

15.31 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
SIXTH REPORT

Shri E. K. Nayanar (Palghat): I beg to move:

"That the House agrees with the Sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 28th June, 1967."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the House agrees with the Sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 28th June, 1967."

The motion was adopted.

15.32 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: SCHEME FOR
PROCUREMENT OF FOODGRAINS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the Resolution regarding scheme for procurement of foodgrains. Mr. Bhagwan Das may continue his speech. Out of 1 hour allotted, 56 minutes remain. . . .

Shri S. K. Tapuriah (Pali): Sir, I may be allowed to move my resolution at the end.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): He should be allowed to move his resolution, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: After the second resolution is concluded, I will try to give just a few seconds. I will try to accommodate him.

Shri Bhagaban Das (Ausgram): Sir, this subject has come up for discussion several times in this House. In the Chief Ministers' conference held in New Delhi from 8th to 11th April 1967, the Union Minister for Food and Agriculture promised to prepare a

National Food Budget, but despite repeated demands from the floor of both the Houses of Parliament, such a food budget has not yet seen the light of the day.

In our country we find the strange spectacle of deficit States lying adjacent to surplus States and scarcity areas surrounded by surplus regions in the same surplus State. The surplus States of Madras and Andhra are neighbours of Kerala with 50 per cent deficit in its foodgrain production. Orissa, a surplus State, is adjacent to both Bihar and West Bengal and there are scarcity areas inside Orissa too. Madhya Pradesh is a surplus State with scarcity areas like Sarguja. The result is wide disparity of prices for the same commodity in adjoining areas belonging to two different States. The same wheat which sells for Rs. 80 per quintal in Punjab and Haryana is available in western UP markets at such prices as Rs. 140 to Rs. 150 per quintal. In Orissa the rice sells at Rs. 1/- per kilogram but the same may not be available in Purulia or Bankura even for Rs. 3/- per kilogram. In Madras rice sells at Re. 1/- per measure in government shops but the price rises to Rs. 3/- and even Rs. 4/- per kilogram at the time of frequent breakdowns of rice supply to Kerala from Central stocks.

The situation is definitely detrimental to the cause of national unity. The people of Kerala and West Bengal will have every justification to demand that they being producers of important foreign exchange earning cash crops should be permitted to purchase rice from abroad out of their foreign exchange earnings. It will certainly not be in the national interest to ask to become self-sufficient in foodgrains by converting their cash crop acreage into food crops.

To end this unsatisfactory state of affairs it has been suggested that a national food budget be prepared. This should be on the basis of monopoly procurement of surplus foodgrains produced by big producers,

[Shri Bhagaban Das]

ending of private wholesale trade in foodgrains and uniform distribution of what we produce, throughout the country, from Government owned or controlled fair price shops. Since the Government has so far not taken any step in the direction of preparing a national food budget, this House must now give a clear direction to the Government in this connection.

Per adult per day availability of cereals on the basis of internal production alone, after deducting 12.5 per cent for seeds, fodder, unavoidable wastage etc., has been fluctuating between 13.3 ounces to 16.9 ounces between 1951-52 to 1966-67. If we take pulses also into account the availability of foodgrains per adult per day is found to be fluctuating between 15.9 to 20 ounces.

It can be seen from these figures that with such a policy of monopoly procurement we can easily provide without any imports a cereal ration of 12 ounces per day per adult all over the country. At present the quantity of foodgrains supplied from government fair price or ration shops is nowhere more than 8 ounces per day per adult and that too is dependent mainly on imports.

The actual availability, taking both the internal production and imports, has been fluctuating between 17.4 and 21 ounces in this period. This means that with imports at the present level there should not have been any difficulty in supplying to every citizen in the country at least double the amount of foodgrains which are at present being issued from government shops, if a policy of monopoly procurement and uniform distribution had been given effect to on the basis of a national food budget.

In our country, nearly 86 per cent of the land under cultivation is under food crops. Average yield per acre of all foodgrains is 7.5 quintals per

hectare or 660 pounds per acre. Since this is an average of low production years (1961-62 to 1965-66) there is no danger of over-estimation. Deducting 80 pounds per acre for seeds etc., the net available produce per acre with the present level of productivity comes to 580 pounds.

If we want to give even 16 ounces of foodgrains to an adult per day his annual consumption comes to 365 pounds. For a family of five persons or four adults the annual consumption comes to 1460 pounds. This amount of foodgrains requires 3 acres of average land to produce it in an average year. Hence we can exempt holders up to 5 acres from procurement altogether.

According to the Draft Report of the National Sample Survey 16th round, holdings up to 5 acres are 61 million acres in area. Hence, deducting this from the total acreage of 325 million acres, all holdings above 5 acres cover 264 million acres. The surplus available from this area will be enough to provide ration at one pound per day per adult to 43 crores of persons.

If we take only holdings of 15 acres and more on a similar calculation we will get enough surplus to distribute one pound per adult per day to 24.5 crore persons. This means that by procuring the entire surplus from big producers of 15 acres and more, we can feed the entire population that is at present getting only 6 to 8 oz. per adult per day, at the rate of one pound per day without any import at all. This is what my Resolution proposes to do.

FAO experts tell us that rats and pests destroy 26 million tonnes of foodgrains in our country per year. This is mainly because big producers and wholesale traders, in order to do blackmarketing hide their stocks in secret godowns. If the Government manages to get the entire surplus in its own godowns most of this wastage

can be avoided. Even if we cut the wastage to half it will be saving more foodgrains than we import.

It may be argued that if you procure so much, big producers will not produce. They will not get good price; so they will produce less. But if big producers do that, we must take away their land. This land should be given to agricultural labourers and poor kisans.

If the Government grant loans to these small producers on the security of their standing crops, they will be willing to pay these loans back in the form of their produce. Because they do not get loans from Government they go to rich peasants. These rich peasants take away their produce in payment of loans. This produce will also then come to the Government. Otherwise, it goes to the rich peasants who sell it in blackmarket.

If the Government is ready to give manufactured articles and things like masala, kerosene oil, sugar, etc. to peasants at reasonable and fixed prices, they will be ready to sell their grain also at controlled prices. So, the procurement centres must supply crop loans to small peasants and non-agricultural things at controlled prices. This will help procurement.

It is only by such a policy the co-operation of majority of the rural population for procurement scheme can be obtained. The Government must also take other measures to secure their support. These steps are distribution of waste land, exemption of small holdings from rent and revenue and reduction of other taxes. The more the Government does for poor kisans and agricultural labour, the greater will be their support for procurement. Without this support the secret hoards of big producers cannot be discovered. Hence, Government must make every effort to give relief to the rural poor in order to make procurement a success. With these words, I place my Resolution before the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that as a measure to alleviate scarcity conditions in some parts of the country, the Government should immediately prepare a scheme for introduction of compulsory procurement of the entire surplus of foodgrains from the big producers and its uniform distribution throughout the country."

Shri Ranga.

Shri Sheo Narain (Basti): Sir, on a point of order. Today we have to decide this. If we exclude the Ministers, the number of Members on both sides are equal. Therefore, we must get equal opportunity. I do not mind if you give preference to Professor Ranga but, afterwards you must call one from that side and then one from this side.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall try to accommodate all.

Shri Sheo Narain: There should be no discrimination. Every member represents a constituency. You have to hear us also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I try to accommodate all shades of opinion, all sections of the House, all parties. But one thing should be borne in mind. Ultimately, the final reply comes from the Minister and his time will be counted, so far as the division of time goes, on the Congress side. Now, Shri Ranga.

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is a great pity that an important subject like this should have been given so little time and should have been brought up here only in the shape of a non-official Resolution because it is likely to prejudice the whole issue and place those concerned in this matter to a very great disadvantage indeed making it impossible for so many of us who wish to speak for the peasants in our country to present their case fully and satisfactorily.

[Shri Ranga]

Now, a distinction is sought to be made between the big producers and the small producers. Who are these big producers? According to the Mover of the Resolution, we are to believe that all those who have got more than 15 acres of land are to be treated as big producers and whatever surplus foodgrains they may possibly come to have should be compulsorily procured by the Government.

15.46 hrs.

[SHRI MANOHARAN in the Chair]

And what sort of a Government do we have? We have a Government which is not very honest and efficient, whose agents are not very efficient, honest, scrupulous or conscientious. What is more, it has been proved beyond doubt and to the hilt, not once but every time this compulsory procurement had been introduced, that these officers had been oppressive to the peasant. Therefore, I have always opposed this compulsory procurement.

Then, what distinction do we make between the big and the small? What is it that the big holders would like to do with their surplus foodgrains if and whenever they have any? If it had not been for some of these small surplus stores, which were kept with our so-called big producers in Bihar and UP and specially in those famine-affected area, if these local stocks had not been allowed by the local governments to be kept there in their villages, during the last two years and this third year of the drought, I am sure, what we are witnessing today of lakhs and lakhs, thousands and thousands of peasants going away from one village to another and from one district to another in search of foodgrains would have come to be witnessed last year and the year before also. It is because of these local stores that the local people were able to purchase those stores and feed themselves keeping themselves alive without having to burden the Government with the task of having to

feed them in a manner in which they are being fed on doles, rations gruel and all the rest of it. Therefore, I am all in favour, first of all, of not having compulsory procurement and, secondly, of allowing these people to continue the traditional practice of local stores being kept in the local areas but with the knowledge of the local sarpanches and other people so that they would know who has got it, how much they have got it and to what extent and how they can help the local landless people and the local insufficient producers to approach these so-called big landholders or producers and obtain foodgrains at reasonable prices.

The country has suffered enough from these zonal restrictions starting at the State level and coming down to the district level and then demoralising themselves to taluka level also. I know of instances where local policemen had been trying to levy their own toll upon those headloaders who were carrying foodgrains from one village to another. Therefore, it is replete with corruption and possibility for coercion of the people and I wish to record my protest against this proposal.

My hon. friend has brought forward so many other Communistic conceptions of his into this proposal. It is said that wherever the big landholders are not prepared to cultivate their lands properly, those lands should be taken away by the Government. That is what the Communists are doing in the Communist countries. They should be distributed. To whom? Not to the workers—only in the beginning—but later on to be taken over at the first stage in the name of the so-called co-operative farms, later on turned into collectives and in the end made kolkhoz, solkhov and all the rest of khozes of Sovietism. We are opposed to all these things.

What is more, I am opposed to anyone coming and saying that the peasants are blackmarketeers. The

peasants are not blackmarketeers; they are producers. You encourage them in every possible manner to produce more and more and afterwards induce them to part with whatever surplus they have by paying a remunerative price, a decent price. You do not want to pay a remunerative price, you want to fix a price at an uneconomical level, and afterwards, if they refuse to give over to you, you call them hoarders. It is not proper to call a kisan a blackmarketeer and to treat him as a hoarder. No democratic country which respects its own democracy, which wants to achieve progress, which wants to see that there is food sufficiency or self-sufficiency in food can afford to treat its kisans either as blackmarketeers or hoarders. The best way to help our people to produce more and more is to give them every possible encouragement and indeed encourage them to consume less, by all means, if that is possible, and to maximise their surplus and place it at the disposal of the market at prices which are remunerative and attractive.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Jammu): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I quite agree with what Prof. Ranga has said that unless and until the Indian farmer is given his due, respectable, place in the society, unless and until he is recognised as a respectable human being living in this country, we will not be able to solve our food problem and we will not be able to increase our agricultural production.

As far as this Resolution is concerned, in fact, after reading the Resolution, it has confused my mind. I am not able to follow what exactly is meant by this Resolution. In one part it says that there should be a scheme for introduction of compulsory procurement of the entire surplus of foodgrains from the big producers and its uniform distribution throughout the country and then there is a line before that which says, "in some parts of the country". We talk of national food budget in order to look to this problem from the entire country's point

of view, not only thinking about certain scarcity areas or about certain surplus areas.

In my opinion, the emphasis should be more on developing farmer-oriented agricultural policy in this country rather than on insisting upon having a national food budget. What we require today is to give proper incentives, to give proper encouragement, to our farmer so that he can increase agricultural production in the country. Whatever grain is produced in this country, I agree, must be efficiently, reasonably, distributed or made available to all the people living in this country and I am certain that the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture has already taken steps to make it sure that no part of this country suffers on account of shortage of foodgrains. If there is a shortage of foodgrains in this country, let that pinch be felt in each and every corner of the country, not only in one part of the country.

When I say, farmer-oriented agricultural policy, I would like to spell it out in only two or three things. The first thing that I want is that if the State Governments do not take such steps by which the things which are due to the farmer are not given to them, the Central Government should not sit idle. I know, from time to time, the Food and Agriculture Minister meets the Chief Ministers of the States and the Food and Agriculture Ministers of the States and emphasizes that—he has been doing it in the past also—but still much remains to be done. It is a great pity that whereas the Central Government is interested to see that sufficient food should be available in the country all the time, to see that agricultural production must increase and that, whatever deficit is there, the Central Government tries to import foodgrains to meet that deficit, on the other hand, the most unfortunate thing is that this kind of seriousness or this kind of consciousness is not being shared by the State Governments. (Interruption). Non-Congress Governments have come. I have yet to see what they

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]
can give us by way of increasing the agricultural production.

An hon. Member: All the State Governments?

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: Yes.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): In Orissa, they have abolished the land revenue.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: That is very good.

It is for the past six or seven years that Government have been telling us very vigorously that they have appointed an Agricultural Prices Commission and that they are collecting the data which should form the basis for the fixation of prices of agricultural products which the farmers should get. I would very humbly tell the hon. Minister that today is the golden opportunity for him to say what really has been done and what really has been achieved in this respect. Unless and until the producers, the farmers, are assured of a reasonable, remunerative price, there can be no other incentive for them to increase the agricultural production.

Coming to the procurement side, there are only two ways to tackle this problem. If we have sufficient surplus available in this country, then there is no problem of procurement at all. Since, in some parts of the country, there is shortage, the problem arises that the grains should not go underground, should not be allowed to be smuggled out of the country and should be available to the people at reasonable prices. It has been suggested in the Resolution that in some parts of the country compulsory procurement should be undertaken. I am opposed to this. You cannot have measures of one type in one part of the country and of another type in another part of the country. That will only create confusion and will create more problems.

Secondly, where is the need for having compulsory procurement? Today the farmer is not in a position to hold his grains even for more than a single day because he has to buy other commodities, which are so costly, to run his house; he has to buy fertilisers, agricultural implements and other things.

Shri D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj): No.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: My hon. friend, Mr. Tiwary, says 'no'. I am afraid, he does not know the plight of small farmers.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: I know much more than he does.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: He is probably talking of jotedars and landlords. I can agree, if a person has about 500 acres or one thousand acres, then he will be in a position to hold his grains from one crop season to another crop season, but what is the percentage of such producers and farmers in this country? In our country, 75 per cent of the farmers are having only less than ten acres.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Then, they have not to sell anything.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: He does not know the plight of those farmers.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Jagjiwan Ram): He is a farmer himself.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: He owns more than 200 or 300 acres.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: No; only 20 acres.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: If he owns only 20 acres and if he has to live on those 20 acres, only on that income, then he can never hold his grains for more than one month. He can never do that.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: I have nothing to sell.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: I would request the hon. Minister that, if he wants to have a scheme of procurement, we should encourage co-operatives. There are States in this country where the co-operatives have succeeded, both for buying grains as well as for distribution of grains.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: That is being done.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: Another alternative can be that, if he really wants to make sure that not a single grain which is produced in this country goes underground, then we should have State trading in foodgrains. Then, they should handle the grains at the producers' level and also at the distribution level. They cannot have one thing at one end and another at another end.

16 hrs.

Since Shri Jagjiwan Ram has taken over, I have seen that he has been faced with such problems as did not exist in the past. I must congratulate him that with his imagination and vision and in spite of the great handicaps that he is facing, because the non-Congress Governments probably do not want to co-operate with him sometimes and they only say 'We cannot give you anything, but you should give us more grains', he has been handling the food problem quite efficiently.

Shri Direswar Kalita (Gauhati): Can he ask the hon. Minister why he is not allowing the Bengal Government to procure rice directly from the Punjab?

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: In conclusion, I would request the hon. Minister that he should make sure that whatever the needs and requirements of the farmer are, and whatever prerequisites required to increase agricultural production are necessary are given to the farmers in sufficient quantity and in efficient quality and at the proper time.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: May I make one submission before you call the next Member to speak?

Mr. Chairman: He can do that afterwards.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Even in non-official business, you should not go by chits. Members must catch your eye and then only you should call them.

Mr. Chairman: I have got a list here before me.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: In non-official business you should not go by chits.

Shri Ranga: Does it mean that my hon. friends opposite should monopolise all the time?

श्री शिव नारायण : यह चिट वाली सरकार है ।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : सभापति महोदय, मैं श्री भगवानदास के द्वारा प्रस्तुत रेजोल्यूशन के समर्थन में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ । पिछले काफी असेसे से यह मांग मल्क में चल रही है कि देश का इस अनाज के मामले में जो बंटवारा किया गया है अलग अलग जोंस में तो यह जोंस खत्म की जायें और सारे मल्क को एक ही जोन कर के माना जाय और कोई भी एक सूबे में या किसी भी एक इलाके में लोगों को अनाज की कोई भी तकलीफ न हो जाय । कई दल इस बात को एक दफा मान लेते हैं अगर जब मौका आता है उस को कार्यान्वित करने का तब कई कारणों से उस का विरोध भी कर लेते हैं । हमने आज ही अखबारों में पढ़ा कि जब फूड कारपोरेशन की ओर से हरियाणा में कुछ अनाज खरीदने की कोशिश करने में आ गयी तब हरियाणा सरकार की ओर से उस गिनती को अस्वीकार करने में आया । अब मैं जानता हूँ कि हरियाणा सरकार चलाने वाले जो लोग हैं वे लोग दूसरे सूबों में या शायद इसी लोक सभा में यह मांग जरूर करेंगे कि जोन्स खत्म की जायें । एक किस्म की इस

[श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज]

मामले में बेईमानी की नीति कई राजनैतिक दलों की ओर से कहिये या व्यक्तियों की ओर से कहिये, चलाने में आ रही है जिस के बारे में सभी लोग सोचें और उस को बदलने का प्रयास करें।

सरकार की ओर से भी यहां कहा गया कि उस की ओर से कोई भी ठोस कदम उठाया नहीं जाता जिस से यह सूबे सूबे दली परेशानियां, जोस जोस वाली परेशानियां दूर हो जायें। शायद फूड कारपोरेशन की ओर से इस तकलीफ को दूर करने का एक जमाने में सरकार ने सोचा होगा मगर मुझे आज यह फूड कारपोरेशन के बारे में कुछ बातें मंत्री महोदय से कहनी हैं। अभी चन्द दिनों के पहले एलान हो चुका है कि फूड कारपोरेशन जिस का कि दफ्तर मद्रास में था वह अभी दिल्ली ला रहे हैं। उस की क्या वजह हुई वह मैं नहीं जानता लेकिन यह सत्य है कि कई लाख रुपया इस प्रकार खर्च करने में आ जायेगा और दिल्ली की शान में, दिल्ली के दरबार में यह फूड कारपोरेशन के जो नौकरशाह लोग हैं वह जरा ज्यादा आराम पाने की कोशिश करेंगे। मेरी तो आज मंत्री महोदय से यह विनती है कि इस फूड कारपोरेशन के बारे में कुछ पुनर्विचार किया जाय, उस के पूरे व्यवहार के बारे में और उस के काम के बारे में और खास तौर से कई वर्षों से उस का जो व्यवहार रहा है उस का जो काम रहा है उस के बारे में सोचा जाय।

मुझे यहां तक मालूम हुआ है कि इस फूड कारपोरेशन के जो बड़े अफसर लोग हैं वे तो इस जुस्तजू में रहते हैं कि उन्हें विदेशों का दौरा करने का कदम मौका मिलेगा और वह उस के इंतजार में रहते हैं। कोई अफसर आस्ट्रेलिया पहुंच जाता है, कोई जापान पहुंच जाता है कोई डबलरोटी बनाने वाले कारखाने खोलने की कोशिश में पड़ा रहता है। इस तरह के झंझटों में वह अफसर पड़े रहते हैं बजाय इस के कि अपने देश में अनाज का भली प्रकार

से प्रोक्योरमेंट करें। जो छोटे अफसर हैं वे भी जिस तरह से उन के बड़े अफसर विदेशी दौरों की तरफ रहते हैं उसी तरह से यह छोटे अफसर इस कोशिश में रहते हैं कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर उन के दौरे निकलें। यह छोटे अफसर इस मुल्क के अन्दर अपने दौरे निकालने की कोशिश में लग रहते हैं।

मुझे यहां तक पता चला है कि एक, एक महीने में हजारों रुपया बड़े अफसरों का हवाई जहाज के टिकटों के कंसिलेशन के कारण खर्च होता है। मैं मांग करूंगा कि उस के बारे में कुछ खुलासा आज नहीं तो जल्द से जल्द सदन के सामने पेश किया जाय कि यह फूड कारपोरेशन के अफसरों का एयर ट्रैवल का खर्च नहीं बल्कि इन एयर टिकटों के कंसिलेशन का खर्चा जब से वह फूड कारपोरेशन बनी है तब से अब तक कितना हुआ है। इसलिए उस का जिक्र करना पड़ता है कि शायद फूड कारपोरेशन की ओर से यह कोशिश हो सकती थी कि अनाज को खरीदने का काम जिस सूबे में अनाज की पैदावार ज्यादा है वहां से किया जाय और जहां अनाज की पैदावार कम हो वहां अनाज को बेचने या बांटने का काम हो जाय लेकिन वह भी प्रयास बिल्कुल असफल रहा है। नौकरशाहों के बीच में और इस सरकार की जो हर काम में कोई न कोई झंझट निर्माण करने की आज तक नीति रही है उस के अन्दर वह फूड कारपोरेशन आज बिल्कुल करीब करीब खत्म हो गयी है। अब एक और बात इस अनाज के मामले में कहनी आवश्यक है। प्रोक्योरमेंट के बारे में हम कहते हैं कि किसानों को उन की उपज के उचित दाम देने चाहिये। मगर अनाज के बारे में दामों को तय करते हुए किसानों को उस की उपज के उचित दाम तय करते समय किसानों के लिए जो जरूरी चीजें हैं उन आवश्यक चीजों के दाम भी हम लोगों को तय करने चाहिये। खास यही अड़चन होती है कि किसान चूंकि वह बहुत मजबूर आदमी है

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Sir, I am very glad that several useful points were raised though the resolution as it stands is not workable in the context of our country's foodgrains position. We have some system of procurement and by common consent it has been left to the Chief Ministers of the States concerned to have a particular system of procurement which they think will be effective in their State. In some States it is from the cultivators; in others it is from the licensed traders or millers. When one thinks of procurement of the surplus from the cultivators, one should not escape the idea that it will not be possible without bringing in the entire food-grain trade into government hands. If that is the implication, will it be a feasible proposition to do at the present stage and even if it is feasible, is it desirable in the present stage of our food production? I think it is not desirable to bring the entire wholesale and retail trade in the public sector. We have made a beginning with the Food Corporation and the idea was that to begin with the wholesale trade would be managed by that Corporation. Shri Fernandes had brought out certain weaknesses of the Corporation and I may assure him that I shall look into them. There is much that is to be done to increase efficiency and effect economy in the Corporation.

So far as the question of bringing the headquarters of the Corporation to Delhi is concerned, it was perhaps thought at the time the decision was taken, that now that the activity of the Food Corporation has extended and it is not restricted only to the procurement of rice, it would be better if it is at Delhi, where it will have to deal with the various State Governments and the Central Government's Ministries. Certainly, the transfer of the office will mean some expenditure, but as I have said, the Ministry must have taken all this into consideration before they decided that the office should be transferred from Madras to Delhi.

About the functioning of the Corporation, and about the number of occasions they have gone to foreign countries, as I have said, I shall go into the details, and I shall if occasion arises, bring it to the notice of the House and inform my hon. friend Shri Fernandes and other Members.

The important thing about our food problem is to increase the production, and unless we increase production, we cannot solve this food problem. So, the problem of food has to be met on the agricultural front. The agriculturist has to be assured that in order to increase the production he will be provided with the requirements and necessary inputs for the cultivation of his land. Government have provided certain facilities but I have no hesitation in admitting that by and large while all these facilities were available up till now to the sizeable cultivators, the small cultivators have not been benefited by them. What I mean to say is, all these things have not been adequate even for the big cultivators. They have not been. Therefore, credit has to be provided through the land mortgage banks, land development banks, co-operatives and marketing societies, so that production can be increased. Again, while fixing the prices of the agricultural commodities, whether foodgrains or others, remunerative prices have to be given to the cultivators. A reasonable return for the inputs and the labour that the cultivator puts in will have to be given, and a mechanism, which will take into consideration the cost of production and a reasonable return over that, will have to be devised.

Mr. Fernandes has raised a very wide question, of price parity. While efforts have been made, and the House is aware that even in the past efforts were made to have some sort of price parity between the agricultural commodities and the various other commodities that the cultivator requires, for this cultivation, it has not been possible to evolve any policy whether we can have any parity in the various

agricultural and industrial products. It should be our effort to see that the prices of agricultural commodities are fixed taking into consideration the prevailing prices of the commodities that the cultivator requires. On that point, I have no difference. I personally feel that efforts should be made and we should devise a mechanism by which it can be implemented.

About procurement, I have always felt that today, as I have said, we are not in a position to take away the entire surplus produced by the cultivators. What we are doing is to take certain quantity of the producers at a price which is regarded as procurement price and the rest is left to the cultivators to be sold in the open market at the price prevailing in the open market. I think that is the best *via media* that could be had in the present context of the foodgrains position.

Then, about the zones. I will not say that zone is the ideal thing. But in the context of the shortage that we have at present, and when we have to procure a certain quantity from the surplus States in order to send it to the deficit areas, perhaps the zone is advantageous. But I will not hesitate in admitting that as soon as our production increases, even if we want to retain the zones, the zones will become unworkable. Once the availability is there, many of the controls and restrictions we have today will become superfluous. So, let us all bend our energies to increase production. In this respect, all the political parties and all men of public opinion can contribute a lot.

Coming to procurement, sometimes the surplus States have got a genuine grievance that the deficit States relax their procurement policies and increase their exemption limits and want the surplus States to procure from their cultivators. Certainly it is not the work of the surplus States alone to procure from their cultivators and feed the deficit States. The deficit States also should collect whatever surplus is available with their cultiva-

tors, so that it can be made locally available. I do not say it should be sent out of the State. Certainly it can be sent from one pocket to another, as Prof. Ranga said. That should be the endeavour of the deficit States.

There is no doubt that there is large wastage of our foodgrains. The wastage starts from the point when the seed is sown in the field. When the seedlings start germinating, worms and insects destroy some percentage. When it flowers, then it is wasted by birds and parrots. Then comes the worst enemy for which the world has not been able to find a solution—rodents and rats. They destroy a very large quantity. They are very wise. They have got a wonderful system of storage underground.

Shri George Fernandes: You can use them as advisers to the Government of India!

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Scientists all over the world are putting their heads together to find out a solution. As yet, they have not found a solution to eliminate this nuisance completely. Storage is not such a problem for the big cultivator. But the small cultivator who has got 1 or 2 rooms only stores the grain in a corner of the room and it is a grand feast for the rats. We are thinking of providing small containers for those persons. These are hard facts one should realise. What the Government is doing is not going to solve the problem completely. It is a big problem.

Shri E. K. Nayanar (Palghat): I am told that flesh is very good and contains vitamins.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji (Howrah): You can export them!

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I am prepared to give the contract to my hon. friend to export them. I will not hesitate. Let him produce a million rats and export them out of the country.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: That will keep them occupied,

Shri Jagjivan Ram: It is a big problem. The other day I was in Mysore. I had been to the Food Research Technological Institute. Some renowned scientists of the world were there. The first thing we discussed with them was this problem. These rats are known for their cleverness. They are very very clever. In our old literature you will find so many anecdotes and stories about the cleverness of the mouse. If some chemical is put to kill it, the first day you might succeed, but from the second day it will not touch it. But we are seized of the problem. The wastage is very sizeable, starting, as I have said, from the point the seed is thrown in the field till the consumption point. At the consumption level, in feasts and marriages there is colossal wastage. Even in the context of the present shortage we see in the towns and villages big parties where pefforce foods are served and wasted. It requires some propaganda on the part of all of us and we should say that when we have scarcity conditions in certain parts of the country these parties should be frowned upon. If there is a big party, even if only non-cereal foods are served, it should be frowned upon. Like that wastage will have to be avoided at every point.

We are passing through a difficult food situation. The successive failure of rain for two years in very large tracts of our country created a condition which was fraught with grave dangers. With the co-operation of the State Governments, with the co-operation of the people and with food imports we have been able to ward off a great calamity in several parts of the country. The governments of surplus States have been very co-operative. There was mention about non-Congress governments. I must take this opportunity to express my thanks even to the non-Congress governments of surplus States who have always come to my help whenever I was in great difficulty of finding some foodgrains for some deficit area. Whether it was the government of Orissa, Punjab or Andhra, all of them have been very co-operative.

Shri A. Dipa (Phulbani): I say Orissa is not a surplus State, it is a deficit State.

16.28 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I have to go by the opinion of the State Government, whether it is a surplus or deficit State. I have said that States have been quite co-operative. That should be the attitude. If some States have surplus foodgrains they should help the deficit areas.

We have some procurement measures, but it is not possible, as I have said, to accept the resolution as it is. The hon. Mover has taken this opportunity to propound or express here some of his pet theories which, even where implemented, it is realised, require some modifications and amendments. So it is not possible to accept the resolution as it is.

श्री जगजिवन राम : अन्वयक महोदय, माननीय सदस्यों ने मेरे इन प्रस्ताव पर गम्भीरता से विचार किया है और इस के सम्बन्ध में अपनी अपनी बातें कही हैं। इस के लिये मैं उन को अन्वयवाद देना चाहता हूँ। चूंकि मेरा यह प्रस्ताव बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है, इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस को स्वीकार किया जाये और इस को सदन के सामने रखा जाये।

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that as a measure to alleviate scarcity conditions in some parts of the country, the Government should immediately prepare a scheme for introduction of compulsory procurement of the entire surplus of foodgrains from the big producers and its uniform distribution throughout the country.

The motion was negatived.

16.30 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: TIBET

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the next Resolution standing in the name of Shri Shri Chand Goel, for which two hours have been allotted.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Sir, may I suggest the time for this Resolution may be reduced from 2 hours to 1½ hours so that Shri Tapuriah may be able to move his Resolution today?

Shri Shri Chand Goel (Chandigarh): If that is the unanimous demand of the House, then I will bow to it.

Shri D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj): When generally the demand is to increase the time, here is a demand for reducing the time allotted to a Resolution.

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): Sir, may I suggest that the time for this Resolution should be increased?

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): If we sit for one hour extra, we can take up the other Resolution today itself.

Mr. Speaker: We will see. Now, Shri Goel.

श्री श्रीचन्द गोयल : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस अपने प्रस्ताव को सदन के सामने रखता हूँ जिस में यह भाग की गई है कि आज समय प्रायः था है कि भारत सरकार भारत में शरणागत के रूप में आये हुए लामा को तिब्बत का कांस्टीट्यूशनल हैड, वैधानिक शासक स्वीकार कर के सब को सब प्रकार की सहायता और सुविधा प्रदान करे और तिब्बत जैसे महान देश को कम्युनिस्ट चीन के चंगुल से निजात दिलाने का प्रयत्न करे। अध्यक्ष महोदय, तिब्बत संसार का महान देश था और भारत के साथ इस की हर प्रकार की निकटता रही है। चाहे सांस्कृतिक क्षेत्र में, चाहे आर्थिक क्षेत्र में चाहे आर्थिक क्षेत्र में हर क्षेत्र में भारत के साथ इस की एकात्मता रही है। वास्तव में जब हम तिब्बत के

इतिहास पर दृष्टि डालते हैं तो दिखाई देता है कि आज से इाई हजार वर्ष पहले महात्मा बुद्ध के समकालीन कीर्त्तल बंश के राजा प्रसेनजित के पुत्र ने भारत से जाकर तिब्बत में राज्य स्थापित किया था और धीरे धीरे तिब्बत राष्ट्र उन्नतमुख होना चला गया, सब प्रकार से अपनी उन्नति करता चला गया। लेकिन किसी भी राष्ट्र के जीवन में उतार चढ़ाव आते हैं। इतिहास ऐसा बताता है कि एक बार जब तानाश्रियों ने तिब्बत पर आक्रमण किया तो उस समय चीन में माचू राजवंश के राजा जो कि बौद्ध धर्म के अनुयायी थे उन का वहाँ पर राज्य था। उस समय तिब्बत ने चीनियों से सहायता मांगी और वह सहायता मिली। उस महायुद्ध के मिनने के बाद जब तानाश्रियों का मुकाबिला कर पाये उसके परिणामस्वरूप फिर चीन का एक एजेंट ल्हासा में रहने लगा। लेकिन यह इतिहास की पुरानी घटना है। उस के बाद प्रनेगी वय का तिब्बत था जो इतिहास है वह स्वतंत्रता का इतिहास है। तिब्बत हमेशा दूसरे देशों के साथ में स्वतंत्र रूप में सन्धि करता रहा, स्वतंत्र रूप में अपना सारा कारोबार करता रहा। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ध्यान दिलाना चाहूंगा कि 1904 में ब्रिटेन ने तिब्बत के साथ ल्हासा सन्धि की थी चूँकि उन को तिब्बत से कुछ खतरा दिखाई देता था। परन्तु वह तिब्बत को भारत के लिए एक "बफर" स्टेट के रूप में समझते थे। अंग्रेजों ने अपनी सारी नीति भारत की सुरक्षा के लिये इस ढंग से बनाई थी, दूर दूर तक जाकर भारत के चारों तरफ ऐसी "बफर" स्टेट कायम की थी, इसलिये उसरी सीमा पर उन्हें दिखाई दिया कि कुछ गड़बड़ है तो अपना मिशन भेजा और उसके बाद 1904 में एक सन्धि की। उस के बाद 1911 में जब चीन के अन्दर क्रान्ति आयी और माचू राजवंश की हुकूमत चीन में समाप्त हो गई तो उस समय तिब्बत बाबों ने भी जो चीनी सन्धियों की या जो चीनी अधिकार था उस को समाप्त कर दिया था।