

**DEMAND NO. 83—MINISTRY OF STEEL,
MINES AND FUEL**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,48,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel'."

DEMAND NO. 84—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,90,75,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Geological Survey'."

**DEMAND NO. 85—MISCELLANEOUS DE-
PARTMENTS AND OTHER EXPENDITURE
UNDER THE MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES
AND FUEL**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 37,19,51,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Other Expenditure under the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel'."

**DEMAND NO. 132—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF
THE MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES AND
FUEL**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 72,16,91,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel'."

16:54 hrs.

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

**DEMAND NO. 37—MINISTRY OF FOOD
AND AGRICULTURE**

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 68,17,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

DEMAND NO. 38—FOREST

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 88,38,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Forest'."

DEMAND NO. 39—AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,94,03,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

**DEMAND NO. 40—AGRICULTURAL
RESEARCH**

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,73,49,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Agricultural Research'."

DEMAND No. 41—ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 99,42,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of Animal Husbandry."

DEMAND No. 42—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,69,46,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Other Expenditure under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

DEMAND No. 121—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON FORESTS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,32,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Forests'."

DEMAND No. 122—PURCHASE OF FOODGRAINS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,97,38,01,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962 in respect of 'Purchase of Foodgrains'."

DEMAND No. 123—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 48,94,45,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

Shri Prabhat Kar: How long are we going to sit?

Mr. Speaker: The time allotted for this Ministry is 8 hours. We will sit up to 6.30 P.M. as usual.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Prabhat Kar: We started at 11 A.M. There was no Question Hour also.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): We will sit up to 5 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: The difficulty is this, I have to apply the guillotine on the 19th. It was expected that the hon. Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel would take an hour. But he had to explain a number of things. Therefore, he took nearly two hours. We must find that time. Otherwise, the time that has been allotted to the other Ministries may have to be curtailed to that extent.

Otherwise, hon. Members may reserve whatever they have to say to the general discussion on the Finance Bill. Therefore, I will apply the guillotine on the 19th. All the Demands must be completed on that day at 6 o'clock. Or, the time for the Finance Ministry may be reduced.

Shri S. L. Saxena (Maharajanj): No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: But they may say everything on the Finance Bill.

Shri S. L. Saksena: We will sit today, Sir, at little extra time.

Mr. Speaker: Is it that the House is not in a mood to sit beyond 5 today? (*Interruptions*). The House is scheduled to sit till 6.30 today. We have the half-an-hour discussion regarding Railways. The discussion on the Demands of the Food and Agriculture Ministry will go on till 6; then, we take up the half-an-hour discussion. So, we will make it up.

Does the hon. Minister want to say anything?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil): I will say at the end.

Shri Khushwaqut Rai (Kheri): Sir, I find from the papers today that certain policy decisions in regard to the sugar mills, the sugarcane growers etc. have been taken and these were mentioned in the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Congress Party. I would like the hon. Minister to enlighten us because that would help us in the debate.

Shri S. K. Patil: I would explain while replying. No decisions have been taken. Naturally, when the party executive meets some indication is given as to what is going to be done etc. We are considering these things. There are the State Governments also concerned in it; and I would be in a position to fully satisfy my hon. friends when I reply to the debate.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Mr. Speaker, Sir, criticising the policies and programmes of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, I think, I shall have to confine myself to two or three very important points. In this debate I propose to take up for discussion the utter disregard of the Government of India during the past years of animal husbandry as also the bungling which has been repeatedly found in handling the food situation.

Sir, I am not at all happy about the functioning of the Ministry. But, unfortunately, although I had sent hundreds of questions and received answers during this Session, I shall not have the time to convince this House by reading from the answers to those questions about what I would unhesitatingly say are the misdeeds of this Ministry.

16:57 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Let us take, first of all, the question of the latest agreement under the P.L. 480. We have had some agreements before. But, I must say, after going through the provisions, that this latest agreement in the P.L. 480 series has been the most unfortunate, and most pernicious one and it has inflicted the most unkindest cut of all on our economy. Normally, I should not say this; but I want the House to consider whether when we have spent a sum of \$1276 million—I think it is revised a little now—it has to be viewed only from the point of view of a loan or whether we should view the effect of this agreement from the point of view of the context of the agricultural economy each of the countries.

I shall not take the time of the House by producing my own arguments. But, permit me, Sir, to read a few quotations from one of the publications which it will be difficult or impossible for the hon. Minister to contradict when he replies. I am reading a series of quotations from the *State of Food and Agriculture, 1960* published by the F.A.O. This gives an idea of what exactly was the situation in regard to the agricultural economy of the United States at the time when we were negotiating the loans and what exactly was the situation or agricultural economy in America as compared to the rest of the world. Here is a quotation from page 4.

"In the United States, however, where wheat yields are much

lower than in most European countries, they are still increasing with considerable momentum. This is in large part the origin of the accumulation of surplus stocks in that country, as well as the chief reason why it has not so far proved possible to check their expansion by means of measures designed to reduce acreage."

17 hrs.

Then I pass on to another page where another reason is given. I am reading from page 21 where it is said:

"In the United States the winter wheat crop is expected to be about 10 per cent larger and, with spring wheat production forecast as increasing 23 per cent, total wheat production may exceed the 1959/60 level by 13 per cent."

This is about 1959-60. So, I want the House to find out whether it was a gesture of philanthropy or whether the wheat loan was forced upon the United States Government by pressure of farm surpluses.

Then a comparison of the agricultural price indexes on the export of agricultural produce would show that the overall position in the world, as reported in the FAO publication, is that while the average unit value of exports had an index of 91 in 1957, it had come down to 87 in 1959. It means that the realisation from the exports per unit was less.

Then again at page 49,—it is very important—it is stated thus:

"The most important development in surplus disposal operations in the first half of 1960 was the conclusion of an agreement between the United States and India which provides for the sale over a four-year period of 16 million tons of wheat and 1 million tons of rice."

Therefore, we see that it was not actuated by any motive to help India as is envisaged in the preamble of the

agreement but because the surplus disposal operations had to be speeded up and the excess grain which had accumulated in the United States had to be sent somewhere.

Then I shall say why India was chosen because there is an explanation for that also. It was chosen in this context; lower down on the same page, page 49, it has been stated thus:

"...this is the first agreement under Public Law 480 to extend over four years, and by far the largest single transaction."

What do the American economists say about that? I do not know what the hon. Minister will say, but the American economists, according to the FAO, say thus:

"It has therefore not unnaturally caused concern to other exporters of wheat and rice. Some economists, mainly in the United States, have also pointed out that the very large amounts of local currency involved may increase the inflationary pressure already evident in a country with a vast development program, and do not in fact increase the country's real capacity for investment."

Here is the crux of the whole matter. The American economists are convinced that in a country where there is already an inflationary spiral, this will not produce any tangible result in the matter of real investment.

Then, at page 53, the report says as follows:

"In the United States the fall in farm incomes from 1958 to 1959 was very considerable. Gross farm income is estimated to have fallen from...."

I do not want to read the figures. But then it says:

"In the first quarter of 1960— that is, just before we concluded this PL 480 agreement—

"net farm receipts were also about 16 per cent less than a year

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

earlier, and an official estimate for 1960 as a whole points to a continuing decline in the net farm income."

Actually we find that if they give us a contract for the supply of 18 million tons of grains, the net agricultural income was falling, was expected to fall further in 1960.

Later on, at page 57, I find that in the United States the problem of surplus is most acute. The problem of surplus there is as acute as the problem of deficit here in India! That may be the argument. The report says as follows:—

"In the United States, where the problem of surpluses is most acute, attempts to reduce them by restricting acreage have largely been offset by rising yields, as discussed earlier in this chapter. So far the chief effective limitation on the further accumulation of surplus stocks has been their large scale disposal under special terms."

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): Will the hon. Member agree to import?

Shri V. P. Nayar: Let the hon. Member wait. Therefore, I am certain that the special terms which have been claimed to be given by the agreement have been terms which have been forced on the United States administration because there was no way out.

At page 58 of the report, I find the following:

"Public Law 480, the principal legislation covering surplus disposal operations, has again been extended."

Further, we find that there have been no significant changes in agricultural policy in the United States in 1959-60. Various solutions to the problem of surpluses continue to be sought and proposed, but the views on price support policy are still divergent. So, I

say there is absolutely no case for anybody to say that in America there was such a desire to help India.

Why do we at all go to America? There was an answer given by our own publication *Agricultural Situation in India*, which is the latest I have—1960. Here it says:

"While delivering an address in Rotterdam early in August, 1960, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture made it clear that the United States was gravely concerned with the implications of such a market—"

he was referring to the European Common Market—

"so far as the agricultural programme was concerned... Concern in both the United States and Canada in regard to the Common Market objectives, has stimulated the interest of both countries in the Far Eastern markets. As a result, there has been a sharp reduction of rail freights in the United States on hard wheats shipped to Pacific Coast ports for shipments to some countries of Asia."

Therefore, I say that this loan was arranged at a time when for the U.S., most of the traditional markets for export of wheat were closed by certain arrangements in Europe and there was no country prepared to take an excess of 8 to 9 million tons a year, which had become an unsaleable surplus.

Let us look at the terms and conditions of the agreement. I have made some calculations and I would very much like the hon. Minister to contradict me if I go wrong in my figures. May be I may not be quite correct up to the second decimal point. I find that wheat was purchased at a cost of Rs. 330 per ton plus transport charges. At the same time, I understand from his own Ministry that Australian wheat was selling at Rs. 305 per ton plus freight. I find that out of every rupee, 42½ nP. will be the loan part, 42½ nP.

will be the grant, 10 nP. will go to the U.S. establishments here and 5 nP. will go to the U.S. private business. This works out to Rs. 140 per ton as loan part, Rs. 140 as grant and Rs. 50 for U.S. Embassy and U.S. private trade.

Let us see how the interest works out. It is very easy to say that they are giving 4½ nP. as grant and 4½ nP. of every rupee as loan. Let us calculate interest at 4½ per cent on the loan part. I presume 4½ per cent is as the average of P.L. 480 loans interest. At 4½ per cent, I find it will work out to about 92 per cent of the principal. It is repayable in a period of 40 or 50 years. I have done all the calculations and I find that on every 42½ nP. the loan part, if interest at 4½ per cent for 40 years is calculated, it will work out to 92 per cent. Apart from that, you will have to calculate the money which is given to the American Embassy for the purpose of meeting the expenditure of the U.S. establishments here. Therefore, I find that if they sell wheat at Rs. 330 per ton, what they will be taking at the rate of this calculation will be about Rs. 319 per ton, whereas Australian wheat was available at Rs. 305. I do not know whether Australia made an offer or not, but the fact remains that although they claim that 42½ nP. in the rupee is given as grant, what we have to repay is very much more than that, and that is at a time when the U.S. had absolutely no chance of selling this wheat in any place. They had either to burn it or sink it in the sea. There was no customer at all who was prepared to purchase that wheat amounting to millions of tons.

I would like to know from the Minister what is the particular advantage which we have derived from this. The answer has always been, "We must necessarily have a buffer-stock of 5 million tons and we must necessarily import in order to stabilise the prices." We have spent crores and crores of rupees—over Rs. 1500 crores on our agricultural programmes, grow more food campaigns and irrigation

240(A) LSD-6.

and flood control programmes. We had raised agricultural production by 30 per cent and 67 per cent of all the land irrigated under the programme has been for food production. With all this, after ten years of planning and increasing the production by 30 per cent or 40 per cent and having a target now of another 30 to 40 per cent whereby at the end of the Plan the production will be 100 million to 105 million tons, now he says that it is necessary to import 18 million tons for 4 years. What is this supposed to be for? Where were we all this time? All this time we were told that the prices have to be stabilised. On the other hand, I think such a large import at such fantastic prices will dampen the enthusiasm of our peasants and will make our authorities complacent in the matter of raising more production.

Sir, the hon. Minister always says that the work of the Ministry is over, questions in the House are fewer and he has nothing more to do. It is not so. By these loans we have committed our children and our grandchildren for the repayment of loans for which there is no justification. I am very sorry that for the sake of adding one more chappati a week to our diet we are making our children and their children pay for the loans under conditions which are not at all favourable to us. I do not want to stretch this point any more. I shall take up the question of animal husbandry. In the field of animal husbandry, you will be surprised to know that when India at the end of the Third Five Year Plan would have made a total investment of over Rs. 20,000 crores in all productive enterprises together only a sum of less than Rs. 50 crores would have been spent on animal husbandry including fisheries. You know that India today has more than one-fourth of the total livestock population of the world. Our cattle as estimated in the 1956 census was over 300 million. We have a poultry strength of not less than 100 million—I am giving only rough figures because there will be no time to read

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

out exact figures. But you will find that our records are so distressingly low today from the point of view of milk consumption that India is the lowest in per capita averages. We have an average of 5.5 ounces as compared to 20 ounces and over in other countries.

The Deputy Minister of Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa): China is the lowest. They have not seen milk at all.

Shri V. P. Nayar: If they have not seen milk at all we cannot say that China is the lowest. I would not include a country in any classification so far as milk consumption is concerned when it has not seen milk at all. When I say India is the lowest it is the lowest among those where milk is available.

I have heard in this House, times without number, hon. Members, moving resolutions, asking questions and even introducing Bills saying that our cow needs protection. You know, Sir, our cows are the successors of those fabulous cows which our ancestors worshipped—Kamadhenu and Nandini which were giving anything to a man who worshipped them. What is the position of the present cows? If you want a cow to give you one ounce of milk she has to be continuously beaten because it is so much starved.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram): In Kerala it may be so.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I will give some interesting figures. Punjab I know, has an average per capita consumption of 13.5 ounces per head. But the minimum prescribed by nutritional experts is 15 ounces. Therefore, even the rich milk drinking State of Punjab has not come up to the minimum nutritional standards fixed by experts.

Let us now look at the average milk yield. The average milk yield of Indian cows during one lactation

comes to 160 kilograms—one lb. of milk per day—while Pakistan is having 913 kilograms, Malaya 520 kilograms, Netherlands 4,040 kilograms and Israel 4,190 kilograms. That is why I said that we are only worshipping the starved cow, we do not feed the cow and make it yield.

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): What about Kerala?

Shri V. P. Nayar: I would request the hon. Member not to interrupt me. I know, Sir, if you take an analysis the overall position of the milk yield you will find that hardly 7 per cent. of cows yield more than 2 pounds a day. If you take buffaloes which are supposed to be very good milk yielders, hardly 13 per cent. give more than six ounces a day. This is the condition.

It is not confined to milk alone. Let us take the question of meat. In 1939 we had 11 calories worth of meat in our daily diet. In 1960 the calorific content of our meat intake has come down to 6 calories while that of Pakistan has increased from 11 to 24. I do not say that in Pakistan the cow is worshipped. That apart, it is 13 in Ceylon, 46 in the United Arab Republic and the fantastic figure of 565 in Australia. In egg consumption we have just 1 calory of egg in our daily intake, while it is 77 in Israel and 80 in the United States. This is the position we are in.

Government would attribute all this to three conditions. I have read so many of their publications and reports. In all these they say that it is due to the poor quality of the breeds of animals as well as our poultry birds, and insufficiency of feeds and fodder and also the improper care which our people are giving. I would like to ask one question. What is the programme by which the Government have considered it necessary or desirable to do away with the cattle population which is no longer necessary for our country.

I know the only person in this Ministry who holds very strong views about this is my hon. friend, the young and energetic Deputy Minister Shri Krishnappa. He has taken courage in both hands and has submitted in this House that, unfortunately, because of sentiments we have a feeling that the cows should be worshipped. I understand that today the worthless cattle number about two crores. I am very sorry to say that the cow-worshipping Punjab has got the largest number of stray cattle and that after the lactation period they are simply driven away to other people, fields to fend for themselves. We have two crores of such cattle which is becoming a menace to our cultivation.

What do we do? There is a scheme for *Gosalas* or *Gosamvardhan*. If we take into account the two crores of cows which are not wanted for any purpose—they are no good for agriculture; they are no good, possibly, for anything except to serve as beef for food, to which I shall come latter—if we are to have *Gosamvardhan* or *Gosalas*, calculated at the rate of 8 annas per cow per day, we have to spend for the rehabilitation of these living skeletons, which we call cow and cattle, a sum of Rs. 1 crore per day. Is it worthwhile? This is very simple question. Why is it that Government cannot take courage in both hands and say it is not worthwhile?

I know that the Constitution has made certain provisions, restricting cow slaughter. We also know that at the time of framing the Constitution there were some sentiments on this subject. I put this simple question to anybody who will defend protection of stray useless cattle. I will come to the question of beef later on.

For that matter, if any orthodox Hindu says that according to our *Shastras* beef can not be eaten, he is completely wrong. Beef has been eaten during the glorious days of Hindu

culture, and if somebody wants authority, I shall give him several authorities also. Everybody will understand and appreciate the authority of Kautilya's *Arthashastra*. I would invite the attention of hon. Members to that.

An Hon. Member: We will refer it to Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

Shri V. P. Nayar: We have got a very good translation of it by Shri Shama Shastri in our library. On page 159 of that book, this passage occurs:

"They (cowherds) may sell either flesh or dried flesh."

It indicates that cowherds had permission to sell cow's flesh, which is called beef. Now what is the taboo on beef. Where did we get this inhibition from? We know that there were sages—I do not want to go into details—who, the moment they arrived at a house as a guest, were treated with beef.

Shri Amjad Ali: *Gokhana*.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Shri Amjad Ali says they are called *Gokhana*. I do not want to go into that. But why is it not possible for the Government of India to have a programme to finish off all the unwanted cow and if there is sentimental or other objection against eating beef in India, why not export that beef? There is already a very good overseas' market for beef. Also do not be under the impression that in India nobody eats beef. My friends from Madras consume the largest quantity of beef in India. In Calcutta also beef is consumed, apart from veal, which is also available in large quantities.

Now, why do you allow the sentiments to stand in the way of developing our nation?

There is a potential export market for beef. By just tinkering with this

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

problem and saying that one *goshala* here and another there will do justice to the problem and solve it, it is difficult to solve it. All the programmes which the Government have in view and have taken up for implementation do not even touch the fringe of the problem of animal husbandry. I have no time to go into the details of poultry or piggery, but the fact remains that Government, although they know the importance of animals in our agricultural economy do not realise that they have not done anything. They know how important it is. I may say that animal husbandry has a more vital role to play in our economy than in any other country because still although machines are being used for cultivation and other agricultural purposes, 90 per cent of agricultural operations have necessarily to depend upon bullock power. In our entire transport I think bullock carts pull a load far greater than any other single medium. The hides and skins in spite of inroads by synthetic products still hold sway in the market. Therefore it is not like any other country. Here unfortunately we have a very vast number which we are completely neglecting and are living in the past traditions with weather beaten superstitions.

I have no time otherwise I would have shown that in India with the present population and the yield per acre of all types of fodders it is not possible to satisfy at least 50 per cent of the minimum food requirement of a head of cattle. That is the position, whether it is straw, bran, barley and every feed and fodder. We do not produce in India 50 per cent of the minimum requirement of this vast animal population. Therefore I say that if the hon. Minister feels that he has solved the food problem in respect of grains he should kindly divert his attention to another problem of which he will find that after living one hundred years he will not have touched the fringe if he goes at the present

rate. I wish him all that life, but let him at least have a serious approach made to it.

I will say a few words about fishery. I know Ch. Ranbir Singh might relish if instead of getting a speech he got a fish from me.

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): Why not offer milk and its product, namely butter, ghee.

Shri V. P. Nayar: This is a field which also has been completely neglected. You know that we have 2,900 miles of coastline. It does not require a lb. of ammonium sulphate to produce more fish from the sea. We do not have to irrigate a single acre to take the fish from the sea. We do not have to have flood control schemes producing more fish from the sea. Yet, with all that there are these natural resources still unexploited. We have only to reach the natural resources and take the fish.

I find that in the last Five-Year Plan a very small provision was made for this. For 2,900 miles of coastline only Rs. 200 lakhs were provided for deep sea fishing. Presumably because the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission did not eat fish—he was very orthodox—the Planning Commission cut it down from Rs. 200 lakhs to Rs. 40 lakhs. Only Rs. 40 lakhs were allotted for this. It is disgraceful to say that with vast resources still to be exploited, such a big country as India would not even import one fishing vessel during the whole of the Five-Year Plan period. I would challenge the hon. Minister to contradict me on this. We have not imported a single fishing vessel during the whole of the Second Five-Year Plan period. I am prepared to congratulate certain sections of that Ministry because despite serious limitations they have done very good work. I have followed their work.

In answer to a question the other day in which I had asked whether any

recent equipment is being used in the matter of mechanised fishing the answer comes from one of the hon. Ministers—I think it was from Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh—that echo sounders are being used... (*Interruption*). The word 'echo sounder' will create an echo in the House and we will think that it is the latest equipment worth several million rupees. But he does not know that an echo sounder to be used in a fishing vessel hardly costs Rs. 1000 or Rs. 1,200. Not even one per cent of our mechanised craft have got that, yet we have not got echo sounders. Government have not understood perhaps that besides echo sounders we have to have electronic equipment. We have to have radio telephone. If a ship is fishing at some place and a fish shoal is sighted immediately a message can be conveyed to another ship which is fishing 15 or 20 miles away so that it can rush and cover the shoal with nets. Nothing of the kind has happened in our fisheries. Nevertheless, I say with very limited resources given to them certain of our scientists have done extremely good work, especially off shore-fishing units and they have acquitted themselves with commendable credit. But what is the advantage? When they do something and when they get good work, Government does not pay them any attention and government does not want to take advantage of the results.

Then, Sir, good work has also been done in the matter of designing and developing fishing gear, tackle and craft by the Central Institute of Fisheries Technology. I do not know the details of the personnel who are there, but from the reports I find quite good work has been done.

But there is another institution in which I am very deeply interested and that is the Marine Research Institute at Mandapam. That also has done good work, but the good work is confined inside the laboratory. I understand that there is no obligation on the part of the scientists of the

Marine Research Institute at Mandapam to go out into the sea. They must wait there, get all the data from those who go from their fishing stations and then they will go on sampling details or analysing the data. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he should change it and see that the scientists attached to that unit must necessarily go out into the sea so that they may get a first hand idea of what happens.

Sir, I would urge upon the hon. Minister to use all his drive, initiative and enthusiasm to convert the Planning Commission into an organisation which is more animal minded, poultry minded and fisheries-minded I would also request the hon. Minister to demand for a grant of at least Rs. 50 crores only for exploitation of our deep seas, because in the world over you will not find many fishing banks and fishing grounds with such vast potentialities as the Pedro Bank and the Wadge Bank. We have not been able to go anywhere near it, while Japanese fishing vessels come steaming 6 to 8 thousand miles and reap a good harvest. Allotment of a crore here and half a crore there might sound very much, but it is not going to solve the problem.

One more point, Sir, and I have done that is the ICAR. I do not know how the ICAR has been entrusted with such responsibilities when it is only a society registered under the Societies Registration Act. Crores of rupees are being spent. No satisfactory progress has been made in any of the schemes which are financed by the ICAR. And when I ask a question, for example, as to what is the date on which there was research in coconut the poor Minister is made to give an answer that the information will be collected and laid on the Table of the House. When I ask a question about the Research station at Palode, the answer is, information has to come. This is the way in which this institution is functioning. I must say with all the emphasis at my disposal that the ICAR

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

should be reorganised and made a wing of the Ministry. There is no question of giving huge grants to non-official bodies and asking them to dole out for research programmes. It must be controlled by a person who is very knowledgeable in science, not by a person who because he happens to belong to the ICS goes round from place to place and ultimately lands himself in Delhi. If at all it is to work seriously it must go to a scientist. I find that the proportion of non-technical to technical personnel is rather shameful. There are more non-technical persons in the ICAR which considers the merits and demerits of these grants, as my hon. friend has given me answer to that effect.

The ICAR is just at the stage at which it was formed years ago and no changes have been made except that the word "Imperial" has been changed to "India". I would very earnestly request the hon. Minister to revitalise the whole programme for animal husbandry, fisheries,

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: And piggery.

Shri V. P. Nayar: My hon. friend Mr. Vittal Rao says that piggery also should be included. Piggery must be an integral part of any programme, because there is no other useful animal which can be kept and which can be multiplied in such a short time as pig. As you know pig has a very short pregnancy and a litter runs into six to 12. That alone will solve the food problem in India. It is not a question of a few minor irrigation works here and there. If you invest Rs. 50 an a piggery, I am sure that will be repaid in the next year and can get Rs. 50,000 in the course of four or five years. That is the law of nature which must be taken advantage of by the hon. Minister and his Department.

I would' resume my seat by making one request of the hon. Minister. He

may, I know by his thundering eloquence, especially of the maidan type be able to floor me. But this is not the type of reply I expect.

I want a realistic approach to the whole problem. If the hon. Minister feels that he has spare time, because he has not much to do on the food side, he must divert his energies to the full to the field of animal husbandry and fisheries and come to us next year and say that some good beginning has been made to lay a solid foundation for our economy.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have received four names with the request that as the Members are leaving today they must be called today. That is not possible for me.

Shri Sankarapandian.

Shri Rami Reddy rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, the hon. Member is one of them.

Shri Sankarapandian (Tenkasi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it is reported that this year we shall have a foodgrain production of 75 million tons. For this substantial upward jump in the availability of foodgrains we have to thank the Food and Agriculture Ministry, though a good portion of it is due to the improvement of weather conditions. Of course the Ministry of Food and Agriculture has realised this fact and made a decision to import foodgrains from America under PL 430 and also an additional quantity of rice from Burma.

Let me go back to the year 1951 when the First Plan was formulated and presented to the country. It was clearly declared then that one of our main objectives is to make our country self-sufficient in food. We are now at the end of the Second Plan and are looking forward towards the Third Plan. But let the Government clearly state whether we are closer to the achievement of that objective now than ten years ago? If it is not so, is it not an occasion to

re-examine some of the plans that we have so far followed? *

It is widely recognised, especially after the Ford Foundation submitted its findings on the food problem of India, that extensive use of fertilisers should be the central plank on which increase of food production should be planned. If this is so, should we not encourage the use of fertilisers throughout the country?

One of the chief bottlenecks in the rapid increase of fertiliser utilisation is our limited production. As a result of this, a substantial increase in fertiliser capacity has now been planned for the Third Plan. The fertiliser from the new plants would be available only towards the end of the Third Plan period. In the meantime the country would have to do with the existing low production plus import. Even after the additional quantity of fertilisers is available, it will scarcely be adequate to meet the requirements of the country. So I would request the hon. Minister to impress upon institutions like the World Bank and the Governments of the other countries that are willing to give assistance, that fertilisers are just as important, if not more, to India's economy as industrial machinery. Not only it is necessary to have a larger quantity of fertilisers, it is also necessary to make it available to the average farmer at a price he can afford to pay. At present fertiliser prices in India are among the highest in the world. As the Fertiliser Distribution Inquiry Committee has pointed out, these prices are greatly out of line with the food-grain prices. A farmer seeing his output at the prevailing prices for foodgrains cannot utilise fertiliser which sells at Rs. 360 per ton. The Government cannot seriously think that at this high price the use of fertiliser can become widely current. It has been argued that increased production of fertilisers in the country in the next few years would bring the prices down. While this may occur,

any substantial fall in the prices cannot be envisaged. It is absolutely essential that the prices of fertilisers should be reduced.

While the prices of fertilisers should be brought down, support must also be given to the foodgrain prices. It is now generally accepted that the farmer must be guaranteed a minimum price for his produce. In principle, this view seems to have been accepted by the Government. In fact, on several occasions, we have been told that Government would actually take measures to implement this policy, but nothing concrete has been done so far.

There is no gainsaying the fact that there are practical difficulties in the way of a guaranteed price. The building up of a buffer stock is hindered by the lack of warehousing facilities. Warehousing occupies an important place in the national economy of other countries like the USA and Canada. But, anyhow, our Government have not devised any methods to improve the condition in this respect. Unless they have an adequate quantity of buffer stock, the minimum price cannot be guaranteed.

I must emphasise that to promote intensive cultivation, which is the only way by which enough food for the growing population of the country can be provided, it is necessary that the agricultural prices are stabilised. It is ridiculous to expect the farmer to make his best efforts for raising the yield on his land in a situation where the major benefit from his effort is always in danger of being swallowed by the middleman. The farmer must be assured of his rightful gains, if he is expected to invest money and put in more of his labour into cultivation.

A guaranteed price alone, of course, is not the panacea for all the ills that beset the agriculturists. Improved yields through better cultural practices—the core of the agricultural development—cannot be brought

[Shri Sankarapandian]

about speedily without the dynamic extension services. The farmer has to be educated in the modern methods of cultivation. He has to be taught how to utilise fertilizers, green-manures and insecticides to maximise his yield. Further, in addition to this overall improvement, he has to be assisted in his special problems. Each area and each village has got special agronomical problems which often cannot be solved by the farmer. In this direction, the community development and the national extension service people are helping them, but it is not sufficient, because the notional extension services are saddled with so many responsibilities and multifarious services that they are not able to focus their attention on these problems. So, agricultural extension service should be given higher priority, and the personnel responsible for it must give undivided attention to it.

I understand that the All India Agricultural Implements Committee has submitted reports recommending some improved implements to be used by the farmers, but no private people are coming forward to undertake the manufacture of these implements, fearing that the agricultural co-operatives and the industrial co-operatives will come in their way. But Government should take some steps in this direction also, to manufacture these agricultural implements cheaply so that they could be supplied to the farmers.

Regarding land ceiling also, I am sorry to say that Government have failed to evolve a uniform policy for the country. Each State and each man speaks as it or he likes. Either in the matter of fixing the ceiling of the land-holding or in the matter of fixing the price of the commodity, I should like to know what formula Government are following.

The hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture is acclaimed everywhere that he is a very successful Minister.

His main function now is turned from the distribution to the production side. For increased production, small tractors like hand-driven tractors etc. are to be supplied to the small farmers.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the Ministry should possess some factories of its own to manufacture agricultural implements which can be supplied to the farmers at a cheaper rate, and high-quality implements also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, Shri Rami Reddy. He should finish within ten minutes, because he asked only for that much time. Because he is going away, therefore, I have allowed him.

Shri Rami Reddy: I shall finish within ten minutes.

Shri M. B. Thakore: Sir, A Member from the north also may be called.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am first calling those who are leaving today. I shall call the others later.

Shri Rami Reddy: At the outset, I would like to congratulate the Ministry on having created a climate of confidence in the country that no one would suffer on account of shortage of foodgrains in the country. Good buffer stocks have been created, as a result of which the wheat zones could be abolished; before long, it is also expected—the Minister hopes so—that the rice zones might be abolished, thus making the whole country into a single zone. But this should not lead us to an air of complacency which is already coming over the Ministry that in future one need not be afraid that there will be shortage of foodgrains etc. This is evident from the fact that even today we are obliged to import 5 million tons of foodgrains per annum, though one year ago we were importing only 3 million tons. Over a period of four years, we will be obliged to import about 5 million tons annually.

Even in regard to the production of other agricultural commodities like oilseeds, cotton and jute, the performance during the last two or three years has not been very encouraging. As a matter of fact, the production of jute and oilseeds has been going down and the position in regard to cotton has not been very satisfactory. This has also been mentioned in the Report published by the Ministry itself.

If we have to achieve self-sufficiency or near-self-sufficiency by the end of the Third Plan, we will have to take into consideration the growing population. The recent census has shown that there is a population increase of 2.1 per cent. per annum. This factor has to be taken serious notice of if we have to achieve self-sufficiency or near-self-sufficiency. A war-like effort has to be made for producing more and more.

In this connection, the only solution is intensive cultivation. For that, fertiliser is the most important item that would contribute for more and more yield and greater and greater per acre yield. The previous speaker has spoken of the Ministry's plans to produce fertilisers by the end of the Plan; therefore, I need not go into that matter again. He has also mentioned that fertilisers should be supplied at a very cheap rate. On this point, I would like to say that the cost of production of fertilisers in our country has been round about Rs. 300 per ton, whereas the cost of imported fertiliser—I am speaking of sulphate of ammonia—is about Rs. 217 or Rs. 220 per ton. So the cost of production itself in our country is already high. In addition to that, there is another element of cost. Distribution of supplies of fertilisers is done by the Central Fertiliser Pool under the control of this Ministry. They pool all the fertilisers, both indigenously produced and imported. They take into account the railway freight, staff charges and other incidental charges and they supply fertilisers at a uniform rate throughout the country.

In this connection, I should say that the Fertiliser Pool was started with the intention of supplying fertilisers to the farmers throughout the country on a no-profit-no-loss basis. If this criterion has to be applied, the price of fertiliser should be only Rs. 300 per ton, because the no-profit-no-loss price cannot be more than that, even according to the calculation of the Ministry. But now they are adding Rs. 50 per ton as profit to this Fertiliser Pool. In addition to that, the State Governments which have to distribute the fertiliser to the farmers, are permitted to charge another Rs. 30 per ton for distribution within the State. The fertilizer is now sold at Rs. 380 per ton. At any rate, I would submit that the making of a profit of Rs. 50 per ton is most unjust when it is the primary duty, of the Government to supply fertilizers at cheap rates, at subsidised rates. The Government has absolutely no justification at all for making profit on this business. It is, in fact, levying a tax from the farmer for the supply of fertilizers. It is an irony that the farmer who is the poorest in the world is charged the highest rate in the world for fertilizers in this country.

Besides that, as a result of this Rs. 50 per ton profit, during the last 3 years they have made enormous profits. I am quoting figure from a report of the United Nations Fertilizer Mission to India. They have submitted a report and from that report I am quoting the figures. In 1957-58, the fertilizer pool made a profit of Rs. 1.54 lakhs; in 1958-59, they have made Rs. 350 lakhs; in 1959-60, they have made a profit of Rs. 637 lakhs; and, probably, during 1960-61 they are making a profit of Rs. 9 crores or Rs. 10 crores. And, it is said that all these profits go to the general revenues.

I could understand if these profits go to a Farmers' Fund for the benefit of the farmers, for the developmental activities of the farmers. But, these profits are being added on to

[Shri Rami Reddy]

the general revenues. I submit this is most unjust.

The Fertilizer Distribution Inquiry Committee also has recommended that the price of fertilizers shall be reduced. Even at the factory concerned, Sindri, the price is given a margin of 10 per cent. of profit over production cost and then, adding Rs. 50 for every Rs. 300 it comes to 16.6 per cent. profit for the fertilizer pool. So, in all its cost to the farmer is more than 26 per cent, over the cost of production. This is very unjust. Therefore, I submit that the Ministry should take proper steps for reducing the cost of the fertilizer to be supplied to the farmers.

In this connection I would like to say a word about the allocation of fertilizers. The allocations are made to the different States on the demands that are made by the different States. The demand itself is not based on the actual requirements. The Central Government indicates that a particular quantity say 1 lakh tons or 2 lakh tons of nitrogen will be available in a particular year. On that basis they will have to calculate the demand. The allocation is not based either on actual requirements or on the extent of the area irrigated or on the basis of population. This is not just; this should be done on the actual requirements in each State.

So is the case in regard to agricultural implements. It is heartening to note that the Ministry has succeeded in supplying iron and steel for agricultural purposes on "core" requirements. They have been added as requirements under the category of "core". But the allocation has not been made on the actual requirements. Again, it is neither on the basis of population nor on actual requirements of a particular State. This also should be done on the basis of actual requirements.

Then, in regard to minor irrigation, I would mention one word. I con-

gratulate the Ministry for they have succeeded in achieving the target. They say that they have exceeded the target in regard to minor irrigation. They have been doing really wonderful work in this regard. I submit that more and more resources should be provided for minor irrigation.

In this connection, I would mention one thing about tube-wells which are connected with this minor irrigation. Tube-wells should be provided in scarcity areas where there is no surface water available. In times of drought and other things the level of underground water does not deplete as much as surface water. Especially in the case of the scarcity areas, these tubewells do wonderful service. The hon. Deputy Minister, Shri M. V. Krishnappa, had also visited the scarcity areas in Andhra Pradesh and Mysore, and he has noticed how urgently these scarcity areas require tube-wells and other things. About the successful well, the Exploratory Tubewells Organisation has said that a successful well is one which yields about 20,000 gallons per hour at a depth of 20 feet. But in regard to the scarcity areas this criterion has to be revised. Special concessions have to be shown to them and I am sure that the Minister would agree to this proposal.

I should like to conclude with one more suggestion. There is enough of foodgrains in Andhra Pradesh. There are some States like Kerala and others where the foodgrains are required. The southern zone consists of the four southern States and there is surplus rice available there. But on account of the shortage of wagons there has been no proper movement of foodgrains. Therefore, the foodgrains could not be exported from several stations in Andhra Pradesh. So, I request that this Ministry should take up with the Railway Ministry the question of supplying more wagons for the movement of foodgrains from the surplus to the deficit States.

श्री प्र० ना० सिंह (चन्दौली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्रालय के अनुदानों पर बहस के अवसर पर मैं इस बात की याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि १४ वर्षों के बाद भी अभी तक खाद्यान्न के मामले में हमारा देश आत्मनिर्भर नहीं हो पाया है।

अभी हमारे मित्र श्री नायर ने पी० एल० ४८० के समझौते की बात उठाई थी। मैं इस बहस में नहीं पड़ना चाहता कि यह समझौता कहां तक वाजिब है। लेकिन उसका महत्व इस दृष्टि से है कि आज इतने साल बीत जाने पर भी इस देश में चार वर्ष के अन्दर १ करोड़ ७० लाख टन गल्ला ७ अरब रुपये की लागत से अमरीका से मंगाया जायेगा। उसी के साथ-साथ यूनाइटेड अरब रिपब्लिक, क्याम, कैनाडा, बर्मा और दूसरे मुल्कों से भी इस देश के अन्दर गल्ला मंगाया जा रहा है। इसका सीधा मतलब यह है कि गल्ले के मामले में जो आत्मनिर्भरता हमको इन पिछले १४ वर्षों के अन्दर प्राप्त कर लेनी चाहिए थी, वह आज तक प्राप्त नहीं हो पायी है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक बेसिक इंडस्ट्रीज की मशीनों के बनाये जाने का सवाल है, उनको भी अभी तक हम बनाने की हालत में नहीं हैं। लेकिन फिर भी अपने उद्योगों के लिए जो कच्चे माल की आवश्यकता है, कृषि के द्वारा जो कच्चे माल के देने का सवाल है उस कच्चे माल को भी हम इस देश में पुरे तौर से पैदा नहीं कर रहे हैं। पिछले साल ६ लाख गांठ रुई की अमरीका से मंगाने की बात हुई और वह मंगाई गई। इस स्थिति को देखते हुए मैं सरकार के सामने इस बात को रखना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक कृषि और खाद्य के सम्बन्ध में वह मौलिक रूप से अपनी नीतियों में परिवर्तन नहीं करेगी तब तक वह इस खाद्यान्न की समस्या को हल नहीं कर सकेगी। इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार को अपनी जमीन नीति के सम्बन्ध में फैसला करना पड़ेगा। इसके साथ ही सरकार को किसानों के सम्बन्ध में अपनी पाम नीति तथा कृषि नीति के सम्बन्ध में भी फैसला करना पड़ेगा।

जहां तक जमीन नीति का तात्लुक है यह जमीन के मालिकाने से मध्यवर्तियों के खत्म करने के प्रश्न को अभी भी पुरे तरीके से हल नहीं किया जा सका है। सन १९६० और ६१ की रिपोर्ट में भी कहा गया है कि अभी तक यह हल नहीं हो पाया है। अभी तक असम, गुजरात, महाराष्ट्र और मद्रास के राज्यों में मध्यवर्तियों की पूरे तौर से समाप्ति नहीं हुई है। अभी तक उन राज्यों में मध्यवर्ती पड़े हुए हैं। जो खेतीबाड़ी करे जमीन उसके हाथ में जाय, यह सिद्धान्त पूर्णतः लागू नहीं हो पाया है। अभी भी हजारों बीघा जमीन के बड़े मालिक पड़े हुए हैं। जहां पर कि आपने मध्यवर्तियों को खत्म करना चाहा वहां पर भी जबर्दस्ती वेदखली के द्वारा जमीन उनके हाथ से निकाल ली गई जो कि जमीन को जोतते और बोते थे और वह ऐसे लोगों के हाथों में पड़ गई जो कि अपने हाथ से मेहनत नहीं करते।

यह लैंड की सीलिंग का सवाल बहुत असें से चल रहा है लेकिन उसके सम्बन्ध में एक स्पष्टनीति सरकार अभी तक नहीं बना पाई है। देश की पैदावार बढ़ाने के सिलसिले में हमको इस बात को ध्यान में रखना चाहिए कि खेतीबाड़ी का काम जो लोग खुद अपने हाथ से करते हैं वही इस देश की पैदावार को अच्छे तरीके से बढ़ा सकते हैं। लैंड पर सीलिंग किये जाने का सवाल बहुत असें से चल रहा है लेकिन अभी तक ठीक तरीके से इस सम्बन्ध में कार्य नहीं हो पाया है। इसके सम्बन्ध में ठीक नीति नहीं अपनाई जा रही है। अभी भी लोगों के हाथों में हजारों एकड़ जमीन पड़ी हुई है फिर भी जमीन के बंटवारे का प्रश्न ठीक तरीके से नहीं चल रहा है।

उत्तर प्रदेश में ५ आदमियों के परिवार पर ४० एकड़ की सीलिंग की गई है और ८ आदमियों के परिवार पर ८० एकड़ की सीलिंग की गई है। दिल्ली में २५ या ३० एकड़ पर सीलिंग होती है। दूसरे सूबों में दूसरी तरह

[श्री प्र० ना० सिंह]

की बात हो रही है। यह आवश्यक है कि लैंड सीलिंग के विषय में एक स्पष्ट नीति हो। लैंड सीलिंग के सवाल को जितनी तेजी से तय करना चाहिए उतनी तेजी से सरकार तय नहीं कर पाई है।

इसी के साथ-साथ हम देखते हैं कि जहां तक सरकार की दाम नीति का सवाल है वह नीति स्पष्ट नहीं है। जब तक कृषि के उत्पादित पदार्थों के दाम के सिलसिले में सरकार ठीक फैसला नहीं लेगी तब तक कृषि उत्पादन को बढ़ाना सम्भव नहीं हो पायेगा। कुछ कृषि पदार्थों के दामों में वृद्धि होने का नतीजा यह हुआ कि लोगों में पैदावार को बढ़ाने में दिलचस्पी पैदा हुई। हमारे मित्र श्री गिबबन लाल सक्सेना ऊव के दाम के मामले में सदन को बतलायेंगे। अब मैं आपको बतलाऊं कि हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में किसानों द्वारा यह मांग करने पर कि उनको २ रुपया मन ऊव का दाम मिले और जो कि उनको आज से ७-८ वर्ष पहले मिलता था भी, बजाय वह दाम देने के, इस पर कैबिनेट में एक डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब के चीनी के कारखाने पर गोली चलाई गई और जिसके कि फलस्वरूप गोरखपुर में दो किसान गोली से मारे गये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस दाम नीति के मामले में ठीक तरीके से विचार किया जाये। इस सम्बन्ध में यह बात भी ध्यान में रखनी चाहिए कि खलिहान के समय गल्ले की कीमत कम होती है और जब दो, चार महीने भर बाद वही गल्ला बाजार में आ जाता है तो उसमें बहुत फर्क पड़ जाता है और उसकी कीमत में करीब दूने का फर्क पड़ जाता है। सरकार को इस तरह की नीति बनानी चाहिये कि जिससे खलिहान में जो गल्ले की कीमत हो और बाजार में जो गल्ले की कीमत हो उसमें एक घाने सेर से ज्यादा का फर्क न पड़े। खलिहान और बाजार के गल्ले के दाम में बहुत फर्क होना किसी तरह से भी उचित नहीं है। सरकार की आज की दाम नीति का नतीजा यह हो

रहा है कि किसान और उपभोक्ता दोनों उस दाम नीति के अन्दर पिसे जा रहे हैं। इसलिए यह बहुत आवश्यक है कि सरकार की दाम नीति बहुत ही साफ होनी चाहिए।

इस समय जो घान बिक रहा है वह पिछले साल के मुकाबले कम दाम पर बिक रहा है। नतीजा यह होता है कि खलिहान के मौके पर किसान को गल्ले का दाम कम मिलता है लेकिन बाद में जब वही गल्ला बाजार में आता है तो उसका दाम बहुत चढ़ जाता है। सरकार को दाम नीति के सम्बन्ध में ठीक तरीके से और स्पष्ट फैसला करना चाहिए।

इसी के साथ-साथ कर नीति का जहां तक सम्बन्ध है किसानों पर किस तरीके से कर लगे इस सम्बन्ध में भी सरकार ठीक तरीके से फैसला करे। मैं सारे देश की बात तो नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन मैं उत्तर प्रदेश का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन जैसी स्थिति उत्तर प्रदेश की है वैसी ही स्थिति लगभग सारे देश की है। जो आंकड़े दिये गये हैं उनके मुताबिक ८० फीसदी किसान ऐसे हैं जिनको कि खेती पर खर्च करने के बाद तथा अपना जीवन निर्वाह करने के बाद कुछ नहीं बचता है। ऐसी हालत में यदि आप यह कोशिश करें कि जो किसानों के पास थोड़ा बहुत बचे उसे टैक्स द्वारा आप निकाल लें तो फिर उनके पास कुछ भी नहीं बचेगा जो कि वह खेतीबाड़ी की तरक्की करने में इनवैस्ट कर सकें। जाहिर है कि यदि खेती में साधन नहीं जुटाये जायेंगे तो उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ पायेगा।

इधर उत्तर प्रदेश में अभी यह बात कर रहे हैं कि सिचाई के सिलसिले में किसानों को जो तीन घाने की रुपया रिबेट मिलता था उस रिबेट को उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार वापिस लेना चाहती है। इसका लाजिमी नतीजा यह होगा कि किसानों के पास जो थोड़ा सा पैसा बचता था और जो कि खेती की तरक्की करने

के काम में आता था, उसको किसानों पर इस तरह से कर लगा कर ले लेना चाहते हैं और जिसका कि नतीजा यह निकलेगा कि वह अपनी खेती की पैदावार को नहीं बढ़ा सकेंगे।

इसी के साथ-साथ हमको इस बात को भी ध्यान में रखना है कि बिना अच्छे बीज के, पूरे तौर से खाद तथा बिना पानी दिये हुये हम खेती की पैदावार को नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं। जहां तक पानी देने का सवाल है जिन जगहों पर नहरें हैं भी वहां पर भी सिंचाई के लिए पानी की सप्लाई बहुत इर्रिगुलर है। उनको ठीक से पानी नहीं मिल पाता है। सिंचाई की व्यवस्था बिल्कुल इर्रिगुलर है। नतीजा इसका यह है कि जहां पर धान की दो या तीन फसलें उगाई जा सकती हैं वहां केवल धान की एक फसल ही पानी है। यदि राइम पेडी की नर्मरी के लिये वरनात के पहले पानी मिल जाये तो उसका लाजिमी नतीजा यह होगा कि एक फसल की जगह पर हम दो या तीन फसल तक आसानी से कर लेंगे। हमको इस बात को देखना है कि जहां इर्रिगेशन फेमेनेटीज मौजूद हैं वहां पर ठीक समय से पानी मिले, नर्मरी के लिये ठीक समय से पानी मिले। इसमें कोई संशय नहीं है कि यदि इर्रिगेशन फेमेनेटीज जहां पर हैं वहां पर ठीक तरह से पानी देने की व्यवस्था कर दी जाये तो खेती की पैदावार बढ़ जायेगी।

जहां तक किसानों को अच्छे बीज उपलब्ध करने का प्रश्न है, मन्त्रालय की १९६०-६१ की रिपोर्ट में बताया गया है कि द्वितीय पांचमाना योजना के आखिर तक लगभग चार हजार मीड मन्टीप्लिकेशन फार्म खोले जायेंगे, जबकि इस सम्बन्ध में टारगेट ४,३२८ फार्म खोलने का था। चूंकि मेरे निर्वाचन क्षेत्र, चन्दौरी, में भी एक मीड मन्टीप्लिकेशन फार्म है, इसलिए इस विषय में जानकारी होने के कारण मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे मीड किसान अपने यहां तैयार कर लेना है, वैसे इन फार्मों में तैयार नहीं हो पाते हैं। सरकार को इस तरह ध्यान देना चाहिये।

फार्मों खुलें, लेकिन खुलने के बाद वहां कैसे सीइज पैदा होते हैं, इस पर नियन्त्रण होना चाहिये। इस बात का प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये कि फार्मों में व्यवस्था ऐसी अच्छी हो कि अच्छे बीज सारे देश को दिये जा सकें।

18 hrs.

इस रिपोर्ट में यह भी कहा गया है कि २३ लाख टन नाइट्रोजनस फर्टिलाइजर्स की जरूरत है, लेकिन उसकी जगह इम्पोर्ट किये गये और इस देश में तैयार किये गये फर्टिलाइजर्स की मात्रा केवल ९ लाख टन है, जिसका नतीजा यह है कि १३, १४ लाख टन फर्टिलाइजर्स की कमी है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि किसानों को अच्छे फर्टिलाइजर नहीं पहुंचाये गये, तो उसका लाजिमी नतीजा यह होगा कि ख.च के बारे में हम आत्म-निर्भर नहीं हो पायेंगे।

माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय ने मुझे दस मिनट का समय दिया है, इसलिए एक और बात कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ। आज हमें ऐसे कंडिज की जरूरत है, जो गांवों में वैज्ञानिकों खांजों और टैक्निकल रिमर्च के परिणामों और फेसलों को किसानों तक पहुंचा सकें। यदि हम इस रिपोर्ट में दिये गये प्रांकों को देखने हैं, तो ज्ञात होता है कि अबतक, १९६३ तक हमको ५० हजार ग्राम सेवकों की जरूरत है, जिसमें मैं से ४२ हजार तैयार हो चुके हैं और ७ हजार ट्रेनिंग ले रहे हैं। जहां तक ग्राम-सेविकाओं का सम्बन्ध है, १० हजार ग्राम-सेविकाओं की जरूरत है, जबकि लगभग २,६०० प्रतिशित हो चुकी हैं और लगभग २०० की ट्रेनिंग हो रही है। इससे उनका काम पूरा नहीं होगा। मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन ग्राम सेवकों और ग्राम-सेविकाओं को किसी भी एकमात्र के सामने रख कर और उनको कोई एक फल देकर इस बात की जांच की जाये कि उनको कितना ज्ञान है और वे किसानों को विज्ञान

[श्री प्र० ना० सिंह]

और टैक्नीक की कितनी सूचना दे पाते हैं, उत्पादन बढ़ाने के विषय में उनकी कितनी मदद कर पाते हैं। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इन ग्राम-सेवकों और ग्राम-सेविकाओं की शिक्षा में भ्रामूल परिवर्तन की आवश्यकता है। मैं तो यह मुझाव दूंगा कि यदि आवश्यकता पड़े, तो इस समय जितने दिनों की ट्रेनिंग दी जाती है, उस अवधी को दुगुना या तिगुना बिधा जा सकता है। लेकिन उनकी ट्रेनिंग ऐसी हो, कि वे किसानों को विज्ञान और टैक्नीक की खोजों और फ़ैमलों के बारे में बता सकें, खेती की उन्नति करने के बारे में उनकी सहायता कर सकें, क्योंकि यदि विज्ञान की खोजों और सुधरे हुए टैक्नीक का ज्ञान गांवों तक नहीं पहुंचेगा, जब तक उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये और सुधरे हुए तरीके किसानों तक नहीं पहुंचेंगे, तब तक खाद्यान्न के विषय में भ्रान्त-निर्भर होने में हमारा मुक्तक सफल नहीं हो सकेगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are 107 selected cut motions relating to the Demands under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. They may be moved subject to their being otherwise admissible.

Failure to raise the price of sugarcane in U.P. and Bihar

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced to Re. 1." (1569)

Failure of the scheme of State Trading in foodgrains

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced to Re. 1." (1570).

Failure to fix the prices of goodgrains in relation to other commodities

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced to Re. 1." (1571)

Need to raise the standard of living of agriculturists in India

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (251)

Need to fix reasonable prices of agricultural commodities on the basis of cost of production

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (252)

Need to set up a price committee to advise the Government to fix the prices of agricultural goods

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (253)

Failure to refix the price of sugarcane at Rs. 2 per maund

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (254)

Failure to check the fall in the prices of "jeera"

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (255)

Need to popularise the uses of fertilisers

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (256)

Need to lower the prices of fertilisers

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (257)

Need to give more financial aid to Gujarat State for anti-erosion measures

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (258)

Need to give improved seeds to agriculturists in time

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (259)

Need to reclaim and develop the Kutch desert in the State of Gujarat

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (260)

Need to popularise foodgrains where cash crops are grown more in proportion

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (261)

Failure to maintain parity between the prices of agricultural goods and other non-agricultural essential goods

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (273)

Failure to construct sufficient godowns for storing foodgrains in the State of Gujarat

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (274)

Need to drill more tube-wells in North Gujarat

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (275)

Need to give specific instructions to villagers regarding preservation and uses of manure

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (300)

Need to raise the prices of sugarcane to two rupees per maund

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (325)

Need to appoint an advisory committee to fix the price of agricultural commodities

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (326)

Need to start factories for producing cattle feeds in the Public Sector .

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1494)

Policy of entrusting money for agricultural research to non-official bodies like I.C.A.R.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1580)

Lack of necessary control over I.C.A.R.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1581)

Functioning of I.C.A.R.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1582)

Proportion of technical to non-technical officers in the Ministry

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1583)

Nomination of the Vice-President and other functionaries of I.C.A.R.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1584)

Need to make I.C.A.R. a governmental institution

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1585)

Over-staffing in Class I posts in the Ministry

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1586)

Unnecessary personal staff for Class I Officers

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1587)

Need to reduce P.S.'s and P.A.'s in the Ministry

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move.

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1588)

Failure to take adequate steps to increase crop production within the country to make it self-dependent

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1589)

Failure to impart necessary scientific knowledge to the agriculturists

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1590)

Failure to co-ordinate the work of the Agriculture Department and the Department of Community Development

Shri V. F. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1591)

Failure to take adequate steps to improve the position of Horticulture

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1592)

Failure to substantially increase the production of leafy vegetables

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1593)

Failure to take adequate steps to change the food habits of the people.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1594)

Need to preserve and maintain forest wealth

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Forest' be Reduced by Rs. 100." (238)

Need to establish forest research centres in Panch Mahal, Danta, Dang and Gir areas of Gujarat State

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Forest' be Reduced by Rs. 100." (239)

240(Ai) LSD—7.

Need to develop and expand the forest by growing and planting different types of trees

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Forest' be Reduced by Rs. 100." (240)

Failure to minimise the use of conventional timber like teak in Government construction

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Forest' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1610)

Need for adequate programme for better utilisation of minor forest produce

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Forest' be Reduced by Rs. 100." (1611)

Failure to ensure unrestrained destruction of wild life

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Forest' be Reduced by Rs. 100." (1612)

Failure to step up forest research

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Forest' be Reduced by Rs. 100." (1613)

Inadequacy of training of personnel required for Forest Department

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Forest' be Reduced by Rs. 100." (1614)

Need to establish agricultural school in each district

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (276)

Need to conduct a free tour of farmers from all over India to the Government farms at Suratgarh and other places to acquaint them with modern farming methods and implements

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (277)

Failure to start cheap grain shops in villages

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1572)

Failure to give Government waste land for cultivation to landless people

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1573).

Failure to increase production of food-grains in the country by using the waste lands

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1574)

Need to find market for the agricultural produce

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1575)

Need to start store houses to store agricultural produce

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1576)

Need to provide tractors to plough the lands at concessional rates to the poor agriculturists

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1577)

Need to establish research centre at Baroda to find out ways and means to reduce diseases of agricultural crops

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (262)

Need to remove the anomalies in the scales of pay of class III and Class IV staff of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1550)

Need for electrification of class IV staff quarters of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute in Delhi

Mr. S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1951)

Need to construct more residential quarters for class IV staff of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute in Delhi

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1552).

Failure to pay arrears of House Rent and Compensatory (City) Allowances to class IV staff and Monthly men of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute for the period prior to January, 1959

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1553).

Need to revise the pay of Monthly men of the I.A.R.I. in the light of the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1554).

Failure to supply uniforms to Ploughmen, Gowalas, and Malis of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1555).

Need to supply badges to the Choukidars of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1556).

Failure to hold regular meetings of the Works Committee in the Indian Agricultural Research Institute as required under Rule 55 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1557).

Need for combined seniority of all daily paid staff of all Divisions in Delhi in the Indian Agricultural Research Institute

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1558).

Failure to create class IV posts on regular establishment and transfer Monthly men and daily paid staff to these posts in the Indian Agricultural Research Institute.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1559).

Need to provide separate water taps in class IV staff quarters of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute in Delhi

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1560).

Failure to confirm temporary class IV staff of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute against the existing permanent posts

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1561).

Failure to pay arrears of House Rent and Compensatory (City) Allowances to the staff of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute at Nagpur

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1562).

Need to intensify research on coconut and arecanut palm diseases.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1595).

Need to upgrade the Arecanut Research Station at Porcha, Palode, Kerala

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1596).

Failure to obtain help from foreign scientists in the investigation on the root and leaf diseases of coconut

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1597).

Need to equip the Arecanut Research Station to the required levels, for necessary research on the yellow leaf disease

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1598).

Need to resort to the use of radioactive isotopes etc. in investigating major epidemics in plants

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1599).

Failure of the Central Coconut Research Station at Kayenkulam, Kerala, to find out the causes and control of the root and leaf disease.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Agricultural Research' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1600).

Policy regarding the upkeep of un-serviceable cattle

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1601).

Policy regarding the promotion of protective foods and their consumption

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1620)

Inadequacy of funds provided for animal husbandry.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1602)

Failure to draw up suitable policies and programmes in animal husbandry

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1604).

Failure to take adequate steps to popularise beef and pork

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1605).

Need to destroy un-serviceable cattle instead of spending large sums of money on their upkeep

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1605).

Policy regarding the promotion of piggeries

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1607).

Policy regarding the upgrading of Indian breeds of cattle

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1608).

Need to take adequate steps for promoting poultry farms

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1615).

Inadequacy of research in poultry keeping

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1606)

Inadequacy of measures to help duck farming

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1618).

Inadequacy of measures to grow special breeds for meat

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1619).

Inadequacy of steps taken for collecting necessary data about the Wadge bank and Pedro bank

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100" (1620)

Policy in the exploitation of the high seas for fisheries

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1621)

Failure to popularise frog meat

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1622)

Failure to draw up a comprehensive fisheries programme, commensurate with the needs of the country.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1623)

Failure to draw up a comprehensive programme of fisheries, in relation to the resources

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1624)

Failure to organise proper research in fisheries and marine biology

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1625)

Policy in regard to the export of fisheries products

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1626)

Policy in regard to the grant of food subsidies to the State

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1627)

Failure to take proper steps to change food habits of the people and the influence of sentiments thereon

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1638)

Failure to take adequate steps to organise fishermen in co-operatives

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Animal Husbandry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1639)

Need to stop import of foodgrains

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (248)

Need to transport imported foodgrains in scarcity areas like Andhra, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Gujarat.

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (249)

Failure to get advantageous terms under PL 480 agreements

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1628)

Failure to provide Indian Flag Vessels for 50 per cent of food shipment under PL 480 agreement

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1629)

Excessive price of U.S. wheat under PL 480 programme

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1630)

Inadequacy of provision under PL 480 agreements, to export Indian goods to U.S.A.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1631)

Policy regarding the export of sugar

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1632)

Failure to negotiate with countries other than U.S.A. for buying wheat

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1633)

Failure to ensure adequate safeguards for India under PL 480 agreements.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1634)

Policy of committing India to huge loans for purchase of food

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1635)

Policy in getting PL 480 loans on the present conditions and terms

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1636)

Conditions regarding interest under PL 480 agreement

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Purchase of Foodgrains' be reduced by Rs. 100." (1637)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The cut motions are now before the House.