

12 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

**REPORTED ACUTE SHORTAGE OF
FERTILIZERS**

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi):
Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The reported acute shortage of fertilizers in Punjab and other parts of the country."

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI F. A. AHMED): As the Honourable Members are aware, the position in respect of availability of fertiliser during the current Rabi season, has been difficult due to a variety of reasons like shortfalls in domestic production resulting from power cuts, shortage of raw material etc. and an acute shortage of fertiliser in the world market, coupled with a global shortage of shipping space. However, all possible efforts have been made by the Government to step up domestic production, as well as to procure the maximum possible fertilisers from the countries abroad, as quickly as possible. There have also been severe operational constraints in respect of port handling and transportation of imported fertilisers. However, with special efforts and in coordination with the Ministries of Transport and Railways, very high priority has been given to port handling and rail movement of imported fertiliser in order that quickest possible supplies are made of the available fertiliser.

In view of the shortage of chemical fertilisers, State Governments and non-Governmental Farmers Organisations have been asked to mobilise and utilise organic manures as much as possible.

As far as supplies to Punjab are concerned, special efforts have been made to see that maximum supplies are made to Punjab State, in view of its contribution to the agricultural production of the country and to the Central Pool of foodgrains. In fact, a review of the supplies by the Central Fertilizer Pool and domestic Manufacturers, from 1st August, 1973 onwards, shows that a substantial portion of the supplies due to Punjab from these two sources have been met. For other States also, despite the difficulties, efforts are being made to make the maximum possible supplies.

SHRI P. K. DEO: The Government fixed the target of food supply of 115 million tonnes for which we needed 3.8 million tonnes of fertilisers. Our total capacity of fertilizer production is 1.6 million tonnes and we still need about 2.6 million tonnes from outside. I would like to know whether it is not a fact that the officers of the Ministry of Agriculture went for a purchase mission with Rs. 250 crores worth of foreign exchange and they came back empty-handed because even the East European countries did not stick to their previous commitment of supplying the fertilizers, because prior booking had already been made by Soviet Union and China in this regard. So far as allocation of fertilizers is concerned even though Punjab is the granary of this country and the per hectare consumption of fertilisers in that State is 75 Kilo against the national consumption of 15 Kilo, Punjab is given a raw deal whereas in certain States like Uttar Pradesh where there is the impending election, special quotas are being released. In a meeting where the Prime Minister was present, Mr. Bahuguna, the Chief Minister had the cheek to say that the promise of immediate large-scale release of fertilisers to U.P. had been made due to his efforts. All these things go to prove that even allocation of fertilizers which go a long way in fulfilling the green revolution, is being made on a political basis

There has been acute shortage of fertilisers, but so far as the distribution to the various States on a pro-rata basis is concerned, some States are being given a better deal because of the coming elections. I would like to know how far this is true.

I would also like to know, so far as the production of indigenous fertilisers is concerned, what steps are being taken to make up the deficit of 2.6 million tonnes. In this regard, I would like to point out that in my State of Orissa, the Government had to put up a fertiliser plant at Paradip. Just at the time of the Cuttack bye-election, Shri Shah Nawaz Khan had been there and he went on laying the foundation-stones of the Malangtoli iron ore project, the Sargipalli lead ore project and the Sukhinda nickel project, which projects never saw the light of the day, is the Prime Minister also going there to lay the foundation-stone of this fertiliser project just before the elections, as an election-stunt?

In view of the fact that Punjab is the granary, and in view of the statement of the Punjab Director of Agriculture, Mr. Pritam Singh Hoshiarpuri that Punjab is short of 2 million tonnes of urea and 2 million tonnes of superphosphate, what special efforts are being made to give the supply to Punjab? In the case of the other surplus States like Orissa and Andhra Pradesh which also contribute to a large extent to the rice requirements of this country and which are also in need of fertilisers, what special steps are being taken to supply them with the fertilisers?

From this statement, I find that the reply given is not even worth the paper on which it is written. So, I request the hon. Minister to give a categorical answer to my queries.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The hon. Member raised three specific questions. The first question is whether a delegation consisting of representa-

tives from the Agriculture Ministry went to foreign countries and came back without contracting for the supply of fertilisers. I would like to correct the impression which the hon. Member has and say that this delegation did not include the representatives of the Agriculture Ministry. The Delegation was led by the Secretary, Ministry of Supply and included the representatives of the Finance Ministry.

SHRI P. K. DEO: This is absolutely no alibi that some other Ministry is concerned. He is replying on behalf of Government, and it is a question of collective responsibility.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Here, the question has been raised with regard to the supply of fertiliser for the coming kharif season in our country. So far as this delegation was concerned, they had gone there for the purpose of negotiating the supply of fertiliser from January, 1974 to June, 1974, that is, for the next year. Therefore, the impression which the hon. Member has that the delegation went and came back without making any contract is not correct, because, so far as the rabi crop is concerned, the action was taken last year.

We were told that so far as nitrogenous fertilisers were concerned, probably 16 lakh tonnes of indigenous production would be there, but unfortunately the production is much less and on that basis, and on the basis of the requirements and what was available in our country, we have decided to import about 10 lakh tonnes of nitrogenous fertilisers from outside. Actually, we have been able to make a contract of 8.90 lakh tonnes, and out of this, nearly 7.38 lakh tonnes has come. So, I would like to correct the impression of the hon. Member that sufficient quantities of fertilisers have not been imported from the foreign countries.

It is true that whatever we wanted we were not able to get from the out-

side market. The quantity was nearly 9 lakh tonnes as against our import authorisation of about 10.4 lakh tonnes, out of which 7.38 lakh tonnes have arrived and the rest is in the course of arrival and will be supplied to the country as soon as it is available.

The second question the hon. member raised is that the fertiliser is distributed on political grounds and not on the basis of requirement of every State. I have already pointed out that having regard to the fact that Punjab is one of our important States so far as food production is concerned, we have given priority of fertiliser supply to Punjab. I will quote figures to show that the propaganda which is intended to be done by the hon. member to show that we are giving more fertiliser to UP because of coming elections is mischievous and there is no basis whatsoever for it.

SHRI P. K. DEO: It is all reported in the papers.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I will give the facts. Please do not depend on what appears in the newspapers.

So far as Punjab is concerned, from the Pool Punjab has been given 71 per cent nitrogenous and 69 per cent phosphatic. So far as supply from indigenous manufacture is concerned, Punjab has been given 93 per cent nitrogenous and 68 per cent phosphatic. The total is 76 per cent nitrogenous and 69 per cent phosphatic.

So far as UP is concerned, in the case of nitrogenous it is only 28 per cent and as for phosphatic it is 55 per cent. Supply from indigenous manufacture is 84 per cent nitrogenous and 83 per cent phosphatic. The total is 45 per cent nitrogenous and 58 per cent phosphatic. Thus the hon. member can see from these figures that no special consideration has been given to UP. If any special consideration has been given out of the

available fertiliser, it has been given to Punjab and Haryana and then come other States.

It is true that we are short so far as the fertiliser requirement in our country is concerned. If we take the whole year, there is a shortage of nearly 9 lakh tonnes. This has been due to the fact that the expected production of 16 lakh tonnes is not likely to materialise, and we are now dependent on the latest figure given by the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals of about 11 lakh tonnes. Also we have not been able to contract for the entire quantity which we require; even here, out of the contracted quantity, some has not yet arrived because Bulgaria and Rumania have failed to supply according to the dates fixed by them. We are making efforts to see if we can get fertiliser from other countries also, but because of the difficult situation, it has not been possible for us to get the required quantity of fertiliser which we need in our country.

SHRI P. K. DEO: My last question regarding the Paradeep fertiliser plant the foundation stone of which is going to be laid by the Prime Minister, has not been answered.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I do not know. This question may be referred to the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals.

श्री मधु सिमरो (बांका) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने मन्त्री महोदय का जवाबी बयान गौर से पढ़ा है, और जैसा कि उन के हर वक्तव्य और काम में होता है, इस में भी मुझे लम्बान की दृष्टि और सम्यक् दृष्टि का अभाव दिखाई देता है।

जब हम लोग यहाँ कोई भी सवाल उपस्थित करते हैं, तो मंत्रियों का हमेशा यह जवाब होता है कि यह ग्लोबल फेनामेन है। दूध में मिलावट क्यों है ?— यह ग्लोबल फेनामेन है। फर्टिलाइजर में मिलावट क्यों है ?— यह

[श्री मधु लिमये]

ग्लोबल फेनामेनन है। दाम क्यों बढ़ रहे हैं?—यह ग्लोबल फेनामेनन है। अगर कोई बीमार पड़ता है—श्री ललित नारायण मिश्र बीमार थे—, तो उस के बारे में पूछने पर जबाब मिलेगा कि यह ग्लोबल फेनामेनन है। हर चीज की कोई हद होती है। हमारी जो कमियां हैं,——— (ब्यवधान) श्री वाजपेयी ब्रह्मचारी क्यों हैं?— यह एक ग्लोबल फेनामेनन है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (स्वालिपर): मधुजी शादीशुदा हैं, या भी एक वर्ल्ड फेनामेनन है। (ब्यवधान)

श्री बी० पी० मौर्य (हापुड़) : श्री मधु लिमये अटल जी को इतना कमजोर क्यों समझते हैं ?

श्री पीलू मोदी (गोधरा) : मौर्य साहब रीपब्लिकन पार्टी को छोड़ कर कांग्रेस पार्टी में शामिल हो गये हैं, यह भी ग्लोबल फेनामेनन है।

श्री मधु लिमये : इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि मंत्री महोदय विषय में उत्तर देते समय इस पिटी-पिटार्ई बात को बार-बार न दोहरायें और थोड़ा आत्म-संशोधन करें।

अगर सरकार के पिछले तीन साल के वक्तव्यों को देखा जायें, तो पता चलेगा कि सरकार की लम्बान की दृष्टि नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य को पांच छः मिनट से ज्यादा समय नहीं मिलेगा वह उसी में अपना क्वेश्चन कर लें।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्यों ने हसीं मजाक में जो समय ले लिया है, क्या उस को भी आप मेरे समय में जोड़ लेंगे? आप ने जो सीमा बांधी है, मैं उस का ब्याल रखूंगा।

सरकार ने दो साल पहले कहा कि हमारा खाद का उत्पादन तेल, फ्यूअल प्रायल, पर आधारित होगा। उस के बाद वह कहने

लगी कि अब वह कोयले पर आधारित होगा। और जब यह देखा गया कि कोयले की भी भंयकर कमी है, तो, जिन्होंने छोटी सरी सोना कांड में ख्यति प्राप्त की है, वह कांग्रेसी नेता, सुखाड़िया साहब, कहने लगे हैं— भाज में ने उन का भाषण देखा है— कि अब गोबर आदि पर निर्भर रहिए। “शुरुआत हुई फ्यूअल प्रायल से और अन्त हो गया गोबर में! दो हजारो साल पहले जो हालत थी, उस में हम फिर आ गये हैं।

अब सम्यक दृष्टि का अभाव देखिये। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि हम लोग खाद के मामले में पंजाब को प्रथम दे रहें हैं। क्यों बिकाज आफ इटस कान्ट्रीव्यशन में डू एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन”। मैं इस बात से समहत हूँ कि पंजाब खेती के उत्पादन में बहुत आगे है और पंजाब की जो आवश्यकताएं हैं, हमें उन को प्राथमिकता देनी चाहिए। अगर मंत्री महोदय ने गेहूं, या चावल, की बात कही होती, तो हम मान जाते। लेकिन उन्होंने पूरे खेती के बारे में उत्पादन की बात कही है। क्या मंत्री महोदय यह नहीं जानते कि जहां तक गन्ने का सवाल है, उस का उत्पादन उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार, महाराष्ट्र और दक्षिण के कुछ राज्यों में होता है और वह भी खेतों के उत्पादन के अन्तर्गत आता है और उस का अपना महत्व है। इसी तरह जूट पश्चिमी बंगाल, आसाम और उड़ीसा में और चावल पश्चिमी बंगाल, उड़ीसा और आन्ध्र प्रदेश में बड़े पैमाने पर पैदा होता है। अगर हम आउटबन्ट और कपास को लें, तो गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र का उसमें महत्व है। इस लिए ऐसी बात नहीं है कि सिर्फ पंजाब की खाद की आवश्यकता को पूरा करने से खेती को पैदावार में वृद्धि करने का हम लोगों का लक्ष्य पूरा हो जायेगा। इस में इनको सम्यक दृष्टि रखनी चाहिए। उस में एक प्लान्टेशन का भी सवाल लीजिएगा जिस से आप को विदेशी मुद्रा मिलती है तो केरल आसाम, मैसूर और पश्चिमी बंगाल

उ३ में आ जायगा । तो सारे राज्यों की आवश्यकताओं का इन को ख्याल रखना चाहिए ।

में मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या फटिलाइजर कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया का जो उत्पादन सम्बन्धी कार्यक्रम है उस में जो उन को असफलता मिल रही है उस के बारे में मैं ने सुना है कि कोई पा क कमेटी बनी थी तो उन की सिफारिशों का क्या हुआ ? क्या उन सिफारिशों पर भ्रमल हुआ ? इसी तरह फटिलाइजर कारपोरेशन जिस उत्पादन खर्चों पर यह फटिलाइजर बनाता है वह बहुत ज्यादा है । मगर उस में जो मुनाफा होता है उसका हालत क्या है ? जहां गुजरात फटिलाइजर को 71-72 में 18 प्रतिशत मुनाफा हुआ, धर्मसी मोरार जी को 38 प्रतिशत हुआ वहां एफ सी आई को डेढ़ प्रतिशत भी मुनाफा नहीं हुआ । तो इस के बारे में सारे तथ्य सरकार सदन के सामने रखे और परिवर्तन और सुधार लाने के लिए सरकार क्या कर रही है, यह बताए ।

जहां तक फटिलाइजर और तेल की खोज का सवाल है, मेरी अपनी राय है कि इस को इतनी प्राथमिकता देनी चाहिए कि चाहे पब्लिक सैक्टर चाहे ज्वाइंट सैक्टर, चाहे विदेशी पूंजी, चाहे मोनोपली हाउसेज कोई भी हों, फटिलाइजर को पैदावार का और तेल की खोज का जहां तक सवाल है जो भी साधन आप को मिले उन का इस्तेमाल कर के उन का विकास करने का काम करना चाहिए । चार पांच दिन पहले टाटा कैमिकल लिमिटेड की अध्यक्षता करते हुए जो आर. डी. टाटा ने इस सरकार पर यह आरोप लगाया है कि जिन्होंने मीठापुर प्रकल्प में जो देरी की खास कर के उस प्रकल्प में सुधार करने के बाद उस का जो संस्कारित प्रोजेक्ट का नक्शा उन्होंने दिया था उस में उन्होंने कहा है कि चार साल का विलम्ब हुआ है, तो उस के चलते पैदावार में कितनी कमी आई, विदेशी मुद्रा

आप को कितनी खर्च करनी पड़ी, इन सारी बातों की सफाई आप को देनी चाहिए । आपकी नीति समझ में नहीं आती । जो कम्प्यूमर इंडस्ट्री है या नान-प्रायरीट्री इंडस्ट्री है उस में विदेशी पूंजी को आप बढ़ने बेटे हैं और मोनोपली हाउसेज को प्रश्रय दे रहे हैं और फटिलाइजर तथा तेल की खोज का जो बनियादी सवाल है उसके बारे में आपकी कोई नीति नहीं है ।

क्या यह बात सही है कि अभी जो सैम्पल सर्वे किया गया था क्या उस में यह पाया गया कि जो फटिलाइजर हमारे देश में बेचा जाता है सैम्पल सर्वे में यह साबित हुआ कि दस प्रतिशत से लेकर पन्द्रह प्रतिशत मिलावटी सैम्पल उस में है । इन के सैम्पल सर्वे ने जो निष्कर्ष निकाला है वह मैं बता रहा हूँ । इन सारी बातों की वह सफाई दे ?

क्या यह भी सही है कि फटिलाइजर विदेशों से मंगवायें में देरी आप ने की । नतीजा यह हुआ कि जिस तरह अनाज समय से चीन और रूस में खरीदा उसी तरह फटिलाइजर भी उन्होंने बड़े पैमाने पर खरीदा और जैसा कि आप को हमेशा सोते रहने की आदत है आप सोते रहें, आप चीजों को समझते नहीं है । अभी अभी नांगल के बारे में और फयुएल बेस्ड टैक्नालाजी के बारे में आपने कहा कि आप वहा टैक्नालाजी बदलने जा रहे हैं । दुनियां में फयुएल फ्राइसिस आ गया । तो आप कोई अनुमान और बिभ्रलपण कर के किसी काम को नहीं करते हैं, किसी चीज को आप ऐंटीसिपेट नहीं करते है और आपके अपने जो कोयले वगैरह के साधन है उन को बढ़ाने के लिए, उनकी पैदावार को बढ़ाने के लिए आप कुछ नहीं कर रहे है । इन सारी बातों का जबाब मंत्री महोदय दें । विभिन्न राज्यों को जिनका खेती के उत्पादन में बड़ा महत्व है उन की फटिलाइजर की आवश्यकता को पूरा करने के लिए क्या आप कर रहे है, यह भी बता दें ।

[श्री मधु लिमये]

अभी आप ने कहा कि उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में अखबारों में जो खबर आई है वह सही नहीं है। लेकिन वहां की मंत्री राजेन्द्र कुमारी वाजपेयी जी का अभी अभी सीमेंट और कैरासिन के बारे में बयान आया है, उसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि कैरोसिन और सीमेंट का कोटा हमारा बहुत बढ़ाया गया है। इस से हम लोग अनुमान कर सकते हैं कि आने वाले महीनों में आप सीमेंट और कोयला वगैरह के बारे में क्या करना चाहते हैं। . . . (अध्यक्ष).....यह राजेन्द्र कुमारी वाजपेयी जी का बयान है। जब दूसरों का बयान वह काटते हैं तो स्वयं उनके अपने मंत्री क्या कहते हैं उस की भी जानकारी उन को होनी चाहिए।

श्री कृष्णचंद्र शर्मा अहमद : आनरेबल मंत्री ने बहुत सारे सवाल किए हैं जिन का मेरी मिनिसट्री से ताल्लुक नहीं है। लेकिन मैं बताना चाहता हूँ, यह बात जरूर है कि जितना हम समझते थे उतनी प्रोडक्शन इस साल नहीं हुई ...

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, फटिलाइजर के अलावा मैंने किसी ऐसी चीज की बात नहीं कही है ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठिए, यह ठीक नहीं है।

श्री मधु लिमये : नहीं, वह कहते हैं कि मेरी मिनिसट्री से ताल्लुक नहीं है। उस का आप फैसला लीजिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप कृपया बैठिए मैं एलाउ नहीं कर रहा हूँ। इतनी पेशीस नहीं है, कुछ पेशीस होनी चाहिए।

श्री कृष्णचंद्र शर्मा अहमद : जरा थोड़ी सी तहम्मूल कीजिए। सारे जवाब सुनिए। मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि बहुत सारी ऐसी चीजें जिन का आप ने जिक्र किया है उन का मेरी मिनिसट्री से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। लेकिन यह बात मैं मानने

के लिए तैयार हूँ कि जितना हमारी कंपैसिटी फटिलाइजर पैदा करने की है उतनी प्रोडक्शन हमारे मुल्क में नहीं हो रही है। हम से जो कहा गया था कि इस साल हम को 16 लाख टन फटिलाइजर, फटिलाइजर कारपोरेशन के जरिए से मिलेगा, अभी तक जो हमारे पास एस्टीमेट आया है उस से मालूम होता है कि 11 लाख टन से ज्यादा हम को नहीं मिलेगा। तो इस के मुताल्लिक गवर्नमेंट ने आपस में मीटिंग की है और मीटिंग कर के किन किन कार्य-वाहियों के जरिए से जो हमारे एग्जिस्टिंग प्लाण्ट की कंपैसिटी है उस को बढ़ाया जाय, उसके लिए स्टेप्स लिए गए हैं। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि आइन्दा साल इस में तरक्की होगी और अगले साल इस साल से ज्यादा फटिलाइजर हम को मिलेगा।

दूसरा सवाल आनरेबिल मेम्बर ने यह किया कि प्रोडक्शन जो है पहले से ही उस का इन्तजाम करना चाहिए था। किन्तु पहले से इन्तजाम नहीं किया। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम हर साल पहले से फटिलाइजर का इंतजाम करते हैं। कितना फटिलाइजर हमारे मुल्क में पैदा होगा यह देखते हैं और उस के बाद हम यह एस्टीमेट लगाते हैं कि कितना हम को बाहर से लाना पड़ेगा। मैं ने अभी जो फिक्स आप के सामने रखी उस से मैं आप को यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि जिस वक्त हम ने साल भर का प्रोग्राम रखा था उस वक्त हम यह समझते थे हमें दस लाख से जरा ज्यादा फटिलाइजर की जरूरत होगी और उस के लिए हम ने दूसरे मुल्कों से खरीदने की कोशिश की। उस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि आज साठे आठ लाख टन का हम इंतजाम कर सके, बाकी डेढ़ लाख टन का हम इंतजाम नहीं कर सके। यह जो इस वक्त कमी हुई वह इसलिए हुई है कि जितना हम समझते थे कि जितना फटिलाइजर हम को फटिलाइजर फैक्ट्री से मिलेगा उतना नहीं मिल सका और वह न मिलने की वजह से इस का इंतजाम पहले से नहीं हो सका।

श्री बीनेन नट्टाचार्य (सीरमपुर) : यह क्या बोलते हैं? ही मस्ट रिजाइन। हम देख कर भ्राए हैं। सुबह और दाम होते हैं शाम को और दाम होता है।

श्री कञ्जवहीन अली अहमद : भानरेबल मेम्बर ने यह कहा कि अभी सैम्पल सर्वे किया था गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया ने। जहां तक सैम्पल सर्वे का ताल्लुक है क्वालिटी आफ फर्टिलाइजर की जांच करने का, यह गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया नहीं करती। यह तो स्टेट गवर्नमेंट करती हैं और इस का ताल्लुक स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स वगैरह से है। लेकिन जो उन्होंने जिक्र किया मैं स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स से मालूम करूंगा कि क्या उन्होंने इन्वेस्टीगेट किया था और क्या उस का रिजल्ट हुआ? क्या उस के लिए इंतजाम वगैरह किया जा रहा है?

तीसरी बात जो भानरेबल मेम्बर ने दोहराई कि यू०पी० के अन्दर हम खास कर एलेक्शन को मद्देनजर रखते हुए वहां फर्टिलाइजर वगैरह ज्यादा दे रहे हैं, मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम फर्टिलाइजर प्रोडक्शन के लिहाज से जहां ज्यादा प्रोडक्शन होती है वहां देते हैं। जहां तक यू०पी० का ताल्लुक है इस वक्त रबी का समय है और फिसर के जरिए मैं ने आप को बताया है कि सब से ज्यादा प्रायरिटी हमने पंजाब को दी है, उस के बाद हरियाणा को और उस के बाद यू०पी० को क्योंकि ये व्हीट प्रोड्यूसिंग स्टेट है और उन का रबी के सीजन में ब्याल रख कर जो भी हमारे पास फर्टिलाइजर है वह प्रायरिटी बेसिस के ऊपर उन स्टेट्स को दे रहे हैं।

SHRI SEZHIAN (Kumbakonam): Increased fertiliser consumption has become a very important aspect in the new strategy for agriculture. The hon. Minister was referring to the global conditions. When he speaks of the global conditions, he should realise that the consumption of fertilisers in India is deplorably low com-

pared to even the world average—not of advanced countries but even the world average. The fertiliser consumption in India is 12.3 kg. per hectare as against the world average of 40.11 kg. per hectare of agricultural land. The entire difficulties have arisen due to faulty planning non implementation of the targeted production, requisite imports not being planned ahead with a proper assessment of the gap that is likely to take place in India and also untimely distribution of the available fertilisers. It is a very poor consolation if the Minister says that his Ministry has nothing to do with production or planning. My point is that Government as a whole should accept the responsibility for this state of affairs.

Even now 40 per cent of our requirement is being imported, and the Minister of planning has said that by 1978-79 we may have to import as much as 44 or 45 per cent of our requirements.

The Minister, in his statement, has attributed the shortfall in fertiliser production and availability to drought conditions, power-cuts, shortage of raw material, etc. Even in the earlier years, the production has not gone well as far as nitrogen and phosphates are concerned, the public sector production of nitrogen fertilisers for the year 1970-71 was only 57.4 per cent of the installed capacity, and in 1971-72 it was only about 61 per cent of the installed capacity. So far as phosphates are concerned, the public sector production was 50.5 per cent of the installed capacity in 1970-71 and 58.6 per cent in 1971-72. Thus, the problem of under-utilisation of the capacity has been a chronic one. The created capacities have not been utilised properly and Government should have a second look on this. If we take the entire production, both private and public sector, in the year 1970-71, of both nitrogen and phosphates, it was only 61.7 per cent of the created capacity.

[Shri Sezhiyan]

and the figure in respect of the year 1971-72 is 68.5 per cent. Thus, it is very clear that the capacities have not been utilised properly in the country. And that has added to our misery. Fertiliser should be given at the right time; the timely distribution is very important, especially in respect of hybrid and other new varieties.

Coming to the position in Tamil Nadu, I would like to point out that this is the right season to give fertilisers for cotton and other crops and, therefore, we urgently require fertilisers. Already the allotment to Tamil Nadu from the Central Pool is very low. Now the Madras Fertilisers have stopped production from 1st November. I do not think that it will produce anything till the end of this year. Therefore, I would like to know what arrangements have been made to offset the non-production in Madras Fertilisers. About FACT, I understand that the Ministry has made a commitment that the production from FACT will be diverted only to Kerala. I have no objection to that. But what about Tamil Nadu where the Madras Fertilisers have closed down from 1st November? I want to know what arrangements have been made to supply to Tamil Nadu.

A commitment has already been made by the Ministry to supply 27,000 tonnes of urea to Tamil Nadu, but the major portion of that has not come. I understand that two ships are to touch the port of Madras on 21st November and 25th November. According to my information, they contain about 20,000 tonnes of urea. I suggest that the major supplies could be made from those ships. I request the hon. Minister to make the position very clear. We want fertilisers urgently for manuring cotton and other crops in Tamil Nadu. Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister to tell us what arrangements he

is making to compensate failure of production in Madras Fertilisers. Will anything be diverted from FACT? As I have already said, a commitment has been made to supply 27,000 tonnes of urea to Tamil Nadu, but the major portion of that has not yet been delivered. I want to know whether supplies from those two ships will be diverted to Tamil Nadu.

The other members have referred to political considerations being given in the supply of fertilisers to U.P. As far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, if not for us, at least for the sake of Mr. Kamaraj, they should supply us our requirement of fertilisers.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: It is true that so far as the production programme of the Fertiliser Corporation is concerned, its performance is not as we expected. The hon. Member has given the percentage. But I will place before him our figures. We expected in 1970-71 a production of 10.5 lakhs tonnes of nitrogen and 3.2 lakhs tonnes of phosphate but the actual achievement was 8.3 lakhs tonnes in nitrogen and 2.3 lakhs tonnes in phosphate. In 1971-72, the target was 13.2 lakhs tonnes of nitrogen and 3.3 lakhs tonnes of phosphate but we actually got 9.52 lakhs tonnes of nitrogen and 2.78 lakhs tonnes of phosphate. In 1972-73 the target was 14 lakhs tonnes in nitrogen and 4 lakhs tonnes in phosphate and we actually got 10 lakhs tonnes of nitrogen and 3 lakhs tonnes of phosphate. In 1973-74 the expectation was 16 lakhs tonnes of phosphate but we actually got 11.2 lakhs tonnes of nitrogen and out of 4 lakhs tonnes of phosphate we actually got 3.35 lakhs tonnes.

As I have said, we are taking steps to see how we can improve the performance of the Fertiliser Corporation so that we may get production of fertilisers according to their capacity. Various steps have been taken by the Petroleum & Chemicals Ministry and

I hope that after the various steps they have taken, there will be an improvement sometime this year or in the course of the next year.

So far as the case of Tamil Nadu is concerned, I may inform you that out of the fertilisers due to them from the supply of manufacturers, 91 per cent has been supplied in regard to nitrogen and 100 per cent of phosphate has been supplied from the manufacturers. Now, so far as the total supply is concerned both from the pool as well as from the indigenous manufacturers, the supply of nitrogen comes to about 48 per cent and phosphate comes to about 65 per cent.... (Interruptions). From the pool, so far as nitrogen is concerned it is only 29 per cent and 67 per cent in regard to phosphate and I can assure him that as and when more fertilisers are available, we shall keep in view the requirements of Tamil Nadu and we shall see that they are also supplied as much as possible.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): At the outset I may point out that the basis on which the allocation of available fertilisers is being made to the different States is clearly unfair. Who determines? And on what grounds? No doubt, Punjab is important. But agricultural production is important to this country from every State and there is no justification for giving 95 per cent of the pool fertilisers to Punjab....

SHRI DARBARA SINGH (Hoshiarpur): We are not eating it up.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: I am giving the facts.

The Minister said just now that out of the indigenous production, Tamil Nadu has been given 29 per cent of its requirements as against 95 per cent to Punjab. There must be some proportion. Is Tamil Nadu utterly useless as an agricultural producer? I am quite certain that if the same

treatment is given to Gujarat as is meted out to Tamil Nadu that would not be reasonable—I maintain Gujarat is a very good agriculturally productive State—it has raised its production from 9 lakhs to 20 lakhs tonnes. Therefore, this is something which I hope the Minister will be good enough to consider. Now, I am going to proceed on the basis of certain basic facts. The fertiliser shortage is very considerable and the new oil situation will almost certainly result in further reduction of our production and availability within the country and therefore our import requirements will go up very substantially and this is likely to be the position for several years to come. Has Govt. given any thought to a long-term fertiliser policy and to a short-term fertiliser policy which will hold good for the next 5 years? It is not good enough for you merely to say that agricultural production is very vital for the country's economic prosperity etc. The whole Plan will collapse if on this basis State after State is given something like only fifty per cent or less of its requirement of fertilisers. The foodgrains production will suffer as also such agricultural commodities as enter into industrial production too. What I would like to know is this. Has Government given any consideration so far to the use of waste material, because both are important, organic as well as inorganic manure? Organic manure is necessary even if there were adequate availability of inorganic manure. That being so, in regard to the fertiliser policy, a proper proportion should be maintained between inorganic and organic manure.

Bearing in mind these particular aspects of this problem I would like to put a few questions to the hon. Minister and I request that he may be good enough to give detailed and satisfactory replies to them.

(1) Has the Government evolved a long-term policy in regard to fertilisers, both organic and inorganic?

[Shri H. M. Pate].

If so, what is it that they have evolved? You can give a brief reply, if you like.

(2) Secondly, has the Government any short-term policy to meet the country's requirements of fertilisers both organic and inorganic during the next five years or so?

(3) To what extent has the Government any policy under implementation regarding organic manure? To what extent are they utilising water borne sewage? To what extent are they trying to utilising waste materials and composts. To waste organic manure is a crime in countries like China and Japan not even a single ounce of waste material including human waste is allowed to go waste, they are used up because they are most valuable fertilisers. What policy has been evolved by us in regard to organic manures? These are the questions which I would like to put to the hon. Minister.

Summing up my points, I would like to refer briefly to the figures that the Agriculture Minister gave in regard to internal production year after year. You are proceeding on the assumption that very large quantities will be available from within the country when you have no basis whatsoever for expecting that higher production. Why do you plan on the basis of 10 lakhs of tonnes of production this year when in the previous three years every year there has been shortfall of the order of several lakhs of tonnes. You could not have realistically expected more than ten or eleven at most. Therefore there was no justification for expecting a higher quantum of production.

Certain references were made to Mithapur. When you are short of fertilisers why are Government going on delaying in finally clearing the Mithapur project? Of course, the

main or the original project was before Government seven years ago. Does this indicate any anxiety in regard to fertilisers at all? That was why my first question was whether Government had got a long-term policy or not.

In short, will Government state what is their fertiliser policy, long-term and short-term, and if they have not cared to evolve one, when do they propose to prepare one and proceed to implement it? My question is with regard to both organic and inorganic fertilisers.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I share the anxiety of the hon. Member that in order to meet the situation with which we are confronted, we should have a short-term as long as well as a long-term policy. Government are aware of this and have taken necessary steps, so far as the long-term policy is concerned, first of all, we are entering into long-term contracts with countries for the purpose of importing fertilisers for our country, and I hope that we shall be able to succeed in our effort and we shall have contracts entered into for a period of three to five years according to our necessities.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: That is short-term policy, because short-term policy takes care of five years' period or so.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: So far as availability of fertiliser within our country is concerned, the present production programme is not adequate to meet our requirements in the future, and it is likely to go up by the end of the Fifth Five Year Plan....

SHRI PILOO MODY: But he knew this five years ago.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: ...to nearly 5.5 or 6 million tonnes. We hope that in the course of the next few years,

our capacity to manufacture fertilisers will increase by about 26 lakh tonnes.

SHRI PILOO MODY: How? By magic?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: So far as new plants are concerned, we are also taking steps for the purpose of establishing new plants which will give us sufficient quantity of fertilisers, but even then there will be a gap left of a few lakh tonnes which we shall have to import in the future.

As regards the basis on which we make allotment of fertilisers, I would like to point out to the hon. Member that these matters are discussed in the zonal conference, and on the basis of the requirement of every State, the quantity is fixed. The question has arisen whether out of the quantity fixed and out of the fertiliser which is available, any priority is given to any State. We have taken into consideration the fact of production in a particular State, the area under high-yielding variety and also the allotment made by that particular State so far as the contribution to the Central pool is concerned. After taking into account these factors, we have certainly decided to give preference, so far as the rabi crop is concerned, to Punjab, Haryana and also UP and Tamil Nadu and so on.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: May I ask what the allotment for Gujarat is? May I also say that one of the criteria is most unfair because it refers to the contribution by the State to the Central pool? How can a deficit State be in a position to make a contribution? And yet Government do want the deficit States to maximise their agricultural production.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I said that that was only one of the considerations.

Secondly, I would like to point out that the hon. Member is incorrect in saying that we are giving 95 per cent to Punjab out of the available fertiliser. It is only 71 per cent....

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Even so, it is too much.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: So far as Gujarat is concerned, I can give the figures to the hon. Member, if he wants.

So far as Gujarat is concerned, out of the supplies from the pool, we have given it 23 per cent nitrogenous and 38 per cent phosphatic and out of indigenous production, 81 per cent nitrogenous and 75 per cent phosphatic. The total of the two comes to 58 per cent nitrogenous and 63 per cent phosphatic. So the hon. member will realise that we have not been very inconsiderate so far as Gujarat is concerned; we have taken into account their production programme and so on. If we have given a little more to Punjab, Haryana and other States, it is because of other considerations which I have mentioned.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: He has not explained about organic manures which is a very vital thing. It would seem that it has been totally ignored by Government so far. Let us understand precisely what he proposes to do in this regard.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: So far as organic manure is concerned, we have taken necessary steps. I have personally addressed letters to all the Chief Ministers and also discussed the matter with non-official farmers' organisations to see that organic manure is used in our production programme as much as possible. Steps in that direction are being taken.