

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock, The Vice-Chairman (Shrimati Purabi Mukhopadhyay) in the Chair.

RESOLUTION REGARDING FORMULATION OF A SCHEME BY GOVERNMENT TO ENSURE REMUNERATIVE PRICE TO GROWERS OF EACH AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY—contd.

SHRI GULABRAO PATIL : As far as the prices of agricultural commodities are concerned, I would urge upon the hon. Minister that unless incentive prices are given to the producers, particularly the farmers, we cannot have more agricultural production. This has been objected to by the Agricultural Prices Commission on the ground that it would push up the market price and that it would be very difficult to procure the quantity that is required for the public distribution system. We should create a psychology of plenty in the country and we should take some steps to see that more and more agricultural production takes place. Of course, for this, we should make available fertilisers, pesticides and other inputs to the farmers. But price is one of the basic factors that has to be taken into consideration. What is the procurement price today? It is less than the market price and the support price is less than the procurement price. Take, for example, the production this year. We have a bumper crop and the country expects 114 million tonnes of foodgrains production this year. When the hon. Minister was replying to the Calling Attention in the morning, he was repeatedly emphasising that Government is prepared to purchase whatever is brought into the Mandis.

I would like to bring it to the notice of the hon. Minister that if he wants to have more procurement and also more production, if both these are to be achieved, the procurement prices must be raised during the coming rabi season, that is, during the season. A high price will encourage the farmer to grow more grains and sell more grains to the Government instead of selling to the private traders or hoarding. Now, because of the emergency, Madam, there is a change of climate, and even the men-

tality of the traders has undergone a tremendous change. Because of this emergency, hoarders, blackmarketeers and others are afraid. Because of credit stringency also they are not getting more money and, therefore, the Government need not be afraid that if incentive prices are given there will be more hoarding and all that. Here I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that even in a country like America where the farming community is only 7 per cent of the population, they are able to produce food not only for their own country but also for other countries. More agricultural production came there because of incentive prices. Therefore, I would urge upon the hon. Minister that while fixing the prices of the agricultural commodities, no *ad hoc* formula should be adopted as is being done by the APC. In fact, there is no scientific basis for the prices that are now being given by the APC. However much the hon. Minister might assure the House that at the time of plenty, particularly when a bumper crop comes, they will be able to purchase the agricultural commodities, I am sorry to say that it has been the experience of farmers, particularly in Punjab when there was a bumper wheat crop, that the purchases were being made by the private traders because the FCI was not in a position to make a deal with the farmers. Now the hon. Minister has said these things. Therefore, I would like to ask why, as far as the present position is concerned, double standards are being observed by the Government as far as fixation of prices of manufactured goods *vis-a-vis* agricultural commodities is concerned. When agricultural production is taken into consideration, particularly the cost of inputs, because of the new developments in the agricultural technology even the small farmers are investing more and more on agriculture with a view to getting more production. From that point of view, the rate of interest charged by the banks is very high and therefore the farmers have to borrow money at a high rate of interest. They have to purchase fertiliser at an exorbitant price. Everybody was saying that the Government had reduced it by Rs. 150/-. But it has gone up to Rs. 2,200 from Rs. 900 per tonne. The prices of insecticides pesticides and other essential commodities required by the farmer have also gone up quite high.

Take, for instance, cloth and other essential commodities required by the farming community. Their prices have gone to such an extent that there is no parity, there is no comparison between the prices of these commodities and the agricultural commodities. Even the prices of steel, cement and such other commodities required by the farmer have never been taken into consideration. Even the National Commission on Agriculture, when this matter was raised before them, have said that the Government should try to see that the prices of fertilisers are reduced and there is more and more of domestic fertiliser production. But as far as this particular aspect is concerned, I would like to tell the hon. Minister that though there will be more production how because of the inputs and all that, if the incentive price factor is lacking, I am quite sure the farmers will be frustrated and next year there will be a different approach taken by the farmers.

Perhaps he may be aware that during last year, that is, 1974-75, in Europe there was a bumper crop of potatoes when the prices fell down to such an extent that no body was there to purchase them. The next year the farmers did not go in for production of potatoes. Perhaps Annasaheb Shinde might be thinking that the farmers are the only community in this country who, whether flood or drought, rain or shine, toil hard day and night to get something out of their meagre land and resources and, therefore, even if they are offered low prices or some sort of price, they will sell their commodities. I must request the hon. Minister to take into consideration these factors. Here is another anomaly. Perhaps, the falling prices may be welcomed by the urban elite, urban population because the entire policy of the Agricultural prices Commission is consumer-oriented. I would like to stress here that though the prices of agricultural commodities are falling, one should not be very happy about it until and unless the prices of all other manufacture goods, particularly the essential commodities that are required by the farmer are coming down. There will be a disharmony as far as the farming community is concerned. Shri Annasaheb Shinde or the Government may be thinking that the farming community is the only community which is unorganised. But the organised sector is always exploiting this unorganised sector and a day is not far off

when there going to be a tension between the rural and the urban population. In order to avoid this, I would like to urge upon the hon. Minister to see that the farming community gets its due share as far as the prices of the agricultural commodities are concerned.

Lastly, I would ask one more thing. What is the basis of our talking so much about the socialistic pattern? The organised sectors, even the textile millowners and other employers are having lock-outs and lay offs. So, I would like to ask the hon. Annasaheb Shinde: What is our socialistic pattern, what is the idea behind this what is the socialistic idea of having *per capita* or per family income of a rural family? It was decided that they should get a least Rs. 1,800 per year or Rs. 150 per month and, therefore, if they are to get Rs. 150 per month as their net income, excluding all other production expenses, then from that point of view also you should determine the agricultural prices. If that is not done, Madam, it will create tensions, not only urban vs. rural but other tensions are also likely to take place.

I would like to say one more thing and then I will finish. As I have stated, Madam, the policy of import has also hardhit our country. We were getting more and more foodgrains under PL 480. An expert committee was appointed by the Government wherein they have opined that with the availability of more and more foodgrains and all that, more and more foodgrains were consumed. The Jha Committee was appointed by the Government and the Government has accepted its recommendation that this particular aid under PL 480 will be utilized for creating buffer stock only. But it was not done. Therefore, an atmosphere was created for getting wheat at cheaper rates. Because of PL 480, millets and other coarse grains which were used earlier were not used and there was more and more demand for wheat and other commodities. Again, the Government have said that they cannot give incentive prices. I would like to ask the hon. Minister how much foreign exchange has been spent during the last 3 to 4 years. When the wheat trade take-over was to be done and fortunately it was not successful, the procurement had reduced to a considerable extent and the Government had to resort to imports again. In that case, even if instead of making a payment of Rs. 1.05 per k.g., had the Gov-

[Shri Gulabrao Patil]

ernment accepted the price of Rs. 1.25 per k.g. the Government would have to spend about Rs. 18 crores by way of giving more price but because the price of the procurement was less, they could not procure more. The Government had to import wheat and by doing so, the Government had to spend Rs. 228 crores. Here I would like to ask the hon. Minister why this price was not paid to the Indian farmer. If instead of paying the American and European farmers, this money was paid to our farmers, they would have produced more and there would have been a psychology of plenty here in this country. That sort of policy of imports also must be stopped. As a matter of fact, we are not getting it now under P. L. 480, but we have to spend our precious foreign exchange. Here, therefore, so long as the Indian farmers are not given some encouragement or incentives to produce more and more by paying them more, things will not improve. I am quite certain that as a result of Emergency and other steps, there would be no such thing as hoarding and profiteering, and the farmers will be willing to sell all their marketable surplus only to the Government. Therefore, I would urge upon him to fix remunerative prices based on cost of production arrived at on a scientific basis so that a new era and a new chapter is opened in the history of the Indian agriculture. A new era has already been ushered in because of new agricultural technology. Though with the help of this agricultural technology there may be more production by the farmers, the farmers have to be given encouragement and incentives. I would request the hon'ble Minister to see that incentive prices on the basis of cost of production studies made on a scientific basis are determined and farming community is given its due share to increase agricultural production and thereby be self-sufficient as far as foodgrains are concerned, and thereby to supply more and more raw materials to our industries which are producing manufactured goods out of agricultural raw materials.

With these words, I commend this Resolution to the House.

Thank you, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : To the motion moved by Shri Gulabrao Patil, there are two amendments, one by Shri Nathi

Singh and the other by Shri Deorao Patil.

SHRI NATHI SINGH (Rajasthan) : Madam, I move :

1. "That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely :—

"based on a reasonable return to the growers keeping in view the cost of agricultural inputs and is further of opinion that the same principles should govern the fixation of prices of industrial products so that a proper balance is maintained in the prices of agricultural and industrial products."

SHRI DEBRAO PATIL (Maharashtra) : Madam, I move :

2. "That in the last line of the Resolution after the word 'growers' insert the following words namely :—

"taking into consideration the cost of production."

The questions were proposed.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI (Maharashtra) : Madam, Vice-Chairman, it is good that this Resolution has come before this House today after a Calling Attention Notice on the same question which preceded it, because I do hope that Shri Shinde, our Minister of State for Agriculture, will be able to give a more concrete and a more detailed reply to the various questions which have been raised and, I should like to add, which have been very ably argued here factually and logically by the hon'ble Member, Shri Gulabrao Patil. I would not like to repeat things which he has said or things which in fact have been said in this House on earlier occasions because this is almost a perennial question which we have been dealing. I would only like to stress a few points. But before that, for the information of the House and also of the Minister, I would like to read out a Resolution which was passed by the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly on the 30th of January this very year—i.e. very recently. It is a non-official Resolution, but I want to point out that that Resolution was accepted by the Andhra Pradesh Government and so it was adopted finally. That Resoution reads :

"That this House recommends to the Government to take immediate steps to fix remunerative prices for foodgrains and commercial crops being raised by the ryots".

Now, what is the purpose of reading out this Resolution ? The purpose obviously is that the Congress Ministry in Andhra Pradesh is obviously not so much satisfied with this entire question or the state of food prices, procurement etc. in Andhra Pradesh as the Central Government appears to be on the basis of the statement made by the Minister this morning. Mr. Shinde gave us a lot of figures and, if I may say so, he expressed a very great amount of satisfaction on the question of the present price level of foodgrains and other agricultural produce, on the quantum of procurement made by the Government during the last year and this year, on the question of buffer stocks that they have been able to built up and on a number of other issues. Though the situation undoubtedly is better, what was stated here this morning by the Minister surely gives an impression of a lot of complacency which, in my opinion, is definitely not justified. Let us look at the question soberly—what has happened, what has improved and where do we stand.

Now, it is undoubtedly true—if you go out in the country, there is a considerable amount of relief among the people over food prices and other prices which have come down; they have become cheaper. The alarming and galloping rise in prices between 1972 and 1974 has been arrested and a certain stabilisation in prices has come about. There is no question of denying this. But one has also to go a step further and look at the factors which have brought about this thing. When we come to the question of factors, Government itself does not deny that the extremely good harvest of last year and this year—the rabi crop—has been an important factor. In fact, with what is expected to be a record harvest of rabi crop this year, we expect something like 115 million tonnes of grains, which would be the highest achieved since Independence. Government does not deny this factor—it is a very substantial factor. The credit surely goes to the Government for the very strict tariff controls which have been enforced and which, I do hope, will be continued after the Budget also. They have undoubtedly played a vital role. And the action against the hoarders, the black marketers, the speculators and the smugglers has also contributed to the stabilisation of the prices and has led to a certain decline in prices. But the Minister will surely not deny

that irrespective of this decline in prices, the question of prices has always been a very complex question under all circumstances. Whether the prices are declining or they are rising, in either case, the price problem is a complex problem. It continues to be very complex, despite the easing of the situation and despite the improvement in the situation. I should think that today it is dangerous to be complacent. Why do I say so? Let us look more concretely at this question. Who have felt the relief as a result of the fall in prices ? The relief has been felt by the urban consumer. I am talking of the food prices now. And the extremely poor people in the rural areas—very important sections, no doubt—they have felt the relief. But so far as the vast masses of our peasantry are concerned, I am afraid they do not look upon it as any relief at all. They are the producers, they are an important section of the people; they are not the rich peasants, they are the common or the lower class of peasants. So far as they are concerned, if you go and meet them in various States, you will find that they do not feel the relief. So far as the food grains are concerned, so far as the commercial crops are concerned they are not only the producers but also they are the sellers. And as sellers, naturally this fall in prices is something which is alarming, which is something which is frightening them as to what is going to happen. So, what I am saying is, let us not generalise such a thing that because there is a fall in prices, therefore, everybody is happy. Everybody is not happy. We have to go more concretely into this question. The peasants in India are definitely not happy over this fall in prices. That is one thing.

The second thing which I would like to point out is that as between manufactured goods and agricultural produce—I will come to the figures later on; they have been given earlier also—there is not the remotest doubt that in the recent past, agricultural prices have declined far more than the prices of manufactured goods. I will come to the other aspect later, but the fact remains that last year and in the few months this year, the fall in the prices of agricultural products, whether of foodgrains or of commercial crops, has been far, far greater than any reduction in the prices of manufactured goods.

[Shri S. G. Sardesai]

There is a third aspect also. There is no doubt that Shri Shinde is an expert on the subject; we cannot deny the fact that he knows the subject very well. But we have also to go into the question of how much has been the fall in prices in the wholesale market and how much has been the fall in prices in the retail market. Speaking in general about the price fall and this kind of thing does not help because when we go into the question of fall in prices, what is it that we have got mainly to see? What we have got to see is that if prices have fallen, is it that the wholesaler is purchasing cheap grains from the peasant—that also means fall in prices—so that at a later stage he may be able to sell them at higher prices? So, it is not an abstract question of whether prices are falling or prices are rising. Concretely we have got to go into the question as to whether this particular fall in prices has really enabled the wholesalers, the big industrialists, to increase their profits at the cost of both the peasant and the final consumer, or whether the fall in prices has really helped the poor people, the common people as against the big industrialists. It is this aspect that we have to go into. A sweeping generalisation that prices have fallen, that the Government is procuring more stocks or that the stock position is better, will not help. This is just the beginning of the subject. We have to go deeper and farther into the subject. And it is in this connection that I want to state emphatically something which is known, something which is not denied but which, I think, in today conditions has become very important. And what is that point? It is common experience not only in the Indian economy but in any capitalist economy, that this process to which we constantly refer, the process of the poor becoming poorer and the rich becoming richer, takes place not only in inflationary conditions, not only when prices are rising, but even when there is a price decline, when there seems to be a stability in prices, when there is a certain amount of relief that the prices have come down. So when we think of the relief which people have got because the prices have come down, we cannot forget that the same process can take place despite the fall in prices. Let us not be complacent that because the prices are coming down, therefore, these people cannot take advantage of the situation to fleece the poor. It happens on both oc-

casions, when prices are rising and when prices are falling. On both occasions, the same process continues. That has always been our experience. So I will very strongly urge on the hon. Minister to consider the problem in this context. I can understand that in 1973, 1974 and 1975, the main worry of the Government, the main worry of the people, was the constant rise in prices. So, the first immediate objective was to control inflation, to stabilise prices, to see that this price rise does not continue, that a certain price control is established, in fact, to see that a certain decline in prices takes place. That has been our concern for the last two or three years. Since last year, the Government has succeeded to a considerable extent in bringing about price stability. What want to emphasise now is that in the coming period, this Government has to give serious attention not only to the question of seeing

3 P.M.

that prices do not rise again, that price stability is maintained, but—what is becoming more important and vital now—also to see that a proper price relationship is established between industrial goods and agricultural products. It is not just a question of reduction in prices. It is a question of relationship between the prices of industrial goods and the prices of agricultural goods. (*Time bell rings*). It is a distinct problem by itself. It is not just a problem of reducing the prices. Serious attention has to be given to that question. The other question is that we should see that the fall in prices is not utilised by the industrialists and big traders against the producers and the consumers. I repeat that these are the two questions that we have to go into very seriously in 1976. It is not just a question of price control. It is a question of seeing to it that there is a proper relationship between these two kinds of products, agricultural and industrial and also to see that the price fall is not exploited by the traders and the industrialists against the poor. What does the Government propose to do on these questions? It has not merely to say that prices have been stabilised, that more procurement is going on and that our buffer-stock has increased. Very good. We congratulate you for that. But what is the new problem which is now staring us in the face? This is the new problem which is staring us in the face now. So with regard, to this, where do

matters stand now ? The Minister assured us this morning that governmental intervention in the market, particularly in regard to foodgrains and agricultural raw materials, has now become so powerful that the situation is not like what it was a few years ago when the wholesalers, the profiteers and the industrialists could exploit the poor. He said that the Government was now intervening in the market in such a big way that that kind of exploitation of the poor has been, if not completely, at least substantially, stopped. That is what we were given to understand this morning. Madam, this is an extremely exaggerated statement to make. Even today, despite all Government purchases, despite all Government intervention, the Indian economy is dominantly, overwhelmingly, a free market economy. The Indian economy is an economy which is dominated mainly by the big industrialists, capitalists and bankers. It is not dominated by Government. For instance, the Minister told us this morning "We are now purchasing grain on such a big scale that practically the bulk of the marketable surplus is being procured by the Government." Is this true ? I really want to understand. Normally, as we all know, about 28 or 30 per cent, or at the most 35 per cent, of the food crops come into the market. It may vary for rice, wheat, etc. But about 30 to 35 per cent of the grain comes to the market. Now this year, is you are going to have a production of 115 million tonnes and even if your procurement quota is not only fulfilled but over-fulfilled, as you said, you may purchase 10 million tonnes. Ten million out of 115 million is not even 10 per cent; it is 8 or 9 per cent. Now if you purchase this quantity—that is the most optimistic estimate—on what grounds can you claim that so far as the grain market is concerned, with this quantum that you purchase at the procurement price, you will dominate the market ? You will not dominate the market. You cannot claim this just by purchasing 8 or 9 per cent of the grain which comes to the market. Take cotton, for instance. The Cotton Corporation of India has again and again been saying that it is not their purpose to purchase the bulk of the cotton. They themselves say this. We examined them last year in the Public Undertakings Committee. They said "We purchased 5 to 7 per cent of the cotton produced in India". You purchase 5 to 7 per

cent of the cotton and yet you claim that you are the main determinant of the cotton prices. How can you, when 90 per cent of the cotton is being purchased by the monopolists ? The point is, you must not make these exaggerated claims. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. He himself gave the figures relating to the fall in the wholesale prices of foodgrains. He said that it is something like 40%, he said that the fall in foodgrains prices is 40% or so.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN
THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
AND IRRIGATION (SHRI ANNASAH
HEB P. SHINDE) : I said that it is 24%.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI : I am sorry, I stand corrected. You give given the correct figure. Obviously, the wholesale market price represents the price which the wholesaler pays to the peasant. Now, the fall is 24% in the price of foodgrains, in the whole sale price of foodgrains. It means that there is that much fall in the prices which the peasant receives from the trader to whom he is selling it. Now, you can go to the other things also. So far as the industrial goods are concerned, not even one per cent, fall has taken place. But you say that in 1974, 1973 and 1972, the grain prices rose faster than the prices of the industrial goods. This is what you say. You see the tremendous fall which is taking place in respect of foodgrains. You are also seeing that, in the meantime, the cost of production has gone up and the prices of the industrial goods have not come down. What will happen to these people than ? So, the first thing that is to be taken note of is the fall in the prices of foodgrains and the rise in the prices of the industrial goods. Let us not say that because of this or that the peasant is affected at this moment. That is no argument at all.

With regard to cotton also about which Shri Gulabrao Patil spoke and Shri Deorao Patil will also speak—I know they are experts on this—with 40% fall in the price, how is the peasant going to stand this ? The point that I have raised again and again is this : Do not make it an abstract question, the fall to the extent of 40% in the price of cotton. What is the fall in the prices of cotton manufactures, the price of cotton cloth ? What is the position with regard to jute manufactures ? You have to see these

[Shri S. G. Sardesai]
things also. On the contrary Mr. Pai went to Ahmedabad and threatened the textile mills there. In order that the prices of the textile goods, cotton and jute manufactures do not fall, these people all over India have started lay-offs, retrenchments and closures and they are being given concessions also. The point to be noted is that the tremendous fall in the prices of agricultural commodities, raw materials, etc. is being exploited unquestionably by the big industrialists and by the big traders both of whom are out to fleece the peasants and try to keep the prices higher for the consumer. Now, let me repeat it : Somebody may be sorry. But it is not an abstract question. It is not just a question of the prices falling or the prices rising or it is not a question whether price stability should be there. Of course, price stability should be there. The question is, in the context of this fall in prices, what the Government is going to do to see that the proper people gain and not the wrong type of people gain.

Now, I want to go into certain details with regard to purchase of foodgrains. I do not want to go into the question whether it has crossed the five million target and reached the ten-million target and so on. You should purchase far more than ten million tonnes. But there are certain points which, I am afraid, the Minister has not clarified. At least so far as Maharashtra is concerned, I know the position and I know it from a number of districts and, the other day, I had an occasion to have an interview with the Chief Minister. As I understand it, the position is this : The Government has fixed the procurement price. Now, you see, the market prices are still not below the procurement prices though in some places they are. In some places they are so. But, by and large, I want to insist that they are not below the procurement prices. I know that the present position of the Maharashtra Government is this that having procured a good quantity of grains, they say that in future, in this season, they will purchase grains at what they call support prices or, what they call—there is another name for it—floor prices. These support prices in Maharashtra are much below the procurement price. The position now is that they want to procure. But nobody is prepared to sell at that price. So, it is no use saying all these things. The Minister

should assure us that whatever grains they have decided to purchase would be purchased and that they have issued instructions to purchase them. At any rate, in Maharashtra, I know that there is a distinction between support price and procurement price and the Government is stopping purchases at what they call procurement prices which are higher. The Government must be able to say that it would purchase any quantity even if the procurement prices are fixed at a higher level.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : Please finish now.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI : My point is this. It is not enough to say that the Government is prepared to purchase. No.

Now, here I want to say one thing seriously. Because of this policy, may be, our procurement is greater than last year's procurement, but even then the bulk of the marketed grain is even today going to traders. Even today it is going to rich peasants and landlords. This is a fact. Nobody wants bad things to happen. These people corner a large amount of grain. Next year, if we do not have rains, what is going to happen ? I want to know, what is going to happen ? Are you sure that we are going to have good rains ? I will be told that we are going to procure 8 million tonnes or 9 million tonnes. We have also imported, I think, 7 million tonnes. Now, these things have been done. There have been times in India when the Government of India has had a buffer stock of 10 million tonnes. I do not remember the year. But I know that in a single year 10 million tonnes of wheat was imported. We have had these buffer stocks in the past. But with this psychology of inadequate rain or failure of rain or famine, even these 10 million tonnes are nothing. So I want to ask in that context whether we will not be confronted with a very serious situation. This is what I am saying. Let me repeat that for procurement, for a certain trend of prices, and for buffer stocks, the situation is better than last year's situation. A part of the credit for that has to be given to the Government for this situation; I am not denying it. But what I am definitely very critical about is complacency. This is my point No. 1. Actually, we need a far greater stock. No. 2, we have to see that there is a price relationship between food, cotton, sugar-

cane, jute, industrial goods, etc. That has to be properly calculated on the basis of cost of production. And that relationship has to be fixed, for which no efforts have been made. Absolutely no efforts have been made to fix a proper relationship between these two types of goods. No. 3, we have to see that the fall in prices is not exploited by big hoarders and industrialists against the interests of the poor, for which also no arrangement has been made.

I would end up by saying that I did not very much appreciate the light-hearted manner in which this morning Mr. Shinde brushed aside certain suggestions as 'too radical', or 'too impracticable' or by saying, 'they were made in the past', and so on. That should not be the attitude. You have already made ascertain advance. What we are now pressing for is to know what further steps you are going to take to improve the situation.

With these three, the question of monopoly procurement comes. I want to know if monopoly procurement is so untouchable. You tried it some years ago. Why do you close your eyes and say, 'No, it has been brushed aside, these are usual things', and so on, ? Some of my friends on that side also made this demand. We have, of course, always demanded it. Don't just brush it aside. Some improvement has been made. The point is that the stocks which have been purchased this year are better than last year's....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : Please conclude.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI : But that is not enough....

(Time bell rings)

First of all, it is not enough to prevent wholesalers from dictating prices which they are doing today. And if that price dictation has to be there, then you will have to procure not one million, but two million and three million tonnes stock. Only then you will be able to say, 'Yes, we have controlled the hoarders....'

(Time bell rings)

I am just finishing. Take the case of the nationalisation of textile mills. It was discussed by the Congress in Bombay. Why is it being brushed aside ? If you want to give proper prices for the consumers and proper wages to the workers, these things

are necessary. The Prime Minister said so many times, "Twenty-point programmes is not the end, it is a beginning. We want to do many more things". We want to know what more things are going to come. It does not end with the distribution system. We just neglect it. It has to be made *pacca* precisely for a rainy day. What we are saying is that certain improvement is there. It is just the time when we should go in for further improvement and not wait until some bad day comes and then we find it more difficult. More procurement at remunerative prices is the only answer. Importing and neglecting the question of profits is not the answer.

श्री नत्थी सिंह : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज मुबह मंत्री महोदय जब कॉलिंग अट्रेशन का जवाब दे रहे थे तो ऐसा लगता था कि समस्या को बहुत सीमित करके देखा जा रहा है। हमारे देश में दीस सूची कार्यक्रम घोषित किया गया है और जिसका मूल आधार यह है कि देश की जनता को सामाजिक न्याय मिले। मैं उसी परिपेक्ष में इस प्रस्ताव को लेता हूं। प्रस्तावक महोदय ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, उसमें न तो उन्होंने प्रोक्योरमेंट प्राइस की बात रखी है और न ही सपोर्ट प्राइस की बात कही है और न ही डिसट्रैस सेल की बात रखी है। इसमें तो यह कहा गया है कि किसान जो अनाज पैदा करता है उसके लिए उसको उचित मूल्य मिलना चाहिये, ताकि उसकी उसमें जितनी लागत आती है, उससे उसको कुछ न कुछ लाभ अवश्य मिलना चाहिए। उसकी चीजों की कीमत इस तरह से तय की जानी चाहिये ताकि हमारे उत्पादन में उसका दुष्प्रभाव न पड़े और उत्पादन भी बढ़ता ही चला जाय। मैंने इसमें संशोधन दिया है और यह कहा है कि इसका आधार यह होना चाहिये कि अनाज के उत्पादन का खर्चा क्या है तथा क्या लाभ उसे देना चाहते हैं और उसी आधार पर और चीजों की कीमत तय की जानी चाहिये। जब तक हम इस मूल नीति में नहीं आयेगे, तब तक हम 80 प्रतिशत जनता की जो गांवों में रहती है, जो खेती करती है, उनको सामाजिक न्याय नहीं दिला सकेगे। इसी लिए मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूं और कहना

[श्री नत्थी सिंह]

चाहता हूँ कि हम सामाजिक न्याय के नाम पर कई चीजें कर रहे हैं। हम खेतिहर मजदूरों की मजदूरी बढ़ाने की बात कर रहे हैं। गांवों के लोगों को कर्ज देने की व्यवस्था कर रहे हैं और बंधक मजदूरों को मुक्त करने की बात कर रहे हैं। लेकिन इन सब का आधार क्या है? इन सब का आधार खेती की पैदावार को बढ़ाना है और उनको उचित लाभकारी मूल्य देना है। अगर हम इन चीजों में सफलता चाहते हैं तो हम किसानों को उसकी उपज का उचित मूल्य दिलवाना होगा और जब तक हम ऐसा नहीं करते हैं, तब तक हमारे जो उद्देश्य हैं, उसमें सफल नहीं होंगे, हम विफल हो जायेंगे।

मंत्री महोदय ने कल जो लोक सभा में भाषण दिया था उसको मैंने पढ़ा और जो आज राज्य सभा में भाषण दिया उसको मैंने सुना। उनका कहना है कि आम तौर पर सभी चीजों की कीमतें इस समय देश में गिर रही हैं। उनका यह भी कहना है कि खेती की कीमतें बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ गई थीं और वे अब नीचे आ रही हैं। इस तरह की बात कह देना कोई आसान बात नहीं है। आपकी जो आर्थिक समीक्षा है, वह इस तरह की बात नहीं कहती है। वह कहती है कि अप्रैल से दिसम्बर तक अनाज, दाल, तिलहन, वनस्पति और जूट के भाव गिर रहे हैं, लेकिन मशीनों के भाव नहीं गिर रहे हैं। रासायनिक खादों के दाम नहीं गिर रहे हैं और जो दूसरी चीजें हैं उनके भाव नहीं गिर रहे हैं। जो भावों में गिरावट आई है वह खेती की पैदावार में ही आई है और कारखानों द्वारा तैयार चीज पर नहीं आई है।

सरकार ने खेती की पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिए बहुत कार्य किया है। आपकी जो आर्थिक समीक्षा है वह भी कहती है कि जो हरित क्रान्ति थी वह तो खत्म हो गई है। अब अगर सरकार को देश में अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़ाना है तो उसको इस बात का खयाल रखना होगा

कि किसान को खेतों में अनाज पैदा करता है, उसका उसे उचित मूल्य मिलना चाहिये। अगर उसको उसकी अनाज का उचित मूल्य नहीं मिलेगा तो वह सोचेगा कि कौनसी चीज पैदा करने से उसकी अच्छे दाम मिल सकते हैं। वह फिर यह सोचेगा कि कौन सी चीज पैदा की जाय और कौन सी चीज पैदा न की जाय। एक तरफ तो हम सामाजिक न्याय दिलाने की बात करना चाहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ 80 प्रतिशत जो जनता गांवों में रहती है, उनको सामाजिक न्याय नहीं मिल पा रहा है। चंडीगढ़ कांग्रेस में भी हमने यह प्रस्ताव पास किया था कि किसानों को उसकी उपज का उचित मूल्य मिलना चाहिये। मैं जिस प्रदेश से आता हूँ, उस प्रदेश की कांग्रेस ने भी यही प्रस्ताव पास किया है कि किसानों को उनकी उपज का उचित मूल्य मिलना चाहिये।

राज्य सरकार ने सरकारी बमूली पर प्रतिबंध लगाया है कि वह दो महीने के लिये रोक दी जाय, इस लिये कि अनाज के भाव कम हो रहे हैं। यह सारी चीजें आप महसूस कर रहे हैं लेकिन आप उस के लिये कोई उपाय खोजना नहीं चाहते और इस को यह कह कर टाल दें कि आज आम तौर पर चीजों के दामों में कमी हो रही है इस लिये अनाज के भाव भी गिर रहे हैं यह ठीक नहीं होगा। अभी हमारे कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के देसाई साहब बोले और उस के पहले हमारे शिन्दे साहब और गुलाब राव पाटिल साहब भी बोले, किमी ने कहा कि 34 परसेंट फाल हुआ है प्राइसेस में और किसी ने कहा कि 24 परसेंट फाल हुआ है। यह आप के एक्सपर्ट्स की राय है, लेकिन मैं उन जगहों से आता हूँ कि जहां पर खेत में पैदावार होती है और आज वहां मैं देख रहा हूँ कि किसान आज लूट रहा है। आप गांवों में जायें, मैं गया हूँ, किसान आज आप से कितना नाराज है इस को मैं बता नहीं सकता। वह कांग्रेस और इन्दिरा गान्धी की जय तो बोल रहा है, लेकिन उसका कहना है कि उस की लूट की बात उनको किसी ने बतायी क्यों नहीं। आज गांवों में किसान की लूट हो रही है और उस बात को

हम यहाँ जाहिर न करें तो यह किसान के साथ कोई न्याय नहीं होगा। यह उस नीति के साथ न्याय नहीं होगा कि जिसके आधार पर हम हिन्दुस्तान को बनाना चाहते हैं। आज किसान माथा ठोक रहा है और उस की कोई सुनवाई नहीं हो रही है। सुबह जब पोस्ट ऑफिस और टेलीफोन विभाग के बारे में बात हो रही थी, तो कहा जा रहा था कि 122 करोड़ रुपया महंगाई का बढ़ाना पड़ा और इसलिये हम ने टैरिफ बढ़ाये हैं। हमारे मंत्री जो कह रहे थे कि हम किसी का वेतन कम करने की नहीं सोच रहे हैं और न हम किसी का महंगाई भत्ता कम करने की सोच रहे हैं। आप जो संगठित मजदूर हैं उन का महंगाई भत्ता कम नहीं कर सकते, लेकिन जो देश में असंगठित मजदूर हैं, जो किसान इस देश की रीढ़ की हड्डी हैं उन को आप दबाना चाहते हैं। याद रखिये कि किसी को ज्यादा दबाने का नतीजा क्या होता है। गेद को अगर आप खूब दबा दें तो वह बर्स्ट हो जाता है। इस दबाने को किसान आप को ही भुगतना पड़ेगा। आज जिन के बल पर आप पार्लियामेंट में और देश में टिके हुये हैं और जिन के बल पर आप शासन कर रहे हैं, मैं चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि उन को ज्यादा दबाना आप के हित में, देश के हित में नहीं होगा। किसानों में आज इस प्राइस पालिसी को लेकर काफी नाराजगी है और उस को उसी स्वर में मैं यहाँ जाहिर करना चाहता हूँ, कुछ दबा कर नहीं, छिपा कर नहीं। इसके लिये हमें क्या करना होगा। मैं भी कुछ आंकड़े बाजार से लाया हूँ किसी एक्सपर्ट से नहीं लाया। बाजार 1-1-75 को बाजार में पहले 205 और 206 रुपये प्रति क्विंटल बिक रहा था, आज उस का भाव 62 रुपये क्विंटल है। अब यह कितने प्रतिशत की गिरावट है इसका हिसाब आप ही लगाइये। गेहूँ 1-2-75 को 220 रुपये के भाव से था, आज वह 95 रुपये है। आप कहते हैं कोर्स ग्रेन की बात। सरसों का भाव 1974 में चार सौ रुपये क्विंटल था, आज वह 155 रुपये क्विंटल है। इसी तरह से जौ जो 103 रुपये क्विंटल

था मार्च, 1975 में उस का भाव आज है 35 रुपये क्विंटल से लेकर 45 रुपये क्विंटल तक। आप परसेंटेज लगाइये कि कितना क़ैश हुआ है और यह 24 परसेंट है या 34 परसेंट है। मैं तो गणित में थोड़ा कमजोर हूँ इस लिये सौ परसेंट या दो सौ परसेंट की बात कहूँगा, लेकिन आप के एक्सपर्ट्स किस गणित के स्कूल में पढ़े हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन को आप खेतों पर और बाजार में ले जायें और देखें कि कीमतें कितनी कम हुई हैं। सुबह जब एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस कमिशन में किसानों के प्रतिनिधि रखे जाने के संबंध में मांग की जा रही थी तो आप ने जवाब दिया कि ऐसा होने पर फिर कंज्यूमर भी कहेंगे कि उस में उन के प्रतिनिधि हो और फिर व्यापारी भी कहेंगे कि उन के प्रतिनिधि उस में हो। हम कहते हैं कि आखिर कीमत निश्चित करने का आधार क्या होना चाहिये। उस का आधार होना चाहिये कि लागत किसी चीज की कितनी है और उस पर आप कितना लाभ देना चाहते हैं। अनाज की लागत जो उसे खेत में पैदा करता है वह बतायेगा। आप देखें कि खेत में जो अनाज पैदा करता है उस का एसोसियेशन उस कमिशन के साथ होना चाहिये कि जो उस की पैदा की हुई चीजों की कीमत तय करता हो। और भी इंडस्ट्रीज हैं। उम में कीमत तय करने वाली बाडी में मैनुफैक्चर करने वालों की राय ली जाती है। आज देश में 80 प्रतिशत लोग खेती करते हैं, लेकिन उन की कही सुनवाई नहीं है, उन का कोई "से" नहीं है। एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस कमिशन में आप ने जो एक्सपर्ट रखे, उन्होंने इस बात को तय करना है कि लाभ का रेश्यो क्या होना चाहिये। लाभ का रेश्यो आप तय कर सकते हैं, लेकिन उस अनाज की लागत बताने वाला किसान ही होगा जो खेत में उस चीज को पैदा करता है। अभी पिछले दिनों कई बार कहा गया है कि जो बहुत ज्यादा कीमतें बढ़ गई थी उन को हम ने कम कर दिया है। रासायनिक खाद की कीमत आपने कम कर दी है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ शिन्दे साहब से कि कीमतें क्या थीं और क्या

[श्री नत्थी सिंह]

कम की है। यूरिया खाद पहले साढ़े 47 रुपये से 105 रुपये हुई और वह 150 रुपये प्रति बैग तक बिकती थी। अब वह 98 रुपये प्रति बैग आती है। डी० ए० पी० जो साढ़े 62 रुपया था उसकी कीमत 162 रु० 50 पैसे हो गई। प्रति बैग 7 रुपया घटाया गया। मोबिल आयल जो किसान यूज करते हैं वह 3 रुपया लिटर मिलता था उसके दाम 13 रुपया लिटर हो गये। डीजल जो 90 पैसे था, उस पर आपने मेहरबानी की, तब भी आज वह 1 रु० 47 पैसे से कम नहीं आता। किसान को जो बीज चाहिये उसकी कीमत कहां जा रही है, क्या इसका ध्यान है? मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि ये हांड फैक्ट्स हैं जिनको हमको निश्चित रूप से ध्यान में रखना चाहिये। अगर हम इसका ध्यान नहीं रखेंगे तो जो इस प्रस्ताव का मंशा है कि कृषि उत्पादन के लिए हमें भावों को भी किसान को सही रूप में देना चाहिए, वह पूरा नहीं होता।

आज एक बड़ी चर्चा चल रही है कि किसान को उचित मूल्य दिया जाए। जब हम गांवों में जाते हैं तो किसान लोग पूछते हैं कि सरकार क्या कर रही है। पिछली बार जब हम डेढ़ सौ रुपया क्विंटल की कीमत गेहूं की प्रोक्योरमेंट की रखने की मांग कर रहे थे तो 105 रुपये रख दिया। आज फिर चर्चा चल रही है कि चूँकि हमारी प्राइसेज गिर रही हैं, इसलिए प्रोक्योरमेंट दाम घटाये जायें। स्टोरियो को आपने रोक दिया, बहुत अच्छा किया। हमारी इकानामी पर इसका अच्छा असर पड़ा है। लेकिन उसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि खेती करने वाला पीड़ित हो। आपने आर्थिक समीक्षा में कहा है कि जब खेती का उत्पादन अच्छा होता है तभी हमारी इकानामी ठीक होती है, मुद्रा-स्फीति पर रोक लगती है और खेती में उत्पादन गड़बड़ होता है जो मुद्रा स्फीति पर जो रोक लगाते हैं उसमें कमी आती है। तो जब आज

खेती में उत्पादन बढ़ रहा है तो खेती करने वाला पीड़ित हो, यह कहां का न्याय है। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये जो कदम गवर्नमेंट ने लिये हैं, बहुत अच्छे लिये हैं। आपातकालीन स्थिति में। आपने स्मगलरों को रोका है, मुद्रा-स्फीति को कंट्रोल किया है, लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसानों को जो बेमिक लाभ मिलना चाहिए, वह नहीं मिल पाया। अगर रिजर्व बैंक ने खाद्यान्नों पर क्रेडिट स्वीज लगाया है तो गवर्नमेंट को सामने आना होगा कि वह यह तय करे कि इतने मूल्य में हम अनाज खरीदेंगे और फिर उपभोक्ताओं को भी ज्यादा मुनाफाखोरी न करते हुए इतने मूल्य में भी देंगे

एक उदाहरण मैं आपके माध्यम से शिन्दे साहब को देना चाहता हूँ। सुबह वह कह रहे थे कि हमने अच्छा बीज देने के लिए सीड कारपोरेशन कायम किया। लेकिन प्राफिटियरिंग कहां है? व्यापारी को हम कंट्रोल करते हैं, किसान मर रहा है, उसकी ओर आंख उठा कर नहीं देखते, लेकिन आपका सीड कारपोरेशन जब किसानों के गेहूं की कीमत डेढ़ सौ रुपये से नीचे थी तो क्वार और कार्तिक के महीने में आपका बीज निगम 275 रुपये क्विंटल के दाम किसानों से ले रहा था। वह किसान की प्राइस से दुगुनी प्राइस ले रहा था, मार्केट प्राइस से दुगुनी कीमत ले रहा था। हम छोटे आदमी की बात करते हैं। हम गरीब आदमी को राहत देने की बात करते हैं। सीड कारपोरेशन में सीड जो आता है वह छोटे किसान का नहीं आता। फिर सीड कारपोरेशन उस पर मुनाफा कमाता है और आज जो सबसे गरीब किसान है वह बारानी खेती करता है, उसके पास सिंचाई के साधन नहीं हैं। उसके पास बिजली नहीं है। वह मानसून के भरोसे बो देता है। अच्छी फसल हो जाती है तो उसकी फसल 14 रुपये मन बिके, फिर उसकी कीमत का हम ध्यान न रखें तो हम कैसे कह सकते हैं कि निश्चित रूप से हम किसानों को राहत देना चाहते हैं।

उसको राहत देने के लिए हमको यह उसूल बनाना चाहिये कि खेती सबसे बड़ा धंधा है, खेती मुनाफे का धंधा हो, यह स्थिति अगर हमने नहीं मानी तो देश का क्या बनेगा ? देश का उत्थान तभी होगा जबकि जो खेती में लोग लगे हुये हैं उनकी ओर हम देखें, उनका धंधा जो किसान का धंधा है उसको महत्व दें। खेती का धंधा आज कल नुकसान का धंधा है, फायदे का धंधा नहीं है, इसलिये मैं कहता हूं कि हमारी जो नीतियां हैं उन पर पुनर्विचार करें।

यहां पर भी और जब मैं विधान सभा में था तब भी मैंने कई बार यह बात रखी कि खेती की असुरक्षा है, इस पर प्रकृति का प्रकोप होता है, इसलिये इसकी फसल का बीमा होना चाहिये। लेकिन हर बार यह कहा जाता रहा है कि कहां से इतने साधन आयेंगे। फसल का बीमा करने के लिये बड़ी कठिनाइयां आती हैं। जो प्रकृति पर निर्भर है और जो देश को कमा कर खिलाता है उसकी सुरक्षा के नाम पर आपको खतरे ही खतरे नजर आते हैं, लेकिन अगर मैं कार खरीदता हूं तो मुझे पहले बीमा कराना पड़ेगा, ट्रक खरीदता हूं तो बीमा कराना पड़ेगा। मेरा कहना है कि यह हमारा दृष्टि दोष है और इसे हमें बदलना होगा तभी सही रूप में सामाजिक न्याय मिल सकता है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि आप जो उत्तर दें, पूरी नीतियों पर अच्छी तरह से विचार करके दें। (Time bell rings)

आप दो तीन बार घंटी बजा चुकी है, इसलिये मैं ज्यादा न कह कर इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि आपके एफ०सी०आई० वाले उसी का गेहूं खरीदेंगे जिसकी जेब में पैसा होगा। गरीब किसान का गेहूं नहीं खरीदा जाएगा। इसके लिये मैं सुझाव देना चाहता हूं कि आप जो इम्प्लिमेंटेशन कमेटी बनाई है उसमें एफ०सी०आई० को जवाबदेह बनाइए। उसके बाद देखिए कि उन किसानों से सही तरीके से गेहूं खरीदा जा रहा है या नहीं। यह जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया है इसमें प्रत्येक कृषि से संबंधित चीजों का मूल्य निर्धारित करने की बात

है। केवल गेहूं या चावल का मूल्य निर्धारित करने की बात नहीं है। इसी दृष्टिकोण को सामने रख कर आपको कदम उठाने पड़ेंगे। जब आप ऐसा करेंगे मैं समझता हूँ तभी आप सामाजिक न्याय दे सकेंगे। अपने देश में जो हम चाहते हैं कि आर्थिक स्थिति अच्छी हो, कृषि उत्पादन बढ़े यह सब तभी हो सकेगा।

अभी की जो आपकी आर्थिक समीक्षा है वह यह बताती है कि '71 से '75 तक कृषि उत्पादन में वृद्धि नहीं हुई है। अगर कभी मामूली सी हुई है तो घटी भी है, क्योंकि उसे प्रकृति का शिकार होना पड़ा। मेरा आप से निवेदन है कि कम से कम किसानों को इतना तो कह दीजिये कि जो अपना सारा पैसा लाएगा अपनी सारी मेहनत लगाएगा उसको बर्बाद होने से बचाया जाएगा और सरकार उसकी पीठ पर होगी। मुझे पूरी आशा है कि हमारे मंत्री महोदय अपने सीनियर कुलीम्स और मंत्रिमण्डल से विचार करने के बाद निश्चित रूप से इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करने की स्थिति में होंगे।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

उपमहाध्यक्ष महोदय, संसद् और विधान मंडलों में ऐसे अवसर बहुत कम आते हैं जब किसी प्रश्न पर सत्ताधारी दल और विरोधी दलों का स्वर एक जैसा हो, चिन्तन एक जैसा हो और सुझाव भी एक जैसे हो। लेकिन कुछ इस तरह की राष्ट्रीय समस्याएं हैं जिनका सबध जन-साधारण से होता है और विशेष कर देश के उस वर्ग से जो किसी भी चीज का मूल उत्पादक होता है।

मैं अपने मित्र श्री गुलाब राव पाटिल को इस प्रस्ताव को लाने के लिये हार्दिक धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं। उन्होंने एक ऐसे उपेक्षित वर्ग की समस्याओं को उजागर किया है जिसकी दुर्भाग्य से न संसद् में लाबी है, न विधान मंडल में, न समाचार पत्रों में लाबी है और न देश के रेडियो पर कोई लाबी है।

हमारे देश के, 1971 की जनसंख्या के आंकड़ों के हिसाब से 85 प्रतिशत लोग गांवों

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

में रहते हैं जो कृषि के ऊपर निर्भर रहते हैं। ये या तो स्वयं कृषि करते हैं या कृषि-मजदूर हैं। मैं कृषक और कृषि मजदूर में कोई ज्यादा भेद नहीं मानता। वह इसलिये कि जो अपने खेत पर काम करता है वह कृषक कहलाता है और जो दूसरों के खेत पर काम करता है वह मजदूर कहलाता है। वास्तव में दोनों कृषि ही करते हैं। इस तरह 85 प्रतिशत जनता गांवों में रहती है और केवल 15 प्रतिशत नगरों में रहती है। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य हमारे देश का यह है कि जितना 15 प्रतिशत की रक्षा, उनके विकास, उनकी सुविधाओं पर पिछले 27-28 वर्षों में ध्यान दिया गया है, उतना 85 प्रतिशत जनता की सुरक्षा और विकास की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। हमारे देश में जितने विकास कार्यक्रम चल रहे हैं, उनमें कितने प्रतिशत नगरों और शहरों से संबंधित हैं और कितने गांवों से संबंधित हैं, यह सब जो हमारे मुह बोलते आंकड़े हैं उन पर प्रकाश डालने से ज्ञान हो जाएगा।

अभी कुछ दिन पहले एक प्रश्न आया था कि हमारे यहां गांवों के बैंकों में गांव के लोगों का जो पूजा का विनियोग है या जो पूजा उन्होंने बैंको के अन्दर जमा कर रखी है उस अनुपात से ग्रामीण विकास के लिये बैंक लगाते हैं या नहीं? तो माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने इस तथ्य को स्वीकार किया था कि यह बात नहीं है। इसी तरह मे हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जितने विश्वविद्यालय हैं, जितने मेडिकल कालेज हैं, जितने इंजीनियरिंग कालेज हैं और दूसरी जितनी टैक्नीकल संस्थाएँ हैं, उनको भी अगर आप देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि यहां पर ग्रामीण विद्यार्थियों का अनुपात क्या है और शहरी विद्यार्थियों का अनुपात क्या है। ऐसी स्थिति में यह कहना कि समान रूप से समाजवादी ढंग से सब का विकास हो रहा है। आज की स्थिति में कम से कम यह बात हमारे गांवों पर लागू नहीं होती है। इस समय मैं उन प्रश्नों के विस्तार में जाना नहीं चाहता। मैं उस मूल प्रश्न पर आना चाहता हूं जिसके

संबंध में श्री गुलाब राव पाटिल ने यह प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया है। उनका कहना यह है कि किसानों को उनके मूल उत्पादन की लागत को ध्यान में रखते हुये लाभकारी मूल्य मिलना चाहिए। हमारी सरकार इस बात के लिए तो प्रयत्नशील है कि औद्योगिक उत्पादनों के मूल्य किसी तरह से भी कम न होने पाये, लेकिन किसानों की चिन्ता वह नहीं करती।

अभी मेरे मित्र ने आर्थिक समीक्षा का उल्लेख किया। मैं भी आर्थिक समीक्षा की एक ही बात को पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूं। अभी पीछे गवर्नमेंट ने लेवी चीनी के संबंध में थोड़ी सी राहत दी है। पहले खुले बाजार में 30 प्रतिशत चीनी बेची जा सकती थी, लेकिन अब उसको बढ़ा कर 35 प्रतिशत कर दिया गया है। यह 35 प्रतिशत क्यों किया गया, इसका कारण बताते हुये आर्थिक समीक्षा के अन्दर लिखा है कि 1974-75 के मौसम के बाद भी लेवी चीनी का अनुपात 70 प्रतिशत से घटा कर 65 प्रतिशत करके लेवी चीनी की समान अखिल भारतीय कीमत रखी गई थी, जिससे कि चीनी मिल उद्योग को जो लाभ मिलता है वह कम न हो। सरकार इस बात के लिए तो चिन्तित है कि चीनी मिल उद्योग को जो लाभ मिलता है वह कम न हो, लेकिन सरकार को इस बात की चिन्ता नहीं है कि चीनी मिलें जिस किसान के कंधों पर चल रही हैं या जो चीनी मिलों को गन्ना पैदा करके देता है उसको किसी तरह की हानि न हो। मैंने इस आर्थिक समीक्षा को आदि से लेकर अन्त तक पढ़ा। मुझे इसमें एक पंक्ति भी किसान के संबंध में ऐसी नहीं मिली जिसमें यह बताया गया हो कि जिस प्रकार से हमारी सरकार चीनी उद्योग के लाभान के संबंध में चिन्तित है, उसी प्रकार से उसको इस बात की भी चिन्ता हो कि कृषकों के लाभ में भी किसी प्रकार की कमी न आने पाये। मैं समझता हूं कि सरकार की मशीनरी के अन्दर कुछ इस प्रकार के लोग बैठे हुए हैं जो जान-बूझ कर जो हम निर्णय लेते हैं, यहां पर हम जो चर्चाएँ करते हैं उनको हानि पहुंचाते हैं ताकि सरकार की तस्वीर

बिगड़े। इस संबंध में हमारा कहना यह है कि मूल उत्पादन करने वाले किसान को सही और लागत मूल्य के हिसाब से उसकी वस्तुओं का मूल्य मिलना चाहिए।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन में मैं जिस प्रदेश से आता हूँ, उस प्रदेश में, खास तौर पर उत्तर प्रदेश के पश्चिमी भाग में दो चीजों की खेती अधिक होती है— एक गेहूँ और दूसरा गन्ना। मैं पहले इन दो चीजों को लेता हूँ। गन्ने की स्थिति क्या है? उपसभाध्यक्षा जी, पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में गन्ने की स्थिति यह है कि दो वर्ष पहले जब गन्ने की रिकवरी 8 प्रतिशत थी तो सरकार ने गन्ने का न्यूनतम या समर्थन मूल्य 8.50 रु० रखा था। लेकिन जब गत वर्ष गन्ने की रिकवरी 10 प्रतिशत हो गई तो भी सरकार ने गन्ने का समर्थन मूल्य 8.50 रु० ही रहने दिया। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जब रिकवरी 8 प्रतिशत थी तब गन्ने का समर्थन मूल्य 8.50 रु० रखा गया और जब रिकवरी 10 प्रतिशत कर दी गई तो समर्थन मूल्य 8.50 रु० ही रहने दिया गया। अगर हिसाब लगाया जाय तो कम से कम इसको बढ़ कर 10.50 रु० तो हो ही जाना चाहिए था। इसमें किसी प्रकार की न्यूनता नहीं होनी चाहिए।

इस हिसाब से आप एक बात और देखिए। अभी प्रातःकाल शिन्दे साहब ने एक ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव के उत्तर में कहा कि “इसके अलावा कपास और पटमन के न्यूनतम समर्थन मूल्य और गन्ने के लिए चीनी के कारखानों द्वारा गन्ना उत्पादकों को दिये जाने वाले न्यूनतम मूल्य निर्धारित हैं। ये कीमतें कृषि मूल्य आयोग की राय से निर्धारित की जाती हैं।” यह बात उन्होंने अपने उत्तर में कही है। यही बात आर्थिक समीक्षा के अन्दर भी कही गई है। आर्थिक समीक्षा के अन्दर यह कहा गया है कि कृषि मूल्य आयोग ने गन्ने का न्यूनतम मूल्य 9.50 रु० करने के लिए हमको कहा था। आर्थिक समीक्षा भी सरकारी प्रकाशन है और ध्यानाकर्षण सूचना के उत्तर

में शिन्दे साहब ने जो उत्तर दिया है वह भी सरकार की तरफ से दिया गया है। ऐसी स्थिति में अब मैं कौन-से उत्तर को सही मानूँ? आर्थिक समीक्षा के अन्दर कृषि मूल्य आयोग ने 9.50 रु० की जो बात कही है उसको सही मानूँ या शिन्दे जी ने जो उत्तर दिया है उसको सही मानूँ। ध्यानाकर्षण सूचना के उत्तर में शिन्दे जी ने यह कहा है कि ये मूल्य कृषि मूल्य आयोग को पूछकर निर्धारित किये जाते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि ये दोनों बातें परस्पर विरोधी हैं। इसलिये मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि जब मंत्री महोदय अपना उत्तर दें तो इसका स्पष्टीकरण अवश्य करें। अगर कृषि मूल्य आयोग 10 प्रतिशत रिकवरी के बाद भी 8.50 रु० मूल्य रखने की बात कहता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कृषि मूल्य आयोग के चिन्तन की शैली बहुत पुरानी पड़ गई है। लेकिन आर्थिक समीक्षा में न्यूनतम मूल्य 9.50 रु० रखने की बात कही गई है। हालांकि मैं समझता हूँ कि 9.50 रु० मूल्य भी 10 प्रतिशत रिकवरी के बाद कोई बहुत बड़ा मूल्य नहीं है।

तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने जितने भी हमारे देश में औद्योगिक उत्पादन करने वाले कारखाने हैं उनको लाभांश की दर में 12 प्रतिशत की छूट दी हुई है कि जो उनका मूल उत्पादन है लागत लगा कर, उस पर 12 प्रतिशत अपना लाभ ले सकते हैं। अगर कारखाने वाला 12 प्रतिशत लाभ ले सकता है तो हम देश के 85 प्रतिशत निवासी किसानों ने क्या अपराध किए हुए हैं जो उनका 12 प्रतिशत लाभ नहीं मिल सकता? इसके लिए सिद्धांत क्यों नहीं लागू होता कि किसान भी 12 प्रतिशत लाभ ले सकता है? अगर इसी हिसाब से ले तो मैं समझता हूँ गन्ने का मूल्य, जो समर्थित मूल्य था, 12 रु० रखना चाहिये था। भार्गव फार्मूले में चीनी मिलों के संबंध में कहा है कि चीनी मिलों का जो लाभांश है उसमें कम से कम आधा किमान को मिलना चाहिए। अगर भार्गव फार्मूला को लागू किया जाए तो यह

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

साढ़े 14 रु० निश्चित रूप से पहुंच जाता। दुर्भाग्य की बात है उपसभाध्यक्षा जी, आज चूल्हे में जलाने वाला जो ईंधन है उसका भाव है 18-20 रु० क्विण्टल और किसान जिस सर्दी और कष्ट में रह कर गन्ना तैयार करता है उम गन्ने का मूल्य जो उसको मिल रहा है उसका न्यूनतम समर्थित मूल्य रखा है 8 रु० 50 पैसा। अब यह किसान के साथ कितनी विडंबना और उपहास की बात है। जब कि संसद् एक मत से आपको कह रही है कि किसान का जो उत्पादन है, उसको लागत भाव देकर ही लाभकारी समर्थित मूल्य निर्धारित कीजिए। जो उसकी लागत है उसको कम से कम पूछ तो लीजिये। आप यह कहते हैं अगर हम कृषि मूल्य आयोग में किसान के प्रतिनिधि को रखेंगे तो उपभोक्ता के प्रतिनिधि को क्यों नहीं रखेंगे। ठीक कहा, नत्थी सिंह जी ने कि जो मूल उत्पादक है उसके लिए कैसे समान नीति रखी जाएगी। उपभोक्ता को क्या आप पूछते हैं कि किसान ने पानी किस भाव से ले रखा है, बिजली की दरें कितनी देनी पड़ती है, डीजल आईल का दाम कितना देना पड़ता है, ट्रैक्टर और उसके सामान का सामान्य मूल्य भी 25 प्रतिशत और बढ़ गया और बड़े ट्रैक्टरों का तो और ज्यादा बढ़ गया है। इसके अलावा भी किसान को जो कई जगह रिश्वतें देनी पड़ती हैं पानी के लिए, बिजली लेने के लिए, उसके बारे में उपभोक्ता को क्या कुछ पता है? तो उपभोक्ता और किसान दोनों को समान स्तर पर रखना और कहना कि कृषि मूल्य आयोग के अंदर किसानों के प्रतिनिधि नहीं होने चाहिए और अगर हों तो ऐसे किसानों का प्रतिनिधित्व हो जो हजारों एकड़ के फार्म रखते हैं, जैसे राजे महाराजे रखते थे। कुछ दिन पहले—अगर मैं भूल नहीं करता हूँ—तो इसी प्रकार के किसानों के प्रतिनिधि कृषि मूल्य आयोग में रहे हैं जिनके हजारों एकड़ के फार्म थे, रियासत के मालिक थे। ऐसे लोग किसानों का प्रतिनिधित्व क्या करेंगे? किसानों का प्रतिनिधित्व वह कर सकता है जो सामान्य कठिनाइयों

से परिचित हो। इसीलिए इन बातों को तय करते समय आप थोड़ा व्यावहारिक स्तर पर आकर निर्णय लीजिए और संसद् अगर किसी बात को सर्वसम्मति से कहे कि दोनों पक्षों का समान रूप से मान किया जाए तो इसको सामान्य न समझ लें, इसको केवल सरकारी दफ्तरों के कर्मचारियों के रहम पर न छोड़ दें, बल्कि आप स्वयं उसमें रुचि लेकर कार्य करें। सौभाग्य की बात है कि इस समय कृषि मंत्रालय में तीनों मंत्रियों का कृषि के साथ सीधा संबंध है। शिन्दे साहब यहां बैठे हैं इसलिए इस बात को नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ, बल्कि इस बात को जानता हूँ कि व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से वह किसानों की समस्या से परिचित हैं। जिस विभाग के मन्त्री जगजीवन राम जी जैसा व्यक्ति है, जिस विभाग में शाहनवाज खाँ जैसा किसान हो अन्ना साहब शिन्दे जैसा कृषि का ज्ञाता हो, आखिर उस मंत्रालय के ऊपर कौन बैठा है? जो कृषि संबंधी मूल्य नीति पर या लागत मूल्य नीति पर मही-मही निर्णय नहीं ले रहा है, यह भी तो हमें पता चलना चाहिये।

अब गन्ने के अलावा गेहूं की स्थिति लीजिये। गेहूं की स्थिति यह है—अगर मैं भूल नहीं कर रहा हूँ—तो अग्रिकल्चरल प्राइस कमीशन ने 1973 के पंजाब के आंकड़ों के आधार पर जो गेहूं का लागत मूल्य था वह निर्धारित किया था 74 रु० 34 पैसे और उन्होंने वसूली मूल्य कहा था कि आज जो स्थिति है कि इसके हिसाब से इसका 95 रु० क्विण्टल के हिसाब से वसूली मूल्य होना चाहिये। अब यह 1973-74 की बात मैं आपको कह रहा हूँ जिस समय डीजल का भाव बहुत नीचा था, खाद का भाव आधा था, ट्रैक्टर का भाव इतना नहीं था और सिंचाई की दरें भी इतनी नहीं थी, उस समय की स्थिति मैं आपको बता रहा हूँ, जिस समय उन्होंने 95 रु० का सुझाव दिया था। आज जब कि सारी चीजों के भाव बढ़कर दुगुने से ऊपर पहुंच गए हैं, तो आज क्या यह स्थिति केवल 105 रु० पर टिकनी चाहिए थी? मैं अपने मित्र से तो सहमत हूँ—अगर आप किसान की

लागत को न समझ कर, उसको ध्यान में न रख कर, लाभकारी मूल्य नहीं देंगे और अरबों रुपए की विदेशी मुद्रा खर्च करके अमरीका और कॅनेडा से गेहूं और अन्न मंगाएंगे—अगर आप बाहर से अन्न मंगाएंगे, तो देश की कृषि व्यवस्था को संतुलित नहीं रख पाएंगे, पूरे देश की कृषि व्यवस्था बिगड़ जाएगी। बाहर से जो अनाज लाने के लिये आप रुपया खर्च कर देंगे लेकिन यहां किसान को लाभकारी मूल्य पर, लागत मूल्य पर नहीं देना चाहते, यह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि इस प्रकार की विडंबना क्यों? इस व्यावहारिक बात के ऊपर सीधे सादे शब्दों में विचार क्यों नहीं किया जा रहा है। आज जो स्थिति है उसमें गेहूं का मूल्य कितना नीचे गिर गया है। नत्थी सिंह जी ने कही मण्डी की बात—सौभाग्य से मैं भी उत्तर प्रदेश की हापुड़, चंदौसी, हाथरस इस प्रकार की छोटी छोटी मण्डियों से परिचित हूँ। सुबह आपने यह कहा था कि हमने यह कह दिया है एफ० सी०आई० को, खाद्य निगम को, कि कहीं 105 रु० से नीचे मूल्य न गिरने पायें। शिन्दे साहब, अगर आपको थोड़ा सा अवकाश हो तो मैं आपको निजी राय दूंगा—यह तो आप बताओ मत उत्तर प्रदेश के कलक्टरों को कि अन्ना साहब शिन्दे का दौरा हो रहा है, आप स्वयं अपने यहां उत्तर प्रदेश की मण्डियों में चले जाएँ, दिल्ली के ग्रामपास की मण्डियों में ही चले जाइये और देखिये कि कहां खाद्य निगम कितनी खरीद कर रहा है और कितना गेहूं किसान को 100 रु० से भी नीचे जाकर बेचना पड़ रहा है। आपको अपने आप पता चल जाएगा कि ये रिपोर्टें जो देते हैं उनमें कहा तक मच्चाई है? ये रिपोर्टें सही नहीं हैं, इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप उनकी रिपोर्टों पर, आप उनके नोटों पर विश्वास न करें, आप स्वयं जाकर मण्डियों में देखें कि क्या स्थिति है।

गेहूं का मूल्य अगर उसी भाव से लगाया जाता तो लागत की दृष्टि से होना चाहिए और किसान के काम आने वाली वस्तुओं के जितने मूल्य आज बढ़ गये हैं तो उसका लागत

मूल्य आज जितना बढ़ गया है, उसके हिसाब से 105 रुपये से जाकर 120 रुपये में रुकना चाहिये था। लेकिन आज उस बेचारे किसान की स्थिति यह हो गई है कि 105 रुपया जो उसे आपने देना तय किया था वह भी 100 रुपये से नीचे पहुँच गया है। जब वह कहता है कि थोड़ी सी क्षेत्रों की दीवार हटा दो ताकि दूसरे प्रान्तों में गल्ला चला जाय और किसी तरह से हमारे आंसू पुछ जायें। लेकिन इस बात के लिये भी सरकार तैयार नहीं है। एक ओर तो यह कहा जाता है कि 85 प्रतिशत भारत जो गांवों में रहता है, उसकी समस्याओं के प्रति हम बड़े चिन्तित हैं, उसकी समस्याओं के प्रति बड़े आतुर हैं। तो इसके लिए एक व्यावहारिक दृष्टिकोण होना चाहिये। यदि आप 85 प्रतिशत जनता की समस्या के प्रति चिन्तित और आतुर हैं तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बात पर गम्भीरता से सोचें।

एक बात और मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि किसान जो कृषि उपज का एक माध्यम है, आज उसकी स्थिति क्या है? आज आप उसकी स्थिति को देखिये। मैं अपने प्रदेश की बात कहता हूँ। महाराष्ट्र की बात पटेल साहब बतलायेंगे, राजस्थान की नन्धीसिंह जी बतलायेंगे और हरियाणा की चौधरी साहब बतलायेंगे। मेरे प्रदेश में केन-सैस लागू किया गया था, गन्ने पर उप-कर लगाया गया था। लगाया इसलिये गया था कि इसके द्वारा जितना पैसा आयेगा वह गन्ने के विकास में लगाया जायेगा। पिछले वर्षों में जितना केन-सैस का पैसा आया था, गन्ने के उप-कर का पैसा आया था, अगर उस पैसे को जोड़ लिया जाय, तो करोड़ों में नहीं, अरबों में जाकर वँठता है। लेकिन यह सारे का सारा पैसा गन्ने के विकास के ऊपर उत्तर प्रदेश में नहीं लगाया गया। हो सकता है किसी दूसरे राज्य में लगाया गया हो। लेकिन मैं अपने प्रदेश की स्थिति जानता हूँ और मेरे प्रदेश में कम से कम इस प्रकार का रुपया नहीं लगाया गया। उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने अभी किसानों के ऊपर डेवलपमेंट टैक्स लगाया,

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

विक्रम कर लगाया, और उम विकास कर से आपको आश्चर्य होगा गत वर्ष 150 करोड़ रुपया आया था। यह जो विकास कर लगाया गया था उस समय कहा गया था कि इसमें जितना पैसा आयेगा उसे कृषि के विकास में लगाया जायेगा। लेकिन 150 करोड़ रुपये में से डेढ़ करोड़ रुपया भी दिया जाता तो मुझे खुशी होती कि वह किसानों के ऊपर ठीक लगाया गया है।

आपकी आर्थिक समीक्षा में कहा गया है जो गेहूँ 105 रुपया क्विन्टल के भाव से खरीदा गया है उसमें से 4.75 रु० बोनस के रूप में दिया जायेगा, यह जो बोनस दिया जायेगा वह किसानों के विकास में और कृषि उत्पादन के विकास में लगाया जायेगा। अब कृषि मंत्री जी बतलाये कि 4.75 रु० प्रति क्विन्टल के हिसाब से बोनस दिये जाने की बात कही गई है, तो इस हिसाब से कितनी बोनस की राशि प्रान्तों को दी गई है और जो बोनस की राशि दी गई है वह कितनी कृषि विकास के अन्दर लगाई गई है। अगर आप इस चीज को देखेंगे तो आपको यह पता लगगा कि जितने भी हैड्स इसके सम्बन्ध में हैं, वे सब बनावटी हैं। केन-सैम के नाम पर जितना पैसा आया है वह दूसरे कार्यों पर खर्च किया गया। डेवलपमेंट के नाम पर जितना पैसा आया है वह दूसरे मदों पर खर्च हो जाता है। जो बोनस 4.75 रुपये के हिसाब से दिया जाता है, वह भी दूसरे कार्यों में खर्च हो जाता है। सरकार इन विकास कार्यों के लिए जो राशि देती है आखिर वह राशि कहाँ चली जाती है? यह तली फोड़ कुंआ है कौनसा, जहाँ यह पैसा नीचे चला जा रहा है? इस का पता लगाया जाना चाहिये कि किसानों के लिए, कृषि विकास के लिए जो पैसा दिया जाता है वह कहाँ खर्च हो जाता है?

चीनी मिलों के राष्ट्रीयकरण की चर्चा एक हमारे मित्र ने की। मैं एक बात निश्चित रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ और मेरी धारणा यह है, मैं उन व्यक्तियों में से हूँ कि जो राष्ट्रीयकरण

को रामबाण नहीं मानते हैं। वह सब समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं है। राष्ट्रीयकरण के बाद बुराई नहीं रहेगी यह भी उचित मालूम नहीं देता है। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को जिस चीज का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना हो उसके बारे में स्पष्ट घोषणा कर देनी चाहिये, यह तलवार ऊपर से लटकने का परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि चीनी मिल मालिक चीनी मिलों का जहाँ आधुनिकीकरण होना चाहिये था वहाँ वह रुक गये हैं, वह कहते हैं कि सरकार इन मिलों को लेने वाली है और इसलिए ये खचड़ा मिलों को खींच रहे हैं। इन खचड़ा मिलों का परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि जो रिकवरी आनी चाहिये थी वह रिकवरी परसेन्टेज घट रहा है। इस तरह से राष्ट्र का नुकसान हो रहा है। चीनी मिल मालिकों का तो नुकसान नहीं हो रहा है बल्कि सारे राष्ट्र का नुकसान हो रहा है, सारे राष्ट्र का गन्ने का रस खोई में चला जा रहा है और जाकर सूख जाता है। सूर्य नारायण उस रस को खींच लेता है। जो मिल मालिक पुरानी मिलों का नवीनीकरण नहीं करते हैं उनको सरकार को ले लेना चाहिये। अगर वह नहीं लेगी तो ये खचड़ा मिलें इस देश को नुकसान पहुंचायेगी। इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि जल्दी ही नीति निर्धारित कीजिये और जब तक नई नीति निर्धारित हो तब तक मेरा कहना यह है कि एक आदेश तुरन्त लागू किया जाय कि अगर मिल मालिक अपनी मिलों का नवीनीकरण नहीं करेंगे तो उन्हें सरकार ले लेगी। इस तरह की नीति आप जल्द निर्धारित कीजिये।

सौभाग्य से उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आप एक ऐसे संगठन की जनरल सेक्रेटरी भी हैं जो इन तमाम चीजों के लिये देश में जिम्मेदार है। मैं आपको खास तौर से इस बात को सुना रहा हूँ कि अगर हम इन चीनी मिल मालिकों को एक, दो या तीन महीने का नोटिस दे दें कि आप इन पुरानी चीनी मिलों का आधुनिकीकरण करें तो अच्छा होगा, इस से देश का कितना नुकसान हो रहा

है इस पर जरा विचार कीजिए।

तीसरी बात यह कि चीनी से पांच सौ करोड़ की विदेशी मुद्रा का लाभ होता है, या सात सौ करोड़ का लाभ हुआ है। उस में से एक या दो प्रतिशत तो किसान को भी मिलना चाहिए। किसान ही तो इस का मूल उत्पादक है। हम उस का लाभ चीनी मिल मालिकों को ही क्यों देते हैं। यदि आधा नहीं तो चौथाई लाभ तो उसे जाना ही चाहिए, वैसे आधा चीनी मिल मालिकों को और आधा किसान को जाना चाहिए। अगर इतना भी नहीं होता तो सरकार इतनी कृपा करे कि सरकार जो विदेशी मुद्रा कमा रही है उस में से कुछ किसान को दे ताकि किसान वर्ग यह महसूस करे कि उस को उस के अधिक उत्पादन का कुछ फल मिल रहा है।

तीसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि चीनी मिल मालिक केवल चीनी पर ही लाभ उठाते हों ऐसा नहीं है। चीनी के साथ ही कई ऐसी चीजें हैं जैसे बगास है, या मोलैमेम है, शीरा है, खोई है, खाद है जो चीनी मिलों में गन्ने के रस से बनती है और खेतों में इस्तेमाल होती है। लेकिन इन की आमदनी सारे चीनी मिल मालिक बताते नहीं। उस में किसान का भी भाग होना चाहिए लेकिन किसान को कुछ मिलता नहीं। तो उस का भाग केवल चीनी के लाभ में ही नहीं बल्कि मोलैसेम, बगास आदि दूसरी चीजों में भी होना चाहिए और इस लाभ के प्रतिशत को हम निश्चित रूप से निर्धारित करना चाहिए।

अपनी बात को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए मैं दो, तीन सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। पहले तो जो हमारा कृषि मूल्य निर्धारण आयोग है उस का पुनर्गठन किया जाना चाहिए और उस में किसानों के प्रतिनिधि लिये जायें ताकि वह अपनी समस्याओं को शान्ति से बैठ वहाँ कर रख सके और यह न हो कि सरकार अधिकारियों की कृपा पर ही कृषि निर्धारण आयोग को छोड़ दिया जाय।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि

कृषकों की और कृषि उत्पादन की समस्याओं का अध्ययन करने के लिये संसद की एक उच्च स्तरीय समिति अवश्य बनानी चाहिए ताकि यह चीजें देर तक उपेक्षा का विषय बन कर न रह जायें। वीस सूची कार्यक्रम में यह बातें आ सकें तो अच्छा है नहीं तो दो, तीन सूत्र उस में और बढ़ाइये, लेकिन 85 प्रतिशत भाग आवादी का जो कृषकों का है और जो गांवों में रहता है वह उपेक्षित नहीं रहना चाहिए।

तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसानों को जो ऋण दिये जाते हैं उन के व्याज की दर उद्योग धंधों के ऋणों के व्याज की दर की अपेक्षा निश्चित रूप से कम होनी चाहिए और सिद्धांत रूप में हमें इस बात को तय कर लेना चाहिए।

अंतिम बात मैं पहले कह चुका हूँ कि विदेशों को जो रुपया हम देते हैं और वहाँ से गल्ला मगाते हैं उस का कुछ प्रतिशत अगर आप किसानों को दे दें तो निश्चित रूप से किसान आप को गेहूँ भी ज्यादा पैदा कर के देगा, गन्ना भी ज्यादा देगा और कपास और मूंगफली भी ज्यादा पैदा कर के देगा, लेकिन आप उस के लिये एक व्यावहारिक नीति अपनाइये ताकि किसान को कृषि उत्पादन की लागत को देखते हुए कुछ लाभकारी मूल्य मिल सके।

धन्यवाद।

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh) :
Madam, Vice-Chairman, this is a very important Resolution and this should have attracted the attention of the House in a more serious way than it has done. In fact, I would have been very happy if somebody who is in charge of the Planning Commission was here. I look at this Resolution from a different angle, different from the approaches that my honourable colleagues in this House have made. This I feel, is a distortion in the economy. It is not merely a problem of the kisan. It is an economic problem. I do not want a good cause to suffer by an incorrect approach. Any sectoral demand will not secure that response which an integrated approach could. Here we have to view the situation from the

[Shri V.B. Raju]

angle of the stability of our economy and stability of prices. Any demand that may be made on behalf of a particular segment of the economy will be countered by the other segments and thereby good causes are lost. So, I would have been happy if this Resolution had been framed in a different manner to secure the same purpose. It is not merely securing a remunerative price for the kisans' produce. Any argument towards that coming from the kisan sector, from the agricultural sector, might be resisted by the other sector. So, I was happy when Shastriji said that this is not a party approach, this must be something like the approach of the whole Parliament that we should obtain a price parity. This idea has also been emphasised by Shri Sardesai, the Member from the Communist Party. What we should aim at is price stability and parity. My approach is a bit different. I would not demand that the prices of wheat and rice should be raised for the purpose of benefiting the kisan. I would not plead for that. The last part of the Resolution is—

“...this House is of opinion that with a view to increasing agricultural production, Government should formulate a scheme aimed at ensuring a remunerative price to the growers of each agricultural commodity”.

What does it mean? It means that the present price is not remunerative and therefore the price has to be revised. That is exactly the point. My asking that the prices of rice and wheat and pulses should be raised so as to secure remunerative prices for the kisan will be resisted by the consumer. No, I do not want any conflict between the consumer and the producer in this country. What I would like to plead for is this. There are, I must say, three groups of prices all of which must maintain internal parity. The first is the prices of the inputs that go into agricultural production; the second is the prices of the agricultural produce and the third is the prices of industrial manufactures which go into the consumption of the agriculturists. Therefore, what we should aim at or what we should formulate is a policy of inter-related price structure. The prices of the inputs should be such as the prices of rice and wheat that are available to the cultivator are remunerative. That is

my approach. I do not think we will succeed if we ask Mr. Shinde that the price of wheat or rice should be raised. No, I do not think he can carry through. I hope that Shri Shastri, on second thought, would agree with me that what we should aim at, when the whole House is considering this, is correcting the distortion in the economy. Now, this is actually my approach, and I hope that it is not in conflict with anything. A good cause shall not suffer by a bad argument. The Law Minister is here, he will say that good causes shall not suffer by a bad argument. The prices of agricultural commodities have fallen so steeply but the prices of industrial commodities have not in the same manner come down. I do not think the Minister will differ from me; I am sure he will agree with me. Shri Nathi Singh has read about it in Hindi. And I would humbly draw the attention of the hon. Minister to page 16 of the Economic Survey where the Government itself agrees—

“An analysis of whole sale prices during April-December, 1975 shows that industrial raw materials (such as raw cotton and oil-seeds), foodgrains and edible oils played a leading role in inducing a fall in prices...”

4 PM

The fall in the prices of these commodities has been mainly responsible for the decline in the wholesale price index. Then it is stated :

“By contrast, there was no significant decline in the prices of manufactures.”

So we need not labour to argue to convince the Minister that there is disparity in the price fall, that there is no equilibrium or evenness. So, when there is no difference of opinion on this matter, the question is how and in what manner the prices of manufactures could be brought down. Even the Minister himself agreed that the price fall has been 24 to 25 per cent in the case of foodgrains and in the case of industrial raw materials going from the agricultural sector, like cotton, oilseeds, jute, etc., the fall has been 30 per cent. And from what date? Even earlier also, I was saying that September 1974 was the watershed. That is to say, inflation is an index, an indicator of the disease of the economy. Now the body politic can be compared to the human body. The temperature had risen to the highest peak in September 1974 when the wholesale price index was 328. Now from that

time it has begun to fall. From July 1975 there has been a steeper fall. It is good. India is one of the very few countries that have not only contained the inflation but actually have reversed the inflationary pressure. That is a great credit to us. It is one of our greatest achievements and we should stand by the Government, by the measures they have employed to contain the inflationary pressure. But what has happened to the prices of other things ? That is the whole trouble. The prices of manufactured products have come down by only three per cent. But again let us examine the details of the products. Take, for instance, coal. The index was 263 in September, 1974. But to day it is 332. That is, from 263 the index has actually gone up to 332. Similarly in the case of mineral oils, the wholesale price index in September 1974 was 390. What is it to-day ? It is 421 to day. Now, forget all these items and take a consumer item like soap. The index was 167 in September 1974. And to-day it is 243. So what can the Agriculture Ministry do in this matter ? We are now trying to make the Agriculture Ministry as the target of our attack and we are pumping our speeches against it. But this does not involve one Ministry. We have to unearth where the weak point lies.

SHRI DEORAO PATIL : It is the entire Government.

SHRI V.B. RAJU : That is what I say. The Members of the planning Commission should have been here. I should have seen them in the lobby. The question is, we are not addressing merely the Chair. The Chair is merely the satellite through which we communicate. Now, my point is, it is a very serious matter. It is not that the Minister does not know. I know the views of the Ministers perfectly well. It is not a party question, as Shastriji put it. Now it is a very serious problem. Now I come to political philosophy.

India is a country of villages. Shastriji knows more about history. He knows that in the past thousands of years the socio-economic life in the villages was not interfered by any dynasty. The villagers paid their taxes and lived in the villages and the rulers lived in their forts. Nothing had happen to the villages. For the first time, after independence, we in the Congress Gov-

ernments went to the villages and tried to rectify the wrongs that had been done to them in the past thousands of years. We tried to remove those disparities and those injustices done to them in those hundreds of thousands of years. What has happened after 24 years of planned economy ? The gap between the rural and the urban areas is getting widened. This is the basic question which I want Shri Shinde to examine as an intellectual. I have gone into this subject for two years. If this gap is further widened—and it is going to be further widened—and if the prices of industrial manufactures do not come down, then whatever little is available in the rural areas will go into the urban areas. This is an automatic shift of income. The rural resources will simply shift to urban areas. What will happen to the people in the rural areas ? They will start marching to the urban areas. It has some sociological implication which will create tremendous tensions from the political angle. The other day it was said by the textile mills that their stock was piling up. Do you think there was an increase in the production of cloth so as to cause stock-piling ? Do you think there was decline in our population growth so as to create surpluses in cloth ? No. The reason is lack of purchasing power in the rural areas. Therefore I am warning the Planning Commission members that it is not only agriculture that will suffer. Industry also will suffer indirectly. This is a dangerous situation. This will lead to lay offs. Then there will be more unemployment. The stocks will not move. I need not take more time to explain all those things. They do not need to be explained. The question is how and in what manner we have to act. That is the question before us. To start with, how can we make agriculture remunerative ? I know our agriculturists look to the market and then plan their crop production. They do not go by our speeches. If I appeal to them to produce more, nobody will listen. Market is their master. In fact, in Andhra Pradesh, which is the rice bowl of the country, if the Nagarjuna command area is fully developed—already Rs. 200 crores have been spent there, but some Rs. 50 or Rs. 100 crores more will have to be invested—then the entire rice eating population of this country can be fed by Nagarjuna. We do not need to import even a single grain of

to ensure

[Shri V.B. Raju]
rice. We can even export our Basmati rice Middle East and West Asia and get good price for it...

SHRI DEORAO PATIL : Provided Government give remunerative price.

SHRI V.B. RAJU : Please forget about that. Now it is a question of price parity. We shall agree on that.

Therefore, to start with this shifting will occur. I would request the Minister to take it seriously. He knows it. Therefore, the prices of inputs must have some relation to the market price of agricultural produce. Towards this end, I would like the Agriculture Ministry to secure control over the input price. There should be some control over prices of fertilizers, pesticides and seeds. Then kindly tell the State Governments not to raise the water rates. They say : We are not getting return on the irrigation projects. Ask them not to look at it from that angle. Then comes electricity tariff. Electricity and water tariffs are there and there is the question of the prices of inputs like fertilizers, seeds, etc. First of all, let there be a national policy on this matter. I would like the honourable Minister to discuss with the Irrigation Ministers and Power Ministers of the States the question of having a policy, a tariff policy, in respect of all these items. Let this Parliament also be seized of this matter and we would assure the Minister that Parliament would stand by him on this point. The Minister also knows that in the USA where the price of everything has gone up, they have not allowed the prices of fertilizers to go up and you will be surprised to know that the economy of the United States of America which is exercising a control over the rest of the world is not dependent on industrial manufactures, but is dependent on agricultural products. So, what I am saying is that there are two things : One is the control over the prices of inputs and the other is the control over the prices of manufactured goods. Now, in respect of the prices of manufactures commodities there is only one thing and that is the public sector. Here, in the case of the public sector undertakings, the cost of production of the commodities produced must be examined. That is the secret. But these days the cost of production is higher. There are many kinds of wastage and there is much room for

price to growers
improvement in terms of efficiency, But, the key is there. If we can have control over the cost of production, then everything is done. It has to be taken care of.

Now, I would like to mention another important thing. What is the rate of interest charged by the banks these days ? They pay to us eight per cent interest if we deposit money with them. But they charge sometimes 24 per cent on the advances they give ! Shastriji, what is the rate of interest that is charged by the banks ? You know it. I do not know whether anybody is applying his mind on this point. Madam, I have mentioned three things which are very very important : Control over the cost of inputs, reduction in the cost of production of all the manufactured goods and reduction in the rate of interest charged by the banks. The prices of inputs must be brought down, cost of production of the manufactured items must be brought down and the rate of interest charged by the banks must be brought down. If these three things are taken care of, then everything will be all right. Thank you.

SHRI KRISHNARAO NARAYAN DHULAP (Maharashtra) : Madam, at the outset, I would like to thank my friend, Shri Gulabrao Patil, who has moved this important resolution in this House which touches upon a very grave problem affecting crores of people in the country directly or indirectly. The plight of the agriculturists in the country today has been clearly described by friends. Madam, I am now reminded of a great poem written by the great poet, Goldsmith. It is the famous poem, "The Deserted Village". In this poem, the poet has referred to the bold peasantry of his own country. He has said :

"Princes and lords may flourish or perish,
A breath may take them as a breath has made them.

But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied."

I would now like to ask the honourable Minister whether the Congress Government at the Centre wants to destroy this bold peasantry of this country. Quite often it is said on the floor of the House and outside also that the prices of agricultural products are crashing down and an appeal is being made to the Government to look into the problem

of the agriculturists in this country. We are now hearing the speeches of the honourable Prime Minister and the other Ministers also and we find that they are very jubilant and happy over the fall in prices of various commodities. My friend, Mr. Raju, referred to the document published by the Minister of Finance, saying that the prices of agricultural products are crushing down to a great extent and there is panic all over the country among the peasantry. Now, because of this emergency they are not calling their rallies, Ministers are not 'gheraoed', they are not asked questions, and so on. But in their heartes they are burning actual-ly.

[*The Vice-Chairman (Shri
V. B. Raju) in the Chair*]

What they feel has been expressed in better words by the hon. Member who spoke in Hindi.

Mr. Raju has referred to three important questions. We agree to it. But is the Government prepared to touch those who have vested interests in the country? Are they prepared to bring down the prices of industrial products? They are not doing this. The question of remunerative prices to the peasantry is not raised for the first time in this country. In the British regime in 1928, the Royal Agricultural Commission was appointed by the then British Government to look into the problems of the peasantry in this country. After that, so many other Committees and Commissions were appointed by the Congress Government and Congress Organization also. In 1947, the Congress Government appointed a Committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Kumarappa. In December 1947, this Committee was appointed. They recommended that parity should be maintained between agricultural products prices and industrial products prices. In 1956, delegation was sent to China under the chairmanship of the then Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. M. V. Krishnappa. They saw what progress had been made by China in agriculture. They came back and submitted their report and said that incentives should be given to agriculturists if you want to have more production in this country. In 1957, the Balwantrai Mehta Committee was appointed to go into the problem of rural development in this country and they

specifically recommended in their report that attractive prices should be given to agriculturists for their produce; they said that that was the only way to boost up agricultural production in this country. Then, the Krishnamachari Committee was appointed. The recommendation of that Committee also was that agriculture should be given more incentives and a remunerative price should be paid to agriculturists for their produce in this country. I shall refer to this at the end of my speech.

Sir, on the 28th and 29th November, 1969, a Conference of Chief Ministers of different States was held in Delhi. The then Home Minister, Shri Chavan said, "Unless the green revolution was based on social justice, I am afraid, the green revolution may not remain green". What is social justice? Are you prepared to give here that social justice to agriculturists who are doing everything to improve agricultural production in this country? It is a way of life. Voltaire said, "The art which feeds the world",—by art, he means agriculture—"The art which feeds the world is a thankless calling". It is because agriculture is away of life with the agriculturists. Whether you pay them remunerative prices or not, they will stick to their vocation. Whether there is rain or no rain, they will till the land. Whether the markets are favourable for them or not favourable for them, they will sell their product. It is a way of life with them. In spite of there being so many problems of which the Government is seized of, the Government is not prepared to solve the problems of these people who are the backbone of the economy of this country. Sir, one of the Chief Ministers of Maharashtra said on the floor of the House that it would not be incorrect to say that the policies of the Union Government were always to the detriment of the cultivators and beneficial to the industrialists and the traders. I am quoting from the *Times of India*, dated the 19th December, 1969. We do not know whether it is the Agriculture Ministry or the planning Ministry. We want that justice should be done to the agriculturists in this country. If this is not done, then the whole economy of the country will be destroyed and those who are sitting in the ivory tower will feel the pinch of their deception of the agriculturists. This is a very grave problem. The onion growers

to ensure

[Shri Krishnarao Narayan Dhulap.]

in Maharashtra ran to Delhi to get some relief at the hands of the Ministry. Now, what is the plight of these onion growers in Maharashtra ? The prices are crashing down. It is less than Rs. 20/- per quintal in the market. The other day, our Agriculture Minister said, I think in the Conference of Chief Ministers, that "if the prices come down in the market, the Government will come to the rescue of the agriculturists and we will purchase whatever commodities are available in the market". Sir, this is said, but this is not being done. In the Maharashtra market at present, the wheat is selling at less than Rs. 90/- per quintal. The Supply Minister of Maharashtra has said in an open meeting with the agriculturists that since there is bumper crop in the State, the Government would not come forward to purchase the surplus foodgrains. The other day Shri Bansi Lal Minister of Defence, held a meeting somewhere in Haryana and he appealed—whether he appealed or he ordered them, I do not know—that the agriculturists should not ask for more price for agricultural products. This is the way in which this Government is looking at the problems of the agriculturists. When I raised this issue about the remunerative prices for the agricultural products, the Prime Minister said on the floor of the House. It is a happy picture on the horizon of the economy of this country that the prices are coming down and containing inflation. The inflation is being linked with the prices of agricultural products. It is an unfortunate situation. Suppose the prices come down, then this bigger section of the society will suffer. Seventy-five to eighty per cent persons are dependent upon agriculture as their means of livelihood. If they are destroyed, then where would you find the market for other commodities which are available in the market ? This is a vicious circle. If they are not in a position, if their pockets are not permitting them to purchase whatever cloth they want for their family members, if they want two dhotis and they purchase one, if they want two sarees for the womenfolk and they purchase one, if the children go without clothing, if they are not in a position to purchase, then, naturally, there will be less demand for cloth and the market will be full of this unsold cloth because there is no purchasing

to growers

capacity with the agriculturists or the majority section of the society. And then this vicious circle will start. There will be lay-offs, whether legal lay-offs or otherwise. So, Sir, this is the way in which this vicious circle is working. And, Sir, the unfortunate situation is this. Concessions are being given to the industrialists. What is the rate of electricity which is being given to the industrialists and what is the rate of electricity which is being given to the agriculturists for boosting up agricultural production ? There is a vast difference. The agriculturists are required to pay through their nose because they are paying a higher rate and thus more money to the electricity boards all over the country. So, more incentives are given to the industrialists, and more concessions are given to them. And, perhaps, more concessions will be given after the presentation of the Budget. Sir, the backbone of the economy of this country is agricultural community. But they are not properly taken care of. Not only this, but there is also some sort of animosity towards these people by those who are sitting at the helm of affairs here, those who are in the Planning Commission and in the Agricultural Prices Commission. They are economists. All right. They may be economists, they may be experts. But what is their attitude, what is their bias ? Is their bias towards the rural poor who are toiling for this country, who are helping the country in the production with their sweat ? What all they are getting, they are spending it only for the boosting up of production of the country. If their plight is not improved, then, Sir, everything is likely to go to dogs.

Lastly, Sir, I will quote what the Krishnamachari Committee recommended at page 60 of their Report :

"We are aware of the desire in certain quarters to reduce the level of agricultural prices, particularly the prices of foodgrains on the plea that agricultural prices influence the cost of production in industry and weaken the competitive capacity of Indian manufacturers in the domestic as well as in the foreign markets. While we are not unmindful of the importance of this consideration, we are of the view that proper consideration should be given to assure an adequate return to the tiller of the soil. Once this is achieved, the increas-

ing purchasing capacity of the agricultural masses will be an adequate insurance of the success of industry. Any deliberate effort to reduce agricultural prices merely to safeguard the interests of the urban areas or the manufacturing industry will be at the cost of the standard of living in the rural areas which is already notoriously low".

Therefore, Sir, the only plea I would make here is that there should be an agriculturists' lobby in this House. And until and unless that lobby is created for their cause and their problems are not properly presented to the Government, we are going to lose the cause by default. As you said earlier, Sir, no newspaper is interested in this problem. No economist who is brought up under the British regime is interested in this problem.

Only agriculturists are interested in solving their problem; but they are dumb, mute people and they are not in a position to put forward their grievances. Unless and until a lobby is created for them their condition will not improve. Of course, the hon. Minister is here and he is with us but when he will stand up to reply, he will have to say something different. This is unfortunate. I am very sorry for the present state of affairs, which we have to face. One day or the other the agriculturists in this country will have to raise their voice and see that their problems and their difficulties are solved in the best interests of the country and in the best interests of the nation. Thank you.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir, as my friend, Mr. V.B. Raju, has just now said, I entirely agree that this problem, this basic problem, is not for the Ministry of Agriculture alone. This is a problem for the entire Government and for Parliament. I would have been happy if the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister were present here when this important Resolution is being discussed because this concerns the national economy.

Sir, I had a cursory look at the Economic Survey presented by the Government. I do not know who the great economists are. I am really surprised that in this Economic Survey I do not find the realisation of what I would say the portend of a very serious crisis on the agricultural front. I am a

peasant, I come from a village, I am myself an agriculturist and then only a parliamentarian. I move with the agriculturists the moment I am at my house.

Sir, I must tell this Government in this House that the small farmer and medium farmer and the poor peasant in the village is cursing this Government today and this is a fact. I, as a representative of the people, have to honestly present their views to the Government and that curse is coming from their heart. It is not only the question of fall of prices. You will have to look at the life of an agriculturist in a composite way, in a comprehensive way. Sir, I need not repeat what all has been said before. Just to quote a few figures about the sudden fall in prices, I may say that maize was selling at Rs. 220 a quintal and now it is selling at Rs. 80; paddy was selling at Rs. 150 or Rs. 160 a quintal and now it is selling at Rs. 60; bajra was selling at Rs. 160 a quintal and now it is not selling even at Rs. 60; ragi was selling at Rs. 160 a quintal and now it is selling at Rs. 58.

SHRI RANBIR SINGH (Haryana) : Barley is selling at Rs. 34 a quintal.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: You can say about that, I do not know the price.

Well, the present prices from the point of view of consumers and from the point of view of general economic situation are not abnormal. But what about their parity prices? What about the justice, I would ask, rather than the parity? Now, the other day it was said that groundnut price in my State is about Rs. 40/- for 40 Kgs which per quintal comes to Rs. 100/-. The Minister said that the support price was Rs. 140/- or Rs. 150/-. I do not know where it is; perhaps, it may be in his files. It is certainly not there. Nobody is there to purchase. Who is there to purchase? Leave the Government. Sir, in my place, there is an educational institution which also does agriculture. Recently I had been to that institution. The Government has imposed a levy and the levy is 200 quintals of paddy. For the past four months, the Director of that institute has been asking the Government to take this paddy and give them money. They want to raise fresh crop. You cannot sell the levy crop outside and there is no buyer. The problem in our area is there is no buyer. The normal

[Shri R. Narasimha Reddy]

trade is not there. Can the Food Corporation of India replace the normal trade ? It cannot replace the normal trade. And now they say : "We have achieved our procurement target." You have achieved your procurement target. It is good. We congratulate you. But what about the peasant ? We have produced and they have procured. Their job is only to procure.

Now, take the other things. The position is, to purchase one bag of urea, I will have to sell one and three quarter quintals of paddy. What a tragedy ? It is a wonderful country we are living in. Why is it ? It is because we are not able to bring down the prices of fertilizers, whether in the public sector or the private sector. Take agricultural implements. Somebody, the other day, was saying that the tractors—I think the duty on tractors is 49 or 50 per cent—are used by kulaks. I do not know why this word is borrowed. These gentlemen...

SHRI KALP NATH (Uttar Pradesh) :
Where are they ?

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY :
I do not know where they are. Today, as an agriculturist, I know if I engage a pair of bullocks and a person, a labourer, to cultivate the land, I will have to pay Rs. 15/- a day plus food for this man and food for the cattle. So, this is regarding inputs, like fertilizers, pesticides. We know it; I need not repeat. We know the cost of agricultural implements. Prices of all the inputs have increased. Because there was suddenly a rise in the prices last year, the Government thought that they can have something from these agriculturists who were making lot of money. So the Government imposed more taxes, betterment tax, increase in water tax, commercial crops were taxed, groundnut was taxed, turmeric was taxed, sugarcane was taxed, everything was taxed. Very well, if the peasant earns, he will not refuse to pay to the Government. He will pay it. Now, suddenly the prices have come down. Sir, you know what is being done in my state. Making use of this emergency, in the name of collection, the officers are going to the poor farmers, dragging their cattle out, pulling out their utensils and throwing them out. This is being done. This is the situation which I want to bring to the notice of the Government.

Sir, we know, food is the basic product in life. If we do not have any other thing, we still live. But if we do not have food, we cannot live. Foodgrains production is the basic thing. But it is not being given the importance due to it. I am really sorry to say that in spite of our saying that agricultural sector is the most important sector, in practice, it is not getting its due. This is the basic sector of the economy.

At the last meeting of the Consultative Committee attached to the Ministry of Industry and Civil Supplies, I raised a question in regard to recession in the industry. Why is there recession ? Why is cement not being sold ? Why fertilisers are not being sold ? Is it because there is no demand for fertilisers, pesticides and cement ? No. There is demand. The reason is, 85 per cent of the people in this country have no purchasing power. I need not give all the figures. Take, for example, a peasant who owns two acres of wet land. He is a fairly good peasant. If he cultivates paddy with the help of a tubewell, calculating the prices of all the inputs, even if he works day and night, he would be incurring a net loss of Rs. 250. I can give the figures to any economist. If he uses a diesel pump, the loss is still more. Only when he cultivates under a system of tank irrigation, his net return would be Rs. 80-100. This is the position. What will happen if he or his son suddenly falls ill ? I am not mentioning other things. His son need not have education. He has to be farmer and always a farmer. The urban people are there to look after the country and, therefore, the farmer's son need not be educated. This is the position.

Of course, it is good that under the twenty-point economic programme, many States have declared a moratorium on debts. It is a very good thing. But have you thought of alternative credit facilities ? No. You have simply declared a moratorium. But what about credit ? Sir, the peasant has not a single pie to raise the Rabi crop today. But the Karnam or the Munsif of the village is bent on collecting taxes. All old dues are collected. The peasant even pledges the *Thali* of his wife. This is the resource to increase foodgrains production in this country. This is an unhappy position in which an ordinary farmer finds himself today. Otherwise, nobody would

give him money. Who would give him money ? Is the Government giving him money ? Are the banks extending credit ? Sir, this is an important sector of the national economy. How do the peasants react to this situation ? The peasants say 'Why should we raise paddy or other food-grains and incur loss ? For example, two crops are raised in Andhra Pradesh. Instead of raising paddy as the second crop, what the peasants propose to do is to sow some variety of gram. There are different varieties of grams. The peasants are able to sow gram without spending anything. When he sows gram, he earns a net income of Rs. 150-200. But if he raises paddy crop, he loses or gets nothing. Therefore, he is switching on to other crops. In such a situation, the production is bound to fall. Because, you cannot expect the ordinary farmer to bear losses and then produce. He gets in debt. The result will be, he will have to sell of his lands. He becomes a labourer. I think it is good for him to become a labourer because, today the ordinary labourer is in a much better position than the small farmer.

Take the urban sector, for example. Mr. Gulabrao Patil was saying that a small farmer earns only Rs. 1,800 per year. In the State Bank, a sweeper gets Rs. 400 per month, that is, Rs. 4,800 per annum. We, the peasants, are worse than the sweepers in the State Bank of India. And what about your salaries in the LIC ? (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, just a few minutes more.

Coming to the seriousness of the situation, I think it was Mr. Sardesai who pointed out a very important fact and, that is, the resolution passed by the Andhra Pradesh Assembly about the need to increase the prices. Sir, what is the significance of this resolution ? The Andhra Pradesh Assembly has reflected the sentiments of the vast majority of the peasants in Andhra Pradesh. I hope Parliament and this Government will also react and respond to the feelings of the peasants in this country.

AN HON. MEMBER : Maharashtra Government also.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY : Yes, Maharashtra Government also.

Now coming to the point of what is to be done in this situation, I have to say a few

words. Take fertilisers, for example. When it is stated "remunerative prices", it does not mean we want increase in prices. We mean that the prices should be remunerative, taking into consideration all the other aspect, that is, the price of fertilisers, the price of inputs, the price of cloth, the price of kerosene and the prices of other articles that the peasant uses.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : There is one more speaker before we adjourn. Please conclude.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY : two minutes more and I will finish, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V.B. RAJU) : Please complete your last point.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY : I will complete, Sir. I am taking only two more minutes, Sir.

(*Interruptions*)

Now it is suggested by certain economists that the first thing that this Government should do to solve this crisis is to see that all the inputs are supplied at a reasonable rate. Take, for example, fertilisers. Sir, this Government should immediately take off all the duties on fertilisers and must subsidise fertilisers. They must sell, for instance, urea, at Rs.45 to Rs.50 a bag. Why should we not subsidise the farmer instead of importing foodgrains ? Likewise, take off the duties on tractors and other agricultural implements and reduce their prices. Similarly, diesel oil, electricity and so on. Please tell your Ministers that electricity for all agricultural purposes should be given at subsidised rates. I suggest this because this is a very critical situation. Our agriculture is always on the brink. Do not think that everything is very satisfactory. Experts feel that the world is going to face a great food shortage. We know what the position of Russia today is as also of certain other countries. We do not know what is going to happen to us. Therefore, from today we must be very careful. We must protect our basic industry which is agriculture our basic sector which is agriculture, take these steps and see that food production is not affected because, once this sector is affected, our entire economy is affected. I am one with the hon. Member on that side when he said that if this sector is destroyed, the entire national economy is destroyed. Thank you.

श्री रणबीर सिंह : उप सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने हैं उसकी भाषा के ऊपर मैं नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। भाषा भी ठीक है और मुझे इसमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। लेकिन मैं यह बात मानता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव के पीछे जो भावना है उसकी तरफ हमें देखना चाहिए। श्री गुलाबराय पाटिल ने जिस प्रस्ताव के द्वारा सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित किया है वह एक बड़ी गम्भीर समस्या के प्रति यह एक सही कदम है। इसलिए मैं उनके प्रस्ताव का दिल से हार्दिक तौर पर समर्थन करता हूँ। समर्थन करते हुए मैं यह कहता हूँ कि अभी हमारे माननीय योग्य सदस्य धनप साहब ने जोश में जो यह बात कही कि कांग्रेस पार्टी इस देश के किसानों को उखाड़ना चाहती है। यह एक सही तथ्य नहीं है। कांग्रेस पार्टी ने इस देश के किसानों को शक्ति देने के लिए राजाओं को खत्म किया, जागीरदारों को हटाया और रजवाड़ों को खत्म किया। इस देश में जो छोटे मोटे छिपे हुए बड़े काश्तकार थे उनकी भी जमीन छीन ली। इसलिए यह कहना कि कांग्रेस पार्टी किसानों के हित में नहीं है, यह गलत बात है।

यही नहीं जब से देश आजाद हुआ है 5 हजार करोड़ रुपये से भी ज्यादा रुपया सिंचाई की व्यवस्थाओं में खर्च किया गया है और यह सब रकम देश में मुख्यतः प्रदेशों में सिंचाई की व्यवस्था करने के लिए खर्च की गई है। इतना कहकर मैं यह कहे बिना भी नहीं रह सकता हूँ कि हम इस देश में एक समाजवादी व्यवस्था स्थापित करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन हमारे देश में अभी भी वही मर्केन्टाइल इकौनोमी की सोच चल रही है। हमारा जो सोच है, वह अभी समाजवादी नहीं बना है और यही सब से बड़ी गलती है कि हम मर्केन्टाइल इकौनोमी के उसूलों पर चल रहे हैं और समाजवादी व्यवस्था की बात सोच रहे हैं। इस तरह की जो नीति है वह समाजवादी समाज स्थापित करने में मुश्किल पैदा करती है।

अमेरिका एक पूँजीवादी देश है। उस देश के अन्दर सिंचाई की व्यवस्था बढ़ाने के लिए जो भी रुपया वहाँ की सरकार लगाती है उसके लिए व्याज की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है और न ही उस कर्ज को वापस लेने की कोई व्यवस्था है। जैसा कि बतलाया गया है कि वहाँ पर खाद पर सब्सिडी दी जाती है। यही नहीं अगर उनके अनाज को खरीदकर फँकना भी पड़े तो वे उसको फँक देते हैं ताकि देश के अन्दर अनाज के भाव कम न हों। अनाज को फँकना कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है। अनाज को दान के रूप में लेना कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है, लेकिन दान करने पर भी कोई हर्ज नहीं है। इस तरह के अनाज देने से दुनिया ईशान्ति बनी रहती है। लेकिन अमेरिका ने 1971 में जब हमारे देश की तरफ कड़वी नजर से देखा था तब वे इस बात को मानते हैं कि हमें सातवे बड़े का डर नहीं था बल्कि वह डर था केवल अनाज की कमी का। वह हमें यह बतलाना चाहते थे कि वे अनाज के ठेकेदार हैं और वे हमको भूख से मार सकते हैं। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी देश किसी दूसरे देश के ऊपर निर्भर नहीं रहता है और न ही उसकी आजादी बरकरार रह सकती है। इसीलिए इंग्लैण्ड और योरोप में जहाँ पर अनाज पैदा करना कठिन होता है वहाँ पर भी लोगों ने अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ा ली है।

वहाँ पर उन्होंने खाद्य में स्वावलंबी होने की कोशिश की और हमारे देश में हम दूसरी फिक्रे करते हैं। मैं फिर दोहराना चाहता हूँ और आप ने भी जिक्र किया कि आप की सिंचाई योजना का कि उस पर दो सौ करोड़ रुपया खर्च हो गया। उस के लाभ का हिसाब लगाइये। आप का प्रदेश तो दिवालिया हो जायगा उस का व्याज देते देते। हमारे प्रदेश में भाखड़ा की योजना बनी। उस पर 45 करोड़ रुपया खर्च हुआ, लेकिन आज हरियाणा और पंजाब देश को तीन चौथाई अनाज देते हैं। वह उस योजना का खर्च

पूरा नहीं कर सकते। वह एक घाटे की (डेफिसिट) योजना मानी जाती है। यह तो सोच का फर्क है। हमें अपना सोच बदलना होगा। हमें इस इकोनोमी के चक्कर से बाहर निकलना पड़ेगा। अगर भाखड़ा डैम न बना होता और जो हम ने 5 हजार करोड़ रुपया खर्च किया सिंचाई को बढ़ाने के लिये वह न किया गया होता तो पता नहीं इस देश की क्या हालत हुई होती। इस देश में लाखों और करोड़ों आदमी भूख से मरते। भूख से बचाने के लिये क्या व्याज की फिक्र होती है। रूस के अंदर भी नहरें बनीं, अमरीका में भी नहरें बनीं। वहां कोई व्याज के लाभ की फिक्र नहीं है, वहां कोई व्याज का खाता नहीं है। हमारे यहां भी यह व्याज का खाता खत्म होना चाहिए। सब से बड़ी बीमारी यह है कि हम जो हिमाव लगाते हैं कि इतने करोड़ रुपया हम को व्याज देना चाहिए यह खत्म होना चाहिए। आज बिजली की दर क्यों बढ़ाई जाती है इस लिये कि प्रदेश सरकारें मजबूर होती हैं, चूंकि वह व्याज नहीं दे सकते हैं इसलिये हमारा सोच आज गलत है। हमारा रिजर्व बैंक कागज के नोट छापता है वह गिल्ट सेक्योरिटी और दूसरी सेक्योरिटी की बिना पर छापता है। सोने की सेक्योरिटी सब से बढ़िया मानी जाती है। लेकिन किस काम आता है सोना। सोना रख कर एक आदमी को किमी कमरे में बन्द कर दीजिए, चार दिन में वह भखा मर जायगा। वह काहे की सेक्योरिटी है? सेक्योरिटी तो जो हमारी बड़ी बड़ी योजनायें हैं, भाखड़ा डैम हैं, आपके यहां का डैम है और दूसरी योजनायें हैं उन को होना चाहिए और उस सेक्योरिटी पर अगर हम रुपया छापें और नोट चालू करें तो न कोई झगड़ा हो और न फिर बिजली की दर बढ़ाने की जरूरत ही पड़े और न फिर... सिंचाई की दर बढ़ाने की बात आगे आये। यह सुझाव कि हम बिजली की दर बढ़ावेंगे यह गलत सोच का नतीजा है। इसके साथ साथ उपसभाध्यक्ष जो, मैं यह कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि यह

जो आर्थिक समीक्षा है, मैं उस की तरफ आप का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं। उस में लिखा है शिन्दे साहब, कि इस देश में बाहर से जो इमदाद मिली है वह कुल 15815 करोड़ रुपये की है और जिसमें से बकाया साढ़े सात हजार करोड़ रुपये होगा और साढ़े सात हजार करोड़ से ज्यादा का अनाज इस देश में आया। यह किसानों के लिये शर्म की बात है और हमारे देश के लिये भी शर्म की बात है और वह जाहिर करती है कि हमारी आर्थिक नीति, हमारा सोच गलत है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री वी० बी० राजू) :
नेक्सट नान्-अफिशियल डे के दिन अब आप अपना भाषण जारी रखियेगा।

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

- I. The appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1976.
- II. Motion of Joint Committee on Offices of Profit.

SECRETARY-GENERAL : Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha

I

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1976 as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 12th March, 1976.

The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India".

II

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha at its sitting held on Friday the 12th March, 1976, adopted the following motion in regard to the Joint Committee on Offices of profit :—