

dits are not available and in case foreign private capital is not flowing and we are not able to get commercial credits enough to put up fertiliser plants, we should go ahead even on the basis of our own foreign exchange resources, and that is the determination of the Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): I think the matter should be a little more clarified. Now the position is this. Last year, we were given a new food strategy by Mr. C. Subramaniam, the Union Food Minister. The king-pin of that strategy was that we would be setting up a number of fertiliser plants in order to produce the requisite amount of fertiliser in order to carry out intensive agricultural programmes. Now, we are told that we are not getting them; though we were promised that we would get them. Now, the hon. Minister did not like the expression 'blackmail'. I do not quarrel over that word because, Sir, those who are blackmailed generally do not admit it until they are prepared to go to the court and file a suit. But is it a fact that the Finance Minister has recently stated that the American terms are getting stiffened and they need to be liberalised and that he was not getting what he was expecting? Is it not a fact that with regard to fertiliser promises, fertiliser factories and so on, we are now absolutely drawing blank and the Americans have said more or less "No", and that we are not going to get them? Is it not a fact that the 'Eastern Economist', which is a journal of the big business in the country, has criticised the Government policy and pointed out that these international combines, on which we are relying for our fertiliser import or import of fertiliser plant, are more interested in selling their by-products in our country than setting up units, industries and so on? Having regard to all these things, why does the Government not come to the very straight conclusion that the food strategy based on imported fertiliser plants has failed, that America has been trying to pressurise India on this

account, that the policy be reoriented and that the real solution lies in radical agrarian reforms, in improved agricultural production through labour incentives rather than through improvement in the technique of production which is proving illusory?

SHRI O. V. AL AGES AN: I could understand if this long statement had come from the hon'ble Member prior to what I said. I have made the position of the Government absolutely clear. We are going ahead with our programme. We are not dependent on any consortium or private companies. I said already that a couple of countries have come forward to give us commercial credits on the basis of which we propose to build up fertiliser factories. I said even if commercial credits are not available, if we come to such a pass, we shall go ahead on the basis of spending our own foreign exchange. That is the position of the Government. That will ensure enough fertilisers, and we propose to make a success of our fertiliser programme.

PROCLAMATION UNDER ARTICLE 356 OF THE CONSTITUTION THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. S. NASKAR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under clause (3) of article 356 of the Constitution, a copy of the Proclamation (G.S.R. No. 1677) issued by the President on the 1st November, 1966, revoking the Proclamation issued by him on the 5th July, 1966, under the said article in relation to the State of Punjab.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION NOTIFICATION

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION