

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL) FOR THE YEAR 1987-88 (NOVEMBER, 1987)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MOSTAFA BIN QUASEM): Now, the Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs, Mr. Jacob, to lay a statement on the Table of the House.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Sir, on behalf of the Minister of State in the Department of Expenditure in the Ministry of Finance, Mr. B. K. Gadhvi, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for the year 1987-88 (November, 1987).

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Minimum Support Price of Toria Crop of 1987-88 season

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MOSTAFA BIN QUASEM): Now, the Minister of Agriculture, Shri G. S. Dhillon, to make a statement.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI G. S. DHILLON): Sir, as announced earlier on 12th instant, the Government have fixed the minimum support price of Toria crop of 1987-88 to be marketed in 1987-88 season itself at Rs. 400 per quintal. The price fixed for 1987-88 season is higher by Rs. 25 per quintal than that of the last year. The price has been fixed at a higher level to provide incentive to the producers to increase the production of oilseeds.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MOSTAFA BIN QUASEM): I think there is only one name here for seeking clarifications. Mr. Chatterjee.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Please include my name also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MOSTAFA BIN QUASEM): Yes, Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, what has been surprising me in all these announcements is the utter disregard for the agriculturists. I am saying this because, last year, the price was Rs. 400/- per quintal. This time the rise is by Rs. 25/- per quintal. This works out to a rise of slightly above 6 per cent. Now, is it the assumption of the hon. Minister that the rise in wholesale price index is 6 per cent this year? If it is not so, if the wholesale price index has risen further, if also the consumer price index, whether of the industrial workers or the agricultural labourers, has risen to two digits—and the anticipation is that it has risen to two digits—Then how can this modest rise act as an incentive for further production of oilseeds? I have on another occasion drawn the attention of the Minister to the fact that increasingly the terms of trade between agriculture and industry, between farm products and industrial products, are going against agricultural products. And we need a break-through in oilseeds. We are tremendously soft to capital in the urban areas, but we are so tardy in the case of agricultural products. Is it necessary? I will therefore request the hon. Minister to kindly reconsider and revise the figure at least by a rise of 10 per cent over the last year's price. The price, a consumer has to pay is not at all necessary, because it is the middleman who seizes the difference between the retail and wholesale price. So if that problem can be handled, a further rise for this product would be beneficial for growth in production. And if productivity also increases the consumers can benefit from that also, Thank you, Sir.

SHRI GIULAM RASOOL MATTO:

Sir, I would request the hon. Minister to enlighten me whether, while fixing the price of oilseeds—the other day also I said the same thing and I reiterate today the same thing—the Government take into consideration only the price that was fixed last year and the increase this year, or the Government also take one factor which he mentioned the other day, namely, the market price? Does he know that the market-price of 'toria tel' is also 50 per cent higher this year than last year? I would like to seek this clarification whether the Government, while fixing the price, has taken the current price of 'toria' edible oil into consideration. Thank you.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY

(Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are short in oilseeds production and edible oil, and we have to import this. During the drought year we are having shorter supply. The Government, it seems, is not taking into consideration all this while fixing these prices. The Government should take this very seriously and study these problems. So far as pulses are concerned, we have to import them. Without pulses, I think the nutrition standards will go down, and without nutrition standards, I think, we are exposed to pestilence. Until and unless the farmers are encouraged to take on themselves the risk of going in for cultivation on a larger scale, it becomes difficult. That is why, all the inputs needed by the agriculturists must be given to them properly. More than that, the agriculturist should get the price which is in comparison with the high level of prices quoted in the market. As has already been shown, the black money which has accumulated in the country controls the market and fixes its own price and the Government is not in a position to interfere with this tendency. The black money hits the farmers by

entering into the market and buying the produce at cheap prices. It also hits the consumers by selling to them at higher prices. Therefore, if justice has to be done to the farmers, these things should be properly planned and properly implemented. The price fixation is one of the essential components for it. I request the Government and the hon. Minister to revise the price if they are serious in giving a satisfactory price to the farmers.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil

Nadu): Sir, it seems that the prices of all commodities are going up. The consumer prices are going up and the wholesale prices are also going up. There has been a clamour in Parliament that the prices of all the essential food articles have to be brought down. The Government has been promising that the prices will come down. But they have not been able to do anything in this matter. The Government is more concerned with the consumers of the agricultural products than with the producers of the agricultural product. I support the opinion expressed by the hon. Members including Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee. The agricultural support price is supposed to be the minimum support price and the minimum support price is also being given for paddy. Now what is happening is that even though we call it the minimum support price, it becomes the maximum support price wherever the levy system is in operation. I come from Thanjavur District which has a levy system for the last 15-20 years. This levy system is in operation in the entire district. Consequently, the farmers of the area have to sell their paddy at the lowest support price that the Government has been announcing, while in other areas the farmers are getting higher prices. The agriculturists are suffering because they are not able to get enough for their paddy. Also, they have to purchase at a higher price elsewhere. This section is supposed to subsidise for the urban population. As has

[Shri G. Swaminathan]

been mentioned by other hon. Members, if you want to support the prices of cooking oils and pulses, you have to give more incentives to these people. Unless incentives are given to these people, a day will come when India will not be able to grow enough for our consumption. Therefore, I want to ask the hon. Minister whether, at least after some time, the Government will allow the market prices to rule. If they want to subsidise, they should subsidise the urban consumers as is being done in Japan. In Japan, the producers are not made to subsidise the consumers or the urban population. Ultimately, what is happening is that the producers are getting the market prices and the consumers are being subsidised by the Government. In India, what is happening is that the agriculturists are asked to subsidise the consumers. It has become topsyturvy. I want to ask the hon. Minister two questions. Will he raise the minimum support price? It is not the minimum support price. It happens to be the maximum price that is being given to the agriculturist. Will the support price be limited to the consumers and will the agriculturists be given the market price

श्री कैलाश पति मिश्र (बिहार) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, 25 रुपये प्रति क्विंटल की वृद्धि करके समर्थन प्राइस निर्धारित की जा रही है। यह हास्यास्पद लगता है कि समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि इसका आधार क्या है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि 1987-88 में क्या सरकार ने ऐससमेंट किया है कि खाद्य तेल की मांग कितनी है और देश के अंदर जो उत्पादन हो रहा है, उससे कितने तेल की आपूर्ति हो रही है? मुझे सन्देह है कि देश में जो सूखे का असर हुआ है उससे खाद्यान्न अन्न का भंडार भी समाप्त होता जा रहा है, खाद्यान्न तेल की तो पहले से ही कमी हो रही है। नीति ऐसी बनानी चाहिए

थी कि विदेशों में पैसा फँकने के बजाय देश के किसानों में उत्साह पैदा करते और वह आयल सीड्स से लेकर खाद्यान्न उत्पादन तक में निर्भर बनते। मैं सीधा प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ जो स्टेटमेंट के अंदर नहीं है, जानबूझकर छोड़ा गया है या छुट गया है मैं कह नहीं सकता। देश में इस वर्ष खाद्यान्न तेल की कितनी आवश्यकता है? सरकार के पास इसका क्या असेसमेंट है? यदि कमी है तो आप कितने मूल्य का खाद्यान्न तेल बाहर से मंगाने की योजना बना रहे हैं? उस पर कितनी राशि बाहर आयेगी? उसी राशि को अगर किसानों को हम समर्थन मूल्य बढ़ा कर देते तो उससे उत्साह उनका बढ़ता और उससे देश आत्मनिर्भर बनता तो इस आत्मनिर्भरता को कैद करने के लिए सरकार के पास कौन सी योजना है

SHRI G. S. DHILLON: Sir, I am thankful to the Members for seeking elucidation. These rates, as has already been referred to, are indicated by the Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices. As earlier indicated the price of toria will be determined...

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार): मंत्री जी ने प्राइसेज एण्ड कास्ट्स कमीशन की बात की है तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें सात सदस्य बनाने की बात है जब कि तीन प्रतिनिधि ही हैं, चार किसान का नहीं।

श्री जी. एस. धिल्लों: आपसे सुन ही नहीं है मैं कहने वाला हूँ। आप पहले ही बोल बैठे। आप पहले सुन लीजिए फिर जो कहना हो कह दीजिए।
(व्यवधान)

Sir, this was indicated by the Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices that the rate of Toria should be fixed after determining the differential between the price of mustard, rapeseed and toria. As you know, the Agricultural Costs and Prices Commission, as I said on a number of

occasions, normally takes into account all factors—inputs, implements, market rates, terms of trade etc. All these are counted. And this is in deference to the indication given by the Agricultural Costs and Prices Commission that this increase of Rs. 40 had been fixed. It could be even lesser, but to give more incentives to the farmers, we have increased this time up to Rs. 25 more than that of last year. Sir, the hon. Members have expressed some apprehension about the market prices. This fixation of the rate by the Government is on assurance that if at all the market price comes down to a certain level, the Government will come in to buy them at a minimum price fixed. Normally, the market prices rule much higher than the price fixed. It is only a sort of protective step that if something goes wrong, this will not be allowed to fall beyond this level. That is the main thing. I think, Sir, this is a very reasonable price. It was suggested that it should not be more than an increase of Rs. 30/-. But still after taking into account many factors the Government has exercised its discretion to go up by Rs. 10 more because due to drought, floods and many other factors, the production of oilseeds could not come up to the level which we expected. The Hon. Member asked as to how much oilseeds we might be importing. So far it is estimated that we may import oilseeds to the tune of 0.5 million tonnes and that will be on an aid basis. We have received some offers from many countries. We are not likely to go beyond this. This is as a sort of precaution and we will be importing this much. (Interruptions). Edible oil target in 1987-88 as asked by the hon. Member shall be 1.7 million tonnes. This does not mean that market prices have not been taken into account. They normally rule in many commodities much above the CSC price. This we have done because we thought that this should be determined on the differential between rapese-

ed, mustard and toria and that we have done and we have liberally done it. I thought you will be very happy to know that we have done this. But still some questions arose out of it.

श्री गुलाम रसूल मट्टू : सरसों की सौतेली बहिन तोरिया हैं। इनके भाव बाजार में 35/- रु० और 32/- रु० है 32/- रु० एडीबल आयल है। यह हालत क्यों है, इसमें हकीकत क्या है, यह बताया जाना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बारे में ईसाफ नहीं हो रहा है।

श्री जी० एस० ढिल्लों : ईसाफ तो कर रहे हैं। लेकिन आप क्या चाहते हैं, यह समझ में नहीं आता है।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : जहाँ तक एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस कमीशन का सवाल है, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आपने यह कमीशन बना दिया है और इसमें जो सात आदमी रखने की बात कही गई थी, क्या आपने उनकी नियुक्ति कर दी है? क्या आपने उसमें किसानों के प्रतिनिधि की नियुक्ति कर दी है? अगर वह कमीशन अभी तक बना नहीं है तो आप क्यों बार-बार उस कमीशन का उद्धरण दे रहे हैं?

श्री जी० एस० ढिल्लों : मैं तो एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस एण्ड कास्ट कमीशन ने जो फीगर्स दी हैं उनको ही कोट कर रहा हूँ।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि क्या एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस एण्ड कास्ट कमीशन बन गया है और उसमें सात आदमियों की नियुक्ति कर दी गई है? क्या उसमें किसानों के प्रतिनिधि रखे गये हैं?

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Sir, the hon. Minister has stated that the oilseeds that we are importing will be by way of aid from other countries. Does he mean to say that we are not going to pay for these oilseeds

[Shri G. Swaminathan]

and that we will not have to pay any foreign exchange for its import? I would like this point to be clarified as to what he means by saying that these edible oils we are getting by way of aid. Do we have to pay for them or we don't have to pay for them?

SHRI G. S. DHILLON: I am sorry, Sir, we will not probably import more than the minimum needed. We have thought that if we do it that will affect prices and ultimately the farmer will be affected. That risk we do not want to take.

THE AIR (PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF POLLUTION AMENDMENT BILL, 1987—contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MOSTAFA BIN QUASEM): We shall now take up the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Amendment Bill, 1987.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am on a point of clarification. While I was speaking before lunch recess, I had to conclude rather hurriedly. At that time there were interruptions about a particular point, which I need to clarify. Kindly give me two minutes. This is in regard to the amendment which my friend, Shri Vishvjit Prithvijit Singh, was mentioning. Where no penalty has been provided, the original provision was a fine of Rs. 5,000 and after conviction, if he refuses to pay, Rs. 100 per day. The amendment now says that the fine of Rs. 5,000 would be Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 100 per day would become Rs. 5,000 per day. Additionally, because of suggestions in the House, they have provided for, as an alternative, a punishment of not less than three months. My only point was when everywhere it has been provided for a longer period of imprisonment when you are moving in that direction, why is it that this amendment is not in the direction of imposing imprisonment compulsorily and for a longer period. On this point,

I wanted to retain my position. Thank you.

SHRI VISHVJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Bill. This is an extremely important measure which I am proud to support. The very nature of the measure becomes clear from the title. The Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Amendment Bill, 1987. In the statement of objects and reasons, it has been said—this point was made by the hon. Minister also a little while ago before lunch—that certain lacunae have been found, certain problems are there, certain things have been brought to the notice of the Government and to bring the Act more in consonance and more in line with the objectives for which the Act was framed originally, the amendments have been brought forward, thereby making it all-comprehensive and, therefore, in the eventual analysis, more effective.

Sir, my point, which I have been making time and time again in the House, is that whenever we bring forward amendments we ought to be very careful. One of our major problems, as I have been saying, is that we have the best of intentions but these best of intentions, by the time they get down and become an Act, by the time the rules are framed and by the time the rules are implemented, go awry. We find ourselves in all sorts of problems. The best of intentions are not implemented. Why are they not implemented? They are not implemented because of the lack of implementational will. It is there within our bureaucracy. It is this lack of implementational will which causes all problems and it is because of this that we have had to bring forward such sort of amendments. It is a totally-comprehensive redrafting of the Act. It amounts to a redrafting of the Act. It is a very good measure.

Having said his, I would now deal with the Act as it stands. I am going to refer to the sections as they stand in the Act now. The nomenclatures I