

MESSAGES FROM LOK SABHA**I. THE ESTATE DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968****II. THE CENTRAL LAWS (EXTENSION TO JAMMU AND KASHMIR) BILL, 1968**

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

I

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Estate Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1968, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 9th May, 1968.

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

II

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Central Laws (Extension to Jammu and Kashmir) Bill, 1968, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 9th May, 1968." Sir, I lay the Bills on the Table.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION RE. PROCUREMENT PROGRAMME OF FOODGRAINS FOR THE CURRENT YEAR

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Now we take up the Short Duration Discussion under Rule 176. I suggest that the mover has 10 minutes and others seven minutes each.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
मगर पंजाब के बारे में कब होगा क्योंकि स्टे
रिजेक्ट हो गया है।

LOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION (SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE): Have you in mind to allot some time for this discussion?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): That is what I said, ten minutes for the mover and . . .

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: Overall time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): There are ten names before me.

श्री राजनारायण : स्टे की एप्लीकेशन रिजेक्ट हो गई।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भागवत) पहले पता कर लीजिए, आप नहीं थे।

श्री राजनारायण : हम नहीं तो आप बता दीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भागवत) : स्टेटमेंट करेंगे तब आप कहिएगा।

श्री राजनारायण : वही ऐसा न हो कि भूपेश गुप्त का खत्म हो जाय और वह आए ही नहीं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I understand the total time allotted is one hour and thirty minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Short duration is two hours.

Now, I raise this discussion with a view to emphasising the need for procurement of foodgrains by the Government on State Government and Central Government account. This is a very important and crucial question from the point of view of overcoming our dependence on PL 480 and also of maintaining supplies to the various States and through proper machinery to the consumer. Unless we succeed on the procurement side, whatever the production is the food prices will not come down to the extent desirable. Hoarding and profiteering will not be checked and the commitments under rationing, statutory or

modified, we would not be in a position to meet and our quotas to the various States we would not be able to supply. In short the food situation will continue to remain bad and critical despite increased production.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, according to the latest reckoning it appears that production in the current year would be of the order of 95 million tonnes and this means that we shall be short of foodgrains compared to our minimum requirements to the extent of not less than 6 per cent of the total requirements. That is the position. Now this bumper production does not mean that the results that would follow would be equally good unless certain effective steps are taken. In 1964-65 production had gone up by about 8 to 9 million tonnes but in those years the price rose and the foodgrains fell into the hands of profiteers and hoarders. The scarcity areas continued to exist and in general the situation was very bad despite increased production. Therefore we have had the experience that increased production does not by itself mean that food will be available to the consumer or he could be saved from the profiteers and hoarders. Therefore procurement by State and Government agencies is very very important.

We have before us the Food Corporation of India which was started I believe about four years ago with the promise that in no time the target will be fixed at about 7 million tonnes or so but the failure of the Food Corporation of India is too glaring a fact today to need recounting, in recent months there has been a slight improvement but if you take the entire period you will find that the Food Corporation of India has not been able to fulfil what was expected of it. The reasons are these: (1) The State Governments had been resisting the operation of the Food Corporation of India due to pressures on such Governments coming from the hoarders and profiteers and the big landlords. (2) The Central Government

did not show very much initiative in this matter nor did it make funds adequately available to the Food Corporation of India. (3) There was no mechanism or machinery for carrying out large-scale procurement operations. These are some of the factors. Now PL 480 foodgrains have been available. In fact those who are in favour of PL 480 foodgrains are also interested in sabotaging procurement of foodgrains in our country.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): No; that is not true.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Patel says it is not true; I do not know from where he gets his knowledge but if you read the speeches that are made in the United States of America they always make out that if the Government relies on the American food loans the problem is more or less settled. In fact the entire policy is not to hit the vested interests in the rural areas and not to create social complications because PL 480 foodgrains are available. The political implications of the PL 480 foodgrains we must remember. In one of the Congressional debates some Senator got up and said that the PL 480 food deliveries are very essential in order to keep the left out of power in India and they meant not only the left as we understand it here but also the leftist elements who are in the Congress. That is how they view this.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the target was fixed initially for the current year at 7 million tonnes. Then suddenly by the beginning of January it had been reduced to 5 million tonnes. This was the amount to be procured by the Government, Food Corporation of India or otherwise. We are told that the target is five million tonnes but it appears that by January they had not even procured one million tonnes of foodgrains. This is the position. I think by the end of April or so or the beginning of May they will not have succeeded in procuring more than, say, 3.5 million tonnes. I

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] doubt whether they will attain even that figure. Therefore it is quite clear that the bulk of the marketable surplus flows into the hoards and secret stocks which are not available for distribution to the people or to the Government for building up its stock. This is a very serious matter. It is a very serious matter. Take, for example, Bengal. When the United Front Government was there, the Food Corporation of India came to an understanding that the UF Government and the Food Corporation of India would together procure one million tonnes of foodgrains from Bengal and arrangements were accordingly made. In fact, the entire Government was attuned to the task and I had a personal discussion with the Chairman of the Food Corporation of India, Mr. K. T. Chandy. He seemed to have been satisfied by his talk with the UF Government that the Government would take adequate steps and make necessary arrangements for reaching the procurement target of one million tonnes from West Bengal alone. Now, naturally that Government did not suffer from any inhibition because it was not prepared to give any concessions to the vested interests in the rural areas and we were prepared to take the consequences for having taken such action in order to make procurement effective. This was one reason why hurriedly just before the harvesting time the Jotdars conspired to overthrow the West Bengal Government and the Central Government and Mr. Dharma Vira obliged the Jotdars by toppling and dismissing the West Bengal Government in the manner they did. Since then, what has happened? Up till now not even 2,50,000 tonnes of foodgrains have been procured and it has been a failure, although the production is a little higher, certainly much higher than before. I give the West Bengal case on the basis of the official figures given by the present Governor's regime. This I have given as an example. Therefore, the marketable surplus, the bulk of it,

practically the whole of it goes to the blackmarketeer and profiteer, whereas our task should be to make the maximum possible procurement of the marketable surplus. If you study the market arrivals at the big markets you will find that there is a tendency for a decline in the market arrivals, which is an indication that food is passing into the hands of secret hoarders and secret channels and not coming even into the open market. Now, if we allow the opportunity of the bumper year to slip by like this, I do not know what is going to happen. On the contrary, when food production is high, when it has reached a high level, here is the time to gear up procurement and continue procurement all over the States and see that the maximum possible marketable surplus is obtained, procured on Government account. The Reserve Bank and the Government should make funds available and the machinery should be also created. In some cases it is possible for the Government to mobilise the existing small trade machinery under proper Government control, for making procurement. It may not be easy immediately to find new recruits. The Government must know how to utilise the existing machinery, whatever arrangement is there. There they are failing and Mr. Chandy has resigned. I am not particular about any individual, but the statement that has emanated in that connection shows that Mr. Chandy, Chairman of the Food Corporation of India, was dissatisfied with the manner in which things were being handled. He had certain complaints against the State Governments. Some of them have given incorrect figures of their production, lest the Food Corporation should make demands for procurement or lest other States should ask for more food supplies from that particular State. There is a tendency on the part of the so-called surplus States or better-off States to deflate their figures of production. You will be surprised to know that Shri Jagjivan Ram does not like there should

be a general national sample survey of food production, because they make, more or less, a correct picture of production, as far as possible under our statistical data.

THK VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, kindly finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing. Then, what happens? The States give their own figures.

SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE: I have not followed the hon. Member when he says that Mr. Jagjivan Ram does not like any survey. What exactly does he mean?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Jagjivan Ram does not like it and, in fact, the National Sample Survey is not allowed to continue the food survey. Mr. Jagjivan Ram is one of those who would like the National Sample Survey not to undertake this task. Now, you find it out from Mr. Jagjivan Ram. Now the position is this. In a bumper year, when we have got so much production, 95 million tonnes or so, the procurement is not going to be more than 3.5 million tonnes. That shows that procurement is a failure. Even in 1965-66 you had procured 3 million tonnes of foodgrains. Now, the food production is much higher today. Even in a quantitative manner your procurement has not looked up so to say and I have given you some examples. I think that we are letting down the country. Therefore, my suggestion would be that the Food Corporation should be given all help and assistance. There is no doubt about it that there should be a national policy of food procurement and in this matter, if necessary, legislation should be passed. We should aim at the marketable surplus, if possible, the entire marketable surplus. That is not possible I know. The maximum possible marketable surplus should be procured. For that we need to offer reasonable prices, remunerative prices to the peasant. At the same time, we want dehoarding measures

and anti-hoarding measures to be stepped up. We want all kinds of bank advances and other advances to profiteers and speculators stopped altogether. It is very necessary that drastic action be taken against the village Jotdars and landlords, who actually are responsible for hoarding these things. The basis of our procurement should be the willing co-operation of the peasant based on a democratic machinery, and also remunerative prices to the peasant. The present Food Corporation of India is no good. It is no use trying to make out as if it is a great organisation. It should have been great, but today it is not so. There is an internal crisis besides. I do not blame the Food Corporation so much as I would blame the Congress Government here because their policy is not to allow procurement to grow apace and carry out such measures as would make procurement successful. Therefore, I say that, although we have got some bumper crop, some good crop this year, the behaviour of the Government of India is one which does not leave us with much hope. I think drastic measures are here called for.

I do not want to go into other things, except to say that in West Bengal rationing is being given up. Whereas we need modified rationing extended everywhere, there is now decontrol, abandonment and abatement under the existing rationing, statutory and modified. I think we should stick to our commitments under rationing, both modified and statutory, all the more so because we have got more food production today to be garnered into Government stocks. The Government must procure at a higher rate, but this time they seem to have lost. Now, therefore, I say, whatever is there, let them keep. Dehoarding should be started. For the future I think the Government should have a proper policy. I say that our purposes in passing the Bill to set up the Food Corporation of India have not been

(Shri Bhupesh Gupta] fulfilled. Our hopes have been belied because of the tardy policy of the Central Government and of some State Governments, who are submitting constantly to the pressures of the vested interests and who place their party interests, because the party is depending upon the Jotdars and the hoarders in the villages, before the interests of the country. I demand discussion by the Minister of Food with other parties and so on in order to work out a thoroughgoing food procurement policy. There should be a committee also to review the operation of the Food Corporation of India and other similar agencies in order to see that not only a much higher target is fixed, but also the target is fulfilled by concrete measures from week to week and month by month.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): May I request hon. Members to restrict their remarks to seven minutes? Otherwise, the debate will be a very prolonged one.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let there be a prolonged debate.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, this debate arises out of my Starred Question No. 129. In reply to the question regarding the difficulties being faced since the procurement is not as per targets, it is stated—I quote:

"The late start of monsoon last year led to late transplantation of paddy and consequently to delayed harvesting. The political instability and the consequent reluctance particularly of governments composed of several parties to make an all-out effort has been another reason for slow progress of procurement in some of the States. Some damage to crops just before harvest also resulted in procurement not reaching the earlier expectations."

In the context of this reply I believe that a national policy for procurement has become absolutely necessary.

In this country of ours when this year we have produced more than 95 million tonnes of foodgrains, if we just look at some calculations of the *per capita* availability of kilos, we find that with this much of crop of 95 million tonnes each individual, big or small, can have 16 to 17 kilos per head per month. When it is possible to give him that much with this production, what is the need of going ahead with PL 480? When there is that much of production, I am told that about 35 million tonnes may be coming this year from outside. If that is also calculated and taken into account, then one individual will be entitled to have 21 kilos. There are various difficulties, I know that. But with that much of foodgrains, why are you depending still on foreign countries? I feel that our food policy right from procurement to distribution has been failing somewhere, and the time has come for us to think of it seriously.

I feel in this vast country of our* with several States and with such sort of political instability which is bound to continue, nationalisation of foodgrains is the important aspect that shall have to be considered today. Foodgrains cannot be left in the hands of private traders. In that direction this trade shall have to be nationalised.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You consider the Congress Government a political instability?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Sir, I am prepared to answer all these queries provided you are prepared to give me some time; Therefore, my submission is that foodgrains trade shall have to be nationalised. The whole country shall have to be treated as one zone. I do not know why so many zones are being kept in this country. Then every village should also be a zone. Whatever is produced in the country shall have to be equitably distributed. Instead of adopting a national policy and a national approach, unfortunately we

are victims of State laws today. That political instability to which I referred is one of the major causes and hindrances in not having the procurement as per targets that were fixed, rather suggested, by the Agricultural Prices Commission.

Sir, I feel that the present opportunity given to the States is not proper. Even in the decisions of the Chief Ministers' Conference it is stated:

"Methods of procurement should be left to each State Government to decide keeping in view the local conditions and the procurement target suggested by the Agricultural Prices Commission."

I think it is here where the Government has failed. You cannot leave it to the States. Again in para, (ii) it is stated:

"A vigorous procurement drive should be undertaken during the year 1967-68".

You cannot leave the matter in the hands of the States. Therefore, I say that a national policy is called for. We shall have to fix targets. Whatever is produced in the villages should be procured and then it should be equitably distributed throughout the country, treating the whole country as one zone. A scientific and national policy is the need of the day. Without that scientific and national policy it is not possible for any Government to procure and stop imports. Because of PL 480 I have no doubt whatsoever that we have stopped the incentive of the agriculturists. We are not prepared to pay them remunerative prices. This is one more reason. In Punjab, in U.P., in various States, the prices have fallen, and we are not in a position to protect the interests of the poor farmers. When we think of industries, we take into consideration all the cost structure of the industries and industrial production. But when we think of the poor agri-culturist, we are not prepared to pay

him a remunerative price. So, I suggest today that the Government should treat this as a very serious matter. When there is a bumper crop in the country, when it is possible to ban PL 480 imports, why are the Government not utilising that opportunity? If the Government fails, if charges are made by Shri Bhupesh Gupta that in order to protect the interests of those who are having their vested interests in these imports and also protect the interests of these foreigners Government are proceeding on those lines, there can-not be any reply. Therefore, I feel that a national policy banning all the imports of foodgrains and seeing that whatever is produced in the country is equitably distributed, that it is properly procured for distribution, is the only way out. In this direction I urge upon the Government to adopt a fresh policy and see that it is executed and implemented with all determination and courage without giving the least opportunity and without giving the least discretion to the State Governments.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Mr. Vice-Chairman, while I am inclined to agree with some of the remarks of my friend, Mr. Dharia, I say that in his thinking like that of many other Congressmen the confusion that has come in after the Krishna Menon regime has not left him. I am equally inclined to support him and if Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said so, to ban all PL 480 imports, I am also not at all for it. I believe the country has been taken into the habit of what I call walking on crutches since we got the PL 480, and every doctor will tell you that unless you throw away the crutches, which may be necessary under certain circumstances, you cannot become self-reliant and independent of them. This country unfortunately has got into that habit because of certain difficult circumstances when we were faced with food shortage, and vested interests of several types came into being as a result of the large im-

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

ports, the importers, the distributors and the rationing staff.

Sir, I come from Bombay, The Bombay Government have been ruthless in many matters. They were ruthless in exacting from people and taking away people's rooms where they used to stay for 15 years or 20 years. For whom? For the rationing employees, for people who were temporary, essential employees. Those permanent residents were thrown out to make room for rationing employees. This was the evil that came with PL 480. This continues. These rationing staff have got rooms which Government gave them because of this policy, and now they have their jobs also to continue. If you stop PL 480, what will they ration? This is not the proper approach. The proper approach is to strengthen the farmers and to strengthen the farm economy of our country.

A few days earlier I have been going round in Punjab and in Har-yana and I saw before me the most lovely sight of a bumper crop. This morning's paper gives news side by side which is a warning to Government. Punjab has been using tractors but some of the agriculturists have not been told of the dangers and as a result of the faulty use or improper maintenance the carbon that comes out of the tractor causes fires and a lot of crop is being destroyed. There may be several other reasons why what the farmer has got due to a lot of labour is not kept. Procurement is not the remedy. The remedy is to educate the farmers, the remedy is to help the farmers to build reserves, to give them proper godowns, if godowns are necessary. I would personally think the better method will be to help them to store as they used to in large earthen, pots that we were used to seeing in the older days.

I have seen them in my times, I do not know whether the present generation has seen them—huge

earthen pots where a man even can enter into, and these pots keep the grains free for years. No germs come. That is a natural way of preserving foodgrains. I do say that in certain cities we may have to go in for mechanical storage, for a proper type of modern storage. But that is not the remedy for the farmer. And this country is not a country of cities yet, they may come up in future; this is to-day a country of villages and the economy of this country must be geared to the village and the farmer. And unless we give strength to the farmer, our economy will not be improved. It is this Congress Government under Mr. Krishna Menons' regime that refused to listen to me and several others who told them to import knowledge from Taiwan and from Israel and improve our crops. Necessity has forced them and now they are learning. They do not care to admit it; they do not say a word of thanks even to Taiwan for giving them the seed. But that is actually what has helped them to improve production. And I am glad that Government has learnt the lesson. At least the people of this country have now something to eat after they have learnt this thing. They have learnt it the costly way. Let them not throw it away. Let us hope that this is not the only one year when we have a bumper crop but that this is the beginning of a series of years when we will have bumper crop one year after another so that we will not have to rely upon PL 480 imports or any imports at all. That is what should be our aim. I am One with our friends in this matter and for that, the first thing, the first necessity, is that the farmer should get a better price. What is the impediment? The impediment is that the Government has introduced the food zones. Unless you remove the zones, the farmer is not going to get a better price. Punjab was not getting a good price until you made the zone larger. Today wheat is being offered in Bhopal and other places at a price of Rs. 70 or Rs. 80. But the same wheat, when it goes to

the market in Bombay, is Rs. 250. Why? It is because at every city corner, at every village corner, there is the police, there is the patil, there is the *patwari*. He has to be paid money so that the truck is allowed to go. It is this corruption that is taking the life out of our people; it is this corruption at every stage that is making food impossible to get and that is driving food go underground. And the remedy is to remove the impediment or the means through which corruption comes and the means is the zone. The zones must be scrapped. I am glad that Mr. Dharia has emphasised that point. This country must be one zone and when you do that, by a natural process, food will go to the places where there is a shortage. Today it is prevented. Who is preventing it? It is the Government. While Prime Minister Nehru always called the merchants hoarders, profiteers and blackmarketeers, today the Government is the biggest profiteer and hoarder and blackmarketeer of this country in every way. And then what happens? Money is wasted and ultimately we see every year that the annual Budget shows how much money goes to waste from Government's hands. At least Government should learn these things. If money can be wasted, it can be recovered by taxation. But if food-grains once produced are not preserved and if they are not properly used, they will not stand indefinitely. They are neither metal nor paper that can be put away or stored; foodgrains must be distributed. They can be kept for two years or three years but they must be used. And the method should be to produce them every year more and more so that the rotation goes on and we have a stock which is needed in case of any difficulty, in case of any shortage in certain areas so that it would come in handy to be sent to those areas. That is how the rural economy of this country can be "kept up."

I am sorry, I cannot agree with all that my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta,

said about West Bengal and the United Front Ministry. The United Front Ministry looted or allowed to be looted crops of the farmers. Under whatever name you call it, I hope we will have no more of this Gherao Ministry; I hope there is an end of it; I hope there is an end of looting of the standing crops of foodgrains under different names. If you loot the crop of foodgrains, who is going to grow crops again? If you do not grow crops, where will this country be? What will you eat? You can preach any sermon. But that is not the thing.

My friend, Mr. Sheel Bhadra Yajee, was talking of Rajahs and Jagirdars. I would like him to come to his own State of Bihar and see how many jagirs, Congress jagirs, still exist there. Mr. Morarji Desai enforced a ceiling on holdings in Gujarat strictly and now you will not find people with large holdings. We had never big zamindars in Gujarat; they were hardly one or two per cent of the people with no hundred acres. But in Bihar and UP, what about those big zamindars? Will any Congressman tell me with his hand on his conscience that he does not have a finger in the Bettiah Estate? The Bettiah Estate was a big zamindari in Bihar. Be honest to your people and tell them that it is because of your fault that food production is falling and we are short of food. Correct your mistakes. Give land to the tiller. And we will be one with you if you can and if you mean to do it honestly. Only if you allow the agriculturist to become strong, will he produce enough, more than enough, and then you will have a natural surplus and you will not have to talk of these artificial means of saving the food-grains, of storing them by artificial methods that you see in the West. I think that the best source of supplying and saving would be for the Government to rely on the agriculturist, to encourage him to produce more and to save the crops.

Thank you.

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज समय आ गया है कि भारत सरकार को अपनी खाद्य नीति, प्रोक्योरमेंट और आयात नीति के संबंध में पूरे तौर से विचार करना चाहिये। इन पांच छः वर्षों में, विशेष तौर से कई बार इन विषयों में बातें हुईं। पर लगता है कि भारत सरकार के मन में यह बात बैठ गई है कि जब तक वह अधिक से अधिक इम्पोर्ट न करे, अधिक से अधिक आयात न करे, तब तक शायद वह खाद्य स्थिति का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकती है। बहरहाल जो कुछ हुआ, लेकिन आज की जो परिवर्तित स्थिति है जबकि इस वर्ष बम्पर क्राप की बात सरकार को मालूम है, ऐसी स्थिति में कम से कम कुछ प्रोक्योरमेंट, इम्पोर्ट पालिसी के बारे में, राशनिंग के बारे में और डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन के बारे में पुनर्विचार करना चाहिये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने आंकड़े देखने की कोशिश की है और मुझे यह लगता है कि कंट्रोल, जोन्स और इम्पोर्ट का कुछ सीधा संबंध है। मेरे पास कुछ आंकड़े हैं। 1954-55 में जब कि कंट्रोल नहीं था, उस समय करीब-करीब 10 मिलियन टन गल्ला पैदा हुआ था और उस साल केवल 8 या 9 लाख टन गल्ला बाहर से मंगाया गया। 1964-65 में, जब जोन्स हो गये, कंट्रोल लगा दिया गया, रेस्ट्रिक्शन लगा दिये गये और जब कि 87 मिलियन टन गल्ला पैदा हुआ था यानी सूखे के पहले सबसे अधिक गल्ला पैदा हुआ था, 27 मिलियन टन गल्ला अधिक पैदा हुआ था 1954-55 के मुकाबले में, तब सरकार ने 75 लाख टन गल्ला इम्पोर्ट किया। यानी गल्ला अधिक पैदा हुआ और इम्पोर्ट अधिक हुआ। आगे आप देखें, जब कि 1966 में सूखे का साल था, तो उस समय 76 लाख टन गल्ला पैदा हुआ, यानी पिछली पैदावार से 11 मिलियन टन कम गल्ला पैदा हुआ, तो उस समय केवल 20 लाख टन गल्ला अधिक इम्पोर्ट किया गया। अब 1967-68 की बात ले लीजिये। इस समय करीब 95

मिलियन टन पैदावार होने की बात की जा रही है और यह आशा पूरी भी होगी। मैं सरकार की इस कोशिश के लिए उसे बधाई देता हूँ और वह बधाई की पात्र भी है। इस साल करीब 70 लाख टन गल्ला मंगाने की बात की जा रही है। इसलिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अब भारत सरकार को अपनी खाद्य नीति के संबंध में पुनर्विचार करना चाहिये कि वह कितने दिनों तक अपने ऊपर डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन और राशनिंग की जिम्मेदारी लेगी। क्या सरकार 7 या 8 मिलियन टन गल्ला प्रोक्योर कर सकेगी। अभी तक की फिगर्स तो मुझे मालूम नहीं है, लेकिन जहाँ तक मुझे पता चलता है वह 3 मिलियन टन से ज्यादा प्रोक्योरमेंट नहीं कर सकी है। वह ज्यादा प्रोक्योरमेंट नहीं कर पा रही है। दूसरी ओर राज्यों में चले जाइये, उत्तर प्रदेश में चले जाइये, आज वहाँ पर यह दुर्दशा है कि भारत सरकार ने जब यह एनाउन्स कर दिया है कि वह 70 और 80 हजार विवन्टल गेहूँ किसान से ले लेगी लेकिन बाजार में गल्ला आ रहा है और उसका कोई लेने वाला नहीं है।

टुडर्स इस डर से उसको नहीं ले रहे हैं कि शायद दाम ऊँचे न जायें। उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार कह रही है कि हमारे पास गोदाम नहीं हैं और इसलिये हम नहीं ले रहे हैं। केवल अखबारों में हमने यह देखा है कि फूड कारपोरेशन वहाँ जाने वाला है। प्रांतों को गल्ला देने की जिम्मेदारी भारत सरकार की है, लेकिन प्रोक्योरमेंट और प्रोडक्शन की जिम्मेदारी प्रांतीय सरकारों की है। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि अगर गल्ला देने की जिम्मेदारी भारत सरकार अपने ऊपर लेती है तो निश्चय ही प्रोक्योरमेंट की जिम्मेदारी भारत सरकार को लेनी चाहिये। मैं यह जवाब सुनने को तैयार नहीं हूँ कि हमारे पास कोई एजेंसी नहीं है। फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की एजेंसी है। आप उसकी सब एजेंसीज बनाइये और वे जा कर प्रोक्योरमेंट करें।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 95 मिलियन टन प्रोडक्शन है और 30 या 35 मिलियन टन यानी 30 पर सेंट गल्ला सरप्लस हो गया और 30 मिलियन टन गल्ला बाजार में आयेगा। जब बम्पर क्राप है तो आप सपोर्ट प्राइस दे कर के सात मिलियन टन या 10, 12 मिलियन टन प्रोक्योर करते। पिछले साल सूने के समय में 14 मिलियन टन गल्ला राशन शाप्स के जरिये सब जगह बांटा गया। 14 मिलियन टन गल्ला काफी होता है। जब उतना बांटा तब भी 7 मिलियन टन का आपने टारगेट रखा है जिस में से तीन या चार मिलियन टन आयेगा। राशन शाप्स आप तोड़ नहीं रहे हैं जो कि तोड़ देनी चाहिये, लेकिन अगर आप तोड़ते नहीं हैं, उनकी जिम्मेदारी लेते हैं तो आपको पूरी जिम्मेदारी लेनी चाहिये। या तो आप यह कहें कि जोनल डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन सिस्टम खत्म और सारे भारतवर्ष का एक जोन है और फिर आप प्रोक्योरमेंट मत करिये, कोई बात नहीं है, किसान खुद बेचेगा और भुगतेंगा, या आपको उसको सपोर्ट प्राइस देना चाहिये और अधिक से अधिक आपको प्रोक्योरमेंट करना चाहिये।

मैं एक बात उपसभापति महोदय से और कहूंगा, पिछले साल उत्तर प्रदेश में मैंने देखा यह कि जब ज्यादा मंहगाई शुरू हुई तो गल्ला 145 या 150 रु० प्रति क्विंटल बिकता था और बम्बई, महाराष्ट्र में ढाई सौ रु० प्रति क्विंटल बिकता था, तब भी बहुत तेजी हुई प्रोक्योरमेंट में और यह हुआ कि जो किसान लेवी नहीं देगा उसको सजा दी जायगी। वहां संविद सरकार की यही पालिसी थी और लोगों को सजाएं भी हुईं। इस तरह वहां चार पांच लाख टन गल्ला वसूल किया गया। जब किसानों का नुकसान होता था तब भी 85 रु० प्रति क्विंटल के हिसाब से गल्ला खरीदा गया। इस साल जब किसान परेशान हैं और कहता है कि हमसे गल्ला लिया जाय तो कोई वहां जाता नहीं है गल्ला लेने के लिये। क्यों ऐसी पालिसी

भारत सरकार की हो रही है? मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत सरकार को स्वयं इन बातों पर सोचना चाहिये। जो व्यर्थ की जिम्मेदारियां इन्होंने अपने ऊपर ली हैं उनसे या तो ये बरी हो जाय या फिर पूरी जिम्मेदारी लें। आप देखें कुछ स्टेट्स में, केरल ने रिफ्यूज कर दिया है। केरल भारत सरकार से कहता है कि गल्ला लाओ लेकिन हम प्रोक्योरमेंट नहीं करेंगे। केरल का रोज भारत सरकार के पास पत्र आता है कि हमको इतना गल्ला दजिये। अगर जिम्मेदारी भारत सरकार लेती है, प्रोक्योरमेंट की तो पूरे तौर से ले और अगर नहीं लेती है तो बिल्कुल छोड़ दे। मैं बधाई देता हूँ महाराष्ट्र सरकार को, आंध्र सरकार को क्योंकि उन्होंने बहुत अच्छे ढंग से प्रोक्योरमेंट किया है कहीं मानोपली प्रोक्योरमेंट से, कहीं कोआपरेटिव प्रोक्योरमेंट से। उसी तरह से भारत सरकार को प्रोक्योरमेंट के लिये ठीक ढंग से काम करना चाहिये जो आज कहीं नहीं हो रहा है।

आज मुझे लगता है कि करीब करीब तीन, साढ़े तीन मिलियन टन का प्रोक्योरमेंट हुआ है उसमें से एक तिहाई गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया अकाउन्ट में है और दो तिहाई स्टेट गवर्नमेंट अकाउन्ट में हैं। कोई कारण नहीं है कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया का अकाउन्ट न खोला जाय और उसी के माध्यम से सब चीजें की जाय। यह कहते हैं कि हमारे पास गोडाउन्स नहीं हैं और जवाब में आ जाता है कि हमारे पास गोडाउन्स हैं। इन सब बातों पर पूरी तरह से विचार करना होगा और बफर स्टॉक हमें अधिक से अधिक बनाना होगा।

अंत में मैं यह कह कर के बैठूंगा कि मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि अब ऐसा समय आ गया है कि कम से कम भारत सरकार का उद्देश्य यह होना चाहिये कि जितना गल्ला हम जनता को देंगे अपने गोडाउन्स से, उसमें 10 फीसदी या 15 फीसदी इमपोर्टेड होगा और बाकी सभी गल्ला भारतवर्ष

[श्री एच० डा० मिश्र]

का होगा। अगर आप ऐसा निर्णय लें तो इससे किसान भी सुखी रहेंगे और प्रोक्योरमेंट का काम भी ठीक ढंग से होगा। प्रोक्योरमेंट के सम्बन्ध में जो आज भारत सरकार की अर्थकचरी नीति चल रही है उससे किसान भी दुखी है। आज आप खुश हैं कि बम्पर क्राप हुई है, लेकिन हो सकता है कि अगले साल फिर मूसीबत रहे। इसलिये हमारी एक लांग टर्म पालिसी होनी चाहिये। आज डर की भावना ज्यादा है। आज डर यह है कि अगर हम प्रोक्योरमेंट कम कर दें और राशन शापस तोड़ दें तो पता नहीं क्या मूसीबत आ जायगी। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रोक्योरमेंट की पालिसी के सम्बन्ध में कम से कम पुनर्विचार इस वर्ष जरूर होना चाहिये।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, बम्पर, बम्पर सुनते सुनते कान पक गये। अभी तक मैं समझता था कि श्याम धर मिश्र जो बोलेंगे तो हम को कुछ रोशनी मिलेगी। इस समय हमारे मुल्क को कितने गल्ले की जरूरत है, मुल्क में कितना गल्ला है, कितना गल्ला बाहर से आना चाहिये, श्याम धर मिश्र जो ने सही कहा कि इसके कोई आंकड़े भारत सरकार के पास नहीं हैं। 1965, 66 में 9 करोड़ 68 लाख टन गल्ला चाहिये था, 1967, 68 में श्याम धर मिश्र जो कह रहे हैं कि बम्बर क्राप है। 1965, 66 में जितने गल्ले की जरूरत थी उतना इस साल पैदा नहीं हुआ है, कुछ टोटल गल्ले की कमी है। 1965, 66 में 7 करोड़ 59 लाख टन गल्ला कुल पैदा हुआ, 1 करोड़ 5 लाख टन गल्ला कुल बाहर से आया, 8 करोड़ 69 लाख और 9 करोड़ 68 लाख टन गल्ला चाहिये, उसमें करीब सौ लाख टन यानो एक करोड़ टन गल्ला खाने का कम रह गया, भुखमरी आ गई और भुखमरी आई। श्री डाह्याभाई पटेल और श्री श्याम धर मिश्र एक रेस्पेक्ट में सही हैं कि भारत सरकार की प्रोक्योरमेंट की पालिसी ही बिल्कुल गलत है।

श्री डाह्याभाई व० पटेल : ऐग्रीकल्चरल पालिसी गलत है।

श्री राजनारायण : इस सरकार ने न तो कभी अपने देश की जमीन देखी, न कभी इसको देखा कि कितनी जमीन आज खेती के काम में लाई जा सकती है और उस जमीन को तोड़ने के लिये क्या योजना बनाई जा सकती है जब जब कोई सुझाव दिया गया तब तब डा सरकार ने उसको उपेक्षा की। एक हास्यास्पद बात है कि भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्रीजी, श्री नेहरू ऐसा कह गये—श्याम धर मिश्र जो को यद होगा—कि कोई जरूरत नहीं है, जब गल्ले की जरूरत पड़ेगी तो गमले में गेहूं बो लिया जायगा और मकान की छतों पर मिट्टी डाल कर के खेती की जायगी। जब हमने 1943, 49 में सुझाव दिया था कि अन्न सेना बनाई जाय, खेतिहर सेना बनाई जाय, तो अन्न सेना का मज्जाक उड़ाया गया। अब क्या इस बम्बर क्राप के सहारे हम रहें। लगातार हमारी आजादी बढ़ेगी, हमारी अन्न की आवश्यकता बढ़ेगी। नेहरू जी के दिमाग में जो यह बराबर था कि हम अमरीकी गल्ले के भरोसे अपने देश में कभी को पूरा कर लेंगे उससे बराबर इस देश की आजादी को यह सरकार गिरवा रखती चली जा रही है। अन्न मंत्री जो जो इस समय यहां पर हैं वे अगर अपने पुराने आंकड़ों को देखेंगे तो उनको जानकारों के लिये और सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को जानकारों के लिये मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि आरम्भ से इस सरकार को कृषि नीति बिल्कुल ही देशहित विरोधी और जनहित विरोधी रही है। 1950 से जो पंचवर्षीय योजनाएं चलीं उनके विषय में अगर कोई इतिहासज्ञ और जानकार अच्छी तरह से लिखेगा तो यही लिखेगा कि ये पंचवर्षीय योजनाएं पूर्णतः नाकामयाब रहीं। वह अलग विषय है। उसी को तह में यह कृषि नीति है। 1950 से 1955 तक लगातार भारत की सरकार ने प्रतिवर्ष औसत 24 लाख टन गल्ला बाहर से मंगाया, 1955 से 1960

तक लगातार भारत की सरकार ने औसत 31 लाख टन गल्ला प्रतिवर्ष बाहर से मंगाया—हमने पांच साल का औसत निकाल लिया क्योंकि एक साल में कम और एक साल में ज्यादा हो सकता है—1960 से 1965 तक लगातार भारत की सरकार ने 40 लाख टन औसत हर हाल बाहर से मंगाया, इसके बाद 1966 से अब तक एक करोड़ दस लाख टन लगातार प्रतिवर्ष गल्ला बाहर से मंगाया, फिर भी यह सरकार देश की जनता को खिला नहीं पाई। मैं आज भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि कृषि मंत्री महोदय इस देश की जनता को अब भी उधार की ओर ले चलें, पूरे देश में कितनी जमीन इस समय खेती के काम में लाई जा सकती है उस जमीन का समुचित आंकड़ा एकत्र करें और उसके लिए अन्न सेना की भर्ती करें, विशेषकर बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश जैसे राज्यों से, उस जमीन के लिए खाद बीज, पानी का इन्तजाम सरकार अपनी ओर से करे। मैं अब भी समझता हूँ कि देश में इतनी जमीन है और इतनी श्रम-शक्ति बाकी है कि देश की जनता देश के अपने साधनों का प्रयोग करके अन्न की कमी को दूर कर देगी।

दूसरी बात जो कहना चाहता हूँ वह है गल्ला वसूली की नीति के सम्बन्ध में। गल्ला वसूली की नीति कुछ है ही नहीं, इस बारे में मनमानी सरकार कर रही है। किसी नीति पर सरकार नहीं चल रही है, किसी बुनियाद पर नहीं चल रही है। उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में बताऊँ बिहार के बारे में बताऊँ। गत वर्ष सविदा की सरकार ने 85 रुपया क्विन्टल गेहूँ का दाम तय किया था। 85 रुपया तब तय किया जबकि खुल बाजार में 72 रुपया क्विन्टल गेहूँ बिक रहा था। जब सरकार ने 85 किया तो आड़तियों ने दाम बढ़ाया, पहले 100 बढ़ाया, फिर 110 गया और फिर 120, इस तरह से मामला चलता गया। आज वहाँ पर केन्द्र की सरकार का शासन है, केन्द्र की सरकार ने उत्तर प्रदेश,

बिहार जैसे राज्यों में अपनी ओर से क्या नीति चलाई है? इस साल जो सरकारी आंकड़े आए हैं उनके अनुसार सरकार ने 75 रुपया क्विन्टल, 72 रुपया क्विन्टल तय किया है।

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र : 76 से 81।

श्री राजनारायण : इस साल 72-75 से 81 रुपया और 85 रुपया क्विन्टल पिछले साल। यह फर्क किस तरह से हुआ। इस दृष्टि से फर्क हुआ कि इस साल किसान के पास पिछले साल की बनिस्वत कुछ ज्यादा गल्ला हो गया तो शायद सरकार ने सोचा कि किसान आसानी से दे देंगे, किसान से सस्ता ले लें क्योंकि किसान को गर्ज होगी, वह शादी करने के लिये, विवाह करने के लिए और जिन्दगी की जरूरी चीजों को खरीदने के लिए गल्ला बेचेगा क्योंकि गल्ला ही एक साधन है जिसे बेचकर वह जिन्दगी की दूसरी चीजों को मुहैया करता है। तो यह सरकार इस माने में बेईमान साबित हुई है, किसान-हित विरोधी सिद्ध हुई है। इसके पास लोक-कल्याण की नीति नहीं है। इसीलिए इस सरकार ने यह काम किया। श्यामधर मिश्र की इस बात की मैं तारीफ करता हूँ कि गत वर्ष जब किसान अपना गल्ला अपने बच्चों को खाने के लिए रखना चाहता था तो जबरदस्ती गल्ले की वसूली हुई, डंडा मार कर गल्ले की वसूली हुई। इस साल जब लगातार कुछ वर्षों की अपनी परेशानी से किसान थोड़ी सी फुरसत पाया है और इस साल कुछ गल्ला निकालने की स्थिति में हो रहा है तो यह सरकार कहती है कि हम गल्ला नहीं खरीदेंगे। सरकार व्यापारी है, या सरकार लोक-कल्याण के लिए है, या निजी हित के लिए है, या आड़तियों के हित के लिए है? इस सम्बन्ध में अगर शुद्धतः किसी नतीजे पर पहुँचा जाय तो नतीजा यही होगा कि सरकार, आड़ती और बड़े बड़े किसान इन तीनों का त्रिगुट मिलकर आज इस देश में अन्न संकट पैदा किए हुए हैं। अगर सरकार में किसान हित है, जनहित है, लोक हित है तो मैं आज चाहूँगा

[श्री राजानारायण]

कि किसान से गल्ले की बसुली के लिए वह बुनियादी नीति तय करे। गल्ले की कीमत क्या है? उसमें खाद जोड़ी जाय, पानी जोड़ा जाय, बीज जोड़ा जाय, जांगर जोड़ा जाय, मेहनत जोड़ी जाय, जमीन का लगान जोड़ा जाय, सबको जोड़कर जो उचित गल्ले की कीमत प्राप्त करने के लिए जो उचित कीमत रख कर जिसका रेमूनरेटिव प्राइस हमारा मित्र कहा करते हैं उसको रखें, इस तरह किसान के गल्ले की कीमत तय होनी चाहिये। और उसकी पेरिटी होनी चाहिये। आज तक कृषिजन्य पदार्थों और कलकारखाने अन्य आवश्यक पदार्थों की कीमत में कोई संतुलन की नीति इस सरकार ने नहीं रखी। इसलिये हमारा कहना है कि जो पेरिटी का प्रिंसिपल है, न्याययुक्त संतुलन का प्रिंसिपल है उसको यह सरकार किसानों के साथ और कलकारखानों के साथ निश्चित रूप से लागू करे। आज सारे राज्य में एक तहलका मचा हुआ है कि सरकार गल्ला नहीं खरीद रही है। मान लीजिए गत वर्ष अगर कुछ बसुली कम हुई और उससे हाहाकार मचा तो इस साल गल्ला सरकार खरीद कर रख दे तो आगे आने वाले साल में वह कमी की पूर्ति करेगी और फिर हाहाकार मचेगा तो उसको हम दूर कर पायेंगे। इसलिये आज आवश्यकता है कि सरकार किसानों का गल्ला खरीद कर प्राइस को सपोर्ट करे, रेमूनरेटिव प्राइस दे और उसके जांगर को, खाद को, पानी को, बीज को, लगान को, सबको जोड़कर किसानों को जितनी कीमत पड़े उस समुचित कीमत पर उनसे गल्ला लिया जाय और कोई कारण नहीं है कि गत वर्ष जब 85 रुपया क्विन्टल तय हुआ तो इस वर्ष 75 से 81 तय हो। इस बार भी हमारी मांग है कि किसान के गल्ले को खरीदने की कीमत को यह सरकार बढ़ाए। अगर नहीं बढ़ाती है तो यह सरकार किसानों को भुखमरी में डोकती है और उद्योगपतियों को मुनाफा करवाती है। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, the discussion on the procurement policy cannot be complete because it is only a part of the entire food policy of the Government of India. It is an integrated policy. So, Sir, I would support some of my friends who have advocated that procurement and the food zones are also inter-related. In this connection, I want to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the entire policy of this Government in maintaining the food zones as well as its laxity in procuring foodgrains is to be condemned, for what is happening, because of these food zones being maintained, is that the prices in the entire country are not coming to a level depending on the market conditions. On the other hand, it is creating a different type of mentality among the farmers, because what is happening is that each State Chief Minister wants to keep the zones. For what purpose? It is because he thinks that by keeping the zones, he can keep down the prices in his State and meet the demand of the population, and thereby become popular. So it is a political decision of the State Chief Ministers. But if we look to the good of the country as a whole, these food zones must be broken, because what is happening is that we are not feeling as if we are one. Now, if a man in Maharashtra finds that food is rotting in Punjab but he has no wheat to eat, what will he think except that the entire food scheme is wrong? For this purpose, there must be a national food policy. There was a Foodgrains Policy Committee which emphasised that national management of food implied a national plan of supply and distribution. The means of implementing the plan, it said, were four-fold: (1) procurement to ensure necessary supply; (2) control over inter-State movement to facilitate procurement and keep the prices at a reasonable level; (3) a system of public distribution to ensure equitable sharing; and (4) building up of a buffer stock to provide against difficult years.

In this connection, I would like to point out that there is another bad tendency being created in the farmers. What is happening is that because of this system of zones, farmers tend to change their production pattern. They think that there is no use in producing wheat if it is allowed to rot in Punjab. They will take to some other crop. Thus, the entire food policy of this country will be defeated. In this connection, what I feel is that the deleterious effect of the present policy will be that each State will adjust its food crop pattern to be self-sufficient in all essential

foodgrains. This will ultimately harm the interests

of the country as a whole if we do not take the advantage of the geographical position. The all-India market will be denied to the producers and they will go on producing particular crops which are not advantageous to their own soil. These are the difficulties I envisage. Because of the Chief Ministers' political decision to keep the food zones, the farmers are having different patterns of food production as per the whims of the Chief Ministers. I think the entire food policy of the country as such demands an integrated approach on cropping, food and cash crops, and soil advantages.

Then, Sir, with regard to procurement, in the last Session the problem came up and 7.5 million tons were declared as the Government target. We criticised here that that target could not be achieved. At that time the Food Minister was emphatic that it would be achieved. This could have been achieved because of the bumper crop. But now they are coming up with so many lame excuses. Actually the Government has got no integrated thinking on food. Unless they have an integrated thinking on food, they would not succeed. (*Interruption*). Now they are coming up with lame excuses saying that the crop was damaged and there was delay in harvesting, etc. These are all lame excuses. The point is that unless

they have a national policy on food and unless they think on the lines mentioned above—abolition of zones and intensive procurement of food-grains,—this problem cannot be solved. If there is no integrated approach to this problem, the population in the various States will not think that they are one.

In this connection I want to mention another aspect.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair] Madam, the distribution of foodgrains is with the Central Government while the procurement is with the State Governments. It is quite necessary that agriculture is a State subject. Some friends of mine have suggested that procurement should be with the Centre. But I have got my own doubts about it, because procurement cannot be done by the Central Government; they will have to again raise another army of Inspectors to collect the foodgrains. I do not support that contention. What I want to emphasise is that unless the Chief Ministers are made to think of the country as a whole, instead of their own empires, the problem of food cannot be solved. Procurement at the Central level is not possible. But some helpful collaboration between the States and the Centre is necessary. We do not want to Balkanise this country so that Punjab may not co-operate or West Bengal may not co-operate. So, Madam, what I am thinking is that procurement must be with the States. The agricultural sector must be with the States. Otherwise it will not get that much nursing and direct attention of the Central Government. So two aspects are to be taken into consideration, i.e. the abolition of food zones and the removal of deleterious effect on long-term cropping patterns. If every Chief Minister thinks that his State should be self-sufficient, then there is no hope that we shall be one integrated country and all the States—Punjab, Maharashtra, Orissa and others—will be thinking in their own way and they will be having their

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni.] own policies on food. For this purpose I again emphasise that the Government must have some re-thinking on procurement and food zones and they must evolve some national policy and also make the Chief Ministers agree to breaking the food zones. Otherwise this country is not going to solve its food problem.

Thank you, Madam.

श्री पंडरीनाथ सीतारामजी पाटील (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभापति महोदया, अभी जो गल्ला वसूली के सवाल पर बहस हो रही है उसमें कुछ विचार मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ ।

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): At least those who have given their names for the Motion should be called.

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): I have also given my name, Madam. Otherwise, let there be a Government motion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not that. Those who have given their names I will call them. But please be brief.

श्री पंडरीनाथ सीतारामजी पाटील : गल्ला वसूली और गल्ला संग्रह के बारे में मैं कुछ विचार सभानेत्री जी आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ ।

मेरी राय में जो छोटे किसान हैं उनसे गल्ला वसूली नहीं करनी चाहिये, जिसने कि पांच एकड़ या पांच एकड़ से कम में अनाज की फसल बोई है उनसे यह वसूल नहीं होना चाहिये और जो बड़े बड़े किसान हैं, बड़े बड़े जमींदार हैं उनके पास अगर गल्ला उनकी जरूरत से ज्यादा हो तो जरूर गवर्नमेंट को उसकी वसूली करनी चाहिये । संग्रह के बारे में बोला जाता है कि किसानों के घर में संग्रह किया जाता है और ग्राहकों को वह बराबर उचित समय पर नहीं मिलता है, इससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ । दरअसल बात यह है कि फसल जब किसान के घर में आ जाती है तो

अड़चन के मारे किसान अपना गल्ला बाजार में बेचने के लिये ले जाता है तब व्यापारी उसे सस्ते दाम पर खरीद कर अपने गोदामों में भर लेते हैं और फिर आगे मंहगे भावों पर बेचते हैं । तो ऐसा न हो और ग्राहकों को सही कीमत पर वह मिले इसके लिए यह जो वसूलो और वितरण का काम है उसको शासन को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिये, जैसा कि महाराष्ट्र में वहां की सरकार ने यह सारा काम अपने हाथ में लिया है । वहां उन्होंने एकाधिकार पद्धति का अवलम्बन किया है और इससे उस प्रदेश में यह गल्ला वसूली का व वितरण का सवाल कोई बहुत कठिन नहीं है । अनाज वहां कम जरूर पैदा होता है लेकिन जो पैदा होता है उसकी वसूली और उसका वितरण वहां की सरकार के अपने हाथ में लेने के कारण वह वहां ठीक तरह से हो रहा है । इसके लिये मैं उस प्रदेश की सरकार का अभिनन्दन करूंगा कि उन्होंने यह काम हाथ में लिया और मैं चाहूंगा कि भारत की सरकार भी इस एकाधिकार पद्धति का अवलम्बन करे । अनाज को वसूल करने और वितरण करने का काम सारे देश में एक नीति अपनाकर अपने हाथ में शासन को लेना चाहिये ।

दूसरी एक बात और मैं गवर्नमेंट के सामने रखूंगा कि अनाज को रखने के लिये अधिक गोडाउंस भी सरकार को बनाना चाहिये ताकि सरकार उसमें अनाज इकट्ठा करे, एकत्रित करे और रखे नहीं तो चूहे, कीड़े मकोड़े अनाज को बहुत नाश करते हैं, नुकसान करते हैं । तो उनसे भी अनाज बचाना चाहिये और उसका भी इलाज करना चाहिये ।

मैं एक बात सुन कर बड़े अचम्भे में पड़ता हूँ । यह बड़ी अजीब बात है कि कुछ लोगों का यह झुंझाल है कि किसान का जो अनाज है वह ग्राहकों को सस्ता मिलना चाहिये लेकिन मैं उनसे पूछूंगा कि किसान से सस्ते अनाज को आप बड़ी इच्छा करते हैं तो यह इच्छा भी करें कि बड़े बड़े शहरों में जो बड़े बड़े कारखाने हैं जिनमें कपड़े बनाये जाते हैं, या जैसे कि लोहे की मशीनों का कारखाना है, बिजली के सामान

को बनाने वाला कारखाना है, मोटर, मोटर-साइकिल और साइकिल बनाने का कारखाना है, इनका सामान भी किसानों को सस्ता मिल। इसकी कोशिश क्यों नहीं करते, इसके बारे में सांग क्यों नहीं करते, एक तो उन लोगों को मालूम है कि जो कारखानेदार हैं, जो पूंजीपति लोग हैं वह अपनी कीमत बढ़ाने ही वाले हैं, वे तो अपनी चीजें सस्ते दाम पर बेचने वाले नहीं हैं। किसान बेचारा गरीब है, उसके मुंह नहीं, वह बोल नहीं सकता, अशिक्षित है और उसका संगठन नहीं है। वे ही लोग इच्छा करते हैं कि किसान का अनाज सस्ता मिलना चाहिये और इस तरह का रंग देने की कोशिश करते हैं कि किसान अनाज के ऊपर बहुत पैसा कमाता है, तो मैं उन भाइयों से बहुत नम्रतापूर्वक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप बैंकों का खाता देखिये, हिसाब किताब देखिये, रिजर्व बैंक है, प्राविशियल बैंक है, तथा कोअपरेटिव बैंक है, वहाँ जाकर देखिये तो आपको यह पता चलेगा कि किसानों के ऊपर लाखों या करोड़ों का नहीं बल्कि अरबों रुपयों का कर्जा चढ़ रहा है। उनके ऊपर तो कर्जों का पर्वत चढ़ रहा है। अगर उनको अनाज से खूब पैसा मिलता है तो फिर उनके ऊपर कर्जा क्यों है। कर्जा लेकर सुद और ब्याज देने का उनको शौक है, ऐसी बात नहीं है। इसका कारण यह है कि किसानों के खेतों में जो चीजें पैदा होती हैं उनकी सही कीमत, सही दाम, किसान के पल्ले में नहीं पड़ता है इसलिये हमारे देश का किसान आज दरिद्र हो गया है और वह दिक्कत में आ गया है। तो मैं कहूँगा कि उनको सही कीमत देनी चाहिये। मैं गवर्नमेन्ट से रिक्वेस्ट करूँगा कि अगर आप अनाज की सही कीमत किसानों को दे दें तो किसान खुद ही ज्यादा अनाज पैदा करेगा और देश के सामने जो अनाज का संकट है वह हल हो जायेगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

श्री पंडरीनाथ सीतारामजी पाटील :
बस एक मिनट में कह दूँगा। किसान को अपने

खेत में अनाज पैदा करने के लिये जितनी भी सुविधा चाहिये, जैसे कि खाद, शुद्ध सुघरे बीज, आधुनिक औजार, छोटी छोटी नहरों के द्वारा पानी, बिजली इत्यादि—ये सहूलियत गवर्नमेंट को किसानों के लिये पैदा कर देनी चाहिये और उसको अनाज की ठीक ठीक कीमत पल्ले में पड़े, इस दृष्टि से भाव मुक्त कर के शासन को उसकी गारन्टी ले लेनी चाहिये।

आखिर में, मैं यह आशा करता हूँ कि आज के जो हमारे कृषि मंत्री हैं, माननीय अण्णासाहेब शिंडे, वह अच्छे किसान हैं, किसान के घर में पैदा हुए हैं, एक देहाती निवासी हैं, उनसे मैं आशा करता हूँ कि वह इन सबालों पर ध्यान देंगे और ऐसी कोई चीज, ऐसा कोई उदाहरण हमारे देश के सामने रखेंगे जिससे हमारे देश में अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ेगी, हमारे देश के अनाज का मसला हल होगा। इतना ही नहीं मैं तो कहूँगा हमारे देश के किसान बाहर के देशों में भी अनाज भेज सकेंगे, इतनी क्रियाशील हमारे देश की खेती बनेगी और इस प्रकार का हम संसार के सामने चित्र रखेंगे, ऐसी मेरी धारणा है।

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Madam, if it admitted that in this year we have got increase of food production and the food production has reached a figure of 95 million tonnes but what does this increased food production mean to the people of this country? In this regard I want to draw your kind attention to the particular opinion given by the Government of India in this respect. I quote:

"After allowing for animal feed, seed requirements and wastage from gross production of 5 million tonnes, . . . The Chart shows that although this level of daily consumption would be over 8 per cent, higher than in the preceding two years, it would fall short of the average level prevailing in 1961-63 or 1963-65."

This means that though there is increased production, the people of our

[Shri Chitta Basu.]

country are not entitled to any increased consumption. This single factor constitutes a very important aspect of the food strategy itself. I am one of those who feel that the policy of procurement is the king-pin in the major food strategy of the country in the present set-up of things. Why do I say so? Without going into a detailed discussion I would simply put forward certain points. We should always bear in mind that we are deficit in food even to-day, although marginal. We have an inflationary tendency in the country. The distribution of foodgrains is by and large in the hands of private traders to-day. The private traders again have turned into profit-hungry hoarders. The big producers too have turned into hoarders and there has been an increasing desire on the part of the big producers to make exorbitant profits at par with the big traders. Keeping these things in view we should understand that we cannot do without procurement to-day. So far as procurement is concerned, my charge against the Government is not that they have any procurement policy but my charge is that the Government is not serious about the procurement itself. For that there may be many reasons. I am tempted to feel that since the Government is committed to import under PL 480 from America, they do not really mean business to get the procurement policy fulfilled. In this connection I wish to draw your attention to the particular reasons which I feel are responsible for the failure of the procurement policy of the Government to-day. If you look back to the proceedings of the Chief Ministers' Conference held in October last, you will find that the Conference did not categorically decide on the mode of procurement. It did not decide on the day in which the procurement drive is to be made. In this connection I say that the Conference decided to allow the respective States to take to different methods of procurement. That being the case, only tar-

gets were fixed but the mode of purchase was not fixed. I know many State Governments were not really serious about the method of procurement. You know in the method of procurement, there are two ways. Either there should be levies on the producers or there should be monopoly purchase by the Government. As far as I know, the Maharashtra Government had the policy of monopoly purchase. I feel in the present context the monopoly purchase is the surest method of achieving the target, but almost all the State Governments did not agree with the proposal of monopoly purchase. You will agree with me when I say that the marketable surplus is about 25 to 30 per cent, of the total production. If the total production of the country is 95 million tonnes, then the available marketable surplus would be about 20 million tonnes but the target has been fixed at 7 million tonnes and even in the matter of fulfilling that, not more than 3 million tonnes will be procured. The reason for that is that there is no harmony between the State Governments, the Government of India and the F.C.I. itself. The agency of procurement varies from State to State. The F.C.I. is not the only agency for procurement. There are other State Government agencies also. If the Government of India is serious to improve the food position in the country, there should be a scientific national food policy including for procurement and there should be State trading all over the country but in fact I feel that the process of climbing down has started. They have abandoned the method of procurement, if I may say so. For instance they are going to abolish the single State zone. They are going to reduce the amount of foodgrains to be supplied to the public through the distribution channels. These are indications that the Government has started the process of abandonment of the basic policy with which the procurement is associated.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS:

Madam, I am one with those who

have advocated that we should have a national food policy and a national food policy does not mean that it is a short-term policy but it should be a long-term policy and we should give more emphasis on the Food Corporation of India and procurement and also on creating a buffer stock. I am not going into the details because I am more concerned with the acute situation that is prevailing in Tny State.

Though we are having fine crops throughout India today, unhappily, Orissa is facing a very acute situation as far as food is concerned. According to Government statistics, out of 13 districts 9 districts of Orissa have been badly hit by drought. First we had floods, then next the cyclone and last of all the October rains failed, as a result of which in some of the districts the production has not been beyond 40 per cent, or 50 per cent, of the normal production. Again according to Government statistics, also some of the Block areas have suffered to the extent of 90 to 95 percent. So, when in other States the position of food production is very fine, Orissa is heading towards a crisis, and if the things move as they are, then I am sure that after two or three months we will be facing the condition of famine or near famine.

Madam Deputy Chairman, you know that two years back a part of Orissa had to face famine conditions and the Government of India tried to help at that time. And now the drought situation in Orissa is not confined to one part only, to one district only; it has spread to nine districts. According to the previous assessment of the Government. Orissa was to have a procurement of three lakh tonnes of foodgrains. But according to the Budget speech of the Finance Minister in the third week of February, the target got reduced to two lakh tonnes. And now, after having a proper assessment, after the harvest and after the procurement, the target stands reduced to one lakh

tonnes only, and I think we have already procured one lakh tonnes— only one lakh tonnes—in four districts, because those four districts are a little bit in a better condition out of the nine districts that are suffering because of drought—there are certain well irrigated areas where we have had some procurement. So that is the position. There is already the talk, agitated talk, that we are having starvation deaths. Of course Government has not admitted up till now that we have had starvation deaths and Government never admits it. And even two years back, when the Congress was ruling there, they never admitted that they were having a large number of starvation deaths.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: Why the present non-Congress Government should not admit it?

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: I feel it has become the usual practice with all Governments not to admit starvation deaths. But one thing everybody is admitting, and it is that Orissa is facing a very bad situation, and if you have heard today's morning radio, you must have heard that the Orissa Government is now rushing foodgrains to certain pockets which are now facing a very acute situation, where the prices of foodgrains have gone up to the extent of 25 per cent. This is the acute situation that we are facing today. The State Government has only a little more than one lakh tonnes as buffer stock and the Food Corporation has assured us that that one lakh tonnes will be utilised for internal consumption because we are facing a very acute situation. But I am sure, as the days roll by, that this one lakh tonnes will be absolutely inadequate to meet the needs of Orissa, and we may have to depend upon other States, particularly on the Central Government for assistance. But I want to tell the House about one aspect of the matter namely that in large areas in some of the districts we are facing a very acute situation, and we can say that near famine

[Shri Banka Behary Das.]

conditions are prevailing there, and the question of employment has also become very acute. Now to mitigate the difficulties arising out of unemployment, to provide employment to the unemployed, we should pay attention to test relief works, either / digging of ponds or canals or other work so that many people can be employed and also we can help them with foodgrains for the work they do. That is why I want to request the Government of India also—whether I they have got the latest reports from the Orissa Government or not, I do not know—that they should send a team from the Planning Commission, so that they can assess the difficulties faced by Orissa, so that they can assist Orissa financially, so that we can start all these test relief works and give employment to the people. In this connection I also want to draw your attention to a report emanating from a press conference held by some Sarvodaya leaders of Orissa, in which they have said that we have already had starvation deaths in Korapat and Balasore districts. They say it is about 100 in Korapat district and about 10 in Balasore district. Now I am not very particular about the number of deaths, but the very fact remains that starvation deaths have already started, and I hope the Government of India will take into consideration the peculiar position that we are landed in, because we have always helped other States. When we see that other States are facing a crisis we have always helped them. Practically every year we have sent about two lakh tonnes of foodgrains to other States, sometimes even three lakh tonnes. Now it is for the Government; at least they owe a moral obligation to us. They should, help us financially so that we can have more irrigation facilities in Orissa, so that, in future as in the past, we can help other States with foodgrains. I have told you about the crisis that we are facing today and I hope the Government will give enough attention to the State of Orissa.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venkataraman Please do not take more than five minutes,

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN (Madras): It is quite difficult to say anything worth the name within five minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is difficult but there are so many names. I need not have called you because your name was not there.

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN: I shall make some points without being able to elaborate them. Now the question of procurement is connected with the question of production as well as the question of distribution. When a national policy is urged by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in relation to procurement, I think it should rather be a national food policy comprising all the three items. But in respect of that I am afraid the Government is not really pursuing anything like a national policy. The Food Ministers' Conference or the Chief Ministers' Conference is called where the issue is discussed from time to time, but eventually you will find that the thing is left exactly where it was. But the nature of the problem is such that it is so vital and all-embracing. When such is the case, unless right now the initiative is taken here and the policy directives are issued to the States as well, there will be no procurement. There will be only playing with the problem.

As regards such a national policy I would barely suggest because of the hardly two minutes left now—I wanted to speak so much on it—that firstly this procurement must be of a sufficient quantity. In Madras State the State Government is procuring about 20 percent; that is, out of about forty lakh tonnes, of rice eight lakh tonnes is the target that will be realised; in fact, a greater procurement is being urged. But there can be real procurement only if the entire surplus is

taken from the bigger landholders owning over and above a certain limit. My suggestion is that no landholder owning less than three acres should be subjected to any procurement. I am anxious, Madam, to spell out what I suggest by way of a national policy. There should be no procurement from peasants owning less than three acres of wet land or its equivalent. There may be a sort of voluntary levy up to ten acres, but over and above the ten acres there must be compulsory procurement of the entire surplus after leaving even a somewhat liberal margin to meet the family needs and the seeds required for cultivation, subject to the necessary scrutiny. Allowing for all that, the entire surplus must be procured. Without that it is idle to talk of procurement, or to talk of discharge of responsibility for distribution as well. I can quite see that a fair price to the peasant is one of the obvious requirements of successful procurement. But then, when the target of production also is organically linked up with this, I do not see the peasant alone, the man who is certainly to receive a fair price, as the only man engaged in production. In my State of Tamilnad 50 percent are agricultural labourers. Have they got to be enthused or not for production? Nearly 20 percent of the people are poor peasants, or tenants; they are faced with eviction. The agricultural labourers are faced with inadequate wages, are also faced with starvation during periods of unemployment. Now we have, with all this talk of land to the tiller, completely shelved the ceiling law, and my esteemed friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel speaking for the Swatantra Party was telling us that the ceiling law was strictly observed in Gujarat and there are no big landlords. But in Tamilnad so far as the ceiling is concerned, of course, the law is there but the actual fact is that hundreds of acres still continue to be in the occupation or in the possession of the same person who owned that entire land even before the ceiling law

came. So I would suggest that for successful procurement, for your procurement to be effective agrarian reforms are very necessary. While saying this I am not suggesting anything new, or something that has not been stated up till now, in fact some thing like it has been stated in our Plans with reference to tenants, with reference to agricultural labourers, with reference to fair prices and all that. All those things should be done in an integrated way. Unless this is done in addition to having a national food policy, the whole policy would not be complete. My point is that just as the Centre is taking the responsibility for a national policy directive in procurement it must also take the responsibility in distribution for keeping the country united. This should also be an obligation on the part of the Centre. In Kerala a man gets only 3 ounces of rice per day while in Tamilnad we get 6 or 7 ounces in statutory Rationing areas. I do not know how much the people in other provinces get. Surely we cannot have three or four types of citizens in our country. We should not treat our people differently in this manner. The Centre should take up the whole thing in its own hands as a national programme so that the surplus in some areas is made available to the deficit areas and the surplus should also be sent away in such a way that those surplus States are not affected. All this can be worked out. But I am afraid food has become part of the centres politics in our country, especially after non-Congress Governments have come up in certain States. All this must go and we must all see that there is a crisis in our country. The Food Corporation is a flop. It is hardly doing anything except deal with the P.L.480 imports and hardly 3 percent of the total requirements are being met by it. In respect of all these things I would strongly support the proposal made by Shri Bhupesh Gupta that we must have a serious discussion with all the representatives of Parties.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a short duration discussion. That will do. Mr. Appan.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, as the son of a farmer I have some amount of experience and I am speaking from my practical experience and from the point of view of a practical farmer. Food is the most vital thing for everybody if he is to live and we have to procure food in order to distribute it. But unless there is sufficient surplus you cannot succeed in your procurement programme. For that one should produce more. How can he produce more unless he is given all the things that are necessary and unless he is able to retain something for himself, his own family, for his own workers and so on, from the quantity of foodgrains that he produces? Things have come to such a pass that now everybody is greedy and wants to earn more. And everybody wants to do less work also. As the son of a farmer I know that in 1939 a labourer was paid only 10 paise, according to the present coinage it was one anna eight pies in those days. Now the same labourer wants not less than Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 a day and he does not do even one-fourth of the work that he used to do in those days. At this rate how can the farmer produce sufficient quantity for himself and also sell to the Government foodgrains at cheaper and cheaper rates? And unless the Government is able to buy the foodgrain at cheaper rates they cannot supply the same to the consumers and so the people also cannot get foodgrains at cheaper rates. One thing is certain. To produce more we should cultivate more land. We have got a lot of arable land and also waste land which is cultivable. What has the Government done to have correct statistical data of all the arable land lying vacant or fallow and without being cultivated in our country? If we collect correct data of everything the extent of land available for cultivation, not only

State-wise but what is available in every village, every firka, every taluka, every district, in every State, and thus for the whole country, then only we will be able to arrive at a practical formula to cultivate land lying vacant in the whole country. When a certain State Government wants more money for agricultural purposes the Centre is not able to give them sufficient funds for their requirements. When they want to build dams they are not able to get what they want. When they want to have a reservoirs they are not able to get the necessary funds. Unless, the States are able to get sufficient money from the Centre it will not be possible for them to improve the food situation prevailing in our country now. For instance in my place of Ramnad District there is a scheme called the Polavakkal Aeri Scheme. Some thirty years back there was a proposal to put up a Polavakkal lake and some people actually started work on it. But nothing further happened and even now all the water that comes down that river concerned goes to waste. If the Polavakkal project had come up all this water could have been utilised by the farmers. Why not tap the resources that are there and utilise the waters now flowing into the sea such waters should be stored in tanks and reservoirs and dams. There are such vast areas of vacant cultivable not only in my State but in other States also.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you please wind up.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: So I request the Government to get correct statistical data of the arable waste lands which could be cultivated and they should have a national army of agricultural labourers in order to increase food production and at the same time to solve the unemployment problem.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. Now the Minister.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: Madam, the . . .

SHRI BANK A BEHARY DAS: Why not have the Punjab announcement now?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If there is to be any announcement about Punjab it may be made now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister's reply is going to be a short one.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE; Yes, I will be very brief. Madam, I welcome this discussion on this very important subject of procurement of foodgrains in our country. As has been mentioned by some hon. Members procurement is very vital and it is an important link in our food programme. But I wish to make one submission for the appreciation of hon. Members and that is that we are in a federal set-up. Ours is a Federal Republic and naturally food is a concurrent subject. And so in these matters the Centre cannot act unilaterally and necessarily we have to involve the State Government in the implementation of the policy and whatever food policy we formulate we have to consult the State Governments and depending on their assessment of the local situation we have to implement the policy through them. So naturally the Centre has to function under certain limitations with regard to these matters. I have no doubt in my mind that the food problem is a problem of both production and of distribution. It is not a problem of production only, neither is it a problem of distribution only. Production must improve and so also distribution must improve and both of them are important. As far as the production side is concerned, I do not want to go into the details of the production side. May I submit for the information of hon. Members Perhaps they already know it—this year good prospects of foodgrains production are not only because of favourable weather conditions but they are also due to positive human efforts and proper Government policy. These also have contributed to bring about

this situation. I wish there is more and more appreciation of this fact in times to come because we want proper appreciation from hon. Members so that we may be in a position* to come forward with appropriate policies and be in a position to make our country self-reliant and self-sufficient with regard to food.

I can very well appreciate the anxiety expressed by hon. Members that the earlier we end our dependence on imports the better it is for the country. Nobody is very happy with the present position when we have to go on continuously with imports of large volumes of foodgrains.. But now I shall try to confine myself to the subject matter of the discussion, namely, procurement. Naturally anxiety has been expressed by hon. Members that this year's procurement has not been satisfactory. I appreciate that. But let there not be an impression that all is wrong with our procurement. As I have already submitted, unless the States also exert and maximise their effort and have the maximum procurement, the Centre will not be able to achieve the target. It is true that when this matter was referred to the Agricultural Prices Commission, that Commission recommended a target of 7 million tonnes as far as the Khariff season is concerned and 1 million tonnes as far as the rabi harvest is concerned. So the total procurement target was considered to be about 8 million tonnes in the beginning. This was also discussed in the Chief Ministers' Conference. Naturally we had to consult the Chief Ministers. Two matters came up for discussion: what should be the target and what should be the mode of procurement. In regard to target some of the Chief Ministers even at that time expressed the view that the target was rather too high and ambitious and perhaps it would be difficult to achieve but even then after discussion the conclusion was that we should not reduce the target because it would be in our national interests to maximise our efforts. In

[Shri Annasaheb Shinde.] regard to the mode of procurement the situations in different parts of the country are so different that if we tried to be rigid in regard to our procurement policy I do not think it will be possible for all the State Governments to follow the same policy. It is very easy to say, as some hon. Member now said, th'at the Centre should issue a directive to the State Governments in regard to procurement. I wish that the Centre was in a position to do that. We being a democratic society and having a democratic set-up, cannot issue any directives. Directives will not ultimately help us unless there is complete concurrence of the State Governments in regard to the mode of procurement.

SHRI M. R. VENKATA RAMAN: About other things you don't hesitate to compel the State Governments.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: Let me explain. At the Centre we are prepared to support any State Government if they come forward with any proposal to maximise procurement efforts. Take the case of Maharashtra for instance. The Maharashtra Government has adopted a policy of monopoly procurement. It has been referred to by an hon. Member. And we have been supporting the Maharashtra Government in regard to that. Similarly if any other State Government wants to adopt that policy we will support them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You don't support because when the State Governments want some financial accommodation for giving remunerative prices to the peasants you say no, we shall not give it. Mr. Morarji Desai said no, it is not possible. When we were in the Government we came and asked for it but you did not allow it.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: I think the hon. Member is trying to divert. As far as procurement efforts are concerned we are prepared to support any State Government *if* it wants to adopt any rigid measure in regard to procurement because we want the

State Government to take the necw-sary action...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; Where is the money to come from?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Are you prepared to give adequate funds to the State Governments for this purpose?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: I think that in this country of ours private trade cannot be allowed complete freedom. Food is such an important matter that the State must intervene in foodgrains. Our experience in the past also indicates that if *laissez faire* economy is allowed in food then the people will be in difficulty because production fluctuates from year to year. As is well known after the 1943 famine a Committee went into the problem. At that time no politics was involved and even that Committee during the British regime came to the conclusion that the Government must play a positive role in foodgrains. Then there was the Asoka Mehta Committee and that Committee also came to the conclusion that more and more socialisation of food trade was necessary. Then there was recently the Foodgrains Policy Committee and this Committee also came to the same conclusion that the Government must play a more positive role and the Food Corporation must have a commanding position in foodgrains trade.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You also once passed a Resolution that we should have socialist pattern of society.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: So the Government of India's approach in regard to this is that the Food Corporation should be supported in such a way that it occupies a commanding position in foodgrains trade in India. I therefore want this House and the hon. Members to support the Food Corporation but unfortunately...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We support it all right.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: . . . it happens that some States do not

want the Food Corporation to operate in their areas. These are the difficulties. I am not blaming the State Governments but they fail to appreciate that unless the Food Corporation is allowed to operate in all the State it will not be possible for the Centre to attain maximum procurement.

As far as procurement at present is concerned, though we shall procure...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How much you have got?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: At the moment we have succeeded in procuring about 3.2 million tonnes and I think it would be a reasonable expectation that it should be possible to reach a figure of 6 or 6.5 million tonnes and it would be quite a good thing because if you compare the past performance in the last year we had never exceeded more or less the figure of 4 million tonnes. If this year all the State Governments co-operate, if hon. Members also educate public opinion in regard to this, I think it should be possible to reach the figure of 6.5 million tonnes which means almost 50 per cent improvement over the previous best figure and I think it will be a good thing. In this country more and more procurement is what you need so that the needs of the deficit States can also be looked after properly and we are in a position to have a control over the food economy.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: What about Orissa?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: I do not want to deal with the individual States.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Shinde, you go and write in your diary that on 10th May you said that your procurement will be about 6.5 million tonnes and after six months you have a look at it.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: When I mention this I expect to receive cooperation from the State Governments. It is on that basis that I

am mentioning. I feel that many of the State Governments, even the non-Congress Governments are giving us co-operation in this regard. As I said if the necessary co-operation is forthcoming from the State Governments there is no doubt in my mind.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Andhra Government believes in encouraging black-marketeers.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: Don't interrupt. I am sure it should be possible to reach that figure.

Sir, I do not want to go into all these details but I welcomed this discussion. This was a very useful discussion. A number of valid points have been made by hon. Members and I thank the hon. Members for having given me this opportunity to say something in regard to our food procurement policy.

RE REJECTION OF PUNJAB GOVERNMENT'S STAY APPLICATION BY THE PUNJAB HIGH COURT

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): Sir, there is a small statement I wish to make about Punjab and that is, although nothing has been communicated to us officially we understand the Punjab High Court which was hearing the stay application moved by the Punjab Government has refused to stay the Judgment but they have given the Punjab Government special leave to appeal to Supreme-Court.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
सुना जाय। सुबह भी मैंने यह कहा था कि वहाँ पर कांस्टीट्यूशनल ब्रेक डाउन हो गया है। जब वहाँ पर कुछ अधिकार वहाँ की सरकार को नहीं रह गया तो वहाँ की सरकार चलेगी कैसे। जितना समय व्यतीत हो रहा है उतने समय कांस्टीट्यूशन के साथ बलात्कार हो रहा है और जो भी पैसा खर्च हो रहा है वह कन्टेम्प्ट आफ दि कोर्ट हो रहा है। यह खबर