

3 P.M.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS) 1980-81

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI C. K. JAFFAR SHARIEF): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (Railways) for 1980-81.

RESOLUTION RE. FIXING OF REMUNERATIVE PRICES FOR AGRICULTURAL .. COMMODITIES—Contd.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: There was no response from the Janata Government. And then I met the officials who are in the ICAR. I told them this is the fate every year. If the particular chemical is imported and if a farmer applies that particular insecticide in his field, the per acre cost will be only Rs. 140. But we are losing Rs. 48 crores if you calculate the total acreage under cultivation of chilly.

Then, Sir, on the same issue, I asked a question and I received a reply on 17th December 1980 wherein I was informed:

“Research trials under Coordinated Project showed that Dimethoate 0.1 per cent was the best insecticide in controlling aphid populations.”

This is the reply that I got from the Ministry. The very same insecticide has been applied in our fields; but there is no use. Even this year the same fate has dawned on our farmers. Even in my field. I have cultivated 8 acres under chilly. I am afraid before I reach home, the whole crop will be destroyed again, by the same attack of aphid. I am not blaming the Ministers or the Government, but the officials who are sitting in the Agricultural Research Institutes and other places. They are not looking to the problem; they do not go deeper into it. So, I request the Minister to

kindly see whether this particular insecticide is effective or not and also the chemical about which I have said that if it is imported, the cost will be very low but the crop can be saved every year. Farmers are really suffering on this aspect alone.

Sir, how are the things going on in the Indian Council of Agricultural Research? I am very much pained to see it. I saw a press report in the *Indian Express* of 24th February under the caption “7-year journey of a Govt. file” I quote from the paper:

“This is a stranger than a fiction tale of a Government file which has been shuttling within a distance of less than two kilometres for over seven years without securing any decision.

The file pertains to the seniority of 33 assistants of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research who were recruited in 1970 after a competitive examination...

In its journey from Krishi Bhavan to Shastri Bhavan to North Block, the file has gathered over 3000 pages and kilos of dust.

The file has seen four governments—Mrs. Gandhi's, Mr. Morarji Desai's, Mr. Charan Singh's and again Mrs. Gandhi's—half a dozen Agriculture Ministers and hundreds of ‘clear the backlog drives’.”

I think this Minister has taken a decision on that file; it is also reported. Our hon. Minister for Agriculture is a very competent person; in the State Legislature also he had that experience as Chief Minister. I would like to request him to set the House in order.

If that is the fate of a Government file which takes 7 years, same reply will be coming to me. Having experienced the difficulty myself, I requested the Janata Government; they did not respond. I put a question and got the same reply. But the farmers are suffering. Many of the farmers ask me to raise the issue and watch the

reaction of the Government whether that chemical is imported. I also agreed with them that let us watch and see, we can only get a good reply. So, Sir, I would request the hon. Minister to look into this problem. Sir, actually, millions came to the Boat Club. Some of the friends were criticising. I am not going into the political aspect. They came, they responded to the call of the Prime Minister. They hope that their tears will be erased by this Government. Hence, they came. Some people raised the question whether they are agriculturists or somebody else. I do not want to attribute any motives. The point is, they came. This shows that they have awakened from their slumber. When the hon. Prime Minister addressed the gatherings, she said, 'we have understood your suffering'. She even said: 'We are prepared to shed our blood for your sake. If necessary, we will irrigate your land with our blood'. This is what has been said by our Madam Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. The farmers have now realised. But Sir, the urban-based people, the people who are living in the cities and towns, are not really giving any respect for the farmers. They are describing them as Kulaks. Sometimes, even in our House, we hear the farmers being called as Kulaks. But the Editor of 'Blitz', Mr. Karanjia, has understood the problem and he has correctly stated—I quite *Blitz* of December 27, 1980:

"The powerful industrial lobby which is interested in maximising profits by denying the producer of cash crops remunerative prices, as also the wholesaler and trader thriving on the loot of the producer as well as the consumer, will surely try to distort the issues at stake. They are already attempting to win the sympathy of the urban workers and middle class employees by propagating through their 'kept' Press that if the farmers are given remunerative prices the consumers will suffer."

This is what they are doing. We should be very vigilant and careful. Otherwise, the farmers cannot be protected. But Sir, we should see the writing on the wall. If we consider their demands sympathetically, if we try to solve their problems in a proper manner, then, we can be secure, we can feel secure. Otherwise, definitely, we will face the eruption of a volcano. The second phase of the freedom struggle, the fight for economic justice and social emancipation of the nation's dispossessed and oppressed peasantry is slowly and surely emerging from the womb of rural India. If we try to beat them, if we try to kick them, then, we will face the wrath of a tiger. I would not agree with those who are saying that the farmers are agitating only on political considerations. This agitation is above politics; this is above party politics. Even politicians have become irrelevant in this matter. Hence, when they start agitations we should not think that this has been sponsored by some political elements or something like that. Because of their sufferings, because of their hardships they raise their voice, they demonstrate. But in some parts of the country, when the agriculturists go and place their grievances, when they demonstrate, they are attacked. This agitation by the farmers started in Tamil Nadu. When I spoke on the floor of this House last year, I said, you should try to solve the problem; otherwise, this will spread up to the Himalayas; this will spread throughout the country. I said, you should go deep into the problem and you should try to solve the problem; otherwise, this will spread like a bushfire. This is what has happened now. Now, I think, the Government is taking keen interest and is trying to solve the problem. When something goes wrong, a hue and cry is raised in this House. When it was alleged that a person was killed, his corpse was brought even upto the house of the Home Minister. But when some agriculturists were attacked and killed in Tamil Nadu, the dead bodies were not handed over

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

to their relatives, they were cremated as orphans, as unclaimed bodies. I came to Delhi to represent to the hon. Prime Minister here. These agriculturists do not belong to any party, neither to my party nor to the party of Mr. Kalyanasundaram. When these agriculturists demonstrated on December 31, there was shooting. Sometimes that shooting can be justified, but the agriculturists were not killed in shooting. Two persons were shot dead, many were wounded. Three persons who were wounded, before the eyes of the crying ladies, were thrown in the police lorries. They were killed by bayonets of the police. This has been stated in the Indian Express paper dated January 17, 1981. They were killed and after that, the dead bodies were cremated as unclaimed dead bodies near Tirunelveli. The poor people belonged to Kurujakulam village in Tirunelveli District in Tamil Nadu.

Sir, they are facing the attack by the police. All along we came to Delhi to represent to the hon. Prime Minister. Nobody can outwit the volcano without solving their problems. This is the appropriate time to give them remunerative price for their produce. Then only their hope and confidence with which they came to Delhi will be established. At least they have hoped that of all the persons the Prime Minister will solve their problems. They came to Delhi with this hope. So, I would request the Minister and the Government to see that their problems are solved, their ambitions and aspirations are fulfilled.

With these words I conclude.

SHRI K. S. MALLE GOWDA (Karnataka): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to speak on this important Resolution. I must congratulate my friend, Mr. Naidu, for having brought forward this very important Resolution for discussion.

Sir, if the nation has to see that its workers have to be paid fair wages,

the employees in public and private sectors have to be paid their fair emoluments, a modern nation must be much more concerned to pay fair prices for farm produces. Otherwise it is sheer exploitation of the rural society by urban society. Sir, it is a historical fact that Indian farmer has been exploited for centuries in the matter of price paid for his farm-produce. Today, even under the modern Government, the Indian farmer, in a way, is made to slave for others. He is allowed to have a plot of land to grow rice, wheat, ragi, cotton, or sugarcane which are required by the nation and, in many cases, he is allowed to sell his produce at a price which does not yield even a fair wage for his labour. Are our farmers getting a fair price for their farm produce? No, not for many of the farm products. Most of our urban friends are thinking that milk and honey flow in our villages and agriculture is a golden profession. But the reality is different.

Sir, what is the fair price for farm-produce? It is the fair wage of the farmer, plus the cost of inputs, like fertilizers, pesticides, etc., plus the interest on the debts incurred for cultivation expenses, plus managerial cost, plus the depreciation value of farm implements plus reasonable profit on the investment in the farm, all rolled in one, just the same way as you would compute the price or calculate the manufacturing cost of any industrial or factory products. It is just as simple, and as just and reasonable as that. In one word, it is parity-price for farm-produce. If the Government does not ensure a parity-price for the nation's principal farm-produces, it is helping farmers to be bled white, it ensures the weakening of the rural economy resulting in the ultimate weakening of the national economy. One sure way to perpetuate poverty in the vast countryside with 5½ lakh villages of India is to depress the farm-prices to uneconomic levels. In our new age of enlightenment, this is the sure way also to spark off political explosions and

farmers' revolutions we are already beginning to witness now in the various parts of the country. These farmers' revolutions seeking parity prices for farm-produces and better deal for them are sure to spread in the country if the Government does not act realistically, pragmatically and wisely in regard to these vital economic problems.

Sir, therefore, I would emphatically say that parity-prices for farm produce should become the goal for our farmers, farmers' organisations and Parliament. Again, I would like to quote from my book. "For Power or For People":—

"In the U.S.A During the 1930's parity prices—that is, fair prices for farm-products in relation to the prices farmers paid for goods, looking back to the 1910—14 period—became a goal for farmers, farm organisations and Congress. Parity prices were to be both the measuring rods and the means of securing for the farmers a fair share of national income and national wealth."

The Yearbook of Agriculture, 1954 (U.S.A:), states:

"A key to how well we think the market is doing its job is our satisfaction or dissatisfaction with prices, for prices help to decide farmers' incomes, on the one hand, and consumers' costs, on the other. Several programmes of the Department of Agriculture provide price assistance to farmers. The most important price-support programmes bring into the market-place an additional type of buyer—the Government—a potential buyer with relatively unlimited financial resources. The Government competes with commercial buyers, but unlike them its objective is to stabilise prices received by farmers rather than to make a profit."

Sir, I would like to mention how the Japanese Government are most concerned about the farmers who are

largely small holders and how the Government has been continually raising the price of rice which is the main farm produce in their country, to raise the income of farmers. I would again quote from my book:

"Thirdly, there is a regular price-support scheme for rice—the major agricultural produce of Japan. Practically the entire quantity of rice sold by the farmers is purchased by the Government. The distribution of rice to consumers is made through the consumers' cooperatives and other licensed traders at a price lower than the purchase rate. The Government sells the same to the consumers at a subsidized rate which is nearly 20 per cent lower than the purchase-rate."

According to *Economic Picture of Japan*, "The producers price of rice was raised from year to year under the Government's policy of assuring the farmer an income comparable to that of the urban industrial worker; and in 1970, it was double the level of 1960. As a result, the price which the Government buys up from its farmers is more than twice the price of imported rice."

Sir, we produce about 130 million tonnes of foodgrains today and 60 million tonnes of sugar. Taking that about half the quantity of 130 million tonnes, or 70 million tonnes as marketable surplus and if the producers get a very modest sum of Rs. 20/- per quintal more, they would be getting over Rs. 1400 crores more of income per annum. And even if sugarcane producers get just 20 paise more per kilogram of sugar as their due, they would be getting Rs. 120 crores more per annum. If the Government secures parity-prices for farm produces from the year 1980—the year of the beginning of farmers' revolutions for a better deal to them—Rural India should be getting over Rs. 2500 crores per annum. When the rural community invests this extra income of Rs. 2500 crores in the next 10 years in bettering their villages and in

[Shri K. S. Malle Gowda]

bettering the quality of life in Rural India, we will be changing the face of India greatly and we will, in truth, be beginning to build a great and vibrant New India of our dreams. Sir, lastly, I would appeal to the Prime Minister to change the constitution of the present Agricultural Prices Commission. It should be a body of not less than 15 members. At least half of its members should be farmers with rich experience and knowledge, and it should include at least one Krishi Pandit who has secured national awards. It should be able to tour in the States, visit farms, make inquiries and collect relevant data for fixing parity price for farm products every year.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. I am in agreement with the Resolution moved before the House except for the fact that the last clause is unnecessary. "The House is of opinion that Government should take steps to fix remunerative prices for agricultural commodities" should have been enough. "... in view of their high cost of production," is absolutely unnecessary, because it seems to suggest that if the cost of production is not high, the peasant is not to be paid a remunerative price—which would be an absolutely wrong thing. Sir, I think the hon. Minister will postpone his private discussion and listen to some of the points being made in the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is hearing you.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Sir, I want to raise some basic conceptual points about the whole question of remunerative prices for agricultural products. I consider the question of remunerative price for the peasant to be as fundamental a slogan as that of land to the tiller and fair wage to the worker. The three slogans flow from the resolution on complete independence adopted by the Indian National

Congress in December, 1929. That resolution declared: we believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as of every other people, to be free and to enjoy the fruits of their labour. How can the people enjoy the fruits of their labour? Only they are assured of a fair remuneration for their labour. A fair remuneration to the worker is a fair wage, a living wage. A fair remuneration to the peasant is a fair price, a remunerative price for his produce. The difference between a worker and a peasant is this: A worker goes and sells his labour to a capitalist. A peasant employs his own labour on his own field and he sells the product of his labour. That is the difference between the two. But workers and working peasants broadly belong to the same category. So, as a worker is entitled to a fair wage, a peasant is also entitled to get a remunerative price. This principle was accepted by the leadership of the national movement right up to the appointment of the Kumarappa Committee, known as the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee. I will just read out one of the recommendations of the Kumarappa Committee:—

"Computation of fair price.—A fair price should assure an agricultural producer an income sufficient to maintain him and his family at a standard of living equivalent to that enjoyed by comparable classes of population. Due allowance, therefore, should be made to the cost of such goods and services as make up a reasonable standard of living for the cultivating class. The fair price should also enable the cultivator to pay minimum wages to agricultural labourers, which we recommend elsewhere, and payment of premium for crop and cattle insurance."

I am not reading everything. I am only reading the other part dealing with parity. In another paragraph the Committee says:

"We do feel that the question of combating a general economic depression is beyond the purview of

this committee and should be tackled by suitable fiscal monetary methods. But if the fall of prices of agricultural commodities is more than that of prices of industrial and other goods entering into the cost of cultivation and cost of living of the cultivators, the state should see that: (1) prices do not fall below the minimum cost of cultivation—including the cost of his and his family's budget and (2) the relation of agricultural prices with industrial prices remain at a parity which is fair to agricultural producers."

Now, these were the recommendations of the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee as it was known, which was appointed in 1947 by the President of the Indian National Congress, and its report was submitted in 1949, with Dr. J. C. Kumarappa, a well-known Gandhian economist as the Chairman. But these recommendations were forgotten; they were not accepted by the Government ... (Interruptions) I challenge the hon. Agriculture Minister to produce any document of the Government of India where they have accepted this principle of a remunerative price for agricultural produce. They have so far not accepted it. On the contrary...

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): They have accepted it.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: ... Opposite recommendations have been made. I would quote from another Government publication regarding the agricultural price policy in India. This is a report submitted by an official of the US Government, Dr. Louis F. Herrman, Consultant in Agricultural Marketing and Price Policy of the US Department of Agriculture, "loaned" by the World Bank to the Government of India to "advise" on agricultural price policy, and his report is published by Mr. G. R. Kamat, the then Secretary to the Government

of India, Ministry of Food and Agriculture in 1965.

श्री लाडलीमोहन निगम : (मध्य प्रदेश)
बहुत पुराना बात कर रहे हैं उन लोगों के लिए बहुत पुरानी जा गई है ।

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: I am coming to that. What does this gentleman say? He says: "Therefore, price incentives in the form of price enhancement may be ruled out as policy alternatives. It should be ruled out. And then: "One of the lesser imperatives of Indian agricultural price policy is to protect certain agriculturally based export industries against rising costs. By keeping grain cheap, wages may be held in check and raw materials cheapened. This is the view of the American Consultant on the Indian agricultural price policy and it was accepted by the Government of India and on that basis the Agricultural Prices Commission was established. And the terms of reference of the Agricultural Prices Commission does not make any stipulation that it is the duty of the Commission to fix a remunerative price or... (Interruptions) I am coming to that. Be patient. that it is their duty to maintain any kind of parity between the prices of agricultural and industrial products. As late as 1978, when Shri Barnala was the Agriculture Minister, in a written note, the Agriculture Ministry stated that the terms of reference of the Agricultural Prices Commission do not authorise them to maintain any parity between the prices of agricultural and industrial products. Now the terms of reference have been revised. If the Minister wants. I am prepared to lay a copy of the revised terms of reference on the Table of the House so that the Hon. Members may see. It is dated the 5th of March, 1980. Even these revised terms of reference do not contain the principle of paying a remunerative price for agricultural produce.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Wheat about the parity?

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: It says:

"(5) To take into account the changes in terms of trade between agricultural and non-agricultural sectors."

(Interruptions)

Have patience. This is the change that they have made. This is not the guideline. This is just a supplementary consideration. The guideline is this:

"To advise on the price policy of paddy, rice and other commodities as the Government may indicate from time to time with a view to evolving a balanced and integrated price structure in the perspective of the over-all needs of the economy and with due regard to the interests of the producers and the consumer."

These are the same terms which were formulated in 1965. No change. The principle of remunerative prices has not yet been accepted by the Government. Why? Why have they not accepted it? What are the reasons? What are their arguments? I will briefly deal with their arguments.

Before coming to that I will just deal with their concept of the cost of production. The Agricultural Prices Commission is supposed to go into the cost of production. Through the agricultural universities a comprehensive scheme of working out the cost of production of various crops is under way. The APC does take into consideration those cost reports. But in those cost reports there are two fundamental deficiencies. The first Chairman of the Agricultural Prices Commission, Prof. Dantwala, in a recent article in the "ECONOMIC TIMES" has confessed that in the beginning the APC was deciding the price only on the basis of the average cost of production." By deciding the price on the basis of the average cost, one-third of the producers who were small peasants, were not covered. That means that they received a price which was less than their cost of production. Then the principle was

changed to what Prof. Dantwala calls, "the bulk line cost of production." But even in this concept of the bulk line cost of production 15 per cent of the peasants who are small peasants are left out. That is, their cost is higher than what is supposed to be the bulk line cost of production as taken into consideration by the Agricultural Prices Commission. So, this is a deficiency. It means that every year the Government earmarks 15 per cent of the smallest peasants to be butchered in the capitalist market, to be reduced to the status of landless labourers, to go bankrupt and sell their lands. This is a conceptual error, not a mistake of this Minister or that Minister or this officer or that officer.

There is another conceptual error. That conceptual error is that the component of labour cost is calculated at the "prevailing rate of the wages". In the case of West Bengal, when the West Bengal Government challenged the cost, challenged the price fixed by the Agricultural Prices Commission for jute and paddy, then, in that controversy, it came out that the prevailing rates of wages of the agricultural labourers in West Bengal were only 52 per cent of the minimum wages fixed by the West Bengal Government for agricultural labourers. So the Agricultural Prices Commission is not prepared to pay even that minimum wage to the peasant which the Government fixes for the agricultural labourers.

So the peasant is paid less as price of his labour than the Government is prepared to grant to an agricultural labourer. So the peasant is treated worse than the agricultural labourer so far as the price of his labour is concerned. And what is the proportion of this cost in the total? In the case of paddy it comes to about 35 to 40 per cent. In the case of wheat it comes to about 30 per cent. Now even if it is 30 per cent of the cost and the rate at which the imputed cost of family labour is calculated is only half the rate which an agricul-

tural labourer is supposed to get, then the cost of production is depressed by at least 15 per cent. It is a simple arithmetical calculation. Thus yet another section of small peasants is earmarked by the APC for annual slaughter in the capitalist market. So, these are the two conceptual errors even now in working out the cost of production.

Now, there are certain arguments advanced by the Prime Minister, by the Government, by the monopoly press and even by some forward-looking radical-minded but, I would say, confused economists. Now, what are their arguments? Their first argument is that if agricultural prices are increased, it will lead to inflation or it will add to inflation. This argument is wrong; because if value is paid for value, it does not lead to inflation. Inflation is caused when money is created without any value, without any material backing, when notes are printed by the Government, when credit is granted by the banks, when hoarding and speculation take place. That causes inflation. As I quoted the other day even the latest report of the Reserve Bank on currency and Finance says that between the four financial years of 1976-80, while the gross domestic product in real terms increased at the average rate of 2.6 per cent per annum, broad money supply increased at the average of 20.4 per cent per annum. So increase in money supply is ten times that of the increase in gross domestic product. Will this not cause inflation? This is the basic cause of inflation. The Government has no courage to put an end to this basic cause. They want to mitigate some of the bad effects of inflation by cutting the wages of workers and employees and cutting the prices of the peasant. Wage cut for the worker and price cut for the peasant are the two facets of the same economic policy which seeks to shift the burden of the economic crisis on to the shoulder of the toiling masses. So this whole argument is false, based on false premises.

Now, the second argument is that if prices are raised, the consumers will have to pay a higher price. Unfortunately there are some bad leaders among the peasants; I would call them misleaders. There are certain misleaders among the peasants. I do not want to name them. Their names are well known. They say that all the towns people exploit all the village people. It is misleading. They set the village people against the towns people. They set the peasant against the worker, against the urban poor and thereby they weaken the struggle of the peasant. Now these misleaders also say: what does it matter if the consumers have to pay more? But the whole thing is false. It is based on a false premise. Just before lunch we were discussing the procurement price of wheat. The procurement price of wheat was Rs. 117 per quintal last year. The peasants got anything between Rs. 100 and Rs. 110, or at the most Rs. 117. Now in the retail market wheat is selling at Rs. 175 to Rs. 200 and Rs. 225. Now, why this inflation in wheat prices? Is it because the peasant has got a higher price? No; because, the traders have hoarded and they have raised the price. And the Government which still has more than 4 million tonnes of wheat in its stocks, refuses to release that stock; because then wheat prices will fall and the traders will suffer and probably the Government will have to face some political difficulties. So they are indirectly aiding the hoarders and profiteers by not releasing even the stocks which they possess. So the result is that the consumer suffers. We on behalf of the kisan movement demand a remunerative price for the peasant. We simultaneously demand a public distribution system which will guarantee distribution of all essential commodities including food-grains at cheap prices where the cost to the consumer will not exceed 15 per cent of the price received by the peasant plus the incidental charges. If the remunerative price is combined with the system of public distribution,

[Shri Indradeep Sinha]

then the consumer will pay less and the peasant will get more, and only the big sharks of industry and trade will suffer. So it is a question of determination, determining who is your friend and who is your enemy... (Time bell rings) I am finishing. I just need five minutes...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, please finish quickly.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : इनको बोलने दीजिए। बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण विषय है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But there are other speakers also. This Resolution will lapse today. So let us accommodate others also. The time-limit is fifteen minutes for each speaker.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : आज ही चलेगा, फिर लैस हो जायेगा ? ... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This will lapse today. We cannot prolong it.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wanted the Minister to reply, and I also wanted to say a few words before winding up the debate. If you are giving more and more time to all the speakers, the purpose will not be served and the Resolution will lapse. So I request you to ask the Minister to reply at 4.15. If necessary you curtail the time of the speakers and give them five minutes...

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up now, Mr. Shina.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: In any case I am concluding, in one sentence.

The third argument is that if peasants are paid more, capital formation will suffer, landlords and kulaks will gain more...

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Who is a Kulak?

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: A kulak is a rich peasant. Kulak is a Russian word. Now, please don't disturb me. You ask him otherwise, he will eat away my time. Kulak means a rich peasant. But I want to put a straight question. This Government is not ashamed of paying full cost and 12 per cent plus to Tatas and Birlas who are monopolists and they start shaking—they are feeling shy—when it comes to paying a remunerative price to the peasant including the sick peasant. They are not afraid of paying 12 per cent or black market price to Tatas and Birlas. So don't hide behind kulaks. You know why? Forty per cent of the operated area was owned by a mere 5 per cent in 1970-71. Why? Because, land reforms were sabotaged, and landlords continue to prosper and those landlords cannot now be killed by not paying a remunerative prices. They will be able to save themselves by reducing their cost. Their cost is already lower and they will buy up the land of all small peasants who will go bankrupt. If you want to liquidate them, then implement the ceiling law, implement the land reforms. You talk of capital formation! Who asks you not to tax agricultural income and wealth? Why have you exempted them? We have been demanding the institution of a system of graded land tax so that the wealthier people contribute more to the exchequer and the poor may be completely exempted.

And finally there is a big argument about food subsidy. I will read out only three lines from an American economist, John De Mellor who is supposed to be an authority on the theory of agricultural prices. What is his evaluation of food subsidies? What role do they play? He writes:

"In this regard it is interesting to note that a continuing policy for providing subsidised food to urban workers may be rationalised in terms of equity in income distribution, but may serve primarily to increase industrial profits and capital

formation at the expense of whoever pays for that subsidy."

Who pays for that food subsidy? All the tax-payers. And who gains? The capitalists. Thus capital formation is taking place. If the Government wants more capital formation, tax the rural rich. We will support you. But if you do not pay remunerative price to the small peasant, the small peasant will not allow himself to be killed. You want to kill him. I. G. Patel has given the slogan: Down with the small peasants; we want capitalist, large scale farmers. I. G. Patel and L. K. Jha are such economists who are out to serve monopolies and landlords. They shall not be allowed to ruin the economy of the small peasants. The peasant has stood up. He is fighting and he will fight till he is able to compel the Government to accept his demand for remunerative price or till he is able to form a Government which will accept this demand.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kulkarni. Please take only 14 or 15 minutes.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra) As you please. During the last 30 to 32 years after the freedom, the Government has been trying to find some method or to evolve an economic pattern whereby the agricultural sector would be benefited.... (Interruptions). Why are you fighting among yourselves?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him complete. The time is very short.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: I want the Minister to reply at 4.15. I do not want the Resolution to lapse. If you want this to be discussed and to lapse, then say so.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Perhaps you do not know the procedure of this House. Your Resolution is not going to lapse. The Minister is going to reply. If you want to catch the next flight to Hyderabad, you can do that.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: I am not going anywhere.

श्री राम भगत पासवान (बिहार)
टाइम बांध दीजिए कि दो-दो मिनट बोलें।

श्री उपसभापति : दो मिनट में कैसे कोई बोल पायेगा।

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: How is it possible to speak in two minutes on a subject like this?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We want to hear you, Mr. Kulkarni.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I was saying that during the last 30 years the Government in power has made conscientious efforts to improve the lot of agriculturists by enunciating various economic policies in their interest. But as the technology advances the terms of trade against agriculture get aggravated year by year. I need not again define what is meant by terms of trade. I have already quoted it once. I do not want to take the time of the House by repeating it. The latest figures I have relate to 4-3-1981. These were prepared by the Research Bureau. This shows that the terms of trade between agricultural sector and non-agricultural sector for 1975-76 were Rs. 170/- paid by agriculture and Rs. 168.3 received by agriculture. In 1979-80 the price paid by agriculture to non-agricultural sector was Rs. 216.2 and the money received was 188.9. In other words the terms of trade were unfavourable to the extent of 87.4 per cent. Sir, the terms of trade also in this country where statistics are usually lacking do not give the correct picture. My friend, Shri Indradeep Sinha, made some reference to the kulaks and the large farmers and the small farmer Sir, this country is a very vast country. I think perhaps friends from Southern India do not know what meant by kulaks and all that.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Yes, Sir

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: In many of the States, the land ceiling laws have been enacted and many States have adhered to the land ceiling Acts. Now, as far as n

[Shri Arvind Ganesh Kulkarni]

State is concerned, nobody has got land, under river irrigation or well irrigation or tube irrigation as you call it, more than 16 acres. It is so not only in Maharashtra, but in Gujarat also, I think, it is the same and in Karnataka and the other Southern States, it must be the same thing. Now, granting that there are some benami and fraudulent transactions, in Maharashtra at least I have never heard of a landlord having a hundred acres or more today, whatever you may say. So, the talk of kulaks and other things is not applicable to Maharashtra. Whether it is applicable to your State of UP or Bihar, Sir, with due respect to you, I should say I do not know.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nobody has got that much today.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I do not know about that and that is why I am not competent to comment on that. But, as far as I am concerned, the theory of Kulaks, etc. should not be raised here. So, if you say that about Punjab or Haryana, where the per-acre yield is more because of perennial irrigation, it may be correct. There also, the economists, particularly the intellectuals and the urban classes, have got a comment to make that the support price for rice or for wheat usually helps the Andhra Pradesh rice-grower or the Punjab wheat grower respectively. I do not understand this. If my information is correct—I am subject to correction—that after asking about 30 to 35 per cent of production the rest is marketed. Whatever you market, that surplus is available for the consumption of the people. I can understand that a farmer here, growing wheat and having a bumper crop or more yield, might be having a surplus while a farmer in Maharashtra or Gujarat, which States do not have the benefit of perennial irrigation, because of the topographical or geographical peculiarities, as the States like Punjab and Haryana or the States in the Gangetic basin or

the Jamuna basin have, will not have such a surplus and because of these factors there may be different levels of yield. But, whatever surplus is there, if the support price is given in a form or manner which helps him in meeting all the expenses including the value of his own efforts that he puts in in the land and the depreciation value of whatever machines or appliances he uses, then, Sir, naturally the small farmer will be better off and he is the biggest customer in this country for our industrial produces. So, Sir, I do not think that this talk of kulaks and non-kulaks should be raised here. It is not proper and it is not proper so far as this country is concerned.

Just in the morning, Sir, I had a little bit of an altercation with a friend of mine who belongs to the Communist Party. While we were discussing, myself and Mr. Raju, along with others, he was also sitting there. We were talking about the kisans and all those things. I just mentioned to him: "This is quite all right. What we talk about the kisans, etc. is all right. But friends, you are all trying for the organised sector. But, what about the unorganised sector, that is, the agricultural sector and the people of the farming community? What about the valuable efforts made by the farmer himself? Does he get any benefit or return for his labour?". Then, Sir, he shouted at me: "Who stopped you from organising the farmers?". I do not quarrel with him. But the organisation of farmers or the landless labour is also necessary in this country. I am belonging to a party which is making its own efforts in organising the landless labour. But even for organising the landless labour, the terms of the trade are between agriculture and non-agriculture and the adverse situation between wages paid to the farm labour and to the organised sector is far more socially dangerous. I will request my friend to look into this aspect.

Sir, I live in a district where there are industrial centres and where there are big factories producing oil, tractors, etc. They are employing ten thousand workers. There are such big factories. In the cooperative sector also we have sugar mills where we usually employ roughly between five thousand to ten thousand workers. In the cooperative spinning mills we also employ between two thousand and five thousand persons. In the cooperative sector, Sir, our relations with our employees are not like the employees of an organisation; they are partners. All the surplus of that cooperative sector is distributed. If it is a sugar factory, at a price fixed by the State Government Cabinet Committee sugar is distributed among the employees and the sugarcane growers. In case of spinning mills there is another formula. But, Sir, in a private sector factory where they employ between ten thousand and twenty thousand workers, even a sweeper gets Rs. 20/-, while his brother who may be working five miles away is not able to get Rs. 4 or Rs. 8. My friend will quarrel with me and ask: Why don't you organise? I will do that. We are organising. But if we raise the wages of everybody by using these Union methods up to Rs 20/-, then what will be the wage level for this country? The country has to have an economic equilibrium. So, Sir, the Government, along with the policy of trade equation between the agriculturists and non-agriculturists, has also to see that there is a fair wage policy either for the organised sector or for the unorganised sector. Unless a fair wage policy is established, social tensions in this country will not be lessened. They will, on the contrary, be aggravated.

Then, Sir, there is another problem. I am not going to make any long speech because you have asked me not to do so. I am only touching the points Sir, about the agriculturists' difficulties, I think many friends of mine have highlighted them. There

is the credit policy of the Government, the marketing policy of the Government, incentive prices, and so on. I would request the Minister to look into the all-India perspective and Marketing Committees being introduced in various States. For example, Mr. Naidu will not be angry with me if I say that in Andhra Pradesh there is no Marketing Committees Act at all. Or if the Act is there, it is practised by not applying the rules, etc.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: There is the Act but it is not being implemented. There are no elections.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: That is your job.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In each State this is the case.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: This is the biggest tragedy of Andhra Pradesh. In the case of Gujarat, for cotton there is the Co-operative Marketing Society. In Maharashtra, there is the Cooperative Marketing Society. There is the monopoly procurement scheme—a step ahead. Similar is the case with Karnataka. But in Andhra Pradesh cotton is being plucked by farmers who put it into gunny bags and keep it at home, and the traders have to go to their homes to collect that cotton, mix and then create their own thing. In this way, the farmer

loses the better price and I do not understand what type of State Government is working in Andhra Pradesh. As cooperators, we have invited their attention for many years, for the last 10 or 15 years, asking them that the Marketing Act should be correctly implemented so that the marketing of cotton is properly taken up. This is another aspect.

In the case of small farmers—perhaps my friend must have mentioned it—I can also criticise the Government. We are in opposition

[Shri Arvind Ganesh Kulkarni]
for the last 3 or 4 years. We know that criticism for small farmers is one aspect and the constructive approach towards solving the difficulties of the small farmers is another thing. I would like my friends, particularly on the left side, to understand one thing. Nobody has ever tried the ancilliary development of the small farmer. You are trying to organise the landless labour. You are trying to organise the farmers. That is all right. But the constructive approach is that the small farmer should be provided facilities for dairy, poultry or some such type of industry. This sort of agro-industrial base has to be created. I am very proud that Maharashtra State has a base for that. Maharashtra State has realised that the development of the small farmer cannot be done by only increasing the prices of products unless he is given financial support in the form of dairying, poultry and piggery. I am proud that my State which was deficient in milk production is surplus. That is one of the ways in which these small co-operatives can be developed.

My last point is about the attitude of the Government agencies. Recently, we attended a session of Bharat Krishak Sabha in December. I do not want to mention the name of my friend, Mr. Balram, as the Speaker of the Lok Sabha, but as the ex-President of the farmers' association. He was very critical of the observations of the Governor of the Reserve Bank at Bangalore. Before that, we took Mr. Balram to see the horticultural development. This is another aspect. In my State and in my district, a revolution has taken place and we are exporting grapes to European countries. We have built up refrigerated wagons to transport grapes right from Shamli up to Calcutta. We can always criticise. But we have to think of the constructive aspect. Roses are being developed. Rose production is one of the foreign exchange earners in this country.

Therefore a larger perspective has to be taken regarding our agricultural development instead of asking only for incentive prices.

श्री लाडनी मोहन निगम : क्या गुलाब भी एग्रीकल्चर है ?

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी : भाई, गुलाब हार्टिकल्चर है । You don't take it in a narrow sense. Horticulture and Dairy are also in the agricultural sector. You cannot limit yourself only to agriculture.

श्री लाडनी मोहन निगम : ठीक है तो गुलाब की खेती नहीं होनी चाहिए ।

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी : क्यों नहीं होनी चाहिए ?

श्री लाडनी मोहन निगम : इस देश में 10 करोड़ आदिमियों के घर तो चूल्हा नहीं जलता और आप कहते हैं कि गुलाब की खेती होनी चाहिए ।

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी : निगम साहब यह आपकी गलतफहमी है, इसको आप मेहरबानी कर के दूर कर लें । गुलाब पैदा होने से भी तो किसान को रोटी मिलेगी. . . (व्यवधान) ।

श्री लाडनी मोहन निगम : गुलाब तो देश का प्रथम नागरिक अपने बोट में लगाता है ।

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Unless you increase his capacity, you cannot do any justice to the difficulties of the farmers. This is my view and I stand by it. The agricultural development must be looked at in all its perspective. We do not look at it from any narrow sense whether they are small farmers or not and whether the prices of wheat or rice are depressed or raised. We look at it from a larger perspective of the growth of the farmer who is

particularly the backbone of the country's economy. Sir, I was talking about the observations made by the Governor of the Reserve Bank. Sir, I am not against Mr. I. G. Patel as such. He might be an economist or whatever it is. Sir, I have read very recently an article by Prof. Raj Krishna which appeared in the 'Mainstream' criticising Mr. Balram for his observations at Kolhapur. Sir, Prof. Raj Krishna is not here. Perhaps, Dr. Adiseshiah who is his friend might feel a little bit uncomfortable. But, Dr. Adiseshiah, I read that article. Intellectually, the argument might be fine. But ultimately it is the commonsense aspect of the difficulty of a farmer that has to be taken care of. Mr. Balram. Jhakar never abused the economists at all. What he said was that the agricultural prices in terms of trade should be equalised, all the ancillary aspects of the growth of agriculture should be looked into and for that copious and liberal credits should be made available. So, Sir, at that time, at the Bangalore session, what we interpreted from the speech of the Governor of the Reserve Bank was that he was against the Government supporting the farmers' claim and kisan rallies and *dundis*, etc. So Sir, I am only on that limited point. I think, Prof. Raj Krishna's article and the speech made by Mr. I. G. Patel, as far as the commonsense approach of us, the farmers, is concerned, are not proper. That is what we see from that. About the person, I have got nothing to say and I don't say at all. He might be an intellectual giant. But the point is that having known the Government's policy, to support the agriculture, he should not have dared to attack that policy. Even as a person—leave aside that he being the Governor of the Reserve Bank—and not that he is the employee of the Government he should not have attacked that policy. The agriculturists have their own viewpoints and the economists must be having their own view points. So, Sir, I am not bringing in this rally and all that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Leave that point.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Sir, enough has been said on all these things. For heaven's sake, let us put all our energies together to benefit the kisans. Thank you, Sir.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदय, विद्वान सदस्य श्री इन्द्रदीप सिन्हा जी ने जो त्रिभुवन प्राइस के संबंध में अपनी बातें कही हैं उनके लिए वे

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हरविन्द राणेश कुलकर्णी) पीठासीन हुए]

बधाई के पात्र है। लेकिन मैं माननीय कृषि मंत्री जी और सिन्हा जी का ध्यान इस तरफ आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि अब तक यह देश जो खाद्यान्न के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर हुआ है यह कांग्रेस पार्टी की कृषि नीति के परिणामस्वरूप ही हुआ है। उसके फलस्वरूप ही आज हिन्दुस्तान पांच करोड़ टन की जगह 13 करोड़ टन गन्ने का उत्पादन कर रहा है।

देश की प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कभी जो दिल्ली में 50 लाख की रैली किसानों की हुई उसमें कहा था कि किसान के तीन बेटे हैं—एक बेटा जो फौज में भर्ती होकर लड़ता है, एक जो खेतों में अनाज पैदा करता है और एक किसान का बेटा जो फैक्टरी में काम करता है और देश का उत्पादन बढ़ाता है। जितने भी किसानों के संबंध में हिन्दुस्तान में कार्य हुए जैसे लैंड रिफार्म, जमींदारी का खात्मा, या लैंड टु द लैंड लेस या लैंड सीलिंग, जितने भी ये कदम उठाये गये कांग्रेस सरकार के द्वारा ही उठाये गए।

[श्री कल्प नाराय]

और मुझे तो खुशी होती, और सिंह साहब... कम से कम मैं बढ़ाई देना चाहता हूँ राव बीरेन्द्र सिंह को कि 12 मार्च 1980 को हिन्दुस्तान की कैबिनेट ने श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की अध्यक्षता में यह प्रिंसिपल स्वीकार किया कि एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस और इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोड्यूस के दामों में पैरिटी एस्टैबलिश की जायेगी। जो खेतों में पैदावार होगी, उस के दाम निर्धारित करते समय हम जो इनपुट्स इस्तेमाल करते हैं उनके दामों को भी मद्देनजर रखा जायेगा और यह कदम मैं समझता हूँ बड़ा ही क्रांतीकारी कदम, है और उसी क्रांतीकारी कदम का कम से कम स्वागत श्री इन्द्रदीप्त सिंह को करना चाहिए कि प्रिंसिपल आफ पैरिटी

The principle of parity was accepted under Shrimati Indira Gandhi's regime on 12-3-1980.

यह एक बड़ा ही क्रांतीकारी—जिस सरकार की और जिन लोगों की आपसहान मदद कर रहे हैं और जिनकी हुकूमत तीन वर्ष तक इस मुल्क में रही है, इन्होंने कौन, सा कदम उस सरकार से उठाया किसानों के लिए, किसान के बेटे का नाग लगाकर जो लोग दिल्ली की गद्दी पर आये और जिनके आप सहयोगी बने हुए हैं, मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया में किसी प्रकार का परिवर्तन तभी होगा जबकि पोलिटिकल स्टेबिलिटी किसी भी कंट्री में होगी और आज अनेक देश को स्थिति को दुनिया की स्थिति से अलग नहीं कर सकते। ब्रेजेनेव साहब तो आकर कहते हैं कि एशियाई, सबसे बड़ी स्टेट्स-मैन श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी है और उनको मजबूत करके ही हम साम्राज्यवाद और उपनिवेशवाद और दुनिया के जंगवाजों का मुकाबला कर सकते हैं, पर आपकी खोपड़ी में यह बात समझ में नहीं आती और आप इस मुल्क में जनसंघियों के साथ

और प्रतिक्रियावादियों के साथ मोर्चे बना करके आज डिस्टैबिलाइज करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। इस मुल्क की हुकूमत के खिलाफ आप मोर्चा बना रहे हैं।

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Sir, it is a slander against our Party to say that the CPI is aligning with the B.J.P. We are not aligning with the BJP in Gujarat. Let them check up the position of their own party.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : यह पूरे हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास ही इस बात का गवाह है . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी) : कल्पनाथ राय जी आऊट आफ कन्टेक्स्ट मत बोलिये।

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : मेरे दोस्त को कुछ तो बोलने दीजिये।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया का इतिहास इस बात का सबूत है कि आज पूरी दुनिया की समाजवादी ताकतें, चाहे कम्युनिस्ट की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी हो, चाहे अफगानिस्तान की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी हो, जो कदम श्रीमती गांधी ने कम्युनिस्ट के सवाल पर और अफगानिस्तान के सवाल पर उठाया, दुनिया के सारे . . (व्यवधान)

उप-भाध्यक्ष (श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी) : भाई एग्रीकल्चर पर आइये।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : आप मुझे थोड़ा बोलने दीजिए। जो कदम उन्होंने उठाया है, उस कदम को सराहना पूरी दुनिया में समाजवाद खेमे में की गई है। तो श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के हाथ को मजबूत करने वाला व्यक्ति ही समाजवादी है। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में जो पोलिटिकल स्टेबिलिटी हमने प्राप्त की, तीन वर्ष में उखाड़-पखाड़ के बाद जो मुल्क को डिस्टैबिलाइज कर रहे थे, तो जो पोलिटिकल स्टेबिलिटी की ताकत है, जो पूरी दुनिया की ताकत है जो दुनिया के सर्वहारा को ताकत दे सकता है, उस पार्टी को आप डैमेज करने की कोशिश हिन्दुस्तान में कर रहे हैं। तो

बेजोब की निगाहों में बहुत ही प्रतिक्रिया-वाद के सारी माने जाएंगे और दुनिया आपको मान रही है। आपकी समझ में तब आता है जब पंच वर्ष बीत जाते हैं।

1942 में आपने एक समझदारी का परिचय दिया। तो 1942 में पीपुल्स वार का साथ दिया। उस समय समझ में नहीं आ रहा था कि गांधी हिन्दुस्तान के सर्वहारे का नेतृत्व कर रहे हैं। बाद में आपको समझदारी आई और मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो रिपोर्ट आप पढ़ रहे थे जवाहरलाल नेहरू की अध्यक्षता में 1928 या 1930 में जो हमने एग्रीकल्चर रिफार्म स्वीकार किये, उस सिद्धांत पर चलने के लिए कांग्रेस पार्टी कठेबद्ध है।

लेकिन 1965 में जिस कमेटी का नाम आ ले रहे हैं, 1965 में कांग्रेस पार्टी के अंदर प्रतिक्रियावादी ताकतें इस हद तक मजबूत हो गई थीं कि पी० एल० 480 की मदद से भारत को स्वायत्त देना चाहते थे और उन्होंने प्रतिक्रियावादी ताकतों को श्रीमती गांधी ने 1969 में हिन्दुस्तान से निकाल बाहर किया और उस समय आपको समझ आई थी कि ऐसे व्यक्ति का साथ देना चाहिए जो मुल्क को मजबूत करे तो किसी भी मुल्क में कोई रिफार्म, कोई सुधार, कोई व्यवस्था, कोई क्रांतिकारी कदम, कोई सामाजिक परिवर्तन, कोई आर्थिक परिवर्तन तब होगा जब उस मुल्क में पोलिटिकल स्टेबिलिटी होगी। पोलिटिकल स्टेबिलिटी के बाद ही हम किसी मुल्क में कोई परिवर्तन ला सकते हैं।

उपसमाख्य महीदय, चर्चा के दौरान उन्होंने कहा कि 'कांग्रेस पार्टी इज कमिटेड इन इस इलेक्शन मेनकेन्स टु गिव्हु रेगुलेटिव प्राइसेज टु फार्मर्स'। कोई भी किसान, योगा-पत्र जनता के साथ एक

हलकनमा हुआ करता है और उस हलकनमे के यू कांग्रेस पार्टी ने अपने घोषणा-पत्र में—यह आप के सामने है—बचन दिया है कि देश की जनता को हम रेगुलेटिव प्राइस देंगे। हम नहीं समझते...

श्री इन्द्रवीर सिंह : फिर दे क्यों नहीं रहे हैं ?

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : दे रहे हैं। उपसमाख्य महीदय, ये कह रहे हैं कि दे क्यों नहीं रहे हैं। जो पार्टी किसानों का ना लेकर आई थी, जो छः २० क्विंटल गन्ने का दाम दे रही थी—पूरे हिन्दुस्तान को उन्होंने बरबाद कर दिया—हम दे रहे हैं 23 २० क्विंटल, 208 २० क्विंटल कपास का दाम दे रहे थे हम दे रहे हैं 500 २० क्विंटल। किसानों का नाम लेकर जब वे सत्ता में आए, उन्होंने कबाड़ा कर दिया, फूड प्रोडक्शन को डाउन कर दिया और पंचवर्षीय योजना तक नहीं बनाई। जब से रव शीरेन्द्र सिंह कृषि मंत्री हो कर आए इन्होंने व्हीट का प्राइस 117 २० क्विंटल कर दिया और अब अग्रिकलचरल प्राइस कमिशन ने 127 २० किया है और हम कह रहे हैं कि वर्तमान स्थिति में आप 127 २० नहीं, 140 २० कर दीजिए, 135 २० कर दीजिए। यह हम कर रहे हैं...

श्री प्यारेलाल खंडेलवाल (मध्य प्रदेश): खाद के दाम कितने बढ़ाए हैं, डीजल का दाम कितना बढ़ाया है, यह भी कहिए।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : आप के अक्ल की बात है। आप का खेती-बाड़ी से मतलब नहीं। न जाने कैसे पालियामेंट में आ गए। डीजल का दाम अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कार्यों से बढ़ा है... (व्यवधान)...

श्री प्यारेलाल खंडेलवाल : डीजल का भाव बढ़ा है, सीमेंट का भाव बढ़ा है, स्टील का भाव बढ़ा है, खाद का भाव बढ़ा है।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : 42 मिलियन टन हिन्दुस्तान में हमारी जरूरत है। 14 लाख टन हम खुद पैदा करते हैं, 28 मिलियन टन इम्पोर्ट करते हैं और हम को 700 करोड़ रु० विदेशी मुद्रा के रूप में देना पड़ रहा है। इसलिए अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति को मद्देनजर रखते हुए आप को कोई काम करना पड़ेगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से कह रहा था और मैं आदरणीय राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ और विरोधी दल के लोगों से, विशेष रूप से श्री इन्द्रदीप सिंह से और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोगों से, कि जब सारी दुनिया पूँजीवादी और समाजवादी खेमों में बंट रही है, तो समाजवादी खेमे में ही वे खड़े हों और समाजवादी ताकतों को ही मजबूत बनाएं। यदि हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर सामाजिक और आर्थिक परिवर्तन करना है और दुनिया की समाजवादी ताकतों को मजबूत बनाना है, क्योंकि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की सरकार ने 20-सूत्री कार्यक्रम के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार किया है, हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में पिछले 2000 वर्षों के इतिहास में दिल्ली में जनता हुकमरां हुई, चाहे वह डेमोक्रेटिक तरीके से हो या किसी भी तरीके से हो और हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों-करोड़ सर्वहारा को हिन्दुस्तान की दौलत में हिस्सा प्रदान किया, पिछले 2000 वर्ष के इतिहास में श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में 20-सूत्री कार्यक्रमों के माध्यम से देश के करोड़ों-करोड़ सर्वहारा को देश की दौलत में हिस्सेदारी के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार किया और भूमिहीनों को भूमि और भूमि का मालिकाना हक देने का सिद्धान्त स्वीकार किया। ये दोनों काम करके हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ने मुक्त के करोड़ों सर्वहारा को मुक्त की दौलत में हिस्सेदारी का सिद्धान्त स्वीकार

किया। जब जनता पार्टी की सरकार आयी थी तो उसने, जो भी भूमि भूमिहीनों को मिली थी, वह उनसे छिनवा लिया और उनके हितों की उपेक्षा कर दी गई। कहना आसान होता है, करना कठिन होता है।

इसलिए, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अन्तिम पोइन्ट मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ, आदरणीय कृषि मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ एक प्रश्न के बारे में जो इन्द्र दीप सिंह ने उठाया कि जब आप किसान को 117 रुपया क्विन्टल देते हैं और बाजार में गेहूँ का भाव 200 रुपये हो गया है तो उपभोक्ताओं को भी नुकसान और उत्पादन करने वालों को भी नुकसान। तो बिचौलियों की लूट को खत्म करना है तो एसेशियल कमोडिटीज की स्टेट ट्रेडिंग करनी होगी। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि स्टेट ट्रेडिंग का इम्प्लीमेंटेशन सिद्धार्थ जी के जमाने में 71 में किया गया, लेकिन जनमत के न होने के कारण वह सफल नहीं हुआ। कांग्रेस पार्टी स्टेट ट्रेडिंग के सिद्धान्त को मानती है। किसी सिद्धान्त को धरती पर अमल में लाने के लिए लाखों कार्यकर्ताओं के जनमत की आवश्यकता होती है। आज इन्द्रदीप सिंह, इसलिए, हमारी पार्टी का समर्थन करें ताकि स्टेट ट्रेडिंग के माध्यम से हम अपने मुक्त में प्रोड्यूसर्स को अच्छी कीमत दे सकें और कन्ज्यूमर्स को भी उचित मूल्य पर अनाज दे सकें। यह तभी सम्भव होगा जब हम स्टेट ट्रेडिंग एसेशियल कमोडिटीज में करेंगे। मुझे विश्वास है, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में हमारे राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह जी कृषि के सम्बन्ध में ऐसी नीतियां अपनायेंगे कि हम हिन्दुस्तान को एक रेगिस्तानी इलाके से निकाल कर समृद्धि और सुख की हरियाली घाटी में पहुंचा सकेंगे और इन्दिरा गांधी के सपने यानी आधुनिक, विकसित, समाजवादी, शक्तिशाली हिन्दुस्तान बनाने के सपने को साकार कर सकेंगे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): I

have got a point to place before the hon. Members. Now, the time is about 4.25. I have been advised by the Deputy Chairman that after Shri Kalpnath Rai, the hon. Minister will intervene . . . (*Interruption*). Just a moment. Why are you worried? This is what I have been advised by the Deputy Chairman. I am in the hands of the House. I cannot say that you should do this or you should do that. I will take the sense of the House. I do not know whether the House desires that this Resolution should be discussed next week. I do not know whether it is possible. I think, it cannot be.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: Sir, . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): You just wait, Mr. Naidu. Why are you worried? The Chair itself is putting the problem before the House. Now, it seems, this Resolution cannot go to the next Session. In that case, we will have to sit beyond 5 P.M. But if you all agree to sit beyond 5 P.M., the Hon. Minister may not agree.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL, RECONSTRUCTION AND IRRIGATION (RAO BIRENDRA SINGH): Sir, I am not here. I have to leave for Bombay this evening.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): May I make a request to the hon. Members? If you want to hear what the hon. Minister wants to say, let him intervene at this stage and then we shall continue the discussion. If the hon. Minister is leaving for Bombay, I do not know what will happen to the Calling Attention.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SITA RAM KESRI): Sir, I do not know whether you are going to ask the hon. Minister to intervene or to reply. If

you are going to ask the Hon. Minister to intervene, then, it is OK. Otherwise, other hon. Members . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Mr. Minister, you must know that this is a non-official Resolution.

SHRI SITA RAM KESRI: That is right.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Here, intervention means, the hon. Minister is not going to take the responsibility for the final reply. Secondly, I am advised by the Secretaries that there is a Calling Attention which is still pending. This also concerns the Agriculture Minister. If the hon. Minister is going to Bombay, I do not know how he is going to reply.

SHRI LADLI MOHAN NIGAM: He should be present when the Calling Attention Motion is discussed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): I do not know who will reply to the Calling Attention. If you do not mind. Mr. Nigam, let us hear the hon. Minister first and then we will decide. Yes, Mr. Minister . . .

SHRI SITA RAM KESRI: Sir, if the hon. Minister is going to reply now, then, other hon. Members of the House will be deprived of the opportunity to speak on this Resolution. In that case, only the Mover of the Resolution will be entitled to reply to the hon. Minister. Hence, before the hon. Minister . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Mr. Minister, I have understood your point. Now, we are in a fix. This Resolution cannot go beyond 5 P.M. and this cannot also be taken up next week.

SHRI SITA RAM KESRI: That is right.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): The Minister's reply or intervention has no meaning in the sense that he

[Shri Arvind Ganesh Kulkarni]

has only to say whatever he wants to say on this Resolution.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: Sir, may I suggest one way out if the hon. House agrees? The Calling Attention Motion is also on the same subject, more or less. If the hon. Members who would like to speak on the Calling Attention Motion speak now, then, at the end, at 5.15 or 5.30 P.M., when the discussion is concluded and I reply, the Calling Attention Motion will lapse and everything will be all right.

SHRI SITA RAM KESRI: It cannot be mixed up with the Calling Attention.

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव (बिहार) : हम लोगों ने भी नाम दिया था। यह एक ऐसा विषय है कि जिस पर हर दल को कम से कम दो आदमियों को हर दल के बोलने का मौका देना चाहिए और हम लोगों ने तो नाम दिया हुआ है और इस विषय पर हमारे दल की क्या राय है यह अगर आप सुनेंगे नहीं तो क्या होगा। पहले से हाउस इस तरह से आपको कंडक्ट करना चाहिए कि सब को समय मिल सके (बयबान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): I appreciate your suggestion, but the problem here is, I have been advised by the Secretariat that this Resolution has got life up to 5.00 p.m. Whether the Minister now replies or not, whether he intervenes or not, he is not bound to reply later on. What the fate of the Calling Attention will be, is a different problem. They cannot be mixed up. So, if you do not mind, because the time limit is 5.00 p.m. . . .

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव : मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर यह प्रस्ताव केवल 5 बजे तक के लिये है तो पहले से हाउस को इस हिसाब से आप को कंडक्ट करना चाहिए था और भाषणों को लिमिट करना चाहिए था। आपने कुछ

को अनलिमिटेड समय दे दिया और अब हम लोगों को कहते हैं कि समय नहीं है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): On a non-official Resolution the House sits up to 5.00 p.m. There can be another business, like Half-an-Hour discussion, after 5.00 p.m., that is allowed under the rules, but the Resolution discussion, as such, closes at 5.00 p.m. So, I do not know whether you want to hear the Minister or not. (Interruptions). I will call you and the name of Mr. Ladli Mohan Nigam is there. I want to know your views. I am in your hands. (Interruptions).

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: You won't get a chance to hear the Minister. You allow the Minister to speak. You will not get a chance to hear the Minister in another two or three years' time.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): Since we have decided to close this Resolution at 5.00 p.m., we will finally accede to your observation. (Interruptions). We will sit down.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: May I know for how much time the Minister is going to reply?

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: If they want to hear me, whatever time is left for me before 5.00 p.m., I will utilise it.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): My purpose of asking is this. There are two things involved. Firstly, the Minister has to intervene and the Mover of the Resolution also has to reply. If the Minister takes about half an hour, then the Mover is not going to have the chance of replying. If you feel that the Mover is not getting a chance, you may stop the discussion at 5.00 p.m., and continue the Calling Attention. All the points that have been raised in the debate may be replied to by the Minister during that Calling Attention.

Then the Mover will not get the opportunity to reply. (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Yes, Mr. Nigam or Mr. Yadav—any one of you.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: They can take five minutes each and complete.

श्री हुसदेव नारायण यादव : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जो अभी यह प्रस्ताव उनका आया है, मेरा यह निवेदन है कि यह प्रस्ताव बिलकुल निर्गुण है और इस प्रस्ताव में अगर किसानों को लाभकारी मूल्य देने के इश्यू पर कोई ठोस बातें कही गयी होतीं तो मैं समझता कि इस प्रस्ताव में कुछ जान है। यह प्रस्ताव सीधा निर्गुण है। इस प्रस्ताव को सगुण बनाने के लिए कोई उपाय प्रस्तावक के जरिये नहीं समझाया गया है। इसलिए मेरा आग्रह यह है कि अभी जो बातें सदन में उठाई गई हैं, इसलिए मैंने कहा कि हम लोगों की बात भी सुनी जाए। किसानों के जो सवाल हैं, जो इश्यू हैं, मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि श्री कल्पनाथ राय जी अभी बोल रहे थे, मैं उनसे भी यह कहूंगा कि एक समय था जब किसानों के सवालों को लेकर हम और वह साथ साथ जेल गये थे —

“अन्न दाम का घटना बढ़ना,
आना सेर के अन्दर हो,

डेढ़ गुने की लागत पर करखनियां
माल की बिक्री हो।”

आज किसानों का शोषण व्यापारियों के माध्यम से किया जा रहा है और जब हम अपने माल की बिक्री करने जाते हैं तब बाजार में कीमत कम रहती है और जब हम खरीदार होकर उसी माल को खरीदने जाते हैं तो उसकी कीमत ढाई तीन गुना हो जाती है। इसको रोकने के लिए अब तक कोई कारगर कदम नहीं उठाया गया है। जब तक इसको रोकने के लिए कारगर कदम नहीं उठायेंगे तब तक काम नहीं चलेगा।

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि आपकी लाभकारी और समर्थनकारी को प्रकार की मूल्य नीति है। सरकार जिसको सपोर्ट प्राइस और रिम्यूनरिटिव प्राइस कहती है, जिसको पैरिटी प्राइस हम लोग कहते हैं। हम लाभकारी मूल्य और समर्थनकारी मूल्य के समर्थक नहीं हैं लेकिन हम लोग समता मूल्य के समर्थक हैं। क्या लाभकारी मूल्य आप देंगे। समता मूल्य हम लोग चाहते हैं। कारखाने में जिन चीजों का उत्पादन होता है, किसान उसी उत्पादित माल को खरीदते हैं तो उसकी कीमत में जिस अनुपात में बढ़ोत्तरी हो, उसी अनुपात में किसानों के अनाज में भी वढोत्तरी होनी चाहिए। कारखाने के सामान की कीमत के साथ-साथ खेतिपा माल की कीमत में भी बढे तरी हो, यह सरकार को दृष्टिकोण बनाना चाहिए। यह नहीं हुआ। इसके लिये कौन अपराधी है। इसके लिए मैं राव वीरेन्द्र-सिंह को अपराधी नहीं कह सकता हूं, न और किसी को। इसके लिए अपराधी इस व्यवस्था का जो संचालन करने वाले लोग हैं वे हैं, जो प्राइस कमीशन बने हुए हैं, कृषि मूल्य आयोग, अग्रिकलचर प्राइस कमीशन में बैठक मूल्यों का निर्धारण करते हैं, उनका वास्तव में हिन्दुस्तान के किसान से कोई मतलब नहीं है। आई० सी० ए० आर० के कई इंस्टीट्यूट है, उसको हमने देखा है। राइस इंस्टीट्यूट के डाइरेक्टर से पूछा, हवीट इंस्टीट्यूट के डाइरेक्टर से पूछा, केन इंस्टीट्यूट के डाइरेक्टर से पूछा कि जब मूल्य तय किये जाते हैं तो आप लोगों को कोई पूछा जाता है, आपसे पूछ-ताछ की जाती है, तो उन लोगों ने कहा हमारा मूल्य तय करने में कोई हाथ नहीं होता है। जहां सरकार के इतने इंस्टीट्यूट बने हुए हैं, अनुसंधान केन्द्र बने हुए हैं वहां के डाइरेक्टर से, वहां के वैज्ञानिकों से किसानों के लिए जब दाम तय किये जाते हैं तो उनसे राय नहीं ली जाती है। यह राय आपको और हमको उनसे लेनी चाहिए। इसलिए उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह निवेदन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं कि जो आज देश के अन्दर किसानों का सवाल है और कहा गया

[श्री हुजूमदेव नारायण यादव]

है कि आप मूल्य बढ़ा रहे हैं, श्री कल्पनाथ राय जी भी कह रहे थे कि जनता पार्टी में ऐसा हुआ, फलाने में ऐसा हुआ तो मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 1975-76 और 1976-77 जो आपका समर्थ था, ये स्वर्णिम युग अपना इसे लिखते हैं जिसमें लाठी के बल से सब चीजों पर कंट्रोल करते थे, मैं आपसे यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि सन् 1964-65 में जहां कृषि जनसंख्या पर आधारित प्रति व्यक्ति आय 220.5 रु० थी वह 1976-77 में, आपके स्वर्णिम काल में 195.5 रु० रह गई। उस समय कौन दोषी था ? उस समय किसके अपराध के कारण यह गिरा ? उसी तरह से 1964-65 में जहां गैर-कृषि जनसंख्या पर आधारित प्रति व्यक्ति औसत आय 639.5 थी वह 1976-77 में 12 रु० हो गयी। जो लोग गैर कृषि क्षेत्र में लगे हुए थे उनकी आमदनी जहां 1964-65 में 639 थी वह बढ़कर 813 होती है वहां कृषि पर आधारित लोगों की प्रति व्यक्ति आमदनी 1976-77 में 220 रु० से घटकर 195 रु० पर चली आई। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह किसके कारण हुआ ? और इसके लिए दोषी कौन है। व्यवस्था दोषी है। आप उस व्यवस्था में परिवर्तन करने के लिए चलिye हम आपका समर्थन करेंगे। श्रीमती इंदिरा नेहरू गांधी के जगह प्रधान मंत्री की कुर्सी पर कोई और बैठ जायेंगे या राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह जी बैठ जायेंगे तो हम समर्थन कर देंगे, ऐसी बात नहीं है। हम व्यक्ति के विरोधी नहीं हैं, व्यवस्था के विरोधी हैं। आखिर में एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा कि खाली किसानों का सबाल हो यही बात नहीं है, गांवों बसने वाले लोग हैं उन लोगों की हिस्सेदारी कितनी है इसका भी सबाल है मैंने जो प्रश्न किया था उसका उत्तर भारत

सरकार के द्वारा के 19-2-80 को जो दिया गया था उसके अन्तर्गत ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में जो लोग हैं, 20 प्रतिशत लोग जो नीचे की आमदनी वाले हैं उनकी देश की भौतिक सम्पत्ति में हिस्सेदारी 1.10 परसेंट है और वित्तीय स्थिति में उनकी हिस्सेदारी 0.62 परसेंट है और शहरी क्षेत्र में जो 20 परसेंट लोग निम्न आय वाले हैं उनकी हिस्सेदारी देश की भौतिक सम्पत्ति में 0.88 परसेंट है और वित्तीय स्थिति में 0.56 परसेंट है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि 20 फीसदी आबादी की हिस्सेदारी इतनी कम हो इसके लिए दोषी कौन है ? जो गांव में। बसने वाले लोग हैं उनकी हिस्सेदारी निरन्तर घटती चली गई, क्यों ? आखिर में एक बात कहना चाहूंगा जो खेती की बात करते हैं, किसानों की बात करते हैं उनसे कहना चाहूंगा कि कृषि संगणना के 16 वें प्रतिवेदन को निकाल कर पढ़ें। इस देश के अन्दर 67.9 फीसदी किसानों में से 32 फीसदी किसान ऐसे हैं जिनके पास जमीन 0.5 हैक्टेयर से कम है। 32 फीसदी किसान इस देश में आधा हैक्टेयर से कम जमीन रखने वाले हैं। 70 फीसदी में से 57 फीसदी किसान ऐसे हैं जो 5 एकड़ से कम जमीन को जोतने वाले किसान हैं। जो 5 एकड़ से कम जमीन को जोतने वाले किसान हैं उन किसानों की बात करिये। कल्पनाथ राय जी ने कहा उनको मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी बिहार के अंदर पुर्णिया जिले में अमोल बाबू के पास 18 हजार बीघा जमीन है। इन्द्रदीप बाबू जानते हैं आज भी बिहार के अंदर रघुवंश नारायण सिंह के पास में 16 हजार एकड़ जमीन है—नामी-बेनामी तोर से वे जोत रहे हैं। क्या आप उनकी जमीन छीन लेंगे ? अमोल बाबू एक तरफ जमीन के मालिक हैं और दूसरी तरफ उनकी बेटी राज्य सभा और लोक सभा में जाती है।

है। उनके बेटे, बेटियां वहां कलेक्टर हैं, कमिश्नर हैं, एस० पी० है, डी० आई० जी० हैं। जो बड़ी-बड़ी जमीन जोते वाले बिहार में है उनकी सत्ता बिहार में है। जमीन के मालिक वे ही हैं, सरकार को चनाने वाले वही हैं। हम कहते हैं कि आप लैंड रिफार्म कर दीजिए। अगर आप के जरिये लैंड रिफार्म हो जाएगा तो आप की किसानों की पार्टी हो जाएगी। मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि तब मार्क्सिस्ट थ्योरी झूठी हो जाएगी। गांधी जी की थ्योरी झूठी हो जाएगी। आप किसान के लिए गांव में रहने वाले किसानों के लिए लैंड रिफार्म करिये। मैं आपको उदाहरण देता हूं। उदाहरण आप के सामने हैं। जो बड़ी-बड़ी जमीन जोते वाले हैं उनका सर्वे कराइये। बिहार में किस पार्टी से वे संबंधित हैं, उनका ताल्लुक किस पार्टी से है, यह आप देखें। हम लोग जानते हैं कि बिहार के अंदर जो गरीब लोग हैं, दबे हुए लोग हैं चाहे वह सी० पी० आई० के हों, सी० पी० एम० के हों, लोक दल के हों अगर वे बड़े किसानों के खिलाफ लड़ते हैं तो उनके ऊपर घोड़ा दौड़ाया जाता है। घोड़ों से मारा जाता है। गोली चलाई जाती है। अभी बिहार के अंदर कम से कम हर्मास 10-20 गरीब के बेटे के ऊपर नक्सलाइट के नाम पर गोली चलाई जाती है। मैं मांग करता हूं इस सदन में कि इसके लिए एक सेलेक्ट कमेटी बनाएं। एक संसदीय समिति बनाएं जो बिहार चले और मैंने जो आरोप लगाये हैं उन आरोपों की जांच करें और उसी के आधार पर वह काम करे।

आखिर में मैं सरकार से मांग करूंगा राव बीरेन्द्र सिंह किसान हैं और खेती मंत्री हैं इसलिये उनको हिम्मत रखनी चाहिये और हिम्मत करके किसानों के सवालों पर आप को आगे आना चाहिए। उनकी मांगों पर टांग

नहीं अड़ानी चाहिये। जो कारखानों में उत्पादित माल है उनकी कीमत को बांधे और हमारी कीमत को भी बांधे।

एक मिनट आप का और लेकर मैं समाप्त करूंगा। मैं एक बात यह कहूंगा कि हमारी आमदनी पर आपने हद लगा दी है। किसानों को जो जमीन है, यानी बड़े-बड़े किसानों की जो जमीन है उस पर आप हद बंदी कीजिए। समाजवादी होने के नाते मैं मानता हूं कि 18 एकड़ इरीगेटेड लैंड को कम करके 12 एकड़ इरीगेटेड लैंड की हदबंदी लगायें तो मैं उसमें आप के साथ हूं लेकिन मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जब 18 एकड़ की जमीन पर हदबंदी करते हैं तो हमारी इन्कम पर सीलिंग करते हैं। जमीन की हदबंदी करना हमारी इन्कम की हदबंदी करना है। दूसरी तरफ शहर में बसने वाले सेठ लोग हैं उनकी आमदनी पर कोई सीलिंग नहीं लागत है। बिड़ला, टाटा 45 करोड़ से 1200 करोड़ का मालिक बन जाए, 42 से 13 करोड़ का मालिक बन जाए तो कोई रोक नहीं है। अगर आप बड़े-बड़े लोगों पर रोक लगाते हैं तब तो कहीं जाकर किसानों को उठा सकते हैं, किसानों को उचित मूल्य दे सकते हैं वरना कुछ होने वाला नहीं है।

श्री प्यारेलाल खंडेवलाल : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, सन् 1976 के कृषि गणना के आंकड़ों के अनुसार इस देश में 8 करोड़ से भी अधिक जोते थीं। कृषि के संबंध में विचार करते समय और किसान के संबंध में विचार करते समय हमें इस बात पर विचार करना होगा कि हमारे देश में जो ये 8 करोड़ से भी ज्यादा जोते थीं और जिनमें लगभग 51 प्रतिशत ऐसी जोते हैं जिनके पास एक हैक्टर से भी कम जमीन है उनके संबंध में पिछले 20-25

[श्री प्यारेलाल खंडेलवाल]

वर्षों में ऐसी कौन सी नीति गांवों के लिए और गांवों में रहने वाले व्यक्तियों के लिए अपनाई गई जिससे हमारे किसानों को लाभ हुआ। आज हम देख रहे हैं कि पिछले साढ़े तीन वर्षों से हमारे देश में गांवों में रहने वालों में एक जागृति की लहर उठी है। आज किसान संघर्ष के रास्ते पर आया है, आज जगह-जगह पर मांगें हो रही हैं कि हमारे उत्पादन का हमें उचित मूल्य दिया जाय और गांवों का विकास किया जाय, उसके पीछे यही भावना है। लेकिन दुख इस बात का है कि आज की परिस्थितियों में किसानों के लिए लाभकारी मूल्य देने की सरकार की नीति दिखाई नहीं देती है। सरकार की इस संबंध में क्या नीति है, यह भी समझ में नहीं आता है शायद इस देश में जो नीति बनाने वाले लोग हैं, जो सरकार को चलाते हैं, उनकी पकड़ में किसानों की समस्याएं नहीं आती है। यही कारण है कि सरकार में बैठे हुए जो लोग हैं उनको किसानों की स्थिति का ठीक पता नहीं होता है। कृषि मूल्य आयोग के बारे में हर बार यह बात कही जाती है कि उसमें ऐसे लोग हैं जो ग्राम किसानों के हित पर विचार नहीं करते हैं। इसलिए आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि एक समुचित नीति इस बारे में अपनाई जाय। मैं समझता हूं कि हमारे देश का किसान राजनैतिक विचारों से ऊपर है। इसलिए किसानों की समस्याओं पर भी राजनैतिक दृष्टिसे ऊपर उठ कर विचार किया जाना चाहिए। सवाल इस बात का है कि किसान के रूप में समस्या पर विचार करके कोई समुचित नीति अपनाई जाय। एक समुचित नीति बना कर उस नीति को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए सरकार को कोई कारगर कदम उठाना चाहिए। सारे देश में अन्य चीजों की कीमतें बढ़ती जा रही हैं। किसानों

के उपयोग में आने वाली जो चीजें हैं जैसे डीजल है, बीज है, खाद है, बिजली है, पानी है, इनके रेट्स भी बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। इतना ही नहीं, किसानों को बसों और मोटरों में भी जाना पड़ता है, रेलों में भी जाना पड़ता है। इन सब के लिए उसको ज्यादा पैसे देने पड़ते हैं। लेकिन आश्चर्य और अफसोस की बात यह है कि किसानों को इन चीजों के लिए तो ज्यादा पैसे देने पड़ते हैं, और हमारे देश में जो एक हैक्टयर से भी कम जमीन का मालिक है उसको अपने उपयोग में आने वाली चीजें महंगे दाम पर मिलती है लेकिन जब वह अपनी चीजें बाजार में बेचता है तो उसको कम दाम मिलते हैं। किसान की अपनी उपयोग के लिए जो चीजें बाजार से खरीदनी पड़ती हैं उनके ज्यादा दाम देने पड़ते हैं। इस प्रकार की स्थिति होते हुए भी किसानों को उनके उत्पादन का लाभकारी मूल्य नहीं मिलता है। सरकार उनको लाभकारी मूल्य देने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। हमारे देश का किसान चाहता है कि उनके जीवन-स्तर में सुधार हो। गांवों से हट कर जब कोई आदमी शहर में आता है तो उसका उद्देश्य यही होता है कि उसका जीवन-स्तर सुधरे। सरकारी कर्मचारी अपनी यूनियन के भरोसे काम करता है। मजदूर भी अपनी यूनियन के भरोसे काम करता है। ये लोग अपनी यूनियनों के भरोसे से और उनके माध्यम से अपनी सब बातें मनवा लेते हैं। लेकिन हमारे देश का किसान संगठित नहीं है। इसलिए किसानों की कोई नहीं सुनता है। मुझे इस बात का आनन्द है कि एक किसान आज हमारे कृषि मंत्री हैं। मैं यह बात भी कहना चाहूंगा कि शायद उनको इस बारे में अपनी आत्मा को टटोलने की जरूरत है। मैं चाहता हूं कि वे अपनी आत्मा को टटोल कर इस बात को सोचें कि इस देश के किसानों की

हालत को कैसे ठीक कर सकते हैं । अगर इस देश के किसानों के जीवन-स्तर में सुधार लाना है, गांवों में रहने वाले कृषि मजदूरों के जीवन-स्तर में भी सुधार लाना है तो उसके लिए एक ही रास्ता है कि किसानों की खेती में पैदा होने वाली चीजों के उनको लाभकारी मूल्य मिलने चाहिए । हमारे देश में आज जो महंगाई की हालत है, बाजार में चीजों के मूल्य जिस तेजी से बढ़ रहे हैं उनको देख कर खेती में पैदा होने वाली चीजों के मूल्य भी दिये जाने चाहिए । अगर किसानों को उनके उत्पादन का लाभकारी मूल्य नहीं मिलता है तो उनकी हालत में कोई सुधार नहीं हो सकता है । यह तर्क दिया जाता है कि पिछले दिनों किसानों की हालत में सुधार हुआ है । हमारे देश में कुछ लोगों को वह सफेद कपड़े पहने हुए दिखाई देने लगा है । लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या सरकार ने इस बात पर गौर किया कि कितने किसान पिछले 15-20 वर्षों में कर्ज से मुक्त हुए हैं ? किसान नें बैंकों से जो कर्ज ले रखा है, सहकारी समितियों से जो कर्ज ले रखा है और अन्य संस्थाओं से जो कर्ज ले रखा है, क्या पिछले 20 वर्षों में वह इस कर्ज से मुक्त हो गया है । मैं समझता हूं कि हमारे देश का किसान अभी अपने कर्ज से मुक्त नहीं हुआ है । मेरी जानकारी के अनुसार मध्य प्रदेश के आंकड़ों के हिसाब से पिछले वर्षों में किसान की कर्जदारी बढ़ी है घटी नहीं है । इसलिए आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि सरकार अपनी नीतियों में समुचित परिवर्तन करे । मैं इस संबंध में दो-तीन सुझाव देना चाहता हूं ।

पहली बात यह है कि कृषि मूल्य आयोग के अंदर जो लोग हों, उनमें 50 प्रतिशत से अधिक किसानों के

प्रतिनिधि रहने चाहिए । किसानों के प्रतिनिधि से मेरा मतलब यह नहीं है कि एग्रीकल्चर यूनिवर्सिटी के वाइस-चांसलर को आप रख दें, वह सही मायने में किसान हों, इसकी व्यवस्था इसमें की जानी चाहिए ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि सरकार नें फूड कोर्पोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया के माध्यम से जगह-जगह पर किसानों के लिए अनाज खरीदी केन्द्र बना रखे हैं । शायद माननीय कृषि मंत्री जी को यह मालूम होगा कि ऐसे सारे खरीदी केन्द्रों पर कुछ लोग एफ० सी० आई० के अफसरों और कर्मचारियों को पटाकर रखते हैं । छोटे किसान, जो विशेषकर फसल के बाद अपना अनाज एफ० सी० आई० के इन खरीद केन्द्रों पर ले जाते हैं तो उनका गल्ला खरीदा नहीं जाता या खरीद में बहुत देरी होती है और पैसा देने में भी देरी होती है जब कि छोटे किसान को तुरन्त अपने खेत में पैदा होने वाले गल्ले को बेचकर अपना कर्ज चुकाना पड़ता है । इसलिए जरूरत इस बात की है कि उन खरीद केन्द्रों में ऐसी व्यवस्था की जाय कि जब किसान के खेत का गल्ला वहां आये तो फिर उसको तुरन्त खरीद लिया जाय और अगर खरीदने में कोई गड़बड़ी होती है तो इन अधिकारियों और कर्मचारियों के खिलाफ कठोर कार्यवाही की जाय । जो छोटे किसानों के खेतों में पैदा होने वाले माल को खरीदने की समय पर व्यवस्था नहीं करते । इसके अतिरिक्त मैं यह भी मांग करूंगा कि आज की वर्तमान परिस्थितियों के अनुसार सरकार को किसानों को ऐसे मूल्य देने चाहिए जो आज की महंगाई के हिसाब से लाभकारी मूल्य हो, कृषि उत्पादन के लिये लाभकारी समर्थित मूल्य तय किये जाने चाहिए ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Mr. Ladli Mohan Nigam please. No?

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: The Minister must reply to the debate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Mr. Mohunta, can you finish in five minutes?

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : मंत्री महोदय को हरएक का जबाब देना है, समय नहीं है, इसलिए मंत्री महोदय को बोलने दीजिए ।

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: Realising the position that the Resolution is only up to 5 00 P. M. and that it lapses after that, I would not say anything except that I support the Resolution and what Mr. Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav has said.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Mr. Minister.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: Thank you, Sir. (Interruptions) Whatever it is, five minutes are there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Why are you worried, Mr. Naidu? The Minister has to reply.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: Sir, I am very happy that this august House has shown much interest in agriculture and that the farmer of the country is receiving increased attention from the hon. Members in this House. As a kisan and the Minister in charge of agriculture, I feel extremely gratified.

There have been so many suggestions, and the debate on the burning issues of the day has been such that it is not possible for me to reply to the points that the hon. Members have raised, within the few minutes that have been left at my disposal. But, Sir, this is a question which

occurs in the House day in and day out and most of these issues have earlier been discussed through questions in Parliament, through Calling Attention motions. Even today there was a Calling Attention motion given by about 65 hon. Members on the question of prices. After this, we shall again be taking it up, and whatever is left out, I shall try to reply during that period. Sir, the main criticism from the hon. mover of the Resolution was centred on the APC and its work. I would like to clarify in the beginning that the APC is only a recommendatory body. The Government is not bound to accept its recommendations. I was surprised when some hon. Members made a suggestion that the APC should be made a statutory body and its recommendations should be binding upon the Government.

SHRI N.P. CHELGALRAYA NAIDU: No, Sir.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: This was the suggestion by some hon. Members. My friends would agree that that would not be in the interest of the farmer. Sir, as I said, the APC is directed by the Government from time to time, by laying down the terms of reference for its working and the recommendations of the APC are based on certain data collected from various universities and institutes and some sampling on the field. There are about 6,000 places selected all over the country, from where the experts are supposed to collect data and supply to the Agricultural Prices Commission. There might be certain flaws in that calculation because nothing can be fool-proof. I am not saying that the recommendations of the APC are very realistic. But, after all, it is supposed to be an expert body, and the Government has to give due weight to its recommendations. In the past there have been occasions when the Government rejected the recommendations of the APC and fixed prices

higher than those recommended, as in the case of paddy last time and even coarse grains...

SHRI N.P. CHELGALRAYA NAIDU: Sugarcane.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: Sugarcane was a different matter because the price that was fixed as the minimum support price for sugarcane was for the purposes of paying the price for levy sugar. So, that is another thing where the hon. Members would kindly appreciate the real situation. The minimum support prices declared by the Government from time to time are not the prices that the Government wants to pay as the final price for agricultural produce. This is a price which is calculated to be a remunerative price which, if paid, will not allow the farmer to suffer any losses on the production on his field. And if the farmer can sell over and above this price, there is no bar at all. My friend, Mr. Chengalraya Naidu would appreciate that his contention that the farmer is forced to sell at a fixed price his produce is not correct. We ensure that the farmer receives a fair price for certain commodities which the Government undertakes to buy if the marketable surplus is offered by the farmer to the Government for purchase. But the farmer is free absolutely to sell at a higher price anywhere in India. There is one zone—the whole country—only to benefit the farmer. And even now the prices that are ruling for most of the agricultural commodities are much higher than the remunerative prices fixed by the Government. Take, for instance gram. When the minimum price fixed by the Government was, I believe, 145, if I am correct, it was selling at more than Rs. 300; it has even been selling at Rs. 400 a quintal. Government did not try to control the price just because we wanted the farmer to be compensated if he suffered losses on certain other things. Similarly, cotton is selling at a higher price than the minimum price fixed by the Govern-

ment. Sugarcane is selling at a higher price than the minimum price fixed by the Government. Hon. Members themselves have said that wheat is selling at a much higher price than the minimum support price given by the Government. This is the real position. There is no bar on the farmer trying to sell at a higher price if he can get a higher price in the free market, and it is always the supply and demand position that regulates the prices in the market.

Another misconception that some of my friends seem to have is, as the language of the Resolution itself signifies, on the question of paying remunerative prices for agricultural produce that paying remunerative prices for agricultural produce will solve all the problems of the farmer. This question cannot be considered in isolation. People generally seem to think that it is only wheat, rice and certain other foodgrains that are most essential. But the Government has to see that the income of the farmer is augmented by various means. It is only then that the living conditions of the farmer can improve. You very correctly said a short while ago, Sir, when you were speaking, that even if a farmer is helped to grow grapes on a small piece of land or to raise good roses, that will also help him augment his income and sometimes it can bring a much better income than a large piece of land. It is not only these three crops, but agriculture also includes raising of cattle, fisheries, poultry, piggery, social forestry, so many other things. Apart from payment of remunerative prices, what is needed more for the farmer is to give him the means of production, the inputs at his doorstep, good seed, supply of power in time, supply of fertilizer. And for all these things there will have to be projects, development projects. Irrigation has to be increased. If there is no development of irrigation, no development of cooperatives, no supply of fertilizer, no indigenous production

[Rao Birendra Singh]

of fertilizer, no multiplication of quality seed, no research in agriculture, or if these essential inputs are taken out of the purview of the policy for helping the farmer, mere payment of remunerative price to the farmer will not solve the problem. All these things have also to be considered simultaneously when we think of benefiting the farmer, helping the farmer, to have a better income.

There has been a lot of criticism about parity in prices. As was stated by me earlier, the Government has now accepted the policy that the prices of agricultural goods and non-agricultural goods and prices of agricultural goods and manufactured goods, will be, so far as possible, kept on a par. But even this parity question is a very complex one. We have to think of parity of price between one agricultural commodity and another agricultural commodity, parity of price between agricultural and non-agricultural goods, parity of price between agricultural produce and inputs and various things. But then, as I said, we have accepted the policy. My friend, Mr. Kalp Nath Rai, has very kindly, correctly appreciated this important step which Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Government took as soon as she came into power...

5 PM

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): We shall have to stop this discussion now under the rules. We will continue with the Calling Attention. You can give reply to the left-over points when you reply to the Calling Attention. I will ask the Members to ask questions, all at a time together, so that the Minister can reply at the end.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: The mover has to be accommodated.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): I can accommodate him in the Calling Attention.

MALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Demand of Farmers for Remunerative Prices for Wheat and Paddy taking into account the rise in the cost of Agricultural Inputs—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Shri Shiva Chandra Jha. I will request the Members to be brief.

श्रीशिव चन्द्र झा : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मेरा पहला सवाल है कि कालिंग अटेंशन..

संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सीताराम केशरी) : पहला है या आखिरी ?

श्रीशिव चन्द्र झा : पहला । जो कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन खेतीहरों की आप केलक्यूलेट करते हैं—चाहे एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस कमिशन हो या आप हों—उस में आप कौन-कौन ने फैक्टर इन्कल्यूड करते हैं ? दूसरा, जो कास्ट फैक्टर्स आप इन्कल्यूड करते हैं क्या वह पबलिक होते हैं या सीक्रेट रहते हैं ? यदि सीक्रेट रहते हैं तो क्यों रहते हैं, उन को पबलिक क्यों नहीं होने देते । तीसरे, जो औद्योगिक वस्तुएँ हैं और जो एग्रीकल्चरल वस्तुएँ हैं उन के दामों में डिस्पेरिटी है । इंडस्ट्रियल वस्तुओं के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं । इसका मुकाबला करने के लिए आप कोई खास नीति दृढ़तापूर्वक बनायेंगे ? कम से कम छठे प्लान में ऐसी बात हो कि दोनों के दाम एक समान हों । यह जो ग्लैयरिंग डिस्पेरिटी है कि इंडस्ट्रियल गुड्स के दाम बड़ी तेजी से बढ़ रहे हैं इस लिए आप कोई खास नीति अख्तियार करेंगे । कम से कम छठे प्लान में जिस से यह डिस्पेरिटी न हो, एक सन्तुलन कायम रहे ? चौथा और आखिरी सवाल । श्रीमान्, यह बात आप के सामने है कि बड़े बड़े खेतिहर