

13.09 hrs.

RESOLUTIONS RE: INDIAN COCONUT COMMITTEE AND THE INDIAN CENTRAL OILSEEDS COMMITTEE

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri C. Subramaniam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"Whereas section 17 of the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944 (10 of 1944), empowers the Central Government to declare, with the previous approval of the House of the People and by notification in the Official Gazette, that with effect from such date as may be specified in the notification, the Indian Coconut Committee constituted under that Act shall be dissolved;

And whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that a declaration to the above effect should be made as in the draft notification annexed hereto;

And whereas this House after considering the said draft notification and the views expressed in support thereof on behalf of the Central Government is of the opinion that the previous approval of this House to the declaration proposed in the draft notification should be accorded;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 17 of the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944 (10 of 1944), this House accords its approval to the draft notification containing the aforesaid declaration.

ANNEXURE

Draft Notification

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944 (10 of 1944), the Central Government, with the previous approval of the House of the People, hereby declares that with effect from 1st April, 1966, the Indian Coconut

Committee constituted under that Act shall be dissolved."

13.10 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I beg to also move:

"Whereas section 16 of the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946 (9 of 1946), empowers the Central Government to declare with the previous approval of the House of the People and by notification in the Official Gazette, that with effect from such date as may be specified in the notification, the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee constituted under that Act shall be dissolved;

And whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that a declaration to the above effect should be made as in the draft notification annexed hereto;

And whereas this House after considering the said draft notification and the views expressed in support thereof on behalf of the Central Government is of the opinion that the previous approval of this House to the declaration proposed in the draft notification should be accorded;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 16 of the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946 (9 of 1946), this House accords its approval to the draft notification containing the aforesaid declaration.

ANNEXURE

Draft Notification

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 16 of the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946 (9 of 1946), the Central Government with the previous approval of the House of the People, hereby declares that with effect from 1st April, 1966, the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee constituted under that Act shall be dissolved."

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

Sir, there are nine commodity committees under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, namely, the Indian Central Cotton Committee, the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee, the Indian Central Coconut Committee, the Indian Lac Cess Committee, the Indian Central Jute Committee, the Indian Central Tobacco Committee, the Indian Central Arecanut Committee, the Indian Central Sugarcane Committee, and the Indian Central Spices and Cashewnuts Committee. Out of these, the first four have been constituted under statutes of Parliament or the Central Legislature and the other five have been registered under the Societies Registration Act.

These commodity committees were constituted for the purpose of developing these commodities by research work, by development work and also by taking care of the marketing of these commodities as far as it was found necessary.

At the outset I might say that at least some of these committees have done very good work with regard to the development of these commodities; but, a stage had come to review particularly the research aspect of these commodities undertaken by the commodity committees. Therefore, this matter of research was gone into in a comprehensive manner, not only with reference to the research in respect of these commodities but also in general with regard to agricultural research in the country. A committee was constituted in 1959 with some American experts and others to review this position. In their report they categorically stated that this commodity approach with regard to research is quite out of date and it has got to be a comprehensive approach with regard to research; therefore, research, even in respect of these commodities, will have to be co-ordinated with general research on agriculture.

In addition to that, a few other points were brought out in that report; for example, for the purpose of

research, even in respect of a single commodity, various other specialities also will have to be attached to that—an agronomics expert, a plant geneticist, an entomologist and various other specialities also will have to be associated—otherwise, no worthwhile research could be undertaken. Not only will these specialists have to be attached but also equipment with regard to these various specialities will have to be attached for the purpose of effective research work even with reference to a single commodity.

Taking into account the availability of research scientists in the field of agriculture, it was pointed out that we were short of these specialists and, therefore, it would be almost impossible to have the specialists attached to each commodity research work; particularly in the context of scarcity of equipment, it would not be possible for any single commodity committee to have all the equipment necessary for the purpose, located in the institutes of research established by these commodity committees and India would not be able to afford these equipment to be located thinly in all these commodity committees separately. Therefore, the recommendation was that it should be possible for us to coordinate these activities so that the specialists who are already available could be made the best use of with reference to research work in a comprehensive way in agricultural sciences.

Another important scientific fact was also brought out. It is not as if any research work could be oriented only to a particular commodity. When we do research work particularly on plant genetics, plant pathology and various other factors relating to plant development, various other factors are thrown out which may not be relevant to that commodity but which might be relevant to other commodities; but, when research is oriented to a particular commodity, all these factors which might be very useful for other commodities are just ignor-

ed because they do not apply to this particular commodity. Therefore, there is a wastage of research work when it is made with a specific approach to a particular commodity.

Therefore, the recommendation of the scientists was that it should be a team work with reference to various allied commodities and they should take advantage of the various factors which may be thrown up during this research work, not necessarily with reference to a particular commodity but with reference to their general application to agriculture sciences. Therefore, the recommendation was made in the report that research work with regard to these commodities should be undertaken under the ICAR and co-ordinated and comprehensive research institutions should be set up so that full advantage could be taken of by locating specialists in the various branches in these institutions, by concentrating equipments in these institutions and also taking into account that work is not done only with reference to any one particular commodity but is done in a comprehensive way so that factors which are thrown out may be made use of for the benefit of a whole set of commodities which might be benefited by this work.

Then, this report was examined by the Government and was gone into in great detail. Later on, another committee was appointed in 1963 with mainly Indian scientists to go into the recommendations of the 1959 committee and indicate to the Government what sort of action should be taken particularly with reference to the re-organisation of agricultural research work which the Government thought was not making the headway which it should make for the purpose of developing agriculture in the country. That committee also went into detail with regard to the research work which is being done in the country with regard to these commodities and also generally with regard to agricultural sciences.

They came to the conclusion that in the light of the paucity of scienti-

fic personnel available in this branch—we have thinly spread out our research work in the country with regard to agricultural development—and because they have been thinly spread out with reference to commodities or with reference to other institutions of agricultural research work, it had not been possible to man these institutions properly and to equip them properly; therefore, no worthwhile results have been achieved. Therefore, on the basis of the 1966 committee report the Government examined the whole aspect of agricultural research work in the country and took a decision to re-organise the ICAR as a whole and bring under it the entire research work.

The one important step we took was that instead of this research institution being headed by a regular administrator, an ICS officer, we took a decision that it should be headed by a scientist of repute in the country and I am glad that a scientist well known in the international world for the work he had done particularly in the field of wheat development has been appointed as the first Director General of ICAR. The constitution of ICAR has also been gone into and we have re-organised it with a purposeful executive body to supervise the work of the ICAR. A decision has been taken that all the research institutions which have been functioning under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture—not under the ICAR; ICAR was only assisting them by providing some funds or giving some technical direction—should be taken over by the ICAR and they should be responsible for the running of these institutions. Some of these institutions are of national importance. I will have to come before the Parliament for giving that national status to some of these institutions. They will be the I.A.R.I., the Indian Veterinary Research Institute in Izatnagar and the National Dairy Research Institute. There are three or four research institutes which may be recognised as of national importance so that men of

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

status could be associated with the work there. For that, I will come later before the Parliament for giving that recognition.

What is important now is that the I.C.A.R. has taken over these institutions and the I.C.A.R., headed by an eminent scientist, will be responsible for the running of these institutions. In addition to that, we have also, in consultation with the State Governments, now come to a decision that instead of the States' research work being done away from the Central research work, we should make a coordinated approach.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): You take them over.

Shri C. Subramaniam: We have not taken them over. But whatever work is undertaken will be done in a coordinated manner instead the work being done in the State research laboratories independently of what is happening in the Central research institutes. That is why a coordinated approach is being made with regard to rice development or wheat development or cotton development and various other things. We have already started research work in respect of commodities in which we want immediate development. We have a coordinated rice research programme; we have a coordinated wheat research programme; we have a co- and a coordinated research program-ordinated millets research programme for hybrid maize and various other things. Even within a short time, I am glad to announce to the House that very beneficial results have come out of this and we are able to make headway with regard to the introduction of these new high-yielding varieties particularly in respect of the six major crops which we have chosen for development during the Fourth Plan.

It is under these circumstances that a decision was taken that as far as the research work is concerned, it will have to come under the supervision of the I.C.A.R., which will make

a coordinated and comprehensive approach with regard to research. It is on that basis that some of the various research institutions which are being run in an isolated way by these commodity committees have been taken over and some others will be taken over hereafter after getting the concurrence of this House and the I.C.A.R. will be responsible to see that they are properly staffed and they are properly equipped and that a coordinated and comprehensive approach is made with regard to the research work which would be done in these committees. As far as research is concerned, we came to the conclusion that we have to get away from this isolated single commodity approach and that we have to make a coordinated and comprehensive approach.

Even then, these commodity committees were functioning as far as development was concerned. The development under the Constitution became mainly the responsibility of the State Governments. Therefore, those developmental activities were mainly looked after by the State Governments. Then, we tried to find out how these commodity committees could play any role because they were constituted for the purpose of developmental work also. So, we said, let them technically advise the State Governments for this purpose and the technical officers of these commodity committees have been making some sort of supervision. But my own impression was that they were not making any impact on the State Governments' work with regard to development.

Again, with regard to marketing, even from the very beginning, these commodity committees could not make any effort in the matter of marketing because that had to be undertaken by the various marketing committees and with regard to the export commodities, the Commerce Ministry became responsible for it. Therefore, whatever work was being done in the matter of marketing had to be done

by other cooperative agencies and institutions under the Commerce Ministry. That is why in all the three sectors in which they had to function their functions became restricted and that is why we came to the conclusion that, research work being undertaken by the I.C.A.R., hereafter these commodity committees would not have any useful work to do. But still we thought it necessary to associate these interests particularly with regard to the development of these commodities even though the research work might be under the I.C.A.R. Therefore, we are now taking away the other functions but for the purpose of guiding and advising the Government, we are constituting for these commodities what we call the Development Council with the growers' interests represented in it, the Parliament being represented in it and the other interests also which are interested in the marketing, etc. being represented in it so that it may advise the Government and indicate on what lines the action would be necessary. As far as the advisory capacity is concerned, it would be done hereafter by a Development Council which will be constituted by the Government under the executive orders and they would look after this work.

This, in short, is the purpose with which I am coming before the Parliament for getting its concurrence. I am seeking the concurrence of the Lok Sabha for two Committees. With regard to the five Committees which have been registered under the Societies Act, it is open to the Committees themselves to assemble and pass a resolution dissolving the committees. Those five Committees are: the Indian Central Jute Committee, the Central Tobacco Committee, the Arecanut Committee, the Sugarcane Committee and the Spices and Cashewnut Committee. They have met in their committees and by a resolution they have dissolved themselves. Therefore, no further action is necessary as far as those five Committees are concerned.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): They are no longer existing now?

Shri C. Subramaniam: They are no longer existing now. They have already passed a resolution . . .

Shri Ranga: By the officials only.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Most of them, as a matter of fact, were non-officials coming from outside. What is the use of our own functioning on the Committee here? That is the greater justification for the abolition of these Committees.

With regard to other two committees, the Government have the power to dissolve them by a mere notification. But these two Committees require the concurrence of the Lok Sabha for their abolition. That is why I have come before the House.

Sir, I am sure all the aspects will be taken into consideration by the House and I hope I would get the concurrence of the House in view of the explanations I have given with regard to the functioning of these commodity committees. I may tell the House that I myself was associated with one of these committees for sometime and at a later stage as the Vice President of that committee also, that is, the Indian Central Tobacco Committee and I knew, to a certain extent, how that Committee was functioning. That is also one of the reasons why I readily accepted the recommendation that was made. I hope the House would give concurrence to this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

(i) "Whereas section 17 of the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944, (10 of 1944), empowers the Central Government to declare, with the previous approval of the House of the People and by Notification in the Official Gazette, that with effect from such date as may be specified in the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

notification, the Indian Coconut Committee constituted under that Act shall be dissolved;

And whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that a declaration to the above effect should be made as in the draft notification annexed hereto;

And whereas this House after considering the said draft notification and the views expressed in support thereof on behalf of the Central Government is of the opinion that the previous approval of this House to the declaration proposed in the draft notification should be accorded;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 17 of the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944 (10 of 1944), this House accords its approval to the draft notification containing the aforesaid declaration.

ANNEXURE

Draft Notification

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944 (10 of 1944), the Central Government, with the previous approval of the House of the People, hereby declares that with effect from 1st April, 1966, the Indian Coconut Committee constituted under that Act shall be dissolved."

(ii) "Whereas section 16 of the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946 (9 of 1946), empowers the Central Government to declare, with the previous approval of the House of the People and by notification in the Official Gazette, that with effect from such date as may be specified in the notification, the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee constituted under that Act shall be dissolved;

And whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that a declaration to the above effect should be made as in the draft notification annexed hereto;

And whereas this House after considering the said draft notification and the views expressed in support thereof on behalf of the Central Government is of the opinion that the previous approval of this House to the declaration proposed in the draft notification should be accorded;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 16 of the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946 (9 of 1946), this House accords its approval to the draft notification containing the aforesaid declaration.

ANNEXURE

Draft Notification

In Exercise of the powers conferred by section 16 of the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946 (9 of 1946), the Central Government, with the previous approval of the House of the People, hereby declares that with effect from 1st April, 1966, the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee constituted under that Act shall be dissolved."

Shri Ranga: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Minister has come with a mercy petition to ask this House to join him in the murder that he has committed over all these commodity committees. I am not prepared to excuse this murderer. He cannot really feel proud of this achievement. If he has got any other achievement to his credit, well, I can only wish him good luck. But so far as this proposal is concerned, in his private counsels with himself, I hope he would have the decency to regret the decision that he has been obliged to take in regard to this.

My hon. friend said that he had some experience of the Indian Central Tobacco Committee and that his experience has persuaded him to agree with these American experts as well as Indian experts, in regard to this matter. I do not know what sort of experience he has had, whether he had it after he became the Minister or before he became the Minister.

Shri C. Subramaniam: As a Minister I cannot be there.

Shri Ranga: So, it was before he became the Minister. Certainly, it did not give him much authority and that must have been one of the reasons which persuaded him to seek this Ministership as well as that Ministership there.

Sir, there is no power in these committees but they certainly have some functions as my hon. friend was good enough to say, if not many functions. I had the opportunity of playing my role in giving shape to the Oilseeds Committee Act. That Bill was here before the Central Legislature, the Parliament.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You were the Vice President of the Oilseeds Committee.

Shri Ranga: Then, I was in several other Commodity Committees also.

I was one of those members who were unwilling to agree with the then British Government in its proposal to levy a separate cess on all these growers in order to find funds for these Committees. Nevertheless, I welcomed the establishment of those Committees because I thought that they would function as miniature Parliaments so far as growers, traders and other people who were interested in the social economy connected with every one of these crops, were concerned. They certainly have functioned as miniature Parliaments. This Parliament, both the Houses, has been very adequately represented on many of these Committees. I became the founder Vice-President of the Oilseeds Committee. For five years I co-operated with the then President, Shri Datar Singh, in laying the foundation for the scope, ambit and effectiveness of the work of that particular Committee and I was glad to be told in those days that we set an example for several other Committees that have come into existence subsequently. They have done good work and I do not know why my hon. friend as well as the scientists have

come to the other view. What was it that the Committees were expected to do excepting the Indian Central Cotton Committee and the Sugarcane Committee? So far as the Oilseeds Committee is concerned, it was not expected to maintain any Research Institute. If they found this reason, i.e., to co-ordinate all these Research Institutes, that certainly cannot be the reason for abolishing the Oilseeds Committee because it has not established any Central Research Institute.

The second thing is: where are they to get the research done from? So far as this Committee is concerned, it was distributing the funds just as the ICAR is expected to distribute funds in future. The ICAR had been distributing funds in the past also and it was distributing these funds on the basis of the schemes that were evolved and developed by the various Research Institutes in different States as well as at the Centre and also by the State Governments themselves. But its developmental function lay in this that, whoever was in charge of this Committee used to go round the States and induce those research workers as well as the Directors of Agriculture and Ministers of Agriculture to take up new problems for research and then ask for grants; then they would pass the schemes here in the Committee, provide funds and place them at their disposal. It was in that way an initiator; it used to help them to develop; it used to place funds at their disposal and see to it that these funds were properly made use of. This is exactly the function that the ICAR has been discharging for the past thirty years, i.e., ever since it has come into existence. I do not know what additional, wonderful, heavenly, new function that he is going to confer on the ICAR which these Commodity Committees have not been discharging till now.

Thirdly, in that case why should there be these Committees at all in addition to the ICAR. It was after the ICAR had been functioning for a large

[Shri Ranga]

number of years that these Committees had been found to be necessary. That was because the ICAR was not able to give sufficient attention to the various developmental activities that were needed in order to develop research, marketing and also growing of the crops. It was when the ICAR was functioning that these Committees were brought into existence in order to supplement the work of the ICAR. On the ICAR, agriculturists are not sufficiently represented; trade union interests are not sufficiently represented; scientists are certainly represented and much more so the Government and the governmental agencies. That is exactly the reason why these Commodity Committees, on the pleading of the Minister and the assurances of his subordinates, simply decided to liquidate themselves. I cannot congratulate him on that achievement. They had no other choice; therefore, they liquidated themselves.

Dr. M. S. Aney: They committed suicide.

Shri Ranga: An ukase was issued and they liquidated themselves. Here on these Committees, peasants are represented; especially on the Oilseeds Committee, agriculturists have been represented by a majority; I saw to it that they were represented in a majority and that was a reason why, in those days, those who were responsible for the formation of those Committees used to hail me as the father of the Committee. What is it my hon. friend is going to do? In their place he is going to have Development Councils. What are they going to do? Whom are they going to represent? If they are going to represent the very same interests, why should be earlier ones be replaced at all? If, on the other hand, he wants to denigrate the present set up, I condemn the Ministry for their game. They say they want to co-ordinate all these Research Institutes. All credit to the decision my hon. friend

has made—I am subject to correction—in appointing as the first Director-General Dr. Pal. He is one of those few scientists who have distinguished themselves all over the world and also in our country, not only through his researches but also through his ability for organisational work and for managing people, keeping them together in good humour and getting the best possible work, he has distinguished himself. That is the only point the hon. Minister has got in his favour.

Is there any reason why these Commodity Committees should be abolished. I do not want the ICAR to be abolished, but certainly I do not want these Commodity Committees to be abolished. They have done good work. So far as Oilseeds Committee is concerned, there is what is known as village ghani industry. It was this Committee which took the initiative in appointing a Committee to go round the whole country and make recommendations for the development of co-operatives among these oil ghani workers; there were about 4 millions of them. It was this Committee which initiated researches into all the various edible and non-edible oils. It was this Committee which gave a fillip to what is known as solvent extraction industry in this country and so many other things can also be said. What is the crime it has committed? It has allowed, from the very beginning, its Chairman to be one of the nominees of the Government. First of all, it was the President of the ICAR, I think, and later one of the Secretaries. He had full authority; the Vice-President was only his adviser; it was this Secretary who used to do the work and lay down the law. If any failure had been noticed anywhere, it was due to their Secretaries and not due to anybody else. If any success has been achieved, it was due to their Secretary as well as the Committee as a whole. It did one thing, i.e., to go on accumulating money as it was coming

from the cesses. Who were contributing the cesses? The people themselves were contributing. Similarly various other people also were contributing according to their Aota. Government, in all conscience, should have placed all this money from out of the General Revenues. Instead of doing that, it has extracted this money from the peasants themselves and other interests and then the Finance Ministry as well as the Ministry of Food & Agriculture would not allow them to spend that money in the manner in which they wanted to spend. So much money has come to be accumulated. I think there is nearly a crore of rupees to the credit of the Oilseeds Committee—I am subject to correction. Why is it that money has been allowed to be accumulated in that manner instead of being spent on various research schemes. It was fault of the Government and not the fault of the Committee at all. The Committee has been asking for freedom to spend the money on more and more researches, to be carried out not in its Research Institute or anything of that kind but in all the various Research Institutes. My hon. friend says that there is dearth of experts in this country, dearth of equipment, and, therefore, we cannot be having separate Institutes or separate Committees and so on. We have never made any such requests. If we had an entomological enquiry, we used to send it up to the Indian Agricultural Research Institute; if we wanted an agronomical study to be undertaken, we used to send it to the concerned expert there. Now all those experts are functioning wherever they are; they can do work not on one commodity, but on any number of commodities. After all, they are specialists and those specialists are not being disturbed at all. In which other better way are Government going to make use of these scientists hereafter? They have not given us any additional information at all on this point. Therefore, there is absolutely no justification for their claim that they are going to make better use of the raw materials of

equipment and of the scientists. All that is going to happen is that they are going to misappropriate the accumulated funds of these committees, the funds that have been contributed by the concerned interests. Government have not told us what they are going to do with all those accumulated funds. Are they going to utilise these accumulated funds for the special purpose of developing those very same commodities or are they going to merge them with the general revenues? I would like Government to give us some information on the point.

I am afraid that the offence is against some vice-president of some particular committee which was not toeing their line, and, therefore, Government have decided that these committees must go. A great Moghul has made up his mind and the subordinate Moghuls have dittoed it and they have passed their orders. Now, I am told that they are having second thoughts among themselves. Their conscience is pricking them because they have made such a big mess of it by telling all these committees that they should go out of existence. At the same time, they are now finding that there is need to provide for some development councils in place of the earlier commodity committees and they are going, therefore, to establish development councils. Therefore, there is not going to be any economy so far as travelling allowances etc. are concerned.

Now, what are these development councils going to do? In addition to what was being done in the past by these commodity committees, may I know what additional work is going to be done by the development councils? Government say that these committees have not functioned very effectively in regard to marketing. At the same time they say that we should be satisfied with whatever the Commerce Ministry would be doing in regard to export promotion and other things.

[Shri Ranga]

It was given to us to have the privilege of taking the Government to task for the manner in which they were distributing the export licences and import licences as between established traders, new traders, old traders etc. On these commodity committees we saw to it that the new traders were given the opportunity, and that the peasants themselves were given the opportunity, their Co-operatives were also given the opportunity. In which other way would it ever be possible for any other organisation not excluding these development councils, to take the Commerce Ministry to task and tell them how they should deal with these exporters and importers in an equitable manner as between the established people, the people at the coastal areas, the people in the rural areas and the people in the areas where the crops are being grown and exploited? In view of these things, I consider it a heinous thing on the part of Government to have come to this conclusion.

I wish to tell you also that Government are not going to achieve any economy either in money or in the use of scientific personnel or scientific equipment. Further, they are not going to be rid of these committees even. For, they are going to create new committees which would be less representative of the growers and even much less representative of this House; they are going to have councils which would not be able to either function satisfactorily or advise the Food and Agriculture Ministry or the Commerce Ministry or the Industry Ministry satisfactorily. So, I refuse to agree with the hon. Minister when he asks us to agree with him to destroy these committees.

I wish to place on record my appreciation of the work of all the vice-presidents and the presidents of these committees ever since they have been established and all those scientists who had been called from the State Departments of Agriculture as well as from the Centre to help these

committees to discharge their duties and help the growers as well as traders. I sincerely hope that Government would not have to come to this House later on to express their regret over the decision that they are making and over the failure that they will have to meet with through the measures that they are now pushing through in this House.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): The hon. Minister has said that there are nine commodity committees in his Ministry. We also know that there are several commodity committees under the Ministry of Commerce or the Ministry of Industry. First of all, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether those committees which are in other Ministries are also going to be dissolved. The Commerce Ministry or the Industry Ministry has got the Tea Board, the Rubber Board, the Coffee Board, the Coir Board, the All India Handloom Board, the All India Handicrafts Board and other such bodies. As regards the commodity committees in his Ministry, which are nine in number, the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture has told us that they would be dissolved and they are going to be dissolved.

I happened to be a member of the Central Jute Committee which has already been dissolved. It was a statutory body, and we as the members of that statutory body gave our consent to dissolving it. But my grievance was that we were not informed of it.

Now, what are the reasons for the dissolution of these committees? The hon. Minister has explained to us the lack of research as one of the reasons. I would submit that let research work go; in the Acts you will find the purposes for which these bodies were created; they were created for the improvement and development and cultivation, and marketing and utilisation of the commodity. That was the function of the Coconut Committee. If that be so, research comes

only later in the body of the Act. Since the object is not research mainly, I would submit that you can take away research, and there will be no harm because of that. What about cultivation? Cultivation is the main thing. We have to consider what these commodity committees have done in the matter of cultivation, how the growers have improved their cultivation, and how incentives have been given by them to the growers. We know that several of these Acts were brought up here for amendment in order to provide for representation to Members of Legislatures so that they could try to improve the agricultural conditions in the country. If we review the five Acts under which these five commodity committees were formed, we find that earlier there was no representation for Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha or the local Legislatures in those bodies, but such representation was provided later on. Will the hon. Minister be kind enough to let us know whether the development council which he is going to form will be a similar body or a much smaller body? You will be astonished to hear that no member of a legislature would be there. I had tabled a question whether in the development councils proposed to be set up in the future in lieu of these commodity committees, representation would be given to the members of the Legislatures also. The answer is that in the first development council, however, the non-official members will be those of the erstwhile and existing commodity committees including Members of legislature, who would all be taken as members. But in the miniature development committee which was there with the jute committee, there was no Member of Parliament at all. Now, they have tried to take some members of the legislatures also. That is good. But would that suffice? Will the cultivation of tea, coconut, oilseeds, areca-nut, jute and sugarcane improve in the country if the growers are not given that much incentive which they were getting before?

As regards jute, better cultivation is

most essential because we are not getting jute from Pakistan, we have to produce our raw material ourselves. We were doing our best, but now the Committee is gone, incentive is gone. When the Committee was in existence, at least twice a year we met and considered all the difficulties faced by the cultivators and gave some redress. But now who is to look after them? There are minute things which should be looked into for the better cultivation of jute. Jute is earning foreign exchange for us. Here I would like to know how jute which earns foreign exchange can come under the Food and Agriculture Ministry whereas as tea, rubber, coffee etc. are under the Commerce Ministry. I cannot understand the logic behind this division of these committees or subjects. How can jute come under the Food and Agriculture Ministry? Some commodities are under the Commerce Ministry and some under the Food and Agriculture Ministry. This should be settled. The Minister cannot say that 'I represent the Food and Agriculture Ministry and I shall give explanation about the activities of that Ministry'. He is a member of the Cabinet with joint responsibility. He has to explain to the House why such things are happening. Are not these things being noticed by Government? Jute will be on this side, tea will be on the other side. How is it happening?

As regards research work, personally, being associated with some of the commodities, I know that research work is not being done well. So research at a place by a higher body should be done. There I have no objection. But as regards the other things, for which these committees were formed, they should be looked into by some body. Let the research work be handled by the ICAR; the rest should be under some committee, not such a small development council where growers' representatives will not find a place to the extent they should. In many such things, I find provision made for 14, 15 growers' representatives from different States. They cannot be accommodated in these small development council[s].

[Shri S. C. Samanta]

Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister to reconsider the thing about considering the problems of better cultivation and other things by some body; as regards the research side, I have no objection to the arrangement proposed, that is, giving it over to the ICAR.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): I am one with both the hon. Members who preceded me. The hon. Minister has taken shelter behind experts. Our disadvantage is that we are not experts. So perhaps the Minister may think that he can get away with his arguments by repeating what the experts—may be American, may be Indian, may be from any other country—have said in some reports submitted to Government.

I will mainly concentrate on one of these committees, the Central Coconut Committee because, although I am not an expert, I come from the land of coconuts, Kerala. On this particular issue, we are a little agitated. Our people are to a great extent, concerned about this, I will just refer to a memorandum submitted to Government quite a few months ago by several members of the Central Coconut Committee.

There are signatories to that, of whom 4 are MPs. As far as I can understand, all the four Members are very prominent leaders of the ruling party itself; so there is absolutely no question of any politics here. It is not as if we are opposing the Motion because we are in the Opposition. But I am sorry to say that the Minister and Government could not give sufficient consideration to a memorandum submitted by people with knowledge, people who come from areas where coconut is cultivated on a large scale.

As far as I could see, most of our daily papers, very influential papers—most of them—have come out with editorials roundly condemning the move here at Delhi to wind up the Central Coconut Committee. When I

speak about this, I may be excused because as I said, this is a crop which is the life-giving crop, I should say, for almost the entire people of our State. 70 per cent of the coconut produced in the country is in our State. I think there will not be a single household or family which is not concerned with this, because every family is depending so much on this. This was the time for Government to take steps to strengthen this Committee which has been in existence since 1945, for the last 20 years. Government did not have to spend anything on this Committee because it exists on the cess collected in the mills which are crushing the copra.

There was some argument put forward in the beginning that this is a move for economy. There was no substance in that. As I said, this was the time to strengthen this Committee because actually this cultivation is passing through a very serious crisis. In spite of all that the Committee has done, in spite of all that the State Government or the Central Government are supposed to have done for the improvement of this, for the development, marketing and research and all that, the situation is that this particular crop is facing a very serious crisis. Already nearly a lakh of acres of this crop are affected by different kinds of diseases. 7 million trees are almost ruined and many million more are under attack by root diseases, leaf diseases and other kinds of diseases. The Minister is nodding his head because he perhaps thinks that his action in taking the research aspect from the Committee to the ICAR will meet this problem. On that particular point, I am also in a mood to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend, Shri Samanta. I am not an expert; if the Minister tells me that on the problem of research to help this crop, the ICAR can do something much more wonderful, of course, I am prepared for that experiment. But my point is that that is no justification for winding up this Committee, be-

cause, as my hon. friend pointed out very correctly, this Committee, when it was constituted in 1945, had before it certain objects, certain aims, which were primarily concerned with the development of this particular cultivation. It was during the British days, and even they had a perspective for the development of this particular crop.

14 hrs.

I am not particularly satisfied with the work of this Committee, there are many drawbacks, and actually this Committee ought to be strengthened much more, they should be given much more funds, much more powers. During these 20 years the crop has increased by nearly 45 per cent, and we are now producing annually 500 crores of coconuts in this country, but still every year we are importing coconut oil and copra worth Rs 10 crores from Ceylon, Malaya and Philippines. So, every effort should be made to develop the cultivation of coconuts in the homeland of coconuts, Kerala, itself and in many other States including that of the Minister. He himself knows that his State comes second among the six States in India which have taken to coconut cultivation. So, instead of helping this Committee, strengthening it to get over these difficulties, the Minister is now winding it up, and he himself is not taking up the responsibility in any way for the development of this crop. That is my main point. He says that the State Governments are there, but an agency in between the Central Government and the State Government, a liaison,—for example, there were cells of research that you may conduct in a co-ordinated manner or in any manner in the ICAR—is much more needed today than at any time before.

Of course, there is a bait that is given to us, an advisory committee, a development council. I do not consider it anything more than a bait. Because there was so much of protest and agitation by the public against the winding up of this Committee, they

are coming out with this proposal of a development council. It is going to be a bogus organisation. Please do not waste money over such committees for God's sake. So, what you should do is to strengthen this Committee at least to look after these two sides of development and marketing.

As far as development is concerned, I do not have time to go into details, but so much of work has to be done. Credit should be given to this Committee for their efforts in the last 20 years. They started lots of nurseries, and 84 lakhs of seedlings were distributed among the cultivators, which is not a small matter. Actually, the main drawback of our coconut cultivation is that it is thoroughly unscientific. People had some seedlings somewhere which were rotten, nothing came out. It will be very interesting to you also to know that our coconut production compared to any other country in the world is very meagre. I have some statistics with me. In Kerala, which is the land of coconuts, we produce per tree on an average 30 nuts per annum. Of course, Madras is much better compared to Kerala, and even there it is not more than 60 nuts per year per tree, while you should know that in Philippines the average is 200 per tree per year. Why does it happen? Not because our people are not doing their best to grow, but because they do not have the money, the manure, good seeds and all these things with them.

Some little work was done by this Committee through its nurseries. They distributed 13.27 lakhs of seed nuts to neighbouring States mainly from Kerala. Then, as far as this pest control is concerned, fight against leaf disease and root disease is concerned, some little effort was made. Of course, it was not at all satisfactory. When Dr. Ram Subhag Singh was in charge of this particular department, we were happy that, although he comes from Bihar, he was taking a lot of personal interest. We had asked many questions on the floor of the House, and he himself took pains to

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

consult some of the experts in FAO about this particular problem, and some research work was also being started. Even as far as research is concerned, although I do not want to contest it because I am not an expert, my fear is that this ICAR, which is a very highly centralised body, will not be able to give sufficient attention to the peculiar problems of particular crops. Unless Government takes care against this kind of difficulty, even research may end in failure, with all your good intentions, but leave that alone. But about development, my main point is that there is every need, every justification, for the continuance of a Liaison agency.

I do not know what use it is our making speeches here, because the Minister has made up his mind, Government has made up its mind. They have got a majority, and in spite of good friends like Shri Samanta who are unhappy about this resolution, it will be passed by this House. The Minister has taken time till 1st April, 1966. I would request him to bestow consideration on this problem during this period and see whether an agency capable of dealing with the problems of development, of extension and of marketing, an effective agency can be established.

The Minister should please excuse me for feeling worried over this problem because I am coming from a people who today are getting some kind of help from this Committee and its various agencies in our State.

Shri C. Subramaniam: You are satisfied with that?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I am not, I made it very clear, and that is why I wanted more strengthening of this institution. If I were satisfied, of course that would not have been my position.

Again the Minister will excuse me for sounding a note like this because this is our life problem and others also

should be concerned about it. I may tell him that Kerala lives if coconut lives, Kerala dies if coconut dies. So, on this particular question of the coconut, its development and its future, I would like the Minister to give serious consideration to the question of maintaining an institution capable of taking care of the interests of coconut cultivators in Kerala and in other parts of India.

Shri A. S. Alva (Mangalore): Some of the arguments put forward by Shri Vasudevan Nair are really sound, but, as the Minister remarked, the scientific and research aspects of these agricultural products have been taken over by ICAR, and there is absolute necessity for it at this stage because we have been following the traditional methods of cultivation not only in coconut but also in other commodities and have not cared much for the research aspect of it. Generally, when there are pests or other kinds of diseases, they wipe away the trees and cause lot of havoc. We have not bestowed much attention on this. As a matter of fact, these committees were also entrusted with the aspect of research till now. All that has been taken over by ICAR now, but in marketing and development of these commodities, the advice of the new Committee will be available.

Our agriculturists are paying great attention to these different kinds of commodities and they are also trying to invest money, especially in coconut, arecanut etc. As such, a popular element, especially these who are well versed with and have got an interest in these commodities, must also be associated, in the matter of Development of Marketing. While constituting the development committee, government should consider, irrespective of whether one is a member of a legislature or not, only those persons who have got real stake in that and know something of the subject. The committee should also be strengthened; it should not merely be an advisory body which sits for one half day or two half days

in a year but it should actively consider these aspects on marketing and development. If that is done, I do not think that there can be any serious objection to abolish the present committees. On these grounds, I support the resolution.

Shri Iqbal Singh (Ferozepur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, these committees were multi-purpose committees looking after not only research but development and marketing also. It seems that the other similar committees are also going to be abolished. Now, research is more or less a matter for the scientists and there cannot be two opinions whether it is looked after by the ICAR or these committees. But with regard to the other aspects, I should say that these committees are doing useful work. These were actually forums where the growers actually ventilate their grievances against the administration or the research worker, where they can say whether the research results were in reality as were claimed by the scientific workers as put to test in the fields. Everything may be exaggerated and scientists are no exception; so the results of science have also to be put to test in the fields by the growers and peasants. Apart from that, I do not think it is correct to take a decision like this in respect of the development and marketing sides. These committees were doing useful work. Some cess was levied. Now you are going to repeal that cess and create a sort of a small committee in the big agricultural department. In these committees we can say about the price, that peasants are getting a lower price. Now, as a peasant where should I go to say that or if I have some other grievance against the research worker? The development council will be a small committee. Will the people coming into that committee will be on their own right or they will be the choice of the Central Government or the agricultural department or the State Government. If the peasant is nominated by the State Government or this Parliament nominates some per-

sons and if it is only a small committee of the agricultural department it will not serve much purpose because the problem of marketing and development is important. We have got no objection for the research side being taken out given to that committee but there must be some forum to speak about the confrontation of the results of research with the actual user. Whether this is going to be a good forum for this will have to be seen in the future. But I feel that the development council will not command such respect and dignity as those committees some of which have got a history of 40 years behind them. Their decisions are respected by the present Minister but how can we expect that the same position will continue in the future also? Where is the forum to speak about the marketing problems, about the prices, about the medium industry or other industries which are based on agriculture? In my view the present set up of committees was much better than the new set up which is coming. But history will be the judge whether the Food Minister was correct in doing this. What we want is a place where the peasant can come and thrash out his problems in a really rational way, not in an emotional way. The experts, administrators and the growers and the middlemen should all sit and discuss together the problems and solve them. That is my point. If these committees are abolished, I think that point will not be looked into. That is what I wanted to say.

बी बड़े (बाराबंकी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, खाद्य मंत्री महोदय जो यह रेजोल्यूशन इंडियन कोकोनट कमेटी और इंडियन ग्रायल मीडम कमेटी को डिजोल्व करने के बान्से लाये हैं उन को मैंने देखा है। उनके रेजोल्यूशन का मकसद इन दोनों कमेटियों को गैरकानूनी करना है, खत्म करना है। इन दोनों कमेटियों को खत्म करने के बान्से उनको पानियामेंट के सामने घाना पड़ा। मैं वो

[भी बड़े]

समझता हूँ कि इन कमेटियों ने काम अच्छा किया है लेकिन अगर अच्छा काम उन्होंने न भी किया हो तो क्या कमेटीज को एवालिश करने से काम अच्छा हो जायेगा। ऐसा कहना तो वही हुआ जैसे "ए बंड कारपेंटर क्वारेंस विद हिज टूल्स।" वह तो बीसा हिन्दी में कहावत है "ताब न भावे घांगन टेंडा" को बारिताय कल्ला हुआ। बूँकि इन कमेटियों का काम बरोंबर नहीं हो रहा है इस वास्ते इन कमेटियों को एवालिश करके दूसरी कोई कमेटीज तैयार करना क्या यही उद्देश्य है। मैं ने जब यह रेजोल्यूशंस देखे तब मन में एक इस तरह का संशय पैदा हुआ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे पास यह रिपोर्ट थीक ही एग्रिकल्चरल रिसर्च रिव्यू टीम 1954 की है। मेरा यह कहना है कि जब मैं यह क्वार्टर इंडो-अमेरिकन टीम इस तरह की एक कमेटी 1954 में मुकरर हुई थी। उसने रिपोर्ट भी दे दी ता यह इतने साल तक हमारा शासन उस बारे में क्या करता रहा? उस के बाद मैं फिर सन् 1959 में एक कमेटी नियुक्त हुई। सन् 1959 में a second joint Indo-American team was appointed to review the agricultural position etc. 1954 में एग्रीजेंट होने के बाद सन् 1959 में फिर रिव्यू कमेटी एग्रीजेंट हुई। उस रिव्यू कमेटी ने सन् 1959 में अपनी रैकमंडेशंस की थी लेकिन गवर्नमेंट ने 1963 में फिर एक कमेटी नियुक्त कर दी थीर मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह से एक कमेटी के ऊपर दो, दो कमेटी बिठा कर शासन ने कुछ देश का फायदा नहीं किया है। सन् 1963 में

for further exploration of the details of the research the Government of India appointed the present agricultural research review committee on October 31, 1963.

1954, 1959 और 1963 में अलग-अलग रिव्यू कमेटीज नियुक्त की गई। 1964 में रिपोर्ट आई थीर अब 1965 में शासन की तरफ से यह रेजोल्यूशंस आया है। एग्रिकल्चर, उस की रिसर्च और प्रोडक्शन के प्रति शासन की उदासीनता और लैगर्जी के कारण ही आज देश में यह फूड क्रइसिस पैदा हुआ है। अब तब हमारे देश में भमरीका से पी० एन०-480 के अन्तर्गत गेहूँ आता रहा है। इसलिए शासन यह सीचता था कि इस बारे में कुछ करने की जरूरत नहीं है। अब जब भमरीका ने हाथ खींच लिया है और कहा है कि हम पी० एन०-480 के अन्तर्गत गेहूँ नहीं देंगे, तो शासन हम इस विषय में कुछ करने को मजबूर हो गया।

हम सब जानते हैं कि हमारे देश में हर चार घाटीयों में से एक सूखा रहता है और हर चार घाटीयों में से दो मेलन्यूटीशन से भरत हैं। यह बात इस रिपोर्ट में लिखी हुई है। हमारे देश में रस, बाढ़, बरफ, बाइजी भूखे रहते हैं, इस का कारण यह है कि शासन ने एग्रिकल्चर की तरफ पूरा ध्यान नहीं दिया है।

शासन की धीर से इस सम्बन्ध में बताया गया है कि उस का उद्देश्य डेवेलपमेंट है। डेवेलपमेंट में रिसर्च तो होनी ही चाहिए, प्रोडक्शन की रकबिलिटी अच्छी हो, यह भी आवश्यक है, लेकिन साथ ही साथ क्वार्टिटी की तरफ भी ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए। हमारे क्षेत्र में कौन क्राफ्ट धीर फूड क्राफ्ट का लगावा होता है। हमारा पूरा क्षेत्र कौन क्राफ्ट के लिए निर्धारित कर दिया गया, लेकिन वहां पर स्थिति यह है कि वहां पर न कौन क्राफ्ट है धीर न फूड क्राफ्ट है धीर वहां के लोग शासन को कह रहे हैं कि

हमें ज्यादा धनाज दो, "लेकिन घर में नहीं दाने, धम्मा चली खाने"—सेंटर के पास दाने ही नहीं हैं, इसलिए वह कैसे है ? इसलिए इन सब बातों की तरफ ध्यान देते हुए इंफ्लेमेंट को विशेष महत्व देना चाहिए ।

कमेटी ने जो काम किया है, उस के लिए मैं उस को धन्यवाद देता हूँ । उस ने प्राइवेट के लिए अच्छा बीज देने की व्यवस्था की, जिस से प्राइवेट की रैवाबार अच्छी हुई और ज्यादा तैल निकला । इसी प्रकार काटन के सम्बन्ध में भी बहुत अच्छा काम किया गया है ।

इस रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि सेंटर की तरफ से पर्याप्त फंड नहीं मिले, जिस के कारण रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट एक लावारिस बच्चे की तरह इमारत किया गया । इस बारे में स्टेट जाती है कि सेंटर से ऐसा नहीं धोया और सेंटर कहता है कि यह स्टेट की रैस्पासिबिलिटी है । इस रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है :—

"Uncertainty of career prospects in agricultural research tends to be aggravated by the temporary nature of the grants made by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), the Commodity Committees of the Government Plan Schemes, under which much of the research in some States is done. We were assured that in practice scientists seldom find themselves out of work because of the termination of the grant. If one grant is not renewed, they will be employed under another. Nevertheless, we feel that temporary grants are too often being given where continuous support is required for development of long-term programmes. And that the system is unsatisfactory, from the point of view of the temporary

employee who tends to become pre-occupied with the search for an established post to the detriment of his research."

रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट में स्थिति यह है कि रिसर्च करने वालों को इस बात की चिन्ता रहती है कि उन को पगार मिलेगी या नहीं । इसी कारण हमारे यहां उचित प्रकार से रिसर्च का काम नहीं होता है । सरकार को-आडिनेशन करती होगी, लेकिन यह प्रत्यक्ष है कि इन संस्थाओं की तरफ बराबर ध्यान नहीं दिया गया, बल्कि यह स्थिति न पैदा होती । यहां तक को-आडिनेशन का सम्बन्ध है, बहुत ही मिनिस्ट्री में भी नहीं है । हमारे यहां फूड मिनिस्टर प्रभु है और एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर प्रभु है । यद्यपि यहां फूड और एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर एक ही हैं, लेकिन पानी और नहर के लिये राब साहब के पास जाना पड़ता है । पीने के पानी के लिए हेल्थ मिनिस्टर के पास जाना पड़ता है । यहां भी को-आडिनेशन नहीं है । धनाज की तरह पीने का पानी भी बहुत आवश्यक है, लेकिन सब जगह पीने के पानी की विकट समस्या है । पानी का निकट सम्बन्ध धनाज से है, धनाज का निकट सम्बन्ध सीकुर से है । इसलिए एग्रीकल्चर से सम्बन्धित सब विषयों के बारे में पूरी रिसर्च किये बिना ठीक डेवलपमेंट नहीं होगा ।

प्राइवरी रिपोर्ट में यह कहा गया है कि इस कौंसिल का नाम 'इंडियन कौंसिल ऑफ एग्रीकल्चरल रिसर्च' के स्थान पर 'इंडियन कौंसिल ऑफ एग्रीकल्चरल एंड फूड रिसर्च' होना चाहिए । केवल एग्रीकल्चरल रिसर्च से काम नहीं चलेगा । इसलिए फूड का प्रावधान भी उस के अन्तर्गत होना चाहिए ; इस बात का रिसर्च हीमा चाहिए कि कौन से खाद्यान्न के लिये कौन सी संयोजन अच्छी है । इसलिए मैं समझता

[श्री बड़े]

हूँ कि सब कमेटियों को तोड़ कर शासन की ओर से सब सत्ता को सेंट्रलाइज कर के अपने हाथ में लेने से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा।

उदाहरण के तौर पर मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि जब सुपर-फ़ास्फेट और फ़र्टिलाइजर को खेत में डाला जाता है, तो ज़मीन सिकुड़ जाती है और फ़सल सूख जाती है और पीली पड़ जाती है। काश्तकार चिल्लाता है कि उसकी फ़सल सूख गई है और फ़र्टिलाइजर काम नहीं करते हैं, लेकिन कोई भी जा कर यह नहीं देखता है कि ऐसा क्यों हो रहा है और फ़र्टिलाइजर के प्रयोग का क्या परिणाम होता है। हम ने प्रायः देखा है कि खेत में फ़र्टिलाइजर डाला गया, किन्तु पर्याप्त पानी नहीं दिया गया, तो हज़ारों एकड़ ज़मीन सूख गई और फ़सलें बरबाद हो गईं। कोई इन बातों की जांच नहीं करता है। स्टेट कहती है कि रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट सेंटर का प्राबल्य है और सेंटर कहता है कि यह स्टेट का प्राबल्य है। इस सूरत में रिसर्च का काम ठीक तरह से नहीं होता है। शासन को यह समझ लेना चाहिए कि केवल रिब्यू कमेटी और रिब्यू वर्मिशन बिठाने से कोई फ़ायदा नहीं होने वाला है। शासन इस समय इंतज़ा में पड़ा हुआ है, क्योंकि इस समय देश में खाद्य पदार्थों की समस्या बड़ी ज़्यादा है और कई क्षेत्रों में फ़ैमिन पड़ गया है। वह देश की जनता को प्रभावित करने के लिये कहता है कि हम कमेटियों को डिज़ाल्व करते हैं और एक सेंट्रल कमेटी नियुक्त करते हैं। लेकिन शासन ने इस बात की तरफ़ कभी ध्यान नहीं दिया है कि रिसर्च के परिणामों को काश्तकारों के लाभ के लिए कैसे इस्तेमाल किया जाए। उदाहरण के लिए शासन ने काउडिंग के प्रयोग की तरफ़ कभी ध्यान नहीं दिया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह तो भलग बात है। काउडिंग का इससे कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है।

श्री बड़े : मैं रिसर्च के बारे में कह रहा हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि काउडिंग के बारे में रिसर्च किया जाना चाहिए। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, शायद आप कभी किसानों के साथ नहीं रहे हैं। मैं किसानों में से आया हूँ और किसानों में रहता हूँ। रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट से मेरा निकट सम्बन्ध है। मुझे मालूम है कि चार तरह के काटन सीइज होते हैं। ट्यूब में डाल कर देखा जाता है कि किसी सीइज पर फ़र्टिलाइजर किस तरह काम करता है। यद्यपि शासन कमेटियों को तोड़ रहा है, लेकिन उन्होंने अच्छा काम किया है। उसको इस बात की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए कि रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट को पर्याप्त पैसे मिलें। उनको फ़र्टिलाइजर नहीं मिलते हैं, फ़ंडिंग नहीं मिलते हैं। इसीलिये यह काम ग़रब कर रहा है। जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, कमेटियों ने अच्छा काम किया है। उनको दोष देकर कि वे काम नहीं करती हैं, शासन सारी सत्ता को सेंट्रलाइज कर के अपने हाथ में लेने जा रहा है, लेकिन उस से काम नहीं होने वाला है।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। मालवे में गेहूँ ज्यादा होता है। पश्चिमी निमाड़ में काटन और प्राउंडेंट ज्यादा होता है। खानदेश में केले और भंगूर के अतिरिक्त कपास अच्छी होती है। मेरा सुझाव है कि उन्हीं स्थानों पर—भान दि स्पाट—रिसर्च करने के लिये इंस्टीट्यूट स्थापित किये जाने चाहिए। इस प्रकार की एक सेंट्रलाइज्ड कमेटी से यह काम नहीं होगा।

जैसा कि मैंने पहले कहा है 1954 में एक रिब्यू कमेटी नियुक्त हुई। उस के बाद 1959 में एक रिब्यू कमेटी बिठाई गई और फिर 1963 में एक रिब्यू कमेटी बिठाई गई। इस सम्बन्ध में इतनी देर क्यों

हुई, इस के बारे में मंत्री जी ने कोई खुलासा नहीं दिया है।

मंत्री जी का उद्देश्य अच्छा है। वह उद्देश्य सफलीभूत हो, इस भाषा और इच्छा के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

Shri C. Subramaniam: Sir, may I make a request that this subject may be taken up the week after the next, on the 29th, because I would not be here throughout the next week.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A few words may be said.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I thought many other relevant points may be raised.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the House has no objection, this subject will be taken up on the 29th, because he will not be here next week.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. The House will now take up non-official business.

14.30 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SEVENTY-THIRD REPORT

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Seventy-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 15th November, 1965."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Seventy-third Report of the Committee on Private Members'

Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 15th November, 1965."

The motion was adopted.

14.31 hrs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Bills to be introduced.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi is not here; he wants postponement.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi,

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL*, 1965

(Omission of Article 35A)

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi (Dharwar North): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi: I introduce the Bill.

14.32 hrs.

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) *BILL, 1965

(Amendment of First Schedule)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I introduce the Bill.