

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** From Laccadives.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Member may look into the report. The report will be made available to him. If he still wants to know anything more, he may ask me latter.

\*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—Contd.

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE—Contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now resume further discussion on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. Out of six hours allotted for these Demands, 2 hours and 10 minutes now remain.

How much time does the hon. Minister want to take?

**The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain):** One hour.

**An Hon. Member:** More than half an hour was taken yesterday by the hon. Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** That will all be taken as consumed from the time allotted to the Congress Party.

I will call the hon. Minister at 1.15 and then the Demands will be put to the vote of the House.

**Shri R. S. Murthy (Kakinada-Reserved-Sch. Castes):** As it is a very important subject, can the time not be extended by two or three hours more?

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members must know that we have already exceeded the time allotted by four hours. I am trying to make up for lost time but it is physically impossible to do so. If we still extend the time, I do not know how long we will have to sit.

Except for those hon. Members—three or four—who belong to Delhi proper, other hon. Members have come

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

from far off places. If I request them to sit for one hour more, it is impossible for me to get the quorum. Hon. Members have come at a lot of sacrifice to themselves and I do not know why should they not sit here. I am not hustling things, I am prepared to sit till twelve o'clock in the night (here, here). As soon as the clock strikes five, it appears that hon. Members get fidgety and want to go away. This is not the way in which we should proceed. Hon. Members, who have come here at very great sacrifice, represent eight lakhs each of the population of this country.

I agree that various interests have to be represented so far as Food and Agriculture Ministry is concerned. Various items compose the Food and Agriculture Ministry. But, all the same, in view of the fact that even at 3.30 I have to ring the bell for quorum I cannot extend the sitting till 6 o'clock.

Hon. Members may make up their mind. Let them think seriously about it tonight. Having made up their mind that they are prepared to sit for one hour or two hours more, if necessary, they should let me know tomorrow.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** Tomorrow is a holiday.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am surprised at this kind of technical objection. Tomorrow means the next day on which we meet.

**An Hon. Member:** What is the decision?

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no decision.

**Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the target set in the Second Five-Year Plan to be achieved in food production is 15.5 million tons and the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee, after having toured the country and having had intimate talks with the ministries concerned in the States, came to the conclusion....

**Mr. Speaker:** If hon. Members are prepared to sit till six o'clock today, I will extend the time for this Ministry by one hour. There appears to be half-an-hour discussion today. So, are they willing to sit beyond six, say, till 6:30?

If the House so desires, I will postpone the half-an-hour discussion to some other day. We will sit for one more hour today and that one hour will be allotted to the Food Ministry. The hon. Minister will now be called at.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya** (West Dinajpur): May I make a submission, Sir? In this matter, hon. Members representing those States in which the food position has become critical should be given a greater amount of time than those from States where it is not so. In saying this I should draw your attention to the case of West Bengal, where the food crisis has led to a ministerial crisis. Therefore, States like this should have more time than the other States where no such crisis has developed.

**Ch. Ranbir Singh** (Rohtak): Those who can produce more should be given a chance.

**Mr. Speaker:** Everything will be taken into consideration.

**Shri Thirumala Rao:** There is a gap between the target of additional production of food to be achieved as assessed by the Planning Commission and the assessment arrived at by the Foodgrains Committee. The other day the hon. Prime Minister, as the head of this Government, asserted that we must produce more food at any cost and the calculations arrived at after consultation with the various States by the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee must be belied. They must be proved to be not quite satisfactory or true by our own efforts. There is a gap between what the Central Government wants to achieve and what the actual capacity of the State Governments is. This gap has to be bridged. This lacuna has to be filled up by the Central Food and Agricul-

ture Ministry by taking vigorous steps to effectively improve all your plans and make the States implement your plans. I am very much diffident to come to the conclusion that with the machinery with which we have been functioning both in the States and in the Centre these targets could be achieved. Our Planners have been telling us that now agricultural production is nearly the base of the Second Five-Year Plan. Unless we produce and produce sufficiently to keep down the prices at a reasonable level the whole plan may suffer a serious unfulfilment of the desired targets.

We shall first consider the difficult position of rice and then come to wheat. The production of rice is somewhere near 26.85 million tons—so much of rice is produced all over the country. It is said that the rice position is difficult, but according to my calculations the wheat position is more difficult than that of rice, because we are only getting about seven lakh tons of rice from outside India. If we see the order of production in the country, we will find that the largest rice-producing State is West Bengal with a production of 4,145,000 tons of rice a year. Next comes Andhra. Third is Madhya Pradesh, fourth is Bihar, fifth is Madras, sixth is Uttar Pradesh and seventh is Orissa. Of these, West Bengal, if we exclude the responsibility of feeding Calcutta from West Bengal, can be sufficient. Andhra Pradesh is surplus. Orissa is surplus and Madhya Pradesh is surplus in rice. Though Punjab produces a small quantity of rice, it is still surplus in rice, because it produces more than it consumes.

If we take the seven lakh tons of rice, which we are importing from outside, we find that about five lakh tons was from Burma and two lakh tons from the United States last year and some other foreign countries. We will be able to bridge this gap. I want this House to consider whether it is possible for us not only to bridge this gap in rice production but also to improve substantially the

[Shri Thirumala Rao]

production in the rice producing areas. How is it being dealt with? We have been hearing about minor irrigation programmes. That is being insisted upon in so many ways. But the targets achieved are not commensurate with the noise that is being made about it.

If you see how a rice-producing State like Andhra is treated with regard to price structure and with regard to the implementation of other schemes with regard to minor irrigation, you will find that we do not know how to feed the cow that really gives milk.

From my experience I may tell you that a project in an area called Korringa in my district had been hanging fire for 20 years and could not be implemented until we were here in 1951. We forced its implementation and an expenditure of Rs. 20 lakhs has brought nearly 20,000 acres under cultivation today.

There is another project in my district called the Yeleru project, which has got now an intermittent supply of water for 30,000 acres. If you spend Rs. 3 crores, one lakh acres can come into production, and an assured supply of 60,000 tons of paddy can be guaranteed.

This scheme has been hanging fire in the archives of the Central Government. I hear that recently when the Andhra Government proposed that this scheme should be taken up as a flood-control scheme, the Planning Commission and their expert advisers in the Irrigation and Power Ministry advised that the scheme did not come under flood control, and therefore it should be dropped.

Similarly, there are several other schemes. If you accept the promise made by the Andhra Government that they will give you another five lakh tons of extra production if you give them Rs. 25 crores for implementing the minor irrigation schemes, a substantial portion of the rice deficit in the country may be wiped out.

So also with regard to Madhya Pradesh and Orissa. If intensive schemes of minor irrigation are carried out, there is no doubt that the production of rice will be augmented in that area.

Let us for the time being leave Kerala out of the Southern Zone. Kerala's demands for rice mount up from year to year as greater supplies are made from the Centre. There was a time when Kerala was satisfied with two lakh tons of rice. Its demand went up to three lakh tons, and now it has gone up gradually to five to six lakh tons today. Kerala depends on a lot of subsidiary food like tapioca, banana, jack fruit and several other things. Rice is also the staple food of that area but since it produces large quantities of dollar-earning spices and cash crops, that can be equated to the demand it makes. But the demand can be put down to the minimum level, up to two to three lakh tons a year of rice for Kerala.

With regard to Madras, an intensified production drive in the delta areas of Madras will enable the State to wipe out its deficit, and even if there is a slight deficit, it can be easily met by the neighbouring State of Andhra.

With regard to Mysore, its 50,000 tons rice deficit can be easily made up if its numerous tanks are kept in repair. Mysore with an area of 27,000 square miles has got about 25,000 tanks. If most of these tanks are kept in order, the 50,000 tons rice deficit can be easily wiped out.

The real problem with regard to rice is in parts of Bihar and Bengal. If the responsibility for feeding Calcutta and Greater Calcutta is removed off the hands of the Bengal Government, I think West Bengal, with the largest production of rice in the country of over four million tons, can be made to be self-sufficient in rice.

Therefore, I do not feel very diffident about meeting the total rice deficit in the country by increasing and

augmenting production in areas where rice has been produced from time immemorial

What is the most difficult part of the food administration? The total production of wheat is about nine million tons, and we were asked to import last year 2·8 million tons. Nearly one-fourth of the total production is being imported. We have to see the figures of production that are acting as a sort of drag on the total economy of food in this country.

The *per capita* production in all the States is not what it ought to be. In Bihar and in U.P., the *per capita* production of wheat has not improved considerably. Whatever be the effort—I do not know—made by the respective State Governments, they have been always a source of anxiety to the Central Government with regard to their total production of wheat. Bihar has proved to be one of the difficult States, whenever the country was plunged in a catastrophe with regard to the food administration. North Bihar is very heavily populated, and with insufficient communications, very many irrigation sources not kept in proper repair, it has always been a difficult part of the whole country. Unless the Central Government and the State Government pool all their resources in money and experience and administrative drive, Bihar cannot be made self-sufficient with regard to its food.

So also, the eastern part of U.P. is a sore spot in the economy of the whole country. It gives periodical headaches to both the Central and the State Governments, and unless the *per capita* yield of this area is substantially increased and all the modern conveniences of irrigation are brought to the door of the cultivator, there is no hope of augmenting the food production of this area.

During the deliberations of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee we have been told and we have seen that several of these tubewells have not

worked properly because there is a sort of lacuna or a stalemate existing between the cultivator and the administration. The administration calculates a certain amount of return on its outlay, the cultivator is not able to utilise the water at the rates offered by the administration. Then ensues a sort of stalemate which is not resolved by the administration and things are allowed to stagnate. The water is allowed to go without use. With regard to the big river valley projects also, there should always be a sort of co-operation and a parallel organisation as suggested by my friend Shri S. K. Patil. There should be co-ordination between these Ministries from the top to the bottom so that simultaneous efforts and simultaneous programmes are followed, so that once a dam is ready and water is allowed into the canals, it should also find outlets into the smaller channels which have direct access to the fields. Not only that. They must also train people who are not accustomed to that way of cultivation.

For instance, in Rayalaseema, they are all accustomed to dry cultivation, and water is given for the first time to the areas under the Tungabhadra scheme. There is no use the Planning Commission and the experts from here crying hoarse over the fact that a large quantity of water remains unused in that area. The method of cultivation there is different. You must take people who are well-accustomed and well-trained in the art of cultivation from the delta areas, settle them there, make them leaders of the area to see that the land that has remained uncultivated for a long time, the virgin land, is brought under cultivation as soon as possible.

It is said that to reclaim land not under cultivation, it takes three generations. The first two generations will lose themselves and destroy themselves in reclaiming the land and utilising all their resources in bringing the land to an optimum standard of production. It is only the third generation that reaps the benefits of

[Shri Thirumala Rao]

that cultivating experience. Therefore, it is no use finding fault with text-book theories not being properly executed and implemented on the actual land.

Then, dealing with Andhra Pradesh, I would draw the attention of the Food Ministry to the need for having a more considerate outlook with regard to the price structure. In the last two years we have subsidised imported food to the extent of Rs. 16 crores.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Rs. 25 crores, is it not?

Shri Thirumala Rao: Rs. 8 crores a year, that is the figure I got. For two years the subsidy is Rs. 16 crores. We have undergone this loss or subsidised the consumer to this extent and have paid higher prices for imported rice. I should say that Andhra Pradesh has got a surplus of four to five lakhs of tons; they have calculated it at six lakhs of tons. You fix up a price which is reasonable and acceptable at a round table conference with all the interests concerned, the Andhra Pradesh Government and the Central Government, fix a target of two to three lakhs of tons, offer that price and take these two to three lakhs of tons, and allow the rest to go to any part of the country where higher prices are offered. By suggesting this, I am not trying to put a spoke in the wheel of your administrative set-up here. I can give you the instance of khadi.

The finest khadi is produced in Andhra Pradesh, and the finest khadi which costs Rs. 5 or Rs. 6 or Rs. 10 a yard is exported in millions of yards to Bombay where it gets a higher price than in Andhra Pradesh. That is how the khadi industry is sustained in Andhra Pradesh. So also, you allow some of the cotton to go to the big merchant princes in Bombay who are earning huge profits by diverting the bajra-growing lands to cotton-

growing lands. Similarly, you should divert the Andhra rice to places where there is purchasing capacity and purchasing power and people can pay a little more; for instance, you can divert one lakhs of tons of Andhra rice either to Bombay or to Calcutta at a higher price, and take the remaining two to three lakhs of tons from the surplus area at a price agreed to.

12.32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

I remember very well how when Shri Prakasam was the Chief Minister of Andhra, in 1947-48, in a particular village which was hoarding rice, he offered Re. 1 or Rs. 1-8-0 a maund extra for paddy, and the result was that two lakhs of maunds were disgorged within twenty-four hours from that village. Similarly, I would suggest that if you are in such difficulties, you divert some of the huge amounts which you are spending by way of subsidy for this little extra payment, and you will be able to get the required quantity from these sources. You can encourage rice-growing in Orissa also in the same way, and also in Madhya Pradesh and Punjab.

I want to draw your attention to the fact how a huge price was demanded by Uttar Pradesh in 1950-52 for the rice produced there. They never parted with their rice until Rs. 24 or Rs. 30 a maund was paid for the surplus rice that was available with them. And that was carried all the way to the Travancore-Cochin State, where it had to be subsidised by the Government there to the tune of Rs. 6 to Rs. 10 a maund. This is the position with regard to rice.

With regard to wheat, I feel that a more concerted effort has to be made all over the country. The largest wheat-producing State is Uttar Pradesh; then come Punjab and Madhya Pradesh, and very little of it is produced in Bihar. We have to make

greater efforts to meet the deficit in wheat. I am afraid, whatever we may say about it, we have to depend for some time to come on some quantum of imports from outside countries with regard to wheat. That cannot altogether be dispensed with. And I am afraid the computations or expectations of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee are nearer to fact than any other estimate with regard to wheat.

Then, I would like to say a word or two about sugar production. I do not know where we are going with regard to sugar production. I believe we are aiming at a production of 22 lakhs of tons a year. In 1951-52, the figure was hardly 11 lakhs of tons. There is, I think, a sort of glut in the offing because the sugar prices are sagging, and in the world market it is difficult for us to compete effectively with countries that produce sugar at a lower cost. Still, we can rest assured that with the tempo of economic development in the country the consumption of sugar among the lower income groups is bound to increase. I believe that it is with that in view that Government have issued licences to sugar factories all over the country.

Andhra Pradesh is one of the very good sugar-producing States in India. The average sugarcane production in Andhra and in Deccan is more than 30 to 40 tons an acre, whereas the production of sugarcane in U.P. and Bihar which have the largest number of sugar factories has remained almost stationary, for a long time. In view of this, it is very necessary that the few factories to which licences have been issued should be enabled to come into existence as soon as possible by providing them with the foreign exchange content to import the necessary machinery. It is difficult to procure capital in an economy which is intensely agricultural. Andhra Pradesh is an agricultural State. It has been lagging behind in industrial development. Even today, when we are having the Second Five Year Plan, sufficient attention has not been

paid towards starting a fertiliser factory there. I do not know what the necessity is to have fertiliser factories at far off places like Nangal and Nellore. Here at your door, there is a consumption of nearly three to four lakhs of tons of fertilisers without inducement and propaganda; still you refuse to have a fertiliser factory near Bezwada or Hyderabad. I would request you to look upon the industrial advancement of Andhra Pradesh in the matter of sugar production and also fertilisers with some consideration.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): This House is naturally exercised over the need for increasing agricultural production. It is one of the greatest tragedies of this country that a predominantly agricultural country like ours has still to continue to bring food from outside and in a greater measure. I know that to some extent agricultural production has gone up, but that is not at all adequate to meet our needs. While it has gone up by about six per cent, what is required is a rise of something like 40 per cent. If that is not achieved, then our Plan itself will be in jeopardy.

There are many measures that have been suggested by hon. Members for achieving this, but I should like to focus attention on one or two important points. The first one may not actually fall within the purview of the Food and Agriculture Minister, but in view of the fact that it is his responsibility to see that food should be obtainable in large enough quantities in the country, I bring it to his notice. More than a thousand crores of rupees have been spent in large irrigation projects, and many of them are nearing completion or have been completed. But there is one very small matter of the greatest significance on which sufficient attention does not seem to have been bestowed, and that is in regard to the channels that are required to bring the water to the cultivator, and the help that has to be given to him to bring that water. Nothing has been done in this respect.

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

Something may have been done in some places, but in a large majority of cases, nothing has been done. I would request the Minister to look into this matter.

Periodical floods and droughts are making our position worse, and there is no doubt that in order to avoid starvation and death, we have had to spend large sums of money on relief expenditure. I am glad that in recent years, or I should say, during the last year, some of this expenditure on test relief work, as I have seen for myself, is being spent not only on roads but on putting up some bunds; but if these are to have any permanent value, then there should be some integration and co-ordination between those who know how to put up these bunds and those who carry out test relief works, because there is no reason why this money should be just frittered away.

I am glad that emphasis has been laid both by the Planning Commission and the Food and Agriculture Minister on minor and small irrigation works. I know also that the Minister wants that this should be worked on a war-footing, as do our Government. But I shall give you one or two illustrations to show how things do not happen as those who have laid down the policy want them to happen. Sometimes, there is over-simplification, and it is said that State Governments do not show enough initiative. It is true that State Governments might have to show more initiative. But this is what happens. Since I have not got sufficient time at my disposal, I shall give you just one illustration, and I shall take my illustration from West Bengal, because I know more about it than about other States; but I believe that the same will be the case all over India.

In pursuance of the decision to encourage more of minor irrigation schemes, the State Government of West Bengal was informed last Nov-

ember that if they were in a position to take up additional minor irrigation schemes which were capable of bringing immediate results and could give details of these to the Centre, the Centre would consider these for financial assistance, and even if they were not able to accommodate them from savings from their own schemes, the Planning Commission would be prepared to make additional provision for minor irrigation schemes. I understand that by the middle of December, five or six minor irrigation and drainage schemes were sent up costing—not very much—something over Rs. 2 lakhs. The State Government was informed early in January, to its surprise, that it was too late to think of taking up these schemes for 1957-58 and that Plan provision had not been made for 1958-59, and so these schemes could not be sanctioned.

Now, I am vitally interested in this, because I myself saw some of the areas in Malda and North Bengal, after having a talk with the Food Minister here, where minor irrigation schemes would make a tremendous difference to the food problem. When some of these schemes were sent up, this was the reply. I am sure the Food Minister himself does not want this, and yet these things happen. This is something that is happening not only in the Food Ministry, but, as I have said before, and I say it again, it is a fault in the administrative machinery. Until we get rid of these faults of the administrative machinery, we cannot go ahead rapidly with any schemes. There is no invidious distinction made regarding the Food Ministry; this is true of all Ministries. I would request the Food Minister that in this matter which needs to be tackled on a war footing, as he himself feels, a matter which vitally affects our food situation and the people, he should immediately think of putting up some organisation with powers to concentrate on these minor and small irrigation schemes, to see that the procedure of

reaction is smoothened, that the State Governments also take up schemes which should be taken up and they are given help, enthusiastic support and initiative. The illustration I have given shows that at the present moment, initiative is crippled. Even if you first enthruse them and try to make them do something, this is the kind of reply that is given at the end. I would particularly request the Food Minister because I know that he himself is vitally interested in minor irrigation schemes.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** But the Planning Commission comes in.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** The schemes came a little too late; none-the-less, we are taking up those schemes, and I will make money available.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** I thank him, but all the same the procedure needs changing.

**Shri Tyagi:** I wish I had also a chance.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now the hon. Member would require only less time.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** No. I want to talk on food policy. I was talking of food production so far.

In regard to food policy, I quite frankly confess that I do not understand why, when the country is in deficit and we have to bring food from outside, we do not face up to things. I do not blame Government for it. It is a position where people in this House, people outside, all, shy away from physical controls. When we are facing a deficit, when there are such emergent situations in certain parts of the country, I do not understand why enforcement of prices should be a paper consideration almost. The whole thing should be enforced properly. I say this as a preface before I speak about a situation that has arisen in West Bengal, about which, I think, a good deal of controversy has been raised and the issue is rather clouded at the moment.

**Shri Ranga:** The rest of the country should also suffer?

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** Shri Ranga speaks of the rest of the country. I certainly do not think—and I think Shri Ranga also does not think—that the cultivator should be defrauded of his legitimate earnings. I do not think that prices should be fixed taking only the consumers' interest into account; the primary producers' interest must also be taken into consideration. But that does not mean that some other persons should be able to benefit out of it. Therefore, the State has to intervene when we are facing such a deficit.

Now, I want objectively, without passion or heat, as some persons sometimes have been displaying recently, to discuss the food situation in West Bengal. It is known that West Bengal is 12 lakh tons in deficit, and the previous speaker has very rightly pointed out that if the requirements of Calcutta were looked after by supplies from outside West Bengal at least the rice consumption of Calcutta—it might be easier to deal with the situation. But that again would require physical controls which mean also rationing, distribution etc.—in big cities like Calcutta and Bombay.

Now, I want to bring to the notice of the House the picture that was drawn by one or two Members who were sitting on the Opposition Benches, who predicted that a famine worse than that of 1943 was going to occur in West Bengal in a few months' time. That was what they said last year. I would like to remind them of this, so that the situation that was facing West Bengal was certainly very critical. It is still critical. But to say that it has not been handled at all well, considering the limitations of the powers of both the Central Government and the State Government in regard to the matters to which I have just made reference, is wrong. Let us see how the whole matter stands



[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

One Member of the Opposition—a Communist Member—while speaking yesterday said that West Bengal had not brought into operation the Essential Commodities Act. What is the picture? In April 1957, West Bengal was delegated the power in regard to movement control. It was not given power regarding price control then. As a result, they brought in cordoning and issued permits to restrict the movement of rice and paddy to the Pakistan border. Licences were issued for rice and paddy transactions exceeding 10 maunds and the cordoning was first in some districts and then, extended to all districts. It was later found that this cordoning had a bad effect on the deficit districts because the free movement of paddy and rice could not take place to them.

Now, I am going to quote from a pamphlet issued by the West Bengal Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I want ten minutes more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No. I shall have to face others who are waiting.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: This is the first speaker from West Bengal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, I have already allowed one other Member from West Bengal earlier.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: In the issue of December 2, Report on the Present Food Policy, it says:

"We have tried to utilise such powers as have been given to us by the Central Government to procure stocks where possible. But it is obvious that no effective procurement is possible without control of all stocks of foodgrains. This control would necessarily mean regimentation and rationing, so far as food supply in the State is concerned".

They say control over all stocks of foodgrains. Does this show a callous attitude? Anyway, it was in January, and then on the 6th February, of this year, that the Central Government issued a notification by which prices were to be fixed. The West Bengal Government, after consultation with the Central Government, decided on a levy of 25 per cent on the rice mill owners in seven or eight districts where most of the rice mills exist. Before the enforcement order of the Central Government had come into force, they had tried or were trying to come to an agreement with rice mill owners, on a 75 per cent levy on an agreed basis. But, when this came at the Central Government suggestion they brought it to 25 per cent levy on controlled rates and that too for the eight districts. Before a month has elapsed, it is argued that the West Bengal Government have failed to enforce the Essential Commodities Act. It is easy to pass an order but it is not so easy to enforce it. When transactions below 10 mds. were allowed, those who took advantage of it tried to make it appear, transactions below 10 mds. Under such circumstances, how is it possible for the State Government in a month's time to do anything? How can they be told that they are not doing their duty? Because they have not had any evidence, how can we complain that they have not taken action under the Essential Commodities Act?

I agree with my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta, who said yesterday that food should be kept out of politics. I would also suggest to those who live in glass houses not to throw stones. In Kerala—I have not got the time to go into the details—is it or is it not a fact..... (Interruption.) I am forced to bring this. Is it or is it not a fact.....

Shrimati Bena Chakravarty (Bambhat): What is the position in Kerala?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order; stop-throwing is not wanted here at least.

**Srimati Benaka Ray:** I am not giving way. Is it or is it not a fact that the paddy purchased from Andhra by Kerala Government was at Re. 1/- per md. or Rs. 27/- per ton higher than what was paid by the Central Government at the same time. How did this happen? There may be a logical explanation. (Interruption.)

**Srimati Benn Chakravarty:** There has been a single complaint.....

**Srimati Benaka Ray:** Let me point out one thing. I believe in the adage that it is possible to fool some people for all time and all people for some time but not all people for all time. The issues may be confused at the moment. The Food Minister of West Bengal, with the Central assistance, has been trying to work under most difficult and trying conditions. Famine has been staved off in spite of the prophecies made here. But many charges have been brought and the Chief Minister—he was not allowed to speak in the Assembly—has said in a statement to the press in regard to permits and licences that these matters will be placed before the Assembly and the public as soon as they are collected. These are given by delegated authority in districts. Therefore, I suggest that it is necessary to understand the position without heat and we should not condemn and denounce anybody because it may help you politically today to do so. Food must be kept out of politics.

I would ask every Member of this House—we are all representatives of the people—to understand the difficulties the Government have to face. We ourselves have not asked for the bringing in of controls. (Interruption.) Without this it is no use blaming the Central or the State Government for not formulating a policy of effective price control, because the majority of us in this House have not asked for that. We should try to understand the

difficulties and help to try to overcome them. It is only through combined endeavour that this country will be able to eventually get over this deficit which faces us in the food situation by producing sufficient for our needs.

**Shri Halder:** (Diamond Harbour—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, India's transition from semicolonial and feudal backwardness to industrial progress and independent economic development is being imperilled by the crisis of agricultural production and the people's urge for national reconstruction is being frustrated by conditions bordering on famine. Happily, on the evaluation of the causes that have led the country to this impasse, there is a broad measure of agreement amongst the different parties and organisation maintaining divergent and even antagonistic views. It is the agreed opinion that agrarian reform is the condition precedent for the upsurge of agricultural production.

The abolition of intermediaries in land or, in other words, the zamindari abolition measures have removed the most outmoded system in our rural economy. Social transformation is not taking proper shape and our rural economy is languishing. It is primarily because the land reforms that have been passed in various States have not undermined the domination of large landowners in the countryside. The data on agrarian relation supplied by the Rural Credit Survey and the Agricultural Labour Enquiry reveal the perpetuation of the old order in our rural economy.

In the period between the two enquiries the First Five Year Plan, the abolition of zamindari and certain measures of land reform have been accomplished; yet the picture remains the same. These measures have failed to check the process of greater monopoly in land. According to the first estimate, ten per cent of the cultivators and according to the second

[Shri Halder]

five per cent of the population, possess one-third of the area under cultivation. An insignificant area between 10 to 15 per cent. of the acreage belongs to 3 per cent. of the cultivators according to the Rural Credit Survey and, according to the Agricultural Labour Enquiry, 86 per cent. of the population. It is an indication of the increasing concentration of land in the hands of a minority of landowners. Hence, there is the necessity for the abolition of the landlord's grip over the land and the distribution of the surplus land over a specified ceiling to the landless peasants. For the fulfilment of this purpose the ceiling too should be so fixed that the land of the working holders is not touched but the land of the non-working holders should be taken and distributed.

In recent years, eviction has taken place to a large extent and nowhere surplus land has been distributed to the landless peasants except in isolated cases. Apart from evictions, small peasants are losing land due to the credit crisis. In order to get credit they are forced to mortgage or sell their lands and the mortgage property is seldom restored. In consequence, land is passing out of the hands of poor peasants and getting concentrated in fewer hands, in the hands of the large land-owners including the top rich peasants. Hence, eviction under any circumstance should be prohibited. Small landholders including those who cultivate the land and share-croppers should be given permanent and heritable rights in the lands they cultivate. 'Small peasants owners will, in the immediate future, from the main body of cultivators', observed the Planning Commission in framing the Second Five Year Plan.

13 hrs.

The Planning Commission further maintained that "a rural structure based on peasants owners can meet the

requirements of food and raw materials of a growing national economy only if land is used with care, the advantage of cooperative work and organisation are fully utilised.....". Hence, whatever might be the degree of achievement through various measures and projects, no structural change in our rural economy has been brought about. The Fourth Evaluation Report on the Community Project had to confess it.

It must be recognised that so long as the peasant's purchasing power is looted by the trading monopolists with the full backing of the banking system, so long as rural credit is controlled by the professional money lenders, wholesale traders and big land-owners, and so long as the operation of the Community Projects and National Extension Schemes remain vested in the hands of die-hard bureaucrats, the desired goal can never be achieved.

The amount of Rs. 565 crores earmarked for agriculture and community development under the Second Five Year Plan is a sizable fund and can regenerate productive forces provided they are spent in a rational manner under the supervision of popular committees. Our country is facing an acute food crisis. West Bengal, Bihar, Eastern Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Orissa are facing famine conditions.

Shri Ranga: Orissa also!

Shri Halder: Our country is expected to import 3.7 million tons of foodgrains this year. The Foodgrains Enquiry Committee is of the opinion that imports to the tune of 2 to 3 million tons a year will have to be continued throughout the Second Plan period. This is a dismal picture of our food position.

Our irrigated area in 1955-56 was only 7.4 per cent of the net sown area, whereas the cultivable land at our disposal is nearly 200 million acres of

land which may produce large quantities of food-grains if they are reclaimed. Hence Government should try their best to irrigate those lands by minor irrigation projects and by reclamation works. A major stride in agriculture and food production is necessary to solve the food problem. Therefore the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee again emphasises on the role of the minor irrigation works both in respect of new canals and tube well irrigation. It has also been found that the irrigation potential is not being fully utilised by the farmer due to prohibitive water rates.

West Bengal is facing an acute food crisis, but the Government is callous on this matter. Criticising the reactionary and anti people policy of the West Bengal Government, the ex-Minister of Justice of West Bengal, Shri Sidharth Ray remarked:

"I am afraid that instead of taking an objective view of the matter and dealing with the problem, affecting our tillers of the soil in a practical manner, the party which happens to be in power prefers holding fun fairs and exhibition in the name of Kisan Conference where not only lakhs of rupees are wasted but where kisans are conspicuous by their absence."

**Shri Rang:** Lakhs of them are there.

**Shri Halder:** Hence my suggestion is that when thousands of people are coming to Calcutta in search of jobs, when thousands of people are waiting.....

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:** On a point information, will the hon. Member kindly say whether these lakhs of rupees were spent by the West Bengal Government?

**Shri Halder:** This was read by the ex-Minister of Justice Shri Sidharth Shankar Ray on the floor of the Assembly. I have only quoted a sentence

from the statement he read in the State Assembly.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The ex-Minister had the privilege of making a statement after his resignation.

**Shrimati Benka Ray:** Could that statement be considered here? If so, others could have brought up many other things.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** The hon. lady Member herself brought it up, I think.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:** The information that I asked for has not been supplied.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member shall have to be satisfied without an answer if the Member to whom the question was put is not prepared to answer it. I cannot force him; nor can the hon. Member himself. We cannot force any reply.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:** I submit to that, Sir. But if he does not reply, we can draw our own conclusions.

**Shri Halder:** In this connection I would like to mention that the Conference which was held at Kakdwip is in my parliamentary constituency. The Central Food Minister was also present at that meeting. The ex-Minister of Justice also made it clear that if the money that was being spent on these exhibition and conferences was utilised for minor irrigation works the peasants' lot could have been improved. But the Government did not take up those schemes and for their political ends they hold such conferences.

I would, therefore, request Government to pay a little more attention to these minor irrigation schemes and also reclamation of land. In this connection I would like to mention that nearly one thousand Central Tractor Organisation workers have been on strike for nearly a week or two. Government claim that by reclamation work they have reclaimed nearly 38

[Shri Halder]

lakhs acres of land for cultivation. But I cannot understand why certain amenities which are demanded by the workers are not given to them.

When thousands of people face a crisis, the immediate measures that the Government should take is the grant of relief, test relief, agricultural loans, distribution of seeds to the poor peasants. But what did the West Bengal Government do? They wasted so much money and rice though they restricted the consumption of rice in hotels and restaurants. In a Kakdwip conference, it is reported that they wasted food which can be sufficient for about a thousand people. It is also reported that one thousand delegates did not turn up in that conference but food was prepared for them. When our political leaders instruct us not to play politics with food, I also accept their advice. On the other hand, I request them not to play politics with food and gamble with it as the Food Minister and the Cabinet in West Bengal had done in the recent period.

Shri Ranga: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am rather surprised as to how it is that we are thinking in terms of a great crisis on the food front. Between four to five years ago, we were told that India was going to have a surplus in food, especially on the rice front. Therefore, we were asked to give our consent to a Bill to authorise first of all, the Bengal Government, and next the Andhra Government and also some other Governments, the freedom to export rice to other countries. What has happened within these four years? Why should we be faced with such a situation in which the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee had warned the country to be prepared to import 2-3 million tons of foodgrains from abroad.

This is an important question which we should all address ourselves to and try to give an answer. We cannot afford to do anything here and now but we have got to think about it and the

Government should give some consideration to it and place the necessary facts before this House and at some convenient hour.

One of the many things that has been responsible for this growing trouble is the unwillingness of the Government and the other parties in this country to deal fairly with the producers of food in this country. Asoka Mehta Committee has suggested to the Government to take early and definite steps to stabilise the food prices and assure to the peasants the payment of remunerative prices. Government had made so much on the appointment of this high power committee. The Ministers, one after the other, who complimented the Chairman of this Committee only say that the Government was still considering this major recommendation of the Committee and that it was not prepared to come to any conclusion so soon. This proposal has not been placed before the Government only in the last few months. It has been before the Government for the last 12 years, to say the least. There was the V.T. Krishnamachari Committee which made the same recommendation. Afterwards, there was the Agrarian Reforms Committee presided over by Kumarappa. That also made a similar recommendation. The First Plan also envisaged the possibility of fixing the remunerative price level for agricultural products, especially foodgrains. I can go on giving details like this. Still the Government is unwilling to come to this House with definite proposals in order to establish the necessary machinery to assure our peasants remunerative prices. It speaks very badly indeed of the statesmanship of the Government.

Secondly, several new campaigns have been inaugurated in the recent past in order to discourage our peasants from producing more and more. I do not know who inspired them but unfortunately a fear has got into their heads, in the minds of the 20 crores of our small holders out the 36 crores of

people in India who are all depending on agriculture, that their holdings would not remain in their possession. Various schemes have been propounded. It was said that a national campaign was going to be inaugurated in order to persuade our peasants to pool their lands to what is known as a co-operative farm. We know how persuasion has resulted in so many other countries about which our friends here to my right have been very keen. We know how it has resulted in coercion in actuality. Even recently, one of the leaders of the Opposition Party told the country that if a majority of the people were to be willing to go into the co-operative farm, the majority should be statutorily compelled to go into the co-operative farm.

Another campaign was started that they would persuade our peasants to place all their lands at the disposal of the village panchayats so that the village panchayat will become the new landlord and all these people would be made to work under the landlordism of the village panchayats. My friend who has just now preceded me was unhappy that the Government has not done enough to liquidate landlordism—a kind of anachronism of colonial economy. Is it not a fact that after we have gained freedom, we have been able to confer peasants proprietorship on tens of millions of peasants in U.P., Bihar, Bengal, M.P., Rajasthan and various other States? They are not satisfied with it. We are also not satisfied with it. We would like to go far ahead. So, it has been suggested that a ceiling should be fixed. It has been suggested by the Planning Commission and hailed by all the parties in the country. The question is this. Where is it to be fixed? Neither the Planning Commission nor the Central Government has been able to give a kind of assurance to our own farmers in the country as to where it is going to be fixed. Is it three times the basic holding or six times as later on thought by the Planning Commission? Or is it 5—10 times as suggested by the minority section of the Agrarian

Reforms Committee, to which I myself belong. There is no certainty about it. Naturally, you cannot expect the millions of our peasants in the country, in such uncertain circumstances, to be very enthusiastic about food production and more more of it.

Only last year, West Bengal somehow or the other seems to have influenced this House in a very queer way. We were told that the prices were soaring high. So, the Finance Minister was in a fright. He issued SOS orders to the banks not to release any more funds and to withdraw whatever funds that were granted to the dealers, factory owners and some landlords also in West Bengal. Just now, Shrimati Renuka Ray was telling us how all that terrible price crisis bordering on famine was staved off. It could have been staved off without the Finance Minister coming unnecessarily into the market and frightening people there and withdrawing the credit given to the food market. The wonder of it is that instead of worsening the situation, the crisis was overcome. Why? Only the other day, the Prime Minister was saying that he was not prepared to agree with Shri Asoka Mehta in suggesting that we should be depending upon imports all the time. He was also confident that very soon India would be able to become self-sufficient in food. I am inclined to agree with him, especially because only four years ago we were more than self-sufficient in food and it should be possible for us once again to achieve that position. The only thing is, seasons must be favourable and the policy of the Government towards the peasants must also be reasonable, liberal and statesmanlike.

In regard to these, one is under our own control, and that is the policy of the Government. It ought to be under our control. Unfortunately, my hon. friend Shri A. P. Jain, who has been saddled with this very onerous responsibility of feeding the people without at the same time starving the growers of food, is not in complete control of all the social sectors that

[Shri Ranga]

ought to be controlled in order that this situation can be controlled.

Sir, the Asoka Mehta Committee said that we should import two to three million tons. Where does the truth lie? Somewhere in between. I do not really think that the Government has got full information of all the food that is being produced, consumed in the production areas and the surplus that are available and going into distribution in this country. Therefore, better statistics are needed.

Supposing we have better statistics and we find ourselves in not such an unfavourable situation as we think that we are, then what is it that we have to do? One or two suggestions have been made, for short-time period, like the development of minor irrigation works, tubewells and all those things. Do all that possible you can in that direction; but, in addition to that, let us also go out of our way—**if necessary**, set aside all considerations of prestige or face—and assure the 200 million small holders in this country that their peasant proprietorship is accepted by the Government, not merely as a matter of concession but as a matter of part of their own progressive policy. I would like the Government to make it very clear that peasant proprietorship is not considered to be standing in the way of development of a socialistic pattern of society.

Sir, the Government has so far recognised the existence of two sectors—the public sector and the private sector. I would like them also to recognise the existence of a third sector—more progressive than the private sector, and possibly more useful and more progressive too than the public sector—and that is, the self-employed peoples family column. This is not only to be confined to agriculturists; the four crores of people employed in our arts and crafts are also self-employed people. There is not much scope, that need to be talked about,

for exploitation in this particular sector. There is uttermost possible decentralisation in this. There is not much scope for bureaucracy also to play upon the credulity of the masses and exploit them. Such a sector ought to be encouraged and better developed.

—  
Within that sector, Sir, the peasants form not merely the fulcrum but also the major portion. These 20 crores of people to be given that particular assurance. Till now that has not been given. Unfortunately, the Government has been quite willing to give various assurances to the private sector. The Prime Minister and various other Ministers also were too anxious to go to Calcutta or Bombay, go to their conferences organised by different groups—in Delhi too—give them all sorts of assurances, invite their co-operation and be extremely careful not to abuse or accuse them. Only the other day, the Prime Minister came to this House and announced concessions to the textile millowners because they were badly hit. But what were the Government doing when our peasants were being badly hit? What are they doing even today?

Sir, I am just now coming from Andhra. I can assure my hon. friend, Shri Jain, that lakhs of tons of rice are lying with the growers—this is not the state of affairs with rice millers—waiting for somebody to buy. The rice millers are not prepared to buy because they do not have money to advance to the peasants. The rice millers do not have money because the banks were ordered by the Treasury Benches—it does not matter which particular member—not to advance any money to the rice millers. Even if the rice millers buy rice with their own resources, there is nobody to buy from them.

They say there is crisis in Bengal. They say there is deficit—we are not allowed to go there. My hon. friend, the Deputy Minister from Kerala State

says there is deficit. I do not know what is wrong. I think they do not seem to be paying.....

**Shri A. P. Jain:** We have already bought two lakh tons and paid more than Rs. 8 crores.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** There is more; let us have it.

**Shri Banga:** There is very much more. Therefore, what ought to be done is for my hon. friend to revise his price structure and price policy. He made a sensible statement, if I may venture to say so, last time when he said that unless we are prepared to pay a remunerative price, a decent price to the growers, we cannot expect more and more production and ready response in the supply of it. He only said that, but he is not prepared to implement it.

So far as surplus production areas in Andhra are concerned, Shri Thirumala Rao has already made a very sensible suggestion. I made that suggestion last September, and I was taken to task by this Government saying that I was going on a war path against this Government. What is it that I have said? Let the hon. Minister go into conference with the Andhra Minister, not only the Andhra Minister but the Andhra Ministry as a whole, and also the millowners, growers and their organisations including the organisations propped up by my Communist friends, and then come to an agreed conclusion as to the reasonable remunerative price that ought to be paid to the growers. The price that is offered to be paid now is not all reasonable, nor does it cover the cost of production.

I am glad that recently my hon. friend inaugurated a kind of a seminar here, for which I had been fighting for the last six years through the FAO Liaison Committee. I certainly hope that with the help of that particular seminar my hon. friend would be able to—in consultation also with Shri Krishnappa who presided over

an abortive enquiry that was instituted by Government in regard to cost of production—come to certain definite conclusions as to the cost of production of paddy, rice, wheat and various other crops. Based upon that, let them fix the price to be offered and not any arbitrary price that they think of. That is how they should fix the price.

It is not an honourable thing, a decent thing for a responsible and democratic government like ours to say that we have fixed a price which is the average of the prices that have prevailed in the previous four to five months. In an emergency that may be excused, not now. They are continuing that emergency policy. I would like them to revise their policy.

Sir, there are very many things that I would like to say but I would like to obey your mandate and, therefore, all that I have to say in conclusion is that, if only the Government were to take their responsibility to our peasants in as serious a manner as they have been trying to take their responsibility towards the private sector and the public sector, I feel confident that within the next three or four years—before the next general elections—it should be possible for our country to be able to say that it has become self-sufficient, that its peasants economy has been stabilised, that its peasants are happy, that its peasants have got an assurance that they are masters of their holdings, that they will be allowed to remain in possession of their holdings, that they will be allowed to encourage and strengthen themselves and, also, that they will be in the enjoyment of what is known as a remunerative price.

**श्री बिजबलाब राव (मनेसपुर) :**  
माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में खाद्यान्न की वार्षिक वृद्धि का लक्ष्य ५.४ रखा गया था और यह लुजी की बात थी कि १९५६-५७ में इससे भी बढ़ कर वर्षावृद्धि की सदी वृद्धि हुई। लेकिन उसके



[श्री विषयनाथ राय]

ठीक साल भर बाद, पिछले साल, जो हालत देश की धरा के बारे में हुई, वह सब लोग जानते हैं वह हालत थी और कैसे हुई इसके बहुत से कारण हैं, लेकिन एक बहुत बड़ा कारण यह है कि जैसे हमारे किसान के पास पैसा और साधन कम हैं, वैसे ही हमारी सरकार ने प्रकृति और बारिश पर भरोसा रख कर किसानों को ऐसी हालत में छोड़ दिया, जिससे वे पूरे साल के लिये बरबाद हो गये। यह कह सकते हैं कि सिंचाई और बिजली का विभाग धरा है और उसका साथ और कृषि से सम्बन्ध नहीं है, लेकिन उसके साथ ही यह सत्य है कि सरकार को जो यह जिम्मेदारी है कि आपत्तिकाल में, संकट में, विशेष परिस्थिति में लोगों को इस लायक बनाया जाय कि वह स्थिति का सामना कर सकें, वह उस जिम्मेदारी को पिछले दस साल से पूरा नहीं कर सकी। बहुत से ऐसे साधन हैं जो छोटे मोटे हैं, जिन के बारे में करोड़ों रुपये की आवश्यकता नहीं है, लाखों और हजारों रुपये से ही काम चल सकता है, उनकी तरफ हमारा ध्यान नहीं जाता है। वे विस्तृत हों, चारों तरफ फैली हुई हों, हर जिले और हर क्षेत्र में हों, तो मैं आश्वासन दे सकता हूँ कि सूखे की स्थिति तथा दूसरी तरह के जो संकट पैदा होते रहते हैं उनका अन्त हो सकता है और हमारी जो समस्या है वह हल हो सकती है। अब तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्वयं इस बात को माना है कि पिछले साल जो सूखा पड़ा वह साधारण नहीं था। वह ऐसी परिस्थिति का द्योतक था जैसी परिस्थिति डेबर्ट होने पर, रेगिस्तान होने के पहले या होने के साथ उत्पन्न होती है। अब तक जो कुछ हुआ तो तो हुआ लेकिन अब हमारी सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री के मुँह से जब ऐसी बात निकली है अब हमारी सरकार को और सास ठीर पर इस विभाग को उसका सामना करने के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये। चाहे

वे कृषि से सम्बन्ध रखती हो, चाहे सिंचाई से सम्बन्ध रखती हों या उन से धरा हों। लेकिन यह बात प्रथम है कि अगर हम हाथ पर हाथ रख कर बैठे रहें जैसा कि अब तक हम ने किया है और अगर हम उसी तरह से उदासीन रहे जैसा कि अब तक हम रहे हैं, तो हमारा काम चलने वाला नहीं है।

उत्तरी बिहार और पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश की सिंचाई के बारे में जहाँ सोचते हैं कि प्रकृति बनायास ही पानी देती है वहाँ की भी हालत ऐसी हो रही है जैसी रेगिस्तान की हालत होती है या हो सकती है। यह बात हमारी सरकार को भी माननी पड़ती है। ऐसी हालत में चाँदू हमारे छोटे मोटे कुँयें हों या छोटे मोटे रिव्यूएट्स हों जो कि हमें हिमालय से मिलते हैं, उनकी तरफ भी ध्यान न देकर हमने किसानों को एक दम ऐसे ही छोड़ दिया तो इस से लोगों को तथा सरकार को बड़े कष्ट और परेशानी का सामना करना पड़ेगा।

आप कह सकते हैं कि कोभोडिनेशन नहीं है और इस बात को इस सदन में भी उठाया गया है। उत्तर प्रदेश में तो खास तौर पर यह बात देखने में आई है कि कृषि किसी के पास है, सिंचाई किसी दूसरे विभाग के पास है, गन्ने की खेती का काम किसी तीसरे विभाग के पास है और बीनी का काम किसी चौथे के पास है। इस तरह से चार पांच मंत्रालयों में हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में यह, जो साक्षात् का काम है, बँटा हुआ है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके जरिये सरकार का ध्यान इस बात की तरफ आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ और इस तरह से जो बिन्दु हूए विभाग हैं जिन का संबंध आपस में बनिष्ठ होना चाहिये लेकिन सब एक दूसरे से धरा हूँ और जिन से अधिक धरा उपजायी योजना में कृषि

कमी है, उन को संयुक्त प्रयास करना चाहिये। वे संयुक्त प्रयास के लिए जो भी कबल उठावें, उसमें एकता धानी चाहिए। इस बात को मुझे सब से अधिक जोर दे कर उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में कहना है। वहां पर एक ही बात—कृषि तथा भ्रष्ट से सम्बन्ध रखने वाले जो मंत्रालय हैं उनकी संख्या पांच है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उस जोर सरकार ध्यान दे।

भ्रष्ट मुझे खास तौर पर दूधर केन, चीनी, गन्ना और गन्ना उत्पादकों के बारे में निवेदन करना है। मैं देश के एक ऐसे भाग से आता हूँ जहां पर चीनी की फैक्ट्रियां तो बहुत हैं लेकिन जो लोग वहां निवास करते हैं, वे बहुत गरीब हैं। वहां के गरीब लोग गन्ने की खेती इसलिये करते हैं कि वे भगान या मालगुजारी सरकार को दे सकें तथा अपने कपड़ों के लिये भी कुछ बचा सकें। अपने भ्रष्ट में कमी कर के भी वे ल हमारे देश के एक ऐसे उद्योग को बढ़ावा देते हैं जो हमारे देश का दूसरे नम्बर का उद्योग है। पहले नम्बर पर कपड़ा का उद्योग आता है और दूसरे नम्बर पर चीनी का जो रोजगार है, वह आता है। करोड़ों रुपये का गन्ना गरीब किसान देते हैं। लेकिन जिस समय उनको सूखे का, या बाढ़ या किसी दैवी विपत्ति का सामना करना पड़ता है उस वक़्त भी उन का करोड़ों रुपया मिल मालिकों के पास बाकी रह जाता है। हाल ही में मैं ने एक प्रश्न किया था जिस के उत्तर में गवर्नमेंट ने बताया था कि 1 नवम्बर, 1957 को करीब एक करोड़ एक लाख रुपया किसानों का मिल मालिकों के पास था। पूरक प्रश्न का उत्तर देते हुए यह कहा गया था कि यह केवल एक प्रतिशत था। यह एक प्रतिशत हो या उन से भी कम हो लेकिन वह एक करोड़ से भी अधिक था। यह रकम एक दो हफ्तों से नहीं-मता नहीं कि कब से चमी हुई थी। उपाम्यक महोदय,

भाप जानते ही हैं कि उत्तर भारत में कई के बाव सारी फैक्ट्रियां बन्द होती हैं। जो यह हासत थी वह पहली नवम्बर को थी। एक करोड़ रुपया भाप बतौर कर्ज के देते हैं और न सहायता के तौर पर। उन को 25 परसेंट सालाना सूद पर गांवों में रुपया लेना पड़ता है। बैंकों से उन को मदद नहीं मिलती है और अगर मिलती भी है तो केवल सहकारी यूनियन के जो कोओपरेटिव बैंक होते हैं उन के जरिये से और उसपर भी उनको पांच, सात या नौ फी सदी के हिसाब से सूद भ्रया करना पड़ता है। उनको सूद विवश होकर मिल मालिकों के यहां जो रुपया छोड़ना पड़ता है, उस पर उन को सूद नहीं मिलता है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर नहीं है? एक प्राथ साल की बात हूँ तो छोड़ दें। यह बात एक दो साल से नहीं लगातार पांच सात बरसों से हो रही है और ऐसी ही हालत चली आ रहा है। पिछले वर्षों में भने हा एक करोड़ की बात न हो लेकिन 60 लाख या 70 लाख रुपया और कमी कभी एक करोड़ से भी अधिक रुपया हो जाता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस ओर ध्यान दे। ये लांग एं हैं ज बहुत गरीब हैं, जो पिछड़े हुए इलाके में रहते हैं और जिन का हालत अच्छा नहीं है। यह इलाका चीनी आवादी का इलाका है और यहां पर प्राकृतिक आपदाएं भयः आता हो रहती हैं। वहां पर इतने अधिक रुपया बाकी पड़े रहना हमारे सरकार के लिए सोभा नहीं देता है।

कहां तक उन को उचित दाम मिलता है और कहां तक नहीं मिलता है? उस को भी भाप देखें। जो आर्थिक भ्रष्टाचार हमारे देश में है या कृषि से सम्बन्ध रखने वाला जो आर्थिक ढांचा हमारे देश में है, उस में उनको जो मिलता है वह उचित है या अनुचित, इस पर भी आपका ध्यान होना चाहिए। चीनी का माल चाहे बढ़ जाय, इस से उस का कोई सम्बन्ध स्थापित नहीं

[श्री विश्वनाथ राय]

किया गया है। तीन चार साल पहले इस बात को उठाने पर सरकार ने इस बात को माना था कि हम उन को भी हिस्सा देंगे। स्वर्गीय श्री रफी अहमद किदवाई साहब ने भी कहा था कि उन को इसका हिस्सा दिया जाएगा। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस में भी अभी तक कोई खास कामयाबी नहीं मिली है। सब से बड़ कर जो मौलिक बात है वह यह है कि जो गन्ने की खेती करते हैं, उन के गन्ने की जो दर होती है वह दर न तो चीनी के भाव को ध्यान में रख कर निर्धारित की जाती है और न खाने का जो दूसरा अन्न है, उस के मूल्य के हिसाब से तय की जाती है। अगर केवल यही मान लिया जाता कि उस की खेती में कितना पैसा लगा है तो भी यह संतोष की बात होती। सरकार के पास दो तीन नहीं अनेकों फार्म हैं। इस के फार्म को छोड़ कर सरकार के पास एशिया का सबसे बड़ा फार्म उत्तर प्रदेश की तराई में है। वहां पर जो कास्ट आफ कस्टीवेशन होती है उस को ध्यान में रख कर अगर भाव तय कर देने तो यह एक तथ्य की बात होती वास्तविकता की बात होती। आपके हर मूबे और हर जिले में कृषि के स्कूल हैं, और कहीं कहीं पर छोटे मोटे सरकारी फार्म भी हैं। वहां पर जो व्यय होता है, गन्ने की खेती में उसको लेकर अगर हिसाब लगाया जाता तब भी यह होता कि चलो आप किसानों की बात सोचते हैं। लेकिन यहां पर बैठ कर भाव तय कर लिया जाता है। मलाह देने के लिए आप के पास विशेषज्ञ हैं जो गन्ने के बारे में ही नहीं बल्कि अन्न के बारे में हर तरह से सुझाव आपका देते हैं। लेकिन यह नहीं देखा जाता है कि कितना धन खर्चता है, कितना अन्न लगता है, कितनी पूंजी लगती है। इन चीजों को देखते ही नहीं और यहां पर बैठ कर भाव तय कर देते हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों गवर्नमेंट

इस बात को टालती रही है? जब आपके पास विभिन्न राज्यों में, विभिन्न जिलों में सरकारी फार्म हैं तो आप उन के हिसाब को लेकर क्यों नहीं देख लेते? क्यों आप इस को टालते हैं? दो तीन वर्षों से वर्तमान मंत्री महोदय कह रहे हैं कि उस के बारे में विचार हो रहा है लेकिन अभी तक वह बात तय नहीं हुई है। दो चार लाख किसानों की बात होती तो दूसरी बात थी लेकिन यह तो सारे हिन्दुस्तान के दो करोड़ किसानों की बात है जो गन्ने की खेती करते हैं। उनकी हालत भी अच्छी नहीं है। उनकी तरफ ध्यान देना और जल्दी करना आवश्यक है। यदि आपने ऐसा न किया तो उत्तरी बिहार पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश और देश के अन्य हिस्सों में जहां पर गन्ने की खेती करने वाले लोग हैं, उनकी हालत बहुत खराब हो जाएगी। इस लिए जो उन के हित की बात है वही आपका करनी चाहिये।

यह बात केवल गन्ने की ही नहीं है। मैं एक दूसरी बात की तरफ भी आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ और वह तिलहन की बात है। दुनिया में जो तिलहन की पैदावार है उस का पांचवां हिस्सा हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा होता है। जहां तक मूंगफली की बात है सब से अधिक मूंगफली हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा होती है। इन निम्नहनों में तिल, सरसों, रेडो, मूंगफली महत्व की वस्तुएं हैं जो लोग इन चीजों को पैदा करते हैं, उन की भी बहुत बुरी हालत है। इन लोगों को वे लोग जिनका काम किसानों को पैसा कर्ज दे कर काबू में कर लेना होना है, एक्सप्लायट करते हैं या जो सट्टेबाज होते हैं, वे इन को एक्सप्लायट करते हैं। हापुड़ यू० ी० की सब से बड़ी मण्डी है। वहां पर दो तीन महीने पहले तक सरसों का भाव ३० रुपये मन था। उस को गिरवा कर २१ रुपये पर ले आया गया यानी ३० परसेंट के करीब करीब भाव गिरा। इस के बाद जब किसानों ने अपना माल बेच दिया तो अन्न

तिलहन के भाव धीरे धीरे बढ़ रहे । यह एक साल की बाल नहीं है कई सालों से ऐसा होता आ रहा है । पहली पालियामेंट के समय में सरकार ने यह एलान किया था कि अगर ऐसी स्थिति पैदा हुई कि किसी श्रम का भाव बहुत गिर जायें तो सरकार उसकी खरीद शुरू करेगी । यही पालिसी सरकार तिलहन के बारे में क्यों नहीं अपना रही है ? सारी दुनिया के तिलहन का िचवा हिस्सा हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा होता है और उस के भाव अगर इस तरह में गिरा दिये जायें तो श्रमज्यी सरकार का ध्यान उस श्रम जाना चाहिये ।

इस तरह में जो क्रीमत नीचे ऊपर जाती जाती है उस को रोकने के लिये हमारे वर्तमान मंत्री महोदय ने भी प्रयास किया और उसमें वह कुछ आगे भी बढ़े हैं । बड़े २ गोदाम कायम किये गये हैं लेकिन उस दिशा में जितना काम होना चाहिये उसमें कम हुआ है । सरकार को इस श्रम अधिक ध्यान देना चाहिये । किसान हमारे भारतीय समाज की बैंकबान हैं और इस नाते यह बहुत जरूरी हो जाता है कि इस देश को तरक्की और खुशहाली के रास्ते पर ले जाने के लिये किसानों की आर्थिक अवस्था में सुधार किया जाय, उनकी हालत बेहतर बनाई जाय और उनको सिंचाई, बीज और पैसे आदि का प्रोत्साहन देकर इस देश का खाद्य उत्पादन बढ़ाया जाय क्योंकि खाद्य उत्पादन पर ही इस देश की समृद्धि निर्भर करती है । यो मोर फुड, अधिक श्रम उपजाओ के नाते लगाने, पंक्-लेट्स बाटने और सभायें करने में यह काम पूरा होने वाला नहीं है । देश में उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये हमें सक्रिय क्रम उठाने होंगे और किसानों को सिंचाई, खाद, बीज आदि की सुविधायें प्रदान करनी होंगी । जब तक किसानों को ये सुविधायें नहीं मिलेंगी खेती के अलावा उसके पास कोई दूसरा साधन नहीं है । यह स्पष्ट है कि अगर उसको उसके लिये तमाम जरूरी सुविधायें

नहीं मिलती हैं तो वह विषय हो जाता है और उसके पास इसके सिवाय और कोई चारा नहीं रहता है कि वह गांव को छोड़ कर मजदूरी की तलाश में शहर चला जाय । हम देखते हैं कि हमारे किसान गांव छोड़ कर दिल्ली, कलकत्ता और बम्बई जैसे बड़े २ शहरों को आते हैं । गांवों में चूक उन्हें सुविधायें उपलब्ध नहीं हैं इसलिये वे शहरों में आ रहे हैं और इस में शहरों की आबादी बढ़ रही है । अगर सबसूच ही आप अपने समाज की श्रम अपनी आर्थिक व्यवस्था की उन्नति करना चाहते हैं तो केवल स्टील और एटॉमिक एनर्जी में यह उन्नति होने वाली नहीं है । हमें अपने देश में कच्चे माल का उत्पादन भी बढ़ाना होगा । आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि इस श्रम सरकार ध्यान दे और कच्चे माल का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये सक्रिय क्रम उठाये जाय । अगर हम श्रम भी न चेते और अपने देश में खाद्य पदार्थ और कच्चे माल के उत्पादन को न बढ़ाया तो हम जहाँ आज हैं वही पड़े रहेंगे । पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना के आरम्भ से अब तक हमने विदेशों में ११ अरब रुपये का गल्ला मंगाया है । अगर हम देश को वाकई खुशहाल और समृद्ध बनाना चाहते हैं तो इस बात की जरूरत है कि हम विदेशों से श्रम मंगाना बंद करें और स्वयं इस दिशा में आत्मनिर्भर बनें ।

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi (Ludhiana):  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, looking at the demands of the Food and Agriculture Ministry and comparing them with the demands of developmental schemes of other Ministries, I confess my disappointment. I feel that the necessary emphasis is not being placed on the agricultural economy of the country, when it is recognised by now that agricultural prosperity alone can be the foundation of all developments of the country, whether in the agricultural sector or the industrial sector. There might have been a

[Shri Ajit Singh Sarbardi]

doubt at one time in the last ten years as to what kind of economy is to be adopted in the country, but after the last crisis, I think there is a consensus of opinion that it is only the agricultural prosperity of the country that can be the foundation of the future development of this land. Looking from this aspect, I would respectfully submit that I feel that the necessary emphasis has not been placed on the agricultural sector in our development schemes.

It would be conceded that today also agriculture continues to make largest single contribution to the national output and if we look at the pattern of living also, 81 per cent of the population live in the rural areas. One of the basic tenets of the policy which the Agriculture Minister was pleased to lay down in one of his speeches is that the farmer should get a fair deal. I feel that is not being fulfilled and the farmer is being let down badly. What does the farmer want? He wants two things. Firstly, he wants incentive to grow more food and secondly, he wants means and facilities to grow more food.

Let us take the first aspect. Is he being given the incentive to grow more food? The main incentive is the price. So far the Government has not fixed a minimum price. Looking at the report of the economic survey of Punjab, I find that the net income per year of an agriculturist with a family of five from unirrigated area is Rs. 61.37 per acre whereas the income of the agriculturist with a family of five from irrigated area is Rs. 190.17 per acre. In this accounting of the expenditure, the report says:

"In these accounts, expenditure, in the first instance, is worked out on the actual conditions prevalent on each farm. Thus only the rent actually paid for land taken on lease, the actual wages paid out to hired labourers and the cost of manure purchased (if any) are

charged to cost and nothing is debited for the land owned, the work put in by family members, the manure (dung) produced by the farm animals and the capital invested in implements, livestock, well, etc."

Taking all these figures, what is the average income of the farmer in comparison to the industrial worker? Here I want to put a specific question to the hon. Minister. It would be conceded that disparity already exists between the income of a farmer and an industrial worker. This disparity has been accentuated in the first Plan. It has further been accentuated in the second Plan. How is this disparity going to be removed? What is going to be done in the matter of increasing the income of the farmer and bringing it along with the income of the industrial worker? That is the main point. I submit so far nothing has been placed before us to let us know how the condition of the farmer will be bettered and brought into level with the income of the industrial worker. I am not against the industrial development of the country. But I feel that agriculture, which is the foundation of our whole economy must also be developed.

I submit that agricultural economy needs emphasis and the farmer needs better protection. Therefore, the first and the foremost thing is that there should be an adequate price level, in order to give an assurance to the farmer that he is assured of a certain minimum price for his produce. That has not been done. The second thing is, not only there should be minimum fixation of the price, but there should be an assurance that he gets it. For that purpose, we have got the recommendation of the Foodgrains Inquiry Committee. The suggestion is also there that the trade in foodgrains should be taken up by the Government. Even if that is not done, we have got the community development

blocks and if the ambit of the activities of the community development blocks is enlarged and if they are entrusted with marketing of the produce as well as purchase of the necessities of the farmers, then the agriculturist will be assured of a certain price. When we have got the machinery, I cannot understand why that machinery should not be utilised to the maximum advantage. Therefore, my submission is that the farmer is not having a fair deal and no incentive is being given to him to grow more food.

I now come to the second aspect. What the farmer wants are the means and facilities to grow more food. Has he been given this? Here again I would submit that we have not given him a fair deal. Let us take the case of Punjab. 48 lakh acres of land are lying water-logged. My impression was that it is 30 lakh acres. Then, at one time, I spoke to the Minister and he said it is 40 lakhs to 50 lakhs. Later on, I was told, that it is 48 lakhs acres of land. Now so much of land is lying water-logged. Punjab has got schemes which will cost Rs. 7½ crores for draining all that water and bringing the land under cultivation. But the Central Government has placed at the disposal of the Punjab Government only a small sum of Rs. 77 lakhs for that purpose. My figures are subject to correction. I submit that money should be made available to the Punjab Government so that the scheme may be implemented and 48 lakh acres of land can be brought under cultivation to increase our food production.

I find from a press report that the Chief Minister in one of the rural conferences had stated that Punjab is losing nearly Rs. 98 crores in the matter of food production because of water-logging. You can imagine the colossal figure of food potential which we are losing—Rs. 98 crores—for which Rs. 7½ crores is a very small amount which could have been placed at the disposal of the Punjab Gov-

ernment to implement the scheme in order to drain away the water. But, nothing has been done. A very paltry sum of Rs. 77 lakhs has been placed at the disposal of the Punjab Government.

So, my respectful submission is this. If we want to look at this problem from a correct perspective, we should really devote our attention to the agricultural prosperity. I understand—here again my figures are subject to correction—that 9 million acres of land are lying fallow and another 60 million acres of land are cultivable waste. I do not say that we should not have intensive cultivation. But, extensive cultivation is also necessary. We should see that no land is left waste. By giving support to the farmer we can improve the food production; we can develop the food potential of the country. Only when we concentrate our attention on that aspect then, and then alone, will we have agricultural prosperity in the country. And when we have got agricultural prosperity in the country, we could certainly have the foundation for both industrial as well as agricultural development.

Take another aspect. The other day we heard the Minister of Irrigation and Power saying that there has not been a proper utilisation of the irrigation facilities. Where does the fault lie? It certainly does not lie on the farmer. Here again, leaving aside for the time being the bigger schemes for the purpose of irrigation, let us take the minor irrigation schemes. We have got the Community Development blocks. It is a very useful machinery which can be put to the use of bettering the condition of the agriculturist. Why not entrust all work to them?

Shri A. F. Jain: It has been entrusted to them. They have got allocation for irrigation and soil conservation.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadhi: I was looking into the minutes of the Sixth

[Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi]

Conference of the Development Commissioners. I feel that if all the schemes that they have decided upon on paper are properly implemented and the Community Development Blocks are entrusted with that work, India can be not only self-sufficient, but surplus in the matter of food. I disagree with those hon. Members who say that India cannot be a surplus country in food.

Shri B. S. Murthy: You are right.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi: I know that the Food Minister is trying his level best. But the Finance Minister is not placing enough funds at his disposal. From the report on Community Development, which has been given to us, I find that the amount allotted for development of agricultural schemes is quite insufficient. So, I submit that the farmers must be given means and facilities to grow more. In the matter of irrigation nothing is given to him. Financially, no support is given to him. In the matter of fertilizers, the situation is much worse. I am glad that in the matter of rural credit, the Minister was pleased to say yesterday that a lot of money is going to be placed at their disposal. Here I would say that the machinery which should be used for this purpose should be the Community Development block agency. Of course, I do not want to digress here. But I would ask: why not Community Development blocks to be manned by men who know the feelings of the people? Why take people from the State Services or IAS? Why not political workers, whether they belong to the Congress or any other party, be entrusted with this work? They are the people who are in contact with the masses. They know the feelings of the people well. But that digression is neither here nor there. My submission is that in the matter of fertilizers also the Community Development Block agencies can be used and that a fair deal should be given to the poor farmers.

I have one more point about Punjab. In Punjab we have got excessive waste lands. When PEPFU was not part of Punjab, there a lot of land was being reclaimed. The PEPFU Government were spending a lot of money on reclamation. I now find that the scheme is absolutely at a standstill; nothing is being reclaimed. Attention should be paid to that aspect. Means should be placed at the disposal of the Punjab Government to reclaim land and that land should be given to the landless people and Harijans.

I would end by saying that more attention should be paid to the agricultural economy of the country. The Minister should do his best and as much of the finances of the country as possible should be spent for the benefit of the farmers and improvement of their conditions.

श्री वाढव ( बागवकी ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यद्यपि हमारा भारतवर्ष देश एक कृषि प्रधान देश है परन्तु दुःख इस बात का है कि हर साल देश के किमी न किमी हिस्सों में अकाल की नी स्थिति रहा करती है। आखिर ऐसा क्यों है? इसका एक ही कारण है और वह है जलकल में कम अन्न का पैदा होना। इसका मिनमिना या इसका रिदता दो चीजों में है अर्थात् बाढ़ और पानी न बरसना। मूल में इसका सीधा सम्बन्ध है। १०, ११ वर्ष की आजादी के बाद भी और प्रधानमंत्री महोदय के बार बार बाढ़ और सूखे में लड़ने के लिये अभियान करने के बावजूद भी आज देश सूखे और बाढ़ दोनों का शिकार बन रहा है।

अगर सभी लोगों को उनको प्रावश्यकता-नुसार भोजन देने की बात की जाय ता इस देश के अन्न उत्पादन में ४० प्रतिशत वृद्धि करने की प्रावश्यकता पड़ेगी। प्रधानमंत्री महोदय ने अपने एक बयान में कहा कि

हिन्दुस्तान के लोग यदि दूसरे देशों से उनका मुकाबला किया जाय तो वे अन्न अधिक प्राप्त करते हैं। परन्तु उन्होंने तसवीर का जो दूसरा पहलू है उसको खिचा लिया। अन्य देशों में लोग अन्न की जगह फल, तरकारी, दूध, गोस्त और अंडों आदि चीजों का भी इस्तेमाल करते हैं और इस तरह उनके द्वारा अन्न का कम इस्तेमाल होता है। परन्तु इन चीजों का हमारे देश में बहुत प्रभाव है। यूरोप में, अमरीका और रूस में प्रति बच्चा अन्न सेर दूध का औसत पड़ता है जब कि हमारे देश में प्रति बच्चा आधी दर्जन बूंद का औसत पड़ता है। यदि प्रधान मंत्री की बात को मान लिया जाय तो हमें नोन सीरिअल्स चीजों का उत्पादन इस देश में ४०० प्रतिशत बढ़ाना होगा। केवल ४०० फ्रीसदी उत्पादन बढ़ाने से ही काम नहीं चलने वाला है बल्कि उसके साथ २ यहाँ के अनसमूह की क्रय शक्ति को बढ़ाना लाजिम होगा। आज जिस तरह की स्थिति में हम रह रहे हैं उसमें हम अन्न अपनी अन्न की समस्या को देखें तो हमें उसके लिये तीन चीजों का ध्यान रखना चाहिये। भोजन की व्यवस्था को हम तीन हिस्सों में बांट सकते हैं। एक तो पीष्टिक भोजन, जो कि शरीर को अच्छी तरह से रख सके और मनुष्य का विकास हो सके। दूसरा काम चलाऊ भोजन जिसको खाकर काम चल सके और तीसरा क्षुधाार्थ भोजन ताकि आसानी से नहीं जीता रहे। आज भारत-वर्ष के प्रति व्यक्ति को १५०० कैलोरीज ही मिलती हैं जब कि पीष्टिक भोजन के लिये २४०० कैलोरीज की जरूरत होती है। इसके विपरीत यूरोपीय देशों में अमरीका आदि देशों में प्रति व्यक्ति ३२०० कैलोरीज का औसत है। आज हम विदेशों की नक़ल करने में लगे हुए हैं और अपने देश में पश्चिमी देशों की नक़ल करके खाद्य का उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान बरत

बंक मिशन की सर्व रिपोर्ट की और धाराबद्ध करना चाहता हूँ जिसमें उसने कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान खेती की पैदावार को देशी साबनों के जरिये ४०० परसेंट बढ़ा सकता है। ग्रीक औसत पैदावार हमारे देश की दुनिया के अन्य देशों के मुकाबले कम है परन्तु क्रोप कमिटीधान ने साबित कर दिया है कि हमारे किसान दुनिया के सबसे ज्यादा उत्पादन करने वाले देश का मुकाबला कर सकते हैं और क्रोप कमिटीधान में हिन्दुस्तान को जो इनाम मिले हैं उनके द्वारा पता चलता है कि यदि उचित और उपयुक्त सुविधायें यहाँ के किसानों को प्रदान की जायें तो वे दुनिया के उन सभी देशों की अपेक्षा अधिक खाद्य-उत्पादन कर सकते हैं और कृषि-उत्पादन में उनका बड़ी खूबी से मुकाबला कर सकते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में एक चीज और देखने की है और वह यह है कि जिन लोगों को इस सिलसिले में इनाम मिले हैं उन्होंने अपने ही देशी साबनों का इस्तेमाल किया है।

14 hrs.

जहाँ तक सरकार का सम्बन्ध है और उसके द्वारा किसानों को सिंचाई आदि की सुविधायें देने का प्रयत्न है, उसके हिसाब से हमारे मुल्क में अन्य देशों की अपेक्षा सब से कम सफलता प्राप्त होती है। आज इसकी तरफ ध्यान देने की जरूरत है।

आज हम पश्चिमी देशों की नक़ल इसलिये भी करते हैं क्योंकि हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में, पूँजीवादी देशों में और साम्यवादी देशों में बड़ा अन्तर है और अन्तर यह है कि उन देशों में भूमि अधिक, आबादी कम और पूँजी ज्यादा है। जब कि हमारे देश में ठीक इसके विपरीत है। भूमि कम है, आबादी ज्यादा है और पूँजी भी कम है। इसलिये अन्न हम उन देशों की नक़ल करते हैं और मिर्कनाइज्ड फ़ार्मिंग की और इस



[वी भाषण]

केब को ले जाते हैं तो इस देश का कल्याण होने वाला नहीं है।

अब सिंचाई के सवाल को ले लीजिये। इस देश में २७ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन पर खेती होती है लेकिन अब तक केवल ५ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन की सिंचाई का प्रबन्ध किया गया है। २२ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन ऐसी पड़ी है जिसके कि सींचने का कोई माकूल प्रबन्ध नहीं है और यहां की खेती प्रकृति पर अर्थात् भासमान की कृपा पर निर्भर करती है अर्थात् पानी अगार बरस गया तो खेती ही गयी लेकिन अगार पानी नहीं बरसा तो सूखा पड़ गया। आज प्राञ्जादी प्रांत हुये बस सात हो गये। इन बस सालों में ६० लाख एकड़ जमीन के सींचने की व्यवस्था की गई है। अगार इस हिसाब से देखा जाय या इसको इयोद्धा कर दिया जाय तो बाक़ी जमीन की सिंचाई का इन्तज़ाम शायद २०० वर्ष में ही पायेगा और इन २०० सालों में तब तक क्या से क्या हो जायगा और आज जैसी स्थिति चल रही है उसकी कल्पना करके मन में बड़ी चिन्ता उत्पन्न होती है।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस सम्बन्ध में पूरी सावधानी बर्तें कि उसके द्वारा जो छोटी २ सिंचाई योजनायें चलाई जा रही हैं और कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट्स के जरिये जो जगह २ नलकूपों के लगाने की व्यवस्था हो रही है वह तमाम काम ठीक से चलें क्योंकि इस सदन के बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों और बाहर के लोगों की यह राय है कि कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट में केवल एक समारोह की दृष्टि से काम किये जाते हैं और बेकार के समारोहों पर काफ़ी धन व्यय होता है। वहां पर असली काम न हो कर जीपगाड़ियों, पेड्रोल और भत्तों आदि पर काफ़ी रुपये खर्च किये जाते हैं। सरकार को इस बारे में ध्यान देना चाहिये और इसके लिये सक्रिय क्रम उठाना चाहिये ताकि व्यर्थ

के समारोहों पर खर्चा खर्च न हो कर जबकी योजनाओं पर खर्च किया जाय।

आज हमारे देश का कोई भी भाग ऐसा नहीं है जहां कि अन्न का संकट न हो। राष्ट्र संघ में २२ देश हैं जिनमें मेरा ज़्यादा है कि मिला को छोड़ कर हिन्दुस्तान अन्न के मामले में सबसे पीछे है। अब प्रश्न यह है कि अधिक अन्न कैसे उपजाया जाय? इसके लिये दो ही परेशानियाँ हैं: प्रकृति और सरमायेदारी। अब प्रकृति के ऊपर भरोसा करके हाथ पर हाथ धर कर बैठ जाना यह आज के प्राधुनिक युग में कुछ उचित नहीं जान पड़ता और हमें उसके लिये कोई माकूल व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये।

दूसरी चीज हिन्दुस्तान में सरमायेदारी का प्रश्न है। सरमायेदारी को जब तक मिटाया नहीं जाता है तब तक हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर बसने वाले किसानों में और मजदूरों में ज़ुम्मेदार का भाव नहीं पैदा हो सकता है। जब तक किसानों में यह भावना नहीं आगत होती कि वे लोग जो मेहनत करेंगे, मुशकत करेंगे, उस से अच्छा नतीजा निकलेगा, अच्छा फल निकलेगा और उस फल का उपभोग वे करेंगे, दूसरा कोई उनका शोषण नहीं करेगा, तब तक यहां पर ज्यादा अन्न की उपज नहीं हो सकती है। इस बारे में ध्यान देने की जरूरत है।

आज क्या हो रहा है? एक तरफ तो हमारे कांग्रेस के नेतागण और मंत्री महोदय आदि धार्ये विन यह भाषण देते हैं कि लोगों को खर्च कम करना चाहिये। कभी कभी तो यहां तक कहा गया कि साक्षात् को कोई राजनीतिक प्रश्न न बनाया जाय। लेकिन आज होता क्या है? इस तरह की अपीलें बहुत होती हैं लेकिन दूसरी तरफ खर्च बहुत होता है। अगार हिसाब लगाया जाय तो प्रधान मंत्री के ऊपर सरकार का २०, ३० हजार ५० रुपये

कर्ष होता है, मकानों पर ५ लाख ६० सालाना कर्ष होता है, केन्द्रीय भूमियों पर १ लाख ६० सालाना कर्ष होता है, राज्यों के भूमियों पर ७० हजार ६० सालाना कर्ष होता है। ऐसी दशा में हम किस तरह किसानों और दूसरे लोगों से भूमिलें कर सकते हैं कि हम त्याग और तपस्या करें क्योंकि उन के सामने तो इस तरह की भिसालें होती हैं ?

भाब तो सरकारी नौकरों और बड़े अधिकारियों का हाल यह है कि जो भन्न उपजाता है उस से तो कहा जाता है कि और उपजाओ, खाद्य समस्या को लेकर लड़ाई की तरह काम करने को कहा जाता है, लेकिन यहाँ क्या होता है। सरकार बढ़ते जाते हैं, जेनरल बढ़ते जाते हैं, डाइरेक्टर्स नियुक्त होते जाते हैं। लेकिन होता क्या है कि ५०० ६० पाने वाला सरकारी नौकर १ हजार ६० मासिक का भत्ता और ५०० ६० मासिक का भत्ता बनाता है। इसलिये यदि इस सिलसिले में कुछ ध्यान दिया जाय तभी शायद कुछ हो सकता है।

भाब आखिर यह समस्या हल कैसे होगी ? हम भी चाहते हैं और सरकार भी चाहती है कि समस्या हल हो। लेकिन अगर विदेशों से ही भन्न मंगा कर हिन्दुस्तान की आवश्यकता को पूरा किया गया तो भुझे पता नहीं है कि सरकार कहां तक इस मामले में सफलता प्राप्त कर सकेगी क्योंकि सरकार ने तो चारबाक के दर्शन पर ही चल कर काम करना शुरू किया है। चारबाक का वर्णन क्या था ?

“भावज्जीवेत् सुखम जीवेत्, ऋणम् कृत्वा  
धृतम् पिबेत्”

अस्मीभूतस्य देहस्य पुनरागमनम् कुतः”

कर्म कर के भी भस्ती से रहो, भी भी खाओ। यही हमारी सरकार कर रही है। लेकिन

अगर सरकार यह चाहती है कि भन्न संकट को सदा के लिये हल किया जाय तो सरकार को चाहिये कि वह सब से प्रथम जमीन का बटवारा करे। यह प्रश्न हर जगह उठता है। कई माननीय सदस्यों ने भी कहा और सरकार भी जगह जगह कहती रहती है कि जमीन का बटवारा होना चाहिये पर जमीन इतनी हो तो कि बट सके। इतनी जमीन काफी नहीं है। इसलिये मैं यही नहीं कहूंगा कि जमीन का बटवारा हो, मैं एक और बात माननीय भंभी के सामने रखना चाहूंगा। भाब हिन्दुस्तान में १५ करोड़ एकड़ के करीब जमीन परती पड़ी है जो कि खेती के लायक है। बेकार पड़ी हुई है। इस के प्रतिरिक्त १० करोड़ एकड़ जमीन ऐसी है जिसका अब तक कोई वर्गीकरण नहीं किया गया। जिस १० करोड़ एकड़ जमीन का वर्गीकरण नहीं किया गया, अगर उस को निकाल दें तो भाब देश में २७ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन पर खेती होती है और १५ करोड़ एकड़ परती पड़ी हुई है। इस तरह से ५१ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन देश में है। लग भग ५ करोड़ परिवार खेती के सहारे हैं। भूमिहीन मजदूर परिवारों और ६३ लाख भूमिहीन किसानों के लिये १० करोड़ ७१ लाख एकड़ जमीन चाहिये। ६ एकड़ से कम जोत वाले करीब २ करोड़ परिवारों के लिये ८ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन की आवश्यकता पड़ेगी। इसी प्रकार ७ एकड़ की निम्नतम जोत के लिये १८ करोड़, ६१ लाख एकड़ जमीन चाहिये। १५ करोड़ एकड़ के करीब जमीन परती पड़ी हुई है जो खेती में इस्तेमाल की जा सकती है। लग भग ६ करोड़ एकड़ मिन सकती है अगर हम ३० एकड़ की सीलिंग को कम कर के २० करें। इस तरह से लग भग २० करोड़ एकड़ जमीन बच जाती है। उस जमीन पर अगर बेकार लोगों को बसा दें तो दस साल के भन्दर हमारे यहां वह भत्तकार पैदा हो सकता है कि हिन्दुस्तान का साध संकट दूर हो जाय और यहां की बेकारी भी

## [श्री याचक]

भूर हो जाय। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह तबज्जह की जाय।

इसी तरह से ४ करोड़ के करीब शेरिह मजदूर हिन्दुस्तान में हैं। उन की मजदूरी के सवाल की तरफ भी सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये। हमारे यहाँ भलाभकर जाते हैं। केन्द्रीय सरकार ने और कई राज्य सरकारों ने भी माना है कि ६ एकड़ से नीचे वाली सभी जातें भलाभकर हैं और उन की लगान माफ होनी चाहिये। इस सिलसिले में मैं सरकार का ध्यान सन् १९३० में जो कराची काँग्रेस का प्रिपोजेशन हुआ था और उस में उन्होंने जो प्रस्ताव पास किया था कि भलाभकर जातों की लगान माफ होनी चाहिये, उस की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उस को इस ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये।

आज देश में दामों की लूट चल रही है। जब फसल कटती है तो भनाज के भाव गिर जाते हैं और जैसे ही किसानों के घर से निकल कर, छोटे बूकानदारों के घर से निकल कर, भनाज भाड़तियों और पूंजीपतियों के यहाँ पहुँच जाता है उन दिन से ही वह महंगा होना शुरू हो जाता है। फी सेर २ और ३ भाना तक दाम बढ़ जाता है। आज इस तरह की लूट देश में होती है इन भाड़तियों और पूंजीपतियों के जरिये से। सरकार को चाहिये कि वह इस ओर भी ध्यान दे। फसल कटने के बाद अगर उस का दाम २ पैसा फी सेर तक बढ़ जाय तो भी कोई बात नहीं है, लेकिन अगर उस का दाम इस तरह से २ भा० और ३ भा० फी सेर तक बढ़ जाय तो यह अन्धेर की बात है। आज जितनी उपयोग की वस्तुएँ हैं उनका मूल्य काफी बढ़ा हुआ है। जब भी इस तरह का कोई बात की जाती है तो सरकार की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि दूसरे देशों में भी सब चीजों के दाम बढ़े हुए हैं। लेकिन मैं आपका ध्यान इस ओर से जाना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरे देशों में, चाहे योरप हो

या अमरीका हो, अगर दूध और घास के दामों को देखा जाय तो वह कोई ज्यादा नहीं बढ़े है। जो दाम हमारे देश में हैं प्रायः वैसे ही दाम वहाँ हैं। वहाँ सिर्फ जो लग्गरी की चीजें हैं, उनके दाम बढ़े हैं।

उपरोक्त महोबय : अगर आप खत्म नहीं करेंगे तो एक प्रान्तेजल मेम्बर श्री रामजी वर्मा रह जायेंगे, इसलिये आपको चाहिये कि आप एक मिनट में खत्म करें।

श्री याचक : मैं बहुत जल्दी खत्म कर रहा हूँ।

तो श्रीमन्, यहाँ आज क्या हो रहा है। सन् १९५१ में प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि भ्रम संकट को हम जल्दी हल कर लेंगे। उसके बाद सन् १९५३ आया, १९५५-५६ आया जब कि वर्षों के कारण फसल अच्छी हुई और काफ़ी भ्रम पैदा हो गया। उस समय फसल अच्छी तो हुई वर्षों से लेकिन सारे का सारा भ्रम सरकार लेने को तैयार हो गई कि हम ने भ्रम संकट पूरी पूरी तरह से खत्म कर लिया है, हम इस मसले पर हावी हो गये हैं, फूड सिचुएशन हमारे कंट्रोल में आ गई है। लेकिन पिछले वर्ष कहीं पर पानी ज्यादा बरसने से और कहीं कम बरसने से फसल खराब हुई तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि यह कुदरत की बदतमीजी है। जब पानी बरसने से भ्रम भ्रच्छा हो जाय तब यह होता है कि काँग्रेस सरकार के काम की वजह से हुआ, लेकिन भ्रम की जब फसल खराब हुई प्राकृतिक दोष के कारण, चूँकि कुदरत में साथ नहीं दिया तो श्री नेहरो कहते हैं कि यह कुदरत की बदतमीजी है। अगर अच्छा पानी बरसने से सरकार फसल होने का सारा भ्रम लेने को तैयार रहती है तो उसमें कम होने पर भी उसकी जिम्मेदारी को बर्दास्त करने के लिये भी उसे तैयार रहना चाहिये।

मन्त्री महोदय या इस मंत्रालय की ओर से जो कानूनात्मक विधे हैं उन में रेलवे डिपार्टमेंट की बड़ी सिकायत की गई कि ट्रांसपोर्ट पोसिबिलिटीय नहीं हैं। सदन में यह कहा जाता है कि जगह जगह पर कम्प्यूनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स चल रही हैं वहाँ सामान ले जाना होता है, लेकिन रेलों की सुविधा नहीं मिलती है। अजीब तरह से यहां चर्चा चल रही है कृषि मंत्रालय और रेलवे मंत्रालय क्या कोई बलघ्न प्रयोग चीजें हैं, फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री बलघ्न चीज है ? जैसे सरकार में संयुक्त जिम्मेदारी कोई चीज ही नहीं है। आज कैबिनेट की हालत क्या है ? अगर इस को संयुक्त जिम्मेदारी, ज्वॉयंट रिस्पॉसिबिलिटी की दृष्टि से देखा जाय, जिस तरह से मंत्रिगण बात करते हैं या माननीय सदस्य बात करते हैं, उस से देखा जाय तो पता चलता है मानो केरल राज्य की कम्प्यूनिस्ट सरकार केन्द्र सरकार के खिलाफ कोई कार्य कर रही है। आज यहां इस तरह का दृष्टिकोण नजर आता है। यह जो हालत है, वह बड़ी ही खतरनाक है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि यदि वे खाद्यान्न की समस्या को हल करना चाहते हैं तो मैं नें जिन चीजों की तरफ ध्यान आकर्षित किया है उन पर विचार करें।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : बूँकि बहुत कम समय रह गया है, इस लिये क्या श्री राम जी वर्मा पांच मिनट में खत्म कर सकेंगे ?

श्री रामजी वर्मा (देवरिया) : मैं पांच मिनट में नहीं खत्म कर सकूंगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister.

Shri A. P. Jain: Sir, my colleague Mr. P. S. Deshmukh has very much lightened my burden in so far as he has answered many of the questions which were raised in the House yesterday. Even so, the number of issues raised in this House are so numerous that I feel a little overwhelmed. I may not be able to answer all the

issues that have been raised, but I can assure hon. Members that if I do not answer any of the issues, it does not mean that I propose to ignore them. It is for want of time that I shall not be able to do it, but I shall pay due consideration to the suggestions made.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rai Bareilly): That you say every year.

Shri A. P. Jain: Truth can not be repeated too often.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Truth is eternal.

Shri A. P. Jain: In the address that I propose to make, I shall deal with three principal aspects of the food problem—immediate, short-term and long-term. By "immediate" I mean the measures which we propose to take during the current year, i.e., 1958-59. By "short-term" I mean the measures which we propose to take during the rest of the Plan period, i.e. up till 1960-61, and by "long-term" of course, I mean the further longer period which essentially would mean the question of stepping up agricultural production.

I also propose to deal with two questions, viz., the rice deal of Kerala, and the criticism made by Shri Siddhartha Ray about the food policy in West Bengal. These two I will treat as one item. And lastly, I propose to say something about the criticism about the delay in the implementation of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee's recommendations, a point which was very much stressed by my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta. If I have any more time, I shall try to deal with other matters.

Shri Asoka Mehta in his speech has said that self-sufficiency in food in an expanding economy is illusive; the need for food depends upon the tempo of development I endorse his remarks fully. If I can use Browning's simile of ever-receding ideals to mundane economy, I would say that in a developing economy, self-sufficiency becomes an ever-receding ideal, because the demand for food depends upon

[Shri A. P. Jais]

the tempo of development, and if we are to increase the tempo of development, there is likely to be a lag between our production and our demands. In fact, Marshall's dictum about the scissors blade theory holds true in this matter, and it applies with all the force to the demand and supply in an expanding economy. The greater the tempo of development, the wider is the difference between the blades of demand and supply. Supply at a level which could make a nation self-sufficient in a static economy becomes quite insufficient on account of the stresses and strains created by developmental policies. This is fully illustrated by what has happened in this country as also by what has happened in conditions of expanding economy in other countries.

Taking up the question of agricultural production, I dare say with a large amount of confidence that during the past years our agricultural production, that is the production of cereals, pulses and the principal cash crops in which I include oilseeds, cotton, jute and sugarcane, has shown a rising trend. In 1951-52, treating 1949-50 as the base, the figures of production were 97.5. In 1952-53 they went up to 102. In 1953-54 they went up to 114.3. In 1954-55 they went up to 118.4. There was a slight drop in 1955-56 and they came down to 115.9. However, in 1956-57 they went up to 123. Thus, agricultural production during these seven years has gone up by more than 25 per cent, and I dare say that that is by no means a mean record.

So far as the production of food-grains is concerned, that has also been going up, but the trend of the rise has been somewhat erratic; in some years, there has been a fall, and in others, there has been a rise. I need not quote the figures year-wise, but perhaps it would be quite enough if I say that treating 1949-50 as the base,

in 1951-52 the production of food-grains was 91.1; in 1955-56 it was 113.5; in 1956-57 it was 119.6. Here, it should also be observed that if we take the moving averages, that is, the averages over a number of years, the production has been constantly going up. Even so, while the production in 1956-57 was almost equivalent to the peak production of 1953-54, that is, it was (for food-grains, cereals and pulses) of the order of 68.7 million tons, we had to undergo stresses and strains; and there were difficulties both in regard to supplies and in regard to prices. We had to import during that year about 3 million tons of goodgrains from abroad. That will justify the remarks which I made, that despite increased production, in an expanding economy, the demand increases because of certain budgetary conditions, because of deficit financing and because of the credit policy and other policies which are outside the scope of this Ministry. The stresses and strains produced by the fiscal and economic policies have their bearing on food.

Coming to the prices, treating again 1952-53 as the base, in January, 1957, the prices were 97; in February, they rose to 100 and hovered round about that figure in the months of March and April; they reached the peak figure of 106 in August, and then they began to decline, reaching the figure of 97 in January, 1958; in the week ending 22nd March, the prices went down to 95. It will thus be observed that in the second half of 1957 and the first few months of 1958 the prices have shown a downward trend. But this downward trend has not been uniform over all the cereals. In fact, the price of rice which was 93 in January, 1957 was 100 in the week ending 23rd March, 1958. Grain-wise, the prices of wheat, Jowar, bajra, barley, maize and ragi have all shown considerable decline. But the same trend has not been shown by the price trends of rice.

So far as the prospects of 1957-58 are concerned, the House is aware that at one time the State Governments estimated their loss at anything between five to six million tons. That was a loss mostly on rice. But the crop-cutting experiments recently done have brought down the fall or have reduced the estimates of damage considerably, and according to the latest estimates that we have got, the fall in the production of rice is going to be of the order of about 3.5 million tons. Now, this loss, which I must submit is a considerable loss, in the short term can be made up only by imports.

Now, the main source of rice import is Burma. According to the May 1956-agreement we were entitled to import 5 lakhs of tons of rice from Burma in the year 1958. The Burma crop has, however, suffered from drought, and the exportable surplus of Burma which normally used to be of the order of 1.5 to 2 million tons has during this year been reduced to 7.5 lakh tons. The Burmese Government have informed us that they will not be in a position to fulfil their commitments, and they will not be able to supply us more than 2.5 lakhs tons of rice. It has been decided by Government that the sterling which was allocated for the purchase of Burma rice will now be utilised for the purchase of rice from Burma as also from other countries that is any unspent balance will be utilised for the import of rice from other countries. The overall availability of rice in the world market is rather difficult. We hope to make up the shortfall of the supplies from Burma by purchases elsewhere, but perhaps we may have to pay a little higher price.

While the supply of rice from Burma is going to be comparatively smaller, its effects will be partially offset by the comparatively large opening stocks of rice this year. As against the stock of 85,000 tons in 1957, our opening stock on 1st January, 1958 was about 2,40,000 tons.

So far as wheat is concerned, we have got a fairly ambitious programme for import, and there is not much difficulty. During the first eight or nine months of this year we have a firm programme of importing 1.7 million tons of wheat. Now, we hope to conclude a fresh agreement for the import of wheat under PL-480 from United States, and the wheat under the new agreement will begin to arrive from the month of September or October. I think that there is no likelihood of any difficulties arising in the supply of wheat. The present stock position of wheat in UP and Bihar is of the order of 50,000 tons and 3 lakhs tons respectively, and I hope that with these fairly large supplies, the State Governments will be able to tide over the lean period that is ahead. If they require more, we shall, of course, supply them; we are in a position to supply them quite liberally.

Now, I would like to say a few words as to how we propose to deal with the supplies of rice to the various States. So far as Madhya Pradesh and Orissa are concerned, according to the information supplied by the State Governments, they will be able to meet their own requirements. In fact, they may be able to supply some of the surplus rice to the Government of India for distribution to other States.

Bombay has been deprived of its traditional source of supply. Bombay was importing large quantities of rice from Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, both of which have now been cordoned off; and the difficulties of Bombay have increased.

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): How much is Orissa going to supply?

Shri A. P. Jain: We have not fixed any figure, but they hope to give us some surplus.

I have had discussions with the Chief Minister and the Food Minister of Bombay, and I have assessed their requirements, and I hope I shall be in a position to meet their requirements.

[Shri A. P. Jain].

to a reasonable extent, and I do not think any major difficulty will arise in that State.

So far as Bihar is concerned, it has lost about 40 per cent of its rice crop. Naturally, we are not in a position to meet the damage to the rice crop by the supply of rice. It has, therefore, been decided that we will meet the requirements of the Bihar Government by the supply of wheat of which there is no dearth. But we also propose to give them a little rice for feeding the adibasi areas and some of the industrial areas. West Bengal's food shortage is estimated to be 7 lakh tons, of which more than three-fourths will have to be met by wheat. That is, we shall supply between 5 and 6 lakh tons of wheat. It will be interesting to know that in 1956, we supplied 3·7 lakh tons of wheat to West Bengal. In 1957, we supplied them 5·7 lakh tons of wheat. So, our supply of wheat is practically going to be of the order of what we did in 1957. We hope to give, on the basis of present availability of stocks, about 1·5 lakh tons of rice to West Bengal. If the rice position improves, I shall give them more. West Bengal is procuring round about 1·5 lakh tons of rice for sale during the lean period, and it is hoped that by pooling the supplies made by the Central Government and quantities internally procured, the West Bengal Government, as Dr. Roy said the other day, will be in a position to control the situation.

The needs of Assam, Tripura and Kashmir will be met to the extent possible by the supply of rice.

Shri Balarama Krishnalah (Gudivada): Is the hon. Minister aware that Andhra has got surplus stocks of rice with the rice mills and the ryotes. They are prepared to supply rice not only to the Southern Zone but to other places like West Bengal, Saurashtra, Bombay and so on? Are Central Government prepared to agree?

Shri A. P. Jain: In fact, I wanted to deal with that question later, but as a specific question has been asked of me now, I will answer it immediately.

In Andhra, our policy is to procure all and any quantity of rice that is surplus there. Already we have procured a little more than 2 lakh tons, and we are prepared to buy all the rice that is surplus to Andhra. We have set up a fairly efficient and good machinery which is making purchases. But it is also our firm policy that we are not going to allow the rice millers of Andhra to export rice to other States, Bombay or to Calcutta, on private account, because that will lead to profiteering. (An Hon. Member: That is good) (Interruptions).

Shrimati Rena Chakravartty: We want rice.

Shri A. P. Jain: We are buying rice and we are supplying the rice.

So far as the southern region is concerned, in distributing the rice, we will give first preference to the States which form the southern region, and only so much of it as is surplus to the southern region, will be made available to others.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Out of the 2 lakh tons, how much has been supplied to Madras State so far?

Shri A. P. Jain: We have supplied some rice to Madras State. I believe it may be about 25,000 or 30,000 tons. I am not prepared to swear by that figure. Madras is, by and large, self-sufficient and our policy in future is going to be this, that we are not going to supply any rice to Madras State. If they need, we will give them wheat.

Shri Tangamani: The Madras State is deficit by one lakh tons.

Shri Wedeyar (Shimoga): Does the price of rice differ from State to State?

**The Deputy Minister of Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa):** Quality to quality.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** From State to State and quality to quality, but the basis of determination is the same all over the country.

This brings me to a somewhat interesting, but a very misunderstood, aspect of the food problem. Hon. Members will remember that a few days ago Shri Sinhasan Singh—unfortunately he is not here—asked a supplementary question whether the food imports could be reduced and the money saved utilised for the import of fertilisers. In reply, I said that it was a ticklish question, and I promised to make the position clear during this debate. Often, it is said that my Ministry—which is, of course, being held responsible for so many troubles about planning and otherwise—is also responsible for the drain on the foreign exchange resources. I want to make the position clear. Shri Sinhasan Singh and many other hon. Members also appear to be under the impression that as soon as we can reduce import of foodgrains and effect any saving, we can utilise that for the purpose of importing fertilisers. This impression is based on a misunderstanding of facts. My Ministry has also been often accused of being responsible for the foreign exchange difficulties through the import of foodgrains. There cannot be a greater injustice than that. The fact is that imports under PL 480, which constitute the bulk of our import of foodgrains, are paid for in terms of rupees, and we have to incur only a very small amount in terms of foreign exchange on 50 per cent of the freight. Besides 80 per cent. of the rupee payments is made available to us for development purposes. That is, if we import wheat worth Rs. 100, Rs. 80 are made available to us for spending on developmental purposes, that is, for the Plan purposes. It is no small advantage to augment our rupee finance by substantial amounts every year which add to our internal resources.

In 1956-57, out of the total imports of foodgrains worth Rs. 111 crores only Rs. 48 crores were paid in terms of foreign exchange. In 1957-58, out of the total purchase of Rs. 176 crores worth of foodgrains, as shown on page 312 of the Explanatory Memorandum, Rs. 17 crores would be for internal procurement and of the balance of Rs. 159 crores, only Rs. 43 crores would be in terms of foreign exchange. In 1958-59, we have asked for a total allocation of Rs. 118 crores of which Rs. 7 crores are provided for making internal purchases, and of the balance of Rs. 111 crores, only Rs. 38 crores are asked for in foreign exchange.

Hon. Members will remember that in the White Paper on the Fall in the foreign exchange reserves recently laid on the Table of the House, the foreign exchange allocation for the import of foodgrains is shown to be of the order of Rs. 48 crores per year under the Second Five Year Plan. As against the allocation of Rs. 144 crores in the first three years of the Plan, we would be drawing only Rs. 127 crores, that is Rs. 17 crores less than the Plan allocation. I may also say that the foreign exchange expenditure in 1956-57 on the import of foodgrains was less than 5 per cent. of the total outgoings, and in the subsequent years too, this percentage is likely to go down.

As regards foreign exchange expenditure on the import of foodgrains, we have to pay for the imports of Burma rice in sterling. But we should not forget that India has been the main traditional market for Burma rice, which enables Burma to import manufactured goods from India. And from the point of view of both countries, neighbourly relations, and the regional trade pattern—a point which was emphasised yesterday by my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, it is desirable to maintain this trade.

In fact, the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee has suggested that an effort should be made to have an agreement with Burma for a longer



[Shri A. P. Jain]

term and for a larger quantity. Unfortunately, the failure of the rice crop in Burma, this year, has created an atmosphere which is not congenial to the making of a long term agreement. I am doubtful, if, keeping in view the friendly relations with a neighbouring country and the regional pattern of trade, it would be wise or desirable to effect any reduction in trade with Burma.

As far as foreign exchange expenditure in import of wheat is concerned, I have already said that the bulk of our imports are under PL 480 which are paid in rupees. But, it is one of the conditions that before we make imports under PL 480 we must import our normal marketing requirements from the open market, may be United States of America, may be Australia or may be Canada. These normal requirements were assessed at 550,000 tons, a part of which we receive under the aid programme from U.S.A. and a part has to be paid for in terms of foreign exchange. Out of these 550,000 tons, we generally receive about 150,000 tons under the aid programme and we have to buy 400,000 tons in the open market. It means that before we can make any import under PL 480, we have to buy our normal marketing requirements by paying sterling or dollars.

Our Budget estimate for 1958-59 provide for an import of foodgrains worth Rs. 77 crores under PL 480; and, unless we totally give up our purchases under PL 480, we shall not be effecting any saving in foreign exchange expenditure.

Hon. Members will agree with me that in the coming year it is not possible to slow down our imports of foodgrains by Rs. 77 crores out of a total of Rs. 111 crores. Therefore, the idea that we can import fertilizers by reducing the import of foodgrains has not much meaning. While we shall make every effort to buy more of fertilizers, so far as the saving of

foreign exchange is concerned, the import of fertilizers and import of foodgrains have no relation.

Now, I come to the short term problem. After very carefully examining the whole question, that is the trends in the increase of population, the trends of urbanisation and the demands against larger incomes, the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee came to the conclusion that India's requirements from abroad, both for consumption and stocks, would vary between 20 to 30 lakh tons for some years to come. The Committee made two suggestions. One was that we should enter into a long term agreement with Burma for the import of rice. They had about 8 lakh tons of import per year in mind. They also suggested that we should make fairly long term arrangements for the import of large quantities of wheat and of some rice from USA under PL 480.

Now, efforts are being made to enter into long term agreements with Burma. But, as I mentioned a few moments before, the recent drought and conditions created by drought have spoiled the climate for the conclusion of such an agreement. USA has relatively small quantities of rice for disposal as surplus. Agreements under PL 480 are normally concluded for a year. But, we were very much lucky that we could enter into a long term agreement. In fact, India was the only country with which the United States made a 3 years' agreement under PL 480 in 1956. We hope we shall succeed in entering into a new long term agreement with the United States. But that will very much depend upon the United States of America.

In this respect we have been trying to follow the recommendations made by the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee. Another important recommendation of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee was that we should build up our reserve stocks. And, I am glad to say that in that respect we have done

fairly well. Our stock position on 1st January 1957 was that we had a little more than 2 lakh tons of rice and wheat. As against that, on the 15th March last, our stock position was that we had 14,71,000 tons of rice and wheat in stock with the Central Government and the State Governments.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** How much rice?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Rice is 4,14,000 tons.

Hon. Members will agree that this is no small achievement to have built up a stock of very nearly 1.5 million tons during this period of 8 or 9 months. (Interruption.)

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):** But it is at the cost of so many deaths.

**Shri Ranga:** Where were the deaths?

**Shri A. F. Jain:** In his imagination.

Efforts will be made to augment the stocks. But, in view of the damage to our rice crop and the non-availability of rice in the world market, I cannot give the assurance to this House that we shall be able to build large stocks of rice. Most of our stocks will have to be that of wheat.

Hon. Members are already aware of what we have done with regard to restrictions on movement; that is the Zonal arrangement. In making those zonal arrangements, we have mostly followed the recommendations of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee.

Hon. Members are also aware of the steps that we have taken to restrict advances against foodgrains. There also we have followed the recommendations of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee. We have also increased the number of fair-price shops. We have strengthened the system of organisation and in some places we have introduced identity cards. There again, we have followed the recommendations of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee.

Now, we have taken certain steps to avoid wastage of food and to popularise substitute foods, particularly wheat in the rice-eating areas. Details of all these have been given in the report of the Food Department and I will not take the time of the House by going into the details.

I would, however, like to say a few words about the procurement because that was another important recommendation of the Committee. The Government of India is procuring rice on its account in Andhra and in the Punjab. Besides, the State Governments of Assam, Kerala, Mysore, Orissa and West Bengal and the Territories of Manipur and Tripura are also procuring rice for their own consumption. The position of the Central procurement schemes which were started a little more than six months ago is as follows:

In 1957, we have procured in Andhra, Orissa and Punjab, 158.6 lakh tons of rice. Until 22nd March this year, we had procured more than 1,47,000 tons of rice in Andhra and Punjab. Altogether we have procured 3,08,000 tons of rice.

**Shri Panigrahi:** How much of this on Central Government account and how much on State Government accounts?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** The whole is on Central Government account. Besides, the State Governments have procured about 120,000 tons. And, the total amount of rice procured by the Central and the State Governments comes to 4,25,000 tons during the period of the last six months, or so. And, I submit in all humility that this is not a bad performance.

**Shri Ranga:** What do you mean by bad performance as if somebody is unwilling to come up to you? You are unwilling to purchase.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** It is easy to say so; there are all kinds of obstacles.

**Shri Ranga:** Provided you pay the proper price.

**Shri A. F. Jain:** Ah, the cat is out of the bag.

**Shri Banga:** I did tell you. Let there be a Conference. There are a number of cats and most of them are in the Central Ministry.

**Shri A. F. Jain:** Besides the Centre and the State Governments have procured 86.5 thousand tons of coarse grains and altogether it makes quite an impressive figure of 5.2 lakh tons of foodgrains during the last six months or a little more. I may add that efforts for increased procurement of not only rice but also other foodgrains will continue.

The measures which I have stated are at best palliatives meant to overcome short-term problems. They are not solutions of the difficulty. The real solution lies in increasing production. The other day, the Prime Minister has said that he was confident that we would be able to show better results than what the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee expected. I join my humble voice to that statement and I am sure that we will give a better performance.

The measures which we propose to take for increasing food production fall under three categories. The first is the reorganisation and strengthening of the administrative machinery; the second is the availability of timely credit and supplies and the third is the rectification of the errors and the intensification of the schemes in operation. (An Hon. Member: What) Rectification, that is, correcting the mistakes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is there any objection to mistakes being corrected?

**Shri Banga:** I am glad that they have admitted it after so many years.

**Shri A. F. Jain:** I have never denied.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let not fresh mistakes occur now.

**Shri A. F. Jain:** So far as the reorganisation and strengthening of the machinery is concerned, about the middle of January, a meeting of the National Development Council was held and the production aspect of agriculture was discussed in all its details. The Chief Ministers and the Agriculture Ministers of the State Governments were present. We have tried to work out a practical scheme for stepping up agricultural production. The Planning Commission and the Food and Agriculture Ministry have sent a joint team. The hon. Members are aware that Mr. Sivaraman has visited a number of States. They have examined the agricultural programmes, the cause of the failures and the shortfalls. They have in consultation with the State Governments worked out a scheme for removing the defects. The Ministry of Community Development has issued circulars to all the State Governments that agricultural production should be given top priority. (Interruptions.)

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):** Sir, may I know if circulars produce foodgrains?

**Ch. Ranbir Singh:** It is new discovery.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am very sorry that several Members would not get their chance. (Interruptions). Order, order.

**Shri A. F. Jain:** Circulars do not produce foodgrains but they produce incentive. Now, Sir, in order to work in co-ordination, a liaison committee of the Ministry of Community Development and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture has been sitting. We meet occasionally. We discuss all the problems. I dare say that we have got a much better co-ordination today than before.

**Ch. Ranbir Singh:** First send them to China so that they may learn something there.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** The Ministry of Food and Agriculture has also set up an Extension Wing to keep in close contact with the State Governments, to reach the results of research and higher technique to the farmers, arrange timely supplies and cut down delays in sanctions and allocations. I also find that there is a greater awareness on the part of the States. I have appointed an Adviser in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture who will stay in the States for a sufficiently long time to discuss the problems on the spot and advise the State Governments on agricultural matters. He will have all the powers of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture to take decisions on the spot. There may be certain matters which may require the concurrence of the Planning Commission or of the Finance Ministry. . . (Interruptions.)

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. Let there be no running commentary.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Those matters will have to be dealt with here but otherwise he will have all the powers of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture to take decisions on the spot.

It must however be admitted that there is a great dearth of personnel in the agricultural departments. Agricultural Department during the days of the British used to be a very minor department. Lord Linlithgow tried to give some life and shape to that department. Even so, it continued to be a comparatively minor department.

**Shri Supakar (Sambalpur):** I do not think it has attained majority yet.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Unless it is allowed to do so, how can it?

**Shri M. V. Krishnappa:** It is they who are in a minority—not we.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** We are training a large number of graduates both in agriculture and veterinary science. But it takes a fairly long time—15-20 years—to train the top personnel. I am afraid that until the top person-

nel is forthcoming, the agriculture department will continue to suffer for want of leadership.

As regards the timely supply of agricultural credit, it has made quite a remarkable progress in 1951-52 the total credit made available by the credit co-operative societies was less than Rs. 25 crores. This year, it is going to be Rs. 100 crores and next year it is going to be Rs. 140 crores.

**Shri Ranga:** What is the total need of the peasants?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Rs. 750 crores. I am confident that by the end of the Plan, 1960-61, we shall achieve the target of Rs. 225 crores in the form of short-term, medium-term and long-term credit.

The scheme of warehousing has started and it will expand. For the first time under the Second Plan, we have got a scheme for seed multiplication farms. The scheme provides that each community development block shall have a seed farm of 25 acres and this seed farm will also have a store. It will produce the foundation seed which will be passed on to the registered growers who will further multiply it so that during the Second Plan, we hope to cover the entire community development area with the improved seed. In the first year, 1956-57, the progress was somewhat retarded. There was difficulty about procurement and certain other difficulties also arose. The performance was only about 70 per cent of the target. Last year, 1957-58, we sanctioned some amount.....

**Shri Ranga:** It is a 40 year old scheme.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Not 40 years.

15 hrs.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The older the better; why should there be any objection?

**Shri Ranga:** 40 years ago, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The better, perhaps.

**Shri A. F. Jain:** In the year 1957-58 we have sanctioned the location of more than 1000 farms, and we are informed that the progress this year is much better.

**Shri Panigrahi:** How many farms have been set up?

**Shri A. F. Jain:** According to information received, I think more than 80 per cent of the farms have been set up about four months ago, and during the period after that more farms will have been set up. Therefore, I hope the performance this year will be better than last year.

It must be, however, realised that the seed farms take about three years to give good results. A seed farm set up in 1956-57 will give results only in 1958-59; because in the first year it raises the foundation seed, in the second year that foundation seed is multiplied and only in the third year it can be spread widely and popularised when only the agriculturists will really benefit by it.

Now, among the schemes of agricultural development, I give top priority to the schemes of irrigation. It is really a matter of concern that all the potential developed from the major and minor irrigation works have not been utilised. At the end of 1956-57 the unutilised potential was of the order of four million acres. We sent round a joint team of the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture to examine the major irrigation schemes in the four States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Bengal and Orissa.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Sir, recently it was stated by the Minister in the U.P. Assembly that certain projects like the Dorighat Canal etc. in Uttar Pradesh are being held up for want of foreign exchange. Could the hon. Minister throw some light on this?

**Shri Kanga:** Ordinary credit is not available, why talk of foreign exchange.

**Shri A. F. Jain:** Some of the schemes were suffering for want of foreign exchange. Some have been given high priority, and others could not be given high priority. I am not quite sure whether this particular project mentioned by the hon. Member was given a high priority. It all depends upon the progress and the amount of foreign exchange that is needed. It is difficult for me to answer that question off-hand, but if the hon. Member writes to me I will supply him with the necessary information.

I was talking about the joint team. These officers are going to visit the States, and I am hopeful that as a result of further examination the defects will be removed.

**Shri Goray (Poona):** Will you please let us know what are the concrete steps that you are going to take?

**Shri A. F. Jain:** The main cause of non-utilisation was that sometimes the main channels had not been built and at other times the minor channels or the field channels had not been built. So far as the main channels are concerned, it was mostly the responsibility of the Irrigation Department which was constructing the dam. These matters have been discussed with the irrigation engineers and in some cases they have already taken steps—for instance, in the case of Sambalpur they have already constructed some of the main channels so that an area of about 1,15,000 acres has come under irrigation. So far as the field channels are concerned, the Community Development Ministry is undertaking the construction of these field channels. As a result of the building of the main channels and also the field channels, I am hopeful that the developed potential will be utilised to a much greater extent, and I do hope that it will yield satisfactory results.

Some Hon. Members rose—

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** Since when has the Community Development Block....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Minister is not giving in and, therefore, no hon. Member should try to interrupt him. I can very well understand the difficulty of those who could not get time to speak; but I am surprised to find that even those who had a chance to deliver their speeches are also going on interrupting. I was certainly thinking of accommodating others, who could not speak, during the debate on the Demands relating to the next Ministry, but I find that they are delivering their speeches all right now itself while sitting. Therefore, I shall not have that consideration next time.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Sir, in the programme of agricultural production, minor irrigation schemes occupy a very important place. Shrimati Renuka Ray raised the question of certain schemes in West Bengal which were sent to us. Unfortunately, they did not reach us in time, and the mistake was not ours. Again, the State Government did not include them in their annual Plan. Nonetheless, I am prepared to consider those schemes. We have received a request from the West Bengal Government, and I hope to make adequate allocations for the implementation of those schemes.

I have already said that maximum importance is given to the minor irrigation schemes. These minor irrigation schemes, I dare say, have done well in the First Five Year Plan. As against the Plan target of 11.2 million acres, the area brought under minor irrigation schemes is 9.5 million acres, which is nearly 85 per cent of the prescribed target. That is not a bad performance. The target for minor irrigation schemes under the Second Five Year Plan is 9 million acres, against which during the first two years we have been able to bring 3.6 million acres under irrigation—that is about 40 per cent of the

Plan target. That again, Sir, is a good performance.

Minor irrigation works are cheaper in areas where water is readily available because no arrangement for the conservation of water has to be made. I will illustrate it from the example of Punjab. A major irrigation work there costs about Rs. 380 to Rs. 340 per acre while a minor irrigation work costs much less. One acre of irrigation by a masonry well costs Rs. 250, by the diversion of streams and nallahs Rs. 100, and a little more than Rs. 100 by lift pumps. Also, they do not raise the question of the utilisation or non-utilisation of the developed potential. I can assure the hon. Members that if any State Government gives us reasonably good schemes, additional schemes for minor irrigation works, I hope I shall be able to find money for those schemes.

Now, I would like to take up the question of the rice deal in Kerala. The hon. Member, Shri Punnoose complained that we have been sitting quiet, that we did not issue any statement or say anything in support of the Kerala Government. In fact, the Kerala Government never sent us any details. All that we have heard about it is either from the papers or from certain complaints or representations made by the critics of the Kerala Government. When these representations were received, I felt that if I wrote to the Kerala Government I will be very much misunderstood; they might feel that their purchase had nothing to do with me, they had bought it on their own and I was trying to put my finger in a place where I was not required to. As the hon. Members are aware, the Kerala Government has already appointed a Judge of the High Court to look into the matter. I have kept my judgment in suspense, and I will recommend to all the sections of the House to keep their judgment in suspense and await the findings of the Judge.

[Shri A. P. Jain]

So far as certain issues that were raised by Mr. Siddarth Ray, about which there have been some talks in this House, are concerned, the position of the Centre is as follows. The West Bengal Government issued two notifications restricting the movement of rice and paddy inter se in between the districts. In one or two cases two districts had been grouped together. These notifications were issued last year, 1957, and they had been issued without any reference to us. The policy of the Central Government in regard to the food problem has been that the Essential Commodities Act, being an Act of the Central Government, we own all responsibility for the functioning of that Act. Sometimes we have been delegating powers under that Act for the enforcement of the provisions to the State Government. On other occasions we have been issuing notifications ourselves. Wherever a State Government has taken an action under any powers delegated by us and which is in fact confined to the State Government, that is, which does not affect neighbouring State Government or which does not affect any major policy of the Central Government, we have not ordinarily interfered with their discretion. However, wherever anything done by a State Government has either affected a neighbouring Government or has affected the major policy of the Government, I have not hesitated in taking action on the line which we considered to be correct, whether they were acceptable to the State Government or not. I propose to follow the same policy, namely, if the State Governments take any action the effects of which are confined to their own region and which do not contravene any major policy of the Central Government, I do not propose to interfere with those actions. But if, on the contrary, they come in conflict with any major policy of the Central Government or in fact of a neighbouring State, certainly we shall see that they are properly remedied.

I said that so far as the first two notifications were concerned they were issued by the West Bengal Government on their own authority. In the month of January we felt that these notifications had failed to achieve the results, namely either to help the West Bengal Government in making any substantial procurement or to bring down the prices. We found that the prices in the surplus areas continued to rule high and in the deficit areas they were further pushed up. My Secretary wrote to the Chief Minister of West Bengal,—I was in Gauhati those days—pointing out that these inter-district restrictions have failed to achieve their object and that the West Bengal Government may consider the question of removing them. On my way back from Gauhati I met the Chief Minister of West Bengal and told him that I was not feeling happy with the operation of those inter-district restrictions on the movement of rice and paddy because they had failed to achieve the object. Broadly he agreed with me. Then we talked about the alternative policy of procurement and we both felt that if a levy of 25 per cent is made on the rice produced by the mills, that is, if 25 per cent of the rice produced by the mills is procured by the State Government at a prescribed price, that means that we shall have to declare the control price for that region the West Bengal Government on the whole will get anything between 1,50,000 and 1,75,000 tons of rice. That was their target.

The question whether this price control order and the levy order should apply to the whole of the State of West Bengal or should apply only to certain districts also came up. We felt that it may not be necessary to apply it to the whole of West Bengal.

Shrinati Benu Chakravarty: Why?

Shri A. P. Jain: I will answer it. The hon. Member should have a little patience. I am prepared fully to

share the responsibility for this decision. I dare say that if under similar conditions I am asked upon either to share the responsibility of the State Governments or to advise them, I will advise them accordingly, as I did in the case of West Bengal. The Food Minister of West Bengal was not in Calcutta at that time. He had gone to Rajgir and was convalescing there. Dr. Roy told me that he will have to consult his Food Minister before he took a final decision on the scheme.

This will make one thing clear. While I am prepared to bear my share of the responsibility, the decision was essentially that of the West Bengal Government, because when I was in Calcutta we had a general talk and the final decision was communicated to us only about a week or so later by Dr. Roy on telephone. The next stage is a visit by Mr. Siddarth Ray to Delhi. I think it was in the first week of February that Mr. Siddarth Ray brought a draft of the notification from Calcutta to Delhi. Mr. Siddarth Ray and Shri A. K. Sen, the Law Minister, both met me with the draft. Now, we all agreed that these inter-district restrictions had done more of harm than good. We also agreed that the levy may be 25 per cent; we also agreed that control price will have to be declared wherever the levy is made. We also discussed the question whether this levy and the control prices should extend to the whole State or they may be confined to certain districts. While we did not take any firm decision it was also agreed that it may not be necessary to extend it to the whole of the State. My talk with Mr. Siddarth Ray and Shri A. K. Sen ended there, and I rang up my Secretary telling him that he should work out the details of the scheme. The same day or the next day my Secretary and some other officers of my Ministry met Shri A. K. Sen and Mr. Siddarth Ray and they worked out the details. There were some telephonic discussion, talks, with Dr. Roy and Mr. Profulla Sen,

and the final decision was that inter-district restrictions should be removed, and that the export of rice and paddy from West Bengal should be banned. The levy should be 25 per cent on the production made by the mills and the levy order as also the control order should apply to seven or eight districts.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Why was not price control put on the whole of Bengal when the prices were very high?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** The hon. lady Member need not be too impatient. I am going to deal with every aspect of it.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I am not impatient. I mentioned the prices.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I am answering that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** As he is coming to that, the hon. lady Member need not interrupt.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Two questions which have been posed by Mr. Siddarth Ray arise. One is, why the levy was limited to 25 per cent and why it was not put at a higher level. The answer is that we do not want to dry up the open market. That is, people have to buy from the open market. Our buying operations were meant for the purpose of procuring rice in order to maintain the supplies during the lean period. If I take away the whole of the rice or the major portion of rice, then there will be dearth of rice and prices will go up. Therefore, we decided on a levy of 25 per cent. The second was, why did we not apply it to the whole of Bengal and why we confined it to seven or eight districts.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I referred to price control.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I am coming to that. Price controls and levy orders have to be applied simultaneously. These 7 or 8 districts represent about more than 80 per cent. of the milling capacity of West Bengal and the remaining 8 or 9



[Shri A. P. Jain]

Districts represent only about 15 or 20 per cent. of the milling capacity of West Bengal. The latter are the deficit areas. The rice mills are concentrated in the surplus areas and if we had applied the control order as also the levy order to the deficit regions and procured rice, the paucity of rice there would have increased and the prices would have been pushed up and people would have suffered. We do not want the people to suffer. So, we wanted to confine our operations only to the areas where there was surplus and where the prices would not be pushed up because of the levy that we were making.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** The result is that when rice was procured in Hooghly, it could have come to Howrah....

**Shri A. P. Jain:** And bring down the price there.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** It is very high in Howrah.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** But it did have the effect of bringing it down there. That is the policy we followed. I dare say that if similar circumstances exist elsewhere, I am going to advise the State Government to do the same and I share full responsibility for what happens.

There is another aspect. Mr. Siddarth Ray was present here during the discussion of all the aspects of the problem. He was a party to all the discussions and I was surprised and shocked that the gentleman who was a party to these decisions and who had collaborated in the formulation of this policy, says that it is a diabolical policy. If it is a diabolical policy, he is as much responsible for it as I am.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** In his statement, he said that they could not buy it at that higher rate, because there was no price control. His point is that the price control was not introduced in the whole of Bengal.

**Shri A. F. Jain:** Such immature persons should not become plenipotentiaries of the State.

**Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi):** On a point of order. Can we discuss the name of Mr. Siddarth Ray when he is not here to defend himself?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is not the name of Mr. Siddarth Ray that is being discussed. But he has made certain allegations and involved others also. Therefore, the defence is being given that he was a party to the policy that was decided here.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** But something wrong is stated. His verbatim speech is here. What is being stated by the hon. Minister is not the correct version at all.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Mr. Siddarth Ray is being sufficiently defended. Why should there be a discussion here?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I have got a copy of the verbatim speech; I have gone through it over and over again and what I am stating is a fact.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** It is not Siddarth but Siddartha.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There need be no discussion about the pronunciation. The identity is sufficiently recognised.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram):** On a point of order. Yesterday, the hon. Speaker said that any remark which touches the character and conduct of some other person should not be made by any of the hon. Members here. Now, it was not an answer to the allegations made by Mr. Siddarth Ray. The hon. Minister just now said that such immature persons should not be made plenipotentiaries of the State. That is a reflection on the character and status of Mr. Ray. It is not a reply to the allegations.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** It should be withdrawn.

**An Hon. Member:** It must be expunged or withdrawn.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. Mr. Siddarth Ray is not being criticised for what he said when he was a Minister; he had no opportunity then to defend himself. Ministers in the State cannot be criticised; that is reiterated here very often. But after his resignation, he has made a statement and that is being criticised here, viz., he was a party to some decision that had been taken and he ought not to have said things which he did in that House after tendering his resignation. I think there is no harm in that. We should have some patience now, because we are already short of time.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** My point is this, whether the hon. Minister could make that remark that Mr. Siddarth Ray is such an immature person and a man of his calibre should not be made plenipotentiary of the State.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That perhaps can be said by anybody. Some may say that he was a very fine person and he should be made Chief Minister or Central Minister. Others can criticise that he was not fit to be made Minister. After he has resigned and gone out of office, if somebody says that he was not fit to be appointed as Minister or plenipotentiary, where is the harm? I do not see anything objectionable in that. Opinions may differ about it. Some may hold the view that he may be made the Prime Minister.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** The hon. Minister has referred to Mr. Siddarth Ray and the Bengal food problem. Why don't you give us an opportunity to discuss the Bengal food muddle?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If some notice is given, that is a different thing. I would request hon. Members not to interrupt.

**Shrimati Resu Chakravartty:** That is an incorrect statement which should be withdrawn.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Lady Member can challenge it some other time that that was not the correct statement. How can she stop him from speaking? She can have some other opportunity to challenge it.

**Shri Subiman Ghose (Burdwan):** On a point of information, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No point of information unless the Minister gives in.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I am not giving in at all.

Then there is the question of enforcement of these orders. So far as this question is concerned, I know of no details—to what persons the permits were issued, etc. That is entirely the responsibility of the State Government. Some questions have been put about them and they have been answered. Dr. Roy was to make a further enquiry and place certain facts. He has asked for certain powers. They are some novel kinds of powers and though I am not happy about it, we are going to delegate them to the State Government, so that the suspicions and clouds which are hanging on this unfortunate controversy might be cleared.

I come to the last point, namely, the implementation of the recommendations of the Foodgrains Inquiry Committee. Mr. Ashoka Mehta said that food must be taken out of politics.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh):** Politics must be taken out of food.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I fully endorse the remark of he has in view that the Central Government should give equal treatment to all the States, no matter whatever be their political complexion. I must treat Kerala as I am treating the States which have Congress Ministries. I also agree with him if he means that food should not be made subservient to party purposes. But if he thinks that the food policy should be treated as something apart from the national and economic policies of

[Shri A. P. Jain]

the Government, I am afraid I shall have to join issue with him.

The Foodgrains Inquiry Committee has made four recommendations....

Shri D. C. Sharma: They are not worth much.

Shri A. P. Jain: ...namely the establishment of a Price Stabilisation Board, a foodgrains stabilisation organisation, an advisory committee and an intelligence division. I am fully in agreement with him about the need for information about the marketing surplus, marketing conditions, marketing trends and other things. We have already taken up that matter and we propose to set up an organisation to deal with these matters. But the linch-pin of his recommendations is the price stabilisation board. While in principle we agree that there must be assurance of reasonable prices to the consumer and the producer, there must be parity between the prices of foodgrains and cash crops and between agricultural produce and consumer goods, in working out the details of the organisation which should implement this policy we are coming across considerable difficulties. The Foodgrains Enquiry Committee has observed—I am referring to pages 81-82:—

"We recommend, therefore, firstly, the setting up of a high-powered authority for the formulation of the policy for price stabilisation in general and determining the programme for enforcing it from time to time."

The Committee is to consist of officials and a representative of the Reserve Bank. Now, the Report further says:

"The Board should examine not only the food prices as such, but also the prices of all related consumer and producer goods, e.g. cloth, oilcake, fertilisers, iron and steel, etc., study the various

margins charged at different stages before sale to the cultivator and make appropriate suggestions."

Now, these recommendations lay down, firstly, the constitution of the Committee and, secondly, the functions of the Committee in discharging these functions. The methods laid down at page 91 are as follows:—

"These prices should be varied from season to season in the light of various factors, e.g., trends of costs, incomes, price parities. We agree that various relevant factors, e.g., cost of production of the concerned foodgrains and competing crops, cost of living of the agriculturist and industrial labour, relative movements in prices of food crops and cash crops, and in incomes of agricultural and non-agricultural workers, may be examined."

At present, there is hardly any data available regarding the cost of production or the farmer's income and it will take a few years before we can collect some data. Shri Asoka Mehta made a reference to Japan and said they are working hard to find out the cost of production. But they have not been successful. We are having an international seminar on "stabilisation of agricultural prices and farm income" in Delhi these days and I had occasion to talk with the leader of the Japanese delegation and also with some other delegates. I was told that as a result of their experiment they found that the cost of production varies, not only according to the soil and climatic conditions, but also according to region and region and according to the size of the farm. The profits on the bigger farm are 300 per cent. of the profits on the smaller farm. In fact, they are finding it more and more difficult to work out the cost of production, which should serve as a basis for the determination of national policies. One of these experts went to the length of saying that it is better to fix the prices on an ad hoc basis.

Now, a committee of officials of the nature suggested by the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee can work only on the basis of certain specific data. That data is not available today. Another question which we are confronted with is, even if the data is available, whether we should set up the board. Here I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to the observation of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee.

At page 79, they say:

"The most important controls of an over-all character bearing on the level of prices are fiscal and monetary policies. The aspect of fiscal policy which has the most decisive impact on the general level of prices is the over-all state of the budget, viz., the extent of the budgetary deficit or, taking receipts from public borrowing and small savings into account, the extent of deficit financing. This is conditioned in turn primarily by the volume and phasing of developmental expenditure as well as the extent of foreign assistance available. If the magnitudes of deficit financing, together with development expenditure offset partly by foreign aid impose a measure of strain on the economy that makes a certain rise in prices inevitable, then any other measures that may be taken can only modify to some extent the impact of that rise in prices but cannot completely obviate it."

n other words, what they mean to say is that fiscal and monetary policies are the dominant factors in determining the prices.

Now, the question is: if these are the dominant factors how is this Committee of officials going to work? It will, of course, work on the scientific basis. But there might be a conflict between the two. If this Committee as the final power of determining the prices, then the over-all economic and national policies will be indirectly

determined by this Committee. No popular government and no Cabinet can abrogate all these powers and hand them over to an official committee.

While I fully agree that action has to be taken to effect price stabilisation in between the different foodgrains, in between the foodgrains and the cash crops and the agricultural produce and the consumer goods, the question what type of machinery it should be is a matter which has been causing us a considerable amount of concern. The position is that while we agree with the broad principle, the shape and the nature of the organisation needed to achieve that end has got to be carefully examined. We are doing it and, as soon as we have come to a conclusion, I will place those conclusions before the House.

Now, there are many more things which have been stated by hon. Members. But, I am afraid, I have already taken more than the time allocated to me.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Thiruvella): I want to ask one question. The hon. Minister has made some promise about the rice subsidy that is to be given to the various States like Bengal and others. Shri Punnoose wanted to know whether he will give it to Kerala also, at least in the coming lean months.

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes, I will.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The C.T.O. strike is going on. Something must be mentioned about it by the hon. Minister.

Shri A. P. Jain: So far as the C.T.O. strike is concerned, their demand is that they should not be asked to go on compulsory leave during the period when there is no work for them to do.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Departmental

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Yes, departmental leave. The alternative before us is either to retrench some persons or to make them go on departmental leave, that is to say, distribute shortage of employment among a larger number of persons. Now, obviously, there has been criticism all over the country that the charges of C.T.O. are high and we have to bring them down. In fact, we are charging even less than the cost of working and we cannot undergo any further losses. We are prepared to accept either of the two suggestions. If the union wants that we should retrench some persons, I am prepared for that. If, on the other hand, they want that the system of departmental leave should continue, I am prepared for that also. Besides, we have referred the matter to the labour officers and we are prepared to abide by their decision.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** The C.T.O. workers are also working under some department. Now the entire matter of service conditions is being considered by the Central Pay Commission, which has been recently appointed. I would request the Minister to refer this also to the Pay Commission, if possible, so that the strike may come to an end.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Whatever the Pay Commission recommends will be applicable to this organisation also. But, meanwhile, I cannot do anything which may upset the present working.

Some Hon. Members rose—

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If I allow questions like this, then there will be no end. One member after another will rise. Now I will put the cut motions to the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President,

to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand Nos. 42 to 46 and 118 to 120 relating to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture."

*The motion was adopted.*

*(The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced below—Ed.)*

**DEMAND NO. 42—MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 67,41,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture'".

**DEMAND NO. 43—FOREST**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,34,90,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Forest'".

**DEMAND NO. 44—AGRICULTURE**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,41,45,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Agriculture'".

**DEMAND NO. 45—CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,35,90,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges

which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Civil Veterinary Services'".

**DEMAND No. 46—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,65,70,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Other Expenditure under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'".

**DEMAND No. 118—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON FORESTS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,72,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Forests'".

**DEMAND No. 119—PURCHASE OF FOOD-GRAINS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,10,12,73,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Purchase of Foodgrains'".

**DEMAND No. 120—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,61,20,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'".

**MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demands Nos. 6, 7 and 107 relating to the Ministry of Community Development for which 6 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members desirous of moving cut motions may hand over at the Table within 15 minutes the numbers of the Selected cut motions.

Hon. Members are already aware of the time-limit for speeches.

**DEMAND No. 6—MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,16,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Ministry of Community Development'".

**DEMAND No. 7—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND NATIONAL EXTENSION SERVICE**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,03,83,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Community Development Projects and National Extension Service'".

**DEMAND No. 107—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,12,91,000 be granted to the