

system of tax collection in our country from being clogged up. It is in danger of getting clogged up today. Having said this, I once again thank the hon. Members who have taken so much pains to study the provisions of this technical Bill and I thank the large number of them who have lent either fully or partially their support to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

16-26 hrs.

ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI) : Sir, on behalf of Shri Dinesh Singh, I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, and to continue the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 1964, for a further period, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 21 Members, namely :—

Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Bibhuti Mishra, Shri Rup Nath Brahma, Shri C. K. Chakrapani, Shri J. K. Choudhury, Shri V. N. Jadhav, Shri Mushir Ahamad Khan, Shri D. K. Kunte, Shri Mohan Swarup, Shri Jugal Mondal, Shri A. Nesamony, Shri Nihal Singh, Shri Kashi Nath Pandey, Shri D. N. Patodia, Shri Bhola Raut, Shri N. K. Sanghi, Shri Sharda Nand, Shri Shashi Bhushan, Shri S. Supakar, Shri G. Viswanathan; and Shri Mohd. Shafi Qureshi."

MR. CHAIRMAN : In the list of business, no mention of the fact that you had a mind to refer it to a Select Committee is made. Only, consideration of the Bill is mentioned in the list of business. It would have been much better if the Chair and others had been informed earlier so that the Members would have had full knowledge of it.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबई) : एक रास्ता यह था, यह अमेंडमेंट की शकल में दे सकते थे।

आप इस प्रस्ताव का तरमीम की शकल में दे दीजिये।

श्री मुहम्मद शफी कुरेशी : यह भी हो सकता था कि मैं कंसिडरेशन के लिए मूव करता और वहां से कोई अमेंडमेंट आ जाता।

I think this information, was also conveyed by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : This should have been circulated. Now, he has mentioned the names. Will the hon. Minister please let us know the time-limit ? He has just now mentioned the fact that this may be referred to the Select Committee, and then he has given some names. No time-limit is mentioned. What time-limit would you like to fix for the submission of the report ?

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : One week's time.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I wish that you could give this motion on a separate paper.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : I will give.

MR. CHAIRMAN : So, it is one week: that is, by next Wednesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

"That the Bill further to amend the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, and to continue the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 1964, for a further period, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 21 Members, namely :—

Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Bibhuti Mishra, Shri Rup Nath Brahma, Shri C. K. Chakrapani, Shri J. K. Choudhury, Shri V. N. Jadhav, Shri Mushir Ahamad Khan, Shri D. K. Kunte, Shri Mohan Swarup, Shri Jugal Mondal, Shri A. Nesamony, Shri Nihal Singh, Shri Kashi Nath Pandey, Shri D. N. Patodia, Shri Bhola Raut, Shri N. K. Sanghi, Shri Sharda Nand, Shri Shashi Bhushan, Shri S. Supakar, Shri G. Viswanathan; and Shri Mohd. Shafi Qureshi, with instructions to report within a week."

श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह (अमरेली) : हमारा यह एक कन्वेंशन बना हुआ है कि जब भी कोई

[श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह]

सिलैक्ट कमेटी बनती है उसमें कब से कम एक लेडी मੈम्बर को अवश्य रखा जाता है—

श्री मधु लिमये : दो होनी चाहियें ।

श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह : लास्ट टाइम यह हुआ था कि होम मिनिस्टर ने कोई कमेटी बनवाई थी । तब मैंने सवाल उठाया था और उनकी तरफ से उसका जवाब भी दिया गया था और उन्होंने कहा था कि गलती हो गई है और बहनों को कमेटी में लिया जाना चाहिये । मैं आप से कहूंगी कि बहनों को भी अवश्य ही इसमें आप शामिल करें ।

श्री मधु लिमये : औरतों को रखा जाएगा तो ज़रा टैक्स वगैरह कम लगेंगे ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : You can either move an amendment or appeal to the minister. Does the hon. minister want to make a speech now ?

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : Not at this stage. The Bill is to be referred to a select committee. After the report of the select committee is received, it will be considered.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi) : Sir, since the minister has at this late stage indicated that the Bill will go to a select committee, it is necessary for me to recast what I was going to say in the form of definite issues which can be considered by the select committee.

The first issue which I would pose to the select committee is whether in view of the Supreme Court Judgment in Golak Nath versus the State of Punjab, this Bill is within the competence of this legislature. The original Bill which was passed in 1956 was subject to a different Constitution; it was subject to the Fourth Amendment which allowed Government in certain circumstances to touch the rights of property and occupation. After the judgment, the Government is precluded from touching any rights of property which are contained in many of the provisions of this Bill. So, I would like the point to be very carefully considered whether this Bill can go on as it is or whether if the Government think this Bill is necessary

they should not bring it under the emergency powers which they still possess.

The Second issue is, what this Bill has done to the economy. If we are thinking of it in terms of increasing the production of this country, we are faced with the fact that since 1956, we have been faced with increasing shortages. Very recently, sugar production, which is so much within the ambit of this Bill has been lower than ever before. In respect of cloth also we have had recently discussions in this House indicating shortage. If the original Act was concerned in maintaining prices, may I remind the Minister that in 1956 the general index was 92 and today the general index is 266 ? Has this original Act of 1956 served either of these two purposes of increasing production and reducing prices ?

The third question is whether this Bill has helped in any way to discipline the flow of goods to the market. The idea of taking possession, of acquiring certain goods, was that the persons in possession of those goods would find it to their advantage to sell them in the market than pay lower prices prescribed in the Bill. It is a very good mechanism if it had worked.

This raises the question why it has not worked. Its enforcement which has been necessary was not there. This Government has failed very definitely in finding efficient and incorruptible officers or a kind of law which was foolproof.

We have got to consider whether any change is going to arise in this matter. If you cannot improve your efficiency, if you cannot make your officers less corrupted, are you going to do better by the provisions of this Bill which are intensifying the penalties of the original Act ? I will elaborate the intensification so that this House may know in what—I do not like to use the word—a savage way this Government is proceeding against the public in this country.

In the original Act there are eight classifications including I think about 60 items. The Government is not content with these items and Government has added two more—khandsari and gur. One would enquire where is the justice in adding these items exactly at time when sugar control is being

relaxed. Is it the purpose of Government to allow a greater and more sophisticated and better backed process to be free from its control and descend on small producers of gur and khandsari ? This is a very cruel contradiction in the Bill which the Minister will have to explain. He may say that without controlling khandsari and gur the measure against sugar is ineffective. Then it is a confession that for the last ten years they have been making do with an inefficient machinery. If it was necessary to control gur and khandsari in order to make the control on sugar more effective, it should have been done in the beginning. That it is being done now is a confession of the way in which government controls are being imposed.

This Bill is savage because the penal provisions of section 6 which were previously confined only to food and edible oils are now being extended to all commodities. These provisions are very severe. They do not involve anything like life and death questions. For instance, nobody is worried whether there is that much of paper in the country to enable the Government to seize not only the paper involved but the vehicle, the animals, anything that is used to carry these materials. I would like this House and this country to consider whether in this year of grace we can think of confiscating a man's bullock cart because it has been used to convey grains. It is a confession on the part of this Government that it is not able to work with civilised measures, that it must proceed to be savage in this manner with some of the smaller people, some of the most helpless people in this country.

Thirdly, the Bill proposes to make the offences cognisable. Now, cognisable offences are very serious offences, offences like murder, rioting and rievous hurt, and we are now asked to agree that anyone who keeps one kilo more than what is allowed under the law can be arrested by a public servant. I do not know if the government is aware about the attitude of their public servants, of their employees; whether they are aware that this power which they are going to give the public servants is going to extend the existing area of blackmail and extortions. It cannot be the intention of the government that such powers, such draconian powers, should be given to officials who are, by com-

mon knowledge, known to exploit them. To make these offences bailable, to imply that they are so serious that no order, no arrest warrant should be taken out is to imply, not lack of confidence in the people but in the capacity of the government to rule this country.

Fourthly, the Bill makes a provision which is most repugnant to law, that it is an offence whether it is deliberately committed or not. Anyone with a remotest knowledge of law should know that *mens rea*, the guilty mind is necessary to establish any criminal offence. Is it the intention of government that this provision of the law should be completely ignored, that any man who, by some mistake, does hold a certain item in his hand, without knowing the precise quantity he is allowed to hold, is to be presumed guilty ? That ignorance is not of law but ignorance of fact. This I say is a provision which is so repugnant to the canons of law that it is surprising that this Bill has passed the Law Ministry and other concerned Ministries of the Government.

Fifthly, the Bill provides very savage, very severe punishments for habitual offenders. One has no sympathy for habitual offenders, but has government ever caught a habitual offender ? Habitual offenders mostly succeed in becoming district Congress Presidents, even legislators. They are never caught and they are never searched at home. These people do deserve punishment but they are never punished. Who are punished ? Their employees, their servants and stooges are apprehended and punished. If you are going to catch these employees and punish them in a very severe way, I think the very severity of the punishment will be defeated.

There is one provision, however, which is even worse than the general provisions about the treatment to be meted out to these offenders, and that is deprivation of occupation for a period up to six months. How this draconian provision will be used to deprive a man, his family of their natural expectation of a return is one that requires to be seriously considered by this House.

Then, there is the question of increasing the sentences, punishments, imposed under the law from 3 years to 5 years. No doubt,

[Shri Lobo Prabhu]

blackmarketeers deserve to be punished. But this question will have to be considered by the Select Committee as to who is creating blackmarketing, who is responsible for smuggling. The Food Minister is on record recently that zonal controls are creating smuggling, zonal controls are creating black-marketing.

Should there be no Bill against the Government to stop such controls, to stop these opportunities for blackmarketing and smuggling? It is not a Bill against the people that you want; you want a Bill against the Government for maintaining the zonal controls which, on the admission of the Food Minister himself, are encouraging smuggling and blackmarketing. If you are not content with his statement, Shri Pai, who was the Chairman of the Food Corporation, made a similar statement. It was recorded in many papers but Government did not have the courage to controvert it; on the other hand, Government maintains these zonal controls which are starving the people, which are increasing scarcity, which are increasing prices and, therefore, breeding smuggling and blackmarketing.

The other controls do the same thing. They create artificial scarcity. The moment a control is removed as in the case of cement, it is found there is no shortage. Today there is no shortage of cement. For all these years Government created under this Act and under the Industries (Regulation) Act this kind of shortage in cement. The story probably will be the same about sugar. Government have relaxed control on 40 per cent and if prices fall, it will confirm that Government was responsible for maintaining high prices and blackmarketing.

श्री बाबू फरनेन्डीज (बम्बई—दक्षिण) : सभापति महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि यह जो विधेयक सदन के सामने पेश हुआ है, इसमें कुछ पैसे का खर्च सरकार को जरूर करना होगा। फाइनेन्शियल मेमोरेण्डम भी इस बिल में दिया है और जैसा कि नियम है—जिन लाजेज के ऊपर पैसे का खर्च करना होगा, उसको बड़े अक्षरों में अथवा इटैलिक्स में छापना चाहिये—इसमें बड़े अक्षरों में तो कहीं कहीं जरूर छपा है,

लेकिन जहां फाइनेन्शियल मेमोरेण्डम वाली बात है—जैसे पृष्ठ 9 पर देखिये—हर एक के साथ ऐसा लिखा है—

“Though expenditure will have to be incurred from the Consolidated Fund of India on such requisition, an approximate estimate of the expenditure to be incurred cannot be made at this stage.”

पहले पैराग्राफ का भी आखिरी वाक्य यही है, दूसरे पैराग्राफ का भी आखिरी वाक्य यही है, तीसरे, चौथे पैराग्राफ में भी फाइनेन्शियल मेमोरेण्डम के सम्बन्ध में ऐसा ही लिखा है। हमें इस वक्त कितना पैसा इस काम पर खर्च करना होगा, इसका कोई भी अन्दाज़ नहीं दे सकते हैं।

ऐसी स्थिति में, सभापति महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान नियम 69(1) की तरफ आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ, इस नियम में यह कहा गया है—

“A Bill involving expenditure shall be accompanied by a financial memorandum which shall invite particular attention to the clauses involving expenditure and shall also give an estimate of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure involved in case the Bill is passed into law.

(2) Clauses or provisions in Bills involving expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of India shall be printed in thick type or in italics :

Provided that where a clause in a Bill involving expenditure is not printed in thick type or in italics, the Speaker may permit the member in charge of the Bill to bring such clauses to the notice of the House.”

सभापति महोदय, अगर कोई इस प्रकार की गलती हो, जो छपते समय हो जाय, बड़े अक्षरों में नहीं छपा हो—तो उस अवस्था में मंत्री महोदय को छूट दी जाती है कि आपकी इजाजत से सदन के सामने उसको बता सकते हैं, लेकिन रूल 69(1) में तो बिलकुल साफ़ लिखा है—

“... and shall also give an estimate of the recurring and non-recurring expen-

diture involved in case the Bill is passed into law."

जैसा मैंने पहले कहा फाइनेन्शियल मेमोरेण्डम में क्लॉज 3(ए) में कितना खर्च होगा यह लिखा है, क्लॉज 3 (सी) में कितना खर्च होगा यह लिखा गया है, क्लॉज 4 और 6 में कितना पैसा लगेगा यह बतलाया गया है। मगर यह नहीं बतला पाये हैं कि इसमें कितना पैसा खर्च करना पड़ेगा। इस तरह से जो नियम हैं उनका सङ्गत और सोधा उल्लंघन होता है। इसलिये यह विधेयक सदन के सामने नहीं आ सकता है। यह मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : The position is that the Bill has been referred to the Select Committee. Possibly, no debate can take place at this stage because the Bill is already referred to the Select Committee. It is for the Select Committee to go into all these matters and report back to the House.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : How can it even go to the Select Committee?

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : My submission is that the Bill has already been referred to the Select Committee. This matter cannot be raised now.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी (बेतिया) : अभी श्री फरनेन्डो ने जो प्रश्न उठाये हैं वह बिल्कुल सही मालूम पड़ते हैं क्योंकि रूल्स के मुताबिक जो फाइनेन्शियल इम्प्लिकेशन्स हैं उसको पूरी तरह से यहां आना चाहिये। जब तक यह सफाई नहीं हो जाती कि गवर्नमेंट की यह पोजीशन है, यह रूल्स को वायोलेट करता है। इसलिये मेरा ऐसा खयाल है कि इसका पूरा जवाब आना चाहिये और तभी यह बिल सदन के सामने आ सकता है।

MR. CHAIRMAN : The motion has been moved for a reference to the Select Committee. This is under discussion. Shri Fernandes has raised two issues, firstly, that the estimate has not been mentioned and, secondly, that the relevant clauses are not printed in italics. The second point can be waived by the Speaker but not the first one. The reply given by the Minister

is that once the motion for a reference to Select Committee is moved, this point cannot be raised. It is only a motion under discussion. The reference has not been made to the Select Committee by the House so far. Of course, the objection should have come at a little earlier stage. But, anyway, it has come now. I find that the estimate is not given in exact words or in exact amount. The question that this motion is for a reference to the Select Committee does not come in the way of the objection that the hon. Member has raised. You may just explain what are the reasons, whether the estimate, the exact amount, could be given or some other relevant information may be given. Of course, he can do it later. For the time being, the discussion may go on. By this evening, you may just give exact figures of estimate and then the debate may continue.

SHRI PILOO MODY : What he could not do for the last three years, I do not think, he is likely to do so in a few hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We can just wait for sometime. Shri Fernandes has raised a perfectly valid objection. I only wish it could have been raised a little earlier and the time of the House could have been saved. Anyway, it has come now. I also find a number of other irregularities. Somewhere, the year is not mentioned, the date is not properly mentioned, etc. I would request the Minister to go into the draft of this Bill himself. Of course, those can be treated as consequential mistakes and we can rectify them by the right of the Chair, but not the very basic objection which the hon. Member on the other side has raised. I hope, he will look into it and see to it that the next time when this Bill is taken up, all these defects are removed.

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR (Sambalpur) : May I be permitted to raise this point of order? In the Financial Memorandum, in almost all the paragraphs it has been stated that an approximate estimate of the expenditure to be incurred cannot be made at this stage. This comes in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4. So, I do not think that, even if the hon. Deputy Minister is given time, he will be able to make an approximate estimate of the actual expenditure involved. The area of control is so large that I do not know whether he will be in a position to

[Shri Sradhakar Supakar]
make even an approximate calculation of the expenditure involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is an estimate. Some amount should have been mentioned rather than keeping silent.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba) : Before you give the ruling, may I submit this ? A very serious note of this lacuna has to be taken; this is not just an irregularity; as far as our rules go, it is an illegality. I may point out to you why these estimates are required. These estimates are required because the House has to assess whether, having recourse to this Bill and by passing it into an Act, the country would be benefited or not; the House should know at what cost we are going to implement this Bill, if the House does not know, if the country does not know, at what cost this is going to be implemented, then it will be very difficult; for instance, one man might bring a suggestion that he can turn dust into gold, but at what cost ? It might be like this. If on the face of it is cannot be estimated, it is really good and necessary that the Deputy Minister, without any point of honour, just withdraws the Bill and assures the House that he will come before this House with all the information. It is for the office to give the information. I might even say that even if he brings the information at the end of the day, the House will have to be allowed to discuss the whole matter again because in the context of the expenditure involved, the matter will have to be looked into again. This is not a simple thing. If it cannot be estimated now, as I said, the Minister should withdraw the Bill now. The Deputy Secretary was suggesting to you, Sir, that it might as well be added. That is a wrong way of interpreting the rules. I take a serious objection to interpreting rules in this way. The rules of this House are meant to be obeyed and not to be trifled with. So, the suggestion that was made that it could be given at the end of the day or tomorrow, is not correct. The point of order raised by my hon. friend, Mr. Supakar, is very valid. If, till now, till the Bill was presented to the House, the office could not either collect the figures or collate them, I do not know how they are going to do this within another 25 minutes or even by tomorrow morning. So, the best course is for the Deputy Minister to withdraw this Bill now. (*Interruptions*) May I point this

out to you in all humility ? You have stated that this objection should have been raised earlier. It was for your Secretariat not to put it up in the order paper till all the preliminaries were gone through. You pointed out—and we admit the mistake—that we did not raise the objection earlier, but it was the responsibility of your Secretariat to see whether all the preliminaries had been gone through or not; if they had not been gone through and if the mistake lies with your Secretariat, then you should be kind to us.

17 hrs.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY (Cuddalore) : I request the Chair to kindly pull up the Law Minister because it has passed through his Ministry. They have processed the Bill. They cannot rather circulate a Bill which is not complete in all respects.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Kunte, I have already made certain observations and also allowed the hon'ble Minister just to see if he could rectify it by the time he comes next. A little time is left now. You had been yourself a Presiding Officer. Procedural irregularity cannot be equated with illegality. It may be due to ignorance or irregularity.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE : Sir, the Rules of the House are very clear. It is clearly a breach of the Rules of the House unless you say that for the moment the the Rule is abrogated.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is a mere irregularity.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Are you suggesting, Sir, that a Bill should be passed without the House knowing what the financial implications are? After all, when a Bill like this comes before us we are supposed to see what it is going to cost us. If it is going to cost us a hundred crores of rupees year, we will say 'We certainly do not want it', but if it is going to cost only Rs. 5 or 6 crores, we may say 'Yes'. So, there must be some idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I just wanted to give some time to the Minister. If it is a question of oversight, he can rectify it, but if he actually does not know anything about the exact amount or estimate, then he will have

to bring the Bill later on. Of course, these procedural irregularities are quite serious, very material; I do not ignore them in the manner they should be taken. Any way I have already allowed him. The discussion may go on for another 20 minutes or so. We may keep up the time schedule. Next time he comes he may come prepared. Also those lines which are not in bold letters should be given in bold letters and you may invite the attention of the House to those relevant clauses. Estimates and also your observations about clauses which are affected by this legislation, should be given.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : I quite agree. The Rule cited by Mr. Fernandes has a proviso which says :

"Provided that where a clause in a Bill involving expenditure is not printed in thick type...."

17-03 hrs.

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

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He will present the estimates tomorrow. We will carry on the Bill today.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY : That will be illegal, Sir. The best way is: let the hon'ble Deputy Minister withdraw the Bill to-day and re-introduce it. We cannot act on illegality.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let me hear him.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : This Bill has already been introduced. Now this is in consideration stage. If there were any objections, that should have been taken at the stage of introduction. Sir, my submission is : if there is any lapse, it is not illegal; it may be due to oversight.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY *rose*—

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : The Financial Memorandum which is attached to this Bill amply makes it clear that it is not possible to give the estimated expenditure at this stage. The purpose of the financial memorandum with a Bill is to know what is the amount we are going to get from the Consolidated Fund of India or

what is the amount we are going to put into it. There we cannot possibly make an estimate as to what is the amount we will be getting out or putting in that Fund. This information is enough.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY : When a provision in the Bill is that it will be charged from the Consolidated Fund of India, then there must be some estimate, whether it is one paise or Rs. 100. Without an estimate, a Bill is not a Bill at all; it is only some sentences printed.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Love letters to the people of India ! They are letters to the people of India saying "We shall put you in jail; we shall put you behind bars; and we shall hang you."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Rule 69 is obligatory so far as the financial memorandum is concerned. I do not think that the hon. Minister is right in pleading excuses. What I would suggest is this. At 5-30 p.m. we are going to have the half-an-hour discussion....

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Let us commence it just now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If the House permits, we could carry on the discussion on this Bill for 20 minutes more....

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No. How can we discuss what is illegal ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If hon. Members do not agree, then this is what I would suggest. I have already said that it is obligatory that the hon. Minister will have to submit a financial memorandum. I have stated that categorically. There are no two opinions about it.

If hon. Members do not agree, then for the 20 minutes or so that remain now, we shall take up the motion regarding the food situation.

The Minister of State for Food is here. Would he like to say something ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE) : I would only move the motion.

SHRI RAJARAM (Salem) : In between let us discuss the Bengal problem.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That has already been disposed of. There can be no more mentioning of that.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY : What is the present situation in West Bengal ? Let the hon. Home Minister tell us about that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, we shall take up the motion regarding the food situation.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : I have not exhausted the 15 minutes' time given to me on this Bill. So, I may be allowed to continue tomorrow.

17-07 hrs.

MOTION RE: FOOD SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE) : On behalf of Shri Jagjivan Ram, I beg to move :

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

At this stage, I do not wish to make any submissions. We have already circulated a document on the food situation and after listening to the views of hon. Members we shall be replying to the debate.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

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

There are some substitute motions, and hon. Members who want to move them may do so now.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV (Barabanki) : I beg to move :

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the food situation in the country, is of the opinion that the Government of India have utterly failed in solving the food problem." (1)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The next motion is in the name of Shri Bibhuti Mishra. He is not present here now.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि सदस्यों को सूचना नहीं है कि अभी खाद्य की बहस होगी। इस समय जो सदस्य सदन में नहीं हैं उनके संशोधन बाद में ले लिए जायें।

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : It will not be proper to deny him the chance to move the amendment later.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : बाद में ले लिया जाय।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : With the permission of the House, I shall consider it.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE : I have no objection.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Substitute motions Nos. 3, 4 and 5 are in the names of Shri D. S. Patil, Shri Yashpal Singh and Shri Bhogendra Jha, and those Members are not present here.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Pa (na) : I beg to move :

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the food situation in the country, is of the opinion that the Government has completely failed in finding a solution to the food problem and in order to find a solution, this House, recommends that—

- (a) monopoly procurement should be enforced in all the States in view of bumper crop this year, cultivators should be given remunerative prices for their produce, and the wholesale grain trade should be nationalised immediately;
- (b) banks should be nationalised in order to exercise control on and bring down rising grain prices;
- (c) immediately stringent action should be taken against profiteers and grain-hoarders and a country-wide effective movement should be launched to unearth hoarded grains;
- (d) fair prices of foodgrains should be fixed; and