

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Tomorrow, there will be no edition of the *Patriot* also, because the strike is in all the newspaper establishments.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): That is the reason why he wants a discussion tomorrow, because tomorrow there will be no paper and what happens today will not come out in the papers.

12.23½ hrs.

ARMY, AIR FORCE AND NAVAL LAW (AMENDMENT) BILL*

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI M. R. KRISHNA): On behalf of Shri Swaran Singh, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Army and Air Force (Disposal of Private Property) Act, 1950 and the Navy Act, 1957.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Army and Air Force (Disposal of Private Property) Act, 1950 and the Navy Act, 1957."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI M. R. KRISHNA: I introduce the Bill.

12.24 hrs.

RICE-MILLING INDUSTRY (REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL

—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Annasahib Shinde on the 26th July, 1968, namely:—

"That the Bill to amend the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Shri Tulsidas Jadhav may now resume his speech.

12.24½ hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

श्री तुलसी दास जाधव (बारामती) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो राइस मिलिंग इंडस्ट्री रेगुलेशन बिल है, उस के ऊपर शुक्रवार के दिन मैं बोल रहा था। उस दिन मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यह था कि जब पब्लिक सेक्टर में हमारी इंडस्ट्री लगती है और इंडस्ट्री लगाने के लिए भारत ने कबूल किया है, कांस्टीट्यूशन में यह कहा है कि कोऑपरेटिव कामनवैलथ के रास्ते पर हमें जाना है, तो यह राइस मिलिंग के बारे में जो यह प्राइवेट मिलिंग चलती है उस को किसी रीति से कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर हो या स्टेट सेक्टर हो, उस में लाना गवर्नमेंट का लाजिमी फर्ज हो जाता है। इस प्ब्लिट से देखा जाय तो उस दिन मैंने कहा था कि जहां डिक्टेटरशिप चलती है वहां किसी न किसी रीति से यह चीज लाने के लिए वह नौकरशाही के तरीके के खिलाफ दूसरा तरीका इस्तेमाल करते हैं और प्राइवेट प्रापर्टी अपने काबू में ये कर वह स्टेट की तरह से या कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर की तरह से चलाते हैं। इस रीति से हिन्दुस्तान को भी यह बात करनी होगी और भ्रष्टचन तो है लोगों को साथ से कर चलने की और उस में फिर दिक्कत पैदा होती है कि जो भाई कभी-कभी समाजवाद की तरफ अपना रुख दिखाते हैं, वह जब इम्प्लीमेंटेशन करना होता है तो हिचकिचाते हैं, यह भी अनुभव हम लोगों ने इस हाउस में देखा है। लेकिन कुछ भी हो, यह तो हिन्दुस्तान को करना ही होगा। हमारा यह राइस मिलिंग का काम प्रोसेसिंग इंडस्ट्री का काम है। यह जितने मीन्स आफ प्रोडक्शन हैं, यह स्टेट के हों या कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर के दायरे में आयें, इस के वरिपर इस देश में कोई चारा नहीं है। हमारा जो गवर्नमेंट प्रिन्सल है वह जमीन से पैदा हो या और कहीं से, उस में जो, धान, मेज काटन, जूट, गुगुर केन और प्राउन्ड नट और माइन्स के और मिनरल्स के जितने नेचुरल वैल्य हैं, उन सभी में यह

[श्री तूलसी दास जाषध]

प्रोसेसिंग इन्डस्ट्री होती है। तो यह प्रोसेसिंग इन्डस्ट्री कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में आ जाय इस के लिए हम लोगों ने कोशिश की है, और उस में से शुगर केन फैक्टरीज जो हैं वह ज्यादा से ज्यादा हिन्दुस्तान में बनती हैं। इन के बनने सेइन की खपत भी ठीक से आई है। हिन्दुस्तान में 209 शुगर केन फैक्टरीज हैं। उस में प्राइवेट 136 हैं और कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में 73। जो प्राइवेट 136 हैं उस में 72 यू० पी० में और 28 बिहार में हैं। लेकिन यह बाकी जो हैं या 6000 राइस मिलिंग की जो फैक्टरीज हैं यह सभी की सभी प्राइवेट सैक्टर में हैं। तो प्राइवेट सैक्टर में से निकाल कर इन्हें कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में या स्टेट सैक्टर में लाने की गरज है। इस बिल में भी इस के लिये कहा गया है कि चाहे तो एक वर्ष के अन्दर वह माडर्नाइज करें और चलाएं या कानून के आने के पहले एक वर्ष या उस के बाद एक वर्ष, इस तरह से दिया है।

एक बात इस में नजर आती है कि जो खानगी लोग हैं, राइस मिलें चलाने वाले, उन की मिलों को लेना हुआ तो उस को न लें और माडर्नाइज्ड मशीनरी लगाएं तो वह मशीनरी आइडिल होगी और वेस्ट होगी। वह भी नहीं करना है। किसी रीति से कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर चाहे तो उस को परचेज करे या गवर्नमेंट ले ले लेकिन वह वेस्ट न हो। जैसे शोलापुर में हम ने देखा। दो से ढाई करोड़ की सूती मिलें, शोलापुर स्पिनिंग एंड बीविंग मिल धूल खाती हुई पड़ी हैं। न मालिक चलाता है न सरकार कब्जे में लेती है। तो राइस मिलिंग के बारे में यह न हो, यह मेरी रिक्वेस्ट है। राइस मिलिंग के बारे में जिन का विरोध है उन को मेरी रिक्वेस्ट है कि उस में छोटी-छोटी बातों में जाने की गरज नहीं है। कि मिल जब गाड़ी ले जाती है तो उस से कुछ निकलते हैं, गरीब लोगों को कुछ मिलता नहीं है, तो ऐसी छोटी-छोटी चीजें

तो फ्यूडल सिस्टम में परसनल प्रापर्टी अनोनरशिप सिस्टम में चलती हैं और यह हिन्दुस्तान में आज यह चीज ज्यादा होती है, बाहर में कम होती है, यह मैं ने देखा है। लेकिन यह चीजें इस सिस्टम में नहीं चलेंगी। यह इंडस्ट्री कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में लायें या स्टेट सैक्टर में लायें तो यह बात मिट जाती है। कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर के बारे में बहुत लोगों के मन में कुछ शंका होती है, लेकिन मेरा खुद का अनुभव है और महाराष्ट्र में जिनतनी भी कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में सोसाइटीयां काम कर रही हैं, वे बहुत अच्छी तरह से चल रही हैं। कम से कम 22 शुगर फैक्टरीज कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटी के जरिये बहुत अच्छी तरह से चल रही हैं। इस लिये मेरा कहना है कि ये जितनी मिलें हैं इन को कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर के नीचे लाया जाय, या इन के जो मिल मालिक हैं उन को ज्यादा टाकलीफ न हो, इस दृष्टि से उन को कम्पेन्सेशन दिया जाय।

दूसरी चीज—आप इन को कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर के नीचे लायें या स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के नीचे लायें, लेकिन जो इन के लोग अनएम्प्लायड होते हैं, उन के पास जो ताकत होती है, अनुभव होता है, उस को भी इस्तेमाल करे। ऐसा न हो कि उन को धन्ये से निकाल दें और उन की जगह पर सरकार आई० सी० एस० अधिकारी रखे, जो पीस एण्ड आर्डर रखने वाले लोग हैं, उन को इकानामिक्स के काम में डाल दे, इस के नुकसान होता है, रिटर्न नहीं होती है, आउट-पुट नहीं होती है और देश की इकानामी बिगड़ जाती है।

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA (Mandya):
Coming in the wake of the resolution passed in the Bhubaneswar Session of the Congress we expected that a giant-sized Minister like Shri Jagjivan Ram presiding over a giant-sized Ministry would come forward with a Bill to nationalise the rice mills in this country, but I am disappointed with the Bill that is before the House.

I appreciate that preferential treatment is sought to be given to the co-operative institutions and the co-operative sector, but it is worth while for the House to have a probe into the working of the co-operative institutions. I am pained to submit that even in the sphere of co-operative there is an attitude to exploit the farmers and particularly the small farmers.

The co-operative rice mills, and in this country there are quite a number of them, have been milling the rice or paddy that is supplied, and particularly after the compulsory procurement drive came into operation, small officers representing the Government have to go to the rich rice mill owners who store their own paddy also in the rice mill premises, and they are asked to mill that paddy for the Government and release it for public consumption.

At this juncture, I would make a request for exempting the rice hullers at the village level from the purview of this Bill. The Bill makes it a point to bring in all the rice hullers, but these hullers are used for various purposes. I know that in the villages the same machine is used to crush sugarcane, to lift water for irrigation purposes etc. It has become somewhat of a cottage industry, if I may say so. So, I would like the Minister to give considerable thought to this problem and see if he exempts the hullers in the villages from this Bill.

The Government of Kerala in the middle of 1967 offered to the Central Government to take over the rice mills in that State under the Defence of India Rules and they asked for the permission of the Union Government, but Union Government turned down that suggestion. In one breath you say that the rice milling industry has to be nationalised, but in the same breath when a non-Congress Government comes forward with a suggestion to take over the rice mills in the State at least temporarily to tide over the food crisis, you turn it down. What is the idea? There are double

standards. We talk so much about bringing the public sector and the co-operative sector into greater play. It so happens—I do not know if I would be well within my limits to bring in this particular point—that there is a joint stock company or public limited company the Bagalkot cement company—in which the Government of Mysore owns shares. There is conspiracy now going on to transfer these shares to a big business house in this country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can refer to it incidentally; do not dilate on it.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA: It becomes relevant. We are talking of having more rice mills in the public sector or co-operative sector. But the proposal now considered in Mysore is to transfer the management and control of the cement company to a big business house. We should be frank about certain things.

When the hon. Minister Shri Shinde piloted the Bill, he told the House that there was a lot of wastage in the hullers. Prof. Ranga referred to that point and showed that there was nothing like wastage; even the husk was utilised by the farmer in one way or the other. The hullers have to be exempted.

I shall now come to the panel clauses. For some reason there is for instance a scarcity of spare parts for rice mills—the owner of a rice mill may be forced to stop the mill for more than a year. In which case he would come under the clutches of some low-paid officers of the Government. If he wants to get the licence renewed he has to satisfy some officer that for some reasons he could not continue the mill. The fine and imprisonment provided in the Bill is somewhat harsh and I should suggest that the penalty should be reduced.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor): The intentions of the hon. Minister in bringing forward this Bill are very good. He says that it would

[SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU].

help the farmers to get more recovery when paddy is milled. In implementing it there are a number of difficulties which the agriculturists would be forced to face. Take for instance, the cost. Only big merchants who have enough money can invest more money and have modern rice mills. The co-operative sector can have more rice mills. But it is not easy like starting a sugar mill and getting cane from the neighbouring area—within a radius of 10 to 20 miles. Paddy can be produced only in areas which have plenty of water. There are only a few places, except the delta areas. In these small places, they could not have very big rice mills. A district may have 3 or 4 modern rice mills but a farmer may have to travel very far with his paddy to get it milled. If the agriculturist wants to sell his own paddy he might be compelled to travel about 70 to 100 miles which is impossible. In the villages everywhere, even the agriculturists themselves are having a rice-hullers and whenever they want they hull their paddy and they hull it for their neighbours also. The Government say that they are not going to renew the licence unless the farmer installs a new type of rice sheller. In three to six months, when the renewals come and at that time, the Government is going to say, "The licence will not be renewed; you instal a new mill." In our country, they can instal only big shellers. You do not have small shellers. So, without thinking, or without making proper arrangements, this sort of rushing with the Bill on the part of the Government is not good.

In Japan, there are small, new types of shellers which will hull about 200 bags of paddy per day. In the villages they have 100 to 150 bags capacity rice hullers. That is a small thing. If the Government can provide or make arrangements to import or to manufacture such small rice shellers, it is possible for the agriculturists to replace their hullers with

shellers. If it is not possible, and if the Government is going to force the agriculturists that within four months or six months or one year, the agriculturist must replace it, it is not reasonable. It is only doing harm to the agriculturists and helping, on the other hand, the big millowners will benefit and the Government will be creating a lot of trouble for the farmers. I only request the Government not to rush with the Bill and frame the provisions in such a way that the farmer is given two years' time or three years' time to replace sheller. Small shellers also can be shellers. We should not insist that the farmer should have only a big sheller. Small shellers also can be had by them. For this, the Government must import from Japan or must arrange for the manufacture of small shellers and supply them to the farmers. This is a most important thing.

The other point is about the penal clause. The agriculturists are not well educated like the consumers nor like the officials, or the townsmen. They live in villages and they are not well educated. They cannot be well-versed with the new amendment. So the penal clause should not be so severe.

Another important point is with regard to the licencees. They have said that licencees should be had for possessing a huller. To have a water pump, are we getting a licence from the Government? We are not getting. Similarly, there need not be a licence for the sheller. The Government can say, "you must have a sheller." I agree with them. But why do you create trouble for the farmer and why should he go in for a licence for a sheller? He need not have a licence. He will come under the mercy of the officers for getting a licence. This condition should not be there. The Government can impose and say, "you must have a sheller," but not a licence I request the Government to

move an amendment that the farmers shall not be required to have a licence from the State Government or from the Central Government for this purpose.

श्री शिहरे (पंजिम) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब सदन में कोई ऐसा विधेयक आता है जिससे सम्पूर्ण राष्ट्रीयकरण की अपेक्षा की जाती है तो मुझे बहुत खुशी होती है। जब ऐसा मौका आता है तो मेरे जैसे बैंक-बैंचर्स भी आगे आकर अपनी आवाज उठाने का प्रयत्न करते हैं। वही मैं भी आज कर रहा हूँ। हमारे गोवा में कहा जाता है कि जब विदेशी किंग आफ किन्ज विह्स्की की तलब आती है और वह तलब पूरी नहीं होती है तो बंगलौर की स्वदेशी महिषासुरी विह्स्की ने तलब पूरी करते हैं। इसी प्रकार जब राष्ट्रीयकरण की माँग पूरी नहीं होती तो महकारी सोसायटी की बात आती है और उसको सपोर्ट करने में मुझे खुशी होती है। इस सदन में जो विधेयक पेश किया गया है उसको मैं बड़ी प्रमत्तता से सपोर्ट कर रहा हूँ। साथ में मैं एक मुझाव भी यहाँ देना चाहूँगा। वह मुझाव यूनिजन टैरिटरिज के बारे में है, विशेषतया गोवा और पांडिचेरी के बारे में।

हमने देखा है कि जो कोओपरेटिव सोसायटीज का मूवमेन्ट चला है वह वहाँ पर ज्यादा सक्सेसफुल नहीं हो रहा है। इतना ही नहीं, गोवा की कोओपरेटिव सोसायटीज में ऐसे मामले हो रहे हैं जिनको देखकर कोओपरेटिव सोसायटीज के मूवमेंट पर घृणा आती है। इसलिये मैं साँचता हूँ कि इन कोओपरेटिव सोसायटीज के मूवमेन्ट के लिये अभी गोवा और पांडिचेरी का कुछ थोड़ा सा टाइम मिलना जरूरी है। महाराष्ट्र में जो कोओपरेटिव सोसायटीज का मूवमेन्ट चला वह काफी सक्सेसफुल हो रहा है इसी से हमारे मन्त्री जो कहेंगे कि सारे भारत में भी ऐसा मूवमेन्ट हो। लेकिन गोवा का जो 1173(A i) LSD—10.

एक्सपेरिमेन्ट हमने देखा है वह ऐसा है कि इस समय में हसकारी आधार पर वहाँ हालार या चक्की चलाने का प्रयत्न ज्यादा फायदेमन्द नहीं होगा।

गोवा के जो लोग हैं उनको, स्वतंत्रता के बाद वहाँ जो नयी परिस्थिति पैदा हुई है, उससे समझने होने के लिये अभी अधिक समय नहीं मिला है इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि वहाँ पर इस विधेयक को अमल में लाने के लिए अभी दो वर्ष का समय और दिया जाए। गोवा चावल के मामले में सरप्लस स्टेट नहीं है। गोवा में जो ईसाई समुनिटी के लोग हैं वे वहाँ पर ब्वायल्ड राइस इस्तेमाल करते हैं। प्रत्येक साल के लिये उन्हें जितने चावल की आवश्यकता होती है उसे वे अपने घर में रखते हैं और साल भर इस्तेमाल करते हैं। उनको जरूरी होता है कि वे समय-समय पर अपनी पैड़ी लें। इसलिये मैं कहूँगा कि गोवा और पांडिचेरी में कम से कम दो वर्ष के लिए इस बिल को अमल में न लाया जाए।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ। यदि वह न हो सके तो कम से कम जिस गाँव की जनसंख्या एक हजार से ज्यादा न हो वहाँ पर प्राइवेट इन्टरप्राइज को मौका देना आवश्यक होगा क्योंकि जिस गाँव की जनसंख्या एक हजार भी न हो यदि वहाँ पर भी कोओपरेटिव सोसायटी का मूवमेन्ट चलाया जायेगा, कोओपरेटिव क्षेत्र में चक्की या हालार लगाये जायेंगे तो उसके एक्सपेंसेज बहुत आयेंगे क्योंकि कोओपरेटिव सोसायटीज के साथ काफी पैराफर्नेलिया होता है। ऐसे गाँवों में जहाँ कि एक हजार से कम जनसंख्या होती है वहाँ पर एक या दो आदमी ही अपनी प्राइवेट चक्की या हालार चलाते हैं। इसलिये मेरी आप से प्रार्थना है कि गोवा और पांडिचेरी के बारे में इस विधेयक का अमल दो वर्ष के लिए स्थगित रखा जाए और उसके बाद ही इसको वहाँ पर अमल में लाया जाय।

SHRI P. GOPALAN (Tellicherry): Sir, this is a Bill which seeks to place certain restrictions on the rice-milling industry. It is perhaps the intention of the Government to hoodwink the people by creating an impression that the Congress Government at the Centre is taking some welcome measures to check hoarders and profiteers in rice mills. I am sorry to say that I cannot support this Bill as a welcome measure, mainly because of the fact that even if this Bill is enacted, it will not serve the purpose for which it is intended.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE): What is your suggestion?

SHRI P. GOPALAN: I am coming to that. I need not say here anything about the bold resolution that was passed some years back by the Congress Party at the Bhubaneswar Session. There the Congress Party demanded that the entire rice mills in our country should be nationalised. Years have elapsed since it was declared and nothing has been done in that direction. Instead of nationalising the rice mills in our country our Government found it necessary to come forward with such a Bill. By putting certain restrictions upon the rice mills in our country the Government think that they can check hoarding and profiteering in rice. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, can nationalisation of rice mills be substituted by this Bill if it is enacted into a law? I want a categorical reply to this question.

Sir, as you know, I come from a State which is the worst sufferer at the hands of this profiteering and blackmarketing Government. When our Government was supplied a quantum of three ounces of rice per head for distribution to the people in our State the State Government of Kerala came forward with a proposal to the Central Government to take over the

management of rice mills under the Defence of India Rules. I do not think anything is wrong with that suggestion. But the Central Government denied permission to the Government of Kerala to take over the rice mills under the Defence of India Rules. I want to know from the Minister why that permission was denied, why the Central Government which seeks to place certain restrictions upon the rice milling industry in our country denied the Kerala State Government the right to take over the management of rice mills under the Defence of India Rules.

Sir, it is quite clear that this is a Government of hoarders and black-marketeers. We are the worst sufferers from the policies of this Government. I wish to say that nothing short of nationalisation of rice mills can save our countrymen. The rice mills are acting as instruments of blackmarketing and hoarding, and it is at a time when our countrymen are on the verge of starvation or semi-starvation that these rice mills are acting as instruments of hoarding and profiteering. But this Government has not come forward with a bold suggestion to check this hoarding and profiteering. Instead of doing that they have thrown the lives of our entire countrymen to the mercy of black-marketeers and other evil elements in our society. Therefore, I repeat that nothing short of nationalisation will serve the purpose. If you want to check hoarding and profiteering in rice you have to nationalise the entire rice-milling industry in our country. That is my only suggestion and I want to repeat that this Bill will not serve the purpose.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to the hon. Members for a very enlightened debate on this very important Bill. I am thankful to all the hon. Members for throwing light on the various provisions of the Bill. But I may submit that many of the observations made by hon. Members were

misconceived or based on misunderstanding without a proper appreciation of the provisions of the Bill brought forward by the Government.

At the outset I would like to dispel the fear expressed by the hon. lady Member from West Bengal, Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri, when she asked whether the provisions of the Bill are likely to affect adversely the hand-pounding industry. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. lady Member to the fact that the original law which provides for adequate protection to the hand-pounding industry remains as it is. The provisions are there on the statute and that adequately protects the interests of the hand-pounding industry. Therefore the hon. Member need not have the fear on this ground.

Of course, extreme views have been expressed in regard to the provisions of the Bill. For instance, Professor Ranga, on the one side, is not prepared even to accept the co-operatives, much less the public sector rice mills, because he has a prejudice. I do not think he was speaking on the basis of his experience but on the basis of his political views. That is why he expressed his view against any sort of a progressive measure by the Government.

On the other side, just now the hon. Member, Shri Gopalan, expressed a similar extreme view which was completely in contradiction to Professor Ranga's view.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR (Palghat): The Central Government is not giving permission to the State Government even to restrict the rice mills.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: I am coming to that; please have some patience.

Shri Gopalan said that nothing short of nationalisation would meet the needs of the situation. I would humbly submit that Shri Gopalan was also

speaking not on the basis of experience of realities of the situation in our country but on the basis of his political views.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR: No, no.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: I have nothing to say with regard to the political views held by hon. Members because they are within their rights to hold any particular view that they like. But may I ask: What is the state of affairs of the rice mills industry in India? The other day I mentioned that there are about 40,000 to 50,000 rice mills spread all over the country, out of which almost 80 to 85 per cent are small units. They are not only small units but have outmoded and obsolete machinery; they are just simply junks. I do not know what purpose would be served by taking over those junks or outmoded machinery and rationalising them. But I know that some of our friends want to run away with slogans and create an impression that they are the only persons who champion the cause of the people and that everything that the Government is doing is not worth anything.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): We are more progressive than those reactionaries.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: Therefore I do not think that Shri Gopalan's suggestion is a very realistic suggestion.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR: Is it not a fact that the Government has not accepted the Kerala Government's suggestion to restrict the rice mills? The High Court has given the judgment... (Interruption).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Minister has already said that he would come to that point a little later.

श्री इस्हाक सांभल: (अमरोहा) :
मंत्री महोदय छोटी राइस मिलों के लिए
भले ही ऐसा कह सकते हैं लेकिन बड़ी राइस
मिलों को नेशनलाइज करने में उन्हें क्या
दिवकत है ? बड़ी राइस मिलों को वह क्यों
नहीं नेशनलाइज करते ?

[श्री استحقاق سامبلی (امروہا)
ملذہ بڑی مہوٹے چھٹی رائس ملوں
کے لئے بھلے ہی ایسا کہہ سکتے ہیں
لیکن بڑی رائس ملوں کو نیشنلائز کرنے
میں انہیں دیا دتت ہے - بڑی
رائس ملوں کو وہ کہوں نہیں نیشنلائز
کرتے -]

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: I was submitting that before this Bill was drafted, we consulted the representatives of the various State Governments—of course, it was quite some time earlier—and most of the State Governments indicated to us that the extreme step of nationalisation might not meet the needs of the situation. That was also the view held by many experts. Taking into consideration the existing situation of the rice-milling industry, I also personally feel that nationalisation would not provide any remedy; on the contrary, that would create more problems and would not help to solve any problem at all.

The hon. Member, Shri Kunte, who spoke at length on this Bill tried to propound, as if, a new theory. He said that the provisions of the Rice Milling Bill are against the policy of the Government of India which is enunciated in the Industrial Policy Resolution. I do not know from where the hon. Member, Shri Kunte, made this discovery. But I would like to submit that the Industrial Policy Resolution itself does not exclude the possibility of giving preference to co-operatives or to public sector rice mills. May I draw the attention of the hon. Member, though he is not here at the moment, to the relevant portion of it? It says in substance:

"All the remaining industries will fall in the third category and it is expected that development will be undertaken, ordinarily, through the initiative and enterprise of the private sector though it will be open to State to start any industry even in this category and the State will continue to foster such industries on cooperative lines for industrial and agricultural purposes."

13 hrs.

Moreover, nowhere, this Bill envisages to oust completely the private sector from the rice-milling industry. The only thing which is provided in the Bill is that in certain areas if the farmers want to come forward, organise themselves on cooperative lines, and if they form a cooperative society to run a rice-milling industry, then preference can be given to such a society being licensed in that particular area. This is the only limited provision of the Bill. Moreover, a similar provision is there for giving preference to a public sector mill if either the Food Corporation or any public body or any State Government is interested in starting or organising a rice mill anywhere in any part of the country. In the old Act, unfortunately, there was no provision which entitled the Government of India or the State Government to give preference either to a cooperative rice mill or to a public sector rice mill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: How long will the hon. Minister take?

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: 15 to 20 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Then, we adjourn for lunch. He may continue after lunch.

13.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at ten minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

RICE MILLING INDUSTRY (REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL—
Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Annasahib Shinde may now resume his speech.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: I was making out the point that the provisions of this Bill should not be looked at from any ideological point of view or on the basis of certain pre-conceived notions but should be examined from the point of view of the situation prevailing in our country. I was also explaining why Government wanted to give preference to the co-operative rice mills.

As is known, the farmers are exploited at various points. They are exploited by moneylenders. They are exploited by traders. They are exploited by processors and the only direction in which help could be extended to the farmers can be through the organisation of farmers in the form of co-operatives. In fact, if you look into the nature of the agricultural economy and why agriculture was not progressing satisfactorily in our country over a number of years, the main reason will be found to be that the farmers did not have enough money to plough back and reinvest in farming and they were exploited at various points. So, we have to plug all those points at which the farmers are exploited, so that the farmers would be in a position to get more return for their produce and they would be able to invest more in farming and as a result the productivity can go up. This is a very sound approach.

As far as the rice-milling industry is concerned, I think the time has come when we must adopt a very sound policy so that not only wastage which is involved because of the use of outmoded and obsolete machinery is eliminated but at the same time farmers are assured of a fair return.

I do not know why Shri Ranga should be so allergic to co-operatives. He is not here at the moment. But may I draw his attention to what even the Ford Foundation Team headed by some American gentleman who went into this problem a few years earlier has suggested? The finding in *The Report on India's Food Crisis and Steps to meet it* submitted by the Agricultural Production Team sponsored by the Ford Foundation is as follows:

"It appears to us that the greatest need today is for more co-operatively owned paddy hulling and rice mills in the major rice-producing areas."

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: An American is pleading for co-operatives.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: Similarly, the team has reiterated the same point by saying:

"Since costs of hand-pounding are reported to exceed machine-milling costs, we believe that the co-operatives in areas having substantial marketable surpluses of rice should be encouraged to establish, either individually or jointly with other co-operatives, co-operative paddy hullers or rice mills."

So, even the American experts who went into this problem have come to the conclusion that as far as the rice-milling industry is concerned, we should have preferably co-operative rice mills. Not only on the basis of the American reports am I saying this, but even the studies by our own experts have come to the inevitable conclusion that in our country unless the farmers are organised on co-operative lines, proper facilities would not be available to them.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte as well as many other Members stressed the fact that there should be co-operatives but they should be genuine co-operatives.

[Shri Annasahib Shinde]

I entirely share the sentiment of hon. Members in regard to this point. That is why the Bill very specifically provides that the society should be a farmers' co-operative society. The definition of 'co-operative society' reads as follows:

"'Co-operative society' means a society registered or deemed to be registered under the Co-operative Societies Act, 1912 or any other law for the time being in force in any State and 'farmers' co-operative society' means a co-operative society the members whereof include farmers and the voting rights in which are, according to its rules and bye-laws, restricted to the following classes of its members, namely:—

- (a) farmers,
- (b) State Governments,
- (c) primary agricultural credit societies as defined in clause (cii) of section 2 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934."

The States have been included here because we want the States to help these co-operative societies by way of capital and by way of share capital contribution, and naturally they become members, but they have only one vote because in co-operative societies, the voting does not depend upon the number of shares held. The rest of the voting rights is naturally restricted to the co-operative societies formed by the members or to the farmers themselves. Therefore, I do not see any reason why the provisions of this Bill which are so salutary and which are so healthy should be objected to.

Then, a point was raised by Shri Ranga who said that he was speaking on the basis of his own experience. I have great respect for Shri Ranga, but with due respect I should say that the point made by him that there was no

wastage in the present rice-milling industry is totally incorrect.

Whatever might be his experience, may I tell him that attention to this point was drawn by an expert team as long ago as 1955? I am referring to the Report of the Rice Milling Committee of 1955, in which on page 23, it has been specifically stated:

"These small huller machines do not serve any useful purpose. On the other hand, they are wasteful and difficult to control. They are wasteful because, unlike bigger rice mills, especially sheller rice mills, they are handled by unskilled labour causing more broken, and less recovery of rice and produce a mixture of broken husks with the bran, thereby reducing the value of the bran as cattle feed. It is difficult for any administrative machinery to control or supervise these machines because they are scattered all over the villages . . ."

This is from an old report. Even recently, a techno-economic survey carried out by the Central Food Technological Research Institute has also said that a lot of wastage is involved if the present outmoded old machinery used in the rice milling industry is continued. It has been mentioned:

"The average milling yield of rice from paddy obtained in Indian rice mills varies from 62-68 per cent in the large sheller—cone polisher mills, and is about 5 per cent less in the huller type mills. Assuming an average husk weight of 22 per cent and 5-6 per cent for loss of bran during milling, a theoretical yield of roughly 72 per cent is possible. In fact, in advanced countries like Japan and USA, where modern mills of improved designs are used and better storage and handling practices are employed, yields of 70-72 per cent are normally obtained.

Then again in regard to rice bran, this is what the review has to say:

"The economically most promising by-product of the rice milling industry is rice bran, which is obtained to the extent of 5-10 per cent depending on the degree of polishing. On this basis, the total quantity of bran produced annually may be estimated at 3 million tonnes, a part of which is used as cattle feed and the rest as manure. About one million tonnes of it containing approximately 2,00,000 tonnes of oil may be available from rice mills; but most of it is not suitable for oil extraction, as it is mixed and diluted with pulverised husk and dust. Further, it deteriorates rapidly because of the lipase enzyme present in it".

These observations corroborate what I was saying that in the existing rice milling industry considerable quantities of by-products are wasted and ultimately lost to the nation. So from these various angles, not only from the angle of the producer and farmers, we have to see how the valuable by-products which are now lost to the nation are recovered and used for the benefit of the nation.

Therefore, I feel that the provisions of the Bill are in the larger interests of the country and of the rice milling industry. In the beginning I had observed that this was the least controversial Bill that Government had brought forward in this House. But I find that due to pre-conceived notions of some hon. Members and because of the fact that a number of hon. members had not had enough time to go into the details, there was no proper appreciation of the provisions incorporated in the Bill.

The hon. Member from Kerala who spoke was very much agitated over the question as to why Government did not allow the Kerala Government to use the powers under the DIR to take over some of the rice mills in

Kerala. I sympathise with his sentiments. But may I tell him that as far as this Parliament is concerned, Government had given a clear assurance to the Parliament and the people that emergency powers like the DIR would not be used in economic matters? This assurance was given to this House that except in the border areas these powers will not be ordinarily used. So, the Government of India was unable to delegate these powers to the Kerala Government.

As far as the request of the Kerala Government for the use of powers under section 3(4) of the Essential Commodities Act is concerned, we readily agree to it, because we think that the powers under this section should meet the needs of the situation with which the Kerala Government is faced.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR: It is not a correct fact. The Kerala High Court judgment . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will allow him a question later.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: I was submitting that we have delegated the necessary powers to the Kerala Government under section 3(4) of the Essential Commodities Act, but I would go a step further. I do not understand why the hon. member should object to the provisions of the Bill when in fact, the powers would be available under the new provisions to the Kerala Government, for having mills in the public sector or organizing farmers' co-operatives. I therefore feel that the hon. member should have no misapprehension and should gladly and enthusiastically support the Bill.

I think I have dealt with the important points raised by hon. members and I hope they will support the Bill.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: I wanted de-licensing of the small hullers so that the agriculturists may not be harassed by the officers. He has not replied.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR: The Kerala Government wanted to use the Defence of India rules for preventing black-marketing. The judgment of the Kerala High Court is as under:

"Held invalid the Kerala Paddy Restriction on Milling Order, 1967, on the ground that the clear concurrence of the Central Government had not been obtained for using power under the Essential Commodities Act, 1955. The petitioner submitted that under section 3(2) (b) of the Essential Commodities Act the State Government had to obtain the prior concurrence of the Central Government before issuing such an order."

The State Government appealed to the Central Government to give them their help. The hon. Minister now says: we are prepared to help the Kerala Government. But in fact the Central Government has not given any kind of assistance to the State Government.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The new enactment will help them.

Shri E. K. NAYANAR: No. The provision here is:

"Provided that if in any such rice mill rice-milling operations are not carried on for a continuous period of one year at any time after the commencement of the Rice Milling Industry (Regulation) Amendment Act, 1968, then such mill shall, on the expiry of the said period of one year, cease to be an existing rice mill and be deemed to be a defunct rice mill."

That is the provision. It is not nationalisation. It does not give power to the State. The hon. Minister should provide for giving power to the State Government so that they may check black-marketing and movement of rice. No such provision is included. Is he prepared to enact any such law?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (भोपाल) : माननीय मंत्री जी ने वेस्टेज को ब्रवायड करने की बात बहुत की। मिल्डिंग मशीनरी आज जो है जापान में 75 परसेंट बह टर्न ग्रावर देती है, अपने देश के अन्दर 1937-38 से मिल्डिंग मशीनरी बनती है वह 65 या 68 परसेंट देती है। तो यह नई मशीनरी जो लगाने वाले हैं कोअपरेटिव सेक्टर में वह जो अपने देश में बनती है वही लगाने वाले हैं या अच्छा पाशिल और वेस्टेज को ब्रवायड करने के लिये बाहर से मशीनरी लाने वाले हैं ?

श्री अन्ना साहिब शिन्दे : मैं माननीय सदस्य को आश्वासन देना चाहता हूँ कि हम यहाँ बनने वाली मशीनरी का इस्तेमाल करना चाहते हैं, बाहर से हम इम्पोर्ट नहीं करना चाहते हैं। हमारे देश में अब अच्छी मशीनरी बनती है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All other questions are postponed to the time of the third reading. The question is:

"That the Bill to amend the Rice Milling Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958, as passed by the Rajya Sabha be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2— (Amendment of section 3).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We take up clause 2. There are three amendments Nos. 3, 4 and 15.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA (Cuttack): What happened to my amendment. It is in list No. 1 dated 6th May 1968.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That has lapsed.

SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA
(Banka): I beg to move:

Page 2, line 1,—

after "year" insert "without reasonable cause". (3).

Page 2, line 5,—

after "year" insert "without reasonable cause". (4).

SHRI HEM RAJ (Kerala): I move:

Page 2, line 24,—(i) after "aid of" insert "electric or oil".

(ii) after "power" insert "except water power" (15).

श्री बंशी शंकरशर्मा : मैं अपने दोनों प्राधोक्षकों के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। माननीय श्री ग्रन्ना साहिब शिन्दे ने जो प्रारम्भिक वक्तव्य दिया है उस में उन्होंने कहा है कि

On the basis of the experience of the last few years we find now that there is a need, in consonance with public policy, to bring about some changes in the existing law.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह पब्लिक पालिसी क्या चीज है वह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। पब्लिक पालिसी का अर्थ जहाँ तक मैं समझता हूँ वह है बहुजन हिताय, बहुजन सुखाय। आज जो बिल वह ला रहे हैं और उस की धाराएँ हैं क्या उससे वे इस बहुजन हिताय बहुजन सुखाय के सिद्धांत पर पहुँच सकेंगे? जो आज महात्मा जी के नाम की शपथ लेते हैं और महात्मा जी की शताब्दी मनाने जा रहे हैं उन से मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि महात्मा जी ने चरखे और धान की हाथ कुटाई के उद्योग धर्मों पर जो ज्यादा और जोर दिया था। क्यों? इसी बहुजन हिताय बहुजन सुखाय के लिए। आज स्व० पन्डित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के कथनानुसार हम बंगलाड़ी के युग से साइकल युग में आ गये हैं और जो हमारा जो चावल उद्योग है वह हाथ-कुटाई के युग से निकलकर हलर्स की कुटाई में आ गया है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय मंत्री

जी जानते हैं और उन्होंने कुछ संख्या भी दी है—हमारे सम्पूर्ण देश में 40-50 हजार मिलें तथा छोटे हलर्स काम कर रहे हैं। मैं केवल बंगाल का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। बंगाल में 750 मिलें हैं, हलर्स अलग हैं इन में से करीब 100 मिलें तो सरकार का काम कर रही हैं या यों कहना चाहिये कि वे सरकार की मर्जी या सरकार की कृपा के पात्र हैं, लेकिन बाकी 650 मिलें बेकार पड़ी हैं। उन में हमारे हिसाब से प्रायः 15 करोड़ रुपये की पूँजी लगी हुई है और यदि "दो, तीन, बच्चे और बस" इसी सिद्धांत को मान लिया जाय तो सब परिवारों को मिलाकर उनसे करीब 3 लाख आदमियों की रोजी चल रही थी। आज वे सब बेकार हैं। अभी माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि इन मिलों तथा हलर्स से हमको 67-68 परसेंट चावल मिलता है, इन के बदले में यदि हम अच्छी मशीने लगाये तो उनसे 72 परसेंट तक चावल मिल जायगा। लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि 72 परसेंट वाली मशीनें लगाने के लिए पैसा कहाँ से आयेगा

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are carrying the debate to a general level. If specifically, on the amendment, you have got anything to submit. I am prepared to give you time.

SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA:
It relates to the amendments.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि हलर्स एक साल काम नहीं करेंगे, उनको लाइसेन्स नहीं दिया जायेगा। ऐसी हालत में जो आदमी इन हलर्स में काम कर रहे हैं, उन के लिए आस्टरनेटिव एम्प्लायमेंट कहाँ से आयेगी? आपने देखा है कि बिहार में दो वर्ष तक सूखा पड़ा। अब अगर धान नहीं मिलता है, तो ये मिलें कैसे काम करेंगी। इस लिये मेरा प्रमेण्डमेंट बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है और उसे स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये कि किसी कारणवश यदि मशीनें

[श्री वेणुशंकर शर्मा]

का कोई पुर्जा नहीं भिल रहा है या धान नहीं मिल रहा है और मशीनें बन्द पड़ी हैं, तो उनका लाइसेन्स कैंसिल नहीं किया जाना चाहिये ।

माननीय मंत्री जी को यह देखना चाहिये कि आज जो पढ़े लिखे लड़के हैं, जिनको काम नहीं मिलता है, वे अपनी स्त्री के गहने बेचकर पांच छः हजार रुपये में हलमै लगा लेते हैं और इस तरह से अपने परिवार का गुजारा कर रहे हैं । इस लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की मिलों को प्रिकरेंस देना और इन छोटे छोटे लोगों के लिए रुकावटें पैदा करना उचित नहीं है । अतः मेरा आपसे अनुरोध है कि आप मेरा संशोधन मन्जूर करें ।

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA: What about my amendment?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It has lapsed.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA: The Bill has not lapsed; if the Bill has not lapsed, how can the amendment lapse? The House is not dissolved. I want a decision on this. Why should it lapse?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On this point, the procedure is very clear. I refer to rule 335, which reads as follows:

"On the prorogation of the House, all pending notices, other than notices of intention to move for leave to introduce a Bill, shall lapse and fresh notices shall be given for the next session:

Provided that a fresh notice shall be necessary of intention to move for leave to introduce any Bill in respect of which sanction or recommendation has been granted under the Constitution if the sanction or recommendation, as the case may be, has ceased to be operative."

The sanction is there; no second introduction of the Bill is necessary. So far as the other things are concerned, they have lapsed.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA: Strictly interpreted, it is only the intention to introduce a Bill. This is not a motion for introduction of a Bill; it is for consideration and passing. So, it has lapsed. If it is interpreted strictly that it is only the motion for introduction of the Bill, it will not lapse. This is not a motion for introduction; this is a motion for consideration and passing. So, this has lapsed. If that is so, if once the Bill is there, the amendments are also there.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Bill was passed by the Rajya Sabha and then it was introduced here. During the last session you submitted your amendment. If it had been moved, it would not have lapsed. But if it was not moved, when the Bill is taken up for consideration in the current session, it is but natural that you are expected to submit your amendment again.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA: If that is your ruling, I have nothing to say, but it has to be reconsidered.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This practice has been followed all along and so far this issue was never raised in this House.

श्री हेमराज : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बिल के अंश 2 पर लाइन 24 में जो शब्द इस्तमाल किये गये हैं, वे इस प्रकार हैं—

"milling-rice", with its grammatical variations, means—

- (i) recovering rice or any pro-
- (ii) polishing rice, with the aid of power"

with the aid of power"

मेरी अमेन्डमेंट "पावर" शब्द के बारे में है । पावर तीन प्रकार की होती है, एक-जो मशीन

बिजली की पावर से चलती है, दूसरी-जो मशीनें ग्रायल इंजिन की पावर से चलती हैं तथा तीसरी-वे मशीनें जो वाटर पावर से चलती हैं। मेरा मुझाव यह है कि पहली और दूसरी पावर तो इसमें कवर होती है, लेकिन तीसरी पावर, जो वाटर पावर है, वह इस में कवर नहीं होनी चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इससे पहले ग्रायल इंजिन से जो मशीनें चलती हैं, उन पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगाई गई थी, उसमें वाटर पावर को भी इन्क्यूड कर लिया गया था, चुनाव के उम्र वक्त मुझको फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री से लड़ना पड़ा, उसके बाद उन्होंने यह फैसला किया कि वाटर पावर इस में ही आती, इस लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि मौजूदा शब्द जो पावर इस्तेमाल किया गया है, वह काफी नहीं है, इसमें पावर शब्द से पहले इलेक्ट्रिक और ग्रायल पावर एक्सेल्टिंग वाटर पावर कर दिया जाय। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि वाटर-पावर की जो मशीनें पहाड़ों में चलाई जाती हैं, उनको इसमें एक्सेल्टिंग टैड रखना चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी अमेंडमेंट हाउस के सामने पेश करता हूँ।

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: I am sorry I am not in a position to accept any of the amendments. Mr. B. S. Sharma's amendment goes to the very root of the Bill. If I accept his amendment, it is as good as withdrawing the Bill. The entire purpose of the Bill is to see that the rice-milling industry is gradually transformed into a modern industry. We have to find out credit facilities and encourage production of modern machinery. There should not be any apprehension that this is going to cause any harm to any sector—cooperative, private or public. I would appeal to Mr. Sharma not to press his amendments.

So far as Mr. Hem Raj's amendment is concerned, I think that is beyond the purview of this Bill. because that

seeks to amend the old statute which has been passed some years ago. In this Bill I have not changed the basic definition of 'power'.

I think the provisions as at present are salutary and I would request him to withdraw his amendment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will now put amendments 3, 4 and 15 to the House.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4 and 15 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Is Mr. B. S. Sharma moving his amendment to clause 3?

SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA: No.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4.— (Amendment of section 5

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are several amendments to clause 4.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi): I beg to move:

Page 3 and 4,—

"omit lines 9 to 41 and 1 and 2 respectively." (6).

SHRI MEETHA LAL MEENA (Sawai Modhopur): Sir, I beg to move:

Page 3,—

for lines 15 to 20, substitute—

"(i) to the applicant who has applied for the grant of a

[Shri Meetha Lal Meena]

permit for re-commencing rice-milling operation in a defunct rice-mill;

- (ii) to a farmers' co-operative society;
- (iii) to a Government company or a corporation owned or controlled by the Government," (7).

Page 3,—

omit lines 21 to 23. (8).

Page 3, line 31,—

after "State" insert—

"and whose membership is one hundred or more". (9).

Page 4, line 11,—

for "one year" substitute—

"six years excluding period of litigation". (10).

Page 4, line 14,—

for "one year" substitute "six years". (11).

SHRI HEM RAJ: I beg to move:

Page 3,—

after line 37 insert—

"(aa) workers employed in the factory,". (16).

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Sir. I would begin by taking up where the Minister said that he would have to withdraw this Bill. That is a very good thought which has occurred to him and for a reason which he has, I regret to say, not yet appreciated.

The original Act, if he will see, related to the development of hand-pounding. It is completely wrong in law to implant a purpose quite different from hand-pounding. In fact, it is opposed to hand-pounding. He is trying to modernise milling, he is trying to introduce big machines. What is the relation between this and hand-pounding for which the original Act

was passed. We of the House must show some respect to law. It should not be said that a Bill is passed or an amendment is passed which has no reference to the original purpose of the Act. I, therefore, ask him not to make us feel ashamed that we passed an amendment which completely frustrates the original purpose of the Act.

I am concerned with one particular aspect of the Bill and that is about priority to co-operative. But that has to be judged in the larger context of this Bill. For whose benefit is this Bill? The Romans had a sound dictum that when they passed a law, when they gave a judgment, they asked the question *qui bono* for whose benefit? One argument which the Minister has been pressing is that it would increase the supply of food in this country, it would reduce the wastage. This argument has been refuted by Shri Ranga. He has said that not one part of the grain is wasted—neither the husk, nor the bran nor the broken pieces. It is no arguments to read what the Americans say or what a techno-survey says. You have to show how those small parts of bran or broken pieces are wasted. Are they burnt or are they buried underground? If not, they are coming into use, if not for those who want polished rice at least for the poorer section of our people and for our animals. Are you against the animals and the poorer sections of our people?

As far as the other part of *qui bono* is concerned, the advantage to the cultivators about which Minister has made great play, may I enquire from him what advantage the cultivator will receive if the competition of the millers is reduced, as it will be, from the priority given to co-operatives? We are not against co-operatives. Shri Ranga is not against co-operatives, nor am I—I am telling the hon. Member if he is not aware of it. I was the first person in this country, in 1934, to start the first co-operative cane marketing society at Deoria.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: You appear to have changed your views.

AN. HON. MEMBER: He is against the *kisans*.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: I am against the co-operatives which are Congress organisations for catching votes. If you are using co-operatives you are giving them your own purposes. Even then, I am not against your introducing co-operatives, but why do you give them priority? Are they not able to compete with the poor small hullers? Is this all you can say for co-operatives that they must, when they come into the field, have monopoly and none else should compete with them? Are not you ashamed that this is the position? By all means have co-operatives (*Interruption*).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (*Diamond Harbour*): It seems, he is considering to change his views once again.

श्री रवि राय (पूरु): धानने पहले कोम्रापरेटिव शुरू की थी. अब उन को आगे बढ़ दिये।

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: We should give scope to those co-operatives which do not include in disguise the industrialists and the tradesmen to which your learned colleague, Shri Gurupadaswamy, made reference yesterday. You say that the co-operatives will be restricted to farmers. Who is a farmer? I am a farmer. I own some land and I am perfectly eligible to become a member of such a co-operative society. If you mean business you should say that a co-operative society will bar all those who have any connection with trade and industry. Introduce a positive disqualification. That you have not done.

In spite of all the restrictions imposed on me I hope I have made this point clear that the co-operatives must be co-operatives. Are you benefiting the cultivator when you reduce hullers? Today if the miller charges so much it is because he is frequently in the position of a monopolist. The more hullers we have, the fewer de-

funct mills we have, the less of these penalties we have, the less redtape and the more competition we have, the better for the cultivators. If this Government does represent the cultivator to any extent, it should be ashamed of this Bill. they should withdraw it at once and should redeem the prestige of this House as one which stands for law and justice.

श्री भीमलाल भीना : अपने संशोधन के सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि जिस उद्देश्य से मन्त्री महोदय ने यह नियम बनाया कि कोम्रापरेटिव सिंस पर लाइसेंस दिया जाए, वह उद्देश्य बिल्कुल ठीक है। मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा कि हमारे नेता गाजी इमके खिलाफ हैं तो उसका कारण यह है कि जिस उद्देश्य से इसको रखा गया है, उस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति इन शब्दों से नहीं होती है। दस सदस्यों के ऊपर भी कोम्रापरेटिव सांसायटी का निर्माण किया जा सकता है और वे दस सदस्य किसी एक र के भी हो सकते हैं। इसलिये मेरा संशोधन यह है कि बजाये दस के जब कम से कम सौ किसान सम्मिलित हों तभी उस मिल को लाइसेंस दिया जाए।

दूसरी बात जो मैं रखी गई है कि कोई मिल अगर एक साल तक बन्द रहे तो फिर उसे नया लाइसेंस लेना पड़ेगा। मिल तो कई साल तक भी बन्द रह सकती हैं। मिसाल के तौर पर राजस्थान और उड़ीसा में सूखाग्रस्त हो जाने पर एक साल फसल न होने के कारण भी मिलें एक साल तक बन्द रह सकती हैं क्योंकि क्षेत्रीय गान्धी के अन्तर्गत दूसरे स्थानों से धान आ नहीं पाएगा। इसी प्रकार से छोटे हालस जोकि पानी के पम्प पर या घाटा-चक्कियों पर चलते हैं वह भी, अगर वहाँ पर धान नहीं पैदा होता है तो अपने आप एक साल के लिए बन्द हो जायेंगे। इसके अलावा किसी सरकारी झगड़े के कारण भी कोई मिल एक साल के लिए बन्द रह सकता है। साथ ही किसी पार्टी की आर्थिक स्थिति भी खराब हो सकती है जिसके कारण एक साल तक मिल बन्द रहे। या पार्टनर-

श्री मीठा लाल मीना]

शिम में कोई विवाद उत्पन्न हो जाए उसकी वजह से भी एक साल के लिए मिल बन्द रह सकती है। इसलिये मेरा संशोधन यह है कि एक साल के पीरियड को बढ़ाकर कम से कम 6 साल का पीरियड रखा जाए और इस पीरियड में अगर सरकारी झगड़े की बात हो तो उसको शामिल न किया जाए। एक साल जो रखा गया है वह बहुत कम है, मेरी राय में इसको कम से कम 6 साल रखना चाहिए क्योंकि एक साल के लिए तो कई स्थितियों में मिल बन्द रह सकती है।

राइस मिलिंग इंडस्ट्री को ग्राम इंडस्ट्री में नहीं गिनते हैं और उन को वह तमाम सुविधाएं नहीं देते हैं जोकि उद्योगों को दी जाती हैं।

श्री हंस राज : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा छोटा सा अमेंडमेंट है कि इन्होंने जो फार्मर्स कोऑपरेटिव सोसायटी की डीफिनीशन रखी है उस में उन्होंने यह शब्द रखे हैं :

"and 'farmers' cooperative society' means a cooperative society the members whereof include farmers and the voting rights in which are, according to its rules and bye-laws, restricted to the following classes of members, namely:—(a) farmers, (b) State Governments,"

मैं उन में एक संशोधन पेश करता हूँ कि वहाँ पर लाइन 37 के बाद यह शब्द इनसर्ट कर दिये जाय :

"वर्कर्स इम्प्लाइड इन दी फैक्टरी।"

दरअसल हालत यह है कि जो गाँव और देहात हैं उन में जो कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटीज के ओहदेदार होते हैं वह सारे के सारे बड़े बड़े जमींदार होते हैं। वहाँ जो छोटे, छोटे किसान होते हैं उनकी कोई पूछता नहीं, छोटे वर्कर्स को कोई नहीं पूछता है। इस समय भी जो कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटीज अथवा

पंचायत हैं उन में उन का इंटरैस्ट सफर करता है क्योंकि वह जमींदारों और मिलमालिकों द्वारा बनाई जाती है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो कोऑपरेटिव सोसायटीज बनगीं उन में भी वही हाल होगा। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय मेरे इस अमेंडमेंट को स्वीकार कर लें।

भुवनेश्वर कांफ्रेंस में भी जो रेजोल्यूशन पास किया गया था उस में भी यह कहा गया था :

"That the workers should be associated with the management of the industry in such a way that rapid progress could be achieved. This should enable the workers to have a sense of participation in the industry and to achieve maximum production."

मैं समझता हूँ कि इंफ़ीनिशन में यह शब्द "वर्कर्स इम्प्लाइड इन दी फैक्टरी" अवश्य इनसर्ट कर दिये जाय ताकि उन्हें वाइपाम न किया जा सके। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं क्लोज़ 4 पर अपना संशोधन नम्बर 16 स्वीकृति के लिये पेश करता हूँ।

SHRI DEORAO PATIL (Yeotmal): I support the amendment.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: The hon. Member, Shri Lobo Prabhu, advanced a very vehement argument and said that the Government of India should be ashamed of coming forward with the provisions of this Bill to this honourable House. I wish to submit that there is nothing in this Bill of which the Government should be ashamed. I know the allergy of the Swatantra Party Members to cooperatives and the public sector. I heard very carefully the speech of Prof. Ranga. Shri Lobo Prabhu repeated the same arguments. In fact, in my speech, I have, in detail dealt with those points I think, in the interest of the rice milling

industry and in the interest of the farmers of this country, it is necessary that cooperatives of farmers and public sector mills should have a preference to private out-moded mills.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: You are afraid of competition.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: I am not prepared to accept any of his arguments and the arguments are not only unsound but they are based on incorrect appreciation of the situation.

About Shri Meetha Lal Meena's point, I think, he made a very valid point that these societies should be broad-based and that these societies should not be of a handful of members. It is a very valid suggestion and our intention also is that these societies should be of a very large number of farmers. Any farmer who is prepared to supply rice to the mill or to get it processed through the mill should not be excluded from the membership. The Government of India's approach all along, has been that it should really be an effective democratic body in its functioning. No farmer should be excluded from that. That is how we are trying to look at these farmers' cooperatives and the rice-milling cooperative mills.

As far as Shri Hem Raj's amendment is concerned, I think, the definition of 'cooperative society' comes under the Cooperative Societies Act and we have said, 'cooperative society' as defined in the Cooperative Societies Act. At the moment, though I have sympathy with the proposition, I am not in a position to accept that as these mills are meant to be of producers.

SHRI HEM RAJ: If the workers are included, that will be much better.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall put all the Amendments together.

Amendments Nos. 6 to 11 and 16 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 5— Amendment of section 6.)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are two amendments by Shri Meetha Lal Meena. Is he moving them?

SHRI MEETHA LAL MEENA: Yes. I beg to move:

Page 4, line 41,—

for "one year" substitute—

"six years excluding period of litigation". (12).

Page 5, line 3,—

for "one year" substitute "six years" (13).

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: He has already argued.

श्री मेथा लाल मेना : मेरा संशोधन यह है कि 1 मल के बजाय 6 साल का दिया जा ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall now put amendments 12 and 13 to Clause 5 to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 12 and 13 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clause 7— (Amendment of section 13.)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is one amendment by Mr. Meetha Lal Meena, amendment No. 14. Is he moving?

SHRI MEETHA LAL MEENA:
Yes. I beg to move:

Page 5,—

for lines 23 to 29 substitute—

“sub-section (2) of section 18, he shall be punishable with fine which may extend to ten thousand rupees.” (14).

इस क्लॉज 7 में जो सजा की व्यवस्था रक्खी गई है वह इसी कठोर और तगड़ी है कि जिस उद्देश्य के लिए इसे रक्खा गया है उस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति इस से नहीं हो सकेगी। केवल कुछ अफसरों द्वारा स में इस तरीके से मिल वालों को डरा, धपका कर उन से ज्यादा पैसा लेने के सिवाय और कोई बात नहीं होगी।

इस में रक्खा गया है कि किसी व्यक्ति द्वारा इस कानून का उल्लंघन व अब हेला करने वाले को एक साल की सजा और 10,000 रुपये जुर्माने तक की सजा दी जा सकती है। इस बारे में मेरा यह है कि उस पर 1,000 या 2,000 रुपये से ज्यादा जुर्माना नहीं होना चाहिए और दूसरे इसमें कैद की सजा का बिल्कुल प्राविधान नहीं होना चाहिए।

अगर कोई गलती को अपनी जारी रखता है अर्थात् कंटावेशन कटीन्ग करता है तो उस पर 500 रुपया जो जुर्माना किया जायेगा। अब होगा यह कि किसी पर लाँछन लगा कर मिल को बंद करवा दें और अगर फिर वह मिलमालिक दबारा मिल चालू करवाता है तो उस को 500 रुपये जोजाना पैनाल्टी के देना पड़ेगा। इस में यह होगा कि अफसरान लोग 2, 2 और 4, 4 महीने तक उस मिल को बंद कर देंगे और कहेंगे कि अगर मिल को पुनः चालू करवाना चाहते हो तो इतना पैसा हमें दे दो वरना 500 रुपये रोजाना यह पैनाल्टी लगाई जायगी। इसके रहने में अफसरों में सिवाय, रिश्वतसतानी और भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ने के और कुछ नहीं होगा। इसलिये जुर्माना 10,000 के बजाय 1, 2 हजार तक होना चाहिए और कैद की सजा

नहीं लेनी चाहिए तथा प्रतिदिन 500 रुपये जर्माना नहीं होना चाहिये।

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: The punishment prescribed in the old Act was six months' imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 5,000. Now we have increased the penalty from six months' imprisonment to one year imprisonment and the fine from Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 10,000. There are valid reasons for increasing the penalty. Some anti-social elements want to evade procurement and want to indulge in black-marketing, and taking advantage of the legal technicalities, they want to evade the law. We had detailed discussion with the representatives of the State Governments and the State Governments themselves represented that the present provisions are not adequate to deal with the offenders. Hence, we have decided to increase the penalty. I think, it would have a very salutary effect and I hope, the hon. Member will withdraw his amendment.

श्री भंडारान मोना : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब एक हलर लगाने की लागत 250 पये पड़ती है और उस पर मंत्री महोदय जुर्माना करेंगे 10,000 रुपये। 250 रुपये का हलर आता है और वह बेचारा यह 10,000 रुपये जर्माना कहाँ से देगा ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall now put amendment 14 to Clause 7 to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 14 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

“That Clause 7 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 8 to 10 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. TENNETI VISWANATHAM: Only two minutes.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam): This is a very important Bill and, therefore, I require not two minutes but five minutes.

15 hrs.

It has been said that white rice, white sugar and white bread are the enemies of mankind; they are the first enemies of mankind. Instead of coming with a Bill not to license new rice mills and revert the country again once more to hand-pounding and good health, the Congress Ministry has come to perpetuate the milling industry.

Milled rice has emaciated the nation, far beyond what our people can reckon. Today, the farmers in the field are not half as strong as they were some thirty or forty years ago. Three hundred years of British rule was not able to take their strength as much as these rice mills during the last thirty or forty years. These rice mills have emaciated not whereby the farmers, they have emaciated the students. Today, several people ask me this question,—if you would excuse a little personal reference—'what is your age?'. When I say that it is 73, they wonder and say 'How is it? What are you doing?', and I tell them, 'I did nothing. My parents fed me upon hand-pounded rice.' That is all the thing'.

During the last twenty or thirty years, particularly after the Second War, the nation has taken to this milling industry like anything, and today Government want not only to

regulate but perpetuate it with all kinds of modern machinery. It is not a question of private or public sector. It is not a question of individuals or co-operative sector. These rice mills have become the bane of this country. Not all the Pimpri factories and vitamin B tablets and B Complexes can restore the nation again to its health, if we continue eating this white sugar and white rice. Now, for heaven's sake, let the Ministry which is running in the name of Mahatma Gandhi stop licensing new mills altogether, and let the old mills die of superannuation gradually die off, and let the country have once more handpounded rice and sound health.

Coming to bran, even the cattle are not allowed to eat the bran as it is. Monopolist friends who can give large donations come and they are given monopolies in each district for taking oil out of the bran, and it is only after the oil is extracted that the bran goes to the cattle. A capitalist gives a large subscription or donation for this college or that college or one per cent of his profits and he is allowed to extract all oil out of the bran and then only the bran goes to the cattle as cattle-feed. So, not only the human being is emaciated, but even the cattle are not allowed to get their cattle-feed in the full measure in which they were getting prior to the full-fledged coming into existence of these rice mills.

I oppose this continuation of these rice mills.

श्री मंडा लाल मीना उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विषयक को तो यहाँ मंत्री महोदय जाये, लेकिन मेरा उन से मैं से पहले मवाल यह है कि आप राइस मिलों को उद्योगों की श्रेणी में क्यों नहीं गिनते ? जिस तरह से आप अन्य उद्योगों को आर्थिक और टेकनिकल सहायता दे रहे हैं उन्ही तरह से चावल मिलों

[श्री मीठा लाल मीना]

को भी क्यों नहीं दे रहे हैं ? क्या अन्य उद्योगों की अपेक्षा यह कम मात्रा में है ? जब कि उन की संख्या आप हजारों की बतला रहे हैं तभी आप उन को कोई औद्योगिक सहायता नहीं दे रहे हैं और उन में कोई भी टेक्निकल सुधार नहीं कर रहे हैं ।

आज आप नई मिलें लगाने जा रहे हैं । मेरा कहना तो यह है कि बजाय इस के कि आप नई मिलें लगावें, आप पुरानी मिलों का ही सुधार कीजिए । राजस्थान में राइस मिलें साल भर में केवल पांच महीने चलती हैं बारह महीनों में और मात महीने बेकार रहती हैं । न आप उनको बारह महीने तक धानी देते हैं और न उन में कोई सुधार करते हैं । आज छोटी छोटी मिलें बन्द पड़ी हैं । आप उन को आर्थिक सहायता दीजिये ।

आज आप मशीनों का सुधार कर रहे हैं लेकिन चावल में से जो 30 परसेंट भूसा निकलता है उस भूसे को जानवर तक नहीं खाते हैं । वह 1.50 क्विंटल तक नहीं बिकता है क्योंकि जानवरों के किसी काम में नहीं आता है । आप को सोचना चाहिये कि वह किस काम में आ सकता है । आप उस को खरीदिये और उस को काम में लाने के लिये कारखाना खोलिये ।

इस के अलावा मेरा सुझाव यह है कि जो मौजूदा पुरानी मिलें हैं उन के सुधार के लिये आर्थिक सहायता दी जाये और उन को उद्योगों में गिनती की जाये । जब भी चावल मिलों को पुनः नया (Renew) लाइसेंस करवाना पड़ता है तब उस की मियाद एक वर्ष की होती है । इस से मिल वालों को बहुत परेशानी होती है । उस की मियाद कम से कम तीन वर्ष की होनी चाहिये ।

आज कोअपरेटिव बेसिस पर नये लाइसेंस देने का प्रावधान है । मेरा कहना है कि नया लाइसेंस उन्हीं मिलों को दिया

जाये जो किसी कारणवश बन्द पड़ी हैं और उन का लाइसेंस एक वर्ष पूर्व कैसल कर दिया गया था । उन को प्राथमिकता दी जानी चाहिये ।

इस के अलावा घाटे की चक्की या कुएं पर जो हलर लगे हुए हैं और जो इस कानून के बनने से पहले से मौजूद हैं, उन पर किसी तरह का लाइसेंस या दूसरी बन्दिश नहीं होनी चाहिये और पुरानी मिलों को गवर्नमेंट के द्वारा ऋण दिया जाये । वे टेक्निकल सुधार सहायता दी जानी चाहिये ।

श्री श्री० सि० सहगल (विलासपुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो बिल लाया गया है उस के सम्बन्ध में बोलते हुए महत में मित्रों ने कहा कि छोटी मिलों की हालत खराब है । हमारे मध्य प्रदेश में, खाम कर छत्तीसगढ़ के इलाके में, इतना ज्यादा धान होता है कि वह दूसरे प्रदेशों को चावल मलाई करते हैं । आज लोग छोटे-छोटे हलर्स में काम करते हैं और उससे जो चावल प्राप्त होना चाहिये उस को प्राप्त कर के बाजार में ला कर बेचते हैं ।

मैं अपने पूर्व वक्ता मित्र से पूरी तरह सहमत हूँ कि कुछाई नष्ट हो गई है । इस में कोई दंां गये नहीं हो सकती हैं । लेकिन उस प्रथा को फिर से चालू करने के लिये जो कुछ भी किया जा सके वह फ्री जमाना अत्यन्त आवश्यक है । यदि हम देखते हैं कि हलर्स के जगिये से काश्तकारों का फायदा होता है तो इा और कदम उठाने में सरकार को कोई दिक्कत नहीं होनी चाहिये ।

अब रह गई फाइन की बात । मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि फाइन हूत ज्यादा है और सरकार को इसपर दुबारा गौर करना चाहिये । आज काश्तकार की हालत को देखते हुए और दूसरे लोगों की हालत को देखते हुए सरकार को यह फाइन कम करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये ।

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur): I have been reading the interim reports of the Administrative Reforms Commission which have been appearing in the press every now and then. One of the fine points made by the commission is that licensing should be reduced to nil and if the system of licensing has to be there it should be entrusted to a private corporation and it should not be kept within the purview of the Ministry. I think that it is a very wholesome suggestion which the Administrative Reforms Commission has made. But what do I find today? I find that where there was a very small system of licensing, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture is going to have a very big cake of licensing. Instead of putting their foot down on licensing and permits which have brought a bad name to our Government, the Ministry is trying to perpetuate and enlarge, augment and expand that system. This Bill is an example of that. I, therefore, oppose this Bill.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: Let my hon. friend vote against the Bill.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA: Sir, democracy exists for you and me because both of us are small men. Democracy is essentially for the small man. Who are the small men? They are the persons who believe in hand-pounding, the persons who want rice hullers and the persons who have rice mills as a cottage industry. But here is my friend who believes in co-operative societies who is going to ring the death-knell of the small farmers by putting an end to those persons who depend upon the small mills.

The third thing is that he has introduced a system of fining. I think fines are a necessary thing in any legislation. But I believe that the fines which have been provided in the clauses of this Bill are too excessive. Against whom are they meant to work? They are not meant to work against the big entrepreneur,

the adventurer, the licence-grabber and the permit-grabber. They are going to work against the small man who lives in a small village or a small town.

I therefore think that this Bill goes against the spirit for which we stand. My hon. friend says that we are going in for modernisation. Why don't they go in for modernisation in other fields? Here it is not modernisation but over-mechanisation for which my country is not yet prepared but for which those members over there may be prepared.

श्री रणबंर सिंह (रोहतक) : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, पहली बार इस हाउस में मैं देख रहा हूँ कि सौ फीसदी ही नहीं बल्कि पाँच सौ फीसदी किसानों के हक में एक बिल हाउस की टेबल पर रखा गया है और इसको पाम किया जा रहा है। इसको देख कर मुझे दिली खुशी हो रही है। मेरे भाई बुरा न मानें। इस बहस में इस बात का पता भी लग गया है कि कौन नुमाइशी किसानों के हमदर्द हैं और कौन फर्जी हमदर्द हैं और कौन सही मानों में उनकी भलाई चाहते हैं। मैं किसी की बदगर्ई नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बिल की मुखालिफत की है वे सब से ज्यादा किसानों के दुश्मन हैं और उन से बड़ा दुश्मन यहाँ और बाहर किसानों का देश में नहीं मिल सकता है।

SHRI D. C. SHARMA: We stand for small farmers, not for big landlords.

श्री रणबंर सिंह : मेरे भाई बुरा मान रहे हैं। मैंने पहले ही कहा है कि बुरा न मानें। मेरे भाइयों ने, कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों ने एक बात कही है कि नेशनलाइजेशन करो। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किम के लिए नेशनलाइजेशन होगा। वे कहते हैं कि इसको गवर्नमेंट को दे दो। एक तरफ तो वे मजदूरों की इंडस्ट्री के मैनेजमेंट में हिस्सेदार बनाना चाहते

[श्री रणवीर सिंह]

हैं और दूसरी तरफ वे कहते हैं कि जिस काम को छोटे छोटे किसान करते हैं, जिम इंडस्ट्री को छोटे छोटे किसान चलाते हैं, उनका गवर्नमेंट को दे दो। मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि उन से ज्यादा बड़ा दुश्मन किसान का और कोई भी हो सकता है।

एक बात जरूर खराबी की हो सकती है कि गलत ढंग को कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज बन जायें। ऐसा हो सकता है कि मोटे पेट वाले भ्रामदी इन सोसाइटीज को बना लें। और वे पलने लग जायें, सरमायेदार पलने लग जायें। ऐसा न हो इस तरफ आपका ध्यान जरूर जाना चाहिये। हमारे सहलग माहब तथा एक और माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है कि जो कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज बनें वे ग्योरलो किसानों की बननी चाहिये और ज्यादा से ज्यादा तादाद में किसानों को ही उनका मेम्बर बनाया जाना चाहिये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरफ आप जरूर ध्यान दें।

दूसरी बात जिस की तरफ आपको ध्यान देना चाहिये यह है कि ये कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज और ये जो कारखाने हैं ये देहातों में हों, शहरों में न हों। अगर ये देहातों में होंगे तो एंथो बेस्ट इंडस्ट्रीज वहां ज्यादा तादाद में फैलेंगे और देहात भी शहरों के नमूने पर आ जायेंगे।

हमारे दोस्त ने हल्लर की बात कही है। आपको भी खाम तौर पर देखा जाना चाहिये और उस को भी डेफॉन्शन में लाया जाना चाहिये। हमारे देश में अस्सों फी सदी किसान हैं और मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो लाइसेंसिंग है वे भी किसानों को मिलें। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि और कोई बिचौलिया बीच में आ जाए और वह फायदा उठा जाय। होता यह है कि मेहनत तो किसान करता है लेकिन जो पैग-माइंटस होते हैं, जो गावों में ट्रेडिंग क्लाम होता है वह फायदा उठा लेती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो लाइसेंसिंग है वे हरिजनों को, गरीब किसानों को मिलें। पहली बार भीका मिला है

जबकि किसान जो कि अस्सों परसेंट हैं उनको लाइसेंस दिये जा रहे हैं। लाइसेंसों की भी एक बड़ी भारी मीनोपोली समझी जाती है। अब किसानों को भी उस में हिस्सा मिला है। मैं लाइसेंसों के खिलाफ हूँ। बेशक लाइसेंसिंग सिस्टम को उड़ाया नहीं गया है लेकिन मैं देख रहा हूँ कि पहली बार इस बिल के जरिये किसानों को उन में हिस्सेदार बनाया गया है इनके लिए मैं मंत्री महोदय को बधाई देता हूँ और आपका मैं मशकूर हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए समय दिया है।

श्री अशुल गनो बार (गुडगांव) : राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी ने फरिस्तों के जरिये बाबू जगजीवन राम जी के नाम एक पैगाम भेजा है इस बिल के बारे में जो इस तरह है :

वाबस्ता मेरी याद से कुछ तलखियां भी थीं अच्छा हुआ जो आपने मुझ को भुला दिया।

जो बिल वह लाते हैं सी बार लायें, मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है। मुझे मेरे भाई रणवीर सिंह बहुत प्रजीज हैं। वह किसानों की बड़ी चर्चा करते हैं। लेकिन उन्होंने समझने की कोशिश नहीं की कि इससे किसानों का भला होने वाला नहीं है। बहुत से किसान यहां भी आते हैं जो कि मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट बन कर बैठ जाते हैं और बड़ी बड़ी मिलें चलाना शुरू कर देते हैं। नाम तो उनका भी किसान ही है, वे भी किसानों के बेटे हैं। लेकिन देखना यह है कि किन फार्मिंग की आप कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटीज बनाने जा रहे हैं। क्या उनकी बनाने जा रहे हैं जो छोटे छोटे किसान हैं और जिनके पास पांच एकड़ या उससे भी कम जमीन है या बड़ों की बनाने जा रहे हैं। अगर छोटों की बनाने जा रहे हैं तो यकीनन आप काबिले मुबारिकबाद हैं, वरना मैं कहूंगा :

तमझाओं से उलझाया गया हूँ
खिलौना देकर बहलाया गया हूँ।

[شری عبدالغنی قار (کوٹانوں) -
داشقریعا سہانما گاندھی نے فرشتوں نے
ذریعے بابو جگجیوون رام جی کے نام
ایک پیغام بھیجا ہے اس بل کے بارے
میں جو اس طرح ہے -

واہستہ مہری یاد سے کچھ
تاخیاں بھی تھیں

اچھا کیا جو آپ نے سمجھا
کو بہلا دیا

جو بل وہ لائے ہیں سو بار انہیں -
مجھے کوئی اعتراض نہیں ہے -
مجھے مہرے بھائی زندہ، سلگے بہت
عزیز ہیں - وہ کسانوں کی بڑی
چرچا کرتے ہیں - لیکن انہوں نے
سمجھنے کی کوشش نہیں کی کہ
اس سے کسانوں کا بہلا ہونے والا نہیں
ہے - بہت سے کسان یہاں بھی آتے
ہیں جو کہ سب سے پارلمنٹ بن کر
بہتہ جاتے ہیں اور بڑی بڑی مہلوں
چلانا شروع کر دیتے ہیں - نام تو
ان کا بھی کسان ہے - وہ بھی کسانوں
کے بہتے ہیں - لیکن دیکھنا یہ ہے
کہ کین فارموز کی آپ کو پیرینگو سوسائٹیز
بلمانے جا رہے ہیں - کہا لی ٹی بلمانے
جا رہے ہیں جو چھوٹے چھوٹے کسان
یا مزروع ہیں اور جن کے پاس پانچ
ایکو یا اس سے بھی کم زمین ہے یا
بڑوں کی بلمانے جا رہے ہیں - اگر
چھوٹوں کی بلمانے جا رہے ہیں تو

بھیلا آپ قابل مبارکباد ہیں ورنہ
میں کہونگا

تملائوں میں اچھا کیا گیا ہے

[کھلونے دے کر بہلایا گیا ہوں]

श्री क० ना० शिवारं (बेतिया) :
मैं एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ। जो किसान
दो तीन हजार रुपया लगा कर देहातों में
हुल्लर चलाते हैं, जो गरीब लोग हैं, उनके
ऊपर भी इस तरह का फायदा लगेगा और
इस तरह की बात होगी ?

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE: I
am thankful to the hon. members
who have participated in the discus-
sion and evinced interest in the Bill.
It has been a very enlightened and
useful discussion.

Shri Viswanatham gave new infor-
mation to the House that one can
live up to the age of 72 or 73 by
eating hand-pounded rice. I may
assure him that this Bill protects the
interests of the hand-pounding indus-
try. In fact, the provisions are al-
ready there in the old statute, and
this new amendment does not affect
them. So, I wish he lives up to 100
years by eating hand-pounded rice.

I have already explained that be-
cause the industry is not based on
sound modern techniques, considera-
ble quantities of by-products are
wasted and that one of the intentions
of the Bill is that by modernisation
we can use the various by-products
in the national interest.

Shri Meena asked why not improve
the old mills. Actually, we are go-
ing to give the old mills oportuni-
ties to modernise themselves. The
purpose is not only to set up new
mills.

[Shri Annasahib Shinde]

I have already explained to the House that the main purpose of the Bill is to give a preference to the co-operative rice mills and public sector mills. While meeting the point of Mr. Kunte I have already stated that it is in the interests of public policy. Our Constitutional directives, and technical reports and the policies enunciated in Five Year Plans, that we have accepted this position, and that is why we have come forward with this progressive legislation.

The penalty prescribed in the Bill is the maximum and it does not necessarily mean that the court will give the maximum penalty in every case, but the Court should have the power to deal with those who indulge in anti-social activities.

Shri Sharma said that there should be no control, no licensing. I think in modern society we cannot do without some restrictions. (*Interruptions*)

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे सवाल का जवाब दिलवाइये ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. No more questions. The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

15.20 hrs.

**ANDHRA PRADESH AND MYSORE
 (TRANSFER OF TERRITORY) BILL**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN
 THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
 (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA):
 I move:

"That the Bill to provide for the transfer of certain territory from the State of Mysore to the State of Andhra Pradesh and for

matters connected therewith be taken into consideration."

It is a small Bill which seeks to transfer a small territory in Abakavarpalli village in Bagepalli taluk of Kolar district of the Mysore State to Andhra Pradesh. When the enclaves in the various States were transferred from one State to another, somehow this particular enclave was lost sight of. This was considered at the zonal council meeting in 1960 and the two State concerned agreed to this proposal. Without a parliamentary enactment, this transfer cannot take place and hence this small Bill has been brought forward. This Bill was also referred to the State legislatures of both the States as required under the Constitution and both of them have endorsed this measure and there has been no controversy about it so far. Clause 3 relates to the transfer of the part of the village and the other clauses make the necessary incidental or consequential provisions such as representation in legislatures, jurisdiction of the courts, etc. Looking to the non-controversial features of this Bill, I do not think that it is necessary for me to dwell at length with the provisions of the Bill, I hope the House will give its consent.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill provide for the transfer of certain territory from the State of Mysore to the State of Andhra Pradesh and for matters connected therewith be taken into consideration..'

There is an amendment for circulation. We have only one hour. Both the States have agreed to this proposal. We should try to be brief and finish it in the allotted time. There is no controversy about it.