

12-04 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS*—contd.

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE—
contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, together with the cut motions moved thereon.

Out of 8 hours allotted, the time already taken is 1 hour and 10 minutes. The balance is 6 hours and 50 minutes. How long will the Minister take to reply?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil): One hour.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, discussion will continue for the whole day today, that is, from 12 noon to 6 P.M. The hon. Minister will be called to reply at the end of the day a minute or so before 6 P.M. and he will continue tomorrow.

Hon. Members who have not spoken will get up first. Those who have repeatedly spoken may not take advantage of this and may try to avoid speaking, in favour of other hon. Members who have not spoken.

Shri S. L. Saksena: He wanted to say something about sugar. I had disallowed his adjournment motion and I am giving him an opportunity to speak now.

An Hon. Member: He is to go on a hunger strike.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajganj): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister had complained sometime ago that he had been forgotten. Probably now he will be happy because he has hit the headlines, particularly in regard to the sugar crisis.

I think the sugar crisis today is an exaggerated one. I do not deny its

existence. I think the mill-owners have exaggerated it to blackmail the Government. I want to quote from the statement of the President of the Sugar Mill-owners' Association. He has said that the total available supply of sugar this year would be 35.5 lakh tons, 3.5 lakh tons being the carry-over from last year and 20 lakh tons the production in the current season. He says that the consumption is only 21 lakh tons and so there will be a surplus of 9.5 lakh tons which should be exported after keeping 5 lakh tons for the normal carryover of stock on 31st October, 1961. I was surprised that he even went to the extent of saying that the cane price should be reduced to Rs. 1-7-0 in order to enable sugar to be exported. He also wanted an increase of Rs. 5:51 per maund in the price of sugar without worrying how much the consumption of sugar would be reduced thereby. These are the demands of the Sugar Mill-owners' Association, and their President has voiced them.

12-05 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Now I want to refer to the report of what our hon. Minister had said in the Consultative Committee of Parliament. He also expressed the fear that he would have a stock of about 2 million tons at the end of the season. He says that the main cause for this crisis is the increase in acreage under sugarcane. Probably he thinks that this is because the price of sugarcane has been raised, that because the sugarcane price has been raised, therefore, there has been an excess of area sown with sugarcane. He has said that the increase in UP alone is about 4 lakh acres this year.

I am surprised that the hon. Minister has given these figures, which I venture to say are wrong. Probably he got the figures of sugar cane acreage from the UP Government. In the UP Assembly, Shri Rauf Jafri,

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

Deputy Minister, replying to Shri Madan Pandey said that the area under sugarcane cultivation had increased from 19 lakh acres to 23 lakh acres, indicating thereby that cane cultivation had become very profitable. I want to tell you that the normal acreage of sugarcane in UP is 30 lakhs, not 19 lakhs or 23 lakhs every year. According to the *Indian Sugar Manual* published by the Sugar Technologists' Association of India, the area under cultivation of sugarcane in UP in 1956-57 was 30.66 lakh acres, in 1957-58, 30.31 lakh acres, in 1958-59 27.47 lakh acres and in 1959-60, 29.17 lakh acres.

Therefore, it is wrong to say that the area under sugarcane has increased. It would have been correct to say that there had been a fall of 6 lakh acres in the area under sugarcane since last year, if the figures given by Shri Rauf Jafri were correct. I want to say that the figures he has given are wrong figures. Probably the figures were supplied to him by the Cane Commissioner, UP who deals with the acreage in sugar factory reserved zones and not with the acreage in the whole of UP. As regards UP, such large fluctuations are normal. Thus the acreage under cane in UP in 1952-53 was 26.45 lakhs. Next year, in 1953-54, this acreage fell to 19.73 lakhs. So in one year alone, there was a sudden fall in acreage under sugarcane of nearly 7 lakh acres.

I will now quote from *Indian Sugar* published by the Indian Sugar Mills' Association. In fact, its figures cannot give an advantage to me but only to the other side, namely, the sugar mill-owners. Even according to it, the acreage under sugarcane in 1959-60 in UP was 29.17 lakhs and in 1960-61, it is 31.09 lakhs. That means there is an increase of 1,92,000 acres in UP only. But in the whole of India, there has been a fall in acreage. In 1959-60, the area under sugarcane was 57.18 lakh acres and in 1960-61, 51.57 lakh acres, that is, there has been a fall in sugarcane acreage of nearly 21,000 acres since last year.

Now, there is a rise in acreage in UP by 1,92,000 acres, a fall in Andhra Pradesh by 72,000 acres, a fall in Madras by 78,000 acres, a fall in Mysore by 19,000 acres, a fall in Bihar by 15,000 acres and a fall in Maharashtra by 14,000 acres. Therefore, the argument advanced by the Mill-owners' Association that because the price of cane has risen, therefore, the acreage has gone up is wrong. The acreage has actually gone down from 51.78 lakhs to 51.57 lakhs all over India since last year.

As for the rise of acreage in UP, I would like to tell the hon. Minister that the rise and fall in the area under sugarcane in UP as well as over India runs in a four year cycle.

Thus, if you see the figures for the past 30 years—from 1930-31 to 1960-61 from the *Manual*—you will find that the maximum area and the minimum area under cane cultivation are obtained every fourth or fifth year. Every fourth or fifth year, there will be the highest and the lowest area under sugarcane. That is to say, this cycle has been going on all along. This year, there was peak acreage under cane. Next year, there will be a fall in area. After that, there will be a greater fall and finally, at the end of four years or so from now, there will be minimum acreage. In that year there will be no cane for the factories and the factories will be starved, for cane.

I will quote the figures for all-India and for Uttar Pradesh to illustrate my point. Sometimes, there is a fall which is as large as 6 lakh acres in one year in Uttar Pradesh. In 1952-53 the acreage was 26.45 lakhs. In 1953-54, it was 19.73 lakhs. So suddenly, the cane acreage had fallen by about 7 lakhs, in Uttar Pradesh alone. This fluctuation by seven lakh acres in one year is nothing. Every year, there is fluctuation in area under cane. I would like to inform the Minister that every fourth or fifth year, this cycle is repeated. As I said, in 1952-53, it was 26.45 lakh acres. In 1953-54, it was 19.73 lakh acres. Suddenly, there was a fall of

[Shri S. L. Saksena] seven lakh acres. In 1954-55, again there was a rise, and the area under cane rose to 22.92 lakh acres. Again in 1955-56, there was a further rise, namely to 27-20 lakh acres. Again in 1956-57, there was a still further rise, and the peak year in the cycle was reached and the area under cane in that year stood at 30-66 lakh acres. But then there was a fall in 1957-58 to 30-31 lakh acres and the reverse cycle began. Next year, in 1958-59, i.e. in the fifth year after 1953-54, the lowest acreage in recent years in U.P. was again reached and the area under cane stood at 27.47 lakh acres. Again, since then there has been a continuous rise, namely, 29.17 lakh acres in 1959-60 and 31.09 lakh acres in 1960-61. So we see the cycle is being repeated every fourth or fifth year during which the acreage goes up and then decreases and every fourth or fifth year the maximum and the minimum areas under cane are repeated.

Now, this rise and fall in acreage does not depend upon the sugarcane prices. The prices of sugarcane may be high or low. It is really the price of gur and the price of cane paid by khandsari that matters here, and that is the reason for this phenomenon in Uttar Pradesh as well as all over India. If the price of gur is high, you will find the acreage is large; last year the price of gur was Rs. 15 to Rs. 17½. This year, the price of gur has fallen and ranged from Rs. 12 to Rs. 14 per maund. The result is that while last year the acreage had gone up, and the area under cane was at its peak, this year the acreage will go down comparatively and the four yearly cycle will be repeated as before.

So, you need not go in search of any law for reducing the acreage under cane cultivation next year. The area is bound to go down. What you have to do is to see that the khandsari and gur industries are fully developed and they have a flourishing export market and there are not fluctuations in their price. Then alone this cycle of maximum and

minimum acreage under a sugarcane every fourth or fifth year can be broken. Last year the factory-owners were demanding the strangulation of the khandsari industry. They said that khandsari was responsible for destroying them. But what did you do? You put a heavy excise duty on it. The Uttar Pradesh Government levied a cess of an anna per maund on cane used by khandsari. The result is what today you have got surplus of cane which you cannot crush. The grower is at the mercy of the millowners and the Government is in a fix. The real crisis today is not the small rise in the acreage under cane which will fall actually according to the cycle next year. The real crisis is that the price of gur has fallen so low that there is large diversion of gur cane to sugar factories this year, but next year there will be a lower acreage under cane owing to the low price of gur this year. Because of the low price of gur this year, the cane that was meant for khandsari has been diverted to the factories, with the result that you are now finding it difficult to crush the cane. This is the main reason.

What is the production of khandsari this year? In the same publication—*The Indian Sugar Manual, 1959*—we find that the production of khandsari in 1958-59 was 2.5 lakh tons. Now, I shall refer to the reply given by the Government in answer to an unstarred question about the total production of khandsari sugar in 1959-60 and the amount of Central excise duty realised from khandsari sugar in 1959-60. The reply shows that we got a sum of Rs. 37,21,000 by way of excise duty on khandsari. That was the basic duty, while the additional duty on khandsari was Rs. 3.46 lakhs. As against Rs. 182 lakhs, which the Finance Minister had expected from this excise duty on khandsari in 1959-60, he got only about Rs. 40 lakhs in 1959-60. If the charges of collection of this Rs. 40 lakhs are deducted, the income from this excise duty on khandsari will be almost nil. But the Finance

Minister has fulfilled the wishes of the sugar millowners and has succeeded in destroying the khand-sari industry and we are therefore faced with the problem of surplus sugarcane this season.

Now, what about the production of khand-sari this year and the last? I am quoting from the statement showing the production of khand-sari sugar State-wise during the year 1959-60. In Uttar Pradesh, the production of khand-sari sugar during what period was 474.50 thousand quintals, while the figure for the whole of India was 505.51 thousand quintals. I do not know if the answer was wrong. If the answer was correct, it only shows that the production of khand-sari in 1959-60 was only 50,551 tons in the country. It had suddenly fallen from 2.5 lakh tons in 1958-59. The quantity of khand-sari produced is thus terribly reduced. I do not know if the figures are wrong. But, if the figures are correct, it means this: that you have succeeded in destroying the most essential cottage industry, viz., the khand-sari industry, and its production fell down from 2.5 lakh tons in 1958-59 to 50,000 tons in 1959-60, and the production cannot be larger this year. So, the cane which used to go to produce two lakh tons of khand-sari has been diverted partly to gur making, bringing about a crash in gur prices and reducing them from Rs. 16, the average last year, to Rs. 12.5, the average this year, and partly to sugar factories, making it difficult for them to crush it.

One maund of khand-sari requires 15 or 16 maunds of cane to produce it. So, 2 lakh tons of khand-sari are the equivalent of 30 lakh tons of cane, and 30 average-sized modern sugar mills will be required to crush it. But a large part of this cane surplus resulting from the destruction of khand-sari has gone to gur making, bringing down gur prices so low. The remainder has been diverted to sugar mills which are finding it difficult to crush the whole of it. So, the entire amount of surplus supply of cane to

factories this year is due to the fact that the cane which was meant for khand-sari has been diverted to the mills. 25 per cent khand-sari mills have closed down because they could not run profitably after paying the excise duty and the cane cess and the other taxes levied on it by the Uttar Pradesh Government. The Uttar Pradesh Government last year said that there was not enough cane and the sugar factories were not having enough cane to crush. This year the case is reversed and the U.P. Government is crying that factories will not be able to crush all the cane even till July. I therefore warn you that if you do not remove the excise duty from khand-sari sugar and if the UP Government does not remove the cess on khand-sari cane and licence fees, the khand-sari industry will be completely destroyed and you will be in a very great difficulty. Therefore, I want to tell the hon. Minister that khand-sari and gur are the only safety valves to keep the sugar industry under control. If you destroy these industries, the grower will be thrown entirely at the mercy of sugar mills and he will not be able to get an adequate return, for this crop. You destroyed the khand-sari industry for the profit of sugar millowners in years of short production of sugarcane. The result is that in this year of peak sugarcane production, the factories cannot crush all the cane and you are thinking how to control the situation.

Coming to the amount of sugar production this year, the Chairman of the Indian Sugar Mills Association has said that it will be 30 lakh tons. I have got some figures. I am relying on *Indian Sugar*, because the Government have got no statistics of their own. I will tell you the main reason why you are in such a great difficulty. You have no department of Sugar statistics of our own. You depend entirely on the figures of the Indian Sugar Mills Association. I want to remind the House of what the Tariff Board had said in 1960. They said that the sugar crisis was

[Shri S. L. Saksena]

merely due to the fact that the Government had got no department of statistics with regard to these matters concerning sugar. You may remember that in August 1949 there was a crisis, when the price of sugar had shot upto Rs. 70/- per maund in some parts of the country. In Bombay, sugar was then selling at Rs. 100 per maund! The Tariff Board had said that Government had their wrong statistics about sugar supplied to them by Mills and that led to the crisis. This is what the Tariff Board said:—

"In order that such control may be effective, it is necessary that the present machinery for the collection and compilation of sugar statistics should be strengthened so as to be able to obtain correct and complete statistics of production . . . We would lay great emphasis on this matter because we have found that the present organisation of statistics regarding the sugar industry is inadequate and unsatisfactory, that the figures furnished by the mills to the Director, Indian Institute of Sugar Technology, are incomplete, because several mills do not send any returns at all, and that there is no machinery to check the accuracy of the figures furnished by the mills from time to time. We have also found that there are considerable discrepancies between the figures, as furnished to us by the Syndicate and there submitted to the Director of the Indian Institute of Sugar Technology by the mills in their fortnightly returns of production, despatches and stocks."

This is the pronouncement of the Tariff Board in 1950. I am sorry to say that no steps have yet been taken to improve the situation and to make collection of correct, verified statistics. You do not get correct sugar statistics because there is no

machinery for compiling it, and there is no machinery to check the statistics. The result is that you have to depend on the machinery of the Indian Sugar Mills Association.

To prove how the Indian Sugar Mills Association tries to see that Government do not get real facts in respect of sugar, let me give one interesting illustration. You will be surprised to know that there was a questionnaire issued by the Tariff Commission to the sugar factories about the cost structure of sugar. You know what happened. The Sugar Mills Association sent a circular to the factory-owners that the Association would give a reply and that the factories need not send a reply. They said so because they wanted first to manipulate the figures to suit their own ones before they sent them on to the Government. This is what the Tariff Commission themselves have complained and the result was the factories did not supply the figures:

"In the questionnaire issued to producers we had asked them to furnish particulars regarding the worn-out machinery proposed to be replaced in the next five years along with specifications and cost of new machinery to be installed. They were requested to justify their claim by giving full information regarding the details of plant and equipment needing replacement in the immediate future, the resources available with them and the amount of external assistance required by each factory. Out of 158 factories only 52 factories have furnished the information on the above points. The response was limited because we understand that the Indian Sugar Mills Association had sent a circular to sugar factories intimating that as these questions were of a general nature the Association would furnish replies to the Commission on behalf of its members."

So, the Association did not want the figures to be given directly by the factories. They wanted to adjust and manipulate the figures and therefore, the Tariff Commission did not get the real figures. So, the complaint of Shri Mehta was perfectly justified. He wanted the real figures from the factories but the factories did not want that he should get the real figures. But because I have no other figures, I also depend only on the figures given by the Association. But even these figures could not justify that there was production of 30 lakh tons this year.

In this issue of *Indian Sugar* we have got figures up to 1st March, 1961. The production was 17,10,496 tons. Last year, on the 1st March, the production was 15,81,139 tons; therefore, the extra production up to 1st March was 1,29,357 tons only. In the months of March and April, all the factories which worked last year worked this year also. Only one factory—Hardoi—and one more factory have closed in March this year. So, in the month of March nearly the same number of factories worked last year. Last year eight factories had closed in April and this year four have already closed. I can give the names. Already Hardoi was closed on 22nd March. This month Masodha has closed. Bhatni will be closed today or tomorrow.

Shahganj is closed and some other factories are closing this month.

The difference in the production of sugar last year and this year cannot be very great. I can accept that some factories will go for longer period in the month of May and probably one in June also. I do not know which factory it is and I really doubt whether it will go in June. But even then, I can say that the difference in production between last year and this year cannot be to the extent they have said. If 1.9 lakh tons was the extra production up to 1st March, in the remaining months, there cannot be more than 2 lakh tons excess production this year. I know that the

amount of sugarcane production in the south is much less this year. In the months from June to October, the total production in the rest of India last year was 78,000 tons. So, it will become reduced this year. In the months of March, April and May there will be some more production and I will put it at 2 lakh tons. Even then, there can be an extra production of only 3 lakh tons over last year. That means, 24:22 lakhs tons were produced last year and this year the production will be 27:51 lakh tons. That is the maximum we can expect. If the figures are properly checked and a proper estimate is made, under no circumstances can the production this year be above 27.5 lakh tons. Therefore, the scare that 30 lakh tons will be produced and therefore Government must come and reduce the price of sugarcane is all bunkum.

Government themselves have said they welcome the increase in the production of sugarcane.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Is the word 'bunkum' parliamentary?

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): It is.

Shri S. L. Saksena: Here is a question put by Shri Khuswaqt Rai and Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:

“क्या खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि पिछले वर्ष का बचा हुआ प्वांती का स्टॉक इस वर्ष अनुमानतः लगभग ५ लाख टन है और

(ख) इसका क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा?”

The reply was:

खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री : जी हाँ ।

(क) इससे बाजारों में बाहुन्यता का वातावरण और प्राचीन में स्थिरता बनाय रखने में सहायता मिलेगी ”

[Shri S. L. Saksena]

There is no psychology of scarcity. This was the reply of the hon. Minister himself. The Estimates Committee have said that it is good that the production has improved and the increase in production should be continued. Therefore, the increase of 2 lakh or 3 lakh tons over last year is something of which he should be proud and on which he should be congratulated and it is not something which he should be worried about.

What then is the real crisis? One cause of the crisis, as I have already said, is the diversion of sugarcane from gur and khandsari to sugar mills. Another thing to which I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister is this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. He has already taken 22 minutes.

Shri S. L. Saksena: I shall finish in 10 minutes. I am the first speaker of my party. Half an hour is the normal limit.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Which party?

Shri S. L. Saksena: PSP.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He might have another 5 minutes.

Shri S. L. Saksena: I would point out that the total despatches of new sugar from the new production from all factories up to 15th March, was 20.30 lakh tons. Of this total despatches, 2.28 lakh tons was the despatch from new sugar this year. That means 11 per cent of the production of new sugar this year has been despatched up to 15th March. I would point out how these despatches of new sugar are distributed among the factories in various States. Of these despatches, the share of the U.P. mills is 7 per cent only. U.P. mills have despatched only 7 per cent of the sugar they produced this year whereas 11 per cent is the all-India average of all despatches of new sugar made

this year. Mills in Mysore, Rajasthan and Kerala have despatched 30 per cent of their new production. Maharashtra mills have despatched 11 per cent. Madras Mills have despatched 13.75 per cent and Andhra mills 12.5 per cent. Because the southern zone is not controlled, the despatches there are much larger and in north India much smaller. If U.P. mills had despatched 11 per cent of their new sugar production equal to their share of average despatches, they would have despatched 10.10 lakh maunds more sugar than they did last year. The godowns of sugar factories in U.P. then would not have been full and their bank ceilings would not have been reached.

Therefore, the complaint of the U.P. Chief Minister is this. In U.P. the sugar factory godowns are full, because the off take is very small. Banks are refusing further credit to mills. Therefore, they cannot implement the Wage Board recommendations and cannot pay the cane-growers. But their off take is small because it is controlled and in southern areas, it is not controlled. The real crisis is this differentiation and discrimination between the north and the south mills. The southern mills are not controlled in their despatches. Therefore, they can sell sugar at higher prices and according to decontrol methods. They can send where they like and how much they like. But the U.P. and other mills in the north are controlled and are given small quotas, with the result that they cannot despatch in greater quantity and their godowns are full. There are, therefore, two main reasons for the present crisis. One is the strangulation of khandsari and gur industries and the second is the discrimination between the north and the south sugar factories in the matter of control. If these two reasons were not there, then there would have been no problem. There is no problem of over-production of sugarcane or larger area being brought under sugarcane. In fact, the area under cane this year has gone down.

About the price of sugarcane, it has been said that the price of sugarcane is too much. But even the Estimates Committee in their report have found fault with the Government that they have not tried to find out the actual cost of production of sugarcane. The first essential and necessary thing is to find out how much is the cost of production of sugarcane. Government themselves say that they have got no figures regarding the cost of production of sugarcane.

Therefore, Sir, I say that this problem of over-production of sugarcane this year is absolutely a myth. The reason of the crisis is different. Either you de-control sugar all over India or you impose control all over India. Then this sugar crisis will be resolved.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra (Bagaha): You want to control khandsari?

Shri S. L. Saksena: No. Control sugar, both in the north and south or you do it all over India. Do not control it in the north and not in the south, with the result that there is muddle.

You want now to export some sugar. There is still some margin for exports. You have already exported one lakh tons of sugar this year. You want to export some more sugar. Where is the money to come from to subsidise these exports? I want to say one thing. The mills in the south get a higher price of Rs. 4 on account of freight advantage. The factories in the south get a price for sugar at which sugar from north lands there. The cost of production may be only Rs. 37, but they will sell it at Rs. 41. So this Rs. 4 is the advantage because production in the south is less, in the north it is higher and sugar goes from here to there. If this money is mopped up by the Government by additional excise duty or in a similar way, that will help the exchequer. They have no right to get this money, and this money can be used for subsidising exports.

If you de-control sugar what will happen? First of all, you know, the consumption will rise. In 1952-53 there was 12 lakhs tons of consumption. Then Mr. Kidwai de-controlled it and in the next year it jumped to 16 lakh tons—4 lakh tons in one year—because the pent up necessities of the people had to be satisfied. Therefore, if you had de-controlled sugar on 1st June last year, the consumption would have been at least 3 lakh tons more this year and there would have been no difficulty now. Now we are in a difficulty. I would suggest that as soon as the season is over, on 1-6-1961 you must de-control sugar and release sugar quotas liberally. Then the problem will be solved, and there will be no crash in sugar prices.

I congratulate the Minister on the increase in production of sugar that has been achieved. But the way of distribution is wrong. The way of imposing control in the north and having no control in the south is also working and discriminatory and must be ended forthwith.

There is one more thing. The difference between the ex-factory price and the price at which it is given to the consumer is about Rs. 2.95 per maund. If you de-control it, you will find that there will not be difference of more than 12 annas. You will thus be able to get Rs. 2 extra. Either you give it to the consumer by selling to him sugar at Rs. 2 a maund less, when there will be increased consumption of about 2 lakhs tons in the country, or you take it for the Exchequer by fixing a higher ex-factory price of sugar and use it to subsidise exports. As I said, there is at present a difference of about Rs. 2.95 in the price, at which the consumer gets sugar and the price at which the factory sells sugar. In the normal market there is only a difference of about 12 annas. Rs. 2 higher price is due to the imposition of control and higher handling charges by Government. This difference can be used for subsidising sugar.

[Shri S. L. Saksena]

Therefore, the present crisis can be solved by merely lifting the control. Of course, it is not possible to do so in the middle of the season. As soon as the season is over, I suggest that you take steps to de-control sugar. I would also suggest that there should be no difference between the north and the south as regards control. There must be similar treatment all over India. The mills in the south have no right to take the extra Rs. 4/- on account of freight advantage. This money must go to the exchequer by way of an additional excise duty and should be used to subsidise exports of sugar.

About the food situation, Sir, I only want to congratulate the hon. Minister on having nearly solved the problem. But this is no consolation, when we are still depending on imports. I must say, Sir, that at least as much money as you spend on imports must be given to the cultivators by way of loans. You cannot expect the poor, starving cultivators to increase the per acre yield unless you give them sufficient loans. You cannot expect him to invest enough money in agriculture unless you assist him by giving liberal loans. Therefore, the cultivator must get enough money to show better results and to increase food yield. Unless that is done, you will not be able to solve the food problem. I hope soon the money that we are spending on imports will be spent on giving loans to the agriculturists.

डा० राज सुभग सिंह (महाराज) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले दिन श्री नायर ने खाद्य और कृषि मंत्रालय के सम्बन्ध में भाषण करते हुए कहा था —

"The Ministry has juggled the food problem".

उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि—

"They have utterly disregarded the animal husbandry side of the matter."

उसका जिक्र करते हुए उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि—

"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, . . ."

इसके अलावा उन्होंने कहा कि—

"I put this simple question to anybody who will defend protection of stray cattle."

मैं उन के सवाल का इमलिये जवाब नहीं देना चाहता कि गाय की पवित्रता का इस देश में काफ़ी प्राधान्य है, मगर इमलिये कि काऊ पर ही यहां की मारी इकोनामी निर्भर करती है। उन के सवाल का सीधा जवाब यह भी है, जैसा कि संविधान में कहा गया है—

"The State shall endeavour to organise agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and shall, in particular, take steps for preserving and improving the breeds, and prohibiting the slaughter of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle."

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हाल ही तक नायर जी की पार्टी केरल में गवर्नमेंट चला रही थी। नायर जी वहाँ के एक माननीय सस्य हैं। पता नहीं उस जमाने में वह कहाँ पर सोते थे, क्योंकि यदि उन में थोड़ी भी सिन्नेटिटी होती, यदि उन में ताकत होती, तो वह उस सरकार को प्रेरित करते और उस धास्य का कानून बनवाते।

उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि यहां पर गाय, खासकर केरल की गाय, बहुत कम दुध देती हैं। अगर और जहाँ की गायों में, और खासकर, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, घास के प्रदेश की गायों में, तुलना की जाये, तो जितने मवेशी केरल में हैं, वे सारे के सारे स्ट्रे केटल माने

जायेंगे। नायर जी को पता होना चाहिये कि अगर गाय और भैंस को रखने में थोड़ी भी मेहनत की जाये, तो कम से कम पांच एकड़ भूमि की काश्त के बराबर ग्रामदानी हो सकती है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि गाय-बल के मरने में ज्यादा दिन नहीं लगते हैं। मरने के वक्त से छः महीने पहले तक गाय दूध देती रहती है और मरने के वक्त से एक साल पहले तक बैल हल में चलाया जाता है। जो भी हो, लेकिन यह तथ्य है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सारी इकानोमी निर्भर करती है मवेशियों पर। नायर साहब की तरफ से कोई यह भी कह सकता है कि चूँकि अब ट्रक्टर चलाने हैं, इसलिये जिस दिन बछड़ों का जन्म-दिन हो, उस दिन उन सब को स्लाटर कर दिया जाये। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये सब चीज गलत हैं।

उन्होंने वीफ खाने का काफी प्रचार एक तरह से किया, लेकिन केरल का जल-वायु, वहाँ की आबो-हवा, ऐसी है कि उन लोगों को वह हज्म भी नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिये मैं मानता हूँ कि भारत के संविधान में इस सम्बन्ध में जो उल्लेख है, वह एक बहुत अच्छी चीज है और उस के अनुसार देश में मवेशियों की तरक्की का पूरा उपाय होना चाहिये। और इस सम्बन्ध में उपाय किया भी गया है। इस रिपोर्ट में की विसेज स्क्रीम और गोमदन आदि की काफी चर्चा की गई है और डेवेलप-मेंट ग्राम फांड के बारे में कहा गया है। उन्होंने फील्ड और फाडर का कारण भी दिया था। १९५० में ५० मिलियन टन घन पदार्थ होता था और आज वह ७५ मिलियन टन है और तृतीय पंच-वर्षीय योजना में उस को १०५ मिलियन टन के ले जाने का लक्ष्य है। इस के माने ये हैं कि जब १०५ मिलियन टन पदार्थ होगा, तो फाडर भी दुगुना हो जायेगा। आज फाडर ६८ प्रतिशत मवेशियों के लिये है। तो पांच बरस के अन्दर ही पर्याप्त फीड और फाडर पैदा किया जा सकता है। ऐसे महाशय बूढ़ तो करेंगे नहीं और मा-हक में जानवरों के कत्ल और गायों को मारने की

दलील देंगे। मैं इस तरह की दलीलों से प्रभावित नहीं हुआ हूँ और मैं उनको बेकार मानता हूँ।

खाद्य के बारे में वह कहते हैं "ही हैज बंगलड दी फूड सिचुएशन"। यह भी एक ऐसी चीज है जिसको मैं मानता नहीं हूँ। हमारी फूड सिचुएशन है क्या? जैसा मैंने कहा कि हमारे यहाँ १९५० के अमाने में ५० मिलियन टन पैदा होता था और अब पैदावार बढ़ कर करीब ७५ मिलियन टन हो गई है। इतना होने पर भी द्वितीय योजना प्रारम्भ होने के समय पर-कॉप्टा केवल १६.९ अउंस अन्न पैदा होता था और आज करीब १७ अउंस के बराबर होता है। सीड वर्ग के लिए जो चला जाता है या जो और बरबादी होती है, उसको हथ निकाल दे तो करीब ११ अउंस एक आदमी को मिलेगा। लेकिन प्रत्येक आदमी को कम से कम २० अउंस फूड ग्रैज और पालिसाइ की जरूरत होती है। ऐसी हालत में अगर केरल की पैदावार को देखें तो पता चलेगा कि ८ अउंस भी वहाँ के लोग अपने बस पर पैदा नहीं करते हैं। पाटिल साहब ने इधर उधर से अनाज मंगा कर लोगों के खाने का इंतजाम नहीं किया होता तो नायर साहब को मैं समझता हूँ पूरा खाद्य पदार्थ नहीं मिलता और न ही उनकी स्टेट को मिल पाता। ऐसी हालत में उन्हें पाटिल साहब को बर्बाद देनी चाहिये कि बंगल करने के बजाय उन्होंने इतना अच्छा इंतजाम कर दिया है।

आज देश में खाने की चीजों का अभाव नहीं है। अगर कोई आज किन्ता की बात है तो वह दामों के बारे में है। किन्तान की ओर से कहा जाता है कि दाम एट्रिक्टव होने चाहिये, इकोनॉमिक होने चाहिये। इस बात को मैं मानता हूँ। दामों में घटा बढ़ी होती रही है। १९५०-५१ के अमाने में दाम बहुत बढ़ गये थे। फिर १९५३-५४

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

के जमाने में वे बहुत घट गये। १९५५ में वे फिर बढ़े और आज वे करीब ४०-४१ प्वाइंट हायर हैं। अभी दाम स्टेडी हो गये हैं। ऐसी हालत में मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई न कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था की जाये जैसा कि आज क्वेश्चन आवर में माननीय मंत्री जी की ओर से कहा जा रहा था कि एक एडवाइजरी कमेटी बनाने की बात सोची जा रही है, जिससे किसान समझें कि उनको एट्रैक्टिव दाम देने के लिए सरकार तिसीयर है। ऐसी कमेटी बननी चाहिये, इस तरह की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। एक उदाहरण भी है। अभी गन्ने के बारे में माननीय सदस्य श्री शि० ला० सक्सेना जी ने काफी आंकड़े दिये हैं और बताया है कि गन्ने और फाटन का मूल्य जो मिनिमम है, वह निर्धारित किया हुआ है। यही दो कृषि पदार्थ हैं जिनका मिनिमम मूल्य निर्धारित है। चूँकि वह निर्धारित है इसलिए किसानों की भी उनके प्राडक्शन पर कंसंट्रेंट करने की तबीयत होती है और वे कंसंट्रेंट करते हैं। उनका उत्पादन उन्होंने बढ़ाया है। जब भी उनको मौका मिला है उन्होंने जी जान से उत्पादन बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न किया है और उत्पादन बढ़ाया है। आज यदि १९ लाख एकड़ में खेती की बात आती है तो किसान को दोष दिया जाता है और कहा जाता है कि उसने क्यों इतना अधिक गन्ना बो दिया कि जिस की खपत नहीं हो सकती है। खपत हो सकती है या नहीं हो सकती है, मिल खरीद सकती हैं या नहीं खरीद सकती हैं, यह भी सोचने की बात है। अभी माननीय शि० ला० सक्सेना ने आपके सामने कुछ आंकड़े रखे हैं, मैं उनको बौद्धान्ता नहीं चाहता हूँ। मैं एक

ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ। आज अप्रैल के महीने में आप जा कर बिहार में या उत्तर प्रदेश में किसी भी गन्ने फँकट्री के गेट को देखें, वहाँ पर सैकड़ों गाड़ियां खड़ी हुई आपको मिलेंगी। जहाँ कहीं भी कांटे हैं, स्टेशन पर हैं, वहाँ पर भी आपको पचासों गाड़ियां खड़ी हुई दिखाई पड़ेंगी। इस वक्त रबी को काटने का सीजन है, हार्वेस्टिंग सीजन है, इस काम को वे लोग करें या अपने बैलों को और अपनी गाड़ी को गन्ना लाद कर लायें और वहाँ पर अपना वक्त जाया करें। यह सब नैशनल वेस्ट है, किसानों की एनर्जी को बरबाद करना है, उनके बैलों की एनर्जी को बरबाद करना है। कई दिनों तक मिल मालिकों की प्रेरणा के चलते उन मभों को खड़ा रहना पड़ता है। प्रेरणा में इसलिए कहता हूँ कि मिनिमम मूल्य निर्धारित किया गया है प्राइस लिफ्टिंग फार्मुला के अंतर्गत और कहा गया है कि अगर लगातार टागेंट से ज्यादा चीनी उत्पादित होती है, तो तीन बरस में जितनी चीनी पैदा होती थी, उससे ज्यादा पैदा होती है, तो जो भी अधिक मूल्य होगा, उस में किसान का भी हिस्सा होगा, तो क्यों उसका गन्ना खरीदा नहीं जाता है। यह जो चीज खरी गई है, मही है। एकसाइज ड्यूटी और दूसरी ड्यूटीज जो हैं, वे सब हैं और वे बसूल होती रहेंगी। अबतुबर १९५६ में जब गन्ने का दाम बढ़ाया गया तो उस वक्त चीनी का भी करीब १ रुपया ८५ नये पैसे मन दाम बढ़ाया गया था। इसका दाम भी उसी अनुपात से बढ़ाया गया और बहुत सोच समझ कर बढ़ाया गया।

अब हमें कृषिग कैंपेसिटी को देखना है । क्या यह बढ़ी है या नहीं बढ़ी है । १५ लाख टन कृषिग कैंपेसिटी १९५५ में उन की थी । आज कायदे के अनुसार २५ लाख टन है । लेकिन एकबुली देखा जाए तो ४० लाख टन की है । ४० लाख टन चीनी हिन्दुस्तान की मिलें पैदा कर सकती है । लेकिन आज अगर २९ लाख भी है तो एक एसी मोनोपोली बना दी गई है चीनी के मालिकों की और से कि उन का प्रभाव देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था पर पड़ रहा है । अगर आप सर्वे कराएँ या फोटो लें या एरियल फोटो हिन्दुस्तान की सभी गन्ना मिलों की लें, उन स्टेशनों का जहां बैलगाड़ियां खड़ी होती हैं, तो यह एक तरसाने वाला दृश्य उपस्थित करेगा । इतनी राष्ट्रीय शक्ति का अपव्यय हो रहा है इन लोगों की मोनोपोली के प्रभाव के कारण । गवर्नमेंट को भी सोचना चाहिये कि क्यों हम एक किसान की एक बैलगाड़ी हांकने वाली की, बैलों की, शक्ति को बरबाद होने दे रहे हैं । पानी वहां नहीं है, खाना नहीं है और आज अप्रैल के महीने में धूप में वे पड़े रहते हैं । उनकी तरफ भी किसी का ध्यान जाना चाहिये । दस आदमी मिल कर फैसला करें कि हमारे पास खरीदने की कैंपेसिटी नहीं है, यह कहां तक उचित है । कैंपेसिटी कहां गई है ? जब लाइसंस दिए जा रहे थे तो उन मिलों की एकमपेशन की कैंपेसिटी थी, आज वह कहां चली गई है और अगर नहीं थी तो क्यों उस वक्त हम चीज पर विचार नहीं किया गया और क्या चीजें थीं जिस पर विचार किया गया था । आप एक दाम गन्ने का निश्चित कर चुके हैं और वह एक रुपया ६२ नए पैसे मन है । अब आप मान लीजिये कि जैसा लोग कहते हैं कि चार लाख टन उत्पादन बढ़ गया है । लास्ट यीयर कुछ कम था । लेकिन १९५८ के साल की अपेक्षा अत्यधिक, वृद्धि नहीं हुई है । मैं मानता हूँ कि किसान

के खेतों के एकरेख में बांड़ी वृद्धि हुई है और यह स्वाभाविक भी था । लेकिन फिर भी जो स्थिति पैदा हो गई है, उस से मैं समझता हूँ कि एक एक गन्ने को खरीदा जाए और उसे क्रय किया जाए और यह काम समय रहते होना चाहिये । मई-जून तक उन को अगर आप पड़े रहने दें, तो उस से उन की खती की भी बरबादी होगी, किसान की शक्ति भी बरबाद होगी, और जो हारबैस्टरिंग में गड़बड़ी पैदा हो रही है, वह अलग से होगी । यह सब एक राष्ट्रीय अपव्यय है और इसको रोका जाना चाहिये ।

अब जो उत्पादन का प्रोग्राम है, उसकी तरफ मैं आता हूँ । जब से देश स्वतंत्र हुआ है, फूड में सैल्फ-सफिशेंसी के प्रोग्राम बनते रहे हैं । जब से प्लान शुरू हुए हैं तब से इस पर और भी ज्यादा निगाह डाली जाने लगी है और कम्युनिटी डिवलेपमेंट के जरिये इसको प्रभाव करने की कोशिश की गई है । यह कम्युनिटी डिवलेपमेंट की जो मशीनरी बनी वह १९५२ में बनी है । यह मशीनरी उतनी कारगर नहीं निकली है । इस ने किसानों को सैल्फ-सफिशेंसी के मार्ग पर ले चलने की कोशिश की है लेकिन इस काम में इसको तनिक भी सफलता नहीं मिली है । आज किसान आप के इस कथन को मार्थक नहीं समझते हैं कि इस मशीनरी के चलते आप देश को सैल्फ-सफिशेंट बना सकने लायक हो सकते हैं । आज हम ७५ मिलियन टन पैदा कर रहे हैं । १९६५-६६ का हमारा जो लक्ष्य है वह १०० मिलियन टन करने का है यानी फूडपैज में ३३ ५० परसेंट बढ़ाव करने का है । आयन-सीइज में करीब २८.३२ परसेंट, सुगर केन में २५.०८ परसेंट, का टन में ३३ परसेंट और जूट में १८ परसेंट बढ़ाव करने का हमारा लक्ष्य है । तो यह हमारा लक्ष्य है और इस लक्ष्य की प्राप्ति

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

करना हमारा ध्येय है क्योंकि देश को आगे बढ़ाना है ताकि देश की शक्ति इन सारे कामों में लगे। इसलिए इरीगेशन, मैन्योर फरटीलाइजर और सीड फार्म आवश्यक है। और प्लाण्ट प्रोटेक्शन भी इसके लिये आवश्यक है। इनमें से मैं पहले सीड फार्म के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। ४३०० सीड फार्म खोजने का लक्ष्य था उनमें से करीब ४००० खुले भी हैं और उनमें से ९० परसेंट उत्पादन में लगे हुए हैं। यह एक अच्छी चीज है। जितना भी अच्छा सीड सप्लाई किया जा सके वह बहुत अच्छी बात होगी। लेकिन मैं इसके बिल्कुल खिलाफ हूँ कि देश में २५-२५ एकड़ के सीड फार्म खोल कर खिलवाड़ की जाए। आपको देखना चाहिये कि इतना छोटा सीड फार्म खोलने में उसका कास्ट आफ कल्टीवेशन क्या पड़ेगा। दो छोटे किसान मिल कर इतने बड़े फार्म को चला सकते हैं। लेकिन आप देखें कि इन फार्मों में से हर एक पर कितने सरकारी अफसर लगे हैं।

आज चीनी के प्रोड्यूसर कहते हैं कि हम गन्ने का जितना मूल्य निर्धारित किया गया है वह देने में समर्थ नहीं हैं क्योंकि गन्ना बहुत ज्यादा है। लेकिन मैं इसका बिल्कुल विरोधी हूँ कि गन्ने का मूल्य किसी भी तरह कम किया जाए।

सुरतगढ़ फार्म मिनेनाइज्ड फार्म है और वहाँ पैदावार बढ़ी है। भले ही बाढ़ के चलते या अन्य वृष्टियों के चलते उसका पूरा लक्ष्य प्राप्त न हुआ हो लेकिन वह फार्म अच्छी तरह चलाया जा रहा है। मेरा विचार है कि कृषि में तब तक तरक्की नहीं हो सकती जब तक कि हम सुधरे हुए तरीके न अपनाएं उसके लिए जहाँ मैने बैलों की बकालत की है, वहाँ में मिनेनाइज्ड यंत्रों की भी मरम्मत करता हूँ। हमको चाहिये कि हम अपनी खेती को ज्यादा

से ज्यादा मिनेनाइज्ड करने की कोशिश करें। अगर हम ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तो आज १९६१ में हमारा खेती में इतना श्रम लगेगा कि जितना लगना नहीं चाहिये। तो मैं चाहूंगा कि आप बड़े बड़े सीड फार्म बनाएं जिनसे गेहूँ, चने, वगैरह का अच्छे से अच्छा सीड दिया जा सके। लेकिन अगर आप २५-२५ एकड़ के फार्म रखेंगे तो इनमें कास्ट आफ कल्टीवेशन जरूरत से ज्यादा होगी, निगरानी अच्छी नहीं होगी और न अच्छा सीड ही तैयार हो सकेगा। आप किसी भी स्टेट में चाहे जितने १-२-५-१० भी सीड फार्म खोलें लेकिन २५-२५ एकड़ के फार्म से कोई लाभ नहीं हो सकता।

मैन्योर के लिये मैं मन्त्रालय का धयवाद देना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि वह हर राज्य में फरटीलाइजर फैक्टरीज खोलना चाहता है लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि फरटीलाइजर का दाम कम किया जाए।

तीसरी योजना की समाप्ति तक हमारी ३० परसेंट खेती सिंचाई में आ सकेगी। ऐसी हालत में यह जरूरी है कि आप माइनर और मीडियम इरीगेशन की स्कीम्स पर ज्यादा ध्यान दें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम इस दिशा में ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रयास करें ताकि तीसरी योजना के अन्त तक हमारी खेती का ५० प्रतिशत सिंचाई में आ जाए।

इसके अलावा आपका इंटेंसिव एग्री-कल्चुरल डिस्ट्रिक्ट प्रोग्राम चल रहा है। हम लोगो के सामने खेती के नमूने रखे जाते हैं। यह अच्छा है। लेकिन जब आज हमारा लक्ष्य है कि हम तीसरी योजना के अन्त तक अन्न का उत्पादन ३३ परसेंट बढ़ाएं तो आवश्यक है कि इन इंटेंसिव एग्रीकल्चुरल डिस्ट्रिक्ट फार्मों का उत्पादन ३३ परसेंट का दुगुना और तिगुना बढ़ना चाहिए नहीं तो जो दो करोड़ रुपया हम इनके लिये दे रहे हैं उसका कोई जस्टीफिकेशन नहीं रहेगा।

मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता लेकिन इंटरनेशनल रिलेशन्स के बारे में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। इसका इस रिपोर्ट में जिक्र किया गया है। एक मिनिस्ट्रों का झुण्ड बाहर गया था, रूस में। हमारे सेंटर के मिनिस्टर प्रीर स्टेट मिनिस्ट्रों में ५० परसेंट बाहर जाएं यह मैं वाजिब नहीं समझता। एक दो मिनिस्टर जा सकते हैं

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): Only for 14 days.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Whatever it may be, I do not want that the Ministers of the Government of India and of the State Governments should waste their time like this. Very often I see that one or the other hon. Minister goes on such tours. I do appreciate that they obtain very good knowledge, but it also indicates that they go to learn about agriculture in the U.K. USSR or other places. But they are not at all familiar with agriculture in India. They should first try to learn what is happening in Indian agriculture and after that if their knowledge is not up-to-date they should go elsewhere to learn something.

श्री० रणबीर सिंह (रोहतक) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रीर कोई बात कहने से पहले, श्री वी० पी० नायर के पशु हत्या के खयालत के बारे में एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, जैसा कि डा० राम सुभग मिह जी ने भी किया है। मैं उनमें कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर उनकी पार्टी ईमानदारी से बर्हा चाहती है जो कि वह कहें हैं तो उसे चाहिये कि वह संविधान में तबदीली करने के लिये एक विधेयक लाए। मैं तो ऐसा मानता हूँ कि उनकी पार्टी का यह विचार है कि किसी चीज को दुरुस्त नहीं किया जा सकता, उसको तो खत्म ही करना चाहिये। लेकिन हम तो इसके विरुद्ध खयाल के हैं। हमने तो ऐसे दोस्तों को भी हम देश में स्थान दिया जो देश के दो हिस्से करना चाहते थे प्रीर प्राज भी कुछ नोन देश के अन्दर ऐसा खयाल रखते हैं

कि चीन ने हमारे देश की भूमि को नहीं छीना है। लेकिन हम विश्वास करते हैं कि उनके खयालात बदल जायेंगे। तो हम तो विश्वास करते हैं कि जिस तरह घादमी बदल सकता है इसी तरह से पशु में भी सुधार हो सकता है। लेकिन अगर उनका ईमानदारी से विश्वास है कि इन पशुओं को खत्म करना चाहिये तो वह इसके लिए संविधान को बदलने के लिये कोई विधेयक ला सकते हैं, प्रीर देश उसके ऊपर गौर करेगा प्रीर जो ठीक फैसला होगा उसको लेगा। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि केरल में पशुपालन में सुधार करने के लिये कुछ सहायता केन्द्रीय सरकार दे सकती है प्रीर कुछ सहायता राज्य सरकार भी दे सकती है, लेकिन इस काम की सारी जिम्मेदारी सरकार पर नहीं डाली जा सकती। असल में तो वहाँ के पशुओं को सुधारने की जिम्मेदारी केरल के भाइयों की है। लेकिन अपनी उस जिम्मेदारी को पूरा न निवाह कर वे सरकार को बुरा बना कहें प्रीर गोहत्या के लिये धावाज उठाएँ तो इसको मैं सही नहीं मान सकता।

चाहे विरोधी दल वाले कुछ भी क्यों न कहें लेकिन अगर देखा जाए तो मालूम होगा कि देश में हर चीज का उत्पादन बढ़ा है। प्राप चावल को लीजिए। सन् १९४७-४८ में चावल का उत्पादन २१.२ मिलियन टन था जो कि सन् १९५६-६० में बढ़ कर २६.३ मिलियन टन हो गया। प्राप गेहूँ को लें। उसका उत्पादन सन् १९४७-४८ में ५.६ मिलियन टन था, जो कि सन् १९५६-६० में ६.७ मिलियन टन हो गया। इसी तरह से प्राप चाहे गन्ने का वेदावार लीजिये या किसी प्रीर चीज का वेदावार लीजिए उसमें तरक्की हुई है। देश के अन्दर तरक्की हो रही है प्रीर देश प्रागे बढ़ रहा है। प्रीर अगर कोई भाई इस चीज को नहीं मानते हैं तो वह केवल नुकतापीनी करने की गरज से ऐसा करते हैं। एक तरफ तो वह चाहते हैं कि केरल में सस्ता घनाब चाहिये प्रीर दूसरी

[श्री० रणवीर सिंह]

तरफ वह चाहते हैं कि इस देश के अन्दर रुपए का फैलाव न हो, वह यह भी नहीं चाहते कि दूसरे देशों से रुपया लाया जाए। पता नहीं फिर वह किस ढंग से देश की तरक्की करने की बात सोचते हैं, या उनकी देश की तरक्की कोई नेक स्वाहिश भी है या नहीं यह वही भाई जान सकते हैं।

लेकिन जहाँ तक इस देश के अन्दर कृषि की पैदावार का ताल्लुक है, जैसा मैंने पहले भी कहा था, इसके लिये यह जरूरी है कि फुड और एग्रीकल्चर का मन्त्रालय एक न रखा जाए। मैं मानता हूँ कि दोनों मन्त्रालयों के मफाद एक दूसरे से मुतजाद हैं। जो मन्त्री खुराक के मन्त्रालय को चलाएगा वह हमेशा यह चाहेगा कि सस्ती खुराक इस देश के अन्दर मिले और वह लाने की कोशिश करेगा चाहे कहीं से लानी पड़े। और नतीजा यही हुआ। चूँकि हमारे जो मन्त्री महोदय हैं उनके डेजिगनेशन में भी फुड एण्ड एग्रीकल्चर आता है। पहले फुड आता है और बाद में एग्रीकल्चर आता है। और उतनी नुक्ते निगाह से वह इस पर सोचते हैं। बात भी सही है कि किसी भी देशवासी को भूखों नहीं मारा जा सकता। अब इस देश के अन्दर उसका नतीजा क्या बना? सन् १९४६ से लेकर सन् १९६० तक १७९१.९६ करोड़ रुपये का अनाज बाहर से आया। आज जितना कर्ज हिन्दुस्तान के जिम्मे बिदेशों का है उतने रुपये अनाज मंगाने में खर्च किए हैं अगर देश में इतने अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ जाती तो हमारे ऊपर बिदेशी कर्ज न होता। अनाज मंगाने पर इतना खर्चा और कोई देश नहीं करता। जितना इस देश के अन्दर बाहर से अनाज आ चुका है उतना और कोई देश नहीं मांगता है। यही नहीं, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहाँ भजीब हालत है। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर सस्ता अनाज बेचने के लिए या जो भाई अनाज के उपभोक्ता हैं जो खुद पैदा नहीं करते हैं उनकी सस्ता अनाज देने के लिये २७७.९२ करोड़ की सबसिडी या बोनस वगैरह की शकल में दिया

गया। इसके अलावा फुड प्रोक्वोरमेंट या बोनस वगैरह की शकल में दूसरी स्टेट्स को २१.०२ करोड़ रुपये दिये गये अर्थात् दूसरे मानों में २९८.९४ करोड़ रुपये इस देश के अन्दर सस्ता अनाज बेचने के लिये दिये गये। यही नहीं अगर हाल के भी आंकड़े लिये जायें और फुड के बारे में एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को देखा जाय तो उसमें लिखा है कि सन् १९५६-५७ में जो घाटा पड़ा अनाज का 13 hrs.

और स्टेट ट्रेडिंग में अनाज मंगाये जाने से जो खसारा हुआ सस्ता अनाज बेचने के सिल-मिले में वह १८.४८ करोड़ रुपये का था। सन् १९५७-५८ में यह २३.०४ करोड़ था और सन् १९५८-५९ के अन्दर १०.२२ करोड़ था। सन् १९५९-६० के अन्दर ८.८२ करोड़ था। एक तरफ तो यह हालत है दूसरी तरफ आपको मालूम है कि चीनी बहुत मीठी चीज है और उसके लिये यहाँ बहुत शोर हुआ और उसको हासिल करने के लिये कितनी जगहों पर लड़ाई झगड़े होने का भी खदसा हुआ और आज से कोई डेढ़ साल पहले इस देश के अन्दर इतनी चीनी पैदा नहीं होती थी जितनी कि देश को जरूरत थी। आपको याद होगा कि करीब दो साल पहले इस देश के अन्दर चीनी के लिये इस सदन के अन्दर एक बाबेला हुआ था। हमारे माननीय मित्र श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन उस वक्त मन्त्री थे। वे इस देश के बहुत अच्छे और लायक इंसान हैं और हमारे दोस्त हैं, उनको इस्तीफा देना पड़ गया था। हर कोई मीठी चीज को खाना चाहते थे और वह जितनी जरूरत थी उसको दे नहीं सके। एक तरफ तो यह हालत है लेकिन दूसरी तरफ इस पिछले डेढ़ साल के अन्दर हालत इतनी बदली कि पार्टिल साहब ने ऐजान किया कि मैं रिप्रायट बन्धा रहा हूँ। लेकिन फालतू जितनी पैदावार हुई उस सारी का हिसाब लगाया जाय तो सिर्फ ५ करोड़ रुपये का फालतू पैदावार पर उत्पादन कर में खमारा हुआ और एक तरह से हम उसको

खसारा भी नहीं मानते। उस नीति को बदलने की ही वजह से वह चीनी ज्यादा पैदा हुई और भ्रामदनी ज्यादा बढ़ी। यही नहीं, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक वक्त था कि एक्साइज ड्यूटी जो खाण्ड से हासिल होती थी वह कुल ५ करोड़ रुपये थी जबकि पिछले साल वह एक्साइज ड्यूटी ४६ करोड़ रुपये तक पहुंच गयी है। अब आप खुद समझ सकते हैं कि कहां ५ करोड़ और कहां ४६ करोड़ ?

अब यहां इसका शोर किया जाता है कि साहब भ्रानाज की पैदावार कम हो रही है और ज्यादा भूमि गन्ने के नीचे जा रही है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप भी जानते हैं क्योंकि आप भी एक किसान हैं और आपको मालूम है कि हर जमीन पर गन्ना पैदा नहीं किया जा सकता है। यही नहीं आज पंजाब के अन्दर वाटरलौगिंग है। पंजाब की जमीन पानी की ज्यादाती की वजह से खराब हो रही है। उस जमीन के अन्दर कोई फसल पैदा हो सकती है तो वह गन्ना ही है। इसी तरह से यू० पी० और बिहार के तराई के इलाके हैं जहां हर वक्त के ऊपर बारिश नहीं होती है और जब होती है तो वह ज्यादा होती है और उन हालात में अगर कोई फसल पैदा हो सकती है तो वह गन्ना ही है। वह ऊख ही है। अब टी और कौफी यह तो बड़े बड़े साहूकार पैदा करते हैं और बगीचों को छोड़ दिया जाय तो गलाबा गन्ने के कोई ऐसी फसल नहीं है जो कि फी एकड़ के अन्दर किसान की पैदावार बढ़ा सके।

यह मोटी सी किताब एग्जिक्यूटिव सेबर के सिलसिले में निकली है और उसके जो डाइरेक्टर हैं उन्होंने इसकी प्रीफेस के अन्दर एक नोट लिखा है जिसमें वह कहते हैं कि इस देश के अन्दर जो खेती के ऊपर निर्भर करते हैं वह रूल पापुलेशन का ६६ परसेंट है। इनमें से २० फीसदी लोग खेतिहर मजदूर हैं और खेतिहर मजदूरों में से करीब ६० फीसदी लोगों के पास थोड़ी बहुत जमीन जरूर

है। एक तरह से कुछ भूमिहीन हैं और और कुछ भूमि वाले हैं। वह लिखते हैं कि उनके सुधार का एक ही तरीका है कि जो भाई हल के पीछे चलते हैं, खेती करते हैं उनकी पैदावार को बढ़ाये। गन्ना पैदा करना इस सिलसिले में प्रागे ले जाने वाला कदम है। अब मान लीजिये कि गन्ने की पैदावार ज्यादा बढ़ गयी वैसे तो मैं जानता हूं और मुझे वह जमाना याद है जब सन् १९४६-५० के अन्दर एक भ्रावाज उठी थी और हमारे डाक्टर देशमुख साहब भी उस वक्त मेम्बर थे और वह भ्रावाज यह थी कि चीनी हमारे पास बहुत पड़ी है लेकिन ज्यों ही कोई दूसरा हुकम निकला वह चीनी पता नहीं कहां चली गई। देश के अन्दर चीनी की भूख का सवाल पैदा हो गया और चीनी बहुत महंगी बिकी। उसी तरीके से एक दफे फिर हमारे इतिहास के अन्दर यह सवाल आया और कहा गया कि कारखानेदारों के पास चीनी बहुत ज्यादा जमा हो गई है और हमने कानून बनाया कि चीनी को बाहर भेजने के लिये एक्साइज ड्यूटी माफ की जाय। उसके बाद एक तोला चीनी बाहर नहीं भेजी गई लेकिन पता नहीं कानून पास होते ही वह चीनी कहां गई और इस देश के अन्दर चीनी का कहल आ गया। आज फिर एक सवाल उठा है। लोग कहते हैं कि चीनी की बहुत ज्यादाती हो गई है। २६ लाख टन चीनी इस साल पैदा होगी जिसमें से ८-९ लाख टन चीनी शायद बचेगी। अब क्या चीनी बचेगी? बंक कहते हैं कि हमारे पास रुपया नहीं है। अब उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी हालत है। एक तरफ वह मजदूर हैं जो कि चीनी मिलों में काम करते हैं और उन को इस बात की इजाजत है कि अगर वे चाहें तो अपनी मजदूरी चीनी की शक्ल में ले लें लेकिन वह धादमी जो कि रात दिन एक करके साल भर मेहनत करके गन्ना पैदा करता है और बुरी से बुरी सबी और गर्मी के अन्दर काम करता है वह गन्ने की कीमत चीनी की शक्ल में नहीं ले सकता है। मैं इसकी कोई वजह नहीं देखता कि एक गांव का मजदूर

[श्री० रणवीर सि-]

जो कि चीनी मिल में काम करता है उसमें प्रौर उस वर्कर में जो कि खेत में गन्ना पैदा करता है, कोई इस तरह का फर्क रहे ? अब अगर गन्ने के काश्तकारों को गन्ने के बदले में रुपया नहीं दे सके चूंकि बैंक रुपया नहीं देते तो मेहरबानी करके उसको चीनी दे दीजिये । ऐसा करने से आपकी परेशानी भी घटेगी प्रौर आपको कोई गुदामों की भी जरूरत नहीं रहेगी । आपको बैंकों के पास भिखारी बनने की जरूरत भी नहीं रहेगी । मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार इस बात का ऐलान करे कि जो काश्तकार गन्ने की कीमत के बदले में चीनी चाहें व उनको चीनी देने की इजाजत होनी चाहिये ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसके साथ साथ मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूं, मुझे याद है प्रौर इस रिपोर्ट में भी लिखा है कि रिजर्व बैंक प्रौर सरकार की नीति यह रहती है कि अनपज सस्ता बिके प्रौर इस खातिर यह रुपया बाजार से खींच लेते हैं । अगर आज चीनी ज्यादा हुई है जैसा कि वह कहते हैं वैसे मैं तो मानता हूं कि चीनी इतनी मीठी चीज है कि अगर कोई एक छटांक रोजाना खाता है तो वह आसानी से दो छटांक खा सकता है । है । इसलिये चीनी की अधिक पैदावार का जो बुझार है वह सही नहीं है । लेकिन खैर वह कहते हैं कि चीनी ज्यादा पैदा हो गई तो टैरिफ कमिशन प्रौर सरकार जिसने यह ऐलान किया प्रौर यह आश्वासन दिया कि १ रुपये १० प्राने की मन गन्ने की कीमत ही जायगी तो हिन्दुस्तान के वह प्रदेश जहां कि गन्ने की कीमत मुकरंर है जैसे यु० पी०, बिहार प्रौर पंजाब में तो यह १ रुपये १० प्राने की उस कीमत को बरकरार रखने के लिये रिजर्व बैंक को रुपये का प्रसार करना चाहिये । रिजर्व बैंक को उनकी मदद करनी चाहिये ।

जहां तक इस देश में खेती की तरफकी का तात्बुक हों, आप को मालूम ही है कि उसके लिये एक महकमा चला है, जिस को

कम्प्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट कहते हैं । जो लोग उस में काम करते हैं, उन को ६०, ७० करोड़ रुपया तनखाहों, जीप्स प्रौर पेट्रोल वगैरा की शकल में दिया जाता है । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि पिछले डेढ़ साल में चीनी की पैदावार जो कहां से कहां बढ़ गई, उसके लिये जीप्स वगैरह पर कितना पया खर्च हुआ ताकि किसान गन्ना ज्यादा पैदा करें । सिर्फ गन्ने की कीमत १ रुपये ७ प्राने मन से १ रुपये १० प्राने कर दी गई । मैं सरकार को बताना चाहता हूं कि सरकार जितनी जल्दी इस बात को मान लें, उतना ही अच्छा होगा कि देश का किसान भोला नहीं है, वह जानता है— प्रौर शायद सरकार के महकमे के अफसरों से ज्यादा अच्छी तरह जानता है— कि सरकार पच्चीस एकड़ भूमि पर जो मीड मल्टीप्लिकेशन फार्म खोलना चाहती है, उसका नतीज सिवाय इसके कुछ नहीं होगा । कि सरकार को हमेशा हमेशा चार पांच हजार फ्री साल का घाटा रहेगा । अगर सरकार कोई मकनाइज्ड फार्म खोलना चाहती है, तो वह कम से कम १०० एकड़ का फार्म होना चाहिये । मुझे इसमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं है कि एक जिले में एक फार्म खोला जाये, लेकिन वह फार्म गवर्नमेंट के लिये इकोनोमिक होना चाहिये । अगर सरकार बीज के फार्म खोले, जिसमें उस को घाटा हो, प्रौर फिर वह किसानों को कहे कि अगर वे उस फार्म के बीज इस्तमाल करेंगे, तो पैदावार बढ़ेगी, तो उनको इस बात पर कैसे ऐतराज होगा ? वे कहेंगे कि कैसे पैदावार बढ़ेगी । वे जानते हैं कि सरकार परा वे हिसाब लगाती है । खेती की तरफकी के लिये रुपया चाहिये प्रौर उस रुपय के सम्बन्ध में, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं हरया नहीं दे सकता हूं ।

श्री० रणवीर सिंह : मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि मेहता कमेटी की रिपोर्ट

निकली है है। उस रिपोर्ट की ३४ नम्बर की सिफारिश यह है कि इस देश में रुपया देने का जो सिलसिला है, उसको सुधारा जाये। ग्रौर स्टेट को कोपरेटिव बैंक की जो मूक्सिमम क्रेडिट लिमिट उनके अपने सरमाया का बीस गुना मुकरर होनी चाहिये, उस को बढ़ाया जाये। इसी तरह को आपरेशन मिनिस्ट्री का जयपुर में जो समिनार हुआ, उसकी भी सिफारिशें हैं। एक बात मैं कह देना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में रिजर्व बैंक ने एक फण्ड निकाला है, जिस को नेशनल एग्रीकल्चरल क्रेडिट लांगटर्म आपरेशन फण्ड कहते हैं। उसके लिये रिजर्व बैंक ने जो रुपया निकाला वह ४० करोड़ रुपया था, लेकिन अभी तक उसमें से २६,१६ करोड़ रुपया इस्तमाल हुआ है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि रिजर्व बैंक के पास सरकार का सैकड़ों करोड़ों रुपया पड़ा है। वहां रखने के लिये तो यह फण्ड नहीं निकाला गया था। अगर सरकार चाहती है कि यहां के काश्तकार तरक्की करें और ज्यादा भनाज पैदा करें, तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि रिजर्व बैंक अपनी नीति को बदले और को-आपरेटिव बैंक की मैक्सिमम क्रेडिट लिमिट बढ़ाई जाये। इसी तरह फार्मल को-आपरेटिव बैंक को मान्यता दी जाय। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि रिजर्व बैंक उसके रास्ते में क्यों खड़ा रहना चाहता है। वह सस्ते सूद पर किसानों को रुपया दे सकता है।

Shri B. K. Galkwad (Nasik): While speaking on the Demands of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture I shall confine myself to three or four points only. Food and Agriculture is an important Ministry and hence priority has been given to its Demands even by the Government. India is considered an agricultural country. In spite of that we find that she has to depend mostly, if not wholly and solely, on imports of foodstuffs from foreign countries.

In the report of the Food and Agriculture Ministry for 1960-61, on page 3 it is said:

232(Ai) LSD—8.

"Taking the country as a whole, the 1960-61 paddy crop is expected to be substantially better than that in 1959-60. The position about the kharif millet crops is, however, less satisfactory. Rabi sowings have been quite extensive and the crops are reported to be thriving well. On the whole, the prospects of foodgrains production appear to be as bright as, if not better than, in 1958-59."

We find this sort of statements giving the country a great hope that she is becoming self-sufficient as regards foodstuffs. The question is whether India is really becoming self-sufficient in respect of foodstuffs. In my opinion, the reply to this question is 'no'. India is not becoming self-sufficient in foodstuffs.

On page 7 of the report Government is pleased to give a statement showing the figures of imports of foodgrains into India. You will find that in the year 1958 they have imported 3,173,000 tons of foodgrains; in the year 1959 3,807,000 tons; and in the year 1960 5,056,000 tons. These figures go to prove that every year India is importing more and more foodstuffs from foreign countries. But the report says that the prospects in the year 1960 were better than those of the year 1958-59. Even then Government has been importing more and more foodgrains every year. If the production of foodstuffs is better, then where is the necessity to import more and more foodstuffs every year? In 1960 you will find that they have imported 12,49,000 tons more foodstuffs than in the year 1959. If the production of foodstuffs in the country is improving, then why are they importing more?

I know the reply of the hon. Minister will be that he wants to have buffer stocks. But I fail to understand why buffer stocks should be increased every year if the position about food production in the country is improving. This is nothing but giving false hopes. Whenever we go to a shop in the bazar there you will find that a

[Shri B. K. Gaikwad]

board bearing the words in Hindi "Aj Naqd, Kal Udhar", that is, "Today you pay in cash, tomorrow you will have credit". In the same way our Government is giving us false assurances that "next year the foodstuffs production will be all right, this year the position is not so good". So they are giving us all these false hopes.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Jammu and Kashmir): And we are paying in cash!

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: Yes. It means that this "tomorrow" will never come. In the same way, our importing foodstuffs every year will never be stopped and the "next year" will never come. They will be increasing the imports of foodstuffs from foreign countries every year.

I will explain why I say this. For this purpose I shall read out the figures given on page 2 of the report. As I have no time I shall read only the totals. They have given figures for five years from 1955-56 to 1959-60. You will find that the total production of foodgrains in India has been as follows:

1955-56	65.8 million tons
1956-57	60.8 " "
1957-58	62.5 " "
1958-59	75.5 " "
1959-60	71.1 " "

These production figures given for the last five years show that there is no considerable increase in the production of foodstuffs. On an average, the production of foodgrains in India comes to 68.9 million tons. That production is not sufficient to meet the demands of the country and hence India has to import foodstuffs every year. Under these circumstances, India cannot become a self-supporting country. Then, is there any way by which India can become a self-supporting country? My reply is, 'Yes'. There is considerable waste land available in the country. I think, last year the hon. Minister Mr. S. K. Patil gave

the information that about 10 crores acres of cultivable land is available. We must find out more cultivable land. We need not go anywhere to find out the cultivable land. The hon. Minister had said that 10 crore acres of cultivable land is available. If that is so, then why is not this land brought under cultivation? Are not the Indian people prepared to cultivate the land? When the people submit their applications for getting these lands, I do not know why their applications are rejected and no such lands are given to them for cultivation. It is not understood as to why the Government is keeping these lands fallow and letting them be not used for agricultural purposes.

Sir, at present, there are two big problems before the country. One is that of foodstuffs and the other is that of unemployment. In order to solve these two problems, the Government should pay their special attention to them and see that these two problems are solved. How can these two problems be solved? These two problems can be solved if the cultivable land that is available with the Government is given for cultivation to the landless agricultural labourers. That way the problem of unemployment can also be solved and the land will be used for agricultural purposes. But, I do not know why the Government is not doing that. Perhaps, the Central Government will say that that is the concern of the State Governments. But, you will find, Sir, that at the Centre as well as in the States there are Congress Ministries working and if the Congress Ministries are working everywhere, the State Ministers can be conveniently requested to do the needful in this matter.

There are something like 7 to 8 crores of unemployed labourers. They all live in villages. In villages their position is very pitiable. During harvest season, they get some job. But, during off-season, they do not get any job. During the winter season, they go in the jungles and bring head-loads

of grass and sell them in the villages or in the cities. In the same way, during the summer season, they go in the jungles and bring head-loads of firewood and sell them in the cities. You know what is the income of their produce. If a headload of firewood is brought from the jungle, one day goes for bringing the headload of firewood and one day goes for selling it in the bazar and that fetches something like Re. 1 or Rs. 1½. That is the income for two days. If on a particular day the head-load of firewood is attached by the forest man, then you will find that on that day there will be nothing in the house to cook. In the kitchen there will be no fire because there is nothing to cook. That is the position. The Government should pay attention to this problem and this problem can be solved by giving those waste-lands to landless people for cultivation. There is another problem of food-stuffs also which is becoming very acute day by day and that will also be solved partly, if not fully.

Then, I will come to fair price shops. The Government has started 51,000 fair price shops throughout the country, as stated in the Report. There are about 5,55,754 villages whose population is below 2000. Of course, I have not taken into consideration the villages or the cities whose population is more than 2000. Sir, you will find that these fair price shops which the Government have started are mostly in cities and towns and in taluks and tehsils places. In villages there are no fair price shops. Now, the people who live in villages, generally speaking, suffer the most. There is more need for a fair price shop in the village, but that is not opened there. This Government is a caretaker Government, it is said and if it is a caretaker Government, it is the bounden duty of the Government to see that fair price shops are opened for the poor people who live in villages. Such fair price shops should be opened in the villages first. I do not mean to say that those shops should not be opened in cities. But, these fair price shops should be

started in the villages first. Now, some of our friends would come forward and say that in village people grow foodstuffs and they are available there. I do admit that. Foodstuffs are available with the landlords and not with the landless labourers. And when the landless labourers go to the landlord to purchase foodstuffs, you will find, they are sold at double the price and not at the market price. The landlord tells them, "It is not my shop. If you don't want it, you go somewhere else and purchase it." That is the position. So, these fair price shops should be started in villages in order to accommodate these poor people who live in villages.

There are several obstacles in the way of the poor agriculturist. If he wants to purchase a bullock or if he wants to purchase seeds, or if he wants to dig a well, you will find that he is always in great difficulty. For instance, if they apply for a taccavi loan from the Government, they have to wait for several days and after some days the reply which is given by the Government is in the negative. Even if a tagavi loan is given—I will quote one instance—it may be a taccavi loan, a substantial portion is eaten away by the officers concerned.

An Hon. Member: It is given as Chai-pani.

Shri B. K. Galkwad: It is not Chai-pani. It is not given willingly. You will find as soon as the man gets a taccavi loan, the clerk will be there, the peon will be there, the talati will be there and the officer concerned will be there. I would give you an instance. It is a very interesting one. I would give it for the information of the House. There was one agriculturist. He got a taccavi loan of Rs. 200 to purchase bullock. Out of Rs. 200, practically Rs. 105 were taken away by these officers and the people who helped him in getting the loan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps, he had no intention of repaying anything!

Shri B. K. Galkwad: I shall come to that point also.

The man took whatever amount was left and went to the *Mamlatdar* or *tehsildar* or whatever he is called; in our State, we call him *mamlatdar*. He went to him and put that amount on his table and said 'all the other people have taken their share. So, why should you also not take your share? You may also take whatever your share is, and then, I shall take the balance and go home'. When the *Mamlatdar* saw that out of Rs. 200 Rs. 105 had been eaten up by the other staff, then, he called all those people, because that was a kind of complaint that he has made; he called all those people and told them, 'Do not do this kind of thing. Otherwise, I shall have to take action against you'. Then, all that amount was paid back to the agriculturist. This is the kind of thing that is going on everywhere.

You, Sir, said a little while ago that perhaps he had no intention of repaying that amount. I shall explain the position in regard to this also. I have seen, it as my own experience what happens to the agriculturists in case they do not pay their instalments regularly. If, unfortunately, due to drought or some other reason, they are not in a position to pay the full instalment during the particular period, then, Government are not only charging a high rate of interest on the loan, but they charge compound interest on the whole amount, and whatever he has paid already is not at all taken into consideration. Suppose a person takes a loan of Rs. 4,000 for purchasing, let us say, an oil engine, and suppose he has paid back Rs. 3,500 out of that Rs. 4,000, and only Rs. 500 still remained to be paid. If some instalments are not paid during the period when it is due, then Government charge compound interest on the whole amount of Rs. 4,000. That is what is happening when an agriculturist fails to pay the amount in the due time. Further, if he fails to pay the amount, then, he is penalised, and his land is sold by public auction.

This is what is happening to the agriculturists. But, so many questions have come up here where amount of Rs. 10 crores and so on have been paid to the Tatas or Birlas etc. without any interest, for starting new business or for expanding their present business. After all, agriculture is almost one of the most important items of business, and Government should, therefore, take necessary care to see that they do not harass these agriculturists in this manner.

As regards ploughing of the land, there are Government tractors available, but they are given only to the big landlords or to the big or rich agriculturists. I would request Government to see that these tractors are allowed to be given to the small-holders to plough their lands at concessional rates; I do not say that they should be given to the small-holders free of cost, but they should be given to them at concessional rates.

Government should also find a market for the production of the agriculturists, because at present whatever is produced does not find a ready market. Government should help the agriculturists in this connection also. They should see that storehouses are started at taluk or tehsil places. At present, what happens is this. If the production of an agriculturist does not find any market, then, naturally, his produce is sold at a very cheap rate, because the merchants go there and say 'This is our rate, if you want to sell your produce at this rate, you may sell it; otherwise, we do not want it'. The poor agriculturists are always very needy, and so they want some help in this connection. Government should start some storehouses where the production of the agriculturists could be stored, and some loans may be given to the agriculturists until they get better price for their produce.

Whenever there is drought, there should be no question of recovery of land revenue. You will always find

that at the time of drought, it becomes very difficult for the poor agriculturist to pay the revenue assessment. During the British period, I have seen many Congressmen criticising the Britishers for this particular provision in the Land Revenue Code. According to that code, even if there is drought, only if the *anivari* is less than six annas in a rupee, the benefit of the drought is given to the agriculturist. But the Government officers always try to put the *anivari* at more than six annas in the rupee, with the result that the poor agriculturists are deprived of the benefit of drought. At that time, many of our friends were criticising the Britishers. But, now they have been in power for the last thirteen years, and yet we find that the revenue code has not been amended so far. I would request Government to go into this matter and see that the land revenue code is amended so far. I would request Government to go into this matter and see that the land revenue code is amended.

The Deputy Minister of Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa): That is not applied now. There are other rules which are followed nowadays.

Shri B. K. Galkwad: I do not know what the position is in other States, but as far as Maharashtra is concerned, this is the rule that is being followed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should now try to conclude.

Shri B. K. Galkwad: I have not spoken at all for the last two months, because I was reserving myself for the debate on this. Anyhow, I shall obey your instructions, and I shall conclude early.

Under the pretext of land reforms, the burial grounds of the Scheduled Castes people have been confiscated at certain places, and there have been so many complaints to that effect. In this connection, I would submit that burial grounds cannot be taken away under any circumstances. I would request that Government should take necessary care to see that burial

grounds of, particularly, the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and backward classes people should not be taken away under the pretext of either land reform or any other reform.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Before I call upon the next speaker, I have to place before the Congress Members the situation that is there. I have got before me a list of about thirty Members from the Congress side, who want to participate. Out of the 8 hours allotted, they can have at the most five hours, and out of those five hours, at least two hours would be taken by the Ministers. So, there are only three hours left, and if hon. Members agree to take ten minutes each, perhaps, a larger number could be accommodated.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : उपाध्यक्ष जी, जो पहले १५ मिनट बोल लिये वे फायदे में रहे और हम घाटे में रहे ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ही ने कहा कि हम ऐसा करेंगे नहीं तो मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं आप किसी एक प्रादमी को भाषा बण्टा दे दें ।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कृषि और खाद्य मन्त्रालय के अनुदानों का स्वागत करता हूँ और उसका जोरदार समर्थन करता हूँ । यह खुशी की बात है कि इस साल हमारा गल्ला अच्छा हुआ है और काफी भी हुआ है । यद्यपि जूट की पदावार कुछ कम हुई है लेकिन दाम के लिहाज से हमको अच्छा पैसा मिल गया है । लेकिन प्रागे कुछ बोलने के पहले मैं श्री बी० पी० नायर के भाषण के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ । खेद है कि वह इस समय सदन में नहीं है । वह उस प्रदेश से आते हैं जहाँ श्री बंकराचार्य पैदा हुए थे । वह कहते हैं कि देश के अन्दर दो करोड़ गांव बेकार हैं उनको मार देना चाहिये । मैं तमन्नता कि दो करोड़ गावों को किलाने में जितना पैसा लगेगा उससे कहीं ज्यादा साम उनके गोबर से हम को मिलेगा क्योंकि गोबर खाद के लिये बहुत उपयोगी है । अन्त

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

प्राप हिसाब लगा कि इन गायों के गोबर से कितनी खाद हमको मिलेगी और फिर उसकी तुलना उस फरटीलाइजर की कीमत से करें जो इसके अभाव में हमको बाहर से खाना पड़ेगा, तो प्राप देखेंगे कि इन गायों का रहना देश के लिये कितना जरूरी है। मुझे तो लगता है कि हमारे बी० पी० नायर साहब को खेती का ज्ञान नहीं है तभी वह ऐसी बात कहते हैं। हमने अपने यहां देखा है कि बंजर भूमि में लोग गायों को लाकर रखते हैं और उनके गोबर और गोमूत्र से वह भूमि उपजाऊ हो जाती है। हमारे तिवारी जी जो बैठे हैं वह इस बात को जानते हैं क्योंकि वे भोग इनके ही जिले के हैं जो हमारे जिले में में आ गए हैं। तो वे इस प्रकार भूमि को उपजाऊ बनाते हैं।

यहां पर हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई कहते हैं कि देश की बेकार गायों को मार देना चाहिये। लेकिन मुझे विश्वास है कि वे गांवों में ऐसा नहीं कहेंगे। क्योंकि आजकल चुनाव आने वाले हैं इसलिये गांवों में वे दूसरी बात कहेंगे। सूकिन मैं इस पक्ष में नहीं हूँ कि इन गायों को मारा जाए और गोमांस खाया जाए।

अब मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी प्लान्ड इकानमी है और हर चीज के लिए योजना बनायी जाती है। इतना बड़ा योजना भवन बना हुआ है और उसमें बहुत से लोग काम करते हैं और सब चीजों के उत्पादन के लिये प्लान बनाते हैं, लेकिन खेती के लिये कोई प्लान नहीं बनाया जाता। अगर खेती के लिये भी प्लान बनाया जाए कि हमको फलां फलां चीज इतनी बोनी चाहिये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि बड़ा अच्छा होता। लेकिन खेती के लिए कोई प्लान क्यों नहीं बनाया जाता यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। मैं नहीं समझ पाता कि योजना का काम किस तरह से हो रहा है।

सके अलावा दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना

चाहता हूँ कि इस साल उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार और पंजाब में गन्ने की खेती ज्यादा हो गयी है। अगर ३० जून तक सारी फैक्टरियां चलें तो सम्भव है कि सारे गन्ने का ऋशिंग हो सके। हमें इस दिशा में अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी से मदद मिली है कि हमारे यहां कुछ फैक्टरियां जो बन्द थीं उनको चलाया गया है। हमारे फुड एण्ड एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर इसमें तत्पर है। फाइनंस मिनिस्टर साहब कहते हैं कि हम पैसा देंगे। अब आजकल हालत यह है कि हमारे किसान जो गन्ना दे रहे हैं उनको पैसा नहीं मिल रहा है और यह ऐसा समय है जब किसानों को बैल खरीदने होते हैं, शादी विवाह करने होते हैं, जमीन की मालगुजारी देनी पड़ती है और कपड़े-सूते पर खर्च करना होता है। किसान को पैसे की जरूरत है और उसको पैसा नहीं मिल रहा है। दूसरी तरफ यह हमारे मिल वाले कहते हैं कि हमारी चीनी जो पड़ी है उसकी रिलीज नहीं हो रही है। जरूरत इस बात की है कि हमारी चीनी बाहर जाये। अब वह कहते हैं कि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है। जितनी बैंक से ले लेने की लिमिट है वह ले चके हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार कुछ निर्णय करे और मिल वालों को चीनी रिलीज करने के लिये कहे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि चीनी की रिलीज के बारे में उदारतापूर्वक विचार किया जाये। किसान अगर आज अपने गन्ने की कीमत चीनी की शक्ल में लेना चाहे तो सरकार को चीनी देने की इजाजत दे देनी चाहिये। मजदूर अपनी मजदूरी की ऐज में चीनी चाहे तो उसको चीनी दे देनी चाहिये। पब्लिक को चीनी देने में सहूलियत देना करनी चाहिये और चीनी को एक्सपोर्ट करना चाहिये।

हमारे पाटिल साहब कहते हैं कि हमारा चीनी का दाम ६०० रुपये प्रति टन है लेकिन बाजार में अभी उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, चीनी का दाम ४०० रुपये प्रति टन है। इस तरह हर टन पर हमको ३०० रुपये का घाटा पड़ता

है। यहां लोकसभा के रिसर्च एण्ड रेफ़ेंस ब्रांच ने एक कागज निकाला है जिसके कि अनुसार सन् १९६१ में इंग्लैण्ड ने आस्ट्रेलिया से ४५ पौंड १ शिलिंग पर टन के हिसाब से चीनी खरीदी है जो कि एक्सचेंज रेट में १ रुपये का १ शिलिंग ५-३१।३२ पेंस होता है। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि इंग्लैण्ड आस्ट्रेलिया से ६१० रुपये टन के हिसाब से चीनी खरीदेगा। अब जब इंग्लैण्ड को आस्ट्रेलिया की चीनी ६१० रुपये टन पड़ती है तो वह हमारी चीनी क्यों नहीं खरीदता है? और जबकि हम कामेनवैलथ में हैं? रिसर्च एण्ड रेफ़ेंस विभाग ने जो कागज निकाला है उसके मुताबिक हम अमरीका से हर साल अरबों रुपयों का सामान मंगाते हैं और अमरीका को भी हमसे चीनी आदि खरीदनी चाहिये। पी० एल० ४८० में हमने करोड़ों और अरबों पये का सामान अमरीका से मंगाया है। इसलिये यह आवश्यक बात है कि अमरीका भी हमारी चीनी खरीदे।

पी० एल० ४८० में १-८-५६ से ३०-४-५६ तक ४,४१४ मिलियन की ऐड एयोराइज्ड थी जबकि हमने अंदाजन ३७३६ मिलियन रुपये का सामान मंगाया है। जब हम अमरीका से इतना सामान मंगाते हैं तो क्या अमरीका हम से चीनी नहीं खरीद सकता है? मैं समझता हूँ अमरीका को हमारी चीनी एक्सपोर्ट हो सकती है।

पहले तो हमसे कहा जाता है कि अधिक उत्पादन करो और जब हम अधिक पैदा करने लगते हैं तो इनको इससे बचड़ाहट पैदा होने लगी है। हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने बतलाया है कि गन्ने की खेती बढ़ गयी है। लेकिन मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो गन्ने की पैदावार बढ़ी है यह इस कारण है कि आज हमारे किसान ज्यादा तगड़े हैं, खूब पानी देते हैं, अच्छी खाद देते हैं और हंग से खेती करते हैं और इसलिए हमारी गन्ने की पैदावार बढ़ी है। अब ज्यादा पैदावार करके किसान

पर तो उचित यह है कि सरकार उनको इनाम देती, शाबाशी देती और उनको हर प्रकार से प्रोत्साहन व सुविधाएं देती लेकिन उल्टे यह कहा जा रहा है कि उन्होंने इतनी अधिक पैदावार कर ली। जरूरत इस बात की है कि हमारी प्लांड एकोनोमी हो। आज मुझे खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि कृषि मंत्रालय और योजना मंत्रालय द्वारा प्लानिंग नहीं की जाती है। किसानों को अधिक पैदावार करके किसानों के लिए इनाम मिलना चाहिए था लेकिन उनको इनाम और सब्सिडी नहीं मिलती है जब कि टाटा, बिड़ला और अन्य लोगों को सरकार हर तरह से प्रोत्साहन देती है। किसानों को आप सब्सिडी दीजिये। सरकार को प्रतिवर्ष चीनी की एक्साइज ड्यूटी की शकल में ४५ करोड़ रुपया मिलता है। सरकार उसमें से ५ करोड़ रुपया किसानों को सब्सिडी की शकल में दे।

मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि जब तक सारे गन्ने की क्रांशिंग पूरी न हो जाये कोई शुगर फ़ैक्टरी बंद न हो। सारा गन्ना कूश हो जाने पर ही किसी शुगर मिल को बंद किया जाये। किसानों को उनके गन्ने का पूरा पेमेंट दिलाने की व्यवस्था की जाये। पेमेंट न होने से किसानों को आजकल बड़ी तकलीफ़ है। दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि आज सरकार की ओर से गुदामों की उचित व्यवस्था नहीं है। फ़ैक्टरी वालों के गुदाम नहीं हैं। सरकार को चीनी के गुदामों की भी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। अब गेहूँ के बास्ते तमाम जगह गुदामों की व्यवस्था की जाती है लेकिन हमारी चीनी को रखने के लिए जगह की व्यवस्था नहीं की जाती है।

यह भी कहा जाता है कि साहब चीनी रिजर्व करने से उसके दाम गिर जायेंगे। अब उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जरा यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह चीनी मिल मालिक कितना भारी मुनाफ़ा कर रहे हैं। इन चीनी मिल मालिकों ने इतने दिनों के बाद इतना पैदा

[श्री विलूति मिश्र]

कर लिया है जिसका कि कोई हिसाब-किताब नहीं है। एक पुरी साहब जो कि शुगर मिल एसोसिएशन के प्रेसीडेंट हैं और हमारे चौधरी साहब के जिले के हैं उन्होंने अपने भाषण में इस चीज को कहा है कि चीनी के दाम कम होने चाहिए। टैरिफ कमिशन की कोस्ट स्ट्रक्चर ऑफ शुगर ऐंड फेयर प्राइस पेएबल टु दी शुगर इंडस्ट्री की रिपोर्ट में यह बतलाया गया है कि नार्दन इंडिया में सन् १९५७-५८ में शुगर की फेयर सैलिंग प्राइस ३५-३० नये पैसे रही। बम्बई वगैरह के बारे में नहीं बतला रहा हूँ। नार्दन इंडिया की बाबत उसमें बतलाया गया है। सन् ५८-५९ में ३६ रुपये ४३ नये पैसे। अब चीनी जो हमारे बहा बिकती है तो मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह चीनी के उद्योगपति कितना मुनाफा उठाते हैं। डी० चीनी हमारी ३६ रुपये ८१ नये पैसे के हिसाब से बिकती है जब कि सी० चीनी ३८ रुपये ५१ नये पैसे की दर से बिकती है। इस तरह आप देखेंगे कि २ रुपया और ९५ नये पैसे का शुगर मिल मालिकों को फायदा होता है। उस रिपोर्ट के तीसरे बरे में यह दिया हुआ है :—

"The Commission has recommended that in addition to the cost of production derived from the cost schedules with reference to duration of season and rate of recovery of sugar, 12 per cent. return on employed capital should be allowed so as to provide sufficient funds for each unit to meet its commitments under bonus and gratuity, interest on borrowed capital and debentures, dividend on preference shares, managing agents' commission and income tax and finally leave a residue to large majority of the units in all regions to declare reasonable dividends'.

इस तरह आप देखेंगे कि १२ प्रतिशत का डिबिडेंड शुगर फैक्टरी वालों को दिया गया है। इसके अलावा फी मन चीनी के पीछे यह

२ रुपये ९१ या ९२ नये पैसे का फायदा और हो रहा है। २५ साल से उनको प्रोटेक्शन मिल रहा है। हर मन के पीछे उनको करीब ३ रुपया एक्सट्रा दाम मिलते हैं। अब यह १२ परसेंट का मुनाफा हो और यह २ रुपये ९१ या ९२ नये पैसे का प्रति मन चीनी मिल मालिक को एक्सट्रा मुनाफा हो और इतने पर भी जो पुरी साहब कहते हैं कि गन्ने के दाम कम करने चाहिए तो यह मुनासिब बात नहीं है।

इसके सम्बन्ध में डाइरेक्टर आफनेशनल शुगर इस्टीमेट कानपुर ने यह कहा है :—

He has stated—

"Some have already carried out extensions and others are doing it. But such extensions should generally be managed from within the resources of a factory or by issue of debentures or raising the capital, and should not in any case, be a charge on the consumer. It needs, therefore, to be examined first, which factories have a case for replacement and to what extent. Secondly, whether, the depreciation allowed to them in sugar price in the last 25 years of their existence coupled with extra profits allowed for replacement (as in 1947-48 of Rs. 2/- per maund), and their Reserve Fund are not sufficient to cover the cost of needed replacement or if they were consumed earlier, how these sums were utilised. While it is conceded that the cost of machineries have gone up several-fold as compared to the original cost of Rs. 14 lakhs on which depreciation at 5% was allowed, but the depreciation charges of Rs. 18 lakhs (which a factory recovered in 25 years at 5 per cent.) may be in most cases sufficient to cover replacement of 1/5 of the plant (if the increase is 500%). And, probably, there would hardly be a case where more replacement than this would be necessary."

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उन लोगों को इतना फ्रायदा पहुंच रहा है, लेकिन फिर भी वह कहते हैं कि रिप्लेसमेंट के लिये पैसा दो। पहले बे हर मन में दो रुपये ले रहे थे और अब लगभग तीन रुपये ले रहे हैं। इस के अतिरिक्त उनको १२ परसेंट डिविडेंड-मुनाफ़ा-दिया गया है। इसके बावजूद वह कहने हैं कि गन्ने का दाम कम होना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उचित नहीं है कि इन पारस्थितियों में भी वह कहें कि गन्ने का दाम कम करना चाहिए।

कारखानेदार कहते हैं कि गन्ने की कीमत गिरानी चाहिए। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि नाथ इंडिया में तो कंट्रोल है—पंजाब, बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश में कंट्रोल है, लेकिन साउथ में कंट्रोल नहीं है। वहां ज्यादा दिनों तक फैक्ट्रियां चलती हैं। लिहाजा साउथ में शूगर का कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन और भी कम होगा। हमारे यहां भी फैक्ट्रियां ज्यादा दिन तक चलेंगी। मेरा अन्दाजा है कि साउथ में पिछले तीन, चार बरसों में फ़ैक्ट्री वालों ने नौ करोड़ रुपया कमाया है। फिर भी साउथ वाले कहते हैं कि हमको एक्सटेंशन और एक्सपेंशन के लिये मौका नहीं मिलता है। यह बहुत गैर मुनासिब बात है। मैं वहां की सरकार और केन्द्रीय सरकार से कहूंगा कि जो रुपया वहां के फ़ैक्ट्री वाले कमा रहे हैं, या तो उसको सरकारी खजाने में रखा जाय, या उस से कोई डेबेलपमेंट का काम किया जाये।

सरकार खेती की तरफ जो ध्यान दे रही है, वह कागज पत्रों में है। खेतों की तरफ उसका ध्यान नहीं जाता है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने पिछली दफ़ा कहा था कि हर एक मिनिस्टर को गांवों में जाकर यह देखना चाहिए कि वहां खेती के विषय में क्या हो रहा है और हमको यह बताया जाये कि कीम मिनिस्टर किस स्टेट में यह देखने के लिये गया है। श्री डा० राम सुभग सिंह ने कहा कि घाट नौ मिनिस्टर इस सम्बन्ध में रखा गये

थ। मैं अपनी स्टेट के बात करना चाहता हूँ। मेरा अन्दाजा है कि वहां की पापुलेशन ४,४३ लाख है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि १९५७ से लेकर १९६१ तक हमारे मंत्रीगण ने वहां कितनी विज़िट्स कीं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हर एक भ्रादमी के काम को देखना चाहिए कि उस ने कितनी विज़िट्स की और कितनी नहीं की, वह कहा गया और कहा नहीं गया, इत्यादि।

खेती का महकमा इतना महत्वपूर्ण और ज़रूरत है कि उस में उसी भ्रादमी को रखना चाहिए, जिसको इस विषय का ज्ञान और जानकारी हो। यह सब को ज्ञात है कि हिन्दुस्तान की कम से कम ५५ फ़ीसदी भ्रादमी खेती से होती है, लेकिन उसके विकास और उस की समस्याओं की ओर यथोचित ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है। अमरीका से यहां टीम आई और चली गई लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि उस से इस देश की खेती को क्या लाभ हुआ ? आज खेतियार को पैरिटी प्राइस देने की जरूरत है। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि कमप्युमर को नुकसान हो। मैं चाहता हूँ कि शहर वालों और गांव वालों में से किसी को नुकसान न हो, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि खेती में जो उत्पादन होता है, उस की कीमतों, को अन्य चीजों की कीमतों के साथ जोड़ दिया जाये। कृषि मंत्री ने इस विषय में कहा कि हम कमेटी बनायेंगे। हमको इन्फ़ॉर्मेशन है कि शायद वह तो कमेटी बनाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन उस कमेटी का मामला प्लानिंग कमीशन में चला गया और वहां फंस गया है। हम देखते हैं कि जब खेतियार से सम्बन्ध रखने वाला कोई प्रश्न आता है, तो कमेटी नहीं बनाई जाती है, लेकिन जब शहर वालों, अखबार वालों और पूंजीपतियों के हित की कोई बात होती है, तो तुरन्त कमेटी बना दी जाती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मंत्रीगण हमारे सामने हाउस में कहें कि यह उनके बस की बात नहीं है। यह ठीक है कि इस में उन को बोड़ी विकल है। वे कैबिनेट के मेम्बर हैं। वे कैसे रेस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी धरल करे ? लेकिन हम लोग तो उन के साथ हैं।

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

इन जन-गणना की रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि इस देश में ७१ फ्रीसदी गांवों की आबादी है, जिसका अर्थ यह है कि इस हाउस के ५०० मेम्बरों में से ३३५ गांवों के वोट पर आये हैं, लेकिन हम लोगों की पुछवाई नहीं होती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि कन से कम पैरिटी प्राइस के बारे में एक एडवाइजरी बोर्ड बनाया जाये, ताकि खेतियार को उस के उत्पादन का उचित पैसा मिल सके।

श्री १० सि० किलेदार (होशंगाबाद): श्रीमान् उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आरम्भ में ही मैं खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री महोदय को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ.....

श्री जखाराम सिंह : काहे के लिये ?

श्री १० सि० किलेदार : कि उन्होंने देश में खाद्य की परिस्थिति को सुधारा है। आज से दो साल पहले यहाँ पर सदन के भीतर और बाहर, दोनों जगह गल्ले और शक्कर के बारे में काफ़ी होहल्ला मचता था। इस साल बैसी कोई आवाज नहीं सुनाई पड़ रही है और इस लिये वह हम सब की बधाई के पात्र हैं। लेकिन जो कुछ उन्होंने यह सब किया है, वह देश के भीतर उत्पादन बढ़ा कर नहीं किया है। उनकी करामात इस बात में रही कि उन्होंने बड़ी भारी मात्रा में खाद्यान्न अमरीका से प्राप्त किया और उस के यहाँ आने के कारण देश के भीतर जो संग्रहीत गल्ला था, जो लोगों ने छिपा कर रख छोड़ा था, वह भी बाजार में आया और इस कारण से देश में इस वक्त गल्ले की बहुतायत दिखाई पड़ रही है। वास्तव में अगर देखा जाये, तो गत वर्ष उस के पहले वर्ष की उपेक्षा उपज कुछ कम हुई। अगर हम अपनी स्थानीय और देश के भीतर की उपज नहीं बढ़ायेंगे, तो तीन-चार साल के बाद जब पी० एल० ४८० के द्वारा यहाँ गल्ला आना रुक जायगा, उस वक्त देश की हालत खराब हो जायगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय में गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार किया जाए और

अभी जो निश्चिन्तता हमारे सामने आ गई है खाद्य के सम्बन्ध में, उसको दूर किया जाये और निरन्तर इस बात का उद्योग किया जाये कि खाद्य-उत्पादन की उन्नति वैसे ही होती रहे, जैसी कि पहले होती थी।

मैं खाद्य मंत्री महोदय को इस बात के लिये बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने ये के प्रतिबन्ध को तोड़ दिया। मध्य प्रदेश में पार साल गेहूँ की जो उपज हुई, उसको बाहर जाने से रोका गया, जिस के परिणामस्वरूप किसानों को बहुत हानि हुई। स्टेट ट्रेडिंग के नाम से जो गल्ला वहाँ किसानों से खरीदा गया, यद्यपि कहने के लिये तो चौदह रुपये मन के भाव उनसे लिया गया, लेकिन वास्तव में उनके पास बहुत कम पहुंचता था। इसके पीछे बहुत से कारण थे, जिनको विस्तार से कहने की जरूरत नहीं है, क्योंकि अब वह मामला खत्म हो गया है। लेकिन एक बात जो सामने रखने की है, वह यह है कि जो भाव किसानों को इस वक्त मिल रहा है, खासकर मध्य प्रदेश के किसानों को, जहाँ पर कि खेती केवल सूखी होती है, जहाँ ड्राई कल्टीवेशन होती है जहाँ पानी का कोई इन्तज़ाम नहीं है, वह पर्याप्त नहीं है और उस विषय में विचार किया जाना चाहिए। कई बार यह चर्चा इस सदन में और कनसल्टेटिव कमेटी में भी आई है। आज भी कई माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बात पर जोर दिया है और मेरी समझ में शायद कृषक समाज का भी यह विचार है कि इस तरह की एक कमेटी बनाई जाये, जो कास्ट फ़ाफ़ प्रोडक्शन की जांच कर के इस बात को निर्धारित करे कि सबसे नीचे की प्राइस क्या हो और यदि गल्ले का भाव उससे कम होता है, तो सरकार किस प्रकार किसान की मदद करे, जो क्वांटम फ़ाफ़ प्राइस सपोर्ट तय करे।

शक्कर के सम्बन्ध में पहले जो यहाँ बहुत शोरो-गुल मचता था, वह समाप्त हो गया है और उस की हालत बहुत सुधर गई है।

भ्राज हमारे देश में शक्कर की कमी नहीं है और उत्पादकों की तरफ से इस बारे में भ्राग्रह किया जा रहा है कि इस के ऊपर से सब कंट्रोल हटा दिये जाये। मेरी समझ में, जैसा कि माननीय खाद्य मंत्री जी का विचार है, भ्रगर शक्कर के ऊपर से कंट्रोल हटा दिया गया, तो उसके भाव गिर जायगे। उस हालत में मिल बाबे गन्ने की कीमत को कम करने के लिए जोर देंगे और भ्रगर उसको मान लिया गया वो इसका मतलब किसानों को नुकसान पहुंचाना होगा। यह भी एक पहलू है जिस पर भ्रापको विचार करना है। भ्रगर कंट्रोल हटा दिया जाएगा तो सारी की सारी शक्कर यहां के कुछ बड़े-बड़े काम करने वाले लोग खरीद करके रखेंगे और वह भूमिगत हो जाएगी और इस तरह से कमी उत्पन्न करके वे ऊंचे भाव से बेचेंगे और बड़ा मुनाफा कमायेंगे। इस तरह से जो उपभोक्ता हैं, उनको कोई लाभ नहीं होगा। इस वास्ते में समझता हूँ कि जो भी कंट्रोल है, वह ठीक है। हां उसमें मुधार की थोड़ी सी मुंजाइश है और वह भ्रवशय होनी चाहिये। पहली बात तो यह है कि इस समय जो प्रदेशों को कोटा दिया जाता है, उसको बढ़ा दिया जाना चाहिये और रेलवे मंत्रालय से भ्राग्रह किया जाना चाहिये कि शक्कर के यातायात के लिए वह कुछ प्राथमिकता दे जिससे एक स्थान से दूसरे स्थान को शक्कर जल्दी पहुंचाई जा सके। भ्राज देखने में भ्राता है कि जहां पर शक्कर का कंट्रोल है वहां एक भ्रादमी को कुछ सेर ही शक्कर दी जाती है और एक दिन में कुछ बोरे ही बेचे जाते हैं। जिन दूकानदारों को इस काम को करने के लिए सरकार ने नियत किया है उनको शक्कर समय पर नहीं मिलती है और इस वजह से कमी-कमी शक्कर की कमी महसूस होने लग जाती है। रेलवे द्वारा शक्कर ले जाने के साधन भी अभी ठीक नहीं हैं। भ्रगर हर एक प्रदेश का कोटा बढ़ा दिया जाता है और जो रेलवे द्वारा शक्कर ले जाने का साधन है, उसमें मुधार कर दिया जाता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जो स्थिति भ्रवर्षा हो गई है, उसमें स निकला जा सकता है

और साथ ही साथ जिस तरह का कंट्रोल अभी चला हुआ है, वह बहुत ही हितकर हो सकता है। इसको हटाया नहीं जाना चाहिये और इसको रहने दिया जाना चाहिये।

14 hrs.

शक्कर के सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह भी कहना है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भाव को जब हम देखें हैं तो पाते हैं कि हमारा जो भाव है बहुत अधिक है और इसको नीचे लाने की प्रावश्यकता है। इसको नीचे या तो मिलों में मुधार करके लाया जा सकता है ताकि उत्पादन में खर्चा कम हो या फिर गन्ने की प्रति एकड़ उपज बढ़ा कर ऐसा किया जा सकता है जिससे कि जो गन्ने के भ्रमी के भाव हैं, वे कुछ नीचे जा सकें लेकिन साथ ही साथ किसान को किसी तरह का नुकसान न हो जैसे पहले हुआ है। जो तरीका भ्रव है उसके जरिये से देखना चाहिये कि जो शक्कर के भाव भ्राज हैं, उनको कैसे नीचे लाया जा सकता है। संसार के जो समुन्नत देश हैं, उनमें शक्कर का पर-कैपिटा खर्चा बहुत अधिक है और हमारे यहां बहुत कम है। यह कुछ तो मंहगाई के कारण है और कुछ भाव ऊंचे होने के कारण। नीचे की श्रेणी के जो गरीब लोग हैं वे इस भाव पर शक्कर खरीद नहीं सकते हैं, उसका उपभोग नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस वास्ते यह बहुत जरूरी है कि बिना किसान को नुकसान पहुंचाए हुए किसी न किसी तरह से शक्कर के भाव नीचे लाये जायें।

खाद्यान्न की भ्राज जो स्थिति है, वह काफी भ्राशाप्रव है। भ्रगर यह स्थिति हमारे प्रयत्नों से भ्राई होती, हमने भ्रपना उत्पादन बढ़ा करके यह निश्चितता प्राप्त की होती तो यह बड़ी प्रसन्नता की बात होती। परन्तु ऐसा नहीं हुआ है। गल्ला बाहर से भारत भ्राया है और उसके साथ ही साथ भीतर जो गल्ला पड़ा हुआ था, वह बाहर निकल भ्राया है, जिन लोगों ने इसको संग्रह करके रखा हुआ था उन्होंने बाहर निकाल दिया है। इस वास्ते इतना बड़ा संग्रह हमें थिकवाई पड़ता है। यह संग्रह उत्पादन का काम न हो करके केवल श्री पाटिल साहब की

[श्री २० सि० किलेदार]

जादू की लकड़ी घुमाने के परिणामस्वरूप हुआ है। जिन लोगों ने गल्ला होड़ करके रखा हुआ था, व्यापारियों ने या किसानों ने, उसको उन्होंने बाहर निकाल दिया है। आज स्थिति अच्छी है। लेकिन अगर हमने ज्यादा उत्पादन नहीं किया तो हो सकता है कि बाद में फिर हमेशा के लिए हमें दूसरों का मुंह देखना पड़े कि कब दूसरे देशों से वह आए और कब हमारा काम चले। आज हालत जरूर अच्छी है लेकिन इसको ऐसे ही बनाये रखने के लिए हमें सतत चेष्टा करनी होगी और यह तभी हो सकता है जब हम अपने उत्पादन को बढ़ायें। इसके दो ही तरीके हैं। एक तो यह है कि जो पड़ती भूमि है, जो अभी कास्त के नीचे नहीं है उसको कास्त के नीचे ला करके, उसको जोत करके गल्ला पैदा किया जाए। लेकिन हमारे पास जो पड़ती जमीन है वह ज्यादा मात्रा में नहीं है और जो थोड़ी बहुत है वह भी ऐसी नहीं है कि जिसके ऊपर बहुत ज्यादा खर्च करने के बावजूद भी बहुत ज्यादा उपज हो सके। दूसरा तरीका यह है और इसी में हमारा कल्याण है कि जो अभी पैदावार पर एकड़ हो रही है, उसमें बढ़ोतरी की जाए। अगर बारीकी से देखा जाए तो पता चलेगा कि हमारे देश में जो भीसत उपज है वह बहुत ही कम है। चार सौ या पांच सौ पाउंड के करीब मध्य प्रदेश में वह है। उत्तर प्रदेश में ज्यादा हो सकती है। मध्य प्रदेश में चूंकि सूखी खेती होती है, इस वास्ते वहां बहुत कम भीसत है। अगर एक बार भी हम उसमें पानी दे दें तो उपज बहुत बढ़ सकती है। मध्य प्रदेश में इसका प्रयोग हुआ है और उससे पता चला है कि इस में एक सौ फीसदी की वृद्धि हो सकती है, चार सौ पाउंड से छठ सौ तक पैदावार जा सकती है। अगर बरत पर पानी दिया जाता है, साध बगेरू प्रचुर मात्रा में दी जाती है तो तीन गुना तक उत्पादन में वृद्धि हो सकती है। उत्पादन बढ़ कर २ हजार पाउंड तक पहुंच सकता है। पानी का होना बहुत जरूरी है। कमी कमी कहा जाता है कुछ बीजों की तरफ से, और एक वैम्पलेट में

मैंने पढ़ा भी था कि पानी की अपेक्षा फर्टिलाइजर का इस्तेमाल करना कुछ सस्ता पड़ेगा और इस संकट के काल में फर्टिलाइजर का उपयोग ज्यादा किया जाना चाहिये। परन्तु मुझे मालूम पड़ता है कि यह बात गलत है। फर्टिलाइजर का उपयोग तभी ज्यादा फायदेमंद हो सकता है जब कि उसके लिए भरपूर पानी हो। अगर पानी नहीं होगा तो फर्टिलाइजर से अक्सर नुकसान होने का डर बना रहेगा। उससे दाना पतला पड़ जाता है और जल्दी सूख जाता है।

पानी के जो माघन हैं, बड़ी और मध्यम सिंचाई की योजनायें, उनके अलावा छोटी सिंचाई योजनायें, नल कूप और कुएं भी इस्तेमाल किए जा सकते हैं और ये जल्दी लाभ पहुंचा सकते हैं। इनके लिए सरकार को बड़ी मात्रा में तकावी देनी चाहिये और लोगों को इनको बनाने का प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये। जितनी अधिक मात्रा में पानी दिया जाएगा उतनी अधिक मात्रा में खेती की पैदावार बढ़ेगी। जितना अधिक उत्पादन होगा उतनी ही निश्चितता की स्थिति हमारे देश में उत्पन्न होगी।

एक बात जिसकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है, मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। सभी यह कहते हैं कि अन्न उत्पन्न करने के लिए और अच्छी फसल उत्पन्न करने के लिए तीन, चार बीजों की आवश्यकता है। इसके लिए अच्छा खेत, अच्छा बीज, अच्छी बाढ़ और पानी की आवश्यकता है। जितनी अधिक मात्रा में पानी दिया जाएगा उतनी ही अच्छी उपज होगी। समय पर अगर बीनी हो तो निश्चित रूप से फसल अच्छी हो सकती है। अभी तक हमने भौतिक साधनों के ऊपर ही विचार किया है, इस बात का विचार नहीं किया है कि इस सब को जो करने वाला है, जो किसान है, उसका हित किसमें है, वह क्या चाहता

है। हम भ्राज खेत के ऊपर ध्यान देते हैं, किसान के ऊपर ध्यान नहीं दे रहे हैं। वह भी भ्राखिर एक प्राणी है और वह भी कुछ भ्राराम चाहता है। वह भी चाहता है कि जो फसल वह पैदा करे, उसका लाभ उसे मिले, उसके बाल-बच्चे भ्राराम से रहें। पाटिल सहिब ने जब पद-ग्रहण किया, था तो भ्रारम्भ में ही एक पालिसी स्टेटमेंट दिया था जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि उनका यह उद्योग रहेगा कि किसानों को उचित कीमत मिले। भ्रगर भ्राप चाहते हैं कि उसको उचित कीमत मिले तो उसके लिए यह जरूरी है कि जो खर्चा उसका बैठता है, उस पर भी विचार किया जाए। भ्रगर उसको थोड़ा मुनाफा मिलता है तो वह अपने बाल-बच्चों को पढ़ा सकेगा, अपने परिवार के लिए कपड़े लते का इतिजाम कर सकेगा, भ्राराम का जीवन व्यतीत कर सकेगा। भ्राज की जो कीमतें हैं उनके भीतर कहां तक इन सब बातों की गुंजाइश है, इसका भ्रंदाचा भ्राप खुद लगा सकते हैं। बार-बार इस बात पर जोर दिया गया है कि ऐसी कमेटी बनाई जाए जो यह पता लगाये कि भ्राखिरकार गल्ला पैदा करने में या खाद्यान्न भ्रंदा कने में कितना खर्चा बैठता है। जब तक इस तरह की कमेटी के जरिे इस बात का निर्णय नहीं होगा, तब तक भ्राप नीचे की कीमत भी मुकर्रर नहीं कर सकेंगे

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य भ्रब खतम करें।

श्री २० सि० किलेवार : दो साल में पहली बार बोल रहा हूं। पांच मिनट तो और हीजिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : बहुत भ्रच्छा।

श्री २० सि० किलेवार : इसके लिए एक कमेटी की बहुत जरूरत है। बार-बार भ्राप इस बात का जिक्र करते हैं, फिर भी मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि अधिकारीगण ऊपर के जो हैं, वे क्यों इसका वि०ष करते हैं। इसको बना देने मात्र से ही किसान को भ्राप

कुछ देने वाले नहीं हैं। लेकिन मालूम पड़ता है कि किसान की जो हालत है, उसको भ्राप छिपे ही रहने देना चाहते हैं, उसको बाहर भ्राने देना नहीं चाहते क्योंकि भ्राप समझते हैं कि भ्रगर वह बाहर भ्राएगी तो ज्माली हालत बदल जाएगी।

मैंने देखा है कि जो भ्रापके सीड फार्म हैं, जो डेमांस्ट्रेशन फार्म हैं, एक्सपेरिमेंटल फार्म को भ्राप लीजिए, कोई भी प्राफिट पर नहीं चल रहा है। मध्य प्रदेश की बात मैं जानता हूं वहां कोई भी फार्म ऐसा नहीं है जिसमें मुनाफा होता हो और करीब-करीब हर एक में नुकसान हो रहा है। बड़ी-बड़ी रकमें नुकसान में जाती हैं। सरकार के पास इतने साधन हैं, इतना पैसा है और एग्ज एरिया एक फार्म का २०० एकड़ के करीब या इससे कुछ ज्यादा बैठता है और इतना होते हुए भी वहां टोटा बैठता है। जब ऐसी बात है तो जो छोटे किसान हैं, उनको कैसे मुनाफा होगा, कैसे फायदा होगा। ऐसा मालूम होता है कि इस सारे मामले पर पर्दा डाला जा रहा है। लेकिन मेरी प्रार्थना है कि पर्दा डालने से या दबाने से जो यह भ्राज भीतर जल रही है यह नहीं दबायी जा सकती। वह बीज तो सामने भ्राएगी और भ्रब समय भ्रा गया है कि उसको सामने भ्राने दिया जाए। भ्रगर भ्राप उसको दबा कर रखेंगे तो उममें कोई लाभ नहीं होने वाला है।

यहां पर उस दिन हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि हमने तीसरी प्लान के लिए टैक्स लगाए हैं और क्योंकि वह जनता का प्लान है इसलिए उसके लिए पैसा भी जनता से ही भ्राना चाहिए। इस देश की जनता में किसानों की संख्या ही सबसे ज्यादा है इसलिए निश्चित रूप से जो टैक्स लगाए गए हैं उनका सबसे ज्यादा भार किसानों पर ही पड़ेगा। ठीक है। उसके लिए मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता। लेकिन जब योजना से भ्रायदनी होती है तो वह किसानों तक नहीं पहुंच पाती, जो वेदान्त इनकम बढ़ती है प्लान के जरिए वह ऊपर

[श्री १० सि० किलेदार]

ही रह जाती है। कुछ दिन पहिले चर्चा हुई थी कि एक कमेटी बनायी जाएगी जो यह जांच करेगी कि जो नेशनल इनकम हुई है वह अगर किसान और मजदूर के पास नहीं पहुंची तो किसके पास रह गयी। पता नहीं उस कमेटी ने क्या किया लेकिन उस नेशनल इनकम में से किसान को कुछ फायदा नहीं मिला है।

जिन चीजों की हमको गल्ला पैदा करने के लिए जरूरत होती है उन पर आपने टक्स लगा दिया है जैसे डीजल आइल है, पानी है वगैरह मशिनरी है। आप इंडस्ट्री को जिस तरह से सस्ता बिजली देते हैं वैसे एग्रीकल्चर को नहीं देते। हमको सस्ती बिजली मिलनी चाहिए जैसे कि इंडस्ट्री को मिलती है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि कृषि को उद्योग क्यों नहीं माना जाता जब कि यह देश का सबसे बड़ा उद्योग है और जैसा कि श्री पाटिल साहब ने बतलाया इसका टर्नओवर ५००० करोड़ का है जो कि किसी भी उद्योग से ज्यादा है। लेकिन इसके बारे में जो दूरी तरह की निगाह रहती है यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। शायद इसका यही कारण है कि किसान संगठित नहीं हैं और उसका संगठन जल्दी नहीं हो सकता इसलिए उसकी आवाज आपके पास तक नहीं पहुंच पाती। अब समय आ गया है कि हमको विचार करना चाहिए और यह देखना चाहिए अगर किसान ज्यादा पैदा नहीं करेगा तो देश के लोगों को आप कहां तक बाहर से मंगा मंगा कर खिलायेंगे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य चरम करें।

श्री १००० नं० शर्मा : उच्च किसानों की आवाज हमारे कानों तक पहुंचा रहे हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : और भी हैं जो पहुंचायेंगे।

श्री १० सि० किलेदार : अगर आप ज्यादा समय नहीं दे रहे हैं तो मैं आग्रह नहीं

करता। लेकिन जो हमारे यहां गल्ला बाहर भेजने की छूट दे दी गयी है इसके सम्बन्ध में मुझे केवल एक शब्द कहना है। यह काम स्टेट ट्रेडिंग द्वारा होता है। लेकिन मेरे राज्य में इस स्टेट ट्रेडिंग से किसान को लाभ नहीं हुआ। उसे उल्टा नुकसान हुआ है। अगर यह धन्धा जो नारमल ट्रेड चैनल्स हैं उनमें रहे तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। एक समय था जब कि लोग चार आने बोरे के मुनाफे से घाटा कर लेते थे। लेकिन बीच में आर्थिक स्थिति बिगड़ जाने के कारण काला बाजार आ गया और ये लोग काले बाजार में धन्धा करने लगे। लेकिन इसके लिए उनको दोष नहीं दिया जा सकता। अगर हम अब काले बाजार को दूर करके केवल सफेद बाजार को ही रहन दें तो यह लोग फिर थोड़े मुनाफे पर काम करने लगेंगे। जिस काम को ये लोग चार आने के मुनाफे पर कर सकते हैं उसको करने के लिए अगर सरकारी अफसर जाएगा तो दो रुपए लगेंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि स्टेट ट्रेडिंग करने से पहले इस बात पर थोड़ा सा विचार कर लिया जाए कि इसमें कितना किसान का फायदा है और कितना सरकार का फायदा होगा। केवल एक स्लोगन उठाने से कोई लाभ नहीं होगा।

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when I see the cut motions I find that there is one cut motion in the name of Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. He wants to check the rise in the price of foodgrains. Well, naturally, people living in urban areas would always like it. But before the cut is put, it is necessary to examine whether the present prices are economic or are unreasonable.

So there are two tests. One test is the parity of prices and the other test is the cost of production. I have never found any other test except these two. Let us examine whether the present prices deserve to be reduced.

I will take up the first test—the parity of prices. Sir, in 1951 taking

the base 1950 at 100, the price index of rice was 104 and in January 1961 it was 99—that is about five points less. In the case of wheat it was 96 in 1951 and in January 1961 it was 91.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): You are giving the wholesale price index figures?

[SHRI JAGANATHA RAO in the Chair.]

Shri P. R. Patel: These are the wholesale price index figures. I will also tell you what the farmers got. If you take up the case of jowar, bajra, barley, maize and ragi, you will find that only in the case of jowar it was 95 in 1951 and in January 1961 it was 114. So there is an increase in the case of jawar. Therefore if there is any increase, it is only in the case of foodstuffs consumed by poor people, and if there is any decrease in prices it is in the case of prices of foodstuff consumed mostly by urban people. Yet, Sir, the uproar is that the prices should be reduced.

Sir, let us see the parity. In 1951, in the case of other commodities the index of prices was 119.9 and in the case of all food articles together it was 113.7. In January 1961, all commodities combined it was 125.6 and food articles combined it was 116.3—and this 116.3 is because of the prices of jowar, bajra, barley, maize and ragi. So there is decrease in the prices of rice and wheat.

Now, if we apply the first test, what should be the prices of rice and wheat? You will be pleased to see that there is an increase of price of about 25 per cent in all commodities. Therefore, if you apply that test, then the prices of wheat and rice require to be increased.

Then, we are importing wheat under PL 480. I think it will adversely affect the agriculturist, the hon. Minister is the Minister of Agricul-

ture and Food. He has to feed the country and remove the scarcity in the country. I think he has done the best in the interests of the country. But I must at the same time say that if he does not look to the interests of the agriculturists, perhaps, they will be hard hit. I would suggest that the price of imported wheat should be increased a little bit or the agriculturists must be given some subsidies in the prices of wheat and rice. If the price of wheat and rice is increased I would suggest that subsidy be given only to the middle-class and low-income groups so that they might get these substantial things at low prices. If at all the question of the agriculturists is to be solved, I am of the opinion that, as in America, the Government should subsidise the agriculturist by giving a subsidy for the production of wheat and rice. That way we can solve the problem.

Shri D. C. Sharma: What should be the extent of the subsidy?

Shri P. R. Patel: Well, I will say that also. If we see the increase in prices, according to the Reserve Bank of India Bulletin of August 1960 the prices of cotton manufactures have increased to 130 if we take 100 as the base in 1952-53. In the case of *gur*, the figure is 150, for sugar 127, iron and steel manufactures 148, timber 140 and oil cakes 139. So, there is increase in the case of all those things that are required by the agriculturists and that increase is 30 or more. Now the poor agriculturist is required to sell his wheat and rice at lower prices and he is asked to buy his requirements at higher prices. Then what would be the condition of the rural economy?

We do not see that the agriculturists get their requirements at control or fixed prices. I know that they are getting corrugated iron sheets by paying Rs. 36 per *kuicha* maund or something more. For iron also they have

[Shri P. R. Patel]

to pay more. So, for their requirements they have to pay more and their produce we take away, not by control; nor by any law, but by importing wheat in large quantities so that they may be forced to sell it at a lower price. I think this requires some consideration.

Then I will come to the cost of production. Here I will refer only to the cost of production of the mechanised farm at Suratgarh. The per acre cost of production there in 1956-57 was Rs. 183.1 and the income was Rs. 186.6. At that time all the acreage was not put under cultivation

In 1958-59 the cost of production was Rs 145.8 per acre and the income was Rs. 184.6. In 1959-60, when 26,480 acres were under cultivation, the cost of production per acre came to Rs. 121.6 and the income per acre came to Rs. 113.3 or so. Looking at these figures, if we bring all the land under mechanised cultivation, what would be the position? When we have a mechanical farm and everything is mechanised, less of labour is required yet the profit is negligible. I do not think this farm or any other farm will pay us at any time more than six per cent profit on the investment. And this we achieve when we have invested Rs. 227 lakhs in this farm as capital investment. If these big farms do not pay well, what about the small farms?

I will give the figures of small farms also. Shri N. S. Randhawa has written a very interesting article in the Government monthly, *Agricultural Situation in India*, and he has given some figures. These figures are not his own but those obtained as a result of the survey conducted by the Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Ministry of Food and Agriculture, in collaboration with the Research Programmes Committee on Planning Commission. So, this was an official investigation, and this shows that for a farm up to 5 acres the cost of production per acre is

Rs. 239.9 and the income is Rs. 200.5. So there is loss. In a farm with 5 to 10 acres, the expenditure per acre is Rs 202.7 whereas the income is Rs. 185.7. For a farm with 10 to 20 acres the expenditure is Rs 180.2 and the income is Rs. 172.9. For a farm with 20 to 50 acres the expenditure is Rs. 154.5 and the income is Rs. 154.4. Sir, agriculturists having a farm of 50 acres do not make any profit; they make both ends meet according to the present prices. In this case also, the labour put in by the agriculturist and his family members is not considered. If you consider that also, it would be a losing proposition.

Now, this being the position, if anybody in the country asks "what about the reduction of prices?", I would say that person is unaware of the agricultural economy. I would request the hon. Minister to consider this aspect and give farmers proper, economic and reasonable prices. If there is any price difference for cotton cloth, that matter is referred to the Tariff Commission. If there is any difference between the price demanded and offered for iron and steel, that matter is referred to the Tariff Commission. If there is any quarrel over the wages of the employees, that is referred to some commission. So far as the prices of agricultural products are concerned, even though a promise was given on the floor of the House by the hon. Minister, that matter is not referred to a commission, and I would say that, with all his sympathy for them, he is not able to implement the promise that he has given on the floor of the House.

That is because of the Planning Commission. With due respect for the intelligence of the people in the Planning Commission, I must say that they know nothing of agriculture and they have little knowledge of rural economy.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Then, please include the hon. Minister in the Planning Commission.

Shri P. R. Patel: Because of that even though we spent money on our two Plans, they have not been so profitable to the rural part of the country, and specially to the agriculturists. I do not know why my hon. friend there speaks out. If there is any question for the labour's wages, bonus, this or that, he jumps out, but for the agriculturists he has to say against them. . . . (*Interruption*).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is a good suggestion which should be accepted. . . . (*Interruption*).

Shri P. R. Patel: I appeal to the agriculturists of the country not to vote for those who are against the interests of the agriculturists in the coming elections.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: And also for those who change their colours.

Shri P. R. Patel: Lastly my Communist friend wanted that cows should be slaughtered, that they are useless and that we have not got sufficient fodder also.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): I only gave my support to Shri Krishnappa.

Shri P. R. Patel: I do not think that my good friend and his Party will ever come in power in this country, but if they come in power they will say that there are useless, old, exhausted people who are not working usefully and that there is shortage of food so why they should not be slaughtered.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: There is a difference between human-beings and animals.

Shri P. R. Patel: I hope my hon. friend will not speak these things when he goes home

Shri V. P. Nayar: Does he know that quite a number of persons in India eat beef in spite of him?

Shri Balraj Madhok (New Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, food is the most important need of our people and agriculture is the biggest industry of our country. It is, therefore, important that steps should be taken to improve this industry and to improve the food position. But, unfortunately, even though two Plans have gone and so much hullabaloo is made about increasing the food production, the fact remains that our food production is not going up to the desired extent. The figures that have been given in Food Ministry's report shows that in 1958-59, that is, year before last while the food production was 75 million tons, in the year under review i.e., 1959.60 it is only 71 million tons. It can be said, as it has been said in the report, that the production has gone down because of the vagaries of nature and because the rains failed. But when production goes up, they say, "It is because of our efforts and our Plans". Actually the fact remains that in our country the vagaries of nature will always play their part in the matter of food production. The question is: What positive steps have been taken by the Government and with what effect to counteract the vagaries of nature and to increase production

It is true that in the First Five-Year Plan a lot of money was spent on agriculture, on paper at least, and the same has been done in the Second Plan too. But what has been the result? I beg to submit that the outcome of all that expenditure and of all that effort has not been commensurate with the needs of the country or with the money spent. If the present approach continues in future too, they will have no result. Actually, there has been more stress on show-pieces rather than on the actual needs of the country. For example, a great amount of money has been spent on irrigation works. There are so many big dams. But then what has been the result. The water from the Bhakra Dam has, of course, irrigated certain areas, but then there are big

[Shri Balraj Madhok]

areas in Punjab and Rajasthan which are still not getting any water. There is politics in the distribution of water also. In the Gurgaon and Rohtak districts, which are the backward districts of Punjab, there is no water. The Bhakra water is also going to areas which have already enough water.

Then there is the question of Rajasthan. The Chairman of the Water Commission, Shri Kanwar Sain, has said that Rajasthan will be a new State, that a new heaven will be born in Rajasthan when Rajasthan Canal comes into operation. But the question is whether it will ever come into operation. The available surplus water has been given away to Pakistan and for ten years more there will not be enough water for us to give to Rajasthan. We expected that the hon. Food Minister should have protested to the hon. Prime Minister for having signed that Canal Water Treaty which almost bartered away Indian interests to Pakistan for the wishful friendship of Pakistan which is never going to come. We have bartered away our own interests to starve our own lands which so badly need water from Indian rivers.

Then, whatever water we have got is not properly utilised. I know fully well that in Jammu and Kashmir State, a lot of money has been spent. I have been living in that State. I know that that State was never deficit in rice. In Kashmir Valley there is no dearth of water. There is not much need for irrigation works there. But all the money is being spent there. In Jammu area which is the Kandi area, which needs water and where small irrigation schemes can increase production, no attention is being paid.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: May I correct the hon. Member as far as the Kandi area is concerned? I come from that area and I know that the Kathua feeder canal is coming up very nicely

and we are very happy and proud about it.

Shri Balraj Madhok: For the last five years they are digging up that canal and are telling the people of Jammu that the canal is being built, but it has not been built so far. The fact remains that in the Jammu and Kashmir State they have simply discriminated against the Jammu people even though the rivers Chenab, Jhelum and Ravi are there. If small irrigation schemes are taken up there, all that land can be irrigated and production can be increased. What we need actually is more stress on small irrigation schemes. It is only through these schemes that production can be increased. Of course, it is said in the report that more stress is being laid on them and more money is being given for those schemes, but I think that is not enough. We can actually scrap some of these big schemes and divert that money to small schemes which can be prepared in six months time and whose result can be found out quickly.

For the increase in the production of food we have to depend actually on the cultivator and on the means that are available to him. It is no use saying that we should mechanise agriculture. Mechanisation of agriculture is not possible in this country. We have not enough land. Most people have not got more than five or ten acres of land. These tractors cannot be used. Therefore what is more important is that we should try to improve our agriculture through the implements that are available to the common man. If that is done, if the common cultivator is enthused and if he is properly educated, he can do wonders. We have the case of Punjab. When partition took place, Punjab was a deficit State. But within ten years it has become a surplus State, not because there have been more tractors or more irrigation plans but because the cultivator has put in more labour because he has

been enthused. If this can be done elsewhere also, things can be improved.

I have travelled widely in eastern U.P. and Bihar. I found people carrying on irrigation through *dhenkali*. The water level there is not very low and Persian wheels and such other means can easily be introduced. But they are not being introduced. If money can be given to them, it can be given to them as loans and that way production can be increased. The same is true of implements.

Then there is the question of cattle wealth. If we want better production, we should have better ploughing. In Punjab there is a well known saying:

दब के बाहु

रज के खा?

It means that you plough deep and you will have better production. But you can have deep ploughing only if you have better cattle. But where are the cattle? They are being destroyed in this country.

Some hon. Communist friends here say that we should kill cows and our friends on the other side are opposing them. But I ask Congress Members: What are they doing to save the cow? They protest against the Communist Members. We have nothing to blame the Communist Members. They stand for that. But I ask Congress Members what they are doing. They protest when the Communist members say that cows should be killed, but what have they done to stop cow killing in the country? You have put cow protection in the Directive Principle in the Constitution. You say that Gandhiji said that cow killing should be stopped. But cow killing is going on; rather, it has increased. I say cows are being killed and in large numbers than ever before. It is not the old cows that are being killed but it is the

young and better type of cows that are being killed because they are killed for beef. It is only young cows which are slaughtered.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): It is Shri V. P. Nayar's food.

Shri Balraj Madhok: It is not his food; it is playing to the gallery. Therefore I say that animal husbandry is good but animal husbandry has to be improved not for meat. Meat is not the staple food of our country. It will never become the staple food of this country. The staple food of this country is cereals, wheat and rice. We can improve fisheries. We can improve cattle. But the stress has to be laid mainly on agriculture, mainly on food.

Then they say that old cows are a burden. There are facts to prove that they are not a burden. Cow dung and other material that comes out of them more than compensate for the money or the fodder that they take. To say that there are more animals in this country is also wrong. I have with me comparative figures which show that in other countries, for example, in Denmark, Argentine and Australia, they have more cattle per square mile and per 100 people than we have in our country. We should disabuse our minds that we have more cattle. Actually, we do not have more cattle. Only the quality of our cattle is poor. We can and should improve the quality with little effort. In the report it is said that *gosadans* have been opened. But what is the condition of these *gosadans*? For example, there is a *gosadan* near Ludhiana. Only two months back hundreds of cows died there simply because they could not stand the winter. There was no shelter for them; there was no fodder for them. What is the fun of opening such *gosadans*? If you open *gosadans* you should pay proper attention to the cattle there. Simply to say on paper that we have opened this, we have opened that is of no use.

[Shri Balraj Madhok]

Besides food production and animal husbandry, there is one important question. That is vanaspati. The report says that vanaspati production has gone up from 3:17 lakh tons to 3.33 lakh tons. Government takes pride in this. It is not a matter for pride; it is a matter for shame. We are trying to encourage a thing which is harmful, according to medical men. In this House there was a discussion on this subject and many Congressmen opposed it. Still production of vanaspati is being encouraged. It was said that a committee has been appointed which is holding meetings, and research is going on, to find a suitable colour for vanaspati. But so far they have not found out a colour. There are as many as fourteen national laboratories in India; there are so many scientists and a large amount of money is being spent on research. But so far none of our scientists and none of our laboratories has been able to find a colour for vanaspati. It is simply a matter of shame for the country. The actual fact of the matter is that they have no will for it; they do not want to find a colour for it, because vanaspati is an industry of the big people. They make money and some other people also share in it. Because of this big money, no colour has been found out for vanaspati. I say that it should be the first duty of the Government to find a colour for vanaspati, because vanaspati is being mixed with ghee and large scale adulteration is going on, as a result of which people's health is being spoiled.

Referring to the welfare of government servants, this report says that welfare officers have been appointed. Actually, the condition of the government employees is very bad. In Delhi there are a large number of employees in the Food Department. They live in Sevanagar, Pusa Institute and other colonies. I would request the hon. Minister to visit these areas to find out for himself how these people live. You have built houses for the Class IV em-

ployees. They are just like hovels. There is only one room and a kitchen. In these quarters there is no ventilation, no water, no electricity. You charge very high rent from them. This is not the way of welfare. Welfare is not meant only for those who have cars, or reside in bungalows. If you really believe in the welfare of your employees, you should look to the welfare of the small man, the class IV servants and lower division clerks particularly. It is they whose welfare should be looked after.

In New Delhi and near-about areas, there are so many Class IV employees' colonies. But the quarters in them are neither electrified nor provided with protected water supply. What is the reason? We are getting so much electricity from Bhakra and many houses are being electrified. But the Class IV government employees have not got electricity so far; they have not got water-supply; they have no separate latrines in their quarters. This is something which is very bad. If you really believe in welfare, you should look to the welfare of these people.

Then, Sir, this report makes a reference to the Rudrapur University.

Shri Ram Krishan Gupta (Mahendragarh): How do these come in this debate?

Shri Balraj Madhok: It is all given in this report.

It has been said that we have opened a University at Rudrapur. It is good that colleges and universities are being opened. But what is the kind of training that is being given? I challenge any inspector, or agricultural graduate coming out of that university to take a piece of land, develop it and produce more out of it. He cannot do it. You are opening farms wherein you employ agricultural graduates. There they have the means, they have fertilisers, they

have implements, which are not available to the common man. Because of these advantages which are not available to the common man, they are able to get increased production.

Shri C. D. Pande: May I correct the hon. Member, Sir? Rudrapur University is in my constituency. It has been working only for the last four months. The system there is that the student will cultivate the land and he will be paid out of the earnings of the land. Therefore it is not correct to say that he has not learned enough. Within four months nobody can learn much.

Shri Balraj Madhok: I am glad that Rudrapur University has been opened; so many colleges have been opened and all sorts of training is given. What I say is that that training is not practical. The fact is that these agricultural graduates work with implements which are not available to the common man. If you want modern knowledge to be imparted to the common man you should open small model farms where the seeds, the manure and the implements that would be available to the common man are used. The agricultural graduates and scientists should be able to demonstrate that with these they will be able to produce more. Then only these farms can serve as a model for the common man. But if you use such seeds, such implements and such manures as are not available to the common cultivator, these farms cannot be model for them. Then these farms will be only a waste of money and nothing else. So many of these farms have been opened. They are not doing much and, as my friend Shri Patel said, the cost of production there is not such as can be an encouragement for food production in the country.

Then in regard to cash crops I wish to say something. Much of the land is being diverted to cash crops. You cannot avoid it, because they bring money. Thus on one side the best

land is being diverted to cash crops, and on the other side food production cannot be increased unless you bring more land into cultivation. So there is a lop-sided development. There must be some kind of co-ordination in this respect. Everybody feels that food is important and that we should not depend on imports. So there must be co-ordination to see that all the best land is not diverted to cash crops. I happened to go to South India, on the Tungabhadra side, and I found that all the irrigated area was under sugarcane. When I asked them the reason for this they said "Because it bring more money". That is all right. But if you go on growing sugarcane and other cash crops in all the lands and do not have food, naturally we will have to depend on imports. For any country to depend wholly on imports for its food is not good. And particularly for a country like India which is faced with foreign danger, from China and Pakistan. If we depend on imports, a time may come when imports may not be possible. A war may come, something else may happen. It is therefore important that we should become self-sufficient in food as early as possible. And we can become self-sufficient only if the wholesale diversion of good land to cash crops is stopped.

In cash crops we are producing sugar. And we have been told that there has been an increase in sugar production. What is the result? Stocks are accumulating. We are giving some subsidy or rebate to the factories. So the factories are gaining. We are giving licence to some traders. Without licence there can be no trade in sugar. But these licences are given to the favourites of the ruling party and they are making money. The people who were formerly living on the sugar trade are deprived of their work. Sugar prices in India are very high and therefore surplus sugar cannot be easily exported. For purposes of export the prices should be competitive. But that is not the position

[Shri Balraj Madhok]

now. It is therefore no use keeping big stocks. Therefore, I would recommend to the hon. Minister to see if this kind of control cannot be removed and free trade allowed. If there is free trade many people can make use of it. At present they are not able to do so even though there is enough of sugar in the country.

I hope that the few observations that I have made will be taken note of and that something will be done about them.

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: (Kumbakonam): The good harvests of the current season should not create in us apathy towards the problems of agriculture. We must remember what happened in 1954. The balance of food production and consumption is a very delicate one. A slight tilt on one side, as for example a ten per cent deficit, is enough to create a crisis in supply. What is equally important is that a surplus of ten per cent on the other side is likely to create a crisis of prices. In each case it is the quantity that matters. Actually the estimate is about 76 million and odd tons, and ten per cent of that will be nearly 7 million and odd tons. We have to remember that it is not the percentage that matters but the quantity that is important. Therefore, considering that our production is in the neighbourhood of 76 million tons, a ten per cent imbalance would mean a little more than 7 million tons. It has to be borne in mind that it is a large quantity which may cause a real tilting of the balance.

Having said that I wish to emphasise that the harvests of the present season which mean near-surplus are not completely the result of permanent improvements of production techniques. What I mean is that for this we cannot say that the Ministry has been completely responsible, though they deserve our congratulations. It has to be borne in mind that this is also due to some extent to the absence of floods and

droughts in some areas. The need, therefore, for treating the problems of agricultural production as of primary importance in a country like India exists today as actually as ever before. The problems of agriculture have, therefore, to be normalised and pegged to fit into a daily economic pattern—to use the usual technical word, a diurnal pattern—and should not be made to alternate between one or the other crisis, that is, the crisis of surplus that threatens prices and the crisis of deficit that threatens supply.

I would submit that it is therefore very important that a permanent nexus has to be established on a proper basis insofar as production, storage, import and sales are concerned. I wish to emphasise that these are the main heads to be borne in mind.

I wish also to point out that our production has to be made scientific. I congratulate the Ministry, because every day improvements are being made in that direction. In that connection we have to remember that there must be a field-to-field soil survey, and analyses while establishing the basis of fertiliser supply. We must have many touring technical teams to tour the countryside for this purpose. There is no doubt that our failure to correlate the input-output ratio results in a wasteful use, especially when we are reaching higher levels of production, and the ratio is adverse to output at each successive level. The improvements in production should be concentrated on multi-favourable areas.

I am aware that Agriculture is a State subject. Still I wish to make these observations, and with your leave, at the end of the remarks that I shall make within the time allotted to me, I hope to suggest how there can be a co-ordination between the Union and the States in this respect.

So far as storages are concerned I wish to say something, because to me

it is rather important. Storages should be decentralised. The creation of huge urban storages in a hot, tropical and humid area like ours is just to invite loss. There must be a village storage system, and this should be promoted and linked up with a decentralised credit structure. Co-operative agencies are suitable for production credit; but it may also be noted that joint stock banks are also suitable for sale-storage credit. Many of these banks have to be encouraged to build storage godowns in rural areas not only for their own benefit, but also to help in the national reconstruction.

I now come to the buying and selling by Government and by governmental agencies. The storage referred to by me just now should be linked to a policy of optional Government-buying and selling at stated levels of prices. To strive for and establish stability of prices is much more important to be taken note of than the high price. I find the hon. Minister, Shri Krishnappa, remarking that he thought I was going to say the opposite. The price levels should be announced for at least two or three successive seasons. What I have stated so far will enable us to establish a normal production-cum-storage-cum-sale nexus which should be the economic pattern of agriculture in a vast country like ours with a vast population.

The Ministry of Agriculture is at the moment presided over by an energetic Minister who is a man of ideas also. It behoves the Minister and the Government to see to it that there is a supervisory arm in the various regions. Today we do not have much of this supervision. There is an appreciation that the various Advisers of the Planning Commission—I find reference has been made to them—are like radio “antenne”, that is functioning and projecting from Delhi. I do not know whether they sufficiently tour the regions of production. They appear to check the

schemes and the money spent at administrative and governmental level and are concerned mainly with the compilation of statistical data and figures. That is not sufficient. The Agriculture Ministry should have Advisers region-wise. There must be one Adviser for wheat, one for rice. I would suggest that a line may be drawn from Bombay to Calcutta. The area south of that can be treated as the rice area, and the area north of the Bombay-Calcutta line can be taken as the wheat area. The duty of these Advisers should be not only to watch and tour as Advisers but also to see to it that the various plans are progressed on the fields. Reference has actually been made to the actual fields not being taken much into account. I do not think it is correct. We have taken care about that. These Advisers will also act as the necessary liaison between the Centre and the States so far as the executive end is concerned.

I wish to refer in this connection to the Aduthurai package scheme in Tanjore District of Madras State. I think many Members have been there. It is a very good example of co-ordinated effort.

May I, in passing, refer to the increase in the acreage so far as agriculture is concerned? I am happy to note that we are seeking to achieve increased area, from a net irrigated area of 70 million acres at the end of the Second Plan to about 90 million acres at the end of the Third Plan. It is also proposed to cover about 40 million acres by dry farming technique. In unirrigated areas large-scale soil conservation measures are to be taken. I believe the tentative target here is about 13 million acres.

Having said that, I wish to refer to the population problem. There is no doubt that this is one of the greatest problems facing the country today. In some States like Kerala, West

[Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman]

Bengal, U.P. and Bihar the population increase appears to have outstripped the resources of food production. With the present rate of increase in population, more and more States are likely to join the ranks of the over-populated areas.

The production of foodgrains in 1947-48, the first year after the advent of independence, was only 52 million tons. This increased to 65.8 million tons in 1955-56. It is generally agreed that the population is increasing at the rate of 2 per cent per annum. So by 1965-66 it will be about 480 millions. Then the requirements of that population in 1965-66, based on a per capita computation will be 15 ounces of cereals and 3 ounces of pulses per day. Calculated at that rate we will have to produce about 100 million tons. We are now reaching about 80 million tons, and there is likely to be a shortfall. I have no doubt that the Ministry will make efforts to catch up with the population situation.

Having said that, I will say one or two words about the irrigation schemes, minor irrigation schemes, which are progressing well. I am glad to see on page 2 of the Summary given by the Ministry the following:

"To accelerate the tempo of minor irrigation schemes, the provision for minor irrigation in 1960-61 was raised from Rs. 21.94 crores to Rs. 27.94 crores during the year."

And I find during the Second Plan period the various GMF schemes will go up to Rs. 100 crores and there is a target of acreage of 9 million additional acres under minor irrigation schemes. I also find that 2 lakhs new open wells are being opened and 3,000 filter-point tubewells are expected to be constructed, as well as 40,000 open wells to be bored or deepened. This is all to the good. But the Ministry also must see to it that many of the tanks which get silted up, especially

in South India, are taken up for repairs. I know that most of the States are attending to it, but if there is a co-ordinated effort and a drive from the Centre it will be better so far as silting of tanks and canals is concerned. This is very important.

Some reference has been made to the import of foodgrains under PL 480 from America. We are getting 16 million metric tons of wheat and 1 million metric tons of rice over the period from 1960 to 1964. While this is very useful to us, we certainly have to think of the days when we will not have this sort of help from abroad, and in this connection I will say this with regard to balanced diet, and that is rather important. I find that attempts are being made to educate people so far as diet is concerned. But getting some sort of a professional man, a pedantic person, to go and ask people who eat rice to take to ragi or wheat will only annoy them. Then even those who do not eat rice will start eating rice! What is more important is to impress upon them the nutritional value of things. I find the healthy substitute for cereals will be tuber crops like potato, sweet potato and tapioca which are cheap and which can be easily grown. It is also necessary that larger efforts should be put in this regard, so far as the diet of the average man and woman is concerned, about the change-over from the diet loaded with cereals to one that is more balanced with vegetables and the like. I am not going to suggest what my learned friend, Shri V. P. Nayar, is suggesting—that it will not cook in India, it may cook elsewhere. He would like to suggest the wholesale slaughter of cattle which, he thinks, are too many. There is another point of view that that cattle helps us in giving fertilisers. But whatever it is, very few of us have got the mental make-up of Shri Nayar and we will not be able to adumbrate theories with regard to beef eating. I wish him all luck in his own venture.

15 hrs.

Shri V. P. Nayar: The State from which the hon. Member comes consumes the largest quantity of beef. Does he know that?

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: Sir, I find that the progress of the Ministry has been uniform and I congratulate the Ministry for the good work they are doing. I find that they must have more and more co-ordinated effort and I repeat, as I told the House at the very beginning, that agriculture is a State subject, but by a proper lead and by dynamism—I hope all this co-ordination will become possible.

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to intervene at this stage to reply to some of the points that have been raised by hon. Members and also to some of the cut motions that have been moved in this House. I am happy to follow my hon. friend, Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman, with whose seasoned and very instructive speech, I must say, I broadly agree.

While intervening last time in the course of discussions on this Ministry's demands for grants, I had occasion to remark that there was less of tension on the food front. This time, I go a step further and I claim that there is confidence on the food front, and several factors have contributed to it.

Shri Balraj Madhok: Is it 'confidence' or 'complacency'?

Shri A. M. Thomas: It is not complacency. My hon. friend is perhaps a little new to the proceedings of the House. If he just waits for a moment—he had not the occasion to hear me before—if he has some patience to wait for a moment, he will be able to see that neither I am complacent nor the Ministry of Food and Agriculture is.

Sir, the present position of easiness and comfort has been the effect of several factors. The primary factor, as the hon. House knows, is of course the record production of foodgrains this year. Although no firm figures are available, it has been estimated that the production will not be below 76 million tons, if at all, it will be only above 76 million tons. The rice production has been 33.7 million tons. The estimates of other crops have not yet come from all States. From the available information, it appears that wheat production may be about 10 million tons as against 9.7 million tons last year. About millets, I concede, it has not shown such a satisfactory performance as wheat or rice. Looking back to the last ten years, we can legitimately be proud of our achievements. Nature has been kind, but all the same it also shows that the steps that have been taken by the Agriculture Ministry, by the Irrigation and Power Ministry, all these Ministries, for increasing the food production are bearing fruit. There can be no doubt about that fact at all. Ten years back, looking at the figures, I find the rice production was only 21 million tons and that has gone up to 33.7 million tons. Going broadly by these figures, it indicates an increased production of more than 50 per cent. Now, take wheat. In 1951-52 the production was only 6 million tons and now we are producing 10 million tons. All foodgrains taken as a whole, the total production in 1951-52 was 51.2 million tons—roughly 51 million tons—and this year, as I have already stated to the hon. House, it will not be below 76 million tons. It also indicates that there has been a considerable increase—to the extent of about 50 per cent. But, all the same we want to be rather conservative in our estimates. Although this is for a period of ten years, we have taken it that the foodgrains production has gone up by only 31 per cent because we want to make allowance for all the inaccuracies in the estimates and the statistics that may have appeared in the first period of last decade.

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

Sir, my hon. friend, Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman has said that according to the 1961 census, the population is about 438 millions. That shows an increase of 21.5 per cent over 1951 census. Based on a conservative estimate, the index of foodgrains production has shown an increase of about 30 per cent. This rate of increase in food production during the last decade has been somewhat higher than that in the population. However, in the eastern region comprising Assam, West Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, while population during the last decade has increased by 25 per cent, the increase in production has been only about 19 per cent. I hope that there has been a shift in the eastern region also. In West Bengal, for example, the production of rice has increased by 12 lakhs tons from that of last year. So, we believe that the eastern region also will fall in line with the rest of India in the matter of foodgrains production.

I may also state here that we have not forgotten or ignored the aspect of increase in the population in framing our targets for the Third Five Year Plan. According to the Third Five Year Plan, the target of production in 1965-66, as the hon. House knows, is about 100 million tons. That was based on the fact that the population would be about 433 millions. But, the actual figures indicates that the population would be 438 millions. Going by the figures of 438 millions, our population in the year 1965-66 will be about 490 millions. It was originally estimated to be 480 millions. Now, it is estimated to be 490 millions. And this 100 million tons target, we believe, will give a per capita availability of about 17½ ounces, both foodgrains and pulses taken together—it may be roundabout 15 ounces as far as cereals are concerned and about 2½ ounces as far as pulses are concerned. So, all together it will be about 17½ ounces and we think that it will not be inadequate to meet our requirements.

Before I answer the criticism that has been levelled against the Ministry by Shri V. P. Nayar, who initiated the discussion, I would also like to mention the level of prices existing because that is something which the House has to be apprised of. Although the position is comfortable, the House will naturally ask me to indicate the latest level of prices that is existing. My hon. friend, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri in his cut motion has referred to the soaring prices and the failure of the Ministry to arrest the prices.

My hon. friend Shri P. R. Patel, who, in fact, takes a legitimate pride in the fact that he is a farmer....

Shri V. P. Nayar: So-called.

Shri A. M. Thomas: He is a real farmer Member.

Shri V. P. Nayar: He is here for nine months in the year. How can he be a farmer?

Shri A. M. Thomas: He has just refuted the arguments that have been advanced by my hon. friend Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. So, the one speech cancels the other speech.

During the week ending the 1st April, 1961, the index number of wholesale prices of wheat was 90.7 as compared to 92 during the corresponding period of last year. The index number of wholesale prices of rice declined from 115.3 in August, 1960, to 100.9 during the week ending the 1st April, 1961. During the corresponding period of last year, it may be noted that the index number was 106.3. Taking cereals as a whole, the present index, taking into account all the fluctuations that have just appeared, is 99.9 during the week ending the 1st April, 1961, as compared to 103.1 during the corresponding period of last year.

Of course, prices are even now prevailing at a high level in certain

regions, but taking the country as a whole, it can now be claimed that the prices are at a reasonable level; and at the same time, I would like to disabuse the impression that some hon. Members may carry, namely that the prices have come down to unremunerative levels or to levels where it is not possible for the farmer to cultivate his fields.

Before I answer the criticisms of Shri V. P. Nayar on the PL-480 Agreements, with special reference to the latest one which was entered into on 3rd May, 1960, it is also necessary for me—since some hon. Members have already referred to it—to refer to the justifiability or otherwise of increasing imports in spite of the increase in production. If I am able to establish that the Ministry is justified in its policy of increasing the imports in spite of the increase in production, then, according to me, fifty per cent of the arguments that have been levelled against it by my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar will automatically fall to the ground.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Only 50 per cent.

Shri A. M. Thomas: All right, let it be even 60 per cent that remains.

The fact has to be admitted that there is increase in population, and increase in population not at the level originally contemplated but at a much higher level. We thought that there would be a population in 1960-61 to the extent of 431 millions to 433 millions, but the latest figure that we have in regard to the population is 438 millions.

The second fact to be borne in mind is that there is considerable improvement in the purchasing power as a result of the several development plans that we have undertaken. Thirdly, there is need for the building-up of buffer stocks to regulate prices. If once it is admitted, and that has to be admitted, that food price is basic to the country's economy, then, the utmost vigilance

is necessary on that front, and food-grains have to be made available in adequate quantities, and it is also necessary to guard against wide fluctuations in food prices.

I shall now examine the criticism that has been levelled against the PL-480 agreement by my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar. It may kindly be borne in mind that nobody has characterised the PL-480 agreement as an instrument of American charity. We do not want charity. Nobody has claimed that it is as a result of American charity that this PL-480 agreement has been entered into.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Has my hon. friend read the Preamble?

Shri A. M. Thomas: If you read the preamble, which I believe my hon. friend has gone through, because he has just made a reference to it in his speech, then you will find that the very preamble of this agreement emphasises that this is a mutually advantageous arrangement.

Shri V. P. Nayar: It is sharing the American excess produce.

Shri A. M. Thomas: It affords an opportunity to America to meet its problem of abundance. That is made mention of in this agreement. They want to give stability to the American agriculture. At the same time, the fact should not be forgotten that it ensures the continuing development and progress of the recipient country, namely our own country, India. In the balance, if my hon. friend has gone through the provisions of this agreement carefully, it would be very easy for him to find that it is weighted heavily in favour of the recipient country. We have secured the best advantageous terms, terms under the like of which imports were impossible from other countries. My hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar said that we had not tried to find out whether it was possible to have imports on such terms from other countries. We have tried, and I might categorically state

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

that it was impossible to get imports from other countries on such advantageous terms as we have got from America under this PL-480 agreement.

In the first place, therefore, if imports are necessary—and large imports are necessary—to keep the price level, and to have a good sizable buffer stock, then, we have necessarily to import, but we have no foreign exchange for that purpose. So, the most important fact that we have to bear in mind in this connection is that we pay for these imports in currency of our own; the payment is to be made in rupees.

With regard to the utilisation of this amount also, we have to remember the special advantages that we have got. Under the previous PL-480 agreements, 80 per cent of the counterpart funds for these PL-480 imports, was to be utilised for advancing to the recipient country either by way of loan or by way of grant. This time, it has been increased to 85 per cent. I think my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar does not want to hear me, because I see him writing something.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I am taking notes of the hon. Minister's speech.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Probably, he does not want to hear, because he finds that this is definitely more advantageous, that is, this agreement which he characterised as pernicious and the worst of its kind. It will be found that 85 per cent of the amount has been set apart for being advanced to the recipient country, 50 per cent of it as grant and 50 per cent of it as loan. Out of the other 15 per cent, 10 per cent is to be used for American expenditure, and 5 per cent is for investment by the U.S. Government through private industries within the country, so that 90 per cent of the counterpart funds is available for development within the country, and that is a fact which has to be borne in mind.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Only 10 per cent is to be returned? Actually, it is 42½ per cent.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I shall come to that presently.

My hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar has said that this will lead to inflation and other things. Perhaps, he would have been influenced by some of the articles that I myself had occasion to see, articles by Mr. Shenoy and others.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I quoted only the American economist from the FAO.

Shri A. M. Thomas: It cannot be denied that the immediate effect of these PL-480 imports is anti-inflationary. That cannot be denied, because, now, we sell this imported quantity, and then withdraw the money which is being circulated within the country. So, the immediate effect of these PL-480 imports is, no doubt, anti-inflationary in character.

The next question that arises is this. What is its effect in the subsequent utilisation for economic development within the country? For this, one fact that has to be borne in mind is this, namely that the PL-480 counterpart funds have also been taken into consideration in estimating or calculating the resources for the Third Five Year Plan. The PL-480 counterpart funds are not over and above the resources that we have taken into account for financing the Third Five Year Plan, but it is within the resources for the Third Five Year Plan itself that these counterpart funds have got a place. And what are these counterpart funds utilised for? They are for development within the country, for projects, which, I do not think my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar himself might consider to be not desirable.

My hon. friend, before going through the FAO publication should

also have gone through the pamphlet entitled External Assistance, which has been circulated by the Ministry of Finance to each and every hon. Member. You will find that out of this counterpart fund, projects such as the Chambal project, Hirakud project, Damodar Valley project, Nagarjunasagar projects, Kosi project, Tungabhadra project and so many other projects have been financed. You will also find that even in respect of the 5 per cent that has been set apart under what is called the Cooley amendment, that amount is to be utilised for development within the country. Among the concerns which have been financed are the Mysore Cement, Hindustan Aluminium Corporation and Premier Tyres Limited. Premier Tyres Limited is in the State of Kerala and as much as Rs. 30 lakhs have been set apart for that concern. Looking at all this, it can never be disputed that this is perhaps a most advantageous agreement.

Supposing for argument's sake—that is impossible, as I have already stated—that we might be able to import foodgrains for our own currency, what about the shipping freight? Under the PL-480 agreement, 50 per cent of the freight that is carried in U.S. flag vessels can be paid in rupees, and that will form part of the PL-480 funds. That will come to as much as Rs. 40 crores. So taking all these things into consideration, the remark made by my hon. friend is quite unjustified.

My hon. friend referred to the fact that there are other features of this agreement, that the amount is payable in 40 years and the interest is 4 per cent. He made much of the disparity in prices. I agree that Australian wheat is a little cheaper than American wheat. You will find that we have also taken into account the quality of the wheat that we import. Of course, the Australian white wheat is good for flour milling purposes and other things. It is not fit for long storage and it is liable to

weevil infestation. But the American wheat bulk of our import is the hard winter wheat, capable of storage for a long time. Also, in the matter of protein content and other things, it is much better than the Australian wheat.

So that we have to take into account the quality also. Take, for example, the Canadian wheat. Its price is higher than that of the U.S. wheat. All the same, people import it. I read in today's papers that Canadian wheat, which is high-priced, has been imported by China to the extent 2 million tons and they are going to import another 2 million tons, payment being in dollars, not in their currency.

It may also be borne in mind that the American wheat which they sell in the world market—apart from the sales they effect under PL-480—carries the same price, so that it was not possible to get wheat from America at any price lower than what we have paid. On all these grounds, I have to state that my hon. friend's arguments will not stand scrutiny for a moment.

Of course, I must sympathise with my hon. friend. He has, in spite of the absence of his leaders in the House, been holding the fort with competence on behalf of his Party. And when he does that, he has necessarily also to put forward the point of view of his Party. I do not grudge that privilege to my hon. friend. But I must say that this import has largely helped us to be in a position of strength, to have so much confidence on the food front, as I have already stated. We do not now find such agitations as we used to in West Bengal and other places. My hon. friend will naturally be disappointed in that there is absolutely no scope for agitations of the kind that we have seen in previous years.

Shri M. V. Krishnappa: And that too when elections are approaching.

Shri A. M. Thomas: My hon. colleague reminds me that this is the position especially when elections are approaching.

Shri V. P. Nayar: What is his view on beef eating?

Shri A. M. Thomas: In the few minutes I have left, I will touch upon one or two other aspects referred to by some hon. Members. Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman referred to the necessity of the Food Ministry adopting a policy which would be helpful in effecting a diversification of our food habits. He also reminded us that it is no good saying that people who are taking rice should take wheat and people who are taking wheat must take millets and so on; there is no use saying such things unless you are able to convince the public that it is in their own interest to have a diversification of their food habits. I need not emphasise that this diversification is desirable with a view to making the diet nutritionally richer and reducing to a certain extent the preponderance of cereals in our diet.

We have in fact undertaken in the Food Ministry—of course not on a very ambitious scale—the development and popularisation of protective foods. My hon. friend, Shri V. P. Nayar, referred to the need for developing animal husbandry and fisheries. Many of our people are vegetarians, and especially for their sake, it is necessary that there must be popularisation of several foods that we have been able to manufacture. Research and investigation should be made to find out other varieties and kinds of food which can be made popular with people who take only cereals. The various programmes in connection with the development of subsidiary foods have been narrated in the Administration Report. I do not want to refer to them. But I would just make mention of the fact that we are conscious of the importance of this. A small technical organisation has been set up in the

Food Department to initiate and implement these programmes. A Scientific Food Advisory Panel has also been constituted for advising the Government on (1) the ways and means of bringing about a change in the pattern of food consumption in the country with a view to reducing the dependence on cereals and achieving a more healthy and balanced diet, (2) the technical problems relating to the various aspects of the production and consumption of subsidiary and processed foods, and (3) the practical application of scientific research in the field of nutrition.

Besides this technical division, it has also been decided that a nutrition division should be set up in the Food Department in order to deal with nutritional problems and to function as the operational arm of the National Nutritional Advisory Committee. Grants-in-aid are also being given to a voluntary organisation for the popularisation of multi-purpose food and products incorporating it.

Hon. Members may be aware of the fact that we have got a provision of Rs. 8 crores for development of subsidiary foods in the 3rd Plan. I think a sum of Rs. 74 lakhs has been set apart in the present budget for utilisation for development of these foods.

My hon. friend, Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman, referred to the need for having adequate storage. I completely agree with him. But when it is said that there should be storage, as mentioned by my hon. friend, Shri B. K. Gaikwad, not in port towns and industrial areas but only in villages, I cannot agree. With a view to facilitate import, storage, distribution and movement, it is absolutely necessary that we should have necessary storage in port towns and industrial towns and other places. The capacity for godowns available for storage of food-grains at present is about 22.97 lakh metric tons, comprising about 5.80 lakh tons of accommodation owned

by us, by the Food Department. Within the very near future, within the next two weeks or so, it may even go up to 7.36 lakh tons. It is owned by us. Then, there is about 15.81 lakh tons of capacity hired from port authorities, defence services, State Governments and private parties. There is also a programme for the construction of godowns, which has been finalised, and the accommodation is for about 2.7 million tons out of which about 1.7 million tons will be available for flat storage of wheat and rice and about one million tons for bulk storage of wheat in silos and port towns and in flat storage godowns in interior centres. The total Government owned accommodation programme, which as I said would be completed soon, would be about 8 lakh tons. There may be a total outlay of about Rs. 35 crores in the third Plan for the construction of storage accommodation. We have streamlined our organisation wing also for facilitating the storage construction. It is expected that the desired tempo of construction would be achieved with the new organisation which is functioning now, and the additional Chief Engineer, Food Wing, has indicated his ability to spend about Rs. 7.5 crores during 1961-62, that is, during this year, from the present budget.

My hon. friend Shri B. K. Gaikwad referred to the question of having storage accommodations in villages. We have that also in view. We have got the storage construction programme under the Central Warehousing Corporation, and that is mainly with the idea of helping the producers in the villages. For lack of time, I do not refer to that in detail. But I may assure the House that everything possible is being done now to take the message of warehousing to the interior parts of the country. Shri B. K. Gaikwad also said that we are distributing foodgrains and other things through fair price shops which have been opened in towns and industrial areas, but as far as villages are

concerned, we are ignoring them. What I would tell my hon. friend in reply to that is this: In the first place, the opening of fair price shops is left to the State Governments. We leave it more or less at the hands of the various State Governments. According to the requirements of each area, they open these fair price shops. I may say that it is necessary to keep the prices in the urban and industrial areas at low level because, the drawing of grains for the industrial and urban areas from the rural parts is the factor that puts up the prices and makes it impossible for landless labour and other low income-groups to have the necessary foodgrains for them. It is the usual practice in the rural parts that payment for labour is made in kind, so that there may not be much necessity for opening fair price shops for agricultural labour. My hon. friend in one breath said that the agriculturists are not getting proper prices and, at the same time, he said that we should have to open fair price shops in village parts.

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I think there is some misunderstanding here.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I may also say that our experience in opening fair price shops in village parts has indicated that there will not be sufficient offtake of grains from the village fair price shops.

Another point to which I would like to invite the attention of the House is this, and with that point, I shall finish. That is about the necessity of subsidised distribution of foodgrains. My hon. friend Shri P. R. Patel said that it is necessary to increase the wheat price and not to subsidise the sale of it.

Shri P. R. Patel: I said two things: first you give more to the agriculturists; subsidise them.

Shri A. M. Thomas: In order to protect the farmer, I might say in the first place that it is not desirable to make a profit out of distribution of

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

foodgrains. That is the general policy that has been adhered to.

Shri P. R. Patel: It is not a question of profit. The point is, you are lowering the prices for the agriculturist by having the import of foodgrains.

Shri A. M. Thomas: With regard to wheat, the price at which wheat is distributed is at Rs. 14 a maund. I find that the price, which is the economic cost, comes to only Rs. 13.92, roughly, Rs. 14. So, we do not want to make a profit out of the sale of it. Of course, there is a substantial subsidy element in the matter of rice. It will come to a little over Rs. 2 per maund apart from other incidental expenditure.

Shri P. R. Patel: What about the agriculturist and his cost of production? (*Interruption*).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I may also say that my hon. friend need not have any apprehension on this score; even though it is imported wheat—of course, nutritionally it is quite good and all that—the people have definitely a preference for indigenous wheat. That is why, in spite of the fact that we are distributing wheat at the rate of Rs. 14, the prices are still high in certain areas. For instance, if my hon. friend would go to Gujarat, he will see that there is some area and for superior wheat the price has gone up to Rs. 26 per maund. I have just got the figures to indicate that the prevailing prices are Rs. 17, Rs. 18 and Rs. 19 for indigenous wheat. (*Interruption*). What I say is, the sale of the imported wheat at the rate of Rs. 14 has not got a dampening effect on the price of the indigenous wheat. In some areas, it is Rs. 16, Rs. 17, or Rs. 18 per maund, but still we will have to go in for it. I would request my hon. friend Shri P. R. Patel to enquire in Delhi what is the price for indigenous wheat here, although we are prepared to give

wheat at the rate of Rs. 14. I do not want to take more time of the House.

Shri P. R. Patel: What about the figures that I have given in regard to local production?

Shri A. M. Thomas: My hon. friend Shri Balraj Madhok waxed eloquent on vanaspati. I am sorry he was not present here when this matter was discussed. I then answered in detail the various questions raised in regard to this matter and all the criticisms that were being advanced on the floor of the House. Still, some of those arguments are being repeated *ad infinitum*.

Of course, considerable time has been taken on the question of the prices of sugarcane and sugar. I do not want to venture on anything about it now, and my senior colleague will certainly answer all the aspects regarding sugar. It is not that nothing has been done or decided about it, but I may assure the House that the situation is not at all alarming as has been sought to be made out. Every step will be taken and is also being taken in that respect.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Sir, if you will permit me, I want to say one thing by way of personal explanation. Replying to the point which I made, the hon. Shri A. M. Thomas was pleased to say that I had quoted from the figures from B. R. Shenoy and others. I want to make it very clear that all the quotations which I made were from the book, *Study of Food and Agriculture, 1960*, published by the FAO. The passage which I read in respect of the creation of the inflationary spiral... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I only wanted to quote the page. I may also submit that I can attempt to take the horse to water but I cannot make it drink.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I must at the very

outset offer my congratulations to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture for having achieved, what Shri A. M. Thomas has just described, the restoration of confidence on the food front. It is gratifying to note that people have a sense of self-confidence, and the Minister has succeeded in acquiring large amounts of loans for import of foodgrains, etc. so that there is no risk of food shortage that is very satisfactory. It is no use saying that we should not import foodgrains, when we look at our census figures and the need for food compared with what we have produced in this country. At the same time, I cannot help feeling a little unhappy within myself at the prospect that is facing us and that prospect appears to be that we shall have to import foodgrains perhaps for all time. That is the picture, that stands up before us. That seems to be the picture before the planners in this country. I remember in 1950 when I was a student in New York doing some postgraduate study in medicine, the Prime Minister visited that country and he said very definitely, "We are not going to import food after one year."—the period might have been slightly different. Some newspaperman asked him, "What are you going to do if you do not grow enough?" I remember he just laughed and said, "We shall starve if necessary; we shall not import".

15.41 hrs.

[SHRI MULCHAND DUBE *in the Chair*]

Of course, it does not mean that we should starve our people. Nobody wants that, but we do want that more emphasis be laid on production and less on import and distribution. Import and distribution are necessary today; I am not criticising the Government for doing this. We have to do it, but the production side has to be emphasised still more, so that we can visualise a day when we do not need to import foodgrains.

The Deputy Minister, Shri Thomas, tried to give a very rosy picture by saying that we have increased the food production by $1\frac{1}{2}$ times or so. I

232(A)LS—7.

have before me the report of the Food and Agriculture Ministry. I do not have the figures for 1950. In 1950, the figures were not very reliable also, because we were just beginning the collection of statistics, it was the beginning of our planning, as the Five Year Plans were evolved later. From 1955-56 to 1960 the report says, the production of rice has gone up from 27.1 million tons to 29.3 million tons. That is not a terribly big increase in five years. The production of wheat has increased from 8.6 to 9.7 million tons. The total increase of all foodgrains including cereals was from 65 to 71.8 million tons. This is not commensurate with the increase that is necessary to meet the increase of our population and at the same time to improve the nutritional standards, that must be improved by bring them to the minimum necessary in this country.

For the increase of agricultural production irrigation is necessary. There are, of course, all these big hydro-electric projects that we have taken up. But I feel there is more need for small-scale irrigation, even small bundings that can conserve the rain water in the soil and make it available for cultivation. If all this has to be done, it means that the Ministry of Food and Agriculture—and Community Development Ministry should be integrated I incidentally might say that the telephone directory used to mention under this Ministry of Agriculture first and then Food, but the last directory has mentioned Food First and Agriculture later, which shows the shifting of emphasis, the emphasis is more on food—import and distribution—than on agriculture and production of food. I wish the emphasis goes back to agriculture and production, which would be helpful for everybody.

Shri M. V. Krishnappa: For 10 years, it is known as the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I disagree with the Deputy Minister. Let him look up the old directories and settle the point.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil): May I interrupt the hon. Lady Member? In the English language, if two words are to be used, the shorter word comes first. That is why 'food' comes first.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I said, I am mentioning it incidentally. I have not made it a big point at issue.

Shri M. V. Krishnappa: Whatever the directory might have said, our Ministry is known as the Ministry of Food and Agriculture for the last 10 years and more.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: Even if it were so, I wish they would change it in such a manner that the emphasis goes to agriculture. At any rate, if they cannot do it, I would say let it be called Ministry of Food, Agriculture and add Rural Development. If the rural development aspect comes in, it will definitely improve the rural economy. The programmes will have to be so shaped as to give the maximum emphasis to food production. From food production they might go to food processing and food preservation, so that green vegetables, fruits and various perishable things can be preserved and utilised and the economy of the rural areas can be built up.

A number of people have brought up the point that the incentives for the producers are lacking. The emphasis is on cash crops. Cash crops are also important, but could not the Food Ministry work out a scientific basis and calculate the cost of production, the labour involved, the various chemical fertilisers and other expenses.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I need at least 10 minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: The time-limit is fixed as 10 minutes. I am sorry I would not be able to accommodate the hon. Member.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I hope you will give me at least as much time as possible without ringing the bell. Much time has been taken by the interruptions of the Deputy Minister. I have to be given some more time; otherwise I cannot make the points that I want to. There are very important points. Everybody has been given 15 minutes.

Let there be a scientific calculation of the cost of production and then let the prices be so fixed that the incentive for the agriculturist is equal for cash crops and foodgrains so that he may produce cash crop or food crop, for whichever crop his soil is more suitable. In that manner he will not feel the necessity of shifting to cash crop production from food crop production for the sake of profits.

Secondly, I wish to say that on the one hand we are trying to bring more acreage under agriculture and on the other hand we are losing a lot of land. This morning a lot of figures were given in this connection by the Opposition Members. I take only one State—Punjab. It has been mentioned in this morning's newspapers that whereas 82,000 acres of land were brought under reclamation and cultivation in a year, 1 lakh acres were being lost, through salinity and through rising water level leading to waterlogging. Some scientific method has got to be found by which waterlogging and salinity can be prevented and we can really have more acreage under food production, grow more food and visualise the day when we can make our country self-sufficient in food production.

For the imports that are to come, the Deputy Minister quoted some figures of storage facilities. It is good that we have some storage facilities. I hope the Ministry will see to it that the imports are so staggered that the imports are not more than the storage capacity and the foodgrains are not allowed to rot and go to waste, as it has happened in some cases in the past. Quite big figures

have been given in this House as to how much food has been wasted because of bad storage, I hope that will not be allowed to happen.

Another point I wish to mention is that while constructing this storage, it may be borne in mind that the storage is so located and designed that it can be used for something else when we achieve self-sufficiency, and it does not go to waste.

I wish to say a word about sugar. Newspaper reports have said that the Government is against decontrol of sugar, because it will lower the price and also that the Government is working out a scheme to ensure the interests of the cane producers and the sugar mill-owners.

Now, this is very good. We want to safeguard the interests of the Sugarcane growers. But what about the consumers? Somebody has to look to the interests of the consumer also. The cane producers' interests must be safeguarded, the interests of the mills may be safeguarded, but the burden of the subsidy given for exporting sugar falls on the common tax-payer—the consumer. There is a fallacy about earning foreign exchange by sugar export. We export a little bit of sugar and earn a little bit of foreign exchange, and we spend a large amount of foreign exchange on importing foodgrains. We may intensify the sugarcane growth and have more sugar produced out of the same land that is already under sugarcane cultivation and export sugar by all means if we can, but we must see to it that the prices of sugar are not merely fixed to safeguard the interests of the millowners and the cane-growers but also of the consumers in this country.

Sir, much has been said already regarding the foodgrain prices, and I congratulate the Minister that the prices have been fairly stable. But, Sir, as I have said already, let there be a scientific assessment of the prices. Let the cost of production be

taken into consideration and prices fixed on a sound basis so that the agriculturists may feel secure in growing foodgrains.

In order really to have the emphasis on small-scale irrigation, on bunding and various other small schemes that will increase the food production in this country, I feel very strongly that the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation should be integrated into Food Ministry, and joined with the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Then the Ministers will fight each other.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: The agriculturists need credit. They need the help of co-operation for getting good seeds, for getting fertilisers and for a number of other things. I have been to the villages. I have gone round the villages. I have walked through the villages. I find that today the agriculturist is confused, completely confused. He has to go to multifarious agencies, which he is not very much able to do (*Interruptions*). Sir, may I proceed without being interrupted? I have very little time at my disposal. If, therefore, we have this Ministry of Food and Agriculture and Rural Development to build up the total rural economy, then they will be able to do justice to food production as well as to other small schemes, such as agro-industries and others, which can really put some money into the pockets of farmers and build up their economy, and build up their position.

Lastly, Sir, a word about my hon. friend opposite, belonging to the Jan Sangh party, who tried to make emotional capital out of Indian people's respect and affection for the cow. Sir, it is a great pity that speeches calculated to be made for election purposes are being delivered on the floor of this House. It would be all right if he had made that speech outside in an election meeting. But what is needed here is constructive

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

criticism, not only we have to save the cow but we have also to make an economic success of the cow. In order to do that, somebody has to come forward and organise the total usage of the carcass of a cow. Today vultures eat it. Our Harijan friends say that they do not want to lift the dead cattle, they do not want to use them as they used to. Nobody else is doing that. So we lose all this wealth in the form of dead cattle, dead cow. Therefore, let some of these cow-lovers, cow-worshipper friends come forward and give a helping hand to organise the total use of the carcass of the cow, so that an economic success can be made of it. Sir, let the hon. Member opposite come with me. I will show him some of his fellow, cow-worshippers and people who talk even more loudly than the hon. Member, keeping cows in their own homes in such a miserable condition that no cow-slaughtering country will ever do. This must stop. The cow must be saved and served properly and used properly both alive and dead.

सुखी मणिबेन पटेल (भ्रानन्द) : श्रीमन्.

हम जानना चाहते हैं कि चीनी के बारे में सरकार ने क्या सोचा है। यह मामला इतना गम्भीर बन रहा है कि अगर इस का कोई रास्ता नहीं निकाला जायगा, तो अगले साल गन्ने की पैदाइश क्या होगी, यह बड़ी समस्या होगी। इस का एक कारण यह भी है कि जितनी चाहिये, उतनी गन्ने की क्वालिटी और शूगर परसेंटेज की क्वालिटी को सुधारने की कोशिश नहीं की गई है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि जो सैस प्रथम उत्तर प्रदेश में गन्ने की क्वालिटी सुधारने के लिये लगाया गया था, वह जेनरल रेवेन्यू में डाल दिया गया और संशोधन के लिये उस का उपयोग नहीं किया गया, इस कारण यह हुआ है।

मैं यह भी जानना चाहती हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में खाली दो फ़ैक्ट्रियों के चीनी के

दाम क्यों ऊँचे रखे गये हैं। उन का कारण क्या है? सब को एक प्रकार से न्याय करने के अलावा दो फ़ैक्ट्रियों के अलग दाम तय करने, उन को ज्यादा प्राइस देने का कारण क्या है, यह हम समझना चाहते हैं।

हम कई सालों से करोड़ों रुपये का अन्न बाहर से ला रहे हैं। उस में शिपिंग में भी काफ़ी रुपया खर्च करना पड़ता है। क्या माननीय मंत्री को ऐसा नहीं लगता है कि अगर इस का दस फ़ीसदी भी किसानों को इन्सेन्टिव के लिये दिया गया होता, तो अन्न की समस्या ज्यादा जल्दी हल हो सकती थी। आज किसान को मौसम पर बीज और खाद नहीं मिलता है। कई दफ़ा उस को खाद और बीज लेने के लिये हैड-क्वार्टर्स पर जाना पड़ता है, तब भी उसको पूरा नहीं मिलता है। तो कुछ ऐसा प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये कि मौसम से पहले ठीक समय पर किसानों को खाद और बीज मिल जाये। बड़े बड़े किसानों को तो मिलता है, लेकिन छोटे छोटे किसानों को भी मिले, इस का हर जगह प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये। ऐसा एक दो प्रान्तों में हो, यह काफ़ी नहीं है।

डेयरी उद्योग के बारे में भी मैं कुछ समझना चाहती हूँ। हर जगह बड़ी बड़ी डेयरीज खोली जा रही हैं, यह बड़ी अच्छी बात है, लेकिन उस के पीछे केवल यही विचार नहीं होना चाहिये कि शहरों को, नगरवासियों को अच्छा दूध मिले और होना भी नहीं चाहिये। डेयरी के उद्योग से किसान को लाभ हो, एक पूरक घन्घे की हैसियत से उस को काम मिले, उस की कैंटल वेल्थ अच्छी हो, उस का दूध बढ़े, इस के लिये क्या कुछ किया जाता है?

इस के अलावा मैं देखती हूँ कि करोड़ों रुपये से बाहर से मिल्क पाउडर लाया जाता

है, क्योंकि डेयरी की और प्राडक्ट्स बनाना चाहते हैं। ज़रूर बनाइये। बाहर से दूध के जो पाउडर आते हैं, वे बन्द होने चाहियें, और हमारे यहां जो दूध है, वह कैसे बढ़े, इस विषय में सोचना चाहिये। यहां पर काफ़ी दूध बढ़ा है, लेकिन उस को किस तरह से जमा किया जाये और डेयरी की तरफ़ लाया जाये, यह भी देखना चाहिये, न कि करोड़ों रुपये का पाउडर ला कर बड़ी बड़ी डेयरियां अच्छी तरह से चले, इस पर सरकार की और अफ़सरों की शक्ति ख़र्च की जाये। आप ज़रा हिसाब लगायें कि कितना दूध का पाउडर बाहर से आता है और कितने दिनों के बाद उस को न लाया जायगा, क्या इस का प्रोग्राम बनाया गया है? जहां जहां सरकार ने डेरीज बनाई हैं, वहां किस किस गांव के किसानों को फ़ायदा हुआ, वहां सहकारी ढंग पर दूध लाने की क्या कोशिश की गई, इस पर माननीय मंत्री निगाह डालें और ठीक प्रवृत्त करें।

हमारे यहां कई चीज़ें होती हैं, परन्तु उन का ठीक उपयोग हो, प्रिज़र्वेशन हो, छोटे छोटे उद्योगों की तरह से, घरों में भी प्रिज़र्वेशन किया जा सके, ऐसा कुछ किया गया है? ग्रामाम में कितने संतरे होते हैं, कितना पाइन एपल होता है और उन का कितना नाश होता है, इस का आप धंदाबा लगायें। परन्तु बड़ी फ़ैक्ट्रियों से यह समस्या हल नहीं की जा सकती है। अगर हर घर में उस को प्रिज़र्व कर के नहीं रखा जा सकता है, प्रिज़र्वेशन प्लांट नहीं डाले जा सकते हैं तो कम से कम हर देहात में आप डाल दें। जिस के पास दो पेड़ हैं, चार पेड़ हैं या दस पेड़ हैं उस के सामने जो समस्या उत्पन्न होती है, वह हल हो सकेगी। उस को उन का ठीक से दाम मिले और उस की वस्तु का नाश न हो, इस के बारे में आप ने क्या किया है, यह मैं आप से समझना चाहती हूँ।

10 hrs.

रूई की बात अब मैं कहना चाहती हूँ। मेरी राय है कि जो भी दाम रूई के आप को तय करने हों, जो भी सीलिंग लगानी हो, वह मौसम के पहले लगा देनी चाहिये ताकि किसान को पता चल सके कि उस को बोलने से उसे लाभ होगा या नहीं। आज आप ने रूई के दामों पर सीलिंग लगाई है और उस के साथ जबर्दस्ती की है कि इतना दाम उस को लेना पड़ेगा, इस से ज्यादा दाम नहीं मिलेगा परन्तु उस के पास तो पैसा नहीं है कि वह उस को होल्ड कर सके और देख सके कि कब उसे अच्छे दाम मिलें और कब वह अपनी रुई बेचे। उस के ऊपर तो आप ने पाबन्दी लगा दी है कि इस से ज्यादा पैसे उस को नहीं मिल सकते हैं लेकिन व्यापारी और मिस बाबे के ऊपर आप ने कोई ऐसी पाबन्दी नहीं लगाई है कि उस को इस दाम से वह रूई खरीदनी पड़ेगी या कपास खरीदनी पड़ेगी। आज किसान के पास कपास पड़ी हुई है, जिनिंग फ़ैक्टरी में रूई बड़ी पड़ी हुई है और थोड़े दिन के बाद बारिश आयगी लेकिन मिन वाले और व्यापारी लोग आज लेते नहीं हैं और सोचते हैं कि आप ने जो सीलिंग लगाई है उस से कम दाम पर अगर वह खरीद सकेंगे। कहां तक किमान उम को रख सकता है? उम को मजबूर हो कर कम दाम पर देनी पड़ेगी। मैं चाहती हूँ कि इस का भी कोई बंदोबस्त आप करें।

तम्बाकू के बारे में मैं पांच सात माल से बराबर कोशिश कर रही हूँ। यह मामला अभी तक हल नहीं हुआ है। जब मैं अफ़सरों को या मिनिस्टर साहब को वहां ले जाती हूँ तब तो वे लोग मानते हैं, कबूल करते हैं कि इस को ठीक करना चाहिये क्योंकि इस से किसान को तकलीफ़ होती है और सरकार को भी पूरा रेवेन्यू नहीं मिलता है।

[सुश्री मणिबेन पटेल]

16.02 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

परन्तु जब वे वहां से यहां आते हैं तो क्या बताते हैं, क्या कायदे कानून हैं, मुझे पता नहीं है। वह चीज उसी तरह से चल रही है और आज तक भी मामला तय नहीं हुआ है। मेरी विनती है कि एग्रिकलचर मिनिस्ट्री फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री के साथ मिल कर के तम्बाकू का मामला तय करे और जहां तक कपास का सम्बन्ध है, उस के दाम कामर्स मिनिस्ट्री से मिल कर के ठीक करे ताकि किसानों को नुकसान न हो।

हमारे यहां ईश्वर की कृपा से हर प्रकार की आबोहवा है, धरती भी है, मौसम भी अनुकूल है और हमें कई चीजों की जरूरत है जिन को कि हम बाहर से बराबर लाते रहते हैं। ये जो चीजें हैं इन के बारे में रिसर्च कर के पता लगाया जाना चाहिये कि ये यहां हमारे देश में कहां पैदा हो सकती हैं। केशर है यह केवल एक जगह ही होता है, काश्मीर में। इस से हमारा काम नहीं चलता है, इतना ही बस नहीं है, काफी केशर आज भी बाहर से आता है। इसी तरह से हींग है जो अफगानिस्तान में पैदा होती है लेकिन हमारे यहां उस का सब से अधिक उपयोग होता है। उस को यहां पैदा करने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये। उस के लिये हमारे यहां उपयुक्त मौसम और हवा है। इसी तरह से कोको है और कई दूसरी चीजें हैं। अगर हम इन के बारे में जरा रिसर्च करें तो हमारे जो किसान पहाड़ों पर रहते हैं वे इन को पैदा कर सकते हैं जिस से उन को धंधा मिल सकता है, पैसा मिल सकता है और साथ ही साथ हमारा जो फारेन एक्सचेंज है, वह भी बढ़ सकता है।

आप ने क्या कभी सोचा है कि रेल का जो फ्रेट है, वह फल के मुकाबले में सब्जी पर अधिक लिया जाता है और इस का क्या रहस्य है? पहले जब अंग्रेजों का यहां राज्य था, तो कई साल पहले कलकत्ता राजधानी थी और जो वायसराय हुआ करते थे और जो बड़े बड़े अफसर होते थे उन को खाने के लिये फलों की आवश्यकता पड़ती थी। चूंकि फल कलकत्ते में पैदा नहीं होते थे, इस वास्ते वहां वे दूर दूर के स्थानों से जाते थे और इसी वजह से फलों के लिये फ्रेट कम था और आज भी कम है। पर सब्जी तो पास होती थी और सब्जी का फ्रेट अधिक है। आज ऐसी परिस्थिति है कि सब्जी दिल्ली से अहमदाबाद तक जाती है बम्बई तक जाती है और वहां से और जगहों पर जाती है। आसपास की जगहों पर जो पैदा होती है, वह भी इसी तरह से आती जाती है। सब्जी पैदा करने वाले फलों के बड़े बड़े बगीचों के मालिकों जैसे नहीं हैं, वे छोटे छोटे किसान हैं। परन्तु उन से फ्रेट चार्जज अधिक लिये जाते हैं। उस में भी अजीब तरीका है कि पपीता अगर कच्चा हो तो सब्जी में माना जाता है, पका हो तो फल में माना जाता है। इसी तरह से केले कच्चे हों तो सब्जी और पके हों तो फल। नींबू फलों में नहीं आते हैं, सब्जी में आते हैं, इसलिये उस के फ्रेट अधिक लिये जाते हैं। बेचारे किसान लोग और व्यापारी रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री से कई मालों से इस के बारे में मेहनत कर रहे हैं परन्तु रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री सुनती नहीं है। मेरी आप से विनती है कि आप इस के बारे में रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री से मिल कर तय कीजिये और सब्जी का जो फ्रेट रेट है, उस का एक ही दाम तय कराइये जोकि फलों का है। आज छोटे छोटे किसान काफी सब्जी पैदा करते हैं और हमारे लोग आज सब्जी काफी खाने लगे हैं और यह एक जगह से दूसरी

जगह काफी मात्रा में जाने भी लग गई है। इस का ठीक से बन्दोबस्त रेलवे में होना चाहिये। फलों और सब्जियों का, दोनों का करीब करीब १५-२० परसेंट रेल में नुक्सान होता है क्योंकि उन का हंडलिंग ठीक नहीं होता है। प्राप रेफ्रिजरेटिड वेगन्ड तो नहीं दे सकते हैं, बैटिलेटिड वेगन्ड तो दे सकते हैं। ऐसी वेगन्ड देने का प्राप को प्रबन्ध करवाना चाहिये जिस से कम से कम फल और सब्जी का नुक्सान हो।

हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के एक भाई ने गो-रक्षा की बात कही है। मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि जो लोग गो-रक्षा की बात करते हैं, उन में से कितने लोग हैं जो गौ का पालन करते हैं और किस तरह से करते हैं, कितने लोग गाय का दूध पीते हैं, गाय का घी खाते हैं और कितने लोग उस में से ये चीजें नहीं खाते हैं। चीज के अन्दर एक प्राइक्ट होता है जिम को रनेट कहते हैं जोकि चीज को प्रिजर्व करने के काम में आता है। गाय के बछड़े की आंत से, एक बहुत ही नाजुक भाग से वह निकलता है। हमारे लोग जानते नहीं हैं और बड़े बड़े वुस्त ब्राह्मण लोग भी यह चीज खाते हैं। ये जो बहुत बार गो-रक्षा के बारे में चिल्लाते हैं, उन में से कितने लोग ऐसी दवाओं का उपयोग नहीं करते जिन में गाय की कोई न कोई चीज नहीं होती है, यह सब देखने की जरूरत है चिल्लाने के पहले। हां यह मैं मानती हूँ कि गाय के बारे में ज्यादा हम को करने की जरूरत है। परन्तु यह मिनटों में नहीं हो सकता है, कोई मशीन की बात नहीं है। गाय की श्रीलाद मुषारानी है तो उस में काफी समय लगेगा। परन्तु इस में भी हमारी गवर्नमेंट किसानों को कुछ इंसेंटिव दे सकती है। जो लोग गाय को और बल को अच्छी तरह से रखें हैं, उन को वह कुछ इंसेंटिव दे सकती है। बल का अच्छी तरह से पालन न करने की वजह से गाय की श्रीलाद गिर गई है। जिन गांव के अन्दर या घर के अन्दर बल

को अच्छी तरह से रखा जाय, गाय को अच्छी तरह से रखा जाय, तो किसान अच्छी तरह से अपनी गाय को रखे और हर साल उस गाय का दूध बढ़ता जाता हो, उस को कुछ न कुछ इंसेंटिव देने की अगर योजना की जाय तो मैं मानती हूँ कि गाय की हालत, आज नहीं मगर एक लम्बे अर्से के बाद, पचास साल में, हम सुधार सकने में सफल हो सकते हैं। इस के लिये एक लम्बा प्रोग्राम प्राप को बनाना होगा, ऐसी मेरी राय है।

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: Mr. Speaker, Sir, recently the hon. Minister for Food and Agriculture made a remark that today he is the "forgotten man of the nation." I would like to tell him that we have not been able to solve our food problem to the extent that the nation can afford to forget the Food and Agriculture Minister. No doubt, to some extent, the efforts made by this Ministry have shown results. My hon. friend the Deputy Minister intervening in the debate said that this year there is more confidence on the food front. I quite agree with him that there is a little more confidence on the food front this year, as compared to last year. But at the same time we should not be over-optimistic and slacken our efforts for agricultural production.

Sir, there is no doubt that our kharif crop this year has been good and certainly our rabi crop would also be good. We have to see what were the main factors which contributed this fact that we had two good crops in our country. In my opinion the main factor had been the normal climatic conditions in the country. The Deputy Minister also said that nature has been good and he recognised that if this year they are able to say that there is more confidence on the food front, it is not due to the fact that they have been able to implement all the agricultural development schemes fully, but it is due to the fact that nature has been good to us and we are thankful to nature.

When there is more food or agricultural production in the country, naturally our anxiety also goes to the price which the farmer would be getting. After all, the farmer is a human being. Why should he work more or put more hard labour into the land and produce more? I know the farmer is a great nationalist. So, from the national point of view he would like to see that his best efforts are put into the land more is produced from that land. But at the same time he cannot afford to be that nationalist that after he produces more he should not get more profit or more money so that he can improve his economic conditions.

Our concern about the food prices is quite right. Hon. Members from all sides of the House have expressed their concern about it. This being the year when there has been more agricultural production, I would request the hon. Minister that when he replies to the debate, he should come out with a guarantee or an assurance to the farmers that every effort would be made to see that the food prices will not be allowed to fall down below a certain level in this country.

The importance of the food prices, its fixation or stabilisation in agricultural economy is of great importance. I would in this connection refer to the report submitted by the Agricultural Production Team sponsored by the Ford Foundation. In its report it has emphasised this fact. It has said:

"To encourage increases in foodgrain production, the cultivator should be assured of a price which will enable him to invest in fertiliser, seed and new equipment, knowing that, with average crop conditions, he can repay any debts with the added income that results from adoption of improved practices. Such assurance would constitute an important incentive to increased production."

I would again emphasise the point that this year it is very necessary for the Government to come out with the assurance and with the guarantee that the prices of foodgrains would be stabilised and would not be allowed to fall down below a certain minimum level.

Now I would move to the PL 480 programme. To control the prices of foodgrains in our country it is necessary to build up buffer stocks. I quite agree with that. But when we are importing a large stock of wheat from the United States of America. I think we are forgetting one very technical aspect of it. It is this, and the hon. Minister had also said on the floor of the House some time back, that from time to time the stocks imported would be replaced by local stocks. What would happen to the imported stocks? These imported stocks would naturally flow into the market and would be consumed. If these stocks go into the hands of the farmers, there is the danger of the imported wheat being used for seed purposes in this country. I think this imported seed would be absolutely useless, because the seed is not acclimatised to the soil and the climatic conditions of India. So, Sir, I would request the Ministry of Food and Agriculture to be vigilant to see that none of these stocks fall into the hands of the farmers and by mistake they use them for seed purposes.

An Hon. Member: These can be recognised.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: I agree that these can be recognised. But, at the sowing time, when the farmer is in a great hurry, when the seed is sown, sometimes there is a likelihood that the imported stock and the local stock would get mixed up.

I would congratulate the Ministry for one thing, that is, for the introduction of package programme in this country. The more thoroughly I study this programme, the more convinced I get that this is the first time

in our country that a consolidated effort has been made to increase the agricultural production. Out of 300 and odd districts in our country, only about 85 districts contribute to the 95 per cent of the total food production of our country. This fact clearly shows that if we could put all our efforts into these 85 districts, we would be in a position to increase the food production and we would be in a position to get better results from these districts. I would appeal to the Ministry that at the same time in other districts the programme of extensive agriculture should not also be overlooked.

While talking about the package programme, I would like to emphasize one point and that is that the Ministry has to be very vigilant as far as the implementation of the programme is concerned. I understand that the personnel who would be implementing this programme would be directly under the administrative control of the State Government. Now, not only in this field but we have been in other fields also that most of our best programmes and best schemes had not been implemented fully in this country due to the administrative bottle-necks. I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister for Food and Agriculture that this is such an important programme that there should be a central coordinating agency existing in the Ministry which, from time to time, should review and see that the administrative bottlenecks are not allowed to come in the way as far as the implementation of this programme is concerned.

Now, I would come to fertilisers. I would not like to emphasize the importance of fertilisers in agriculture. But, there is one fact regarding which I would like to draw the attention of the Ministry and it is this that the setting up of the various fertiliser plants in our country is the responsibility of the Commerce and Industry Ministry. When the fertilisers would come out of these fertiliser

plants, then it would be the responsibility of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture to distribute them and see that the fertilisers reach the farmers. Now, as far as the utilisation of the fertilisers is concerned, I can see the importance that is attached by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture because they know its value in agriculture. I am sure the Ministry of Commerce and Industry cannot recognise the importance or the urgency of it, so, this a very confusing situation. The Ministry of Commerce and Industry can say that they are taking steps and they are doing their best to see that the fertiliser plants are established in this country as soon as possible. But, I would emphasize upon the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and I can assure them that the whole House is with it in seeing that the delays do not occur in the Commerce and Industry Ministry and all efforts are made to see that the fertiliser plant are established as early as possible so that our foreign exchange spent on import of fertiliser can be reduced.

Now, I would come to agricultural research. Here I would like to say, at the very beginning, that on previous occasions also I have referred to the work being done and the role being played by the Indian Agricultural Research Institute at New Delhi. But, again this year, I am sorry to say that there has been no improvement in the working of the Institute as compared to last year. Rather, that institute has now become a hot-bed of favouritism and nepotism, as far as promotions are concerned. I fail to understand why the heads of departments are being granted extensions after extensions every year. Do we not have our younger people there? Do we not have our younger research workers working there? What incentive would be left to them, if the same person is to be given extension after 55 years of age or after completing a service of about thirty years in that institute?

In order to see that good comes out of this institute, I would request the

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]

hon. Minister to pay his personal attention to the state of affairs there and see that the clique existing between the Indian Agriculture Research Institute authorities and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture is broken, and that the programme of research is implemented fully, so that better things can come out of that institute.

In conclusion, I would like to say a word about my State of Kashmir. As in other parts of the country, so also, in the Jammu and Kashmir State, the agricultural production has been good. We have opened two agricultural colleges there. The double cropping in paddy has been very successful. Here, I would invite the attention of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture to the fact that since the double cropping in paddy has shown very good results in that part, they should have a scheme for going into the various aspects of that programme more intensively.

I would now like to say a word regarding the irrigation projects in Jammu province to which my hon. friend Shri Balraj Madhok has made a reference. At that time also, I said that a lot of good has been done in my State, and particularly in Jammu province. I can only invite my hon. friend to come with me and visit the Jammu province and see for himself whether the Kathua canal feeder and other irrigation projects are coming up or not.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): They say that the Roman soldier conquered Greece, but famine conquered Rome. The world civilization has survived on six to nine inches of the top soil. Remove one-third of the skin cover of man, and he will die. Scrap off the top soil of the earth, and life will cease to subsist. With the loss of the fertility of the good earth, many a great civilization in Asia, Africa and Europe and other parts of the country has disappeared. In India, the soil is impoverished, and its capacity to produce has decreased

to a twentieth part of its original potentiality. The food that an Indian eats is about 1,800 calories, whereas 2,200 calories are the necessary average for this part of the world. The average life is half of the average life in civilised countries. The situation needs a serious thought, and remedy demands radical changes of science and technology.

Like any other sphere of life, agriculture too has passed through many phases, from direct appropriation and pastoral agricultural through hoe culture, settled agriculture, the use of bullocks and mules, to iron plough, tractors and now combines. Agriculture has passed from the stage of subsistence occupation to the stage of an industrial enterprise in the world. The great changes of the Industrial Revolution from 1775 to 1840 brought industry from the individual artisan to the large machine factory and from scarcity or mere need to abundance and luxury. The agricultural revolution has its duration from 1750 to 1850. From the hoe and horse husbandry, it culminated in the modern big farms worked by combines, and turned it into an industrial enterprise.

In India, unfortunately, things remained poor and static. Agriculture was no exception. The bullock and plough, as they are today, date back to about two thousand years. The world has changed, civilisation has changed from the muscle civilisation; then oil came, and now we stand at the threshold of the nuclear energy civilisation. But ours is still at the muscle stage. What a woeful tale to tell! Here it is that the man of destiny has a sacred mission to fulfil—from starvation, nakedness and mere subsistence to change to a full, healthy meal and abundance.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Is it over?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Where we stand has been well described by my hon. friend, the Communist Member, Shri V. P. Nayar. I cannot agree with

him in many respects, but the tale is true and it is so sad. However, I may read from Lourd.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Is it all quotation?

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. Member could speak *extempore*.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: If you give me enough time, I will speak *extempore*. Because the time is limited, I have reduced my speech to writing.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Lourd says about China:

The correct figure representing a growth at least twice as high as ever achieved by Russia or Japan and about five times that of India is a miracle of our time. But there is an immense material progress and there might be a basis for real freedom later as there begins to be freedom from draughts and floods and famines. The do-nothing policy of the benevolent and humane British Indian civil service was a continuance of famine, of degradation and misery for millions without hope of change. Is the sin of omission less than the sin of commission?

What is the hope of change? 18 million tons of wheat from the USA. It is no good begging from the neighbour and let the stout youth sleep in the bed. This was the benevolent English policy continued by the hon. Minister, representative of the Indian people. It may be good motherly affection, but not a healthy contribution to the growth of life. The situation needs a charismatic character to force radical changes in the agricultural economy. Change is the central factor of economic life and the focus of economic analysis. Economics, including agricultural economics, is essentially a science of social dynamics.

Each country must work out a solution for itself. No country, in-

cluding the USA, can do it for another. The pronouncements of the Hot Springs Conference on food and agriculture are to the same effect, namely, (1) that enough food can be produced in the world to give all people the food they need for health and working efficiency, (2) that the task of doing this is the responsibility of each nation and (3) the task can be done more effectively, however, if the nations help each other to do it.

I therefore submit in all humility but with all the force at my command: do not play the fond mother and beg for food, but get the technical know-how and send your man to the field to work harder and harder, to work longer and to work more intelligently. Let the muscles and brains be used to the full. Then the era of abundance will not be far off.

Mr. Speaker: Whose muscles—the Ministers?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Muscles of the peasants as well as of the bullocks.

These are the ways and means of doing it. First reduce the numbers of population living on land so that each family can come closer to its optimum output and accompany level of living. Secondly, improving the arts and technologies. Thirdly, increasing the productivity of the workers by enabling them to feed them and have better health: also by educating and training them to increase their skill and efficiency. Fourthly,—

Shri D. C. Sharma: To whom does the word "them" refer?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: ...developing the productive resources of land by improvement of all kinds—by utilising water power, better conservation of resources, etc. Fifthly, increase in the amount of capital goods used per worker in the form of power in all its form, tools, equipment, building, fertilisers, livestock, feed, etc.

[Pandit K. C. Sharma]

The agriculturists are the poorest section of the people. I shall now give the relative size and *per capita* income level of urban and rural groups. The percentage of urban population in all India is 17 while the *per capita* income of the group, as percentage of all-India *per capita* income, is 209. The percentage of rural population is 83, while the *per capita* income percentage is 77; similarly, non-farm, rural, 16; percentage, 93; farm, rural, 67; percentage 74: cultivators, 44, percentage, 93: labourers, 33, percentage 38: Urban combined with non-farm rural, 33; percentage 153.

The agriculturist is poor. He has not the benefit of good education. Secondly, he has not his strong organisation to fight for his interests. Hume Martin enumerates seven lines of attack on an unduly low income in agriculture. They are: firstly, to raise the physical productivity per man; secondly, to increase the demand for agricultural commodities. It does not hold good here. Thirdly, to raise the price the farmer receives; fourthly, to pay the farmers the subsidies over and above the market price; Fifthly, to make direct grants to the farmer in order to raise his income to the desired level; sixthly, to encourage the movement of agriculture, so that of those remaining, each can receive a large share of the total agricultural income; to encourage farmers to combine in their own economic defence.

As I pointed out earlier, the agricultural section of our people is the poorest in the country. In other countries they have got a strong organisation. In 1919-1920, in the United States there has been a great movement among the agricultural population, and they had affirmed that they would work harder, produce more; and they demanded that they should have better prices and a better standard of living. In India, unfortunately, because there is lack of education among the agriculturists, there

has not been any strong organisation to fight for their interests.

Take, for instance, the hours of work on land producing cotton. Some cotton is being woven into cloth. Now, calculate for two seers of cotton, the labour spent on it, the capital in the shape of price of the land,—apart from human labour,—then the fertiliser, water and everything including cultivation cost. And then find out also the distribution on the basis of the muscle power exercise on production. (*Laughter*). With regard to the share of transport—well—do not laugh; if you would laugh in any other country you would not be Minister tomorrow. It is a serious problem. When it comes to the interests of the man who produces the very means of livelihood, you laugh it off. I do not understand this. Remember a day may come when people grow conscious and sensitive and a revolution will take place. Other people have laughed and they have been kicked out.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Will a revolution take place?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: It will take place if things remain as they are. It is a strange irony of fate that a man works from morning till evening and his part of the share in the produce is negligible. A man sits in the shop or sleeps in the palace and he gets the major part of the income from the produce of the land. This situation is not to last long. I am sad to see that the Minister laughs when serious things are mentioned.

In other countries, there have been great movements and the Governments in those countries have yielded to the pressure of the rural population. In England, as far back as 1938, there was a law for minimum price for the agricultural produce. In the United States, there is a law for guaranteeing minimum price for the agricultural produce. I may tell my hon. friend that it is not charity; the

U.S. Government is under a legal obligation to find markets for the surplus grain and we are getting it like a fond mother to let our children to sleep. That is not a good policy. You say you want a buffer stock. It is a strange story to have buffer stocks. Is there no land? Have you got no hands? Can you not have intelligence enough to use your hands on the land, to make use of fertilisers and science and technology? I fail to understand the story to have buffer stocks.

With all respect I beg to submit that it is a case not of an ordinary evolutionary process; it is not a case of ordinary, slow and steady working up on the basis of the resources as exist now. It is a case of a charismatic nature to bring about dynamic changes, to change the entire situation and to bring in new conditions. People will help you provided you go out of your office and instead of running to New York, you go to the fields and ask the peasants to co-operate.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Is it a speech or a manifesto? (*Interruption*).

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Sir, the budget discussions naturally reflect the position of food supplies and other supplies in the country. We have found on this occasion no talk about starvation or any scarcities and not much also about high prices which the consumers cannot afford. We are happy that the temper of the House and the tone of the speeches have reflected the adequate and satisfactory nature of our food supplies in the country. That also reflects in fact the progress we have made in the field of agricultural production.

My friend who opened the discussion happened to complain about the superfluity of cattle in the country. Other hon. Members have harped on the surplus of sugar. These two questions have figured largely in the debate we have had so far. I am sorry to see that this bony cow of India has been the bone of contention between Shri V. P. Nayar on the one hand and

some other hon. Members of this House, on the other to such an extent that he has been almost torn to the bone.

We have also similar trouble about sugar. But, as my colleague Shri Thomas has already assured the House, the House need not worry about the surplus and the Government would be doing all that it can so far as either the difficulties of the sugar mills, on the one hand, are concerned, and on the other, so far as the question of disposal is concerned.

Sir, since the last ten years we are working according to Plan. We had the First Plan, the Second Plan and the Third Plan is about to be before the country I would have wished, therefore, that the performance of my Ministry were judged more on the items that have been approved in the Plans because, the Plans are not made merely by the Government; those are national Plans approved by the House from time to time. That would have been better. Especially I am speaking about those hon. Members who make somewhat off-hand assertions that there has not been much progress in agriculture and that the agricultural production has not increased.

Now, instead of merely relying upon off-hand statements like that, if we try to examine the question in a little detail, I think every one of us would be wiser. The agricultural production is not based merely on a matter of sentiment or merely some vague feeling. Agricultural production and its increase is based on certain items which we are asked to implement. Those contain irrigation, more availability of fertilisers, soil conservation, seed and so on. There are very many things, and I am coming to them one by one.

Although we have already handed over to hon. Members a complete report of what we have done in all these matters, I would like to state in

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh]

a summary manner what achievements we have made and how far we have reached the targets that were set to us so far as our Ministry was concerned. We know the fondness and legitimate like of the House and preference for minor irrigation. My Ministry has paid the greatest attention to this and emphasised this factor with the result that we will be reaching the target—which was I think increased in the middle—and we will be covering 9 million acres with minor irrigation. In soil conservation, to which I admit we were awakened a little later because there was not much provision in the First Plan, the target of 2 million acres set in the Second Plan is about to be achieved. So far as seed farms are concerned, we had set a target of 4328 farms and near about 4000 seed farms have come into being.

I might deal with the objection that some hon. Members have raised with respect to the size of the seed farms. Sir, it is correct, and that appeals to me, that the small farms are likely to be a little more expensive because the overhead charges have to be borne. Therefore, from the very beginning we had suggested that wherever the State Governments would like to have larger areas if they can get it they are welcome to do so. Now, the real idea behind 25 acres was that it should provide nuclear seeds for the particular block in which the seed farm is situated. This was never intended to be only 25 acres, and later on on a reference it was even told to the State Governments that they need not stick to 25 acres, and they can easily have larger ones. I am glad to say that in many States larger areas have been taken and, therefore, the criticism or the objection that has been raised has been at least partially met.

Then, we had to attend to improved agricultural practices. Next comes the "intensive agricultural district" programme.

As my hon. friend Shri Malhotra has stated, we welcome it because it is intended to give us more production due to our concentrated effort there. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh wanted to know if we have fixed any target so far as these districts are concerned. I can say that we expect to produce 50 per cent more in the course of the five years.

Various points have been raised with respect to various matters such as fertilizers, implements and so on. We have given a complete account in the annual report as to what we have been doing with respect to availability of more manure which is indispensable for better agriculture, what composting we have done, what urban composts we have been able to secure and all those things. As a matter of fact, in the short time at my disposal it would not be possible for me to cover all the points. But I can assure the House that every one of the cut motions, whether moved or not, has been examined in my Ministry and complete examination of all the points which the hon. Members urged is before us in all the cases and wherever suitable action is called for, that will be coming forth.

My hon. friend, Shri Nayar, made a point about the composition of the ICAR. He thinks that it would have been much better if it had been made a part of the Government rather than leaving it as a society registered under the Societies Act. This ICAR is something which has been there for long and not something which we have done recently. It was constituted as a result of the proposals of the Royal Agricultural Commission, which was appointed in 1928. It was according to their suggestion that this Institute was registered, and it has been functioning well. I would like to tell Shri Nayar that I do not think any change in its composition or in its character would be beneficial to the agriculturists in the country, much less to the research programme.

Mr. Speaker: What are the special advantages?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I was just coming to the special advantages. There is a little more of latitude and elasticity of operation. Secondly, if it were a Government department, many interests are involved in it. For instance, a good deal of research is done by the States. Universities also come in. So, in their deliberations all these representatives figure. If we make it an administrative unit of Government, we will have to dilute our authority, so far as administration is concerned, with all these representatives. The present arrangement is far better and the history of the working of the ICAR will prove that this has been the wisest decision, because we have to consult the experts, who are not, all of them, in our employ. We could not employ all the experts. There are experts all over the country, under the universities, various institutions, State Governments and under various organisations. Further, according to our reckoning at any rate, this Institution, viz., the Council, has been working very satisfactorily and no change is called for. If and when the agricultural commission is appointed, if there is anything to be examined with respect to this, they would of course be free to do so. But I do not think my friend's feeling is correct that it would have worked better had it been entirely under the control of Government, as purely a part of Government machinery.

There has been a complaint from Shri Malhotra, so far as the working of the reasearch institute in Delhi is concerned. He had voiced that complaint earlier also and I had promised that we would certainly look into it. Because, if there is any truth in the allegations he has made, the points that he has referred to, I have no doubt that we will examine them most sympathetically and see that there is nothing of the sort that he had to complain against. Because, if we allow the sort of thing that he has observed, or he has been informed about, it will certainly ruin the best

institution that we have. But, in many cases, it is found that prejudices arise as a result of individual cases and individual representation. We are all human beings and therefore if somebody places before us one side of the thing, we are certainly influenced and we are likely to take it for granted that all that he says is correct. In this particular case I am not on such a strong ground because my hon. friend was himself in the Institute. So, he is likely to know a little more than all other hon. Members of Parliament. We are approached by various people.

Mr. Speaker: Who was in the Institute?

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: I was there. I was a student in the Institute.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I think he also held some appointment there.

An Hon. Member: He was a research student.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: That is why I wanted to add this proviso, namely, that the same considerations do not apply to him. He has a little more personal knowledge about the Institute than many other people.

We are prepared to take his caution about fertiliser factories also. We have, in fact, from the very beginning, knowing the urgency of providing fertilisers to the country, always pressed the Commerce and Industry Ministry to see that the fertiliser factories come into operation soon and we get the much needed fertiliser.

In the case of implements also I admit again that we had neglected this sphere very much. But in the Third Plan there is a very considerable provision for seeing to it that better implements are offered. We have a large provision. I have also suggested that every State Government, should have a big workshop so that better implements are made available. There is also a provision for giving loans for purchase of implements to the farmers. As a result

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh]

of what we have proposed in this respect, I think, the situation is sure to improve.

My hon. friend, Shri Nayar, was worried about poultry development, fisheries and piggery. All these things, at least since the Second Plan, have been attended to very effectively. Of course, the tempo is not so much as to answer the requirements of the country. There is much leeway to make up and there is need also to get to the work to proceed faster than we have done. But he will find, if he goes through even the annual report, that there has been very considerable development in poultry as well as fisheries. We have nearly 1,500 mechanised boats. We have also taken to deep sea fishing on a much larger scale than we did before. We have also many other proposals by which this activity is likely to be increased and intensified.

Some people take a one-sided view when they look at the need for food-grains. They forget that for the all-sided development of the country the cash crops are also equally necessary. Take even the case of sugar. If we look at the situation about a year and a half ago, we would know what an uproar there was when there was shortage of sugar. Similarly, cotton, jute and other articles also are necessary for the development of the country because these form raw materials for our industry. I am glad to say that in all these respects we have very substantial progress to report.

Mr. Speaker: In spite of the surplus, sugar prices do not seem to have come down.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: They cannot.

Mr. Speaker: Why?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Because it is tied up with other things. We have to pay Rs. 1|10|- per maund for sugarcane. It has been worked out by the Tariff Commission. There might be a small margin, but all the prices

have been fixed after due examination. Of course, if you wish to reduce the margin of profit further than what the Tariff Commission has agreed to, or do something else, you might probably be able to do a little; but I do not think that there is much of a chance of doing that. The question of export and so on would, of course, be dealt with by my senior colleague.

I was just coming to the point with regard to the trends of agricultural production. When I became a Minister in 1952, I was asked in the Rajya Sabha about the trend of production in the country. From the statistics I had to admit that there was not much of a trend of increase in foodgrain production in the country, although the situation was not so bad so far as cash crops like cotton, etc., were concerned. After ten years of independence and planning and what the Ministry, country and the farmers have been able to do, it is quite apparent that not only have we been able to achieve substantial additional production, in almost every case, but even the per acre yields have also increased substantially. The case of rice and wheat has already been dealt with by my hon. friend Mr. Thomas. Even if we take the case of cotton, jute or oil seeds there has been improvement. All people who are familiar with agriculture have to bear in mind and admit that agriculture depends on weather and also human efforts. Very often there is an inclination in this House on the part of hon. Members to give every credit only to the weather, as if weather alone can produce more. It does not. It has, no doubt got to be helpful. Even this year, although some hon. Members think that weather has been favourable, there have been floods in Orissa and drought conditions in Punjab and other areas also. It will thus be found that although nature has been good and kind, she has not been good and kind altogether and there have been misfortunes, droughts and floods on account of which agricultural production has suffered.

16.57 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

If we look at food production, we were in the neighbourhood of 50 million to 51·8 million tons in the first five years of our independence. From that we have gone up to more than 65·7 million tons by 1956-57. I am speaking only of the average God willing, in the next five years we will be far above 70 million if not near about 75 million tons. I feel a little more optimistic than my hon. friend Mr. Thomas, so far as this year's production is concerned and I would not be surprised if we are was in fact a revised target set for the Second Plan which was in fact a revised target. Actually, the reasonable target which was worked out, in consultation with the experts in the States and my Ministry, was lower than 80·5 million tons, but we do not want to quarrel with that. We accepted that because we did not wish to slacken our efforts. Even this increased target of 80·5 million tons, it would not surprise me if we are near to that despite all the calamities that we had to face this year. We had unprecedented floods in Orissa; we had visitations of the locusts throughout the country. Even the States which had never heard of locusts had visitations of locust. We had many other difficulties from which we suffered. In spite of all that, I would like to say that the position so far as food production is concerned, is hopeful, and we should be confident that we may not have to rely upon foreign imports for a long time. This is only a temporary phase, but it is all to the good that it is there. Otherwise my hon. friends on the other side may have had the chance of shouting about starvation deaths, scarcity and all that. They are their patent slogans which they delight in flinging at us.

I may strike a note of confidence so far as the future is concerned and if all our efforts which have succeeded so far do succeed in the future, also we would not be found wanting in achieving the target of not only 100

million tons, but probably 105 million tons even. I would not like to take more time, because we have distributed the time among three Ministers, and half-an-hour was allotted to me. My time is about to be over and so I cannot deal with all the points.

My hon. colleague Mr. Thomas referred to warehousing. We are doing a lot so far as godowns and other things are concerned. So far as agricultural credit is concerned from about Rs. 23 crores about six or seven years back, we have ploughed into the farmers' hands something like Rs. 190 crores so, only through the co-operative societies, I know it is not enough; there is need for five times that much, to say the least. There is not a shadow of doubt about that. But all the same, with the resources at our command, and with the kind of co-operative organisation we have in the country, I think we have done the maximum we could.

17:00 hrs.

We have also paid considerable attention to horticulture. We are taking care so far as the nutritional aspects is concerned. Apart from what my colleague Shri Thomas has referred to, we are encouraging horticulture, and we are trying to increase the plantation of cashew-nut, for instance, and the House would be glad to learn that in about a year's time we would have doubled the area under cashew-nut. It is a tree which is important not only so far as exports are concerned; it has a very great impact on the economy of Kerala because a lot of people depend for their livelihood on working on this cashew-nut, and therefore the employment and other factors also come in.

I have no time to deal with the cattle question. This is a very serious problem, and I am glad the two lady Members who have spoken have really given a very reasonable turn to the debate. That is the attitude that we will have to adopt. On the one side, it is said that nobody should

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh]

touch the cow even when it is about to die; and, on the other hand, nobody will agree that any slaughter of good cattle should be permitted. But there is not a shadow of doubt and we should be committed to it that the salvation of good animals, with better milk yield, lies in reducing the number of the animals by some way or the other. We have thought of *goadans*. It is the only method to reduce the population of the cattle. Unless we do that very substantially, no cow is likely to survive and no cow is likely to yield more milk. It is no use blaming Government. We pass laws banning cow slaughter and so on. But what do we do to the cow? I am very happy that Dr. Sushila Nayar has put this pertinent question to all those who want to be very eloquent about the protection of the cow and about the great and sacred place it should occupy. What little these people do is well known to the countryside. And unless they have a sense of realism so far as the cow and the cattle are concerned, we are not going to get out of the mess in which we are placed, so far as the cattle wealth in the country diminishing in its productivity and other problems are concerned.

I do not think I will take more of the time of the House. If there are any points that I have omitted, it is not because of lack of respect for anybody but only because of want of time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, I will request hon. Members to condense their remarks within ten minutes.

Shri M. B. Thakore (Patan): Since the last one hour nobody has been called from the opposition.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We should he worry? We shall see that the opposition gets the time allotted to it. And if the first hour begins from this side, has he ever raised that objection? Anyhow, I will be careful.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (हिसार) :
जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर, मैं डा० देशमुख की स्पीच सुन कर किसी कदर हैरान भी हुआ और किसी कदर एक तरह से मुझे तसल्ली भी हुई। एक तरफ तो मैं श्री बी० पी० नायर से सुनता हूँ कि जितने यहां के कैटिल हैं सब यूजलैस हैं। अब इस देश के ग्रन्दर तरह तरह के लोग बसते हैं। इधर मिस्टर बी० पी० नायर बसते हैं जोकि कहते हैं कि ऐनिमल हस्बैंडरी यह जरूरी चीज है और जितनी निकम्मी गायें हैं उनको स्लाटर कर दिया जाय। दूसरी तरफ ऐसे लोग भी बसते हैं जोकि यह कहते हैं कि किसी सूरत में भी गाय को नहीं मारा जाना चाहिये। उस के लिये वह जो रीजनिंग देते हैं वह सिर्फ यही नहीं है कि ऐसा वह रैलीजस सेंटिमेंट की वजह से कहते हैं बल्कि वह यह भी रीजनिंग देते हैं कि देश में एकोनामिक स्वराज्य होना है तो वह गाय के जरिये प्राणा है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं ने दो स्पीचेज सुनीं। एक डा० मुशीला नायर की जिन्होंने फरमाया कि जहां तक एकोनामिक इंटरेस्ट्स का सवाल है गाय को हमें एकोनामिक बनाना चाहिये और दूसरी स्पीच सुनी डाक्टर देशमुख की, जिन्होंने फरमाया कि हम इन दोनों के बीच का रास्ता खलतियार करते हैं। उधर नहीं चाहते कि उनको स्लाटर किया जाये और इधर यह भी नहीं चाहते कि उनको जिंदा रहने दिया जाये। मुझे उन की स्पीच सुन कर बड़ा ताज्जुब हुआ और साथ ही दुःख भी हुआ। मैं उस चीज को देश के वास्ते ठीक नहीं समझता।

अब मवेशियों की सुरक्षा के लिये हम ने अपने कांस्टीट्यूशन में दफा ४७ और ४८ रक्खी हैं और बक्त की तंगी की वजह से मैं उन दोनों दफाओं को हाउस के सामने पढ़ कर नहीं सुना सकता। इस देश की कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली ने इसको पास कर दिया।

है कि काऊ स्लाटर शुड भी बेंड । लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उस पर ठीक से अमल नहीं किया जा रहा है । लेविल ग्रौफ न्यूट्रीशन बढ़ाना सरकार की प्राइमरी ड्यूटी है । ४७ अर्टिकल का रू से अब जाहिर है कि लेविल ग्रौफ न्यूट्रीशन कैसे बढ़ सकता है जब तक इस देश के अन्दर दूध की पैदावार न बढ़े । सरकार इस और क्रिमिनल नेगलेक्ट कर रही है । डाक्टर साहब की यह बात सुन कर कि वह यह पर्वह नहीं करते कि गाय जिन्दा रहती है या नहीं मुझे बहुत ज्यादा ताज्जुब हुआ और साथ ही दुःख भी हुआ । मैं उन को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह सवाल सिर्फ रैलीजस नहीं है और मैं उस बेसिस पर अर्ज भी नहीं करना चाहता । मैं उस कांस्टीट्यूशन की दफा ४८ के वास्ते जिम्मेदार हूँ और इसका आधार हूँ मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय मैं ने यह अर्टिकल ४८ पेश किया था तो एकोनामिक बेसिस पर इस की जरूरत साबित की थी और हाउस ने सही तीर पर उस को मंजूर किया था । गाय की रक्षा हमारे देश के लिये एक एकोनामिक सवाल है ।

अभी अपने एक नये मेम्बर साहब की मैं ने तकरीर सुनी जिन्होंने कहा कि हमारी एग््रीकलचर मिनिस्ट्री ने कुछ नहीं किया है । मैं तो उस को सुन कर हैरान रह गया कि आखिर किम तरीके की यहां पर तकरीरें की जाती हैं । मैं अपने दोस्त को बतलाना चाहूंगा कि भाखड़ा बांध बनने की वजह से जिला हिसार का धानज का प्रोडक्शन ८ गुना बढ़ गया है । पहले ५४ मिलियन टन अनाज पैदा होता था जबकि अब ७५ मिलियन टन अनाज की पैदावार हमारे प्रदेश में हो रही है । अब यह हकीकत होने पर कहा जाय कि हमारी अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ी नहीं तो यह चीज दुस्त नहीं है और मैं तो इस तरह की स्पीच सुन कर हैरान रह जाता हूँ कि आखिर ऐसा क्यों कहा जा

रहा है, गायद एलेक्जब्रस को महेनजर रख कर कहा जाता है लेकिन इस तरह से कहना कतब दुस्त और वाजिब नहीं है ।

मैं इस मिनिस्ट्री की तबज्जह देश में दूध की पैदावार में कमी होते जाने की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ । मैं ने दो तीन वर्ष हुए जब इस हाउस के अन्दर बतलाया था कि सन १९५१ के मुकाबले सन १९५६ में जा कर दूध की पैदावार सरकारी आंकड़ों के अनुसार ५ करोड़ मन कम हो गई । मतलब यह कि ६ अरब रुपया सरकार ने इस देश का जाया किया । अब वह फीसर्ग ऐसी हैं जोकि किसी से छिपी हुई नहीं हैं । लेकिन उस के लिये कोई जवाब नहीं दिया गया । मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से जानना चाहूंगा कि सन १९५६ से ले कर आज तक गायों में कितनी बढ़होत्री की है और दूध की पैदावार कितनी बढ़ाई है । मैं ने एग््रीकलचर मिनिस्ट्री की रिपोर्ट को बड़े गौर से पढ़ा और यह जानने की कोशिश की कि यह मालूम हो सके कि इस देश में दूध की कितनी पैदावार बढ़ी है लेकिन इस में इस का कोई जिक्र नहीं मिलता है ।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि शेडयूल्ड कास्टस के लोगों का स्टैंडर्ड ग्रॉफ लिबिंग जिस को कि सरकार बढ़ाना चाहती है वह सब तक नहीं बढ़ेगा जब तक कि देश में छाछ की पैदावार नहीं बढ़ेगी और दूध की पैदावार नहीं बढ़ेगी । इसलिये इस देश में दूध की पैदावार बढ़ानी सब से जरूरी चीज है । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सन ५६ से आज तक हमारे देश में दूध की पैदावार कितनी बढ़ी है ? अब रिपोर्ट में और सब चीजों का जिक्र है । सबलिबिएरी फूड का जिक्र है और बीनियों चीजों का जिक्र है लेकिन उन के अन्दर मिल्क का नहीं जिक्र नहीं है । मैं चाहूंगा कि आप की मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से जो रिपोर्ट छपे उस में दूध के बारे में इत्तिला दी जानी चाहिये ।

मैं धानरेबुल फूड मिनिस्टर का शुक्रिया अर्पण करना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भागव]

राज्य के मुताबिक देश के अन्दर गोसंवर्धन कौंसिल कायम की और उस को आप ने बड़े अख्तियारात दिये हैं। उस ने कुछ काम शुरू भी किया है। मैं उन की खिदमत में और साथ ही अपने वजीर आजम की खिदमत में जोकि यहां इस वक्त मौजूद न हैं, कहना चाहूंगा कि उन्होंने हम को इस गोसंवर्धन के लिये बतौर प्रेसीडेंट एक बहुत बड़ा आदमी दिया है जोकि हिन्दुस्तान में अपनी किस्म का एक ही आदमी है और जिन की कि हम बहुत इज्जत करते हैं लेकिन आप करते यह हैं कि एक के बाद एक जिम्मेदारी उन पर डाल रहे हैं। अब सिड्डी ट्राइव्स और कस्ट्स के वास्ते जरूरत पड़े तो उन जिम्मेदारी सौंप दी। अब उन का जैसा शरीफ और नेक आदमी कभी भी चाहे उस पर कितना ही काम और जिम्मेदारी लाद दी जाय, अपने ऊपर लेने से इन्कार नहीं कर सकता और पीछे नहीं हट सकता लेकिन इस सब का नतीजा यह है कि वह महीनों यहां से गैरहाजिर रहते हैं और गोसंवर्धन का काम नहीं कर पाते। उस को प्रोपरली एंटेड नहीं कर पाते हैं। अब सुना जाता है कि उन को एलेक्शन के वास्ते तजवीज किया गया है। अब यह तो वही मामला हुआ कि एक अनार और सी बीमार। मेरा इशारा अपने श्री डेबर भाई से है जिन के कि ऊपर यह सब जिम्मेदारियां एक एक कर के लादी जा रही हैं। अब डेबर भाई तो अपनी जवान से कहने से रहे कि उन पर इतनी जिम्मेदारियां और काम न लादे जायें। यह तो सरकार का काम है कि उन पर इतनी सारी जिम्मेदारियां न लादी जायें ताकि जो काम गोसंवर्धन का उन के पास पहले से है उस को वह प्रापरली एंटेड कर सकें। लेकिन सरकार ऐसा नहीं करना चाहती। मेरी मिनिस्टर साहब की खिदमत में गुजारिश है कि जब उन्होंने इतनी कृपा कर के हम को ऐसे आदमी दिये हैं, तो बराये मेहरबानी उन को मौका दें कि वह पूरा काम कर

सकें। शुक है और मुझे बहुत खुशी है कि जहां तक केटल का सवाल है, देश में हमें इस से बेटर आदमी नहीं मिल सकते। हम देखते हैं कि प्लानिंग कमीशन में श्री श्रीमन्नारायण हैं और यहां पर पाटिल साहब और डा० देशमुख हैं। मैं ने पहले भी उन की जवान से सुना है और वह हमेशा इस हाउस में कहते रहे हैं कि हम दफा ४८ के पाबन्द हैं, लेकिन आज मैं एक नई बात सुन रहा हूँ, जो मेरे लिये ताज्जुब की है। जनाबे वाला इस को जरा गौर से देखें कि इस का क्या नतीजा निकलेगा। नतीजा यह निकलता है कि मेरे पास जो फ्रिगर्ज थीं, उन का आज तक कोई जवाब नहीं है। १९५० से एक ग्रीस भी दूध नहीं बढ़ा है। इस देश में १९४८ में सात ग्रीस की दूध की ग्रीसत थी और आज ४.७५ की ग्रीसत है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट ने इस सिलसिले में क्या किया है। उस ने कुछ नहीं किया है। उस की नेग्लिजेंस वैसी ही जारी है। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि गो-संवर्धन कौंसिल बना दी गई है, लेकिन उस से यह मामला तय नहीं होगा। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में करीब १५ करोड़ गाय हैं और चार करोड़ भैंस हैं, कुल २० करोड़ जानवर हैं। श्री कृष्णप्पा ने पिछली दफा फरमाया था कि और देशों में तीस परसेंट फाडर प्रोडक्शन होता है। उन्हो ने इस सिलसिले में अमरीका और रशा का जिक्र किया। अमरीका में ६८ परसेंट और विलायत में २१ परसेंट होता है, लेकिन इस देश में फाडर के लिये सिर्फ ४ परसेंट जमीन दी जाती है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह गवर्नमेंट बिजिनेस मीन करती है, तो गो-संवर्धन कौंसिल तो एक तरफ रही, जहां तक फाडर का सवाल है, आईन्दा के लिये कम से कम १६ परसेंट जमीन तय कर दीजिये, यहां पर १६ परसेंट जमीन पर फाडर बोया जाये। अगर यह गवर्नमेंट यह नहीं करेगी, तो उस की सब तरकीबें

घरी की घरी रह जायेंगी। गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि देश में १०० और गोशालायें खोली जायेंगी। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उस से क्या असर पड़ेगा। ५२ करोड़ मन दूध के मुकाबले में १०० गोशालाओं में कितना दूध होता होगा? मुश्किल से पांच दस हजार मन। गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से यह भी कहा जाता है कि दिल्ली में १,८०० मन, बम्बई में ५,००० हजार मन और कलकत्ता में १,४०० मन दूध का इन्तजाम किया गया है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि ये तो छोटी छोटी चीजें हैं ये तो लिलिपुटियन चीजें हैं। देश में बड़ी बड़ी चीजों की जरूरत है और उन की तरफ गवर्नमेंट को ध्यान देना चाहिये।

जब तक गवर्नमेंट इस देश में ऐमी कन्डीशनज पैदा नहीं करेगी कि हर गाय और बैल को, हर जानवर को पूरा चारा मिल सके, तब तक यह नामुम्किन है कि इस सवाल को हल किया जा सके। आज इस देश में क्या सूत है? आज यहां पर ४८ परसेंट ऐमे प्रादमी हैं, जिन के पास पांच एकड़ जमीन है और ३१ परसेंट ऐसे हैं, जिन के पास ढाई एकड़ जमीन है। क्या गवर्नमेंट उन से उम्मीद करती है कि वे अपने जानवरों को चारा खिला सकेंगे? उन मिलसिले में सब तरह की फसलों को का-आडिनेशन करना गवर्नमेंट का फ्रज है।

गवर्नमेंट ने एनिमल न्यूट्रीशन के लिये एक कॉमिटी बिठाई थी। उस की रिपोर्ट मेरे पास है। उसमें ब्राय्डीमम बेलेंसड फूड के बारे में कहा गया है कि इन्सान के लिये १४ फ्रीस सीरियल्स और ३ फ्रीस पल्सिज की जरूरत है। ये दोनों के दोनों पूरे हो चुके हैं। आज के दिन देश में ७५ मिलियन टन अनाज होने से २० फ्रीस खुराक गवर्नमेंट दे सकती है, जबकि उस को देना है १४ और ३, कुल १७ फ्रीस। जहां तक सीरियल्स का सवाल है, उस की सैल्फ-सफिशिएन्सी

एटेन कर ली गई है, लेकिन मुसीबत यह है कि यह सैल्फ-सफिशियन्सी एटेन करने के बाद भी गवर्नमेंट अपनी ज़बान से नहीं कहती है कि हम ने वह एटेन कर ली है। बेलेंसड फूड दूध १० फ्रीस देना चाहिये, लेकिन उस के बजाये ४७५ फ्रीस देते हैं। मिल्क और मिल्क प्राडक्टस देनी चाहिये २ परसेंट लेकिन देते हैं ३६। ब्राय्डीमम बेलेंसड फूड में जो कमी है, वह इस बात की है कि मिल्क प्राडक्टस नहीं दी जाती हैं और इस तरफ गवर्नमेंट को ध्यान देना चाहिये।

मुझे वह दिन याद है, जब किदवई साहब ने हाउस में कहा कि हम थोड़ी सी शूगर इम्पोर्ट करेंगे। उस वक्त मैं ने उन की खिदमत में कहा कि हम को डूब कर भर जाना चाहिये, हमें इस देश में मूंह नहीं दिखाना चाहिये कि हम शूगर इम्पोर्ट करते हैं। उन्होंने जवाब दिया कि मुझे उम्मीद है कि ब्राईन्दा शूगर इम्पोर्ट नहीं होगी। मुझे खुशी है कि आज शूगर इतनी ज्यादा हो गई है कि इम्पोर्ट का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता है। गवर्नमेंट ने विलायत से १६ मिलियन टन अनाज मंगाया है। हम ने १०० एल० ४८० की बातें भी सुनीं। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे पाटिल साहब के अलफ्राज पर यकीन है। मैं उन से यह एणोरेंस चाहता हूँ, और मुझे उम्मीद है कि वह उस को पूरा करेंगे, कि १६ करोड़ टन का बकर स्टाक बनाने के लिये वह ब्राईन्दा इस देश में फूडग्रेन्स इम्पोर्ट नहीं करेंगे। ७५ मिलियन टन से हम सैल्फ-सफिशियन्सी हैं। जब हमारी पैदावार १०० मिलियन टन हो जायगी, तो वह सैल्फ-सफिशियन्सी और भी ज्यादा हो जायगी। जो बकर स्टाक बनाया जायगा, उस को रिप्लेस कर के देश के अनाज से बकर स्टाक बनाया जायगा, यह एणोरेंस इस देश में एक एक प्रादमी को बड़ी भारी

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

तसल्ली देगी और मुझे उम्मीद है कि यह एशोरेंस पूरा हो जायगा ।

इस डिबेट में इन्टरवीन करने में मेरा मतलब यह था कि अब वह वक्त आ गया है, जब कि यह सवाल नहीं है कि कितना भ्रनाज पैदा करें, कितनी रई पैदा करें कि और कितनी क्या चीज पैदा करें, लेकिन यह जरूर देखना चाहिए कि पंजाब में जैसे प्योर सीड काटन लगाया गया है और वहां पर एक खास तरह की रई पैदा की जाती है—डा० देशमुख इसको जानते हैं—जिसका नतीजा यह है कि अपनी काटन पालिसी की वजह से हमने अपने देश का करोड़ों रुपये का फायदा कर दिया । इसी तरह मैं चाहता हूँ कि देश में सब चीजें को-ऑर्डिनेटिड हों । मैं गन्ने के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ । जितना गन्ना पैदा हो, उतनी चीनी एक्सपोर्ट की जाये और उससे सब दौलत देश को मिलेगी । जहां तक फूड का ताल्लुक है, उस में सेल्फ-सफिशेन्सी होनी चाहिए, लेकिन उसके लिए यह जरूरी है कि क्राप पैटर्न को तब्दील किया जाये । जहां तक फ़ाडर प्राइव्शन का सवाल है, और देशों की तरह ३० परसेंट तो हम नहीं दे सकते हैं, लेकिन १५, १६ परसेंट आसानी से कर सकते हैं । अगर ऐसा कर दिया जाये, तो फिर १०० करोड़ रुपया खर्च करने की जरूरत नहीं है । प्लानिंग कमीशन ने एनिमल हसबैंड्री के लिये जो १०० करोड़ रुपया रखा है, वह उसके लिये पूरा नहीं होगा । उससे कुछ नहीं होगा । वह दिया, उस के लिये हम मशकूर हैं । हमारे पास अलफ़ाज नहीं हैं कि हम उसके लिये शुक्रिया अदा कर सकें । लेकिन इसका फ़ैसला सिर्फ इस तरह से होगा कि क्राप पैटर्न में कम से कम १६ फ़ीसदी आराजी फ़ाडर प्राइव्शन के लिये बढ़ावें ।

मिक्स्ड फार्मिंग के लिये एक करोड़ रुपया रखा गया है । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ

कि क्या एक बीघा जमीन पर भी मिक्स्ड फार्मिंग हुई । मैं चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट जैसी मिक्स्ड फार्मिंग चाहती है, वह वैसी ही हो । मैंने फ़र्ट और सैकंड फ़ाइव यीअर प्लान्ज को देखा है । दोनों में वही चीजें दोहराई गई हैं, लेकिन उन पर अमल नहीं किया गया है । अब सैकंड फ़ाइव यीअर प्लान खत्म हो रहा है । गवर्नमेंट ने एनिमल हसबैंड्री को तरक्की देने के लिये जो कुछ तय किया था, उसका क्या असर हुआ है? एक आंस भी दूध नहीं बढ़ा है और वह नहीं बढ़ सकता, जब तक कि देश में हर एनिमल की जिम्मेदारी गवर्नमेंट न लेगी । महात्मा गांधी और किदवई साहब कहते थे कि हर एनिमल की जिम्मेदारी गवर्नमेंट की है, यह ख्याल गलत है कि कैटल के मालिक की ही है—जैसे हर इन्सान की भूख की जिम्मेदारी गवर्नमेंट की है, उमी तरह कैटल की जिम्मेदारी भी गवर्नमेंट की है । अगर यह दुस्त है, तो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि उस दिन देश का भला होगा, जिस दिन हर एक फ़ार्मर के फ़ील्ड पर एनिमल्ज, बैल, मजबूत होंगे । पहले बैल ३५, ४० मन बोझा उठाते थे और अब मुश्किल से १५, २० मन उठाते हैं । पहले गायें १२, १५ सेर दूध देती थीं और आज ७, ८ सेर देती हैं । यह मैंने अपनी आंखों से देखा है । यह सब गवर्नमेंट की नेग्लिजेंस है । गवर्नमेंट को पचासों दफ़ा हमने कहा है कि इस बारे में एक्शन लो । उसने एक्शन लिया है, लेकिन रीयल एक्शन नहीं लिया गया है । जरूरत इस बात की थी कि मासिज को समझाओ और फ़ार्मर्स को इस बारे में इन्ट्रेस्टिड करो, लेकिन वह अभी तक नहीं किया गया है और वह नहीं किया जा सकता है, जब तक कि क्राप पैटर्न को तब्दील न किया जाये । जितनी गोशालायें थीं, उन सब की जमीन पर सीलिंग लगा दी गई । जिनके पास जमीन थी, जिस पर वे डंगर चरा कर सकते थे, वह भी नहीं रही । मीडोज को भी

खत्म कर दिया गया । ४ परसेंट मीडोज बाकी रह गई है । हमारे बुजुर्गों ने पंजाब के हर एक गांव में बड़ी बड़ी जमीनें गौचर भूमि के तौर पर चराने के लिये छोड़ी थीं । वे भी तोड़ दी गई । पंजाब में दस परसेंट आर्पिटमम तय किया गया था, वह भी तोड़ दिया गया, पंचायत को दे दिया गया है । यह उन गरीब बेचारे जानवरों के साथ जुल्म है, जो मुंह से नहीं बोल सकते हैं । कोई कन्सिलकट जानवर और भ्रादमी में नहीं है । यह ख्याल गलत है कि इस देश में जो दूध आता है अमरीका से आता है, उसमें फ्रैट कन्टेन्ट होता है और हमारे मुल्क के मुकाबले में ज्यादा होता है । मुझे बताया जाये कि अमरीका में कौन सा कनसेन्ट्रेट दिया जाता है । हर एक भ्रादमी हमारे मुंह पर यह कहता है कि यह नामुमकिन है कि इस देश में यह मसला हल हो सके । क्यों? इस लिये कि इस देश में ७८ परसेंट के लिये चारा है और २८ परसेंट के लिये कलमेंटेड । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वे लोग हिसाब को भूल गये । सारे एक्सपर्ट्स को क्या हो गया ? फ्रैस्ट फ्राइव यीगर प्लान में सीरियल्स का २० परसेंट इन्क्रीज हुआ । कहा जाता है कि सैकंड फ्राइव यीगर प्लान में १५, १६ परसेंट का इन्क्रीज हुआ है, जिसका मतलब यह है कि ३६ परसेंट इन्क्रीज हो गया सीरियल्स में इसका चारा कहाँ गया ? भ्रादमी तो चारा खाता नहीं है । वह तो जानवर के लिये ही हुआ । इसके मानेये हैं कि चारे की तादाद बढ़ी है, जो कि जानवर के काम के लिये है । लेकिन जानवरों की परवरिश करना और उनकी नस्ल को मुधारना बड़ा मुश्किल है । इसमें वक्त लगता है । इसलिये इस बारे में कहा जाता है कि इस देश में जमीन नहीं, यह नहीं है, वह नहीं है । दूसरे मुल्कों में भ्रादमी को रोटी खाने के लिये छः सात एकड़ जमीन चाहिए । हमारे देश में फ्री भ्रादमी के हिसाब से प्राधा एकड़, धीन एकड़ या एक एकड़ से ज्यादा नहीं है । अगर कोई कहता है कि हम मर रहे हैं, तो यह कवर्ड

भी ठीक नहीं है । हमारे देश में घनाज और चारा काफी है । दोनों बड़े प्राराम से रह सकते हैं अगर हम मिक्सड फार्मिंग करें । जो हम कहते हैं, उसको अगर हम प्रमल में लायें, तो यह काम हो सकता है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि ब्राइन्दा जो रिपोर्ट आप उसके अन्दर अन्दरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब को साफ साफ दिखाना चाहिये कि ये-ये काम इसके बारे में हुए हैं । आज जो रिपोर्ट आपने पेश की है, यह देखने के काबिल नहीं है । इस रिपोर्ट के अन्दर कहीं पर भी एनिमल हस्बैंड्री का दूध के लिहाज से एक लफ्ज भी नहीं लिखा गया है । आपको शर्म आनी चाहिये । इतना सस्ता इडिक्टमेंट हाउस में हुआ है लेकिन फिर भी आपने इसकी तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया है । आपने छः अरब रुपया वेरा का बरबाद कर दिया है पांच करोड़ मन दूध कम कर दिया है । आपने यह तक नहीं कहा है कि इस सब की क्या बज्जुहात है । आपके पास इसका कोई जवाब नहीं है, आप इसकी बज्जुहात बताने की जुरत नहीं कर सकते हैं ।

मैं नहीं चाहता कि इन खराबियों को रिपीट करूं । मुझे शर्म आती है यह कहते हुए कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहबान की बज्जुहात से यह चीज हो गई है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि ब्राइन्दा जो रिपोर्ट आप हमें दें उसमें यह दिखाये कि फिलवाका इतना दूध बढ़ गया है, इतनी जानवरों की तरक्की हुई है । एक मैम्बर साहब ने कहा कि जब तक प्रॉटिकल ४८ के मुताबिक गवर्नमेंट नहीं चलती है, तब तक यह कांस्टीट्यूशनल गवर्नमेंट नहीं है । अगर आप चाहते हैं कि कांस्टीट्यूशनल गवर्नमेंट के मिनिस्टर होना तो यह आपका फर्ज है कि सारी कांस्टीट्यूशन की प्रॉबिजन्स को आप मानें । यह देश का दुष्म है । यह प्रॉटिकल ऐसे नहीं बन गया है । इस प्रॉटिकल को लेकर हमारे नायर साहब और उनके फेलो ट्रेबलर्स सुप्रीम कोर्ट तक में गए हैं और इसकी बिलज किया है और कहा है कि यह बुफ्त नहीं है ।

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने करार दिया है कि यह दुस्त नहीं है, देश की इकोनामिक हालत के मुताबिक है और इस पर अमल किया जाना चाहिये।

मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जो चीज सैंकटीफाई हो गई है उस पर अमल होना चाहिये। यह देश का तबाजा है, इस पर अमल करने में ही सारे देश की भलाई है। ग्रेन का जो प्राबलैम है, वह साल्व नहीं होगा, फूड का जो प्राबलैम है, वह साल्व नहीं होगा जब तक आप इस मसले का ठीक हल नहीं करते हैं। दूध में न्यूट्रिटिव वैल्यू बहुत अधिक है, एक सेर दूध में साढ़े छः छटाक घाटे की वैल्यू है—

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं मेम्बर साहब से रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि वह चेयर ले लें। उनको तकलीफ होगी अगर ज्यादा बोलोगे।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : आप मुझे सतम करना चाहते हैं—

श्री बजरंग सिंह : हम चाहते हैं कि आप बहुत देर तक रहे।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : जल्द से ज्यादा वक्त दिया है आपने मुझको, इसका मैं खयाल रखूंगा—

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको जो तकलीफ थी, उसकी याद मैं आपको दिला रहा हूँ। इसके बाद मैं आपसे दरहवास्त करने वाला हूँ कि आप चेयर ले लें। उस वक्त जब दूसरों के लिये आप घटी बजायगे, तो आपको तकलीफ होगी।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : हर इन्सान को जितने घंटे वह स्पीच तैयार करने में सगाये, स्टडी करने में लगाये, एक मिनट की घटा के हिसाब से तो वक्त मिलना चाहिये। मैं आपसे सच कहता हूँ कि जो कुछ मैं कह रहा

हूँ वह बीस घंटे की मेहनत के बाद कह रहा हूँ।

Shri M. V. Krishnappa : I did not want to interrupt Panditji while he was speaking. If I have understood his Hindi correctly, he has challenged three or four times that the milk production in the country has gone down. He said, he has challenged the Government and the Government is not able to answer. The hon. Member knows that the cattle census is held once in five years. In 1951 the production of milk in the country was 466 million maunds, i.e., cow, buffalo and goat milk. In 1956, there was a census again and according to the latest census, the milk yield in the country is 528 million maunds. So, in five years, milk production has gone up by nearly 6 crore maunds.

It may be true that the per capita yield per cow may have gone down, but that is because of the number of useless and old cattle existing. Because of the ban on cow slaughter in the various States, since the last 10 years, the number of useless and old cows has gone up greatly. Therefore, if you divide the total milk production by the number of cows, including the useless and old cows, the yield per cow goes down. It is not our fault. So, the milk production in five years has gone up by 6 crores maunds.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : The figures about 1956 are the Government figures given in the Live Stock Statistics, 1956. The figures given by the hon. Minister are not published yet.

Shri M. V. Krishnappa : In 1951, the production of milk in the country was 466 million maunds. In 1956, census it was 528 million maunds. That is the latest census; we have not had any census afterwards.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : In 1956 the figures was 466. Have your figures been published by Government anywhere?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Both the figures are equally reliable.

श्री रामजी बर्मा (देवरिया) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, चंद मिनट का समय जो आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए दिया है, उस के लिए मैं आपके धन्यवाद करता हूँ। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान दो एक बातों की तरफ ही आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ।

इस मुद्दे में खाद्य की स्थिति को सुधारने के लिए हमारे वर्तमान मंत्री जी ने जो प्रयास किया है, उसके लिए वह बधाई के पात्र हैं। इसके लिए उनको जरूर बधाई मिलनी चाहिये। उन्होंने बाहर से कर्ज का गल्ला ला करके स्थिति में सुधार कर दिया है। लेकिन मैं मंत्री जी और सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कर्ज लेकर खाने की जो प्रवृत्ति है यह बहुत अच्छी नहीं है। हमारी सारी एनर्जी, सारा पैसा, समस्त धन जो है, वे कर्ज प्राप्त करने में लग रहे हैं और जो ध्यान हम इस ओर दे रहे हैं वहीं ध्यान हमने अगर लोगों की ओर, किसानों की ओर, दिया होता तो मैं समझता हूँ कि समस्या बहुत कुछ हल हो गई होती। बरसों से इस बात का वादा किया जा रहा है और सरकार से यह मांग की जा रही है कि प्राइस फिक्सेशन बोर्ड बनना चाहिये और किसान को उसकी पैदावार का उचित मूल्य दिया जाना चाहिये। लेकिन किसी न किसी बहाने सरकार इस मांग को मजूर करते हुए भी टालती जा रही है और दाम मुकर्रर करना नहीं चाहती है। अगर उचित दाम किसान को आज नहीं मिल रहे हैं, तो वह सरकार की इस नीति के कारण ही नहीं मिल रहे हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बहुत प्रयास के बाद, बहुत संघर्ष के बाद आपने अपने मंत्री-काल में गन्ने की प्राइस थोड़ी बहुत बढ़ाई है और इसके नतीजे के तौर पर आपने देखा है कि किस कदर गन्ना पैदा करके किसानों ने दिखा दिया है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि गन्ने की जितनी प्राइस बढ़ी है वह उचित है, वह बहुत कम है। लेकिन उसी से किसान को

जो उत्साह मिला उसका नतीजा यह है कि गन्ना इतना पैदा हुआ है कि आपके लिए गन्ने को खपाना और मिला में पेरवाना मुश्किल हो गया है। जिनमें आज फैक्ट्रियां हैं, वे इसके करने में असमर्थ हैं, सरकार असमर्थ है और उस गन्ने को कंज्यूम नहीं किया जा रहा है। अब आप उनको यह कह कर या स्टेट मिनिस्टर यह कह कर कि गन्ना बहुत हो गया है, निरुत्साहित करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिनमें चीनी की देश को आवश्यकता है, उसके मुताबिक गन्ना मुल्क में नहीं है। जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह है कि थोड़ा सा दाम गन्ने का आपने बढ़ाया और उसके फलस्वरूप किसान में इतना उत्साह बढ़ा कि गन्ना ही गन्ना हो गया। इसी तरह से व्हीट के, राइस के और गल्ले के दाम अगर आप बढ़ा दे, प्राइस फिक्सेशन बोर्ड बिठा दे और हर साल उन चीजों के दाम तय हुआ करे तो मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि किसानों में इस कदर उत्साह का संचार होगा कि वे गल्ला भी भारी मात्रा में पैदा करके आपको दे देंगे और उसी तरह से वे देंगे जिम तरह से उन्होंने केन दिया है। परन्तु गल्ले की तो आज आपके लिए एक समस्या ही बन गई है और आपको नहीं सूझता है कि इसको कैसे हल किया जाए। अगर किसानों को उत्साहित किया जाए तो फिर न अमरीका से और न ही आस्ट्रेलिया से आपको कर्ज लेने की जरूरत पड़ेगी। लेकिन इनसेटिव आप किसान को देना नहीं चाहते हैं। आप गलत पालिसी प्रस्तियार करते हैं। आप बाहर से कर्ज ले करके और मुल्क के कर्जों पर इन कर्जों का बोझा लाद करके समस्या को हल करना चाहते हैं। आप यहां के लोगों पर विश्वास नहीं करते हैं। किसान के ज्ञान पर, किसान की पद्धति पर और किसान खुद भी बढ़ा हो सकता है, इस पर आपका विश्वास नहीं है। नए-नए मैथड आप खोजते फिरते हैं, कर्ज ले करके कमी को पूरा करना चाहते हैं। आप कोओपरेटिव की बात करते हैं, कोओपरेटिव कामिंग की

[श्री रामजी वर्मा]

बात करते हैं, फिर चाहे वे सर्विस को प्रोमोटिव ज हों या कोई और हों, उस पर भी आप ग्रमल नहीं करते हैं। आप इस चीज को लागू क्यों नहीं करते हैं, चालू क्यों नहीं करते हैं? जब आप देहातों के लिये प्लान करना चाहें तो आप गांव वालों से कह दें, पचायतों से जो कि अब बन गई हैं कह दें, कि तुमको अपने गांव का गल्ला प्लान करना पड़ेगा, तुमको यह प्लान करना पड़ेगा कि तुमको कितना कर्जा चाहिये, कितनी तुमको तकावी चाहिए, कितना सीड चाहिए और कितना फर्टीलाइजर वगैरह चाहिए, और आपको उनसे कहना चाहिए कि तुमको अपने इस साल के उत्पादन से अगले साल अधिक उत्पादन दिखाना होगा। मैं समझता हूं कि अभी यहां के किसानों में जीवन शक्ति बाकी है जिसके जरिये से वह आपको अधिक गल्ला पैदा करके दे सकते हैं और फिर आपको किसी तरह का कर्जा लेने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी। लेकिन आपको उन में विश्वास नहीं है, आप उनमें इंसेंटिव पैदा होने देना नहीं चाहते और उनको उचित प्रयास नहीं करने देते कि जिसके जरिये से वे अपना काम खुद कर सकें। यह जटिल हालत है। इसी कारण से इस देश की खाद्य समस्या हल नहीं होती। जब तक आप उसका विश्वास नहीं करेंगे, और उल्टा अपने चन्द अफसरों का विश्वास करेंगे, अपने मंत्रिमंडल का विश्वास करेंगे और जब तक आप उन हजारों, लाखों और करोड़ों किसानों को, जो कि देश में फैले हुए हैं, यह समझेंगे कि ये बेकार हैं और कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं, तब तक आपकी यह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती। आप उनका भार उनके कंधे पर डालिए और उनके मन में आत्म विश्वास पैदा होने दीजिए। जब करोड़ों किसानों में आत्म विश्वास पैदा हो जाएगा तो मुल्क की खाद्य समस्या अक्षय्य हल हो जाएगी और आपके सामने गल्ले की अधिकता की समस्या

उसी तरह खड़ी हो जाएगी जिस तरह कि आज गन्ने की समस्या आपके सामने है।

गन्ने के सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं। गन्ने के सम्बन्ध में सरकार की नीति स्पष्ट नहीं है और प्रगति को रोकने वाली है। एक तरफ किसानों ने इतना गन्ना पैदा किया है कि आपके लिये समस्या बन गयी है और आपको उसे अपनी मिलों में खपाना कठिन हो रहा है। दूसरी तरफ अगर लोग छोटी छोटी मशीनें लगा कर खंडसारी वाले उस गन्ने का उपयोग करना चाहते हैं जिसको कि आप मिलों में क्रश नहीं कर सकते, तो उनके रास्ते में आप रोड़ा अटकते हैं और इस चीज को रोकना चाहते हैं। इस मुल्क के व्यापारी, इस मुल्क के किसान आगे बढ़ रहे हैं, लेकिन उस आगे बढ़ते हुए कदम को अगर कोई रोकता है तो वह हमारी सरकार की गलत नीति है।

मैं अपने खाद्य मंत्री जी से यह जरूर निवेदन करूंगा कि जब से उन्होंने यह भार लिया है तब से लोगों में थोड़ा सा आत्म विश्वास पैदा हुआ है कि हां मुल्क की यह समस्या हल हो जायेगी। लेकिन जो उन्होंने बाहर से कर्जा लेने का तरीका अपनाया है यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है। कुछ दिनों तक आप इस कृत्रिम तरीके से लोगों को रख सकते हैं। लेकिन सही तरीका किसानों में आत्म विश्वास पैदा करने का है।

कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग के सिलसिले में भी मुझे दो एक बातें कह देनी हैं। आप यदि अफसरों के जरिए से गांवों में कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग कराएंगे तो मैं कहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान में फिर भी प्रोडक्शन नहीं बढ़ेगा।

अभी सबेरे जिक्र हो रहा था और डा० राम सुब्रह्म सिंह जी ने बतलाया कि आप हर गांव में एक छोटा सा सीड फार्म बनाए

जा रहे हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह भी बिल्कुल गलत पालिसी है। इसके बजाए आपको यह चाहिए कि गांवों के खेतों में से जिस खेत में सबसे अच्छी पैदावार हो आप गांव वालों से कहिए कि उसी को सीड के काम में लाएं उनको खुद यह काम करने दीजिए। आपने पंचायतें बना रखी हैं, उनके जरिए आप बहुत काम ले सकते हैं। इस तरह से सरकार का भार बहुत हल्का हो सकता है और अफसरों की तनख्वाह बच सकती है और लोगों में आत्म विश्वास पैदा हो सकता है।

इसके बाद चूंकि समय हो गया है और बहुत रिक्वेस्ट के बाद उपाध्यक्ष जी ने मुझे समय दिया है, मैं एक ही बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। शुगर वेज बोर्ड की जो रिपोर्टें प्रकाशित हुई हैं उसकी सिफारिशों को अमल में लाया जाए। बड़ी बड़ी कमेटियां बनती हैं उनकी रिपोर्टें आती हैं और आप उन सबको ताक पर रख लेते हैं। मैं आपसे कहूँ कि इस तरह से आप लेबर में भी आत्म विश्वास खो रहे हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि आप वजबोर्ड की सिफारिशों को लागू कीजिए। शुगर फक्टरीज में जो मजदूर काम करते हैं उनकी हालत को आप जानते हैं, हम सभी जानते हैं। मेरे जिले देवरिया में तो १४ शुगर फ़ैक्टरियां हैं। वहां लेबर की क्या हालत है, केन ग्रीन्स की क्या हालत है, यह सवाल हम असेम्बली में भी उठाते हैं और यहां भी किसी न किसी तरह प्राये दिन उठा कर आपको तंग करते हैं। लेकिन हमारा उद्देश्य आपको तंग करना नहीं बल्कि मुल्क को आगे बढ़ाना होता है। मेरा निवेदन है कि लोगों में जो हीसला है, उस हीसले से काम लीजिए, उनको उत्साहित कीजिए। ऐसा करने से हमारे देश की समस्याओं का अन्वय हल निकल आयेगा।

डा० गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सबसे पहले जिनमे मेरा

बहुत पुराना सम्बन्ध है और जो मेरे निकटतम मित्रों में से एक मित्र रहे हैं उन श्री पाटिल साहब को मैं हृदय से बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने बहुत थोड़े समय के अन्दर अपनी योग्यता का पूरा पूरा परिचय दिया है।

स्वर्गीय श्री रफी अहमद किदवाई के सिवा श.यद कोई भी मंत्री इस विभाग में इतना सफल नहीं हुआ जितना कि पाटिल साहब हुए हैं। और जब मैं उन्हें यह बधाई देता हूँ तो एक प्रकार से वह बधाई मुझे स्वयं मिल जाती है क्योंकि मैंने अभी आपसे निवेदन किया कि वे मेरे पुराने से पुराने और निकट से निकट के मित्र रहे हैं।

खेती का उत्पादन कितना बढ़ा है इस सम्बन्ध में मेरे मित्र पंडित ठाकुर दास जी भागव ने कुछ अंक उपस्थित किए। इस विषय में कोई सन्देह तो होना ही नहीं चाहिए कि उत्पादन बढ़ा है, लेकिन दो प्रश्न हैं और बहुत बड़े प्रश्न हैं। क्या यह जो उत्पादन बढ़ा है इसमें स्थायित्व की बात है? इस देश की खेती बहुत दूर तक जो वर्षा होती है कम या अधिक, दूसरे इसी प्रकार के जो नैसर्गिक परिवर्तन होते हैं, उन पर निर्भर करती है। इधर कुछ फसलें अच्छी घाई हैं, उत्पादन बढ़ा है, लेकिन हमें यह देखना है कि जो यह उत्पादन बढ़ा रहा है यह स्थायी हो जाए और हमें आगे चल कर वही कठिनाई फिर न पड़े जो अनेक बार पड़ती रही है।

दूसरे जो प्रश्न इस संबंध में है वह अनाज के भावों का है। मैं मध्य प्रदेश से आता हूँ। हम लोग इन भावों के मामले में बहुत तकलीफ उस प्रदेश में बरबादत कर चुके हैं। छत्तीसगढ़ में धान का उत्पादन होता है। एक समय प्राया जब धान का उत्पादन सब बढ़ा लेकिन भाव इसने घट गए कि बेचारे किसान फिर भी भूखों मर गए। यही बात अनेक बार गेहूँ के सम्बन्ध में होती है। तो हमें इस विषय में दो बातों की तरफ विशेषकर ध्यान रखना

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

है कि जो उत्पादन बढ़े वह स्थायी उत्पादन बढ़े, और उसी के साथ एक खास सतह पर भाव रहें, उनसे नीचे भाव न जावें, जिससे कि किसानों को उनकी मेहनत का एवजाना मिल जाए ।

उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए जमीन की जुताई, खाद, अच्छा बीज, सिंचाई, सब आवश्यक हैं । स सम्बन्ध में सभी बातों के लिए कुछ न कुछ हो रहा है । किन्तु सर्वोपरि मैं गोरक्षा को मानता हूँ । और मुझे इस बात का खेद है कि स विषय में मैं पाटिल साहब को, श्री देशमुख साहब को, श्री कृष्णप्पा साहब को या श्री धामस साहब को और उनके विभाग के किसी व्यक्ति को भी कोई बधाई देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ । जहां तक कृष्णप्पा साहब का मामला है, उनके सम्बन्ध में तो मुझे बड़ा क्षोभ है उनके उस भाषण पर जो भाषण उन्होंने श्री झूलन सिन्हा साहब के विधेयक पर २५ नवम्बर, १९६० को किया था । वह भाषण हमारे संविधान के विरुद्ध था, वह भाषण जो हमारा सर्वोच्च न्यायालय है उसके फैसले से विरुद्ध था, वह भाषण उन्होंने अपने संविधान के प्रति वफादार रहने के लिए जो शपथ ली है उस शपथ के विरुद्ध है ।

जहां तक गाय का मामला है, मैं हमेशा एक मत का रहा हूँ । भारतीय संस्कृति का मैं एक छोटा सा पूजक हूँ । भारतीय संस्कृति धर्म प्रधान संस्कृति है । उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपके आसन के ऊपर लिखा है "धर्म चक्र प्रवर्तनाय" । तो जहां तक गाय का आर्थिक मामला है, जो कुछ मेरे मित्र ठाकुर दास जी ने कहा उसके एक एक अक्षर का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ, लेकिन यह हमारा सांस्कृतिक मामला भी है, और जब मैं यह कहता हूँ तो नायर साहब का जो यहां पर भाषण हुआ, उस भाषण पर मुझे आश्चर्य होता है, दुःख होता है और क्षोभ होता है । मैं हमेशा कहता रहा हूँ कि यह साम्यवादी दल और

उसके सदस्य भारतीय हैं या भारत के बाहर से आये हुए हैं यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है और ऐसे लोगों को अपने को भारतीय कहना यह किसी प्रकार भी युक्तिसंगत नहीं है । उन्होंने बड़े बड़े वेद, शास्त्रों और पुराणों की बातें कही हैं । मैं समझता हूँ कि उनका न किसी वेद में विश्वास है, न किसी शास्त्र में विश्वास है और न ही किसी पुराण में विश्वास है । उनका विश्वास है मास्को में, उनका विश्वास है पैकिंग में, उनका विश्वास है भारत के बाहर जो देश हैं और जो भारत पर आक्रमण करते हैं उन देशों पर ।

वेदों में इन सम्बन्ध में क्या कहा गया है ? यजुर्वेद में गाय को अघ्न्या कहा है । अघ्न्या का अर्थ होता है हत्तुं अयोग्या ; जिनकी कि हत्या नहीं की जा सकती । गोमेध यज्ञ का वर्णन हमारे वेदों में और हमारे शास्त्रों में आया है लेकिन गोमेध यज्ञ में गो जो शब्द है उसका अर्थ यहां पर गाय नहीं होता है अपितु गो का अर्थ बहां पर पृथ्वी होता है । पृथ्वी की जुताई की जाय । गाय को मार कर उसके मांस की आहुति देना यह गोमेध यज्ञ का अर्थ नहीं है । उत्तर राम चरित नाटक में गोधन अतिथि शब्द आया है । बहां पर गो का अर्थ वाणी है । जिस प्रकार से गोमेध यज्ञ में गो का अर्थ पृथ्वी है उसी प्रकार उत्तर रामचरित नाटक में गो का अर्थ वाणी है । जिन अतिथियों के सामने हमारी वाणी झुक जाती है, आदर-सूचक हो जाती है उनको हम बड़ा मान कर कुछ कहते हैं, वे अतिथि गोधन अतिथि हैं । ऋग्वेद में एक लम्बा श्लोक है जो कि इस प्रकार है :—

“यः मानुषेयेण क्रिविषा समंघत
यो ऋद्वेनेन पशुना यातुषानाः
यो अघ्न्याया हरति क्षीरमने
तेषां क्षीर्षाणि हरसापि द्रश्च”

इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि जो मनुष्य मांस खाता है और जो घोड़े आदि पशुओं का मांस खाते हैं, जो गाय का दूध इतना दुहता है जिससे उसके बच्चे भूखे रह जायें, राजा को उनके सिर धड़ से अलग कर देने चाहिए। संस्कृत न जानने वाले व्यक्ति ही गो शब्द का अर्थ न जान कर उसका अर्थ करते हैं और उनमें एक हमारे नायर साहब भी हैं।

गोवध कतई बन्द होना यह सबसे अधिक आवश्यक चीज है। गोवध बन्द होना सांस्कृतिक और आर्थिक दोनों कारणों से आवश्यक है। अच्छे जानवरों की रक्षा भी बिना गोवध कतई बन्द किए नहीं हो सकती है। इसके में अनेक प्रमाण हम मंच में अनेक बार दे चुका हूँ।

जिस प्रकार मेरे मित्र पंडित ठाकुर दाम भार्गव को आश्चर्य हुआ मुझे भी डा० पंजाब-राव देशमुख की और उस के बाद कृष्णा साहब की बात को सुन कर आश्चर्य हुआ। उन्होंने बेकाम पशुओं की बात कही है। सरकार इस सम्बन्ध में एक स्पष्ट नीति स्वीकार कर चुकी है। बेकाम पशुओं को गोसदनों में रक्खा जायगा यह सरकार की नीति है। हमारी सरकार नहीं चाहती कि बेकाम पशु यहाँ पर बढ़ाये जायें लेकिन उन को मार कर और हम देश की संस्कृति और धर्मप्राण जनता के हृदय पर आघात पहुंचाना, यह हमारी नीति नहीं होनी चाहिये। हमारे बेकाम पशु न बढ़ें इसलिये आप ने गो सदन स्थापित करने की नीति अत्यन्त ही की है। यह आवश्यक है कि गोवध कतई बन्द किया जाय क्योंकि बिना इस के अच्छी नस्ल के अच्छे जानवरों की भी रक्षा नहीं हो सकती है।

आवश्यक चारे-दाने और खली का प्रबन्ध किया जाय। आप को अभी पंडित ठाकुर दाम भार्गव ने बतलाया कि हमारे देश में चारा काफी नहीं है लेकिन इतने पर भी हम

पशुओं के खाद्य पदार्थ बाहर भेजते जा रहे हैं। सन् १९५३-५४ में गुवार के सिवा खली आदि का जो निर्यात दस लाख छत्तीस हजार सात सौ पचासी रुपये का हुआ था वह १९५६ में १६ करोड़ रुपये तक पहुंच गया है। हमारे यहाँ के जानवर भूखों मरें और इस प्रकार से खली और गुवार आदि का निर्यात हो यह किसी प्रकार भी उचित नहीं है।

हमें सांडों की आवश्यकता है। यह सरकार न जाने कितनी बार स्वयं इसे स्वीकार कर चुकी है परन्तु उस कमी को पूरा करने के लिये जो प्रयत्न आवश्यक हैं वे नहीं हो रहे हैं। इतना ही नहीं हमारे यहाँ से सांड बाहर भेजे जाते हैं। विश्व कृषि मेले के समय जो स्मृति ग्रंथ प्रकाशित हुआ है उस में सरकार ने स्वीकार किया है कि प्रांगोल और गवालऊ नस्ल के भारतीय सांड बाजील, आस्ट्रेलिया, हिन्दोशिया, फिलिपाइन आदि देशों को भेजे जाते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं जो यह बार बार घंटी बजा रहा हूँ तो यह कोई खिलौना समझ कर तो बजा नहीं रहा हूँ।

डा० गोविन्द दास : मैं दो मिनट में खत्म किये देता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ने एकस्ट्रा टाईम मेरे घंटी बजाने रहने पर भी ले लिया है।

डा० गोविन्द दास : बस आप की आज्ञा से मैं केवल एक मिनट में अपनी बात को पूरा किये देता हूँ।

मैं पाटिल साहब को बधाई और धन्यवाद देते हुए भी यह कहूँगा कि जहाँ तक गोमंबर्डन का मामला है, उन को इसके बारे में उम्मी प्रकार से गौर से देखना चाहिये जिस प्रकार कि वे अपने दूसरे विभागों को देखते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में उन की जो राय है वह मैं जानता हूँ और मुझे विश्वास है कि अगर उन्होंने न

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

अपनी राय के अनुसार काम किया तो इस देश में गोवध कतई बन्द हो जायगा। इस देश से जो हमारा पशु खाद्य का खली गुवार आदि का निर्यात हो रहा है वह भी बन्द हो जायगा और सांडों का निर्यात भी बन्द हो। इस से अच्छे सांडों की द पैदाइश भी बढ़ेगी।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri M. B. Thakore. The hon. Member will be very brief.

Shri M. B. Thakore: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is very kind of you to have given me an opportunity to speak on the Demands of the Food and Agriculture Ministry. At the outset I would like to pay my tribute to the hon. Ministers, the Deputy Ministers and the Ministry itself for setting up one of the biggest dairies in Asia at Patel Nagar in Delhi. I am one of those Opposition Members who would always give a constructive suggestion and appreciate the work done by any Ministry.

I am glad that this Ministry has been saddled on by the hon. Minister, Shri S. K. Patil. You know formerly it was a trouble-Ministry, but under the present Minister, Shri S. K. Patil, it has been settled and is running smoothly. Some friends do not like to give credit to him and say that he is lucky. I congratulate him to be lucky, and I may tell you that he has always been lucky throughout. Yes, I come from Bombay. I know his career, and he has always been lucky. My friends may not give him credit, but I do, as an Opposition Member.

Sufficient replies have been given to my Communist friend, Shri V. P. Nayar, and I need not go into detail about that. But there is one thing that I would like to say, namely that ours is a democracy, and if we believe in majority rule, and ours is ruled by majority, then the feeling of the majority of the people should be respected. I am talking here about cow slaughter. I would repeat that the

majority of the people are against cow slaughter and cows' meat etc. Therefore, that should be stopped immediately. I congratulate the Government of Gujaraṭ who have recently passed a legislation prohibiting cow-slaughter.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): In U.P. also.

Shri M. B. Thakore: I am sorry that my hon. friends Dr. P. S. Deshmukh, Shri M. V. Krishnappa, Sushri Maniben Patel, and Dr. Sushila Nayar are against such a kind of move. I do not know what they will say about this when they go back to their constituencies.

Shri M. V. Krishnappa: Nobody will care for it in our constituency.

Shri M. B. Thakore: I challenge them if they are convinced about this thing, they should go and preach this in their constituencies also, and see whether they are elected or not. I would ask my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar also to preach these things in his constituency.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Last time, I said these things, and I won by nearly 200,000 votes.

Shri M. B. Thakore: I would say one thing regarding the import of wheat under the PL-480 agreement. When we are a deficient country, there is no other go but to import. From where should we import? I think my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar would not have any objection, if we import from Russia or China, but unfortunately, I do not think they have any surplus foodgrains to export to any country. But one thing is certain namely that the import of wheat would affect the prices adversely, and from that point of view, I would not support the imports as such. But since we are a deficient country, there is no other go but to import foodgrains from other countries.

I do not think my communist friends would have any serious objection if wheat is imported from Australia and Canada. I do not think my hon. friend has said anything about it. His objection has probably been due to the ideological difference that exists between the U.S.A. and the USSR.

Now, I come to the prices of foodgrains. You know that there is disparity in prices between agricultural goods and non-agricultural essential goods. When foodgrains prices rise by Rs. 1.50 or Rs. 2, my communist friends raise a hue and cry, but I would congratulate my hon. friend now on the fact that, for the first time, I think, he has advocated the cause of the agriculturists.

As far as prices of foodgrains are concerned, there should be some price policy. I am sorry to state that the hon. Minister has not so far implemented the promise that he gave twice, once here on the floor of the House and another time in the consultative committee. He said that a commission would be appointed by Government to look into the prices of foodgrains. Unless the prices are stabilised, I do not think we serve the interests of the agriculturists. Shri Bibhuti Mishra has said that there are more than 300 Members of Parliament here who represent agriculturists. But I do not think there are more than 20 or 30 Members who take much interest in agriculturists.

I have no time. So I will not go into details. But I would request the Minister to appoint a Price Commission or some such body to look into this matter and to advise Government. I would say that the Estimates Committee has also recommended that there should be some kind of a Commission to fix prices.

Now I will turn to my State. It is a deficit State as far as foodgrains are concerned. There is no godown accommodation, there are no transport facilities, there is no fertiliser factory and there is very little anti-erosion work done there. I know that the

land in north Gujarat is very salty. Drinking water is not there at all. I am glad that some tube-wells have been drilled recently, but they are not sufficient. Would the Government drill more?

Here I would make one point. In Delhi, there is a tube well progress officer in the office of the tube-well authority. He is not a technical hand. He was a mere section officer. I do not know how he has become a technical hand and appointed there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should not go into individual cases and name persons here.

Shri M. B. Thakore: I am not mentioning any name. I am just citing a case.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No names should be mentioned in favour of or accusation against any individual officer. He should conclude now. The second bell has been rung.

Shri M. B. Thakore: The price of jeera has fallen down. Jeera is a foreign-exchange earner. But nothing has been done to raise the price of this commodity which has fallen by more than 50 per cent. compared to the prices prevailing in 1959 and beginning of 1960. So I would request the hon. Minister to take some action.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I was very keen to accommodate Shri N. R. Ghosh Shri Shivananjappa and Shri Kotaki. West Bengal, Mysore and Assam have not been represented.

Shri V. Eacharan (Palghat): Kerala also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We started with Kerala.

So three States have not been represented. If hon. Members are agreeable, we can sit for about 20 minutes more, thus allowing 6 or 7 minutes to each of those hon. Members.

An Hon. Member: There is a half-hour discussion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We can push the half-hour discussion further.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: They must be accommodated.

Shri N. R. Ghosh (Cooch-Bihar): I have got a few minutes and I shall try to utilise them by mentioning a few points.

At the outset, I must congratulate our hon. Minister on achieving a very great success by securing from U.S.A. this large stock of foodgrains. It has a very great psychological affect in our country. It has stopped speculative hoarding and soaring prices. It has brought about a sense of security. The only thing demanded of us is that we must by increased production, augment the stock of our foodgrains, which will be a permanent solution to our problem and price stabilisation.

Coming to increased production, I would however say that though it is mentioned in the report that there is provision for medium and small-scale irrigation schemes, the requisite emphasis is not paid to them. Whatever may be the programme on paper, it is not being translated actually in the country. I come from North Bengal. I know that in places where the lands are not wet, there are no irrigation facilities. We only get about 12 maunds of paddy per acre. But if in those places irrigation schemes are introduced, then the production increases to 31 maunds per acre. Big or large-scale irrigation schemes may have their advantage, but they are very costly. I would ask the Minister—of course he has given certain figures in the report—to pay more attention to smaller schemes, and I would say that if these small irrigation schemes are actually followed up with vigour, we can work wonders. Our Minister has great imagination and drive, and I would ask him to lay special emphasis on the minor and medium irrigation schemes.

18 hrs.

As regards subsidiary foods, I may point out that in Japan the arable land is only one-third of the area of the whole country. But they have solved the problem in two ways. First, they solved it by the Japanese method of cultivation, by small irrigation schemes particularly and by fertilisers and secondly, by introducing sweet potato crop and by seafish. Sweet potato is rich in food value; it is richer in food value than the white potato, and it is grown even as a second crop. In North Bengal and in many other parts of India, you can grow sweet potato in abundance. I would ask the Minister to pay particular attention to this humble suggestion of mine. If actually sweet potato is cultivated as an additional crop in the fields, then this problem of food will have partial, but substantial solution.

As regards co-operative farming, it may be necessary and of course it will be specially useful where the holdings are small. But the country psychologically is not fit for it as yet. I would, therefore, ask the Minister to lay emphasis on fertilisers, on good seed and on small irrigation schemes. These big projects or schemes may wait, but as the food problem is urgent and as the people are to be educated about co-operative farming, we should not put much emphasis on co-operative farming now. But I would submit that we should devote special thought to the improvement of seed, better implement small irrigation schemes and fertilisers for self-sufficiency in food.

It is the experience of all of us that when we expect a very good crop in a particular year, our hopes are shattered by drought, but if the irrigation schemes be there, then we need not depend upon God, so to say, for our crop.

Another thing that I would submit is this: we at least in West Bengal have been the worst victims of this

partition. All our big rivers have gone to the share of East Pakistan. There is an extreme scarcity of fish. I would ask the Minister to pay some attention to this aspect of the question. The Bengalis do not generally take meat, but fish is an absolute must in their food. I would ask the Minister to give some attention in West Bengal to deep-sea fishing. There have been some attempts made by the State but they have not been very successful. There must be bigger projects helped by the Centre. In the west coast of India, Government are doing something substantial for sea-fishing. I think special attention should be given to West Bengal so as to remove the fish-scarcity brought on by partition.

As regards cattle, I would submit that scrub cattle has got its value. As a matter of fact, I read an article where it has been proved almost mathematically that scrub cattle is not a burden on our country. You do not have to give them much fodder; they actually fend for themselves. But the value which you get from scrub cattle is much more than what they get from the land or from us. I would submit that there should be an earnest attempt to improve the quality of this scrub cattle than to think that they are a burden and they ought to be liquidated, which is an atrocious idea.

I would like to say a few words about vanaspati. Not only as food, but as a part of our culture, ghee has actually permeated into the very texture of our life. I think the whole country resents the idea that up till now the Government has not succeeded in colouring the vanaspati. This is not the place where the question whether it is good or not as food is to be canvassed; but big money seems to be all powerful. However, I would submit that this is the thing which is used very largely for adulteration of pure ghee and the Government must find out some colouring substance, so that ghee may not be adulterated.

Shri Shivananjappa (Mandya): I rise to support the demands of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. I

congratulate the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture and his able lieutenants for the excellent job that they have done in easing the food situation in the country. They have also built up a sizeable stock in order to stabilise effectively the food prices. In these years, they have accelerated the tempo of minor irrigation schemes. The Second target of 10 million acreage has been nearly achieved. There is a marked progress in the development of animal husbandry, dairying, poultry, fisheries and forestry.

But more remains to be done. This Ministry cannot be complacent. The country has yet to achieve self-sufficiency in foodgrains and other food-stuffs. Agriculture is still on subsistence level. The vocation of 90 per cent of the population of the country is still unremunerative. There is no proper price policy for agricultural commodities and no price-incentive.

With the limited time at my disposal, I will confine myself to the more limited problems of sugarcane cultivation and the location of sugar factories. Sugarcane is a tropical crop largely grown in sub-tropical areas like UP and Bihar. Incidentally, it is very interesting to note that North India taking to sugarcane cultivation was a historical accident. Before the I World war, large quantities of indigo used to be grown in the sub-tropical India. Owing to an embargo put on the export of indigo during war time, the areas growing indigo had to be diverted for growing sugarcane.

I beg to submit that sub-tropical India is most ill-suited for sugarcane growing, since the yield per acre and the recovery of sugar out of it is very low when compared to peninsular India, particularly Deccan Plateau. The average yield per acre in U.P. is 11 tons per acre and in Bihar it is 14 tons per acre, whereas in the Deccan factories it is nearly 40 tons per acre. The sugar recovery out of sugarcane in U.P. and Bihar is about 9 per cent whereas in the factories of peninsular India, it is above 11 per

[Shri Shivananjappa]

cent. In U.P. in spite of providing better irrigational facilities, fertilisers and improved seeds, the average yield per acre of 11 tons has remained stationary even from 1952. If application of chemical fertilisers and improved seeds and irrigational facilities were to produce sugarcane, most of the sub-tropical States of Europe would have produced cane-sugar.

Since sugarcane is a climatic crop, I would urge upon the Government to encourage sugarcane cultivation and establish new sugar factories only in peninsular India, as that is the only remedy for reducing the cost of production of sugar, because the yield, recovery and duration of working of sugar factories is more.

I would further urge upon the Government to pursue a policy of gradually shunting out the sugar industry from the north to suitable places in the Deccan and in the south. The late lamented Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, resourceful as he was, openly declared on the floor of the House that establishment of more sugar factories and more sugarcane cultivation must be undertaken only in the south. The Estimates Committee in their 127th Report—recommendation 28, para 51—have said :

"The Committee are of the opinion that the policy for location of new sugar factories needs to be carefully laid down. Both regional considerations and the suitability of the particular sites may guide the choice of location."

Further, I would like to impress upon the Government the necessity for increasing the minimum price of sugarcane. In fixing the present minimum price of sugarcane, the cost of production of sugarcane is arbitrarily fixed, though the Sugar Control Order, 1955 enjoins upon the Government to fix the minimum price of sugarcane on the basis of cost of production, recovery of sugar and its market sale.

The representative of the Ministry while giving evidence before the Estimates Committee admits that there is no proper working of the cost of cultivation of sugarcane. He says that the cost of cultivation of sugarcane was taken in a general way. The Estimates Committee in its 127th Report, on page 9, para 19 says :

"The Estimates Committee considers it important that an assessment is made early of the cost of production of sugarcane in different areas in order to fix the minimum price of sugarcane to be paid to the producers having regard to the provision of clause 3(1) of the Sugarcane Control Order, 1955."

It further makes a plea for the increase of cane price. It says in Report 13, para 22 :

"The Committee feel that the example of Maharashtra and Gujerat, where the sugar factories are able to pay a higher price for sugarcane than the statutory price is worth emulating by sugar factories in other regions."

Hence I request the Government to increase the statutory minimum price of sugarcane from Rs. 1.62 per maund to Rs. 1.75 per maund as it was before.

Shri A. M. Thomas: What do you get in Mysore?

Shri Shivananjappa: The statutory minimum is Rs. 1.62 per maund.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Then there is extra also.

Shri Shivananjappa: That depends upon the recovery.

Further, Sir, it is a matter of great gratification to note that the sugar production has over-shot its mark and the country is left with an exportable surplus of five lakh tons

now. With more factories to be established during the coming years, we will be left with a sizeable surplus of at least a million tons of sugar for export. But the cost of production of indigenous sugar is Rs. 300 more per ton than the international price. Hence there is a great necessity to approximate the internal prices of sugar with international prices in order to build up a sizeable export. The Government must seriously think of this problem. I, however, suggest the reduction in the incidence of central and State taxation in sugar, since central and State taxation on sugar about 35 per cent in the present cost-structure of sugar.

I want to say a word about the Mysore sugar factory at Mandya. This sugar factory at Mandya in the State of Mysore has requested the Central Government to give its accord to increase its daily capacity. Its present capacity is 2000 tons daily. They want that it should be increased to 3000 tons. But somehow or the other the Government is not giving its sanction. I request the Government to consider this problem and give its sanction allowing this factory to enhance its capacity from 2000 tons to 3000 tons daily.

Shri Liladhar Kotoki (Nowgong): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the burden that has to be carried by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture is indeed very heavy. They have not only to produce and find food for the ever increasing population of our country, but they have also to produce the raw materials, for various industries particularly the export earning industries like jute and cotton. Therefore, it was quite just and proper that in the First Plan stress was laid on self-sufficiency of agriculture. But during the First Plan we have not succeeded in attaining self-sufficiency. In the Second Plan also the emphasis had to be carried on. Now we find from the Draft Plan that the same emphasis has to be continued in the Third Plan also. God alone knows whether we are going to attain self-

sufficiency even during the Third Plan period. There are various factors on account of which self-sufficiency could not be attained during the last ten years. This is mainly due to the fact that we have not yet been able to save agriculture from the vagaries of monsoons. From this year's report we have seen the extent of heavy damage done to crops during the year 1959-60. Even during the year 1960-61, although the overall crop position has been good, there has been extensive damage due to natural causes of flood and drought. Therefore, if we want to attain self-sufficiency, we will have to prevent damage to crops by floods and also remove the handicap for standing crops due to drought. These are the two things on which I would request the hon. Minister to lay special emphasis.

Even in this respect, the measures that we have taken for controlling the floods appear to be very defective sometimes. I will particularly refer to one scheme in my own constituency of which I have got direct and personal knowledge. There, a 35 miles long embankment was constructed along the Brahmaputra by the irrigation department. But, at no stage, the agricultural department was consulted, with the result that we got into such a difficult situation that we could not get even the normal water that is necessary for irrigation. Then an enquiry had to be made in the matter and all that sort of thing followed, the details of which I do not want to go into. What I am stressing is that such schemes should be taken up in a co-ordinated manner by the irrigation department which constructs the irrigation projects, and the agricultural department which actually utilizes these benefits.

Then, regarding irrigation, the position is very unhappy. We have, up till now, only 17 to 20 per cent of our net sowing areas under irrigation. We have not yet brought all the area under irrigation. Unless we bring all the area under irrigation how are we going to attain self-sufficiency in food?

[Shri Liladhar Kotoki]

In spite of our having a good crop this year, so far as jute is concerned, the production has fallen. Then Report says that it is due to unfavourable weather.

Another cause why we have not been able to reap the fullest benefit from whatever schemes have been taken up in the First and Second Plans is due to lack of co-ordination and also our failure to create the agency, which is very necessary to implement these schemes, namely the formation of panchayats and co-operatives. I have no time to go into the details of all this. In fact, we discussed this subject in this House only the other day. What I would particularly urge on the hon. Minister is, although he is not directly responsible under the present set up for panchayats and co-operatives, nevertheless, it is so very essential for him to take direct responsibility of co-ordination in order to attain self-sufficiency in agricultural production. That is the greatest responsibility that the Minister will have to assume because indirectly the responsibility is his; indirectly he has assumed responsibility for filling up the deficit in foodgrains by importing foodgrains from foreign countries. During the last ten years of our planned economy, we have spent about Rs. 1226 crores on import of foodgrains. We have to impress upon the State Governments, by whatever means we can, that they make all endeavours and attempts so that within the Third Plan we actually attain self-sufficiency in food production.

An Hon. Member; There is a cat in the House, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is also listening.

An Hon. Member; Animal husbandary.

Shri Liladhar Kotoki: I know, Sir, that you are going to ask me to conclude. I am concluding, by saying that foodgrains and other agricultural commodities must be taken up on a war footing. I would request the hon. Minister in charge, Shri Patil, who is reputed for his dynamism—not only that, as he says, he has got some magic in him—that he should take up the lead in launching a nation-wide campaign of agricultural self-sufficiency.

Shri S. K. Patil: Did I say that?

Shri Liladhar Kotoki: I read it somewhere in the papers. Anyway, I am sure that he will be able to inspire all State Governments and panchayats and I hope that this programme of agricultural self-sufficiency will be taken up in that spirit and with that enthusiasm and seriousness which are necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have yet to fulfil two promises. I might have been reckless but I have to give five minutes each to Shri Umrao Singh and to Shri Banerjee.

श्री उमराव सिंह (घोडी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे समय दिया। मैं इस मिलसिले में आप को एक उलाहना दूँगा कि या तो आप जो खड़ा हो उस को बोलने के लिये बुलावें या कोई और तरीका हो कि हम पीछे बैठने वालों को भी बोलने का मौका मिल सके। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या तरीका है जिस से हम को समय मिल सके ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : यही तरीका है कि जब आप को बुलाया जाय तो फौज तकरीर शुरू कर दें।

श्री उमराव सिंह : मैं फूड मिनिस्टर सास्ब को बहुत ही धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने ने अपनी विशेष योग्यता से इस देश को भर्त्ता

मरने से बचा लिया। उन्होंने ने बाहर से गल्ले के मामले में इतनी सहानुभूति प्राप्त की कि उन का मुल्क बचा रहा। लेकिन इसी के साथ साथ मैं फूड मिनिस्टर साहब का ध्यान इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ एक तरफ उन को सफलता मिली है और उन्होंने ने देश को भूखों मरने से बचाया है, उसी के साथ साथ मैं उनसे चाहूँगा कि उनके सारे अंग जो हैं वे एग्रीकल्चर को बढ़ाने में लगने चाहियें। आप के विभाग का नाम है फूड और एग्रीकल्चर। इस से मालूम होता है एग्रीकल्चर को दूसरा स्थान दिया गया है, और मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि अगर यह चीज न की गई तो आप की सारी सफलता असफलता में परिणत हो जायगी। हर गांव का किसान आप से पूछता है, इलेक्शन आने वाला है। वह आदमी आप के सामने खड़ा है, आप उस को बतायें कि आप की सरकार ने उस के लिये क्या किया है। उस ने भी अग्रेजों से लड़ाई लड़ी थी और उसे भी उम्मीद है कि उसे भी उस का उचित स्थान मिलेगा। लेकिन अभी गांव का किसान यह समझता है कि उस का राज नहीं आया है, अभी राज देने गिने लोगों का आ गया है। लेकिन उस को भी अपनी जल्दी उन्नति करनी है। वह देखता है कि शहरों के लोगों को सुविधायें मिल गई हैं लेकिन उस को नहीं मिली हैं।

आप ने कहा कि चीनी का बहुत ज्यादा स्टॉक जमा हो गया है। हम भी सोचते हैं कि हो गया है लेकिन उस का चीनी के भाव पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ता है। लेकिन गांवों में चावल ज्यादा हो गया। अब आप किसान से पूछिये कि चावल का क्या भाव है। मैं बस्ती में गया था, मैं ने देखा कि जो चावल दिल्ली में १ रुपये दो आने सेर मिलता है उस चावल को वहाँ किसान एक रुपये का १ सेर १२ छटांक बेच रहा है, और उस से सराब चावल दिल्ली में १८ आने सेर बिकता है, और नई दिल्ली में तो और भी महंगा बिकता है। अगर कंज्यूमर्स को गल्ला सस्ते दाम पर

मिलता तो वह कम से कम इसके लिए धन्यवाद देते लेकिन ऐसी बात नहीं है। बस्ती में जो चावल १२ आने सेर मिलता है उसी क्वालिटी का चावल यहाँ दिल्ली में लोग १ रुपये २ आने सेर खरीदते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कोई अच्छा नक्शा नहीं है। हमने बिचौलियों को खत्म कर दिया। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे लोग जो किसानों और कंज्यूमर्स के बीच में इतना ज्यादा फायदा उठाते हैं उनकी ओर सरकार का खयाल जाय। सौभाग्य से आपका जन्म एक किसान परिवार में हुआ है। अब यह आपकी खुशकिस्मती है कि बम्बई में आपको दोनों तरह के लोगों का विषय प्राप्त है। गांधी जी से हमारे गरीब लोग भी उम्मीद करते थे और धनी भी करते थे लेकिन गांधी जी धनी को दबा कर गरीब को आगे बढ़ाते थे। धनी ने त्याग करा कर गरीबों को मदद करवाने थे। मैं आशा रखता हूँ कि आप उन दोनों में एक ऐसा मामंजस्य पैदा करने में सफल होंगे और उसी तरह से आप भी करेंगे। आप पूंजीपतियों से त्याग करा कर गरीबों को राहत दिलवायें। यह चीज असह्य है कि यहाँ मिला में इतनी चीनी पड़ी रहे और किसान को उसके वाजिब दाम न मिल। किसान को गन्ने के दाम १ रुपया १० आने से कुछ अधिक मिले और उसके गन्ने के दाम बढ़ा दिये जायें, एक एक आने की वृद्धि के लिये पार्लियामेंट में आवाज उठाई जाती है। यहाँ तो यह आवाज उठाई जाती है कि किसान को जो दाम मिल रहा है उसमें घाना बड़े घाना अधिक मिले लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाऊँ कि वहाँ माइंट पर किस तरह से किसानों को उनके गन्ने के बजन के बारे में ठगा जाता है। मिल वालों के जो आदमी कंटे पर रहते हैं वह तोल के बारे में किसानों को हर तरह से परेशान करते हैं और वह उन बेचारे किसानों को भुलवा कर उनका कम बजन लिखवाते हैं और परिणाम यह होता है कि उसको प्रति अन्न १ रुपया भी नहीं पड़ता है। सही

[श्री उमराव सिंह]

वजन उसके गन्ने का किताब में दर्ज नहीं किया जाता है। यहाँ हम लोग और हमारे मिनिस्टर साहबान भी किसानों के हित की बात सोचते हैं और उसके लिये उचित कानून आदि भी बनाते हैं लेकिन जिम मशीनरी से किसानों को रोजाना सावका पड़ता है वह मशीनरी ठीक तरह से वर्क नहीं करती है और वह किसानों को हैरेस (परेशान) करती है।

आप किसानों के लिये सिंचाई और पानी की व्यवस्था करते हैं लेकिन होता यह है कि पानी का लाभ उस नहीं मिल पाता है चूँकि पानी उसके खेतों में वक्त से नहीं पहुँचता है इसलिये सारा परिश्रम बेकार चला जाता है। यह सारा प्लान बेकार हो जाता है और बारसब में किसानों को वह मुक्त सुविधाएं मिल नहीं पाती हैं जिनको कि सरकार उनको देना चाहती है और ऐसा इसलिये है कि मशीनरी ठीक से वर्क नहीं करती है। इसलिये मैं चाहूँगा कि सरकार अपनी मशीनरी की ओर भी ध्यान करे और उसमें आवश्यक सुधार करे। आप गल्ला किसान को सीड की शकल में देते हैं और उसको सवाई में वसूल कर लेते हैं। जब ऐसा करके आप किसानों पर कोई भ्रहसान नहीं कर रहे हैं। आज सरकार एग्रीकल्चर की मदद में काफी रुपया खर्च करती है लेकिन दरअसल (एक्चुअली) किसानों को उतना रुपया नहीं मिलता है। यह सैंटर में और सुबों में जो विशाल सेक्रेटेरियट खड़े हैं और उनमें सैंकड़ों हज़ारों कर्मचारी बैठते हैं उनकी तनख्वाहों आदि का तमाम खर्चा भी इसी मद में से खर्च होता है।

आपने यहाँ तो तह तय कर दिया है कि इतनी आमदनी से कम पर टैक्स नहीं लगेगा और वह आमदनी टैक्स फ्री होगी लेकिन एक किसान जिम्मे कि पास बिसे घर भी जमीन है दस रुपये के नीचे का भी किसान है उसकी मालगुजारी आपने नहीं माफ की है। छोटे से छोटे किसान से आप टैक्स ले रहे हैं,

मालगुजारी वसूल कर रहे हैं। छोटे से छोटे किसान से भी आप लगान वसूल कर लेते हैं और उसको कोई छूट नहीं देते हैं। किसान की गरीबी का नाजायज फायदा उठाया जाता है। आज गरीब किसानों से जो टैक्स वसूल किये जा रहे हैं उनका रिटर्न उनको नहीं मिल पाता है। उसके पानी के दाम बढ़ा दिये गये हैं। खाद के दाम भी काफी बढ़े हुए हैं। किसानों के आवश्यक (एम्प्लीमेंट्स) कृषि मशीनरी आदि भी उनको काफी महंगे मिलते हैं। जबकि जरूरत इस बात की है कि वह उनको सस्ते दामों पर सुलभ हों। सरकार को किसानों के वास्ते उत्तम बीज, अच्छी खाद, सिंचाई के लिये पानी और खेती के लिये जरूरी चीजें, मुनासिब और कम दाम पर सुलभ करने चाहिये। अब किसानों के हित के लिये जो रकम रखी जाती है उसका बड़ा हिस्सा इतने बड़े सेक्रेटेरियट पर खर्च करने की जरूरत नहीं है। कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट के जरिये नये तरीके से खेती कैसे की जाती है इसको गिनात सीख गया है। जरूरत सिर्फ इस बात की है कि उसको मुनासिब दाम पर आवश्यक चीज सुलभ की जाय और यह जो काफी बड़ी रकम सेंटर और सुबों के सेक्रेटेरियट के ऊपर किसानों की मद के रुपये से खर्च होती है वह इस तरह जाया न की जाय। यदि आप ऐसा कर देंगे तो किसान आपको आशीर्वाद देंगे।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I should confine myself to two or three points and I will try to finish within four or five minutes. Before I speak on the sugar prices or the production of sugar and other commodities in the country, I may remind the hon. Minister regarding the unfortunate incident which took place in Calcutta when an employee of this Ministry in the Food Directorate committed suicide. Mr. Rajeshwar Chatterjee is no more with us. At that time I requested the hon. Minister to have an impartial enquiry as to the

reasons which led to the suicide of Mr. Chatterjee. When I speak in this House I am reminded of the unfortunate widow. The hon. Minister collected more than Rs. 25,000 after the death of Dr. Joseph. I would request him to see that the family members of Mr. Chatterjee do not starve. I am thankful to the hon. Prime Minister for donating Rs. 2,500 to the late Mr. Chatterjee's family. But this case requires impartial investigation and a judicial enquiry as to the reasons which led to the death of a sane man like Mr. Chatterjee. This is an unfortunate story and I would request the hon. Minister to look into this.

When people speak about sugar, I do not know whether any decision is likely to be taken regarding the control or decontrol of it. Recently on the 30th of last month, a Tripartite Conference was held in U.P., in which was represented the employers, the employees and the representatives of the Uttar Pradesh Government. The Government and the employers in the sugar industry raised the slogan of increasing production. At that time the slogan was: produce or perish. But unfortunately people who produced are perishing now. It would be unfortunate for the country if the slogan were to be reversed to produce and perish. So, I am really surprised that the business magnates and the sugar magnates in that Tripartite Conference refused to implement the recommendation of the Wage Board, which was a unanimous recommendation and to which the employers were a party. They want more concessions from the Government. They have also come forward with a suggestion that the sugarcane prices should be reduced. If here is more production and if the production has risen from 21 or 22 lakh tons to 29 lakh tons—and it is going to be 30 lakh tons—, who is to reap the harvest? Do you think that the entire profit has to go to the employers only? Is this Government only to protect their interests? Surely, they have to protect the interests of the cane growers and also of the

workers who are working in the sugar factories.

The only three Government-run sugar mills in my State, namely those at Doiwala, Mohiuddinpur and Khadda, have agreed to implement the Wage Board recommendations. But unfortunately all the other mills run by the big businessmen have not agreed to do so. The All-India Trade Union Congress has issued an appeal and raised the slogan that it is high time that the Government should nationalise the sugar industry and sugar factories owned by the private sector. If you see their balance sheets, you will find that they are making fabulous profits. Even their own report clearly indicates the amount of dividend paid by them to their members and shareholders. Even then they want more concessions, and they want the sugarcane prices to be reduced to Rs. 1-7-0 or even less. I would therefore request the hon. Minister to consider the matter seriously.

I would also submit that if the control is kept only to suit the big mill-owners, it is high time that the control should be removed. A very pertinent question was asked by the Speaker when he was in the Chair. He asked, "How is it that when the production is going up, the price of sugar has not been reduced?" The reply came from the hon. Minister, Dr. P. S. Deshmukh, that it is not possible. I do not know why it is not possible. Can we not possibly release at least fifty per cent of the quota for free sale? Let us have this experiment for six months. If it is a bad experiment, after all the hon. Minister is much more mature than myself and he knows the minds of the businessmen, whether they are small or big, better than myself. I would therefore request him to consider the matter in all seriousness. And if the mill-owners do not want it and they also want the control to be there, I am sorry, it should not be agreed to.

[Shri S. M. Banerjee.]

Another point about exports. When it comes to a question of exports we are giving concessions. Then the mill-owners want concession after concession for promoting export. And when we take the United States let us not forget the situation in Cuba today. The planes which came over it and dropped bombs are supposed to be unidentified. But we know where the planes came from and who is at the back of them. It is these imperial forces who want to crush the growth of independent countries, because Cuba is headed by Fidel Castro which is not liked by the western imperialists headed by the United States. Some day these planes are going to be identified. But let us not identify ourselves with the forces that want to finish the liberty of these newly born countries.

My last point is about the condition of those who are working in the Delhi Milk Scheme. I would request the hon. Minister to implement the Pay Commission's recommendations there also, since they are committed to it. Orders were issued to implement them, but another Deputy Director or somebody in the Department issued an order that this will not be implemented. I would request the hon. Minister to give a definite assurance today in this regard.

And the hon. Minister cannot keep the country in suspense about sugar. If more production results in less cost for sugarcane, I will be sorry. Reasonable prices should be assured for the sugar-cane.

Shri S. K. Patil: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, with your permission I will continue tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes.

18.34 hrs.

DAMAGE TO COCONUT CROPS IN KERALA STATE*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall now take up the half-an-hour discussion.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): Sir, I am raising this discussion to focus the attention of this House to the distress which prevails in Kerala on account of the fast-spreading destruction of coconut trees by a disease which has not been properly checked so far. This discussion has become necessary as the answers to several questions which I have tabled earlier during this session have been uniformly unsatisfactory.

You know that in Kerala the coconut tree has a place in the day-to-day life of the people which perhaps no tree has in any other State. I can also say that the usefulness of the coconut tree to the people of Kerala is something very different from the usefulness of any other tree anywhere in the world. The domestic economy in our State is so very much interlinked with the well-being of the coconut cultivation. Our State itself has taken its name, unlike other States, from this tree. You know, Sir, that Kerala means the land of *kera*, that is, the coconut. When we find that this cultivation which in 1939 accounted for 25 per cent of the entire land revenue and 50 per cent of the entire customs duty collected by the old State of Travancore was being neglected by the Central Government as we find it today, and as some of the answers which I shall have occasion to refer to later will reveal, I thought that a discussion was absolutely essential.

This tree, as I submitted earlier, is useful from the root to the flower. Every part of it has not merely one use but a variety of uses. Take, for example, its root. Shri A. M. Thomas knows that it is not merely used as firewood or as a substitute for firewood, but it has its own medicinal

* Half-an-Hour Discussion.