

Vehicles Act, 1939, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members, 15 members from this House and 30 members from the Lok Sabha ;

And whereas this House appointed fifteen members from this House to the said Joint Committee;

And whereas this House recommended that the Lok Sabha do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by the Lok Sabha to the Joint Committee;

And whereas a message was thereafter transmitted to the Lok Sabha on the 4th August, 1966, communicating to the Lok Sabha the adoption of the said motion by this House;

And whereas the Lok Sabha was dissolved on the 31st March, 1957, before any action could be taken pursuant to the said message, and a new Lok Sabha was thereafter constituted;

Now therefore this House do resolve that the Bill further to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members, 15 members from this House, namely :

1. Shri Anand Chand
2. Moulana Abdul Shakoork
3. Dr. B.N. Antani
4. Shri M.V. Bhadram
5. Shri M.P. Bhargava
6. Shri Niranjana Singh
7. Shri Mahabir Dass
8. Shri N. Patra
9. Shrimati Lalitha (Rajagopalan)
10. Shri M. Govinda Reddy
11. Shri Ram Sahai
12. Shrimati Sarla Bhadauria
13. Shri C.L. Varma
14. Shri Niranjana Varma
15. Shri Tirath Ram Amla.

and 30 members from the Lok Sabha;

That in order to constitute a meeting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee.

That in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Select Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Chairman may make ;

That the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 31st August, 1968; and

That this House recommends to the Lok Sabha that the Lok Sabha do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by the Lok Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion was adopted.

THE RICE MILLING INDUSTRY (REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1967

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN
THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE,
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION
(SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE) : Madam, I beg
to move :

"That the Bill to amend the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958, be taken into consideration."

This Bill is intended to remove some of the difficulties experienced in the working of the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958 for the last few years and also to bring the enactment in line with the changing pattern of public policy. During the last two years we have had to face a

[Shri Annasaheb Shinde]

very serious situation which arose out of the unprecedented drought in the country. The situation was kept under control without undue stress developing over large parts of the country by undertaking increasing commitments about distribution of foodgrains at reasonable prices. In our effort to achieve self-sufficiency by 1970-71 the Government has to ensure that not only production in the country increases but also that wastage is minimised, and as much as possible of the production is made available for consumption. In the implementation of this objective, the Rice-Milling Industry now holds a key position in as much as the bulk of the production in the country is paddy and every year more and more paddy is being processed into rice through the rice mills.

The Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958 was enacted to regulate the working of the rice mills in the country, in order that hand-pounding industry should get adequate facilities. There has been a growing public demand that rice mills in the country should be brought more and more under public control. To meet this public demand as well as to have rice mills with modern technology, we have no doubt taken up some projects for setting up modern rice mills under the public sector. But under the present Act there is no scope for any preferential treatment to the public or co-operative sector in the establishment of new rice mills. We feel that some steps should now be taken or promoting the growth of new rice mills under public or co-operative sector. This Bill seeks to achieve this purpose. It is, therefore proposed to amend the Act to provide that in future preference should be accorded in the matter of grant of permits for the establishment of rice mills to public sector undertakings like the Food Corporation of India and to mills to public sector undertakings like the Food Corporation of India and to registered Co-operative Societies composed exclusively of farmers. It is hoped that the farmers who are producers but do not

generally have rice milling under their control will really be benefitted by this Bill.

The necessity of modernising the rice mills can hardly be over-emphasized. Most of the existing rice mills are antiquated and use outmoded technology with the result that the outturn of rice from outmoded hullers is much lower than that from sheller-cum-polisher type of mills. Such hullers decrease the over-all availability of rice. We are taking the present opportunity in amending the Bill to ensure that rice mills both existing and new ones are equipped with modern equipment and also use a modern technology.

This Bill also provides for certain other amendments which have been felt necessary on the basis of experience in the working of the Act during the last nine years. It is not necessary to emphasise the importance of maximising internal procurement. In many states there is a levy on rice mills. A substantial part of Government procurement would be from the rice mills which are controlling the major part of the rice milling operations in the country. Experience has, however, shown that the small hullers are not only difficult to control but there can be hardly any procurement from them. These hullers are scattered all over the country-side far away from important markets and in many cases are run along with other power-driven plants like flour, oil and dall mills or pumping-sets, etc. without obtaining, requisite permits or licences under the Act. These hullers sometimes operate clandestinely at night making their activities difficult to detect. The existence of a large number of unauthorised hullers has proved a serious loophole in the system of procurement. It is, therefore, proposed to provide in the Act that attachment of hullers with other power-driven units are mentioned above would amount to the establishment of rice mills and also to tighten the penal provisions in respect of running of unauthorised hullers.

Under the present Act, it is also possible for the existing or new rice mills to stop

rice-milling operations for a considerable period and thereby affect the supply position. It is, no doubt, necessary to check these tendencies which inhibit the supply of rice in the country. It is, therefore proposed to provide that if any mill ceases to operate for a continuous period exceeding one year, it would become a defunct rice mill and require a fresh permit for recommencing rice-milling operations.

The present Bill also seeks to make the penal provisions of the Act more stringent. It has been brought to our notice that even in the cases of gross offences the wrong-doers can get away with a light punishment. Moreover, the penal provisions have to be rigorous enough to check the clandestine activities of rice-millers and hullers effectively. It is therefore, proposed to provide for more stringent punishment.

There has been another loophole in the present Act and the huller-owners who actually mill the rice can take shelter in the plea that their operation is nothing but polishing of rice. It is necessary that removal of bran poultry known as 'polishing of rice' after it is recovered from paddy should also be covered by the term 'milling rice'.

Madam, I commend the provisions of the Bill for the consideration of the House.

The question was proposed

SHRI ANNA SAHEB SHINDE : My only request at this stage is that the amendments should be circulated.

THE DEPUTY CHAI : that will be done.

Yes

श्री रमेशचंद्र शंकर राव (इंटेकर (मध्य प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, माननीय अन्न मंत्री ने अभी जो विधायक सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया है उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ । लेकिन स्वागत करने के

साथ साथ मुझे निराशा भी हुई क्योंकि आज की जो आवश्यकता है वह इस बिल क द्वारा पूरी नहीं हो सकती है ।

आपको शायद याद होगा , जहां तक मैं समझता हूँ कांग्रेस पार्टी ने ही कुछ वर्ष पहले अनेक अधिवेशन में इस देश में जितनी चावल की मिलें हैं उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के सम्बन्ध में या उन को अपने अधिकार में लेने के सम्बन्ध में एक प्रस्ताव पास किया था, लेकिन आज तक उस प्रस्ताव पर कोई अमल नहीं हुआ है ।

मैं जिस प्रदेश से आता हूँ उसका काफी हिस्सा चावल का उत्पादन करता है और वहां पर काफी चावल की मिलें भी हैं । पिछले दो वर्षों में जब इस प्रदेश में वर्षा नहीं हुई थी , सूखा पड़ा था तो स्वभावतः चावल की पैदावार बहुत कम हुई थी और प्रदेश को और पूरे देश को भी संकट का सामना करना पड़ा था । उन दिनों चावल के मिल मालिकों ने कितना अनाप शनाप रुपया प्राप्त किया और जो शासक वर्ग उम समय था उन्होंने इतना फायदा उठाया था कि यह महसूस किया गया कि जब तक उन के ऊपर कोई नियंत्रण नहीं किया जाता या ऐसी मिलें सरकारी क्षेत्र में नहीं आ जाती तब तक समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकता । चावल के जो बड़े बड़े मिल मालिक हैं वे गरीब काश्तकारों से जब धान बहुत सस्ता मिलता है तब खरीद लेते हैं और फिर मनमाने तरीके से उस प्रदेश में या अपने पड़ोसी प्रान्त में काफी ऊंचा दामों पर बचते हैं । इस तरह की परमिट्स प्राप्त करने में शासक वर्ग के साथ, अधिकारियों के साथ सांठगांठ कर के दोनों रुपया कमाते हैं और उसका परिणाम यह होता है कि उप-भोक्ताओं को चावल काफी ऊंची कीमत पर खरीदने पड़ते हैं । इस से न तो काश्तकारों को फायदा होता है न उपभोक्ताओं को; केवल जो मिल मालिक हैं या जो उन के दलाल

श्री रमेशचंद्र शंकरराव खांडेकर

हैं वही फायदा उठाते हैं। इसलिए यह भी आवश्यक था कि जितनी चावल की मिलें हैं वे सरकारी क्षेत्र में लाई जायें। इस संबंध में प्रगतिशील पार्टियों के प्रस्ताव पास किए और कांग्रेस पार्टी ने भी प्रस्ताव पास किए कि जो चावल की मिलें बनाई जायें वे पब्लिक सेक्टर में ही हों और इसी उद्देश्य से यह बिल लाया गया है।

लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो हजारों की तादाद में प्राइवेट मिलें हैं उनके ऊपर सरकार किस तरह से नियंत्रण कर रही है। बिल में कछ प्रावधान जरूर है और मंत्री जी भी कहते हैं कि जो उसके संबंध में कानून है उसको सख्त किया जा रहा है और ऐसे लोगों के खिलाफ कड़ी कार्यवाही की जायगी, लेकिन आज तक का अनुभव यह है कि चाहे जितना कानून हो, चाहे जितने सख्त प्रावधान हों, वह कागज पर ही रह जाते हैं, जो मिल मालिक और सरमायेदार होते हैं वे उस कानून को ताक में रखकर मनमाने तरीके से पैसा कमाते हैं और उपभोक्ता और काश्तकारों का जीवन असह्य कर देते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में, जहां तक मझे याद है, हमारी असेम्बली में भी इस प्रकार का प्रस्ताव आया था कि कितनी चावल की मिलें हैं उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया जाय। केन्द्रीय सरकार को भी चाहिए—आइन्दा जो पब्लिक सेक्टर में मिलें आएंगी वे तो पब्लिक सेक्टर में रहेंगी ही—कि जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर में मिलें चल रहीं हैं, जिनकी मशीनरी भी खराब हो गई है, ठीक तरह से काम नहीं कर रहीं हैं और स्थिति का फायदा उठा कर काफी दाम कमा रही हैं उन के ऊपर नियंत्रण कर के उनको अपने क्षेत्र में ले ले और उन के ऊपर कड़ा कन्ट्रोल रखे। केवल यह कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि हमने कानून में प्रावधान कर दिया है। उस पर सख्ती से अमल करना चाहिए। कानून केन्द्र बनाता है लेकिन उस पर अमल करना राज्य सरकारों पर छोड़ दिया जाता है।

राज्य सरकारें किस प्रकार से काम कर रही हैं उस बारे में चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता पर पिछला अनुभव यह है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार कुछ भी कानून बनाए उस पर राज्य सरकार का सख्ती से अमल नहीं होता और अच्छा कानून भी कागज पर रह जाता है। तो मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जिस उद्देश्य से यह बिल लाया गया है वह स्वागतयोग्य है, उसका हम स्वागत करते हैं, लेकिन उस में जो खामियां हैं उनको दूर करें और भविष्य में जितनी चावल की मिलें हैं उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण करें।

अगर हमें देश का विकास करना है तो सबसे पहले अनाज का सवाल हल करना है। इतना बड़ा कृषि प्रधान देश होने के बाद भी हजारों मन अनाज हमको बाहर से मंगाना पड़ता है। तीन पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के बाद भी हम उसी अन्न संकट में से गुजर रहे हैं। कल राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में कहा गया था कि इस वर्ष पूरे देश में अनाज के सम्बन्ध में काफी उत्साहवर्धक चिन्ह हैं। मैं भी इसे स्वीकार करता हूँ, लेकिन मुझे कल ही मालूम हुआ कि आज भी कुछ ऐसे प्रदेश हैं जिनके अधिकांश हिस्से में आज भी स्केयरसिटी कन्डीशन्स हैं। उड़ीसा के बारे में हमारे साथी कहते थे कि वहां स्केयरसिटी कन्डीशन्स हैं और कल वहां अकाल हो सकता है, दूसरे हिस्सों में भी स्केयरसिटी कन्डीशन्स हैं और वहां अन्न का अभाव हो सकता है। पूरे देश में अनाज की पैदावार गत वर्ष की अपेक्षा अच्छी हुई है, लेकिन उससे हमें कम्प्लेसेन्ट नहीं होना चाहिए, केवल आशावादी बन कर नहीं रहना चाहिए। अन्न का सवाल बुनियादी सवाल है, अन्न के सवाल को हमेशा के लिए हल करना चाहिए और सही तरीके से अनाज के बारे में सही पालिसी नहीं बनाई गई तो इस देश की इस मूल समस्या को हल नहीं किया जा सकेगा।

मेरी मान्यता है कि पूरा अनाज का व्यापार जब तक सरकार अपने हाथ में नहीं

सिद्धि, प्रोडक्शन से लेकर डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन तक, तब तक अन्न का सवाल हल नहीं हो सकता। चाहे जितना अन्न पैदा कीजिए, जब तक सरमायेदारों के पास शक्ति है पैदावार को कंट्रोल में रखने की और जब समय आए तब अधिक दामों में काले बाजार में बेचने की तब तक यह अन्न समस्या वैसी की वैसी रहेगी।

जब तक अनाज के सम्बन्ध में कोई बुनियादी नीति नहीं आयेगी तब तक इस तरह का बिल लाने का कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। लेकिन कुछ न होने से यह अच्छा है कि जहां तक हो सके चावल मिलों को अधिक से अधिक पब्लिक सैक्टर में लाए, उनके ऊपर सरकारी क्षेत्र का कंट्रोल हो। अकाल के समय छत्तीसगढ़ की चावल मिलों ने कितना अनापसनाप पैसा कमाया लोगों को भूखों मरते हुए देख कर भी? वहां के गोदामों में हजारों मन अनाज था लेकिन सरकार कुछ न कर पाई।

सरकार लैवी की बात करती है कि मिलों ने हमको लैवी दी। उन्होंने थोड़ी सी लैवी दे दी लेकिन कितने लोगों का शोषण किया उसकी ओर सरकार का ध्यान नहीं है। तो मेरा निवेदन है कि इतना ही काफी नहीं है, एक काम्प्रीहेंसिव तरीके से बुनियादी सवालों का हल होना चाहिए और जितनी चावल की मिलें हैं उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण करना चाहिए। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ।

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala) : Madam, so far as increase in rice production in this country and an equitable distribution of foodgrains, particularly rice are concerned, I would submit that the two most important things that remain to be done but have been, in the past, very often referred to as things of necessity are the introduction of State trading in foodgrains and as incidental

thereto, the taking over of all the rice mills in the country in the public or cooperative sector. It would be seen, on a reference to an Act passed by the Parliament as early as 1954, the Food Corporation Act, that the act provided that the F.C.I. that would be formed on the basis of that statute would take over the trade in foodgrains in the country and the act also provided, particularly by virtue of the provision contained in section 12 of that Act that all rice mills in the country would be taken over into some sort of public control, either as public sector organisations or in the ambit of the cooperative field.

So far as State-trading in foodgrains is concerned, the provision that is now attempted to be made in this Bill, would undoubtedly help to bring about that policy, but it will help only in a very limited and partial manner. What has been attempted in the provision in this Bill is to provide for a preference so far as new rice mills are concerned that they would be preferred to be organised as a public sector organisation or as a farmers' co-operative society. The amendment that is now brought to this Act—the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Act—is absolutely inadequate to meet the requirement of bringing into operation State-trading in foodgrains, and so far as this measure is concerned, in rice, and it would be necessary to have a provision in this Act as per which it would be possible for Government to take over, at least in stages, all the existing rice mills. In Andhra Pradesh the Food Corporation of India, which is doing the procurement for the State Government and which is doing the distribution of surplus rice to other States, is procuring it from the rice-millers. A large margin of profit accrues to the rice-miller on account of that method of procurement and it deprives the cultivator of paddy in Andhra Pradesh of his more legitimate dues in the shape of the price paid to him for his produce. Now this middle agent, who has nothing to do with the crop or its cultivation, gets all the profit practically. So one method by which we can improve the situation so far as production

[Shri K. Chandrasckharan]

and distribution of rice in this country are concerned, would be to take the earliest possible steps to bring over all the rice-mills, particularly in that big surplus State of Andhra Pradesh so far as rice is concerned, into the public or co-operative sector. But there is no attempt made in that regard in this Bill. I would even say, Madam, that the amendment covered by sub-clause 4-(2) of this Bill, which envisages the opening of new rice mills on a preferential basis either in the public or co-operative sector, is only a comouflage intended to hoodwink the public and save the prestige of the Government for the time being. That attempt has been there, Madam, since 1954. I do not remember how many times it has been repeated by hon. Ministers on the floor of this House and outside that State-trading in foodgrains would be brought into force and the rice mills would be taken over. Some months back I had tabled a question in this hon. House regarding the taking over of the existing rice mills, and for that purpose had asked how far the Central Government would be able to extend financial help to the State Governments concerned. And the answer was provided by the hon. Minister of State, Shri Gurupadaswamy, that the matter was under consideration. We do not know what stage of consideration the matter has reached what I believe, Madam, that nothing tangible has been attempted to be done so far, because I do not know whether any steps have been taken in this regard calling for statistics from the State Governments in this regard and the extent of financial help and the mode of financial help required. Therefore I submit, Madam, that the amendment that is now introduced by this Bill, giving this preferential possibility so far as new rice mills are concerned, is not likely to be of any benefit at all so far as State-trading in foodgrains is concerned, or the bringing over of rice mills ultimately under public control is concerned.

श्री बिभलकुमार भन्नालाल जी चौरडिया: उपसभापति महोदया, यह जो धान कटाई

उद्योग (विनियमन) संशोधन विधेयक रखा है। अभी जो पूर्ववक्ताओं ने दलील दी कि सरकार ने अनाज के सारे व्यापार को अपने हाथ में ले लेना चाहिए, उससे हमारी सारी समस्या हल हो सकती है, इसको सुनकर उपसभापति महोदया, मुझे बड़ी हंसी इसलिए आई कि मैंने मध्य प्रदेश में सरकार के द्वारा नियंत्रित स्थिति को भी और अभी सरकार के द्वारा जो जनता को छूट दी गई, उस स्थिति को भी, देखा। जब सरकार के द्वारा नियंत्रित स्थिति थी तब रात को, रात के दो बजे नहीं तो शाम को 8 या 9 बजे से ही लोगों को क्यू पर सवेरे तक बैठे रहना पड़ता था। माननीय खांडेकर जी जहां से आते हैं उस नगरी में क्यू में एक आदमी की मौत हो गई थी

श्री रमेशचंद्र शंकरराव खांडेकर : आज भी 160 मिल रहा है।

श्री बिभलकुमार भन्नालाल जी चौरडिया: आदमी की कीमत से 160 के बारे में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है। उपसभापति महोदया, कीमत का जहां तक सवाल है मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि ग्वालियर का तो मुझे पता नहीं, मैं अपने मानपुर गांव की जानता हूं जहां सहकारी समिति के द्वारा जो अनाज प्रोक्वियर किया गया है वह खरीदने के बाद, वजन में लेने के बाद और तमाम बीमारियों को निकालने के बाद भी हजारों के दीवाले में रहा। जनता को जितना कष्ट होता है, लैवी और मोनोपली परचेज का जो झगड़ा है उसके व्यौरे में अभी जाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मगर हमारे यहां के किसान को जो सुख महसूस कर रहा है, हमारे यहां का समझौता जो मेरे क्षेत्र का है उसको कितनी खुशी है, मुझे पता नहीं ग्वालियर प्रापर में क्या स्थिति है . . .

श्री अण्णासहब शिंदे : ग्वालियर तो मध्य प्रदेश में ही है।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया :
मगर मैं अपने यहां की मिसाल देता हूँ। वहां लोगों को खाने को अनाज नहीं मिलता था, सरकारी दुकानों पर अनाज मिलता नहीं था और चूंकि वह ग्रामीण क्षेत्र है इसलिये वहां सरकारी दुकानों पर अनाज पूरा नहीं मिलता है, लेकिन आज वहां के आदमियों का खाना जिस दर पर अब सरकार देती है उससे पता चलता है और इसको मैं चैलेंज करने के लिए भी तैयार हूँ और उसका एकमात्र कारण यह है कि मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार ने जो नीति अपनाई कि लैबी किसान से लेने की अपेक्षा व्यापारियों से ली जाय। किसान को हमारे सहकारी विभाग, सहकारी समितियों के जो सरकारी कर्मचारी अपने ही शासन का एक हिस्सा समझ कर उस हिसाब से दुर्व्यवहार करते थे उस दुर्व्यवहार से हमारे किसानों को मुक्ति मिली है, जो पैसा देने में बीस बीस बखड़े लगाते थे, कई तरह की शिकायतें होती थीं, वह शिकायतें किसान को नहीं रह गई हैं। आज आप किस के लिए काम करना चाहते हैं। या तो आप यह कह दें कि सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर हमें काम करना है, तब तो मुझे कुछ कहना नहीं है और यदि जनता के लिये करना है तो जिस जनता के लिए करना चाहिए उसको उसमें रिलीफ मिलती है वह काम हमें करना पडगा। हमारे मंत्रों जी ने इसमें बड़े प्रेम से लिख लिया है कि जनता को और से इस बात की अधिकाधिक मांग रही है कि देश में धान मिलों को सहकारी या राजकीय प्रबंध के अधीन अधिकाधिक लाया जाना चाहिए...

हम जनता में नहीं। जनता में डाह्याभाई पटेल नहीं और जनता में और लोग नहीं हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : जनता में डाह्याभाई पटेल और आप भी हैं।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया : जनता में हम नहीं हैं क्योंकि अगर जनता में

होते तो जनता की राय से सरकार चलती। जनता तो आजकल कांग्रेसवालों की है। जो कांग्रेस वालों ने निर्णय कर लिया वही जनता का निर्णय हो गया। लेकिन मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आज कांग्रेस में पूरी जनता नहीं है और आज हमारी सरकार जनता का नाम लेकर उसकी समस्याओं को हल नहीं कर सकती है। अगर जनता आपकी है तो आपने शक्कर पर से कंट्रोल क्यों तोड़ा? शक्कर के आधे हिस्से पर तो कंट्रोल रहे और आधे पर न रहे, इसकी कौन सी आवश्यकता थी। आज हमारी सरकार गांधी जी का नाम लेकर जनता को गुमराह करना चाहती है। गांधी जी ने कहा था कि जनता को हाथ कूटा धान खाना चाहिये। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार उन के बतलाये हुए रास्तों पर चल रही है? आज हमारे देश में चावल की बड़ी बड़ी मिलें हैं जहां पर धान की कुटाई होती है और उन की वजह से हमारे घरेलू धान की कुटाई समाप्त जैसी हो गई है तथा उसकी गुंजायश कम हो गई है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You may continue your speech later. The House now stands adjourned till 2 30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock. **THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA)** in the Chair.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सदन के उठने से पहले धान कुटाई उद्योग संशोधन विधेयक पर चर्चा कर रहा था। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार की जो यह नीति होती जा रही है कि जनता का नाम ले कर वह सारे उद्योगों पर नियंत्रण करें और इस तरह से वह जनता की भावनाओं को प्रकट करना चाहती है, ऐसा मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। मध्य प्रदेश में इस समय जो खाद्य नीति चल रही है उसके मैं कुछ उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ।

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया]

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां तक गांधी जी के सिद्धान्तों का प्रश्न है, वहां हमारी सरकार कहती है कि हाथ का कटा हुआ चावल खाना चाहिये क्योंकि उस में सब तत्व मौजूद रहते हैं और विटामिन किसी तरह से नष्ट नहीं होते हैं और दूसरी ओर वह लार्ज स्केल पर नई नई राइस मिलें खोल रही है। हमारी सरकार की नीति यह है कि जो गांवों में इन समय हल चल रहे हैं वे भी न चलें और वह इस तरह से छोटे-छोटे उद्योग करने वालों को कोई प्रोत्साहन नहीं देना चाहती है और इस तरह से उन पर बंधन लगाना चाहती है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जिस स्थान से आता हूं, उस के कुछ उदाहरण आपको बतलाना चाहता हूं। हमारे यहां कई स्थानों पर छोटे पैमाने पर राइस पैदा होता है और उस को साफ करने के लिये लोग, छोटे हलर से काम लेते हैं। एक तरफ तो सरकार हाथ कटाई की बात करती है और दूसरी तरफ दुगना खर्च कर के बड़ी बड़ी राइस मिलें कायम करती है, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूं कि वह हलर्स को क्यों बंद करना चाहती है। सरकार का मुख्य लक्ष्य यह है कि अनाज का वेस्टेज न हो क्योंकि हमारे यहां चावल की कमी है। जहां तक चावल की कमी का संबंध है और वेस्टेज का मामला है, इस बारे में किसी तरह का मतभेद नहीं हो सकता है। लेकिन जहां तक उत्पादन और वितरण का संबंध है, राइस मिलें हमारे उत्पादन को नहीं बढ़ा सकती हैं। हमारे देश में चावल की जो कमी है वह नई मिलें स्थापित करने से दूर नहीं हो सकती है। आप को जो वितरण की समस्या है उसके लिए यह माध्यम नहीं है कि आप राइस मिलों पर कंट्रोल करें। अगर आपको कंट्रोल करना है तो उन के द्वारा जो प्रोडक्शन होता है उस पर आप नियंत्रण करें। इस वर्ष मध्य प्रदेश में, जिस स्थान से मैं आता हूं वहां के मंदिरों में चढ़ाने के लिये चावल भी उपलब्ध नहीं हो

सकता था क्योंकि उस समय हमारी सरकार की नीति ही ऐसी थी। लेकिन अब वहां पर सरकारी नीति बदल गई है जिस के परिणामस्वरूप वहां पर चावल गेहूं और ज्वार सब कुछ मिलता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो सारी नियंत्रण की योजना चल रही है मैं उस का विरोध करता हूं। जहां तक हलर्स का सवाल है, हमारी के द्रीय सरकार इसका विरोध करती है और उसको चलने नहीं देना चाहती है। यह छोटे पैमाने पर गांवों में चलाया जाता है और सरकार इस को बंद करना चाहती है। इस तरह की सरकार की जो नीति है, वह मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। सरकार आज सारे देश में नई बड़ी बड़ी राइस मिलें खोलने की योजना बना रही है और इस में वह विदेशी कोलों बोरेक्षण करना चाहती है। वह जापान से राइस मिल ला रही है और इस तरह से फारेन एक्सचेन्ज जिसकी हमें बहुत ज्यादा सख्त जरूरत है वह खर्च कर रही है। हमारी सरकार को इस तरह से फारेन एक्सचेन्ज खर्च करने में चिंता नहीं होती है। उसको तो चिंता सिर्फ इस बात की है कि जो हमारी योजना है योजना वह सक्सेसफुल हो। आज हमारे देश में पब्लिक सेक्टर में जो उद्योग चल रहे हैं वे नुक्सान पर चल रहे हैं। और उन में जो हैं वे नुक्सान पर चल रहे हैं। और उन में जो मशीनरी लगी हुई है उसके स्पेयर पार्ट्स में काफी रुपया खर्च करना पड़ता है और फिर भी वे आसानी से उपलब्ध नहीं होते हैं। आज हमारी सरकार हलर्स को बंद कर के नई राइस मिलें स्थापित करना चाहती है। मैं चाहता हूं कि अगर सरकार नियंत्रण करना चाहती है तो वह उत्पादन पर नियंत्रण करे और इस बारे में कोई आपत्ति नहीं हो सकती है। लेकिन जो छोटे छोटे आटे पीसने की चक्कियां हलर लगा कर लोगों को चावल साफ करके खाना दे सकती हैं, उस में हमारी सरकार क्यों बीच में आ रही है।

हमारी सरकार इस कार्य में क्यों बंधन डाल रही है कि हलर नहीं चला सकते हैं और जो यह कार्य करेगा उसकी सजा दी जायगी।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे यहां गांव में एक हलर है और हमारे पड़ोस में जो छोटे छोटे लोग हैं वे अपना पोटलो में पैडी लाकर साफ करवा कर ले जाते हैं। हमारी सरकार सहकारिता की बात करती है और उसकी नीति भी यही है। लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो सहकारिता की बीमारी है वह पावर लूम में भी अपनाई गई। हमारे नगर में इस सम्बन्ध में एक सहकारी समिति भी बनाई गई तथा लोगों ने पैसा भी इकट्ठा किया। सरकार ने भी अपनी तरफ से पैसे से मदद की और वस कुछ किया, लेकिन नतीजा यह हुआ कि जिस के पास पावर लूम है, उन के पावर लूम नहीं चल रहे हैं और उन पर कर्जा हो गया है।

श्री अण्णासाहेब सिंदे : आप सहकारी आन्दोलन में मदद नहीं करते होंगे ?

श्री डाह्याभाई बी० पटेल (गुजरात) : लेकिन सरकारी आन्दोलन में तो मदद करते हैं।

श्री बिमल कुमार भालालजी चोरडिया : हम सहकारिता आन्दोलन की मदद करते हैं और जहां तक उस के मदद करने का सवाल है उसका विरोध नहीं करते हैं। समाज में यदि इस तरह की वृत्ति हो, समाज में इस तरह त्याग करने की शक्ति हो तो हम अपने भाइयों की मदद करने में बहुत ज्यादा सफल हो सकते हैं। आखिर हमारी सरकार भी तो सहकारिता के आधार पर चल रही है। लेकिन जब सहकारिता के आधार पर किसी मंत्री पद के बारे में या किसी प्रतिष्ठा के बारे में कुछ मत भेद होता है तो फिर सहकारिता बिलकुल गायब हो जाती है और एक दूसरे को टिकने नहीं दिया जाता

है। जहां तक सहकारिता का सिद्धान्त है वह बहुत अच्छा है। सत्य बोलने का सिद्धान्त बहुत अच्छा है। लेकिन कितने प्रतिशत लोग अपने स्वार्थ का ध्यान रखकर इसका पालन करते हैं। आज हमारी सरकार वास्तविकता को ध्यान में रख कर, आगे बढ़ने का काम नहीं करती है। इस दृष्टि से आज हमारी सरकार इस चीज पर प्रतिबंध लगाने जा रही है और उस को ज्यादा सख्त करने जा रही है, जिसका कि मैं विरोध करता हूँ।

दूसरा प्वाइन्ट मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने यह जो बंधन लगाया है कि एक साल के अन्दर अन्दर जिस ने कुछ काम नहीं किया वे मिलें बंद समझी जायेंगी। इस सम्बन्ध में पहली बात तो यह है कि गत वर्ष हमारे यहां पैडी की पैदावार कम हुई थी और पैदावार कम होने के लिये राइस मिल मालिक दोषी नहीं हैं। यह तो प्रकृति का प्रकोप था जिसकी वजह से हमारे देश को इस तरह की स्थिति का सामना करना पड़ा। अगर हमारे देश में पैडी पैदा नहीं हुई तो नियम के अन्तर्गत वे मिलें बन्द हो जायेंगी जिन्होंने कुछ काम नहीं किया। इस तरह की मिलों को लाइसेंस नहीं दिया जायेगा, इस तरह का जो प्रतिबंध सरकार लगाने जा रही है, वह न्यायसंगत मालूम नहीं देता है।

इसके साथ जो हमारे देश में राइस मिलें हैं, जिनकी मशीनरी पुरानी हो गई है उन्हें नई मशीनरी लगाने के लिए कहा जा रहा है। मेरा नम्र निवेदन है जिन लोगों की इस तरह के मिलों में पूंजी लगी हुई है उनको बहुत परेशानी का सामना करना पड़ेगा क्योंकि उनकी इतनी पूंजी इस काम में लाब्ड है। हमारे गांव वालों ने हलर्स में उनके नाम से काफी रुपया लगाया है और इससे गरीब लोग अपने धान की सफाई कराते हैं जिसको सरकार रोकना चाहती है। इस तरह से जो रुपया गांवों में लोगों ने हांस और

[श्री: बिमलकुमारमन्नालालजी चौरडिया]
शैलर्स में लगाया है वह सब ब्लाक हो जायगा और उसका कोई उपयोग नहीं होगा। इस बारे में सरकार को अवश्य ध्यान रखना चाहिए ताकि गरीब लोगों ने जो रुपया इस कार्य में लगाया है वह बेकार न जाने पाये।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार ने यह फैसला कर लिया है राइस मिलों के नाम पर वह एक भी पैसा विदेशी मुद्रा में खर्च नहीं करेगी। हमारे यहां जो कुछ शैलर्स और हलर्स हैं, उनमें ही कुछ परिवर्तन करके यहां कार्य करेगी। सरकार विदेशों से कोई नई मशीनरी नहीं मंगायेगी और जो कुछ हमारे देश में उपलब्ध है उसी से काम चलायेगी। जो लोग इस तरह से कार्य करेंगे उन्हें सरकार ग्राण्ट देने की व्यवस्था करेगी, क्या यह सरकार इस तरह की कोई योजना बना रही है।

जहां तक हाथ कुटे धान का सवाल है, सरकार कहती है कि इससे नुकसान ज्यादा हो जाता है और चावल बेकार जाता है। इस हाथ कुटाई से ज्यादा होता है और चावल भी ज्यादा नष्ट होता है। यदि आपको सिद्धान्तप्रिय है कि इस में ज्यादा नुकसान होता है तो फिर हाथ कुटाई क्यों अप्रिय है? इसलिये प्रिय है कि गांधीजी इसको ऐडवोकेट करते थे और इसीलिये हम अभी तक खोदी पहनते हैं क्योंकि इससे गरीबों को मजदूरी मिलती है। अगर हाथ कुटे में वह ज्यादा टूटता है तो वह छोटे हलर वाले बेचारों पर इस तरह का प्रतिबंध लगाना न्याय संगत प्रतीत नहीं होता है। इसलिए मैं आप्रह करूंगा कि हमारी सरकार इस पर पुनः विचार करे। अगर प्रोड्यूसर अपना काम करवाने आता है तो ठीक है आप वितरण की दृष्टि से उसका सारा स्टाक रख लीजिये और उत्पादन से लेकर वितरण का काम अपने हाथ में कर लीजिये अगर आप को यह प्रिय हो यद्यपि हमको यह नहीं है। लेकिन अगर आप प्रोड्यूसिंग के

काम को लेना चाहते हैं और छोटे छोटे लोगों के कामों को करना चाहते हैं तो इससे राष्ट्र का हित नहीं होगा, इससे राष्ट्र को बहुत नुकसान होगा और यह हमारे देश की प्रगति में बाधक होगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Miss Mary Naidu.

MISS M. L. MARY Naidu (Andhra: Pradesh) : So soon ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Miss Mary Naidu.

MISS M. L. MARY NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh) : So seen ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P.] BHARGAVA) : If you want to speak later I can call Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

MISS M. L. MARY NAIDU : Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Shri M.P. Bhargava) : Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not know exactly what is at the back of the mind of the Minister when he has brought forward such a Bill. The Ministry of Agriculture after having miserably failed to guide our peasants, to give them better seed to encourage them, to help them to become self-reliant, to import seed and know-how from people who know, now want to take control of the situation because of the good monsoon and because wilfully better seed and better know tim: has come to this country I consider this as one of the measures that this Government introduces as a part of their policy of regimentation and trying to control the life of everyone including the ordinary simple farmer who grows a little paddy This Government has not come forward ever to say a good word to the poor cultivator or to encourage him or to see that he gets a better deal for the hard labour that he puts in, for the hard work that he puts in even in inclement weather but comes forward readily to take control of his crop when it is ready. This is a most misguided m asu_{re}

The previous speaker referred to Gandhiji's ideas on rice milling but I think the measure is a far cry from Gandhiji's ideas and the reasons why he was opposed to rice milling. The first point that he brought forward was that rice was milled too fine and that the people went after the taste and the look of fine and beautiful rice and throw away the real substance that is there in the outer coating of the rice before we come to the shell. No effort is made in this Bill to ensure that so much of milling is going to be prevented. Nothing in this Bill says that hand pounding of rice which is in vogue in the villages is going to be encouraged in any way. The only thing that this Bill says is : here is a snare laid for you and you are bound to fall a prey to it and so the Government will take control whether you like it or not. And just now we have received a copy of the amendment of the hon. Minister that displays his mentality. He wants the words "the regular membership whereof is restricted by the bye-laws and rules of the society to farmers 'farmers' co-operatives and State Governments" to be put in.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : Why not ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Because we know what it is. We know how your societies are being run. How much is your society's debt ? You come out with all that before you go further.

Sir, this is exactly the point. These Congressmen want to come into position and power and want to get control of all these societies so that they can mismanage them. And there is nobody to ask them. That is their outlook on co-operation and this is the type of co-operation that these people want to preach in this country. They want to crush the poor simple farmer, instead of encouraging him, instead of making him stand on his own legs, you remove all other means of dehusking rice, even the small hullers. In villages we have water pumps and along with the water pumps we have mills where flour is ground. If one farmer is able to add to it a huller so that it helps the economy of the village, it is going to be illegal accord-

ing to this and the poor farmer is going to be at the mercy of the rice mill, whether it is private or Government. Even though many of our friends on the other side are so much in level with State enterprise experience has shown that State enterprise is inefficient and expensive and not helpful to the progress of this country.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR : Private sector is also sometimes like that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Private sector sometimes, public sector always; that is the difference. You have to choose. I am not pleading for inefficient or corrupt private sector. You have your laws; deal with them properly. If your officers do not deal with them properly deal with your officers. If your Ministers are incompetent and if they cannot deal with these people, throw them out. But this is not the remedy; the remedy is not more and more State control. Where are we going ? What is happening to our economy ? All this is the result of this sort of politics of the Government. In this Government people who are found to be inefficient, people who are found to be corrupt, are promoted to higher posts. The case of Mr. Malavia is well known. And after all that, where has he been put ? He is put in charge of one of the biggest State enterprises. That is the outlook.

श्री विमल कुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
लंगड़े लूले बैनों के लिये व्यवस्था है ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : प्रपने-प्रपने
दिलों में पूछिये ।

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : That is what I say is wrong with this Bill, the very outlook and the policy of this Government.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Malavia has done some service to the country and you also know that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am not saying about that; that point is

[Shri Dahyadbhai V. Patel
am not referring etc. I am referring to
the point.]

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE :
You are out of point.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL :
I am thoroughly on the point. If it is
too thick for you I cannot help it.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Have
you ever run a co-operative ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL :
I know something of the co-operatives.
I have heard a little of your co-operatives
also, my dear friend.

MISS S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras) :
Co-operatives are nothing but corruption
breeding centres.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Then
it must be your breeding.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL :
This measure is an indirect measure but
even though it is indirect it is very open
to those who want to see. This is a measure
by which the Government wants to ac-
quire control over the rice milling industry;
small or big, to crush out the rice milling
centres in villages and to put the villages
and the small cultivators at the mercy
of big rice mills whether they are in the
public sector or in the private sector.
We know where the large public sector
units have to look to. They have to look
for mercy to the Government. If they
want electric power, if they want water
pipe, if they want to import some machin-
ery, if they want some parts for their machi-
nes, they are strangled if they are not in
the good books of this Government. There-
fore this is where this Bill is going to take
you and I would appeal to friends who
see reason, who understand things, to
oppose this measure. Sir, this Bill cannot
be supported by any reasonable person.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pra-
desh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I support
the Bill, but I must say the Bill is very
disappointing.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West
Bengal) : Still you support it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : I support
it because this is step forward from the
present confusing state of affairs in the
rice-milling industry. I would have been
happier if this Bill was the Rice-milling
Industry Nationalisation Bill rather than
the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation)
Amendment Bill. I say so because as
a humble Congressman I have not for-
gotten the Bhuvanewar Resolution of
the Indian National Congress passed in
January 1964. That Resolution was pre-
sented as a Resolution on Socialism. It
was, of course, not a Resolution on Social-
ism, but it was a progressive Resolution
which pleaded for the nationalisation of
certain industries. In this rice-milling
was prominently mentioned. The national-
isation of the rice-milling industry is im-
portant because it has as its raw material
the produce of small producers and these
small producers are cheated by those who
run the rice-milling and rice-hulling mach-
inery. Apart from nationalisation, which
is a progressive step, it would have pre-
vented the small cultivator from being
exploited by unscrupulous businessmen
and unscrupulous millowners. It is really
unfortunate that four years after the Bhu-
vanewar Resolution, the Government has
brought forward a Bill only to amend the
Act of 1958 and to make a provision
that the defunct mills will have to obtain
a new licence. The only correct step is
if a rice-milling unit or a rice-hulling unit
becomes defunct and remains defunct for
one year, it should be taken over, because
a rice-milling and a rice-hulling unit is
established in a certain area to provide
certain facilities for the cultivator. If
the unscrupulous or inefficient millowner
denies the cultivators an opportunity to
get their rice hulled and milled in their
area itself and the unit does not function
for one year, what is the point in giving
him another licence, after one year ? It is
like a radio licence. In the case of a radio
licence, if the radio set is defunct, you do
not need a licence. So, by asking the

the defunct rice mill to take a new licence, the Government is doing nothing much. It is only providing for some waste of paper.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab) : Why should the Government take over a losing concern ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : The Government should take over a rice mill which is defunct and which is even losing because it encourages the people to produce rice and it provides the agriculturist an opportunity to get his rice milled in his own neighbourhood. That encourages the production of more rice which many people in this country like to set and which is in short supply.

Another interesting thing about the Bill is that the Statement of Objects and Reasons says :—

“Most of the rice mills are antiquated and use outmoded technology with the result that the out turn of use from outmoded hillers is much lower than that from sheller-cum-polisher type of mill. Now, if most of the units in this country are outmoded, the correct policy was the one which Mr. Subramaniam enunciated when he was the Minister of Food and Agriculture. He said that the Government would set up modern rice-milling plants in certain areas which really produced good quality rice, but it appears the Government has no policy or at least in the Government there is no continuation of policy. When a Minister is changed or when a portfolio is reshuffled, the old policy goes by the Board. What has the Government done to follow the good policy about rice-milling which Mr. Subramaniam had enunciated in 1966 ? I am told that four modern plants were ordered. Has the Government cancelled the orders ? I am told that at one or two places construction of big buildings for the modern rice-milling units was also started, but as soon as Mr. Subramaniam left the food Ministry, the rice-milling units were gone. The Minister himself says, the

Govt. itself says that most of the units are out of order and the use of outmoded units means less of outturn which means waste of valuable food products. Still the Government proposes to give them a new licence again and again. The correct policy in the matter is the Bhuvanagar Resolution. If you do not have the courage to implement the Resolution of the Indian National Congress, at least follow what Mr. Subramaniam began and set up modern rice-milling plants in areas where rice production justifies it.

I think this Bill has many defects and I hope the Minister will himself bring forward amendments to the amending Bill and improve its provisions.

3 P.M.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I support the Bill, but I feel the purpose of the Bill will not be served unless we take note of the real deficiencies on the food front. The purpose of the Bill is to have sufficient control on the rice-milling industry, so that rice may be procured properly and the deficiency in rice tackled effectively by the Government. But the object of this Bill has a limited scope. Unless paddy is grown, unless paddy is sufficient in this country, this rice-milling industry, even if it is nationalised, will not help us much. But within the limited resources that we have, namely, limited production of paddy, whatever we could do we are being baffled every year because of the nefarious manipulations of those persons who have at present the control over this rice-milling industry. How things take shape in rural areas we all know. The farmer grows paddy. That paddy is purchased by the persons engaged in the rice-milling industry. The farmers do not get the proper price, that is, the paddy rather at a discount to those who have the rice-milling industry plus the money sufficient enough to purchase the paddy. Wherefrom this money comes ? This money comes from the big banks. This can be done by an ordinary method, namely, that the Government itself

[Shri D. L. Sen Gupta]

should start the rice-milling industry and as such purchase the paddy through the Food Corporation.

As we all know, more than Rs. 100 crores or Rs. 120 crores is in this rice trade. This Government of ours has got to be conscious of this financial commitment if it wants to engage itself in this rice-milling industry. So far the Government has not arranged for sufficient godowns or warehouses to keep the stock of paddy, and the Food Corporation of India has therefore not been able to produce sufficient quantities of rice even from the market. The Food Corporation of India, to function effectively must have not only sufficient fund but also the other essentials necessary for the successful functioning of this rice-milling industry. We have four sources of production of rice. One is hand-pounding; another is through the Food Corporation of India; another is through registered co-operative societies, and the fourth is through private persons or body of persons. If the fourth one is eliminated, I do not think the third one, that is the registered co-operative societies, should be allowed to function. The co-operative movement in this country is very very poor. I as the President of the goldsmith workers union in the State of West Bengal have seen that after the Gold Control Order. . . (Interruption). . . the co-operative was for big jewellers. Similarly if we stop the private person or body of persons to continue in this rice-milling industry directly or indirectly, we should also stop their coming in a camouflaged manner through these registered co-operative societies also. Unless the co-operative is a co-operative in the true sense of the terms, it becomes again a syndicate of the millowners, the private persons, under the garb of co-operative. I am in favour of the hand-pounding industry which keeps a large number of people engaged even as labour. Besides, there is also what Gandhiji suggested about the vitamin aspect of the rice so produced. But broadly speaking, the Food Corporation of India or the Government should

take matter up in all seriousness. The unfortunate feature of the thing is this. In the Financial Memorandum it is said : Non-recurring expenditure Rs. 25,000; Recurring expenditure Rs. 50,000 per year. This estimate is too poor, and with this estimate, with this financial commitment you cannot make the scheme a success even for the purpose of its regulation.

My friend, Mr. Chordia, has spoken against the incorporation of section 3A in this Bill, which provides :

“The provisions of this Act shall apply to rice-hullers attached to, or maintained with, any flour, oil, dal or other mill, or pumping set as they apply to rice mills subject to the modification” etc.

The purpose is not to kill these rice-hullers. The purpose is to stop the corruption. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I know as one who had occasion to study this matter that in our State of West Bengal the Government's policy of levy could not be successful because of the various devices of the rice-milling industry, and one such device was these rice-hullers. What was the position? There was a levy on the rice-milling industries. But those rice-milling industries used to get rice milled through these hullers; it was in fact milled by them or milled through them as these rice-hullers had no rice and had no levy because they were supposed to be small people. In fact, their production is unaccounted for. During the regime of the United Front Government, they wanted to procure 100 per cent production of these rice mills. During the present regime in West Bengal, instead of 100 percent, they have suggested 75 per cent procurement. The present Government's as well as the other Government's target of the procurement was several lakhs tonnes of rice but because of the manipulations of this rice milling industry, which is an important factor, the procurement could not be more than one million tonnes. So, procurement has very often failed because of the absence of sufficient control on this

rice milling industry, and now the Government has become conscious the seriousness of the situation.

In our State there are about 1,400 husking machines, powers-driven, out of which about 700 are unlicensed and in many cases even three weeks' production do not come into the Government stocks. The ingenious device of these rice millers or the husking machines wallas is to take away a big portion of the rice into the black market, which goes in for hoarding and which indirectly goes to increase the price of rice, creating an artificial scarcity. If there is no rice, we can understand it, but when it is there, how and why it should be had at a higher price, we cannot understand. So, the deficiencies and failures of the Government as well as the various loopholes in our economic system, all cannot be stopped by this piece of legislation. Legislation has got to be more realistic; legislation has got to be more practical and practicable, and this is only possible. If the Government puts its mind to the problem and wants to do something really serious.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise here to congratulate the Government for bringing forward this Bill. However, as my friend, Mr. Arjun Arora, has rightly pointed out, a Bill has got its own shortcomings and we should have really got a complete Rice Milling (Industry) Nationalisation Bill. Instead of that, we have got a partial approach to this problem. Even then, I congratulate the Government for this approach because ultimately it will go to such a stage where the rice milling industry will fall in the pattern of the public distribution system and the processing of rice.

Sir, I am really sorry, because certain of my learned friend from that side have criticised the cooperatives. I can appreciate their feelings because the cooperatives might not have been working well in every State of this country. It is just like the case of an elephant and nine blind men and

whoever touched the elephant said that was the elephant. It is not so here. The failure of co-operatives is the failure of the human beings and nothing else. It is only the co-operatives in an economic system which can bring the weaker sectors together and better their prospects in the agricultural processing and in the small industrial sectors.

I also do not understand the remark of my friend there, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, about this amendment. What is wrong in the organisation of the co-operative processing society wherein the weaker sector is usually given share contribution by the Government? It is not State participation in the co-operatives, it is equity participation and it helps the weaker section to get that much of help for that co-operative society.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : How will Mr. Dahyabhai Patel know this?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I want to tell him.....

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : I wish you succeeded in convincing him.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : The point is that the Swatantra Party has along been encouraging modernisation. Now, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel is coming here saying about the small pumpwalla having a rice mill and of getting a wastage of 10 to 15 per cent. In rice milling why encourage him? On the country he should have encouraged the modernisation of the apparatus. I would have liked it.

Now, I will come to the main part of my observation. I really looked into this Bill. This Rice Milling Control Order or the Control Bill should have been drafted in such a way that those outmoded rice mills which are installed in this country—say, hullers or some other contrivances which have been either independently worked or have been connected to either flour mills or water pump sets, etc.—they should have been gradually scrapped. There should be some provi-

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

sion for this because, as you know, if you want to get out of the difficulty of this chronic food shortage in the country, unless modernisation and avoidance of wastage is attempted, there is no solution. I looked at this Bill in the hope that the hon. Minister would have introduced certain clauses in certain amendments that gradually, within a period just like the textile mills—the old hullers, type 16, must be scrapped and instead of that money must be given either to the private sector men or the small people or the co-operative societies wherever they are to instal machines on some modern basis so that wastage can be avoided. It was not there; some such amendment should have been introduced for this purpose.

I also see from the Bill that the penalty clause is absolutely inadequate. I do not say this only for the purpose of saying. But I know; the entire procurement scheme of every State wherever rice is grown, has been sabotaged by these rice millers in the private sector. What is happening is that they are purchasing at a very high price and sabotaging the Government's effort at public distribution of rice. The penalty introduced is some six months' imprisonment. And now they have amended this with the confiscation of the machinery. But the old machinery has got no value. So, the punishment must be more deterrent. The penalty must be to such an extent that must be afraid of sabotaging the Government's effort at rice procurement. Similarly, in the case of any rice miller who indulges in black-marketing, if the punishment is enhanced, this type of anti-social activities will be curbed and we will get the co-operation of the co-operatives and modern rice mills installed by the private sector people so that the public distribution system can work better.

There is another aspect, as rightly pointed out by Mr. Chordia. I support him. Perhaps, the Minister may not be able to say; there should be no control on the purchase of indigenous rice mill,

and that cannot be introduced in this Bill. But may I request the hon. Minister that while the co-operatives and the public sector mills are encouraged and helped by Government money, there should be a dictum that only the modern mills indigenously manufactured in this country would be financed by Government money and nothing else?

With these remarks, I support the Bill.

MISS M. L. MARY NAIDU : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity. I rise to support this Bill because we have seen last year how much food wastage was there and how difficult it was for the Government to have control over certain mills. All the same, Sir, I agree with some of my friends that there are a few defects in this Bill specially with regard to one years' minimum time given for taking over a mill. As my friends, Mr. Chordia, said there may be many causes which one years' time is too small. There may be flood and rice may not be available. Or a certain mill-owner may have died due to accident or some sickness and the children may be minors and the people may be ready to hand over the mill to take advantage. Such injustices should not be done because of this Bill. I would like the Government to see that some provision is made that people do not suffer because of one year's lapse.

I have one more point to make. Modern mills are really very necessary. But as Mr. Arjun Arora said, this want of continuance in Government work is hurting the nation and the people. During Mr. Subramaniam's time, elaborate plans were drawn up and expenses undergone to construct Government buildings which are now lying unused. If such a thing goes on, the country will be suffering a lot. We would therefore, like the Government to see that whatever was constructed by Mr. Subramaniam should be put to the maximum use. Rice is being wasted by the rats enjoying it rather than the human beings enjoying it

With regard to the growth of rats I have been giving suggestions from time to time but the Government never bothers about it. Of course, a couple of lakhs of rupees spent by Ministers on research in their department may make them sit up. In Burma after long research they have found out that Lantana plant fruits, which are plenty in our country, are great breeders of rats by lakhs. This research was undertaken by the Burma Government because of some plague areas there. I would like the Government to write to the Burma Government on this subject and see whether these lantana plants cannot be destroyed here to save our food from destruction by rats.

Then I come to another point. My hon. friend on the Opposite side was speaking about Andhra Pradesh being over surplus. I say it is not enjoying its own rice because of Government taking over stocks of rice or some such thing. The hon. Minister recently visited Andhra. There may be some talukas which may be over-surplus. But what about the majority of those talukas in Andhra Pradesh which have terrific drought about which no fuss is made? They are having no food and like gypsies people are leaving their homes and going to talukas where there is enough food available. I am referring to talukas like Darsi, Podli and Udaigiri in Nellore district and also some parts of Rayalaseema and Guntur districts. Actually, the people have left their homes and gone over to some surplus areas in search of work and food. That is the situation in the over-surplus areas of Nellore district itself; they are not having their own rice. They are having such horrid rice that the people are ready to revolt.

AN. HON. MEMBER : Why do they not?

MISS M. L. MARY NAIDU : They might when the time comes. But at present they do not. They are waiting for better times. We hope this year will be better and everybody will have sufficient rice because the situation in the other

parts of the country has improved and there may not be any more demands on Andhra and Andhra may be able to use its own rice and thus escape hunger. So that is the situation in Andhra Pradesh.

Sir, I most heartily welcome modernisation of co-operative mills in Andhra. But that is all in the public sector. I repeat the word "public sector" because we have no public sector industries there.

(Interruption by Shri Arjun Arora)

They are not all in the public sector. Most of them are in the private sector. For instance, Andhra is the biggest consumer of fertiliser. But have we got one industry in the public sector there? No. The public sector industries are elsewhere. Power production can be best in Andhra Pradesh, and we are the biggest users of power. But power is in another State. Therefore, let it not be like that. If the rice industry is to be in Andhra let the public sector mills also be in Andhra Pradesh and let the Government control them and make whatever use they want to make of the rice produced in the State.

Sir, I do not want to say such about the subject because the Bill is really good. Unless a Bill is introduced to control and modernise the industry we must go ahead. The Bill would make a few people suffer also. I would like the Government by some means or other to see that there is no discontent in the poorer classes, that the smaller industries that are already existing there do not suffer.

With these words I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to speak.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I find that this is one of those usual eye-wash Bills which are being generally produced almost with machine-like rapidity and accuracy, if I may say so, by the Congress Government. It is a kind of sop to the demands of the people that something should be done in the food sector so that the people may get better food and more

[Shri A.P. Chatterjee]

food. We hear all those usual cliches that are read out by the Government at the time of bringing in such Bills.

They have said that the public sector undertakings, the co-operative societies, should have something to do with rice Mills. That is one of the objects and reasons given in the Bill. That is also one of the objects and reasons on which the Bill is sought to be supported and passed into legislation.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, may I just submit before you that this kind of hanky-panky with the demands of the public in the matter of food supply, I think, makes the situation worse rather than bettering it? The public has been persistently and insistently demanding before the Government the complete take over of the rice mills because unless the rice mills are taken over, unless they are brought into the public sector, or are directly Government owned, this kind of black-marketing in rice and paddy will continue. We know how—at least that is the experience in the State of West Bengal—the big Jotedars play foul with the people who produce the largest quantity of paddy in the country. These producers bring the paddy to the rice mills, get it husked and then we do not know how the paddy gets away from the control of the Government, from the lands of the people, it goes into the black alley of the notorious black market in the different cities of India and gets lost there. And you do not know how to get that paddy back. Your procurment agencies, your procurement officers run helter-skelter in the villages; they go into the villages and try to ferret out whatever paddy can be obtained, from the jotedars and the hoarders. But that becomes an absolutely losing game of hide and seek, a losing effort to get the rice back into the open market from the black market. Therefore, Mr. Vice Chairman the only way by which black marketing in rice could have been stopped the only way by which people could have been assured of food for all the months of the year, was to take over the rice mills. And

that was the demand from the public and from the various public organisations. But what do we find in this Bill? We find in this Bill a mere lip-service paid to the question that some preference would be given to public and co-operative sectors in the establishment of rice mills. We find there is a provision in section 4 of the amending Bill which says that "In granting a permit, the Central Government shall give preference to a Government company or a corporation owned or controlled by the Government or to a farmers co-operative society." But what prevents them, Mr. Vice Chairman, from taking over the rice mills when we know very well that these are the rice mills through which black-marketing in paddy and rice is carried on? Actually every one knows that paddy is a thing which in order to be used has to be husked and, therefore, paddy can be made usable either through husking mills or through hullers. Therefore, if the Government had been a little serious in tackling the food situation in the country, the least that the Government should have done and could have done was to take over the rice mills. As you know Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have had this bumper crop of food grains, and we have heard that about 95 million tonnes of food grains will have been produced this year. Now I am quite sure, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that, as happened in 1964, we shall not be able to build up any stocks, we shall not be able to build up any buffer stock for rainy days because this huge quantity of food grains, produced by the labour of the people in India will also get lost through the Government's criminal negligence, and that will be possible only because the machineries through which paddy is husked and made usable—I mean the rice mills and the hullers—are still preferred to be left in the hands of private persons. It won't do to say that when you issue a new permit, that permit will be given to a Government owned undertaking a Government company or a farmers' co-operative society because firstly the old rice mills will continue to operate. Secondly, the Bill itself says that when a particular rice mill has ceased to

operate, preference will be given to it also if it comes forward for a fresh licence or a fresh permit. So the space available for Government-owned companies and Government-owned undertakings for the purpose of rice milling operations will be woefully narrow.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Suppose an old mill closes down and it applies again and there is an application from the co-operative or public sector, then they *i.e.* old mills are not entitled under this.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : That is quite true, as the hon. Minister points out. But then section 4 says this "In granting a permit under this section (whether for the establishment of a new rice mill or for re-commencing rice-milling operation in a defunct rice mill, the Central Government shall give preference to a Government company or a corporation owned or controlled by the Government". That can be all right, but then it is merely a question of giving preference. Why was it not provided in this section that in such cases, a licence shall be given only to Government owned companies or Government-owned undertakings? Mr. Vice-Chairman, we know from our experience that preferences are often made topsy-turvy in certain situations, situations which are created by influences working from the back stairs. It is true that preference will be given to a farmers' cooperative society or to a Government company or to a Corporation owned or controlled by the Government. But we do not know when and under what circumstances this question of preference will be decided in favour not of the Government companies or Government corporations or farmers' co-operative societies, but of the old defunct mills themselves because there is nothing mandatory in this section that in such cases—either in the case of new mills or in the case of defunct mills—the permit will not be given to private concerns. That is not stated. It is a question of mere preference and we know that 'preference' is a term which is very elastic in its content and this elasti-

city is rather suspicious. Well, if the hon. Minister thinks that in the case of starting of new mills or in the case of re-starting or re-commencing of defunct mills, he means to give licences or permits only to those rice mills which are owned by the Government or by corporations owned or controlled by the Government or by farmers' co-operative societies, then the hon. Minister can even now amend this section to lay down that in future no licence or permit will be given to private corporations or private concerns. That at least, Mr. Vice-Chairman would speak for the *bona fides* of the Bill. If that is done, mere preference will not do. The whole thing, therefore, retains the *status quo*. And what is the *status quo*? The *status quo* is a state of things which is in favour of blackmarketeers and hoarders. These hoarders will continue to have black-marketing in rice after getting the paddy through the rice mills. You know the owners of these rice mills and the owners of the paddy in villages always work hand in glove. It is not a question of 'often'. They 'always' work hand in glove. And sometimes we find that the owners of the rice mills are also big *jotedars* in the villages and they set up hulling operations and husking operations either through their own mills or on some cottage industry basis which is merely hiding screen for the rice mills to be run by them in their own interests. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, what I am saying is that it is absolutely important that this Bill should be amended thoroughly. This amending Bill which seeks to amend the Act of 1958 is no good and if any measure is to do some good to the people then the hon. Minister should withdraw this Bill at the present moment and bring forward another Bill to this House after due consideration and mature deliberation from the point of view of giving benefit to the people. Mr. Vice-Chairman, after all this is a year in which we can make up for the huge deficits that we were suffering from the last three or four years. This is a year in which we can garner our stocks and we can make do with our own resources and then perhaps a time may come when we may not depend at all on foreign imports

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

of foodgrains. Therefore much will depend on what we do with the foodgrains of this year. It is very important that this year's grains should be properly stocked and garnered. Of course when I say this, I also bear this in mind that a good percentage of the stocks of foodgrains perhaps have by now found their place in the black market. This Bill therefore could have been brought a little earlier to show their *bona fides*. But perhaps something can yet be retrieved and saved from total loss and if the Government is serious, the Government should immediately do something to save the situation by taking over the rice mills by amending section 4 of the Act to say that from this day onwards no licence or permit for rice milling shall be given to private concerns. If you cannot do this, I will humbly submit that this Bill will be worth nothing and will be just like old wine in a new bottle, nothing more than that. Therefore I am suggesting with all the emphasis at my command that the hon. Minister should withdraw the Bill at the present moment and he can bring forward another Bill during this very Budget Session after getting this Bill amended thoroughly and making a provision for nationalising or taking over the rice mills of the country. In that way we can get over the chronic food deficits and food shortages which are artificially created by persons who want to trade on the blood and sweat and toil and tears of others, I mean the blackmarketeers and hoarders. That is what I would like to submit.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Amendment Bill, 1967 has been discussed in the House. A number of hon. Members have participated in the debate. Contrary to my expectations, some controversies have been raised about the principles involved in the Bill. In fact I do not know why some of the hon. Members should have been so suspicious about the measures which the Government contemplates to take by enacting this law. There are certain broad policies which

have been accepted in this country by the representatives of public opinion. Rice is one of the very important cereal crops in our country. About 40 per cent. of our foodgrains production constitutes paddy and, as has been mentioned by some hon. Members, paddy cannot be used by consumers without being properly processed and in a country like ours where we are struggling with food deficits and food shortages, we have to see that the element of wastage is minimised at every stage. While dealing with the Bill of course I do not want to deal with the other aspects of wastage involved.

The main point for consideration, as far as the present Bill is concerned, is that during the processing of paddy at present a considerable amount of rice, a very valuable food, is wasted, because our rice milling industry is mostly outdated having antiquated type of machinery. The figures available with me indicate that we have almost 50 thousand rice mills spread all over the country; they are small units and most of them are very old and outmoded; they have no proper equipment for separating the grain and in the process the grain breaks into pieces and a valuable part of the grain also goes away along with husk. Though the experts differ with regard to the quantum which goes waste, it can be anything between 5 and 10 per cent., even more. Now the experience all over the world shows that if we can introduce modern techniques, it is possible to minimise the element of wastage to a considerable extent. In the interest of the country there is no escape but to see that our rice-milling industry is modernised and we have to approach this problem from this angle. Now the important point involved in this Bill is that whenever we have to start a new mill, a co-operative mill, a modern, the old Act does not provide for preference over private mills. There was also some legal difficulty which confronted a number of States. In fact a number of States brought this to our notice and pointed out to the Government of India that the

old Act should be amended to provide for preference to either the public sector mills or the co-operative mills. This position has been accepted by the Government of India. In fact even in one of the National Development Council meetings this principle was unanimously accepted and if I have to say anything, I can only say that this measure has been slightly delayed. But being a good and sound measure, I think the hon. House should welcome it and support it. So, the first important point of principle involved in this Bill, that as far as the establishment of new and modern rice-milling industry is concerned, the public sector mills and the co-operative sector mills should get preference over the private sector mills. As I have already mentioned, there was no provision in the existing Act for such a preference. Mr. Chatterjee has raised the point that preference does not mean anything at all. In fact I humbly beg to differ with him. If we take into consideration the existing constitutional position, I do not think we can completely eliminate the private sector mills. In fact we consulted law on this point and we found that it would be difficult constitutionally to have a clear reservation but it would be possible within the existing framework of law to have a preference. And our experience with regard to preference is not such as has been alleged by Mr. Chatterjee. He says it means nothing in implementation. I can cite one instance to show how preference is actually implemented and how it works in practice. Take the case of co-operative sugar factories. In the case of co-operative sugar factories during the last 10 years, the Government of India has taken the position that in licensing these units the co-operative sugar factories will have preference over the private sugar factories. Now during the last 10 years more than 85 sugar factories have been licensed and hardly half a dozen are in the private sector. Most of them are in the co-operative sector. If there are two applicants at a place, co-operative, and private, the licence is necessarily issued to a co-operative sugar factory. Therefore I do not see any

difficulty in implementing this preference in favour of public sector and co-operative sector units.

Then the second point of principle involved in the Bill is in regard to improving the existing machinery. A point has been raised by some hon. Members. Why not outright nationalise the rice-milling industry? I think theoretically it is a proposition which can be repeatedly mentioned and Members can have their own views in regard to that. But I would like to know whether the hon. Members have given any serious thought to it. There are thousands of rice mills spread all over the country and they are most outdated. What is the use of nationalising those outmoded and antiquated mills? We have to pay them compensation and then discard them. So, I do not think that provides any solution to the problem. The right solution to the problem can be by resorting to modernisation of existing mills. This Bill also provides for improvement to existing machineries, in the sense that if the period of licence expires and if they apply afresh, the Government can put in a condition that they must attach modern equipment to their machineries, so that the element of wastage is minimised and rice can be processed in a proper way. Most of the rice mills now functioning in the country are antiquated, have old machinery and use out-dated technology. They have not been generally modified to include modern, efficient, parboiling equipment and mechanical drier, paddy cleaners, bran separators, etc. This Bill is a sort of beginning in the direction of efficiency. I think the hon. Members who have applied their minds to this subject will appreciate the Government's move in this direction.

Then the third major point of principle involved in this Bill is in regard to the enhancement of penalty. We got complaints from a number of State Governments that the Act of 1958 does not provide for adequate penalties to those persons who committed breaches of law. In the case of paddy especially, when during the

[Shri Anna saheb Shinde]

period of shortages a number of a small rice mills, which are spread all over the country, committed a large number of malpractices, the State Governments found it very difficult to adequately deal with them. So this Bill provides for enhancement of the punishments and penalties. I hope the House and the Members will wholeheartedly support this measure because there has been a demand in the House as well as outside that the anti-social elements should be very strictly dealt with and this Bill makes a provision for that.

Regarding the various points referred to by Members, I may refer to a few of them. For instance, Prof. Ranga was very sensitive about State partnership. In fact the amendment which I have moved provides—in fact it was also in the original Act—for a definition of a cooperative society that a cooperative society means a society of farmers with State partnership. I do not know how Prof. Ranga does not know this.

AN HON. MEMBER : Prof. Ranga is not here.

SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE : I am sorry, it was Mr. Dahyabhai Patel—the views are the same—who made the observation : “Why the State partnership should be there in the society?” I do not know why such a senior statesman and politician should not know the facts that most of the societies which are formed at the village level are composed of poor farmers and unless the State gives assistance to the societies by way of equity share participation, those societies will not be in a position to develop their activities. So the partnership of the Government does not in any way imply Government domination over the society. It is only to support and help the poorer section of the society and therefore Shri Patel should not be scared away by the fact that the State would be participating in such societies.

SHRI V. V. RAMASWAMY : Cooperative society means society formed exclusively of farmers. At present there are so many

consumer cooperative societies that are running rice mills. What would happen to them?

SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE : As far as this Bill is concerned it does not affect in any way the position of the existing societies. So the doubt of my friend should not be there regarding the measure taken by the Government. What we are doing is to provide for preference. We are saying that in the farmers' cooperative societies the farmer should get preference but normally a society which takes the initiative in establishing rice mills will have three types of membership. First of all there are the farmers who are members, secondly, the State is also a member and thirdly, the credit society of farmers is also a member in the society. So the present Bill provides that such societies formed for establishing a rice-milling industry should have preference over the private sector mills.

Some doubts were raised by some Members as to what would be the position of the hand-pounding of rice. The original position remains. This Bill does not withdraw in any way the protection given to the hand-pounding of rice in the villages. If the protection is withdrawn, I can see the force of the argument that it may result in some unemployment but the original Act of 1958 provided for protection for the hand pounding rice mills and therefore, that protection remains. This law does not change the position in any way.

Shri Arora raised the point that while Mr. C. Subramaniam was the Minister a move was initiated by the Government to have a large number of public sector rice mills and his impression is that as soon as Mr. Subramaniam left, the Government seemed to have recoiled from that position. I wish to assure him that whether Mr. Subramaniam is there or not, it was the Government's policy and even now when the Department is headed by Shri Jagjivanramji, the Government's policy continues just the same. In fact we are trying to implement what was declared then and

there is no departure from the basic approach adopted earlier by the Government of India.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : Have they been established?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : All those plans are being implemented. If we have done any thing we are trying to expand the programme.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : Is there any proposal before the Government to have any public sector projects for rice mills?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Yes. In fact the F. C. I. has undertaken a plan to establish a number of modern rice mills and we are trying to import machinery for establishing these mills.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Not manufacture here ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : I am coming to that because some wrong impression should not be there. As far as establishment of public sector rice mills is concerned, the Government is going ahead with the plans. The F. C. I. is looking after that.

Some doubts were raised as to importing machinery. It was asked : 'If we have to establish modern rice mills, why should we unnecessarily spend foreign exchange in importing machinery?' Shri Chordia thought that valuable foreign exchange was unnecessarily being spent on this. At the time the F.C.I. decided to establish modern rice mills, full plants were not available in this country and in order to popularise modern mills, the Government took some decision then but in the meanwhile a good manufacturing capacity for rice mill is coming up in our country and it is in the interest of our country that such capacity should come up. Henceforth I am quite sure that all the machinery which will be manufactured, all the plants for modern rice mills, would be utilised for the modernisation of our rice-milling industry.

I think I have covered most of the points and at this stage I do not wish to go into details of the various clauses because they would be discussed at the appropriate stage.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : The Minister referred to my remarks about cooperative societies and he said that the cooperative society consists of farmers, State Governments and cooperative societies. It is my impression—if I am wrong, the Minister may correct me—that in these societies there is a restriction on the holding of shares by everybody. So, if the society is to be helped by way of capital substantially it means Government share of the capital is going to be substantial. That means, the co-operative society is going to be run by the officers and not by the farmers. If my impression is wrong, the hon. Minister may correct me.

4 P.M.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : I think the impression of the hon. Member is entirely wrong and without any basis. May I suggest to him—he perhaps knows it himself because he was closely associated, I think, with the co-operative sugar mills in Gujarat . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I was not and I am not.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Somehow he knows it because when they were established, he was one of the Congress workers there in Gujarat; it was a decade earlier. Anyhow now my only limited point is to say that it is true that there is a limitation on the share-holding of shareholders in a co-operative society. Otherwise, a few capitalists or the rich elements will dominate the co-operative society. So, we see that the share holding in a co-operative society is not monopolised by a few rich elements and so the restriction placed is very much justified. But as far as the State Government is concerned, the Government is completely exempt from that because, after all, participation

[Shri Annasaheb Shinde]
of the State Government is only by way of helping the society, and it does not mean dominating the society at all. As far as the voting right is concerned, unlike joint stock companies, it is only one vote here irrespective of the number of shares held by a shareholder. Whatever be the number of shares held by the State Government in a particular society, the number of votes which the State Government can exercise is only one, as is the case with other members, with the hundreds and thousands of members of a co-operative society.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Does the restricted holding of shares apply to the Government or not?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : That is what I said; it does not.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

“That the Bill to amend the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2—Amendment of section 3

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, I move :

3. “That at page 2, line 7, for the figure ‘1967’ the figure ‘1968’ be substituted.”

4. “That at page 2, line 13, for the figure ‘1967’ the figure ‘1968’ be substituted.”

The questions were proposed.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, may I explain this?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is not necessary to explain these amendments. The question is :

3. “That at page 2, line 7, for the figure ‘1967’ the figure ‘1968’ be substituted.”

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

4. “That at page 2, line 13, for the figure ‘1967’ the figure ‘1968’ be substituted.”

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

“That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the bill.

Clause 3—Insertion of new section 3A

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, I move :

5. “That at page 2, line 36, for the figure ‘1967’ the figure ‘1968’ be substituted.”

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

“That clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 4—Amendment of section 5

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, I move :

6. “That at page 4, line 8, for the figure ‘1967’ the figure ‘1968’ be substituted.”

8. “That at page 3, lines 32 to 34, for the words ‘and “farmers’ co-operative society” means a co-operative society

the membership whereof is restricted by the bye-laws and rules of the society to farmers only; the words "and "farmers co-operative society" means a co-operative society the members whereof include farmers and the voting rights in which are, according to its rules and bye-laws, restricted to the following classes of its members, namely :—

- (i) farmers,
 - (ii) State Governments,
 - (iii) primary agricultural credit societies as defined in clause (cii) of section 2 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934;
- be substituted."

The questions were proposed.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
हमको यह अमेंडमेंट नहीं मिला है। हम को और मिला है वह दूसरा है और यह दूसरा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : This is why he has read it out. You will have a chance to speak if you want.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
वह ठीक है, लेकिन साधारण नियम यह है कि जो भी अमेंडमेंट श्रीमान् प्रस्तुत करना चाहें वह हम को सकार्युलिट हो जाना चाहिये। यह सकार्युलिट हुआ और इसके तुरन्त बाद ही न जाने क्या अमेंडमेंट हो गया। अब हम को क्या करना है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाविर प्रसाद भागंब) : आपके पास आ रहा है।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
अब आ रहा है लेकिन यह गलत तरीका है और हम इस पर प्रोटेस्ट करती हैं और जानना चाहते हैं कि इसका क्या कारण है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I am told that the amendment, in substance, is the same as the one that has been circulated. Only there is a little change in the wording and it is because of the advice from the Law Ministry.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
तो फिर इसके लिये ला मिनिस्ट्री के पास पहले जाना चाहिये था।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : You are right.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
हम राइट हैं तब भी हमें ही इसके लिये पेनाल्टी भोगनी पड़ेगी या श्रीमान् को भी कुछ क्षोभ है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Chordia, that is why I asked him specifically to read out the amendment. Otherwise the normal practice is that, when an amendment has been circulated, it is taken as read.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
नार्मल प्रैक्टिस यह बिल्कुल नहीं है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Have you anything to add ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : I can only say that it would have been better for me if I could have copies of this amendment circulated to hon. Members I am sorry it could not be done but, as you are aware, Sir, when I contacted you, I explained to you my difficulties. There is no change whatsoever in the substance of the amendment circulated brought about in this amendment in substitution thereof. Only this much happened. When we sought the advice of the Law Ministry, they said that the wording had to be properly put in. So on that basis this substituted amendment has been brought in. There is no change whatsoever in the

[Shri Annasahib Sinde]

substance. There is no attempt whatsoever to deprive the hon. Members of a copy of this reworded amendment.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : When did the Law Ministry advise you ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Just now.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : What was the Law Ministry doing ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : So I will urge on you, Sir, that if the hon. Members have to make any observations in this regard, you kindly allow them to make the observations.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : That I have already said. Do you want to say anything as to why you want this amendment ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : I have already in fact explained the position. The amendment which was originally circulated also contemplated this, what the "farmers' co-operative society" meant. It has been explained now in the amendment I have moved earlier. There are other types of members which are part of the farmers' co-operative society. The State Government is also sometimes a member of such a society. Similarly an agricultural credit society is also some times a member of such a society. So the substance is the same in both the forms of the same amendment and therefore hon. Members should support this amendment in this form.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो सरकार का रवैया चल रहा है कि जो काम हम को सर्क्युलेट किये जाते हैं उनको सर्क्युलेट करने के बाद भी उनके दिमाग में नये नये ब्यूज उठा करते हैं और उसका आज यह दूसरा दृष्टांत है। पहले एक लिस्ट राज्य सभा की ओर से सर्क्युलेट की गई और उसमें प्रो० वी० के० अर० वी० राव द्वारा जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत

किया जाता था उसमें यहाँ पर आ कर के नया संशोधन प्रारम्भ किया गया और डिप्टी चेयरमैन महोदय जो उस समय कुर्सी पर थी उनके सामने वह सब तमाशा हुआ . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : What was circulated was the old list adopted on 3rd August, 1966. You cannot compare that. Because of the circumstances certain changes had to be made. The Ministers have been changed. Some ceased to be Members of this House. So consequential changes have to be made.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया : परिवर्तन के लिये मुझे अब भी आपत्ति नहीं है।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : The change took place in March.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया : परिवर्तन के लिये मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : Not after ten months.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया : परिवर्तन करने का उनको अधिकार है। इसके पास हो जाने के बाद भी वे परिवर्तन कर सकते हैं। लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि यह जब सर्क्युलेट किया गया और इसमें जब सारे संशोधन दिये गये थे तो फिर क्या वहाँ से आती आती रास्त में यह तय हो गया था क्या बात है। इसके लिये हमारी सरकार ने लामिनिस्ट्री से पहले क्यों नहीं पूछा। यह लामिनिस्ट्री की गलती है या आपकी गलती है। आपने उनको कब कन्सल्ट किया ? आप कन्सल्ट करने न जाओ और बेकार लामिनिस्ट्री को बदनाम करो, यह ठीक नहीं। गलती किसकी है ? यह विधेयक कब आपने उनके पास भेजा और कब उन्होंने सुझाव दिया और कब आपके दिमाग में आया कि इस तरह का परिवर्तन आवश्यक है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय यह राष्ट्र का नुकसान है। ठीक है आपकी निगाह में किसी कागज की कोई कीमत नहीं होगी, लेकिन मेरी निगाह में बहुत कीमत है उन कागजों की जो सर्क्युलेट किये जाते हैं। यह क्यों तमाशा किया जाता है हम लोगों के साथ कि हमको कुछ अमेंडमेंट दे दिया जाय कि यह ला मिनिस्ट्री ने किया है? जो कानून की दृष्टि से आवश्यक किया जाना है, वह किया जाना चाहिए उसके लिये मेरी शिफायत नहीं है। आपके रिमार्क का उससे कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। सरकार इस बात का जवाब दे कि ला मिनिस्ट्री को कब रिफर किया, ला मिनिस्ट्री ने कब इनको जागृत किया और कब शिन्दे साहब और जगजीवन राम जी की नींद उड़ी कि इसमें इस तरह का संशोधन चाहिए।

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN :
Sir, I oppose this amendment and I oppose also this amendment to the amendment. I think that by virtue of this amendment the matter would become very rigid and while actually applying this measure difficulties are likely to be caused in particular States. Those difficulties according to the present provision can be solved only by an amendment of this Act in Parliament. I suggest that if both co-operative societies and farmers' cooperative societies are to be retained by inclusion in these provisions, then the definition thereof may be directed to be made by subordinate legislation as per rules framed under this Act. Then that difficulty can to a large extent be reduced. I would also, alternatively suggest the absolute deletion of the word "farmers" in clause 4, that is to say, from sub-section (5) (a) (ii), where it is stated :

"to a farmers' co-operative society over every other applicant,".

I move an oral amendment that it may only be "a co-operative society". I say this because, as you know, a co-operative society can take up works and tasks only

as per its bye-laws and rules. Only if there is provision in the bye-laws and rules of a particular society to take up this work can that society take up this work. Therefore no other restriction in the definition in this clause seems to be necessary. I therefore suggest that instead of "farmers' co-operative society" it may remain as just "co-operative society" and in the Explanation the definition of "co-operative society" alone may be retained.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Have you anything to say?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE :
I have only a few words to say on the point which Shri Chandrasekharan had raised. He says that, if we say "co-operative society" that alone would be quite adequate and we need not go into the details. But I would submit that, in fact in this country what happens is that if we keep the definition vague then even traders can form co-operative societies and seek permission to have the rice-milling industry. So this measure is likely to be misused by some sections of middlemer. Therefore the Government had gone little further ahead and examined all the implications in this connection and we feel that in the interest of the producers and the consumers, the present definition with all its implications will better serve the interest of society.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

6. "That at page 4, line 8, for the figure '1967' the figure '1968' be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

8. "That at page 3, lines 32 to 34, for the words 'and "farmers' co-operative

[Vice-Chairman]

society" means a co-operative society the membership whereof is restricted by the bye-laws and rules of the society to farmers only; the words 'and "farmers' co-operative society" means a co-operative society the members whereof include farmers and the voting rights in which are, according to its rules and bye-laws, restricted to the following classes of its members, namely :—

- (i) farmers,
- (ii) State Governments,
- (iii) primary agricultural credit societies as defined in clause (cii) of section 2 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934;

be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That clause 4, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 5—Amendment of section 6

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, I beg to move :

7. "That at page 4, line 38, for the figure '1967' the figure '1968' be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That clause 5, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 6 to 10 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title and commencement

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, I beg to move :

2. "That at page 1, line 4, for the figure '1967' the figure '1968' be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That clause 1, as amended, be added to the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Enacting Formula

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, I beg to move :

1. "That at page 1, line 1, for the word 'Eighteenth' the word 'Nineteenth' be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill, as amended be passed."

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
 उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बड़ा खेद हुआ, जैसे कहा जाता है चोरी और सीनाजोरी, ठीक उसी तरह से हमारे एग्रीकल्चर डिपार्टमेंट के मिनिस्टर साहब ने पहले तो यह गलती की कि जो अमेंडमेंट दिया उसके बाद जो दूसरा अमेंडमेंट दिया उसके लिए मैंने नम्र प्रार्थना की थी कि स्पष्टीकरण दे कि ला मिनिस्ट्री के यहां कब भेजा, उन्होंने कब जवाब दिया।

श्री अकबर अली खान : उन्होंने "सौरी" कहा।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
 यह सौरी का सवाल नहीं है। यह दूसरा सवाल है। आपको झपकी लग गई होगी। मैं बड़ा पर्टीकुलर हूँ इस मामले में।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबोर प्रसाद भार्गव) : किस मामले में बड़े पर्टीकुलर है, चौरडिया जी ?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
 इस मामले में बड़ा पर्टीकुलर हूँ कि आपकी निगाह मुझ पर पड़ जाय। यह स्पष्ट है कि यह टुकड़ों में सोचने की, ठीक तरह से अपने दिमाग का उपयोग न लेने की, जो धुन में आए उस तरह से अमेंडमेंट दे देने की, उसमें बार-बार परिवर्तन करने की प्रवृत्ति हमारे यहां पर बढ़ती जा रही है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, गलती मनुष्य से हो सकती है, मगर उस गलती का रियलाइजेशन न हो या जानबूझकर उस गलती को दूसरे पर डालने का असफल प्रयास करने की जो प्रवृत्ति रहती है वह निन्दा की पात्र है। ऐसा लगता है कि इस मामले में हमारे जो कृषि मंत्री हैं गलती उनके डिपार्टमेंट की है और टालने का प्रयत्न किया ऐसे कि ला डिपार्टमेंट ने सलाह दी। ऐसा लगता है कि अपनी गलती का हिस्सा उन पर डाल कर उसे हल्का करने का प्रयत्न किया।

SHRI ANNASAHĒB SHINDE :
 No, I did not say that.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
 मगर ज्योंही उस प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं दिया त्योंही वहां से स्पष्ट हो चुका है कि यह सारी गलती हमारे कृषि विभाग की है और यदि कृषि विभाग इसी तरह से टुकड़ों में सोचता रहा, इसी तरह से सुस्ती से काम करता रहा तो यह संभव नहीं कि हमारे देश की कृषि की उन्नति हो जायेगी। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसीलिये मैं हमारी सरकार की हमारे मंत्री महोदय की, इस प्रवृत्ति की निन्दा करता हूँ।

दूसरी बात ...

साद्य तथा कृषि मंत्रों (श्री जगजीवन राम) : और कीजिएगा क्या।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
 आप गैर हाजिर थे, आप मंत्री जी से पूछ लीजिए क्या कहा।

दूसरी बात यह है कि यह कानून आप पास कर रहे हैं, पास हो रहा है, मगर मेरी कुछ मध्य प्रदेश के मित्रों से चर्चा हुई और वे स्पष्ट इस मत के हैं कि हम राइस हलर्स को चलायेंगे अपने यहां, हमारे यहां जो छोटे छोटे उद्योग करने वाले हैं उनको प्रोत्साहन देंगे, चाहेंगे कि उनका उद्योग चले। अब उस समय आपका यह कानून किस तरह से चलेगा, एकजीव्यूट करने वाले कौन हैं? अच्छा होता अगर सरकार उनका भी मत ले लेती इस मामले पर ताकि वे भी कांविन्स हो जाते। वे भी देशभक्त हैं यह नहीं है कि वह देश के विरोध में काम करना चाहेंगे। हम कांविन्स नहीं हो पाए इसलिए हम विरोध कर रहे हैं, यदि हम कांविन्स हो जायेंगे कि यह राष्ट्र के हित में है तो हम ऐसे नहीं हैं कि राष्ट्र हित के विरोध में काम करेंगे। आपका अप्रोच अलग हो सकता है, हमारा अप्रोच अलग हो सकता है। इस दृष्टि से यह यहां का व्यक्तिगत मामला है मगर जहां

पर प्रान्तीय सरकारें अलग अलग मत की है ऐसी स्थिति है यह हम सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लिये लागू करने वाले हैं तो अगर प्रान्तीय सरकार को यह मामला जंचा नहीं तो उस समय आपके कानून की मखोल के सिवाय कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। मध्य प्रदेश में हमारे लोग वर्तमान स्थिति में इस पक्ष के हैं कि हमारे यहां हलर चलाना चाहिये।

श्री जगजीवन राम : सिर्फ एक दल मध्य प्रदेश में सरकार का। सब नहीं।

श्री विमलकुमार भन्नालाल जे. चौर-
ड़िया : यह तो दल का दलदल ऐसा है कि कभी एक दल होगा कभी दो दल होंगे। क्या होगा, आप कहाँ रहेंगे, हम कहाँ रहेंगे इसका...

श्री जगजीवन राम : नहीं नहीं मैंने यह कहा कि सरकार में ऐसा एक दल है सिर्फ।

श्री विमलकुमार भन्नालाल जे. चौर-
ड़िया : सरकार का एक दल भी हो सकता है, सरकार का वह दल आपके साथ सहयोग भी कर सकता है। मैं अभी इस मत का नहीं हूँ कि आदमी वास्तविकता से मुंह मोड़ कर चले, नारों के सिद्धान्त में चलें। नारों के सिद्धान्त में चल कर ही आप कहते हैं राष्ट्रीयकरण एक मात्र औषधि है सब बीमारियों की। हम इसमें विश्वास नहीं करते। हम कहते हैं अगर देश के हित में किसी चीज के राष्ट्रीयकरण की आवश्यकता है तो किया जाना चाहिये और अगर यह आवश्यक है कि हमारे देश का उत्पादन व्यापारियों से व्यापार करवाने में ज्यादा होता है या उनको छूट देकर हो सकता है तो वह किया जाना चाहिये। हम इसमें कसम खा कर नहीं चले हैं कि सब बीमारियों की दवा केवल राष्ट्रीयकरण है और सब बुराइयों की जड़ राष्ट्रीयकरण है। हम इस पर विश्वास करने वाले नहीं हैं और इसी दृष्टि से मैं यह चाहूंगा... पहली बात फिर दुहरा देता हूँ कि ला मिनिस्ट्री को कब भंजा या

कभी नहीं भंजा, नहीं तो सारा आरोप आप के ऊपर होगा। दूसरी बात, वह स्थिति क्या होगी, चाहे उसमें मद्रास की सरकार हो या काँड और कहीं की सरकार हो, कि अगर वह आपसे सहमत नहीं होंगे उस समय आप क्या करेंगे।

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Sir, in reply to the points, that we raised during the course of the debate in the first reading of the Bill the hon. Minister said that he did not want to take over the mills at the present moment because he wanted to have big modern rice mills and he asked what the Government could do by taking over derelict rice mills. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that is a good way of parrying the demand for nationalisation or taking over of the rice mills but then though it is a good debating point which the hon. Minister may seem to have scored, really the *bona fides* of the Ministerial measures in this respect are before us for consideration and if the Minister really and sincerely meant that the Government was not taking over the rice mills, was not nationalising the rice mills just because the Government wanted to set up modern rice mills, then we should have expected that the programme for setting up these modern mills would also be disclosed to us but we are sorry to note that though the hon. Minister wanted to score a debating point on the floor of the House he has not come out with any concrete proposals, concrete details or a concrete picture of what he is going to do in regard to the setting up of modern rice mills as he has said with some amount of flourish on the floor of this House. Therefore, perhaps, after all, this Bill is going to be passed today. With the majority that the Congress has nobody can prevent them from passing it as it is without any amendments but one thing we can ask the hon. Minister to assure us that even if this Bill is passed into law at least the promise which he just now made on the floor of the House that the Government

is going to set up such modern mills would be implemented and realised without delay. Can we ask the Minister if he has such a programme for setting up modern rice mills within a period of six months from date ? If he can assure the House of that then at least we can go away with some hope but if he cannot give that assurance then I must say, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that all those points which he has raised in reply to the debate are merely points of debate merely to say something in opposition to what we have said and actually they are not *bona fide* suggestions made by the hon. Minister.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: Why don't you persuade Chordiaji

SHRI V. V. RAMASWAMY : Again I want to refer to the definition of farmers' co-operative society by which it is restricted to the farmers. In the State of Tamil Nad there are many good working consumer co-operative societies in the urban areas which are running rice mills and the State Government has also been encouraging other co-operative societies to start rice mills and many marketing societies have already begun to purchase land for setting up rice mills. If you restricted the issue of licences to co-operative societies which are restricted to farmers only, what is to become of the others societies? Will the State Government refuse to give licence to such consumer co-operative societies and also the big marketing societies which have already been encouraged by the State Government to start such rice mills? In fact they have been given subsidies and other assistance and I think restriction should not be there.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in regard to the point raised by Mr. Chordia I say that I did not try to shift the blame to the Law Ministry. In fact we referred it to the Law Ministry only today perhaps after the discussion on the Bill started because there was hardly any time for me to go to the Law Ministry earlier. Therefore it

was not a question of making any body scapegoat and I did not try to shirk my responsibility. I am prepared to own up my responsibility and I have already expressed my sorrow. I wish it had been possible for me to go into this matter a little bit earlier. It was consistent with the principles embodied in the Bill and there was no departure whatsoever. I think the hon. Mr. Chordia who is a very responsible Member should not make too much of this.

In regard to the other point raised by him, the Jana Sangh has a particular attitude towards private sector. May I tell him most of our ills specially why we have not succeeded in raising agricultural production in the last few years with quick enough speed, have been due to the middlemen who in our society always take away the cream from the consumers as well as the producers and unless this factor is eliminated it will not be possible for us to raise the growth rate of our economy either in the agricultural sector or elsewhere I may for the information of Mr. Chordia tell him that even in capitalist countries—take the case of Japan—rice is procured mainly through co-operative societies. Take the case of Italy; again it is through co-operative societies. A Government sector organisation is the main agency for purchase of foodgrains in Australia—the Wheat Board. In Canada also the Wheat Board is a public sector agency. I think food is such an important and essential commodity that in order to give protection and in the interests of the larger sections of the society, we have to take such measures and rice-milling is one of the very important sectors.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
सारी खेती का राष्ट्रीयकरण क्यों नहीं कर
देते ताकि यह सारी बीमारी खत्म हो जाय ।

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE
I would humbly request that Shri Chordia should go into this problems in more detail

and as he is intelligent, if he studies it, I am sure that he will himself come to the same conclusions to which we have come. In future, if our agricultural economy and the paddy economy is to prosper, I think we must have on a large-scale the rice-milling industry both in the co-operative and public sectors and gradually we will have to eliminate the outmoded, old mills in the private sector.

Shri A. P. Chatterjee has repeated the same argument to which I have replied earlier. May I ask him. How are you going to nationalise an outmoded mill if the machinery is not worth anything at all. What is the practicality involved in it? As a slogan it is all right. We can give many slogans, but I think we should go to the brass tacks and see that some practical solutions to our problems are found out. I do not think that in this country we can try to solve our economic problems by resorting to slogans and dogmas.

Shri V.V. Ramaswamy raised the point whether societies formed by consumers for rice-milling would have their place. As I have already said, it will not affect their position, but the main purpose of the Bill is to see that protection is given to societies formed by producers and farmers. That is the position taken in the Bill, because in the name of consumers any body will form a society. The traders can form a society. What we want is to eliminate this risk. We do not want to expose our co-operative movement, by the backdoor to the danger of being exploited by middlemen. That is all I have got to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."
The motion was adopted.

THE DELHI AND AJMER RENT CONTROL (NASIRABAD CANTONMENT REPEAL) BILL, 1967.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI M.R. KRISHNA): Mr. Vice-Chairman,

beg to move:

"That the Bill to repeal the Delhi and Ajmer Rent Control Act, 1952, as in the Cantonment of Nasirabad, be taken into consideration."

The Bill is very simple and direct and its purpose is very limited. I do not think it requires any elaborate explanation, since in the Statement of Objects and Reasons it has been clearly stated that the Bill is being introduced in order to bring about uniformity in the various cantonments. The measure, which was passed by the Rajasthan Assembly, was declared to be *ultra-vires* the Constitution, since the State Government has not got the power to legislate on cantonments. Therefore, it is left to the Union Parliament to legislate another measure in respect of cantonments, and this Bill has become necessary. Since there is already in existence the Delhi and Ajmer Rent Control Act, 1952, as in force in the Cantonment of Nasirabad, until and unless the Act is repealed, we will not be able to help the State Government to bring Nasirabad also in conformity with the other cantonments. It is a non-controversial measure and I think hon. Members, who have read the Bill have already formed their opinion. I have nothing more to add except that if this measure is passed, it will help the cantonments in Rajasthan to have uniform laws relating to rent control. I hope the Members of this House will be able to give their consent to get this Bill passed.

The question was proposed.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नाजाल जोरड़िया (मध्य प्रदेश): उपमहाधक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि इस बिल का अंग्रेजी से हिन्दी में जो ट्रान्सलेशन हुआ है और "रेंट" शब्द की जगह "भाटक" शब्द का प्रयोग किया गया है, वह बहु तही कठिन शब्द मालूम देता है। यह ठीक है कि जो शब्द के लिखने वाले हैं वे विशेषज्ञ होंगे