

**Mr. Speaker:** We have not had any more light than what we started with. Let them take their own time. I would like to make it clear that it was not for the purpose of reappointing the Deputy-Speaker that the proceedings of the Committee were adjourned. The proceedings had to be adjourned on account of the illness of the hon. Commerce and Industry Minister; the other junior Minister also was not able to come. I do not want the impression to be created that the Deputy-Speaker or any of us is anxious to be reappointed to the Committee. Otherwise it might appear that whenever he wants, he can resign and whenever he wants to come back, he can come back.

The question is:

"That Sardar Hukam Singh be appointed to the Joint Committee on the Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1959 in the vacancy caused by his resignation from the Joint Committee on the 5th September, 1959."

*The motion was adopted.*

13 hrs.

#### MOTION RE: FOOD SITUATION

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now resume further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri S. K. Patil on the 16th December, 1959, namely:

"That the food situation in the country be taken into consideration."

and also further consideration of the substitute motions moved by Shri Surendra Mahanty, Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy and other members. The time allotted was six hours and the time taken is 1 hour 31 minutes. The balance is 4½ hours. Now it is

1 o'clock. It will go up to 5.30. Very well. We will sit till 5.30 and dispose of this matter.

I may also remind the House that the other day when sugarcane and sugar prices were sought to be discussed on the Excise Duty Bill, in order to avoid that discussion on the Excise duty Bill I said that they may carry on the discussion in the food debate. Later on, I found there was time and, therefore, I allowed a special motion to be moved regarding sugarcane and sugar. Therefore, so far as this matter is concerned, the subject of sugar or sugarcane need not be brought in. They may proceed with the discussion on food.

**Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal):** On a point of order.

**Shri Naldurgkar (Osmanabad):** I request that I may be permitted to move my substitute motion Nos. 12, 13 and 15.

**Mr. Speaker:** Why did he not move them on that day? It is not usual to permit the moving of substitute motions during the discussion, because once the discussion has started, it is both on the original motion as well as on the substitute motions. So, if any substitute motions are now allowed to be moved, those hon. Members who have already spoken will not have an opportunity to speak.

**Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):** We want to move our amendments. They may be taken as moved.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. There is no difference between one or the other. Hon. Members will bear in mind that once a motion is moved, the substitute motions are also moved along with it and both are before the House for discussion. If after the original motion is moved and some discussion has taken place we allow some more substitute motions to be moved, we would be denying an opportunity to the hon. Members who have already spoken, though they may like to speak on them and support them or

[Mr. Speaker]

oppose them. Therefore, unless it is treated as an exceptional case—and I do not think there is anything exceptional, so far as this matter is concerned it is not usual to allow the moving of such substitute motions.

**Shri Mahanty:** On a point of order.

**Shri Naldurgkar:** As discussion over this matter is not concluded, with your permission, I would like to move my substitute motions, so that they may also be before the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** No, that is not possible; that is exactly what I am saying. If I now allow them to be moved, those who have already spoken would not have an opportunity to speak on these amendments, because I am not going to give them another opportunity to speak on the amendments alone as then it will be endless. Therefore, hon. Members should take note of it that they have to table substitute motions before the original motion is moved, and as soon as a motion is moved, if the amendments or substitute motions relate to the motion as a whole, I will allow those substitute motions to be moved here, and discussion will go on both the motion and the substitute motions. Thereafter, no further amendments or substitute motions will be allowed to be moved, except on exceptional circumstances.

**Shri Naldurgkar:** I was not present on that day.

**Mr. Speaker:** He must thank himself. Now we will take up the discussion.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad):** What about the discussion on the Pay Commission Report?

**Mr. Speaker.** Hon. Members will read it better and come fully prepared for the next session. I will then give some more time.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali):** I suggest that it may be carried to the next session.

**Mr. Speaker:** I find that there is a Half an Hour discussion scheduled for today. Since the food debate will have to be concluded, the Half an Hour discussion will also go to the next session.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** It was admitted during the last session, but was postponed. Since then I have been writing letters to you, urging you to allot some time for it.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have no objection. After 5.30, we can sit till 6 O'Clock. But the hon. Member must keep fifty members here.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Very well.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then I have no objection.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** About the discussion on the Report of the Pay Commission, may we take it that it will be taken up during next session and not tomorrow?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes. Now we will take up discussion on food.

**Shri Mahanty:** On a point of order. My submission is that large matters of policy cannot be discussed and approved of by the Parliament in the shape of a flimsy motion, without conforming to specific provisions laid down in the Constitution. This motion is a laconic one, a one line affair, which says:

"That the food situation in the country be taken into consideration."

But as the motion is unfolded before this House, we find that there are at least three specific issues to which the sanction of the Parliament is being sought. No. 1 is the food issue. I beg to submit that we cannot discuss

about the food zone without infringing upon the limitations of the Constitution, as enshrined in article 303(2) of the Constitution. I may point out that article 303 comes in Part XIII, which relates to "Trade, Commerce and Intercourse within the territory of India". I would most humbly invite your attention to article 303, sub-clauses (1) and (2).

**Mr. Speaker:** Whenever hon. Members raise a point of order, they have first to state what the point of order is and then, if necessary, support, the point of order.

**Shri Mahanty:** My point of order relates to the creation of the food zone, to which the hon. Minister referred in the course of his speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Minister has referred to the formation of the food zone?

**Shri Mahanty:** He has said that he is going to enlarge the existing food zone by linking Orissa with West Bengal and by linking Madhya Pradesh with Bombay. And I find from a publication, *the Hindustan Times*, 19th December that Shri B. B. Ghosh, the Union Secretary, is leaving for Calcutta to finalize the food zone. My point of order is that this is infringing upon the provisions of article 303(2) of the Constitution. Article 301 says that there is freedom of trade throughout the territory of India. Article 302 says:

"Parliament may by law impose such restrictions on the freedom of trade, commerce or intercourse between one State and another or within any part of the territory of India as may be required in the public interest."

Here mark the words "by law". Remember, article 303 is very relevant. Sub-clause (1) of article 303 says:

"Notwithstanding any thing in article 302, neither Parliament nor

the Legislature of a State shall have power to make any law giving, or authorising the giving of any preference to one State over another, or making, or authorising the making of, any discrimination between one State and another, by virtue of any entry relating to trade and commerce in any of the Lists in the Seventh Schedule."

Then, sub-clause (2) says:

"Nothing in clause (1) shall prevent Parliament from making any law giving, or authorising the giving of, any preference or making, or authorising the making of, any discrimination if it is declared by such law that it is necessary to do so for the purpose of dealing with a situation arising from scarcity of goods in any part of the territory of India."

Therefore, the first thing is that there must be a law, and that law must clearly specify the purpose for which these restrictions are going to be imposed, or being sought to be imposed. Now I understand that Orissa is being linked with West Bengal and Madhya Pradesh is being linked with Bombay.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there no zones, already?

**Shri Mahanty:** They were separate zones by themselves. For instance, Orissa was a zone.

**Mr. Speaker:** If there is only one State, there is no question of zone. If there is more than one State and they have already been formed into a zone, under what law was it done?

**Shri Mahanty:** That is what I am asking. I am saying that so far as Orissa or Madhya Pradesh, to which I have referred and to which the hon. Minister had referred, are concerned, these two States were not part of any zone. They had continued as separate entities unto themselves.

[Shri Mahanty]

Now, I am not going into the merits of these proposals. It is not the time for me to do that. But what I am saying is that if he wants to impose these restrictions, for instance, I will not send my rice to Andhra if I can get a better price there, by linking Orissa with West Bengal.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is going into too vast a matter. I am not clear about one thing. I want to know whether already there are not zones. Again and again I have found hon. Members.....

Shri Mahanty: I am not concerned about the Southern Zone.

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): May I submit.....

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear him later on. Again and again repeatedly questions are asked here about the Southern Zone for Andhra, Kerala, Madras and so on.

Shri Mahanty: I am not concerned with the Southern Zone.

Mr. Speaker: How was it constituted?

Shri Mahanty: This is what I am saying. Under clause (3), sub-clause (d) of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, under the powers of notification the Government had constituted certain zones which were bad legally. But I am referring only specifically to Orissa and Madhya Pradesh which have been referred to by the hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: What he says is that that is not legal. Then this cannot become legal merely because there is a precedent. Hon. Member is interested in Orissa. Therefore he is entitled to raise this point, namely, that it is not legal and that this zone ought not to be constituted except by an Act of Parliament.

Shri Mahanty: That is what I want.

Mr. Speaker: What is the objection if he referred to these matters here? In a debate also can he not say that "I contemplate doing so or that I am going to do so."? We will assume that it is illegal. Hon. Member can say that it is illegal. In fact, he has said so. But what is the point of order?

Shri Mahanty: The point of order is that the scope and ambit of this debate must be well delimited if the Government is coming at a future date with a legislation to form these zones. We certainly accept it. We do not want to stand in the way.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members are not committed to anything in this debate. If he says that they are constituting a zone, he is not asking the permission of the House to enable him to constitute a zone. If the constitution of zones is valid otherwise than by this resolution, it is valid. I can only say this much that this resolution is not for the purpose of validating any zone that has been formed. This is a general discussion on food. The hon. Minister is only giving us information. Even if this resolution is passed and otherwise the constitution of zones is illegal, it will be illegal.

Shri Mahanty: But we would like to know definitely. Here is a news item published on the 19th December, 1959, in the *Hindustan Times*, that is only yesterday. It says:

"Shri B. B. Ghosh, Union Food Secretary is leaving here for Calcutta tomorrow for discussion with West Bengal Government on measures to regulate flow of rice from Orissa to West Bengal when the new zone comes into being."

That means that they are rushing through with their arrangements. I would like to know as to under what law they are doing it, how they are doing it and whether they are taking the opinion of the State Governments.

Opinions of the State Governments must be elicited because it is a subject on the Concurrent List. Had there been a.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I find there is no point of order in it. I will, however, ascertain from the hon. Minister if he has anything to say on that.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** The point of order is absolutely devoid of any import.

**Mr. Speaker:** May I know under what authority you are doing it?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Under the same authority under which we constituted Orissa into one zone and West Bengal into another zone. We are doing it under the same authority. We are doing it under the Essential Commodities Act under which Parliament has vested this authority in the Central Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** To form any zone?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Any zone.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Minister's contention is that the provisions of article 302 have been invoked already. A law has been passed. The article says that "Parliament may, by law, impose or restrict the freedom of trade" etc.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** The Essential Commodities Act is the law.

**Mr. Speaker:** It comes under this?

**Shri Mahanty:** This is hoodwinking the Parliament. The Essential Commodities Act was passed under article 369 of the Constitution under the Temporary Provisions Chapter. The Temporary Provisions Chapter's life is only five years. The Temporary Provisions under article 369, under which the Essential Commodities Act of 1955 has been enacted, is applicable only for inter-State purposes and not for intra-State purposes. I want a clear ruling from you on that.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** As you, Sir, have correctly pointed out, in the first place we are not seeking any authority from this House to do something. We have only indicated to this House as to how our mind is working in this matter. We have not sought from this House any permission to do any particular thing.

My hon. friend was saying that now something is going to be done with regard to the formation of Orissa and West Bengal zone. Have we not, by reason of the powers exercised by us under the Essential Commodities Act, constituted Orissa into a particular zone and West Bengal into a particular zone? My hon. friend's point of order has no basis at all. Under the very same power, we have got powers to join West Bengal and Orissa. We can even have one zone for the entire country.

**Shri Mahanty:** He is still rather being confused. I quite admit that it was under the Essential Commodities Act. But the Essential Commodities Act was passed under article 369 of the Constitution, under the Temporary Provisions Chapter.

**The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil):** It has been extended. May I point out that this is a pointless discussion. If we are not otherwise authorised to do what we are going to do, that is an illegal action. But this has nothing to do with the food discussion or any resolution that we are passing today. If after the passing of that resolution also, the Act is illegal, it is illegal. But we are thoroughly convinced that under that Act, which gave us the power to constitute those individual zones, we have also the power of joining them. We have been using it all these years in that way. We have extended the period of that Act also. Therefore this point of order has no substance at all.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Hissar):** I would only submit that unless Government brings a law

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

under article 303 no person has a right to object. If a law is brought then the question would arise whether that is being done illegally or otherwise. There are courts, there is the Supreme Court and they can say, "you cannot make these zones. A person has the right to have free intercourse like that" as given in that Chapter. So, unless a law is brought, no objection can be taken here.

**Mr. Speaker:** A point of order was raised by Shri Mahanty to the effect that during the course of the debate the hon. Minister said that Orissa and West Bengal would be constituted into a separate food zone. He referred to a newspaper report. It appears that there is a Secretary of the Orissa Legislature.....

**An Hon. Member:** Secretary, Agriculture Department.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** Secretary of our Department.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Secretary of the Food Ministry is going to West Bengal to settle this matter expeditiously. Shri Mahanty's objection is that the formation of a new food zone comprising of the two States of West Bengal and Orissa will be imposing restrictions on free trade and movement of goods from one State to the other State and that it is opposed to article 302 of the Constitution. The hon. Minister has explained that under the Constitution they are entitled to pass a law and that a similar law has already been enacted in the form of the Essential Commodities Act. Regarding an objection that was raised, namely, that it has lapsed, the hon. Minister has explained that it has been extended and is still in force. So, the food zone that is constituted is quite valid.

But that does not appear to be directly influencing this matter, that is, that the extended Act does not operate. As Shri Mahanty contends,

the Act came into being under article 369 and not under article 302. I am not called upon to decide this issue here because that is not the issue before the House. If and when an issue arises as to whether that Act is valid or not, even then I do not know whether it is competent for this House to decide.

Evidently, what Shri Mahanty wants is an opportunity, because he is interested in it. He wants to have an opportunity to discuss this matter, namely, whether the constitution of this zone comprising of these two States is proper or is not proper. That is a matter of substance. His fear seems to be that if this Resolution, namely, that the food policy of the Government be taken into consideration—there is an amendment to it saying that it should be approved and we will assume that it is approved—if it is passed, he does not want to make it appear that this House has approved of the policy of clubbing Orissa and West Bengal together. I can assure him that passing this would not commit this House. It is open to this House to come to any conclusion. These zones are matters of such great importance that constantly questions have been asked here. Whenever such matters of policy are adopted, Government must come as quickly as possible, after the decisions are taken, to this House to take its opinion also on that policy. After all, the Ministers act only under the authority of Parliament. The hon. Minister may take note of the feeling of the House and the Members coming from that area and give an early opportunity, after the zone is formed—either before or after as he thinks proper and as the circumstances permit.

Almost every day I receive five or six motions for discussion, but I have not yet received even one motion on this. Then it will be for the Minister to say what objection he has, whether it should be before or after and so on. Then we can have it.

**Shri Panigrahi (Puri):** I brought this matter of the zone to your notice, and you said because the food question was being discussed, it would be discussed there. I brought it to your notice.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur):** You observed that discussion of the food policy of the Government will not necessarily include sanction by this House of the formation of the food zones. I beg to disagree with you because the food zone is part and parcel of the Government food policy.

**Mr. Speaker:** No, no. I have given my ruling already.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** The moment this House approves it, that is approval of the zone also. The food policy of the Government will also include the zones.

**Mr. Speaker:** Not everything. There are so many things, there is the buffer stock of five million tons and so on. Every detail is not accepted by this House. The general food policy is accepted by this House.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat):** Provided the Minister does not accept some amendment which may be specific. If he accepts that, then the House will vote on that and that will be the policy.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** When I move for it I will quote the authority and also explain as to how I am competent to do that.

**Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat):** This question of the formation of the Orissa-West Bengal Zone was discussed on a Government motion in the Orissa Assembly,.....

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** No, no. You are wrong.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** .... and they passed a resolution giving complete authority to the State Government to do as they think best in this matter.

**Shri Mahanty:** What does it mean?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Does it mean that this House will not discuss it?

**Shri A. C. Guha:** That means the Orissa Assembly endorsed it in effect.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Does that mean that this House will not discuss it? Is this the argument?

**Shri S. K. Patil:** We are going into the merits. May I ask: who has given Orissa that authority to regard Orissa as one zone? It is done by the same authority from here. Otherwise, the whole of India is one zone, and Orissa is not one zone.

**Shri Mahanty:** The point is.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I have understood the point. Shri Mahanty evidently is not in favour of clubbing Orissa with Bengal. Therefore, he wants to have an opportunity of discussing the matter in the House. That the Orissa Government has approved of it is no justification for preventing us from going into it if otherwise it is a very important matter and a number of hon. Members are interested in it. Shri Mahanty desires that in this general food debate on this motion it ought not to be understood, unless pointed attention is given to this, that this House approves or disapproves, one way or the other, the formation of the zone comprising Orissa and Bengal. If that is the intention, he would like evidently to have an opportunity and put it separately.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** May I submit that even if this House were not sitting, I was competent to do that by issuing a notification in the Gazette? Since this House is sitting and the food debate is going on, I just said that. Otherwise, that right exists in the Government by the legislation that we have passed. We could join Bombay and Madhya Pradesh the day after tomorrow when the House is not sitting, under the same powers that

[S. K. Patil]

are given to me. It is out of courtesy to this House that, while we are having this debate, I am mentioning that I am going to do that.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going further into it. All that I can say is any hon. Member who wants may refer to any of the matters referred to by the Minister. Generally when we pass a resolution here, merely the policy is to be taken into account, it is not committing anybody, but if in addition we add a rider to it or make an amendment, I am not competent to say whether it includes everything. If I find that sufficient number of hon. Members are anxious to have a discussion on that matter in the House, I will not allow this to stand in the way of a discussion separately, if I am satisfied that there is not sufficient discussion now. If there is sufficient discussion now, once again I may not allow a discussion afterwards.

Shri Dwivedy.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The other day I was submitting that the Food Minister took more of our time speaking about production over which he has practically no authority under the Constitution. There is no difference of opinion that agricultural production in this country should increase. The only question is: what concrete steps are we taking to see that production increases? The policy, therefore, should be a realistic one and the agriculturist should be given the necessary incentives and the State Governments should also carry out the policies decided by the Commission effectively.

Therefore, what I propose in my amendment in this regard is that there should be a Central Agricultural Development Council entrusted with the task of drafting a progressive plan for food self-sufficiency and promoting its execution according to plan. There must be a changed outlook, that agriculture will never be subservient to industry. Only if some such concrete

steps are taken, we can hope for an increase in the agricultural production in the country.

I will not deal more with this, since there is not much disagreement about it. I was rather amazed to find the Food Minister devoting more of his time to a matter, I still insist, over which he has no authority and power, but avoiding giving clarification to the House about his own sphere of authority, that is supply and distribution. That is the main question before us today.

The entire country is in confusion today. What is the policy of the Government regarding State trading? What is the policy of the Government about the zones? I think he has created confusion. Perhaps he believes that by creating such confusion, he can build up something out of the chaos. It is quite different from the policy we have been pursuing so far.

What is wrong with State trading? I still maintain that the Food Minister is working at a deliberate policy of reversing State trading. That is my charge against him, because I find no report has been submitted to the House so far to show that State trading in food grains has failed. On the contrary, I will prove that the reports that have been placed before the House go to show that State trading has been effective in the matter of food supplies, distribution, purchase etc.

Who raised this controversy? Neither State trading nor the zones is new. The Food Minister appears to create an impression that he is now going to solve the problem by creating more zones. This has not come before us suddenly. There were several policies pursued before we took to State trading in 1958. One after the other the Government followed about seven policies to see that the difficulties regarding food supply and distribution in the States were solved. They took to the quota system, restriction and



some other things, and lastly the zonal system which was introduced in 1957, also proved a failure. This was not adequate to solve the problem. Therefore, it was thought necessary that there should be compulsory limited procurement in the country through State trading. If we really want the food policy to be a success, we should see that State trading is a success. The introduction of State Trading was deliberated upon for a number of months, and it has been admitted by the Prime Minister that the Chief Ministers were consulted informally. Even the National Development Council considered this matter, and the State Governments agreed to take to State trading, and yet some of the State Governments said to it that State trading was not a success. They worked deliberately against it, and they sabotage the whole scheme.

12.29 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I was thinking the former Food Minister neglected his duty, because he did not take the House into confidence, and he did not come forward to say that such and such State Governments, after agreeing to the policy, are now sabotaging it. He concealed these matters from the House. Now, the present Food Minister should have come forward and told us these are the difficulties placed before him by the State Governments who had themselves agreed to this proposal in the beginning, and these are the remedies to carry that policy forward. Instead of doing that, what he is pursuing to-day is this policy of zones. This is really going to create more difficulties, and take us back to where we were in 1957. This is not solving of the food problem.

I maintain that State trading was a success. If we go through the report which has recently been circulated to us, and which has been issued by the Economic and Statistical Adviser to the Government of India, namely the *Report on Market Arrivals of Food-*

*grains—1958-59 Season* we shall find that from producers down to everybody, no one is against State trading: it is only the traders and the large producers who are against it. Even in Bengal, I maintain that the Government of Bengal in collusion with the traders saw to it that State trading was a failure.

**Shrimati Ha Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip):** That is an entirely wrong statement.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It may be wrong according to my hon. friend, but I shall prove it with facts.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Statements wrong as well as right are being made here.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** My hon. friend may correct her statement in the light of facts. I shall prove my statement with the facts that I have before me. *The Report on Market Arrivals of Foodgrains—1958-59 season* is a Government publication, and it says that there was no justification for withdrawing the levy. And this is the statement which has been made after a survey made by some economists.

I may point out to the hon. lady Member.....

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** My hon. friend cannot convince her.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** At page 154 of this report, we find:

"This speculative tendency seemed to have been very strong in June, and in the end, benefited the millers as soon as the controls were lifted."

That means that the controls were lifted, and the millers were benefited. Even looking back, they say:

"Looking back, therefore, it is difficult to find enough of ground to justify the lifting of the controls on prices and the rescind-

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

ing of the procurement programme. It seems that if controls had to be lifted at all, they should have been done only when the 1959 crop would have been ready for the market."

This is a statement of fact here. Then, I shall go on and show who were against this, and prove this statement from the report itself. At page 195 Of this report, it has been stated:

"Our study also showed that the foodgrains markets in Bihar, West Bengal and to some extent Orissa are characterised by a high degree of uncertainty."

This is what they have stated after having discussed the whole thing. Then, they go on to say:

"The dealers and traders in the market are feeling insecure and uncertain in view of the announcement of the Government policy in favour of State trading. They are unanimous in their opposition to it and are trying progressively to make the situation difficult for the Government, often with the support of the large farmers."

This is a statement of facts. So, it is the traders who are against State trading.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** She is supporting not Government, but the traders.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Two contestants should not be so near each other.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** So, it is the traders who were responsible for this failure, and it was to them that this work was entrusted. The West Bengal Government instead of taking steps to remedy these difficulties, themselves, in collusion with, and with the co-operation and connivance of, the traders, worked out this policy in such a way that State trading was a failure, and they now come forward

and say that the policy of State trading was a failure.

The creation of zones is not going to solve the problem, but is only going to create more difficulties. Government are thinking that probably if the zones are created those difficulties would be over. I say that if a new zone is created, that is, a composite zone comprising West Bengal and Orissa is created, it will not only create more difficulties, but in my opinion, it will be an extension of misery. If the problem of West Bengal would be solved by merely putting West Bengal and Orissa into one zone, I would be the first person to support it.

The Food Minister has stated that the food problem should be taken as a national problem. Nobody disagrees with him on this point. But he was very eloquent in saying that the peasants must share with others. But what about the riches in Bombay? What about the wealth in Bombay? Has he said a word at any time that those also should be shared?

So far as Orissa is concerned, whether there were zones or not, Orissa has been supplying food to all parts of the country, not today, but years back when there was scarcity in Madras and other places. By combining West Bengal and Orissa into one zone, what is it that you are going to achieve? I do not think it is going to solve any of the miseries of West Bengal. My hon. friend has said that the prices of West Bengal which are now about Rs. 40 would come down. But I would point out that the requirements of West Bengal are about 12 lakhs tons. But Orissa's surplus is only 2 to 3 lakhs tons. So, if you have the two States in one zone, you are not going to solve the deficit of the State of West Bengal. So far as the Orissa State is concerned, the Orissa Government on their own admission, by resorting to State trading, have supplied the Government of India, for supply to other States, more than two lakhs tons this year. In order to enable

them to procure more than what they had done, they wanted just a modest increase in the procurement price. The Orissa Food Minister himself says that they had not demanded something unreasonable. The Central Food Minister himself has said that the price in Orissa has been very low. Orissa Food Minister says:

"The most modest request of the State Government to the Government of India to raise the procurement price of common rice from Rs. 15 per maund to Rs. 16, fine rice from Rs. 15.81 Np. to Rs. 17 and superfine rice of various categories from Rs. 17 to Rs. 18, Rs. 19, and Rs. 20...."

So, they only wanted one rupee increase, but the Central Government would not grant that. He has said in the course of the discussion on the food situation, in the Orissa Assembly, that Government of India were purchasing foodgrains from foreign countries at a high price and at a huge cost, and he failed to see why the Government of India did not agree to this very modest request. The positive statement made in the Orissa Assembly is that the Central attitude is hampering State trading in food. Here is a State which took to State trading in right earnest, in order to supply food to any quarter of the country, wherever it was necessary, and it did it successfully.

From the study which has been made by the Central Government's Economic and Statistical Adviser, we find that the producers and others were satisfied with it.

In this connection, I want to point out one other thing. This question was very elaborately discussed by the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee which was set up, after the zones were created, because the zones did not function successfully. The Foodgrains Inquiry Committee discussed this question of zones; they did not want to say that these should be abolished altogether, but they felt that if new zones were

created, certainly, there would be some upset in the market. Therefore, they said that so far as the then existing zones were concerned, they may be allowed to remain, but they did not advocate further extension of zones. Regarding Orissa, they have definitely stated:

"Although Orissa is a surplus State, the pressure from Calcutta, Jamshedpur and other industrial areas of West Bengal and Bihar with high purchasing power often denudes it of its stocks, raises prices abnormally and creates distress for the local population. Cordonning off of Orissa is, therefore, necessity."

That is the positive statement that they have made after going through all aspects of this question. This matter has thoroughly been looked into by the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee. Now, the whole issue is being confused as if we want compulsory procurement and we want something else. That is not so.

So far as Orissa is concerned, if you want to feed the people of this State, if you do not want that another deficit State should be created along with the other problems that you are already facing, it is proper for you to continue the present policy as it is, so that Orissa may be able to supply food to other parts, and to West Bengal, if you want it.

In conclusion, I would say that the creation of zones is not going to solve the problem at all. If it is going to solve anything at all, it is not the people's difficulties, but it is the political difficulties that would be solved. It is to satisfy the traders and some merchants in the cities that this is being done by the present Food Ministry. I say that in Orissa, there are political problems that are facing them, and that is why they have suggested like this. There was disagreement even in the coalition there. Therefore, they have suggested some safeguards. I would again impress upon you, Sir,

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

and the House that the safeguards do not solve any problem. We have seen how the fair price shops have been functioning in Bihar and UP. We have seen how the distribution machinery has been working. Even if you have a buffer stock of 75,000 tons, there is no storage capacity in Orissa, and it would not reach the people; the communications are so bad, and the railways will not be able to carry it; nor will the prices be controlled. So, the safeguards have no meaning except they will satisfy the coalition Ministry there.

It is unfortunate that whenever there is a coalition Ministry in Orissa, Orissa becomes a victim of famine. In 1953, there was a coalition Ministry there. Then, some such measure as this was taken, supply of rice began to be made to Bengal, all the food-grains were purchased and transported to Bengal, as a result of which, about 3 million people died in Bengal, and in Orissa also there was famine and people died. So by resorting to this again, what they are going to do is this: again famine would be extended to Orissa. People will die. That will be the concrete result of the policy of the Coalition Ministry that you have there. They have admitted that there are differences in the Cabinet. So as a face-saving device, they have opposed this proposal. I oppose this food zone. I think this a move to upset and sabotage the entire State-trading. I want the House to take this matter seriously into consideration.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Dr. Ram Subhag Singh. I might make it clear that no hon. Member will be allowed more than 15 minutes.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram):** Just now my hon. friend, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, raised a basic question regarding State trading. He also changed the ex-Food Minister with negligence of duty. I do not share that view. But I do not want to go into the details of the matter. I have seen two articles recently published in the *Times of India* in which

he said that the question of State trading and some other basic questions were raised in the National Development Council, despite the fact that they were not on the agenda. I do not know how far it is true. But I would like to ask Government to tell us whether those decisions were taken without consulting State Governments and if the Government or the National Development Council thought it fit to take those decisions, why did they not ask the Food and Agriculture Ministry to furnish adequate data in order to arrive at those decisions? Therefore, I think that unless and until all these matters are properly clarified, it is no good charging anybody with negligence of duty.

I also do not think that it is good for any Minister to create any condition where all the officers get demoralised, because the ex-Food Minister has mentioned in his article that the officers of the Ministry became demoralised when the decisions were being taken in Mussourie or here in the National Development Council. Those decisions were taken on the basis of a note given by some members of the Planning Commission who were not conversant with agricultural or food problems. Therefore, I want that if Government take any basic decision regarding any matter, be it on State trading or on joint co-operative farming or anything else, they should properly consult all the Governments and all the people who count. Otherwise, it is no good taking any decision in a hurry, because there is no implementation of that decision or policy. Even if they take any wrong decision, they ought to be strong enough to implement it fully. But here I think Government have been very hesitant in regard to implementing decisions which they have already taken. I do not want to say more on this because you have imposed a time-limit of 15 minutes.

The other day, Shri S. K. Patil was very kind in saying that he wanted to concentrate mainly on production. Re-

garding production, he raised many points. Production in 1951 was to the tune of about 45.49 million tons and we imported about 4.72 million tons—all included, it came to over 50 million tons. With that quantity, we succeeded in providing about 12 ounce of food per capita per day. On that basis, today we require about 85 million tons of foodgrains. Despite very good food crops—we have produced about 73 million tons—we are still short and there is a deficit. He wants to meet it by creating a buffer stock of 5 million tons. We are importing on an average over 3 million tons foodgrains per annum. It may go to 4 million tons. We are not having enough storage facilities.

He was also good enough to say that we were going to construct more godowns etc. and we would try to do it as soon as possible. In that way, we will have to create storage facilities for about 9 million tons. I do not know whether we will succeed in that. Furthermore, this will also require strengthening of our procurement policy, because if we depend entirely on imports, our country will suffer greatly as we are already importing foodgrains of the value of over Rs. 150 crores every year; if we go on importing 5 million tons, it will become unbearable for the country.

Therefore, I think he was right in emphasising that we should try to increase production. But production cannot be increased only by bringing wastelands under cultivation. In regard to wastelands, he said that he was ready to give free facilities to anyone who wanted to go and till it. But at the most, wasteland is about 110 million acres. Only half of it can be brought under the plough, despite the best efforts which one can make. It is because there may not be good irrigation facilities and the yield of the soil may be low.

Therefore, I say that we should try to concentrate on irrigation and production of fertilisers. Regarding irrigation, about 100 million acres can be brought under it within two years.

We were already having about 61 million acres under irrigation by 1960-61 and with the completion of the First and Second Five Year Plans we will have succeeded in building the remaining irrigation potential. But that potential has not yet been fully utilised because, the irrigation facility to cover about 19 million acres built during the First Plan and 30 million acres built during the Second has not yet been utilised. Here lies the crux of the problem. Water rates in different States are different. They are not only different but very excessive. The treatment given to the farmers is very harsh. No farmer thinks that it is his right to take water anywhere, either from canal or from tube-wells. This fact is known to all the Governments—the State Governments and the Government of India. Government do not pay attention to this aspect. Instead, they want to give training to others, because they are very keen on sending delegations. The other day also, Shri S. K. Patil said that they wanted to send a delegation to Yugoslavia to learn about their programmes of agriculture. I know about our ex-food Minister and the Planning Commission. They were also very delegation-minded. They had sent so many delegations. They learn that in China agricultural production had been increased to 350 million tons. Later, that figure came down to 250 million tons. Now it has come down to 100 million tons!

I do not know why such persons are selected to be sent in delegations and why they come here with exaggerated reports. When they come back, they start painting a picture which is better than heaven. We have not seen heaven, but the picture which they have drawn—we have heard their talks in the Central Hall—looked like that of heaven or even better.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If someone came back from heaven, perhaps he would give the same picture.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** You are right.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : नमक का कुछ  
बखर तो होना चाहिये ।

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Because  
Shri Raghunath Singh had also been  
to some place.

**The Deputy Minister of Agriculture  
(Shri M. V. Krishnappa):** The hon.  
Member may suggest some names; we  
can include them in future.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** I do not  
want that you should carry out such  
programmes. It is foolish to send any  
delegation anywhere. If you want to  
learn anything you must learn what  
is in India because the hon. Minister  
himself said that in Madras or in  
Andhra there are farmers who are  
producing 2 tons per acre. Everybody  
here is in the habit of flying in the  
air without knowing what is going on  
on the ground. They go there to see  
what is happening on an experimental  
field in U.K. or America or Yugosla-  
via. There they learn something and  
come here. They themselves admit  
that there are farmers who are pro-  
ducing more than 2 tons per acre.  
What principles are they applying and  
how elaborate they are in applying  
fertilizers or utilising irrigation faci-  
lities and others? If a farmer comes  
here with his soiled hands they do not  
want to be touched. But when they  
go there or when President Eisen-  
hower comes here and says that he is  
a farmer then they think that they  
should create here a forum whereby  
the Members of Parliament also may  
become farmer-minded. I think it is  
no good telling these things here after  
learning them from foreign countries,  
or hearing them from foreign sources  
because all these things are already  
existing here. Because they have not  
heard all these things or learnt those  
things from the people of India they  
are always living on an aerial plane.  
I want the Agriculture Ministry not to  
commit the same mistakes which have  
been committed so far.

We can bring easily under cultiva-  
tion two-thirds of our land, about 100  
million acres perennially and about

100 million acres depending upon  
monsoon and protected irrigation faci-  
lities. But irrigation can only increase  
our production to the extent of about  
7 mds. or 8 mds. per acre or at the  
most 10 mds. Therefore, it is neces-  
sary that we must create some facility  
or create some technical device to  
increase the yield. We must send  
some officers to find out what kind of  
fertilizer a particular soil requires.

This compost making programme is  
a good programme and it is being  
carried on on some good scale. Yet it  
cannot cope with the situation because  
our land demands about 40 million  
tons of fertilizers of all varieties and  
we have succeeded in growing green  
manure fertilizers to the tune of  
about million acres. We are burning  
cowdung and other things. When we  
talk of waste land we should also  
think of cowdung manure programme.  
About 40 per cent of this is availed of  
and the rest 60 per cent is wasted.  
Though it is having only one-fifth of  
the firewood capacity, they are utilis-  
ing it for fuel.

People are not utilising bone-meal.  
We are having bone-meal to the tune  
of about 5 lakh tons. If they concen-  
trate on all these things it will be  
better.

Besides, we have not done anything  
regarding our cattle improvement  
programme. One cow alone can give  
us milk and other things with an  
income to the tune of about the yield  
of 5 acres of land. We have com-  
pletely neglected that. We talk a lot  
about all these things—about agricul-  
ture and cattle programmes and  
others. A programme has been given  
that our officers will go to the fields  
for at least 15 days. If our Ministers  
and Members of the Planning Com-  
mission also go to the fields and  
devote at least 6 months on the field  
then it will be a very good example.  
If they cannot go for 6 months, they  
should at least go for two months or  
even one month. They can tend some  
cows or buffaloes in the big lawns  
which they are maintaining because  
that can give a better yield and that

may also prove as an incentive to farmers to tend more cattle . . .

**Shri M. V. Krishnaappa:** I have two cows.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member should conclude.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** I shall stop.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am sorry: If the hon. Member wants to complete his sentence he may do it.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** I would like to have two ministers if you can permit me. Fertilizers, mechanisation and other things are also necessary, though we may differ and differ very fundamentally. If we introduce mechanisation in agriculture many of our people will be dislodged and it is a fact. But we have to build up the fertility of the soil and introduce better techniques.

We may differ from or agree with all the things that we may see in the exhibitions but we should try to introduce some better techniques which can be easily availed of by the agriculturist. There are many instruments which cost less, many light instruments which can easily be introduced. We should also try to give good prices to the farmers.

Now they have said something about the setting up of a Price Fixation Advisory Committee. You heard the other day that big leaders were there on a committee but they were not invited to meet for six months and now they are going to be invited, perhaps. If any statutory committee is created it should be given the freedom to determine prices on a scientific basis and they should have the authority to collect statistics etc. and determine the prices on that basis. They should not be made to have only advisory capacity.

Adequate loan facilities should be given. If we give loans only of Rs. 60 per acre our land under the plough will require about Rs. 2000 crores of

loan. Even if a rough estimate is made our irrigated land requires about Rs. 150 per acre for growing paddy etc. or about Rs. 300 for sugar-cane. Putting it at the lower rate of Rs. 150 we will require about Rs. 4,000 crores as loan. But there is no loan facility. So, I would request the Government very earnestly that they should try to give the farmers as much facilities as possible for crop production programme and for buying cattle and small implements and better implements.

About training . . . .

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now the hon. Member must conclude.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** All right; thank you, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** Sir, we have to move amendments we should be given some time.

उपायध्वज महोदय : नमो मुव हो गया ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : हमारा मुः नहीं हुआ ।

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** It had already been decided by the Speaker that they will not be allowed to be moved because they can come subsequent to the starting of the debate.

ब्रनाव डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं आप को खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि बड़े जोग गाँव से हमारे फूड मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनी स्पाँच दी । इस इम्पेयन्ड तरीके से दी कि वह बहुत कन्विसिंग मालूम हुई । लेकिन मैं यह देख कर हैरान रहा कि जहाँ उन्होंने चार चीजों का जिक्र किया, मकेनाइजेशन का, फरटीलाइजर का, इरीगेशन का और सीड वगैरह का, वहाँ जो असली बेसिक चीज है, जो सारे एग्रीकल्चर का बेस है, उत एग्रीकल्चर का जो कि हमारी सारी

### [पंडित ठाकुर दास बार्नव]

इकानमी का बेल है, यानी ऐनीजल हव-बैटरी का उन्होंने जिक्र तक नहीं किया। मुझे बड़ा अफसोस है वह देख कर कि आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब, जो नये बने हैं, उनका अभी तक ब्याल ही इस चीज की तरफ नहीं गया है। मैं देखता हूँ कि जो एपरोथ उनकी फूड प्राबलैम के बारे में है वह बड़ी रीयलिस्टिक है। मुझे लुशी है कि जिस तरह से उन्होंने अपना काम शुरू किया है और जो तरीका अपनाया है, वह निहायत ही मुबारिक तरीका है और मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि उनके रिजोम में या इस ग्रस में फूड प्रोडक्शन बढ़ेगी। उन्होंने जो बातें कही हैं उनमें से बहुतों के बारे में वह बहुत आप्टिमिस्टिक थे और मेरा खयाल है कि इस देश में जो लोग जोर जोर से यह पुकारते फिरते हैं कि फूड काफी नहीं है, वह देश के साथ इन्साफ नहीं करते हैं। १९५१ से अब तक १३ अरब की फूड आप लाये हैं। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कितनी डेम्स स्टॉकेशन के कारण हुई हैं या फूड की कमी के कारण हुई हैं। लोगों की परवेजिंग पावर कम है अगर या लोगों के पास खरीदने के लिये पैसा कम है और उसकी वजह से अगर कोई आदमी मूल से मर जाता है तो यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि फूड का फॉर्मिन है। उन्होंने दुस्त ही कहा है कि ७३ मिलियन जो फूड का टारगेट है जब वह हासिल कर लिया गया तो इंडिया सैल्फ सफिशेंट हो गया। यह कहना कि फूड की कमी है लोगों को बिमारोलाइज करता है। इस वास्ते मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस तरह से आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब ने शुरू किया है, अगर उसी तरह से वह चलते रहे तो वह सभी मामलों को तब कर लेंगे।

14 hrs.

अपनी मांग को इस हाउस में पेश कर चुका हूँ। मैं कई बार कह चुका हूँ कि एनीपथ हसबैटरी की तरफ ज्यादा तबज्जह दी जाए। १९५१ में एक कमेटी बनाई गई थी, जो मोर फूड कमेटी उसका नाम था। मैंने उस कमेटी को भी लिखा था कि जो मिला है इन्को भी फूड माना जाए और उसके बाद से, धाठ बरस से मैं इस हाउस में हमेशा ही, जब कभी इस मामले पर बहस हुई है, यह कहता चला आया हूँ कि जो मिल्क है यह भी एक फूड है लेकिन मिनिस्टरी ने आज तक इस चीज को नहीं माना है। शायद ही कभी कोई मौका आया हो जबकि मैंने इस बात पर जोर न दिया हो। लेकिन मुझे बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि फिब बाका गवर्नमेंट ने मिल्क को फूड नहीं समझा है।

जनाबेवाला, यहां पर बड़े जोर शोर से अभी हरिजनों के रिजर्वेशन का मामला आया था और उस पर खूब स्पीचिंग हुई थी। लेकिन यह कोई नहीं देखता कि आज सारे देश के अन्दर हरिजनों की कितनी छाछ मिल पाती है और मिलती भी है या नहीं मिलती है। दूध तो नहीं मिलता है लेकिन छाछ भी बहुत कम मिलती है। फूड का प्राबलैम शहरों का ही प्राबलैम नहीं है, बम्बई और कलकत्ता का ही प्राबलैम नहीं है, सारे देश का प्राबलैम है। अगर इस देश के लोगों को, अगर हमारे इस इलाके को छाछ नहीं मिलेगी तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा जो फिजीक है, वह बड़ा खराब हो जाएगा। मैं जानता हूँ कि आज के दिन भी गरीब आदमियों को छाछ नहीं मिलती है, दूध का तो कहना ही क्या। गवर्नमेंट सब जगह डेरीज खोलने की बात कर रही है और खोलने की कोशिश कर रही है ताकि शहरों को दूध बहम किया जा सके। लेकिन गांधी की या गरीब लोगों की किसी को फिब नहीं है कि उनकी हालत की जैसे अफसोस किना

लेकिन मेरी जो राय है इस बारे में उसको सभी मंगर जानते हैं। मैं कई बार



जा सकता है, उनकी सेहत को कैसे प्रभावित किया जा सकता है, उनकी सुराक के बारे में क्या किया जा सकता है। अगर आप कमेटी बनायें तो आपको पता चल सकता है कि उनकी वियल प्रॉब्लम क्या है। उनकी वियल प्रॉब्लम यह है कि उनको जो चीजें पहले खाने को मिलती थीं, आज नहीं मिलती हैं। हमारे आनरेबल मिनिस्टर को सबसे ज्यादा तवज्जह इस बेसिक चीज की तरफ देनी चाहिये थी। उनको देखना चाहिये था कि एनिमल हस्बैंडरी के बारे में क्या कुछ किया जा सकता है। मैं कई बरस से यहां कहता चला आ रहा हूँ और आनरेबल प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की खिदमत में और आनरेबल होम मिनिस्टर साहब की खिदमत में भी मैंने चिट्ठियां लिखी हैं और उनके सामने यह मांग पेश की है कि मेहरबानी करके यहां पर एक पोर्टकोलियो एनिमल हस्बैंडरी का बनायें और एक मिनिस्टर इस काम के लिये रखें लेकिन हमेशा ही यह कहा जाता रहा है कि क्या करें, उसमें खर्चा बढ़ जाएगा या यह हो जाएगा और वह हो जाएगा।

मैंने पिछली बार फिगरें दे दीं थीं और उनको मैं रिपीट करना नहीं चाहता। उनको मैं यहां पर चार पांच दफा दे चुका हूँ। कम से कम आठ अरब रुपया सन् १९५१ से १९५६ तक हमारी फूड मिनिस्ट्री ने जहां तक मुल्क का सवाल है, इस देश का जाया किया है, इस देश को इस रुपये से हाब चोना पड़ा है। गवर्नमेंट की अपनी फिगरें हैं कि पांच करोड़ मन दूध कम हो गया है १९५१ से १९५६ तक। ये फिगरें दुकस्त हैं या गलत, सके बारे में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है, इसके लिये गवर्नमेंट खुद जिम्मेदार है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत आ गया था कि इस किमिनल निगलैस्ट को जो गवर्नमेंट करती चली जा रही है, खत्म किया जाता, इसको दूर किया जाता और अपने फर्म को बढ़ा दिया जाता। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उस चीज की

तरफ आज भी गवर्नमेंट का कोई ध्यान नहीं है, उसकी तरफ उसकी ध्यान ही नहीं खूनी है, गवर्नमेंट सोई हुई है।

अब कुछ कुछ जरा जरा तवज्जह ही बने लगी है। मैंने सुना है कि फाउंडर और कंट्रोल चीज के लिये कुछ तज्जुबें हैं जिन पर ध्यान दिया जा रहा है या किया जाने वाला है। साथ ही हमने देखा है कि हमारी जो आरे कालोनी है जिसके बारे में पिछली बार इतना झगड़ा हुआ था, उसके बच्चों की तरफ भी जो जाया किये जाते थे, अब तवज्जह की जा रही है और गवर्नमेंट उनकी देखभाल करना चाहती है। जिस चीज का जिक्र मैं हमेशा करता रहा हूँ और बहुत मर्तबा यहाँ धरुं कर चुका हूँ, यह है कि दूध की तरफ जब तक हमारी तवज्जह नहीं होगी तब तक नामुष्कन है इस देश के अन्दर एपीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाना। मैं इस के बारे में कई बार एदादोशमार पेश कर चुका हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश में दो करोड़ बैलों की कमी है। इसको गवर्नमेंट ने भी माना है। जब तक दो करोड़ बैल नहीं आयेंगे तब तक जो ड्राफ्ट पावर आपको चाहिये वह पूरी नहीं होगी। ३३० मिलियन की यहाँ खेती होती है जिसमें एक परसेंट सिर्फ ट्रैक्टरों के जरिये होती है। १०,००० ट्रैक्टर इस मुल्क के लिये क्या चीज है। छोटे से छोटे मुल्क में भी आप जाएं वहाँ भी आपको इतने ट्रैक्टर मिल जायेंगे। अभी हमारे लायक दोस्त राम सुभग सिंह जी ने कहा कि हमारे इस देश में अनएम्पलायमेंट का भी सवाल है। हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि सब जगहों पर ट्रैक्टर पहुंच जायें और इस तरह से अनएम्पलायमेंट के सवाल को और जटिल करें। लेकिन जब तक यहाँ ट्रैक्टर बनने शुरू होंगे तब तक अनएम्पलायमेंट कम हो जायगी, बड़ी बड़ी खेती में बड़े बड़े ट्रैक्टरों की जरूरत होती है और उनमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा इस्तेमाल इनका होना चाहिये। अनएम्पलायमेंट का क्वेश्चन भी है लेकिन साथ साथ फूड प्रोडक्शन का क्वेश्चन भी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि फूड प्रोडक्शन

### [वंशित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

तब तक नहीं बढ़ सकती है जब तक कि बड़े बड़े फार्म्स जो हैं, वहाँ पर ट्रेक्टरों का इस्तेमाल नहीं किया जाता है। एक ट्रेक्टर कम से कम सौ एकड़ या दो सौ एकड़ जमीन के लिये काफी होता है और इसके लिये अगर आप बैलों की मदद लें या भादमियों के जरि से वह काम करवाना चाहें तो खेती नहीं हो सकती है।

मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आप काफी स्टील पैदा करना चाहते हैं और कर रहे हैं और अब वक्त आ गया है कि जब आप ट्रेक्टर इस देश के अन्दर ही बनाने लग जायें। अगर आप ने ऐसा नहीं किया तो जो बड़े बड़े फार्म्स हैं या जो कोओपरेटिव फार्मिंग यहाँ पर आप करना चाहते हैं उसको कैसे कर पायेंगे? आप जब ५०० या १००० एकड़ के फार्म बनायेंगे तो उनके लिये अवश्य ही ट्रेक्टरों की जरूरत होगी, वना काम ही नहीं चल सकेगा। इसके साथ ही साथ बैलों की बरक्की की तरफ भी आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिये। इस वास्ते मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर आप एंजिनियरिंग प्रोब्लम बढाना चाहते हैं तो आप को चाहिये कि आप देश के अन्दर ट्रेक्टर बन और साथ ही साथ इनका स्पॉट और ज्यादा करें। आजकल होता है कि जब किसी को ट्रेक्टर लेना होता है तो उसको छः छः महीने पहले से ही आर्डर देना होता है, जो उनमें ब्लैकमार्केटिंग होती है वह अलग से होती है। लोगों को आज ट्रेक्टर नहीं मिलते हैं। पहले तो लोगों के पास भी जमीनें ज्यादा थी और अब तो आप स सीलिंग की वजह से उनके पास जमीनें कम कर देंगे लेकिन फिर भी जो गवर्नमेंट के अपने फार्म्स हैं, उनका भी आज बुरा हाल है। उन फार्म्स की तरफ भी आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिये।

मैं एक छोटी सी बात आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ। कल का ही वाक्य है कि हमारे श्री कृष्णप्पा साहब और प्लानिंग कमीशन

के श्री श्रीमभारायण जी हिसार गये थे और वहाँ जा करके जो बिगैस्ट फार्म एशिया भर का है, उसे उन्होंने देखा, वह ४०,००० एकड़ का हिसार फार्म है। उस फार्म का पिछले ग्यारह बरस के दौरान में क्या हाल रहा है, उसका जिक्र अगर मैं यहाँ पर करने जाऊँ तो आपकी आँखों में आंसू उतर आयेंगे। इतनी बुरी तरह से इन पिछले ग्यारह सालों में बिहेव किया गया है कि जिसका कुछ ठिकाना ही नहीं। मैंने कई बार कहा है कि क्रिमिनल निग्लेक्ट आप करते आ रहे हैं। ये जो शब्द मैंने इस्तेमाल किए हैं ये काफी नहीं हैं, ये काफी सख्त नहीं हैं, ये मेरे विचार जो दुख भरे हैं जो यहाँ पेश करने के लिये काफी नहीं हैं। दरअसल गवर्नमेंट ने इस देश को तबाही में डालने में कुछ कमर नहीं रकी है। वहाँ पर कई हजार गायों रेंट सिस्टम पर है। बन्दे दूध पीते हैं। तीन हजार गायों इसी तरह से फिरती हैं जिनका दूध नहीं निकालते हैं। इसके बाद यह यकीन दिलाया गया कि हम उनकी मदद करेंगे। यह उस प्राविम का हाल है जिसके अन्दर कि गायों की ज्यादा परवाह की जाती है और प्राविसिस के मुकाबले में, जहाँ पर लोग दूसरे प्राविसिस के मुकाबले में ज्यादा दूध पीते हैं, ज्यादा पैदा करते हैं। जब उस प्राविसिस का यह हाल हो तो आप अन्दाजा लगा सकते हैं दूसरे सूबों का क्या हाल होता होगा, उनका भी ऐसा ही हाल होता होगा। इस वास्ते मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट जितना भी रुपया खर्च कर सकती है, उसे इस तरफ खर्च करना चाहिये।

अब आप देखें कि दूध में कितनी फूड वैल्यू होती है। पिछली मर्तबा मैं ने इस हाउस में इसका जिक्र किया था कि एक सेर दूध में कितनी फूड वैल्यू होती है। अभी डा० राम सुभग सिंह जी ने कहा कि एक गाये जो जो कि दस सेर के करीब दूध देती है वह आसानी से सात एकड़ जमीन से जितना फायदा हो सकता है, पशुका सकती है।

लेकिन गवर्नमेंट का अभी तक इस तरफ ध्यान ही नहीं गया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि फूड मिनिस्टर साहब इसको समझें कि १/४ भाप ए टन जितना अनाज उसमें पैदा होता है। अब आप उसकी वैल्यू को देखें। जो गाय दस सेर दूध वाली है वह तकरीबन पांच हजार पाउण्ड साल में दे सकती है और सात एकड़ का काम कर सकती है। लेकिन आज इसकी कोई परवा ही नहीं करते हैं, इस तरफ देखने के लिये ही तैयार नहीं हैं। १३ अरब रुपये का अनाज मंगा लिया, आठ अरब रुपया दूध की कमी में जाया कर दिया, लेकिन इस तरह की चीजों को आप देखने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। यह वैसी ही बात हुई कि जैसे पंजाब में भाखड़ा डैम आया लेकिन वाटरलागिंग की क्लिफ ने परवा नहीं की और चीज वहीं की वहीं रही। इसी तरह से जब तक आप दूध की परवा नहीं करेंगे और इतनी तरह की दूसरी चीजों का तरफ ध्यान नहीं देंगे उस वक्त तक यह मसला हल नहीं हो सकेगा। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि सक्ता तरफ ज्यादा तवज्जह दी जाय। पिछले मिनिस्टर श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन ने यहां पर एक गो-अवबंदन कोमिल बनाई हुई है मैं भी उसका एक अदना मेम्बर हूँ, मैं आपका विद्यमान में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि उस गो-अवबंदन कोमिल को बिल्कुल अस्थायारत नहीं दिये गये, उसको फंड्स काफी नहीं दिये गये, उसको काम नहीं करने दिया गया। लेकिन आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब का उस वक्त खयाल था कि हम एक ऐसी चीज बना रहे हैं जो कि जहां तक एनीमल हर्बेडरी का सवाल है, उसे देखेंगे। पिछले दिनों इतना जोर देने के बाद, यहां पर एक रेजोल्यूशन लाने के बाद पिछले आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब ने हुक्म दिया कि इस कोमिल को ब्रोड बेस करो, और अस्थायारत दो, जो कि गवर्नमेंट के हैं वह अस्थायारत उसे दिये जायें और सारे देश के अन्दर सक्ता कमिटीज बना कर फाडर का सवाल तय किया जाय। लेकिन आज तक भी उसका फैसला नहीं हुआ, हालांकि इस हुक्म को दिये हुए

बन्द माह हो गये। फूड मिनिस्ट्री के कहने के मुताबिक अगर ठीक से खाने को दिया जाय जानवरों को तो ५० परसेंट ईल्ड बढ़ जाती है, ६० परसेंट ब्राफ्ट पावर बढ़ जाती है, लेकिन हमारे जानवरों को ठीक खाने को नहीं दिया जाता। कहते हैं कि जानवरों और इन्मानों का मुकाबला है, किस को खिलायें। यह बिल्कुल गलत ब्याल है। अगर सही मानों में हम गायों को अनाज, जो कि देना चाहिए और सब घरों में लोग देते हैं, तो दूध को सिकदार तनी बढ़ सकती है जिसका ठिकाना नहीं है, हालांकि आप उसकी फूड नहीं समझते। इस तरह से आप किसी हद तक फूड की प्रब्लम को हल कर सकते हैं। मैं अपने कास्टिट्यूशन का दफा ४८ और ३५५ को तरफ आपका तवज्जह दिखाना चाहता हूँ। कास्टिट्यूशन के आर्टिकल ४७ व ४८ में लिखा हुआ है कि इस तरह से जानवरों की परवरिश की जाय, लेकिन उस के ऊपर हमारी गवर्नमेंट कहती है कि यह एक मेंटमेंट है, यह हिन्दुओं का स्मोगन है, और यह कह कर इस मसले को टाल देती है। यूजफुन कंट्रोल के मुतालिक कानून पास किया गया, आर्टिकल ३५५ कहता है कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया का फर्ज है कि इस को तरफ तवज्जह करे। अक्राडिंग टु कास्टिट्यूशन यह चीज जरूरी है, आर्टिकल ४८ के मुताबिक यह गवर्नमेंट को जिम्मेदारी है; अगर आप उस की पढ़ कर देखें तो मालूम होता है कि गवर्नमेंट का फर्ज है कि न्यूट्रिटिव वैल्यू, खुराक सब लोगों की हेल्थ के वास्ते मूहैया करे। लेकिन इस की तरफ तवज्जह नहीं दी जाती। लोगों तक न्यूट्रिटिव फूड पहुंचाने का सिवा इस के कोई तरीका नहीं है कि दूध उन लोगों को दिया जाय, खुसूसन हिन्दुस्तान जैसे देश के अन्दर जहां पर लोग गोशत खाने के ज्यादा प्रादी नहीं हैं। यह चीज दफा ४७ व ४८ में दर्ज है, जो कि कास्टिट्यूशन के मुताबिक हर स्टेट पर बाईडिंग है। यह स्टेट पार्लिसी का सवाल है जो कि फंडामेंटल राइट्स से भी ज्यादा जरूरी है और जित्त के लिए कहा गया

### [पंडित ठाकुर दास नार्वण]

है कि उसे एम्फोर्स किया जाना चाहिए। स्टेट बासिली होने की वजह से यह गवर्नमेंट घाफ इंडिया का फर्ज ही जाता है, लेकिन मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस की तरफ तवज्जह नहीं दी और एक तरह से कांस्टिट्यूशन की खिलाफतों की। गवर्नमेंट घाफ इंडिया ने कभी भी पार्लिकल ३५५ को घांज खोल कर नहीं पड़ा कि उन का फर्ज है कि सारी स्टेट्स के अन्दर इस चीज को जारी करायें। अब हम सवाल पूछते हैं, हम रेजोल्यूशन पेश करते हैं कि सारी स्टेट्स के अन्दर इस काम को उठाया जाय तो यहां कह दिया जाता है कि यह स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स का फर्ज है। यह हजिज स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स का फर्ज तो है ही, यह गवर्नमेंट घाफ इंडिया का फर्ज है कि कांस्टिट्यूशन के मुताबिक सारी स्टेट्स के अन्दर काम चले। इस की तरफ यहां पर कभी तवज्जह नहीं दी जाती। इसलिए मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि वह बेसिक चीज है, सब से इम्पार्टेंट चीज है, जिस पर यहां ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता। हमें बतलाया गया कि साइसोटोप्स हमारे यहां आयेंगे। लेकिन पता नहीं वह कब आयेंगे और कब हमारे यहां फूड प्रोडक्शन बढ़ेगा। इस से कहा जाता है कि हमारा प्रोडक्शन बहुत बढ़ेगा। कब वह होगा मुझे पता नहीं, लेकिन जो प्रोडक्शन का तरीका हमारे हाथ में है, जिस के लिए सब से ज्यादा जानवर हमारे देश में हैं, उस की तरफ गवर्नमेंट तवज्जह नहीं देती। इस हाउस का फर्ज है कि वह गवर्नमेंट को मजबूर कर दे, गवर्नमेंट के हाथ बांध दे, गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ सेंसोर मोशन धायें कि जब तक गवर्नमेंट इस चीज को ठीक नहीं करेगी तब तक देश के अन्दर हजिज सस्ली नहीं होगी।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : घ्राप लायें मोशन हम घ्राप को सपोर्ट करेंगे।

पंडित ठाकुर दास नार्वण : घ्राप हमें हजिज सपोर्ट नहीं करेंगे, घ्राप को इस के लिए श्लिप मिन जायेगा।

मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि घ्राप की बहुत का असर यह होना चाहिए कि एक ऐसा रिप्लिमेंटिक मिनिस्टर हमें मिला है इस तरह की चीजें जो हम बतलाती हैं उन की तरफ ध्यान दे, इतनी शीजीशन वाला मिनिस्टर हमें मिले जो कि फूड प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाये।

मैं निहाम्त इम्फोर्सरी से कहता हूँ कि यहां ऐनिमल हस्वैट्री का सवाल है, उसे तबकी दी जाय। लेकिन असल में होता यह है इस में एकतरफा कारवाई की जाती है। घ्राप फूड प्राब्लेम जो है वह इस तरह की नहीं है कि उस की अदर उधर की बातें कह कर टाल दिया जाय। अब वक्त आ गया है कि हम इस की तरफ ज्यादा तवज्जह किया करें। साथ ही ऐसी चीजों का भी सवाल है जो कि इस देश में पैदा होती हैं और जानवरों की खुराक के काम आती हैं। जनाबबाला सुन कर हैरान होंगे, मैं ने पिछली दफा फिगर्स दिये थे, वह दूसरे मुल्कों को भेज दी जाती हैं। ग्वार जो जानवरों के खाने की चीज है, उस का गम निकाल कर दूसरे मुल्कों को भेज दिया जाता है। यहां पर खली बनती है वह इस्तेमाल की जाती है खाद के वास्ते, यह नहीं है कि वह जानवरों को खिलाई जाय ताकि उन की दूध देने की ताकत बढ़े। जितनी भी चीजें जानवरों के खाने की हैं, उन का सदुपयोग नहीं किया जाता।

अभी मेरे लायक दोस्त ने काऊ डंग का श्लिक किया। मैं ने कुछ फिगर्स भेजे थे मिनिस्टर साहब के पास। उन्होंने उन को देखा। मैं आवाद बतलाऊं तो मुझे में कहने की जुरंत है कि इस देश के अन्दर ऐनिमल हस्वैट्री का जो कंट्रिब्यूशन है वेसमल इम्फाज में यह २५ परसेण्ट है। घ्राप में देखाता हूँ कि फर्स्ट फाइव इयर प्लेन में हम ने उस के लिए कुछ नहीं किया। सेकेंड फाइव इयर प्लेन में साबद उस के कुछ बेटर रिजल्ट मकर आते, लेकिन जो कुछ किया था वह है वह काफी नहीं है।

ई सर्व कल्याण कि सेकेन्ड हाइव इपर प्लेन का वो सारा बाकी है, इत में कितना सप्ला किये गया है वह सारे का सारा खर्च कर दिया जाना चाहिए और एग्रिग्रेन्डा पौन्ड में जो खर्च से ज्यादा कम्परी चीज है, उसे सब से ज्यादा खर्चा दिया जाना चाहिए ।

**D. Krishnaswami (Chingleput):**  
 Sir, an excruciating experience to sit through a debate on food, for one finds that this House sometimes wades important issues and enters the paradise of abstract theories.

The crux of the problem today is that while the wholesale price indices of rice, wheat and pulses are lower today by about 3 per cent, 6 per cent and 12 per cent than what they were a year ago, public indignation at the high level of food prices continues. We cannot dismiss this indignation by quoting statistics of wholesale price indices. Surely it will be conceded that as a result of record harvest of 3 million tons in 1958-59 the prices did not rise as much as they did during the lean months from May to August last year. But let it also be realised that notwithstanding the bumper crops, notwithstanding the fact that we had substantial imports from abroad the prices have not gone down as much as we anticipated.

There is a closely allied issue, partly statistical but which, nevertheless, has a vital bearing on public attitudes. The present index of wholesale prices for foodgrains takes into account about 508 quotations. A sizable proportion of these quotations is inevitably from producing centres in surplus States. It is right from the point of view of compiling index that we should adopt this procedure, but under a normal market system the wholesale prices in the producing centres set a tone for the general level of prices throughout the country. If prices are high in one area foodgrains move to it and depress prices.

But what happens when restrictions on movement of foodgrains are imposed? The result is that there are

low prices in surplus States which get fully reflected in the index, and there are high prices in the deficit States which are only partially reflected, if at all, in the index. The price index is low, but in the deficit States which have a fairly dense population the prices are excessively high. This is the explanation of the apparent contradiction of low prices as reflected in the wholesale price indices and public wrath at high prices.

The other important point about recent trend in prices, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, is that while the indices of foodgrain prices have been reasonably steady, the prices of other food articles such as milk, meat, spices, tea, coffee, sugar and gur, have mounted up very steeply. In the case of some commodities like clove and cardamom, import restrictions are the villain of the piece. In the case of commodities like milk, eggs and meat, supplies have not been commensurate with increased demand,—a consequence of increase in money incomes. In the case of tea and coffee our export demand has been rising rapidly, but we have allowed internal demand also to rise. In the case of sugar and gur the difficulty of obtaining sugar in certain States has forced up gur prices. What is the result? The result in brief is that the wholesale index of food articles is today higher by six per cent over what it was last year and by about 25 per cent over what it was in 1952-53.

Now, it is clear that the present system of each State remaining as a separate zone has broken down in many cases. We expected good harvests and movement restrictions in surplus States to lead to the States obtaining substantial procurements of food-grains. These procurements, with substantial imports from abroad were expected to force down prices, but procurement has been very poor. Indeed, whenever a State has attempted to procure directly in the open market, prices have risen very sharply. Nor is it politically feasible to procure at fixed prices. Even the

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

Kerala Government under Communist rule recoiled from this prospect. In brief, deficit States have borne the full brunt of these movement restrictions.

The Food Minister the other day pointed out that we should have a single zone. Now, it is a grand idea. In fact, we have not as yet reaped the benefits of a common market, the result of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel's monumental achievement of integrating India into one unit, but in the short run, this is not practicable. There are so many difficulties. For instance, the strain on our railway transport facilities would be great. There would also initially be a crisscross movement of foodgrains from one centre to the other. Let us realise that it will imply a violent break with a pattern of distribution and market arrangements which rightly or wrongly have emerged during the past seven years.

Now, I agree with my hon. friend that the other alternative is to modify the present system by enlarging the food zones so that each zone is self-sufficient in the major cereals of the area. This would tend to equalise prices in different areas and improve the effectiveness of the market. But here I wish to emphasise once more the problem of deciding whether the zones are really self-sufficient and of providing cereals and pulses in which a particular zone is deficient. The so-called southern zone which might be held as a model, cannot be termed a genuinely self-sufficient zone, for, no realistic assessment of the needs of Madras, Kerala and Andhra was made. Unless the Government really attempts to solve the problem and ensure that these zones are properly self-sufficient, it is no use flaunting this zone as a model to be copied by others. The Centre, even after a zone is formed, should provide cereals and pulses in which a zone is deficient, and this ought to be an integral part of any zonal arrangement. Besides, there is the problem of meeting the requirements of large consuming centres and

port towns like Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta and other urban centres ought to be met from the centre. To achieve this efficiency, the Centre will have to play a more active role in purchasing, storing and distributing foodgrains. But this does not necessitate or imply monopoly trading by the State in foodgrains. Indeed, the State must enter the foodgrains trade only in order to act as a market leader, but it does not, and indeed, it should not have to be a monopolist. The State has neither the organisation nor the aptitude for taking over fully the wholesale trade in grains.

My hon. friend the Food Minister referred to the distribution of foodgrains by fair price shops. Today, we have about 50,000 fair price shops. Even if we double it within another year or two, it still would not be sufficient to meet the demands of our population. What is the alternative that faces us? As everyone knows, the retail foodgrain shops are highly imperfect and, in the jargon of economics, there is a great deal of market imperfections for those retail trade shops. But it does not mean that we should simply give up or throw our hands in despair and say that nothing can be done. No trader lives by profit alone. There are other motives which operate as well and it is a great mistake to think that some of these non-profit incentives cannot be exploited to the full. Indeed, in the past, nearly four decades ago, honest traders were made Justices of the Peace and according to all accounts that have appeared, they showed how they have behaved. It is clear that in periods of food crises they acted very well and very appropriately.

I suggest to the Food Minister that he should give all the impetus to the organisation of retail trade associations. They can be made to work efficiently. They can ensure that prices charged are uniform and reasonable in foodgrains. There is today an enormous scope for this, but let us realise that if they do not

behave properly, they can be punished and there is no doubt that we have sufficient powers to punish them. At the same time, our recognition of such associations must be positive and helpful. Otherwise, those running such associations will have the worst of both the worlds. They would lose caste with those who are black marketeers and they would not have attained a social position in our society. But I do recommend to my hon. friend the Food Minister to think seriously on the problem of organising retail trade associations, for, I feel that however much he might attempt to open fair price shops, they cannot be a substitute for the retail trade as such, and if we wish to improve the morality of the retail trade, one such way is organise these retail trade associations and thus show that we can do a great deal through public co-operation.

I should like to refer briefly to one or two points which my hon. friend the Food Minister brought to our notice. He said that he was willing to have a buffer stock of five million tons. It is excellent to have a buffer stock of five million tons. But there are certain questions which I would like to ask. Has the Planning Commission overcome its prejudice in the matter of extending ware-house facilities? At present we have ware-house facilities to store  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million tons or thereabouts. Secondly, if we decide to procure, I suggest that the Government should adopt the procedure which they adopted in 1957-58. It was not a very good year for procuring foodgrains through agencies. But then it was possible for those agencies to substantially procure foodgrains at fairly normal prices with the result that we were able to build up proper buffer stocks.

The third and the more important point is that a substantial portion of the foodgrains should be procured from within our country and not imported from abroad. What is the grave danger we are facing? The grave danger about the recent rises in price trends lies not in the upward

movement of cereal prices—though that has been something and it is subject to seasonal fluctuations—but the gravest danger is the slow, persistent and creeping rise in prices of all other components, fuels, lubricants, manufactures and intermediates, which have tended to raise the floor for the general level of prices. When we discuss the rise in prices of foodgrains and other things, we have also to remember that another rise is occurring in different sectors of our economy, a rise which cannot be ignored. Even if there is a bumper crop, they will not slide down as in the past but when there is an indifferent harvest, they will rise further. There is thus a strong bias in favour of prices creeping up little by little after spells of steadiness. I warn the Food Minister against ignoring these trends in our economy, and I hope that the Planning Commission and other bodies will be very reasonable.

If I refer to the Planning Commission, it is because I have felt that that body with its superannuated wisdom, has seldom shown a sense of realism, and has generally tried to play the role of the fifth wheel in the Cabinet coach of our administration. Minister after Minister has got up and defended the Planning Commission and the reason why the House has been severe on Ministers is not because they have not submitted to the Planning Commission but because the House feels that a body which is constitutionally not responsible to this House cannot be brought to book and the only other man who can be made a scapegoat is the Minister. I hope that the Food Minister will show sufficient courage to stand up to the Planning Commission. It is my view that unless we have a genuine form of Cabinet Government, where Ministers are really responsible to this House, we will have a repetition of what occurred in the past, a Food Minister resigning or relinquishing office because he was more loyal to the Planning Commission and not sufficiently loyal to this House.

Shri Mahanty: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, any debate on the food situation can have two distinct aspects—the micro-aspect and the macro-aspect, the short-range aspect and the long-range aspect. But I venture to think that today, situated as we are, we are not considering the long-range aspect, even though it is very important from many points of view. Today the real crux of the situation, so far as I understand, is the spirally increasing rise in food prices, which is almost competing with the rise in food production. We have almost reached the target of production, which we had laid down for the second Five Year Plan. Our target was 75 million tons and as against that 75 million tons, today we produce 73.5 million tons. That is not a bad achievement at all. But when we consider this with the increasing prices, we are really confronted with almost a baffling situation. We had expected the hon. Food Minister to have given pointers or indications to these baffling issues, without taking us to his very laudable schemes for the future. We are very much concerned with the future, but today we are more concerned with the present and I submit that any realistic discussion on the food situation has to confine itself to the bitter present, as it obtains today.

A little while ago, I have said that the food production is increasing, but the food prices are also increasing and the vicious circle has not yet been broken through, even though we have sacrificed an hon. Minister. The House will remember that Shri A. P. Jain had to quit the Cabinet in the rising crescendo of food prices as well as public criticism. Today it is only fit and proper that the Food Minister gives us here and now the steps he proposes to take to curb down the food prices, which is bedevilling all our plans for development and progress.

For instance, in 1956-57, our production was 68.7 million tons. The next year was a very unfortunate year for a variety of reasons and the

food production had gone down. But the year 1958-59, was a peak year from the point of view of food production. Yet, the food prices in 1958-59 were higher than the food prices which had obtained in 1957-58, which was an unfortunate year. 1959-60 is also a bumper year. We had a bumper crop this year, and yet the food prices which rule today are higher at certain points than the prices which had ruled last year. The market prices of Calcutta may be taken into account in this connection. I have no time; otherwise, I would have quoted those figures.

So, in this context, we have to analyse and examine the Government's proposal, or should I say the Food Minister's proposal, to withdraw State-trading in foodgrains. As he has very rightly said, State-trading is not an end in itself. But in this relative world, nothing is an end in itself. Even the Government is a means to an end; it is not the end in itself. Everything in this world is a means to an end. But what we have to judge is whether the means which we have forged are going to serve those ends, if not, what inadequacies we suffer from and how best to remove them. But I regret to say that the hon. Food Minister has left us in the same darkness as we were before. (Interruption). It is a matter of opinion; if my hon. friend sees more light, I only wish him the best of luck.

Much has been said against State-trading in foodgrains, which I can appreciate. But I wonder how the memory of the ruling party is so proverbially short. It was only in the Nagpur Congress that so much was said about State-trading in foodgrains. But I do not place my case on the resolution which was passed in the Nagpur Congress. The basic fact has to be remembered that you have to maintain a consistent price-line if you are going to achieve anything worthwhile, be it the second Five Year Plan or the third. Today we know from the initial papers which have been worked out by the



Planning Commission that our production is not commensurate with the rise in the national income. Today or tomorrow, you are going to be faced with that situation when you are going to formulate the basis of the third Five Year Plan.

Why has this kind of thing happened? It is because we have not been able to maintain a consistent price-line. It has not been able to enthuse the rural masses or the urban city-dwellers or the workers in the fields and factories. How are you going to maintain a consistent price-line? As a result of our experience in 1957 the Government was forced to take to State-trading in foodgrains. In all humility, I may say that the Government was never serious or sincere in giving effect to State-trading. A working group was appointed in the Food Ministry to work out the programme and the plan of State-trading in foodgrains. I can say with all sense of responsibility that they merely played with the fringe of the problem; they never reached the core.

At that time we had given two warnings. We said, do not entrust the scheme to the traders, the hoarders, the black-marketeers, whose only mission in life is to thwart the scheme. The country knows, this House knows, that this entire scheme was left as though on a platter of silver in the hands of the very same people whose only mission in life was to thwart it. Having done that, it is not absolutely honest to say that State-trading in foodgrains has been a failure. I ask, did you give it ever a fair trial?

The Deputy Minister had stated elsewhere that on account of the cordoning off the States, they were not able to mop up the excesses in the surplus States. That is an absolutely wrong statement and I repudiate it. I wish the hon. Minister repudiates it and withdraws it. Take, for instance, rice. Your target was, out of 28 million tons of rice production, you wanted to build a stock of 2 million

tons of rice. I say, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa have contributed to about 1.7 million tons to it.

Shri A. M. Thomas: That is wrong. I will come to those figures.

Shri Mahanty: How much have they contributed?

Shri S. K. Patil: They do not produce as much.

Shri Mahanty: Orissa produces 22 lakhs tons of rice.

Shri S. K. Patil: Yes; lakhs and not millions.

Shri Mahanty: I am sorry; I stand corrected.

An Hon. Member: It is a dangerous slip.

Shri Mahanty: Many more dangerous slips occur; it is only a slip of the tongue. You have almost been able to build your stock of rice up to the target you had set yourself. I want to ask, where has the State-trading in foodgrains stood in your way? You had said that in deficit States, when the Government entered the market, the prices shot up. The prices did not shoot up because the Government entered the deficit States' markets. The prices shot up because you had absolutely left yourself helpless in the hands of the very same traders and manipulators whose only job in life is to trade in human misery and starvation. While the pavements of Calcutta were crying for the blood of those hoarders and black-marketeers, you had entrusted the very scheme in the hands of Pasupatidas and Sons and others, whose very job in life was to frustrate it. So, there is no good saying it was a failure. You can say so for reasons best known to yourself.

Shri S. K. Patil: May I just say to help the hon. Member that neither of us who spoke on this subject has ever said that it is a failure?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He is addressing me perhaps!

**Shri S. K. Patil:** You can look after yourself

**Shri Mahanty:** Therefore, I beg to submit that State trading in food-grains has not failed in building food stocks which was our aim. It has also not contributed to shoot up the prices. If anything has contributed to shooting up of the prices, it is the unholy alliance between the Government and the food traders, whose very purpose and mission in life was to thwart State trading.

I come to another aspect, and that relates to the food zone. This morning I raised a point of order, the only purpose of which was to take the Government into confidence, so as not to create an occasion in future to say that "they did not tell us". The hon. Food Minister said "I will tell wherefrom I derive my authority". He derives his authority from the Essential Commodities Act, clause (3), sub-clause (d) of the Essential Commodities Act of 1955. That Essential Commodities Act was enacted under article 369 of the Constitution—temporary and transitional provisions of the Constitution. This article relates to inter-State trade, as opposed to intra-State trade. I do not know why the legal advisers of the Food Ministry have missed this fundamental point. The Essential Commodities Act, even though it was legally bad enough, even though it was constitutionally bad enough in the year 1957, it was only good for the purpose of inter-State trade. I have no time, therefore, I do not wish to repeat it.

It is clear from the wording of article 369, sub-clause (a), "trade and commerce within a State" that it was under this article the Essential Commodities Act was originally enacted and then extended. But today you have to come to this House under article 303(2) of the Constitution; there is no-escape from it. The wordings are clear and the mandate is

specific, because this relates to building inhibition against free trade, giving preference to some States against some other States. For instance, Madhya Pradesh will be linked with Bombay. I have great admiration for the hon. Food Minister but with all respect and with all humility I agree with him to bring down the food prices in his own constituency in the City of Bombay. But let him not create any difficult situation in Madhya Pradesh, the rice bowl of Madhya Pradesh. Economic parity of the Madhya Pradesh rice bowl peasants cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be equated with that of the urban city dwellers in Bombay. The same thing can be said about Orissa and Calcutta. I told him once, I told him twice and I repeat it here—we undertake to supply to Calcutta every single grain of ours which is surplus. We undertake that. But we want it to be done through State trading in foodgrains. That has been the view of the Orissa Government also.

What right has the Government not to tell this House what the views of the State Government are. If the constitutional personality of the States are going to be tinkered like that, if they are going to be toys in the hands of a ruthless centre like this, then—I do not know—I think it is time enough to bid good-bye to this Constitution and this scheme or pattern of things. What do I say? You are absolutely right when you say India will be one zone. I am the first person to reciprocate that sentiment. But for that you have to bring about economic parity between States and States. For that first you have to bring about parity between the rice bowl of Madhya Pradesh and the rich and prosperous cities of Bombay and Ahmedabad. It is the primary producers of the rice bowl of Madhya Pradesh and Orissa who have to build the super-structure of the industrialisation of this Plan and all that.

So, if in the interests of saving your consumers in the big cities, who are politically better-organised, who are possibly your voters, who are

possibly your main bulwark, if for them you are going to sacrifice the fundamental interests of the consumers who are also the producers in the economically backward State, then it will be an injustice which the Parliament will be doing, not only to the Constitution but also to these States. If he wants to do it, let him come through the normal procedure, there be a legislation, let there also be a specific purpose for which these zones are going to be formed; let there be a legislation, let there also be merits and let the Parliament give consent to it, and not like this under an omnibus motion bringing large matters of policy and seeking the approval of Parliament.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir. I have sought, with your permission, to intervene in the debate to answer certain points that have already been raised by some hon. Members, leaving of course the major aspects and more serious aspects of policy to be dealt with by my senior colleague when he replies to the debate. Usually the food debates are being held on the floor of this House in the context of very difficult food situations, so much so that we usually get ourselves lost in problems of distribution and allied matters, in the course of the debate, when the only remedy is increased production. Members usually do not attach much importance to it, nor discuss it thoroughly.

According to me, this debate marks a real shift in the practice so far adopted. I must say that the keynote of the Minister's speech was a passionate appeal for increase in production. He has not only made an appeal but he has also dealt with the various aspects governing increased production.

A very high priority is now sought to be given to the targets of food production, and the targets proposed and the programmes set out for the Third Plan are with a view to place the food economy on a sound footing

and enable us to depend on our production to meet all our needs.

I was really surprised when I listened to the speech of the hon. Member, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy. He was blaming the Food Minister for having devoted much of his time to problems of food production, rather than problems of supply and distribution. According to Shri Dwivedy, food production must be solely left to the States and the Centre should not have anything to do with that. The Centre should only look to the problems of supply and distribution. I am glad that other members of this House do not subscribe to this view. From the substitute motions that have been tabled I find that Members attach importance to the problem of increased food production. The other day also Shri Dwivedy has been pooh-poohing the idea of self-sufficiency and all that. Shri Tangamani also referred to it. He said that we have been speaking about self-sufficiency in food for such a long time, from the year 1949 onwards. It is true. We have been speaking about food self-sufficiency since 1949, because we launched our Grow More Food campaign in that particular year.

I may also say that at that time when we launched the Grow More Food campaign it was the idea to achieve self-sufficiency in food by the year 1952. We then thought that with an additional production of 4.2 million tons of foodgrains, with the then level of consumption it would be possible to attain more or less self-sufficiency in the matter of food.

But I beg of this House to consider the things which have taken place subsequently. In the year 1949-50 our foodgrains production was in the region of 54 million tons, cereals as well as pulses taken together. In the year 1958-59, as has been pointed out by the hon. Member, who just preceded me, we have reached—I do not say a bumper crop—peak production, that is 73.5 million tons. For easy calculation, we will say 74 million tons. That means that during the

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

last ten years there has been an increase to the extent of 20 million tons, that is, at an average of 2 million tons every year. The increase every year may vary, but on an average it is 2 million tons.

We had thought that by the production of 4 million tons, on the level of consumption then, we would be able to achieve self-sufficiency. Then since we found in 1952 that it was not possible and that we may have to import some quantity, we introduced the term relative self-sufficiency. That was the term used for the period following 1952. When subsequently, even after so much of production, we have not been able to attain self-sufficiency, this target of self-sufficiency has become, to use the same expression which has been used by the Food-grains Enquiry Committee, a moving target.

All the same, I would like the hon. Members to consider that if we had taken the then level of consumption, that is, the level existing in 1949-52, we would have been in a position to export some quantity by this time. By the increase in consumption to the extent of one ounce of cereals or foodgrains, the additional commitment that the nation would have will come to about 5 million tons. I would beg of this House to consider that aspect. One ounce of increased consumption means an additional commitment of 5 million tons.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** You never thought that you will take....

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** I am just coming to that.

Although with this increased production of 20 million tons we have not been able to attain self-sufficiency, the House has to consider necessarily some aspects. One aspect

certainly is the growth of population. Of course, the growth of population had also been taken into account when we talked about self-sufficiency. In 1951 our population was 362 million. Two projections have been made to this figure—one by the Census Commissioner himself and the other by the Central Statistical Organisation. According to the Census Commissioner, going by the past figures, the population in 1961 would be 410 million. According to the Central Statistical Organisation, in 1961 the population would be 431 million. In 1971, according to the Census Commissioner, our population, based on past figures, will be 481 million and according to the Central Statistical Organisation it would be 528 million. So, this is one aspect that we have to consider when we speak about self-sufficiency.

The second aspect that I would ask this House to consider is the improvement in the purchasing power of the people. Along with that, I would ask the House to consider also the heavy developmental expenditure that we are incurring under the various plans that we are working. These two aspects, according to me, have to be considered together. There is no doubt with regard to the fact that our standard of life is rising. It is a very healthy feature. Our consumption requirements are also going up. This also is a very healthy feature. The total investment in the economy has been increasing from year to year. I am giving certain figures which the House may consider.

In 1956-57, public investment amounted to Rs. 641 crores. It amounted to Rs. 863 crores in 1957-58; to Rs. 1,064 crores in 1958-59 and during 1959-60, that is, during the year in which we have entered, the plan investment would be Rs. 1,092 crores. We are also.....

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** In industry and agriculture.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** I am coming to industry . . . Yes, that is public investment in industry and agriculture.

Deficit financing, the House knows, has been of the order of Rs. 1,200 crores from 1956 to 1960. I would now come to the investment in the private sector also. According to the investigations which have been undertaken by the Reserve Bank of India, investment in the private sector comes to about Rs. 700 crores a year compared to an average of about Rs. 500 crores which was estimated in the Second Five Year Plan.

14.56 hrs.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair.]

So, over the original estimate of Rs. 500 crores in the Second Five Year Plan there has been an increase to the extent of Rs. 200 crores on an average. Just consider, public investment of the order of Rs. 1,000 crores and private investment bordering on Rs. 700 crores, in all Rs. 1,700 crores, being injected into the public every year. That will certainly have its effect on the price factor also.

**Shri M. K. Ghosh** (Jamshedpur): That expenditure would go out.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** I just said that with the purchasing power that the people get, the demand for foodgrains and other articles would naturally go up.

**Shri M. K. Ghosh:** That would go out and not to the people. The amount which has been spent on importing machinery and other things on planning should go out and would not be distributed among the people.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** To that extent, it may be so.

Increase in production has, I must say, tended to moderate and absorb

the inflationary impact to a certain extent, otherwise the prices would have gone up. I ask this House to show a little more of understanding and appreciation of this aspect of the problem. In considering an appropriate food policy, this large growing and increasingly complex economy has also to be taken into consideration. There are other factors which are known, namely, rapid urbanisation and the producers themselves consuming much more than they used to consume originally. All these questions have also to be taken into consideration.

It is after taking all these into consideration that we have fixed tentative targets for the Third Five Year Plan. The House knows about the report of the Ford Foundation team. It recommended that by the end of the Third Five Year Plan, to meet the consumption requirements of this country, there must be a production of not less than 110 million tons of foodgrains. That will be 37 million tons over and above the record production of 73.5 million tons in 1958-59 and will have to be achieved over a period of about seven years. I need not tell the House that an all-out effort will have to be made to reach this high target.

I will next come in some general way to the question of buffer stock operations and whether imports are necessary. Hon. Members were condemning the practice of importing more and more foodgrains. I would recall to this House the position that we found ourselves during the year 1955. Early in 1955 we found that foodgrain prices had reached the rock bottom level or so, and then towards the end of 1955 they began to rise and even a stock of 15 lakh tons was not sufficient to serve as buffer stock operations. At that time we even thought, having had two or three consecutive good harvests, that self-sufficiency was round the corner. I must confess that we relaxed a little, but as far as the Food and Agriculture Ministry is concerned, as is

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

borne out by the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee's Report, it was even then in favour of a large buffer stock, but that was not built up. I do not want to enter into the reasons why a large buffer stock was not built up at that time. Now we have the context of a better cycle of production. Last year we had a good crop. This year also we are going to have a good crop, and possibly next year also. That may perhaps temporarily alleviate our difficulties, but even then the idea of the Food and Agricultural Ministry is that we should never make the mistake that we committed on the previous occasion when there were two or three consecutive years of good production. That underlines the necessity of building up a huge buffer stock pointed out by the hon. Minister when he initiated the debate.

15 hrs.

When we speak about imports, we have also to take into consideration the advantages we have of imports under Public Law No. 480 under which about 40 per cent will be by way of grants, 20 per cent for meeting the expenditure of the American officials and other establishments here, while the balance 40 per cent will be given to us by way of loan for financing our own development projects here. This arrangement, therefore, would certainly be a mutually advantageous arrangement, advantageous to us and also to the United States. So, the terms under which we are importing these large quantities may also be considered when the Government is blamed for these large imports.

The next point is about the price trends to which my hon. friend Shri Tangamani referred. He referred to some statement that I made in the Rajya Sabha. I am sorry he ought to have given the full picture that I gave to the Rajya Sabha. I have nothing to hide from this House or the other House, and I gave a clear picture of the price trend both in the

North and South. I made the statement that in the South the level of prices was a little higher than that existing last year, although the price of cereals taken as a whole was much lower. My hon. friend took that sentence and said that I had stated in the Rajya Sabha that the prices in the South were going up, without referring to the other part of my statement.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Even the Governor has stated that in his joint Address.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I am not yielding.

He also quoted some economic weekly of Bombay to which he and the party to which he belongs have got a particular fascination, and stated that on the index of food prices on 5-12-1959 was 119.9 but we have to take into consideration the fact that this is an index of all the food articles—not only cereals and pulses, but also milk, eggs, meat, fish etc. We all know that the prices of eggs, meat, fish and milk have gone up and hence the index is high. Even that has come down recently. According to the latest figure I have got, it is only 119.2.

The prices of cereals and other foodgrains, for which this Ministry has a special responsibility, are having a steady downward trend. The index for cereals has declined from 110.3 on 17th October, 1959 to 100.8 on 12th December, 1959. The index number of cereals was 105.3 on 12th December, 1958 but this year it is 100.8. The index number of wholesale prices of rice has declined from 112.9 on 24th October, 1959 to 101.3 on 12th December, 1959. The index number of the wholesale prices of wheat on 12th December, 1959 was 95.4 as compared to 114 on 12th December, 1958, so that there is a substantial reduction. We have also to consider that the price of wheat is steadily falling during the lean period when ordinarily it should rise.

I do not want to take up the time of the House by mentioning other facts. The fall in price has been most pronounced in Bihar, U.P. and West Bengal. I do not want to give the figures because I have to refer to some other points.

Next come to the question of zones. Of course, the Orissa-West Bengal Food Zone and the safeguards that we intend to adopt will be dealt with by the hon. Minister. I just want to give a short background to the formation of the zones. How in a matter like this there can be differences of opinion is clear even from the wording of the amendments that have been tabled to this resolution. Members coming from surplus States want their States to be cordoned off, and Members coming from deficit States want their States to be tagged on to adjacent States.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** It is a mis-statement. I come from a surplus State, and I was for a complete one unit much earlier than you started the zones.

**Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):** What is the position of your Chief Minister?

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** He agrees.

**Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Baloda Bazar):** He is talking of State Governments probably.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** All Members are not so generous and wise like Shri Mathur.

The crux of Shri Mahanty's argument is this, that we had a bitter experience of these larger zones and the decision to constitute each State into a zone was taken after mature consideration, and therefore there is no reason why that arrangement should be disturbed. I want to bring to the notice of the House some facts concerning that. Due to the very serious drop in production in 1947-48 to the extent of about seven million

tons of foodgrains, there were requests from the surplus States that their States should be cordoned off, so that whatever they had might not be drained off or sent to the deficit States. We knew even then that prohibition of export of foodgrains from a particular State, while helping that surplus State, would have an adverse effect on the other deficit States. Madhya Pradesh had not seen such a serious drop in production for a large number of years. So, we thought where the purchasing power was low, it would be better to accede to their request. The Government of India accordingly decided to prohibit in December, 1957 the export of rice from Madhya Pradesh and from U.P. Then, Bihar was also cordoned off. So, it was only when there was a substantial drop in production and there were even scarcity and famine conditions that we adopted this course. Whether we should adopt the very same course when there are better crops is a matter which has to be considered by this House.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain):** This year, the production of the rice crop has gone down in Madhya Pradesh.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Bihar was also cordoned off, at the same time, and as a corollary to that, West Bengal was cordoned off in January, 1958. Orissa was cordoned off in June, 1957 and later in February, 1959; the Western wheat zone comprising of Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan was split up and each of these States was constituted into a new separate wheat zone. This was greatly influenced by some other decisions also which had been taken by Government.

Then, there were some aspects mentioned by Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, which I would like to correct. He was saying that he had found that the system of State trading that was being adopted was a great success. As has just now been pointed out by the hon. Minister, we have never stated that State trading has

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

been a failure. Of course, we have said that in the State trading that has been adopted, some difficulties have been experienced, and we are trying to get over them. My hon. friend also read out some portions from The Report on Market Arrivals of Foodgrains—1958-59 season. As the House knows, the Prime Minister has constituted an all-parties consultative committee consisting of representatives of all parties in this country. After the putting into practice of the decision of the National Development Council for some time, it has been alleged by several Members from the Opposition that we never gave a fair trial to the scheme that had been adopted by the National Development Council, and that we were never sincere and so on. I would only refer the hon. Members to the statement that has been made by the Prime Minister in the other House a few days back, in answer to the criticism that has been made by the ex-Food Minister in some of the articles that he had written. When he was confronted with those articles, he said:

"As far as the Food and Agriculture Ministry is concerned, it wanted to push up the scheme."

—these were the words used by the Prime Minister; he further said—

".....and did everything in its power to see that the scheme succeeded."

So, it is not fair to make such a criticism.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** The point was whether adequate allocation was made for increasing food production as was desired by the National Development Council, and the Mussourie Conference.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** That was a different matter altogether. That relates to increasing the target from 75 million to 80 million tons. I am not referring to that. I am referring to

the State trading scheme that has been adopted by the National Development Council.

**श्री साबोबाबा (इन्दौर) :** समय थोड़ा है मैं बोलने वाले बहुत हूँ। अभी समय लाने के बजाए मंत्री जी अन्त में जवाब दे सकते थे।

**श्री राधे लाल व्यास :** मंत्री जी ही सब समय ले लेंगे तो हमको क्या मिलेगा।

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** But for these interruptions, I would have been able to finish quickly.

When the question came up before the consultative committee to which I was referring a little while ago, it was asked why the market arrivals had been dwindling and why it had not been possible to mop up the excess. In fact, the Members representing the Opposition made a demand that this matter had to be enquired into further. We enquired into that further, and two surveys were conducted, one by five agro-economic research farm management centres, which included a study of 21 markets, and another by the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission. These two bodies, although they worked independently, came more or less to very nearly the same findings. And what were their conclusions? They are not as has been pointed out by Shri Surendranath Dwivedy. The conclusions were as follows:

"I. While the smaller producers appear to have sold their surpluses in the market, large and medium producers have tended to withhold stocks in expectation of being able to realise higher price in later months. Some of the larger producers have also been buying up from the small producers. There is evidence that large and middle farmers in particular have now



greater capacity to withhold produce from the market.....”.

The second conclusion was this:

“2. The diminution of market arrivals has been more pronounced in deficit or marginally placed States where market prices have been considerably higher than the Government purchase prices.”

The third conclusion was:

“3. ....There has been a tendency amongst the producers and traders to enter into transaction outside the normal market or point of sale, assembly or despatch.”

Then, they have stated that because of the heavy disparity in prices there had been smuggling also.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** These conclusions have been challenged when Shri A. P. Jain had read them out; they are not true that the farmers have withheld the supply to them. For, there is Shri Raghunath Singh who comes from UP, and he is not finding any market to sell his own thousand maunds of wheat.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** This has not been challenged. If the hon. Member wants, I shall read out one or two sentences from the report. How can it be challenged? I have got the figures for U.P., and these figures show that in the U.P. markets, after the procurement operations started, the market arrivals came to even nil. I do not know how the hon. Member can make this statement.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Shri Raghunath Singh comes from U.P. and this is what he has stated.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** I would like to reply to this when I speak.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** That is why I think Shri Raghunath Singh who has got better knowledge of U.P. has moved an amendment to the effect that State trading has to be scrapped.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** And there should be decontrol also.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** In the report from which I have just now read out, it has been stated:

“In the U.P. and Punjab, the volume of market arrivals of wheat in the post-harvest months of the current year has been much smaller than in the corresponding months of the previous year. In Bombay, arrivals this year have shown an improvement over last year.....”.

In Bombay, they had not at all adopted this scheme of State trading. Then, the report goes on to say about U.F. that:

“As a result of levy and price control, there has been some diversion of trade in wheat from the established markets to unauthorised and under-ground channels.”

Regarding Rajasthan, they say:

“More recently, the pace of arrivals has slowed down in the mandis where purchases are being made by the State Government and has gone up in the mandis where there are no purchases.”

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** That is right. ....

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** So far as the Madras State is concerned, the report says:

“Only those of the larger producers who combined in themselves the roles of producer, trader and miller had cornered stocks.”.

Stating the reasons for the higher prices in the Southern Zone existing then, the report says:

“One of the reasons for this has been the tendency of traders to recoup from open sales what they lose by surrendering stocks to Government under the procurement scheme at controlled prices.”

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

So, these are some of the conclusions that have been arrived at. So, when my hon. friend says that the present zonal system has succeeded, I have necessarily to refute that argument.

Then, the question was raised about land reforms, and it was stated that it was absolutely necessary for increased food production. It was stated that after the Nagpur Resolution, although it was promised that the necessary land legislation would be enacted in all the States by December, 1959, no progress had been achieved. With regard to that, I would say that that is, of course, the responsibility of the State Governments, but it would not be correct to say that no progress has been achieved in this field at all. The position with regard to this is as follows.

Legislation for abolition of intermediaries has been enacted and implemented almost fully. Secondly, as regards tenancy reforms, comprehensive legislation for tenancy reforms has been enacted in all States except a few where land legislation is pending. As far ceiling on landholdings legislation for a ceiling on existing holdings has been enacted in Assam, Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh and the former State of Hyderabad. In Jammu and Kashmir, the ceiling has been enforced, and 4.6 lakh acres were declared surplus including 2.3 lakhs acres which were already in the possession of tenants. So, the charge that has been made by Shri Tangamani that only the State of Kerala has enacted this legislation, and it is being held up is not correct.

Shri Tangamani: That Bill has not been assented to yet.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Other States also have come forward to enact legislation. With regard to the particular legislation that the hon. Member has referred to, I may inform the hon. Member that even if the President gives his assent to it now, it would

not be possible to implement it, because there are some provisions such as the formation of the land tribunal or land board etc. which can be implemented only after the new Legislative Assembly comes into existence. For electing some members to the land tribunal or land board also, the panchayats have to come into being. So it would not be possible to implement this legislation now, even if it gets the President's assent.

Therefore, I am sorry that my hon. friend has taken this opportunity to make that point.

Mr. Chairman: May I request the hon. Minister to be very brief? There are a good many hon. Members who would like to speak.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I will take only five minutes more.

An Hon. Member: He has already taken 35 minutes.

Shri A. M. Thomas: With regard to the question of fertiliser, Shri Tangamani raised some points. With regard to the two factories of which he made mention, there are some details with me. The Fertiliser Production Committee recommended three sites in Andhra Pradesh—Vijayawada, Kothagudam and Ramgundam—for the establishment of fertiliser factories. Vijayawada was put in category II and the others in category III. Neyveli was included in category I. So it has been given preference.

As regards Vijayawada, of course the matter has to be considered when we have our plans in the Third Plan. With respect to whether the erection of the plant could be speeded up and other things, of course, there is no provision for starting any fertiliser in Vijayawada at present. Concerning the Neyveli plant, the construction is expected to be completed by June-July, 1962 and we may expect production to commence in trial stages towards the end of 1962.

Coming to the quantity of fertilisers, as has been pointed out by the Minister when he initiated the discussion, this matter has been given top priority. Our idea in the Third Plan period is that there must be a production of 1.2 million tons of nitrogen and 0.5 million tons phosphate. The present production (1959-60) comes to only 5 lakh tons of ammonium sulphate. We will be importing about 5 lakh tons. The demand comes to about 18 lakh tons. That is the position. So this is a matter which is given proper attention.

Then I come to my last point. My hon. friend questioned our competence to disturb the zonal arrangement with regard to Orissa. He even said that it would be unconstitutional to do so. Perhaps under the Essential Commodities (Temporary Powers) Act which was passed for five years under article 369 of the Constitution, that interpretation is correct. But the position after the passing of the Constitution (Third Amendment) Act, 1954 amending item 33 of the Concurrent List is different. It says:

“Trade and commerce in, and the production, supply and distribution of—

“(a) the products of any industry where the control of such industry by the Union is declared by Parliament.....”

we are not concerned with that—

“(b) foodstuffs, including edible oilseeds and oils”.

Under (b) the Centre is entitled to have legislation regulating the transport and movement of foodstuffs and other things. It is under that item in the Concurrent List that the new Essential Commodities Act, which is now in force, has been passed. It is under that Essential Commodities Act that Orissa has been cordoned off into a zone. It is under that Act that we are going to link West Bengal and Orissa into one zone. So that there is absolutely no substance in the constitutional point that has been raised.

I do not wish to take up more time. The matter will be further dealt with at a later stage.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shri Radhelal Vyas.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Rajasthan goes unrepresented.

**Shri Khadiwala:** Madhya Pradesh also.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** So is the case of U.P.

**श्री राधे लाल व्यास :** सभापति जी, खाद्य मंत्री महोदय ने डिबेट को प्रारम्भ करते समय जो भाषण दिया है उसको दो भागों में विभक्त किया जा सकता है। पहले भाग में तो उन्होंने इस बात पर जोर दिया कि हमारे देश में जब तक खाद्य पदार्थों का उत्पादन काफी नहीं बढ़ाया जायेगा तब तक यह फूड प्राब्लेम हल नहीं हो सकता। इसके बारे में जो भी प्रयत्न वह करना चाहते हैं, उनका उन्होंने वर्णन काफी विस्तार के साथ किया है। जहाँ तक खाद्य उत्पादन बढ़ाने का सवाल है, मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई दो मत नहीं हो सकते हैं और देश का प्रत्येक निवासी हर तरह से शासन को इस में जो भी सहयोग आवश्यक होगा, सहयोग देने के लिए तैयार है। लेकिन मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में केवल इतना कहना है कि इस खाद्य समस्या को मैं कम से कम सन् १९४७ से देखता आ रहा हूँ। सन् १९४७ से आज तक इन बारह बरसों में छः खाद्य मंत्री यहाँ पर आये हैं और आदरणीय पाटिल साहब छठे खाद्य मंत्री हैं और प्रत्येक खाद्य मंत्री ने यह बताया है कि खाद्य उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए काफी प्रयत्न किया जाना चाहिए और बड़ी बड़ी स्कीम्स इस हेतु बनाई हैं। लेकिन इतना होना पर भी आज हम देखते हैं कि सन् १९४७ में जहाँ हम थे, इस देश की आबादी बढ़ जाने के बावजूद भी और खाद्य उत्पादन बढ़ जाने के बावजूद भी, आज देश में अन्न की कमी है और इस कमी को दूर करने के लिए आप जो भी प्रयास करना चाहते हैं करें और मैं प्रार्थना

### [श्री राधे काल श्यास]

करता हूँ कि आपको इस में ईश्वर सफलता बख्ते और आप के जमाने में यह कमी दूर हो जाये ।

इस सम्बन्ध में और अधिक कुछ मैं कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ । एक सुझाव अवश्य मैं मंत्री महोदय के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि प्रत्येक अवसर पर जब भी पार्लिमेंट का सेशन शुरू हो, उसके सामने कम से कम सही धाकड़े विस्तार के साथ रख दिया करें जिस में यह दर्शाया गया हो कि क्या प्रबल हुए हैं, देश में कितना साक्षात् बढ़ा, कितनी इरिगेशन फेसिलिटीयें बढ़ाई गईं, खाद अधिक दे कर प्रति एकड़ उत्पादन किस हद तक बढ़ा है तथा क्या क्या सफलतायें मिली हैं । ये डिटेल्स आप एक स्टेटमेंट की शपस में प्रत्येक राज्य के सम्बन्ध में हमारे सामने रख दिया करें, तो ज्यादा उचित होगा और इस परिपाटी को आप कालों और हाउस को विश्वास में लें . . .

**श्री ब्रज राज सिंह :** धाकड़े तो गलत नहीं दिये जायेंगे ?

**श्री राधे काल श्यास :** गलत दिये जायेंगे तो हम देख लेंगे कि गलत है या सही ।

तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि साक्ष मंत्री इस पर विचार करें और प्रत्येक सत्र में नहीं तो कम से कम सास में एक बार विस्तार के साथ फूड डिपार्टमेंट की रिपोर्ट के साथ नहीं बल्कि उससे बिल्कुल अलग यह चीज हमारे सामने साथें ताकि हम उस पर विचार कर सकें ।

दूसरा विषय जिस के बारे में मैं अपने विचार प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन का है । इस डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन के मामले को ले कर अब तक चिंतने साक्ष मंत्री धायें हैं, सभी ने नई नई पाबिधीयें हमारे सामने रखी हैं । उनके बारे में काफी परीक्षण हुए । मुझ में आदरणीय श्रेयें बन् राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी बन् १९५७ में साक्ष मंत्री बने । उनके समय में

एक बरीक्षण किया गया । डीकंट्रोल उस समय किया गया । महात्मा गांधी का तब बड़ा और था । मैं आप से निवेदन करूंगा कि तब जो फूड मिनिस्टरस काफ्लेंस हुई थी उस में सब स्टेट्स सिवाय एक दो को छोड़ करके इसके खिलाफ थीं और नहीं चाहती थीं कि डीकंट्रोल किया जाये । इस के बावजूद भी केन्द्रीय सरकार ने डीकंट्रोल किया । उसके बाद जयरामदास बीसतराम साहब साक्ष मंत्री बने । उनके जमाने में फिर से फूड मिनिस्टरस की काफ्लेंस हुई और बाहे सभी फूड मिनिस्टरस इसके खिलाफ थे कि अब फिर से कंट्रोल लागू किया जाये, सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने फिर कंट्रोल लागू किया ।

उसके बाद हम देखते हैं कि जो भी फूड मिनिस्टर धायें उन्होंने कुछ न कुछ परिवर्तन किया पालिसी में लेकिन इतने परीक्षणों के बावजूद भी, हम इस मतीजे पर नहीं पहुंच सके हैं कि हमारे लिए कौन सी सही पालिसी है । इसको हम अभी तक तय नहीं कर पाये हैं । हर बार हमें कुछ न कुछ कराबी ही बिल्वाई देती है ।

जहां तक साक्षात् के वितरण का सम्बन्ध है, उसमें सराबियां ही रही हैं और वह प्रश्न अभी तक हल नहीं हो पाया है । मैं साक्ष मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि इस प्रश्न को बहुत जांच पड़ताल के साथ ही तय करें और इसमें कुछ भी रद्दोबदल करें, कहीं ऐसा न हो कि जो कदम हम धाने बढ़ायें, उससे फिर पीछे हटना पड़े । उन्होंने बताया है कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट अगर कंट्रोल रखती है तो उसे स्ट्रेचुटरी राक्षनिग करना पड़ेगा, मोनोपोली प्रोक्योरमेंट करना पड़ेगा और बड़ी तबालत उठानी पड़ेगी । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बकरत पड़े दी यह भी धायें करें ।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बन् १९५७ के पड़ने गवर्नमेंट यह करती रही है और उसके अन्तर्गत सब से बख्ता इतिहास कहां था । बाबलपुर, कीचीन, नाराय और

जेसूर इन चार राज्यों में, चूंकि वहाँ मोनोपली प्राक्वोरमेंट था, वहाँ स्ट्रेचुटरी रासनिंग था, हर भाग के जो भी सरपलस घनाज होता था, वह किसानों से ले लिया जाता था और हर एक को सरकार की तरफ से यह गारंटी दी गई थी कि उसकी तरफ से खाद्यान्न मुहैया किया जावेगा रासनिंग के द्वारा और लोगों को हर दर भटकना नहीं पड़ेगा, उनको थिल्लाना नहीं पड़ेगा, उनको धोरगुल मचाना नहीं पड़ेगा और यह कहना नहीं पड़ेगा कि कीमत दे कर भी घनाज नहीं मिलता है, सब से अच्छी व्यवस्था थी। जिन राज्यों में यह व्यवस्था नहीं थी उन में स्थिति खराब थी। इसके बारे में काफी साहित्य है, वेगरी की रिपोर्ट आप पढ़ें जोकि भागवत पीता के तौर पर है खाद्य समस्या के बारे में और खाद्य समस्या को हल करने के लिए और बुराइयों को दूर करने के लिए, उसको आप देखें। फिर हमारे यहाँ डिकंट्रोल किया गया क्योंकि कियवई साहब के जमाने में अच्छी फसल हुई थी। उसके बाद जो कंट्रोल किया गया उसकी वजह यह थी कि फी वितरण नहीं चल सका, कीमतें बहुत बढ़ गईं और उसके बाद जोन बने। जोन जब बने उस वक़्त मैंने निवेदन किया था कि वे ठीक नहीं बने। जोन्स के पक्ष में उबर्दस्त शब्दों में पैरवी की गई थी और कहा गया था कि वे बनने चाहियें। एक जोन बना दिया दक्षिण का। वह राइस जोन था, बिल्कुल ठीक था। पूँ का जोन चार रियासतों का, असम, बंगाल, बिहार और उड़ीसा का था। वह भी ठीक था। लेकिन इधर क्या किया कि जो बम्बई राज्य गेहूँ में और चावल में डिफ्लिसिट था, कमी वाला प्रान्त था, उसकी मध्य प्रदेश और राजस्थान से मिलाया। जिस बम्बई को पंजाब से भी घनाज मिलता था, पंजाब को घसल रखा गया। पंजाब हिन्दुस्तान के उन प्रान्तों में से है जोकि काफी घनाज पैदा करते हैं, काफी गेहूँ पैदा करते हैं, उस के साथ कुल १७ लाख की आबादी बांजा दिल्ली प्रदेश मिला कर एक जोन बनाया गया। इसी प्रकार से उत्तर प्रदेश को भी घसल रखा गया।

15-21 hrs.

[SHERI MOHAMMED IMAM in the Chair.]

बोड़े से जमाने के पहले, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, बम्बई को गेहूँ और चावल ५० पी० से मिलता था, पंजाब से भी मिलता था, हिमाचल प्रदेश से भी मिलता था, मध्य प्रदेश से और राजस्थान से भी मिलता था। लेकिन उस के बाद उन्होंने एक छोटा जोन बना दिया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि राजस्थान में, वहाँ गेहूँ के भाव मामूली तौर पर थे, तमाम गेहूँ नायब हो गया। वहाँ की मंडियों में गेहूँ दिखाई नहीं पड़ता था और राजस्थान भर में नाहि नाहि मच गई जहाँ का तमाम अच्छा गेहूँ अहमदाबाद और बम्बई में चला गया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि हमारे यहाँ अच्छा गेहूँ ३५ २० और ४० २० मन बिक गया। इतनी कीमतें बढ़ गईं थीं। ज़त्तीसगढ़ में दो साल पहले बम्पर क्रप चावल की हुई थी, वहाँ पर अब तक कोई कमी चावल की नहीं थी, लेकिन बम्बई में घनाज के जाने की वजह से वहाँ चावल के भाव बहुत ऊँचे बढ़ गये।

श्री आबब (मालेगांव) : काश्तकारों को पैसा मिलेगा।

श्री राधे सास ब्यस्त : काश्तकारों को अगर आप पैसा दिलाना चाहते हैं तो उस का यह ठीका नहीं है। इस प्रश्न पर मैं बाद में आऊंगा कि शासन काश्तकारों को बाकई पैसा देना चाहता है या नहीं। मैं केवल इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो यह जोन बनैरह बने वे उस का एक नतीजा यह हुआ कि उन को राजस्थान को घसल करना पड़ा और मध्य प्रदेश और बम्बई को एक रखा गया। उसके बाद बम्बई को घसल कर के मध्य प्रदेश को भी घसल कर दिया। फिर यह घसल राज्य बना। आब कौब दो साल के ऊपर से मध्य प्रदेश घसल चल रहा है और हमारे यहाँ जो कीमतें बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ी हुई थीं, वह अधिक कम नहीं हुईं। शासन ने जो गेहूँ की कीमत रखी है वह १४ २० से १६ २० मन तक है। लेकिन इधर

[श्री राधे लाल व्यास]

जमाने में भी वहां अच्छा गेहूं प्राप्त नहीं किया जा सकता। स्टेट में गेहूं की खरीदी बहुत कम है, लेकिन इस वक्त भी गेहूं १६ ६० मन से कम नहीं है। हल्के से हल्का गेहूं जो है वह १६ ६० से कम नहीं है और अच्छा गेहूं १८ ६० मन से कम नहीं है। मैं कल ही उज्जैन से आया हूँ और वहां पता किया है।

**श्री पु० २० पटेल (मेहसाना) :** काश्त-कारों को उस की कितनी कीमत मिलती है?

**श्री राधे लाल व्यास :** मैं उस पर भी अभी आता हूँ। मैं इस पक्ष में नहीं हूँ कि उस के लिए कीमत कम हो, लेकिन मैं यह भी नहीं चाहता कि वह २०, २५ या ३० ६० मन बेचे। हम जानते हैं कि देश एक है और उस को अनाज खाने के लिए मिलना चाहिए। लेकिन क्या जोन्स के हटाने से बम्बई प्रदेश को सस्ता अनाज मिल सकेगा? नहीं मिल सकता। वहां के व्यापारी उस को खरीदेंगे। अभी हमारे यहां से चावल और गेहूं नहीं जा सकता है, लेकिन दूसरे सीरियल्स जा सकते हैं, ज्वार जा सकती है। जितना गेहूं मध्य प्रदेश में पैदा होता है उस से ज्यादा दूसरे सीरियल्स हैं जो हमारे यहां से जा सकते हैं, और बम्बई में वह जाते हैं, और उस की कमी को दूर करते हैं। और यही कारण है कि आज ज्वार वगैरह के भाव गेहूं से मिलते जाते हैं और किसानों को दाम काफी मिल जाता है। मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने जब उस वक्त ज्वार पर भी प्रतिबन्ध लगाया तो उस समय भूतपूर्व खाद्य मंत्री जी ने कहा कि किसानों के लिये कम से कम हम एक चीज छुट्टी रखना चाहते हैं ताकि अगर अदर सीरियल्स किसान ले जायें तो उन्हें उस की अच्छी कीमत मिल सके। इतनी छूट होने के बाद आज बम्बई के साथ एक जोन्स बनाने की बात कही जाती है, क्या यह कीमत की दृष्टि से ठीक होगा? मध्य प्रदेश की आबादी २ करोड़ ६१ लाख

है जब कि बम्बई प्रदेश ४ करोड़ ८२ लाख की है। मध्य प्रदेश में कितना सर्व्वय वह समझते हैं? ६, ७, ८ या १० लाख टन, सर्व्वय वह हरिजन नहीं हो सकता और ४ करोड़ ८२ लाख की आबादी वाला प्रदेश भी उतना ही अनाज पैदा करता है। वह हम से सिर्फ ३ लाख टन कम पैदा करता है। वहां बूक पैदावार हम से ३ लाख टन कम है इस लिये हमारे यहां से १६ लाख टन अदर सीरियल्स जो हैं वह वहां खुली से जा सकता है, मगर मध्य प्रदेश में अनाज की कीमतें बहुत ऊंची हो जायेंगी। मध्य प्रदेश एक गरीब प्रदेश है। हमारे यहां जो आदिवासी और हरिजन क्षेत्र हैं उन का अनुपात करीब ३४ प्रतिशत है। उन के लिये सरकार दूकानें खोलना चाहती है, लेकिन वह उस अनाज को नहीं खरीद सकेंगे।

यहां अक्सर कहा जाता है कि हम बफर स्टॉक रखेंगे, हम फेब्रुअरी इस शाप रखेंगे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बफर स्टॉक की बातें सुनहरी दिखाई देती हैं। हम ४०, ५० लाख टन अनाज का बफर स्टॉक हर साल रखने की बात करते हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो हम देश के राज्यों को अनाज देते हैं बाहर से आया हुआ उस के अलावा ५० लाख टन का बफर स्टॉक रखना चाहते हैं या जो अनाज हम उन को देते हैं वह उसी बफर स्टॉक में से होगा जो कि हम हर साल बचाते हैं। अगर उसी में से देना चाहते हैं जो कि ४०, ५० लाख टन का बफर स्टॉक हम बनाते हैं, तो बफर स्टॉक का कोई मतलब नहीं है। हां अगर इस के अलावा हम ४० या ५० लाख टन अनाज बफर स्टॉक के रूप में रखना चाहते हैं तब तो हम उस को समझ सकते हैं।

गत वर्ष जबकि केरल में अनाज बाहर नहीं जा सकता था, हमारे यहां भी फेब्रुअरी प्राइस शाप खुली, उज्जैन और ग्वालियर ऐसे शहरों में। सुनने में आता है

कि उन दूकानों पर कोई भला आदमी जा नहीं सकता था। रात के दो बजे से ही लोग आ कर क्यू लगा लेते थे। उस समय में जो ब्लैक मार्केटिंग करने वाले लोग थे उन्होंने एक धन्धा बना लिया था वहाँ गड़बड़ करने का। कोई भला आदमी उन की बजह से वहाँ नहीं जा पाता था। इस लिये फेब्रर प्राइम शाप्स की बात बिल्कुल गलत है। उस से प्रदेश सरकार की परेशानी हल नहीं हो सकती। वह बिल्कुल ही व्यर्थ की बात है। अगर आप कुछ करना ही चाहते हैं तो मैं निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि बम्बई ऐसे शहरों को आप इस मामले में भ्रमण कर दीजिये। सारे देश में १२ ऐसे शहर हैं जिन की आबादी ४ लाख से ज्यादा है। आप स्टेचुटरी राशनिंग इन १२ शहरों में कर दें। उन को कार्डन आफ कर दीजिये। अगर आज आप बम्बई राज्य के बम्बई, अहमदाबाद और नागपुर राज्यों को कार्डन आफ कर के उन में स्टेचुटरी राशनिंग लागू कर लें तो मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि बम्बई प्रदेश में जो आज चावल और गेहूँ की कीमतें हैं वह कभी नहीं रह सकतीं। मध्य प्रदेश में और बम्बई में १ या २ ६० का ही अन्तर रह जायेगा। अभी मध्य प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी की वकिंग कमेटी की बैठक दो तीन दिन पहले भोपाल में हुई थी। उस में भी इस का प्रपन आया था। उस में छत्तीसगढ़ क्षेत्र से जो कांग्रेस के सदस्य आये थे उन्होंने काफी गम्भीरता से विचार करने के बाद तय किया जो हमारा सर्व्वस राइस है वह हम देना चाहते हैं।

अब मैं किसानों की हित की बात जो करते हैं उन की तरफ आता हूँ। हम किसानों की कीमत को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकार उन की कीमत को नहीं बढ़ाना चाहती है। राज्य सरकार चाहती है कि उन की कीमत २ ६० मन बढ़े और हम भी चाहते हैं कि २ ६० मन बढ़ जाय, लेकिन यहाँ कहा जाता है कि प्लैनिंग कमिशन ऐसी नहीं करता। जहाँ तक किसान को ज्यादा कीमत

देने की बात है, काश्तकार को १४ ६० मन राइस के लिये और १५ ६० मन गेहूँ के लिये मिलना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि किसान की कीमत, जिस तरह से काम आज चल रहा है, उस से बढ़ने वाली नहीं है, घटेगी ही। और सरकार ऐसा कर रही है। जब भी इस के लिये कहा जाता है तो सरकार प्लैनिंग कमिशन की आड़ ले कर कहती है कि गेहूँ और चावल के भाव नहीं बढ़ सकते हैं। प्लैनिंग कमिशन तो गवर्नमेंट की बनाई हुई एजेंसी है। अगर गवर्नमेंट ईमानदारी के साथ अनुभव करती है कि किसान की कीमत बढ़ानी चाहिये तो उसे प्लैनिंग कमिशन से कह देना चाहिये कि यह हमारी पालिसी है हमें किसान का हित और प्रहित का पता है। और ऐसा कह कर उन को कदम बढ़ाना है।

काश्तकारों को रेलवे हेड पर बड़ा कष्ट उठाना पड़ता है क्योंकि सरकार वहाँ पर उन से अनाज नहीं लेती। वह तो सिर्फ बैंगन लोड ही खरीदना चाहती है। गांव के किसान जो छोटी-छोटी तादाद में गन्ना ले कर वहाँ पर आते हैं उन से सरकार नहीं खरीदना चाहती। स्टेट ट्रेडिंग पालिसी को सरकार स्वयम् खत्म कर रही है। जब तक स्टेट ट्रेडिंग को ठीक से नहीं चलाया जायेगा तब तक काम नहीं चल सकता है। अगर हमारी स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कामयाब हो जायेगी तो को-ऑपरेटिव सोसायटी के जरिये से बढ़ना प्रारम्भ हो सकेगा और नागपुर रेजोल्यूशन में जो आदर्श हम ने सामने रखा था वह कामयाब हो सकेगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Chairman, a few moments back, the hon. Deputy Minister intervened in the debate and referred to the total increase in the food production. When we say that there are a few factors to be considered. This increase may be due to the

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]

increase in the area under cultivation or due to the increase in per acre yield. I would like to know to what extent or what percentage of this increase is due to increase in the yield per acre and what percentage is due to increase in the area? When we look to the records of our yields for the last 12-13 years, we shall find that there had not been any significant increase in the yield per acre of the foodgrain crops. If we want to achieve more yield, one of the important factors involved in this is that we must have high yielding varieties. From where are we going to get these high yielding varieties? These varieties of various foodgrain crops can be evolved in our agricultural research institutes. I am sorry to submit that the conditions and the attitude of the research workers in our research institutions are not according to the desired tempo or according to the needs keeping in view the conditions prevailing in our country. We find that they are carrying on more of paper work than actual useful research work. I would give an example. We take the example of a particular officer who had been working for the last five or six years on wheat crop in connection with fertiliser doses or some other problem like this. When that officer gets a promotion, immediately there comes a change in his agricultural research problem also. Likewise, when such a person is shifted to another problem, a new man comes in and certainly he would not have the same background which that person who had been working on that problem did. Our agricultural research programmes in the country certainly need a thorough enquiry and some kind of a committee or commission must be appointed to re-evaluate our whole agricultural research programmes so that these problems can be laid on sound lines keeping in view the various regional and zonal problems concerned with various foodgrain crops.

There is another very important factor as far as the increase in food

production is concerned—that is the supply of improved seeds. Here again, I would submit that the conditions prevailing today in various parts of the country in the seed multiplication farms are not very good. I would even go beyond this and say that the conditions are very bad. There are no nucleus seed multiplication farms in the country. The present farms are being handled by the State Government agriculture departments. They have no nucleus seed multiplication farms. The person in charge of these farms should not be an agricultural inspector but an expert. An expert should be put there. Unless there is hundred per cent. purity in the seed produced at the seed multiplication farms and the seed which is going to be supplied to the farmers, how can we be sure that when that seed is planted in the soil, we will get the desired increase in the per acre yield for which we have evolved and multiplied the seed at the seed multiplication farm after spending so much money and time? So, unless that is done, we do not get the desired results.

I agree that fertilisers also play a great part in increasing the yield. But the indiscriminate use of fertilisers in this country would, after a certain number of years, become a factor which would, instead of increasing the yield, lower it. Our farmers need to be told exactly how to apply and when to apply and how much to apply. Even at the Government agricultural farms, there are no standard doses for any crop; no standard methods of application for any crop. If these practices are not in operation at the Government agricultural farms to the extent of perfection which we want our farmers to adopt, from where is our farmer going to learn all these things? So, while the application of fertiliser is necessary, the right type of application and the technique of application are also very important factors.

There is absolute lack of co-ordination between the agriculture departments and the community development



departments. We have so many campaigns in our country. Every year we hear about the rabi campaign and the other campaigns. Sometimes, it is said that the responsibility for the supply of seed lies with the agriculture department. Sometimes distributing the seed is the responsibility of the block development officer. The supply of improved seeds gets lost between these two responsibilities. Not only during the campaign years or time but always, there should be a specific responsibility fixed upon all the officers who are directly connected with agricultural development and agricultural operations.

**Shri Sampath (Namakkal):** Mr. Chairman, about 1,800 years ago, our great Tamil teacher, Thiruvalluvar said:

*Ilanenrasai irupparai kanin  
Nilamennum nallal naghum*

which in English would read, 'Mother earth laughs at those who, being idle, complain that they have nothing to live upon'. This has never been more true than today. In spite of the vast potentialities for increased food production, we are cutting a sorry figure before the world as a nation whose main problem is how to feed its teeming millions. It is not a matter for gratification or pride that we depend more and more on imports of food-grains from foreign countries although the hon. Minister might tersely say that we pay for our imports. It is all right for nations like the United Kingdom and West Germany if they have to import their food requirements, for they are greatly advanced in industries and their export of industrial products is considerable. Ours is a land where a great majority of our population depend upon, and are engaged in, agriculture and we are most backward industrially. Therefore, there is no justification for this sort of conceited complacency of the Minister in saying that we pay and import.

Sir, after hearing the Food Minister when he initiated the food debate,

what we find is that there is another platitudinarian. His varied techniques to make his speech interesting failed to save his tired truisms from tedium. What has he said new except being oracular in telling that we would achieve self-sufficiency at the end of the Third Five Year Plan? He has not improved much upon his predecessors. Sir, may be in the Congress circles, there is a kind of hope that the present Food Minister will manage to tell a series of long tales more interesting than those of the Sultana of Arabian Nights.

We expected that our Food Minister would be in a position to explain to us through facts and figures the real position and the clear policies of the Government to improve the present position and solve this serious problem. We are sorely disappointed in that. The first part of his speech is an admission that the Government and its agencies have been guilty of losing proper perspective in this regard. Next he regretted how low our average yield per acre was when compared to those of the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia. Then he spoke about the wheat-beet and beet-wheat cultivation in Yugoslavia and he lingered on for some time on the musical aspect of it and about his enchanting meeting in Washington with the U.S. Congressmen and Senators and how he was amazed to know that they were all having their own farms and even the President of the United States of America had his own farm to do farming and all such things.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Is the hon. Member's speech a parody of the Minister's speech?

**Shri Sampath:** Sir, I am not yielding, because the hon. Deputy Minister did not yield to Shri Tangamani and other hon. Members when they wanted to seek some clarification.

It was in fact the travellogue part of his speech which, if we had but arranged a meeting under the auspices of the Parliamentary Group in the Central Hall soon after his return from

[Shri Sampath]

the voyage, could have been saved. When he was describing how the U.S. Senators and the President are owning farms and because of that fact they were able to manage their agricultural affairs better, I felt and many other Members of this House have as well felt whether he was opposing the much talked of land reforms. For, only a few minutes earlier before he began his speech the able Deputy Home Minister, Shri Datar, when he was moving the Tripura Land Reform Bill, enlightened us on the evils of absentee landlordism and his Government's determination in wiping out not only the absentee landlordism in particular but landlordism in general. Sir, the unity in diversity of India of which we hear so much is not as fascinating as the unity in diversity of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's Cabinet. Even with regard to the much boosted policy of State trading in foodgrains what is the impression the Food Minister's speech gives, even after the supplementary speech made by the Deputy Minister now? He seems to hold that policy in such contempt that he does not even mention it once in his speech. On the contrary, he advanced most formidable arguments against any kind of monopoly trade which will ultimately result in rationing. He was praising the God for some of his beautiful arrangements in placing a deficit State with a surplus State so that the hon. Minister could without any difficulty form into zones. I want to know whether it is also one of those God's beautiful arrangements that there is a Prime Minister in the Cabinet who declares that the Government is bound to adopt State Trading in foodgrains, because the highest body, namely, the National Development Council, has decided that way, and the Food Minister in the same Cabinet to denounce it totally?

Sir, before I go into the general aspects of the problem, I shall say a few words regarding the persistent demand put forth by the Madras State and Andhra Pradesh Governments to declare them as two different zones.

This demand of the people, the legislatures and the Governments of those two States has fallen on deaf ears and is treated with supercilious contempt. This attitude of the Centre is provoking a great indignation among the people of that region. Madras especially has earned a reputation for speedier execution of projects and economic utilisation of Plan funds. The people of Tamilnad have been successful in their efforts to raise the food production in their State from 44.21 lakh tons in 1955-56 to 50.21 lakh tons of food crops in 1958-59 and the area of cultivation has also been increased from 109.8 lakh acres in 1955-56 to 113.2 lakh acres in 1958-59. And the reward for all this is this sort of treatment that is now meted out by the Centre. If this attitude of the Centre continues, deficit States will be afraid to become surplus and the surplus States will regret having become surplus and strive once again to become deficit States to enjoy the petting and patronage of the Centre at the cost of surplus States. I would only request the Government to change their present attitude and to show proper appreciation of hard and honest efforts of the people of Tamilnad and Andhra Pradesh and concede to their demand.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Is the hon. Member reading any document?

**Shri Sampath:** Sir, I have to speak with responsibility unlike the Ministers; therefore, I must have facts and figures.

In this connection, I might also give out how different minds have started working. Shri Sanjeeva Reddy, Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister and, now, the future Congress President, two months back while speaking in a prize distributing function of a cattle show at Madras made an observation which is worth noting in this context. He said that because Delhi is far away they are not realising the reason, the justice in our demand. If this "far away" feeling in Shri Sanjeeva Reddy's mind and in Shri Kamaraja

Nadar's mind is allowed to grow, this Government should not find fault with the D.M.K. which has been complaining that south is being neglected deliberately by the Centre, and it is being dominated by northern imperialism.

Sir, I would have spoken something more, but, for want of time, I am closing my speech.

15.56 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Dr. Gangadhara Siva (Chittoor—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, coming as I do representing the Chittoor Constituency being elected unopposed, the first man to be returned unopposed from Congress in the whole of India in 1957, along with our beloved Speaker, I would be failing in my duty if I do not bring to the notice of this Government the miserable state of affairs existing in Rayalaseema, Andhra Desa, in particular Chittoor and Cuddapah Districts which are always visited by the famine demon. Sir, you must have heard about the condition of the people in the famine-stricken areas of Rayalaseema some few years ago, when the hon. Prime Minister and the Central Government gave a lot of help and got us redeemed from that famine affair.

I sent a Short Notice Question about this to the hon. Food Minister, but he was kind enough to turn it down. My Short Notice Question which concerned lakhs of people in my area was turned down abruptly and I was informed that they were not going to reply it. Is that the way how we should get response from the Ministers concerned? Are we not responsible to our constituencies and the population whom we represent? Is it not our duty to help them in times of need? What is the food production that they have made? I wonder and I am still wondering. What are the bulldozers and tractors for that they have supplied to Andhra Desa and in particular Rayalaseema which is visit-

ed by natural calamities? In recent months the seasonal rains have miserably failed. The slogan now is: "Water, water everywhere, not a drop in Rayalaseema".

16 hrs.

Sir, even the Minister does not know the condition of people in Rayalaseema. The Agriculture Minister, Shri Thimma Reddi, of Andhra has repeatedly sent reports to the Central Government with regard to the existing famine condition in our place. No reply has been received by him yet. I wonder what the Ministers and Deputy Ministers are doing so far as the condition of people in my area is concerned. When it reaches the highest peak and conditions become very miserable, then the Government rushes to save the lives of those people. It is not good to wait till that stage is reached. I said that the price of each measure of rice ranges between Rs. 1-2-0 and Rs. 1-4-0. How could we expect these poor people to buy rice at such high rates and maintain their lives? On this matter, I have sent in a suggestion as was done some years ago. The suggestion that I repeat now is, some gruel centres should be started in this particular area. Of course, the Government merely depend upon the official versions and other reports that they may receive, and these reports may be made by those who want to gain in their status, promotion, and all that. The Government officials may be sending their reports to the effect that there was good rain, that so far as the cultivating season was concerned, it was good, and all that. But then, no Minister has gone into the interior villages to examine the real situation that exists among the poor people and the ryots. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister at least to take note of these things and see what he can do to establish gruel centres especially in the interior villages just to relieve the difficulties of the poor people in Rayalaseema and, in particular, in the Cuddapah and Chittoor districts.

श्री खानदेशी (बिलासपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं गत बहुसंख्यकवार को माननीय खाद्य मंत्री का भाषण बड़ी गम्भीरतापूर्वक सुन रहा था कि किस प्रकार से देश में खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन बढ़ाया जा सकता है। किन्तु किन्तु उपायों को अपना सकते हैं और विदेशों में जाकर और वहाँ पर हम अपने डेलिगेशंस भेज कर और किस प्रकार से हम अपने खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन वहाँ से नये तरीके सीख कर उनका अपने यहाँ उपयोग कर के बढ़ा सकते हैं। उन सब बातों को मंत्री महोदय ने हमें बताया था। चूंकि समय कम है इसलिए मैं उन तमाम बातों का विस्तार से यहाँ पर खुलासा नहीं दे सकूंगा।

यहाँ पर मेरे प्रान्त मध्य प्रदेश और बम्बई प्रदेश को मिला कर एक खाद्य जोन बनाने का उल्लेख किया गया है। यह एनाउंस किया गया है कि मध्य प्रदेश और बम्बई का एक जोन तैयार हो जायेगा। मंत्री महोदय ने यह अलबत्ता कहा है कि जब तक उसके बारे में मध्य प्रदेश का शासन अपनी पूरी राय नहीं देगा तब तक हम उसे अमल में नहीं लायेंगे, तब तक हम वह जोन नहीं बनायेंगे, ऐसा उनका डिक्लेरेशन है। यह जोन बने या न बने यह तो जुदा सवाल है पर जोन बनने के पहले मेरी बहुत सी शंकाएँ हैं जिनको कि मैं माननीय मंत्री के सामने रख देना चाहता हूँ और उन शंकाओं का मैं समाधान चाहता हूँ।

चूंकि उपमंत्री महोदय के पास कोई इंटरप्रेटर नहीं है और मैं हिन्दी में अपनी बात कह रहा हूँ इसलिए हो सकता है कि वे मेरी बात ठीक से न समझ पायें और मुझे डर है कि वह शायद मुझे उनका जवाब न दे पायें।

पाटिल साहब ने कहा था कि मध्य प्रदेश और बम्बई का एक खाद्य जोन बनाया जायेगा तो उसके सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह कहना है कि यह जोन बनाने से मध्य प्रदेश में खाद्यान्न

की कीमत बहुत बढ़ जायेगी। अभी छत्तीसगढ़ और मध्य प्रदेश के बहुत से भागों में चावल १४, १५ रुपये प्रति मन बिकता है और गेहूँ भी १६ और १७ रुपये मन बिकता है। अब बम्बई में जो चावल का प्रीवेन्सिंग रेट ३५ रुपया प्रति मन है और नागपुर में २३ और २४ रुपये है तो यह जोन बनने से मध्य प्रदेश में भी खाद्यान्न का भाव एकदम बढ़ जायेगा। यह तो ठीक है कि अनाज की कीमतें बढ़ेंगी तो किसानों को १, २ रुपये बढ़े हुए दाम मिल सकते हैं परन्तु न जाने कीमत कितनी बढ़ सकती है और उसके बाद वह जो मारा मुनाफा है वह सारा व्यापारियों और ब्लैकमार्केटर्स को चला जायेगा। अनाज हम स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन के जरिए खरीदने की बात कहते हैं और गत वर्ष राज्यीय व्यापार निगम ने खाद्यान्न स्टेट लेबिल पर खरीदने की कोशिश की लेकिन मालूम नहीं खाद्यान्न की कीमत कितनी बढ़ सकती है और स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन कहां पर से अनाज खरीदेगी और किस भाव पर अनाज खरीदेगी इसका कोई ठिकाना नहीं रहेगा। यह तो ठीक है कि शासन ने १५ रुपये फ्लोर प्राइस रखी है लेकिन उस भाव पर अनाज उपलब्ध कहां से होगा? किसान बेचारे अपनी अपनी बेल गाड़ियों में अनाज लाद लाद कर रेल हैड सेंटर्स या रेलवे केन्द्र पर ८, ५ रोज तक पड़े रहते थे लेकिन उनको उनके अनाज की उचित कीमत नहीं मिलती थी। उनको १५ रुपये के हिसाब से वाजिब दाम नहीं मिलते थे और व्यापारी उसके पक्षों में प्रेशरिंग आदि का बहाना और अड़ंगा लगवा कर वहाँ पर खरीद लेते थे और मुनाफा कमा लेते थे। इस प्रकार की हमारी हालत होती थी। मुझे इस बात का डर है कि इस नये जोन के बन जाने से इस स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन के जरिए स्टेट लेबिल पर जो खाद्यान्न का व्यापार चलाने की बात है और जिसके लिए देश की प्रत्येक प्रगतिवादी पार्टी काहूरी है कि राज्यीय व्यापार निगम का व्यापार

बड़े उसका कार्य भी करीब-करीब समाप्त हो जायेगा। दूसरे मुझे डर है कि आज़ जो हमारे प्रदेश में चावल १६, १७ रुपये प्रति मन के भाव से उपलब्ध है वह इस जोन के बन जाने से २२ और २३ रुपये हो जाने वाला है। वह भाव इतना चढ़ जाने वाला है कि वह पहुंच के बाहर हो जायेगा और उसको हम बैंक नहीं कर पायेंगे। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि हम मध्य प्रदेश के लिए ५ लाख टन का बफर स्टॉक बनाने वाले हैं तो मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि वे अनाज कहां से खरीदेंगे और किस भाव पर खरीदेंगे इसका कोई पता ही नहीं चलेगा। उन्होंने कहा था कि उसको हम पूरी सप्लाई कर सकते हैं पर यह ५ लाख टन अनाज स्टैंट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन द्वारा कहां पर खरीदा जायेगा, बाहर से लाया जायेगा या कहां से लाया जायेगा।

अब कई बार राज्य सरकार ने इस बात का प्रयत्न किया कि अनाज की कीमत बढ़े पर न तो प्लानिंग कमिशन और न केन्द्रीय सरकार ही १५, १६ और १७ रुपये से ज्यादा कीमत बढ़ाने को तैयार हुईं पर अब यह बम्बई और मध्य प्रदेश की फ्री जोन बन जाने से शासन किसानों को उनके अनाज की ज्यादा कीमत देने को तैयार है और यह अपने आप कीमत उनको मिल जायेगी। यह उल्टी बात है कि वैसे तो खाद्य मंत्री महोदय १५, १६ और १७ रुपये से अधिक खाद्यान्न की कीमत बढ़ाने को तैयार नहीं हैं परन्तु इस नई जोन के बन जाने पर उसकी कीमत बढ़ाने को तैयार हैं। जब मध्य प्रदेश अकेला रहा तो यही शासन किसानों को अधिक कीमत देने को तैयार नहीं है परन्तु बम्बई के साथ मिलने पर अपने आप कीमत को बढ़ाने को तैयार है। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि छत्तीसगढ़ इज दी राइस बाऊल और दी ग्रेनरी आफ इंडिया। अब बात तो यह भीठी अग्रेसरी है लेकिन उनके ऊपर जब आपत्ति आई है तो केन्द्रीय शासन हमेशा

उसकी ओर से उदासीन रहा है। सन १९५६, ५७ में जो बम्पर क्रीप हुई थी तो वहां पर उस साल भी चावल बंगाल, दार्जिलिंग और और पूर्वी पाकिस्तान को स्मगल होता था और उसकी कीमत छत्तीसगढ़ में १५ रुपये के बदले २६ और २७ रुपये हो गई थी और एक-एक स्टेशन से दार्जिलिंग आदि के बहाने १६, १६ और १८ हजार मन चावल स्मगल होता था। इस सम्बन्ध में कई बार हमारा गिफ्टमंडल भूतपूर्व खाद्य मंत्री श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन से मिला और उसने चाहा कि या तो हमें चावल एक्सपोर्ट करने दिया जाय या रिलेक्सेशन हो तो वह उसमें बिलकुल तैयार नहीं थे परन्तु अब नये खाद्य मंत्री महोदय मध्य प्रदेश और बम्बई को मिला कर एक नया जोन बनाने के लिए न जाने कैसे तैयार हो जाते हैं।

मंत्री महोदय ने अभी कहा था कि मध्य प्रदेश में कोई दस लाख टन का सरप्लस है और चूंकि बम्बई में दस लाख टन का डेफिसिट है इसलिए दोनों का एक जोन बन सकता है और प्राइस इक्वेट हो सकती है और कीमत बराबर आ सकती है। मैंने खाद्यान्न की कमी के सम्बन्ध में एक शॉर्ट नोटिस क्वेश्चन दिया था और जो बंगाल को चावल स्मगल हुआ उसके लिए भी मैंने एक प्रश्न किया था लेकिन वह डिसएलाऊ हो गये। इस वर्ष मध्य प्रदेश के हमारे छत्तीसगढ़ और रायपुर जिले में अभी दो, चार आने ही फसल हुई है और मैंने उस कमी की ओर शॉर्ट नोटिस क्वेश्चन दिया था जो कि डिसएलाऊ कर दिया गया। खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने उस ओर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया और हमेशा जब जब वहां पर क्रीप फेल्योर होता है तो केन्द्रीय सरकार उसके प्रति उदासीन रही है और उनकी इमदाद के लिए कोई कदम नहीं उठाती है। बम्बई के करीम भाई और लाल भाई आदि अभी से अनाज को स्टोक करने में लगे हुए हैं। बम्बई के कोर्डन हो जाने पर भी हमारे मध्य प्रदेश के

[श्री जांगड़े]

गल्ले को स्टॉक करने के लिए वे तैयार हैं और वह कीमत बढ़ा सकते हैं। आखिर बम्बई और मध्य प्रदेश का एक जोन बन जाने के बाद जो खाद्यान्न की कीमत बढ़ने वाली है उस कीमत को गवर्नमेंट के पास नियन्त्रित करने का क्या तरीका है यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि १५, १६ रुपये की जो फ्लोर प्राइस रक्खी थी, उसको आप कैसे कंट्रोल करेंगे क्योंकि इस नई जोन के बन जाने से न मालूम भनाज के कितने दाम बढ़ जायेंगे। इसलिए मेरा तो सुझाव यह है कि मध्य प्रदेश का एक ही जोन रहने दिया जाय और ४०, ५० परसेंट लैबी रख कर ४०, ५० परसेंट व्यापार करने की व्यापारियों को छूट दी जाये जिससे कि वे बम्बई में बेच सकें और इस प्रकार से एकोनामिक क्राइटेरिया कायम होगा और एक प्राइस लेवल अपने आप से स्थिर हो जायेगी और उस स्टॉक में से लैबी स्टॉक में से हम कर्मचारियों और बड़े-बड़े शहरों के मजदूरों को सस्ते दर पर भनाज दे सकेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह बम्बई के डेफिसिट को हम पूरा कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि ५० परसेंट लैबी लगा कर ५० परसेंट स्टॉक गवर्नमेंट अपने पास रखे और उसे व्यापारियों के यहाँ सीलबन्दी करके उन्हीं की कोठियों में रखें तो हमारा सर्वा इस्टैबलिशमेंट का इन्स्पेक्टर का और प्राइस कंट्रोल का बच जायगा।

मैं आपके सामने मध्य प्रदेश के सम्बन्ध में कुछ और कहना चाहता हूँ। अभी मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि हम चाहते हैं कि देश में कोई जोन न हो। वह कभी कहते हैं कि जोन न हों और कभी भ्रलग-भ्रलग जोन बनाने की बात करते हैं। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि देश में जोन बनाने से पहले वह हर एक राज्य में इरीगेशन फैसिलिटीज ज्यादा देने और उत्पादन बढ़ाने की ओर ध्यान दें। जोन की अभी आवश्यकता नहीं है। सबसे बड़ी

उत्कृत तो इरीगेशन की फैसिलिटीज देने की है। लेकिन डेफिसिट एरिया में जहाँ कि ज्यादा भ्रस पैदा हो ही नहीं सकता अगर आप इरीगेशन फैसिलिटी देंगे भी तो अधिक उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ेगा। जैसे बंगाल में चाहे आप पूरे राज्य को इरीगेशन फैसिलिटी दें फिर भी वह राज्य सरप्लस नहीं हो सकता। बम्बई राज्य में चाहे आप पूरे एरिया में इरीगेशन कर दें लेकिन वह सरप्लस नहीं हो सकता क्या कि वहाँ केश क्राप की तरफ ज्यादा ध्यान है भ्रस के उत्पादन की तरफ नहीं। जो सरप्लस एरिया है, जहाँ पर खाद्य का उत्पादन होता है वहाँ खाद्य का उत्पादन और बढ़ाया जा सकता है वहाँ पर इरीगेशन की फैसिलिटी दी जाए। मध्य प्रदेश का छत्तीसगढ़ का एरिया हमेशा से उपेक्षित रहा है। वहाँ के लिए इरीगेशन की कोई फैसिलिटी नहीं दी जाती, पर यहाँ कहा जाता है कि मध्य प्रदेश प्रेनरी ग्राफ इंडिया है और देश का राइस बोल है। लेकिन वहाँ के लिए इरीगेशन फैसिलिटी देते समय मंत्री जो खिच जाते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे एरिया में जहाँ कि उपज बहुत बढ़ सकती है वहाँ पर आप इरीगेशन की फैसिलिटी दें। जब तक इरीगेशन फैसिलिटीज नहीं होंगी तब तक यूगांस्ताविया, चीन या जापान कहीं की भी आप प्रणाली अपनाएँ कोई सफलता नहीं हो सकती। जब तक इरीगेशन की फैसिलिटी नहीं होती तब तक फरटीलाइजर का भी उपयोग नहीं किया जा सकता और उससे कोई फायदा नहीं हो सकता। जब तक खेत के लिए पानी का प्रबन्ध नहीं होगा तब तक किसी तरह उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ सकता। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि इस चीज की तरफ ध्यान दिया जाए।

इसके बाद मुझे एक बेसिक चीज की ओर सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना है, और वह है फाइन स्टॉक। वह गोसम्बन्ध

का प्रश्न है, गायों और बैलों को बढ़ाने का प्रश्न है।

लैंड रिफार्म की तरफ सरकार ध्यान दे रही है और ३२, ६४ और ६६ एकड़ की सीलिंग रखी जा रही है। ३२ एकड़ बेट लैंड की, ६४ एकड़ हाफ बेट लैंड की और ६६ एकड़ ड्राई लैंड की सीलिंग रखी जा रही है। लेकिन इसके बाद हमने एक प्रावधान यह रखा है कि जो ट्रैक्टर से खेती करता है उसके लिए यह सीलिंग ४०० और ५०० एकड़ भी हो सकती है। जब हम यह व्यवस्था कर रहे हैं तो सीलिंग का तो कोई भय ही नहीं रहेगा। इस तरह से ग्राप लोगों को ट्रैक्टर का उपयोग करने के लिए उकसा रहे हैं। इसका मतलब यह है कि देश में बेकारी फैलेगी। ग्राप जानते हैं कि हमारे देश में ट्रैक्टर का उपयोग सफल नहीं हुआ है। भोपाल में सेंट्रल ट्रैक्टर धारणेनाइजेशन है। लेकिन उससे कोई लाभ नहीं हुआ है। उससे कांस उन्मूलन में भी हमको सफलता नहीं मिली है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि ट्रैक्टर के उपयोग को न बढ़ाया जाए और लैंड रिफार्म के अर्न्तगत भूमि की अधिकतम सीमा जितनी कम हो सके उतनी कम रखी जाए। जिनके पास अधिक जमीन है वे खेती नहीं करते। उनकी जमीन पड़ती पड़ी रहती है पर वह किसान को नहीं देते। जो किसान खेती करना चाहता है उसको पानी नहीं मिलता। जिन लोगों का घर है, जिनके भाई बाक्टर हैं, वकील है उनको खेती की जमीन ज्यादा मिल जाती है। पर किसान को न जमीन मिलती है और न पानी मिलता है। इसलिए हमारा लैंड रिफार्म जितना प्रगतिशील होना चाहिए उतना प्रगतिशील नहीं रहा है और इसीलिए फूड प्रोडक्शन भी जितना बढ़ना चाहिए उतना नहीं बढ़ा है।

इतना ही मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri P. R. Patel.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Rajasthan has been completely ignored.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I know that.

An. Hon. Member: Bengal has been completely ignored.

Shri Raghunath Singh: U.P., which is the biggest State, has also not been given an opportunity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would request hon. Members to condense their speeches.

Shri P. R. Patel: I have heard the speech of the hon. Minister and I found in his speech no trace of the voice of the people, or the voice of the farmer. It so happens in this country that persons who have no knowledge of agriculture, no knowledge of rural areas, no knowledge of the traditions of agriculture happen to be the Agriculture Ministers, and the food question becomes more complicated. That is the experience of our country.

We know that we are importing foodgrains to the tune of crores of rupees and yet the food situation has not become easy. We talk of fertilizers and so many other things, but the situation remains the same. We say that we have given credit to the agriculturist for digging wells and for so many other things. We are saying that we are giving them improved seeds. However, the situation has not improved. Why? According to my way of thinking, we are thinking of improving the hands, legs, body, head but we do not want to talk or think of the soul. What is the soul in agriculture? The soul in agriculture is not fertiliser, nor loan, nor improved seeds or irrigation. These are the things no doubt necessary but the soul is the agriculturist, and until the Government looks to the agriculturist for better production, I see no hope of more production.

Our hon. Minister talked of Australia, Canada, United States of America and so many other countries.

**An. hon. Member:** Because he went to those countries.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** He said that the production in those countries is four times, six times or eight times more than what we have in our country. He talked of production but he did not tell us how the production in those countries has increased to more than what we get. He talked of U.S.A. But he did not talk of the strong farmers' organisations in the U.S.A. I must tell him that in U.S.A. the practice is to guarantee the floor price, and the agriculturists are allowed to take much more than the floor price. And if the price goes down, then the Government guarantees and pays the floor price. Do we follow that policy here? We follow the reverse policy. We have got ceiling price, and farmers are not free to sell at a higher price than the price fixed. That is not so in U.S.A. and Canada. There the farmers are allowed to take as much price as they like. But if the price goes down, the Government comes forward and buys the stock at the guaranteed price.

The hon. Minister said, "We are going to have a buffer stock." How is he going to get that? Naturally, by imports. I may tell him for his information that U.S.A., only one country, spends every year Rs. 500 crores as the expenditure on storing foodgrains, because that Government gives a guarantee, whenever the prices go down the Government buys and stores and the yearly expenses are Rs. 500 crores. There is a surplus, so much surplus that the Government has to spend so much. Why is that surplus there?

There is one thing more also. There, there are three strong farmers' organisations and on agriculture, specially, these organisations are consulted, say, for fixing the prices. These organisations are consulted and it is in consultation with these organisations that prices are fixed. Here, in our country, it is for the first time that we have heard the hon. Minister say, "Yes, we are going to have a price fixation

board and we shall have the representatives of agriculturists". Some days back, I asked his Deputy Minister a question about the World Farmers' Organisation. I asked him the names of members of the deputation sent from this country and he said that the Maharaja of Patiala was one of them—an active farmer! I do not mind it. You can take X, Y or Z. I want that whatever representatives you take, you ask the farmers' organisations to represent the country to give one, two or three or whatever you want, representatives.

**An Hon. Member:** This is that organisation.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** He says that farmers' organisations are not there. Let me tell you, we have always maintained a step-motherly attitude towards the farmers' organisation. We see some fear in the farmers being organised. That is a wrong thing. In this country, where 80 per cent. or more than that, are farmers and if these people organise themselves, what is the harm in consulting them? Farmers' organisations may not be there in the whole of the country. They may be in some district.

**Shri Panigrahi:** Shri Punjabrao Deshmukh's Farmers' Forum is there.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** In some districts even, I would like to know whether the Collector or the Agriculture Officer has ever consulted or called the representatives of these farmers' organisations just to discuss as to how to produce more. Never. Have you ever consulted the farmers' organisations?

**The Deputy Minister of Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnaappa):** They are all lawyers.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** If lawyers be there, my hon. friend, Shri Patil does not deserve to be the Minister of Food and Agriculture. But the question is as to who represents. If my hon. friend, Shri Nanda, could be the representative of the labour union, if my friend,



Shri Khandubhai, can be the representative of the labour union, I do not understand why Shri Punjabrao Deshmukh could not represent the farmers' interest if he is elected by the farmers' organisations.

**Shri Panigrahi:** He is the President of the Farmers' Forum.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** About the Farmers' Forum and other forums, I do not want to say anything more today. I do not like it.

**Shri D. C. Sharma** (Gurdaspur): No, no, you say something.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** But I would like to say only one thing. What I say is that the future policy of our country, if we wish to have more production, should be to get the co-operation of the farmers' organisations and to know their viewpoints.

I know fertilisers are given, but I say they are misused. Do agriculturists know in what proportion fertilisers should be used? There must be a link between the top and the agriculturist, and if the farmers' organisations can serve as a link just to help us in getting more production, I do not understand why the co-operation of these organisations should not be taken

My hon. friend talked of Great Britain and said there also production had increased. I do know that during the last war Great Britain made every effort to increase food production and food production has increased there. But how it has increased I would like to know. I would like to know whether the Government is prepared to adopt all the remedies, all the steps, that had been taken in Great Britain to increase food production. In Great Britain subsidies were given for production. Whatever production was made by the farmer, he was entitled to a subsidy. If our Government is prepared to give subsidies on production basis, I think there will be more production. That they do not want

to do. They only say that in the other countries production is eight to ten times more, and that ours is very meagre. Ours will remain meagre until and unless we follow the footsteps of other countries which have increased their production.

I know that we spend money on irrigation. Punjab has probably much more of irrigation facilities than any other part of the country, but that has resulted in waterlogging. We spend money for keeping fields irrigated, and it has resulted in waterlogging, and now the farmers desire that they must be able to do away with this water. If such developments go on, how are we going to have more production?

In my constituency I do know that this year there was heavy rain. I approached the Collector and the Government, not once but so many times, I had been requesting them to have certain drainages in my constituency. They do not spend money on drainage. Estimates are prepared, the promise is given, everything is done, but the drainage has not been taken up. And this time our cultivators suffered a loss of lakhs. The whole crop is wiped out by water. If that is the case, how are you going to have more production?

Whatever be the faults of his predecessors, the hon. Minister is right this time. He said that the first thing should be production, and distribution is second, and that unless we look to production, we cannot succeed. To have more production, I would request him that agriculture should not be a shuttle-cock between the States and the Centre. The problem of agriculture is always shuttled from this place to the States, and the States shuttle it back, and the dashing is going on. I wish somebody is responsible for this. Today it is nobody's responsibility. The State Governments say, 'What can we do? The Centre does this.' The Centre says 'It is the responsibility of the States'. So, ultimately we find that

[Shri P. R. Patel]

the responsibility is no one's, and the country suffers.

Lastly, I would say that unless and until a reasonable price—I mean by reasonable price, the cost price, expenditure that is incurred in agriculture, plus some profit—is not guaranteed, we cannot give any incentive to the agriculturists.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now, Shri Harish Chandra Mathur. There are certain States which have not yet been represented.

**Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak):** Punjab has not been represented.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Punjab has already been represented.

So, I shall not call any other Member from that State.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** Nobody from UP has spoken.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** None has spoken from West Bengal.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** After Shri Harish Chandra Mathur, I shall call one from Bengal. Then, perhaps, there will not be any time for other Members.

**Shri Jagdish Awasthi (Bilhour):** You must call at least one Member from UP on this side.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** The names had been given long ago, but we have not been given any chance so far.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I find that there are four Members from Bengal who have risen. Can all of them be accommodated?

**Shri A. C. Guha:** At least one might be accommodated.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** One will be accommodated.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** Out of the 86 Members from UP, at least one should be allowed to speak.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Since it was a zone by itself, I thought they could speak on some other occasion. I thought there was no dispute about UP.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** But two Members from Madhya Pradesh have spoken.

श्री जगदीश अवास्थी : श्रीमान जी . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी इनको बोल लेने दीजिए । फिर देखेंगे क्या होता है ।

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** The hon. Food Minister, while speaking in the other House as also in this House, has stated that if we make a real and serious effort, it should not be difficult to solve the food problem. He has stated that it was not even difficult if we made a real and sincere effort to solve it. The clear implication of this statement made in the other House and repeated here is that during all these eleven years, we had failed to realise the vital importance of this problem, that we have not given a real thought to this matter, and that we have not made a sincere effort in this direction. There is a little of truth in what the hon. Minister has stated. I like plain speaking. This is a serious indictment, and we stand condemned by our ourselves, because the bold fact stands out that even after eleven years of freedom, today we are faced with a very serious food problem, and we have been importing large quantities of foodgrains from outside.

Even after this plain speaking, I wish to know what assurance my hon. friend gives that this state of affairs would not continue.

In the course of his speech, he has mentioned that we must have better irrigation, mechanisation, better seeds, fertilisers and so on. We have been talking about these four things all these eleven years; we understand the importance of all these four items,

and these very items have been repeated by my hon. friend. What assurance is there that in future, the state of things would be better than what it has been during all these years?

It is my feeling that the food problem in this county will not be solved either by eloquent speeches such as I am making here or by a statement by the hon. Minister or by elaborate notes in the secretariat or by the delegations to the foreign countries or by a report like that of the Nalagarh Committee where they have suggested another additional director and joint directors to be appointed. I think there are only two ways in which we can really increase the food production. One is possibly the regimentation of the masses, as has been done in China, and making every farmer work night and day as you like. Then possibly you might be able to increase food production. The other is giving the initiative to the farmer. I wish to state emphatically that either you do that regimentation from the top or you see that the initiative passes on to the farmer. He must have the resources, the authority and power to go ahead in the field because food is going to be produced in the field. We have discussed and we have come to realise that the only way to pass the initiative and the resources to the farmer is complete decentralisation of the administrative machinery, vesting all the powers and placing all the resources at the disposal of the farmer. Rajasthan, though a backward State, has taken a definite lead in this matter. The initiative has now been passed on to the panchayats and panchayat samitis. The resources have been placed at their disposal on the spot. It is the panchayats and panchayat samitis which will give the taccavi. It is those people who are going to have their plan target. It is only by this method of complete decentralisation and passing on the initiative and resources to the panchayats that we could expect some departure from what we have been experiencing all these years. A very silent revolution,

as was very correctly remarked by the *Times of India*, has taken place in Rajasthan, though it has gone almost unnoticed. I wish the hon. Minister takes a serious note of it. So at the lowest level this must be done.

The second step, which was very correctly stated by the hon. Prime Minister, is that the Chief Minister of each State must take over the Food and Agriculture portfolio. We find that no Chief Minister feels interested in the food problem. He considers it to be a headache. They want to hold those portfolios where they have the administrative power. I think it must be insisted upon that in every State the Chief Minister takes over the Food and Agriculture portfolio as well as the Community Development portfolio.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Why not ask the Prime Minister to do likewise?

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** The Development Commissioner must also be the Agriculture Secretary so that there is absolutely co-ordinated effort. If this is done, there is decentralisation down below. They have got the resources and the initiative. Then they have the Chief Minister and the Development Commissioner co-ordinating everything and making everything available to the farmers.

I wish my hon. friend, the Minister of Food and Agriculture spends ten days in a month in the rural areas with the agriculturists. Then he will be much wiser than by listening to our debates here; he will be much wiser than he will be by going on his foreign visits and also reading the notes prepared in the Secretariat. This is my first suggestion.

I shall come to the next point and submit that we have taken really very little care, as a matter of fact, regarding our priorities. Do not think that I am talking anything regional when I refer to the Rajasthan Canal. This programme has been staggered. It is really most unfortunate that it has

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

been so. As a matter of fact, the Rajasthan Canal by itself could make up for the entire deficit of food in this country. At present, we are importing about 3 or 4 million tons of food-grains. That could be produced along the Rajasthan Canal, because we should realise that we are bringing under cultivation absolutely virgin new alluvial soil—where there is no cultivation at the present moment. Let us also remember that we do not require any fertiliser for another three years in that entire area. I think top priority should be given to it and even the military machinery should be used. Earth-moving equipment should be centred there and we must give top priority to it. I wish that this Canal is completed in another two, three or four years time and that this staggering of eight to ten years is not permitted. It is not in the interest of Rajasthan so much that I am speaking. Rajasthan is already a surplus State.

Then I will pass on to the question of distribution. I come from a surplus State. I have listened to all these speeches very patiently. Every hon. Member from surplus States has for one reason or other opposed the policy of zones. Sir, their apprehension is very much justified. Even before my hon. friend took over charge, while speaking during the last session I stated that I want these zones to be completely washed out. I said it then and I repeat it now, that you cordon off completely Bombay, Calcutta and a few other places where the purchasing power is very great and whose problem creates a headache for the country.

You have made certain procurement; you have some imported foodstuffs. Please make these foodstuffs available to the 8 or 10 cities which should be completely cordoned off; and then the entire country should form absolutely one zone. If you were to tack the Bombay State with the Rajasthan I would myself strongly resent it. I would stoutly and stubbornly oppose

that movement because it is our experience in the past—and I brought it to the notice of the House here—that the grain is completely drained away from Rajasthan. As my hon. friend pointed out correctly, the prices shoot up immediately.

There was such a cross movement of food that my hon. friend was faced with such a difficulty, particularly in Jodhpur town, that there was no food to be seen anywhere. So, he had to divert the imported food from Bombay and they wasted more than Rs. 60 lakhs only on the cross movement of the foodgrains from Bombay to Rajasthan and back from Rajasthan to Bombay. I am only telling you about the wastage; I am not speaking of the surplus stocks which were moved away. It is a really serious problem. Therefore, I say: do not go that way. As my friend from Madhya Pradesh said, their position is likely to become difficult. I wish my hon. friend the Minister would take a little more courage in his hands and completely quash all these zones and cordon off only the few cities.

My friend is already going to cajole and coax the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh to agree to this. I do not know where this cajoling and coaxing comes in. It is all because he wants to create artificial zones. The difficulty is the creation of my own hon. friend under the Essential Commodities Act. He has created this artificial scarcity. Let him withdraw this order; let there be one zone; let him take a bold step forward. That is my submission regarding distribution.

I will then pass on to State trading. So much has been said about this. It has a definite advantage; nobody can deny it. In some form or other when you make procurement you will have to take to State trading. I do not think, as my hon. friend stated, he is going to do away with State trading altogether. But I do not want State trading for different reasons, not for the reason that we do not believe in planned economy.

I do not want State trading because my hon. friend has not got full faith and confidence in himself. He has no faith in his administrative machinery to do the thing honestly and efficiently. They have no faith in the administrative machinery that if State trading is resorted to, it will be done efficiently and honestly. Let us understand the apparatus we have got in our hands. What is the use of asking Government to take a step which they cannot manage and which results in confusion of all sorts and difficulties. In this State trading we create more difficulties instead of solving them. I do not want the Government to stand between my food and my mouth when they have not the capacity to serve it well. Therefore, I am opposed to this.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member should conclude soon.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** I may be given another two minutes which are due to me.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member may have two minutes.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Therefore, on very different grounds I am entirely opposed to State trading—monopoly State trading to be the main source of supply. There is another thing. Many hon. friends pointed out about the prices. The prices of food-grains are the main problem in this country. We would never have had the necessity of this Pay Commission had the prices of foodgrains not been so high and caused anxiety all over.

Another aspect was correctly pointed out. What do you want? You people living in the cities want cheap food but you do not want to give anything to the agriculturist. There is force in that. But these two have got to be reconciled and the reconciliation will solve not only the food price but also remove all these difficulties and the entire problem. Definitely the remedy is that we must, through scientific methods, see that

food is produced in larger quantities in the same acreage. If you have more food produced at a higher cost, then the problem remains. So, we want more food to be produced than what is produced today and we want that this food should be produced at a cheaper cost so that the farmer receives a much better return in the shape of increased returns because of the cheaper cost of food production and larger supplies.

One minute more, Sir and I shall wind up.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Half of that one minute is now gone.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Thank you very much.

**Shri N. B. Maiti (Ghatal):** Sir, I congratulate the Food and Agriculture Minister for the enunciation of the policy that he announced on the 16th of December. It was a bold grasp of the whole situation giving a new orientation to the policy and programmes that the Ministry was following in the last few years. One of my hon. friends asked: in all these eleven years, what has the Ministry done? I believe he was not quite correct in that interpretation because in the First Plan the Ministry gave as much attention as it required to the production of food. In the Second Plan, it lacked that initiative. Now that realisation has come and the Food and Agriculture Minister has become more an Agriculture Minister than a Food Minister. That is a thing to be congratulated upon. As far as the agricultural production is concerned, he has given a very lucid statement of policy that should be accepted by the House. In regard to food production, it has been the cry of the people that the minor and small irrigation schemes should be given more attention if possible, than the big irrigation projects. Somehow or other, during the last few years, that has been a cry in the wilderness. Now the present Minister of Food and Agriculture has given thought to it and has considered

[Shri N. B. Maiti]

them as much important, if not more than, the major irrigation schemes. That is a very good thing.

So far as fertiliser factories are concerned, it is a good idea to have one factory in each State and I hope that it will come into being. The idea is that every State should have one or more fertiliser factories though the cost may be lesser than the Sindri fertiliser factory.

So far as seeds and other matters are concerned, the decision that the technological aspect of the question should be considered and taken in hand is a good sign for the future.

Some of my hon. friends objected to his reference to other countries. I do not know how that objection can come in. After all, if our production is small, if the per acre yield is much less if not the least in the world, certainly we shall have to learn something from somewhere, particularly from the countries where the production has been much better than that of our country. Therefore, I would certainly support going to foreign countries and sending delegations, because we shall have to learn many things. Of course we may learn things from Madras because Madras cultivators have been producing, I understand, two tons per acre. That is a thing which others have to learn, but, more than that, some countries are producing five or six tons per acre and that is not known to Madras farmers. Why should not the Madras farmers, as a matter of fact, we ourselves, go to foreign countries and learn those things?

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** *Din Rath wanhi Rahiye.*

**Shri N. B. Maiti:** My hon. friend, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh for whom I have the greatest regard is saying that *din rath* we should not go to those places.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Sir, even today two delegations are in Yugosla-

via for learning co-operation and other things. It is not good to multiply such delegations.

**Shri N. B. Maiti:** Sir, I might remind my hon. friend that in olden days it was thought derogatory for us to go beyond the seas. What was the result? We found so many "frogs in the well", Bengalis, Bombay people and all others. Therefore, when things are to our advantage and we can learn things, certainly we shall go to foreign places and see things for ourselves. That is not a bad thing. That will be a lesson not only to the officers and to the Ministers but also to our enthusiastic friends like Dr. Ram Subhag Singh and others. If he does not want to go, if he refuses to go, then we can go. But that door should not be closed, that door should remain open.

I congratulate the hon. Minister for the bold stand that he has taken, that agricultural production should be given the first priority and that would be his objective in the Third Five Year Plan. It is unfortunate that we have not done so in the case of the Second Five Year Plan. That should have been the national duty. If that light comes to us late in the day, even then I should congratulate him and I should think the country should be grateful to him for having got hold of that idea.

Reference was made to co-operative farming and service co-operatives. These two have been sanctioned, have been resolved upon by the Indian National Congress, not only the Indian National Congress but also some other parties in India. I do not know whether any political party objects to these things. Even though formation of these two co-operatives has been resolved upon, they have not been given effect to in practice. It is a new thing for India and if it takes some time to come into being I think nobody should grudge or grumble on that score. Rather, those people who grumble should take upon themselves the work, and go ahead, so that other

people might imitate them. If by co-operative farming, a great country like the USA or the USSR, besides their countries, could give better production, then why should we not imitate that spirit and imitate the example?

Then, one of my hon. friends suggested that credit facilities should be given generously to the farmers. That is a thing to be taken into consideration seriously, because, if a man wants Rs. 200 and if I give him just Rs. 10 or Rs. 20, it will be nothing for him. Therefore, greater credit facilities should have to be given to the farmers so that they can meet their needs and requirements.

My hon. friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, referred to livestock. I think the Food and Agriculture Minister perhaps forgot the matter. Indeed there are so many things. I can name fisheries, for instance. My hon. friend is very fond of livestock and milk, but we in Bengal are very fond of fish and fisheries. Therefore, I add one more point, namely, the culture of fish and fisheries should be taken into account. When the Minister makes the final programme he should kindly see that we get more milk, more fish, more eggs and more meat too.

So much about food production. I may now suggest one thing very humbly to the hon. Minister. I know his difficulties, but even then, I join my hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur in the suggestion that the State Ministers of Agriculture should be persons of high position in the Cabinet. He has suggested that the Chief Ministers should take up the food and agriculture portfolio. I do not know whether all the Chief Ministers are competent for the purpose. But I know there are Ministers in some of the Cabinets who can do more justice to this subject.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let us not appoint them from here!

**Shri N. B. Maiti:** I suggest that this question can be taken up. I would

humbly beg of the hon. Minister to see his way to influence, if he can, the Chief Ministers of the States in this respect, so that they might allow the best persons to take upon themselves the portfolio of agriculture.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** Those who have got experience.

**Shri N. B. Maiti:** Yes; those who have experience and who can mix with the farmers. One of the important points that were made by the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture was that the Agriculture Extension Officers, the B.D.O.s and others should have agriculture training and they should be interested in the promotion of agriculture. He has also suggested that the M.P.s should be farm-minded or they should be farmers. I would request the hon. Minister—I do not know whether he has referred to himself or others.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** The majority of M.P.s are agriculturists.

**Shri N. B. Maiti:** ...to see that the Ministers also are all farm-minded. Really, for the present, there is no other problem which is greater than that of agriculture as far as India is concerned. If our highest men in the land become agriculture-minded that is all the better for the country, for India and for many other nations too.

17 hrs.

श्री जगदीश प्रबन्धी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहाँ इस सदन में काफी समय से सरकार की खाद्य सम्बन्धी नीति पर विचार विमर्श हो रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश के अन्दर जहाँ पर और बहुत सी समस्याएँ अपने गम्भीर रूप धारण किये बैठी हैं वहाँ पर हमारी खाद्य समस्या एक प्रमुख समस्या है। यह ठीक है कि यह सरकार इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत प्रयास करती है और उसने देश में जो खाद्यान्न की कमी है और जो मंहगाई है उसको दूर करने के लिए कुछ जोन बनाये और सस्ते दस्तों की दुकानें

## [जीवनदीक्षा अध्याय]

कोली, सिन्धु की व्यवस्था करने के लिए बाँकड़ा बांगल बाँक बनाये और अब इस दिल्ली की महा नगरी में एक विश्व कृषि प्रदर्शनी का आयोजन भी किया, यह सब कुछ हो रहा है लेकिन फिर भी हम देख रहे हैं कि नित्य नई नई खाद्यान्न सम्बन्धी समस्याएँ हमारे सामने उत्पन्न होती जा रही हैं और हम विशेषों से जो अपने खाद्यान्न का ध्यायत कम करना चाहते हैं वह कम होने की बजाय बढ़ता जा रहा है। हमारी मुद्रा जो निरन्तर घटती जा रही है वह एक बहुत गम्भीर समस्या है और उस पर गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार दिया जाना चाहिए कि अखिर अन्न के मामले में हम आत्मनिर्भर कैसे बनें और इस मुद्रा के ह्रास को कैसे रोके। मे समझता हूँ कि जो कुछ सरकार कर रही है वह जड़ को देखते हुए और उसे ध्यान में रख कर नहीं कर रही है और जड़ को न देखकर खाली पत्तियाँ काट रही है। असली समस्या इस बात की नहीं है कि कौन अधिकारी रहें, कौन मंत्री रहें, इत्यादि, इसमें किसी व्यक्ति का दोष नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जहाँ तक हमारी भारत सरकार की खाद्य सम्बन्धी नीति का सम्बन्ध है, उसके बूस में ही कहीं कोई कमी है और उस पर सरकार विचार नहीं करती है। अगर खाद्य नीति सम्बन्धी उसके मूल में देखें तो वाक्या यह है कि आज हमारे देश की जो ४० करोड़ की जनसंख्या है उसका अधिकांश भाग बाँबों में रहता है और कृषि उसका मुख्य बंधा है लेकिन कृषक जो कि इस देश में अन्न उगाता है, रबी और खरीफ की फसल पैदा करके अनाज पैदा करता है वह रबी या खरीफ की फसल के समय अपने गल्ले का भाव तय नहीं करता है। इसके विपरीत इस देश के अन्ध खाद्यान्न के अनायास मिल मालिक और तमाम जितनी बीजें पैदा करते हैं उनकी कीमत और उनका भाव वे स्वयं तय करते हैं। यह जो बेचारा कृषक बर्न है, जो खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन करने वाला है और जिसका कि

मुख्य बंधा ही खेतीबाड़ी करना है, वह अपनी तैयार की हुई फसल के दाम तय नहीं करनी पाता है। इसलिए हमें यह जो उच्च साध डिस्क्रिमिनेशन बता जाता है उस पर विचार करना चाहिए। अगर आज इस भारत सरकार की खाद्यान्न की मूल्य सम्बन्धी नीति को देखें तो उसकी तह में धाय पायेंगे कि सरकार की जो हमारी खाद्यान्न सम्बन्धी मूल्य नीति है उसमें और मिलों में जो अन्य तमाम चीजें तैयार होती हैं, उनमें कोई एकरूपता नहीं है कोई एक समानता नहीं है। किसान द्वारा पैदा किया हुआ अनाज जो खाता है उसमें मट्टी का रोग लग जाता है लेकिन इसके विपरीत जो लोहा, सीमेंट, कपड़ा और बीनी इत्यादि मिलों द्वारा तैयार होता है और जिनको कि कृषक इस्तेमाल करता है उसमें कभी यह मट्टी का रोग नहीं लग पाता है। मैं जानूँगा कि इन दोनों चीजों में, अनाज जो कि किसान पैदा करता है और दूसरी तमाम वे चीजें जिनका कि वह इस्तेमाल करता है, इन दोनों के मूल्य में कोई एकरूपता होनी चाहिए, कोई एक समानता होनी चाहिए और कोई एक सामंजस्य होना चाहिए। अब हमारे किसान जो कि गल्ला पैदा करते हैं तो फसल के वक्त तो उनका पैसा किया हुआ गूँठ रुपये का साढ़े चार सेर बिकने लगता है और जब बीरे बीरे उसके घर से गल्ला निकलने लगता है तब अनाज में तेजी आने लगती है और अनाज के दाम सुरसा की भाँति निरन्तर ऊँचे ही बढ़ते जाते हैं और जबकि कि नतीजा यह होता है कि जब उसकी खेत में अनाज बोना होता है तो उसको बही गल्ला जो कि उसका साढ़े चार सेर का बिकबाधा बना था बही गल्ला उसको ढेड़ सेर के हिसाब से खरीदना होता है। इसलिए मैं जानूँगा कि सरकार इस बारे में गम्भीरता से विचार करके अपनी खाद्यान्न की जो मूल्य सम्बन्धी नीति है उसको ठीक करे। इसके लिए होसपिस्ट पदवीं चारे देश में आयोजन कर रही है



कि फसल कटने के वक़्त जो कल्ला किसान के घर में धाता है तो कल्ले का मूल्य तय करने के पहले बिलतनी काश्तकार की फसल पैदा करने में लागत धाती है, खाद की, बैल खरीदने में और पानी देने आदि में, उनका हिसाब बैड़ाकर लागत निकाल ली जाय और तब ही कल्ले का भाव नियत किया जाय ताकि यदि धाप १५ रुपये गेहूँ का भाव नियत करते हैं तो धान की फसल के धाने तक उसमें किसी भी हालत में एक आना रुपये से ज्यादा गेहूँ का भाव बढ़ने न पाये और दूसरी फसल धाने तक गेहूँ का भाव १५ रुपये १२ आने या १५ रुपये से ज्यादा न होने पाये। इसके साथ ही मैं यह भी कहूँगा कि मिल मालिक जो यह कपड़ा, मोहा, सीमेंट, चीनी और अन्य चीजें तैयार करते हैं, उन चीजों का भी भाव, जितना भी मूल्य धाप उनका नियत करे उससे साल भर में उनका मूल्य थोड़े से अधिक नहीं बढ़ना चाहिए। इस तरह से धाप देखेंगे कि अगर सरकार खाद्यान्न और अन्य चीजों के मूल्य में इसका ब्याल रखेगी और इस हिसाब से उनका मूल्य तय करेगी तो किसानों को बहुत कुछ राहत होगी और इस तरह से उसको इस बात की गारंटी सी हो जायेगी कि जो अनाज वह पैदा करेगा उसका उसे उचित मूल्य मिलेगा और साथ ही उसके इस्तेमाल में धाने वाली चीजें भी उसको उचित मूल्य पर मिल सकेंगी। अभी तक किसान को इस बात की कोई गारंटी नहीं है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमारे देश के अन्दर बहुत से राज्यों में, खासकर उत्तर प्रदेश में, सरकार की रिपोर्ट है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में जो ८० प्रतिशत जोते हैं, उनमें से सवा ६ एकड़ जोते ऐसी हैं जिनसे किसानों को किसी प्रकार का कोई लाभ नहीं होता है और वह अनाजकृत जोतें होती हैं और जिनको कि अनाजकीनामिक होल्डिंग्स कहा जाता है। सरकार का अब एक अनुभव बड़ा हुआ है जिसके जरिए धानकनी का जो बरिदा होता है उस पर टैक्स लगता

है लेकिन वह इनकमटैक्स ३५ रुपये वा ४५ रुपये के बाद में, जिसको कि इनकम मान कर उसके बाद की धामकनी पर इनकमटैक्स जगाते हैं। अब खेती भी तो आखिर एक धंधा है। खेतीवारी प्रथा धापने समाप्त कर दी है। अब कोई लगान नहीं लगता है बल्कि अब मालगुजारी लगती है जिसका कि अर्थ यह होता है कि धाप उसको इनकम पर उस धंधे के ऊपर कुछ टैक्स लगाते हैं। अब सवा ६ एकड़ तक ऐसी जोतें हैं जिनमें कि कोई लाभ नहीं होता है तब किसानों से मालगुजारी लेते वक़्त इन अनाजकृत जोतों का ध्यान क्यों नहीं रखा जाता और जो नियम शहरों में रहने वालों की धामदणियों पर टैक्स लगाने समय प्रमल में लाया जाता है वह किसानों के लिये क्यों नहीं वाम में लाया जाता और उन बैच रे किसानों से क्यों जबदस्ती मालगुजारी बसूल की जाती है? इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा तो सुझाव यह है कि राज्यों में जहाँ जहाँ भी ऐसी अनाजकृत जोतें हों, उन पर एक पैसा भी मालगुजारी तब तक नहीं लगाने चाहिए जब तक कि वह लाभकृत जोतें न हो जायें।

तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज जो हमारा खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन कम होता जा रहा है उसमें सबसे बड़ी बात तो यह है कि हमारी सरकार की ओर से किसानों को बीज और सिंचाई आदि की समुचित सुविधाएं उपलब्ध नहीं होती हैं, कमी कमी बांध लगाते भी हैं तो वह बह जाते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार सिंचाई सम्बन्धी सुविधा की ओर ध्यान दे और मेरा सुझाव यह है कि धाप जहाँ ट्यूबवैल्स लगते हैं, जहाँ नहरें हैं वहाँ एक तो धापका पानी का रेट बहुत बढ़ा हुआ है और आज किसानों की जैसी शोचनीय और गिरी हुई आर्थिक स्थिति है उसमें वे इतना अधिक पानी का मूल्य नहीं दे पाते इसलिए धाप पानी का रेट कम करवाइये।

धाप एक साध नहीं और ट्यूबवैल्स नहीं लगा सकते हैं और उसके लिए मैं यह सुझाव

## [श्री जगदीश अग्रवली]

देना चाहता हूँ कि जो छोटे छोटे कुएँ हैं उनको सरकार की तरफ से खुदवाया जायें और उन स्थानों पर जहाँ कि बन्ने नहीं हैं, जहाँ कि नहरें नहीं हैं और सिंचाई के कोई साधन नहीं है, ऐसे स्थानों में अपनी ओर से, राज्य सरकार की ओर से २०, २० एकड़ के बीच में एक एक कुआँ खुदवाया जाय ताकि दो बैलों की जोड़ी से समय पर पानी मिल सके और वज्र पर खेतीबाड़ी हो सके। अभी उचित व्यवस्था के अभाव में होता यह है कि पानी किजूल बहता रहता है, उसके जमा करने का माकूल इन्तजाम नहीं होता है और जब पानी की जरूरत होती है तो वह नहीं मिल पाता और अन्न पानी नहीं बरसे तो उसके लिए कह दिया जाता है कि परमात्मा को मर्जी है उसके प्रागे किसका वश है। यह कह कर सन्तोष दिलाने का प्रयत्न किया जाता है कि परमात्मा या कुदरत की बदतमीजी है कि पानी अधिक बरसा दिया, अतिवृष्टि हो गई या पानी उसने नहीं बरसाया और सूखा पड़ गया और दोष भगवान के मत्बे मढ़ कर मानों यह कहा जाता है कि इसके लिए सरकार की कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कितने राज्यों में नहरें हैं। राज्य सरकारों का पानी बहता रहता है। समय पर किसानों को पानी नहीं मिलता है, फसल सूख जाती है। यह किसकी जिम्मेदारी है इसको आपको देखना चाहिए। मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि उत्तर प्रदेश में और खास करके कानपुर जिले में, जहाँ से कि मैं चुन कर यहाँ आया हूँ और जिसका कि प्रतिनिधित्व करने का मुझे गौरव प्राप्त हुआ है, वहाँ यह समस्याएँ मौजूद हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि जो मीने खाद्यान्न की मूल्य सम्बन्धी नीति के बारे में सुझाव दिया है उसके अनुरूप नीति बनाई जायगी और जो अन्नाभकारी जोते हैं उनकी माल-गुजारी माफ की जायगी। इसके साथ ही साथ जहाँ पर कि कोई सिंचाई के साधन मौजूब नहीं हैं वहाँ पर कुएँ खुदवाने की

व्यवस्था की जायगी और कृषि का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के हेतु सरकार की तरफ से कृषकों की कोई श्रम या अनुदान देने की व्यवस्था की जाय।

Shri S. K. Patil: I am very grateful to the House for the various suggestions which, I am quite sure, will benefit us. But I can tell one thing to the House in a very humble spirit and that is this: as a Food and Agriculture Minister I am neither a magician nor a juggler who can produce a rabbit out of his hat. I cannot perform any miracles. I also confess to one great defect in me and that is that I have not been an agriculturist myself. But with all these limitations from which I suffer, if the House or the Government or anybody has chosen me to look after this thing for some time, I assure them that I shall give my best to this portfolio. I shall give them the cleanest and the most efficient administration that I am capable of. I do not claim that my thoughts or my plans are infallible. There may be lots of mistakes in them. But let me continue those plans for some time and I assure this House that with your co-operation I shall be able to bring the situation under control.

Opinions will vary. Naturally, they will vary. I must not take much of your time just now because the time is running out fast. But I can tell you of two good features for which this House should have real satisfaction. One feature is that during the last two or three years the prices of the food commodities are the lowest and they are going to be lower and lower a little. I had a hunch some time back, but I could not express it so very openly because not having the experience of agriculture I could not do so. I had a hunch that when we produce 73.5 million tons and all that and we call it a bumper crop and a record crop—a record it was, bumper it was not—when we produce that where has our food gone. Many people were thinking—and the reports

also were there—that there might be some kind of a hoarding. I shall not call it a hoarding. My hunch was that a prudent farmer, not knowing as to what is going to happen in a lean year, is keeping something behind. Well, he is the wisest farmer. I congratulate that farmer for that attitude. I do not call it hoarding. Hoarding is done by a man or by a trader in order to get some more money. If he hides it, I can call it hoarding. But if a farmer does it in his own interest, not knowing about the future and having suffered quite a lot in the past, if he lays by something as a precautionary measure, surely he is doing something which is in the nature of a prudent act, for which I would really compliment him. Some such thing did happen. I had a hunch. I did not know to what extent this kind of grain would be there which would be unloaded on the market when the fresh crops came. I had been in my own mind thinking that it would be of the order of about a million tons. May I say, not that I was a prophet, that to a large extent my hunch was correct.

About Madhya Pradesh so much has been said. I am proud of that Pradesh because it is the granary. I do not say anything in a sarcastic manner. It is the granary. It is the rice bowl of which we are proud. In Chhatisgarh alone, nothing less than 150 thousand tons was unloaded, which was the saving of last year, because now the fresh crop has come. If you take it from all the places—I am not talking only of Madhya Pradesh, but from wherever it is—if it is not unloaded on the market and is kept still with the farmer, I say it is a good precaution. There is nothing wrong about it. Food cannot last for ten years. The farmer has got to eat it and sell something out of the new crop or sell it and eat something out of the new crop. That is one good feature. So far as the prices are concerned, let us not scare away the farmer or ourselves and you will see that the prices will be lower and lower a little.

Another good feature that is there is the production prospect of this year to which reference was made by my hon. colleague. We had thought that because of the unprecedented floods etc. in Bengal and in some parts of Bombay and Kashmir, possibly production this year might be less. But I am very much heartened—not that I have got the final reports—by the reports that we are getting from most of the affected areas and by the public speeches that the Food Ministers and the Chief Ministers of those concerned Provinces have been making. They lead me to believe that the food production this year is not only not going to be worse but possibly, if at all, it can be slightly better than that of last year. I was very much heartened by the speech which the Food and Agriculture Minister of West Bengal made that in spite of the floods he expects that the production of Bengal this year would be even slightly higher than that of last year and surely even higher than of the year previous to that when it was higher than last year. It may be right. It may be wrong. But I take it just as I take the opinion of my hon. friend opposite. Surely, I must take the opinion of the Food Minister because he is supposed to know something about food production of his Province. So also in other Provinces food production is not bad although for stating their case most emphatically, Shri Vyas and other hon. Members from Madhya Pradesh might say that Madhya Pradesh production would not be good. Their own suspicions, God help us, should not be realised and the food production in Madhya Pradesh should be better than what it was even last year. If it is not, I would be very sorry. Let us not scare ourselves and say this is bad, because it does create a bad reaction in the country.

My attempt is this, and it is an honest attempt. I may be wrong. I do not say that I have got a specific remedy which will really answer all the things. I agree with my hon. friend Shri Mathur that if the whole of India could immediately be made

[Shri S. K. Patil]

into one zone, there is nothing like it, if some cities are protected. At one time I was fiddling with the idea, I am still doing it. It is good I can openly express my thoughts, because the reactions can be known. There are several cities with a population of five lakhs, not only Bombay and Calcutta; it includes Madras, Delhi and several others. There are twenty cities with a total population of two crores, and their annual food requirements are of the order of two million tons. We could separate them and make the rest of the country into one zone. It would be an experiment to emphasize that this country must be one, even if the price rises a little bit here and there, but now at some places it is double that of the price in others. That should not happen.

Before I do that, my attempt positively is in that direction. Again and again I repeat it, that God willing it shall be my effort during the next one or two years to see that the zonal system, either smaller or bigger zones, does not exist in this country, that we are self-reliant so far as our food requirements are concerned, and that the prices also rule, to the best extent possible, within limits.

An hon. Member stated that during the last three or four years we have had deficit financing to the tune of Rs. 1,000 crores. That means in our real milk we have added so much water. That must also be partly responsible. I am merely stating what we did, whether good or bad. Therefore to the extent our rupee has gone down in value, sometimes inflationary pressures are being felt, and if as a result of that, in spite of higher agricultural production, prices rise, surely the Food and Agriculture Ministry alone is not responsible for that, because we have spent that money in development and it might produce favourable reactions later on.

Therefore, this is the policy I am aiming at. If the arteries and the veins function normally, then the capillaries and others should function, so that the whole body politic

really functions without any restraint. With that object in view, I am trying that these big zones should be created.

I have got power under the Essential Commodities Act. Who created the Madhya Pradesh Zone, as it is today? It was created under that Act. If I withdraw that Act, there is nothing like a Madhya Pradesh Zone. I do not want to put them into difficulty immediately. I shall accustom them to what is coming slowly, so that they should be in a position to share both the fortunes and the misfortunes of the country. With that object in view, for the last many months I was trying that Orissa and West Bengal should come together, although it is not exactly a self-sufficient zone, because, as I have pointed out, the deficit of West Bengal is more than the surplus of Orissa.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Five times more.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** I do not take the figures from the hon. Member.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It is your own figure.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** No. It might be perhaps just the same and nothing more. If really Bengal's production becomes greater, its deficit might be equal to the surplus of Orissa. I am not considering it in the sense that I have nothing to give. I say that we shall protect them against any eventuality. If the prices rise in Orissa beyond a particular figure, we rush in. We are taking sufficient precautions to see that the non-producing consumer should not suffer, because the producers who have their own food can eat it.

With that object in view I am making a statement. It is a good circumstance that the House is in session; otherwise, as I said under that Act by a notification in the Gazette I could have done it. The notification has been issued today creating the

zone of Orissa and West Bengal.

The Government of India had been discussing for some time past with the West Bengal and Orissa Governments the question of creating a rice zone of the two States of Orissa and West Bengal. It has now been decided with the consent of the State Governments to form this zone and a notification to that effect has been issued through a Gazette of India Extraordinary on 21st December, 1950—that is today.

The formation of the zone will help in stabilizing the prices of rice in West Bengal at a suitable level and will also enable the cultivators of Orissa to get a high price for their produce. Rice will now move freely without restriction in the zone consisting of the States of Orissa and West Bengal.

In order to ensure that the prices of rice do not rise unduly in Orissa, it has been decided to continue distribution of rice from Government stocks in Calcutta and also to maintain a reserve stock in Orissa which would be distributed in those areas of Orissa where the prices might rise.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: They are all paper safeguards.

Shri S. K. Patil: The following measures are proposed to be taken to ensure smooth working of the Zone and to prevent undue rise of prices in Orissa after the formation of the Zone:

- (i) Rice will continue to be distributed in Calcutta from Government stocks. This will ensure against unduly heavy demand of Calcutta falling on the Orissa markets;
- (ii) A reserve of 75,000 tons will be built up in Orissa by purchase of rice locally from Orissa for which a levy scheme is being introduced by the State Government,

so that the people of Orissa should eat the rice which they produce....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That would be in Calcutta, because there is no suitable warehouse in Orissa.

Shri S. K. Patil: This rice will be distributed in Orissa, if such distribution becomes necessary, after the formation of the Zone, on account of the rise in prices in certain areas of that State.

Shri Panigrahi: May I ask one question only?

Shri S. K. Patil: I am not yielding, because I have no time.

Shri Panigrahi rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. When the hon. Minister is not yielding, then the hon. Member must yield.

Shri S. K. Patil: Please, for God's sake, let there be no interruptions

I am simply saying this here, because it is a happy circumstance that the House is in session. I am exactly reading the notification that has been issued to the Press. It is not for me to change it even by a comma or a full-stop just now; the notification has been issued.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy said that it may be that it may all go wrong. Anything that a man can do may go wrong.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It has gone wrong.

Shri S. K. Patil: If there are people who always curse, possibly it will go wrong more quickly. But what I am expecting is this that in the larger interests of the distribution of food in this country, in the larger interests of the great thing called planning of which you are talking, you would give it a trial and you will bless it.

My hon. friend Shri Mahanty said that the price-line should be held.

[Shri S. K. Patil]

But is he holding the straight line or is he holding a curve? What is he holding just now? Is he holding the price-line in Bombay and Calcutta, where, as I said, the price is shooting up to Rs. 35 or Rs. 40 per-maund? Is he holding the price-line that is obtaining in Bhubaneswar and Cuttack? Therefore, if we have got to hold the price-line, it has first got to be consolidated into a straight line in the big cities, for, if the big cities suffer, that means that the whole industrial sector suffers, the cost of living ratio goes up, and everything that we produce industrially becomes costlier and costlier. That is why I say that whether it be fortunes or misfortunes, they have got to be shared. It is with that object that we are doing it. Supposing we fail, even assuming that we fail, the remedy is with us; we can go back. Today, therefore, please do not curse us on the very eve of it; bless us, and try to help us in every possible manner, so that with your co-operation and the general goodwill and the confidence that we shall be creating in the country, we shall go ahead.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It has been experimented and found to be wrong.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** This is as far as the prices and production are concerned. Then, the House should also know some of the figures as to how much money we are spending just now, on this thing, that is, the food position in this country. These figures are worthwhile knowing. Annually, so far as the imports are concerned, we have spent Rs. 135.64 crores for the import of foodgrains, both wheat and rice.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rai Bareli):** Which year?

**Shri S. K. Patil:** I am giving current year's figure, that is, the figure for the year 1959-60.

Then, internally, the amount spent on procurement was Rs. 37.75 crores. But I do not count that, because after all, it is our own rice or wheat that we have taken. Then, for mere charges for handling it and clearing it, and the machinery that the Government of India are using, we have spent as much as Rs. 15.39 crores. If as they proposed, it is going to be a monopoly procurement and monopoly distribution, as I said in my speech earlier, then from Rs. 18 crores, it is bound to go up to Rs. 100 crores. Therefore, you must also imagine that. If it is necessary, it can be done. But what I am telling is that all this price ultimately is added on for the consumer. For after all, Government do not give anything; Government have no pocket; it is a bottomless pocket. Therefore, anything that Government spend is ultimately passed on to the consumer.

श्री विभूति मिश्र (दंगल) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मे एक प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय मंत्री बैठने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। आप जब वह खतम कर लें, सवाल पूछ सकते हैं।

**Shri S. K. Patil:** The establishment charges are Rs. 32 lakhs, that is, on the D.G. Food; and the regional organisations cost another Rs. 2 crores odd. Therefore, really, it comes to about Rs. 18 crores. The mere management of it comes to Rs. 18 crores and that is passed on, besides the charges for the imported food-grains, which is Rs. 135 crores. The total comes to Rs. 207.14 crores.

I am merely saying this for the simple reason that whatever you do does not fall from anywhere. Ultimately it is the poor consumer who buys these things and who has got to pay for that.

Besides, certain States have added a little money to it. In Punjab, I

am told even on sugar—not on the other things—if our prices were Rs. 35 per maund, they added Rs. 5 on their own, making it Rs. 40. I am not finding fault with them. Possibly it may be necessary for them to do so. It is their right to do so. But what I am saying is that we must have an idea as to how the consumer has to pay for these things, through his nose.

Having said that, I shall now very rapidly deal with the points remaining—which are not many. So far as the record production last year is concerned, people ask: where have our foodgrains gone? It is a good thing to ask where the foodgrains have gone. Our people have started eating more, our people have started eating better, our people have started really turning from coarser grain to finer grain and people have started using varieties of food. These are all very healthy signs and they are not to be deprecated just because for the time being we are experiencing some difficulty.

Take, for instance, the State of Kerala, a very wonderful State. I have great love in my mind for that State. It was never deficit to the tune of 7 lakh tons of rice per year in the past because they were living on tapioca and things like that. Their deficit was not really of the order of more than 2 to 3 lakh tons. Now it has gone up to 7 lakh tons. I congratulate them on that, because at last instead of tapioca they have now come to rice. I am now encouraging them. I have really called their officers and told them: 'You cannot always live on other States. Therefore, we shall do everything possible in the Third Plan to see that you step up your production. We shall give whatever money is necessary for that so that you largely become self-reliant'.

Therefore, whenever the standard of living of people rises, what is the meaning of it? It is not that their bank balances have increased. It

means that they eat better food, sufficient food, healthy food and, if possible, a balanced food also. That is exactly what is happening in this country. Therefore, the mere fact that we produced 73 million tons and yet we are feeling shortage need not really dishearten us. If the rising standard of living has any meaning, it must manifest itself in the general good of the people. That is exactly what is happening in this country.

My hon. friends, Shri Tangamani, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy and others were talking about the zones. I have explained my policy. It may be a wrong policy. I do not join issue with them on that. But they have got a regimented mind and they think that a particular thing is bad. If the Essential Commodities Act was not passed, we would have had no power to make the zones that exist today. We have made them for a different reason—in order that sufficient and adequate quantities of foodgrains should be available at reasonable prices to the 370 million people of this country, and not only to the people of Orissa or other surplus States (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** May I ask one question?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** At the end.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** Therefore, let us carefully watch all these things that are happening about the zones. Let us be cautious about them. If we really find that our experiment is not succeeding, there is the Orissa Government sitting there. Do you mean to say that the Orissa Government has entered into a trap? They are clever people. Their State may be small, but they are very clever people—people like my hon. friend, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, and there are outside this Chamber also still cleverer people who have done this.

It was by inducing the Chief Minister of Orissa and the Chief Minister of West Bengal that

[Shri S. K. Patil.]

they sat together. Then even I was taken out. They said: 'We are neighbours. You are a far-away person. Therefore, you sit outside'. I was made to sit outside for one hour.

An Hon. Member: Waiting.

Shri S. K. Patil: Waiting and waiting, cooling my heels. When they returned, they returned with smiling faces and they told me that they have composed their differences. Even then, it took five or six months. Today we are in a position to gazette this coming together of Orissa and West Bengal.

My hon. friend, Dr. Krishnaswami, made some very interesting points. He said that more retail trade associations should be formed and they should be helped. My hon. friend, Shri Mahanty, countered it by saying that all the private traders must be completely destroyed. In any society, if I may say so with due humility, there cannot be all angels on one side and all devils on the other. There is a little component of the angel and devil in every one of us. When it is more of angel, we are good human beings and where there is more of the devil, we are bad human beings. Therefore, the trader cannot be so bad if he comes out of our society. So it is not my intention to destroy anybody. If the half a million or million traders behave well and do not add to the misfortunes of the country, it shall be my duty to see that they do remain and they carry on their trade. In our country, we do require such people and we do not want a new class of unemployed people to be created, to whom we shall have to cater in one form or another. It is not for that point that we are specially doing anything.

He also suggested some difference between the Planning Commission, the Cabinet and the Food Ministry. I do not like to go into that question.

But I can assure him of one thing. The Planning Commission is an advisory body made up of experts. Therefore, a man like myself who has no experience of agriculture, if I borrow a little experience from where it is possible to borrow, then, surely, can anybody find fault with me? I do not know. But, ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Food Minister who is responsible to this House. Therefore, if I cannot carry on that responsibility I would not be the Food Minister even for a minute. About that you need have no doubt in your mind. There is nothing like bifurcation of responsibility and any question of anybody wanting to take the responsibility of any other person. The relations are smooth and good now. By experience we learn and by trials also we learn.

An Hon. Member: How long?

Shri S. K. Patil: Then, my hon. friend, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh referred to the N.D.C. and all that. Let us not go into old quarrels; let us not quarrel with old tools that have become useless. Whatever might have happened in the past, let us forget those and let us sharpen our tools so that they can be put to the best use. If we have any difficulty in the N.D.C. in the next meeting let us see. Last time it was more an exploratory meeting. I was a new Food Minister. It was called within a week of my becoming the Food Minister and they did not take any decisions. I requested them not to take any decisions to which I was not a party. I said I must study the question. That is why, though they were keen enough, they did not take any decision. Therefore, there is no difference of opinion between the N.D.C. and the Ministry.

He was also saying that the statutory body that I am considering may not meet once in six months and so on. If I am mistaken he may correct me. It is not a committee that meets



once in three months or once in six months. I am calling it a statutory advisory committee. The members and officers will sit from day to day, all the 365 days of the year. It is a committee which would lay down the principle as to what has to be done.

My hon. friend Shri P. R. Patel referred to the practice in the United States of America where the floor prices are supported. The time may come in this country when I would have to support the floor prices. I went even a step further in the Rajya Sabha and said that as in France where subsidies are given to the farmers even before they produced the crops sometimes we shall have to do so. The progress of this country entirely depends upon the prosperity of the farmer himself. Without the farmer nothing is going to happen. Therefore, they will continue to meet from day to day and it will examine the price and the structure and from time to time give advice to Government as to what should be the floor price—and not the ceiling price. Therefore, let us have no misgivings; let us set them all aside so that we shall come to some kind of a decision and establish healthy precedents which will help us in future.

My hon. friend, Pandit Thakurdas Bhargava referred to animal husbandry. Here, he and I belong to the same clan. He knows—what you may not be knowing—that I happen to be the President of the Animal Welfare Association of this country. Therefore, animals to me are as important as anybody. Surely, I do not give him the honour as I give to this House or to the members thereof. Surely animals must be looked after, because, as the Prime Minister said yesterday in his speech while inaugurating another symposium, the real aspect of our agriculture is proper husbandry. And, in that husbandry, animal husbandry forms a very important part indeed. Therefore, it shall be my

duty to see that the bullocks, for whom no sympathy was expressed by anybody here except sometimes by my Deputy Minister, are looked after. A Bill is also coming before this House wherein proper precautions would be taken in order to safeguard these animals and animal husbandry would be improved.

So far as my hon. friend Shri Mahanty is concerned, I think, I have replied to most of the points raised by him.

My friends, Shri Jangde and Shri Vyas and many others talked about Madhya Pradesh. I may tell them that I do not want to hustle them into anything. I have told them again and again that if there is any hustling I have all the power under the Essential Commodities Act. But I cannot use that power foolishly because I know the difficulties of the Madhya Pradesh Government which are my difficulties and that we must share their difficulties. I must not allow these difficulties to remain but they must also understand that the proper price structure of this country is not that some prices should rule in Madhya Pradesh and exactly different prices should rule elsewhere. I know also that M.P. should be joined to Bombay. It is natural because Bombay is near. I cannot say that it should be joined to West Bengal. There is nothing sacrosanct about it except the geographical nearness of the two. Therefore, if I have to do that, I have got to see that the price in Madhya Pradesh does not shoot up beyond a particular level. It is just as we have taken the precaution in Orissa where if the prices go beyond a certain level—let us say if the prices go beyond Rs. 18, if the price is Rs. 18 today—a lot of stocks will be released. It is kept ready there. The shops are keeping it ready and nobody could play any tricks with that. The same things could be done in Madhya Pradesh. Bombay was unnecessarily dragged in. If the city

[Shri S. K. Patil.]

of Bombay has got a very great sucking power, then, surely, I told yesterday and I repeat it today, I am prepared to cordon the city of Bombay so that it should not have to impose any burdens on M.P. That could be done. But they can also persuade themselves that the people in Madhya Pradesh, farmers, are entitled to a little rise in the price. You cannot expect that a rise should be given while you keep an attitude and say that you are not going to share the fortunes or misfortunes with other people. Therefore, let us come together and let us club together. Let us suffer a little bit while the others are suffering more. It is not that I am levelling the misery. I am levelling prosperity so that the degree of misery might be a little lower, so that most people in India may feel the misery much less than today. That is the objective. Surely, I see no reason why my friends in M.P. should not come to my rescue and help me so that ultimately big zones come and within another year we shall have that zone to which reference was made by Shri Mathur, by cordoning of the cities, we take the whole country as one zone and later on even the cities' cordon should go away and India should be made one zone by the accelerated production that we shall put out.

These are some of the points. I began by saying that there was no miracle in it or magic in it. I do not claim to know anything. I am learning. Somebody said that I should be in a village for ten days. Ten days may probably be long time but I do mean to go into the villages. Immediately I assumed charge of this portfolio, I have told my officers and my people—I do not know how many lakhs and thousands they are—to identify themselves with the farmers. At least 15 days in a year they should remain with the farmer and understand these things and soil their hands with mother earth so that they can smell it. It is that dignity that I

want to add to my farmer and if the farmer is allowed that dignity and he is appreciated, I am sure that the problem of food will not remain a difficult problem for a long time to come.

**Shri Panigrahi:** I wanted some clarifications.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** I am sorry, Sir, I did not say this because it was a little unpleasant but from the tenor of my speech it will be seen that I cannot concede to any of the amendments that have been moved.

**Shri Panigrahi:** The hon. Minister has stated that 75,000 tons of foodgrains will be stored in Orissa. I would like to know whether the Government of Orissa has storage capacity to store these 75,000 tons in Orissa. Secondly, when you introduced State trading in foodgrains, ever since that time, the Government of India is maintaining a food directorate in Orissa having 200 employees. Is the Government of India going to close down this directorate and in that case are these 200 employees going to be unemployed? Thirdly, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government of India is advancing all the money needed for purchasing 75,000 tons of foodgrains and if they are going to advance, what will be the amount of levy.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** All these are matters of detail but I can assure my hon. friend that all these will be gone in to the complete satisfaction of the Orissa Government.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** There is an important question regarding the increase in the prices.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Vyas had already had a say....  
(Interruptions.)

Some Hon. Members rose—

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** I want only half a minute.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There are so many of them and if I allow half a minute to each of them, that would mean six minutes.... (Interruptions.)

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. They would excuse me now.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad):** There has been some talk in the Press about de-control of sugar. May I know from the hon. Food Minister whether he has got any plan like that?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We have a different subject today. Now, am I required to put any amendment separately?

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then I shall put all of them together.

*The substitute motions were put and negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The discussion is over. We shall now take up the other item.

17.41 hrs.

#### \*CONTRIBUTION TO EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to raise a discussion on points arising out of the answer given to Unstarred Question No. 281 on 6th August, 1959 regarding enhancement of the rate of contribution to provident fund from 6½ per cent. to 8-1/3 per cent. The hon. Minister has stated that the decision to enforce the enhanced rate has not yet been finalised. This inordinate delay in enhancing the rate of contribution to the Employees' Provident Fund elicit, session after session, the same stereotype reply that the matter is under consideration.

Sir, I do not want to read the answers over again, suffice it to say that the attitude of the Government in this regard is very disquieting and calls for immediate revision. The issue is one which vitally affects nearly 50 lakh workers in mines, plantations and factories.

What are the arguments that are being advanced by the employers? They say that the labour legislations have been casting a heavy burden on them and, therefore, they are not in favour of this enhancement. Let us examine the facts. What has been the position? They say that the enhancement will increase their liability, and therefore the capital formation and development of the industry will be affected. Sir, I need not go far to find a reply to that, but I will simply quote what Mr. H. V. R. Iengar, Governor of the Reserve Bank had to say when he spoke to the Statisticians Conference. He said:

"In absolute figures the internal resources used for capital formation in public limited companies for which alone we have continuous figures were as follows:

Average for five years 1951—55

—Rs. 69 crores.

1956—Rs. 117 crores.

1957—Rs. 83 crores

What precisely is the significance of these figures! It has been argued in some quarters on the basis of drop in 1957, that excessive taxation has reduced the ability of Indian industry to put in adequate depreciation and reserves. That point, however, required more careful analysis than has been given to it. If the cotton textile industry, which had a bad year in 1957, were excluded, it would appear that the conclusion would not really be warranted. "Moreover, the preliminary figures of 1958 show an overall improvement over 1957". This is with regard to capital formation, to show how much they have been able