

(d) A copy each of the following papers :—

I (i) Annual Report of the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi for the year 1970-71.

(ii) Statement (in English and Hindi) giving reasons for not laying simultaneously Hindi Version of the Report mentioned at (i) above [Placed in Library See No. LT—1965/72 for (i) and (ii)].

I. ANNUAL REPORT (1970-71) OF THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KANPUR AND RELATED PAPERS

II. ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS (1968-69) OF THE INDIAN SCHOOL OF MINES, DHANBAD AND RELATED PAPERS

PROF. D. P. YADAV : Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers —

II. (i) Eleventh Annual Report of the Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur, for the year 1970-71.

(ii) Statement (in English and Hindi) giving reasons for not laying simultaneously Hindi version of the Report mentioned at (i) above [Placed in Library See No. LT—1886/72 for (i) and (ii)].

III (i) Certified Annual Accounts of the Indian School of Mines, Dhanbad, for the year 1968-69 and the Audit Report thereon.

(ii) Statement (in English and Hindi) giving reasons for the delay and for the laying simultaneously Hindi version of the Report mentioned at (i) above [Placed in Library See No. LT—1828/72 for (i) and (ii)]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr Anandan wanted to say something Is he here ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : Sir, I have a motion of privilege. . . ,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 2 45 P M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-two minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at forty-five minutes past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : At the time of adjournment

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let us take up the discussion of the working of Agricultural Ministry. Shri V. B. Raju.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I am already on my legs You cannot debar me Yesterday

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Niren Ghosh, I have called Shri Raju.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Yesterday when Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury was asserting that the small car project was being considered on a priority basis and priorities were being arranged, I said that he was misleading the House The Prime Minister has written to me otherwise. I now produce the letter of the Prime Minister

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Nothing should be recorded.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : (Continued to speak)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Niren Ghosh, nothing is being taken down.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : (continued to speak)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Niren Ghosh, Nothing is being recorded

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : (continued to speak)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Niren Ghosh, nothing goes on record

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : (continued to speak)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Ghosh, you should discuss this with the Chairman tomorrow and if the privilege motion is admitted, it is okay and then you can place it on the Table But without any notice you cannot raise it like this.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I am bringing it to the notice of the House.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : This is not a matter which has arisen out of today's discussion.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Before lunch break, I said I was going to bring it here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It does not arise out of the proceedings of the House today. Therefore, you can go to the Chairman tomorrow morning and discuss it.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Before that, I wanted to raise it so that the House is seized of the matter

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If you continue, nothing will go on record Let us have a discussion on the Agricultural Ministry. Shri Krishan Kant will initiate the discussion Shri Krishan Kant.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to raise a discussion on the working of the Ministry of Agriculture When I look at the question of agriculture, it is not merely from the

angle of production in foodgrains and pulses and forest policy, etc., but I look at it from the angle that Agriculture is our basic industry. Seventy to eighty percent of our population live in villages on agriculture and 50 per cent of our national income comes from the rural areas. I would not today discuss the various aspects of the working of the Agriculture Ministry. But this is the basic issue on which we fought our freedom struggle When we were fighting the Britishers, Gandhiji came on the scene and he said that our job in a free society would be first to reconstruct the rural society so that the common people and the poorest of the poor will have a sense of feeling that they belong to this country, that they are the respected citizens of this country and that they belong to this soil. So, he gave the slogan of *Dardra Rarayan* meaning that the poorest of all will be the Gods in a free country. So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, when I look into the question of agriculture, I would like to see whether our agricultural strategy has fulfilled those hopes, those aspirations and those promises that we made at the time of our freedom struggle. Our production might have increased But, Sir, what has happened to our rural society? The basic question, Sir, is the question of land I would like to quote here what Shri Nehru said in his "Glances of World History" :—

"The wind is blowing into the villages and the mud huts where dwell our poverty-stricken peasantry and is likely to become the hurricane if relief does not come to them soon. All political problems and discussions are at the background for the outstanding and overwhelming problem of India is the land problem."

So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, when I go through the Report, I wonder what we have done to the land problem which Shri Nehru dealised at that time This is the most crucial problem, not only of India, but the whole of Asia Our approach has been somewhat of a technological approach.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE (Uttar Pradesh) : What approach ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Technological approach. That means with techno-

[Shri Krishan Kunt]

logical change, production will grow and prosperity will come. But, is that so? No. Technological change does not bring about social transformation. Socio economic transformation needs determined action and a determination to bring in a new society so that the poorest of the people can rise up. Now, Sir, there has been this green revolution. What has it brought? Has it brought prosperity? No. It has touched only 12% of the rural households, not all the rural households. As a matter of fact, with the coming of the green revolution, disparities have increased and the disparity between the poor and the rich peasants has increased. Tensions have grown as a result of this. May I say here, before quoting figures, that all our governmental expenditure, all the attempts that the Government has made, all the money that has been pumped into the rural society, which has come either from the banks or the rural credit societies, have gone to help the rich peasants only? They have gone to those who had something, who had money, with them. But, Sir, the person who did not have anything remains still where he was.

Here, Sir, I will quote some figures. Between 1951 and 1971, the rural population rose from 299 crores to 438 crores, an increase of 46%. But, what has happened to the poorest man there, the agricultural labourer? Their population increased by 72%. When the rural population increased by 46%, the persons who have got nothing in the rural sector, their population rose by 72%. Not only that. Now, let us look at the income. In 1960-61, nearly two-thirds of the rural population lived below an income of Rs 261 p a. A sizeable section of the population was below the poverty line. In 1960-61, 63.8% of the rural population had per capita consumption of less than Rs 8 per month or 27 paise per day. Now, Sir, after a decade, all that we find is that the gains of development have been very unequally distributed affecting the different sections of the rural population. If we study the conditions of the 20% of the rural poor, they have remained stagnant and they have not grown. If we study the conditions of the last 5%, we find that their consumption level has gone down by 1% and the consumption level of the 63.8% who have only 27 paise per day has gone down by 1%. On the

other hand, the consumption of the 40% of the population, the upper strata of the rural society, has gone up by 4%. What does it show? Where has all the money gone? Where has the prosperity gone? Sir, the Government has not come out with the latest figures. Sir, the first Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee had brought out in 1954 that the annual income of the agricultural labourer was Rs 107. After a decade, in 1964, when the second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee came into being, the annual income came down to Rs 100. Prices have gone up, cost of living has gone up. But, Sir, the income of the agricultural labourer in the rural areas has gone down by Rs 7. Where has all production gone? Where has the prosperity gone? After some time, turmoil and discontent are bound to come. Not only that, Sir. I have given you the overall figures only. If we compare the percentage of the working force when the Britishers were here in India, the picture will be different. Here, Sir, I have got some figures. The percentage of cultivators and agricultural labourers in the male working force in 1911 was 66.7%. After independence, in 1951 it was 66.5 per cent. Last year, in 1971, it was 67.4 per cent. If you remove the cultivators and only have the percentage of agricultural labourers in the male working force, in 1911 it was 14.9 per cent, in 1957 it was 14.6 per cent and in 1971 it was 21 per cent. They say that a lot of credit policies are there to help the rural poor. But here are some figures. Cash borrowings in 1951-52 were 51.7 per cent. In 1961-62 they came down to only 48.8 per cent. Is this the picture that the Indian National Congress gave to the poor? This is the real question. Today if you examine the work of the Ministry of Agriculture, we have to examine it from that angle, whether we have really reached the goal, whether we have fulfilled the promises that we gave to the common man. What happened after Independence? I will come to it later.

Just before Independence, at the time of Quit India movement, what picture Gandhiji had of the peasantry. Sir, in an interview with Louis Fischer, which Gandhiji gave in the same year before entering jail, here are some questions which I would like to reproduce.

Louis Fischer asked, "What would happen to a free India. What is your programme for the improvement of the lot of the peasantry?" Gandhiji replied, "The peasants would take the land". We would not have to tell them to take it. They would take it". Then Louis Fischer asked, "Should the landlords be compensated?". Gandhiji replied, "No, that would be physically impossible. You see, our gratitude to our millionaire friends does not prevent us from saying such things. The village would become a self-governing unit living its own life." Then, again, Louis Fischer asked, "Do you think that there would be violence?" "There may be violence, but then again the landlord may cooperate", Gandhiji replied. Louis Fischer again asked, "They might organize violent resistance". Gandhiji knew it. He said, "There may be fifteen days of chaos, but I think we could soon bring that under control." Then, Louis Fischer asked, "You feel then that it must be confiscation without compensation?" Gandhiji replied, "Of course, it would be financially impossible for anybody to compensate the landlords".

That was the picture that Gandhiji gave at the time of Quit India movement. After Independence, the Kumarappa Report came in the Karachi Resolution. It said "Land to the Tiller. But what happened." Nothing. We abolished Zamindari after Independence but there was some private exploitation. Semi-feudalism still remains. Sub-tenancy remains.

Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, I will not like to go into the details of what the First Plan said, what the Second Plan said or what the Third Plan said. The Fourth Plan said that the important task would be to ensure that land reforms become a reality. All the land ceilings passed brought out only 2.4 million acres of surplus land declared. And not even half of this land has been distributed.

3 P.M.

This is the state of land reforms. Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, 24 years have passed since then and the country has been discussing the question of land reforms. In the morning also we discussed in the Question Hour land reforms. Is it not saddening

that today when we have come back with a massive mandate, we are quibbling, playing and tinkering with the idea of land reforms? We do not want to play a fair game with the poor peasants, with the poorest men in this country who have voted for the Congress either in the Lok Sabha or in the State Assemblies. Today, I am not concerned with the words that are used in the recommendations of the Land Reforms Committee. Whatever may have been the intentions of the Government and the Ministers, they may have been honest, but the common man in the country is not concerned with what happens behind the scene or what the Chief Ministers discuss or what the recommendations of the Land Reforms Committee are. The Ministers in the Government want to save their face by having a *post facto* recognition of what the Ministry has done. The poor peasants are not interested in that. We have got votes from the people on the basis of election manifesto and today we are quibbling with the words. The rich peasant lobby in this country, and vested interests in and outside our party want to serve themselves on the basis of irrigation or on the basis of quality of land. Will the people of India tolerate this? It is rather funny. It is interesting to see how all those things are happening. The tragedy of land reforms in this country has been that all land legislations have been indifferently implemented. Land legislation was drafted with loopholes deliberately. It was interpreted by the Revenue Officers, the Magistrates, the Revenue Courts, the High Courts and the Supreme Court in favour of big landlords. Now we are seeing another spectacle. Some sections of the ruling party want to interpret certain words which have been mentioned in the election manifesto in their own way to favour rich peasants. This is an attempt. The people in villages will be mocking at us. I would like to quote what the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, said at the Chief Minister's Conference 1970. She said, "Land reform is the most crucial test which our political system must pass in order to survive." Sir, is this the way to pass that test? For the last 20 years, the High Courts and the Supreme Court have been quibbling with the words. The Ministers, the Chief Ministers and even the Secretaries sitting in the Ministries are trying to smuggle words here and there so as to see that the

[Shri Krishan Kant]

land irrigated from private sources is taken out of the land tilled Sir, is this the way ?

Now, Sir, I will refer to the question of irrigation and how it is coming up Sir, the total irrigated land in 1966-67 was 27.5 hectares. Out of that the land belonging to the Government sources is only 10.3 hectares. If you stick only to the Government irrigation, it means two-thirds of the land will not come under this ceiling. Already many people are saying that all the ceiling laws framed up till now are a mockery and I do not know how much surplus land is available. But you want now to take away that also. It must be remembered that whatever Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed or Shri Shinde may say that the historical facts have to be looked into, but history has changed. During these 10 years, science and technology has advanced rapidly. Tubewells have come in. Rural electrification has come in. The real purpose of rural electrification is not to provide lighting to the houses, but its real purpose would be to utilise that power for tubewells. Haryana villages have been provided with lights. That rural electrification is mostly used for tubewells. Same is the case in other places also. So if you want to take away the land, again that lobby is active to defeat the very purpose for which the Congress is standing.

Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, as against 20,520 private tubewells including filter points in 1950-51, there were 1,13,216 such tubewells at the end of the Third Plan period and an estimated number of 2,70,545 private tubewells including filter points in 1968-69. Compared to this the number of State-owned tubewells rose from 2507 in 1950-51 to 12,286 in 1965-66 and 15,754 by 1968-69. The Government tubewells have not grown with that speed as the private tubewells. It is not functioning with the same efficiency as the private tubewells. Not only that. If you take away the canals and the Government sources, what do you get? You get nothing to give to the common man. They want to take away by assessing in different ways. About private tubewells a study has been made by the Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad in regard to Meerut district. As against the realisation of Rs 4.05 per each rupee spent on one acre-inch of water in case of farms having electrically operated tubewells, it was only

Rs 1.44 in case of farms having water from the State tubewells. Farmers with oil engine operated pumps also realised higher returns than those using State tubewells. You take away the private tubewells and put ceiling on that, what do you get? Another argument is advanced. I think it was the Chief Minister of Maharashtra who said 'If you do not calculate the private tubewells also, then tubewells will not come in'. How strange? If you feel they should come, the ceiling can be put in such a way that an area which is having ground water where tubewells can come in, the ceiling can be put accordingly at the place and not according to the area where there is already a tubewell. So this question of looking at this, the whole approach is of tinkering with the problem of poverty of the common man of the country because that lobby which has ruled the country till now does not want to shake away. As the Prime Minister said, this is a most difficult task and as I quoted earlier, when Churchill asked Stalin which was the most difficult fight, whether it was the fight against Hitler or against the Kulaks in the Soviet Union, he said that the fight against Kulaks was more difficult. *(Interruptions)*

It is a very vital question and permit me to say something. They say that if this ceiling comes it will be difficult. Many studies have been done. I do not like to go into them. Even Mr Bhalla of Punjab has gone into it and said that productivity continues up to 15 acres. In 1966 when we are passing through a most difficult period in regard to foodgrains, and we had to import, the American Ambassador said 'If you want to increase production'—I am not quoting socialist countries or Communist countries but he told Mr C. Subramaniam—'Please implement the land reforms as we did in Japan when it was under US Military regime or in Taiwan or in South Korea'. I am not saying what the leftists say or what the Communists say. I am saying what the capitalist society says. It was because of the land reforms that there was increase in industrial production and there was stability in the Japanese society. Not to talk of these is to talk of ignorance. It has been said that land is God given but good land is man-made. A land is made by technology by the hand and the ceiling must come down and with intensive cultivation we can have good production. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would not

like to say much more about our Central Land Reforms Committee. But look at the way it is functioning. For two days they met and again they have postponed. What are the pressures working? What are the various forces which are working behind the scenes? The whole attempt is to scuttle the land reforms. There is a whole conspiracy among people, whether in our party or outside, that whatever attempts the Prime Minister is making should all be frustrated. They say beyond 18 acres you put a ceiling; then there would be tubewell. The incentive would come. If you want to give compensation for tubewell you will have to spend more but do not stop taking over the surplus land for giving to the poor people of this country. They want something to be done. They say there is no land. In this connection I would like to refer to a small incident which took place a year back in Bihar where Jayaprakashji is working in the Bhoodan Movement. There was bhoodan and gramdan movement of Vinoba Bhave but lands were not being distributed. So in a particular village the villagers got together and they went and surrounded the house of the landlord and the moneylender. They attacked him and took out all the papers connected with moneylending. They put that landlord on those papers and burnt him. He said, I will give you the land. You know what these people said, they said, we will take the land ourselves. Sir, the argument that there is no land, there cannot be lower ceiling, is academic. It is the people living in the cities who are talking like that. You will have to remember history; see the rural countryside and see how things are moving. You cannot play with those people; you cannot fiddle with them. Today the dynamics of society have changed. Nobody can play with it. You cannot frustrate these changes. Many people came forward in support of Mrs. Indira Gandhi on the slogan of Garibi Hatao but when the question of Garibi Hatao comes up they stand up and say that the would not allow land reforms to be implemented. They think that with money in their pockets they can purchase everything. That is the approach of some people. Sir, I would not like to say much more on this. But I would like to warn the Government and those Chief Ministers and those who are still living in ivory towers to realise the gravity of the situation. After

independence the Telangana movement started and forcible capture of land took place. At that time land grabbing stopped because Vinoba Bhave started the Bhoodan Movement. He thought that by persuasion and by peaceful means land distribution can take place in the country. After some time when the peasantry, when the landless rural people found that land distribution is not taking place, then started the Naxalite movement. And there was also the land grab movement. All these violent eruptions started. But again they subsided when the Congress was split and when slogans of nationalisation and socialism came up. People had faith, people had hope in the Congress Party and the Prime Minister that something will be done in this regard. If you do not do what they want, if this is what is happening in the Central Land Reforms Committee, it is a shame for all of us, shame for the party, shame for the Government. Sir, a decision has to be made by us today and by the country, whether you want this to be done by peaceful legal methods or by violence, murder and loot. That is the simple question before the country today and I am sure the country will decide it in the proper way. We have to realise the trends of history, history is not going to stop; time is not going to stop. We have to realise the pace at which the world is moving, it is moving much faster than we of the last century can comprehend. I will end by saying this. Heed the warning; don't play with the people; don't fiddle. Let us not be accused of tampering with the promises that we have made. Minor modifications and other things do not matter to them but the people will not tolerate. I am reminded here of what Faiz Ahmed Faiz has said when I see what is happening in our party and in our country. Some people seem to think that by capturing power and with slogans they can play with people and with their money power they can get anything done. This is what he has said :

‘कुछ लोग है जो इस दौलत पर परदे लटकाए फिरते हैं हर परबत को हर सागर को नीलाम चढ़ाते फिरते हैं कुछ वह भी है जो लड़-भिड़कर यह परदे नोच गिराते हैं हस्ती के उठाईगीरो की हर चाल उलझाए जाते हैं। इन दोनों में रन

[Shri Krishan Kant]

पड़ता है नित बस्ती बस्ती नगर नगर हर
बसते घर के सीने में हर चलती राह के
माथे पर सब सागर शीशो लालो गुहर
इस बाजी में बिद जाते हैं उठो कि खालो
हाथों को उस रन से बुलाने आते हैं ।”

May I translate it into English ?

“There are some busy

Drawing blinds on wealth

They strive to pawn every hill and
sea

But not all are despaired by the loot

There are those too

Who tear those curtains down

They expose and defeat

All moves of looters

Through continuous struggle

The two battles all over

There is strife in every house and
street

In populous cities and tiny villages

And all power and pelf

Are staked

And the call comes

To the raised fist of have-nots.”

Let us heed the call, Sir.

श्री नवल किशोर : उपसभापति जी, मैंने अपने दोस्त श्री कृष्णकान्त का भाषण बड़े ध्यान से सुना और मैं उनसे सहमत हूँ कि कृषि आज हमारे देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था में एक महत्वपूर्ण स्थान रखती है क्योंकि 70 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा आदमियों का जीवन खेती के ऊपर मुनहसर है। हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में यह संख्या करीब 75 प्रतिशत है, पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में

और बिहार में यह संख्या 85 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा हो जाती है।

यह बात सही है कि पिछले दिनों हमारे यहां खेती का उत्पादन काफी बढ़ा है और आज हम बड़ी शान से यह बात कह सकते हैं कि हमारे देश को अब बाहर से अनाज इम्पोर्ट करने की आवश्यकता नहीं रह गई है। आज हम अनाज के मामले में आत्म-निर्भर हो गये हैं और सैल्फ सफिसियन्ट हो गये हैं, लेकिन साथ ही साथ ताजुब इस बात पर भी है कि जो पर कैपिटल कंजक्शन है वह घट गया है।

श्रीमन्, जो हमारे देश में हरित क्रांति हुई उसकी वजह यह है कि जो हमारे देश में वैज्ञानिक है, जो साइन्टिस्ट हैं उन्होंने हाई ईल्डींग वैरायटी के बीज तैयार किए और कुछ सरकारी नीतियों की वजह से और किसान की मेहनत से हमारे देश में इस क्षेत्र में उत्पादन बढ़ा। हमारे देश में गेहूँ का उत्पादन खासकर के ज्यादा बढ़ा है। लेकिन यह बात भी सही है कि चावल का उत्पादन इस मात्रा में नहीं बढ़ा है या जितनी आवश्यकता चावल की देश में होती है उसके अनुसार नहीं बढ़ा है। कपास, जो एक बहुत ही बुनियादी चीज है, जिसके द्वारा कपड़ा बनाया जाता है, उसका प्रोडक्शन भी जितना बढ़ना चाहिये उतना नहीं बढ़ा। पिछले दो सालों से इस दिशा में कुछ तरक्की हुई है। पिछले साल हमें 100 करोड़ रुपये की कपास बाहर से मंगवानी पड़ी थी लेकिन इस साल पैदावार बढ़ी है पर साथ ही साथ कीमत घट गई है। सरकार की कोशिश की वजह से कुछ कीमत बढ़ी है लेकिन काटन कारपोरेशन सारे काटन को उठा नहीं पायी है।

आयल सीड का जहां तक सम्बन्ध है उसकी हमारे देश में कमी है और हमें sunflower (सनफ्लावर) वगैरा बाहर से इम्पोर्ट करना

पड़ता है, खाने का तेल बाहर से मंगाना पड़ता है। गन्ने की पैदावार भी हमारे देश में घटी है।

पश्चिम बंगाल में जूट के सम्बन्ध में एक इन्क्वारी कमिशन बिठलाया गया था लेकिन उसने अब अपना काम करना बन्द कर दिया है। मैं यह बात नहीं जानता कि उसने अपना काम करना क्यों बन्द कर दिया। ऐसा महसूस होता है कि जूट की जो सही कीमत है वह जूट प्रोवरो को अभी तक नहीं मिल पा रही है।

श्रीमन्, यह बात सही है कि हरित क्रान्ति की वजह से हमारे देश में उत्पादन बढ़ा है, लेकिन उसका ज्यादा फायदा बड़े-बड़े काश्तकारों को ही पहुँचा है और छोटे काश्तकारों को उसका उतना फायदा नहीं पहुँचा है जितना कि पहुँचना चाहिए था। चाहे आवपाशी का सवाल हो, चाहे बीज का सवाल हो, चाहे फर्टिलाइजर का सवाल हो, इसका फायदा बड़े-बड़े किसानों को ही मिला है और छोटे किसानों को इसका फायदा उतना नहीं मिला है जितना कि मिलना चाहिये था।

पैदावार घड़ी लेकिन अभी तक गवर्नमेंट के पास कोई डाटा और बेमिस नहीं जिस पर एग्रीकल्चर प्रोड्यूस की कीमत को निर्धारित किया जाय। आपके पास एग्रीकल्चर प्राइस कमिशन है, लेकिन ताज्जुब यह है कि उस पूरे कमिशन में कोई भी फार्मर नहीं है, कोई भी किसान नहीं है, जो किसानों की स्थिति को जानता हो। टैक्नीकली हर आदमी एक्सपर्ट है किसान के मामले में। एक सही काम उसने किया है कि हर साल कीमतों को घटाने की बात करता है। गवर्नमेंट ने पहले गेहूँ की कीमत 76 रुपए क्विन्टल मुकर्रर की थी, वही कीमत आज भी है, लेकिन क्या कभी उसकी कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन निकालने की कोशिश की गई। मेरा कहना यह है कि फी क्विन्टल गेहूँ की कास्ट

आफ प्रोडक्शन 85 से 86 रुपए है जबकि आपने उसकी कीमत, 76 रुपए क्विन्टल रखी है। आप कन्ज्यूमर को भी फायदा नहीं होता। आप 76 रुपए क्विन्टल गेहूँ खरीदते हैं, मगर फेयर प्राइस शाप्स पर 98 रुपए से कम कन्ज्यूमर को नहीं मिलता है। मार्केट में उसका भाव 110-115 रुपए फी क्विन्टल तक पहुँच गया है।

आपने तो कीमत तय कर दी, लेकिन, आपका जो फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इण्डिया है उससे बड़ी कोई करप्ट बौड़ी पैदा हुई है यह ढूँढ़ने की बात होगी। मुझे याद है उत्तर प्रदेश की बात। पिछले साल आपने 76 रुपए के दाम रखे थे, किसान को 60,65.70 रुपए कीमत दी गई यह कह कर कि तुम्हारा अनाज भोग गया था, सब भोगा हुआ अनाज गवर्नमेंट के गोदामों में आया, गवर्नमेंट से पूरा पैसा गया लेकिन किसान को नहीं मिला और बीज का पैसा इन्स्पेक्टर और दुकानदार की जेब में गया। मेरी इत्तला है, पोजिटिव इनफार्मेशन है कि शायद ही कोई इन्स्पेक्टर ऐसा होगा जिसने एक मंडी से दो-तीन लाख रुपया न कमाया हो। मुझे हंसी आई जब एक डी. एम. ने मुझसे कहा कि इससे तो हम इन्स्पेक्टर होते, तब अच्छा था क्योंकि उसकी आमदनी तो बगैर टैक्स के होती है, यहां तो जो मिलता है उस पर टैक्स पड़ जाता है। यह हालत है फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इण्डिया की।

श्रीमन्, गन्ने के बारे में कई बार मांग हुई कि उसकी कीमत दस रुपए क्विन्टल होनी चाहिए। सरकार ने 7 रुपए 37 पैसे तय की यद्यपि उन्होंने कृपा की, स्टेट गवर्नमेंट से कह दिया कि अगर ज्यादा पैसा शुगर इंडस्ट्री से मिल सकता है तो दिलवा दिया जाय। डिक्स्ट्रोल के बाद आज बाजार में शक्कर साढ़े तीन और 4 रुपए किलो बिक रही है। यह वह शक्कर है जो उस गन्ने से पैदा की गई

[श्री नवल किशोर]

जिसकी कीमत 7 रुपए 37 पैसे थी। नई शक्कर तो अब आ रही है। 7 रुपए 37 पैसे वाले गन्ने से जो शक्कर पैदा हुई उसका भाव साढ़े 3,4 रुपए किलो बाजार के अन्दर है। यह जो एडीशनल प्रोफिट हुआ है उसमें कास्त-कार का हिस्सा क्या है, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ।

श्रीमन् बहुत बात हुई है समाजवाद की। कृष्ण कान्त जी बैठे हुए हैं, उनकी बहुत तपिश है समाजवाद लाने की।

डा० जेड०ए० अहमद (उत्तर प्रदेश): आप भी है।

श्री नवल किशोर: उनसे और डा. अहमद से ज्यादा ही है, लेकिन पत्तेबाजी की नहीं है।

हमने उत्तर प्रदेश में माग की थी कि शुगर इंडस्ट्री को नेशनलाइज किया जाय। आपने उसको देखने के लिये एक कमेटी बना दी, शुगर इंडस्ट्री के भाग्य से उसके चेयरमैन साहब का इन्तकाल हो गया, नए चेयरमैन आए। यह पता नहीं है कि उनकी रिपोर्ट कब आएगी। मुझे यकीन है कि जब फखरुद्दीन साहब का टैन्पौर खतम हो जायगा उससे पहले रिपोर्ट नहीं आने वाली है। श्रीमन्, उत्तर प्रदेश में राजनैतिक आवाज लगाई गई कि नेशनलाइज किया जाय। बम्बई के कांग्रेस के प्रस्ताव में, जिससे मैं इत्तफाक करता हूँ, मगर केवल उत्तर प्रदेश को छोड़ा गया राजनैतिक कारणों से, आज उस चीज को तीन साल होने को आ गए। हमने बहुत कोशिश की थी इसको नेशनलाइज करने की, लेकिन वहाँ के जो दो एडवोकेट जनरल थे उन्होंने कहा कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट नेशनलाइज नहीं कर सकती। एटार्नी जनरल कहते हैं कि वह नेशनलाइज कर सकते हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने उस पर यह कहा कि आप सारे देश में इसको नेशनलाइज कर दीजिए या कोई ऐसा कास्टीट्यूशनल एमेन्डमेंट

कर दीजिए कि हम स्टेट के अन्दर नेशनलाइज कर सकें। आपने दोनों में से एक भी काम नहीं किया। लोगों की तो यह धारणा है कि चुनाव में चन्दा देने की बात थी इसलिए उनको डरा दिया गया जैसे बाज वक्त जब गाय भौकती है तो डंडा दिखा कर उससे दूध दुह लिया करते हैं।

श्री महावीर त्यागी (उत्तर प्रदेश): शिन्दे को डंडा दिखा दो।

श्री नवल किशोर: शिन्दे साहब इतने खूबसूरत आदमी हैं कि डंडा दिखाने की हिम्मत नहीं पड़ती है। श्रीमन् मैंने यह बात अर्ज की थी कि एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइसेज कमीशन जो है उस में एक दो काश्तकारों को भी रखा जाय ताकि वह यह समझा सके कि लोगों की क्या दिक्कतें हैं और क्या दिक्कतें नहीं हैं।

श्रीमन्, जहाँ तक काश्तकारों का सवाल है मेरे दोस्त कृष्णकान्त जी यहाँ नहीं हैं उन्होंने तमाम ग्रामीण जीवन के पुनर्गठन की एक दवा बतायी कि भूमि की सीलिंग होनी चाहिये, लैंड सीलिंग होनी चाहिए। मैं उन से इत्तफाक करता हूँ। अगर इसी तरह से गरीबी हट सकती है और वाकई उनका विश्वास है कि इस तरह से सीलिंग के बाद गरीबी हट जायेगी और समाजवाद आ जायगा और इस काम में अगर वे डा० जेड० ए० अहमद की पत्तेबाजी में न फसे रहे तो मैं यहाँ तक जाने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि सीलिंग बजाय दस पन्द्रह या बीस एकड़ के पाँच एकड़ तक कर दी जाय, लेकिन यह तो पहले यकीन हो जाय कि उस के बाद समाजवाद आ ही जायगा।

मैं श्रीमन्, तीन, चार बातें जानना चाहता हूँ गवर्नमेंट से, क्योंकि सीलिंग जो है उसके दो आस्पेक्ट्स हैं। एक तो पोलिटिकल आस्पेक्ट है और दूसरा आस्पेक्ट है इकोनामिक। पोलिटिकल आस्पेक्ट के बारे में मुझे कुछ नहीं

कहना है, इकोनामिक आस्पेक्ट के बारे में जरूर कुछ कहना है। यहां इस सदन में और लोक सभा में दो किस्म के राजनीतिज्ञ हैं, एक तो फ्यूडल सोशलिस्ट और दूसरे कैपिटलिस्ट सोशलिस्ट। जो बड़े-बड़े फार्मर हैं, जब मामला आता है प्राइव् सेक्टर का और पब्लिक सेक्टर का, तो वे बड़े जोर से कहते हैं कि सारा काम पब्लिक सेक्टर में होना चाहिए तभी समाजवाद आयेगा और जब सवाल आता है लैंड सीलिंग का, तो जितने बिजनेसमैन हैं वह कहते हैं कि केवल इतने एकड़ तक भूमि पर ही सीलिंग की जाय। इस प्रकार दोनों समाजवादी हो जाते हैं और दोनों का काम बन जाता है। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या आपने कोई डेटा इकट्ठा किया है कि 15 या 18 एकड़ को सीलिंग होने के बाद कितनी जमीन आप को हिन्दुस्तान में मिलने वाली है। (Interruption) हमारे दोस्त श्यामलाल जी कह रहे हैं कि अभी डेटा इकट्ठा हो रहा है। कानून आ गया, मध्य प्रदेश में पास हो गया, उत्तर प्रदेश में पेश हो गया, लेकिन यहां अभी तक डेटा इकट्ठा हो रहा है। कई वर्ष हुए जब उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा में डा० अहमद हमारे साथ बैठा करते थे। उस समय वहां 40 एकड़ की सीलिंग हुई थी और उससे हमको उम्मीद थी कि 6 लाख एकड़ जमीन हमको मिल जायगी, लेकिन दो लाख एकड़ भी हमको नहीं मिली। और दो लाख एकड़ जो जमीन मिली उसका जो बंटवारा हुआ, मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि उसमें भूमिहीन किसान को दो परसेंट भी जमीन नहीं मिली। भाई भतीजों में ही वह जमीन बंट गई और श्रीमन्, आपको हसी आयेगी, मेरे एक दोस्त हैं, क्योंकि मैं दोनों कांग्रेस को एक ही मानता हूं, लेकिन वह आजकल हैं उधर, उनके पास दो हजार एकड़ जमीन थी। बड़े शौकीन आदमी हैं। उनके पास हर जानवर का नाम है, कुत्ते का नाम है, गाय का नाम है, भैंस का नाम है और हर एक के नाम में 30, 30 एकड़

जमीन है। मैंने पूछा कि यह कैसे, तो उन्होंने कहा कि हमारा पटवारी जिन्दा रहे, हमारा काम ठीक है, फिट है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि उस कुत्ते के नाम की, उस गाय के नाम की या उस भैंस की जमीन को आप क्या करेंगे? यही नहीं, आज भी पिछले दो तीन साल के अन्दर बहुत से ट्रांसफर्स हुए हैं (Time-bell rings) श्रीमन्, आपकी चेयरमैनशिप में यह मेरी मेडन स्पीच है, इसलिए आप समय का ख्याल मत कीजिए। तो जो ट्रांसफर हो गये उनके लिए आप क्या करेंगे? क्या कोई जमीन बची है आपके पास? कोई जमीन आपके पास बचने वाली नहीं है और अगर हम मान लें कि 70 परसेंट आदमी खेती करते हैं तो 55 करोड़ की आबादी में इस हिसाब से 38 करोड़ आदमी खेती करते हैं और उसमें करीब 4 करोड़ लोग भूमिहीन होंगे, उनको कितनी जमीन मिल पायेगी? फी आदमी को कितनी जमीन मिल सकेगी? और उसके बाद अनइकोनामिक होल्डिंग्स के बारे में आप क्या करेंगे? तो मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि आपके पास बेसिस क्या होगी सीलिंग की? किस बेसिस पर आप सीलिंग फिक्स करेंगे?

[THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) in the Chair].

और उसके बाद आप बांटेंगे कैसे? आप की जमीन बांटने की मशीनरी क्या होगी? अगर यही प्रधान और लेखपाल वगैरह हुए तो जो पहले हुआ है, यही अब भी होगा।

दूसरी बात में यह जानना चाहता हूं कि हमारे शिन्दे साहब या हमारे दोस्त कृष्णकान्त जो देहात में फी व्यक्ति या परिवार में मैक्सिमम इन्कम कितनी रखना चाहते हैं? एक आदमी की आमदनी 1000 या 1500 तय की जाय इसमें मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं, आप 500 ही रख दीजिए, लेकिन अगर देहात में किसी आदमी की मैक्सिमम इन्कम 1000 या 1500 रखी

[श्री नवल किशोर]

जाय तो यह उचित नहीं होगा कि किसी गवर्न-
मेंट आफिसर की इन्कम 4000 रुपया मासिक
हो और फिर मिनिस्टर साहब को भी देखना
पड़ेगा कि 2250 रुपये के ऊपर उन पर क्या
खर्च होता है, एम. पी.जी. को भी अपने को
देखना पड़ेगा...

डा० जेड० ए० अहमद : सब की वारी
आयेगी, हमारी आपकी सब की ।

श्री नवल किशोर : उपसभाध्यक्षा महोदया,
डा० अहमद साहब का काम है कंप्यूजन पैदा
करने का, काअस पैदा करने का create confu-
sion, create chaos and things would take
care of themselves.

डा० जेड० ए० अहमद : कुछ नहीं करेंगे ।

श्री नवल किशोर : लेकिन वह तो मैं
चाहता नहीं । हां, हमारे दिमाग में एक साफ
तस्वीर होनी चाहिए कि हिन्दुस्तान में हम क्या
प्रपोज़शन रखना चाहते हैं । मैं तो कहता हूं कि
आप लैंड सीलिंग 5 एकड़ ही रखिये, लेकिन
फिर उस की बेसिस पर ही सारे हिन्दुस्तान का
नक्शा बनाना पड़ेगा । आप गांव और शहर की
आमदनी में भेदभाव नहीं कर सकते । मैं तो
समझता हूं कि डा० जेड० ए० अहमद साहब के
पास किसी पूंजीपति को गाड़ी भी यदि हो वह
भी उनके पास होने पर कम्युनिस्ट गाड़ी हो
जाती है और हमारे पास फटीचर गाड़ी होने पर
भी वह कैपिटलिस्ट की गाड़ी हो जाती है । मैं
जल्दी ही खत्म कर रहा हूं । तो मैं यह अर्ज
करना चाहता हूं कि आप जो प्रोक्योरमेंट की
बात करते हैं उसमें मेरी इस बात से शायद
शिन्दे साहब भी इत्तफाक करेंगे कि जितना
आप प्रोक्योरमेंट करना चाहते हैं 6.5 मिलियन
टन्स, उतनी आपके पास स्टोरेज कैपेसिटी नहीं
है । इसके अलावा ट्रांसपोर्ट की भी दिक्कत
है । किसानों की कीमत के बदले में जो चेक
मिलता है वह बैंक भुनाते नहीं । कहते हैं कि
उनके पास पैसा नहीं है और उसमें किसान के

चार, पांच दिन नष्ट हो जाते हैं । उसको पैसा
उसी दिन मिलना चाहिये । आपने मेहरबानी
कर के गेहूं की कीमत कम नहीं की मगर वह
कीमत होनी चाहिए थी 90 रुपये, मगर उसको
आपने 76 ही रक्खा जबकि किसान के काम
की हर चीज तेज हो गई है । लेकिन उसके बाद
जो एफ. सी. आई. का करप्शन है उसको आप
बंद करिये । कृष्णकांत जी ने एक तस्वीर खींची
कि गांव-गांव में बिजली पहुंच गई है, ट्यूबवेल्स
पहुंच गये हैं । उनका सोभाग्य है कि वे हरियाणा
से आते हैं । हरियाणा में शिन्दे साहब भी जानते
हैं कि वहां उनकी बड़ी कृपा है और इसलिए
वहां के गांव-गांव में बिजली पहुंच गई है । मैं
उत्तर प्रदेश से आता हूं, जो देखने में तो बहुत
बड़ा है मगर वहां मामला उल्टा है (Interruption)
अगर छोटा करने की ही बात है तो उसे आप एक
कंट्री ही मान लीजिए । एक बंगला देश बना है,
एक उत्तर प्रदेश भी बन जाय । तो मैं आप से
अर्ज कर रहा था कि वहां बिजली की भी कमी
है और इरिगेशन की भी कमी है । आज उत्तर
प्रदेश में 32, 34 परसेंट इरिगेटेड लैंड है और
वह भी पूर्ण रूप से नहीं । बिजली वहां कभी
आती है और कभी नहीं आती । कहीं-कहीं आज
भी पीने का पानी प्राप्त नहीं है । आपने समाज
वादी गवर्नमेंट में कानून तो बहुत अच्छे और
खूब बनाए हैं, आप देखें कि उनमें सूद जो
किसान को देना पड़ता है वह ज्यादा देना पड़ता
है और एक इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट को सूद रुपये पर
कम देना पड़ता है । एग्रीकल्चर पर जो पावर
खर्च होता है उसका दाम ज्यादा है और इंडस्ट्री
पर जो पावर खर्च होता है वह कम है । क्या
तमाशा है ? हम किस ओर जा रहे हैं । तो यह
सब बातें हमारे यहां चल रही है ।

महोदया, दो एक बातें और कह कर मैं
खत्म करूंगा । मैं यह कहना चाहता था कि
आप जिस समग्र सीलिंग की बात करते हैं तो
उसके साथ ही आप क्राप (Crop) इंड्योरेंस की
बात भी करें ताकि एक फिक्स्ड इनकम की बात

पक्की हो जाय और किसान को उसकी क्राप सेवयोरिटी पर कर्ज देने की भी बात होनी चाहिए। आज बैंक का नेशनलाइजेशन हो गया है और काफी लोगो को उसका फायदा भी हो गया, मगर बाई ऐड लार्ज जो गरीब आदमी है किसान है उसको उसका कोई फायदा नहीं हुआ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि आप एक नेशनल क्राप प्लानिंग बोर्ड बनायें ताकि जब आप इटिसिव कल्टीवेशन की बात करते हैं तो क्या पैटर्न हो क्रापिंग का इण्डिया में इस के बारे में भी लोग समझ सकें और जान सकें।

महोदया, ट्रैक्टर्स जो हैं आजकल यह कुछ लोग ही इस्तेमाल करते हैं। सीलिंग होने के बाद उनकी कितनी आवश्यकता रहेगी, यह भी देखने की बात है। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि उस के बाद भी सरकार छोटे-छोटे ट्रैक्टर्स बनाये ताकि छोटी-छोटी होल्डिंग्स में वे काम आ सकें और उसके साथ ही उनके लिए हर चार, छ गावों के बीच में एक स्टेशन बनाया जाय कि जहाँ से किसानों को वे ट्रैक्टर्स मिल सकें और जहाँ उनकी सर्विसिंग आदि हो सके, तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। और महोदया एक बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि जब तक कि नेशनल और इन्स्टीट्यूशनल चेजेज नहीं होंगे एग्रीकल्चर में तब तक कोई भला होने वाला नहीं है। डा० जेड० ए० अहमद साहब की तो इत्तिफाक से शादी हो गई है मगर इनके जो नेता हैं उन बेचारों की आज तक नहीं हुई है। महोदया, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो खेती करने वाले हैं उनका मान सम्मान कब होगा, कितने आदमी हैं जो कि अपनी लड़की को किसान के साथ, खेती करने वाले के साथ शादी करना चाहेंगे, हर एक आदमी चाहता है कि इन्जीनियर हो, हर एक आदमी चाहता है कि डाक्टर हो और शिन्दे साहब ऐसे खूबसूरत आदमी मिनिस्टर हैं और फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब ऐसे बुजुर्ग मिनिस्टर हैं लेकिन

अगर एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्ट्री को इम्पार्टेंस के हिसाब से देखा जाय तो यह कोई इम्पार्टेंट पोर्ट-फोलियो नहीं माना जाता है जब कि 50 परसेंट नेशनल इंकम इसी से होती है। अमेरिका में जहाँ 8 या 10 परसेंट आदमी खेती करते हैं, या जैसा कि अभी कहा जहाँ 6 परसेंट आदमी खेती करते हैं, वहाँ पैटागान का जो बड़ा भारी ढाचा है उसके बाद नम्बर दो पर एग्रीकल्चर का है। वहाँ लिखा है Where agriculture begins, all arts follow. तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप को इसके लिए बेसिक कंसेप्शन को बदलना पड़ेगा। इसको हम इंडस्ट्री कहते हैं मगर सही मायनों में यह इंडस्ट्री नहीं है, अभी तक जो एग्रीकल्चरल मजदूर है वह अपनी शक्ति से चाहे जितना भी पैसा कमा लेते हैं लेकिन उन का कोई वेजेज फिक्स नहीं किया है। (Time-bell rings)

I am just coming to the end of my speech.

एक बात और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। फोर्थ प्लान में यह लिखा हुआ है कि 500 करोड़ रुपये का पैंडी प्रोसेसिंग में नष्ट हो जाता है और उसके बचाने के लिये 550 कोआपरेटिव प्रोसेसिंग युनिट्स बनाई जायें लेकिन अभी तक 98 ही बनी हैं। और शिन्दे साहब आप की मिनिस्ट्री की ग्रांट नम्बर 115 है जिसमें कैपिटल आउटले आन एग्रीकल्चर आता है और उसमें 71-72 में साढ़े आठ करोड़ रुपये बच गया। डेवलपमेंट स्कीम्स में आप के यहाँ सेविंग्स होती हैं और जो ग्रांट न० 26 और 28 है उसमें भी सेविंग होती है। तो महोदया, एग्रीकल्चर के मामले में भी ऐसा होना है, कि साढ़े आठ करोड़ रुपये तक की सेविंग जाती है। तो आपकी जो बकिंग एफिशियेसी है उसका आप इससे अंदाजा लगा सकते हैं। आप देखिये कि फर्टिलाइजर्स की कमी है और हर चीज के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं। तो मेहरबानी कर के अगर आप कृषि को इंडस्ट्री मानते हैं और उसकी बात करते हैं तो

[श्री नवल किशोर]

लिए कुछ कीजिए और जो एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस है उसके स्टोरेज के लिये प्रबन्ध कीजिये, एग्रीकल्चरल और इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोड्यूस की कीमतों को ऐट पार रखिये, सीलिंग कीजिए और मगर उसको आल इंडिया काटेक्स्ट में कीजिए, सीलिंग में रूरल और अर्बन इनकम में एक पैरिटी होनी चाहिये। अर्बन प्रापर्टी सीलिंग की बात जब की जाती है तो मैं आगे बढ़कर कहना चाहता हूँ कि अर्बन आमदनी पर भी सीलिंग कीजिये, एक हजार रखिये, दो हजार रखिये, ढाई हजार रखिये, कुछ भी कीजिये, मगर सारे देश को एक सा कीजिये तब तो समाजवाद आयेगा नहीं तो यह सब कुछ fiasco बन कर रह जायेगा and nothing else.

DR K MATHEW KURIAN (Kerala): Madam Vice Chairman, we are discussing the working of the Ministry of Agriculture at a time when we are almost at the cross-roads of our political, economic development. To-day Mr Krishan Kant and many other Members are airing the views expressed by those who have been supporting radical land reforms for a long time. I do sympathise and agree with those hon. Members on the other side who have very vehemently talked about implementing land reforms in a very radical manner. While supporting their sentiments, I would like to remind them that they are caught within the hoodwinking tactics of their own party. During the last two General Elections, the ruling party had been going round promising the people all kinds of radical land reforms. But the same party had put up landlords kulaks and rich peasants as their candidates in Maharashtra, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh and in many other States. To-day despite the tall talk of socialism, their own ruling party has a large number of landlords sitting in the treasury benches.

How do they expect radical land reforms to be implemented so long as the complexion, the class character, of the Government remains with it is, a bourgeois landlord Government continuing capitalist development in this country?

I would like to bring to your notice

in this connection two major points. We had a new agricultural strategy introduced by the former Agriculture Minister, Mr. Subramaniam, who is now heading the Planning Commission. He started a new policy or rather the Government of India accepted his proposal for a new policy in agriculture which has been described as the New Agricultural Strategy. And for everyone who knows the background of this new strategy it is very clear that the whole proposal was hatched in the experts' rooms in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the United States of America. A programme of capitalist development in agriculture was initiated by the then Minister of Agriculture and the main proposal, as we understand, has been to rely on the high yielding varieties of wheat, maize and rice in about 60 million acres out of the 250 million acres of cultivated area; in other words to select a few areas of controlled irrigation and in those areas to concentrate Government's attention and effort, financial and other help, inputs, credit, and so on, to precisely those who are landlords and rich peasants under the cover that they are people who are progressive farmers, they are the ones who have the highest growth potential. So, in the name of growth potential rich peasants and landlords are deliberately fostered and propped by the Government's own policy. Today after so many years we have the tragic situation admitted by no less an authority than the Home Ministry itself in the classic report on the 'Nature and Causes of Agrarian Tension in the Countryside' where they had to admit, on the basis of evidence collected by the Home Ministry, that as a result of this new agricultural strategy of supporting rich peasants and landlords in select areas in the country, imbalances in income have increased, the rural rich has become richer and the poor has become poorer. Today we find in the rural areas an explosive situation which might result in a very serious law and order problem unless the agrarian policy is immediately reversed. If the Government thinks that they can get away with giving figures about agricultural production—of course, production has increased, but not in pulses, not in a number of agricultural raw materials, but even if you assume that production has increased—they are sitting on a volcano, with mounting, struggle of the peasants, agricultural labour, hutment dwellers, and so on.

I can give you a concrete instance of absolute lack of sincerity of the ruling party in their tall talk of land reforms. I have here one important reference, that is, the Kerala Land Reforms Amendment Act, 1969. This was an amendment to the original Act of 1963. And the Prime Minister in a letter to the Chief Ministers had commended the Kerala Land Reforms Amendment Act of 1969 as a model Act to be applied in other States. But what is the history of this Land Reforms Act? As soon as the Land Reforms Act was passed during the period of the then United Front Government under the leadership of Comrade E.M.S. Nambudiripad, the Congress Ministers at the Centre, the Congress Party in the State and at the Centre, engineered a sabotaging of the United Front Government with the help of certain other parties, and a new Government was formed. Immediately following that we had mounting struggles of the peasants and agricultural labour, in Kerala, started from January 1, 1970. We had a series of struggles of agricultural labour and peasants for implementing land reforms non-bureaucratically, extra-legally.

Mr. Krishan Kant and many other Members of the ruling party, I think, would agree with me when I say that if there is one great lesson to be drawn from the history of land reforms in India, it is precisely this; that land reforms can never be implemented legally and bureaucratically. Land reforms will be successful only if the legal enactments are implemented by the combined pressure of the organised mass struggles of the peasants and of agricultural labour, implemented in a manner which is non-bureaucratic and extra-legal. This was the lesson drawn in 1970 by the peasants movement in Kerala and immediately following this the then Government of Kerala supported and propped up by the Congress Party itself had started a very serious repression against the people. But nonetheless, history has again vindicated the truth of the assertion that land reforms can be implemented only non-bureaucratically and extra legally. Today Kerala Government itself has come forward with proposals for removing the obstacles of vested interests and legal courts.

Back in April 1970, Kerala Government has sent a communication to the Government of India that in order that the Kerala Land

Reforms Amendment Act can be implemented properly, the difficulties posed by the legal courts must be removed and these could be removed only by including these amending Acts in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution. But for two long years there has been no action by the Central Government. The then Home Minister Shri Chavan agreed to that in principle and a communication was sent to the Kerala Government saying that the Government of India agreed in principle that the proposal was correct. But then he said that there were some practical difficulties in implementing the law in view of the Golak Nath case. But the difficulties posed by the Golak Nath case were removed by the 24th Constitutional Amendment Bill. Even after that in November 1971, the Kerala Government wrote to the Central Government saying that now that the difficulties posed by the Golak Nath case and other Constitutional difficulties are removed, let the Kerala Land Reforms Amendment Act of 1969 be included in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution. Even today the Government of India has not taken any firm decision on this step in that direction. They are wavering. Why are they wavering? Why this hesitation to include the Land Reforms Amendment Act of Kerala in the Ninth Schedule? This Act was acclaimed by the Prime Minister himself as a model Act. Why then the hesitation for including this Act in the Ninth Schedule? The only explanation I can see or any reasonable thinking person can see is that the Congress Party today is torn between two conflicting aims and two groups of people. One group thinks that in their own interests and in the interests of consolidation of power, radical reforms must be implemented. But the old dead weight of landlords and rich peasants represented in the ruling Party would not like that. Shrimati Gandhi who is a shrewd politician understands the power structure and she does not want to upset the power structure.

Madam, Vice-Chairman, In Kerala a very serious situation has arisen because the High Court had struck down a number of important provisions of the Land Reforms Amendment Act of 1969 and the Supreme Court recently has upheld the High Court's decision. As a result of this several important provisions of the Act cannot be implemented. Section 73 of the

Act, for instance, lays down that all arrears of rent accrued before the 1st of May 1968 and outstanding at the commencement of the Amendment Act of 1969 shall be scaled down according to a prescribed formula. Kerala High Court has struck it down. As a result, landlords are today given the freedom to collect the arrears of rent and in that process even the land held by the tenant is sold out to clear the arrears. Similarly, hutment dwellers who were given right of the utensils in about 10 to 15 cents of land around their huts are today threatened with eviction...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY): Your time is up.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: I will conclude by saying that important provisions like these relating to arrears of rent, rights of hutment dwellers and tenants, etc. have been struck down by the Supreme Court. The costly delay of the ruling Party in not including the Kerala Land Reforms (Amendment) of the Constitution has resulted in a serious law and order situation, not to speak of problems of agrarian reforms. Therefore, unless the Ruling Party agrees to include the Kerala Act in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution, they are going to face a volcanic struggle of peasants and agricultural labour leading to violence which no political Party, with all their desire, can control. You are therefore sitting on a volcano of very serious problem. Unless the Government of India rises to the occasion and include the Kerala Land Reforms Amendment Act of 1969 in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution, the problem will not be confined to Kerala alone, but it will affect the whole future of Indian economy and polity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY): Mr. Sakshalecha.

AN HON. MEMBER: I wanted to speak.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: Are you calling us in order?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY): I am calling according to my order.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: We would like to know what that order is. We have also given our names.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY): You see, he said he was going. That is why I called him.

श्री वी० के० सखलेचा (मध्य प्रदेश) : महोदया, यहाँ खाद्य और कृषि मंत्रालय के बारे में चर्चा हो रही है। जैसा कि डिबेट इनीशियेट करते हुए श्री कृष्ण कान्त और नवल किशोर जी ने कहा, कृषि का सम्बन्ध देश की 70 प्रतिशत जनता से है और खाद्य सम्बन्ध तो देश की समूची जनता से है। ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विभाग का माननीय फखरुद्दीन अली साहब चार्ज लिए हुए है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, जो कुछ चर्चा सवेरे यहाँ पर हुई उस चर्चा को ध्यान में रखते हुए मैं यह माग करना चाहूंगा प्रधान मंत्री जी से कि माननीय फखरुद्दीन अली साहब ने कुछ ऐसी बातों की है कि अच्छा होगा कि देश के हित को देखते हुए उनका त्यागपत्र ले लिया जाये अगर वे चाहती है कि क्लीन एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन हो, भ्रष्टाचार की कहीं बूंद भी न रहे। हमने अखबारों के अन्दर पढ़ा कि कांग्रेस के कोडीडेट्स को टिकट देने सम्बन्ध में इस बात का विचार करने के इंस्ट्रक्शन प्रधान मंत्री दे रही है कि जिसको टिकट दिया जाय भ्रष्टाचार का किसी प्रकार का आरोप उस पर न हो, लेकिन माननीय उपाध्यक्षा महोदया, मैं बड़ी विनम्रता से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि तीन ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण मामले हैं जिनमें घोटाला हुआ है, गड़बड़ हुई है और उसके लिए मंत्री जी रेस्पॉसिबिल है। सबसे पहले ती यह घोटाला हुआ है जिसकी चर्चा आज सवेरे सदन के अन्दर हुई। कांग्रेस सदस्यों ने भी कहा कि नेपोटिज्म है, भ्रष्टाचार है इस इंस्टीट्यूशन में, इसके अन्दर गड़बड़ चल रही है जिसके कारण एक साइंटिस्ट को आत्महत्या करने पर मजबूर होना पड़ा। क्या यह हमारे लिए आई-ओपनर

नहीं है, क्या यह हमारा ध्यान आकर्षित करने के लिए प्रयाप्त नहीं है? हमारे सामने स्वामीनाथन रैस्पासिबिल नहीं है, हमारे सामने मंत्री रैस्पासिबिल है, इस सदन के प्रति मंत्री उत्तरदायी है, उसके विभाग के अन्दर कोई घटना होती है तो मंत्री रैस्पासिबिल होता है। उस नते से एक साइंटिस्ट को प्राणान्त करना पडा इससे बड़ी बात क्या हो सकती है। आप यह कहे कि सर्विस क्लस है, सेलेक्शन ठीक ढग से हुआ है, बड़े-बड़े साइंटिस्टों की सेलेक्शन कमेटी हैं, ये कारण सदन को सन्तुष्ट नहीं कर सके, यह आपने स्वयं देखा।

दूसरा महत्वपूर्ण मामला जो सदन के सामने लाना चाहता हूं वह है शक्कर के बारे में। शक्कर के सम्बन्ध में इस विभाग के अन्दर कोई नीति है ही नहीं। सैन कमेटी ने 65 में कहा था कि एड हाक पालिसी से काम नहीं चलेगा। उसके इतने वर्षों के बाद यह हालत है। अभी-अभी लोक सभा की एस्टीमेट कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट के अन्दर एड हाक पालिसीज के बारे में ध्यान आकर्षित किया है, लेकिन उससे बड़ी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि क्या कारण है कि एक ओर बड़ी-बड़ी शुगर मिल्स के मालिकों का प्राफिट रेशो बढ़ रहा है, वे बड़ी मात्रा में मुनाफा कमा रहे हैं, दूसरी ओर जो कैन ग्राउंसेस हैं, जो गन्ना-उत्पादक हैं उनके उत्पादन की प्राइस नहीं बढ़ाई जा रही है। शुगर मिल्स की प्रोफिटेबिलिटी 69-70 में 8.4 परसेंट थी, 70-71 में 9.5 प्रतिशत प्रोफिट था, 71-72 में 10.5 प्राफिट था। ये प्राफिट्स क्यों बढ़ रहे हैं? आपने बड़े-बड़े स्टेटमेंट दिए हैं। शुगर मिल्स की प्रोफिटेबिलिटी के बारे में एक मंत्री जी ने खुद एडमिट किया है, जो 18 मार्च 1972 को हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में पब्लिश हुआ है :—

"The sugar industry is making a lot of profits in free sales. There is no

justification for the high prices that have been prevailing for the last four weeks. Effective steps will be taken to curb the price rise."— The Minister of State for Agriculture, Prof. Sher Singh, told the Rajya Sabha today.

इस सदन के अन्दर यह स्टेटमेंट दिया। एक ओर आप स्वीकार करते हैं कि वे ह्यूज प्रोफिट्स बना रहे हैं, दूसरी ओर बारबार यह स्टेटमेंट दिया जाय, यहां तक कि फुल शुगर कंट्रोल का स्टेटमेंट दे दिया प्रो० शेर सिंह ने 22 मार्च को—

"The Union Minister for Agriculture, Prof. Sher Singh, disclosed here today that the Government at the highest level was considering imposing full control on the sugar distribution."

यह 22 मार्च को स्टेटमेंट होने के बाद आज मई आ गई है और फुल कंट्रोल नहीं हुआ। शुगर मिल्स खूब मुनाफा कमा रहे हैं और गरीब कंजुमर को साढ़े तीन पौने चार सौ रुपये क्विंटल के हिसाब से शुगर खानी पड़ रही है। दूसरी ओर उत्पादक को उचित मूल्य नहीं मिल रहा है। यह क्या घोटाला है। इसके अन्दर क्या गड़बड़ है। उपायशा महोदया, इसी लिये मैं चार्ज करता हूं कि यह गड़बड़ मिनिस्ट्री का है, वही पर घटोला हो रहा है। शुगर मिल मालिकों से लाभ उठा कर ये सारी बातें करना उचित नहीं मालूम होता है। आपके खुद के स्टेटमेंट है। सबसे पहले फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब ने अपना स्टेटमेंट अगस्त, 1971 में दिया। जिस समय प्राइसेज बढ़ने लगी उस समय उन्होंने यह स्टेटमेंट दिया था उनका खुद का जो स्टेटमेंट है 28 अगस्त, 1971 का वह यह है :

"The Government have viewed with concern the increase in the price of sugar since the beginning of the month. After removing controls on price, distribution and movement of sugar

[श्री वी० के० सखनेचा]

from May 25, 1971, Government have been releasing adequate quantities of sugar each month in keeping with the monthly offtake and internal consumption, and prices remain reasonably steady...."

अगस्त के महीने से प्राइसेज बढ़ रही हैं। उस समय से आप स्टेटमेंट दे रहे हैं, बारबार आपने कहा है, लेकिन क्या स्टेप्स आपने उठाये। क्यों नहीं प्राइसेज आप चैक कर पा रहे हैं। फूल कंट्रोल की बात आप करते हैं। यह बात भी आप कहते हैं कि अनुचित रूप से वे प्राफिट कमा रहे हैं, फिर भी उनके खिलाफ कोई कार्रवाई करने के लिये आपसे कोई इफेक्टिव स्टेप नहीं उठाया जाता। इसका मतलब केवल एक ही निकलता है कि शुगर मिल्स जो हेवी प्राफिट अनं कर रहे हैं उसमें आप भी शेयर कर रहे हैं, उससे आप भी लाभ कमा रहे हैं, उस अनुचित आमदनी के आन्दर आप का भी हिस्सा है। अन्यथा क्यों नहीं आप इसको रोकते हैं। आज अनुचित लाभ उठा कर के कंज्यूमर को लूटा जा रहा है। साढ़े तीन रुपये किलो के हिसाब से आज उसको शकर दी जा रही है। इसको रोकने के लिए क्यों नहीं कदम उठाया जाता है। बार बार इस प्रकार के स्टेटमेंट इन के द्वारा दिये गये और बार बार आपने प्रामिस किया। 13 दिसम्बर का जो स्टेटमेंट फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब का है उसके अन्दर उन्होंने यह कहा है :—

"Domestic consumers will get sugar at Rs. 2— per kilo", the Agriculture Minister, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed told the Lok Sabha.

आप के सारे स्टेटमेंट मेरे पास हैं। लेकिन मेरे पास इतना समय नहीं है कि मैं उनको यहां पर पढ़ सकूँ। इसी प्रकार 24 दिसम्बर को लोक सभा में आपने यह कहा :

"Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed warned in the Lok Sabha today that the Government would not hesitate to step in

if the sugar industry did not properly behave."

उसके बाद भी यह सब चल रहा है और कंज्यूमर को लूटा जा रहा है।

दूसरी ओर शुगरकेन प्राइसेज के बारे में मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा। शुगर मिल ओनर्स की फेडरेशन कहती है कि प्राइसेज बढ़ाई जाय, उनको इन्सेंटिव प्राइस दी जाय, लेकिन उसके बाद भी नहीं दी जाती। जितने शुगर मिल ओनर्स के स्टेटमेंट हैं, वे सब मेरे पास हैं। उनकी फेडरेशन ने कहा, फेडरेशन के अध्यक्ष ने कहा, मिल मालिक कह रहे हैं कि शुगर केन की प्राइसेज बढ़ाई जाय उसके बाद भी वे बढ़ाई नहीं जातीं। आपको यह युनकर आश्चर्य होगा कि आज तकड़ी 10 रु० क्विंटल मिलती है और गन्ना 8 रु० क्विंटल किसानों से खरीदा जाता है। मैं खुद गन्ने का उत्पादन करता हूँ। आज यह हालत है कि वही किसान जो गन्ना पैदा करता है उसको उसकी उचित कीमत नहीं मिलती है और जब वह बाजार में शकर लेने जाता है तो वह साढ़े तीन रुपये किलो उसको मिलती है। इसके साथ-साथ वह उसको उपलब्ध भी नहीं होती है। मैं गांव से आता हूँ। गांवों तक शकर पहुंचती नहीं है। आज ब्लैकमार्केटिंग हो रही है। हर जगह प्राइसेज में बहुत भारी अंतर है। सरकारी फेयर प्राइस शाप्स को जो कोटा इश्यू किया जाता है दो रुपये किलो के हिसाब से, वही बाहर बिकता है साढ़े तीन और चार रुपये किलो के हिसाब से। सारी शकर की बोरियां वहीं बेच दी जाती है और गांव तक पहुंचती नहीं है, कंज्यूमर तक पहुंचती नहीं है। उसको वही साढ़े तीन रुपये किलो में खरीदना पड़ता है। इस प्रकार उसका ब्लैक मार्केट हो रहा है। एक शब्द मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ...

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

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) : 15
मिनट हमारी पार्टी के है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY): If he takes the Party's time, I have no objection. But he cannot take the time of the House.

श्री बी० के० सखलेचा : एक बात मैं कह कर खत्म करूंगा। मेरा एक निवेदन था ट्रैक्टर की प्राइसेज के बारे में। ट्रैक्टर की प्राइसेज के बारे में बहुत घोटाला हुआ है और यह चुनाव के पहले हुआ है। क्या कारण है कि ट्रैक्टर की प्राइसेज अचानक इतनी बढ़ा दी गयी कि एक-एक ट्रैक्टर की प्राइस 5, 5 और 7, 7 हजार रुपया बढ़ा दी गयी। एक और कार प्राइसेज बढ़ाने का सवाल था। उसको एक कमीशन 4 P. M. को रेफर किया गया, उसके बाद वह मामला कोर्ट में गया, और वहां कार प्राइसेज बढ़ाने के बारे में इतनी सारी बातें हुईं और यहां ट्रैक्टर की प्राइसेज, जो हिन्दुस्तान ट्रैक्टर की प्राइस 1968 में 15,000 थी, वह सितम्बर, 1971 में 17,000 हो गयी और उस के बाद फरवरी, 1972 में वह दो हजार रुपये और बढ़ा दी गयी। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इस प्रकार प्राइसेज बढ़ाने की अनुमति किस कारण दी गई। मेरा ख्याल है कि इसमें घोटाला हुआ है और इसकी जांच होनी चाहिए और उस पर कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। और जहां तक एग्रीकल्चरल रिफार्म्स की बात है, मैं एक बात की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित कराना चाहता हूं। मुझे समय नहीं है लेकिन मैं इस बात की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि आज अगर कोई सबसे बड़ा पूंजीपति है तो वह शासन है। मध्य प्रदेश में केवल सरकार के पास 10 लाख एकड़ जमीन है। चीफ मिनिस्टर्स काफ़ेस में या लैंड रिफार्म्स कमेटी में आप क्यों नहीं इस बात पर विचार करते हैं। आप बड़े-बड़े

आदमियों की आलोचना करते हैं, आप चाहते हैं 20, 30 एकड़ वालों की जमीन लेकर उसकी सीलिंग की जाय और उसको डिस्ट्रिब्यूट किया जाय, लेकिन उससे भूमिहीनों को जमीन नहीं मिलेगी। एक और शासन दस लाख एकड़ जमीन लेकर बैठा रहे और उसे डिस्ट्रिब्यूट न किया जाय, और जो उस जमीन पर खेती करते हैं उनको निकाला जाय और दूसरी ओर आप लैंड रिफार्म और समाजवाद की बातें करें, इस में अगर कोई सब से बड़े अपराधी हैं तो वह हमारा राज्य शासन है जो इस प्रकार से लैंड रखे हुए हैं और उसको डिस्ट्रिब्यूट नहीं कर रहा है। क्या आप उन के खिलाफ कार्यवाही करेंगे? मेरा निवेदन है कि इन बातों की जांच की जानी चाहिए।

DR. Z. A. AHMAD : I want to state first of all that agriculture still remains the key problem for Indian economy. With 50% of the national income coming from agriculture and 70 of the population depending on agriculture for its livelihood, agriculture is the base on which the superstructure of our new economic development is being raised and the future of this superstructure depends largely on how strong and stable that base is. In this connection I want to state that despite the advance that we have registered in the production of foodgrains and despite the achievements of the so called green revolution, our agriculture is still, as a system, a semi-stagnant system. It is not a dynamic system. Why is it so? It is because not only is there a tremendous amount of instability of production in agriculture but the rate of growth is very slow. Small tiny farmers, marginal farmers dominate the scene and they are in the centre. Capital accumulation is very low. There is a colossal wastage of human labour, in manpower in agriculture because nearly 40% of the agriculturists are landless or have such a small holdings that they are virtually landless. In addition, multi-forms of exploitation is there. About plan expenditure, Mr. Krishan Kant has very correctly said that the great part of it went into the pockets of the comparatively richer sections of the rural section. Now looking to the problem of agriculture, the main problem is not just technology. It is essentially a

[Dr. Z. A. Ahmad]

problem of socio-economic transformation of the rural society. Without changing the relationship in land, the production relations you cannot bring about rejuvenation of agricultural life. Therefore, I submit that the Indian agriculture today needs really a new path of development. The question of path of development has now come to the fore. We cannot fight blindfold moving about and throw our hands in the dark. We have to have a conscious path of development and we should tread on it from step to step and go forward. Indian agriculture should be formulated in this manner. The path of development of this should mean directly the bringing about a rapid increase in the production by unleashing the productive initiative of millions and millions of small tillers through direct State, Co-operative and collective enterprise. I want to submit, Madam, that the future of Indian agriculture does not lie in the hands of the so-called big farmers whom my friend was representing just now, or those big kulaks or these big rich peasants. The future of Indian agriculture really lies in the hands of these petty farmers, small farmers, marginal farmers who have to be united, who have to be brought together through various schemes of co-operation in order to develop their production initiative, their production enterprise. The future of Indian agriculture lies in this ; let us be very clear about it. So this new path of development should bring about a total transformation of the existing land relations. It must put an end to absentee landlordism ; it is very essential. Absentee landlordism is the most parasitical system ; it must be put an end to along with all other forms of parasitism. It should ensure full protection to the actual tiller of the soil ; it should break up the present concentration of land in the hands of the upper classes and distribute the land among the landless peasantry. Finally it should curb all forms of feudal, semi-feudal or capitalist exploitations such as land grabbing, evictions, excessive rents, usury, blackmarketing and profiteering through price manipulations. All this has to be broken. It is not a question of having a ceiling here and there of 10 acres or five acres. That is part of it but the main thing is that the entire agricultural system from top to bottom must be re-organised so that the production enterprise of the small and the marginal tillers is developed in a big way.

Now, Madam, I submit therefore that land reforms have to play a very big part in the reconstruction of Indian agriculture. Without land reforms you cannot make any progress. You can bring tractors, you can subsidise big farmers; all that you can do but nothing will happen unless production relations change. Land reforms have two major aspects. One aspect is this ceiling. We are paying so much attention to ceiling because inequalities must go. There are terrific inequalities. If you can give me a little more time I can tell you how terrific these inequalities are. For example, I would submit, Madam, that the National Sample Survey of land holdings according to household ownership held in 1954-55 revealed that peasants owning no land or owning land less than one acre constituted 47 per cent of the total number and they altogether owned only 1.37 per cent of total land. Things have deteriorated since then. Fragmentation has been going on and many people have gone out of cultivation, have left cultivation. And according to the sample survey conducted in 1959-60 we find that operations of more than 25 acres constituted 4.7 per cent of the holdings and these holding amounted to 31 per cent of the total area; 4.7 per cent having 31 per cent of the land and since then the situation has deteriorated. Now you talk about prosperous States, States in which there is a lot of production. I will give you some figures. For example in Punjab which is considered to be a prosperous State 62 per cent of the households have either no land or they hold land less than 2.5 acres of each and all these households together own only 4 per cent of the total land; 62 per cent of the population owns 4 per cent of the land. At the other end 3.72 per cent of the households having 75 acres or more each between them own 30 per cent of the total land. When such is the case can you imagine that any progress can take place, any advance will take place? There is so much of inequality. The fundamental rule which has to be recognised is that unless there is justice for the common people, unless they know that there is future for them, no progress can take place. Today there is no future for them; therefore there inequalities have to be brought down. For that strict ceiling laws have to be imposed. If you ask me what the limit should be, I would say that I agree with the limits proposed by the Central Land Reforms

Committee but those limits have to be enforced. That is the main point. It is not a question of fixing some limit only, because you remember we had the ceiling laws of 1960-62. What did they yield? They yielded nothing because the ceiling limits were circumvented. Actually the practical aspect of the imposition of ceilings, the administrative aspect has to be very carefully borne in mind and worked out. Otherwise, even these ceiling limits will become fictitious. Another aspect is that the peasant must become the owner of the land. What have you in perspective in agriculture? What is the future of agriculture? Here, agriculture will have to become a family enterprise. You cannot have 100 acres and 50 acres of land, you living in the towns, and have that land for surplus income. No. If agriculture has to be rejuvenated, in future agriculture will have to become a family enterprise. Either you are an agriculturist or you are not an agriculturist. Go to the soil, go to the land, work with your family and produce the results. It is clear now that economic research has proved that the best results are obtained from the land which is owned by a person, by a cultivator. Landlordism does not yield anything. The Minister, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, was asking me, "Will production fall?" I say, "How can production fall?" The green revolution is proof of the fact that a man with three acres or five acres will produce more per acre than a man with a hundred acres because he cannot cope with these hundred acres. He will cultivate 10 or 15 acres properly because these are days of intensive cultivation, high-yielding seeds, proper manuring, good labour inputs and all other inputs.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE): He has to be given resources.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: Provided he gets the resources. True. Provided the infrastructure is there and the resources are given. Therefore, in a welfare State we take it for granted that you will give them the resources, that at least you will try to give them the resources. That I take for granted. Otherwise, what is the use of all

this? Therefore, I may tell my friend, the hon. Minister Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, "Don't be afraid of the fall in production." There may be a temporary fall in production here and there because the big farmers may resort to sabotage. I can understand this. History shows that people out of resentment will resort to sabotage. They may take the stand, "We are not going to invest more because you will take away this land also." So, that challenge will have to be met. Therefore, the question of tenancy rights also becomes a very important question. We are concentrating our attention correctly on reducing land ceilings. We should also concentrate our attention on question of giving the land to the tiller and making the tiller owner of the land so that he has the incentive to improve the quality of his land and produce more from that land. Therefore, this is another very important question to which you will have to pay attention in the coming days. And that is a very vital part of land reforms. I will just read out a note on this question, just a paragraph from there. "Leasing of land on a considerable scale by land-owners to tenants, sub-tenants or under-royats, and share-croppers exists in all parts of the country. According to the Census data of 1961, tenanted households constitute about 24% of total cultivating households within the country. The proportion is not large in some States comparatively less than in some other. Now, in addition to that, there is illegal sub-letting. There are millions of tenants who have no rights." Even in a State like Maharashtra where, on a particular day, every tenant was declared owner, what happened? Mr. Shinde knows it very well. Out of 24 lakhs of tenants whose record was prepared for granting ownership rights, only 8 lakhs got, and the remaining 16 lakhs were just chucked out. Why? Because the Tribunal said, "Voluntary surrenders. They have given papers giving voluntary surrenders." Those surrenders were forced out of them. They were intimidated into giving those surrenders. Then a man is absent. He does not come there. He is not allowed to come before the Tribunal. And he has lost his case. The land-owner gets it. Out of 24 lakhs cases on record, only 8 lakh peasants got ownership right. And it is supposed to be a model State. What will happen in Bihar where there are no land records? What will happen in Eastern UP, in Orissa and in other States?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: I do not say that the tenants interests were not affected, but show me a State where at least a million acres of land have been given to them.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: I can say comparatively you are better.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: I do not justify the eviction of even these persons.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: Comparatively you have done something. At least out of 24 lakhs you have given rights to 8 lakh people. What happens to Bihar? They have no land records at all. The administration say how can we give any rights because there are no land records. Therefore, Madam, I submit that an integrated understanding should develop. There should be a complete overhauling of the agrarian system, the agrarian relations. There should be a complete overhauling of the property rights that exist. Then give the maximum concession and all sorts of help to the small man. The future of agriculture is in the hands of the small cultivator. Therefore, do not just stop after passing some ceiling law. Move forward. Have a larger conception of agrarian reforms in which tenancy legislation also should be brought in. The slogan of 'land belongs to the tiller of the soil' is the basic slogan which we have raised at the time of our struggle for freedom. The tiller should become the owner of the land. Today he is not. Concentration of land is there. Fictitious tenancy is there. Underhand tenancy is there. All sorts of people who have no right are cultivating the land. That lacuna has to be removed. That would mean a very big struggle. We should be prepared for a very big struggle between the 'haves' and 'have-nots'. We should be prepared for a very big struggle between the landless and kulaks who are trying to defend their property rights. They know that they cannot defend it for a long time. Those who cultivate the land, those who give us the raw materials, are the disinherited people of this country. Therefore, I would request my friends, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed and Mr. Shinde, who are the Ministers concerned, to please work out a proper system of land records. Do not confine yourself to ceiling. Have an elaborate conception of land reforms. A whole scheme to improve Indian agriculture has to be thought of. Whatever

help you need from us, we are there to give you. There has to be a drive in our political and economic life. This has to be the major target that we should place before ourselves, and we should achieve it.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Vice-Chairman, we are discussing the working of the Agriculture Ministry. It means today we are discussing rural India. Yesterday we discussed about urban India, when we were discussing the working of the Industrial Development Ministry. Since the present climate is for the lowering of the ceiling on land, the other aspects of the Ministry, the other functions of the Ministry, have not come in for much discussion. When we are discussing land reforms, as Dr. Z. A. Ahmad very correctly said, we are talking of only one factor, one item, namely land ceilings—i.e., fixation of ceiling or lowering of ceiling. Though this is very important, the other aspects of land reforms have also to be considered. There are four categories of people working on land. One is the landlord. In fact, he is not the lord. He is an occupant or a land-holder or a Pattedar. In fact, I would quote from what the Land Commission of Hyderabad had said in the early fifties: "In theory the State is the owner and the overlord of all land. Private rights are recognised to the extent they are granted by the State." In fact, I have not come across any law in my State where it is said that the cultivator is the owner of the land. In the Land Revenue Act the Pattedar is defined as one who is obliged to pay rent to the Government. It is an obligation. Nowhere have the rights been spelt out clearly. From times immemorial it has been accepted, along with other natural resources land also belongs to the State. It is given for the individual for the purpose of tilling, for cultivation. The Hyderabad Agricultural Lands and Tenancy Act clearly stipulates that if a pattedar does not cultivate, if he does not utilise the land for which it is given consecutively for two years, the State has the right to assume management of that land. Such a revolutionary land legislation was passed in the early 50s, I am saying this, because Mr. Krishan Kant has referred earlier to the Telengana Agrarian Revolt. There have been two movements in Telengana—one shall not be confused with the other. One was an agrarian revolt and the other was for a separate State. I am

referring to the earlier movement which was actually for land distribution or which was a reflection of or which revealed the urge for land or the hunger for land or what you might call the determination of the working peasants to be the occupants of the land.

As I was saying, there are four categories on land. One is the land-holder who is called the *pattadar*. The other is the tenant. Among the tenants, there are the tenants who have secured rights and there are also tenants at will. There is the huge mass of agricultural labour and there is the absentee landlord about whom a reference was made, the one sitting in the urban area. What we, sittings in Parliament, are trying to do now is to read just the land relations. In my view, the relations have already been to a great extent adjusted. In the early 50s, the zamindari abolition had taken place. A direct contact was established between the tiller of the land and the State, to a great extent. In the early 60s, the Ceiling Act was brought in many States. As has been pointed out by many here, it is true much land was not available. In fact, in my own State, under the 1961 Act, 25,000 acres of land were declared to be surplus but actually the State could get only 4,100 acres though the legislation that was passed by the Andhra Pradesh Assembly at that time, in 1961, was a progressive one. Many pointed out that there are loopholes in the law. I would like to point out that not only are there loopholes in the ceiling law, but there are also loopholes in the very social law.

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister now to the definition of family. It is now sought to be defined that a family consists of husband, wife and three minor children. But suppose the husband and wife *i.e.*—the father and the mother, are not there, what will happen to the family? Is there no family? I would like the Minister to carefully go into it because it would be committing another mistake if it accepts the Central Land Reforms Committee's definition of the family as "father, mother and three minor children"

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : One more, the grandfather.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: We are trying to define family. That is already available

in the 1961 Act of Andhra Pradesh. We considered it thoroughly. We knew the loopholes in the law particularly in the Hindu Law "Family means, in the case of persons governed by Hindu Law, an undivided Hindu family consisting of members entitled under that law to a share in the property held by the family on a partition thereof and in the case of other persons a group or unit, the members of which are by custom or usage joint in estate." This is the definition of family. I would like the Ministry to re-examine the definition of 'husband, wife and three children'. It is not the only pattern of family. Suppose the father and the mother are not there. There are three brothers who have a right in the property. Don't you think they could constitute a family? The eldest brother or member will be the head of the family.

Suppose again in the family there are not only minor children but also an adult major child. What would happen? Is he entitled to another ceiling limit? You have actually to see how the law obtains all over the country. Why we could not secure the surplus land in the manner that we thought is because the Hindu family system is such, the property rights in the Hindu family are such, that merely if the family members declare that they have an intention to separate they are separated. Even now what happens? We were talking about land reforms so much that we are warning everybody, "Come on Express your intention to separate". For the last one year what we have been doing from Delhi is tomming all over that we are going to bring down the ceiling. I know a family in Andhra Pradesh. What did it do? Among the family children the property was so divided and distributed that the law could not have any effect. Therefore, simply throwing the blame on the State Governments or State Legislatures that they have not given due consideration to the provisions of law for arresting such a practice may not be correct.

Sir, there are eight classes of land in my own State...

SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE: Tell me what can we do with the Hindu law?

SHRI V B RAJU I gave the definition of a Hindu family before you came. In my view it is not a correct concept to define the family that is actually the husband, wife and their minor children. It will lead to many difficulties.

Can we sit here and actually determine the extent or the ceiling? No doubt, ceilings have got to be lowered. But there must be some criteria. In my view the criterion cannot be merely the income. We determined in 1953 that the net annual income should be Rs 3,600. Now the value of Rupee is not the same. If you take the same income as limit today, it may not have the same area. But as the price index goes up and as the wages are actually determined and redetermined, are you, in every year, every time going to redetermine the ceiling? In fact, the income factor in terms of rupee will not be the correct guideline for determining the ceiling.

Then, can it be the crop pattern? Somebody was asking for exemption of orchards. I say it amounts to asking for keeping the land always a waste land if you ask for exemption for orchards. It is the waste land that is under orchards and if it is exempted from ceiling it will never be improved. A land which is very poor is meant for orchards. And if you give exemption the land holder will retain hundreds of acres under orchards. He will keep it like that without improving it.

Can you determine the ceiling on crop pattern, say groundnut growing land, paddy growing land, sugarcane growing land? You cannot. In my view the determination of ceiling is guided by socio-economic compulsion. We should be very frank about it. Today in the country the people want land to be held by a greater number of families. Political parties in the country also want that more number of families should share the land. I think that alone will be the correct approach.

You said you arrived at 10—18 acre ceiling. How did you arrive at 10—18 acre? You said the maximum should be 54 acres. How did you arrive at that maximum? What is the criterion? In fact in my own State the best land is 27 acres and the

poorest land is 324 acres. That was the ceiling limit. Now from 27 acres if it is to be brought down to 10 acres, what is the argument? My argument is only socio-economic compulsion. There are more people to depend on land today. There are more families who want self employment. I may not agree with Dr Z A. Ahmad that a cultivator family should always be a cultivator family. (*Interruption by Dr Z A Ahmad*) I agree with the hon'ble Member that the person should be present on the spot i.e. on the soil and not sit in urban areas. It should not be back seat driving or remote control. It should not be like that.

The children of the rich peasants are taking to other occupations. Secondly, Madam, the ceiling on land is not a ceiling on agricultural income. The ceiling is not on income at all. Land belongs to the State and the State gave land to a certain number of families and created certain rights to them. Now the State wants to change that pattern. That is all. (*Time bell rings*) Two minutes more. I will not go to other subjects. I will finish with this subject. After having heard the views of Parliament, after having discussed with experts, the best thing will be for the Centre to create teams for each State, let the teams go and discuss with the Governments there, and advise the Governments there what should be the relation between the various classes of land and what should be ceiling on each class of land. Let it not be done sitting from here. Let it not be uniform because quality and character of land is not uniform and conditions are not uniform.

Secondly, about the implementation part, I would like to suggest that as we did in the early 'fifties in Hyderabad State, a Land Commission must be appointed and land committees up to the village level should also be appointed. These committees should consist of such people who are progressive-minded and who are not big landlords, who are really for the peasants. Such committees must be appointed for implementing the ceilings. Otherwise, anything which is done from here in a so called uniform way will not get the proper response in the States, and there will not be proper implementation. (*Time bell rings*) I am concluding. I agree with Dr Z A. Ahmad that there must be no

absentee landlordism. Every new tenant must be a tenant for five years, and after five years, he should be a protected tenant. A protected tenant is one who has 60 per cent of the share in the land. The right is heritable. Therefore, all tenancies in future must be for five years in the beginning and if the tenant tills the land for five years, he should become a protected tenant. To me the more important thing is security of tenure and fair rent. These are equally important, if not more important. The Land Reforms Committee and the Ministry must examine these things and send expert teams to the various States.

*SHRI M. C. BALAN (Tamil Nadu) : Madam Vice-Chairman, I would like to express my thanks for giving me an opportunity to speak on the discussion relating to the working of the Ministry of Agriculture.

It is twenty-five years since India attained independence. We have now to think as to how far the position of the agriculturists has improved in our country. Speaking at a meeting held recently at Ahmedabad, the Minister of Planning has expressed his views on this matter. He had stated that in spite of the fact that it is twenty-five years since we attained independence, in spite of the fact that we have completed three five year plans and are in the midst of the fourth five year plan and in spite of the fact that four general elections have been completed, there has not been any improvement in the lot of the agriculturists. Eighty per cent of the agriculturists are living in conditions of semi-starvation without any amenities. We are not able to supply them with good quality seeds. They have not been given loans at the proper time and they have not been supplied with fertilisers. This has been stated and admitted by the Minister of Planning. We find this state of affairs prevailing in India after 25 years of independence,

Let us take the working of the Ministry in the last year. I would like to state that whatever amount has been earmarked for agriculture it has not been fully spent. Under demand No. 25 of the Budget for 1971-72, 77 lakhs of rupees earmarked for

improving the lot of the agriculturists have not been spent. Under demand No. 26, 1 crore and 2 lakhs of rupees have not been spent. Under demand No. 28 relating to forests, 25.20 lakhs of rupees have not been spent. Under demand No. 30 relating to community development, two items of 2½ lakhs of rupees each have not been spent. The reason for the non-utilisation of these amounts is that the Government have not given proper attention to the improvement of agriculture. The Government have not followed the policy of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who had stated that India could not be saved unless there was a revolution in agriculture. It is only due to this reason that the amounts mentioned above have not been spent. When we ask the reason for the non-utilisation of these amounts, the Minister states that it is due to the fact that certain posts which become vacant occasionally could not be filled up. I request that at least this year all the amounts earmarked for agriculture should be fully spent.

It has been stated that by the end of the fourth-five year Plan period paddy worth 4000 crores of rupees will be pounded into rice. It has also been stated that paddy worth 3000 crores of rupees has been pounded into rice annually. Out of this paddy worth 1500 crores of rupees has been hand-pounded into rice. As a result of this there is a loss of 150 crores of rupees worth of Paddy. During the last seven years the Food Corporation of India has started only 13 modern rice mills. More modern rice mills should be started and then only we can mitigate the losses.

At the present time, Government have earmarked 1 crore of rupees for the benefit of 400 Co-operative Marketing Societies. Each society gets about Rs. 25000. But now we find that these societies are not being properly utilised and the Food Corporation of India is being utilised. I suggest that these societies should be utilised for procurement and supply of fertilisers instead of leaving it to the Food Corporation of India. The procurement of foodgrains by the Food Corporation of India should be

[Shri M. C. Balan]

stopped immediately. If you see the various godowns of the Food Corporation of India there you will come to know that in the past four or five years a lot of fertilisers have gone into waste because they have not been sold. In Visakhapatnam alone about 4000 metric tonnes of fertilisers have been spoiled and wasted because they have not been sold.

(Time bell rings)

This is my maiden speech, Madam.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER : He is making his maiden speech, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : Maiden speech, but we are very much short of time.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : He has taken only five minutes. Our Party has got more time and nobody has spoken.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : He has spoken for 8 minutes. Alright.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER : You go on.

SHRI M. C. BALAN : The Reserve Bank of India gives loans to the agriculturists at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent. This money first goes to the State Cooperative Bank, then to the Central Bank and it is being given to the agriculturists through the credit societies. But when the agriculturists get the loan from the credit societies they have to pay at the rate of $9\frac{1}{2}$ percent. It should be seen that the agriculturists get the loan at a lower rate of interest.

At the time of the closing of the Third Five-Year Plan a short-term amount of 230 crores of rupees have been earmarked by Government for the agriculturists. But when we see as to how much loan the agriculturist with a property of 1000 rupees gets, we find that only 7 crores of rupees have been spent on the poor agriculturists. For the past 25 years it has been stated repeatedly that our country can progress only when the position of the agriculturist is improved and made better.

I would like to emphasise here that only Tamil Nadu has made great progress and has revolutionised agriculture. In the year 1966 people there could not get rice and there were big queues. But today in Tamil Nadu there is no scarcity of rice. Within five years the position has changed drastically in Tamil Nadu. There are no controls there. The agriculturists are getting loans and fertilisers at cheap rates.

(Time bell rings)

In this way, a green revolution has been ushered in Tamil Nadu. Only Tamil Nadu has brought about a green revolution and has given the lead to all the States. There is no surprise in it.

At this time of the green revolution in Tamil Nadu it is Tanjore that rice is produced in a large quantity. We get water from the Cauvery to Tanjore. An Anicut is being constructed on the river Cauvery and in spite of many representations by Tamil Nadu to the Centre, the Centre are not taking any action about it.

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

SHRI M. C. BALAN : I also request the Government to implement the Ganga-Cauvery Link Scheme.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair*]

Tamil Nadu has also introduced another revolutionary measure in fixing the land ceiling at 15 acres and has given the lead to all the States in this matter also.

With these words, I conclude my speech.

Thank you.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उपसभापति महोदय, आज अखबारों के माध्यम से ज्ञात हुआ कि भूमि सुधार समिति ने इस बात का निर्णय नहीं किया कि सीलिंग लागू होने के बाद जो जायज भूमि बचेगी, वह किस को दी जाएगी और इसके लिए उस समिति ने यह तय

किया कि कृषि विभाग इस बात पर अध्ययन करके नोट तैयार करे और मुख्य मंत्रियों का सम्मेलन यह तय करे कि यह भूमि भूमिहीनों को दी जाए या उन भूमि-मालिकों को दी जाए जिनके पास अलाभकारी जोत है, यानी भूमि-हीनों को दी जाए या अलाभकार जोत वालों को दी जाए। दूसरा मुद्दा जिस पर तय नहीं हो सका वह यह भी है कि सीलिंग क्या रखी जाए, और इसके लिए भिन्न-भिन्न मत इस आधार पर है कि सिंचित भूमि की क्या सीमा हो, असिंचित भूमि की क्या सीमा हो, सरकारी साधन से सिंचित भूमि की क्या सीमा हो, गैर सरकारी साधन से सिंचित भूमि की क्या सीमा हो और विभिन्न प्रकार की भूमियों की क्या सीमा हो।

श्रीमन्, इससे ऐसा प्रकट होता है कि सच-मुच अभी तक सीलिंग की कोई सुकम्पल रूप रेखा भारत सरकार के कृषि विभाग के पास नहीं है और इससे यह भी प्रकट होता है कि यह सीलिंग का सारा तमाशा, जिस तरह से शासक दल ने चीनी मिलों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का तमाशा आज से 2 साल पहले खड़ा करके और करोड़ों रु० चीनी मालिकों से चंदे के रूप में लिया, उसी तरह से खड़ा करके, जनता को गुमराह करके, एक और इलेक्शन जीतने का आगे प्रयास है। इसके पीछे कोई उनका ईमानदारी का इरादा जाहिर नहीं होता। अगर सचमुच सीलिंग लागू करके भूमि के वितरण करने का ईमानदारी का इरादा होता तो आज कई सालों की तैयारी के बाद भी नतीजे पर पहुंच नहीं पाए, ऐसी शकल नहीं होती।

श्रीमन्, मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये जो यंग टर्क लोग हैं, वे बिला वजह फखरुद्दीन अहमद साहब और शिन्दे साहब पर हमला करते हैं कि ये बात नहीं तय करते और ये अपना रेटेमेन्ट बार बार बदलते हैं, मैं यह

कहता हूँ कि सही बात यह है कि प्रधान मंत्री साहिब सचमुच इरादा नहीं रखती हैं। अगर वे इरादा रखें तो, अगर प्रिवी पर्स का मामला 12 बजे रात को तय हो सकता है, तो यह सीलिंग का मामला उनके लिए कौन सी बड़ी बात है, यह तो घण्टे भर में, चन्द मिनटों में तय हो जाता। मगर साफ जाहिर है कि शासक पार्टी इन तमाम बातों को केवल प्रचार का साधन बना करके, देश की जनता को गुमराह करके, अपना स्वार्थ-साधन करना चाहती है और कर रही है। उनका कतई इरादा भूमि के बंटवारे का नहीं है, उनका कतई इरादा उम समाजवाद को लाने का नहीं है जिस समाजवाद के नारे पर उन्होंने मासिव मैन्डेट प्राप्त किया।

श्रीमन्, मैं यहां पर कहना चाहता हूँ कि सचमुच भूमि का वितरण करके समाजवाद को हासिल करने का इनका इरादा होता तो वे एक सीधा सादा और ईमानदारी का आधार आम-दनी बना लेते और अगर आमदनी को आधार बना लेते तो फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब के सामने या शिन्दे साहब के सामने या भूमि सुधार समिति के सामने इस तरह का मसला नहीं आता कि सिंचित का क्या हिसाब रखा जाए, असिंचित का क्या हिसाब रखा जाए, सरकारी सिंचाई का क्या हिसाब रखा जाए, गैर सरकारी सिंचाई का क्या हिसाब रखा जाए? आपको चाहिए था कि आमदनी को आधार बना लेते कि मैक्सिमम आमदनी अधिकतम आमदनी एक जोत से इतनी होगी और इस निर्णय को आधार बना कर चाहे पहाड़ की जमीन होती चाहे रेत की जमीन होती, चाहे उपजाऊ जमीन होती, चाहे सिंचित जमीन होती, चाहे असिंचित जमीन होती सबको एक आधार पर तौल देते तो किसी को कोई शिकायत या शिकवे की गुंजायश नहीं होती।

मैं यह बात इसलिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये तमाम दिक्कतें बनाकर के इस मामले को

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

चार, पांच साल तक लटकाये रखना चाहते हैं ताकि इस समय तक दूसरा इलैक्शन भी हो जाय। यह जो सिंचित और असिंचित जमीन का झगड़ा है, उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपने लोगों के लाभ के लिए, उनको लाभ पहुंचाने के लिए इस तरह की बात की जा रही है। नमूने के तौर पर मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जिले में एक सज्जन है जिनके पास पांच हजार एक एकड़ जमीन है और सारे जमीन में गन्ने का फार्म है। वे 15 अगस्त, 1947 तक 'सर' थे, अंग्रेजों के साथ थे, लेकिन 16 अगस्त, 1947 को कांग्रेसमैन बन गए। आज कांग्रेस लिस्ट में एक्टिव वक्ता हैं उनका नाम दर्ज है और कांग्रेस पार्टी के टिकट पर वे चुनाव भी लड़ते हैं। जब सीलिंग का मामला आया तो कोई जरिया नहीं निकला। क्योंकि कागज में जितनी भी उनकी जमीन है कल्टीवेटेड लैंड के नाम से दर्ज है। उन्होंने बकीलों से इस बारे में सलाह मशवरा किया और यह तय पाया गया कि सारी जमीन को ग्राव लैंड डिक्लेयर कर दिया जाय क्योंकि ग्राव लैंड को सीलिंग से एग्जम्पशन मिला हुआ है। कागज में तो उनकी जमीन ग्राव लैंड दर्ज नहीं है। उन्होंने इस बारे में अफसरों से साठ गांठ की कि जमीन का इन्स्पेक्शन कर लिया जाय। एक हफ्ते के अन्दर उन्होंने पचास, पचास गज की दूरी पर पेड़ काट काटकर वहां पर लगा दिए। इस तरह से दो तीन लाख का उस जमीन को ग्राव लैंड करार देने के लिए सोदा किया और आफिसरों द्वारा लिखवा लिया गया कि यह ग्राव लैंड है। "I inspected the site and found the land to be grave land and I exempted it".

श्रीमन्, उनका करीब 5 हजार बीघा का फार्म है और दो, तीन हजार बीघा उन्होंने अभी हाल में ही सरकार को बेचा है इंजीनियरिंग कालेज बनाने के लिए। मैं यहां पर उनका नाम लेना नहीं चाहता हूँ। आप चबें और देखें कि

उनका कितने हजार बीघा का फार्म है। आज वे कांग्रेस के एक एक्टिव मेम्बर हैं और कांग्रेस के साथ हैं। यह जो झगड़ा सिंचित और असिंचित जमीन का था क्या वह भूमिहीन किसानों को दी जायेगी या जो कम अनाधिक जमीन जोतने वाले गरीब किसान हैं उनको दी जायेगी। उनको यह जमीन मिलने वाली नहीं है। यह तो जो करंट व्यूरोक्रेसी के कर्मचारी हैं वे उन लोगों को देंगे जिनके पास आज भी कई बीघा जमीन है। गरीब किसानों को यह जमीन मिलने वाली नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, इसलिए मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप आज आमदनी का आधार बनायें। गवर्नमेंट के सामने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई दिक्कत नहीं आयेगी और आप समाजवाद के रास्ते पर अग्रसर होंगे। श्रीमन्, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज जान-बूझकर आमदनी को आधार नहीं बनाया जा रहा है। क्योंकि अगर आमदनी आधार बन जायेगी तो जो बड़े-बड़े लोग हैं वे इसके ग्रिप में आ जायेंगे। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप इस देश में समाजवाद लाना चाहते हैं तो उसको क्यों नहीं राष्ट्रपति से शुरू किया जाय। अगर आपगरीबी मिटाना चाहते हैं, जैसा श्री चन्द्र शेखर जी ने कहा तो पहले भूमिहीनों को मिटाइये। राष्ट्रपति जी को जो 7 लाख रुपये की कार दे रखी है वह इस देश की गरीब जनता की जरूरत मुताबिक नहीं है। अगर आप आमदनी को आधार बनाते हैं तो प्रधान मंत्री महोदया ने अपनी छोटी कार के कारखाने के लिए भारत कम्पनी से जो 22 लाख का हिस्सा अपने लड़के के नाम में लिया है, वह मामला भी फंस जायेगा। 22 लाख रुपये का शेयर भारत कम्पनी में श्री संजय के नाम से लिया गया है और जब आमदनी का आधार बनेगा, और जब अधिकतम आमदनी तय होगी, तो उसमें ये सब ग्रिप में आ जायेंगे।

आज आप गांव के किसान की जमीन की सीलिंग करके उसकी जमीन लेना चाहते हैं। आपने 18 एकड़ की सीलिंग उसके लिए लगा दी है और अबन प्रापर्टी के लिए आपने 3 लाख की सीमा रखी है। मैं आप से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि आपके समाजवाद का क्या स्टैंडर्ड है? आपने गांव वालों की जमीन 18 एकड़ तक रखी और शहर वालों के लिए 3 लाख की सीमा तय की है। क्या आप यह समझते हैं कि गांव वालों की जो 18 एकड़ जमीन है उसकी कीमत 3 लाख रुपये के बराबर होगी। आज गांव में आप चले जाइये तो आपको मालूम हो जायेगा कि जो 18 एकड़ की जमीन है उसके लिए 18 हजार भी रुपये मिलने वाले नहीं है। तो गांव में रहने वालों के लिए एक मापदंड है और शहर में रहने वालों के लिए दूसरा मापदंड और फिर समाजवाद का नारा।

सीलिंग को लागू करना बहुत आवश्यक है। बहुत से वक्ता बोले। जिन्होंने देहात देखा नहीं, खेत में पैर नहीं रखा वे लम्बी चौड़ी बात करते हैं, जो जानते नहीं कि जो की बाली कैसी होती है, धान की बाली कैसी होती है वे लम्बा चौड़ा भाषण देते हैं। जिन्होंने खेत को देखा है, खेत में काम किया है—मैं जिम्मेदारी से कहता हूं वे इस बात को समझते हैं कि 12-13 एकड़ में साधनहीन किसान खेती करके उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ा सकता, उत्पादन गिरेगा। उस के लिए 40 हजार का ट्रैक्टर खरीदना सम्भव नहीं हो सकता। 10 हजार रुपये से छोटा ट्रैक्टर बेल नहीं बैठा सकता, कोई मशीन नहीं रख सकता। इसलिए उत्पादन न गिरे और भूमि का वितरण हो, छोटी-छोटी होल्डिंग्स हों तो लाजिमी है कि गवर्नमेंट की ओर से मशीन स्टेशन्स हों, काश्तकार जाकर रिपोर्ट कर दे कि आज हमारे खेत में पानी चाहिए, सरकारी ट्रैक्टर बेल से पानी मिल जाय, खेत काटने के लिए सरकार के यहां से मशीन पहुंच जाय। जब तक आप 5-5, 7-7

गांवों के लिए सरकारी मशीन स्टेशन, जैसे रूस में हैं, नहीं बनाएंगे तब तक छोटी होल्डिंग्स वाले काश्तकार खेती नहीं कर सकते, उन्हें कभी लाभ नहीं हो सकता है, उत्पादन अवश्य गिरेगा। इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि आप सीलिंग के साथ-साथ इन काश्तकारों के लिए मशीन स्टेशन्स की ओर सरकारी साधनों की व्यवस्था जरूर करें।

अन्तिम बात कह कर मैं खत्म करता हूं। आज सवेरे जो बड़ी चर्चा रही उस सम्बन्ध में मैं मंत्री महोदय फखरुद्दीन साहब से कहना चाहता हूं कि अपने देश में एक उदाहरण प्रस्तुत है। एक छोटी सी रेल दुर्घटना हुई और लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी ने इस्तीफा दे दिया। आपके यहां एक बैज्ञानिक आत्म हत्या करें और आप चुपचाप बैठे रहें, यह कहे कि घटना हो गई, जांच होगी, पड़ताल होगी। यह मोरल ड्यूटी है, यह नैतिकता की पुकार है कि आप इस्तीफा दें। अगर आप इस्तीफा नहीं देना चाहते हैं तो जैसे कि '62 में जिस समय हमारी सेनाएं हारों और पंडित जी ने रास्ता निकाला, खुद इस्तीफा न देकर कृष्णा मेनन से इस्तीफा दिलवा दिया और उसी तरह आप के सामने भी भागने का रास्ता है, आप इस्तीफा दिलवाएं स्वामीनाथन् से, बचाएं अपने मंत्रि पद को। थोड़ी सी भी नैतिकता आप के अन्दर हो, अपनी गद्दी बचाना चाहते हों, स्वयं इस्तीफा नहीं देना चाहते हो, तो स्वामीनाथन् से इस्तीफा दिलवाएं। इतनी बात कह कर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Panda.

SHRI K. C. PANDA (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it appears as if self-sufficiency in food and green revolution is working as per reports by the Government from time to time. If we see the index, as per the reports supplied by Government of Cereals, we find that in 1959 the average was 198 and by the end of March this

year it is 209. The figures in respect of rice rose from 194 to 204 and in respect of wheat we have achieved 218 from 209. So, I would request the House to consider how far we have progressed towards self-sufficiency. Anyway we are glad that we have stopped importing foodgrains. For the last 25 years we were simply importing foodgrains and Pakistan was importing arms. The result was known to the entire country recently, I need not repeat it. We are also proud that we have produced scientists in agricultural field, in agricultural engineering and in different subjects pertaining to agriculture. They are very talented research scientists but, as it appears, they are all fighting for existence. Their activities are limited in the research centres only. What about the real backbone of agriculture in rural areas? We have not been able to distribute them in rural areas. On 28th December, 1968, at the time of Bihar Appropriation Demands, I had given certain suggestions about the location of agricultural colleges in our country. I believe not a single agricultural college is situated in rural area. It remains in the sophisticated areas. So much so, sometimes the students go on strike for shower bath and stainless steel utensils in their hostels. We have to go to the rural areas and establish some colleges where these scientists will go and work for research. They could educate the students, educate the farmer's sons who would go and till their fathers' lands. We must have some provision in the constitution or some rules somewhere for implementing such works so that the agriculturists and agricultural graduates will go to villages and work there in their fathers' lands and develop their own land as well as they will work as advisers to their poor village farmers. They can be teachers in schools.

We have got the research work and education at the higher stage. We have failed up till now to implement anything substantially at the secondary level and we have totally forgotten the basic education which came out of the mind of the father of the nation. It is because the bureaucratic machinery has totally ignored that type of education for our new generation. The result is that there is frustration in the minds of highly educated agricultural scientists specially and they have been fighting among themselves for existence. I believe as has already been told by some of my

colleagues, that there may be frustration again after these educated agriculturists go to their villages when they will find that their fathers' lands or their relatives' lands have been distributed among others. So we will have to take certain decisions if we want to introduce mechanised farming. We will have to take a separate decision with regard to the lands which come under cultivation, and different decisions for other lands. The farmers get very little or no facilities for soil testing. My 5 P.M. suggestion is that there should be soil testing laboratory in each block headquarters so that the farmers can get instructions from the specialists very easily. I have already mentioned about ceilings. There are some places in the country where deforestation is going on rapidly and the farmers are being instructed by the Government machinery for growing forests in their highlands and wastelands land. I believe the authorities will take care to exclude the forests in the agricultural lands from the ceiling.

Another suggestion is about the fishing tanks. I am glad that West Bengal Government has taken such a decision and in Orissa also I believe, which is also a fish-eating State, the tanks will be outside the limit of ceiling.

I now come to the activities of the Food Corporation of India. It has become such a panic in the minds of the real farmers.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : It gives food to the traders.

SHRI K. C. PANDA: I invite my friend to a news item that appeared in 'The Times of India' of day before yesterday about quality control. Out of 100 bags only 20 bags are selected and the rest are allowed to be sold at throw-away prices. Mr Kulkarni should note this. The quality Control Inspectors are multi-millionaires.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Who is not in this country?

SHRI K C. PANDA : I know you have to support them.

SHRI A G. KULKARNI: It is the cross section.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE: Mr. Kulkarni gets annoyed unnecessarily.

SHRI K C PANDA: I have no criticism, 'Safri' rice is being sold in the Eastern Zone border as fine rice and if you cross the river and go to Madhya Pradesh, which is the Western Zone, it is superfine. You accept the challenge and come along with me and I will show you. It is just on the border. Storage godowns are not there. That is why they do not take charge of the food grains from the cultivators. As soon as rain comes there is no road to take it to the storage godowns. The cultivators suffer and they have to sell it at throw-away prices. Paddy seeds supplied Orissa farmers from Bezwada are mixed seeds whereas Taichung seeds which are procured from the farmers of Orissa are paid for at very low rates.

Then comes the problem of fertilisers. In agriculture, fertiliser plays a very important role. As you know Orissa is a rice-producing State and we have been fighting with the Government and requesting for having a naphthabased fertiliser unit in Paradeep. At last the Centre agreed to have a naphtha based fertiliser unit in Paradeep. At last the Centre agreed to have a naphtha-based fertiliser unit in Paradeep but for four years no action has been taken and Orissa is paying crores of rupees for importing fertiliser at a very high cost which becomes intolerable for the farmers.

Then comes jute which is one of the important crops of Orissa. In spite of the assurance of having a jute mill in Orissa so that the cultivators will get better price for their jute, no action has been taken and we have to send the jute, the entire production of it, to West Bengal for being manufactured. In this not the cultivators lose in the price but there are also certain shortcomings in the Government Departments in certain sections.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV : What about sugarcane price that is not being paid in Orissa ?

SHRI K C PANDA ; I am coming to it; one by one I will take up.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV ; Eighty per cent is not being paid.

SHRI K C PANDA : It is obvious now that the price of sugar is going up and up. I believe every citizen of India will have to consider himself that he is suffering from diabetes and he should keep off from sugar. Of course there is the doctor's advice that after the age of 50 one must reduce the intake of sugar by 50 per cent. Everybody here will feel that he has attained the age of 50 and give up sugar to that extent.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You must conclude.

SHRI K C PANDA : I have got some more important points; I am only giving suggestions.

Now let me come to the scheme for small farmers. Such schemes are being thrust on the people and the States. The schemes are prepared here but conditions vary from district to district. In some places persons having two to five acres may be called small farmers but in forest areas though one has 10 acres still he is unable to till his land with his own initiative and I think Government should give some consideration to such cases and recognise them as small farmers.

One thing more I want to tell in this connection. In respect of loans from co-operative societies the farmers have to pay much higher interest. My suggestion is these loans should be distributed through the revenue authorities who are watching the activities and progress of the cultivators. The loans should be advanced through them and the Reserve Bank should be moved to give their assent to this being distributed through the revenue authorities just as taccavi loans. Taccavi loans are smaller amounts and there too I suggest the limit may be raised in regard to the schemes for

small farmers (*Time-bell rings*) I am the only man from my party and I may be given some more time.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Each has to take a limited time only.

श्री पंडरीनाथ सीतारामजी पाटिल (महाराष्ट्र) : अपने यहां का कुछ किस्सा सुनाइये, आपके प्रदेश का क्या हाल है।

श्री उपसभापति : किस्सा तो बाद में सुना जायेगा, अभी तो बत की भी कमी है।

SHRI K C PANDA : Of course Mr Dharia is not here. He has committed in this House that plans will be made so far as agriculture is concerned at the district level. But I should say : Why district level ? We have taken Panchayat as a unit, and I believe we are more than 750 Members of Parliament, and when we are propagating socialism and they have got a majority, and we also include ourselves for development of the country, let us take up one Panchayat each, along with the Members of the Legislatures also, as a pilot project. Let us develop it. Let us make it self-sufficient and let us see that there will be no beggar in that particular Panchayat. Let us then move to another Panchayat, so that we can develop one Panchayat up to the mark and move to another Panchayat for its development. That way, I think in a much shorter time we can eradicate poverty.

With all these things I thank you very much for allowing me to speak.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now Mr. Shinde will intervene in the debate.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman Sir, a number of hon Members have participated in this debate and, as is usual, quite a number of useful suggestions have been made,

Some of the points which require clarification, I would come to these points later on. I shall try to cover those points a little later. But, Sir, I must say that I really take serious objections to some remarks, for

instance to Shri Shahi's. He spoke and went away. He said that the Minister, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, must resign for the reason that a scientist has committed suicide. Then, the same thing was repeated in a different strain by Shri Sakhalecha, who is also not here now. Of course I am not going into the merits and demerits of the case because enquiries will have to be made, and the Minister, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, himself has mentioned this morning that it is a very unhappy and unfortunate event. Suppose, if there is something wrong and the hon Members have given some suggestions, they will have to be considered.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV : Ministers do resign. When will they resign if not, now, and for the reason of suicide committed by a scientist ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Now, Sir, so far as my Ministry's performance under the leadership of Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is concerned, is there anything to be ashamed of ? May I appeal to the good sense of the hon Members who are very illustrious and knowledgeable ? In fact, what has happened during the last one or two years in this country as far as my Ministry is concerned ? I think all of us should be proud of this very fact that our agricultural production, particularly food production has started coming up. When we gave a pledge to this country a few years back that we shall be stopping imports of foodgrains, there were many amongst us also—I do not want to blame anybody because that was the prevailing feeling in the country, I am not referring to anybody—who were harbouring the feeling that the country can never attain self-sufficiency. That was a genuine feeling prevailing in the country and outside. What has happened ?

श्री नवल किशोर सब का नहीं है।

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Because there was a genuine feeling, I am referring to that feeling. But what has happened to it ? Not only we have redeemed our pledge that we shall stop the imports ; we have also become self-suffi-

cient, and I would repeat that we are on the threshold of export markets today. Now this has happened under the leadership of Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed. Why should we look only at the negative sides or the weaknesses? We are a vast country. We have many problems. We are a vast society. There may be many failures, many weaknesses. Suppose there are the weaknesses, I have the courage to admit them and I am prepared to admit them before my colleagues. There is nothing wrong in that. But let us have a balanced view of things; let us look at things in a balanced way.

Then, Sir, remarks were made by Dr. Mathew Kurian—he is not here. I do not know what wrong has happened to him and his party. Now, Sir, he sees everything wrong with Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her Government and her party. He said that all ideas of Indian agriculture were imported from U.S.A. He mentioned the Massachusetts University where, he said, he whole plot was hatched.

I think this is condemning our people, condemning our scientists, condemning our farmers, condemning our extension officers and even our State Governments who have been equal partners in this great enterprise. In fact, agriculture or any branch of development benefits from an international experience, the way humanity is progressing, because of communication channels. Because of the two-way traffic in various fields of science and technology, naturally we take advantage of whatever is good. Whether it is from this particular bloc or that particular bloc, we have no likes and dislikes as far as scientific development is concerned. I think there is some prejudice. They always look with prejudice. I have no quarrel with individual Member, but why should they try to give ideas to the country as if our people, our scientists, our politicians, our social extension workers, our farmers have no originality, as if they do not understand the problems, as if only foreigners who come here for a few days to understand the problems of Indian agriculture? I must say that I have been associated with the development of Indian agriculture for the last decade. I am proud to say and I am sharing it with you because as I said, your goodwill has helped us to develop this strategy. I would like to make

a submission that though international experience was used in Indian agriculture, they were mainly based on Indian expertise, Indian experience and Indian understanding of Indian problems. Why should we look at the problems in a wicked way, in a crooked way?

Then, Sir, Mr. Sakhalecha also said that the Ministers should resign because everything is wrong with the ICAR. As I said earlier, in regard to the functioning of the ICAR suppose some improvement is required, some radical reorganisation is required, we shall not hesitate. My Ministry has open ideas. In regard to all these matters we accept criticism, constructive criticism, but as far as ICAR is concerned, should we not be proud of the fact that all this development in Indian agriculture has come about because of the contribution made by the scientific community? Do you think that if the Ministry of Agriculture had not properly encouraged scientists, reorganised scientific activities, all these would have come about? Steps had been taken by my Ministry over a number of years to encourage scientists and to organise scientific activities in this country and particularly in the field of agriculture we have combined research, extension and education. In the past all these activities were being carried out in isolation without having proper correlation. Now, we have made our research problem oriented and we are proud of the fact that many of our scientists are coming up and making valuable contributions for the development of this country. It is like nuclear energy. Some discovery was made somewhere. Those countries which have the ability to adopt it and use it are going forward. A similar thing is happening in the field of agriculture. Because our scientific organisations particularly in the field of agriculture have been able to absorb international ideas and adopt those ideas to our own use, production is coming up. Take this particular year of 1971-72, What a difficult year it was. Just today morning I was discussing with some of my officers and economic experts. Suppose this development in Indian agriculture had not come forward. A major tragedy and very serious developments would have taken place. Remember last year the way we started. We forget history very quickly. Human memory is prover-

bially said to be short. Last year when the monsoon began what was the position? I come from an area where there was not even a blade of grass up to August. There was drought in Andhra. There was drought in Mysore. The whole North was suffering from floods. What terrific floods. My colleague, Dr. K. L. Rao, said that they were unprecedented in a century. Take the history of agriculture and the food economy of this country. Any such happening in the past would have created an unprecedented calamity. We would have been required to resort to large-scale imports. When the Bangladesh crisis was developing, when we had the conflict with Pakistan, the American administration did not take a very friendly attitude towards us. Do you know what would have been the tragedy in this country? What happened in 1943? When the Bengal famine developed the British administration was really a powerful administration, but disruption of supplies from Burma took place and a great human tragedy occurred in this country. Last year despite all this tragedy, the influx of ten million refugees to this country and the terrific set back in the food economy, particularly in the Kharif production, nothing happened.

Do you think that this has all happened without the Agricultural Ministry putting in any effort, without the leadership of the Minister, all our officers and others. Why I am mentioning this is, this is the occasion, because we require your support. Unless there is goodwill and support from you, we will not be able to function effectively and properly. Therefore, I am mentioning this, not to criticise. Therefore, a balanced view of things should be taken, and not as if something happens somewhere and that the Minister should resign. You are very seasoned politicians. I would plead with you to have a proper appreciation of the things that are coming up.

For instance, when last year we saw that agricultural production is having a set-back, what a tremendous amount of effort the Ministry put in. For instance, have you heard in the past? Sixty thousand tonnes of seed was carried to Bihar by special trains. And I made a statement at Patna, my senior colleague made a statement in Patna that we would see that this com-

mitment is carried out. Never before in the history of Indian agriculture has such a large scale movement of seed taken place. When we made the statement in Patna that we will carry out this movement according to schedule, nobody was prepared to believe us. Even the Press correspondents asked me in Patna: How is it that you are making such a statement, a thing which is not possible? May I say? Except one special train, every other train that was sent to Bihar went according to schedule, and that one too went in a week. That was not delayed much.

Take the way we took up wheat production. On the front, in the Ferozpur and other areas, because of this confrontation, there was the fear that thousands of acres would remain fallow. We took up the campaign of late sowing and all lands were sown. Seed was supplied, inputs were supplied, even fertiliser movement in special trains was carried out. In good old days, special trains used to be run when we had *yatras* or fairs. Now, we are having a large-scale movement of special trains for building our agricultural production potential. All this was done under the leadership of the Ministry.

Look at the way rice production is coming up in Punjab, Haryana and West U.P. There was a heavy set back in Andhra Pradesh as far as rice production was concerned. Punjab, Haryana and West U.P. saved it, and they are giving this year 1 1/2 million tonnes of rice to the Central pool. That has helped to improve the economy. That is how we could claim, we could make the pronouncement that we are not going to import even rice from other countries, and we do not want to import rice.

Take the eastern region, the most difficult area — West Bengal. You know the social tensions there. I think I will not be making any exaggerated statement if I say that the entire social fabric of West Bengal was in difficulty. You will be surprised to know — West Bengal which was producing hardly a few thousand tonnes of wheat, this year the wheat production there is going to be more than one million tonnes. You can imagine the amount of

contribution to the economy of West Bengal, the amount of employment potential that would have been created in a poor State like West Bengal and what a great contribution this has made to the economy of West Bengal.

Then, take the summer rice programme which was taken up there. Last year it was four lakh acres. This year it is 8 lakh acres — a million tonne rice from the summer crop. This is the new strategy that is coming up, emerging as a result of all this experience. And all this has been under the leadership of my senior colleague. Why should we be ashamed of it?

Therefore, I would plead with the hon Members : While making some statements, they should be a little sober. They should have a little appreciation, a balanced view and understanding of the things which are happening (*Interruptions*) Yes, I am coming to them. Thank you very much, Mr. Misra.

Then, Sir, some criticism has been made of the Food Corporation of India. I know there are many weaknesses, and I am prepared to welcome any suggestions or criticisms from the hon'ble Members. Because it is a public sector organisation and has been established with a view to serving the interest of the producers and consumers, if it is failing anywhere in its duty it has to be corrected. The hon'ble Mr. Panda mentioned some problems somewhere. May I suggest to him to give some concrete facts and we will immediately look into those facts?

SHRI K. C. PANDA: Let them procure directly from the cultivator.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: I agree. That is our policy. In fact, we have been encouraging direct procurement from the farmer. That is our policy.

One hon'ble Member, I think Shri Nawal Kishoreji, asked how are we going to procure 6.5 million tonnes and how are we going to store it. I would request Nawal Kishoreji not to bother. We will take care of it. We will also see that not a single bag is left unprotected and we will see

that nothing goes waste for lack of storage. It is true that the problem of storage is difficult.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE: What do you mean by storage? Bags and bags are lying in the open. I only said that the storage capacity is not in proportion to production this year.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: I was coming to that. I was just going to mention that every year we are spending nearly Rs. 25 crores for constructing additional storage. Since our country is surplus storage has assumed very great importance. Unless we have adequate storage facilities for additional buffer stock we shall not be in a position to maintain the food economy of the country. We appreciate the importance of storage facilities.

As far as buffer stock is concerned, a few years earlier it was decided that we shall have buffer stock of 5 million tonnes by the end of the Fourth Plan. We have already a buffer of 5 million tonnes by 1972. In the good old days people use to say that the Ministry works better paper target while those targets are never fulfilled. Sir, so far as this Ministry is concerned, we have achieved targets well ahead of schedule. For that should you not give compliments to us? (*Interruption*) I am developing my argument. Then, recently in consultation with the Planning Commission we have reviewed the whole approach regarding buffer stock. We have thought that even in the worst year we should be in position to take care. So we have increased the target from 5 to 7 million tonnes. This will naturally require largescale storage because during peak periods storage facility may be required for 10-12 million tonnes. Therefore, we are constructing for that capacity. Last year because of defence movements, and a number of other priorities sometimes steel was not available, sometimes coal was not available for brick kilns. Can you imagine that sometimes I myself or some officers of my Ministry had to plead with the Railway Ministry to give coal for brick kilns? These are the practical difficulties. But despite that we are going ahead. Even then this year despite that there will be difficulty in having pucca storage for 3 million tonnes

of food-grains in the coming season itself. But, as I said, our young engineers and the storage wing of the Food Corporation of India is again making very good contribution. I think Nawal Kishoreji must have seen our open storage which we call capped storage. Open storage is a very misleading word because many hon'ble Members think as if grain is just thrown in the open. It is not so. It is covered by polythene and is very safe. Our experience is that this storage is much cheaper from the point of view of capital investment. The grains are even safer than private godowns which are not constructed according to certain standards and norms. The grains is absolutely safe without any risk to the public exchequer or the grain itself. We have planned for 3 million tonnes of such storage. Therefore, the national interest is not jeopardised in any way.

Saklechaji again referred to tractor prices being increased just before elections. He sees politics in everything. Sometimes when political parties get setback they try to find fault with the ruling party. First of all, he has addressed the question to the wrong Ministry. According to law the tractor prices are controlled by the Ministry of Industrial Development. Therefore, why should he ask Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed to resign, I do not know. The hon'ble Member was expected to prepare himself well. I am not allergic to legitimate criticism.

SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh) : That is probably because Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed was the Industrial Development Minister then.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Shyamdhari, when these prices were fixed, fortunately or unfortunately, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed was not there, he was with us.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : He is a new Member to the House. What can we do ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : He is an old colleague of mine. I am only explaining the facts. Hon. Members will appreciate that if we look into the figures of indigenous production, we will find that

from 19,000 tractors the production has come down to 18,000 and then to 15,000. That means imports were increasing. indigenous production was falling while demand was increasing. There was something basically wrong. The steel prices have gone up. The raw material price have gone up. I think the Industrial Development Ministry has taken a very wise decision in the interest of the country because when we import tractors from outside, we spend foreign exchange and we give work to the engineers in other countries while our engineers are unemployed. There was need to look into this aspect and I think the Industrial Development Ministry has done the right thing in giving an increase to the tractor prices so that indigenous tractor production could go up. Our country is so vast and our requirements are so big that we cannot depend on imports. Unless we try to build up our indigenous capacity, it will not be possible to cater fully to the demand of tractors in this country. I think Nawal Kishoreji again made a suggestion for small tractors. We are attending to that problem.

Then Nawal Kishoreji made the point that cotton production is not coming up.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : What the suggested was that you might organise tractor stations where people could get servicing, repairs, etc. done and tractors can also be had on rent.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : That is true. Some other hon. Members, including Tyagiji have made this suggestion. I am glad the House is appreciating this. In fact, my Ministry has advised the State Governments to organise an Agro-Industries Corporation in each State. Fifty per cent of the capital is being contributed by the Government of India to the State Agro-Industries Corporations and our advice repeatedly to these Agro-Industries Corporations is that they should see that they organise a large number of service centres in the country. In this country a large number of farmers because of their poverty are unable to own even bullocks. Recently the Reserve Bank carried some research study and went into this problem and they have found that only 25 per cent of the total requirement of drought power is available in the country. That means 75 per cent of drought power either

in the form of bullocks or in the form of tractors is not available.

DR. Z A AHMAD : Has any tractor station been started in any State ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : They are coming up. These tractor service centres should be in a position to give tractors, . .

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : On hire.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : . . . on hire and for small farmers, even credit should be made available. As soon as they apply, tractors should be made available. This is the line which we have indicated. These service centres will have to be organised not for tractors alone, but also for plant protection and for giving a number of other inputs because in this country our infrastructure is really the weakest link. Therefore, these things will have to be done so that our agriculture improves. Some hon. Members seem to harbour a fear as to what would happen if the ceiling law is applied and how we could use the tractors. I do not share this fear. If we have service centres, then these fears will be dispelled.

Then I was referring to cotton production.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: The demand for resignation may be deemed to have been withdrawn.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Thank you. Nawal Kishoreji spoke about cotton development. I have limited time; otherwise I would have spoken more. Very interesting developments are coming in the field of cotton and we should be proud of this. Many persons in the country do not know that a new strain has been evolved by our own scientists. In the case of wheat there is some contribution by international scientists. In the case of rice, the International Rice Research Institute has been making a contribution. But in the case of cotton, our own scientists in Gujarat have evolved a new strain, H-4. It is long staple cotton and moreover the yields are so high that people just refuse to believe it—as high as 10 quintals and 15 quintals and some farmers have made even 20 quintals. The average may be a little low, but the potential is there. And it is spreading so

fast. Mr. Kulkarni, who is very critical of us sometimes, was speaking to me the day before yesterday and he said, "When your Ministry makes a statement about cotton, I was not prepared to believe it. But when I saw it. . . ." he admitted that really very good development in national interest is coming up. I am glad he is connected with cooperative spinning mills and he knows the subject. Cotton development is being attended to. Now about cost of production data. We have organised a large number of units. In fact, a big scheme has been taken up because this is a perennial controversy. Everytime we come up with fixation of prices, the honourable Members ask us : Where is the cost data ? Where is the data for cost of cultivation in this country ? Therefore, our Ministry has taken a decision to organise a very large number of centres ; just as we have centres for working out the cost of living index, we have set up centres all over the country and mostly they are working in close cooperation with Agricultural Universities, with the Economic Wings of Agricultural Universities and we shall be getting data now very regularly and this data will be useful for formulation of our price policy in future, and that is being taken care of.

श्री पंडरीनाथ सीतारामजी पाटिल :
कपास की आज बाजार में बाजार में कोई नहीं लेता, उसकी तरफ भी मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान है।

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE :
जी हाँ ध्यान है। I know Mr. Pandarinarath Patil comes from cotton area. We are attending to it. Sir, I would not like to prolong my speech. I will take half an hour more if I have to cover all the points. I am just finishing. I will take some other opportunity to say all those things. Only one point I want to mention. I have my difficulty ; Dr. Mathew Kurian is not here ; he referred to the law framed by the Kerala Government. He thinks what was done by Mr. Nambudiripad is the only revolutionary thing and whatever is done by us about land reforms is all bogus. Now I have a book in my hand. I do not want to criticise Mr. Nambudiripad or any-

[SHRI Annasahab Shinde]

body else. They have enacted a law. Do you know what there is in that law, in the law enacted under the CPM leadership? There is a clause that for love and affection lands can be transferred. (*Interruptions*) This is what is done under Mr. Nambudiripad's leadership. (*Interruptions*) The point is that people are so unfair to us, they think everybody else is wrong and they alone are correct . . .

SHRI S. D. MISRA : Has the Minister any objection when the transfer is because of love and affection?

SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE : I have no objection for love. I do object to the transfer of land for love.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He has no objection for love and affection. To the transfer of land he has objection.

SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE : Sir, I thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to say a few words in regard to the functioning of my ministry. I thank all the Members for giving a patient hearing.

SHRI N. R. CHOUDHURY (Assam) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the very outset I shall be failing in my duty if I do not appreciate our Government for the emphasis they lay on the development of our agriculture. In all our Plans stress was laid on the development of agriculture and several crores of rupees have been spent and remarkable advances have been made in foodgrains production in the country. Foodgrains production in the country is on the threshold of self-sufficiency now, according to the 1971-72 report of the Ministry of Agriculture. We definitely agree that so far as production of foodgrains is concerned, production has increased. But agricultural development does not mean increase in production of foodgrains alone. India is a country where 80 per cent of the population mainly depends on agriculture. And if we want to develop our economy, then agricultural development must be given importance.

But little effort has so far been made for production of cash crops and also introduction of multi-crop system. I do not know what is the position in other parts of the country. But I am well acquainted with the rural economy of eastern region and there I know little efforts have been made on the part of the Government to introduce multi crop system or to cultivate cash crops. If we study this report, the picture, so far as production of commercial crop is concerned, is not very bright. So far as execution of our developmental plans are concerned, the Government has taken up certain pilot projects and package deal programmes for commercial crops and multi-crops. But from a study of this report of the Ministry of Agriculture, we find that the Government has a definite bias for certain States of North India and Central India and they have an apathy towards the Eastern Indian States. If you study this report, you will find that so many projects have been sanctioned and approved by the Central Government for production or cultivation or commercial crops. But you will not find the names of States of the Eastern India such as West Bengal, Tripura, Assam, Bihar, Manipur, Meghalaya and the newly formed States of Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh. You will find the names of some of them only in connection with jute production. But I do not know what has been done for the development of jute production in these areas. But in the cases of other commercial crop, you will not find a single name of any one of these areas. So, we find that the Central Government have been apathetic towards the development of agriculture in these States, although production of foodgrains in these areas is remarkable. Even then, our agricultural economy cannot survive without commercial crops. Then again, there is the possibility of cultivation of cotton and sugarcane in these States. In the case of pulses, there are no plans at all to cultivate them in any of these States in the Eastern India. We not only take rice and fish, but we take dal also. But our Central Government forgets that we require these things also. So, there is a feeling among the people of Eastern India that the Central Government is apathetic towards the development of this region because in the case of industries also, other than West Bengal, other areas are backward. Very little is

done for the development of industries in these areas. Like industry, agriculture is also neglected by the Government of India in these areas. That is the general feeling of the people. What I feel is that the Ministry of Agriculture should give serious thought to this matter and try to remove these regional imbalances that have been created due to the wrong policy followed by them for so long. They should make definite efforts for the removal of these regional imbalances, Sir.

Then, Sir, the short-term and medium-term loans are advanced through the co-operatives and in the report we find that the magnitude of loans advanced has been increasing year after year. Yes, it is so, Sir. But the loans that are being advanced to the agriculturists do not reach the agriculturists in time. Again, they also do not get the requisite amount of loan which they require at the appropriate time as a result of which they have to manage their affairs in times of need by borrowing from the money-lenders and after repayment to the money-lenders they become paupers. Of course, they have to tide over their difficulties also. Actually, they cannot do anything with the amount of loan received from the co-operatives. They do not get the requisite amount and they do not get it at the appropriate time, and so default repayment and the loan has to be realised by snatching away bullocks and even seedlings from the farmers. This is how the co-operatives or the co-operative banks are advancing the cause of agriculture and the developments of rural economy. Therefore, Sir, I feel that the policy of advancing loans through the co-operatives should be changed and a new system should be developed so that the agriculturists get the requisite amount of loan and also in time, in time of their need and utilise it properly and repay the same in time. *(Time bell rings)* . . . Only two minutes more and I will finish, Sir.

Sir, in our agriculture, four types of people are engaged (1) The capitalist, (2) the land owners, people who own the land, but do not actually till it; (3) the share-croppers, people who have no land, but who are the actual tillers, tillers of others' lands, and (4) the agricultural labourers. Now, Sir, the first two categories of people do not till the land, but get the major share of the produce and the other two categories of pe-

ople are the persons who actually till the land and they are the people who can develop our agriculture and they are the persons who can increase our agricultural production. But the policy adopted by our Government can little motivate these people to just work for increasing production, because if they work and if production increases, a major share of the increased production will be taken away by the capitalists and the land-owning class and they will be left with little and so, Sir, they are not at all interested in increasing the production. Therefore, Sir, the main problem of our agriculture is how to motivate these share-croppers and the agricultural labourers for working for increased production in the agricultural sector. This will be possible only when the steps proposed by the Central Government now are taken. They are trying to introduce land ceiling, maximum ceiling on land and this has to be enforced in all the States. Sir, some of the State Governments may not be very much co-operative with the Central Government in the matter of enforcement of the ceiling laws and also, Sir, some of the States may not be interested in amending the existing laws for reducing the ceiling. The Central Government, therefore, should devise means or find out a way for enforcing these ceiling laws, even if a hostile Government is there, unless this is done, the whole thing will not be effective. . . *(Time bell rings)* Just a minute, Sir.

Lastly, Sir in the Report, crash programme has been referred to. It was a very important programme. It was announced on the basis of the policy of our Prime Minister, of *garibi hatao*, for creation of employment for the village people. But, Sir, though the Report says under the Crash Programme for Rural Employment that about 875 lakh man-days of employment are expected to be created during the full year through the implementation of schemes of land development, reclamation, drainage, minor irrigation, soil conservation, afforestation, road building, etc.—it is really a very nice plan—but it is only on paper. In the practical field—I have come from the field—I know what is happening. Our people who are in charge of executing this *garibi hatao* programme. Block Development Officers and Panchayats, seldom realise the spirit in which this programme has been taken up by the Government and actually

they utilize this money for their selfish ends and just to provide employment to their own men and to do local village politics. The amount sanctioned for the purpose has been misused in bogus unproductive projects. This programme is a total failure. Very few persons get employment in the true sense of the term under this programme. So I will request the Minister to make an enquiry about the execution of this crash programme and decide on the course of action so that in future some good programmes are not spoiled by our people who are actually executing things in the fields.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Dr. Ramiah.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI . How long have we to sit ? It is about six

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN . There are three speakers more.

DR K RAMIAH (Nominated) : Sir, I am not a politician. All my life I have been an active worker in the proverbial sense, and trying to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before. I can only say things as I see them and not take the black side of things.

Mr Shinde has already referred to some of the points which I wanted to deal with. But still I do appreciate that some tangible results have come out of the work of the Ministry during the last two or three years.

There are some in the country even today who say that our increased production is the result of two or three of good agricultural seasons. But the actual results which we are enjoying at present have come out of the programmes of research and development that were planned and started about six or seven years ago. The actual increase in food production from 95 million tonnes to 108 million tonnes during the last three years and of 96 million tonnes from 83 million tonnes of cereals alone is no mean achievement. The evolution of the high yielding varieties was the result of All-India crop coordinated breeding schemes, in the initiation of which I had a small share myself.

That was done about 7 or 8 years ago. We have so far evolved a large number of new varieties and understood the agronomy requirements and the technique of growing them and we have also found out how the pests and diseases which attack these plants can be met. I was really sorry when some Member said that we are just doing what the Americans are telling us. I think though initially we did import some material from outside, so far as rice is concerned, there are present nearly 17 new varieties released by the All India Coordination Scheme. Only three out of this 16, are the ones imported from the International Rice Research Institute, and to say that we are just copying what some-body shows us to do is an insult to the Indian Scientific talent available in the country. Of course the tremendous increase that has occurred in the production of wheat which has almost doubled in the course of 4 or 5 years is not to be seen to the same spectacular extent in the case of rice. The reasons are obvious. Rice in India is mainly a monsoon crop where as wheat is a rabi crop, grown in a cool season and comparatively free from insects and diseases whereas in the monsoon season the improved varieties of rice suffer badly most by the incidence of diseases and pests. In rice the same variety grown in summer is comparatively free from pests and gives a higher yield. We now have some improved varieties which have given 5 or 6 tonnes of paddy per hectare.

We all know about the Plan type, that has been responsible for higher production. This type was identified accidentally by a Chinese breeder in Taiwan and it was imported to India through the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines. It has been found as a result of the work in the last 4 or 5 years that so long as we use the imported material as the parent in hybridization, we cannot get rid of the susceptibility of the progeny to two important diseases, the bacterial leaf blight and the Tungro virus. Fortunately expensive survey made in India itself particularly in the North East region which has never been surveyed before, has given us some breeding material which are as good as the imported material, and I am sure the breeders in the All India scheme will be able to release some new varieties which in addition to the yield will also carry the resistance to the diseases. Another important thing so far

as rice is concerned was that the new varieties originally bred in this country or introduced were not acceptable to the consumer. The grain was some what large and coarse. Now out of the 16 new varieties, nearly 10 have fine grain and very much acceptable to the trade and also to the housewife. Incidentally some effort is also being made, I find from the report to improve the protein content and the cooking

quality in the new rice varieties
6 P. M. In addition to the evolution of these varieties I find from the Report considerable knowledge has been accumulated as to what varieties should be grown in particular regions, the particular seasons they are suitable for, how much of the fertiliser that should be used, and at what stage, and so on. That all this new knowledge has come out of the coordinated schemes, is noteworthy.

There is the criticism that the so called green revolution has only benefited farmers of large and medium size holdings and has not reached the small farmer, I think the Ministry is fully alive to it and hence the initiation of a large number of new schemes, crash programmes for marginal farmers and labourers, schemes for small farmers, dry farming schemes etc. These schemes started last year, had not made much headway, but recently they appear to have made good progress in some States and could be extended to more areas.

One thing that has to be remembered is that these programmes are expected not only to benefit the small farmers but, also to meet the problem of rural unemployment.

A lot of discussion has already taken place about land reforms and I do not wish to deal with it but I find there is one important land reform to which attention has not been paid. I am referring to consolidation of holdings. It is only in some States like Punjab and Maharashtra...

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV : Uttar Pradesh also.

DR. K. RAMIAH : .. and parts of Uttar Pradesh the problem has been tackled.

So far as I know in the southern and eastern States consolidation of agricultural holdings has received no attention. Not only the holding is small but often even this area is cut up into several bits with the result that the efficiency of cultivation is very much reduced.

(Time-bell rings).

Just one or two more points. I think some years ago there was this complaint that the results of research are not reaching the farmers quickly. The country knows that the community development programme was started on a very large scale throughout the country, but experience has shown that so far as agriculture is concerned, the results have not been as tangible as were expected. Particularly when research is getting intensified and new technology is developing fast we need a more trained worker who would be able to teach the farmer what he should do under particular conditions about the varieties of crops about the application of fertilizer about the control of diseases and pests etc. In fact it is being considered that the village level worker is not sufficiently equipped to do this job and he should ultimately be replaced by a graduate. But whether the country can afford this change remains to be seen. Often the question of price of agricultural produce comes up for discussion. It is true that a successful farmer has to get a remunerative price for what he produces. There has been the Agricultural Prices Commission and recently there was a suggestion that the procurement price of wheat should be reduced. Unfortunately, it did not meet with the approval of the farmers. But there should be some price incentive for the farmer to be able to grow new crops or to go in for a large amount of inputs and to increase his production. We should at the same time see that the price agreed to does suit the consumer. So, price guarantee is absolutely necessary. Let me give an example. Three years ago there was a complaint that the sugarcane growers were not getting a proper price for the cane, and Rs. 10/- per quintal was recommended. At that time sugar was selling at about Rs. 2.10 per kilo. in the open market and at about Rs. 1.50 per kilo. in the controlled market. What has been happening now? The price of cane has been reduced, to Rs. 8.50 per quintal, while the controlled price of sugar is Rs. 2/- and the open market price is about Rs. 3.50

[Dr. K. Ramiah]

Thus the farmer is getting less for his cane and the consumer pays more for the sugar. It is such anomalies that create some disbelief in the actions and policies of the Government. I do hope that these points will receive the attention they deserve.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : माननीय उप-सभापति जी, अभी जो बहस हो रही है इस सिलसिले में शिन्दे साहब ने जिन बातों की तरफ इशारा किया उसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती, यह सही है कि उत्पादन में वृद्धि हुई है और उसका श्रेय, चाहे जिस भी प्रकार से वृद्धि हुई हो, सरकार को है, जिन बातों की तरफ उन्होंने इशारा किया उनको छोड़ते हुये केवल दो बातों की तरफ सरकार का ध्यान आपके द्वारा दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

पहला, चीनी उत्पादन और चीनी मिलों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का सवाल है। चीनी उत्पादन के, चीनी के, मामले में जिस प्रकार की नीति भारत सरकार साल ब साल बनाते हुये तदर्थ रूप में चल रही है वह मैं समझता हूँ कि गन्ना उत्पादन में और चीनी के उत्पादन में, दोनों में, हानि पहुँचा रही है। इसलिये इस सम्बन्ध में एक अंतिम तरीके से कोई स्थायी रूप से लागू रेंज पालिसी निर्धारित होनी चाहिये जिससे कि गन्ना-उत्पादन में वृद्धि हो सके, उसका क्षेत्रफल बढ़ सके और चीनी का उत्पादन भी बढ़ सके। मान्यवर, जब जोत की सीमा, जोत की हदबन्दी, की जा रही है तो इस बात का अंदेश होता है कि अगर किसानों को गन्ने का मूल्य कम मिलता रहेगा तो फिर गन्ने का उत्पादन देश में घटेगा उसका नतीजा होगा कि चीनी का उत्पादन घटेगा, इस तरफ भी सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये। मान्यवर, कई इक्वायरी कमिशन बैठे, 1964 ई० में टेरिफ कमिशन ने और 1969 में भी जो कमिशन बैठा उसने सिफा-

रिश की थी कि गुड का भी बफर स्टॉक रखा जाना चाहिये और गुड की खरीद के लिये एक समर्थन मूल्य निर्धारित होना चाहिये। इसकी तरफ सरकार ने कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसको करना चाहिये जिससे कि गुड उत्पादन में भी वृद्धि हो सके और अगर मिले गन्ने का उचित मूल्य नहीं दें, जितना मिलना चाहिये उतना नहीं दे, तो किसान गुड का उत्पादन कर के अपना काम चला सकता है और इससे गन्ने का क्षेत्रफल भी नहीं घटेगा। तीसरी बात इस सम्बन्ध में यह है कि गन्ने का जो मूल्य है वह सारे देश में मिलो पर बहुत बकाया है। जो हमारे पास फिगर्स हैं उससे 30 सितम्बर 1971 को 16.85 करोड़ रुपया चीनीमिलों पर बकाया था और उसमें सबसे अधिक प्रतिशत अगर देखा जाय तो 80.63 प्रतिशत उड़ीसा में है और 12.46 प्रतिशत तामिलनाडु में और उसके बाद उत्तर प्रदेश में, पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में 10.4 प्रतिशत है, इतना बकाया किसानों का पड़ा हुआ है और उसकी उगाही के लिये सरकार कोई प्रभावकारी कदम नहीं उठाया। इसी सिलसिले में अन्तिम बात कहते हुये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ...

कृषि मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (प्रो० शर सिंह) : बहुत पुरानी बात है।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : सितम्बर 1971 की बात मैं कह रहा हूँ।

प्रो० शेर सिंह : उसके बाद बहुत कुछ हुआ।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : जो फिगर आपकी किताब में है वही मैं दे रहा हूँ।

मान्यवर, आखिरी बात मैं इस सिलसिले में कहना चाहता हूँ कि चीनी मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण क्यों नहीं हुआ, उसका कोई जवाब सतोष-प्रद ढंग से आज सरकार की तरफ से नहीं दिया।

जा सकता। जब बम्बई में कांग्रेस अधिवेशन हुआ तब आपने उत्तर प्रदेश की चीनी मिलों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का एक प्रस्ताव सर्वसम्मति से पास किया और उस प्रस्ताव को पेश करने वाले आज पिछले एक साल से उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री हैं, फिर भी, जब कि प्रदेश में उनकी सरकार है, प्रस्तावक महोदय वहां मौजूद है, केन्द्र में उनकी सरकार है, उनकी सरकार चीनी मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं करती। कोई कारण नहीं कि चीनी मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण न किया जाए, इसका कोई समुचित आधार नहीं है और माननीय मंत्री जी अपने जवाब में इस बात को स्पष्ट करें कि आखिरकार उनकी नीति क्या है। अगर इस तरह से शुगर इन्क्वायरी कमीशन बैठा कर उस मसले को टाला है, नहीं कुछ करना है, तो बात दूसरी है। हमें तो यही लगता है कि एक राजनैतिक हथकंडा आपने अपनाया, दूसरे विरोधी दलों को नीचा दिखलाने के लिए यह नारा दिया। आप वास्तव में तब भी समझते थे और आज भी समझते हैं कि चीनी मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण आप नहीं चाहते इसलिए हीला-हुवाली करके देश को गुमराह करने के लिए था राजनैतिक लाभ उठाने के लिए यह प्रस्ताव पास किया गया।

दूसरी बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ खेती के ज्ञान प्रसार के सिलसिले में पंचायतों का, विकास खंडों का, निर्माण हुआ। इस समय विकास खंड और गांव सभाएं दो या तीन स्तर की हैं, किन्हीं स्टेट्स में 4 स्तर की पंचायतें हैं जहां चुनाव होते हैं। मैंने देखा कि अग्रिकलचर कमीशन की तरफ से सुझाव दिया गया गया है कि इन पंचायतों का चुनाव स्थगित कर दिया जाय, तो सरकार इस पर क्या निर्णय करने जा रही है? यह इसलिए जरूरी है क्योंकि चुनाव बड़ी तेजी से प्रदेशों में चल रहे हैं और इस तरह की बात से लोगों में भ्रम फैलता है। आखिर ये चुनाव होंगे या विकास खंडों को हो बदलने जा रहे हैं? मेरे खयाल से जिस

प्रकार से काम उन्होंने किया है, उसमें किसी परिवर्तन की इस समय आवश्यकता नहीं है, वरना जो काम हो रहा है उसमें बाधा पड़ेगी और कठिनाई पैदा होगी।

आखिरी बात जिस पर काफी चर्चा हुई, शायद माननीय मंत्री जी उसका जवाब भी देंगे, वह है जोत की हदबंदी इसके लिए लैन्ड रिफार्म्स कमेटी ने सुझाव दिए, मैं समझता हूँ उसका आधार जो आपने निर्धारित किया है वह बिलकुल लचर है, अनिश्चित है, अधूरा है, और विभिन्न काल, देश, स्थान और व्यक्ति को दृष्टि में रखते हुए उसके विभिन्न अर्थ लगाए जाएंगे। कोई वैज्ञानिक आधार आपने नहीं दिया कि किस आधार पर ये सीलिंग आप रखने जा रहे हैं। आपने रखा कि बारहमासी सिंचाई की भूमि जो दो फसल दे सकती है। वह सिंचाई की भूमि सरकार के द्वारा सिंचित हो या प्राइवेट रूप से हो, यह मतभेद आपकी पार्टी में उठा है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ, जो सिंचित भूमि को ग्राम तौर से देश के किसान समझते हैं, उसका अर्थ एक ही है कि सरकार के साधनों के द्वारा सिंचित भूमि। कोई दूसरा अर्थ नहीं होता। सरकारी साधन की सिंचित भूमि जो है, अगर आंकड़े देखे जाएं, तो उसमें 2 फसल के लिए सरकारी साधनों से सिंचाई नहीं मिलती है और अगर दूसरी फसल काश्तकार बो देता है तो उसको नोटिम मिल जाता है कि सिंचाई नहीं हो सकती है। पंजाब में जहां पर दो-फसली है, उसके आंकड़े उपलब्ध हैं कि कितनी फसल हुई। वह इस प्रकार है—गुरदासपुर 149 परसेन्ट, अमृतसर 147 परसेन्ट, कपूरथला 118 परसेन्ट, जालंधर 137 परसेन्ट, होशियापुर 137 परसेन्ट, रोपड़ 148 परसेन्ट, लुधियाना 153 परसेन्ट, फीरोजपुर 127 परसेन्ट, भटिण्डा 132 परसेन्ट, संगरूर 144 परसेन्ट, पटियाला 130 परसेन्ट। किसी जिले में 200 प्रतिशत फसल नहीं हो पाती है या साल में दो फसल नहीं होती। लियाजा यह कहना दो-

[श्री श्याम लाल यादव]

फसली हो, सिचाई हो, ऐसी कोई भूमि नहीं निकलेगी और कानून के मातहत इसपर फसला होने लगेगा तो जो लोग प्रभावी होंगे वे तो इसका फायदा उठा लेंगे और फिर हमारा रेवेन्यू डिपार्टमेंट का अधिकारी इसका फसला करेगा, इसका लाभ उठाएगा। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ, इस कदर लचर आधार रखा है—बारह-मासी सिचाई दो फसल का—उसमें कामयाबी नहीं हो सकती है। जो तरीका पिछले जमाने में किन्हीं प्रदेशों में लागू किया गया, खास कर उत्तर प्रदेश में, कि जो भूमि की किस्म हो, क्वालिटी आफ लैंड हो, जो पिछले सेंट्रलसन्ट निर्धारित हुई है उसको आधार मान कर चलते तो मैं समझता एक निश्चित आइडिया, एक निश्चित बात, किसान को मालूम होती, आपको भी मालूम होती जिसके आधार पर सीमाबंदी की जानी चाहिए। उत्तर प्रदेश में चकबन्दी के सिलसिले में तो सारे गांवों के लोग इकट्ठा हो कर जमीन की कीमत लगाए हैं जो ठोस आधार हो सकता है। सिंचित जमीन निर्धारित करते वक्त यह भी कहा जा सकता है कि आज जिस जमीन की सिचाई नहीं हो रही, कल उसकी सिचाई हो सकती है। यह जरूरी नहीं है कि जो आज खराब भूमि है वह सिंचित होने मात्र से अच्छी भूमि में परिणत हो जाए। इसलिए सारे आधार को आपको बदलना चाहिए और एक निश्चित ढंग से आधार रखना चाहिए, हर प्रदेश, हर व्यक्ति, हर काल के संबंध में एक-रूपता रखे। यह सिचाई की भूमि की जो भाषा है इससे बराबर किसानों को असुविधा होगी और मैं समझता हूँ, इस कानून की तहत किसानों की लूट होगी। आपने दूसरी श्रेणी निर्धारित करने के लिए रखा है कि भूमि के परिवर्तन अनुपात का निर्धारण, उसमें पानी की उपलब्धि, उत्पादकता, मृदा वर्गीकरण, उगाई जाने वाली फसलों आदि के आधार पर किया जायेगा। आप स्वयं ही, जो सिफारिश है उसके मुताबिक मानते हैं कि भूमि की सीमा को

निर्धारित करने का जो आधार होगा वह एक तरफ उसका सिंचित होना है और दूसरी तरफ जमीन की जो क्वालिटी है, जो विशेषता है, जो उसकी कैफियत है, उसको आधार माना है। इस तरह से आपने जो दो तरीके अपनाये हैं उससे किसानों पर घोर अन्याय होगा। इस चीज से जमीन निकलने वाली नहीं है।

अन्तिम बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस जमीन के कानून को रिट्रोस्पेक्टिव तरीके से लागू किया जायेगा। मान्यवर, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बात गैर मुनासिब होगी। एक तो संविधान द्वारा किसी भी विधान सभा को या पालियामेंट को यह अधिकार प्राप्त नहीं है कि जो अधिकार एक समय मौजूद थे जिसके तहत किसान या किसी व्यक्ति ने कोई कार्यवाही की है उस अधिकार को बाद में रिट्रोस्पेक्टिव तरीके से कानून लगा कर छीन लें। इस प्रकार की बात नहीं हो सकती है कि किसी मंत्री ने कोई बयान दे दिया तो वह कानून हो जायेगा। इस तरह से तो जो हमारी विधान सभाएं हैं, पालियामेंट है और कोर्ट है, वे सब निरर्थक हो जायेगी। इसके कोई मानें नहीं हो सकते हैं कि किसी मंत्री ने कोई बयान दे दिया और वह कानून बन गया। ऐसा जनतंत्र में संभव नहीं है।

एक अंतिम बात मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अभी उत्तर प्रदेश में फालतू जमीन की मूल्य निर्धारण करने के सम्बन्ध में बिल पेश हुआ है उसमें अर्बन सीलिंग के लिए मार्केट वेल्यू का 75 प्रतिशत दिया जायेगा और गांव की जमीन का मूल्य रेट सर्किल का 80 गुना रखा है। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि 10% ही देंगे अगर आप गांव की जमीन को लेते हैं। शहर की जब जमीन लेंगे तो उसके लिए 75 प्रतिशत देगे। मैं समझता हूँ यह किसानों के साथ अन्याय होगा।

अन्तिम बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि

इस प्रकार से सीलिंग लगाने से सरकार के पास पास कोई जमीन आने वाली नहीं है। जो पिछला तजुर्बा है उसको ध्यान में रखते हुए आप बतलायें कि पिछली बात जिन स्टेटों ने सीलिंग लगाई थी वहां पर कितनी जमीन मिली थी क्योंकि इस चीज का तो आप के पास पक्का रिकार्ड होगा। अब आप फिर सीलिंग लगा कर जमीन इकट्ठा करने की बात कर रहे हैं तो इस तरह से जमीन इकट्ठा होने वाली नहीं है। इससे न लोगों की जमीन की भूख मिटने वाली है और न ही इससे गांव में बेकारी ही दूर होने वाली है। अगर आप को गांव में बेकारी दूर करना है तो आप वहां पर उद्योगधन्धे खोलें, कारखाने लगायें, ट्रांसपोर्ट बढ़ाये जिससे लोग खेती से हटकर दूसरे धन्धों में लग जायें। अगर आप इस तरह की बात करते हैं तब ही देश में गरीबी हटेगी और लोगों को काम मिलेगा तथा गांव वालों को काम मिलेगा। इस तरह से जमीन बांटने का जो आप का तरीका है वह एक राजनैतिक नास्ता है और इस तरह से गांव में उथल-पुथल मचा कर आप को ज्यादा फायदा होने वाला नहीं है।

एक अंतिम बात आप ध्यान में रखें कि दुनिया में कहीं भी समाजवाद किसानों के जरिये नहीं आया है। इंडस्ट्रियल लेबर और आर्गनाइज्ड लेबर से ही देश में समाजवाद आ सकता है और लड़ा गया है। किसानों की जमीन छीनकर, जैसा कि अभी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लीडर ने कहा है सरकारी खेती कलेक्टिव फार्म की खेती कराने का विचार सरकार का प्रतीत होता है और इस प्रकार जोत की हदबन्दी करके अवैज्ञानिक तरीके से आप बिना किसी आधार के यह कार्य करना चाहते हैं तो आप को इसमें सफलता मिलने वाली नहीं है। इस चीज से गांव में अव्यवस्था फैल जायेगी और सहकारी खेती को किसी तरह का प्रोत्साहन नहीं मिलना चाहिये।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Sardar Amjad Ali.

SARDAR AMJAD ALI (West Bengal) : Sir, I have forgone for my friend, Mr. Choudhury. So, let the hon. Minister reply.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am indeed grateful to the hon. Members who have made observations and suggestions on the discussion of the Annual Report of my Ministry. Sir, as you know, agriculture is one of the largest sectors of our economy and therefore any change the socio-economic structure of agriculture is likely to have an effect on our national life. Therefore, I share the concern of the hon. Members in discussing the subject and in giving their valuable suggestions. I am also grateful to the hon. Members who have tendered me advice for submitting my resignation.

SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE : Unsolicited advice.

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : The only thing that I can tell them is, it is the privilege of the hon. Members to make any observation and they can take advantage of that privilege and I will be the last person to deny them the pleasure they derive by making such an observation. I am also grateful to my colleague, Shri Shinde, for giving me the credit of all the improvements which have been made in this Ministry. The only thing I would like to point out is that we should not do so. I do not want to take that credit. I want to make it clear that if any improvement has been made in my Ministry, it is due to the effort put in by the farmer, the work put in by the scientist and the co-ordination brought about by the main Ministry with the I.C.A.R. It is the effect of all this co-ordination and effort that some improvement has been made. It is not a question of only one person taking credit while depriving those who really deserve such credit.

Since the time at my disposal is very short, I would briefly touch upon one or two important matters which have been discussed during the course of this discussion. So far as the question of land reform is concerned unnecessarily a controversy was

[Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed]

raised as a result of which implementation of land reform is being delayed. But on account of this controversy, because it came to the forefront, we consider it necessary that all the points regarding which doubts exist should be clarified so that we may be able to implement land reforms as soon as possible. Therefore, the land Reforms Committee, while considering the question whether the land irrigated through Government source should be at par with the land irrigated through private source thought that it would be better that while taking the decision the Chief Ministers and the States are involved so that *uniformity may be brought about and the reform may be implemented accordingly*. That is why the decision has been postponed till the next meeting of the Chief Ministers to be held very soon. I think it will be held at the time of the meeting of the National Development Council towards the end of the month.

Sir, at that time also some doubts were raised with regard to one or two matters, namely whether it would be better and profitable to give the available surplus land to those people who hold uneconomic holdings or to the landless people. That is also a matter which has to be discussed. About that a decision has to be taken.

Another decision that has to be taken is what should be retrospective effect of this ceiling law. These two or three matters are to be discussed in the Chief Ministers' meeting and a decision will be taken there. I have no doubt whatsoever that whatever decision will be taken there, it will be followed up by all the States by bringing in legislation in their States and by implementing the provision of that legislation.

One hon'ble Member went to the extent of doubting the sincerity of our Prime Minister so far as land reforms are concerned. I would only like to emphasise that there is no basis in that allegation. Our Prime Minister is very serious about land reform and she has taken all the action necessary for the purpose of seeing to it that not only the laws are enacted in every State but also laws, after they have been enacted, are implemented properly in all the States as early as possible. I would like to make it very clear there is no such

thing as delaying the land reforms or not being sincere to what we are committed to. And we may take a few days or a month to implement them. We will implement them as early as possible.

Another question which has been raised is about sugar. I share the concern of the hon'ble Members and I share their anxiety also on that account. But I would like to point out that the policy had to be adopted at least to provide relief to the domestic consumer or to those sections of people who were vulnerable. Therefore, it was decided to provide sugar at a lesser price to domestic consumers by reserving 60 per cent of the sugar for distribution through the levy system, through fair-price shops. If it had not been possible to make that arrangement, then the vulnerable section of our community, the domestic consumers, would not have got that much of sugar at such a low price. And only 40 per cent of the sugar was allowed to be sold in the free market. It is true that whatever losses the sugar factories suffered by giving levy sugar at a low price, they tried to make up by charging a higher price for the free sale sugar. Sometimes they even charged much more than they were justified. And for that reason, the matter is engaging our attention and we are considering what long range policy we can adopt so that we can give, on the one hand, a proper price to the sugarcane growers and on the other, we can have a sugar policy which will ensure a sufficient quantity of production of sugar to meet consumption. I may point out in this connection that while the production of sugar has gone down during the past two years, the consumption of sugar has gone up. In 1969-70 our production was about 41 or 42 lakh tonnes. In 1970-71 it was 37 lakh tonnes. We had a fairly good stock on account of the increased production. But this year we are not expecting to get much more than 30 or 31 lakh tonnes, while for our internal consumption alone, we require 39 to 40 lakh tonnes. Therefore, this difficulty has arisen. I hope after the matter has been discussed by us at all levels, with the Planning Commission and with the Finance Ministry, a long range policy will be adopted which will take into consideration the question of providing a fair price to the sugarcane growers and at the same time, we can have increased pro-

tion in future in order to meet internal requirements as well as the requirements of export.

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI : When are you going to take a decision? For the last one month, the prices are going up. There is now a new controversy, the northern prices being different from the southern prices. Some clarification should come from him. Otherwise, tomorrow again the prices will go up.

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : There is no justification for making any difference on the basis of the understanding which has been arrived at with the factories. If there is anything, I shall certainly send for them and see what action can be taken in that behalf. As far as the decision is concerned, it is pending for discussion between the Planning Commission and others and we will be able to reach a decision very soon. Not only the Planning Commission, but the entire Government will be involved in taking a long range view so far as the sugar policy is concerned.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I asked about the northern mill owners asking for a certain price and the southern mill owners asking for a different price. You must put an end to this controversy. What is the use of this controversy?

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : They should stand by the informal arrangement arrived at until the Government takes a decision and adopts a policy in that behalf. If there is any difficulty, I shall look into that matter.

Another point which has been raised is that while there has been increased production in agriculture the benefit of that has gone to the richer section of the farmers.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV : Regarding the nationalisation of sugar mills, what is the policy now?

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : About the sugar mills also, I have made it very clear that so far as the Government is

concerned, we have referred the matter to the Sugar Enquiry Committee and when the report of that committee will be available, we shall be able to take a decision on behalf of the whole of India. We cannot take a decision so far as India is concerned only on the basis of one State asking for it. We have given the freedom to Uttar Pradesh to enact a law if they want to do it. And I think they have taken certain action in that behalf and they have sent a proposal to us which is under examination and it will be sent back to them as early as possible. So far as the question of how to remove the disparity between the rich and the poor farmers is concerned, this is one question which is of great importance to us. That is a matter which cannot be solved in one day. But I would like to point out that we have taken certain actions in that behalf, how we can remove this disparity between the rich farmer and the poor farmer. We have taken a large number of schemes like the small farmers scheme, the marginal farmers scheme, the drought-affected areas scheme, the dry-farming scheme, the crash scheme for unemployment, etc. Through all these schemes the effort is being made in order to remove the disparity and I can assure the honourable Member that once these schemes are fully implemented and are enlarged in future, we shall be able to remove the disparity between the rich farmer and the small farmer to a great extent. And this will be in addition to what action is being taken under the land reforms measures. One thing I would like to point out. This morning I was very sad to hear criticism about our scientists. I would only beg of honourable Members to consider that there may have been some mistakes which might have been committed by one person or the other. But for that reason to condemn the entire group of scientists or the entire organisation, I think, will not be proper and will not be advisable because these scientists will lose heart and they will not be able to put up such good work through which it has been possible for us to take their efforts to the farmers and increase our production. In the interests of the scientists I would ask honourable Members to bear in mind that if there is anything wrong, that will be looked into, but to blame either the Director or any other person without knowing the facts, I think, is neither fair nor just. I would only like to point out that our scientists have

[Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed]

been doing a yeomen service so far as agricultural production is concerned. They have not only found out high yielding varieties in wheat, they have not only found out new varieties of seeds so far as rice is concerned, they have not only found out new varieties so far as cotton is concerned, but they are also engaged in helping us in finding out high yielding varieties of oil seeds for soyabean, for sunflower, etc. In all these efforts they are engaged. And I am sure they are continuing their efforts and it will be possible for us to utilise the fruits of their research and further increase

agricultural production in our country. I thank honourable Members for giving me this opportunity to make these few remarks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned thirty-three minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 11th May, 1972.