

[Shri B. Gopala Reddy]

each of the following papers:—

- (i) List of concerns to which exemption under section 56-A of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922 was granted during the year 1958-59. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2008/60.]
- (ii) Agreement between the Governments of India and Denmark for the avoidance of double taxation of income published in Notification No. G.S.R. 316, dated the 9th March, 1960. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2009/60.]

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

### SEVENTY-SECOND REPORT

**Shri Dasappa** (Bangalore): I beg to present the Seventy-second Report of the Estimates Committee on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Forty-second Report of the Estimates Committee (First Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Community Development—CPA Part III.

## CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

### CLOSURE OF TEXTILE FACTORIES IN LUDHIANA

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, there is a calling attention notice, Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi. The hon. Member is absent. Then, Shri Braj Raj Singh. He is also absent. Since neither of them is present here, the hon. Minister may lay the statement on the Table of the House.

**The Minister of Finance** (Shri Morarji Desai): I beg to lay the

statement on the Table of the House. [See Appendix II, annexure No. 89].

12.14 hrs.

## DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—Contd.

### MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE—contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now resume further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. Shrimati Renu Chakravarty who was in possession of the House may kindly continue her speech.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty** (Basirhat): What I was trying to place before the House was the serious situation arising out of the...

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member has already taken 19 minutes.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** I have taken only 18 minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** Anyhow, that does not matter.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** I shall finish within half an hour.

I had already stated in my earlier speech that prices were going up. The hon. Minister, when he met me, told me that he would completely refute this fact by facts and figures. I would be very glad if he could do so. As far as the outside market is concerned, we know that prices are prevailing high, but when we go and look up the prices given in the books supplied to us by Government, often, we cannot exactly find whether they are really going up. But, when I looked into even these figures, I find that even in the index of wholesale prices of cereals, this rising trend is shown in January. That is the point that I would like to urge. The point is not to show that it was high in

November but lower in January. The point is how in January-February, it is going up, because that is the post harvest period.

For cereals, in December, 1958, it was 105. In January, 1959, it was 103. That is the trend normally. In December, 1959 it was 101. On January 6th, 1960, it was 105.1. The same thing is true of wholesale index of food articles. On 3rd January, 1959, it was 112.5. On 16th January, 1960, it was 118.4.

Even if we take a surplus province like Andhra Pradesh, we find that in January, 1959, it was 17.50. In January, 1960, it was 18.50, while on 6th February, 1960, it was 19, and on 13th February, 1960, it was 19.25.

If we take a deficit State like West Bengal, which is a chronically deficit State, where the prices always go up, we find that in each of the *mandis* the prices have gone up. In Calcutta, in February, 1959, it was 21.60. In February, 1960, after the formation of the food zone, it was 24. So, for each one of the areas, we find this sort of trend.

So far as Orissa is concerned, in Balasore, on 3rd January, 1959, it was 14.50, while in January, 1960 it was 20.50. In each of the States, whether deficit or surplus, the prices have been going up in the course of the harvest period.

So, the question of how to hold the price-line has become very important. This morning, in the papers, we saw that the National Development Council had again taken up this matter, and the Chief Ministers are going to meet again in April. There is a small statement in the press saying that they have said that there should be no expert committee, that it is a political question, and, therefore, some other type of a committee will have to be set up.

Having gone into the question of holding the price-line, which was

proposed by the Foodgrains Inquiry Committee, I find that they have taken into consideration the fact that part of it is a political question. We have seen already the Swatantra party coming out the other day with their policy in regard to this question of State trading. We do know that it does need co-operation of the people to have a sound price policy. Therefore, the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee had suggested a Central Food Advisory Council. At page 81 of their report, they have stated that there should be representatives of the Government, there should be representatives of the parties, there should be other representatives of the trade, industry, workers, consumers, banks, co-operatives, leading political parties and economists; and they should meet as often as is necessary but at least twice a year in connection with the *kharif* and *rabi* season.

**Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana):** What about representatives of cultivators? No representatives of cultivators?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** Yes, the very first thing that they have stated is about representatives of agriculture, or agriculturists. Besides this, there is another very good and important suggestion, which seems to have receded into the background, and that is about the Prices Intelligence Division. Without a Prices Intelligence Division, it is impossible for any body, whether non-official or official, to really function. For, only the wholesale index of prices does not give the trend about the sectional variations of prices of produce, of market arrivals, imbalances that are created thereby and so on. And we have seen what a mess we have made on the question of statistics. Even among Ministers, we find contradictory figures. One Minister gave us the deficit in West Bengal, two days before, as being 6 lakhs tons. Two days afterwards, on the 26th January, it became 12 lakhs tons. This kind of thing is continuously happening. I do not know why this kind of difference should be there.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** Chinese way of statistics!

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** We should give up this way of having statistics and completely misleading this House.

Then, there was a suggestion made in regard to the price stabilisation board. It was more or less suggested as a high-powered or high-level body, properly integrated with the machinery of decisions within Government on economic questions. That was why they suggested that there should be representatives of the Planning Commission, of the Reserve Bank of India, of the Ministries of Food and Agriculture, Finance, Commerce and Industry and Railways. This kind of committee alone could deal effectively with the problem of price stabilisation, examining not only food prices but other related consumer and producer goods prices etc. They would keep a constant watch over the situation, making a realistic assessment not only of current trends but of future prospects, and prescribing measures to be taken in different circumstances.

The fourth important suggestion which was made was regarding the foodgrains stabilisation organisation. The Foodgrains Inquiry Committee did not say that immediately we have to jump into wholesale monopoly procurement, but they did say that we have to go on steadily increasing the arena of what they called the socialisation of trade. The machinery through which you will have to do that may have to be, partly, the wholesale traders, those who are not licensed to sell part of what they procure themselves and thus making profits as they like. But, the Committee have also suggested that you will have to have your own organisation in the mandis making open market purchases. We have to do these things. That is why this is a very important organisation that has to be set up.

Actually, when the debate took place here on sugar scarcity, the Food Minister, Shri Patil said that we are going to have such a body within two months when we will see the prices coming down. That promise yet remains to be actually implemented in practice.

If State trading has to be successful it must be built on a widespread basis of cooperatives; and if cooperatives have to be successful, it will also depend on how effectively State trading is given effect to. The N.D.C. has made it very clear also at the last meeting. Actually, the entire thing has to be taken into consideration. We have been speaking again and again that if cooperatives are to be successful there must be successful land reforms. But often what we say is immediately dismissed as ideological fad.

Here is the Community Development Evaluation made by the United Nations Programme of Technical Assistance. What is it that they have said? They have actually gone into this entire question of the formation of cooperatives. They have said,

"The current proposal for State monopoly of the grain trade cannot succeed unless there is a vast network of local co-operatives for storing and selling grain."

At this stage I do not propose to go into this whole question of the failure of the warehousing programme. As regards this yet we are for short of our targets. The U.N. Committee go on to say:

"Marketing co-operatives should form a major part of any plan for national or State marketing of agricultural products, particularly of foodgrains, and producer co-operatives should indeed be the foundation of a national marketing plan."

Then, they go on to say what are the obstacles to co-operation. They say:

"The obstacles to co-operation are not merely a matter of organisation; they are also closely related to the social structure in village society."

This is where the question of land distribution and the breaking up of the monopoly on land and the breaking up of hold of the money lenders comes. This is one of the main things that they have brought out and they have said this.

"Some reduction of economic inequalities would probably help in this matter; hence the importance of land reform measures (such as 'ceiling') which, as already stated, should on no account be unduly delayed."

"A real community of interests between money-lender and debtor, between landowner and share-cropper, who receives half of the crop while bearing the entire cost of cultivation, is obviously not easy to establish."

So this is a very important point. We have harped on it on many occasions. It is stated that we have on paper many land reform laws. But, what has happened? Actually, these laws are not implemented at the village level. On that point, they say:

"...failure to abide by the provisions of the law saps a village's community spirit, the community development authority should be empowered to step in."

That is to see and ensure that proper enforcement of the law is actually there. It gives the example of the share-cropper's right and the tenants' rights and say that all these are not actually implemented. So this is very important.

Regarding production, I do not like to go much into it because our second speaker will deal with it. There is only one point, or rather two, which I would stress, the question of credit and minor irrigation. On the question of credit, there is a report of

July 1959 which shows that the loans advanced increased from Rs. 25 crores to Rs. 198 crores. But, there is one feature. In this report, they say that the number of State cooperatives fell from 23 to 21. The number of individual membership shows much larger decline than in preceding 2 years. We should like to know whether this is due to the amalgamation of the various State Cooperative Banks; because, as far as we know, it is the primary units that have been amalgamated and not the State Cooperative Banks. Then, also it says that the Central cooperatives fell from 451 to 418, though the working capital, deposits and loans advanced increased. It says that the position of the societies earning profit has gone down. Now, the question is, is it because the base has been widened; is it because a large number of peasants not having security of land have been given loans. But I find from the report of the Technical Assistance Evaluation Committee of the United Nations that actually it is not so. They say that the majority of people who have received loans has been the richer sections of the peasantry and as yet it has not become broad-based.

Therefore, I would like the Minister to tell us the reason. These recommendations have also found force with the Ford Foundation. They have said two things. One is that creditworthiness should not be based on the assets, that is land, but should be on the prospects of the future crops. That is the first principle. The poor share-cropper who does produce a quite substantial portion of the total production in our country should also get the credit facilities. I think, this is very important. They have said that the primary societies must be improved for the extension of credit and that they believe that there should be no due date by which time Government advances should be repaid because, they say, it is necessary to give a period of time, a sufficiently long

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

period of time for capital formation at the local level. This is very important.

Then, there is the question of minor irrigation. The United Nations Technical Assistance Programme people have very clearly stated that, in the blocks which are supposed to have quite a bit of the minor irrigation work under them, the achievement amounts to not more than 30 to 40 per cent of the original targets and in some areas nothing at all has been achieved. Not only that. In an article which I read by one of the Members of the Technical Evaluation Committee, it is stated by one of the members, Reno Dumont that last year the Damodar river supplied only 2,000 hectares of water in comparison with a target of 4,00,000 hectares altogether—that is the target in the rainy season. And, that last year, out of 6.4 million acres which the First Plan provided with irrigation facilities only about 1.6 million acres were, in fact, irrigated.

This is a point which Dr. Ram Subhag Singh has raised with force on many occasions. This point of minor irrigation is a very very important one and as yet we find that this is the thing. The allocations are made under various heads, under Irrigation and Power, Community Development, under Food and Agriculture, under the G.M.F. schemes and various other schemes. They have got to be integrated. Not only that; but quick decisions have to be taken.

I know myself that in one of my areas in my constituency, it requires drainage. Without drainage a huge area of some thousands of acres is inundated. For 4 years I have been trying. We have got money allocated also. For four years, in this Kararabad area, we have not been able to do this. If this is the position, my hon. friend will come forward and say the same thing about many other

areas with this slow pace of progress, with all the best intentions in the world, we find that we are not able to progress on this question of minor irrigation.

With these few words I say that it is necessary to give much more thought and take really concrete steps. We have had report after report, evaluation committee after committee and as yet we have neither been able to hold the price line nor have we been able to really bring about a big break through in the way of increased production. We have not been able even to do much with the question of minor irrigation, with the question of going apace with credit facilities so that the money-lenders who are yet taking 80 or 85 per cent of the money in the village areas are not loosening their stranglehold on the peasants.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, today there is a general recognition without exception of the fact that all efforts must be combined to bring about self-sufficiency in food. It is also a very gratifying thing to know that the N.D.C. have decided that the holding of the price level is of paramount importance.

**Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):** What about the Chief Ministers?

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** I am talking about the Chief Ministers' Conference.

The rough outline of the Third Plan that has come out shows that Rs. 600 crores are available for the Agriculture Ministry and Rs. 400 crores for Community Development. At the very outset I should like to say that this lack of integration between different Ministries—the hon. Member who preceded me also spoke about it—does impede the progress of our plans to a very large extent in regard to raising the level of agricultural production. I do not hold any particular opinion as to which should be the means through which the work should be executed. I suppose the

word 'agriculture' denotes that it is the Agriculture Ministry but in any case there should be integration between all these Ministries in a proper manner. There is no coordination and it is very difficult for us to find out what funds have been utilised for what purpose. It is not merely a question of the allocation of funds but it is a question of actual utilisation of funds. This is something we have been asking for year after year, but somehow this complete picture has never been placed before us.

**Shri Tyagi:** Confused picture.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** According to the Ministry's report we find there is an increase of 6 per cent in the year 1958-59 over the production of 1956-57 and 14.3 per cent over that of 1957-58 which was a bad year. But the Report says that in spite of the large increase in output, that is 6 per cent, the price in 1958-59 did not show a corresponding improvement. This is what is stated in their own Report. It is certainly the position that we see around the country.

Again, the total quantity of food-grains that had to be imported during the year 1959 was 38.7 lakh tons which is higher than in the years immediately preceding it. As the figures show, the food production this year was 73.5 million tons and the extra stocks from Government including imports amounted to 4.4 million tons that were to be utilised. Thus 70.9 million tons or, say, 78 million tons—I think my figures are more or less accurate—is the figure that had to be utilised according to demands. I feel that in view of this position we are facing a very serious situation in the coming year firstly because there is a population increase of 2 per cent and secondly because of the rising standard, though it is slight but it is there. Therefore, the effective demand will go up to 80 or 81 million tons. You have estimated the food production at 73.5 million tons. May I know whether that will be maintained? The indications are not very helpful. For example, take the case of rice—50

per cent of cereals is rice production. Last year, the drop in rice production was from 118 to 99 and this year it has dropped from 113 to 105 and it is a much lesser drop. That does not augur well for the future. There is also a doubt with regard to wheat crop.

Under these circumstances, I would ask the hon. Minister whether there is any reason to paint such a rosy picture as the Report shows because it would be much better not to be complacent. For myself I do not want to suggest any counsel of despair. I do not believe in such things and I am glad that the Ministry does not go in for that. But at the same time I feel a little despondent because it might have an effect on the working and implementation of our plans.

The Ministry has explained some of the difficulties which are, of course, due to floods in West Bengal and in some of the districts of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bombay, Mysore and Jammu and Kashmir and also droughts in U.P. All the same, in some of the parts where they had been expecting a fairly bumper crop, the actual production was not very much less and in fact in some cases it was not less than the level of production of the preceding year. That shows that we cannot say that we are entirely at the mercy of Nature.

Now, Sir, why should we not have started earlier some of the long-term measures? I am going to mention something which the Minister always expects from me. I have to mention it because it is an absolute fact, namely, the delay in the construction of Farakha Barrage on the Ganges. There had been unprecedented floods in 1956 and also there were unprecedented floods in 1959 in West Bengal. They were all due to the fact that the construction of Farakha Barrage which is also necessary for the port of Calcutta has not even been started. It will take years to complete. We have not started on some of these

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

long-term measures which are of absolute importance even in regard to the maintenance of the crops that grow because floods destroy these crops.

Speaking about smaller things, I do not want to divert the little time that I have from agricultural production which is the most significant thing, but I would like to say one thing and that is, that we have in our country paid very little attention to the protection of the crops. After all, we are at the mercy of Nature and so many crops fail. As I have seen in my own constituency during previous years, and also in other parts of West Bengal and Bihar the crops have grown up high but they fail on account of pests and diseases. The machines that you require for spraying and various other things and the insecticides, for all these things you have not got proper measures. It is just like the sick persons who are not being properly treated. Of course, it is true about human beings also and for human beings we are setting up more health-centres, but, for the crops on which the human beings have to live we also ought to do something a little more quickly. Even though it is true that we have improved the administrative side to some extent—it is a great improvement—but there is lack of co-ordination, synchronisation and all that. Although it has come down to some extent, it is still very much there.

Now the question of food policy arises. I know the estimate in the Third Plan is that we shall attain self-sufficiency in food. If we do that, there is nothing like that. But we have not given proper consideration to the geometrical increase of population. Though we talk a great deal about it, even where the demand is there we are surprised to hear that the implements required for controlling the birth-rate and the size of families are not supplied; they are not made in India and they are not even imported in sufficient quantities. The Health Minister, I think, will bear me out

on this point. I am sure this is more important to the Food Ministry at least from a materialistic point of view than to the Health Ministry. That is why I have brought it up here.

**Shri Tyagi:** We must share his budget for it.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** I come to the recent decision taken by the N.D.C.—it has come in today's paper—that the price level is to be maintained. I am glad, because nothing is more important today.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are they vigorously carrying on similar propaganda for family planning in China?

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** I do not know about China.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** In China they are doing it now.

**Shri Tyagi:** Divorce is the only cure

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** The propaganda about family planning is done in the United States also.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** The most important factor, as I was saying, until we reach self-sufficiency in food is the maintenance of the price level. How do we do this. It is no use wavering among policies of *laissez faire* and controls which are half-hearted controls, regulations which are no regulations and movement restrictions which are provocative and irritating and zonal systems which do not operate. It is perfectly true that the zonal system has created more problems than solving them I do not believe in *laissez faire* economy at all, when we are in short supply and if we have to maintain the price level we will have to do certain things. But if you believe in *laissez faire* economy, why do you have these movement restrictions instead of having one zone for the country as a whole? Even in this zone—West Bengal-Orissa zone—there is not much sign of improvement and I do not know if

Madhya Pradesh and Bombay were made one zone, it would be better. Why not leave the whole country free for movement of foodgrains, when you believe in letting the demand and supply have a free run. I personally think that if the price level is to be held, we have to take two things into consideration. First of all, the price level cannot be held if the food prices, the prices of cereals are allowed to go up. On them, depend the prices of others. You may speak about the cultivator. The cultivator is very important, no doubt.

**Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana):** Have you considered the cost of food production?

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** I am just coming to that. In regard to the cultivator, I would say this. Once you have computed the minimum price level that should be maintained, the cultivator can be helped in a better way. He need not be helped by just allowing the prices to go skyrocketing. If you want to help the cultivator, we should provide him with certain facilities like fertiliser, etc. Let him have every facility to increase his yield per acre. We are not doing much there though we talk about it. If we do that, we can keep the price level stable. If such a price level was maintained in regard to food, the cultivator himself will reap the benefit from it because the price of goods that he buys, correspondingly, would not go sky high. It is an important and fundamental principle of economics and I was happy to know that the NDC—the National Development Council—had more or less come to realise this point.

If we did all this, eventually, I think, an efficient system of price will emerge.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member's time is up.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** Just a few minutes more, Sir. A system of distribution with priorities is essential. It is the only way out when supply

is so short of demand. I have been advocating this earlier and I repeat it today. The last speaker spoke about the Asoka Mehta Committee's report. She went into details of it and I do not want to recount what she has said. But I do maintain that we could have implemented some at least of the major recommendations. For instance, it has been suggested that the price stabilisation policy is possible only if there is a stabilisation board, for foodgrains prices especially. That has not been done.

So far as State trading is concerned, what is it if taken to its logical conclusion? I do agree that just State trading in the air will not help. The logical conclusions that flow from it have to be gone into and brought in until we become self-sufficient in foodgrains production. One can see that in the NDC meetings also—as reports appear in the newspapers—these things are gone into. Maintenance of the price level and the distribution of food to the citizens in a welfare State are both of great and urgent importance. When we have attained self-sufficiency in food when self-sufficiency comes after checking the population growth as well as increasing the food production, manifold or thousandfold, of course we can do away with controls. The ideal of free flow of demand and supply can come in then. I particularly plead for the children of this country, for those who are the future citizens and every child has a right to a sufficient quantity of nutritious food. When we import food from outside the country, surely that is the least that we can do. I do not say that a great deal is not being done. I know that famine conditions are averted although the natural conditions are bad in many years. Food is being supplied to people and crores of rupees are spent on relief measures. All this is there. These can only be obviated by our long-term measures coming in and our short-term measures being implemented properly, giving fruitful results.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani.



**The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas):** It is a ladies' day. . . . (Interruptions).

**An Hon. Member:** That too from West Bengal.

**Shri Tyagi:** They catch your eye very easily!

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi):** We are concerned with kitchen more.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sure every hon. Member goes and sits in front of his sister or mother for food every day; therefore, I am giving them an opportunity.

**Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):** I am an exception in this respect.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** This year's food grain production has been the highest on record, namely, 73.5 million tons and this is a matter of gratification. The index of agricultural production declined from 123.6 to 114.6 in 1956-57.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** 1957-58.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** Not only have we made up this decline but it has risen sharply to 131. In fact, inspite of fluctuations there is an unmistakable evidence of expansion of foodgrains production and the average rate of growth is 3.4 per cent per year which does not compare so unfavourably with the other regions of the world. . . . (An Hon. Member: How is it?) It is also noteworthy, that the growth since the advent of planning has been more rapid than the previous decade. In the preceding decade, the average level of production was 50 million tons but in this decade it has never gone down below 62.3 per cent. No doubt all this improvement is due to the formulation and implementation of various development programmes in the field of agriculture.

In the very first page of the report of the Food Ministry, they say that

the increased food production has helped to relieve the difficult price situation. Unfortunately, I do not quite agree with this remark of the Ministry because we find that the price is continuously rising. It may have helped the situation a little. But even the tables given in the *Economic Survey* show a different picture. It says that the food price index 118.2 in 1959—the highest on record, the figures for the two preceding years being 106.6 and 112. We also know the various causes to which this price rise is due but I do not wish to go into the details of it. I would only like to draw your attention to one aspect. In our country a psychology has developed among the producers as well as the traders whereby a marginal surplus is turned into a deficit and a marginal deficit is turned into a huge deficit. If there is a slight production decline, the market arrivals are much less than are justified and consequently the prices rise leading to hoarding, black-marketeering and other things. Our experience of the First and Second Plans teaches us that stabilisation of food prices and increase in agricultural production are, and will remain, the basic task of the Third Plan. Because without price stabilisation, as has been emphasised by the other speakers, the plan expenditure goes up, and then in spite of high financial expenditure, we do not get matching results in physical terms. A vicious circle is thus created. The costs increases creating more and more difficulties for the Plan implementation.

Therefore, Sir, a solution has to be found. One solution is to build up a substantial reserve, a big buffer stock which will check rise in prices. The difficulties in this connection are of procurement within the country for building up this buffer stock when there is expectation of a rise in prices. At such a time if procurement is made it leads to further rise in prices. But I do not contend that there should not be any procurement within the country; all that I wish to say is that procurement should not

be made when there is scarcity. When it is unavoidable, procurement should be made from richer sections, sometimes even compulsorily. But foreign stocks in time of need must be secured. This would dampen the profiteering psychology and facilitate procurement at proper prices. Therefore, there is an absolute need for a sufficiently big buffer stock, whether we get it from our country or whether we get it from outside. It is unpopular to talk of foreign imports, but it cannot be helped under the present conditions.

In this connection, Shri Patil's original plan of negotiation with some countries, especially USA, for storing part of their disposable stocks was worth considering. It had the merit of not involving us in advance, in foreign expenditure or even loans. While the presence of stocks in our country would have had a psychological effect on the market and also in time of need, we would have got the stocks quickly avoiding shipping bottlenecks etc. I do not know, for some reason or the other this scheme has been given up. Perhaps it may be still in the offing; if that is so, I think that is the best thing that we could have.

Against this, there is an argument that if we import from outside the States become complacent, their efforts towards production get relaxed and this acts as a disincentive. But we have to realise that stabilisation of prices is the biggest task as far as the Plan is concerned. The entire Plan depends on that. Therefore, in order to stabilise the price we may have to import foreign stocks for the time being. It may be a necessary evil, but we have to do it and we must face the situation.

This brings me to the question of increased food production and allocation for agriculture in the Third Plan because, after all, price stabilisation can only come when we increase our production. It is agreed

that increase in food and agricultural production will help to solve our foreign exchange problem, export problem and price stabilisation problem.

Let us take the foreign exchange problem. This cannot be solved because we have heavy import requirements. Even if we defer payments today, debts accumulate and sometime or the other we will have to discharge those debts. The only way way to get over the foreign exchange problem is increased agricultural production.

Let us then take the export problem. This too cannot be solved without additional agricultural production. I shall only give a few examples. Take the case of cotton. When raw cotton production falls, the cost of cotton manufacture rises and it becomes less competitive in the export market. A ceiling on cloth production also comes to be indirectly fixed thereby. Again, take the question of jute. When there is a fall in the quality of raw jute, jute manufacturers face trouble in the export market. Otherwise, in spite of substitutes, cheap and good jute manufacture can hold ground. Then I come to the case of oilseeds. Because of insufficient production of oilseeds, vegetable oils cannot be exported in large quantities as we used to do. Our exports have dwindled. Because of insufficient production of potatoes, onions etc. Though there is a very good market in South-East Asia where we banned export of these commodities. Therefore, our exports can be built up only when our agricultural production has been stepped up to a great extent. If we try to export under the present conditions, it will only create an imbalance in the structure of prices at home.

Let us see what is the true position with regard to production. We have increased our production to a great extent, but our productivity per acre is the lowest yet in the world. The average production of wheat per hectre in India during the

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

period 1948—52 was about 6.6 thousand kilograms. It rose to 7,000 kilograms by 1957, about six per cent rise in five to six years or about one per cent per year. During the same period rice and cotton rose by about 6 per cent and 11 per cent respectively.

The F.A.O. Year Book, in this connection, tells us that in spite of developmental activities, better techniques and methods, more fertilizers, improved irrigation facilities, the productivity of the various crops has not registered the increase that it should have. Therefore, it is worthwhile for the Food Minister to give special attention to this aspect of the situation.

I am afraid, a very grave situation will arise if food production falls short of the target in the coming years. It is calculated that in order to cope with the increased population we should have 105 million tons as the target in the Third Plan. If there is a shortfall, what will be the consequences? Our recent experience has shown, as I have already referred, that a shortfall of three million tons leads to a shrinkage in the market arrivals of the order of 7 million tons to 9 million tons. The effect of a multiple of the shortage is felt by the people on a still higher level. Therefore, if in the Third Plan production rises, say, to 95 million tons from the 1959 level of 73 million tons, even then there will be a shortage of about 10 million tons to 15 million tons. The impact of this shortage on the market and a multiple of the shortage falling on the people will be of the order of 30 million tons to 40 million tons. This will be a terrible disaster.

How, then, are we to ensure the increase of food production of necessary volumes? That brings me to the question of allocation. I do not know, but the hon. Minister is here and he will enlighten us as to whether there has been a tussle going on between

his Ministry and the Ministry of Planning on the matter of allocation, whether his Ministry has demanded Rs. 1,000 crores and the Planning Ministry has conceded only Rs. 600 crores. Now, can this outlay bring the desired results, that is what we have to consider? In the Second Plan the outlay was Rs. 350 crores. That has given us an increase of 10 million tons. How do we expect the increase of 25 to 30 million tons with an investment of only Rs. 600 crores? This morning we had some figures announced by the National Development Council, that only Rs. 1,000 crores have been allotted both for Community Development and Agriculture together. I do not know how the break up is within this figure. But there is a general impression that for agriculture too much money is not needed and more money is needed only for industries. The impression is that for industries you need money from the beginning to the end but for agriculture you can spend money up to a certain level and then leave the rest to the people. This, I think, is a very unrealistic assessment of the situation. In countries where they have really brought about good improvement in their agricultural production they have found that only with proper investment do they get proper returns. Therefore, Sir, I should think that a proper allocation should be made for agriculture and it should not be mixed up with other items connected with the agricultural problem if we want to achieve the target we have set before us.

Therefore, a lot of re-thinking is necessary in this regard. People think that popular efforts will bring about this result. I am one who believes in it, but what have we seen in these years? In spite of all efforts popular effort has not in any measurable extent helped agricultural production. If that kind of popular effort has to be brought about, it cannot be left on this Ministry alone,

it is a matter which has to be looked into by this Ministry, the Government, all political parties and all popular organisations. That means there should be very great co-ordination between the Ministry, the people and the various parties. Is it possible under the present set-up to bring about that kind of a co-ordination?

Sir, while popular effort will yield results in the matter of food production, food production is a matter which cannot be left to its fate. Therefore, refusal to allocate larger funds to the Ministry of Agriculture based on this reasoning is defective. In case of failure to reach the target the Food Ministry will be made the scapegoat. Sir, I hold no brief for the Food Minister, but this position is illogical. Therefore, we must strike a balance. For a minimum increase with which we can somehow manage the country's food situation, we should depend entirely on the Government's extension programme in agriculture that is, on official machinery, and for the balance depend on popular efforts. Therefore, I raise my voice strongly that more allocation should be made for agriculture, because I think that of all the projects that we have in the Third Plan this is the most important project and we must give sufficient money to it.

Another point, to which reference has been made by hon. Members who spoke before me, is about the lack of co-ordination between the various Ministries dealing with agriculture. We have the Ministry of Food, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Community Development and the Ministry of Irrigation and other Ministries. For the time being I am only taking into consideration the Ministry of Community Development. The Ministry of Community Development is supposed to devote 80 per cent of its task for the development of agriculture. I would like to see a better co-ordination among these three departments. I do not know much about the working of C.D. projects, but I have visited block areas

and what did I see? If there are six officers at the block, out of these six, one is an agricultural expert, and that one agricultural expert is so much buried under the files that he has no time to go out and see how the work is done. There is not only a lack of co-ordination among these three departments but in some places you find an atmosphere of rivalry, each pulling the other way. Therefore, we want a complete co-ordination not only at the ministerial level but it must percolate down to the lowest level. Only then some substantial results can be achieved.

13 hrs.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister on two things. Firstly, about the lead he has given in allowing private sector to start small and medium fertiliser factories in the States. The scheme will help increase fertiliser production without impinging on the Plan resources. Secondly, the package plan. I do not know the details of the plan, but the idea of having one model district in each State is welcome. This will mean intensive work in specified areas where the Government will supply the technical knowledge and other wherewithals—popular efforts will be harnessed. It would be possible to check the achievements and find out the defects. If we can work in a proper way in these areas, we will be in a position to assess the difficulties and the defects of our work and correct the defects.

Now, I should like to sound a note of warning. Along with fertilisers we should also step up soil testing programmes properly. Because, if the soil testing programme lags behind the production of fertilisers, it will lead to disastrous results, namely, the erosion of land and antipathy of the people. We have seen what is happening in many areas. In the first one or two years, the yield is good and then the land is exhausted. Therefore, it is essential to find out what should be the combination of the fertiliser for each plot. So, greater

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

emphasis on soil testing should be laid and more work should be done in that field.

Sir, as you have rung the bell, I do not wish to continue. I would like to emphasise, and add my voice to that of other hon. Members who have spoken before me, that much greater attention should be paid to the aspect of giving credit facilities to the cultivators. Our cultivators are experienced, and they are good workers. They know their job. But they have not got the facilities that they need. If credit is given to them and irrigational facilities are given to them, I am sure they can give good results.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (हिसार) :

जनाब स्पीकर साहब, अभी बहुत सी तकरीरें प्राइसिज और दूसरी चीजों के मुतालिक हमारी बहनों ने कीं। प्राइस स्टैबिलाइजेशन एक दक्कीक सबजेक्ट है और अगर मैं उस दक्कीक सबजेक्ट में पड़ा, तो वे मोटी मोटी बातें रह जायेंगी, जिन को मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं।

सब से अग्वल तों मैं उस बात की तरफ तबज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूं, जिस के बारे में मैं चन्द मर्तबा पहले भी कह चुका हूं। इस सिलसिले में हमारा जो सब से बड़ा ड्राबैक है, वह हमारी कांस्टीच्यूशनल डिफ़िकल्टी है। जब तक इस कांस्टीच्यूशनल को ठीक नहीं किया जायगा, मुझे डर है कि सैलफ-सफ़िनेन्सी और फूड प्राबलम का यह मामला तय नहीं होगा। जिस वक्त हम कांस्टीच्यूएन्ट असेम्बली में थे, तो हम ने आर्टिकल ३६९ उस में रखा था। उस आर्टिकल की वजह से सेंटर को यह अस्तियार दिया गया था कि जहां तक इन चीजों का सवाल है, फूड का सवाल है, उन पर सेंटर को अस्तियार दिया गया। पांच बरस खत्म हो चुके और दफा ३६९ खत्म हो चुकी। फिर डिफ़िकल्टीज आईं, तो हम ने एसेम्बल कामोडिटीज एक्ट पास किया। उस के पास करने से वह प्राबलम हल नहीं होती,

जो दरअसल सेंटर की पूरी जिम्मेदारी होने से हल होती है। आज के दिन जो सब से खराब बात है, वह यह है कि सेंटर और स्टेट्स में डिवाइडिड रसपांसीबिलिटी है। यह बात मही है कि सेंटर की बात पर स्टेट्स मुनासिब तरीके से चलना तो पसन्द करेंगी और कहना भी पसन्द करेंगी कि हम उस पर चलते हैं, लेकिन दरअसल वे उस पर चलने को तैयार नहीं हैं। यह बात हम सिर्फ फूड के मामले में ही नहीं देखते, एनिमल हसबैंड्री और एग्रीकल्चर में भी देखते हैं, जिस का नतीजा यह है कि आज सेंटर स्टेट्स को रूल नहीं करता है, बल्कि स्टेट्स सेंटर को रूल करती हैं। अगर आप पिछले चन्द बरसों की हिस्ट्री को देखें, तो पता लगेगा कि जो १३५० करोड़ रुपये बाहर से फूड मंगाने पर खर्च किये गये, वह स्टेट्स की मेहरबानी से और गफलत से और स्टेट्स के सेंटर का कहना न मानने से खर्च करने पड़े। आप पुरानी हिस्ट्री को देखिए। सेंटर ने हुकम किया कि प्रोब्योरमेंट करो, लेकिन कोई स्टेट पूरे तौर पर प्रोब्योरमेंट नहीं करती थी और लिख कर भेज देती थी कि इतना गल्ला मंगाओ, नहीं तो हम भूखे मर जायेंगे। कई दफा इस बारे में तहकीकात हुई। मुझे याद है कि श्री जैन के जमाने में एक कमेटी भेजी गई कि वह उन डिमांड्स को असेस करे। उस से मालूम हुआ कि स्टेट्स की डिमांड्स बहुत इनफ़्लैटिड थीं। एक दफा का मुझे और याद है—गालिबन वह १९५३-५४ था—जब स्टेट्स ने आठ मिलियन टन की डिमांड की। इस पर सेंटर ने यह डायरेक्टिव दिया कि इतना गल्ला मंगाया जायगा, लेकिन जो स्टेट्स चाहती हैं, वे उस के लिए इतना रुपया जमा करा दें। इस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि स्टेट्स ने एक त्रफ़ने में अपनी डिमांड्स आधी कर दीं।

मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि स्टेट्स में फ़िलवाके न तो इस मामले में कोई अरजेंसी है और न ही वे सेंटर के हुकम पर पूरे तौर पर अमल करती हैं। आज ही इस जमाने में हम

जानते हैं कि जोन बनाने के लिए मध्य प्रदेश और बम्बई को मिलाने के बारे में आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब की क्या राय है। लेकिन हम क्या देखते हैं? बम्बई में ३५ रुपये मन गेहूँ बिकता है। मैं ने अपने एक रिश्तेदार से बम्बई में गेहूँ का भाव पूछा, तो उस ने बताया कि वहाँ पर ३५ रुपये मन गेहूँ वह लेते हैं। मध्य प्रदेश में गेहूँ साढ़े ग्यारह रुपये मन है।

12.06 hrs.

[SHRI MULCHAND DUBE in the Chair]

मैं नहीं समझता कि किसी भी तरह यह मुमकिन है कि सेंटर इस तरह के मुस्तलिफ़ भाव चाहता है। मैं कई बार पहले भी कह चुका हूँ कि सब तो यह है कि मैं तो हिन्दुस्तान में स्वराज्य आया नहीं समझता, जब तक कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में एक ही प्राइस सारे सीरियल्स की नहीं होती, सिवाय इस बात के कि ट्रांसपोर्ट की वजह से, अगर कहीं ज्यादा गल्ला पैदा हुआ है, कीमत ज्यादा कम हो जाये। जब तक यह नहीं होता, जब तक इस का सेंटिस-फ़ैक्टरी हल नहीं होता, तब तक कांस्टीच्युशन की दफ़ा १४ किसी काम की नहीं है। लेकिन यह कैसे मुमकिन है, जब एक जोन बनाने में इतनी हुज्जत है? मध्य प्रदेश कहता है कि हम नहीं शामिल होते हैं। एक जोन बनाने में इतनी हुज्जत है, तो मैं नहीं समझता कि सेंट्रल मिनिस्ट्री क्या कर सकती है। वह सिर्फ़ यह कर सकती है कि उन्होंने रोना रोया कि हम को इतना गल्ला चाहिए, चाहे कितनी ही पैदावार हो, तो फिर उतना गल्ला वह मंगाया और उतने का उतना आता है। सन् १९५१ में हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब और एग््रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर साहब ने फ़रमाया था कि दस परसेंट की कमी है। आज हमें पता है कि ३६ परसेंट पैदावार बढ़ गई है। इतनी पैदावार कभी नहीं हुई, जितनी कि पिछले साल हुई यानी ७३.५ मिलियन टन, लेकिन अब के भी हम देखते हैं कि ३८ लाख मंगाया जा रहा है,

१४१ करोड़ रुपया पिछले साल खर्च हो चुका है और इस साल के लिए भी कोशिशें हो रही हैं। मैं यह भ्रजं करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक बाहर से गल्ला आता रहेगा और उस की यहाँ पर जरूरत रहेगी, मैं समझता हूँ कि उस वक्त तक इस देश का कल्याण नहीं होगा।

अब मैं श्री पाटिल की एक दूसरी तरकीब सुनता हूँ—उन्होंने वह बड़ी नेक-नीयती से की होगी, लेकिन मुझे वह पसन्द नहीं है। वह चाहते हैं कि पचास लाख टन गल्ला अमरीका से यहाँ पर आये और यहाँ पर वह बतोर बफ़र स्टॉक रहे। मैं भ्रजं करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं बफ़र स्टॉक के तो हक में हूँ, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे कंट्री में ही वह बफ़र स्टॉक इकट्ठा किया जाये और हमारे कंट्री का ही बफ़र स्टॉक बने। बाहर से गल्ला आयेगा, तो वह वापस नहीं जायगा। उस की कीमत हम को देनी पड़ेगी और उस का असर यह होगा कि कई बरसों तक हम उस कीमत पर रहन हो जायेंगे। आज सरकार यह करे कि जितना लैंड रेवेन्यू वह लेती है, वह काइंड में ले, बटाई के जरिये से ले। जिस जिस सरकार की जमीन है, उन की बटाई के जरिये से ले ले। यह नैचरल चीज सरकार के पास आ जायगी और फिर वह प्रोक्योरमेंट कराये। मैं यह भ्रजं करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक फ़्लोर प्राइस और सीलिंग प्राइस मुकरंर नहीं की जायगी, तब तक यह मामला तय नहीं होगा। फ़्लोर प्राइस वह कि जिस पर अगर किसान चाहे तो सरकार को गल्ला दे दे और सीलिंग प्राइस वह कि जिस पर सरकार बगैर उस की शिकायत के प्रोक्योरमेंट कर ले। सरकार किसानों को फ़्लोर और सीलिंग दोनों प्राइसिज माकूल दे, ताकि वे खिन्दा भी रहें और उन के लिए इन्सेन्टिव भी रहे। अगर ये दोनों नहीं होंगे, तो क्या बनेगा सरकार की सारी स्कीमों का? दुनिया के दूसरे हिस्सों में भी फ़्लोर और सीलिंग प्राइसिज फ़िक्स्ड हैं। जब तक वे फ़िक्स नहीं की जायेंगी और जब तक हम

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भागव]

अपना बफ़र स्टॉक नहीं बनायेंगे, मेरे स्थाल में तब तक सरकार प्राइसिज़ को कंट्रोल नहीं कर सकेगी। मेरे स्थाल में यह बहुत जरूरी है कि हमारी एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्ट्री के अस्तित्-यारात बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ाये जायें। इस सिलसिले में जिन दूसरी मिनिस्ट्रीज़ का जिक्र किया गया है, मैं उन में एक और एड कर देना चाहता हूँ। जब इरिगेशन मिनिस्ट्री के फ़िगर्ज़ आयेंगे, तो हम देखेंगे कि उन्होंने बड़ी भारी तरक्की की है, देश में इरिगेशन का रकबा कितना बढ़ा दिया है। लेकिन इरिगेशन का रकबा बढ़ाने का क्या फ़ायदा है? हम प्यासी ज़मीन को सिर्फ़ पानी तो नहीं पिलाना चाहते हैं। हम तो चाहते हैं कि उस में कुछ एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस पैदा की जायें। सवाल यह है कि जितने एरियाज़ इरिगेटेड हैं, उन में से कितने ऐसे हैं, जिन में दो क्राप्स होती हैं? अगर किसी ऐसे एरिया में दो क्राप्स नहीं होती हैं, तो एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्ट्री को यह अस्तित्यार दिया जायें कि वह इरिगेशन मिनिस्ट्री का मजबूर करे कि जिस इरिगेटेड एरिया में आप दो क्राप्स पैदा नहीं करते हैं, वहां यू आर नाट इइंग यूअर इयूटी, क्योंकि उस को अस्तित्यार है कि वह वक्त पर पानी दे या न दे। अगर वह वक्त पर पानी नहीं देगी, तो यह काम सक्सेसफ़ुल नहीं होगा। रबी क्राप पर कई बार जोर लगाया गया। हमारे जिले में और दूसरी जगह बहुत लोगों में बीज और दूसरी एफ़र्ट्स, लगवाई गई लेकिन जब पानी का वक्त आया, तो बिचारे तरसते के तरसते रह गये। किसी देश में इतनी इरिगेटेड जमीन हो, तो यह बहुत नामुनामिब है कि वहां दो क्राप्स न हों। मैं एक छोटी सी बात अर्ज़ करना चाहता हूँ और उस के बाद मैं अपने असली मज़मून पर आऊंगा। जहां तक इरिगेशन का सवाल है और जहां तक सवाल है फूड का, इस देश में अब मिक्सड फ़ार्मिंग ही एक ऐसी चीज़ है, जिस में हमारा कल्याण है। मैं बहुत दफ़ा यह अर्ज़ कर चुका हूँ और एग्रीकल्चर

मिनिस्ट्री के जो एक्सपर्ट्स हैं, उन की क्वो-टेशन्ज़ यहां पर बहुत दफ़ा दे चुका हूँ और कई दूसरे मुल्कों—जैसे अरजन्टाइना, ब्राज़ील, इजिप्ट वगैरह की बात बता चुका हूँ कि वहां मिक्सड फ़ार्मिंग से लोग बहुत फ़ायदा उठाते हैं। मिक्सड फ़ार्मिंग एनिमल हसबैंड्री को फ़ायदा पहुंचाता है और फूड की प्राबलम को हज़र करता है। इन्टेन्सिव और मिक्सड फ़ार्मिंग, ये दो ही तरीके हैं, जो हमारे देश को बचा सकते हैं। इस तरफ़ पूरी तवज़ह दी जानी चाहिए और इसी में हमारे देश का कल्याण है।

अब मैं इस मज़मून को छोड़ कर और मज़मून का जिक्र करूंगा। हमारे कृष्णप्या साहब हिसार में तगरीफ़ ले गए थे। उन्होंने एक बड़ी भारी बात कही, जिस को वह कई बार दोहरा चुके हैं। उस बात में मैं सोलह आने यकीन रखता हूँ। उन्होंने फ़रमाया कि सारी इंडस्ट्रीज़ की बेस एग्रीकल्चर इंडस्ट्री है और एग्रीकल्चर की बेस एनिमल हसबैंड्री है। लेकिन यह कहने को तो ठीक है, इस में अमन मैं बिल्कुल नहीं देखता। मैं आखिरी बात यह अर्ज़ करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक एनिमल हसबैंड्री ठीक नहीं होगी, तब तक फूड की प्राबलम हरगिज़ ठीक नहीं होगी। फूड की प्राबलम हिन्दुस्तान में एनिमल हसबैंड्री पर बहुत ज्यादा डिपेंड करती है। आप दूसरे मुल्कों की तरफ़ मन देखिए। इस देश में हरगिज़ नामुमकिन है कि सरकार ज्यादा फूड पैदा कर सके, जब तक कि एनिमल हसबैंड्री की तरफ़ पूरी तवज़ह न दी जायें। इस का हाल क्या है, इस का तो जरा स्थाल फ़रमाइये। गवर्नमेंट की किताबों में मैं ने जो फ़िगर्ज़ लिए हैं, उस के हिसाब से ट्रैक्टिव पावर के हिसाब से दो करोड़ बैलों की जरूरत है। ३५ करोड़ और ५० लाख या ३६ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन कल्टीवेट करनी है। लेटेस्ट फ़िगर्ज़ ये हैं कि आठ एकड़ से ज्यादा एक पेयर आफ़ बुलाक्स काफ़त नहीं

कर सकता। अगर इस हिसाब को फँस जाये, तो मालूम होगा कि दो करोड़ बुलाक्स की जरूरत है। अगर हम ट्रैक्टिव पावर और गांवों की तरफ देखते हैं, तो जरा पुराने रिकार्ड तो देखिए, जिस को बताते हुए मुझे गमं घाती है। कई मिनिस्टर तशरीफ ला चुके। डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद यहां मिनिस्टर थे। उसके बाद श्री जयरामदास दौलत राम आए। फिर श्री मुंशी आए और फिर श्री जैन साहब आए और अब श्री पाटिल पांचवें मिनिस्टर हैं हमारी इस मिनिस्ट्री में।

श्री अ० चं० गुह (बारसाट) : बीच में किदवई साहब थे।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब : किदवई साहब बेचारे खत्म हो चुके। बाकी जिन्दा हैं। मैं अब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि किदवई साहब ने जो कुछ किया ठीक किया। मुंशी जी के बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सारी चीज, सारी स्कीम जो चली वह उनके हाथ की बनी हुई है। मैं जानता हूँ कि मुंशी जी खुद पंडित नेहरू के पास गए और चालीस पेज का नोट ले कर गए और देशमुख साहब के पास भी वे खुद गए और उन्होंने उस नोट को उनके सामने रखा। उन्होंने कहा कि इस कंट्रोल को हटा दो चूंकि मुन्क सैल्फ-सफीशेंट है फूड के मामले में, स्टारवेशन से डैप्स नहीं होती हैं लेकिन उन्होंने बिल्कुल भी उनकी परवा नहीं की। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब और देशमुख साहब ने बिल्कुल इसकी परवा नहीं की। तब मैंने मुंशी जी से कहा था कि इस्तीफा दे दो लेकिन उन्होंने इस्तीफा नहीं दिया। फिर जैन साहब आए। उन्होंने क्या किया? अब हमारे पुराने कोलीग हैं; उन्होंने मेहनत

में बहुत अच्छा काम किया है लेकिन जितना अर्सा भी वे मिनिस्टर रहे, प्लानिंग कमिशन और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की राय पर चलते रहे। जिस चीज में उनको विश्वास था, जिस चीज में उनका कनविकशन था उस चीज को वे नहीं कर सके। अब हमारे पाटिल साहब आए हैं और मैं जानता हूँ कि उनमें करेज है और जिस चीज में उनका कनविकशन है जिस चीज को वह सही समझेंगे, वही करेंगे। वह एक्सपर्ट नहीं हैं लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि एक्सपर्ट होने की कोई जरूरत भी नहीं है इस फूड प्रबलैम के मामले को हल करने के लिए। इसके लिए मैं आप कनविकशन चाहिये, Man of conviction, courage and imagination, मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किदवई साहब में क्या बात थी जिस की वजह से लोग आज भी उनको याद करते हैं। वह हमेशा अपनी जेब में इस्तीफा रखा करते थे। वे कहा करते थे कि अगर मेरी बात नहीं चलेगी तो मैं मिनिस्ट्री को नहीं चलाऊंगा। यह बात वह कई बार कह चुके थे। मुझे याद है कि एक बार पंडित नेहरू ने एक स्पीच दी थी और उसके बारे में मैंने जा कर उनसे पूछा था कि आपके इस स्पीच के बारे में क्या विचार है और क्या आप समझते हैं कि गोसंवर्धन खत्म हो चुका है, उन्होंने कहा जब तक मिनिस्टर हूँ, मेरी बात चलेगी, पंडित नेहरू को अख्यार है कि कोई भी स्पीच कर दे। मैं आज भी यही चाहता हूँ कि हमारे धानरेबल मिनिस्टर जो पॉलिसी सही समझते हैं, उस पर अमल करें, अपनी राय पर चलें, his should be the last word on the subject, मैं नहीं चाहता कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब या प्लानिंग कमिशन उसके अन्दर कोई दखल दे और उनकी अपनी जो चीज है वह खत्म हो जाए। मुझे उम्मीद है वह मेरी इस बात पर चलेंगे और इसीलिए मैं उनको मुबारिकबाद देता हूँ। उनमें करेज है कि उनका इस्तीफा जब में पड़ा हुआ है, उनको मिनिस्ट्री की जरूरत नहीं है। अगर कोई ऐसा वक्त आए जिस वक्त उनकी मर्जी के मुताबिक काम न हो सके तो उनको अपना इस्तीफा



[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

हमेशा तैयार रखना चाहिए। जब जैन साहब ने इस्तीफा दिया तो मैंने उनसे जा कर कहा था कि अगर आपने इस वजह से इस्तीफा दिया है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर और प्लानिंग कमिशन आपको अपनी मर्जी के मुताबिक काम करने नहीं देते हैं तो मैं खुश हूँ और मैं आपको मुबारकबाद देता हूँ।

श्री मू० चं० जैन (कैथल) : आप इनको भी भड़का रहे हैं।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : अगर यह भड़काना है तो मैं भड़का रहा हूँ। मैं हर एक मेम्बर के लिए यह कहने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि जब कभी कोई बात उनकी कंसेंस के खिलाफ हो, तो उनको पार्टी के खिलाफ भी वोट देना चाहिये....

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप अपने को भड़का रहे हैं।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : जब आप यहाँ पर सात लाख लोगों को रिप्रेजेंट करते हैं और आप कांस्टीट्यूशन के मुताबिक देश को सही रास्ते पर नहीं ले जाते हैं तो इससे फायदा नहीं हो सकता है।

मैं एनिमल हसबैंडरी के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। पहले डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद आए थे। उन्होंने कमेटी बनाई थी। उस कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट दी और उस रिपोर्ट के ऊपर उन्होंने कुछ भ्रमल किया। उनके बाद हमारे दूसरे दो मिनिस्टर आए और वे डरते डरते चले। उसके बाद मुंशी साहब ने गोरखधन काउंसिल बनाई। निहायत उम्दा तजवीज की और स्वीचें दीं। लेकिन आगे बढ़ने के लिए वह डरते थे, ना-मालूम क्यों डरते थे। अगर कोई मिनिस्टर अपनी कोई राय बनाता है तो वह क्यों डरता है उस राय पर भ्रमल करने से? अगर आपको यही डर है कि आप पंडित नेहरू को इस्तीफा दे दें तो बेहतर है। मैं पाटिल

साहब की राय को एनिमल हसबैंडरी के बारे में जानता हूँ और बहुत पहले से जानता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अब वक्त है जबकि ठीक तरह से देश के फायदे के लिए, ईमानदारी से जो कुछ आप करना चाहते हैं इसके लिए, करें।

आप देखें कि आज हालत क्या है। ४०—५० बरस पहले बैलों का एक एक जोड़ा ३० से ४० मन तक बोझा ढो कर ले जाता था। तब एक गाय हरियाना में १५ से २० सेर दूध देती थी और निहायत उम्दा नस्ल की वह गाय होती लेकिन आज आजादी के बाद बारह बरस में क्या हो गया है? मैंने पिछली मर्तबा भी अर्ज किया था कि आज सारे देश में, अनडिवाइडिड एंडिया में सात आउंस की औसत थी और आज पीने पांच आउंस पर-कैपिट्टा मिल्क कंजम्पशन है। क्या यह शर्म की बात नहीं है? मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अब पहले गायें इतना दूध दे सकती थीं तो आज यह हालत क्यों हो गई पहले ४१३ पौंड फी दिन और अब ३५६ पौंड। सन् १९५१ में यहाँ पर जो औसत दूध का था वह ५२ करोड़ मन साल की थी। सन् १९५६ में वह घट कर ४७ करोड़ मन रह गया, ५ करोड़ मन दूध आपके जो रिकार्ड है, उनके मुताबिक कम हो गया जिसका मतलब यह हुआ कि एक अरब रुपये का नुकसान इस मिनिस्ट्री ने पांच सालों में किया। १९५६ के बाद क्या हालत है इसका पता नहीं। मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक बार जवाब दिया था कि क्या करें हमारे कुछ रिकार्ड गलत थे और इसको सन् १९४२ में किसी ने गलत कर दिया था। लेकिन आप हमेशा इनको छापते रहे हैं। मैं १९५६ तक आपके रिकार्ड के मुताबिक कहता हूँ कि इतना नुकसान हो गया है, इसका क्या जवाब है? मैं समझता हूँ कि इसका एक ही जवाब है और वह यह है कि आपने इन पिछले बारह बरसों में इसके लिए कुछ भी खर्च नहीं किया है। मैं इसके बारे में आपके रिकार्ड कोट कर सकता

हूँ। मेरे पास वक्त नहीं है कि मैं इनको पढ़ कर सुनाऊँ लेकिन मैं आपको सफे बतला देता हूँ। फर्स्ट फाइव यीयर प्लान की रिव्यू सफे १२, और १३१ आप देख सकते हैं जहाँ पर कहा गया है कि मिल्क प्राइवशन में फ्रिज भी टच नहीं हुआ है। कब इसको आप टच करेंगे? क्या उस वक्त टच करेंगे जब डम्स डे आ जायेगा? जब ये खत्म हो जाएंगे तब क्या इसकी तरफ आप ध्यान देंगे?

फीड एंड फाडर का क्या हाल है? इसमें भी पिछले पांच दस सालों में किसी किस्म की तरक्की नहीं हुई है, फर्स्ट फाइव यीयर प्लान में कोई तरक्की नहीं हुई है। जितना रुपया दिया गया था, उसका आपने क्या किया? २६२ लाख रुपया आपने एनिमल हसबैंडरी की इम्प्रूवमेंट के लिए रखा था जिस में आपने २० लाख ही खर्च किया पहले प्लान में बमुम्ब रिपोर्ट १९५३-५४ २० लाख रुपया खर्च किया और जानवर हैं २० करोड़। आप स्थल करें कि हर साल में पहले प्लान के दौरान में आपने एक जानवर पर क्या खर्च किया है। आगे आप देखें। आपने ६७ लाख रुपया गो-मदनों के लिए रखा था, उसमें से आपने सिर्फ तीन लाख ही खर्च किया। दूसरे प्लान में आपने कुछ रुपया दिया था, मुझे पता नहीं उसमें से कितना खर्च हुआ है। इसका पता तब चलेगा जब आप रिपोर्ट देंगे। मैं हालात से वाकिफ हूँ और मैं जानता हूँ कि क्या हालत है। मेरे जिले में एक ४०,००० एकड़ का एग्रिकलचरल फार्म है, एनिमल हसबैंडरी का फार्म है जोकि सारे एशिया में सब से बड़ा है। हमारी आप खुशकिस्मती कहें या बदकिस्मती कहें कि वहाँ पर ऐसा फार्म है। श्रीमन्नारायण जी व श्री कृष्णप्पा साहब उसे थोड़ा भ्रसा हुआ देख चुके हैं। उसके अन्दर कई हजार जानवर हैं जिन में से तीन हजार से चार हजार जानवरों को कहते हैं Ranch System रेंच सिस्टम ह। रेंच सिस्टम क्या बला है, मैं नहीं जानता

मैं तो समझता हूँ कि यह रेंच सिस्टम (Wrench System) है। वे गाये एक कतरा भी दूध नहीं देती हैं। हरियाना की गायों से एक कतरा भी दूध नहीं लिया जाता है, उनको जंगलों में छोड़ दिया जाता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर मिनिस्टर साहब खुद जा कर हालत को देखें और मुझे यकीन है वह हालत को देख कर जार जार रोने लग जायेंगे। आज हिन्दुस्तान में दूसरे मुल्कों से मिल्क प्राइवट मंगाई जाती है और उस हिन्दुस्तान में जहाँ पाक दूध की नदियाँ बहती थीं। आज यहाँ पर यही हो रहा है। यहाँ के लोग आज दूध को तरसते हैं। अगर आप फिगर्स को देखें, औसत को देखें तो आप हैरान रह जायेंगे। सिवाय पंजाब के जिस की मिल्क कंजम्पशन औसत फिगर अच्छी है, १३ आउंस के करीब है, बाकी सारे हिन्दुस्तान में, असम और उड़ीसा में अगर आप देखें तो आप का पता चलेगा कि शायद वह एक आउंस या आध आउंस की नीबत है। एक गाय डेनमार्क में साढ़े दस सेर दूध रोजाना देती है लेकिन यहाँ की औसत साढ़े दस छटाक के करीब है। इस में ज्यादा जाने की जरूरत नहीं है। इस को आप आखों से देखते हैं। इस की वजूहात क्या है? पहले तो आप ने पूरा खर्च भी नहीं किया। इस के सिवा आप ने क्या किया है? फिर खर्च करने के लिये रुपया बहुत कम रखा है। ६०० करोड़ मिलेंगे या नहीं मिलेंगे, लेकिन मेरी राय में प्लानिंग कमिशन जो यह ६०० करोड़ देती है इतने कम दे कर बहुत सल्ल गलती करती है। पहले प्लान में हम ने कुछ रुपया दिया था, हमारी पैदावार २० परसेंट के करीब बढ़ी थी। दूसरे प्लान में हमेशा शिकायत होती रही, श्री जैन हमेशा कहते रहे कि मुझ को फरटिलाइजर्स के लिये सौ करोड़ दो, मैं यहाँ कुछ न कुछ कर दूँगा, लेकिन यह नहीं किया गया। तीसरे प्लान में ६०० करोड़ रुपये ही देना बड़ी सल्ल गलती करना है।

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

यो ध्रुवं परित्यज्य अर्ध्रुवं परिसेवेत ।  
ध्रुवं तस्य नश्यति अर्ध्रुवं नष्टमेव च ॥

जो चीज ध्रुव है, एप्रिफलचरल इंडस्ट्री को मैं जानता हूँ, इस को रुपया देने से देश की हालत भ्रच्छी होगी लेकिन इस की कौन परवा करेगा? इण्डस्ट्रियलाइजेशन की तरफ हम भागते हैं और ममझते हैं कि देश का कल्याण इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन में है। मैं इस के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ। लेकिन बेस को मजबूत न कर के जब हम चाहते हैं कि कुछ कर लिया जाय तो कभी काम सफल नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिये बेहतर होता कि दूसरे प्लान में ही ज्यादा रुपया दिया जाता। वह नहीं किया गया। अब तीसरे प्लान में तो ज्यादा दिया जाय। आप कहते हैं कि ६०० करोड़ और ४०० करोड़ दिया जायगा। ४०० करोड़ किस को आप दे रहे हैं? यह जो कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स के लिये आप दे रहे हैं इस के जरिये क्या हल चलाये जायेंगे? मैं जानता हूँ कि कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट में क्या-क्या होता है। मैं भी एक ब्लाक का वाइस-प्रेसीडेंट हूँ। ४०० करोड़ रुपया भी इस के जिम्मे मढ़ दिया जाय, यह जायज नहीं है। इस वास्ते मैं प्लानिंग कमिशन से दरखास्त करता हूँ कि इस एलोकेशन को वह बढ़ाये।

जनाबेवाला, दूसरी एलोकेशन को आप देखें। ८० करोड़ रुपया कागज पर लिखा जा रहा है लेकिन हम सब जानते हैं कि सेंटर में या स्टेट्स में जब कभी कट होता है, तो सब से पहले वह कट एनिमल हसबैंडरी पर होता है। यह नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि उस ८० करोड़ को बढ़ा कर आप मौ करोड़ कर दीजिये। इस का कारण यह भी है कि पिछले दो प्लान में इसके लिये कुछ भी नहीं किया गया है। जो लीवें मेक-अप करना हैं वह बहुत भारी है। मौ करोड़ से भी वह होगा या नहीं मैं नहीं जानता। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इतना रुपया रखे बगैर आप इस बजट-बचन को बिल्कुल भी साल्व नहीं कर

सकते इस को पूरा फरोग नहीं दे सकते हैं। मौ करोड़ से कम रखना एनिमल हसबैंडरी के साथ खेलना है। किसी भी जिम्मेदार व्यक्ति से पूछें, और मैं ने जिन से भी बात की है वे सभी यही चाहते हैं कि इस के लिये इतना रुपया रखा जाय, वे आप को यही कहेगा कि इस रकम को बढ़ाया जाय। इस के बारे में एक रेजोल्यूशन भी गोसंवर्धन काउंसिल में पास हुआ था। हमारे हाउस के ज्यादातर मेम्बर भी इसी राय के हैं और सभी यह चाहते हैं कि इस एलोकेशन को बढ़ा दिया जाय।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब गोसंवर्धन काउंसिल बनी उस वकत मुंगी जी की जो स्पीच हुई और अगले साल किदवई माहब की जो स्पीच हुई, उन दोनों को देखने के बाद मैं ने इस हाउस में एक रेजोल्यूशन पेश किया जिस में मैं ने अर्ज किया था कि गोसंवर्धन काउंसिल एक तमाशा बना हुआ है। तीन लाख रुपये का जिस का बजट है लेकिन काम उस के पास कुछ है नहीं। अलबत्ता जब गोप अण्टमी होता है तो उस समय रुपया खर्च कर लेते हैं और उस मौके पर लेकर बाजी कर लेते हैं और एक तमाशा जरूर कर देते हैं। इस के सिवाय कतई कोई काम नहीं करते हैं। मैं ने यह हाउस में उस के मुतालिक रेजोल्यूशन पेश किया था कि किस तरह से इस को एक स्टैंचूट बौडी बनाया जाय और गोसंवर्धन काउंसिल को ग्राडेन किया जाय। जिस बौडी का इतना रुपया दिया गया है तो कम से कम यह तो किया जाय कि उस का तीन आफिशिएल चेअरमैन हो और तीन आफिशिएल वाइस प्रेसीडेंट हो। आज जो उस में एक आफिशिएलडम नजर आती है वह खत्म हो और वहाँ पर एक नये सिरे से काम करने की इजाजत दी जाय। अब एनीमल हसबैंडरी को जो हमारी सरकार द्वारा नेग्लेक्ट किया जा रहा है और उस के नतीजे के तौर पर यह जो हमारी कौटिल ब्रीडिंग तबाह हो रही है

हरियाना ब्रीड को तबाह कर दिया है उस का अगर मैं आप को पूरा किस्सा सुनाने लगू तो आप को सुन कर बहुत दुःख होगा कि किस तरह से उस को तबाह किया गया है। चूंकि मेरे पास टाइम नहीं है इसलिये उस को इस मौके पर न सुना कर केवल यह कहूंगा कि मेरे उस प्रस्ताव को लाने के बाद जैन साहब ने मुझ से वायदा किया था कि जिम तरह आप कहते हो, मैं उस में चेंजेज कर दूंगा। अपने इस्तीफा देने से पहले उन्होंने ने अपने डिपार्टमेंट के सेक्रेटरी को बुला कर मेरे सामने हुक्म दिया कि मेरे सामने प्रपोजल्स ले कर आयें। उन्होंने ने कहा कि हम चाहते हैं कि गोसंबर्धन कौंसिल को ब्रीडन किया जाय और सरकार एनिमल हस्बैंडरी के वास्ते और अधिक रुपया रखे और देखे कि अब तक जो उसकी नेगलेक्ट होती आई है वह आयन्दा न हो। ५ वर्ष में देख लिया था कि मिनिस्ट्री ने एनिमल हस्बैंडरी के वास्ते कुछ काम नहीं किया था, उस को नेगलेक्ट किया था और फिलवाकया उस ने उस चीज को तबाह ही किया है। गवर्नमेंट ने उसके काम को ध्यान नहीं बढ़ाया है। अब जिस रोज बदकिस्मती में मैं उन के घर गया तो उन्होंने ने अपना इस्तीफा मेरे सामने रख दिया और मुझे कह दिया मैं ने तो मंत्रिमंडल से इस्तीफा दे दिया है। खैर अब आप उन की जगह पर आ गये हैं और आप ने ६ महीने का समय ले लिया है। ठीक भी है जो काम गांच-त्रिचार करके होता है और वह सही होता है और ऐसा कर के आप ने कोई गलती नहीं की है। लेकिन मैं अब आप को कहना चाहता हूँ कि हाउस में आप की मिनिस्ट्री की डिमांड्स चल रही हैं और मैं चाहता हूँ कि जब मंत्री महोदय जवाब दें तो इस बात का साफ एलान कर दें कि वह गो संबर्धन कौंसिल को ब्रीडन करना चाहते हैं और उन की यह मंशा है कि इस कौंसिल द्वारा व्यापक रूप से ऐनीमल हस्बैंडरी का काम किया जाय। स्वर्गीय किदवाई साहब व मुष्ठी जी ने अपनी स्पीचेज में कहा था कि वह इस गो संबर्धन कौंसिल के काम को बढ़ाना

चाहते हैं और इस को आई० सी० ए० प्रार० की तरह चलाना चाहते हैं। जैन साहब ने भी आखिर में इस के लिये फरमाया था मगर वह तो इस्तीफा दे कर चले गये और अब यह जिम्मेदारी आप पर आती है कि आप उन की मंशा को अमल में लायें।

यह ठीक है कि कुछ दवाइयों और वैक्सीन आदि के बनाने पर सरकार ने रुपया खर्च किया है लेकिन मेरी शिकायत तो सरकार से इस बात को ले कर है कि उस ने प्रीवेंशन आफ डिजीजेज और ग्राम वेलफेयर व बहुतरी बोर्ड के बारे में जरूरी कार्यवाही अमल में नहीं लाई। अब आप ने कुछ दवाइयों और वैक्सीन बना लीं और उन का हमारे देश में बीमार पशुओं पर इस्तेमाल होने लगा है और वे दवाइया बाहर के मुल्कों में भी जा रही हैं लेकिन जो प्रीवेंशन आफ डिजीजेज के वास्ते गाय, बैलों की नस्लों में सुधार करना जरूरी था, गाय बैलों को मजबूत बनाना जरूरी था, वह इस सरकार ने नहीं किया। अगर हमारी गायें मजबूत और तगड़ी हो जायें तो हमारे देश में दूध की पैदावार ५० फीसदी बढ़ जायगी। सरकार ने पशुओं के लिये फीडर का मुनासिब इंतजाम नहीं किया है और आज हमारे देश में चारे की बहुत कमी है। दरअसल सरकार ने इन पिछले चन्द वर्षों में ऐनीमल फीड को मुहय्या करने की ओर तवज्जह नहीं दी है और यह तय बात है कि जब तक आप जानवरों के वास्ते ऐनीमल फीड और फीडर फीड का इंतजाम नहीं करेंगे तब तक यह अनाज और घी दूध आदि का मसला हल होने वाला नहीं है। हमारे मंत्री महोदय को यह भी समझ लेना चाहिये कि यह काम जब तक गो संबर्धन कौंसिल में आफिशिएलडम रहेगी तब तक होने वाला नहीं है। इस के लिये जरूरी है कि गो संबर्धन कौंसिल को ब्रीडन करें, उन में नान आफिशिएल्स का सहयोग लिया जाय, उन को ब्यापक अधिकार दिये जायें और यह केवल ३ लाख रुपया ही इस काम के लिये

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भांगव]

खर्च न करने बल्कि जितना भी रूपया आप की मिनिस्ट्री में आये वह उस काम के लिये उस कौंसिल के सिपुर्द कर दिया जाय और अमली तौर पर उस काम को आगे बढ़ाया जाय ।

एक दूसरी चीज जिस के कि वास्ते में लगातार पिछले १२ सालों से जब से कि देश को स्वराज्य मिला है, अर्ज करता आया है कि इस वनस्पति आयाल को या तो बिल्कुल बंद कर दिया जाय या फिर इसको रंग दिया जाय । मैंने इन वनस्पति आयाल के बारे में एक छेददार घड़े की मिसाल दी है कि घड़ा पूरा भरने से भी पूरा भरा नहीं रहता और छेद इतना बड़ा है कि थोड़ी देर में वह घड़ा बिलकुल खाली हो जाता है और उस कर सारा पानी उस बड़े छेद के जरिये बाहर निकल जाता है । आज वनस्पति आयाल के उत्पादन में बड़े बड़े पून्जी पतियों का हाथ है लीवर ब्रदर्स वगैरह सेट इस को तैयार करा रहे हैं । उन लोगों ने एक एक साल में अपनी सारी मशीनरी की कीमत वसूल कर ली है । वनस्पति घी के प्रोड्यूसर्स ने बहुत काफी मुनाफा कमा लिया है और कमाते चले जा रहे हैं लेकिन उस के साथ ही यह भी वाक्या है कि इस वनस्पति ने हमारे देश के लोगों की सेहत को बहुत नुकसान पहुंचाया है और मेरी राय में वनस्पति से बढ़ कर देश के वास्ते खतरे की दूसरी चीज नहीं है । ऐनीमल हस्बैंडरी गैर मुमकिन है कि कामयाब हो सके जब तक कि जमींदार लोग जो देशी घी पैदा करते हैं उन को उस की पूरी कीमत न मिले । उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है कि इस वनस्पति आयाल के जरिये ६६ परसेंट ऐडवर्टिशन होता है और जब तक कि यह वनस्पति अपनी मौजूदा शकल में चालू रहता है मिलावट पर हावी पाने में कामयाबी नहीं मिल सकती है । मैं इस वनस्पति आयाल पर पाबन्दी लगाने के लिये एक बिल हाउस में लाया था और वह बिल वहाँ चला और उस पर खूब स्पीचेंच हुई और सोच विचार हुआ और

पंडित नेहरू जी ने मेहरबानी कर के उस के लिये एक कमेटी बैठा दी । अब कमेटियां हम देखते हैं कि समय समय पर बैठाई जाती रहती हैं । पार्लियामेंट के आधे से ज्यादा मेम्बर्स ने अपने दस्तखत कर के यह मंग की थी कि इस वनस्पति घी को बन कर दिया जाय या ऐसा न हो सके तो इस को बन्द कर दिया जाय । अब पंडित जी ने कहा कि हम ने इस के वास्ते एक कमेटी बना दी है और आप उस कमेटी में चले जाइये । अब पंडित जी का वायदा है, मुंशी जी का वायदा है और श्री थिम्मलराव जी जोकि उस कमेटी के चेयरमैन थे वे भी आज मौजूद हैं । इन सब का वायदा था कि हम वनस्पति को रंगेंगे लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उस सिलसिले में कुछ भी तो नहीं किया गया । उस के बाद किदवाई साहब आये और उन्होंने ने भी कहा था कि देखो भाई हम इस वनस्पति को रंगा कर छोड़ेंगे और मुझे पूरा यकीन है कि अगर वे हमारे बीच में होते और अपने ओहदे पर होते तो वह मर्दे मैदां जरूर उस को रंगवा कर छोड़ता । मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे जैन साहब जिन्होंने कि उनके बाद इंग वजारत को सम्हाला उन पर किदवाई साहब का काफी असर पड़ा था, छाप पड़ी थी और मुझे भरोसा था कि वे इसको जरूर करेंगे लेकिन वे भी किदवाई साहब के इकरार को भूल गये । अब वे भां चले गये और आप उनको जगह पर मौजूद हैं और मैं तो आपको किदवाई साहब समझता हूँ और मुझे उम्मीद है कि आप इसको जरूर करेंगे, वनस्पति को रंगवायेंगे और एनिमल हस्बैंडरी के काम को आगे बढ़ायेंगे । अब यह एनिमल हस्बैंडरी और कैंटिल शोडिंग को तरफ तबज्जह न देने का हो यह नतीजा है कि हमारे देश में घी और दूध का उत्पादन लगातार कम होता चला जा रहा है । पहले यहाँ पर घी का उत्पादन १६३५ में २ लाख ३० हजार मन था जो कि अगले पांच वर्षों में घट कर १ लाख ४१ हजार मन रह गया है

श्रीर भ्रामन्दा ५ साल में उसकी पैदावार १ लाख ११ हजार मन रह गई थी। मैंने अपने नोट आफ डिसेंट धी प्रडलटरेशन में यह ताम चीखे दी हुई है श्रीर मैं उनका यहां पर जिक्र नहीं करना चाहता क्योंकि मेरा समय समाप्त हो चला है। बस मैं एक मिनट में एक बात कह कर खत्म किये देता हूं।

सेठ गोविन्द दास इस हाउस में एक बिल लाये थे कि सारे देश में गोवध बंद कर दिया जाय। अब आर्टिकल १४८ के मुताबिक मैं इस मौके पर बहस में नहीं पड़ना चाहता। जब इसके बारे में यह झगड़ा हुआ कि इसको कैसे करे तो मैंने पंडित नेहरूजी की सेवा में कहा मैं आपको उसकी तरकीब बताने को तैयार हूँ बशर्ते कि आप दो, तीन बातों का इकरार करें। एक करार तो यह कि हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर दूसरे मुल्कों में वीफ न भेजा जाय। साथ ही बछड़ों धी की खालें भी इस देश से बाहर न भेजी जायें, उनका एक्सपोर्ट न किया जाय। इससे यह न समझा जाय कि मैं फारेन एक्सचेंज नहीं चाहता लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज जो हमारे कैबिनेट धड़ल्ले से बम्बई और कलकत्ते भेजे जाकर काटे जाते हैं वे न काटे जायें। हरियाना, रोहतक, हिसार दिल्ली और पंजाब के हमारे मवेशी बड़ी तादाद में बम्बई और कलकत्ते ले जाये जाते हैं और यह मैंने अपनी आंखों से जाकर देखा है कि उनके बछड़े काटने के लिए सीधे कसाईखाने में ले जाये जाते हैं। डा० पंजाबराव देगमुख श्रीर मैं ने खुद अपनी आंखों से देखा है कि किस तरह से हमारे मवेशियों को कलकत्ते में स्लाटर किया जाता है। मैं खाली यह बात कोई धर्म के स्थाल से ही नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि गाय, बैलों की हत्या न की जाय वरन् एकोनामिक प्वाइंट आफ व्यू से भी इसके लिए कह रहा हूँ। अब हकीकत यह है कि यूजलेस कैबिनेट ही अगर काटे जाते हों तब तो श्रीर बात है लेकिन आज हो यह रहा है कि यूजफुल कैबिनेट भी स्लाटर कर दिये जाते हैं और मैं यह कहे

बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि अगर आप चाहते हैं कि यूजफुल कैबिनेट का स्लाटर न हो तब आपको कैबिनेट का स्लाटर मुहम्मिल तौर पर बंद करना होगा वरना जैसा कि आजकल हो रहा है यूजलेस कैबिनेट के साथ यूजफुल कैबिनेट भी काटे जाते रहेंगे।

तीसरी चीज यह है कि पंडित जी ने एक कमेटी मुकरंर की थी जिसके कि जिम्मे यह हरियाना काऊ श्रीर कैबिल ब्रीडिंग के काम को तरकीब दिलाना था श्रीर मवेशियों की नसल में सुधार करना था और उस नन्दा कमेटी ने सन् ५४ में अपनी रिपोर्ट भी गवर्नमेंट को दे दी और उसने जानवरों की तरकीब करने और उनको बचाने के वास्ते कुछ सिफारिशात की थी लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि अभी तक गवर्नमेंट ने उस कमेटी की सिफारिशातों के मुताबिक अमल करना शुरू नहीं किया है। जब मैंने उसकी बाबत पूछा कि उस कमेटी की सिफारिशात के बारे में क्या अमल हुआ तो गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से इवैसिव रिप्लाईज दिये जाते हैं। हकीकत यह है कि हमारे यहां की नसल खत्म कर दी गई है। अब वह नसल नहीं रही और जो उसके अन्दर पोटैन्शीलिटीज थीं वह खत्म होती जा रही हैं। यह खाली हिसार और रोहतक का ही सवाल नहीं है बल्कि इस नसल को कायम रखने का सवाल है जो आज सारे देश की बड़ी नसल है और यह आपका फर्ज है कि इस को कायम रखें। दफा ४८ में कैबिल ब्रीडिंग पर खास जोर है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आपने जो एश्योरेसेज दिये हैं उन पर अब अमल करना शुरू करें। वीफ और बछड़ों के खाल को बाहर भेजना बन्द कर दें। गौ संवर्धन कौंसिल को ब्रीडन करें। मुझे उम्मीद है कि मैंने जो कुछ फरमाया है उस पर आप तबज्जह देंगे और इस मसले को हल करेगे क्योंकि इसके हल होने पर देश के गल्ले का मसला हल होगा। मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे इतना वक्त दिया।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी बाई (विकाराबाद) :  
सभापति महोदय, मुझे भी बोलने का मौका  
मिलना चाहिए ।

Some Hon. Members rose—

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Mr. Chair-  
man.....

Mr. Chairman: Shri Rajendra  
Singh.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Mr. Chair-  
man, Sir, the onerous and complex  
nature of the food problem facing  
the country is at once acute and  
chronic. It has so far eluded grasp  
and has defied all attempts at solu-  
tion. But however, stubborn a prob-  
lem this food issue may be it could  
not be contradicted when I say that  
so far as the comprehension of the  
problem is concerned we have got it.  
My indictment of the Government is  
not about the policy which the Gov-  
ernment has pursued during the time  
of the outgoing hon. Minister. My  
indictment of the Government is that  
this Government which has been  
posted with so many brilliant reports  
of various committees and organisa-  
tions could not take advantage of  
them and has remained impervious  
to them with the result that the food  
situation remains what it was five  
years ago. As is evident from the  
annual report of the Department,  
there has been only 6 per cent in-  
crease in agricultural production. It  
is difficult to say how this increase  
has been obtained. One would say,  
rather the Government would say  
that this increase has been effected  
because of the measures pursued  
and adopted by the Government. I  
do not agree. If that could be so  
what could be the reason for a con-  
stant fall till 1957-58 from the 1955-  
56 level? So it is quite evident that  
agricultural production today in this  
country depends as much on the sky  
as it had ever been. The old pro-  
verb that in India agriculture is a  
gamble in monsoon remains as much  
true and valid as it was ever be-  
fore.

The reports of the Asoka Mehta  
Committee and of the Ford Founda-  
tion are such that if this Govern-  
ment had any intention of taking  
advantage of them it could have  
taken this country a long way to-  
wards solving the food problem. But,  
as I told you, this Government is  
impervious to all suggestions which  
will have any adverse effect on the  
vested interests. I do maintain that  
this Government has vested interests  
in corruption, inefficiency and nepo-  
tism. The hon. Minister of Food and  
Agriculture is a very good friend of  
mine.

An Hon. Member: Really?

Shri Rajendra Singh: Yes, that is  
so. I admit that he is a likeable per-  
son..... (Interruption).

Shri Amjad Ali (Dhubri): Also!

Shri Rajendra Singh: So far is his  
personal traits are concerned, I like  
his ebullience, buoyant spirit and  
easy manners. But these very per-  
sonal traits, when applied to prob-  
lems, social and economic, add more  
to the dangers which are already  
there.

13.38 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

That is why the light-hearted opti-  
mism with which the hon. Minister  
has revised and, I should say, revers-  
ed the policy adopted by his predeces-  
sor is not only going to bring about  
a rapid and progressive deterioration  
in the food situation but is also going  
to bring about a frustration so far as  
it is a question of social policy. The  
policy of monopoly procurement and  
State trading in foodgrains had not  
ever been dictated by any ideological  
considerations or by any considera-  
tions of doctrine. It was dictated by  
the inevitable and inescapable situa-  
tion prevailing in this country be-  
cause of the backward economy and  
because of our outmoded system of  
agricultural production and various  
other factors. As far as I am aware.

and this House is aware, nobody could accuse any of the committees, either it be the Mehta Committee or it be the Ford Foundation or it be the UNO delegates of having a socialist bias. They had all been objective observers and the whole series of recommendations were based on the objective observation of things as they obtained. But this hon. Minister, with all due respect to him, I would submit, is playing ducks and drakes with the Objective Programme, so formulated from the angle of social policy and that which is immediately of practicabilities and feasible. You can accuse Shrimati Renu Chakravarty of being a Communist, but what about Shrimati Renuka Ray? Both of them have said that this free movement of foodgrains in this newly created zone is no solution; rather the prices are rising, and at the same time, there is nothing in sight to check the rise in prices and see that the prices are held at a certain level. I do not understand any man with a moral conscience saying that the business community—I do not mean of this country alone, but throughout the length and breadth of this little planet—could be relied upon to play the game with a sense of moral conscience and with a sense of fair conduct. It cannot be. Human nature is such that the businessman concentrates only on his profits, irrespective of the fact whether he sticks to moral conduct or serves the social interests or not. He is interested immediately in his own profit. Therefore, to believe that by creating certain artificial zones and by giving a free licence to the grain dealers, and at the same time asking the Reserve Bank and the various banks to give them credit facilities the demand and supply position would become such that the price line would be held and the country will have a sigh of relief is going too far.

Much has not yet been lost. Therefore, I again request the Minister and this House also to reconsider the position. There had not been any defect in the policy of Shri Jain. Our cri-

ticism of him was about the imperfections, the defects and the difficulties in the implementation of his policy. Therefore, my submission is this that the Minister must reconsider his position.

Where does he want this country to go? He says he wants to have a buffer stock which will stabilise the prices, which will check prices from shooting up. This is, in fact, making this country a constant, a permanent beggar. Therefore, I would submit that there should be an immediate revision of the policy which this Minister has followed.

With all due respect to my hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, who is not here, who is an irrepressible man—I am using the expression "irrepressible", and that could be said about me as well—....

**An Hon. Member:** It is unparliamentary.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Is it unparliamentary? Then I withdraw.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is not, though I would be reluctant to use that word for the hon. Member.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** That is because of your greatness and the greatness of the Chair, I am not so great.

His encouragement to the Ministry to follow a policy of *laissez faire* is, in fact, something which no man who is alive to the situation, who is committed to give our peasants a fair price and to give our consumers a time to have their commodities at reasonable prices, can accede to.

Prices are rising. The working class demands a corresponding rise in its emoluments, salaries, and what does the hon. Minister of Finance say? He says no increase can be made in the emoluments and the salaries of the working class and the wage-earners. The tussle is there as you find, and God knows where this country would go!



[Shri Rajendra Singh]

Therefore, as the NDC has rightly looked at the thing, the whole question today is to hold the price line firmly and resolutely, and this can be done not by free movement of grains, not by giving freedom to our businessmen to act as they please. Impossible, ridiculous, fantastic.

As I have been telling you, there has been only a six per cent rice last year on the level of output which we reached in 1955-56. This is an indication of the fact that all our measures to improve agricultural production have been woefully inadequate. That means to say, that we still depend as largely on rains, monsoons and the vagaries of the sky, as we have ever been. Therefore, today the problem before this Ministry should be to de-link and to isolate our land from the vagaries of the sky and to the extent you succeed in that, you will find agricultural production going up.

The question is: how to step up our agricultural production.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** By an ordinance!

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** No, Sir. It will take time for you to understand, because you have revised yourself so many times so recently.

We do not have much virgin land, and as Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava has said, it is by intensifying cultivation of available cultivable land that we can step up our production. The Ford Foundation has rightly pointed out that if we do not treble the present rate of production on the available land, by 1966 we will have a population of about 480 millions and, at the present level of production, there will be a shortfall of 28 million tons. From where are you going to fill this deficit? If the Minister says that he will address the United States and take their surplus products for feeding this country, that would also become impossible.

It is all right to take two or three or five million tons of surplus products from the USA but it would be impossible to import 28 million tons of food-grains into this country every year, if for no other reason at least because of the difficulties of transport.

Therefore, I most humbly submit that if the rate of production has to be trebled, there should, naturally, be three-fold investment in agriculture. When I found today in a report that the NDC has allotted Rs. 1,000 crores for agriculture and community projects for the Third Plan, I simply felt bewildered, because of this blindfold attitude towards agriculture.

You know, Sir, agriculture is the heart of the problem. Either there is agricultural production and the survival of the nation as an independent country and the survival of democracy or we go to pieces. There can be no two opinions about it. Therefore, my submission is this that, planning or no planning, all our efforts, all our investments, should be tuned to the needs of increasing agricultural production. Naturally, from this calculation you find that to treble our present rate of production, we need Rs. 3,000 crores at once.

As to America, I have been to America and I am glad to say that I have made many friends there. I have great regard for that great country and its great people. But, in all humility, I would like to tell you that in America, to part with the surplus produce is something like a problem. Every day, in America, \$1.5 million are spent on the storage of this surplus farm produce. Therefore, it is rather in the interest of the American economy to part with their surplus farm produce to India. If American friends are sincere in helping us, I would like to reciprocate with same sincerity to them then they must give us credit. We do not need surplus farm produce, what we need is credit facilities to the tune of \$10 million, for

importing machinery and for erecting in this country fertiliser plants, for procuring and manufacturing in our country agricultural implements and tools and various other equipment for fulfilment of the various irrigation projects and so on. We do not need farm produce, but we need credit facilities. And you will see that it is an easy thing for America, when you know that \$10 million are simply two days' earnings. So, if the American friends are sincere towards us, then I would submit that credit facilities to the tune of \$5 billion every year, for two years, should be provided by them. That would mean that they have to give one days' national income of theirs to this country every year, for two years, and we shall be able to pay it in six or seven years and with good interest.

The mere import of the farm surplus is going to help nobody, neither the Americans nor this country. Rather, it would make us a beggar country, all the time at the mercy of our good friends. It is rather a despicable state. Left to myself, I would like my country to go to starvation and to go to death than to live on this beggary.

**Shri Ansar Harvani (Fatehpur):** No starvation for us.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** That is what the hon. Minister says, and the hon. Member may take him at his words.

I have a few suggestions to make in this connection. The first of them is in regard to the recommendations made by Raja Surendra Singh, and also the Ford Foundation Team. The Ford Foundation Team has pointed out that if agricultural production is to be stepped up to meet the requirements and needs of the country, then the agricultural department should not be a Government department, much less a third-rate department of Government. It should be a concern of all the people of this country. The people who should preside over this department should not be Ministers. This department should consist of people

from all walks of political life, from all welfare societies, people who have control over public opinion, people who are of enlightened minds, people who have at their hearts the service of the country, and so on. Such people should be brought together to preside over this agricultural department, which should be eventually converted into an agricultural commission.

**Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur):** How many people will be there? What will be the number?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** There can be a dozen or more. Why should my hon. friend worry about the number?

I have suggested that it should be eventually converted into a commission. People from various elements of public life should be associated with it, and it should not be a government department. That is necessary in the interests of the country. Of course, I say that there should not be participation in government, but some people say that there should be participation in the stepping up of the production from the soil, and that could be done when all the elements in the country unite together to do so.

**The Deputy Minister of Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa):** Whom will the hon. Member criticise then?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I am only saying what the Ford Foundation Team has recommended. I am not simply saying it from the figment of my imagination. The hon. Minister may look into the report of the Ford Foundation Team. Why should he not look into it? And they are not communists, nor are they socialists, they are just dispassionate observers.

At present, this department is callous and impervious to all suggestions which are made for the good of the country. I might give you just one instance. Raja Surendra Singh, who is a departmental man, was entrusted with the duty of finding out what administrative changes should be brought in in order to streamline

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

the agricultural department. That gentleman, in collaboration with his friends, gave a very brilliant report. The periodicals like *Indian Finance* and capital made very good comments about it. That report is still lying somewhere in the custody of white ants. The former Food and Agriculture Minister said here that in financial terms, it would mean only Rs. 2 crores of further expenditure. But the overlord, or the monarch of all it surveys, namely the Planning Commission did not heed to his advice, and the Minister had to go out on that account also.

The reply of the Prime Minister on the score, namely the Nalagarh Committee's report, is rather fantastic and ridiculous. How can anybody believe him when he does not tell us by what time these recommendations are going to be implemented? As far as my information goes, even those recommendations which do not have any financial implications, and which could have been easily implemented, have not been implemented so far. The Prime Minister does not take care to look into all things. He is given some brief, and he just picks up here and there from it and projects it in the House and rather misleads us. That is very unfair. I do not think democracy would survive in that way.

**Shri M. V. Krishnappa:** We shall starve democracy?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I am speaking on behalf of my party. So, 30 minutes must be given to me.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does not hon. Member want that time from the opposite side?

**Shri M. V. Krishnappa:** He is Shri Asoka Mehta, the second.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** The position of those in the agricultural department should be improved not only in the States but even in the districts. From my own personal experience in the districts, I can say that the district

agricultural officer is something like a very junior man or rather a third-rate subordinate of the district collector. He has to depend for everything, financial grants, for controlling the administration etc. on the district magistrate, who does not know anything about agriculture. Therefore, even if there be any necessity to amend our Constitution, it must be done so that our agricultural officers in the districts are made an independent institution by themselves, with full financial powers, with an independent cell inside for audit, and at the same time, with full and absolute control over their departments, in the same way as other heads of departments. I would also submit that all departments of Government which are related to agricultural production should be amalgamated with the agricultural department. Take, for instance, the community projects and the national extension service blocks. I have been associated with the national extensive service blocks with nearly six or seven of them, and from my own experience I wish to submit that they are neither fish nor fowl nor good red herring; they are all rotten meat.... Therefore, this department should be wound up, and these community projects should go away. It is all nonsense.

**Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak):** Why?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** And the features of these community projects which are related to agricultural production must be handed over to the agricultural department or the Agriculture Ministry. Then, the department of irrigation, the department of everything....

**Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir):** What is the 'department of everything'?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I am not coming from Kashmir. I am coming from Bihar.

14 hrs.

Now, the principal problem which faces the peasants today in improving agricultural production is their age-long indebtedness. Even on the modest scale it has been calculated that our agricultural indebtedness—of the peasants—at the present level of production comes around Rs. 1,000 crores. Only 6 per cent of it is provided either by Government or by co-operative institutions. What an awful situation! If we want to emancipate our people from exploitation by the various social parasites you cannot do it unless these Rs. 1,000 crores are injected here and now into the village, put in the hands of the peasants. Unless you do it they are not going to be emancipated and freed from the oppressions and exploitations of the social parasites living in the villages. Unless they are freed from these clutches, you are not going to inspire them for increasing their production.

We need three-fold increment in investment for increasing our production three-fold. Therefore, we need at least Rs. 3,000 crores additional to go into the hands of our peasants so that they have enough of credit. Then only would agricultural production brighten up.

I am the only member from my party and I would require some more time, Sir.

I will come to sugar I submitted before and I maintain that Government has vested interest in corruption. I am again emphasising that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member ought to be sweet at least in sugar.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** It is so bitter now, Sir. (*Interruption.*) Sir, Government have excused the additional excise duty on the production of additional sugar. Well and good. I do not mind it. But where does that additional saving go? If it does not go to the consumer, if it does not go

to me and to you, we can leave that. But, what about the cultivators whose production of sugarcane makes it possible for us to have sugar? What about labour whose sweat contributes to our sugar production? Is it not rather morally incumbent on us to provide a certain share of that additional earnings to the labour as well as to the sugar cane producers? Therefore, this ear-marking of additional earning in favour of the mill owners by Government is rather very unfair to the producers and labour. I submit that there should be a certain proportion of distribution among these two elements also.

डा० राम दुभग सिंह (सहस्रराम)  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे खाद्य और कृषि...

एक माननीय सदस्य : प्रश्नजी में बोलिए।

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I like the programme which has been chalked out by the Food and Agriculture Ministry for increasing our agricultural production during the Third Five Year Plan and also in the coming year. Our target in the Third Plan is reported to be between 100 and 110 millions tons. Last year the production which we had was short of the target which we should have achieved according to the Second Plan Schedule. This year we should have about 80 million tons. But, I do not think we are going to have that 80 million tons.

This indicates that our efforts directed to increase our production are not such as would go to meet our requirements. And, I also feel that there are certain defects in our programme, and also in our efforts to achieve that programme. Because, in 1951, we imported about 4.7 million tons of foodgrains. And, in 1952, we imported about 3.8 million tons. In those two years, the production figures were 51.1 million tons and 58.27 million tons. I mean to say that our production last year and even this year has gone up compared

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

to 1951. The production has gone up by 22 million tons during last year. But our import has also virtually remained the same because, last year also we imported 3.8 million tons and year before last year we imported about 3.1 million tons. I say defective because despite the fact that the peasants are contributing towards our agricultural production, our import figures are also the same as they were before, about 10 years ago. I do not know whether we are going to reduce our import programme because, according to the present Plan, we are going to import about 25 million tons of foodgrains from the United States, about which some Members have said some harsh word and others have made appreciative remarks. I do not share the view fully, that we should depend upon imports, because if we are to depend upon imports we will not only be running our agriculturists, but we will be running the country as a whole. The arguments that are advanced by the Ministry and those who are in favour of importing foodgrains are that it will provide us relief during the emergency period and will also save us from difficulties which we are having and that it will enable us to meet our present difficulties because it will enable the Government to reduce the prices of foodgrains.

Regarding prices, I think we must try to keep down the prices. I also share this view to some extent. But, in the interests of agriculturists, I feel that we should not reduce the prices to the extent which may mar their efforts to increase agricultural production. No aid or subsidy, whether it be in the shape of fertilizers or in the shape of irrigation facilities or anything like that will reach everyone of the Indian agriculturists because they reach only the selected few. Irrigation facilities and fertilizers may reach large number of farmers but not all. Most of the Indian agriculturists even today are depending for manure purposes only on their village manure, cow-dung etc.

If we do not give fair prices or good prices to the agriculturists they would not be able to increase production and they would not find any incentive to increase it.

There are two Ministries, the Steel Ministry and the Oil Ministry. Shri Malaviya said that despite the fact that they have obtained some concessions from the oil firms, they are not going to give it to the people of India in the shape of concession in the oil prices. The Steel Ministry also announced that despite the fact that our steel production is going up, we are not going to give any concession in the steel prices.

This brings us to the cost of production of food because, as was said a little earlier, we are having at present 320 millions acres under the plough, about one-third of which has not got any kind of irrigation facilities. And about one-third is having good monsoon irrigation and the other one-third is having irrigation system of all varieties—perennial and other kinds of irrigation facilities. If the cost of production is not reduced, it brings in two aspects of the thing. We are now dedicated towards increasing our agricultural production and that can be attained only by doubling the area under plough. There is no hope of having that much of land in India because already about 41 per cent of the entire area is under plough and that is the second highest percentage in the world. We are only second to Italy. There is no other country except Italy in the world which is having as high a percentage of land under plough as we are having in India. There is no possibility of increasing the acreage under the plough because if we resort to more reckless cutting of the forests, then there will be less rainfall. Therefore, there is no possibility now of increasing the acreage under the plough. You may increase it to 10 million or 20 million acres but you cannot just double the country's acreage under plough.

The other two alternatives are that we must have land-intensive programme and also labour-intensive programme. As regards the land intensive programme, there comes the irrigation, fertiliser and other things. Prior to 1952 we had about 51 million acres under irrigation. During the First Plan we were having 16.3 million acres under irrigation and during the Second Plan we will be having 21.3 million acres. But we have been always hearing that the irrigation potential that was created is not fully utilised and this also is not the fault of the farmer. The people may say that the farmers are not keen on utilising the irrigation facilities. I have myself seen that farmers were not given irrigation facilities as was told by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava a little earlier. In my area and Damodar Valley also about which Shrimati Renu Chakravartty made a mention, those difficulties do exist. I do not want to have any inhibition because we must have land-intensive programme and we must have a good system of irrigation. It is not enough that some big projects are undertaken or are going to be planned or completed. We are having enough projects—and we must have more and more—but there is some lack of co-ordination. The man who is incharge of agriculture must know how many fields or how many acres he is having under himself which he should properly utilise for increasing the agricultural production and that man will have to see how much of that land should be brought under irrigation and it should be his outlook to find out the avenues of irrigation. Similar is the case of minor irrigation also. Today, out of every two rupees that are spent by the Food and Agriculture Ministry, one rupee is spent by the Community Development Ministry on agricultural programmes like minor irrigation or medium irrigation and something like that. I not only want that there should be coordination between the Ministries which are dealing with agricultural subjects but I want that there should be only one Ministry of Agriculture. I have nothing to say

against anybody. Let anybody be the Minister, but there should be only one Minister of Agriculture and no more. There should not be any more Ministries dealing with agricultural problems because when we go for irrigation purposes, we are told to go to the Irrigation Ministry or the Irrigation Department and all that. There is total lack of coordination. Similar is the case in regard to community development. Therefore, I want that there should be only one Ministry. I was dealing with land-intensive programme. In that way if one person is enabled to apply his mind fully and sincerely to agricultural problems, he may be removed if he is not working well; but by having three or four interests and all interests colliding and on top of them there being the Planning Commission which has not so far given a fair account of itself so far as agricultural problems go, we are creating confusion.

I pay my tribute to the Indian agriculturist. In 1957 the agricultural production was 62 million tons and in 1958-59 it went up to 73 million tons. On account of good monsoons they increased the production by about 10 million tons. It is the Indian agriculturist who increased the production by 10 million tons and not any department. I am prepared to pay my tribute to anybody, provided the Ministry or the Planning Commission creates conditions under which the farmer is enabled to fight the vagaries of nature. That atmosphere has not been created by the Ministry. If you want to increase the production from 73 million tons to 110 million tons by 1965, it is necessary that the Ministry enables each and every farmer to fight the vagaries of nature. I want that programme to be chalked out by the Ministry. Let the Ministry be so competent, so strong and so thoroughgoing that it enables every farmer in India to fight the vagaries of nature and increase the production to 110 million tons. In that case everybody will give full cooperation. Not only

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

will they give cooperation but they will enthusiastically come forward to implement the programmes. The rural indebtedness should be eliminated. We have already invested over Rs. 1,300 crores in importing food-grains from foreign countries. But if we invest Rs. 1,300 crores in the shape of crop loans or cattle loans—this cattle problem was raised by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava—it will largely solve our problem. We not only need food, but we also need vegetables and protective foods, like, milk, fruit, fish, meat, etc. The vegetable production is estimated at 6.17 million tons whereas we need 38.62 million tons. It means we have to increase the production by over 600 per cent. About meat and fish also, if we compare our resources with those of foreign countries, we have to increase the production by 400 or 500 per cent. Similarly in the case of fruit and milk also we have to increase the production by 400 or 500 per cent. How can the milk production be increased if the people are not in a position to buy even a single head of cattle? There comes the question of giving them loans.

There also comes the question of feed and fodder. Today we are having only 68 per cent of fodder which we require for our cattle. Unless and until we increase fodder crops we would not be able to have enough feed or *bhusa* for feeding our cattle. We should have good varieties of fodder in the country. The Ministry of Agriculture and other departments are labouring hard to introduce different varieties of fodder, but they have not so far contributed much as was disclosed by Pandit Thakur Dasji, and the Ministry is also not so keen in making a special mention of these facts. Unless and until we increase our fodder and feed production we would not be able to undertake our cattle improvement programme. Unless and until we increase our cattle, it will not be possible to increase our milk and draught cattle

requirements. Our food production is also very much dependent on it.

Apart from irrigation, fertiliser is also another essential factor which contributes to increasing agricultural production. We want about 23 lakh tons of fertilisers but our indigenous production of fertiliser is only about 6.56 lakhs. We are short of about 16.5 lakh tons. Though the hon. Minister has said that he was prepared to allow private concerns to increase fertiliser production even in our Third Plan I do not think it is envisaged to produce enough fertiliser because according to the Third Plan our consumption will be only 17 lakh tons and our indigenous production will be about 8.45 lakh tons. Still we will be short by 8.35 lakh tons. Personally I think that our fertiliser requirement—I mean chemical fertiliser—will be much more than 17 lakh tons; it may go up to 25-30 lakh tons. There also we are not making as good an effort as is needed.

Similarly, regarding electricity also only 3.9 per cent. of the total electricity produced was utilised in 1950 for agricultural and irrigation purposes. It was 6 per cent. in 1958 though the power production has gone up by more than 100 per cent, from 5,500 kws in 1950 to over 12,000 kws in 1958. Therefore, I think that much attention is not given by the Agriculture Ministry to this problem of giving more electricity to the agriculturists. And unless and until we give more electricity, it will not be possible to increase production.

श्री मनुमनुवाला (भागलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह खेती का जो मसला है यह मसला बहुत ही जरूरी है, और जब तक इस में तरक्की नहीं होगी, हमको समझ में नहीं आता कि हमारे देश की दूसरी इकानमी किस तरह से तरक्की कर सकती है। आप देखें कि ग्राम्भ से ही हमारी प्लानिंग कमीशन इसके प्रति एक स्टेप मददरली ट्रीटमेंट करती आयी है। इसके प्रति उतना ध्यान

नहीं दिया गया जितना कि देना चाहिए था, और नतीजा यह हुआ है कि दिन पर दिन—यदि हम फिगर देखते हैं तो हमारा प्रोडक्शन बढ़ रहा है और यह ठीक है कि प्रोडक्शन बढ़ रहा है—हमारा जितना प्रोडक्शन बढ़ना चाहिए या जितना बढ़ सकता था उतना नहीं बढ़ रहा है। इसके बहुत से कारण हैं। सब का यदि यहाँ पर उल्लेख किया जाय तो इतने थोड़े समय में वह सब बातें नहीं कही जा सकती। हमारे पूर्व वक्ताओं ने अच्छी तरह से बहुत सी बातें आपके सामने कह दी हैं। जहाँ तक मिनिस्ट्रीरियल लेबिल की बातें हैं, उस में सब से भारी मुश्किल बात यह है कि एक मिनिस्ट्री में और दूसरी मिनिस्ट्री में जितना कोऑर्डिनेशन होना चाहिए उतना नहीं है। अगर एक मिनिस्ट्री को किसी चीज की आवश्यकता है तो दूसरी मिनिस्ट्री इसकी ओर ध्यान नहीं देती। जैसा कि पंडित ठाकुर दास जी ने आपको बतलाया, एग््रीकल्चर मिनिस्ट्री में और इरीगेशन मिनिस्ट्री में पूरा कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं है। केवल इरीगेशन बढ़ा देने से ही काम नहीं चल सकता। यह भी देखना चाहिए कि जो जल है उसका किस तरह से सही उपयोग किया जाय ताकि हमारा एग््रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन बढ़े। लेकिन इसको नहीं देखते। जब वह इसको नहीं देखते तो हमारा नुकसान हो जाता है और हमारा एग््रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस नहीं बढ़ता।

दूसरी एक और बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण बात है, लेकिन प्रायः लोग उसकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं देते और उसको मामूली बात समझते हैं। वह समझते हैं कि यह तो एक मामूली बात है, पुरानी चीज है। इसमें कोई लाभ होना वाला नहीं है। अगर मैं इस बात को दुहराऊँ और कहूँ तो यही लोगों का खयाल होगा, मिनिस्ट्री भी यही समझेगी, कि यह एक बेकार की चीज कही जा रही है और इससे कुछ लाभ तो होने वाला नहीं है। इसके लिए यद्यपि कुछ रुपये रख दिये जाते हैं, लेकिन वह ठीक तरह से काम में लाये जाते हैं या नहीं इसकी तरफ भी ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता। केवल बड़ी बड़ी

योजनाओं और बड़ी बड़ी चीजों की तरफ ही हम लोगों का ध्यान रहता है, और उन पर बहुत सा लिटरेचर लिख दिया जाता है। बड़े बड़े डाम्स आदि के प्रति हमारा ध्यान जाता है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि ये सब चीजें आवश्यक नहीं हैं, उन सब चीजों की भी बहुत आवश्यकता है। परन्तु जो चीज मूल आधार है हमारी एग््रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन का, उस को यदि हम लोग निगलेक्ट करेंगे, जैसा कि अभी तक निगलेक्ट करते आये हैं, तो यहाँ का प्रोडक्शन नहीं बढ़ सकता। हमारे पंडित ठाकुर दास जी भागवत ने बार बार कहा है और आज भी उन्होंने एनीमल हसबैंडरी के बारे में बतलाया है। हम लोग काऊ ब्रीडिंग आदि के बहुत से फार्म खोलते हैं, परन्तु कहीं पर तरक्की हुई हो, यह नहीं दिखायी देता। सब जगह यह दिखायी देता है कि जो हमारी चीज है उसका ह्रास हो रहा है। जैसे हरियाना गायें बहुत नामी गायें थीं। उनका विवरण पंडित जी ने आपके सामने रखा है कि वह कितना दूध देती थीं और अब वह कितना दूध दे रही हैं। उनकी ब्रीड का दिन पर दिन ह्रास होता जा रहा है। इसका नतीजा क्या होगा वह मैं जितना भी मेरे में जोर है उतनी बलवती भाषा में रखना चाहता हूँ। इस चीज को आप डेसपाइज मत कीजिये। इस चीज को छोटी दृष्टि से मत देखिये कि इससे क्या होने जा रहा है।

अब फरटीलाइजर का सवाल है। मैं ने तो अनुभव करके देखा है कि गोबर का जो फरटीलाइजर है उस में सब तरह की प्रापर्टीज हैं। जमीन में उसको देकर जो आप उपाखंड कर सकते हैं वह अन्य सब तरह के फरटीलाइजर से नहीं कर सकते। मैं ने एक ही जमीन में उन का अनुभव करके देखा है। परन्तु जो गोबर से प्रोडक्शन बढ़ता है वह किसी दूसरी चीज से नहीं बढ़ता। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि ये फरटीलाइजर नहीं होने चाहिए। जरूर होने चाहिए। सब कुछ होना चाहिए। परन्तु हमारे किसान लोग उनका उपयोग पूरी तरह से अच्छी तरह से नहीं जानते हैं



### [श्री भुनभुनवाला]

कि किस में कितना नाइट्रोजन है, कितनी दूसरी चीजें, जैसे मलफेट आदि हैं। उनका न तो वह प्रोपीरेशन अच्छी तरह जानते हैं, और न यह कि किस जमीन में किस चीज की कमी है और किस जमीन में कौन सी चीज देनी चाहिए। उनको इसका अनुभव नहीं है। नतीजा यह होता है कि उत्पादन बढ़ने के बजाय घटना है और वहाँ की जमीन भी खराब होती जा रही है। अतएव मैं कहूँगा कि इसके प्रति हमारे मंत्रालय को पूरा ध्यान देना चाहिए। हमारे श्री कृष्णप्पा साहब ने कुछ दिन पहले प्रश्नों का उत्तर देते हुए कहा था कि गोबर से गैस बनती है, और उस गैस प्लांट से जो चीजें बच जाती हैं, वह बहुत ही उपयोगी फर्टीलाइजर होती हैं। गोबर में जो गुण होते हैं वही गुण उस में रह जाते हैं। तो मैं मंत्रालय को यह कहूँगा कि क्यों न इस प्रकार के प्लांट सारे देश के गांवों में लगाये जायें ताकि जो हमारे किसान भाई हैं वह गोबर को न जनार्थें। देहात में लकड़ी न होने से वह हमारी खाद के मूल कारण गोबर को ही जला देते हैं जिसका नतीजा यह होता है कि हमारे मैन्योर का इतना नाश हो जाता है। हमारे मंत्रालय को इस तरफ ध्यान देकर उस मैन्योर को पूरे तौर पर काम में लाना चाहिए। ये गैस प्लांट देश के हर हिस्से में चलायें जायें और हमारे इस मैन्योर को जो हमारा बड़ा भारी धन है बचाया जाय। परन्तु उस दिन जो हमारे कृष्णप्पा साहब ने जवाब दिया वह बहुत संतोषजनक जवाब नहीं था कि किस तरह से वह इस काम को सफलीभूत करेंगे। बहुत से प्रश्न भी उसके बारे में किये गये परन्तु कोई भी संतोषजनक जवाब नहीं दिया गया। मैं जानता हूँ कि यह प्लांट बहुत सक्सेसफुल है। लेकिन एक आदमी इस को नहीं कर सकता जब तक कि सरकार उसकी सहायता न करे। तो सब से पहला प्रोग्राम यह लेना चाहिए और जो यह प्लांट है इस पर पूरा ध्यान देकर इसको उपयोग में लाना चाहिए।

एनीमल हसबैंडरी के बारे में आपको पंडित जी ने बताया कि उसका प्रोडक्शन कितना घट गया है। हमारे पंडित जी ने आप को १० अरब का फिगर दिया। मैं ने भी इस तरह वे बहुत से फिगर देखे हैं। उनके डिटेल् में जाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। नये फिगर तो वह देते नहीं हैं कि क्या हुआ क्या नहीं हुआ। वह एक अन्दाजिया फिगर रख देते हैं। हमारे खाने की जो खास चीजें हैं घी और दूध, उन का दिन-प्रति-दिन ह्रास हो रहा है, और उस का नतीजा यह है कि हमारे लोगों के—खास तौर पर जो लोग बैजिटेरियन हैं, उन के—स्वास्थ्य का ह्रास होता जा रहा है। यदि आप शुद्ध गाय का दूध चाहें, तो आप को वह नहीं मिल सकता है। हमारे पास ये फिगर हैं : हीं है कि पहले हमारे यहाँ कितना दूध और घी होता था और अब कितना होता है। हमारी नेशनल इनकम आधी एग््रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस से आती है और पर-कैपिटा इनकम नेशनल इनकम पर निर्भर करती है, लेकिन हमारे पास इस के फिगर नहीं हैं कि पहले के मुकाबले में उस की स्थिति क्या है। इस बात पर हमारा कुछ ध्यान नहीं है कि एग््रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस कम हुआ है या अधिक। उस पर पूर्ण रूप से ध्यान देना चाहिए। एनिमल का तो हम कुछ भी स्याल नहीं करते हैं, लेकिन बड़े बड़े फ़ार्म्स और इंडस्ट्रीज के प्रति हमारा पूरा ध्यान है। परन्तु बेचारे गरीब एग््रीकल्चरिस्ट्स, किसानों, की जरूरियात पूरी की जाती हैं या नहीं, इस का किसी को ध्यान नहीं है। किसान बिना पैसे के खती नहीं कर सकते हैं। उन के पास हल नहीं हैं, उन को वक्त पर बीज नहीं मिलता है। इरिगेशन की फैसिलिटीज उस को नहीं मिलती हैं। उन को कुछ भी नहीं मिलता है। इस स्थिति में हम यह कैसे समझ सकते हैं कि एग््रीकल्चर के जो मेनस्टे हैं अर्थात् पूअर एग््रीकल्चरिस्ट्स, उन की तरफ हम ध्यान न दें, गाय बैलों की तरफ हम ध्यान न दें, उन को नैग्लेक्ट करते जायें, और फिर भी

हमारी एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस बढ़ सकती है और हमारी इकानामी, जो कि एग्रीकल्चर पर निर्भर है, उन्नति कर सकती है ? इस बात को सब कोई मानता है और कहता है कि बिना इस के हमारा उद्धार नहीं है, परन्तु हम उस को काम में नहीं लाते हैं ।

हमारे देशमुख साब ने पिछले दिनों कहा था कि यदि एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट्स लोग कोई चीज अधिक पैदा करें, ज्यादा प्रोड्यूस करें तो उन को दाम कम मिलते हैं । क्यों नहीं हमारी मिनिस्ट्री इस को ठीक करती ? क्यों यह बड़ी भारी एनामोली हो रही है कि यदि हम अधिक प्रोड्यूस करें तो उस का दाम हम को कम मिलता है ? ऐसे तो वह कम मिलता ही है, क्योंकि गरीब एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट्स को मार्केटिंग की सुविधा नहीं है, उन के पास क्रेडिट फ़ैसिलिटीज नहीं हैं, वे ठीक तरह से अपने माल को स्टोर नहीं कर सकते हैं, बहुत दिन तक उस को रख नहीं सकते हैं । इन सब बातों को देखते हुए हम को इस तरफ़ ध्यान देना चाहिए कि पूअर एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट्स जो प्रोड्यूस करते हैं, उन को उस का पूरा पैसा मिले, ताकि उन को उत्साह हो और उस उत्साह से वे लोग और अधिक इन्टेन्सिव कल्टिवेशन कर सकते हैं । मेरा निजी अनुभव यह है कि अगर उन को उत्साहित किया जाय, और उन को पूरी फ़ैसिलिटीज दी जायें, तो बड़े फ़ार्मज़ का जो लाजं-स्केल प्राडक्शन होता है, उस से कम वे प्रोड्यूस नहीं करेंगे, वे उस से अधिक प्रोड्यूस करेंगे । वे अपनी थोड़ी सी जमीन पर व्यक्तिगत ध्यान देते हैं, परन्तु उन को सब चीज़ें मुहैया नहीं हैं, जिसका नतीजा यह है कि उन के जरिये जितना प्रोड्यूस होना चाहिए, उतना प्रोड्यूस हमारे यहां नहीं होता है ।

एक बहुत जरूरी, आवश्यक और महत्वपूर्ण बात यह है कि जो एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर हैं, उन को पूरा अधिकार रहना चाहिए कि वह अपनी राय के अनुसार काम कर सकें ।

वह रात दिन इसी बारे में मोचते रहते हैं, इसी को देखते रहते हैं । मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारे पाटिल साहब इस के लिए विद्वान हैं कि किस तरह से ऐसी कोई योजना कायम की जाय, जिस से लोगों को ठीक दाम पर चीज़ें मिलें । उन की ईगरनेस में, उन की इच्छा में कोई कमी नहीं है । लेकिन हमारी समझ में नहीं आता कि कहां आ कर उस में बाधा उत्पन्न हो जाती है । जैसा कि पंडित भागव ने कहा है, मिनिस्टर को अपनी राय एसर्ट करनी चाहिए और हमारी कैबिनेट को चाहिए कि वह उस को पूरा मौका दे कि वह अपनी राय को अच्छी तरह से एसर्ट कर के उस को काम में लाये, ताकि वह अपनी योग्यता सब के सामने दिखा सके कि हम प्राडक्शन भी अधिक कर सकते हैं और डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन भी ठीक कर सकते हैं । अभी तक कई प्रकार के प्रोग्राम्ज हम लोगों के सामने रखे गये ।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** माननीय सदस्य अब खत्म करें ।

**श्री मृगमृगवाला :** सभी कुछ कर के देख लिया गया । कंट्रोल उठा कर देख लिया गया और कंट्रोल कर के देख लिया गया । कई प्रकार के जोनल सिस्टम बनाये गये, लेकिन मेरा ख्याल है कि उस की फ़्लोअर का मुख्य कारण यह है कि जो भादमी उस काम को चलाने वाला है, उस की नहीं चलती है ।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** माननीय सदस्य का समय खत्म हो गया है ।

**श्री मृगमृगवाला :** जो भादमी काम को चलाने वाला है, उस को चाहिए कि वह अपनी राय को एसर्ट करे । जैन साहब जब तक मिनिस्टर थे, तब तक उन्होंने कुछ नहीं कहा कि हमारी ये दिक्कतें हैं, इसलिए हमारा काम आगे नहीं बढ़ रहा है । जब उन्होंने मिनिस्ट्री से इस्तीफ़ा दे दिया, तो वह पचास सी कारण बताते हैं कि प्लानिंग कमीशन ने यह नहीं किया, वह नहीं किया ।

ची० रणवीर सिंह (रोहतक) : पहले वह लिख ही सकते थे, कह नहीं सकते थे।

श्री झुनझुनवाला : वह कह भी सकते थे, परन्तु उन्होंने नहीं कहा। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे पाटिल साहब भ्रवश्य इस काम को करेंगे कि उन की जो इच्छा है, उस को वह एसर्ट करें।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : राय एसर्ट किस तरह की जाये, कोई मानता ही नहीं है। माननीय सदस्य का समय खत्म हो गया है।

श्री झुनझुनवाला : मार्शल की सहायता से बनिये जाट को हटाने की जरूरत नहीं है। मार्शल की कम्युनिस्ट लोगों को हटाने के लिए जरूरत पड़ेगी। मैं बैठ जाता हूँ और मिनिस्टर साहब से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह सोच कर कुछ ऐसी तरकीब निकालें, जिस से हमारे यहां का प्रोड्यूस बढ़े, लोगों को सस्ती चीज मिले और गरीब किसानों को अधिक दाम मिलें और एनिमल हसबैंड्री को पूरा प्रोत्साहन मिले।

Shri P. R. Patel: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it has become a fashion in our country just to give advice on a problem where the persons giving the advice do not know. Agriculture is a problem. On this subject, only persons having some insight into rural areas, some insight into agriculturist family, some insight into agriculture, can give an opinion. But nowadays, opinions are expressed by those who have nothing to do with agriculture and who have absolutely no knowledge of the rural areas. I may be excused if I say that the Planning Commission, composed of big pandits, tender their advice on agriculture, and the Ministry of Agriculture is obliged to follow that advice. The result is that matters of agriculture have become more complicated in this country.

The second big body is the National Development Council. There also, big

pandits sit and tender advice. The latest advice given by them, according to the reports of the *Times of India*, runs as follows:

"Considerable attention was devoted to the question of prices at today's meeting and it was agreed that every effort must be made to hold the price line".

It is said that every effort must be made to hold the price line. They did not consider it proper just to give a thought as to how the living conditions of the agriculturists can be improved. I do not find any report wherein the big pandits have given thought to the living conditions of agriculturists. However, when the question of agriculture comes up, they impose their terms and their advice. But when the question of labour comes, they become helpless. On the question of labour also, the press report says:

"Advice was given to freeze wages and a proposal by one of the members of the Council for a wage-freeze was vigorously resisted by the Labour Minister, Shri Nanda, and others".

These are very fine things! It means this: we bow down to those persons who come with the weapon of strike. We dictate our terms to those who bow down to us. Agriculturists in the country are most unorganised and they carry out whatever is said by the Government. They do not go on strikes and so they are dictated too very often.

Recently, we have been seeing the strike of bank employees. They gave a threat of strike, and the State Bank employees went on strike. Our Labour Minister rather goes down to them and approaches their unions for settlement of the strike. I want to know from the Government whether the Government desires that agriculturist should also go on strike. Let us decide it. If that is the desire, there are ways and means. But let the Government decide that.

I would humbly submit that most of the pandits sitting at these big councils have not studied the reports

published by the Government. I would refer to one report only, which deals with the living conditions of agricultural labour and of persons living in the rural areas. The report is called *Agricultural Labour—How they work and live*. This is a Government publication. In it there are figures for 1950-51, and statements are given, showing the annual *per capita* expenditure of agricultural labour families and of the rural families. For agricultural labour, the figure is Rs. 107.2. For rural families, the *per capita* figure comes to Rs. 204. This is given in statement 30 of the book.

Much has been said about big landlords living in the rural areas and about the money-lenders and other persons doing other business. Considering all these points I would like to know what must be the living conditions of men engaged in agriculture. Everybody including my Communist friends and PSP friends wants living wages for the workers. Workers are also those engaged on farms. 90 per cent. of agriculturists are as good as other labourers. So, I want to know what should be their living standards. Has the hon. Minister of Agriculture ever considered this point? What would be the living standard of men engaged in agriculture?

Everybody says there must be price fixation. Everybody says that there must be a holding of the price line. Everybody says it. But how are you going to improve the social and living conditions of these persons engaged in agriculture? One of my hon. friends also said that agricultural labour lives most miserably. I agree with him. But he must also understand that when there have been increases in prices, there have been increases in wages of the farm labourers also.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

An Hon. Member: That is mopped up by townsmen.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri P. R. Patel: I am coming to that. From page 24 of the report which I mentioned—*Agricultural Labour—How they work and live*—it is seen that taking the base year 1938-39, and with the base at 100 during that year, the figure for food prices in North India came to 493, in 1950-51. The wages rose from 100 to 508. So also in Assam, the food prices came to 392 from 100, while the farm labourer's wages came to 374. I am not reading the whole thing, but I am submitting that the wages have increased as the prices have increased. So, those persons who talk of lowering the prices are the enemies not only of the agriculturists, but of the agricultural labourers.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: What is the wage of the agricultural labourer?

Shri P. R. Patel: I am giving the earning of an agriculturist and an agricultural labourer. I think there should be no haste. The cultivating labourers in this country are 44.8 million and cultivators are 204.2. Non-agriculturists are 37.7 million. Let us consider the income of the agriculturist and of the farm labourer. I am reading from page 21:

"From the average agricultural wage income of the agricultural labour family, their estimated wage bill for hired agricultural labourers in such families works out to about Rs. 500 crores. According to the report of the National Committee, agriculture other than plantations accounted for Rs. 4,800 crores of the national income."

Rs. 4,800 crores is a big sum, but let us understand that that is the gross income.

The pandits sitting in the Development Board and in the Planning Com-

[Shri P. R. Patel]

mission consider that agriculture is a profession where the net income is 50 per cent. I would ask those persons to take up agriculture and if they do not lose 20 or 25 per cent. more, I would compensate that. Everybody who is an agriculturist knows that agriculture is a profession where one is hardly able to make both ends meet because of the buffalo. One year may be a surplus year, but the two successive years are such that he becomes indebted. However, our pundits sitting here under the fan believe that agriculture is a profession which gives 50 per cent net income from the gross earning. Whatever be the advice given by these pundits, I do not understand how agriculture is going to be improved.

I think the best course for the country would be just to disband these pundits—the Planning Commission and the Development Board—and let our Ministry handle this problem. I think that will be a wise thing for the country. If there is any dispute between the bank and the bank employees, the bank and the Government do not say, "Let the bank employees come to us individually and we shall talk to them and look into their grievances". They never say that. But they consult the organisation of the employees.

The hon. Minister has been in office for the last one year, I would like to know from him whether he has ever consulted any farmers' organisation and if not why. Somebody raised a question regarding the farmers' forum and much was said about it today in the Press. I do not want to say anything more. Let there be a true farmers' organisation. You can come with a Bill, define a farmer and you can do so many things. Why should there not be a farmers' organisation and why should they not be consulted? The Government talks of ceiling, co-operative farming and so many other things, but Government does not talk of agriculturists and their organisations. So long as the Government does

not encourage the farmers' organisations and consult them, the food problem shall never be solved. That is my understanding.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is not the hon. Member a farmer?

**Shri P. R. Patel:** I have been a farmer, but it was my good fortune that I left farming.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is being consulted at every moment.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** No, Sir; I know how we are consulted. I will just narrate that story.

**Shri M. V. Krishnappa:** He is still looking like a farmer.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** Take fertilisers. It is a very fine word and fertilisers must be given to the agriculturists. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what profit has been made by selling these chemical fertilisers within these three or four years. My information is that the Government has made a profit of about Rs. 2 crores from fertilisers.

**An Hon. Member:** Rs. 3 crores.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** My information is it is Rs. 2 crores. Government makes money from everything and Government makes money from the fertilisers also. Let the prices be kept under check. That is the only thing. I would request the hon. Minister not to make profit out of this. There is a proverb that a poor man's wife is the bhabhi of one and all. So, agriculture has become the target of one and all. There is not only the Planning and the Development Board, but there is another board also, viz., the Forward Markets Commission. I will show you how this Forward Markets Commission works as the great enemy of the agriculturists. Recently in Ahmedabad, there was the forward market dealing in Kalyan cotton. The ceiling price fixed by Government is

Rs. 840. The marginal line was Rs. 770. The fluctuation varies between the floor price and the ceiling price. The margin was Rs. 2,500 for 100 bales. That is to say the buyer has to deposit Rs. 2,500 if he buys in the market 100 bales. The price shot up and went to Rs. 803. So, it was Rs. 37 below the ceiling price, and the Forward Markets Commission issued another margin that those who buy 100 bales must deposit Rs. 7,500. The result was that the prices were checked. So, the business of the Forward Markets Commission is to check the prices when the prices go up.

15 hrs.

When the agriculturists are expected to get more, than the Forward Markets Commission goes there to check the prices. When the prices go up there is an uproar from this side and that side that the price should be checked and we talk of control, this and that. May I submit that the Forward Markets Commission is also another body which should be done away with or put under the Agricultural Department so that the advice of the Agricultural Department may be taken by it off and on? Now it is under the Commerce Ministry and, as you know, in commerce they only consider what profits should be earned by the businessmen and what losses should not be incurred by the businessmen. They never think of the agriculturists and the result is that, in the name of Forward Markets Commission and all other bodies, they dictate and the dictation is just to ruin the farmers.

Sir, everybody says that the farmers are making money. Even the mill-owners, who are earning more than one crore rupees a year, say that any additional tax would ruin them and their industry. So there are the agriculturists who can bear the burden! Persons moving in motorcars, going in aeroplanes, living in bungalows, they say that they cannot bear the burden. So I would like that our Agriculture Minister should be a man who should be the defender of the agricultural

interests. If he could not, I would submit—it is not for me to advise because the working of the present Cabinet system I know—I would only request him to better resign and not to just bring bad name to him.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He would also be compensated like the Planning Commission?

**Shri P. B. Patel:** No, Sir. The Agriculture Minister, I know, is a bold man, is a practical man. Some days back, at Hyderabad he gave out his views which really represented the views of the agriculturists. When I said to the agriculturists about this, they were very happy. He had stated:

"Today the farmer's fate was decided by the Government and others. The forward markets decided the prices of his produce. The pattern of crop was not his concern. Others decided it . . . As long as the farmer continued to be a neglected factor, improved production is not possible . . . Any scheme to increase production would be of no avail unless the farmer was enthused to produce more. Fertilizer might be made available, soil might be tested, research might be conducted, the technical 'know-how' might be provided, but it was only the farmer who could increase the production. . . . Patriotic appeal could not enthruse the farmer to step up production. He should be made to understand that by doing so he stood to benefit. He should not be asked to produce things which he could not sell at his option."

If at all the Government of India accepts this advice, I think the agriculturists will be happy and the agricultural problem would be solved.

In the end, I would just like to remind the hon. Minister what advice was given by a Kashmiri pandit to the then ruler in the 12th or 13th cen-

[Shri P. R. Patel]

ture. It is an extract from "*Rajatarangini*" translated by Ranjit Sitaram Pandit, page 127. His advice to the ruler was:

"Action should be taken repeatedly so that the people in the villages should not possess grain for consumption and bullocks for the area of the fields in excess of annual requirement.

For if they were to have excessive wealth they might become very terrible Damaras in a single year able to violate the authority of the king."

The ruling party is now, perhaps, in the place of the king.

"When once the rural population secures raiment, women, woolen blankets, food, trinkets, horses, dwellings which are worthy of the capital; when fortifications which ought to be cared for are neglected through arrogance by the kings, and when they show lack of appreciation of the character of their officers, when from a single district is exacted the mainenance for the armed forces; when the civil servants have formed a league by matrimonial alliances with one another; when the kings take the same view as the civil servants in the departments of State then it may be known without doubt that there has been a reversal of the good luck of the subjects."

I also believe it. Perhaps the Planning Commission is in the position of this Kashmiri Pandit and if the Planning Commission and the Development Council give advice to the ruler, the Congress Party and if that advice is followed, not only will it bring ruin to the country but it will also bring ruin to the political ruling party.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I wish to make a few observations on the Demands for

Grants of the Food and Agriculture Ministry. The main objective before the nation, as made out by the Finance Minister in presenting his Budget, was to help the growth of conditions by the end of the Second Five Year Plan for a favourable and hopeful launching of the Third Five Year Plan. The Finance Minister observed in his speech that the first requisite for this is increased production. He further stated:

"This is axiomatic and we cannot afford, even for a moment, to lose sight of it."

Then he says:

"mobilising the resources required for this is not going to be easy and will entail progressively harder work and larger sacrifices by all sections of the community."

May I take the liberty, Sir, with your permission, to ask the Government of India, whether they regard the hierarchy of public servants in the employment of the Government of India and the State Governments from the President of the Union Government to the peons of the offices as falling under the category of some section of the community to whom he has made this earnest appeal for harder work and larger sacrifices. If this class which represents the most cultured and enlightened class of the Indian population is included in his appeal then there lies a great responsibility on the members of this class occupying the most exalted and respectable positions to set an example of that harder work and larger sacrifice before the public. I humbly suggest, without meaning any disrespect to anybody, that Government servants drawing high salaries, say, above Rs. 1,500 per month should be persuaded by the Government of India to agree to some drastic cut in their salary before approaching the public with an appeal for harder work and larger sacrifice. In presenting a Budget of this kind we should have imposed the same harder work and larger sacrifice on them. I can assure you that a sacrifice like that volun-

tarly offered by the Government servants occupying higher positions will be very much appreciated by the people and their prestige will certainly not suffer. On the other hand, it will add to their strength and to the power today given to these people.

In India the position and the prestige of an officer or a man never depended upon the amount of wealth which he was acquiring every time. It depended upon his merits and character.

क्रियासिद्धिः सत्त्वे भक्ति महताम् नोपकरणे

The success of the enterprise of the great men was not so much on the external resources but on the spiritual force and character. Chanakya, the Prime Minister of Bharat Samrat Chandra Gupta, who defeated the Greeks and emancipated the motherland from their domination, lived the life of a poor pious Brahmin and his only wealth consisted of a few balls of cowdung, bundles of small sticks of wood called *samidha* and a few pools of *kusha* grass brought by his students from the forest for the performance of his fire worship. Yet his writ ran throughout the Empire of Chandra Gupta. That great Sovereign even could not think of issuing an ordinance to suspend it even for a minute. Similarly, Shri Samarth Ramdas remained a poor devotee of Prabhū Ramchandra earning his livelihood by begging from door to door. Yet Shri Chattrapati Shivaji Maharaj would not initiate any big policy or take any important step without consulting him. We have seen that spirit in our own times in Lokmanya Tilak, Mahatma Gandhi and Pujya Vinobaji who is still before us as the living symbol of that supreme spirit of renunciation brightened by his lofty ideal of universal brotherhood coupled with a continuous service to the people in distress and suffering. But in the last few years I have unfortunately seen several instances where public men have sacrificed principles for the sake of office and not office for the sake of

principles. I am afraid that lectures by hon. Ministers are not going to create that spirit of sacrifice in the people on which the hon. Prime Minister has pinned his hope for the success of the Third Five Year Plan. The hon. Finance Minister has also mentioned that there will be need also for substantial external assistance. The investment target for the Third Five Year Plan, as now reported to be accepted by the National Development Council, is to the tune of Rs. 9950 crores in the public and private sectors together.

The point which is of the utmost importance in this connection and which the hon. Finance Minister has very earnestly pressed in his speech is that the Government of India "are anxious to make the period of dependence on special external assistance as short as possible". It is a very good decision, no doubt. But that is possible if we can reach the stage at an earlier date where the bulk of our investment programme is based on the domestic output of capital goods and equipment. Our production, both agricultural and industrial, must be quickened to expedite that stage. We should therefore be able to solve the problem of the availability of foreign exchange by minimising the imports and maximising the exports. That is the only solution of the problem.

Viewed in this way, agricultural production must occupy the first place in the programme to be carried out in this year and in the first few years of the Third Five Year Plan. The magnitude of the operations of purchase of rice and wheat can be imagined from the fact that the budget estimates for the present year for that are Rs. 2,07,11,18,000 while the total expenditure of the Ministry is Rs. 2,87,66,11,000 excluding the amount of Rs. 1,07,90,000 for the Demands for Grants for Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Manipur and Tripura, which are also controlled by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.



[Shri M. S. Aney]

The hon. Ministers have a very difficult and delicate job to handle. I hope that the hon. Minister in charge of this Ministry will not leave any stone unturned to make a success of the job which he has been called upon to handle and to take up. His effort of building up a buffer-stock and re-organisation of the present zones with a view to stabilise and equalise the prices, which has been criticised severely by my hon. friend who has just preceded me, is significant though he has not yet succeeded in persuading the Madhya Pradesh Government to accept his suggestion of bringing the Bombay State and the Madhya Pradesh State together in one common zone.

What I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. Members of this House is that the entire Vidarbha region is the worst sufferer on account of the tug of war that has been going on between the Government of Bombay State and the Government of Madhya Pradesh State. Vidarbha Division and Chatisgarh Division have been interdependent for more than two hundred years on each other in the matter of supplies of their foodgrains and also trade, commerce and industry. In Balaghat District, which now comes in Madhya Pradesh State, considerable agricultural land is under cultivation of people living in Nagpur and Bhandara Districts. The rice grown in their land cannot be brought by them outside the limits of Balaghat District on account of the ban imposed upon the export by the Madhya Pradesh Government. The disparity of prices of rice at Balaghat in Madhya Pradesh and Gondia and Tumsar in Bombay is very great. Rice is sold at Rs. 6 or Rs. 7 a maund in Balaghat whereas the price at Gondia and Nagpur is more than four to five times of that amount. It is reported that a good deal of smuggling is going on between places on the border and black-marketeers are thriving probably with the connivance of a considerable number of petty officers put in charge of these operations or of supervising them. When Gov-

ernments create unnatural conditions, it is the people who ultimately have to suffer. If the Chief Minister of Bombay had, in the alternative, urged on the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh that that Government should remove the ban on the export of rice to the Vidarbha districts which had been one with them till three years ago, the suggestion might have been acceptable to him, but it did not occur to the Chief Minister of Bombay to do it. He probably thought that the demand for such a concession for Vidarbha, however just or reasonable it might be, would go counter to the uniformity of policy throughout the State which is his aim, and also decidedly prejudicial to the emotional and administrative integration of Vidarbha and Maharashtra which he wants to bring about, and for which he has been trying for two or three years, I do not know with what amount of success.

15.22 hrs.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Vidarbha must swim or sink with Bombay. For the present at least that is the position. We are being asked to stand with our friends in the Bombay State and silently submit to whatever may happen.

There are two small points to which I wish to refer. Agricultural production can be increased rapidly by two ways. All the cultivable land should be given for cultivation to those who can undertake it. I learn that several lakhs of acres of land has been obtained by revered Vinobhaji in his *Bhoodan* and *Gramdan* campaign. Government must not allow that land to remain fallow or indifferently cultivated. It is, in my opinion, unpardonable not to take proper steps to bring this land under efficient cultivation.

The second suggestion is that the farmers must be encouraged to make use of improved methods of cultivation and

use improved tools and mechanical instruments like tractors and power pumps on a larger scale in cultivating their lands. It is necessary to take recourse to these methods of cultivation. It will be wrong, therefore, to include agricultural tractors in motor cars; they should be exempted from the levy of this new duty, that is my suggestion.

I have here with me telegrams received from the farmers as well as other persons interested in cultivation in Madhya Pradesh. One telegram reads:

"We understand Central Board Revenue have extended motor vehicle excise duty rupees 2500 to agricultural tractors consequently over hundred farmers of Vidarbha who placed orders on number dealers have been badly hit and unable accept delivery tractor and implements ordered due prohibitive price increase stop exemption excise duty agricultural tractors absolutely essential to success third five year plan self sufficiency food stop failure give relief will result utter failure country agricultural programme stop please exempt agricultural tractors payment excise duty President Nagvadarbha Chamber of Commerce."

Many telegrams and letters like this are received by us and I am sure the Ministry of Agriculture will press upon the Finance Minister the claims of the agriculturists in this matter of exemption on agricultural tractors at least and also pump engines which are of so great use in irrigating the lands that are being brought under agriculture by the people. The case of electric pumps used for agricultural purposes deserves to be favourable considered for exemption.

This is my last point. I join with my hon. friend Seth Govind Das in demanding the prohibition of the slaughter of cows. I do not think it is necessary to go into any long arguments on this point. When Seth

Govind Das was speaking I heard some hon. friend remarking that this demand was more sentimental. I do not agree with that and I want the Government of India not to belittle it even if it be deemed to be sentimental by them. It is a sentiment of nine-tenth of the population of this country. It is a national sentiment. We have been exempting salt from any duty year after year. Is that not due to sentiment? There are certain sentiments which have gone deep into the intellectual and social structure of the people. But, as a matter of fact, the prohibition of cow slaughter is imperative from the economic point of view also. Akbar had done it. I say it is cruel to kill a cow for food, an animal that helps you to grow food and feed your children by its milk in infancy. It has a right to live and it is justice to rescue it from the knife of the butcher by statute. I conclude with a prayer of the Vedas:

मानो हिंसीत् ज.तवेदो  
ग म् अश्वम् पुरुषम् जगत् ।

That is, "Oh Fire, do not kill our cow, horse, man and anything that has life." This is our Indian tradition, in other words, our Dharma. I hope the House will take this dharmic consideration also into account while considering the demand for the prohibition of cow slaughter.

**The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas):** I would like to intervene at this stage to answer certain points raised by some hon. Members, in order that my senior colleague may, within the time that he likes to take and within the time that the Chair is pleased to give him, deal with certain larger questions of policy.

It is not my idea, as has been pointed out by Shrimati Renuka Ray, to paint a rosy picture of the situation on the food front and to be accused of an attitude or approach bordering on complacency. Nonetheless, taking the country as a whole, recent months,

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

according to me, have witnessed a situation which reflects, you may call it, a lessening of tension on the food front. There have been months of comparative ease—I underline the word “comparative”.

If this House is a mirror of the position obtaining in the country at large, then the trend of the present discussion, the questions asked during the Question Hour and the motions which have been given notice of for discussion etc., reflect a state of affairs which has not deteriorated, but has only, if at all, improved. We may ignore for the time being the index of wholesale prices and all those things. The hon. lady Member Shrimati Renu Chakravartty raised the question of the level of prices. She said that it was not fair to compare the pre-harvest peak prices with post-harvest prices. I agree with her, but I would like the House to remember that comparisons can be made between prices obtaining in a particular period in a particular year with the prices obtaining in the corresponding period in the previous years. If you compare like that, even if you compare the off-season prices, you will be able to find that the situation has improved. The hon. lady Member quoted some figures from the Administration Report, but she has not cared to notice what has been stated therein later on.

It has been stated there that in the case of rice, even if we had regard to the off-season periods, the maximum index in the off-season of 1959 was 113 as against 118 in the previous year. With regard to wheat, the position has been a little better. The figures indicate that the maximum that had been obtaining in the off-season period in 1958 had been 114, whereas the maximum obtaining in 1959 was only 100.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain):** What about 1964?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** We have to compare figures relating to periods

which are comparatively nearer, such as 1957 or 1958 or even 1956. It is not fair to compare with prices obtaining in the preliminary stages of planned development in this country.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** Why should the hon. Minister not compare with 1950 and 1951?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** I can compare with those years also. If my hon. friend cares, he can just go through the administration report and the other publications that have been made available to hon. Members, and compare the figures himself.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** They are much lower.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** I agree that the speech of the hon. Member who has just interrupted me has served as a corrective to the trend of discussion in this House, concerning the anxiety that has been expressed on the ground of rise in food prices.

A clearer picture can be had if we compare the wholesale prices of cereals as a whole. It may be borne in mind that the prices of cereals remained a little lower, I do not say, substantially lower, in January and February of 1960, as compared with the prices during the corresponding months of last year.

I said a little while ago that we may for the time being ignore the index of wholesale prices and other things, because if we do not take also the circumstances into consideration, then we are apt to draw incorrect conclusions.

For example, take the case of the index of rice. In Orissa, after the formation of the zone with West Bengal, we all know that the prices had gone up by about Rs. 2 to 3 per maund. We do not grudge that, because even then it is a fair price. If from Rs. 15 it has gone up to Rs. 18 it will reflect a great deal in the index

of prices. I just want to drive at that only.

Also, the index may not give us the correct position. Suppose, for purposes of comparison, we take the index of rice at a time when controlled prices were prevailing in West Bengal, and compare them with the index of present prices, that may not give us a real picture of the situation, because even when the controlled prices were prevailing in West Bengal, the open market prices would have been really much higher than the controlled prices.

I would also like the House to remember that when we consider the index of prices of food articles in general, we should not be guided by the impression that the index rises simply because of the increase or decrease in foodgrains prices only.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** May I interrupt the hon. Minister? Is it not correct that rice price dropped last year to 99, whereas now it has come down only to 105? Is that not significant?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** It is not 105; it has gone up only to 105.6 or something like that. The point that I was driving at was this. Of course, it changed the prices in Orissa, and made some difference in those prices, but we do not regret that difference at all, because that will be reflected considerably in the index of prices. So also is the position with regard to the difference in the situation in West Bengal. Of course, there have been rises in other parts of the country, as, for example, in the southern zone; there has been some rise there, but there has not been any abnormal rise there also.

We have also to take into consideration the prices of food articles other than foodgrains. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the publication *Economic Survey, 1959-60* which has been circulated to hon. Members along with the budget papers. It has been stated therein:

"The index of wholesale prices has of late been around 119. At the end of January, 1959, it was about 114. . . . The index for rice at 104.3 is higher by about 14 per cent. while that for wheat at 97.1 is lower by 25 per cent. Cereals taken together show a fall of some 3 per cent. and pulses have gone down by as much as 24 per cent. On the other hand, the other constituents of the food index such as edible oils, sugar and gur and tea have gone up by about 12, 11 and 24 per cent. respectively."

With regard to the other articles, the House knows—not that the Food and Agriculture Ministry wants to disown responsibility altogether—this Ministry has very little control on the level of prices of articles other than foodgrains.

Later on, it would be seen in that publication that:

"Of the rise in wholesale prices in 1959, food articles other than foodgrains accounted for nearly two-thirds, industrial raw materials for about one-sixth and manufactures for about one-tenth."

Later on, there are other indications also which should serve as a corrective when we approach this problem.

This leads me on to make a reference to the eastern rice zone, which has been made mention of by two or three Members from West Bengal who have spoken earlier. Shrimati Renu Chakravarty said that the expectations which the hon. Minister had roused when he announced the formation of this eastern zone have been belied. What were the expectations that were raised by the hon. Minister? Even before the formation of the rice zone, when it was said that the Central Government's inclination was to form Orissa and West Bengal into one composite zone, it was

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

pointed out that this zone would not be self-sufficient; it would be deficit to the extent of 3 to 4 lakh tons or something like that. So, no spectacular result was intended or was expected when this zone of West Bengal and Orissa was formed. But I may say that the results so far achieved do indicate that the expectations have not been belied, but I would say that the step has been justified. Now, what is the position in Orissa? You will find that after the formation of the rice zone of Orissa and West Bengal, the movement of rice and paddy from Orissa at the first stage was not adequate to begin with, but from February onwards, the movements have been fairly heavy.

Here, I may just refer to the point raised by Shrimati Renu Chakravarty that whereas I had stated on a previous occasion that there had been movement to the extent of about 80,000 tons, at that stage, the Orissa Food Secretary said that it was only about 40,000 tons or something like that. I would like to submit that my statement with regard to these figures is based on railway movement figures which I think are more authoritative than any other estimates of movements.

By 3rd March, 1960, about 1.23 lakh tons of rice and paddy had moved from Orissa to West Bengal. During the week ending 3-3-60, despatches amounted to about 20,000 tons, which means that if the movement is maintained at this rate, the despatches will be of the order of 70,000 to 80,000 tons per month. There have been also despatches by road and by the sea route. In spite of this heavy movement, there has been no undue rise in the prices of rice in Orissa which are now ranging between Rs. 16 and Rs. 18 per md. for common rice at the rail-head centres and for hand-pounded rice in the interior the prices are Rs. 14 to Rs. 15 per md.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** Have you seen the prices in Bengal?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** With regard to Orissa I have certainly got the daily prices prevailing there. It was between Rs. 16 and Rs. 18.

As far as the agricultural producer in Orissa is concerned, the position has improved; and as far as the consumer is concerned, he has got a fair price also. (*Interruption*). So far as Orissa is concerned, so far as the prices fair to the producer as well as to the consumer are concerned, there is nothing to find fault with the Centre.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** Is it a fact that initially the producer was getting only Rs. 9 per md.? He was selling in the *mandi*.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** That is paddy; it will work out to Rs. 15 or Rs. 15-8-0. At Rs. 9-8-0 per md. of paddy it will work out to Rs. 15 or something like that for rice.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Do you think that is fair price for the cultivator?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** That would also indicate that had it not been for the zone the Orissa cultivator would not have got that fair price. Even this the Orissa cultivator would not have got.

It must be admitted that soon after the formation of the eastern zone there has not been a considerable change in the price situation in West Bengal. The West Bengal prices had hardened to some extent even in January 1960 in spite of the formation of the zone. But we have to bear in mind that the zone was formed on the 19th December, 1959; but the formation of the zone was talked about even 2 or 3 months before that and it was more or less definite that the zone would be formed about a month or so before. So, in anticipation of the formation of the rice zone, the prices in West Bengal had already declined.

You will find that in February the prices started easing down and are now ruling between Rs. 22 and Rs. 23 per md. for common rice. I have got the daily bulletins and if the hon. lady Member wants to refer to them and get better informed, I am prepared to hand over that paper to her.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** In Calcutta is it Rs. 25.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** For common rice the price was between Rs. 22 and Rs. 23. In certain areas it was something like Rs. 24 or so. Compared with the prices that have been existing in Calcutta or in other parts of West Bengal, it cannot be said that the prices were abnormally high. There is definitely improvement in the situation in West Bengal, notably in Calcutta. I believe the hon. lady Member will agree with me that there is no atmosphere for starting a further agitation on the scale that was prevailing before the zone was formed or the controls on prices were withdrawn in West Bengal. (*Interruption*).

You will find that last year the conditions became extremely difficult. The entire House is aware of that. After State trading was undertaken by the West Bengal Government through a system of levy on mills and attempts were made to enforce price control orders, the market arrivals practically stopped and a large number of rice mills closed down for want of paddy. In spite of very large scale distribution of rice from Government stocks, it was found very difficult to maintain supplies in that State. I do not know whether the hon. lady Member Shrimati Renuka Ray wants a reversion to this state of affairs by insisting on controls.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Is it not a fact that it was because of the imperfection of the machinery that we had there that the crisis came up?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** I will come to your State. (*Interruption*). This year the condition is entirely different.

**Mr. Chairman:** Let the hon. Minister proceed. It is very unfair that he should be interrupted like this. We must hear what he says. Let the hon. Minister be allowed to proceed. There is no question of talking like this. This is not the way that hon. Member should go on giving a running commentary.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** This year the condition is entirely different. The supply in the market is plentiful.

**An Hon. Member:** A point of clarification, Sir.

**Mr. Chairman:** After the speech is over a question may be put, if necessary.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Although in January the prices rose to some extent, they have now declined and there is a perceptible easy tone in the prices of rice in West Bengal. It will be our endeavour by various measures to maintain this easy tone. As a result of the cordoning of the Calcutta industrial area against exports and large scale supply of rice by the Central Government for distribution in the Calcutta industrial area, the movement of rice into the Calcutta industrial area from outside is relatively small. There is, therefore, no fear that the demand from Calcutta might upset the price level in Orissa or in the West Bengal districts. We propose to make available a certain proportion of finer qualities of rice for distribution in Calcutta so that the prices of finer qualities also might be kept under check. When necessary, we shall be prepared to make available some rice to West Bengal Government for distribution in urban areas too.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Were not the prices higher than last year at that time?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** No.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Your index figures show that.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** That is exactly what I pointed out. The index figures

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

may not give us a correct idea because although there were controlled prices the index prices were based on the prices existing. Really, the open market prices were much more than the controlled prices. It may not give us a correct idea to compare the present West Bengal prices with the prices obtaining during this period last year according to the controlled prices. (*Interruption*).

By all these measures we hope to be able to keep the prices in West Bengal at a reasonable level. The conditions would have been even better but for the unfortunate drop in production in West Bengal once again as a result of serious floods.

This leads me to the questions that have been raised by hon. Members from Madhya Pradesh and especially Shri Shukla. He said that it should be the endeavour of the Central Government to persuade the Madhya Pradesh Government to agree to the formation of a zone with Bombay and Madhya Pradesh. We have already expressed our preference and we have made it clear more than once before this House that our preference is for a larger zone linking Madhya Pradesh with Bombay.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** Why not one zone for the whole of India?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** That question has already been raised. I think Shrimati Renu Chakravartty's approach appears to be that of a young child. If you cannot have controls, then have no controls at all. She cannot think of any *via media* between controls and *laissez faire*. . . .

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** I am not Renu Chakravartty.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** My hon. friend Shri Shukla was pointing out to certain defects obtaining in the procurement machinery in Madhya Pradesh. It may be that in the beginning of the last crop season there may have been some delay in our procurement organisation starting

functioning, but the present position is that our officers are spread out throughout the Chattisgarh area and brisk purchases are being made. You will notice from the figures that after November, 1959 we have been able to purchase, by about this time, 3.8 lakh tons of rice and by about this period last year we had been able to purchase only about 1,80,000 tons of rice. The entire quantity that we have been able to purchase last year till October has been 4,05,000 tons so that it would appear that our procurement machinery is working very satisfactorily there having regard to the quantum of purchases that have been made by the Central machinery within this short period. Our officers are prepared to purchase rice from anybody who can offer it at the Government purchase prices. There should, therefore, be no question of price in Madhya Pradesh declining below the Government purchase prices.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** What about wheat?

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Shri Shukla has also referred to the purchase of boiled rice and he has also referred to the question of the export of broken rice. We are purchasing boiled rice and we have also allowed the export of broken rice so that the main complaints of Shri Shukla are things of the past and it would not be correct to raise some complaints in the context of circumstances obtaining in Madhya Pradesh now.

It is true that in the case of wheat it may be said that the Centre has no procurement machinery there. With regard to the purchase of wheat, we have left it to the various State Governments who would desire to have purchases of wheat. The situation that is now obtaining in Madhya Pradesh with regard to wheat can only be remedied by adoption of one or the other course. Either the Madhya Pradesh Govern-

ment should agree to link up Madhya Pradesh with Bombay so that the producer in Madhya Pradesh would find a ready market and that for a reasonable price, or the Madhya Pradesh Government should itself make purchases. The Madhya Pradesh Government (also has been raising some difficulties with regard to this purchase, but we have been impressing on the Madhya Pradesh Government that it should be prepared to purchase wheat that is available in Madhya Pradesh at the procurement prices that have been fixed by the Centre.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** May I interrupt the hon. Minister? May I know...

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** When I interrupted you did not allow me to do so.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. This is not the way to put the question to the Chair.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** The Madhya Pradesh Government has already got stocks of wheat which are lying there and large stocks are coming there which are surplus to the requirements of the Madhya Pradesh State. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister is prepared to allot that quota to any other State, say, Bombay State or any other State. Unless this is allowed to go out of the State, the Madhya Pradesh Government cannot purchase the stocks.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** That is not correct. The Madhya Pradesh Government has not brought to our notice that large quantities are lying there and that we should take over those stocks. In fact, if large quantities are there we are prepared to take them over, we are prepared to allot to flour mills or other consumers so that there would not be any difficulty on that score.

**Shri M. V. Krishnappa:** We will arrange special trains.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Several hon. Members have referred to the question of State trading. I do not want to take the time of the House by referring to this question in detail. The policy of the Government has been explained to this House more than once regarding this matter. It has been pointed out by Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani that it will not be advisable to have procurement in deficient areas where there are only marginal supplies. That is also the point of view of the Government. My hon. friend Dr. Ram Subhag Singh also was arguing that it would not be proper to repress prices in surplus areas to such an extent as to create circumstances that would not give any incentive for the farmer to produce. These are the two points of view which have also to be taken into consideration when we discuss the question of State trading.

We have taken some steps in the matter of the tentative scheme that has been adopted with regard to State trading. The hon. House knows that wholesale traders throughout the country have been licensed and the purchase of foodgrains are being now made wherever possible and necessary. It will, however, be appreciated, as has been mentioned in this House more than once, that State trading in foodgrains is only a means, not an end in itself. State trading has, therefore, to be undertaken judiciously according to the circumstances of each State.

Last year, a number of States purchasing rice and paddy were not, however, happy. For example, in West Bengal after the introduction of the levy scheme and the control on prices with effect from 1-1-59, the arrivals of paddy and rice in the market declined. At one time it looked as if the rice had practically disappeared from the market. Similarly it happened in Bihar. The procurement of rice had to be given up in June, 1959 in order to ensure adequate availability of rice in the open



[Shri A. M. Thomas]

market. In the deficit States the factors of demand and supply have powerful influence on the market and any attempt on the part of the State Governments to enforce price control orders immediately results in the stocks going underground and the black-market developing. In the surplus States, however, there is no such difficulty. In the light of the experience of last year, the Madras and Mysore State Governments have also given up procurement of rice and paddy. At present, rice is purchased on behalf of the Government of India in the surplus States of Punjab and Madhya Pradesh. In Andhra Pradesh also Central Procurement Unit is continuing its function. But purchases are being made only on voluntary efforts and we have not been able to purchase any substantial quantity there. In the States of Assam, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and the Union Territories of Tripura and Manipur the rice and paddy are being purchased by the State Governments to meet the local requirements during the lean period. After the last harvest the wheat was purchased by the Government in the States of Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. At present, procurement of wheat in Punjab and Rajasthan stands suspended and the purchases are made only in Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh.

I make this position clear because I do not want to create any impression that we have given up State trading. As has already been pointed out, we have been purchasing foodgrains wherever possible and wherever it was found to be necessary.

I only want to refer to one or two points more. One point that was raised by the hon. Member, Shri Rajendra Singh is with regard to imports. He said that it is a despicable thing—it is his own expression—

to import foodgrains from America under PL 480. He more than once said that he was speaking on behalf of his party and that the entire time that is devoted to his party should be given to him. But I doubt whether he was voicing the feeling of his own party.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Yes, I do.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** He said that imports under PL 480 had to be discouraged as it was not advisable to make such imports. But some of the spokesmen from his party were voicing a different line of approach on previous occasions. Under the present circumstances it is impossible to avoid imports on the scale that we are having now.

16 hrs.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Sir, may I explain? He is distorting the fact.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. If he wants to put a question he will be given an opportunity after the speech is over—not in between. Otherwise, there will be no debate.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** He has been making certain very bold statements with regard to procurement policy and imports and on other things also. He has been accusing us in the matter of formation of the West Bengal-Orissa zone. I do not think these points deserve any answer in the light of what I have stated earlier.

My hon. friend, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, has said that in 1951 when our production was perhaps 18-20 million tons less than the present production, we had been importing more than four million tons and more or less the same quantity is being imported even now. It is true and it has been explained on the floor of the House on several occasions. This additional quantity has to be made available in the country in order to meet the increased de-

mand for foodgrains. In the context of a larger population, with an increasing purchasing power and larger development expenditure and increased money supply and provision of credit facilities, we have necessarily to maintain adequate supplies and our indigenous production, though it has substantially increased, could not meet these increased demands. We cannot proceed on mathematical calculations in these matters. We have to take into consideration the changed circumstances, quantum of money supply, etc. The *Economic Survey*—I referred to it earlier also—under the heading 'monetary trends' says that over the 12 months of 1959 the money supply in the hands of the public increased by Rs. 170 crores. In the previous two years it was lower: Rs. 75 crores in 1958 and Rs. 96 crores in 1957. It also mentions the other expansionary factors. So, we have for sometime more to import substantial quantities.

I would now refer to the point raised by Shri Rajendra Singh that the PL 480 imports were of advantage neither to America nor to India. He says that in one breath. In another breath, he says that it is of advantage to America. I may say that it has been mutually advantageous. In view of the foreign exchange difficulties we import wheat largely from the United States under PL 480. It provides two advantages: firstly, payment in rupees in India and secondly, payment on deferred basis. They also add to our resources for the development of the country as a large proportion of the sale proceeds of wheat become available to us for expenditure on development projects. The United States has no large surplus in rice and only a small quantity is being imported from that country under P.L. 480. The rest of our needs has to be met largely from Burma. This involves expenditure on foreign exchange. We have, however, succeeded in obtaining some additional rice

against additional exports—some sort of an indirect barter, without having to pay for the rice in foreign exchange.

What I have been driving at is this. There is a large surplus in America which they want to dispose of but they need not give it to India for that matter. We also do not want to get these things in *gratis*, we want to pay for them. We want to pay for that. The only thing is, because we have our foreign exchange difficulties we want some favourable terms to which America is also agreeable, and it is under that arrangement that we are importing.

Sir, I do not want to take any more of your time. I will only refer to one more matter before I sit down. Shri Rajendra Singh raised the question that we have given an incentive of 50 per cent rebate on sugar production which is more than the average in the last two years. I may inform him that these incentives have been successful. It has been stated that the production of sugar has increased. Not only that, over and above the minimum price of Rs. 1-10-0 that was being paid to the growers several factories now pay a little more, round about two annas more. The factory is in a position to pay that because it anticipates that it would be able to make up from this rebate of 50 per cent.

I may also inform the House that the price-linking formula, however, did not specifically cover these concessions. In order to ensure that the cane growers get their proper share in the above concessions in the calculations of deferred payment—the concessions in the matter of rebate, early crushing and other advantages—we have also now made a provision and the Central Government have made suitable amendments in the price-linking formula to that effect. That will be seen from the notification that was issued on 2nd March, 1960. Therefore, it is not a case in which the Central Government was oblivious of the benefits

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

that should accrue to the sugarcane grower.

Sir, I think I have covered many of the points that have been raised so far in this debate.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shri Rajendra Singh may now put his question. He can only put a question, and not make a new speech.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Sir, I never said that imports of foodgrains from America are only to the advantage of the American people. My submission was that if America is sincere enough to help us they should help us by giving ten billion dollars worth of credit facilities and not in the form of farm surplus. That is the point that I made out.

**Some hon. Members rose—**

**Mr. Chairman:** Shri P. G. Deb may put his question.

**श्रीमती रघुनीबाई :** प्रा. घा. वंटा तो मे बर साहब बोल चुके हैं और उसके बाद भी सा. पूछे जा रहे हैं। इन सुबहा से बैठे हुए हैं और हमें बोलने का मौका नहीं मिला है।

**Mr. Chairman:** He wanted to put a question when the hon. Deputy Minister was speaking. He wanted some clarification. Then, I am only asking him to seek that clarification now.

**Shri P. G. Deb (Angul):** The State officials said that the price of rice in Calcutta had risen from Rs. 20.5 a maund to Rs. 23.5 within three weeks in January. I want to know whether the price has risen or not.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** The figures given here are all different from what have been published.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Deputy Minister is not inclined to reply. Shri Venkatasubbaiah.

**Shri Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you very

much for giving me an opportunity to speak on these Demands. Sir, India is mainly an agricultural country. Out of the total geographical area of 811 million acres the area that is under cultivation is 403 million acres. As per the report of the Planning Commission, at the time of partition, the area that was actually under irrigation was 26.5 million acres. But after the attainment of Independence, much progress has been made under irrigation with the result that by the fourth year of the Second Five Year Plan nearly 38 million acres of land have been brought under irrigation. At a cost of nearly Rs. 1,510 crores, nearly 62 million acres of land are being brought under cultivation by way of major, minor and medium-sized irrigation. If we look at these figures, we may come to the conclusion that much progress has been made so far as the irrigation facilities are concerned.

But still there is much to be done. The way in which our planning is being carried out, so far as increased production in agriculture is concerned, is most haphazard. The Prime Minister the other day said that nearly Rs. 2,000 crores are going to be allotted in the third Five Year Plan for improvement in agricultural production in this country. Nearly Rs. 600 crores are being brought directly under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture for this purpose.

**16.12 hrs.**

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The Planning Commission, in the first instance, suggested that by increasing the irrigation potential in the country, every effort should be made to secure an additional production of at least 48 per cent in the matter of food in this country. But ultimately, when the States were taken into confidence and when they were asked to put in their maximum effort towards agricultural production, they came to the conclusion, in consulta-

tion with the States, that by the end of the second Plan they would be able to increase food production by 28 per cent. only. From the notes circulated by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, it can be seen that by this time an increase of 14.3 per cent. in food production has been achieved. So, we can say that we have not made much headway in this direction in spite of the efforts put forward by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

But there is the other side of the picture also. As I said, out of about 411 million acres of cultivable area in this country, we could only get about 60 million acres of land under irrigation with assured water supply and the rest of the area has to depend upon the vagaries of the monsoon. So, looked at from this point of view, we can say that there has been a sincere effort made by this Government to increase food production in this country.

But for increased food production, we are only thinking in these terms, namely, whenever the prices increase, we at once consider how to bring down the prices. We are unable to say whether agricultural production has actually progressed in the country, whether intensive cultivation has been taken up and whether any facilities have been given to the agriculturists to increase production. Through the Community Development programmes and the NES schemes it has been thought that much impetus can be given to increase agricultural production in the country. But when it comes to the actual state of things, I am sorry to state that there is not much of co-ordination between community development and the Agriculture Ministry. Each is thinking in its own way. In many fields of agricultural production, you will find mere duplication, with the result that we are not able to make a concentrated effort for increased agricultural production.

When we think of agricultural production in this country, we have to

think in terms of how to increase agricultural production at the village level and whether we are able to supply to the agriculturist's doors his needs for increased production. Firstly, much emphasis has to be laid on intensive cultivation and soil conservation. These are two important items for increased agricultural production. The other items are fertilisers, manure, better seeds, better marketing facilities, etc. When I put a question the other day, the hon. Minister said.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am conscious of the fact that so many Members have made preparations for their speeches during this debate that they are getting restless—I must use that word. But what can I do? I have decided to extend this debate by one hour and the Government has agreed. Even then only a limited number can be accommodated. I shall try to accommodate as many as possible. If the Congress Members put a ban on themselves that they will not take more than 10 minutes, I will be able to call many of them.

**Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat):** There is no use in having 10 minutes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This cut would apply retrospectively.

**श्री विभूति मिश्र (बंगहा) :** यह बजट सेशन जब से शुरू होता है तब से यह १५ मिनट या कुछ अधिक का समय वक्ताओं को दिया जाता है और यह देखने में आता है कि एक ही भावमी को बजट डिसकशन में तीन, तीन बार बोलने का मौका मिल जाता है लेकिन बैंक बैंचर्स को जब कभी बोलने का मौका मिलता भी है तो यह आखिर में चल कर इस तरह १०, १० मिनट का टाईम देने की बात की जाती है, आखिर यह कहा का न्याय है ?

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं ने इसीलिए कहा है कि मुझ तो कोई एतराज न होगा अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी के जितने भी वक्ता हैं वे

[उपा-यक्ष महोदय]

एलीटड टाइम को प्राप्त में बांट लें। लेकिन अगर वे २०, २० मिनट भी बोलना चाहें तो मुझे तो कोई एतराज न होगा लेकिन यह बात जरूर है कि उस हालत में थोड़े ही मेम्बर्स बुलाये जा सकेंगे।

श्री श्री ११ व बस (दरभंगा) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चाहूंगा कि यह १० मिनट के बजाय १५ मिनट कर दिया जाय क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ कि १० मिनट के अल्प समय में कोई भी वक्ता अपनी सम्पूर्ण बातें ठीक प्रकार से निवेदन नहीं कर सकेगा और १० मिनट के अन्दर डिबेट कोई विशेष अच्छा और उपयोगी भी नहीं हो सकता। इसलिए १५ मिनट की टाइम लिमिट रहनी चाहिए।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीबाई : औरतों के लिए बोलने का टाइम बढ़ा दिया जाय।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर। कई मिनट तो इसी तरह बेकार में चले गये।

**Shri Venkatasubbaiah:** Regarding the distribution of fertilisers, when I said that from the border States of Andhra Pradesh, some fertilisers are finding their way into the Andhra State by way of black-market, I did not mean to say that those States should not be supplied with adequate quantities of fertilisers. I only meant that there was some defect in the supply of fertilisers to the farmers. I only wanted that strict measures should be taken and the supply of fertilisers to the agriculturists must be made fool-proof, so that the actual benefit may go to the farmers. That was my only intention and not that fertilisers should not be supplied to the agriculturists in those States.

The hon. Minister was reading from a report and against a demand of 18.8 lakh tons of fertilisers in this country, he was able to give only 11.9 lakh tons, much of which had to be im-

ported from foreign countries involving much foreign exchange. So, from the intensive cultivation point of view, we are still lagging behind, because we are not able to supply the required amount of fertilisers to the farmers. So far as the supply of better seeds is concerned, it has been pointed out that efforts are being made to set up more seed farms and to supply the agriculturists with better seeds. Another thing necessary for the increased production is the establishment of co-operatives and marketing societies. Much has been said on the floor of this House regarding marketing societies. If we want to place our agricultural economy on a sound footing we have to make a re-orientation of those marketing and credit societies so that they may give the agriculturists the necessary capital to increase food production. The outdated co-operative laws in this country, which insist more on the credit-worthiness of the borrower, are the biggest obstacles in the way of giving the necessary aid to the agriculturists at the village level.

Then I come to another important point, and that is the need for better communication in the ayacut areas. We have completed many irrigation projects at the cost of several crores of rupees and nearly some millions of acres have been brought under irrigation. But, simultaneously, we have not given our best thought on improving the communications, so far as the ayacut areas are concerned. Projects like Tungabadra, Nagarjunasagar and Hirakud have been taken up and some are nearing completion. At the same time, the need for improving communication within the ayacut area has not been given proper thought. The Tungabadra project has been completed a long time back and nearly 50 to 70 per cent. of the anticipated ayacut area has been brought under irrigation. But, for want of communications, the agriculturists are not able to go from one field to another to pursue their agricultural operations in

an efficient way. I understand that the Andhra Pradesh Government have made a request to this Government to give them a subsidy for laying certain roads in the Tungabadra project area. I plead with this Government on their behalf that for increased food production sufficient attention has to be bestowed on this aspect of the problem, and I hope this Government will certainly look into this matter and see that the communications in the ayacut areas are improved.

Then, though it has been pointed out that irrigation potential has been created for 15.7 million acres of land, the area that has actually been irrigated is only 5.9 million acres. Because of the difficulties which I have pointed out earlier in my speech, I think there are more valid reasons for utilising the entire irrigation potential for irrigating the land.

I congratulate the Government of Punjab for having introduced the crop insurance scheme in the State of Punjab. As I pointed out, a major part of the area is subject to the vagaries of monsoon and so agriculturists are not in a position to go ahead with increased production. The Agriculture Ministry should bestow their attention on this aspect of the question also.

Lastly, coming to the Ministry and the Ministers who are handling this portfolio, any amount of our sincere effort is not sufficient unless we create confidence among the people that, so far as agriculture is concerned, the Government is bestowing its best attention. In this respect I can congratulate the hon. Ministers who are at the helm of affairs. Soon after Shri Patil has taken charge of the Agriculture Ministry he has created a confidence among the agriculturists and has created a favourable atmosphere in this country that agriculture will receive its due attention and sympathetic consideration at the hands of the Government. I hope that increased attention will certainly be given and more capital outlay will be given

430 (A) LS—7.

for agricultural production in this country.

**Shri D. A. Katti** (Chikodi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, on many occasions the food problem has been discussed on the floor of this House and today again we are discussing this problem. But in spite of all these discussions the food problem has not ceased to be a problem at all. It is really a very unfortunate thing that though this is an agricultural country, we have not been able to achieve self-sufficiency in respect of food. We still depend for our food on foreign countries and are still facing the food crisis. Our Government is fully aware of the need of food and has spent a colossal amount during the two Plan periods. But our Government has not been able to improve the food situation. Every year some improvement is expected but it is only disappointment that falls to the lot. The situation is therefore getting worsened as a result of which the food prices have swelled to an extent which is extreme.

The Food Ministry in its report says that the production of foodgrains in the year 1958-59 touched a record level and that the yield during 1958-59 was 73.5 million tons as against 62 million tons in the previous year. Moreover, according to this report, the year 1959-60 holds promise of a fairly good year from the point of view of agricultural production. If this is the position then food prices ought to have been fairly reasonable. But the fact is that food prices have shot up to such an extent that even during the war time life was not so much miserable. Therefore one is forced to think that either the production figures are wrong or the Government have wrongly handled the food situation.

According to the figures supplied by the Government you will find that 1958-59 is the best year from the production point of view. The production in 1953-54 was 68.72 million tons. In 1954-55 it was 66.60 million tons.

[Shri D. A. Katti]

In 1955-56 it was 65.29 million tons. In 1956-57 it was 68.72 million tons. In 1957-58 it was 62 millions. In 1958-59 it is 73.5 million tons. Secondly, Government imported in 1957 35,82,000 tons, in 1958 38,73,000 tons and in 1959 38,07,000 tons. From these figures it is clear that in the year 1958-59 production is more and the import is also more. As regards the correctness of these figures I have got a reason to doubt. The production of foodgrains in the year 1955-56, according to the 1957-58 Report, is 65.29 million tons; according to the 1956-57 Report it is 64.80 million tons and according to the 1958-59 Report it is 65.8 million tons. This is the case with the figures regarding 1954-55 and 1956-57 production of foodgrains also. I do not know which of these figures is true, and why there should be any such discrepancy at all. Government may tomorrow say it is 37.5 million tons instead of 73.5 million tons, because here we are noticing a discrepancy. Therefore, I am not sure of these figures.

Even taking the figure as correct, I ask why, in view of this position, the Government allowed the food prices to go up, why prices have swelled to this extent. In the past when production was low, when import was low, prices were no doubt high, but they were tolerable, but today in spite of this production, prices have gone so high that they are intolerable. In answer the Government says in its report:

"The increase in production (i.e. in the year 1958-59) heled in relieving the difficult price situation in respect of foodgrains during this year."

You once told me, Sir, not to use the wor "lie", and I am not using the word "lie", but it is incorrect, because if you please refer to the token cut motions, you will find references to high prices, and anybody who wants to know whether there is any relief from the difficult price situation can go into the market and find out the prices. The prices are too high

Our friend Shri P. R. Patel says that prices must be high because the agriculturist is going to be benefited. There are 30 per cent of the people who are landless agricultural labourers, who earn only twelve annas per day. What about these people? Are they going to be benefited on account of these high prices? Sixty seven per cent of cultivated land is owned by 17 per cent of people in this country, and according to Shri Patel, the benefit will go to this 17 per cent of the people, and not the 83 per cent of the people. Therefore, the prices must be controlled, and price fixation is essential.

I think some time back, our Food Minister promised to appoint a Price Fixation Board. As yet he has not done that, there was so much complaint from Shrimati Renu Chakravarty this morning. That is essential, and prices should be fixed. Whenever prices fall, the State Trading Corporation must step in and purchase, and whenever there is a rise, it must release the food grains, and in that way it will be possible to control the prices.

Moreover, restriction on movement should also be removed. I am against it, because whenever there is any restriction, the tendency is to make as much profit as possible irrespective of any other consideration. Whenever any restriction is put, that creates a sort of impression that there is shortage, and immediately that impression brings in the profit-making tendency. Then hoarding starts and artificial scarcity is created which results in an inevitable shooting up of prices.

I have got experience of the Southern Rice Zone, because I am living on the border. Every day I find hundreds of trucks crossing the border. They carry rice. Before the zone was formed, prices were quite all right, after the formation of the zone, prices shot up. This is the ex-

perience of the zonal system. The zonal system has not worked successfully, and therefore I am opposed to that system. As Shrimati Renuka Ray said, let India be one zone, and there be free movement.

If you take into consideration food production during the two Plan periods, we find that there is no increase at all. On the eve of the launching of the First Plan, i.e., in 1949-50, production amounted to Rs. 57.9 million tons, and in 1957-58 it was 62 million tons. This increase is negligible, it cannot be counted at all whereas during the period 1952-57 there was a 40 per cent increase in food production in France, 52 per cent in Japan and Sudan, 60 per cent in Yugoslavia, 80 per cent in Turkey and 85 per cent in Iraq. This is the increase that these countries have achieved, whereas here we are only going up from 57 odd million tons to 62 million tons. This year, according to Government figures, the figure is expected to go up to 73.5 million tons. I do not know whether that is a correct figure. But, next year, there may again be a fall in production.

Whenever there is any decrease in production, then, immediately, Government throw the blame on the natural calamities, and they call the rain gods as the blind gods. India is such a vast country that natural calamities in some part of the country or other are natural; we cannot put the blame on them. But, whenever there is some slight increase in production, immediately, Government take the credit to themselves. The 1956-57 report says:

"The increase in production of most of the crops cannot be explained merely by increase in acreage nor can it be attributed purely to favourable weather conditions. Of late, agricultural productivity has been increasing due to developmental measures, such as the extension of irriga-

tion facilities, intensive use of fertilisers and manure, supply of improved seeds and adoption of better agricultural practices."

That is, Government want to say that that increase is due to their efforts and not due to the favourable weather conditions. But the time has come when Government should have some self-inspection now and see whether they have committed any mistakes. They think that everything that they have done is successful, and that they are doing a right thing. But that is a wrong thing, and that is why the country is facing this crisis today. They must have this self-inspection and stand for correction, if they have got any courage to do that and if they are honest to the cause and the purpose.

This is, of course, a very strange logic, but, anyway, let Government take the credit for themselves, if there is an increase. I have nothing to say. But my point is that there should be increase in production. And how can we achieve it? We have not been able to achieve it, even though we have incurred a colossal expenditure on these Plans. Some time back, the Prime Minister said that Rs. 900 crores has been spent on agriculture and community projects without any better return; he has expressed regret over that. That is, of course, a very good thing, that at least this much is known to them.

According to me, production can be increased by increasing the acreage and also by increasing the production in the lands that are already under cultivation.

This brings me to the question of land reclamation. In the fact of the growing population, a population which is growing with geometric progression, and the food shortage, it is necessary that land reclamation should also be given greater importance. I do not say that Government are not doing anything, they are doing something in this direction, but that is not



[Shri D. A. Katti]

at all satisfactory. For example, the Central Tractor Organisation has been able to reclaim from 1948 to 1959-60 only 16.79 lakhs acres of waste land. Out of a total provision of Rs. 450 lakhs in the Second Plan for land reclamation, only a sum of Rs. 273 lakhs upto December 1959, has been spent. This is not a satisfactory progress at all, for, in this country, the cultivable waste land measures about 60 million acres.

**Shri D. C. Sharma** (Gurdaspur): From where has my hon. friend got all these figures?

**Shri D. A. Katti:** My hon. friend Dr. Ram Subhag Singh said that at the most, 10 to 20 million acres can be reclaimed but that is not a correct thing. There is about 60 million acres of land lying waste, 85 million acres are barren land, and 29 million acres permanently fallow. 60 million acres are cultivable waste land, and people are ready to cultivate these waste lands.

I have found that they have appointed some expert committee to locate the waste lands in the villages and to suggest suitable measures to reclaim the lands. This committee will submit its report to Government in the Third Plan; the Government will take action in the Fourth Plan and the actual implementation will be in the Fifth Plan or Sixth Plan. I think it is not desirable. Every Deputy Collector's office or the Collector's office has got this information. It is not necessary to entrust this matter to this expert committee for locating the waste land.

The Scheduled castes in the villages, who are landless agricultural labourers, make applications every day and I have dealt with thousand applications and more. What was the reply from the Government? They say that land is required for grazing. As between man and cattle Government prefer cattle. Of course, I have got sympathy with cattle being a Bud-

dhist but many people here are crying for milk while there is the question of bread. (*Interruption.*) There should be some proportion. In the Bombay State and in the Mysore State it is not something which is proportionate at all. In Bombay it is 50 acres of land for 100 cattle; and in Mysore it is 30 acres of land. Is this the proportion?

Moreover, if this land is brought under cultivation, we would be able to get fodder for the cattle. I think they can live on that fodder only which will be available from this cultivation. In Bombay, the people who applied for this waste land had to start *satyagraha*. Thirty three thousand people courted jail within two months. This is the figure I am giving from Government of Bombay. Lastly, the Bombay Government agreed to give these lands to these people. This is an important question. There will be addition to production. The problem of unemployment of a number of these families will automatically be solved and there will be increase in production. I do not know why Government is not taking this matter into consideration. I have referred to this matter 4 or 5 times in this House. But the Government is thick-skinned; and it is not at all disturbed.

The Government spend Rs. 150 crores for import of foodgrains. Our fertilizer requirement is so great that you cannot produce it. You cannot import more because of the foreign exchange difficulty. Here you spend so much on these things. If you can do this, you can save foreign exchange and save people also. But, that you are not prepared to do. You do not want to give land to 30 per cent of the people, land which is cultivable.

You have spent on the C.T.O. in the Second Plan Rs. 293 lakhs. In Bombay State 39 lakhs of acres of land is being given to the people; give them at least Rs. 50 lakhs. They will

simply show you how the land has to be reclaimed. You do not do that; you do not give them land; you do not want to have radical land reforms; you do not give them better wages; you do not give them work. Human beings have no value in this country. Thirty per cent of the people earn at the most 12 annas per day. That too is not even guaranteed. But yet, Shri Patel says that the prices should go high. It is a wonderful argument.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** If you want higher wages we should no oppose.

श्रीमती सहोबरा बाई राय (सागर-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आपने कहा था कि दस मिनट में स्पीच खत्म होनी चाहिये, लेकिन अब तो बीस मिनट होने को आए हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : दस मिनट में आपसे साहबान के लिए कहा था । ये अपोजीशन के हैं इनको ज्यादा वक्त देना होगा ।

**Shri D. A. Katti:** Then comes the question of increasing production in the lands already under cultivation. To increase production three things are necessary. Irrigation facilities should be provided; fertilizers should be provided; and improved methods of cultivation should be adopted. According to the statement made by the hon. Minister last time, the yield per acre is 1/4th of a ton whereas in other countries it is more than 2 tons per acre. So, other countries produce 8 times more than what we produce here and it is possible to double or triple the production per acre provided we honestly and sincerely in a right way try to increase it.

So far as the question of irrigation is concerned, a lot of money has been spent. Irrigation potential is made available, but is the irrigation potential fully utilised? No. Only 50 to 55 per cent of the irrigation potential that is made available is utilised. Why then there should be this waste?

The major irrigation is not going to irrigate all the lands. Therefore, we have to depend on minor and medium irrigation schemes too. But this question of minor irrigation which is so important is completely neglected. The Ministry in its Report says that the minor irrigation is very important because it gives quick results. When Government knows this, why not lay more stress on minor irrigation works? But the beauty of the Government is, they know this well but they do not do it. They speak of this, but they do not do it.

In U.P. there are about 6000 State tubewells and these State tubewells are useless, and are not working for the major part of the year. This is due to ill plan. That thing is not taken into consideration. I am just stating one example, but there are many such things. Minor irrigation is to be given more importance; more money should be spent on minor irrigation works.

Some hon. Members said that they are not getting two crops a year. But in my constituency, wherever there is an irrigation facility, they are getting two crops a year. On account of the major irrigation about 18 million acres have been brought under irrigation but they are not getting double crops. That has to be enquired into because irrigation is specially meant for that. Of course, whenever there are no rains irrigation is essential, but whenever there are rains irrigation is essential for getting two crops.

Then comes the question of fertilisers. There is a lot of demand for fertilisers. Government is not able to supply fertilisers in sufficient quantities. This year there is a demand for 18.80 lakh tons of fertilisers whereas the total availability during 1959-60 is 11.94 tons. That is Government is able to meet only half the need. Fertiliser is very essential. If you are not able to produce more fertiliser, you must import it. You must curtail expenditure on other schemes, but you

[Shri D. A. Katti]

must import more fertiliser because fertiliser is essential.

Then comes the question of improved methods of cultivation. In spite of all these campaigns, research centres and many other schemes—I cannot name them here—cultivation is done in an old fashion. There is absolutely no change in the method of cultivation here whereas in other countries they have followed improved methods and they have been benefited by them. There should be no hesitation in following the methods that are followed by other countries.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Members time is up.

**Shri D. A. Katti:** I must say that the country is facing the food crisis because of the wrong approach and because of the efforts which are half-hearted.

**Shri Shobha Ram (Alwar):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would like to confine myself only to two points. One is with regard to land management and the other with regard to the regulation of prices.

Land Reforms have a great bearing on the agricultural production. We have admitted that there are two objectives of the land reforms: firstly to remove certain impediments upon agricultural production arising from the character of the agrarian structure and secondly, to create conditions for evolving as speedily as possible an agrarian economy with high levels of efficiency and productivity. I am not going to refer to the first one because appreciable progress has been made by abolishing intermediaries, making the tenure safer and regulating fair rents.

So far as agrarian reorganisation is concerned, I would like to throw some light on it. Land reforms cannot succeed without the extension of credit facilities and without the pro-

gramme for eliminating the weaknesses as arise out of the uneconomic and fragmented holdings and deficiencies in the use of land management. Therefore, four aspects had been given by the Planning Commission of the agrarian reorganisation: (1) consolidation of holdings, (2) land management practices, (3) development of co-operative farming and (4) co-operative village management. I am not going to lay great stress on the consolidation of holdings programme but certainly I would like to say something about land management practices. It has been admitted by all that agricultural holdings, irrespective of any size, should be managed efficiently and only a few years back a panel on land reforms was appointed to study these questions. There were certain recommendations made by the committee and I would like to refer to two main recommendations of that committee. Firstly, the recommendation was that all cultivators have an obligation to maintain reasonable standards of production and to preserve and develop the fertility of the soil. Therefore, land management legislation should provide for the necessary incentives and sanctions for the performance of this obligation. Prescription of standards should also be linked with the fulfilment of certain conditions such as consolidation of holdings, progressive development of co-operatives and Government assistance by the provision of financial resources, technical guidance and supplies. Secondly, the most important recommendation was that the land management legislation should also provide for certain standards of efficient cultivation and management. But these recommendations have not been implemented. Only a few years back, the Planning Commission issued a memorandum to the State Governments to appoint a land commission with a view to implement these recommendations and I am afraid that most of the States had not taken any step in that direction.

Now, with regard to the development of co-operative forming, there is much criticism from many quarters for the last one year. I am requesting the Minister that the targets for the co-operative farming should be determined now so far as the Third Plan is concerned. These targets should be related to and dovetailed with the targets of agricultural production as well as the programme of national extension service and community development project areas.

Lastly, the pattern of village development, so to say, co-operative village management was the principle which was enunciated even long before in 1951 when the First Plan was prepared. But nothing has been done in this direction. With the progress of land reform, it is certain that the number of owners in each village will increase, while the disparities in the ownership of land would be reduced. Apart from the artisans and other persons who are engaged in non-agricultural activities, there is a fair section of population depending upon agriculture and who have got practically no share in the ownership of land. This is a problem which should be solved now. We want to establish a socialist pattern of society. But what about the share of this agricultural labour who are working in the field? They have not got any share in the ownership.

**Shrimati Laxmi Bal:** Have the factory labour got any share in the factory?

**Shri Shobha Ram:** That is being suggested now, I suppose.

Sir, there are three types of management of land which have been prescribed by the Planning Commission during the present Plan. That means there will be individual farmers who cultivate their own holdings, secondly certain groups of farmers who will pool their lands into co-operative working units and, thirdly, there will be some land belong-

ing to the village community as a whole. Our aim is to enlarge the co-operative sector by and by until the management of the entire land of the village becomes the co-operative responsibility of the community.

Now, how to achieve this state? This is a problem. How to solve it? The solution of the problem lies in the starting of service co-operative societies in the beginning. These service co-operatives must also be set up on two main principles; firstly, that the beneficiaries of the land reform should acquire the status of peasant proprietors, and, secondly, in respect of those lands which have been held by peasant proprietors the principle of "State aid to the co-operators only" to apply. This principle of State aid to co-operators can be applied in the following manners: firstly, long term loans, medium term loans, short-term loans as well as subsidies for the various categories of food production schemes should be made available only to the co-operators; secondly, the profit from State trading should go back as loans and grants for food production programmes and rural development—they should also be channelised exclusively through the service co-operatives to their members; thirdly, fertiliser seeds and implements and other facilities which are at present made available direct to the producers through departmental agencies should now, in future, be channelised through the service co-operatives to their members.

17 hrs.

Lastly, I would like to say something about the regulation of prices. For the successful implementation of the Plan the prices should be regulated, because we find that in an un-planned economy the level of prices is determined by the forces of supply and demand. As a result, the prices are subject to the influence of economic factors which some times go against the interest of planned development.

[Shri Shobha Ram]

While in the planned economy we cannot just permit these prices to remain at the mercy of market forces. There are certain conditions to be fulfilled for controlling the prices.

First, there should be an adequate supply of foodgrains to meet the growing demands of the increasing population and incomes. We have accepted the policy of State trading in foodgrains. For the success of State trading, it is essential that there should be a sufficient and adequate supply of foodgrains being maintained. For the maintenance of the adequate supplies, as my hon. friend just now narrated, there are vast tracts of land which are lying uncultivated in the different parts of the country which should be reclaimed by the Government and be converted into mechanised farms and operated by the Government.

Secondly, buffer stocks should be built up with a view to implement the policy of stabilising the prices. How to build these buffer stocks? It is essential that warehouses should be made available in advance. Government should also do one thing more. It should build up an organisation for direct purchases from the farmers

Lastly, the price level of all other articles of consumption, like cloth, sugar and vānaspati, etc., should also be watched and should be kept in control, because we find there is a large section of the population which is not in a position to afford to pay the prices and specially when the prices of these commodities are rising. What is to be done? One thing has been suggested by many eminent economists of our country. They have said that the adoption and effective implementation of common production programmes will go a long way in solving this problem and that will try to curtail the rising tendency of the prices of these commodities. Further, that will also give an opportunity for work to a large section of

the people. Therefore, the question of the regulation of prices is most important. Thus, I have mentioned two points in the main. I have stated that so far as agrarian reorganisation is concerned the State Governments should take immediate steps and a date-line should be fixed within which all the land legislation should be completed and implemented.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री विभूति मिश्र ।

श्रीमती सहोबरा बाई राय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, महिलाओं को भी बोलने का भवसर दिया जाना चाहिये ताकि वे अपने अनुभव यहां रख सकें ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री विभूति मिश्र ।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, फूड एंड एग्रिकल्चर मिनिस्टर को जो डिमांड्स पेया की गई हैं, मैं उनका हार्दिक समर्थन करता हूँ। हमारे एक भाई कट्टी साहब बोल रहे थे और उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कहा कि किसान जो पैदा करते हैं उनकी कीमतें नहीं बढ़नी चाहियें। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर किसानों को जो चीजें वे पैदा करते हैं ज्यादा कीमत नहीं मिलेगी तो जिन मजदूरों की वे बात करते हैं, उनको कहां से अधिक दिया जा सकता है। जब किसान के पास पैसा होगा, जब किसान को कुछ बचत होगी, तभी तो वह मजदूरों को देगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह भाई खेती नहीं करते हैं और खेती का उनको कोई भ्रंदाजा नहीं है। वह मजदूर हो सकते हैं लेकिन खेती के मजदूर वह नहीं है, वह शहरी मजदूर हैं।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जब तक मौसम अनुकूल नहीं होता है, जब तक मौसम किसानों का साथ नहीं देता है, पैदावार नहीं होती है। हम चाहे जितनी कोशिश करें, बिना वर्षा के, और समय पर वर्षा के फसल अच्छी

नहीं हो सकती है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि पार-साल का हम लोगों को अनुभव है, हम लोगों ने जो तोड़ कर खेती की थी, बीज डाले जे, खाद डाला था लेकिन वर्षा न होने के कारण हम अपनी धान की फसल को रोक नहीं सके, पाटिल साहब हों, पंडित नेहरू हों, दुनिया का कोई भी आदमी हो, जब तक मौसम गवाही नहीं देता है, कुबेर भगवान हमारा साथ नहीं देते हैं, मेघ भगवान हमारा साथ नहीं देता है, खेती नहीं हो सकती है। वर्षा के बिना खेती का होना असम्भव है।

मैं अपने मिनिस्टर साहब से एक बात की मांग करता हूँ और वह यह है कि चाहे एग्रिकलचर कमिशन हो चाहे प्रेजीडेंट कमिशन हो जैसा कि स्पीकर साहब ने कहा है लेकिन इस किस्म के कामशन की बहुत सख्त जरूरत है। हमारे ठाकुर दास भागवं जी कहते हैं कि दूध के बारे में कोई डाटा नहीं है, कोई दूसरे भाई कहते हैं कि हमारे पास खेती का डाटा नहीं है और मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब के पास कई बातों का डाटा नहीं है, यह सब इकट्ठा करने के लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि इस किस्म के कमिशन की सख्त आवश्यकता है। एक कमेटी उन्होंने मेहता कमेटी के नाम से बिठाई थी और दूसरी फोर्ड फाउंडेशन कमेटी थी लेकिन इस तरह की कमेटीज से काम चलने वाला नहीं है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने देखा होगा कि रायल एग्रिकलचर कमिशन बैठा था और उसकी रिपोर्ट जो है उसमें सब कुछ है, मजदूरी की क्या हालत है, खेती की क्या हालत है, फारेस्ट की क्या हालत है। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से अगर पूछूँ कि वह बतायें कि हिन्दुस्तान में कौन से सूबे में, कौन से गांव में, कौन से थाने में कितनी जमीन पहले ढर्जे की है, कितनी दूसरे ढर्जे की है, कितनी तीसरे और चौथे की है, तो वह नहीं बता सकते हैं। जब बटवारे

का कोई केस चलता है तो वह जमान का क्लासिफिकेशन हो कर ही चलता है और उसी के हिसाब से जमीन बंटती है। लेकिन हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब के पास कोई लेखा नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान में फस्ट, सीकंड, थर्ड और फोर्थ क्लास की कितनी कितनी जमीन है और न ही वह यह तय कर सके हैं कि इस क्लास से हम इतनी पैदावार लेंगे, इससे इतनी लेंगे। इनके पास डाटा नहीं है कि कितने बागीचे हैं, कितनी ऊसर जमीन है। ऐसी हालत में किस तरह से आशा की जा सकती है कि पैदावार बढ़ेगी। डाटा का होना बहुत जरूरी है और इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि एग्रिकलचरल कमिशन या प्रेजीडेंट कमिशन का स्थापित किया जाना बहुत जरूरी है और इसकी स्थापना तुरन्त हो जानी चाहिये।

प्राइसिस का भी यहाँ जिक्र किया गया है। रेखा गणित में एक बिन्दु उसका प्राण होता है, वैसे ही देश के लिए खेती प्राण है। हमारे पास किस तरह की जमीन है, उसका हम किस प्रकार से उपयोग करेंगे यह सब चीज का पता लगना बहुत जरूरी है। आपने एक रिपोर्ट दी है जिसमें कहा गया है कि ३२ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन हमारे पास है। इस जमीन में पिछले बरस ७३.५ मिलियन टन, आप कहते हैं कि पैदावार हुई। इससे हिसाब लगाने पर पता चलता है कि सात मन या पौने सात मन फी एकड़ पैदावार हुई। आपने यह भी कहा है कि आपने ३८ मिलियन टन अनाज बाहर से मंगाया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर एक एकड़ जमीन में १३ सेर पैदावार बड़ जाय तो हम को अमरीका से अनाज मंगाने की जरूरत नहीं रह जाएगी। लेकिन यहाँ पर जितनी स्पीचिज हुई हैं सब प्राइसिस के बारे में हैं, खेती पर किसी का ध्यान नहीं गया है। ये स्पीचिज शहर वालों की तरफ से हुई हैं। ये लोग खेती के ऊपर एक बोझा हैं। हमारा पाखाना, हमारा पेशाब, हमारा कूड़ा सभी खेतों में जाता है। हमारा

### [श्री विभूति मिश्र]

खून पसीना वही बहता है। गांधी जी ने लिखा था कि शहर वाले जो हैं वे हमारे गांवों को लूट कर खाते हैं। १।४ पापुलेशन हिन्दुस्तान की शहरों में बसती है और बाकी गांवों में और यही हम को लूट कर खाती है, हम को कुछ नहीं मिलता है....

श्री सुनीलाल (अम्बाला-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियां) : ऐसी बात नहीं है।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : ऐसी बात है। गांवों में किसान रहता है और थूक खखार, पेशाब, पाखाना, लोटा जो मिट्टी से साफ करता है, वह मिट्टी इत्यादि सभी जमीन में जाते हैं और जमीन का जरखेजपन बढ़ता है। जो वहां पर पैदा होता है उसे शहर वाले खाते हैं। इस वास्ते में फिर मांग करता हूँ कि हमारे लिए कम से कम एग्रीकलचरल कमिशन जरूर बिठाया जाए। जब हम को पता होगा कि हमारी खेती की क्या हालत है, तो हम खेती की पैदावार को बढ़ाने के उपाय सोच सकेंगे।

फूड एंड एग्रीकलचर मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है कि हम प्राइम फिक्सेशन बोर्ड बनायेंगे लेकिन वह अभी तक नहीं बना है। जो सामान आपने कारखानों में पैदा होता है उसका लागत खर्च तो आप मालूम कर लेते हैं लेकिन खेती में क्या आता है, इसको आप मालूम नहीं करते हैं। हम लोग जूट पैदा करते हैं जोकि मिलों में जाता है, और जो मिल मालिक हैं वे तो मालामाल होते जा रहे हैं लेकिन जूट के निम्नम दाम आज तक आपने तय नहीं किए हैं। जूट की पैदावार का ताल्लुक तो पाटिल साहब से है लेकिन उसके दामों को फिक्स करना शास्त्री जी के हाथ में है। अगर शास्त्री जी बीमार न पड़ते तो दाम फिक्स हो गए होते। इस काम में कौन-कौन से बोर्ड लगे हुए हैं, कौन कौन से बोर्ड सम्बन्धित हैं, इसका पता नहीं चलता है। इस वास्ते जरूरत है कि

जल्दी से जल्दी प्राइस फिक्सेशन बोर्ड की स्थापना हो। कल नेशनल डिवेलपमेंट काऊंसिल ने कहा है कि हम को देखना चाहिये कि इंट्रेप्रेटिड प्राइस हो और वही मिलनी चाहिये। मैं पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को और एन० डी० सी० को घन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने आप को इंट्रेप्रेटिड प्राइस देने के लिए कमिट किया है। जब तक इंट्रेप्रेटिड प्राइस नहीं दी जाती है, हमारा उद्धार होने वाला नहीं है।

बिहार में जो चीनी मिलें चल रही हैं, उनमें चीनी की रिकवरी बहुत कम जा रही है। मैंने सेंट्रल सूगर केन कमेटी को पत्र लिखा था और उसके द्वारा वहां एक आदमी जांच के लिए भेजा गया था। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, पता चला है कि पीने नी, साड़े आठ, नौ परसेंट से ज्यादा एक आध मिल का छोड़कर, किमी की रिकवरी नहीं की जा रही है। इस वास्ते जरूरत है कि सरकार देखे कि क्या वजह है कि बिहार में सूगर की रिकवरी कम जा रही है। पहले दस परसेंट होती थी लेकिन आज नी, नौ प्वाइंट एक, दो या तीन से अधिक नहीं जाती है। इस वास्ते पाटिल साहब से मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह देखें कि सूगर की रिकवरी अच्छी हो। यह काम जितनी जल्दी हो सके, किया जाना चाहिए।

यह मंत्रालय कितने ही डिपार्टमेंट्स में बंटा हुआ है। एक कम्युनिटी प्राजैक्ट निकला है जिसमें २२ लाख आदमी ट्रेन किए गए हैं जो कि गांवों में काम करेंगे। करीब १८ लाख आबादी में वी० डी० प्रोजे० के दफ्तर खुल गए हैं। मैं कम्युनिटी प्राजैक्ट एरियाज में गया हूँ। मेरे जिम्मे ए० आई० सी० सी० ने एक काम सौंपा था कि बिहार में फूड प्रोडक्शन के बारे में मैं जा कर देखूँ। मैं कितने ही वी० डी० प्रोजे० से मिला हूँ और मैंने उनसे कहा है कि हर एक इंडिबिजुअल प्लांट के लिए आप टारगेट फिक्स करो

श्रीर कहो कि कौन कौन से प्लाट में कितनी कितनी पैदावार होनी चाहिए । उन्होंने मुझे जवाब दिया कि हम से नहीं होगा । उनके जिम्मे दो काम हैं, एक रेवेन्यू का और दूसरा डिवेलपमेंट का । मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक आप इंडिविजुअल प्लाट्स के लिए टारगेट फिक्स नहीं करेंगे, तब तक पैदावार बढ़ नहीं सकती है । पैदावार पॉलियमेंट में नहीं बढ़ेगी, यहां पर स्पीचिज कर देने मात्र से नहीं बढ़ेगी पैदावार तो खेतों में बढ़ेगी और खेत हैं गांवों में और गांवों में हैं प्लाट और इन प्लाट्स के लिए आप कहें कि फलां जो प्लाट है, इस से हमको इतनी पैदावार मिलनी चाहिये ।

छ: करोड़ से उपर हमारे पास सिचाई की जमीन है । सिचाई वाली जमीन में हमको निश्चित रूप से पैदावार मिलनी चाहिये । लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी सरकार के पास, चाहे वह मेट्रल हो या स्टेट की हो, यह डाटा नहीं है कि सिचाई की जमीन कितनी है और उस जमीन में कितनी हमको पैदावार लेनी चाहिए । जहां तक नौन इरीगिटेड लैंड्स का ताल्लुक है वहां पर पानी न होने की वजह से क्रॉप्स का फेलियोर हो गया लेकिन कम से कम जो सिचाई वाली जमीन है इरीगिटेड लैंड है वहां पर तो अच्छी पैदावार होनी चाहिए । ७५ परसेंट कम से कम इरीगिटेड लैंड है वहां पर तो फसल अच्छी होनी चाहिए लेकिन इस मंत्रालय के पास उसके कोई आंकड़े नहीं हैं । वह किसान से नहीं पूछेंगे कि तुम्हारे यहां इतनी सिचाई की जमीन है और उसमें वह किसान कितनी पैदावार करके दिखाते हैं इसके इस मंत्रालय के पास कोई आंकड़े नहीं हैं । यह डिपार्टमेंट आकाश में चलता है और नीचे से ऊपर तक इस डिपार्टमेंट का उसमें कोई काम नहीं है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि जितना भी इरीगिटेड लैंड है उसके टारगेट फिक्स होने चाहिए और इंडिविजुअल प्लाट्स के टारगेट्स फिक्स होने चाहिए तभी पैदावार बढ़ेगी । यह सही

बात है कि खेती के जो मिनिस्टर बनाये जाते हैं उनको कम से कम साल में ६ महीने गांवों में घूमना चाहिए । खेती यहां दिल्ली में नहीं है । खेती तो बम्बई में नहीं है । कलकत्ते में खेती नहीं है बल्कि खेती तो गांवों में है । गांवों में जाने के बाद उन को पता चलेगा कि खेतीबाड़ी किस तरह से होती है और उसके रास्ते में क्या क्या दिक्कतें दरपेश आती हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब मैं अपने जिले की बाबत बतलाऊं कि जो हमारे यहां इनडिगों प्लांट्स थे और इनडिगो की खेती करते थे वे मुबह अपने घोड़े पर चढ़ कर ८, ८ और १०, १० मील जा चक्कर लगाते थे और देखते थे कि एक एक प्लाट में कौसी इनडिगो की खेती हुई है और जिस के खेत में अच्छा प्लांटेशन नहीं होता था उसको सजा देते थे और उस से पूछते थे कि क्या बात हुई और उसकी खेती अच्छी क्यों नहीं हुई ?

अब यह हमारे फूड एंड एग्रीकलचर मिनिस्टर हैं मैं इनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इनको मंत्री बने साल भर हो गया लेकिन यह बिहार में कितनी दफा गये ?

पंडित हु० चं० शर्मा : बिहार का मिनिस्टर जायेगा ।

श्री बिभूति मिश्र : मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपके उत्तर प्रदेश में कितनी मर्तबा गये यह तो आखिर सारे देश भर के खेती के वजीर हैं ।

पंडित हु० चं० शर्मा : हम तो नहीं चाहते ।

श्री मो० ब० कृष्णप्पा : आप इनवॉ-टेशन दीजिये ।

श्री बिभूति मिश्र : इस मंत्रालय को न तो बिहार का पता है और न उत्तर प्रदेश का ही पता है कि वहां पर खेती की क्या स्थिति है ? इतना बड़ा कृषि मंत्रालय बना दिया और उसके लिए गगनचुम्बी मकान बना दिया । अब गगनचुम्बी मकान



### [श्री विभूति मिश्र]

से तो पैदावार नहीं बढ़गी। उस आलीशान इमारत के निर्माण में सरकार ने बहुत अधिक पैसा खर्च किया है लेकिन उससे कोई पैदावार में तरक्की होने वाली नहीं है। अब हमारे पाटिल साहब यदि दिल्ली की अपनी कोठी छोड़ कर गांव में चल कर झोंपड़ी में रहें तो देखेंगे कि वहां पर किसानों को खेतीबाड़ी करने में किन किन दिक्कतों का सामना करना पड़ता है। वहां पर किसान को उसी जगह पर बैल को भी बांधना होता है और वर्षाकाल में उसे भीगते हुए खेती करना होती है। पाटिल साहब अगर वहां स्वयं जा कर देखें तो उनको सही स्थिति की जानकारी हो सकती है कि कितने कष्ट में वहां किसान रह कर खेती करता है, पानी में भीगता है और रात में जब पाटिल साहब को झोंपड़ी में मच्छर काटेंगे तब उनको पता चलेगा कि गांवों की क्या हालत है ?

एक सब से बड़ी बात जो मैं इस समय कहना चाहता हूं वह है देश की खाद्यान्न के सम्बन्ध में आत्मनिर्भरता। मैं बाहर से देश में खाद्यान्न मंगाये जाने का सख्त विरोधी हूं और मैं चाहता हूं कि पार्लियामेंट के सारे मेम्बर्स तमाम पार्टीज के माननीय सदस्य इस बात का व्रत लें कि अमरीका से या किसी भी मुल्क से हम इस देश में गल्ला नहीं मंगायेंगे। जितना भो गल्ला हमारे यहां पैदा होता है हम उसी पर जीवन यापन करेंगे भले ही हमें चाहे अपने पेट को काटना पड़े और एक ही वक्त क्यों न खाना पड़ जाय लेकिन हम किसी भी हालत में विदेशों से अन्न नहीं मंगायेंगे, मैं समझता हूं कि अगर आज महात्मा गांधी जीवित होते तो व तमाम देशवासियों से यह व्रत लिखवा कर छोड़ते। आज तो हालत यह है कि जहां जरा भी गल्ले की कमी महसूस हुई तो यह अखबार वाले जो कि यहां ऊपर बैठते हैं वे हल्ला मचाने लगते हैं और अर्पोजीशन वाले और नेरी पार्टी के भी सदस्य लोग हल्ला मचाने लगते हैं कि

अनाज की कमी है और मंत्री महोदय तुरन्त अमरीका चले जाते हैं और वहां से गल्ले की मदद प्राप्त कर लेते हैं। हमें सबको इस बात का व्रत ले लेना चाहिए कि जो भी हम बाहर से अनाज नहीं मंगायेंगे और जैसे कि हमने अंग्रेजी हुकूमत को एलानिया कह दिया था कि उन्हें फलां तारीख तक हिन्दुस्तान छोड़ देना चाहिए उसी तरह का एक टारगेट हम फिक्स कर सकते हैं कि अमुक तिथि तक हम अपने देश को अधिक उत्पादन करके खाद्यान्न के सम्बन्ध में आत्म निर्भर बना लेंगे। मुझे यह खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि खेतीबाड़ी के ऊपर जितनी तबज्जह देनी चाहिए उतनी तबज्जह हमारी सरकार द्वारा नहीं दी जाती है।

इसी तरह फटिलाइजर्स की बात है। अब यहीं दिल्ली में आप देखिये कि नार्थ एबन्यू और साथ एबन्यू में पेड़ों पर से जो पत्ते गिरते हैं उन को जला दिया जाता है और इस तरह बहुत सारी खाद को नष्ट कर दिया जाता है। मैं समझता हूं कि इस तरह का कोई इंतजाम कर दिया जाय कि इन तमाम पत्तों को किसी जगह सड़ा कर इनकी खाद तैयार कर के गांव में भेज दी जाय तो वह खेती के काम में आ जायगी और पैदावार बढ़ाने में सहायक सिद्ध होगी। हम इंग्लैण्ड और अमरीका से तो खाद मंगाते हैं लेकिन यह नार्थ एबन्यू और साउथ एबन्यू की तरह न मालूम कितनी खाद जोकि हम स्वयं तैयार कर सकते हैं उस को नष्ट हो जाने देते हैं।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब माननीय सदस्य अपनी स्पीच समाप्त करें। वह पन्द्रह मिनट बोल चुके हैं।

**श्री विभूति मिश्र :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं तो बहुत कम अवसरों पर इस सदन में बोलता हूं और यह मेरा प्रधान विषय है इसलिये मुझ पांच मिनट का समय और दिया जाय।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब और समय न लीजिये क्योंकि ऐसा करना दूसरों के साथ ज्यादती करनी होगी।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : जैसी आप की आज्ञा। यह जो सूरतगढ़ में फार्म बना है उस का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। अगर उस फार्म में पानी आ गया तो कम से कम हिन्दुस्तान में अच्छे बीज सप्लाई करने का मौका मिलेगा। अब मैं अपने जाती अनुभव के आधार पर बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैं ने डेढ़ एकड़ पर उन्नत बीज को ले कर खेती की और एक तिहाई एकड़ भूमि पर ट्रेडिशनल बीज से खेती की है और मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि उन्नत बीज के जरिये एक एकड़ में जितनी पैदावार होगी उतनी पैदावार ट्रेडिशनल बीज के जरिये जाकर डेढ़ एकड़ जमीन में होगी। इसलिये अच्छे फार्म और अच्छे बीज की खेती होनी चाहिये। मुझे उम्मीद है कि यह सूरतगढ़ का जो फार्म है यह अच्छे बीज जरूर देगा बसते कि उस में पानी दिया जाय। अब बी० डी० प्रो० को पचासों काम रहते हैं। यह काम अगर अपने हाथ में ले कर करते तो कुछ काम होता भी बरना इस तरीके से कुछ विशेष काम होता नहीं है। इसलिये मेरा अपना खयाल है कि खेती का जो मुहकमा है उस को कहीं भी एक जगह रहना चाहिये या तो वह बी० डी० प्रो० के मातहत रहे अथवा फूड एंड एग्रीकलचर मिनिस्ट्री के मातहत रहे। कुछ इधर रहे और कुछ उधर, इस तरह तीतर बटेर से ठीक से काम चलता नहीं है। इसलिये एक भादमी के हाथ में यह काम सौंपा जाय तभी इस में तरक्की हो सकती है और काम ठीक से चल सकता है, दूसरी दूसरी जगह रहने से यह काम चलने वाला नहीं है।

अब चूंकि आप मुझे आगे नहीं बोलने देना चाहते इसलिये और अधिक न कह कर मैं आप को धन्यवाद देते हुए अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ।

श्रीमती कृष्णा मेहता (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्रालय पर देश को खाद्यान्न के सम्बन्ध में आत्मनिर्भर बनाने का महान् दायित्व है। यह बात भी सही है कि भारत में भारी उद्योगों और गृह व कुटीर उद्योगों के क्षेत्र में चाहे कितनी प्रगति हो परन्तु जब तक हमारा देश अनाज के मामले में स्वावलम्बी नहीं होगा जब तक जनता को पेट भर खाने को नहीं मिलेगा तब तक उस की समझ में यह नहीं आयेंगी कि भारत कितनी शीघ्रता से आगे बढ़ रहा है और कितनी तरक्की कर रहा है। अनाज एक ऐसी चीज है जिस का प्रतिदिन के जीवन में वास्ता पड़ता है और इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि माननीय खाद्य मंत्री उस और ध्यान दे रहे हैं और वे अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के प्रयत्न में लगे हुए हैं। मैं तो इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहूंगी कि इस काम में बहुत मेहनत और चतुराई से काम करने की जरूरत है। भारत एक कृषि प्रधान देश है और उस की करीब ८० प्रतिशत जनता देहातों में रहती है। गांवों की भलाई में उन की भलाई है। जब तक गांवों में रहने वाले किसानों को उस की आवश्यक चीजें उचित मूल्य पर मुलभ नहीं होंगी तब तक वह अनाज का उत्पादन कैसे बढ़ा सकते हैं ? उन्हें समय पर अच्छे बीज, खाद और सिंचाई की सुविधा मुलभ होनी चाहिये। अक्सर देखा गया है कि जब खेतों में अनाज के पौधे हरे होते हैं और उन्हें पानी देने की जरूरत होती है तो सिंचाई की उचित व्यवस्था के अभाव में वह अनाज के पौधे मुरझा जाते हैं और कभी कभी प्रकृति का भी उन पर कोप हो जाया करता है और जरूरत के वक्त चूंकि वर्षा नहीं होती है इसलिये खेती मुरझा जाती है। ग वों में छोटी छोटी सिंचाई की योजनायें वक्त पर नहीं बनाई जाती हैं और जो ग व वाले म ग करते हैं उस में भी कमी हो जाती है।

कृषि मंत्रालय ने जो कृषि यंत्रों में सुधार करने की बात सोची है तो बेशक

### [श्रीमती कृष्णा मेहता]

यह एक अच्छा और स्वागत योग्य कदम है और उस से बहुत लाभ होगा। अक्सर देखा गया है कि गांवों में किसान लोग इन यंत्रों के अभाव में जितना वह खेतों में श्रम कर के उत्पन्न कर सकते हैं, नहीं पैदा कर पाते। समय पर उन को अच्छे बीज उचित दर पर सुलभ नहीं किये जाते हैं और कभी कभी पारिवारिक संकट के कारण वह जितना खेत लगाना चाहते हैं उतना नहीं लगा पाते हैं। जैसाकि फोर्ड फाउंडेशन की रिपोर्ट में भी है यह ठीक है कि भारत के कृषि के अधिक उत्पादन में अनेक रुकावटें आ जाती हैं जिन के कि कारण खेती की अधिक पैदावार नहीं हो पाती है। उदाहरणार्थ खेतों में मिट्टी अच्छी नहीं है या सिंचाई का माकूल इंतजाम नहीं है। खेती पुराने औजारों से की जाती है क्योंकि हमारे किसान बहुत गरीब हैं उन के पास इतना पैसा नहीं है और न ही उन को इतना ज्ञान है कि वे नई नई चीजें पढ़ें क्योंकि आजकल की साइंटिफिक नौलेज की जानकारी हासिल करने के लिये जो ज्ञान होना चाहिये वह उन के पास नहीं है। मैं समझती हूँ कि हमारे देश के किसानों को सब आवश्यक चीजें समय पर मिलें और अगर हम उन के लिये यह इंतजाम कर सकें तो वह देश में अधिक उत्पादन कर के दिखला सकते हैं और अधिक पैदावार करने में वह किसी से पीछे नहीं रहेंगे सामुदायिक विकास योजनाओं द्वारा इन सब बातों पर ध्यान दिया जाता है। परन्तु जितनी शीघ्रता से काम होना चाहिये उतनी शीघ्रता से नहीं हो रहा। प्राकड़ों को देखने से यही मालूम होता है कि जितने लक्ष्य रखे गये थे उन से हम बहुत पीछे हैं। अगर गम्भीरता से विचार करेंगे तो आप देखेंगे कि करोड़ों रुपये की योजनायें बनती हैं, बड़े बड़े दिमाग उन में लगते हैं और बहुत सोच विचार कर उन को बनाते हैं परन्तु गांवों में उन की कार्यान्वित करने की सारी जिम्मेदारी छोटे छोटे कार्यकर्ताओं पर होती है। कहां तक वह अपनी

जिम्मेदारी निभाते हैं यह देखने की बात है। अगर वह सुस्ती कर देते हैं तो वह योजना पूरी तरह कार्यान्वित नहीं हो पाती। इसलिये हम को चाहिये कि इन छोटे छोटे कर्मचारियों को ठीक तरह से तैयार करें और उन को जिम्मेदारी दें। उन को इस तरह सिखाना चाहिये कि अपनी सारी जिम्मेदारी किसानों की तरफ लगायें, वह एक तरह से किसान ही बन जायें, और उन के दुःख सुख में और उन की कठिनाइयों में उन के काम आयें।

देश में लगभग ४ करोड़ ७० लाख किसान भूमिहीन हैं। अगर आप इन में से आधों को भी औद्योगिकरण द्वारा कारखानों में लगा देंगे तो आधों के लिये जमीन की जरूरत होगी। तो हमें उन का भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये।

भारत की भूमि का क्षेत्रफल ८१.१० लाख एकड़ है। इस में से ७१.६६ लाख एकड़ पर सरकार ने जानकारी प्राप्त की है। इस में से कुछ भूमि पर तो खेती की जाती है और कुछ भूमि पर जंगलात लगे हैं। इस तरफ अधिक से अधिक ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। अगर खेती की जमीन बढ़ेगी तो हमारा अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़ सकता है।

हमारे देश के किसान बहुत गरीब हैं। इतनी मेहनत के बाद भी उन को कुछ अच्छा फल नहीं दिखाई देता है। बहुत थोड़े किसान ऐसे हैं जिन के पास काफी खेती की जमीन है। कुछ के पास खेती है भी तो बिखरी हुई है, कुछ खेत इधर हैं कुछ उधर हैं। वह उन सब पर ठीक तरह से काबू नहीं कर सकते। मेरा तो विचार है कि अगर ये सब किसान सहकारी खेती करना शुरू करें तो उत्पादन बढ़ सकता है। उस समय एक से ज्यादा किसान खेत में काम करेंगे तो उत्पादन जरूर ज्यादा होगा, उन को बीज इकट्ठा मिल सकेगा, खाद मिल सकेगी और बिक्री की भी बहुत आसानी हो सकती है। इसलिये जरूरी है कि

हम सहकारी खेती पर ध्यान दें। ऐसा करने से खेती की देखभाल आदि में भी उन को आसानी हो जायेगी। अगर किसानों को यह विश्वास हो जाय कि सहकारी तरीके से खेती करने से उन को लाभ होगा और उन का उत्पादन बढ़ेगा तो वह उस में कोई ऐतराज नहीं करेंगे। सरकार को इस बात की पहले पहल जिम्मेदारी लेनी चाहिये कि अगर उस से किसान को नुकसान होगा तो वह उस की सहायता करेगी। उन को शक है क्योंकि उन्हीं ने इस तरह का काम पहले कभी किया नहीं है। मैं समझती हूँ कि उन को इस से कोई नुकसान नहीं होगा। लेकिन मुझे उम्मीद है कि अगर सरकार पूरी जिम्मेदारी ले लेगी तो जनता को बहुत फायदा होगा। और किसान को भी ऐसा महसूस होगा कि मेरी जिम्मेदारी तो सरकार ने ले रखी है, अगर मुझे कुछ कमी हुई तो सरकार जरूर मदद करेगी।

मुझे इस बात से बड़ा दुःख और चिन्ता होती है कि भारत को एक कृषि प्रधान देश होते हुए भी बाहर के मुल्कों की तरफ अनाज के लिये देखना पड़ता है और वहाँ से अनाज मंगाना पड़ता है। मेरे विचार में खाद्य मंत्री जी की इस घोषणा का जनता स्वागत करेगी कि वह एक खाद्य भंडार खोलना चाहते हैं। मुझे दुःख है कि हम बाहर से मंगाये बगैर नहीं रह सकते। लेकिन इस के बगैर हम रह भी नहीं सकते। जब हमें कोई चीज नहीं मिलती तो हम चिल्लाते हैं, जब मूल्य बढ़ जाता है तो भी हम चिल्लाते हैं, इसलिए बाहर से कुछ तो मंगाना पड़ेगा, पर हमें पूरा भरोसा बाहर पर नहीं करना चाहिये।

भारत में सन् १९५८-५९ में अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़ा है। सन् १९५८-५९ में खाद्य का उत्पादन ७ लाख टन बढ़ा है। इस से कुछ खुशी तो होती है, लेकिन जब हम देखते हैं तो इतना बढ़ने पर भी कहीं कुछ नजर नहीं आता। तब विचार आता है कि इस का क्या कारण है।

जम्मू काश्मीर राज्य में भी दूसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजना में अनाज आदि के उत्पादन के लिये काफी ध्यान दिया गया था। राबी नहर और प्रताप नहर आदि पर काम हो रहा है। इन के पूरे होने पर आशा की जाती है कि वहाँ हजारों एकड़ जमीन जो बेकार पड़ी है अब उस में उत्पादन बढ़ेगा और जो संकट वहाँ पर है उस में कुछ आसानी हो जायेगी।

जम्मू और काश्मीर राज्य में सन् १९५६ से १९५९ तक कार्य किया गया है। लेकिन अच्छा बीज देने का लक्ष्य ३.६ लाख मन था पर दिया गया ०.९९ लाख मन खाद देने का लक्ष्य था ५.७ लाख मन, पर दिया गया १.७६ लाख मन। फार्म से ३२ लाख मन मक्की पैदा करने का जो लक्ष्य था वह पूरा कर दिया गया। उसके लिए जो बीज दिया गया था वह १०,३८५ मन था। इसी तरह से फलों के पीछे और तरसरी का भी जो लक्ष्य था १८ लाख का उसमें भी यह चीज बनायी गयी। जंगलात में भी लगभग १ करोड़ दरख्त लगाए गए हैं और उसमें भी बहुत कोशिश हो रही है।

यह हमारी भाव्य हीनता है कि जितनी भी हम कोशिश करते हैं बाढ़ आती है या और कुछ बातें हो जाती हैं जिनसे हमारा नुकसान हो जाता है। मुझे आशा है कि जम्मू और काश्मीर की जनता का सारी भारत की जनता के साथ ध्यान रख कर सरकार उसकी सहायता करती रहेगी। वहाँ की जनता भी मेहनत कर रही है और सरकार भी इस कोशिश में लगी हुई है कि किसी तरह हम अनाज के मामले में स्वावलम्बी हो जाएं।

मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को भुबारकबाद देती हूँ कि उन्होंने कृषि प्रदर्शनी को सफल बनाया। उसमें भारत के किसानों ने वे चीजें देखीं जिनको वे कभी देख नहीं सकते थे और समझ नहीं सकते थे।

[श्रीमती कृष्णा मेहता]

इसके बाद मैं मंत्रालय के अनुदानों की माँगों का समर्थन करती हूँ और आपको धन्यवाद देती हूँ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Guha.

**Pandit K. C. Sharma:** Sir, I gave my name yesterday; I am representing the peasantry. Then, should I go away. It means I should resign. I think the Chair seems to be....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is for the hon. Member to decide whether he should resign or not.

**Pandit K. C. Sharma:** What else should we do?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He should decide for himself. Why should he say that?

**Pandit K. C. Sharma:** Then I go away.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Did I ask him to stay here?

**Pandit K. C. Sharma:** You did not ask me.

(At this stage Pandit K. C. Sharma left the House.)

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Guha.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, several Members preceding raised the question of co-ordination between the different authorities and the Ministries having some control or some say in the matter of agriculture. I think it is a very important matter because certain schemes have to be implemented e.g. minor irrigation. Though the money is spent, the scheme is either not properly implemented or not put to proper use. In most of these cases, this lack of proper implementation or lack of proper utilisation of funds is due to lack of co-ordination between the different Ministries. Not only is there lack of co-ordination between

the authorities in the Central Government but, I think, there is also lack of co-ordination between the Ministries at the Centre and their counterparts in the States.

I can quite understand the position of the Minister here. He gets sanction from this House for several crores of rupees. Most of this money he hands over to the State Governments; but he has hardly any control over the money being spent, how it is spent or whether it is being spent for the purpose for which the sanction has been given by this House. That is why I want to raise the question of co-ordination not only between the different Ministries here but also between the Ministries and the State Governments.

Food and agriculture are both State subjects. But, here, in this House, we have to spend every Session some hours over one or two discussions on Food and Agriculture. It is only an indication of the importance which this House attaches to these subjects. The Minister can easily take his defence that these are State subjects. What assurance can he give us about co-ordination between his Ministry and the State Governments for the proper implementation of the schemes and the proper utilisation of the funds?

Moreover, now has come another authority, the N.D.C. By the end of 1958, that Council took a snap decision about State Trading. And, I think, the Ministry or the Minister could not concur with that decision. Even now the N.D.C. has decided about State Trading. But, if the newspaper report is to be relied upon, then, the same position prevails between the N.D.C.'s opinion and the opinion of the Minister or of the Ministry. The Minister is reported to have said that he would be guided by pragmatic standards. That is the correct thing from his point of view and also from the position of the nation's economy in such a delicate matter.

If a decision is thrust upon the Minister or the Ministry by some other authority, then, what is the position of the Ministry *vis-a-vis* this House? The Chief Ministers in September, 1958 took the decision of State Trading. But, I would ask the hon. Minister here, how many of the Chief Ministers were earnestly implementing that policy in their own States after the decision had been taken. (*Interruption*). I would say that the West Bengal Government, in their zeal, rushed with the scheme and brought disaster both for themselves and also for the State and they had to eat the humble pie and to withdraw the whole thing. There should not be any sort of mental reservation in such a delicate matter. The Minister should clearly state what is the policy. The statement made by Shri Thomas here indicates that hardly any procurement is made by the Central Government or by the State Governments to show that State trading is really to be implemented. I am afraid there is some mental reservation about this decision in the minds of the Ministry and I am afraid the Ministry does not really intend to implement State trading in food-grains. I have my own doubts about the feasibility and practicability of such a decision. I think the Government has not the proper machinery and proper resources to implement that policy.

Many things have been said about the holding of the price-line. That is a very important aspect regarding food. From the reports I find that the production of foodgrains has been increasing and even the *per capita* supply has also increased during the last two or three years by about an ounce in spite of an increase in the population. The main difficulty is the price. On the one hand floor prices are to be fixed so that the peasant may have the proper incentive to produce more, on the other hand the ceiling prices are to be fixed so that the middle-man and the traders may not take undue advantage or profit out of this trading in foodgrains.

430 (Ai) LS—8.

That is what is happening. If the profits coming out of high price had gone to the pockets of the peasants then, we would not have objected so much. We would have rather taken it as our consolation that the peasants who have been working so hard, have got proper share out of the profits. But the profit does not go so much to the peasant but it is taken away by the trader and the middle-man. The National Development Council has decided that they should try to hold the price level. May I ask the hon. Minister if the Chief Ministers would have the courage or even the competence to implement this policy? Would it be possible to keep the prices within control? We have been hearing of his promise year after year but it has not been possible for the Government to do it. So, there should not be any illusion that the price of foodgrains would be kept under control. I think, the country has to pay a higher price and that is somewhat inevitable also under the present circumstances, in view of the huge amount of deficit financing, in view of the huge amount of development expenditure that is being incurred year after year. The country should be plainly told that this is the position, that it would not be possible for the Government to hold a price line which is profitable for the peasant and also for the consumer particularly in the low income group.

About two years ago an assurance was given to this House that there would be subsidised supply of foodgrains to some vulnerable sectors of population. I do not know what has happened to that. Even now, I think, the Government should take up this matter and see if low income group people can get proper supply of food at subsidised rates and they may get the requisite relief in this regard. For this a buffer stock will have to be kept.

Now, I shall go to the agricultural side. I have stated that the total production has been increasing considerably and also the *per capita*

[Shri A. C. Guha]

supply. The total increase during the period of the Second Plan is about 12 per cent. and considering from the beginning, that is the First Plan, the total increase of foodgrains would be about 25 per cent. or 30 per cent.—I am not so sure about the exact figure; it would be near about that. But it should be remembered that the yield per acre continues to be very very low. Perhaps, it is the lowest in the whole world. The only criterion of any improvement in agricultural production is the increase in per acre production. Otherwise, with the population increase, it would be impossible for this country to be self-sufficient in food. Nothing has been said in the annual report about the per acre increase in production. From the other papers, I find that the per acre productivity has remained more or less the same; it has increased only slightly.

I hope the hon. Minister, Shri Patil, will hear me and look into this report.

**The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil):** I am very attentive.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** The report should give a clear idea of the activities and the advances made by the Ministry. But this report is very meagre and very cryptic. It does not give the proper picture of the whole thing.

On page 20 of the report, referring to the resettlement of landless agricultural workers, it says that so much money has been sanctioned for the resettlement of 1,555 families of landless agricultural labourers in certain States. Is this the whole thing that the Ministry has to say about this? This question was several times discussed in the House. The Ministry should have given a better note on this.

Again on page 2, it is said that the gap that was found to exist between the availability and utilisation of irrigation facilities created under the two

plans has been greatly narrowed. The report should have given the position in clear terms: what is the Irrigation potential created, how much is now being utilised, etc. I can cite many other paras like this. They are two or three line paragraphs simply mentioning that so much money has been granted. Again, it says that a total of Rs. 55,000 has been granted to farmers organisations during 1959-60. What is the purpose? What are the organisations? How the money has been utilised? Nothing has been mentioned about these things. So, he may please look into this thing and see that a better report is supplied to this House so that it may get a better picture of the activities and advances made.

Matters relating to the supply of seeds, fertilisers and credit have been discussed in this House ever since Independence but there has not been much improvement in this matter. I can understand the difficulty in increasing the quantum of the supply of rural credit or fertilisers or even seeds, in the course of one or two years. But at least they can supply these things in time. It is a perennial complaint that they are not given in time and the Minister should please see that these things should be supplied in time.

For importing foodgrains and fertilisers, we spend about Rs. 160-180 crores annually. I learn that a small or medium fertiliser factory which would turn out fertiliser worth Rs. 12.5 crores annually, would cost only about Rs. 20-25 crores. If we could spare Rs. 160-180 crores annually for importing these things, would it not be possible for the Government to find another Rs. 20-25 crores annually to set up a fertiliser factory in each State? I hope such a programme will be implemented vigorously. Again, they need not have to spend about Rs. 20-25 crores at a time; they are sure to get some deferred payment facilities. I hope this scheme of having one fertiliser

factory in each State will be implemented with the vigour which is associated with Shri Patil generally.

About three years ago the National Co-operative Development and Warehousing Board was set up and an Act was passed and great expectations were entertained about this board and also its ancillary, the Central Warehousing Corporation.

Now the Board has been transferred to another Ministry, whereas its ancillary—the Corporation—remains with this Ministry. I think that is a bad arrangement. Only one Ministry, whichever Ministry it may be, should hold both these bodies. This bifurcation of one integrated thing, taking the main thing to one Ministry and the ancillary to another Ministry is not correct. In the report of the other Ministry it has been said that the main body—the Board body is with them and the Central Warehousing Corporation remains with the Food and Agriculture Ministry. I think both these units should have been under one Ministry.

Again, Sir, neither in the food section nor in the agriculture section I find any mention about the working of the Central Warehousing Corporation. Has it been put in the warehouse or in cold storage, or is it still functioning? The report is completely silent about it.

Lastly, Dr. P. S. Deshmukh said the other day in reply to supplementaries that when the cultivators produce more they get less price, and that naturally acts as an incentive to produce less.

**The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh):** The Government always tries to give a fair price.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** The cultivators have produced less raw jute this year because the Government did not give them a fair price last year. I think the Government should learn a lesson straightaway from this.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Sir, the Central Warehousing Corporation is an autonomous body whose report I have already placed on the Table of the House.

**श्री राम सेबक यादव (बाराबंकी) :**  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसा मालूम देता है कि खाद्य समस्या और यह सरकार दोनों ही देश के लिए एक समस्या बनी हुई हैं। जब से देश स्वतंत्र हुआ है, इस खाद्य समस्या का कोई हल नहीं निकल पाया है।

हर वर्ष इस खाद्य समस्या पर बहस चलती है, जब बजट पर बहस चलती है तो भी इसका जिक्र होता है, उस समय कुछ की तरफ से नुक्ताचीनी की जाती है, कुछ की तरफ से सरकार की तारीफ की जाती है। लेकिन ऐसा मालूम होता है कि मंत्रियों पर या सरकार पर इस नुक्ताचीनी का कोई भी धरसर नहीं पड़ता है और जो नीकरशाही है, जो मंत्री महोदय हैं, वे जिस तरह से चलते हैं चलते रहते हैं। इस नुक्ताचीनी का उस पर कोई धरसर नहीं पड़ता है और यह बराबर चलती जाती है।

हमारा देश कृषि प्रधान देश है और कृषि प्रधान देश में खाद्य समस्या का होना एक बहुत ही ताज्जुब की चीज है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप देखें कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जितने भी देश हैं, उनमें केवल मिश्र को छोड़ करके हिन्दुस्तान तमाम देशों से इस खाद्य के मामले में पीछे है। खाद्य समस्या की स्थिति को आप देखेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि सन् १९४७ से लेकर सन् १९५८ तक ३१३.१० मिलियन टन खाद्यान्न विदेशों से मंगाया गया है और इसके लिए कम से कम १३००.६२ करोड़ रुपया विदेशों को दिया गया है। अगर दो सालों को भी इस में जोड़ लिया जाए और उसका हिसाब लगाया जाए तो शायद यह राशि ३०० करोड़ रुपया और होगी और इस तरह से कुल राशि १६०० करोड़ तक पहुँच जाती है। इतना रुपया हमने विदेशों से ऋण मंगाने में खर्च किया है। इतना



### [श्री राम सेवक यादव]

होने पर भी समस्या का हल नखर नहीं आता है। जो टारगट मुकर्रर किए गए हैं, उन्हें आप देखें और जिस रफतार से आबादी बढ़ रही है, उसको आप देखें। जहां तक आबादी का सम्बन्ध है, सन् १९६६ में हमारे देश की आबादी लगभग ४८ करोड़ हो जाएगी जिसके लिए ११० मिलियन टन अनाज की आवश्यकता होगी जब कि इस समय हमारे पास ७३.५ मिलियन टन ही अनाज है। ऐसी सूरत में किस तरह से यह समस्या हल होगी? जिस तरह से कृषि मंत्रालय और भारत सरकार की नीति चल रही है, उसमें तो यह समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है।

जब हम खाद्य समस्या को देखते हैं तो दो जबर्दस्त सवाल हमारे सामने आते हैं। पहला तो दामों का है और उसी के साथ साथ दूसरा सवाल यह है कि कैसे अधिक अन्न अपने देश में पैदा किया जाए। निस्सन्देह अगर देखा जाय तो किसी भी कल्याणकारी सरकार को चाहे वह जिस नीति को बरते, चाहे वह समाजवादी ढंग के समाज की रचना करना चाहती हो या फिर पूंजीवादी समाज की रचना क्यों न करना चाहती हो, हर एक सरकार का सर्वप्रथम कर्तव्य होता है कि वह अपने देश के नागरिकों का पेट भर सके और जो जिनकी की आवश्यक चीजें हैं जिनमें कि खाद्यान्न का नम्बर पहला है, उन आवश्यक चीजों को देशवासियों को उचित दामों पर सुलभ कराये ताकि साधारण लोग भूखों न मरें। यदि हम इस समस्या की ओर नजर डालते हैं तो यह पाते हैं कि चाहे हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार हो अथवा राज्य सरकारें, सभी इस सम्बन्ध में असफल रही हैं।

मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि जब अनाज के दामों में वृद्धि का सवाल उठा तो हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि अनाजों के दाम और अधिक नहीं बढ़ने देना चाहिए जब कि हमारे श्री विभूति मिश्र ने कहा कि मौजूदा अनाज के दाम बढ़ने चाहिए। मैं निवेदन करूँ कि

अनाज न अनाज के दाम घटाने का सवाल है और न बढ़ाने का सवाल है...

श्री विभूति मिश्र : माननीय सदस्य मुझे गलत कोट न करें। मैंने इंटेग्रेटेड प्राईस के लिये कहा था।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : अब लोगों का ख्याल यह है कि जो खाद्यान्न के मूल्य में वृद्धि होती है तो उसका फायदा किसानों को पहुंचता है और इसी कारण हम देखते हैं कि अनाज के दाम बढ़ाने की मांग की जाती है और इसको लेकर शहर और देहात के बीच में एक झगड़े बाजी पैदा की जाती है और दिखाया जाता है कि किस तरह शहर वाले देहाती किसानों का शोषण कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं यहां पर यह चीज साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि बात ऐसी नहीं है और खाद्यान्नों का जो मूल्य बढ़ता है तो उसका फायदा कभी भी जो उस गल्ले को पैदा करने वाले हैं उनको नहीं मिलता है बल्कि बीच के बिचौलिये और जो बड़े बड़े व्यापारी और बनए लोग हैं वे उसका फायदा उठा लेते हैं। इसलिए मैं तो कहना चाहूंगा कि जब तक एक लोक कल्याणकारी राज्य की नीति नहीं अपनाई जायगी तब तक यह अनाज के दामों की समस्या सही रूप से हल होने वाली नहीं है। यह दुःख का विषय है कि आज हमारे ऐसे लोग कृषि और खाद्य मंत्री बने बैठे हैं जिन्हें कि गेहूँ और जौ के पीछे का अन्तर नहीं मालूम है और जिनको कि हर वक्त यह चिन्ता लगी रहती है कि किस तरीके से पूंजीपति लोग फले फूलें और किस तरह से इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को फायदा हो। ऐसे लोग आज हमारे कृषि और खाद्य मंत्री बने हुए हैं और इन से देश की खाद्यान्न की समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर आज तक इन दामों के सवाल को हल करने के लिए क्या किया गया? मैं इस अवसर पर नुस्ताचीनी न करके मंत्री महोदय को यह सुझाव दूंगा कि अगर वे चाहते हैं कि कि आज दामों को लेकर जो नाच कूद होती

है वह बंद हो तो उसके लिए मुनासिब कदम उठाये । अब गेहूँ की फसल काफी घा रही है और गेहूँ के दाम गिर गये हैं । जब फसल कटती है तब गेहूँ के दाम गिर जाते हैं और बाद में जो भनाज के दाम बढ़ जाया करते हैं तो इसका कारण यह नहीं है कि खाद्यान्न नहीं होता या उसकी कमी हो जाती है बल्कि उसका कारण यह है कि किसान जब अपना भनाज बेचता है तो चूंकि यह भनाज बेच कर ही वह अपनी जिन्दगी की जरूरी चीजों का बंदोबस्त कर सकता है । और दूसरे उसको लगान भी देना होता है तो वह मजबूरी में अपना भनाज बेचता है और किसानों की उस मजबूरी का फायदा यह बिचौलिये व्यापारी बनिए और झाड़तिए और पूंजीपति लोग उठाते हैं और किसानों से सस्ते दामों में गल्ला खरीद लेते हैं और वह तमाम भनाज बनियों और बिचौलियों के पास पहुंच जाता है और भनाज तो सारा किसान के घर से निकल ही जाता है और तब बाद में वे उस भनाज को काफी मुनाफे पर लोगों को बाजार में बेचते हैं और मजबूर होकर लोगों को महंगे दामों पर भनाज को खरीदना पड़ता है । नतीजा इसका यह होता है कि उत्पादकों और उपभोक्ताओं दोनों को ही इस तरह नुकसान होता है और इस तरह नाजायज मुनाफा बिचौलिए और झाड़तिए कमा लेते हैं । इसमें फायदा केवल बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों का, झाड़तियों का या जो बड़े बड़े किसान हैं बिड़ला सरीखे जो कि बड़े पैमाने पर मिकैनाइज्ज फार्मिंग करते हैं, उनको फायदा होता है । इसलिए अगर खाद्यान्न के मूल्य को और बढ़ने से रोकना है और किसानों को उसकी उपज का उचित दाम दिलवाना है तो सरकार को भ्रम का भाव एक फसल से लेकर दूसरी फसल तक निश्चित कर देना चाहिए और एक फसल और दूसरी फसल के बीच में भ्रम के दाम सेर पीछे एक भाने से अधिक न बढ़ने देने चाहिए ।

दूसरे कुछ जिन्दगी की जरूरी चीजें हैं जैसे चीनी, कपड़ा और मिट्टी का तेल

इत्यादि जो कि यह कल कारखाने पैदा करते हैं तो सरकार को इनके दामों पर भी रोक लगानी चाहिए । आज इनकी कीमतें लागत मूल्य से ३, ४ और ५ गुना अधिक बढ़ गयी हैं और नाजायज मुनाफे यह पूंजीपति कमा रहे हैं और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार जो कि एक कल्याणकारी सरकार होने का दम भरती है तो उसे यह जो इंसान के वास्ते बुनियादी जरूरत की चीजें हैं जैसे कपड़ा, चीनी, मिट्टी का तेल और लोहा, आदि, इन आवश्यक चीजों के सम्बन्ध में यह प्रतिबंध लगा देना चाहिए कि इन का दाम लागत मूल्य से डेढ़ गुने से अधिक किसी सूरत में भी न बढ़े ।

इसी के साथ साथ प्रश्न है कि किसान कुछ कच्चा माल पैदा करता है जैसे गन्ना है, जूट है, रूई है और उसी के साथ साथ धफीम है तो सरकार को जो कच्चा माल पैदा करने में लागत भ्राती हो उसके मूल्य में और जो कल और कारखानों में जाकर चीजें पैदा होती हैं उन दोनों के दामों में सरकार कोई एक समंजस्य और संतुलन रखे और यह देखे कि किसान जो कच्चा माल पैदा करता है तो उसकी उसे उचित कीमत मिले । सरकार को यह तीन चीजें करना जरूरी है । एक तो यह कि सरकार उचित रीति से अपनी मूल्य नीति स्थापित करे और आज यह जो दामों को लेकर उलट पुलट चलती है और जो कि घरबों रुपयों तक जाती है वह बंद हो । अब डाका तो कोई किसी के यहां लाख दो लाख का ही डालेगा लेकिन यह धाम तौर पर खुले सजाने पूंजीपति और सरकार मिल कर उत्पादक और उपभोक्ता की जब हूर साल घरबों रुपयों की काटते हैं और मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि यह यह एक लोक कल्याणकारी समाज की स्थापना करने के लिए वचनबद्ध सरकार के लिए कदापि शोभा नहीं देता और उसे अपनी नीति में क्रांतिकारी परिवर्तन करना होगा और मूल्यों के सम्बन्ध में सही नीति अपनानी होगी । जब सरकार एक मंगलकारी राज्य की स्थापना की बात करती है और एक समाजवादी समाज

### [श्री राम सेवक यादव]

की स्थापना की बात करती है तब उसको अपनी मूल्य नीति में परिवर्तन करना ही होगा।

**श्री विभूति मिश्र :** राम राज्य है।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** राम राज्य का मतलब अगर रावण राज्य से है तो मैं आप से इतिफाक करूंगा।

भ्राज देश के सामने प्रश्न है अधिक भ्रष्ट उपजाने का। अब रिपोर्ट में जिक्र है कि राज्यों में ऐसे भूमि सुधार के कानून बनाये गये हैं। कहीं पर तो जमींदारी खत्म हो गयी है और कहीं पर कह दिया कि चक्रवन्दी चल रही है लेकिन मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि जब तक भ्रामतौर से युनिफार्म बेसिस पर सारे देश के वास्ते कोई भूमि सुधार सम्बन्धी कानून नहीं लाया जायगा तब तक कुछ भला होने वाला नहीं है। आपने जमींदारियां समाप्त कर दी हैं लेकिन जब तक कि यह कानून न बन जाय कि जो खेती करता है अपने हाथ से भ्रम करता है वह उस खेत का मालिक होगा तब तक कुछ नहीं होने वाला है। भ्राज हमारे देखने में भ्राता है कि जहां जहां जमींदारियां खत्म हुई हैं वहां खेती करने वाले भ्राज भी वही लोग हैं जिनके कि कल कारखाने भी चलते हैं और दूसरे रोजगार भी चलते हैं और यह पूंजीपति लोग होते हैं और यह लोग मजदूरों से उन जमीनों पर काम कराते हैं। अब मजदूरों से खेती का काम करा कर यदि भ्राप देश में भ्रष्ट की उपज बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो इस में भ्राप को सफलता मिलने वाली नहीं है। मैं तो कहूंगा कि इस तरह से जमींदारी खत्म करना और यह दावा करना कि हम एक समाजवादी की स्थापना करने जा रहे हैं लोगों को धोखा देना है और इस तरह से यह समस्या कभी हल होने वाली नहीं है। अगर भ्राप बाकई में सही तौर से यह चाहते हैं कि देश में अधिक उपज हो तो

सारे भारत में एक जैसा भूमि सुधार कानून होना चाहिए और यह कानून होना चाहिए कि जो भी व्यक्ति अपने हाथ से खेती बाड़ी करे वह उस जमीन और खेत का मालिक हो, ऐसी व्यवस्था करने से ही देश में कृषि की पैदावार बढ़ने वाली है अन्यथा नहीं।

अब यह जो हमारे पाटिल साहब कहते हैं कि हम क्या करें हमें राज्य सरकारों से पूरा पूरा सहयोग नहीं मिलता है और राज्य सरकारें इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ करती नहीं हैं तो मैं उन से पूछना चाहूंगा कि अब तो भारत भर में कहीं पर भी गैर कांग्रेसी सरकार कायम नहीं है, केरल में भी जहां कि पहले गैर कांग्रेसी सरकार थी वह पर भी आपकी सरकार कायम हो गई है इसलिए आपका यह कहना कि हमें उन से सहयोग नहीं मिलता बड़े प्राश्चर्य का विषय है। मैं नहीं समझता कि जब सब प्रान्तों में आपकी कांग्रेस पार्टी की सरकारें कायम हैं तब आपके रास्ते में क्या भड़चन है और आप सारे देश के लिए एक सा युनिफार्म भूमि सुधार कानून क्यों न बना सकते और उस पर भ्रमल क्यों नहीं करवा सकते? आप जमीन का बंटवारा समुचित आधार पर क्यों नहीं कर सकते? अब आप किसान की दो बीघा जमीन पर भी टैक्स लगाते हैं तो अगर आप जो भ्रनएकोनामिक होल्डिंग्स हैं और जिन पर कि उन को कोई भूनाफा नहीं है उनसे लगान न लें तो किसानों को प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा। इसके भ्रलावा सरकार को किसानों को उचित दामों पर जो नये नये ढंग की खेती की मशीनें हैं और यंत्र हैं और जिन से कि अधिक उपज की जा सकती है किसानों को दिलवानी चाहिए। भ्राज हालत यह है कि उसके पास लगान देने के बाद इन मशीनों और यंत्रों को खरीदने के वास्ते पैसा नहीं बचता है।

इसी तरह से सिंचाई की योजनाएं हैं। अब नहरी क्षेत्र बड़ रहा है इसलिए पानी भी

उनको अधिक मात्रा में सुलभ होने लगा है सो ऐसी बात नहीं है। सरकार गावों में छोटी छोटी योजनाएं सिंचाई की चलती हैं उनके वास्ते किसानों को क्यों नहीं रुपया देती है ताकि वे अपने यहां इन योजनाओं को चला सकें।

भाजकल विभिन्न योजनाएं चल रही हैं लेकिन योजनाएं उसी पुराने नौकरशाही के ढंग पर चलती हैं जिससे कि उन में जो सफलता मिलनी चाहिए वह नहीं मिलती है। भाज कृषि मंत्रालय, कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट और फलटस कंट्रोल बोर्ड के मुहकमे मौजूद हैं और उसी के साथ साथ फुड और एथीकलचर का मंत्रालय है। यह तीनों मुहकमे मिल कर भी खाद्य समस्या को हल नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। उस दिन हमारे खाद्य मंत्री ने कहा था कि यहां पर घास्मान से ही सारी चीजें होती हैं और प्रकृति का प्रकोप हो जाता है तो उसके लिए क्या किया जा सकता है। अब मेरा कहना यह है कि यह तो कोई बात नहीं हुई क्योंकि, जब प्रकृति धनुकूल हो जाय तब तो पाटिल साहब कह दें कि हम ने समस्या को कामयाबी के साथ हल कर लिया है लेकिन अगर कहीं प्रकृति का कोप हो जाय और वह धनुकूल न हो तो कह दें कि हमारा उस में क्या वश है, प्रकृति हमें सफल नहीं होने देती और उसके जरिये हमारा सारा काम फेल किया जा रहा है। क्या आप पानी देकर सूखा को रोक नहीं सकते? जहां पानी ज्यादा बरसता है वहां के फलट को क्या आपका फलट कंट्रोल विभाग नहीं रोक सकता? वह विभाग क्या करता रहता है? एक बार मैं ने प्रश्न किया था कि राज्यों में नहरों का कमांडेड एरिया कितना है। लेकिन भाज श्रीमन् कृषि मंत्रालय के पास और सिंचाई मंत्रालय के पास इसके आंकड़े नहीं हैं। कहा गया कि राज्य से पूछिए कि कितना सिंचित एरिया है। आखिर वह यहां करते क्या हैं? क्यों यहां बैठे हुए हैं एथीकलचर मिनिस्टरी और इर्रिगेशन मिनिस्टरी और कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट डिपार्टमेंट बनाये हुए। वह सदन के सदस्यों को यह तक

नहीं बता सकते कि नहरों का कमांडेड एरिया कितना है। तो भाज सिंचाई का यह हाल है। जब तक यह चीजें नहीं होतीं खाद्य समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती।

18 hrs.

अगर खाद्य समस्या हल करनी है तो आप को एकरेज बढ़ाना होगा और उपज भी बढ़ानी होगी। आप कहेंगे कि एकरेज बढ़ाने के लिये जमीन कहां है। मैं कहता हूँ कि देश में बहुत सी खेती लायक वंजर जमीन है और बहुत सी ऐसी जमीन है जिसमें पानी भरा रहता है। अगर आप स्कोम चलायें तो आप के उपयोग के लिये यह जमीन मिल सकता है। लेकिन आप की नीति तो यह है कि जमीन की जूनार्ड हांगो ट्रैक्टर से और वह ट्रैक्टर भावेंगे अमेरीका से, लेकिन अमेरीका से मंगाने के लिये आप के पास फारिन एक्सचेंज नहीं है, इसलिये वह काम नहीं हो सकता। लेकिन आप के पास जो विशाल जनशक्ति है उस का आप उपयोग क्यों नहीं करते? आप के पास जो यह विशाल जनशक्ति है, यह जो हरिजन और पिछड़ी हुई जातियां हैं इन को आप जमीन तोड़ने के लिये क्यों इस्तेमाल नहीं करते। आप इनको इस काम के लिये रुपया दें तो इन की बेकारी भी दूर होगी और नई जमीन टूटेगी जिस से अन्न की समस्या हल होगी। लेकिन यह तो आप करने नहीं जा रहे हैं।

भाज कहा जाता है कि देहात वाले बड़े सुखी हैं, भाज देहात में दूध और चीनी की नदियां बह रही हैं, वहां पर लोग बड़े मालामाल हो रहे हैं। लेकिन सरकार की रपट को हम देखें तो हम यह पाते हैं कि सन् १९४८-४९ में देहात की पर कैसीटा इनकम १५१ बी जो कि सन् १९४५-४६ में १३६ रह गयी, यानी १५ घट गयी, और साहूर की पर कैसीटा इनकम जो कि सन् १९४८-४९ में ७३३ थी वह सन् १९४५-४६ में बढ़ कर ८१० हो गयी। तो आप देखें कि जो देहात में रहने

[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

वाले हैं और खेत में काम करने वाले लोग हैं उनकी तो भ्रामदनी घटती है और जो शहर म रहने वाले हैं उन की भ्रामदनी बढ़ गई है। इसलिये यह कहना कहां तक ठीक है कि देहात के लोग तरक्की कर रहे हैं क्योंकि उनकी तो भ्रामदनी घटी है जब कि शहर वालों की बढ़ी है।

दो मिनट में मैं कृषि मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान गन्ने की कीमतों के बारे में दिलाना चाहता हूँ। सन् १९४७-४८ में किसानों के गन्ने का मूल्य दो रुपया था। इस के पहले लागत के अनुसार गन्ने की कीमत देने की व्यवस्था रही। है। और यह सिद्धान्त था कि जितने भ्राने मन गन्ना उतना रुपये मन चीनी होगी। लेकिन उस के बाद सन् १९५१-५२ में कह दिया कि दाम कूता जायेगा और पहले वाले सिद्धान्त को छोड़ दिया गया। सन् १९५१-५२ में घटा कर गन्ने का दाम एक रुपये १२ भ्राने किया गया, सन् १९५२-५३ में १ रुपया ५ भ्राने और फिर १ रुपया तीन भ्राने कर दिया गया। फिर जब लोगों ने एजीटेशन किया और हड़ताल वगैरह हुई तो सन् १९५३-५४ में १ रुपया ७ भ्राने और १ रुपया ५ भ्राने किया गया। सन् १९५१ में किसानों को ६ करोड़ का घाटा हुआ, फिर सन् १९५२-५३ में १५ करोड़ का घाटा हुआ, और सन् १९५३-५४ में ११ करोड़ का घाटा हुआ। इस तरह से बराबर किसानों को घाटा होता रहा। तो आप देखें कि किसान के गन्ने का, कच्चे माल का, मूल्य तो घटता है लेकिन चीनी का दाम क्यों बढ़ जाता है? मैं तो मंत्री महोदय से चाहूंगा कि अगर वह आंकड़ों के साथ, तर्क के साथ इस मामले पर बहस करना चाहते हैं तो किसी दिन चीनी और गन्ने के मूल्य के बारे में तर्क से बहस हो जाये तो मालूम हो कि किस को उचित धाम मिलना चाहिये।

मैंने भ्रफीम का जिक्र कर दिया था क्योंकि हमारे डिप्टी विस्र मंत्री ने यह कहा था कि

भ्रफीम तो दवा के लिये बुवायी जाती है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ. . . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : भ्राप चीनी में भ्रफीम को कहां से ले भ्राये ?

श्री राम सेवक यादव : श्रीमान् इसलिये कि किसान उस को बोता है। मैं कृषि मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि भ्रफीम का इलाका बढ़ रहा है, और सरकार की जो दाम नीति है उस से किसान की लुटायी तो होती ही है, उस के कारण वह भ्रष्ट भी हो जाता है, उस के कारण वह लोग भ्राज बेईमान भी बन रहे हैं। किसान को भ्रफीम का मूल्य ३२ रुपया सेर दिया जाता है। यह तो भ्रच्छी से भ्रच्छी भ्रफीम का दाम है और जो खराब होती है उसका दाम उस से भो कम दिया जाता है। भ्रब तो ठेकेदारी नहीं रही, लेकिन जब ठेकेदारी थी तो भ्रफीम का दाम ७२० रुपया सेर होता था। तो मैं पूछूंगा कि जब ३२ और ७२० का दामों में भ्रन्तर हो तो क्या हरिश्चन्द्र जैसे भ्रादमी के मन में भी यह स्याल नहीं भ्रायेगा कि मैं ब्लैक मार्केट कर लूँ, काला बाजार कर लूँ। तो सरकार की दाम नीति के कारण किसान की लुटाई तो होती ही है उस को बेईमान भी बनाया जा रहा है। तो मैं खाद्य मंत्री और कृषि मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि वह समस्या का हल करना चाहते हैं तो उन को दाम के सवाल को हल करना चाहिये।

श्री बिश्वनाथ राय (सलेमपुर) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी भारतीय समाज का सब से बड़ा समूह जो भारत की प्रजा का लगभग ७० प्रतिशत है, हमारी राष्ट्रीय भ्राय का लगभग ५० प्रतिशत देता है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय माननीय सदस्य कल जारी रखेंगे।