedure says that a cut motion "shall not anticipate a matter which has been previously appointed for consideration in the same session." This Resolution was obviously before the House even before the Demands for Grants relating to the Food and Agriculture Ministry came up before it. The cut motion should therefore, have been disallowed. But as it was not done, there is no point in raising any objection to the discussion of this Resolution.

Shri K. K. Basu: There was one cut motion in the name of my hon. friend Mr. Chowdhury which my hon. friend Mr. Thomas read out. That specific cut motion we did not deliberately move because of this.

Mr. Chairman: There was a cut motion moved—No. 432—which sought a reduction in the Demand under the Head of Food and Agriculture Ministry by Re. 1 to discuss the problem of agricultural prices *vis-a-vis* prices of industrial goods. There is another—No. 620; it was also moved; it related to the inadequate measures to check fall in agricultural prices. These were moved and discussed.

Shri Amjad Ali: Can you name the persons who have moved these?

Mr. Chairman: It was circulated; notice was given; a number of cut motions were moved in this House. I remember to have read out 432 and 620 to the House. I specifically remember 432 because it was scored out in ink on the paper and I entered it again in pencil.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Every hon. member spoke on this; almost the whole of the reply today was devoted to this point alone.

Mr. Chairman: I find both 432 and 620 here on the paper; 620 was added later.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): Before you give your ruling I would like to bring to your notice one point. You already pointed out that this Resolution is very wide; it goes beyond the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. It discusses not only about agricultural products. There is mention about the prices of imported and manufactured goods. I wonder whether the Minister of Food and Agriculture can have a say in this matter.

Mr. Chairman: Where is the word 'imported' in this Resolution?

Dr. Rama Rao: It is here. It reads ".....absence of a similar decline in the prices of imported and manufactured goods and to give adequate relief....." How can the Minister of Food and Agriculture come in the way of discussing a subject which is very wide here. Lastly, you have also the various commodities and industrial raw materials. Naturally, raw materials do not mean only cotton and jute; there are so many other industrial raw materials.

Mr. Chairman: I understand that the substance in this Resolution is that the prices of agricultural commodities have fallen whereas there has been no corresponding decline in the prices of manufactured goods. That is the substance of the problem. Since both are not commensurate, it was said that it was imbalanced. Therefore, I think that this question has also been discussed substantially at the time when we were discussing the cut motions in respect of the Food and Agriculture Ministry.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East): There is another part of the Resolution which advocates the policy of price support. I do not know whether there was a cut motion moved for a policy of price support but that aspect is also there; I think that aspect was not discussed and decided upon in the debate on the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman: So far as that question is concerned, it is absolutely clear to the House that this matter of price support was substantially discussed though, perhaps, it was not the subject matter of a cut motion because the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture devoted a good part of his time in his answer to this part of the question. He gave all the details—what he was doing and what he proposed to do. So, this matter must be taken to have been substantially discussed. Not that it was in any cut-motion. The rule is—the word is 'substantially'—"A notion must not raise a question substantially identical with the one on which the House has given a decision in the same session."

Shri Sadhan Gupta: The House has not given a decision on the matter of price support as no motion regarding price support was before the House. Therefore, this is the time for the House to come to a decision on whether there should be a policy of price support and if so what kind of policy should it be.

Mr. Chairman: To my mind, criticisms were made by many hon. Members on this point and a decision was announced by the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture supporting that policy. Not only that he made an announcement some time back about wheat. Today also he clearly stated in the House that the Government has accepted this policy and it has embarked upon this policy. A decision has been announced; it has been taken in accordance with the wishes of the House. What else remains? That is a substantial compliance with the principle of this rule and I think that this matter has been fully discussed. We will proceed to the next question. (*Interruptions.*) I have heard all the hon. Members and I have given the ruling and I do not propose to review it.

Shri K. K. Basu: I do not want to challenge your ruling; I would like you to consider whether it will go as a precedent.

Mr. Chairman: I have given a ruling and I cannot answer any hypothetical doubts; I have given a ruling and that ends the matter.

Shri K. K. Basu: I accept your ruling but I only want a clarification on one point. The Resolution partly concerns the industrial raw materials and the Food Ministry is not in a position to answer that. If a part of the Resolution can be considered to have not been discussed or decided upon, can we not discuss that?

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to enter into discussion on this matter. I have given a ruling. If he kindly goes through the entire resolution, he will find first of all that there is the question of imbalance—that is fall in the agricultural commodities' prices and as opposed to it there is an increase in the prices of manufactured goods. There is a fall in one respect; there is no fall in the other respect. So, it is clear that there must be a price support policy which, I submit, Government had accepted. The hon. Minister dilated upon it. Therefore, according to me all the matters concerning this Resolution have been substantially discussed.

Shri K. K. Basu: If it is 'industrial raw materials *vis-a-vis* manufactured goods', it has not been discussed. I cut out the portion relating to agricultural commodities as you say. Government shall embark upon a policy of price support in respect of industrial raw materials; we have got to discuss that. I would like to be clear. Once you give a decision, it will go as a precedent.

Shri Bansal: If you read it, you will find that it relates to price support policy for such agricultural commodities and industrial raw materials—in industrial raw materials of agricultural origin.

Shri K. K. Basu: How?

Shri Bansal: Is it the idea to discuss about iron ore etc?...

Mr. Chairman: I have given a ruling and I do not wish to deviate from that. We proceed to the next resolution.

RESOLUTION RE RIVER VALLEY
SGHEMES

Mr. Chairman: Shri Jhulan Sinha

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathl): May I submit that this will come within the provisions of rule 325?

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of objection?

Shri Hathl: The point is this. Rule 325 says that no member shall anticipate the discussion of any subject of which notice has been given provided that in determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by the speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time.

We will have discussion when the Demands for Grants for the Irrigation Ministry are discussed. It is a question of policy. The other point is that in principle this has been accepted by the Planning Commission. It is substantially the same matter; a policy has been enunciated also and the policy has been accepted; substantially it is the same but that may not be very relevant to the point of order. Under the rule, "the matter is likely to be brought for discussion before the House within a reasonable time" is relevant here. Therefore, I think that the resolution is out of order.

Mr. Chairman: The rule runs as follows:

"No member shall anticipate the discussion of any subject of which notice has been given provided that in determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by the Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time."

It is quite true that so far as the Ministry of Irrigation and Power is concerned, the Demand will be coming, but so far, we do not know whether cut motions are going to be moved or not. How can we say that? We do not know whether a Member may move his cut motion or not. The Member may or may not move his cut motion and he may not choose to have a discussion at that time.

Secondly, I would like to know for certain, so far as this resolution is concerned, when the notice of this resolution was given and when the notice of the cut motion was given, because at the time when the notice was given, it could not be said that the matter would come under discussion during the Budget. After all, it may happen that the discussion of this motion under this particular Demand may not come off at all, as it happened in the case of so many cut motions under the other Demands. Some of them were moved and some were not moved. So it cannot be ascertained at this stage with any precision that the matter is sure to come before the House. I would, therefore, think that the Resolution may be moved and discussed now. Moreover there may be no cut motion in regard to the policy of priority in respect of quick results and cheaper cost.

Shri K. K. Basu: (Diamond Harbour): Is this Resolution the concern of the Minister of Irrigation and Power or the Minister of Planning, because the Resolution emphasises certain criteria of the schemes to be executed in the second Five Year Plan? It concerns planning, thereafter for the execution of the work the Ministry of Irrigation and Power comes into the picture.

Mr. Chairman: So far as this Resolution is concerned, the Government have not themselves pronounced any decision in the matter in the House. Yes, Shri Jhulan Sinha.

Shri K. K. Basu: What is the time allotted for this Resolution.

Mr. Chairman: Two hours.