

**MOTION RE FOOD SITUATION—**  
continued.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण (महाराष्ट्र): आदरणीय सभापति जी, आम जनता के जीवन-मृत्यु से सम्बन्धित अनाज की जटिल और गम्भीर समस्या पर कल से हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं। हमारे सामने दो सवाल हैं, एक आज का और एक कल का, कल का सवाल भरोसे पर छोड़ा जा सकता है लेकिन आज का सवाल भरोसे पर नहीं छोड़ा जा सकता। आज आम जनता इस महंगाई के कारण जिस मुसीबत में है उसको देखते हुए हमको सोचना चाहिए कि हम उनकी मुसीबतें कुछ कम कर सकते हैं या नहीं। मैं जिस प्रदेश से आता हूँ वह डेफिसिट प्रदेश है और मैं जिस जिले से आता हूँ वह भी डेफिसिट है। आज महंगाई यहाँ तक पहुँच गई है कि मेरे जिले में गेहूँ १२५ से १३५ रु० फी क्विंटल बिक रहा है, ज्वारी जो मेरे प्रदेश का स्टैपल फूड है वह ७०, ७५, ८० रु० क्विंटल बिक रही है, बाजरा ७०, ७५ रु० क्विंटल बिक रहा है और जितनी रोज की आवश्यकता की चीजें हैं उन सबके भाव डेढ़गुने और दुगुने हो गए हैं। आप मूंगफली के तेल को ले लीजिये, महीने भर पहले तेल २।।। रु० किलो० बिकता था और आज वही तेल ३। रु० किलो० है, दाल जो १२ आने और १४ आने सेर बिकती थी वह आज १। ८० सेर है। यह जो तमाम चीजों के भाव बढ़ते जा रहे हैं इससे जनता त्रस्त है, मेरे यहाँ तो यह हालत है कि गरीब हरिजन और गिरिजन आम की गुठली और इमली के बीज पीस-पीस कर आटे में मिला कर रोटी बना कर खा रहे हैं।

मैं माननीय मंत्री का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि आपके यहाँ से प्रदेशों को ठीक तरह से गेहूँ या और अनाज की सप्लाई हो रही है या नहीं। दूसरी बात यह है कि मैं यह जानता हूँ कि आपने स्टेट्स को लिखा है कि अनाज की मैक्सिमम

प्राइस निश्चित जाहिर कर दी जाय तो क्या महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात ने आज तक यह मैक्सिमम प्राइस फिक्स की है? और क्यों नहीं फिक्स की? जिसके कारण आज महाराष्ट्र के कई जिलों में ज्वारी रुपया किलो० बिक रही है और जनता में इतना असंतोष फैल रहा है कि मुझे डर है कि कुछ दिन बाद बाजार लुटने लग जाएंगे। आप कह सकते हैं कि हम सब जगह फेयर प्राइस शाप्स चला रहे हैं, आपने हिन्दुस्तान में आज ८० हजार प्राइस शाप्स शुरू कर दिया है, महाराष्ट्र में भी ११ हजार से ज्यादा हैं, परन्तु मैं जानना चाहूँगा कि ये फेयर प्राइस शाप्स रोजाना खुलती भी हैं? मुझे पता है, मेरे पास रोजाना पत्र आते हैं कि इन फेयर प्राइस शाप्स को न तो रेगुलर सप्लाई होती है, न पर्याप्त सप्लाई होती है, आठ आठ दिन ये दुकानें बन्द रहती हैं और जब खुलती हैं तो एक लम्बा क्यु लगता है जिसमें मजदूर स्त्री, पुरुष चार-चार और छः छः घंटे खड़े रहते हैं और फिर कुछ न मिलने के कारण लौट जाते हैं। आपने कभी हिसाब किया कि इन फेयर प्राइस शाप्स में माल न मिलने के कारण हमारे मजदूरों के कितने घंटे और दिन बेकार जाते हैं, और यदि उन सबका हिसाब किया जाय तो देखिये देश का कितना नुकसान हो रहा है।

मैं अभी तीन दिन हुए आगरा जिले के एक कस्बे में गया था। उस कस्बे में दो फेयर प्राइस शाप्स थीं। मुझे पता चला कि वे १२ दिनों से बन्द थीं क्योंकि उनको माल नहीं मिल रहा था। १२ दिन के बाद उन दोनों दुकानों को बीस बीस आटे के बैग्स मिले और जब दुकानें खुलीं तो वहाँ इतनी जबरदस्त भीड़ थी कि दुकानदार बचारे डर के मारे दुकान नहीं खोल सके, पुलिस को बुलाना पड़ा और जब सबइंस्पेक्टर आया तब दुकानें खुलीं और चार घंटे में वे बीसों बोरीयां बांट दी गईं और आधे आदमी वापस गये। यह आपकी सप्लाई और आपके डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन की आज हालत है। इसके लिये कौन जिम्मेदार है? आप

[श्री देवकीनंदन नारायण]

कह सकते हैं कि स्टेट्स जिम्मेदार हैं परन्तु जो कंज्युमर है, जो गरीब जनता है वह इसमें भेद नहीं कर सकती कि यह प्रन्तीय सरकार है या यह मध्यवर्ती सरकार है । इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि बावजूद इसके कि आपकी ८० हजार फेयर प्राइस शाप्स हैं, जनता की यह जो दिक्कतें हैं उनको कम कराने के लिये आप क्या कोशिश कर रहे हैं । कहने को यह भी कहा जाता है कि हमारा उत्पादन कम अधिक बढ़ता जा रहा है, यह भी कहा गया कि इस साल भी मार्जिनल इम्प्रूवमेंट है, इससे पहले ४ टका, ६ टका या ७ टका इम्प्रूवमेंट होता रहा है यहां तक कि १९६३-६४ में उसके पिछले वर्ष से ४६ लाख टन चावल अधिक पैदा हुआ और गेहूं १० लाख टन कम पैदा हुआ—जोड़ लगाय जाय तो यह पता चला कि ३६ लाख टन जमादा ही पैदा हुआ और उसके अलावा बाहर से कितना अनाज आया ? १९६३ में ४१ लाख टन गेहूं अमरीका से आया, इस वर्ष अभी तक करीब-करीब ४० लाख टन आ चका है और वर्ष के अंत तक ५६ लाख टन आने का है । यह तमाम बातें होते हुए भी मैं आज तक नहीं समझा कि फिर यह कमी क्यों है । मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि मुझे डर है कि हमारे स्टेटिस्टिक्स जो हैं उनमें बहुत गड़बड़ी है । आपको पता होगा कि इन स्टेटिस्टिक्स मरहूम उस वक्त के कृषि मंत्री रफी अहमद ने बहुत विश्वास नहीं किया और मुझे पता है कि आपसे पहले जो मंत्री थे पाटिल साहब उनको भी इन स्टेटिस्टिक्स पर बहुत अधिक विश्वास नहीं था । कारण स्वाभाविक है । छः लाख गांवों में खेती होती है, खेत पर ही हमारे गांव बसे हुए हैं, अब छः लाख गांवों में रहनेवाले जो किसान हैं जो निरक्षर हैं, गरीब हैं, सब तरह मुसीबत में हैं, उन से मालूमात हासिल करना कितना कठिन है और वह किस तरह एकत्रित हो सकती है । इसलिये खाद्य के संबंध में स्टेटिस्टिक्स आपको कभी पूरी, अच्छी और ठीक नहीं मिल

सकतीं । फिर आप भरोसा करते हैं सैम्पल सर्वे का । अब सैम्पल सर्वे की बेसिस पर यदि आप हिसाब लगाएंग हिन्दुस्तान जैसे विशाल देश की खेती के या उपज के संबंध में, तो वह कभी पर्याप्त नहीं हो सकता ।

SHRI N. PATRA (Orissa): Does the hon. Member want that there should be no compilation of statistics? Does he consider that it is not necessary.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I have said that it must not be too much relied upon. If you have understood me, you would not have asked me this question.

अमेरिका के बहुत अहसान हैं हम पर । हम मानते हैं । नहीं तो आज हमारी क्या हालत होती, ईश्वर जाने । अमेरिका से आज तक अनाज काफी आया है, आगे भी आएगा, यह हमें जान लेना चाहिये । परन्तु मैं आपसे कहना चाहूंगा कि यह कोई हमारे लिये बहुत गौरव की बात नहीं है । हमें शर्म मालूम देनी चाहिये कि जिन्दा रहने के लिये हमें परायों की, यानी दूसरे देशों की, मदद पर जीना पड़ता है । मुझे पता है, अभी, शायद जुलाई महीने में, अमेरिका के जो हमारे यहां एम्बेसेडर हैं उन्होंने हमारे कारेस्पॉण्डेंट्स से बातें कीं, उन बातों में उन्होंने अपने अहसानों की गिनती कराई । उस लिस्ट को पढ़कर कोई स्वाभिमानी मनुष्य शर्म से लज्जित हुए बगैर नहीं रहेगा कि हम कितने औरों पर डिपेन्डेंट हैं । मैं थोड़े में उस गिनती को कहना चाहूंगा ।

(1) Increasing supply to India, two ships a day, payment in rupees.

(2) Sending shipping and port experts for speedier removal of grains from ships.

- (3) American experts in pricing of foodgrains to advise the Government of India.
- (4) Supply of fertilisers to the extent of 4,33,000 tons in 1964.
- (5) Financing fertiliser plants at Trombay and Visakapatnam.
- (6) American expert for advising us on large-scale aerial spraying.
- (7) Four American scientists for developing dal production—how to produce pulses.
- (8) Nine American technicians for soil and water conservation.
- (9) A team of American experts for irrigation.
- (10) American help to set up seven Agricultural Universities.

ये दस बातें गिनती कराई हमको अमेरिका के एम्बेसेडर ने। हम उनको धन्यवाद देते हैं इस मदद के लिये। परन्तु जब मैं इस पराधीनता को देखता हूँ तो शर्म से लज्जित होता हूँ। कुछ दिन हुए पूज्य विनोबा ने एक जगह कहा था कि यह देश स्वतंत्र तो कहलाता है पर असली मानी में परतंत्र है, क्योंकि अन्न के बारे में परतंत्र, संरक्षण के, डिफेन्स के बारे में परतंत्र और अकल के बारे में भी यह परतंत्र है। हमारी पराधीनता सिर्फ अन्न की ही नहीं, डिफेन्स की ही नहीं पर अकल के बारे में भी, विसडम के बारे में भी हम परतंत्र हो गए हैं। (Time bell rings.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have taken fifteen minutes.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: Sir, I have not even taken ten minutes, and yesterday I was given to understand that I would be given at least 20 to 25 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would have allowed you but some other Members will lose their time. You should know that.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : इसके बाद जो खास बातें मुझे कहनी हैं उनमें से एक है, "सरप्लस और डेफिसिट एरियाज"। हिन्दुस्तान आज सरप्लस और डेफिसिट एरियाज में बांटा गया है। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि क्या कभी आप ने सोचा कि ये डेफिसिट एरियाज क्यों हैं? डेफिसिट एरियाज इसलिये नहीं हैं कि वहां उपज नहीं हो सकती है, डेफिसिट एरियाज इसलिये हैं कि डेफिसिट एरियाज में अनाज के बदले कैश क्राप पैदा की जाती है, उत्पादन किया जाता है। कैश क्राप इसलिये किया जाता है कि किसान को अधिक पैसा मिले। मैं यहां पर अपने जिले का आपको उदाहरण दूंगा। मेरे जिले में २१ लाख एकड़ जमीन है जिस में अनाज सिर्फ ७ लाख एकड़ जमीन पर पैदा होता है और बाकी करीब १४ लाख एकड़ जमीन पर कैश क्राप होती है। मेरा जिला अच्छी उपज वाला जिला है, श्रीमान जिला है, वहां की जमीन अच्छी है। वहां के किसान अधिक पैसा कमाने के लिये कैश क्राप करते हैं। इसी तरह हर एक डेफिसिट एरिया में, कछ दो चार को छोड़ कर, किसान लोग अधिक पैसा प्राप्त करने के लिये तम्बाकू, कपास, आउन्डन्ट और बहुत सी ऐसी चीजें जैसे शुगरकेन, केला, अंगूर, हल्दी वगैरह पैदा करते हैं और उनसे बहुत ज्यादा पैसा मिलता है। इसलिये डेफिसिट एरिया को जब आप सरप्लस एरिया से अनाज पहुंचाना चाहते हैं तो स्वाभाविक सवाल पैदा होता है कि एक जगह का किसान तो हजारों रुपये पैदा करे और दूसरी जगह का किसान सस्ता अनाज दूसरे प्रदेश को भेजे यह किस तरह से हो सकता है और यह कहां तक न्यायसंगत है। इसलिये मेरा सुझाव यह है कि यदि आपको बैलेन्स रखना है इस देश में और एक जगह डेफिसिट दूसरी जगह सरप्लस को निकालना है तो आपको क्रॉप प्लानिंग करनी होगी। और क्रॉप प्लानिंग इस बेसिस पर करनी होगी कि जिससे हर एक जिले में यह हालत पैदा हो जाय कि वह स्वाभ्ययी,

[श्री देवकी नन्दन नारायण]

स्वावलम्बी और स्वयं पूर्ण बन सके। आप सारे देश को स्वयं पूर्ण करना चाहते हैं लेकिन आपके यहां कागज पर सारे हिसाब रह जाते हैं। आप को वहां फील्ड पर जाना चाहिये, गांव में, तहसील में, जिले में जाकर देखना चाहिये कि उसको किस तरह से स्वयं पूर्ण किया जा सकता है और किस तरह से क्रांप प्लानिंग की जा सकती है और क्रांप प्लानिंग से ही यह इम्बैलेन्स दूर हो सकेगा।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आपको रेम्यूनरेटिव प्राइसेज देनी चाहिये क्योंकि रेम्यूनरेटिव प्राइसेज कई वर्षों से आप कपास पैदा करने वालों को दे रहे हैं, मूंगफली पैदा करने वालों को दे रहे हैं, कैंश क्रांप को दे रहे हैं, आपने अपने निवेदन में यह मान लिया है कि हम उनको रेम्यूनरेटिव प्राइसेज दे रहे हैं। अच्छी बात है और मैं धन्यवाद दूंगा कि आप अनाज पैदा करने वालों को भी अब देना चाहते हैं। परन्तु रेम्यूनरेटिव प्राइसेज का अर्थ भी आपको समझना चाहिये। रेम्यूनरेटिव प्राइसेज का अर्थ यही नहीं समझा जाना चाहिये कि प्रोडक्शन कास्ट दिया जाय। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि किसान की जो जरूरत की चीजें हैं उन तमाम चीजों की कीमतों को लक्ष्य में रखकर आपके रेम्यूनरेटिव प्राइस फिक्स करनी होगी, इसके साथ-साथ कैंश क्रांप से जो उसे पैदा होता है उस इनकम के साथ अनाज से पैदा होने वाली इनकम की कुछ पैरिटी होनी चाहिये तब तो वह रेम्यूनरेटिव प्राइस हो सकता है नहीं तो नहीं। और यदि आप क्रांप प्लानिंग नहीं करना चाहते हैं तो मैं आप से कहूंगा, कैंश क्रांप को टैक्स करिये ताकि उस टैक्स का लाभ सारी जनता को मिल सके। कुछ लोग तो कैंश क्रांप ही पैदा करें और कुछ अनाज पैदा करें और अनाज पैदा करने वालों को कम पैसा मिले यह कभी निभ नहीं सकता क्योंकि उसका नतीजा यह होगा—कल एक महानुभाव कह रहे थे कि जो प्रदेश

आज सरप्लस हैं वे प्रदेश भी कुछ दिन बाद सरप्लस नहीं रहेंगे क्योंकि वे भी कैंश क्रांप करने लगेंगे। धीरे-धीरे जैसे जैसे उन्हें सूझेगा वैसे वैसे वे भी बदल जायेंगे। हर एक को पैसे की चाह होती है और अधिक पैसा प्राप्त किये बगैर वे संतुष्ट नहीं रहेंगे।

इसके बाद मैं एक प्रार्थना यह करूंगा कि अगर आप उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो उसके लिए यह जरूरी है कि फूड मिनिस्टर बार-बार नहीं बदले जायें जिस तरह से गत १०-१५ सालों में बदले हैं। मैं यह बात मानता हूं कि अगर हम ५-१० साल के लिए फूड व एग्रीकलचर मिनिस्टर को उसकी जगह पर कायम रखें तो वह अपनी अकल, होशियारी और मेहनत से जिस चीज को करना चाहता है, जिन उपायों को वह अमल में लाना चाहता है, उन सबको ला सकेगा। जब तक आप इस तरह की बात नहीं करेंगे कोई भी मिनिस्टर अपनी पालिसी को अच्छी तरह से नहीं चला सकेगा, कोई भी प्लान जिसको वह चलाना चाहता है नहीं चला सकेगा। इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि भविष्य में जो भी फूड व एग्रीकलचर मिनिस्टर हो उसको ५-१० साल के लिए रखा जाय ताकि वह अपनी नीतियों को अच्छी तरह से चला सके। मुझे आशा है कि आज के हमारे मिनिस्टर १० साल इस पद पर रहेंगे। आज हम स्टेटों में यह देखते हैं कि वहां पर फूड व एग्रीकलचर मिनिस्टर दो होते हैं वे अलग अलग होते हैं। कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट और सप्लाय मिनिस्टर भी अलग अलग होते हैं और इन तीनों विभागों में कोई कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं हो पाता है।

(Time bell rings.)

Two minutes please, I will not take more than two minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid you will take four minutes.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: No, I will not take more than that. I would finish.

तो मेरी आपसे यह प्रार्थना है कि मिनिस्टर्स के अपाइंटमेंट के समय इस बात का ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिये। हमारे लेट प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब कई बार यह बात कहते आये थे कि खेती के महकमे को चीफ मिनिस्टर्स को अपने हाथ में रखना चाहिये। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि कितने चीफ मिनिस्टर्स हैं जो खेती के काम को स्वयं जानते हैं? इसलिए मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि जो भी एग्जीकलचर मिनिस्टर हो उसको ही सप्लाय और फंड का भी मिनिस्टर बनाया जाना चाहिये और उस पर ही यह सारी जिम्मेदारी डाली जानी चाहिये।

आखिरी में मेरी प्रार्थना अपने भाइयों से, जो विरोधी दल में हैं, कम्युनिस्ट हैं, जनसंघी हैं, यह है कि जब जनता को कोई दिक्कत होती है, मुसीबत पैदा होती है तो वे उस मुसीबत को साथ लेकर अपना पोलिटिकल उल्लू सीधा करना चाहते हैं। मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि १२ अगस्त को हमारे भाइयों ने महाराष्ट्र राज्य में एक बंददिन मनाया और उस दिन उन्होंने सब जगह हड़ताल करने का एलान किया। यह हड़ताल उस दिन हुई और मैं अपने भाइयों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस हड़ताल को कराने में उनको क्या लाभ मिला? अकेले बम्बई शहर में मजदूरों की एक दिन में ४० लाख रुपया मजदूरी डूबी। अगर उस दिन हड़ताल न हुई होती तो मजदूरों को ४० लाख रुपया मिला होता। उस दिन हमारे भाइयों ने जो हड़ताल कराई उससे उत्पादन में ३ करोड़ रुपये की कमी आई। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की हड़ताल कराने से उन्हें क्या कोई पोलिटिकल गेन हुआ? कोई नहीं। लेकिन मैं सदन को यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस हड़ताल से मजदूरों को नुकसान पहुंचा, देश को नुकसान पहुंचा, इससे एक पाई अनाज के भाव कम नहीं हुए और न एक दाना अधिक खेतों में अन्न पैदा हुआ। मैं अपने भाइयों से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस मुसीबत के समय

वे जनता के जीवन के साथ खिलवाड़ क्यों करते हैं। मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि वे इस तरह की नुकसानदेह, खतरनाक बातों को छोड़ दें।

**प्रो० मुकुट बिहारी लाल (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** सरकार जो बात कहती है उससे पता चलता है कि वह जनता के जीवन के साथ किस तरह से खिलवाड़ कर रही है।

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण :** मैं आप से यह कह रहा हूँ कि इस तरह की बातों से भाव नीचे नहीं आये और न अनाज अधिक पैदा होगा। कुछ बातें ऐसी हुआ करती हैं जिनमें सलाह मशिवरा हुआ करता है, बैठकर बातें तय की जा सकती हैं और इस तरह से मोर्चा लगाकर, इस तरह से हड़ताल करके कोई भला काम नहीं हो सकता है।

**प्रो० मुकुट बिहारी लाल :** श्री डी० नारायण के प्रेसर से नहीं पैदा हो रही है।

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण :** मैं आप सब विरोधी दलों के भाइयों से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की गरीब जनता के साथ आगे इस तरह की खिलवाड़ न करें। एक ही महर में मजदूरों का ५० लाख रुपये का एक दिन में नुकसान हो गया और अगर सारे महाराष्ट्र का हिसाब लगाया जाय तो करोड़ों रुपयों का हिसाब होगा। आप खुद ही इस बात का पता लगाइये कि अगर उस दिन हड़ताल न हुई होती तो यह रुपया मजदूरों के पास रहता और वे दो सेर ज्वार गेहूँ अधिक ले सकते तथा अपने पैसे का सदुपयोग कर सकते। परन्तु आपने उनकी मुसीबतों की ओर नहीं देखा, उनकी दिक्कतों को नहीं देखा और आप यही चाहते हैं कि ऐसे मौके का फायदा लिया जाय तथा अपना पोलिटिकल उल्लू सीधा किया जाय। आपको सामने कई अवसर आ सकते हैं, आपको कई मौके मिल सकते हैं मगर जिस चीजका जनता के जीवन के साथ सीधा सम्बन्ध है अगर उसमें इस तरह की

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

बात करेंगे, इस तरह की खिलवाड़ करेंगे, तो उससे गरीब जनता को भारी नुकसान पहुंचेगा यह न भूलें।

श्री निरिराज किशोर कपूर (मध्य प्रदेश) : क्या माननीय सदस्य को पोलिटिकल उल्लू के बारे में मालूम है ? बताने की कृपा करें।

श्री सभापति : सबको मालूम है।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, विरोधी दलों के ऊपर यह आरोप लगाया गया है कि वे अन्न संकट का राजनैतिक लाभ उठाना चाहते हैं। क्या सरकार और उसके समर्थक विरोधी दलों से यह आशा करते हैं कि जब जनता जीवन की आवश्यक वस्तुओं को उचित मूल्य पर प्राप्त न कर सके और जन जीवन पर प्रहार हो जाय तो विरोधी दल राजनीति से सन्यास ले ले, अपने कर्तव्य का पालन करना छोड़ दे और हाथ पर हाथ रखकर बैठ जाय ? इस देश की जनता के प्रति हम भी कुछ जिम्मेदारी अनुभव करते हैं और जब शासन अपने कर्तव्यों के पालन करने में विफल हो जाता है, जब शासन की खाद्य नीति में संकट उत्पन्न होता है और शासन उस संकट का सफलतापूर्वक निराकरण नहीं कर सकती तो जनता के रोष को, जनता के क्रोध को शान्ति-पूर्वक तरीके से प्रकट करने की जिम्मेदारी विरोधी दलों पर आती है।

सभापति जी, जब भूखा आदमी गुस्से से भर जाता है और अगर गुस्सा दबाया जाता है तो बगावत पैदा होती है। क्रोध जब मौन होता है तो क्रान्ति को जन्म देता है। आपको विरोधी दलों को धन्यवाद देना चाहिये था कि उन्होंने जनता के गुस्से को, रोष को, शान्तिपूर्वक तथा संगठित तरीके से प्रकट किया। अगर यह गुस्सा और रोष अन्दर ही अन्दर दबता तथा घुटता रहता तो देश में

शान्ति व व्यवस्था के लिए बड़ा संकट पैदा हो जाता।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : आप जिम्मेदार बनते।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : जिम्मेदार सरकार है जिसने अन्न संकट पैदा किया।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह संकट किस ने पैदा किया ?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : यह अन्न संकट सरकार ने पैदा किया। फूड सिचुएशन के बारे में जो रिब्यू रखा गया है उसमें यह बात मानी गई है कि १९६३ के पहले छमाही में ही इस बात के लक्षण प्रकट हो गये थे कि खाद्य स्थिति पर दबाव पड़ रहा है। सरकार को पता था १९६२-६३ में कि १९६१-६२ की तुलना में ३० लाख टन अनाज कम पैदा हुआ है। गेहूं की फसल बिगड़ चुकी थी, इसकी भी सरकार को जानकारी थी और प्रायः १९ लाख टन गेहूं का उत्पादन कम हुआ था। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि सरकार ने इस आने वाले संकट को दूरदर्शिता से क्यों नहीं देखा ? फसलें खराब होंगी इस पर सरकार को विश्वास नहीं होगा लेकिन फसलें खराब होने के कारण देश में गेहूं की मांग बढ़ेगी, भावों में वृद्धि होगी, उसके लिए हमें अपने भंडार भरे रखना चाहिये, उसका इन्तजाम क्यों नहीं किया गया ? मैं खाद्य मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि वे सदन के सामने ये आंकड़े प्रस्तुत करें। जब सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी ने खाद्य मंत्रालय का भार संभाला था तब सरकार के बफर स्टॉक में कितना गेहूं था और जब वे मंत्रालय से चले गये तब फब्र स्टॉक में कितना अनाज था ? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि उन्होंने बफर स्टॉक रिलीज करने में, छोड़ने में बड़ी उदारता से, बड़ी दरियादिली से काम लिया और उस बफर स्टॉक को भरने की चिन्ता नहीं की ? आज हम क्या सुनते



हैं कि आस्ट्रेलिया से जाने वाले जहाजों को बम्बई में बुलाया जा रहा है। अमरीका इंग्लैंड और कनाडा की सरकारों को कहा जा रहा है कि वे अपने जहाजों का मुंह फेर दें और देश की भूखी जनता के लिए अन्न दें। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब सरकार लगातार यह घोषणा करती रही कि हम अन्न संकट पैदा नहीं होने देंगे और अगर पैदा होगा तो हमारे पास इतना अनाज है कि हम उससे बाजारों को पाट देंगे और लोगों को भूखा नहीं मरने देंगे तथा चीजों के दाम नहीं चढ़ने देंगे। बाजारों को पाटा क्यों नहीं गया? विदेशी अनाज जो हम बड़ी मात्रा में मंगा रहे हैं। वह अनाज आवश्यकता के समय बाजारों में क्यों नहीं आया? मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे भंडार क्यों नहीं भरे गये?

एक प्रश्न मैं और भी पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बम्बई की बंदरगाह पर जहाजों से अनाज उतारने में जो संकट पैदा हुआ और जिसके कारण जहाज महीनों तक बंदरगाह में खड़े रहे और अभावग्रस्त क्षेत्रों में अनाज नहीं पहुंच सका, क्या आपसे पहले जो भी खाद्य मंत्री आये, वे इस बात की व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकते थे कि बंदरगाह में जहाजों को आवश्यकता से अधिक खड़ा रहना न पड़े और उनका अनाज उतारने में और उस अनाज को अभावग्रस्त क्षेत्रों में पहुंचाने में किसी तरह की कठिनाई न हो? मेरा निवेदन है कि इन दोनों प्रश्नों की उपेक्षा की गई।

श्री एस० के० पाटिल की खाद्य नीति से किसी का मतभेद हो सकता है। मगर एक भारी भंडार बना कर उन्होंने देश के बाजार के विश्वास को बनाये रखा। उनके बाद यह विश्वास कम हो गया, इस विश्वास को धक्का लगा और देश में यह हवा फैल गई कि सरकार के भंडारों में पर्याप्त अनाज नहीं है और दाम चढ़ गये। लोगों ने अनाज की जमाखोरी शुरू कर दी और उसका नतीजा यह है कि आज का संकट हमारे सामने है।

यह संकट सरकार की गलत नीतियों के कारण पैदा हुआ है। विरोधी दल केवल दोष लेने में हिस्सा नहीं बटा सकते। क्या सरकार ने इस संकट को राष्ट्रीय संकट के रूप में देखा है। आज हमारे कांग्रेस के सदस्य कह रहे थे कि विचार विनिमय करके यह संकट टाला जाना चाहिये। मैं उन्हें बता दूँ कि केन्द्र में विरोधी दलों के नेताओं की बैठक मेरे सुझाव पर बुलाई गई। वह सुझाव प्रधान मंत्री जी की तरफ से नहीं आया। हमारे खाद्य मंत्री ने भी विरोधी दलों के नेताओं की बैठक बुलाने की आवश्यकता नहीं समझी। मैंने उन्हें लिखा कि परिस्थिति गंभीर हो रही है, आप विरोधी दलों के नेताओं की बैठक बुलाइये। आप विचार विनिमय करने के लिये भी नहीं तैयार हैं।

सभापति जी, सरकार संकट पैदा करे और हम राष्ट्रीयता के नाम पर उस संकट में अपना कर्तव्य छोड़ दें, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता, हां, कहीं बाढ़ आ जाय, कहीं भूकम्प आ जाय, विदेशी आक्रमण का खतरा हो, तो हम सरकार के साथ मिल कर खड़े रहेंगे। लेकिन जो आंतरिक संकट सरकार की गलत नीतियों के कारण पैदा होते हैं, उसमें जनता की सेवा करने के लिये उसे शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से हम अवश्य संगठित करेंगे। प्रदर्शन, हड़तालें ये तो लोकतंत्र के अंग हैं। आपको विरोधी दलों को और जनता को बर्बाद करना चाहिये कि अहिंसदावाद को छोड़ कर कहीं भी हिंसात्मक घटना नहीं हुई और हम विश्वास दिलाते हैं कि आन्दोलन हिंसात्मक होने भी नहीं चाहियें। लेकिन आखिर सब की भी एक सीमा होती है। उत्तर प्रदेश में, महाराष्ट्र में उन लोगों से हम पूछें जो बड़े हुये चीजों के दाम दे नहीं सकते और जो पर्याप्त अनाज खरीद नहीं सकते।

क्या आवश्यकता थी देश को अलग अलग क्षेत्रों में बांटने की? यूरोप में राष्ट्रों की

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

सीमाएं टूट रही हैं, कामन मार्केट बन रहे हैं, और हम अपने देश में राज्यों के बीच में दीवारें खड़ी कर रहे हैं। अमेरिका का गेहूं बम्बई में जल्दी पहुंच सकता है। अमेरिका का गेहूं कांडला बंदरगाह में जल्दी आ सकता है। मगर पंजाब का गेहूं पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में नहीं पहुंच सकता। ये जोन क्यों बनाये गये। राष्ट्रीयता पर कुठाराघात करने वाले, व्यापार के सहज मार्ग में बाधा पैदा करने वाले? विरोधी दल इस बात पर सहमत थे कि ये जो गेहूं के क्षेत्र हैं, ये खत्म कर दिये जायें। क्या कठिनाई है इन गेहूं के क्षेत्रों को खत्म करने में? क्या इनमें पंजाब और मध्य प्रदेश की राजनीति नहीं आती? मैं मानता हूं कि सरकार को यह प्रबन्ध करना होगा कि अगर क्षेत्र हटा दिये जायें और अनाज का आवागमन मुक्त कर दिया जाय तो उसका लाभ व्यापारी न उठा सकें और जिन क्षेत्रों से गेहूं अभावग्रस्त क्षेत्रों में जाना हो वहां अप्रत्याशित रूप से भाव न बढ़ जाय, लेकिन इस क्षेत्रीय योजना का कोई औचित्य नहीं है।

मुझे खेद है कि इस विवाद में कहा गया कि हम अमेरिका से गेहूं मंगा रहे हैं, इसके लिये हमें शर्म आनी चाहिये। काका साहब गाडगिल को पंजाब से चावल आता है इस लिये शर्म आती है। श्री भूपेश गुप्त को अमेरिका से गेहूं आता है इसलिये शर्म आती है। मगर किसी को इसलिये शर्म नहीं आती कि हम जनता को पर्याप्त अनाज नहीं दे सकते। हम आंकड़े पेश नहीं करना चाहते हैं। यह विवाद का विषय नहीं है। मगर अनाज न मिलने के कारण उत्तर प्रदेश में, बिहार में लोग भूख से मरे हैं, यह बात सही है, और शर्म आनी चाहिये तो इसलिये कि अनाज नहीं मिलता जिसके कारण लोग आम की गुठलियां खाते हैं, पेड़ों की जड़ें खाते हैं। हम अमेरिका से गेहूं खरीदते हैं, भीख

नहीं मांगते हैं। हम पाकिस्तान से चावल लेते हैं तो दाम दे कर लेते हैं। इसमें शर्म आने की बात नहीं है। मगर मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि जब देश में आप अनाज का उत्पादन पर्याप्त मात्रा में नहीं बढ़ा सकते तो देश की जनता की भूख मिटाने का इसके अतिरिक्त क्या तरीका है कि हम बाहर से अनाज लें। कोरी भावुकता से किसी का पेट नहीं भरता है और फिर:

“बुभुक्षति किम् न करोति पापम्”

भूखा आदमी क्या पाप नहीं करता है। यह सस्ती भावुकता है जिस ने हमारे स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री को प्रेरित किया सन् १९४८ में इस बात की घोषणा करने के लिये कि दो तीन वर्ष में देश अनाज की दृष्टि से आत्मनिर्भर हो जायेगा। मैं खाद्य मंत्री से कहना चाहूंगा कि यह हमारा लक्ष्य होना चाहिये कि हम देश को अनाज की दृष्टि से आत्मनिर्भर बनायें, लेकिन इस सस्ती भावुकता में आ कर हम विदेशों से अनाज मंगाना बन्द न करें। यह अब भी हमारे देश के लिये इतना आंतरिक संकट पैदा करेगा, जिस को शायद हम संभाल नहीं सकते।

कुछ दूरगामी उपाय भी अपनाने की आवश्यकता है। कहा जाता है कि खेती का हमारी अर्थ व्यवस्था में बड़ा महत्व है। कल रात प्लानिंग कमिशन ने एक नोट सदस्यों को भेजा है जिसमें कहा गया है कि हमारी ७० फी सैकड़ जनसंख्या प्रत्यक्ष खेती पर निर्भर करती है। हमारी राष्ट्रीय आय का प्रायः ५० फी सदी खेती से प्राप्त होता है। औद्योगिक विकास के लिये कच्चा माल खेती से मिलता है और औद्योगिक उत्पादन के लिये भी बाजार खेती से सम्बन्धित लोग देते हैं। हमारी जनसंख्या का दो तिहाई भाग कृषि पर निर्भर है। बिना कृषि के विकास के हम औद्योगिक विकास नहीं कर सकते। मगर केवल इसकी दुहाई देने से



कृषि का विकास नहीं होगा। उसी नोट में कुछ आंकड़े दिये गये हैं जिन से पता लगता है कि तीसरी योजना में हमारा लक्ष्य था १० करोड़ टन अनाज पैदा करने का और हम ६ करोड़ २० लाख टन से ज्यादा अनाज पैदा नहीं कर सकते। ८० लाख टन अनाज की कमी रह गई। यह कमी कैसे पूरी होगी?

हमने सिंचाई के जो लक्ष्य रखे, हमने उर्वरक की जो लक्ष्य रखे, हमने उर्वरक खाद के जो लक्ष्य रखे, वे लक्ष्य तो हमारे पूरे नहीं हुये और प्लानिंग कमिशन मान रहा है कि इन लक्ष्यों के पूरा न होने की वजह से ४५ लाख टन अनाज पैदा नहीं होगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि ये सिंचाई के, बीज के और खाद के जो लक्ष्य पूरे नहीं हुए हैं, क्या इसके लिये भी विरोधी दल जिम्मेदार हैं?

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** या मौसम जिम्मेदार है?

**श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी :** या इसके लिये मौसम जिम्मेदार है? इसके लिये शासन जिम्मेदार है। शासन को अपनी गलतियाँ स्वीकार करनी चाहियें?

सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि तीसरी योजना में खाद्यान्नों के उत्पादन की जो वार्षिक दर है जो पहली योजना में थी। पहली योजना में २.५ पर सेंट वार्षिक वृद्धि हुई। दूसरी योजना में यह वृद्धि बढ़ कर ३.५ प्रतिशत हो गई और अब हम फिर २.६ पर सेंट पर तीसरी योजना में आ गये हैं। हमारी जनसंख्या २.३ पर सेंट की गति से बढ़ रही है। गांवों से लोग शहरों में आ रहे हैं। उनके खाने की आदतें बदल रही हैं। लोगों के पास अधिक पैसा आता है, तो वे अधिक अच्छा अनाज खाना चाहते हैं। किसान की हालत भी सुधरी है और वह भी अनाज को अपने पास रखना चाहता है। समस्या यह है कि इस गति से कैसे हम इस अन्न की समस्या को हल करेंगे?

दो चीजें और जिन्होंने संकट पैदा किया है। वह कांग्रेस पार्टी की खोखले नारे लगाने की नीति है। नागपुर में नारा दे दिया, हम सहकारी खेती करेंगे, उसने किसानों के मन में एक अनिश्चितता पैदा कर दी। हमने इस सिद्धांत को स्वीकार किया कि जमीन जोतने वाले को जमीन का मालिक बनाया जाय मगर सहकारी खेती का नारा लगा कर हमने किसान के मन में यह डर पैदा कर दिया कि उसकी जमीन कभी भी उसके हाथ से निकल सकती है। अगर किसान को यह भय होगा कि उसकी जमीन उसके हाथ से जाने वाली है तो जमीन के विकास के लिये वह पूंजी नहीं लगायेगा, कुआँ नहीं खोदेगा, खेती के नये तरीके नहीं अपनाएगा। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि किसान के इस डर को निकाला जाय। किसान मिल कर खेती करे यह कहना सरल है मगर मिल कर खेती करना कठिन है। जब कांग्रेस के नेता देश-सेवा के लिये मिल कर काम नहीं कर सकते तो हम किसानों से किस मुंह से कह सकते हैं कि वह मिल कर खेती करें, जब सरकार और विरोधी-दल भी राष्ट्रीय-संकट पर मिल कर काम नहीं कर सकते तो केवल किसानों से यह आशा नहीं की जा सकती है कि वे मिल कर खेती करेंगे। हम व्यावहारिकता से अपनी आँखें मूंद नहीं सकते...

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh):** The cat s out of the bag.

**श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी :** . . . केवल नारा लगाना ही आवश्यक नहीं है उस नारे को अमल में लाने के लिए पर्याप्त व्यवस्था करना भी जरूरी है। हमने अपने देश में भूमिसुधार किए हैं और अन्न उत्पादन के लिये भूमिसुधारों का पूरा करना जरूरी है। हमने लैंड सीलिंग लागू किया है और इस सीलिंग को भी दृढ़ता के साथ पालन होना चाहिये। जिन राज्यों में भूमिसुधार की प्रक्रिया अभी पूरी नहीं हुई है उन राज्यों में यह प्रक्रिया पूरी की जानी चाहिए लेकिन

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

साथ ही यह एलान कर दिया जाना चाहिए कि आगे आने वाले १०-१५ वर्षों तक सीलिंग के कानूनों में किसी तरह का फर्क नहीं किया जायगा। यह सुझाव योजना आयोग के सदस्य श्री श्रीमन्नारायण जी ने दिया है, यह सुझाव अत्यंत समीचीन है। हमने भूमि-सुधार कर दिया, हमने सीलिंग के कानून बना दिए, उसके अन्तर्गत सीलिंग की एक मर्यादा तय कर दी, अब किसानों से कहना चाहिए कि उस मर्यादा की भूमि उनके पास रहेगी और वह उसमें जितना अधिक अनाज पैदा करेंगे उतने अनाज की उन्हें प्रोत्साहित कीमत मिलेगी, इससे उनका भी भला होगा और वह राष्ट्र के अन्न संकट को, अन्न की कमी को भी पूरा कर सकेंगे।

सभापति जी, देश में कुछ दल हैं जो मांग करते हैं कि सरकार को अनाज का व्यापार अपने हाथ में ले लेना चाहिए। कुछ दल ऐसे हैं जो कि यह मांग करते हैं कि सरकार थोक व्यापार अपने हाथ में ले लें, कुछ दल ऐसे हैं जो मांग करते हैं कि सरकार फुटकर व्यापार भी अपने हाथ में ले लें। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह सिद्धान्त का प्रश्न नहीं है, यह व्यवहार का प्रश्न है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार बाजार में खरीदार बन कर आए और इस दृष्टि से खाद्य मंत्री की एक कार्पोरेशन की जो योजना है उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ लेकिन जो लोग आज सरकार को यह सलाह देते हैं कि वह खलिहान से लेकर रसोईघर तक अनाज के वितरण की हर एक स्तर पर व्यवस्था अपने हाथ में ले ले वह सरकार के मित्र नहीं हैं। वह जानते नहीं हैं कि इसमें क्या कठिनाइयाँ पैदा होंगी। क्या सरकार के पास अनाज खरीदने के लिये पर्याप्त पूंजी है? क्या उस अनाज को रखने के लिये उचित भंडार की जगह है? क्या वितरण के लिए सरकार के पास तंत्र है? ये सब चीजें सरकार के पास नहीं हैं तो पहले वह चीजें खड़ी करनी पड़ेंगी और उसके बाद

ही सरकार पूरा व्यापार अपने हाथ में लेने का विचार कर सकती है, लेकिन आज अगर सरकार सारा व्यापार अपने हाथ में लेने की जिम्मेदारी लेंगी तो अन्न-संकट और गम्भीर हो जाएगा। सरकार को आंशिक व्यापार अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिए और सरकार को किसानों को प्रोत्साहक मूल्य देकर भारी भंडार बनाना चाहिए, केवल विदेशी अनाज का नहीं देशी अनाज का भी, जिसे बाजार में लाकर सरकार मूल्यों को बढ़ने से रोक सके। आज अगर सरकार के भंडार में पर्याप्त अनाज होता—चाहे विदेशी चाहे देशी होता—तो चीजों के, अन्न के, दाम इतने नहीं बढ़ सकते थे। अगर अन्ततोगत्वा सरकार यह निर्णय करे कि पूरा व्यापार सरकार के हाथ में आ जाना चाहिए तो मैं उस मार्ग में बाधक नहीं बनूंगा लेकिन सरकार के हाथ में जो चीज आती है उससे जनता की परेशानी बढ़ जाती है, कंट्रोल के साथ अण्डाचार आता है, सरकारी मशीनरी जैसी है उससे हम आंखें नहीं मूंद सकते, जो हमारे पास ह्यूमन मैटीरियल है, मानव तत्व है उसकी कशियाँ और खामियाँ से भी हम अपनी दृष्टि ओझल नहीं कर सकते, इसलिए सरकार एकाधिकार अपने हाथ में न ले मगर आंशिक व्यापार अपने हाथ में लेकर इस स्थिति में आए कि वह आवश्यकता पड़ने पर बाजार को प्रभावित कर सके।

मैं एक बात कह कर समाप्त कर दूंगा। अनाज के मूल्यों का प्रश्न है। मूल्यों का प्रश्न बाकी की अर्थ-व्यवस्था से अलग करके नहीं देखा जा सकता। तीसरी योजना में एक बात कही गई थी, उसमें एक वाक्य कहा गया था :

**"The success of a price policy depended upon a successful farm price policy."**

यह "फार्म प्राइस पालिसी" तो अभी तक बनाई नहीं, अब मंत्री महोदय उसे विकसित करने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं और

हम उनकी सफलता की कामना करते हैं, जिस दिशा में वह आगे बढ़ रहे हैं उस दिशा में व्यवहारवादी दृष्टिकोण अपना कर और आगे बढ़ना चाहिए। मैं उनकी अधिक तारीफ नहीं करना चाहता अन्यथा यह भी उनके लिए कठिनाई का विषय हो जायेगा, उनसे कहा जायेगा कि जनसंघ वाले आपकी तारीफ कर रहे हैं, आपकी नीति में जरूर कोई दोष है, जरूर कोई गलती है। लेकिन मूल्यों के सवाल पर गम्भीरता से विचार करना होगा। एक विकसित, विकासशील अर्थव्यवस्था में मूल्य बढ़ते हैं मगर मर्यादा के भीतर बढ़ने चाहिए, अगर मूल्य बढ़ते हैं तो उसके साथ खरीदने की ताकत भी बढ़नी चाहिए। आज जो मूल्य बढ़े हैं उसका लाभ किसान को नहीं हो रहा है, आज उपभोक्ता उस मूल्य पर अनाज खरीदने की क्षमता नहीं रखता और इसलिए सारी अर्थव्यवस्था पर पुनर्विचार करने की आवश्यकता है।

मुझे दुःख होता है कि हर एक जगह स्वर्गीय नेहरू जी का नाम लिया जाता है और सरकार से कसम खाकर यह एलान करवाया जाता है कि हम उनकी नीतियों में बदली नहीं करेंगे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर स्थिति बदल जायेगी तब भी बदल नहीं करेंगे? क्या नीतियाँ जड़ होती हैं या नीतियाँ सक्रिय होती हैं? नीतियाँ जीवन्त होती हैं, परिस्थितियों के अनुसार नीतियों में हेर फेर करना होता है। आज बुनियादी नीतियों में परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है लेकिन अगर परिस्थितियों का तकाजा नीतियों में परिवर्तन करने की मांग करता है तो कोई भी सरकार अपने स्वर्गीय नेता के प्रति श्रद्धा रखते हुए भी उन नीतियों में हेरफेर करने से इंकार नहीं कर सकती। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि लोगों की बुनियादी आवश्यकता की चीजें कैसे पूरी होंगी। देश का औद्योगिक विकास आवश्यक है, उसके लिए भारी उद्योगों की रचना भी होनी चाहिए मगर हम लोगों की बुनियादी आव-

श्यकताओं की उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते। आखिर देश में लोकतंत्र है, तानाशाही नहीं है, हर पाँच साल के बाद आपको जनता का दरवाजा खटखटाना है और अगर आप गलती करेंगे तो उसका फायदा उठाने के लिए हम भी यहाँ बैठ हुए हैं। इसलिए लोकतांत्रिक ढंग में आर्थिक नियोजन जनता की तात्कालिक आवश्यकताओं की उपेक्षा करके नहीं चल सकता। औद्योगिक विकास के लिए दृढ़ आधार कायम करते हुए हम खेती पर, उपभोग्य वस्तुओं के उत्पादन पर अधिक बल दें और दूरगामी दृष्टि से अपनी आर्थिक, मौद्रिक और वित्तीय नीतियों में परिवर्तन करें, सरकारी खर्च को हटायें, नोट छापना कम करें, और अपनी नीतियों को अधिक यथार्थवादी बनाएं तभी हम इस संकट पर काबू पा सकेंगे। परिस्थिति केवल कठिन ही नहीं है गम्भीर भी है और अगर उचित उपाय नहीं किए गए, उचित योजना नहीं की गई तो यह काबू से बाहर हो सकती है जिसके लिए सरकार को सजग होकर कदम उठाना चाहिए। धन्यवाद।

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR (Mysore):  
Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to say a word of appreciation about the literature that has been supplied to us on the eve of this debate and one of the good effects of circulating these two brochures has been that almost every speaker who has spoken has not spoken on the facts because the facts are quite clear. And if at the time of every important debate the Government were to circulate similar things, I think we might have better debates than sometimes we have.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

Secondly, Sir, I should like to put in a word of appreciation of the efforts of the Minister for Food and Agriculture. During the short time

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.] that he has been handling this difficult portfolio he has shown a rare courage because, for any Food Minister, in the present context, it requires a lot of courage to handle things, and he has shown a rare competence also because, in the short range, the problem was really about the difficulties of States in short supply, and with imports still coming, he has been able to manage a rather very difficult situation in a very competent manner. Thirdly, I should also like to say that I appreciate very much his approach to the long-term problems. He has, obviously, fully realised the importance of production in this matter. He has also realised the great defect that has been there in the working of our food distribution. At the same time he has not thought in terms of any revolution—he has not entertained the ambition of covering the whole of food distribution—and I think his idea of the foodgrains organisation, the trading organisation, is a very good idea, and if worked out in full, to some extent, I think, it will meet the difficulties in the situation. Sir, in a sense debates like this, in the present context, also necessarily involve a little of retrospect. I have been looking through the figures in these brochures, but knowing the situation as a layman, having had to buy grains every day, every week, I fail to really understand the position. I am not speaking of the past for a retrospective condemnation but with a view to emphasise the fact that this subject requires our constant attention always. Now we all of us know that prices go down when the harvest season is on, and the prices gradually go up during the year. But it was something of a phenomenon, which even a layman could observe, which experts certainly could not have missed, that during the last harvest season the prices were substantially higher than during similar periods in the earlier years. That, I thought, should have been the time when very vigorous efforts, frantic efforts, should have been made to see to it, to find

out what was wrong with the situation when the foodgrains, their prices, were substantially higher, in a sense significantly higher, I might say, to affect the situation, than during any previous harvest season, and if some vigour had been shown then by way of imports, redistribution, and things like that, we might not perhaps have had to face that difficulty in the situation as we are bound to face today. Then again incidentally, I would like to say that as soon as we mention the food situation, the two cereals that stand largely before our eyes are rice and wheat because, for a large majority of our countrymen, their staple is rice or wheat. But I am afraid we have failed to see that there is a sizeable portion of our countrymen whose staple food is *jowar*. In Rajputana, in Maharashtra, in Madhya Pradesh, in Karnatak areas and in places elsewhere nothing else will satisfy the people as *johar*, and in our civilised eyes *jowar* is a coarse grain. When we have *jowar* rooti in our house and we try to give it to our servant who hails from the North, he asks our people: Do men also eat *jowar*?" This is the opinion here and therefore *jowar* is outside our consideration. Just as much as rice is dear to my hon. friend, the Minister for Food and Agriculture, to the same extent, or to a little more extent *jowar* is our favourite food, because of this also; once, through a sort of curiosity, when I referred to Dr. Ankroyd's book on Nutrition for the nutritional content of *jowar*, I found to my satisfaction that, as against wheat, by itself, without the addition of ghee, *jowar* contains a little more fat than wheat and therefore, Sir, it is a little more nutritious than wheat. But in our eyes it does not count for much, because the number of people consuming *jowar* is very small, but, ultimately, — may be three, four crores, or whatever it is—we have to take them into consideration also. All of us are aware that much has been done for the research in rice, also much research in the case of wheat, but very

little research in the case of *jowar*. The other day it gave me a little psychological comfort to know that the Ford Foundation or some other body has earmarked some lakhs of rupees for research in *sorghum* which I think, is *jowar*, and it is something. Then again when we consider cereals, we just do not so much consider the other nutrients, like pulses for instance. A glance at the relevant section in this brochure will shew that of the pulses *Tin-* has been rising in price during the last two years out of proportion to the rise in prices of other cereals. If, say, the rise in price-; of the other cereals is X per cent, the rise in *Tur* is 2X per cent. In other words, today, *Tur dal*, which for the vegetarian is the principal source of protein, is a neglected thing; nobody thinks about how to increase the production of *Tur* except the Maharashtra Government who, I understood the other day, was taking some steps in the matter of *Tur* and *Jowar*. But then all these things have to be taken into consideration. I am mentioning this, not because it is going to give us a solution to the major problem, but particularly because it is an important aspect concerning some part of the population.

Having said that, I should like to say that when we think in terms of increase of production, we are faced with a difficult problem. It is all very easy for us to say: "Give the farmer modern implements; give the farmer credit; give the farmer improved seeds" and things like that, but ultimately there is one hard reality. Ours is a very large country; secondly, ours is a country of many Governments, not one. Had it been an authoritarian Government, a unitary Government, the problems would have been simpler; thirdly, though food and agriculture has been given a sort of importance in the Central Government—it has been so always; even that Ministry is an important Ministry—in the States the

Agriculture Ministry ranks fourth or fifth. Naturally, the Chief Minister is the most important. Second comes the Home Minister—that is an old tradition; then perhaps the Finance Minister comes, round about there; then the Industries Minister—the most powerful people come to occupy this post—then the Agriculture Minister comes, may be fifth or sixth or seventh or eighth in the order of priority. By saying this I do not mean to cast any reflection, but ultimately the strength of any Ministry depends upon the presiding Minister—there is no doubt about that joint at all. We might have the ablest Secretariat—it is a great asset—but if the Minister is not as competent as he should be, then naturally his incompetence is reflected in the Ministry, and therefore it is that the highest importance is to be attached to this question in the States, because it is in the States that ultimately our fate in food production is being determined. Then we think in rather loose terms in the sense of improved implements and so on. It is true; during the last ten years there has been, I think, a creditable increase in food production, something which can do credit to the country, though not as much as we have been wanting to; it is very obvious even to the layman that whereas our population has increased, during the last Census, by about 29 per cent or 25 per cent, our imports have remained round about the same three or four million tons; from 1949-50 onwards till now, round about three or four million tons; that is to say, in terms of the population increase the imports have not increased; they are almost stationary; if we wanted X tons *per capita* earlier, by way of imports, we are today managing with the same old low imports; in other words, in terms of the increase in population, our imports should have been round about six or seven million tons a year, which is not the case; only in times of difficulty we imported five million tons, which is doubtless proof of the fact that we have done well in production apart

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.] from statistics. We have got statistics which sometimes err and the error is in the margin 10 to 20 per cent. Nobody can do it very accurately; it all depends again on the village officers, how they show things, but there is no doubt about this fact that food production has increased appreciably and the gap that we have to fill is a small gap; it is not a big gap, and therefore it is that with a little more coaxing, with a little more enabling the farmer to grow more, I think we can cover this gap. But there is one thing. This gap cannot be covered by circulars. Whatever we say, whatever we might think, the increase in production has been due to the economic incentives which the farmer has been getting during the last ten years; there is no doubt about that. Economic incentives are necessary. But a little more than that is also necessary. We want something like the fervour which we had at the time of our freedom struggle and every farmer should feel that this is his cause, that he must do something more. Unless this is added, I am afraid things might run on as they have been running and with greater population and pressures these imports of some 4 million tons will continue for all time. How to create that fervour? It is a difficult problem. It cannot be done by means of brochures. It cannot be done by lectures. By these means it cannot be done. Something has to be done dynamically and organisationally and the whole people have to be enthused about this. This is about the aspect of production. Of course there have been short shifts in countries like Russia and China where food production was increased by other methods, by having communes, by having joint cooperative farming and so on, but at the same time they had to decimate a part of their population. That is not our method. Our methods are democratic and this method along with its advantages has this disadvantage also, namely, that in all our endeavours we have to move the whole population with us,

with their voluntary will. Therefore it is that our problem of production is much more difficult than it would have been had we been an authoritarian country.

After production comes the problem *at* distribution. I think it has done us more harm than good, inveighing in season and out of season, our own countrymen, branding them all with the same brush. Ultimately all of us, whether in the Government or in the Opposition, all of us in the Congress and in other parties, we are not all saints. There are, doubtless, some sinners also. And certainly among those in the merchantile world all are not sinners. Everybody is not bad. This inveighing of our own people, whether in the field of industry, commerce or business, is bad for us, and it has done us all more harm than good at the moment, calling some middlemen, that all middlemen are bad and things like that. Instead of that I think a rational approach would be to proceed, as the Food Ministry is proceeding, to have a plan for the future. I shall take three more minutes and then finish. In having this plan. I should like to urge two considerations. One is this. We all think in terms of a socialist society, of a socialist order. I speak very diffidently because I have to speak against the whole outlook that has been there dominating our thinking since the attainment of freedom. We are working towards a socialist structure and there is no doubt about it. We should try to have more and more industries in the public sector. So far so good. We should begin to pay special attention to social welfare also. But I am afraid we missed one thing. We talk about Russia and people who go to Russia and see things there come and say that everything is good there. But I think we have to borrow one leaf from the Russian economy. Whereas at one end they had at the top the big industrial developments, petrol, iron and steel, cement and everything else at the other end and along side of it and simultaneously



and without a moment's loss, at the base of it all, the common man's lot was happy, in any case reasonably comfortable. Shoe may be selling at Rs. 90 a pair in Russia. Their economy is like that. But they repair it and wear it. Food, housing and things like that they have tried to make common to all. Here we have not worried about it. With due respect I would like to say that in spite of our great enthusiasm for a real socialist economy, we have forgotten one thing. We are building a socialist structure and we should not forget what happened in England and America where the weavers suffered while the mills prospered. We should not have the same thing here. In America prosperity from the top percolated below. We cannot have it like that here. In our country though prosperity has to be there, at the same time the base should be sure and therefore, food should be available to the poor man at the proper price. Naturally as time goes on and when we spend more on food, he may have to pay a little higher price. But he should be able to get it at the proper price. And he should have proper housing. If you look into these aspects, you have to enter into this question of distribution, and this is a good thing. But a note of caution I would like to sound. It may not be possible for the hon. Minister to say "Yes" just now, but I hope he will try to appreciate what I say and let it be this. At the present moment we are in a hurry to proceed in every direction. That is to say we want increased national production. At the same time we want to see that the ground roots of democracy go to the bottom-most level, to the villages, to the Panchayat and things like that. When the history at Panchayati Raj is written some 30 years later, we shall have a good and notable picture. But during the last ten years of panchayati development, we know what it has been. We know what we are. We know our people. We know that at the present moment these ten years are years of racing everybody forward. Spiritual conceptions, moral conceptions, are in

the background and everybody is after material success. If I have two sons, one should be a top engineer earning some Rs. 3,000 a month and the other should be a top doctor earning Rs. 4,000. It does not strike me that one of my sons should be devoted to the nation, which used to be the case in our generation. I do not contemplate a poor life for my son and that is a good thing, but we should keep this also in mind. While capable people make a success of a thing in an honest way, the incompetent people resort to fraud and things like that. The Minister of Community Development and Cooperation—I am sorry he is not here now—in one sober moment did confess that out of 320,000 cooperative societies about 160,000 were false or fraudulent. Of the remaining 160,000 how many are incompetent? He was not good enough to say and if he had said it, I don't know what would be the number. Therefore, my hon. friend is unconventional sometime; and it is good. It is good for him and good for us all and good for the Government to speak in terms of cooperation. The idea is good that it should be treated as a good business. He should stick to that and if the cooperative society is good as a business, he should be encouraged, not simply because it is a cooperative society, but because it is a competent one. Where there is an incompetent society it should be dealt with accordingly. He should look upon it strictly as a business proposition.

Just as I began I shall conclude. I say that of all the portfolios at present in the Government of India, Food and Agriculture portfolio is the most difficult and I wish the hon. Minister every success.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : We have a number of speakers yet to speak and so we will sit through the lunch hour.

Prof. B. N. Prasad.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the food situation in the country has become extremely critical and it has almost

[Prof. B. N. Prasad]

reached the stage to precipitate a precarious and serious crisis. The food problem has become the burning topic at present. Wherever we go, whether in the aeroplane or in the railway train, whether in a social gathering or any where else, the talk is about food and this talk occupies a most prominent place. This means that a very large number of our people, almost the whole of our population is affected by this burning problem of food. Surely, it is the people's birthright to get a square meal, whatever be the form of the government. It is therefore quite easy to realise the depth of the misery of the people and their physical and mental agitation when food becomes so scarce.

Such being the gravity of the situation, I must pay my tribute and express my appreciation of the gigantic efforts that are being made by our very energetic and dynamic Minister of Food and Agriculture. He has been devising all sorts of plans to control the spiral of the rising food prices. But even though we read in the papers that prices are being controlled and they will soon go down, the next morning we find, Sir, that the prices have shot up instead of going down. In today's morning paper we find that the headlines are like this "Wheat prices in Delhi shoot up. Traders seek excuses and find one more." This is the type of news with which we are met. Unfortunately the odds seem to be against the present Minister of Food and Agriculture. In fact the situation may be depicted by the familiar words—

“मन बहल गया क्यों क्यों दवा की।”

Public faith is very much shaken in the assurances and encouraging pictures given by the Government. It is all the more so because for some reason or the other, the promises and hopes of a better future in the matter of food given in the past on so many occasions have not materialised.

The question naturally arises: How is it so? What is the reason for such a crisis developing so suddenly and

abruptly? Is such a situation an unexpected one. Has there been followed or is being followed a satisfactory and correct food policy? The answer involves the careful consideration of a number of factors and I shall try to briefly dwell upon them.

First of all, I must say that this problem really should be taken up as a national problem. Naturally there might have been mistakes committed in the past and hundreds of mistakes might have been committed before the present condition was arrived at but I think this is not the time when we should be quarrelling or fighting here in the House as one party against another. Let us at least for the time being forget the past and let us all put our heads together to find out a satisfactory solution. There have been suggested a number of ways. Of course, production, price and control are among the main factors which have been mentioned. It has been suggested that there should be complete or partial State trading. Well, so far as it goes, it seems quite all right, the plan may be good and correct but everything depends upon the correct implementation of the policy. Our difficulty in this country has been that we set up a large number of plans which are quite nice on paper but when we come to implement them we find that they do not bear the fruits expected of them. If we go to the smaller places we find the sorry state of affairs of the working of the Fair Price Shops. Of course, the name is very good but one can find many an unfair thing being done in those Fair Price Shops. I am told, Sir, of course, I must say that I do not bear personal witness to this but I am told that the grains that are supplied to these Fair Price Shops are such that portions of good grains are taken away and the weight is made up by adding dust, etc., with the result that when the people go there they get disgusted so much so that, I know personally, many people do not prefer to buy grains from those Fair Price Shops. They go to the private

dealers and pay a high price for good grains. I stated this only to emphasise the point that even when State trading is brought into existence, one has got to take proper precaution to see that it works in a nice, correct and useful manner. If we only have this State trading on paper and if we do not go into the details to see its working I am afraid it will not give us the expected results.

The hon. Food Minister stated a number of points concerning this matter. There was the question of the levelling of prices. Naturally, when he has set up a committee of experts in economics, we should leave this matter to that committee because they being experts are expected to go into greater detail about the matter and when their report comes before us let us hope that they will prove useful for dealing with the problem at hand. I should say that when the levelling of the price is decided upon naturally one would be taking into account all types of factors but the important point is that the price of foodgrains should be stabilised at a level commensurate with the pay and salary allowed by government and non-governmental agencies to their employees. In view of the high price of the many other associated articles if food prices are to be fixed at a high level I am afraid this will not be very helpful to the public at large. Therefore, great care should be taken when the price level is fixed.

There are two types of problems before us, one of which is that today we find that prices are soaring high and it is becoming increasingly difficult for the public to buy foodstuffs. This means that we have got to devise ways and means by which the availability of cereals may be increased. This by itself involves several factors, and the most important individual factor naturally is rise in production. One has got to devise means whereby there may be improvement in the

680 RS—5.

raising of crops. A number of speakers have spoken on this and I need not go into elaborate details but various factors like seeds, fertilisers, irrigation, agricultural implements, crop diseases, labour and other connected things have got to be taken into consideration. As far as seeds are concerned, there have been complaints that very often seeds of the right type do not become available to the farmers in general. Fertilisers, we have very often been reading, are very much in short supply. Somehow, the agencies that are set up by those in authority to do so do not come into practical working within a reasonably short period of time. Reference was made by one previous speaker regarding the big fertiliser factory to be erected at Trombay near Bombay. I myself have seen, during the last two or three years, buildings coming up, quarters being erected and so on, but so far as the actual working of the factory is concerned, we do not know when it will come into existence. Now, the condition of the country being such, is it really right that this organisation should proceed in such a leisurely manner? Government was quite aware of the fact that we are running short of foodgrains and fertilisers are required urgently. Could they not expedite the matter? Of course, if the question were to be asked, they will give reasons and sometimes it may be difficult for us to contradict the reasons but we have got to see whether the thing is actually done or not or only the reasons are given however elaborate they may be. Regarding crop diseases they have set up plant protection offices. I know from personal experience of some of the plant protection offices that although on paper they are filling in the routine matter, reports, etc., in actual practice we have not been finding satisfactory co-operation from these Departments. (Time belt rinoO Sir, I may be allowed some more time. I have got a number of points. Previous speakers have taken 40 and 45 minutes each and I do not speak very often.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Everybody has to be accommodated. There are over forty speakers. I want you to try to finish as soon as possible.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD: Some people have been given 40 or 45 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : That is according to the party arrangements. You need not go into all that. You please try to wind up.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD: Allow me to just state some of the points at least.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I won't be able to give you more than five or six minutes. That is why I am telling you to finish as early as possible.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD: Well, Sir, as I said, the primary factor is the improvement in the production of cereals but the improvement in the production of cereals by itself cannot solve our problem. It is a positive source but then you have got a number of negative sources to dispose of regarding the cereals that you produce. Such a one is the storage business. The storage system in our country is not scientific. As a matter of fact there is a huge amount of loss on account of the faulty system of storage. If on the one hand we want to raise production, we must on the other hand also see that our storage system is of the right type. No doubt a beginning has been made through the Indo-T.J.S. Agreement No. 31 of 1963 concerning projects for modern storage of foodgrains, but its tangible results are so far very insignificant. Therefore I should like to emphasise that due attention must be given to this storage business.

Then there is the question of protection against loss due to insects,

rodents, pests, etc., which is very heavy. As a matter of fact if statistical results were to be relied on there is a feeling in certain quarters that the annual rise that might be effected in the production of cereals may be even less than the amount of annual loss due to these insects, rodents, pests, etc. and due to the careless way in which foodgrains are stored in the country. So if we are giving so much emphasis on the one hand for raising production we must give equal emphasis to preserving those things from being lost due to such factors.

Another step that is necessary is about the safety and efficiency in transport. Many a trouble has arisen on account of inefficiency, delay and loss in transport. Sir, I am in a hurry and I am only touching on the points; I am not elaborating them.

These are anyway temporary measures for improving the situation. Even if we take these the time for harvesting is still very far. The wheat harvest, as you know, comes round about April. All this that we are doing is to cover the intervening period but the Ministry of Food and Agriculture must also draw up a policy which may be satisfactory in the long run. The Ministry of Food, I may say, is not only a Ministry of Foodgrains but it is the Ministry of Food. And food does not consist only of grains. Food involves many other things which go to satisfy the hunger and keep the human body supplied with the requisite energy. Therefore it is necessary that we should consider the other items of food which might help us in preserving or lowering the requirement of cereals. The recommendation of the Indian Council of Medical Research regarding cereal requirements per person per day in our country is four hundred grammes, but the average consumption comes to 470 grammes per person per day. As against this

cereal consumption in advanced countries is only 328 grammes per person per day. Still the average Indian gets only 2100 calories per day as against 2700 calories of minimum requirement. All this shows that there is absolute necessity for supplementing cereal food by other items of food.

Now, next in order would come fruits and vegetables. In our country there is enough production of fruits and vegetables but on account of various difficulties including transport, processing, preservation, etc. the fruits do not reach the consumers in time. As a matter of fact the estimate is that due to these faulty arrangements only 40 per cent of the fruits that are produced in this country actually reach the consumers. Therefore arrangements must be made to tackle this situation. There must be refrigerated system of transport, etc. so that distribution of fruits and vegetables may be improved.

Then we know that a very large section of the Indian population consumes fish. From the medical point of view fish is said to be a very useful item of food. Now a surprising thing that I would put before the House is that we in India have got a coastline of about 3,000 miles, 17,000 miles of rivers and canals and a considerable area under tanks and ponds. Yet our annual catch of fish amounts only to 1.4 million tons compared to 12 million tons in the small country of Japan. India can easily become one of the largest fishing nations of the world if this industry could be organised properly and it will greatly make up the deficiency of cereals. The price differential between the amount received by the fishermen and that paid by the consumers in the interior is generally as much as 300 per cent. If this be the state of affairs, it means that a proper regulation of this supplementary item of food should be made.

I might just say a word about poultry. Poultry is the best source of high grade protein. Although some stimulus has been given to poultry by the Government, still it is far below the requirements. If you take the statistics you will find that even now there is an average of only eight eggs per person per year in our country. If we take the number of birds into consideration then we find that there is one bird for four persons in this country whereas in Denmark there are seven birds per person. My idea of giving these figures is only to lay emphasis on the necessity for improving poultry development in the country.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Gujarat): The majority are vegetarians in India.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD: That is questionable; I do not want to enter into a discussion of this type as to whether the majority is vegetarian or not. Even vegetarians take eggs.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Professor, please try to finish.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD: I am coming to the last point. Therefore I would request the Minister of Food to consider the problem of food from the various points of view. On the one hand we may raise the production of grains; on the other hand it is equally necessary that we should set up a food industry and I want to lay special emphasis on this point. I want to say that due to the lack of a proper type of food industry in our country we are incurring a lot of waste. To give an example, after de-husking the percentage of head rice that we get in our country comes to about 58 per cent only compared to about 72 per cent, in other countries. If we had a proper type of arrangement in this respect, we can easily raise the amount of available cereals even in this way.

[Prof. B. N. Prasad.]

Then, Sir, the bran that we get can give us a good amount of edible oil. It can give us food.

Then, another type of thing to which we have got to give attention is milk products. Now, the milk industry in our country is in a deplorably condition. Perhaps we have got the largest number of cattle in the whole world, but our yield of milk is comparatively very small. It is said that to equal the milk that is produced by one cow in the United States we require seventeen cows in this country. Then, there is another problem connected with this milk.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I am afraid I will have to stop you now. You have taken thirty minutes.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD: Two minutes more. Special attention should be given to breeding the right type of cattle. As a matter of fact, we have got a number of cattle which occupy so much of area without giving the proportionate yield. As a matter of fact, if I may say so, there may be a selective type of birth control, even among these cattle. Then, Sir, I was just emphasising on the food industry and I will make . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : You may emphasise it at some other time. I am afraid you are taking away the time of other speakers.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD: Half a minute, Sir. Lastly, I would suggest that, in view of the importance of setting up a food industry, the Ministry, instead of being designated as the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, should be called "the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Food Industry." Then only it will be possible for us to get from all possible sources edible things which will go towards diminishing the actual amount of cereals. And that will solve the problem of the country. Otherwise, I am afraid that, with all the

pictures that are being given, it is only hoping against hope. I, therefore, strongly recommend that a food industry should be set up.

Thank you.

**कुमारी मनिबेन वल्लभभाई पटेल (गुजरात) :** व्हाइस चेयरमैन साहब, आज जो हालत हो रही है और जिस तरह खाद्य पदार्थों की कमी देश भर में अनुभव हो रही है वैसा हमारे स्वतंत्र होने के बाद पहले देश में कभी नहीं हुआ था। कुछ समय में नहीं आता कि जहाँ अनाज भरा पड़ा है वहाँ भी कहीं गायब हो जाता है। कभी कभी ऐसा लगता है कि हमारे व्यापारी किसी के हाथ में फंसे हैं जिससे यह हालत हो रही है।

आज के हमारे अन्न मंत्री, फूड मिनिस्टर पर देश ने बड़ी आशा बांधी है। आपकी इनर्जी, होशियारी, इन्टेलीजेन्स, झटपट निर्णय लेने और फैसले कर उस पर अमल करने के तरीके के कारण लोग भरोसे से विश्वास रखते हैं कि यह मामला आपसे जरूर सुलझेगा। कहां हमारी गलती हो रही है, वह हम को सोचना चाहिये। अनाज पैदा करने वाला किसान है और अधिक अनाज कैसे पैदा हो इसका साहित्य, प्रचार और प्रकाशन अधिकतर अंग्रेजी भाषा में होता है। थोड़ा सा विदेशों में प्रचार के लिये अंग्रेजी भाषा का प्रयोग हम समझ सकते हैं लेकिन बाकी तो प्रान्तीय भाषाओं में वह काम होना चाहिये। किसान के अंदर भरोसा पड़ना चाहिये कि सरकार की ओर से जो किया जाता है, प्रचार चलता है, वह उसके फायदे में है ऐसा करने से ही उस को लाभ पहुंचेगा।

बड़े बड़े फार्म एक दो जगह भले बने हैं परन्तु थोड़ी जमीन पर खेती कर के और मोडल फार्म जगह जगह बना कर के फिर उसकी पैदाइश का लाभ, हिसाब किताब गिनती कर बताना चाहिये कि किस प्रकार की जमीन में कितना फर्टिलाइजर किस



प्रकार से उपयोग करने से पैदाइश बढ़ती है जिस से उस का लाभ किसान की समझ में आये तभी वह उस तरफ बढ़ेगा ।

मिसाल के तौर पर मैं अपना एक अनुभव देना चाहती हूँ । बारडोली तहसील में पहले कभी केले नहीं होते थे । बारडोली के सत्याग्रह के बाद बारडोली सत्याग्रह आश्रम में थोड़ी सी जमीन पर केले की खेती की बहुत अच्छी फसल हुई । यह देख कर आसपास के किसान दूसरे साल बार बार देखने आते थे, पूछते रहते थे कि कब केला बोया गया, कितना पानी डाला गया, कितना और किस प्रकार का खाद लगाया गया । और आज बारडोली तहसील में इतने केले होते हैं कि किसानों की एक को-ऑपरेटिव्ह सोसाइटी केलों के लिये वहां बनी है और कई लाख के केले दिल्ली तक आते हैं, इतना ही नहीं अब तो विदेशों में भी वहां से केले जा रहे हैं । १९४६-५० में जब मैं यहां थी तब दिल्ली में हमारे यहां केला लगाया गया । तब मुझ से कहा गया था कि दिल्ली में केला हो नहीं सकता है लेकिन दो तीन जात के केले तो हम ने खाए । केले अच्छी तरह से हुए और काफी लगे थे, हां ज़रा दिमाग चलाना पड़ता है और इस तरह से केला लगाना चाहिए कि अक्टूबर के आखिर तक केला पके । गर्मी के दिनों में केले के पेड़ को काफी पानी दे कर संभालना पड़ता है ।

किसान को समय पर ठीक दाम में खाद और फर्टिलाइजर मिलना चाहिये, नहर का, कैनल का पानी मिलना चाहिए, अच्छे बीज मिलने चाहिये और उस का पैदाइश के ठीक दाम मिलने का भरोसा पड़ना चाहिये । फारेन एक्सचेंज पाने के लिये प्रदेश सरकारों को कौश क्रॉप्स बढ़ाने को लिखा जाय । और उस पर अमल किया जाय । इस प्रदेश को अनाज पहुंचाने की जिम्मेदारी केन्द्र सरकार के ऊपर है और इसका बंदोबस्त होना चाहिये ।

परन्तु इस साल हमें अनुभव तो यह हुआ कि उत्तर प्रदेश में किसान को गुड़ का पूरा दाम नहीं मिला और गुजरात में तो लोगों को गुड़ देखने को भी नहीं मिलता था और कितनी लोगों को तकलीफ हुई । अजीब बात तो यह है कि खाद्य मंत्रियों और प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्रियों की कान्फरेन्स यहां की जाती है और उसमें जो निर्णय लिया जाता है उसके ऊपर अमल नहीं होता । लिखा हुआ हुक्म कुछ होता है परन्तु जबानी हुक्म दूसरा ही होता है ।

अभी दस दिन पहले का अपना अनुभव मैं बताती हूँ । मध्य प्रदेश और गुजरात की सरहद पर एक बोर्ड लगा हुआ है मध्य प्रदेश का कि यहां से कोर्स ग्रेन, चना जा नहीं सकता है । यहां तो यह निर्णय हुआ था कि कोर्स ग्रेन हर जगह जा सकता है कहीं उसमें रुकावट नहीं हो सकती । इसी प्रकार से और जगह भी तकलीफ हो रही है । सचमुच में अगर हम अधिक अनाज पैदा करना चाहते हैं तो हमारा कोऑर्डिनेटड प्रयत्न होना चाहिये । हमारे यहां गुजरात में कई साल से नर्मदा नहर का मट्टी कनाल का काम चल रहा है लेकिन वह काम एक तरह से रुका पड़ा है क्योंकि बसल के प्रदेशों के साथ का मामला तो केन्द्र सरकार ही हल कर सकती है । उस का निर्णय नहीं होता है । जितना विलम्ब होता है उतना उसके ओवरहेड चार्जेज बढ़ते हैं । किसान को कनाल वाटर का दाम ज्यादा देना पड़ेगा । अगर यह मामला हल हो गया होता तो गुजरात में कई लाख एकड़ जमीन में अधिक पैदाइश होती, दो तीन क्राप एक साल में हो सकती थीं ।

क्या आज की हालत का एक कारण यह नहीं है कि बंदर में मजदूरों ने हड़ताल की और क्या हम उस हड़ताल को रोक नहीं सकते थे ? इसेन्शियल सर्विस के अंदर इस को ला कर हड़ताल को इल्लिगल नहीं करना चाहिये था । जिन मजदूरों को इस हड़ताल

[कुमारी मनिबेन बल्लभभाई पटेल]

में शामिल किया गया उन की कितनी कमाई चली गई, देश भर में कितनी तकलीफ अनाज के बिना लोगों ने पाई। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि अगर किसान को भरोसा दिया जाय कि उस को अनाज का ठीक दाम मिलेगा, समय पर पानी मिलेगा, फर्टिलाइजर मिलेगा और खेती के बारे में जानकारी दी जाय कि किस जमीन में कौन सी खाद दी जाय तो वह जरूर ज्यादा पैदा कर सकता है और खेती की समस्या हल हो सकती है। प्रचार और प्रकाशन से हम अनाज ज्यादा पैदा नहीं कर सकते और देश के अन्दर अनाज के दाम कम नहीं कर सकेंगे। देश के अन्दर जिस तरह से आज अनाज की परिस्थिति का लाभ उठा कर कुछ लोग हड़ताल कराते हैं वे लोग कितने तरह से हमारे देश का भला चाहते हैं, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है।

एक बात और भी है कि किसान खाली खेती पर ही निर्भर नहीं करता, वह गाय और भैस भी रखता है और उन की नस्ल सुधारने का काम भी हमारा ही है ताकि हमारे देश में दूध बड़े क्योंकि वह भी एक खाने की चीज है। सरकार ने यह निर्णय कर लिया है कि कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर में डेयरी कायम की जानी चाहिये लेकिन दूसरी तरफ आप का यह ख्याल है कि जो बड़ी बड़ी विदेशी कम्पनियां हैं उन्हें फैक्ट्रियां कायम करने के लिये लाइसेंस दिया जाय। लाइसेंस लेने के लिए ये कम्पनियां इन्डस्ट्री डिपार्टमेंट के पास जाती हैं और इस तरह से उन्हें लाइसेंस दे दिया जाता है। अगर सरकार का यही ख्याल है तो हम अपने कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर को कैसे बढ़ायेंगे, हमारे किसानों को कैसे दाम मिलेंगे और उन की हालत कैसे अच्छी होगी।

इसलिए मैं यह चाहती हूं कि हम खाली फूड एग्जीक्यूटिव को ही न देखें बल्कि ग्रामिनिस्ट्रीज की ओर भी हमारा

ध्यान जाना चाहिए और इस बात का प्रयत्न किया जाना चाहिये कि उन के कार्यों में मेल हो। मुझे भरोसा है कि हम इस मामले को मुलखा लेंगे और इस समय जो परिस्थिति है, दाम बढ़ रहे हैं, उस को कम कर सकेंगे। अनाज के दाम जब बढ़ते हैं अगर और चीजों के दाम भी बढ़ जाते हैं और इस से हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता है क्योंकि किसान को भी खाने को चाहिये, कपड़ा पहनने को चाहिये, अपने बच्चों को पढ़ाने के लिये पैसा चाहिये, उसको सफर में टिकट के दाम देने पड़ते हैं। तो अगर हम सब जगह एक साथ प्रयत्न करेंगे और तब चीजों के दाम बढ़ने से रोकने का प्रयत्न करेंगे तो अनाज के दामों को बढ़ने से रोक सकेंगे।

आज हम कहते हैं कि मजदूरों को मजदूरी ज्यादा देनी चाहिये, जो लोग नौकरी करते हैं उनको ज्यादा तनवाह देनी चाहिये। अगर हम उन की तनवाह बढ़ाते हैं तो इसका असर अनाज पर पड़ेगा। इसलिए मैं चाहती हूं कि हम सब लोग सोच समझ कर, सब साथ बैठ कर, सब मंत्रालय एक साथ बैठ कर निर्णय करें। केवल निर्णय करने से और उन्हें कामज के रूप में प्रदेशों को भेज देने से काम पूरा नहीं होगा बल्कि जब तक हम सही रूप से अमल नहीं करेंगे तब तक हम इस चीज में कामयाब नहीं हो सकते हैं। मुझे पूरा भरोसा है कि हमारे यहां इस समय जो परिस्थिति है उस को हल कर लेंगे।

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the food policy of the Government as enunciated by the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister in his short but concise and lucid speech has dealt in an outspoken manner with the causes that have resulted in the present crisis. He has also dealt with the remedial steps which are proposed to be taken by Government. I am very happy, Sir, that the hon. Minister has emphasised

the evolution of an integrated food policy with regard to production, distribution and price of foodgrains. To my mind the malady has been properly diagnosed, and I have no doubt whatsoever in the efficacy of the treatment proposed. It is not possible, Sir, for me to deal with the various aspects of the question in the short time which is at my disposal. I will have to confine myself to simply touching a few points.

The first point on which I want to express myself is the zonal system which was probably introduced in March. I have not been able to appreciate as to why it was introduced. It has very adversely affected the deficit States without in any manner benefiting the surplus States. I will refer to page 8 of the Review of the Food Situation, the booklet supplied to us by the Ministry in which the prices of indigenous wheat in different States in August 1964 are given. It shows that in Punjab the price was Rs. 49 per quintal. Of course in Maharashtra it is the highest; it was Rs. 104 per quintal. In U.P. it was Rs. 80 per quintal at Allahabad, and it was Rs. 87.50 at Saharanpur per quintal.

The per capita income in U.P., as everybody knows, is lower than the per capita income in the Punjab. The expenditure on food in U.P. is, having regard to these rates, practically double that of the expenditure per individual in the Punjab. It is only to be inferred that as far as U.P. is concerned, the average poor class man cannot have the capacity to purchase food at that price. No doubt the grain supplied by the Centre at the fair price shops is sold at the rate of 2½ seers a rupee. But this is only for cities, and at the most only 5 or 10 per cent of the rural population can get benefit from it. It is estimated that at least 40 to 50 per cent of the rural population do require this relief. So, speaking of the zonal system, if there had been no restriction, if there had been a free flow of foodgrains from one State to the other, naturally the producer in Punjab

would have benefited by getting the higher price because in Punjab there is no scarcity of foodgrains. The supply is more than the demand and therefore the prices are lower. Although it would have levelled the prices in other States also, at least the Punjab producer would have certainly got more than what he actually gets under the zonal system. "The only persons who are likely to benefit from the zonal system are either the hoarders or the smugglers and nobody else. I cannot see any justification for it. I think the hon. Minister has only said that this question is under consideration and that a certain decision is to be taken before the next harvest. I can at best presume that this zonal system is going to be abolished. But why wait till the next harvest season? This morning's paper says that smuggling is continuing even now. What should I understand from the "next harvest"? Is it intended to be abolished from the next harvest of Rabi crop or the harvest of Kharif crop? Kharif crop is about to come in about a month's time. So, my submission is that the zonal system has got to go and the Government, I am quite sure, will take early action in this matter.

The other point to which I want to draw the attention of the Ministry is the acute shortage of foodgrains in U.P. I have got some figures which I have collected from the Government of Uttar Pradesh, which will go to show that the production of food-grains which stood at 142.53 lakh tonnes in 1960-61 has come down to 116.18 lakh tonnes in 1963-64. There has been a gradual decrease in production in that State. The requirements of the State come to 156.51 lakh tonnes. So, there is a deficit of 40.33 lakh tonnes. On this subject, in this Review of the Food Situation, it is said:

"U.P. has suffered from the largest shortfall in production of wheat. The production of wheat in U.P. this year was only 27 lakh tonnes as against 32 lakh tonnes during the previous year and 41

[Shri Nafisul Hasan]

lakh tonnes in 1961-62. This shortfall in production has created serious difficulties for the Government of U.P."

They have also said here that it has now been decided to send 1,05,000 tonnes every month to that State. I may, however, point out that this quantity is most inadequate because when there was not so much difficulty, even then the Government of India were directly making issues from their own stocks to the KAVAI towns—Kanpur, Allahabad, Varanasi, Agra and Lucknow—and also to Meerut and Bareilly—20,000 to 25,000 tonnes per month. Besides that they were giving a monthly quota of 68,000 tons of imported wheat to the flour mills in the State. The entire production from the flour mills was taken over by the State Government for distribution through fair price shops. So, even before this serious situation arose, the Government of India were sending 68,000 tonnes plus about 25,000 or 20,000 tonnes—about 90,000 tonnes—of foodgrains to Uttar Pradesh. So, in this promise of 1,05,000 tonnes there is an addition of only 15,000 tonnes which, in the situation that obtains in U.P. now, is most insufficient I can only tell the Government that only yesterday I received information that in my own town wheat was selling at 14 chataks per rupee, and it has already appeared in the papers that in many towns the price of wheat has shot up to Rs. 40 or Rs. 45 per maund. I need not go further into the matter because we have apprised the hon. Minister of the difficulties which we are facing in U.P. and he has promised to consider the matter favourably. But the acuteness of the problem is being 'felt just now. I am reminded of a line of Ghalib which I quote:

†[हमने माना कि तयाफुल न करोगे लेकिन,  
खाक हो जायेंगे हम तुमको खबर होने तक ॥]

So, please do not delay. Take immediate action. Otherwise, very serious consequences are bound to follow in the State of Uttar Pradesh.

Mr. Vajpayee has said that there have been deaths *on* account of hunger. I have no information about that but if it has not happened till now, it is bound to happen in a few days hence.

Sir, the Government has decided to fix the prices of foodgrains. I have no objection to that. Nobody can have any objection also to the giving of incentive which is necessary to the producer. Therefore, the prices must be fixed in such a way that there should be an incentive to the producer to produce more. But one thing has to be taken into consideration. Also, the prices must be fixed in such a way that they may come within the capacity of the poor consumers to purchase the foodgrains. What is the position today? Not only the prices of foodgrains, but the prices of all other commodities also have gone up; prices of necessities of life have gone up. So, the present prices of the other commodities also are to be taken into consideration. Of course, the price will have to be fixed in such a way as it may be within the power of the ordinary consumer to pay for the foodgrains. The prices of foodgrains do affect the prices of other commodities and I feel that if the prices of foodgrains are brought down, the prices of the other commodities also will come down. A Committee has been appointed by the hon. Minister and I think a balance has to be struck and the price should be fixed in such a way that on the one hand it should give the incentive to the producer and on the other, it should be possible for the poor consumer to pay for the foodgrains.

I also welcome the proposed State Trading Corporation. Personally, if

tf. ] Hindi transliteration.

it had been possible, I would have thought that the handling of the whole business, from the producer to the consumer, should have been taken over by the Government. But I agree with the Minister and also with my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, that we have not got the machinery to handle such a stupendous task. Whatever experience we have had in the past of food controls and other things in which there was corruption, that prevents me from suggesting to the Government to take that step. As a matter of fact, if we need additional staff for doing anything, naturally we have got to make recruitment of temporary staff which has no stake in the service and to expect such a staff to remain honest in the face of great temptations before it will be vain hope.

*(Time bell rings.)*

Only one thing more and I have finished, Sir. It is not only the scarcity which has led to the abnormal rise in prices but it is the scare about that scarcity, the feeling that there is scarcity in foodgrains, with the result that on the one hand the consumer wants to buy as much as possible and on the other hand the producer wants to hold it on and the hoarder also wants to keep it back in the hope that the prices will shoot up further.

Then along with the proposed Corporation I do suggest that there must be sufficient stocks to keep under control the prices of foodgrains. Even now we are importing between 4 and 5 million tons annually. It has been so at least this year. Although our final solution of the problem will come only when we are able to produce enough to feed all the people, but if it is necessary—and I think with the experience we have had it is absolutely necessary that—we must have buffer stocks either by procuring grains in the country or by importing them. Once it is realised that there is no scarcity in food, there will be no holding back of foodgrains and there will be no shooting of prices. With these words I support the motion

which has been made by the hon. Minister and the amendments approving the food policy. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the very outset I must congratulate the Food Minister who has come forward with a very imaginative approach to the entire understanding of the food problem which, if implemented properly, would go a long way to solve the food crisis of this country.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is very easy to become rhetorical on this occasion in describing the conditions created by hunger and squalor in this country. But what is the need of the hour? The need of the hour is a dispassionate understanding of the problem purely from the point of view of economics and the condition that is prevailing in this country; otherwise we are likely to be misled by emotions. So, Sir, in the limited time at my disposal I would like to make a reference to certain points only instead of making an elaborate speech.

Sir, the question is whether it is the question of production that is at the root of all this problem. It is not exactly so. There is no denying the fact that production should be improved by every means. And production has increased from 77.51 million tons in 1962-63 to 80.87 million tons in 1963-64 while the prices have risen by 17.79 per cent. Hence it is not the production crisis that can be responsible for the immediate rise in prices. Sir, I am quite aware of the fact that production is absolutely necessary, but to attribute the entire crisis to the question of production in the present context relating it to the price system is not correct.

Then, Sir, another argument that is advanced is that the population growth and migration from urban to rural areas are responsible for this rise in prices. Between 1950-51 and 1962-63 the population has grown by 27 per cent. The percentage of the rural population to the total popula-

[Shri K. V. Raghunatha Reddy.] tion has declined from 82.65 to 82.03. It shows that there was migration o'f rural population to urban and industrial! areas. But while the population has grown by 29 per cent the food-grain production has increased by 45 per cent. Therefore, the argument that population growth is solely responsible for the present price rise is not a correct proposition in economics.

Another argument that is advanced is that due to increase in money supply some prophets of dispensation have come forward with an expression that because the supply of money has increased, naturally or probably according to the quantity theory of money in economics—the pricey have risen because of a large quantity of money in circulation. Sir, during the 13 years of planning, while the average rate of economic development was 3.5 per cent, the money suprl y has risen by 4.4 per cent. Bank credit by scheduled banks in 1955-56 was 760 crores while in 1963-64 it was 2,000 crores. Even though there is an increase in output by about 5 per cent, from 1960-61 to 1962-63 and a further increase i<sub>n</sub> 1963-64, including the imports, on the supply side the commodity stock is of the order of Rs. 1,500 crores .and on the demand side it is about Rs. 4,000 crores. Thus there is an imbalance as it is, but this kind of imbalance alone is not responsible for the rise in prices.

Another curious argument that has been advanced is that the rise in per capita income is responsible for the rise in prices because people now come to buy more> consumer articles. This argument also does <sup>no</sup>t stand validity in economics. The fact that the *per capita* income has grown by 9.5 per cent, during the Third Plan is sought to be used by some to base an argument that there is a rise in the purchasing capacity and it is at the root of the mischief. It is no consolation for any common man in the street to be told that the *per capita* income

in the country has risen while in fact that is the question to be considered. How has this distribution of income taken place?

Sir, from the figures given in the Reserve Bank Survey, which has conducted a research into the income distribution, in 1956-57, 20.98 per cent, of the population got 22 nP., i<sub>n</sub> 1963-64 it ha<sub>E</sub> risen to 25 nP. In 1956-57, 43.8 per cent, of the population got 55 6 nP. whereas in 1963-64 it got 62 nP. and in 1963-64, 30.4 per cent, of the population got Rs. r04 instead of 91-1 nP. in 1956-57. The question is that about 94 per cent, of the population do not get Re. on<sub>e</sub> per day. If that is the nature of the income distribution, how is it possible to say that there is a rise in the *per capita* income of an ordinary citizen that is usually sought to be attributed to a rise in the price system? The very approach to the problem of income distribution is not properly considered. Unless it is understood, the rise in the *per capita* income of an ordinary citizen cannot be correlated to the rise in the price system of the country.

Next I come to the producer's share of the consumer price. Naturally the producer who has got the capacity to stay gets about 75 per cent, of the price whereas the majority of the producers who have to make distress sales during the harvest time get not more than about 50 per cent, whatever the rise. So whatever the rise in price, it on/ly goes to the middleman or to the rice miller or to the people who pledge their commodities with the banks.

Sir, another very curious argument that has been advanced is that because of deficit financing the prices have increase^ and, therefore, better stop the deficit financing. Thi<sub>s</sub> question will have to be viewed, Sir, both from the statistical point of view and also from the economic development point of view. Sir, if we take the period between 1961-62 and 1963-64, the investment has risen by Rs. 900



crores. But the prophets of dispensation, who argue that industrial development should be shifted to agricultural development, forget that while deficit financing of the order of Rs 900 crores has been made, Rs. 700 crores have been realised by the Government by way of taxation, and the very gentlemen forget that it is only the private banks which have given, during this short period of a year or two, Rs. 570<sup>1</sup> crores of credit to the private sector. This in fact is mainly responsible for a large rise in prices. This fact can be viewed if once you take into account the advances made by the banks towards food articles. Last year it was Rs. 157 crores and in 1963-64 it is considered to be Rs. 135 crores and previously it was about Rs. 140 crores. Therefore when more than Rs. 130 to Rs. 150 crores are being advanced by the banks towards food articles, it is very easy for the hoarders to stock commodities and therefore this also explains the way the food prices have risen.

I thank you very much for the time you have given me. I do not want to take any time but it must be understood that the argument that because there is deficit financing, there is money in circulation greater than what the necessity of the situation would demand, there should be a shift from industrial development to agricultural development;—this argument—is a misunderstood argument by those who do not understand the operation of money and finance in relation to banking and economic development. If at all this problem is to be solved, if the Government comes forward and takes a bold step to nationalise the banks and adjust the finances using the mechanism of financing by banks for the development of industries, then this problem of prices can be solved and I congratulate the Food Minister for coming forward with the Foodgrains Corporation. I hope it would not only be a Foodgrains Corporation but it would ultimately succeed to be a Food Articles Corporation.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, since the time the problem child of food, has come to the hands of Mr. C. Subramaniam he has fathered it well.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHAKGAVA): There he is.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: He has fathered it well. He has neither spared energy nor initiative nor his time nor even his health in taking a dynamic course in trying to solve this problem. I think we must appreciate the vigorous efforts that he has made to solve it. If he does not achieve, after all his efforts, the maximum results, nobody can say that it is due to want of initiative on his part or want of drive on his part or want of courage or conviction on his part. The whole House, as the Food Minister himself has said, was looking for light on this question from the Opposition Benches, some of whom went to the extent, extreme extent, of taking up an agitational approach and even visiting the jails. I thought that at least in prison they will have received enlightenment and they would throw light on this question to us but what have they shown here? The first speaker, the Leader of the Swatantra Party, has asked the Food Minister to do nothing but copy Taiwan. He has made no other suggestion but to copy Taiwan. I ask him, is there no country in the world to take an example of, excepting Taiwan, where for all I know, there is no democracy but there is only feudalism? And even from the limited point of view of agriculture, I do not think it is an example to copy.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: (Uttar Pradesh): But he is a feudalist himself.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Yes. That is why it is in consonance with the aims of his party and the outmoded economy of his party. Therefore he has come forward with an example which suits him. From the next speaker, the learned Professor,

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

the Leader of a Party which has exchanged the letter 'P' with 'S', I thought some more knowledge and some more help would come. In solving this problem but unfortunately instead of devoting his time to constructive suggestions, he has thought fit to be very harsh on the Food Minister. He has blamed the Food Minister for not giving details. I do not know what details he expected. The Food Minister owned that this is a difficult problem. He said that we should make an integrated approach. He said that the administrative machinery and the Extension Schemes have to be reviewed and re-aligned. He said that research and proper equipment will have to be provided to the peasantry. He said that a comprehensive White Paper he is going to place reviewing or giving a rethinking about agriculture and inviting the House to make its contribution to that White Paper. The Learned Professor has thought fit to blame him for not giving details of the Corporation. Naturally when it comes before the Parliament, then we will discuss the details. This is not the time to discuss its details.

The other speaker Shri A. B. Vajpayee was defending the role of the Opposition in adopting an agitational approach. If I have understood him correctly, he meant to say, in fact, he

said: 'We do not grow foodgrains by expressing our anger or resentment. It is true that the situation is difficult. It is true that there is dissatisfaction but then what is expected of the Opposition and particularly from the Leaders of Parties is not to take to Satyagrah but to help the Government. I am glad he suggested to the Prime Minister that a Conference of the Opposition leaders and the different political leaders should be convened and it is a good plan. That way I think this Government is most responsive to all constructive suggestions and I do not know how anybody can blame the Government.'

We do not grow foodgrains by expressing our anger or resentment. It is true that the situation is difficult. It is true that there is dissatisfaction but then what is expected of the Opposition and particularly from the Leaders of Parties is not to take to Satyagrah but to help the Government. I am glad he suggested to the Prime Minister that a Conference of the Opposition leaders and the different political leaders should be convened and it is a good plan. That way I think this Government is most responsive to all constructive suggestions and I do not know how anybody can blame the Government.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta, although he said that he will think this as a national question and would take a national approach to this problem, said he was condemning the Government.

This food question is not a new question to-day. Food shortage has been there in this country all along. There have been famines and those who know history know that several times famines had been there. There had been thousands and thousands of deaths even centuries ago. There have been but that does not mean that they should recur. I do not mean to say that, but I only mean to say that this is nothing new nor can the Government be blamed for the shortage of foodgrains because this is a legacy which we have received all along. This is not a creation of the Government. This is not a thing for which the Government is responsible. There are several reasons for the shortage of foodgrains and for the rise in prices. Unfortunately you do not give me more time and therefore I cannot go into the question of the rise in prices where I can show that because of the very schemes that we are launching, the very planned progress that we are launching, because of the thousands of crores of rupees that we have invested and the efforts that we are making in building up the projects which necessitate movement of population—thousands of people from one State to the other and from one area to the other—creates an upheaval.

PROF. M.B. LAL: it will be better if instead of criticising the Opposition you give your analysis of the reasons that led to the rise in the prices.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I am sorry I have no time to reply to you as I would like to. All these questions are there but I have not the time to develop. I could convince you, I have that confidence that although the Government could have

adopted a better approach, although the Government could have done more to solve this question, still it is not the fault of the Government that this price situation has come up. This; has come up not only in India. The price situation is common to every country in the world. Let the Opposition Members or any Member show that the prices have not gone up in any country. It is common .

PROF. M. B. LAL: Not to this extent.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: We have our own Indian contribution to make in several ways. I need not go into that question. This question has to be approached from three strategic points, namely, production and distribution, prices and consumption. Now I am not going into the latter two because I am in full agreement with the line that the Minister has adopted. I am only taking up the production side because there is a great risk, and that risk is that there is no indication that the production will rise in future unless we review the whole question of agriculture and the food problem. Therefore I am making these suggestions. I do not know if I will have the time to develop all these. Even the American Ambassador, while opening an Agriculture University at Mysore, has said that unless a reappraisal is made of agriculture in India, there is not going to be more production of at least foodgrains, of agricultural commodities, and that this reappraisal might be made in order to see that the underlying social forces have a sense of participation and a sense of pride in their work. It is to that question that I have invited the attention of the House several times and it is that question again which I want to invite the attention of the hon. Minister to.

Certain things which I am going to suggest here are not entirely in his power to remedy, they go beyond him; it is a matter pertaining to States and the Cabinet as a whole, and when

he prepares the comprehensive White Paper, I would like him to take into consideration this question. The first is the psychology and the status of the peasant. This House will remember my referring to this question several times. We have, Mr. Vice-Chairman, not associated the peasant in administration. Well, that may be because we representatives are there, the Members in the local Legislatures, and the Members of Parliament here. But there is need to give more and more representation to the agriculturist in several activities. He has to be associated with—I am only giving examples—the commodity committees. Now the policy of import and export has a very vital reaction on the internal prices of such commodities as are exported or imported, and the grower must have a voice in controlling it, in shaping the export and import policy, whether a certain commodity should be exported, how much should be exported, how much should not be exported. If the export policy has to be decided on, say, groundnut, he must have a say in the matter, if it is to be exported, when it is to be exported, etc. Now I make an investment thinking that the same level of prices will continue to prevail and I grow groundnut; but by the time the crop comes into my hand, the export will have been stopped and consequently the price will have fallen, and the man who grows it will not even get his cost of production. That will be the situation if he has no voice—I am only giving examples.

The Food Minister must try to influence his Cabinet to inject practical elements into the Planning Commission and into the Food and Agriculture Ministry. I have pointed out time and again that if we have not achieved success to the maximum extent in all our food schemes, it is not because there is lack of will on the part of the Government; it is because there are no people—those who are in charge of implementation—who have got intimate knowledge of rural conditions, who have

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy]

got intimate knowledge of the peasantry. It is better, whether it is in the Ministry of Community Development or whether it is in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture or whether it is in the Planning Commission, whtoever has got anything to do with agriculture and foodgrains must have intimate knowledge of rural conditions, and therefore we must inject practical elements into these. Then there must be a Central coordination body *vis-a-vis* the States, the Centre *vis-a-vis* the States.

Now the Centre has got several schemes, but then the States will ha/e to implement them; both food and agriculture is a State subject; the Centre cannot own responsibility for what the States do, and in the States, as everybody knows, agriculture and food have been delegated to the least important Minister. In sipte of our late Prime Minister writing to the Chief Ministers to give importance to this portfolio, and the present Prime Minister emphasising the same and insisting on the Chief Ministers themselves handling this portfolio, sufficient attention has not been given by the State Cabinets to this question. So in every State, if proper attention is to be given to promote more growth of foodgrains, more growth of agricultural commodities, it is necessary that a concerted plan must be going on, and in order to see that there is a concerted plan there must be a coordinating body—I do not know what the machinery will be. I have also proposed that there must be under the food Ministry here some Regional Commissioners. Now there is no knowing what State is doing in what way about a particular foodgrain. Well, these Regional Commissioners must go and sit with the Agriculture Ministers and Food Ministers in the States and must try to find out exactly what they are doing, and if they are not doing anything, they must induce them to do, and must also solve the difficulties if they have any. Now, I would like him to consi-

der the question of appointing a commission to go into the economic condition and the social position of the agriculturist himself.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it can be easily understood that as long as there is a grower contented with his lot we can expect him to produce the food-grains. But what is happening is that the peasant is not finding his profession paying. So he is shifting to cities and towns, and due to this shift in population there has been a growth in urban population by seventeen million in the last three years, and then in the last ten years, in 112 cities in India the population has increased by 9 million or 32 per cent, and the shift in population from rural to urban area is some considerable proportion—I cannot lay my finger on that now. This is because urban conditions are becoming more attractive. This Government has given hundreds of crores of rupees for house building in cities and towns whereas for rural housing, no, a paltry sum is allotted. Why? It is because the problem is colossal and therefore we cannot cope with it. Is that the reason why we should not try to solve that question? Now the peasant, he works hard in wind, sun and rain and he has his abode in a hovel, whereas in urban areas one takes advantage of the loans given at a very low interest; he builds a house and lets it out at a fantastic rate of rent to others and makes a profit. This is one thing.

Then if you take education, the standard of education, everything, is attractive in the cities, whereas the least important fellows are appointed as teachers and they are posted to rural areas. So no man who can afford to spend some money on education would like to keep his children in the villages; he would like to send them to towns. How many can afford that? Similar is the case with hospital facilities. We have almost none, I should say. Now we have some dispensaries—it is true—but for bigger things he will have to move to towns and cities.

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

Therefore, in every way town life has become attractive. The job of a mill worker is much more paying than a tenacre piece of land would give to a peasant. These are the conditions which certainly have to be gone into. In fact it is a very sad trend that the agricultural population is losing interest in its profession. Now it is true, as far as record goes, that there are more landlords; the population engaged in agriculture is shown in figures as considerable. But most of these people, people who own lands particularly near the cities, well, they do not live in villages; they live in cities— number one. That is number one. I will just mention the other points and then finish. Number two is that landowners are not raising crops. There is a landowner near the place where I live and he has a piece of land adjacent to mine which is quite fertile. He was digging up the soil and making bricks and when I asked him why he was digging up the soil and making bricks, he replied, "I do so because making bricks pays me much more than raising crops." That is the situation.

Therefore, there is no attraction for the peasant to remain on the land. And there is another thing. There is no labour to be had for agricultural operations. You know agricultural operations cannot be run only by the family members. At certain seasons more hands are required and either other families come to help or labour has to be employed. But today we do not get agricultural labour. That is the problem they are facing. So we have to reduce the attraction for the city and make the villages and little towns more attractive.

Then there is this question of setting up of industries. These big industries are set up nearby and thereby the rural population are going there

to that city. There is one sad feature about this. When the land that is acquired for these industrial projects— agricultural land they acquire much more land than they require. Recently we found in Punjab that some 600 acres of agricultural land which they had acquired is now found to be unnecessary, useless and is being surrendered. These are some of the things which should be gone into when we have to improve agriculture.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not want to tax your patience too much and so I shall only mention the other points without developing them. There should be diversification of small industries. There are some landlords and some industrialists, they can be encouraged to invest in rural industries where agricultural commodities are the raw materials used. There is another thing which is discouraging the agriculturist. The States are raising their land revenues. It is within everybody's knowledge that till about a decade back lands were surrendered by peasants who had defaulted in their payment of land revenue. Of course, now agriculture is looking up. But now land revenue is being raised by the State Governments because the States want to increase their revenues. This is a very unfortunate thing. The Food and Agriculture Minister should seriously take up this question and try to see that they do not take up this question at least as long as we have this food problem before us. And if the States insist on raising the land revenue, then certain extent of holding should be prescribed which is reasonable, for the purpose of raising this land revenue.

PROF. M. B. LAL: That is what I said.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: They should have an afforestation programme and it should be implemented. Now there is great danger. We are reclaiming forests for agricultural

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] purposes and all the fertility is going away from the soil. Forests are disappearing and there is now on the other hand soil erosion. And goats, the enemy of forests, they must be weeded out. There is nothing wrong in it, though this is a State subject, because everybody knows that goats are the enemies of forests. But nothing is being done. This must be done.

About fertilizers, I do not want to go into the production of fertilizers because attempts are being made to increase production. But this fertilizer is being sold at one hundred rupees per ton of profit. Fifty rupees profit is given to the fertilizer manufacturer in the retention price and fifty rupees to the distributing agency. How on earth do you expect the poor peasant to buy this fertilizer paying 100 rupees more per ton?

PROF. M. B. LAL: That is what I was also saying.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Very good. I thank you. There is then the question of agricultural implements and this is a question which troubles the peasantry every now and then. But the Planning Commission or the Food and Agriculture Ministry, whoever is responsible for it, have not been visualising the need to have a programme for the production of agricultural implements. They should prepare a programme of 'manufacturing the required implements in advance. That can be attended to.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, there are other points but I do not want to take up any more time. I am sure when the White Paper will come up all these points will be dealt with there and once and for all we will get a clear perspective and an integrated approach to this question. Thank you.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister

of Food and Agriculture on his tiding over the difficult food crisis and having turned the corner, as he said, because a few months back it was worse, now it is bad today and tomorrow it will be better. So it is a question of dealing with a situation which was worse a few months back.

If one goes into the question of food and its production, one is reminded of the fact that at least from the year 1936 onwards we have had a plethora of advices and less of implementation, in the year 1936 a British expert, Sir John Russel, gave us seven advices. These were better variety of seeds, better control of pests and diseases, better control of water supply, prevention of soil erosion, better use of manures and fertilizers, better employment of the cultivators, better system of crop rotation. Then Sir John Simon said that no substantial improvement can be achieved in the country by the peasantry unless they themselves had the ambition to achieve a higher standard of living and the will to make use of the opportunities put at their disposal by the Government. Then Dr. Radhakumud Mukerjee also said that we can double our agricultural production provided we used improved seeds and manures and utilised the idle or semi-employed labour. After that we had the Asoka Mehta Committee's Report and others, including Lord Lothian's advice.

As far as the price structure is concerned, as early as the year 1962, measures were adopted to stabilise conditions and to prevent speculators during the emergency caused by the Chinese invasion and the Department of Economic Affairs of the Ministry of Finance was always scrutinising the current prices and the price currents to formulate the necessary proposals. Then the Essential Commodities Act was passed and certain measures were also taken which included the stepping up of imports and the building up of adequate stocks, the instituting of uniform conditions of licensing of wholesale traders, regulation of ad-



vances and the construction of additional storage capacity and the procurement of food by the State and Central Governments. Then, Sir, in 1964 in the month of March, certain other measures were taken which included the formation of certain committees at the level of the Cabinet and at the level of the Secretariat.

At the administration level, measures were proposed to ensure close coordination between the administrative activities connected with food and agriculture and planning, irrigation and community development projects. These and some other measures were also taken.

The question will now be asked why after all these measures had been taken and after the Essential Commodities Act was put on the Statute Book, the prices have risen. Cannot the prices be prevented from rising? Cannot this rise in prices be arrested? The answer to this will be found in the answer to the question whether we have tried to implement what we had thought of doing. Here I am reminded of a passage from Barbara Ward where after paying high tribute to the achievements of India she has said:

"I think agriculture is handicapped by administrative shortcomings and by some lack of appreciation of the profit motive or, if you like, of incentives. In fact, I believe that many of the particular problems can be only understood in the light of these two wider issues."

She means patchy implementation and want of proper incentive to the farmer. Further she says that theoretical solutions had been generally known:

"There is no secret about this essential core of any effective programme of agricultural reform. The trouble lies in its patchy implementation and, if any one reason more than any other lines behind the patchiness, it is the lack of administrative concentration and

skill. On the technical side, I doubt very much whether the universities are producing enough young agro-nomists;

And then she writes:

"I doubt whether they are being sufficiently persuaded to work actually in the countryside. Village level workers often know no more than the farmers, who do not respect someone who cannot in fact advise."

I quote:

"On the side of the administration proper, from the highest level downwards, agriculture gets priority in rhetoric but rarely in fact. No Chief Minister in a State has taken over the portfolio of agriculture. The bright entrants to the civil service head for the old levers of power—finance—or for the new prestige areas like industry. No young collector is likely to feel that his promotion will depend absolutely on raising productivity acre in his district. The urgency and interest are simply not there. So the known solutions do not receive that charge of administrative drive and follow—through which would help them to get off the ground."

Therefore, for the last so many years through the Plans we have formulated broad policies and we have implemented them in a halting manner and that is the reason why we had not been fortunate enough to get better economic results on the whole. The Third Plan Appraisal has stated that this has been discouraging. We have not done whatever we wanted to do in a serious manner. The price structure that we are thinking of should be an integrated one. Formerly, it was said that the maximum price would be paid but now it is remunerative price. What will be the difference between the maximum, price at which the Government used to buy foodgrains—and this was the lowest price which was prevailing in the market and below which it never wanted this price to go—and the remunerative price is still to be seen.

[Dr. M. M S. Siddhu]

In the case of sugarcane we have seen the remunerative prices that were asked for and the struggle that went on between the sugar factory owners and the sugarcane producers and the debate and bickerings that went on. At the same time, we must understand that if the producers were to produce more as they did in the case of sugarcane or when they did in the years 1954, 1955 and 1960, there is the possibility of prices falling as happened in those years. The prices went below his cost of production leaving no incentive for him to produce more and so I would be glad to know what would be the nature of the remunerative price that would be given. It is not only the integrated price which is required but something more. The farmer now has lost the confidence that he will be given a fair deal. The question that arises now is about the prevalence of scarcity conditions. First of all, did we know that these conditions were likely to arise? Yes, this Review which was given to us says that the trend of a rise in prices was felt mainly from June 1963 in the case of cereals and pulses. Later on, it was known in March 1964. After that, one has to ask what measures were taken and why we did not succeed.

The policy formerly of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture had been to create more and more of buffer stocks which would be released in the market through Fair Price Shops. Once those buffer stocks were used up and were not replenished the mechanism by which we could regulate the market was lost. The people knew it and that may be one of the reasons why in spite of the knowledge that we have, we were not able to arrest the rise in prices. Now, Sir, in those difficult conditions there was no other alternative but to go in for import. After these imports came in, the next question of importance was distribution, a wider one. Nobody was satisfied with the controls or the system of rationing that we had earlier. Reports are available with Government, especially

those made by Mukerjee and Kanungo on the rationing system of Uttar Pradesh and Punjab. They say there that, the administrative machinery lacks in ability as well as in its wisdom. Even if they wanted to do something effective, the machinery was not available because the right type of policies were not there.

Similarly, Sir, every time we talk of control and decontrol, rationing of this and that, why on earth can't we have an effective machinery for distribution, especially when we think that we have every row and then to come to such a pass? If it were known that market prices were to rise so steeply then the Centre should have given a clear directive to the States to have the distribution done by the Government on the basis of a card system rather than on the basis of the queue system which enables one who comes early to get most and the person who comes last having to go without anything. Later on, when cards are issued, things look better.

As far as my own State of Uttar Pradesh is concerned, the Centre has promised to give us 1,05,000 tons per month. I was looking through the papers given to us and I find that this Review shows a figure of 773,000 tons given to Uttar Pradesh upto July, 1964, which, in other words, means an average of 1,10,000 tons per month. [THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.]

So upto July 1964, we were receiving an average of 1,10,000 tons and now, under worse conditions we are being given 1,05,000 tons. I would request the Food Minister to look into this question. It is not a question of the figures given by the State being correct or not. He must take into consideration the fact that the urban population consists of one crore. When we take into consideration the landless labour as well as those holding less than two acres whose condition is no better than that of landless labour then we get a figure of two crores.

In other words, there is a shortage in respect of three crores of people and even if we were to calculate at the rate of six kg per unit (adult or a child above ten years) we find that every person has to supplement this by another three chhataks from the market where the ruling price anywhere in the region of Rs. 38, R; 40, Rs. 42 per maund, perhaps even more. So there is a case for giving more supplies to the State of Uttar Pradesh till such time as the kharif crop comes in. The other reason which I would put before the hon. Minister is that if you were to create confidence among the people now by giving them food, they will be in a better position to part with the rice after the coming

crop. Otherwise there will be a 3 P.M. tendency on their part to keep

it back with them and the rice procurement position may not be so good as the Government would like it to be.

Thirdly unless and until the rural population is supplied with foodgrains the peasants cannot have the confidence that the Government wants them to have. As he said, it is a crisis of confidence. Therefore in whom have we to create confidence? We have to create confidence in the small peasant, in the small farmer, that when the crops fail we will go to his rescue. If we do it, it will create a better atmosphere and the hoardings which are there in the villages will come out into the markets.

More important than feeding the farmer is his seed requirement. I would like the hon. Minister to see that coarse grain seeds like *chana* and barley are also supplied to him. The seed requirements for coarse grains in Punjab as well as in Uttar Pradesh should be gone into carefully because these are two States which produce more of grams and have surplus coarse grains. As far as wheat seeds for Uttar Pradesh are concerned, I would request him to give it top priority and to see that the seeds reach in time. Otherwise if there is a delay of even a few weeks, it means bad

harvest. Therefore the urgent needs of my State are to feed the landless labour, the small holder who has got less than two acres of land and the urban population as well as to provide seeds to the farmer.

As far as State trading and the Commission for an integrated price policy are concerned, they are welcome moves and one will have to wait for the details that have yet to come. As far as the scientific and technological side is concerned, it is easy for us to produce a strain of a particular type of seed, but how difficult it is for that seed to reach the peasant. The trouble is that the scientists today are not devoting their full attention to the problems of today, the problems which affect the country at the present time and it is all the more necessary that the agricultural universities, the Pusa Institute and all those who are interested in agriculture must devote their full attention to the problems which are facing the agriculturists today rather than occupying themselves with more and more of fundamental research. It would be far better if for a couple of years or for a few years our scientists were to devote all their attention to applied science and solving the problems as they crop up. They should even try to find out from the villagers what their problems are because some of the villagers may not even know them. As far as aerial survey of the soil is concerned, it is a good move but more important than that is the need for the knowledge and measures which are known.

In the end I would like to say that no substantial improvement can be made unless the farmer gets a price which is remunerative and I would add that if we prosper in agriculture then and then alone our industries will prosper.

Thank you.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, first of all I would like to say that the

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

speech of the Swatantra Party spokesman seemed to me a sort of an apologia for the ruling party. They seemed to be made of the stuff politically as the Congress Party; they were very much kith and kin with them. However, it is their business. My business is only to point out the facts.

Now, the hon. Food Minister has spoken of a technical approach that this problem should be viewed from a technical and scientific point of view and also there should be a national approach, not an agitational approach thereby implying that we in the Opposition are having an agitational approach and the Treasury Benches are having a scientific and national approach. Now I think it is rather wide of the mark. The point is, does the Congress Party, the ruling party and the Government of India have a political approach towards this food problem? I think they have. And what is that? In a nutshell I would say that that approach is pro-feudal, pro-profiteering, pro-hoarder, pro-speculation, designed to ensure a continuous rise in prices and as such anti-national. This is their approach. For seventeen years the ruling party has been saying<sup>1</sup> that they are going to hold the price line and every year they are giving us a dose of a rise in the price line. That is their gift to the people and they are talking of holding the price line. It is not an accident; each year this happens. Then there is some method in madness too. It is a deliberate policy that is being pursued by this Government and as such it is a reactionary policy of a reactionary party. Now precisely because of this the Government wants to hide its ugly features. They do not want to talk about those things, about the political approach that they have towards this problem, the most burning problem of the country. In order to avoid that, they are saying, You ought to have a technical and scientific approach and that will solve the problem'. Well, the Britishers used

to say the same thing. They said, some more fertilisers, some more irrigation projects and some sort of tinkering with land reforms and the production will rise. That was their recipe. There has been no deviation from this recipe of the Britishers. You have sunk about Rs. 2000 crores in irrigation projects, in electrification, in fertilisers, and this and that. But what is the net result of that policy? Has it increased our production? Now, I have got the Government's figures from the "Review of the Food Situation". As regards average production it has very slightly improved from 5.5 per cent to 6.7 per cent. The production per acre has been stagnant despite about Rs. 2,000 crores having been sunk. As regards availability of foodgrains it is something like this: —

1954..... 13.2 oz.

1962..... 13.2 oz.

So, availability of foodgrains stands where it was. As regards per capita availability of pulses, it has declined. In 1954 it was 2.3 oz. In 1963 it was 2.1 oz. So, the *per capita* availability of pulses has declined. The average food production per acre has only slightly improved overall. In many areas perhaps it has declined. As regards sugarcane there is shrinkage in the area under cultivation. This is an essential commodity. Recovery of sugar from sugarcane too has gone down, but the excise tax has gone up. In 1950-51 it was Rs. 6.56 crores. In 1963-64 it is Rs. 81.33 crores.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : The quantity of sugar has increased from 20 lakh tons to about 30 lakh tons.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: You may have increased the quantity of sugar, but what is the net result? Prices have gone up. The area under cultivation has shrunk. Recovery of sugar from sugarcane, too is low. So, that is your agriculture. That is an essential commodity. And now you subsidise sugar to be exported to the Western Powers in order to gain some

foreign exchange, whereas we people do next get any sugar. So, that is the crux of the problem.

As regards rice production, it is an all-time high in rice production according to the figures of the Government this year, but at the same time we have an all-time high in the rise in the price of rice this year. How do you correlate that? How it has happened I can tell you from the experience of my State. When the paddy was harvested, the Chief Minister said that it was a bumper crop, that the Opposition was getting panicky, that they were creating a sort of scare. Prices came down heavily and all the millions and millions of medium and small peasant-producers were defrauded. They could not hold on to their stocks. They had to part with them at whatever price they could get at that time. So, the entire produce, except that of the big producers, the big zamindars, etc., of the medium and small peasants, of millions of producers—whatever was their marketable surplus—got into the hands of hoarders at the cheapest possible price. Then, the price began to rise. From Rs 30 when it went up to Rs. 33 the Chief Minister issued a statement: "Oh, you are doing a bad thing. I will apply to DIR. This cannot be tolerated. My Ministry will not tolerate it." It went up to Rs. 35. Another statement. It went up to Rs. 37. Another statement. It went up to Rs. 40. Then, he said: "I shall fix the price at Rs. 40 per maund." Now, do you get rice at Rs. 40 per maund? No. In the black-market it is selling at Rs. 60 per maund. That is why I say it is an all-time high. So, they are hand in glove with the profiteers, speculators and hoarders. The same is the cause with mustard oil. The price began to rise from Rs. 2.25p. The Chief Minister began issuing statements.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAKBAR ALI KHAN): The matter regarding the Chief Minister relates to (he Bengal Legislature. Don't you think 60?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Yes, it is because the same ruling party controls them and the same Government of India says that West Bengal is a model example to follow. They have been instrumental in shooting up the prices.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): When the Government of India says that it is a model Ministry, their example should be followed, when it comes in.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Then, they fixed the price at Rs. 3.25. Do you think that you can get mustard oil at Rs. 3.25. No. The container came in. The oil millowners wanted 80 p. per container. It can be purchased for 20 p. So, there is another clear eight annas per kg. The Government says there is no law by which they could check it. So, from Rs. 2 mustard oil goes up to Rs. 4 and the Government says this is the price. I am doubtful whether you can get it even at this price. So, there is a continuous rise in prices. This is a deliberate policy. I say that this is not accidental. Why? In this underdeveloped country they have gone in for complete capitalism. Wherefrom, can they get capital? Some accumulations they had made during wartime by serving the war needs of the British. Our big industrialists accumulated capital. That was not sufficient. The British accumulated capital by looting India. So, in that traditional method they thought: "Why cannot we loot the forty crores of people"? How to loot them? Taxation and price rise is the only method by which you can loot the people and accumulate capital. You have gone in for that, for indirect taxation and looting and in seventeen years you have taken out of the impoverished people more than the British could take even in half a century. So, that is a deliberate policy on your part. Only you want a controlled rise in prices. But your friends, your colleagues, whom you serve, whose pockets are filled by your policies, are not prepared to have a con-

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

trolled rise in price. The hoardeis and speculators want whatever pretext to have a run-away rise in prices and take as much profit as they can. There you are pressed. There you become helpless. Let the price rise and let the people be fleeced to an unlimited extent so that it breeds discontent, so that disaffection spreads. So, that is the position. Some amount of aid from the Western Powers— that is the policy you have adopted in order to industrialise the country. You cannot industrialise the country in that fashion. You can have some machinery, one or two machine-building industries and steel plants, but in this process our whole country will become dependent. It is becoming dependent upon the Western Powers. Their economic credit is tainted. Our peasantry is impoverished. The peasantry is the backbone of the villages. Their back is being broken. In seventeen years of Congress rule you have evicted more peasants than the British could evict in their hundred years of rule and how can we expect that this Government will give food to the people? I have calculated the marketable surplus. The marketable surplus is 15 million tons. Some say it is 20 million tons. I have made calculations. If there is a price increase of four annas per kg., then their profit amounts to Rs. 405 crores, but the rise in price is double that. So, in this process you have taken away from the impoverished peasantry about a thousand crores and you think thereby you can accumulate capital and industrialise the country. You are ruining the country, bringing the country to the brink of a precipice and you say that it is a national matter. I do not know what can be a bigger hoax or mockery than that. As I said, in the British days we have had experience in our State. In 1943, 30 lakhs of people died. There was a famine. The price of rice was Rs. 50. The stocks were cornered. There was rationing too. People from the countryside came to the streets of Calcutta and

every day a thousand or two thousand persons died . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: What were you doing at that time?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: We were fighting against that . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: You were simply silent and you were helping the British.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Your friends, who are giving money to Mr. Atulya Ghosh's Congress fund—the mustard oil millowners and the rice merchants—for the AICC session to be held in Durgapur, they also at the same time were drafted by the British to be their handling agents. (*Interruption*) Your friends whom you are serving minted money under the protection of the British, under the direct protection always through their private trading agencies. That is your record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): YOU are referring to 1943. Come to the present.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Thereby you never arrested them. The Government could arrest anybody.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: On a point of order, Sir, Is my hon. friend in order in accusing us of having made money under the British?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: The ruling party serves those elements. They had at that time minted money, and they are even now minting money under the protection of this regime.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Sapru, you can answer when you are on your legs. You go on, Mr Ghosh.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: So a sort of ring was formed even at that time of these profiteers and speculators. This ring had been nourished, nurtured and made to grow under the Congress rule. They have become a hydra-headed monster and on many occasions they even defied the

Ministry. They go in for unlimited exploitation. But everybody knows who are these profiteers. You cannot arrest them. But you can arrest cer-iain people, for example, Shri R. M. Gangare in Wardha because he led a "moreha" for food. You can keep Shri B. T. Ranadive and other;; in jail for two years for no reason whatsoever if only for the interests of the ruling party. But you cannot arrest a single big profiteer or speculator because in a way they are your friends and in a wav you are made to do their bidding. You cannot but do that.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In some cases partners also.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: All those palliatives that the hon. Food Minister ha, doled out have been tried. They have been tried by the Britishers and they are <sup>now</sup> being tried by the Congress Government. They will not solve the problem. Everybody knows that the basic problem is the abolition of feudal survivors.

*(Interruption)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR "A15 KHAN): Order please.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Why is it that in. the U.S.A. or France the peasantry is prosperous? There was feudalism in the U.S.A. and in France. In France the bourgeois revolution abolished feudalism and gave the peasantry land. So it was a free peasant proprietorship and thereby their entire economy changed.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about capitalism?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Capitalism does not thrive under feudalism.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: May I know from my hon. friend what are the causes of shortage in China?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Let us discuss our problem. Then I will reply to those of other countries. I am referring to those countries from which you draw your inspiration, spiritual inspiration,

*(interruption)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR AU KHAN): No interruptions please. Mr. Ghosh, you have to finish in five minutes.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Let me now quote from the report of the expert appointed by the Government to advise it. What does it say?—

"In Tanjore, West Godavary and Shahabad the land records dp not contain any information about tenants. Ejection of tenants has taken place in the past and the landlords still continue to change tenants from plot to plot to defeat the tenancy laws. The few tenants who were allowed to continue over a fairly long period feel insecure. Thus, a large number of cultivators hold no title to the leased lands, pay extortionate rents, and are never certain of their status. They are left with little to subsist on and much less to invest. The reason for this state of affairs is two-fold: one is the faulty legislation itself, and the second is the negative attitude of the Government officials at State, districts, block or village levels. With the exception of Aligarh, no serious attempt was made to enforce the enacted land reform legislation. If land tenure conditions were a part of the criteria for selection a package district, West Godavary and Tanjore would not qualify at all."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): What is that you are reading?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I am reading from a report made by Mr. Lade-jinsky, a report made by him under instructions from the Government at

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

India. He says that if this condition persists, you cannot expect that the producer can grow more. That is the conclusion he has reached after describing all these things.

So, this is the basic question and I want to raise this question. If there are landlords who hold 1000 acres, 500 acres and all that, and if they are the backbone of the Congress in the rural countryside and if they are the very persons who get them elected to the Parliament and Legislatures, how can you expect this Government to enact land reforms and abolish this retrograde and reactionary land tenure system and give land, to the peasants? You cannot. That will never take place. This is the basic question.

Then I come to the question of usury. Peasant indebtedness stood at Rs. 900 crores. Now some say that it is calculated at Rs. 2000 crores. Some say that it is even more. What do you give to them? What amount of credit facilities do the State Governments extend to them? It merely amounts to Rs. 10 crores or Rs. 12 crores or Rs. 15 crores or at best Rs 20 crores all over India. When you have spent Rs. 2000 crores in all those projects designed for improving agricultural production, cannot you give or at least write off this indebtedness or declare a moratorium and each year annually give Rs. 60 crores or Rs. 70 crores, whatever you like, for our agricultural purposes so that they can increase production? You will never do that, but you can advance money to Tatas and Sir Birens and you cannot even recover that. But you will not abolish landlordism. You will not write off peasant indebtedness. You will not give them money. The fertiliser would be used or the irrigation facilities would be used by a thin upper strata of the peasantry or the big landlords, but they cannot increase the agricultural production as a whole. That is why taken as a whole for seventeen years

the production is stagnant. So that is how it has come about.

Now what about the PL 480? It is a shackle. It is a shameful thing. I do not say that if we are short in foodgrains, we should not import. But we cannot have any agreement which shackles us, shackles us politically and economically, both ways. And what is this PL 480? It is a mutual security programme of a military character. I do not know what we have got to do with the military security of the Government of the United States. They are powerful enough. But that programme, PL 480, is made under that. What is that? Those are surplus stocks any way, which they buy from the farmers because of their price support policy. If they cannot dispose of the surplus stocks, they will rot in the godowns. Their prices will go down. These stocks which they cannot dispose of are now being shipped to India. Under what conditions? The shipping charges, the freight charges, are very high. For Rs. 2,000 crores worth of food imports, how many crores have you paid in dollars to the American shippers? Could you contribute that much? And the counterpart funds they use—it is provided in the treaty—for investment in American private enterprise here, there is penetration and exploitation of India by the American capitalists. You deliberately did it. " And the other portion, the huge amount, they spent for what purpose? Our Government have no control. They can purchase newspaper editors, they can corrupt intellectuals. They can do this or that in order to create a political climate in India which will suit their purpose and not the purpose of India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR AU KHAN): Your time is up.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: So, that is how they are going about. I say, it is an anti-national PL-480 agreement. If we can import food with no conditions



attached, it is well and good. But this is landing us in a position of complete subservience to the American imperialists in many respects. We have an industrial and economic base. We are not the satellites and stooges of others. But the Government is surrendering to the American demand on many of the points, economic and political. And PL 480 is one of the instruments in their hands.

So, what I suggest is this. There should be a thorough going agrarian reform and the abolition of all feudal survivals. It does not matter whether the peasant gets one chhatak or one quarter of a chhatak of grain. The whole point is that the feudal elements control the land. This is the figure after 17 years of Congress rule. This is the figure—five per cent control 37.29 per cent of the land, which is concentrated in their hands, and hardly 70 per cent, of the peasant families own 20 per cent of the land. So, this is the position.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The Food Minister will reply to that. You finish the speech.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: A few minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Your time is already up.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Only two minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Many other speakers are there.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I will finish within two or three minutes.

Secondly, there should be a moratorium on peasant indebtedness. Thirdly, I should say that a sum of Rs. 50 to Rs. 100 crores annually should be advanced to the peasantry and credit facilities should be advanced to them in order to meet their needs of im-

plements, techniques, seeds and other things. Then there should be State Trading in foodgrains. What we say is that the entire wholesale trade should be taken over and no wholesaler should be drafted into the State Trading Corporation. (Interruptions) If you do that then there will not be any State trading and the Corporation would be another instrument in the hands of these profiteers and wholesalers. The profiteers and the wholesalers should be excluded from it; otherwise, it will pass into their hands. We are not in favour of such a Corporation which just legalise their activities and gives them sanctity. And the millions of retail shopkeepers and others should be there, they should be drafted into it. And then the PL 480 Agreement should go and transactions should be made without any strings attached. The prices of industrial goods should be brought down. It is essential. Then people's committees should be there in order to implement all these measures. It should not be left to the bureaucrats to implement these measures; otherwise, inevitably, they will do the very opposite of what is wanted of them.

The question is can this Government do this? I think, no. Can the people get any benefit from this Government? I think, no. They cannot have big mercies, they can hope for little mercies if they pressurise the Government by all possible ways, by peaceful means. And they can expect some mercy from this Government. But they cannot get food as such or the price line cannot be held. If the price line is to be held, if the people are to get food, then the people should devise ways and means to replace this reactionary Government by a government with a democratic purpose. That is the only way.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Now you have mercy on other speakers.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-

[Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya.]

Chairman, Sir, hunger and food are eternal problems. Man and animal have been, all through the centuries, roaming about for hundreds and thousands of miles in search of food. Famines and floods there have always been in all countries at all times. No king, emperor or dictator could ever stop them. So, for our new democracy, food production and food prices have been a constant problem and for a long time they will remain so. Even in the countries where there is one-party rule, countries like China and Russia, even they have to purchase food from outside. Because our country is a democracy, therefore the difficulties of implementing the agricultural plans are very great. Even the Opposition parties who are adopting an agitational approach towards this problem, if they come to the Treasury Benches—I doubt very much; that will not happen for a long time to come—even if they are in the Government, how can they solve this problem permanently? I say, they cannot solve it. There will always be good and bad years. Our countrymen should understand that an agitational approach can create crisis of confidence, can create difficulties and that it can aggravate the difficulties. But it cannot solve the food problem.

Sir, by saying this I am not saying that our Government should sit idle or it has no responsibility or that it has got nothing to do. Neither do I say that at the present juncture there are no difficulties and the people are not facing difficulties. In some States which are surplus there are very bad deficit areas. Even in surplus States there are such pockets where people have to stand in long queues and very little is available to them. Although there are fair price shops, the stock is exhausted very soon and they have to return very much disappointed. At some pockets the prices have been exorbitant. The poor of the city and the poor of the village also are finding it difficult because of the high prices. Here, the anger grows against the profiteer and the hoarder and, as

the Food Minister has pointed out, even in the surplus States, even there, the arrivals into the market are very much less. That shows that there is a dangerous combination of the traders and the big producers. As a short-range scheme our Government is importing food, and some foreign countries are even diverting their own shipments to help our country. Therefore, our Government is doing everything possible to minimise the difficulties of the people.

Sir, we cannot leave our country at the sweet will of the trader of the big producer. We have seen that the trader is too selfish and even in the matter of adulteration of food-stuffs, he is not having any scruples. So, Sir, I support the idea of a trading corporation in food. And, of course, it will grow gradually. I think Mr. Masani has also supported it, though with some conditions. Even the Jana Sangh recently has supported that the State should come into the food trade.

Sir, I give my full support to the idea that prices should be fixed well in advance of the coming harvest of rice, jowar, maize, wheat, etc. and it should be done by an expert body of persons who should fix integrated prices of food. The price should be remunerative to the peasant. All this is a good policy. But I think if the price is to be remunerative, it shall have to be sufficiently high. That will again prove to be a problem. I hope in the matter of food the Opposition parties shall give up the agitational approach and have a constructive approach to this problem which all the parties in the country have to solve.

Sir, as we are angry against the hoarder and the profiteer, we are also angry against the corrupt and inefficient people, whoever they are, in the administration or the politicians.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Vijaivargiya, in view of the number of speakers,

i am irunjung xo nave xer,. minutes lor each speaker. I hope you will finish it soon.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA; I hope you will give me some more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Four minutes more.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Sir, I speak very seldom.

There is a great fear that proceeding with nationalisation at a hasty speed may result in a lot of wastage and corruption. But we must deal with them strongly. Ever since I have been in the Rajya Sabha I have always been pointing out the necessity of eradicating corruption, inefficiency and lethargy, etc. So I think we have to set up this machinery of implementing state trading. For that purpose we will have to take strong action against 'such people if we have to completely eradicate corruption.

Sir, sometimes I think that we have to give up liberal law courts and liberal laws of evidence, and go to some kind of a stage of dictatorship, though I do not support it. I think that we should proceed within the democratic framework and eradicate corruption. At the same time whatever Nandaji is doing in the direction of eradicating corruption, I strongly support it.

Sir, there is nothing new in the Food Minister's programme. He has given us a programme which has long-range schemes. There is nothing in it which the previous Food Ministers have not said, for example, in regard to fair price shops, imports, state trading, fixation of prices, minor irrigation, fertiliser, reorienting the Community Development projects, co-operatives and so on. All these things were already there. But there is one great difference. Our young

and energetic Food Minister has the capacity of implementing all these ideas. So I fully support the programme he has put forward, and let us hope the White Paper will be a very good thing.

Probably nature has also come to our help. We shall have a good crop and we shall be able to solve our food problem much better. But I can say one thing that during this crisis we have not gone to the position of the 1943 famine as referred to by my friend who spoke previous to me. This Government has done something and has not allowed things to deteriorate. It has not allowed people to die of hunger and starvation. So I support, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the idea that there should be control, that the stocks should be declared and all kinds of restraints should be there. Our food habits also should change.

Then, Mr. Vice-Chairman, there should be a campaign in respect of service co-operatives. While service co-operatives have been successful in Japan and Denmark and other countries, why should they not be made successful in our country? I think in the other House Dr. Punjabrao Deshmukh mentioned one thing that there should be gradual mechanisation and further fragmentation of land should be stopped. But that should be given some thought to. I think one more thing he has not mentioned was about the tiny pieces of land. Small holdings cannot be cultivated profitably without bringing them into some kind of co-operative farming. When there can be joint stock companies in industry, why can there not be co-operative farming about small pieces of land? So I support the co-operative farming idea also. But I have to say that at present we should make the co-operation movement a success . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Thank you.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAI- I  
VARGIYA: With these words I support the Food Minister's programme.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA  
PARANJPYE (Nominated) Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the food crisis is now getting into the habit of becoming an annual event like the Holi or the Diwali or whatever you like to call it. But this year it has reached an all time high, as so many people have said before me.

Sir, we tell ourselves and others that India is a predominantly agricultural country where 70 per cent, of the population are agriculturists. If that be so, Sir, I think it is a crying shame that we should have to be importing foodgrains in order to satisfy our hunger.

We have had seventeen years ' of independence and planning. At times I cannot help wishing that outside help was denied to us. Many of us will die no doubt but those who live will have to do something, put their shoulders to the wheel, and get out of this habit of depending on others; we will try to do something for ourselves.

As I said, we plan and we plan. But we seldom carry out any of our plans to their logical end. Take irrigation. We have harnessed the water. We have had so many irrigation projects. We have so many dams, and yet we are seeing that the farmer is not taking advantage of the irrigation facilities. Now what is the reason for all this? It is mainly because we have not constructed waterways that would take the water from the big canals into the field of the farmer. Let the Government charge the farmer the just and adequate price for the water. But he should have the facility of the water reaching his own fields. There again the Government has to make up its mind to do it. It is going to be an expensive project but here again I would like to advise the Government to go into the irriga-

tion channels one by one and not ask for a big allocation for all of them at one time. What we do is, we like to make our plans on paper and we seldom think of the practical difficulties that are going to crop up when we try to implement our plans. I remember when this Village Pan-chayati Raj was introduced, I was in the Maharashtra Legislature and at that time I said: "For goodness sake, do not go in for this Pan-chayati Raj wholesale. Try it out in one district in each division. See how it works for three years and if you think that it is successful, then introduce it in other districts" but nobody was willing to listen to anything that was reasonable.

Now the same, I could see, has taken place about the land ceiling. Many people have referred to it. Many have said that land ceiling is there only in the Act and it has not been implemented. The land tenure system has not been abolished but what I want to say is that even in places where the tenant has been given his own land, he is not able to cultivate it on a profitable basis because we only pass legislations. We do not go deeper to find out what difficulties the tiller will come across and what difficulties he will have to face as regards fertilisers, implements, irrigation and everything else if he was to do it on his own. There also I can say that I have the same contention to make that we make plans but we do them only in theory and do not look to the practical side of it. Very often while we are planning, we look to the East and to the West. Some of us look to this side and some to that side. We look at the different progressive countries of the East and the West with very longing eyes but we never try to emulate the methods of either the East or the West of hard work and purposeful planning and of putting our shoulder to the wheel or rolling up our sleeve; and getting down on our knees. That we do not do. Until we do that I am afraid we will not be able to solve any problem of our country.

Again we do not plan ahead enough. We wait. We are a smug people, I am sorry to say this but we are and we wait till the crisis comes in with all its fury and is right on us. Then we start doing or think of doing something. That is exactly what has happened every year about the food crisis and this time also we are doing the same thing. We practically lose our heads. We heed no warning and we do not learn from what we have experienced in the past. I can say that we learn nothing and we forget everything and it is this habit of ours that we will have to change if we want to progress. Since independence we have been hearing great slogans like: "The blackmarketeers will be bung in the market places; the food adulterators will be shot or flogged in public places" but nothing has come out. It is not only that but they all thrive, in fact. Much has been said about the zonal system and, I think, even our Food Minister is having second thoughts or first thoughts because he was not the Food Minister when it was brought, I must say in all fairness. I think it will be abolished but what I would like to know . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He has promised to reconsider it.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPEY: I know he said that he would reconsider it but what I would like to know is, in whose head this idea had originated? It must have been suggested by one of the grain-merchants and our Government, I am sorry to say, fell a dupe to that idea and those grain-merchants must be nose-thumbing at us. These grain-merchants, certainly have made their pretty piles. Now I hope we will do away with this zonal system for ever. I do not want to repeat the arguments which my friend, Prof. Lai, had so effectively made and the argument about the fortnight's good conduct leave that we were giving to the stock-holders. We thought that the

would be out with their stocks and they would tell us what stocks they had and where they were but I am not going to dilate upon that point but it reminds me of a story that my grandmother used to tell me.

There was an old rich woman who had a lot of jewellery. That particular day her husband had gone out. A thief knew about it. He visited her house at night. When she heard the noise of somebody rummaging about in the cupboards in the house, she knew it was a thief who had come to pay a visit. She was a kindly woman. She thought that if she tried to be sweet to the thief, he would depart. So she said: "Whatever you may take, do not take that heavy gold necklace of mine which I have tucked away in the wheat sack." So the thief naturally knew where to look for it and he rummaged in the wheat sack and took the necklace. When she knew that that was gone, she said: 'At least now leave alone my thirty-tola gold bracelets which are in the old sari box'. So the thief took away that. You can imagine what happened when she went on telling him whatever she had. The thief had taken everything that he could lay his hands on. When everything had been taken, she took out her nosering and she said: 'At least I am sure you will leave me this as I have had it from the day of my wedding.' The thief picked it up, pocketed it and joining his palms said 'Namaste Ma-raj i' and went away. It is something like this—our expecting good conduct from the stock-holders.

Then as has been suggested, the Food Trading Corporation must come into existence, and the sooner it comes the better. We have to see that the producer gets a reasonable price. The minimum price has got to be fixed and if in the months to come the prices go up or rise, the Government will have to buy the grains from the producer at the prices proclaimed and that is a thing we must do. That is a 'must'. Again we will have buffer stocks. That is

[Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye.] very necessary and we have felt the need for so many years but we have not really set our minds to it. It was in Australia and I have seen silos higher than this hall, where grain "was stocked. We/ could easily build some silos and we could store our grain. Why should not this grain come from our land? Why cannot we buy grains at the harvest times? I am afraid even now when the prices begin to go down perhaps our Government will be just sitting back quietly and closing their eyes to what is happening and will wake up when the prices go up but I would implore and beseech the Government to do something about it and buy the necessary grains and provide buffer stocks at the harvest time. We are told that in order to go into the wholesale transaction in grains, we have not the adequate administrative staff. It may be that in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture there is not adequate staff but I feel and many share my view that in other Departments and other Ministries we suffer from an excess of staff and we could easily borrow some staff from the other Ministries and I am sure they would be the better for it and so also would be the Food Ministry better off for it. The Minister himself concedes the point that black money plays a big part in the rise in prices, and it is an unfortunate state of affairs, Sir, as we have been told that this year the production of foodgrains has been higher than last year, and in spite of that the prices have risen to an all-time high. Now that means that there must necessarily be some black grain hoarded somewhere. So this black money and black grain play a big part in the manipulation of prices and I think we must get rid of all this blackness.

And one last point I am going to make, Sir, and it is about population. It is said on all hands that the population is increasing by leaps and bounds and that is why we cannot keep pace with it by producing more

foodgrains in that proportion. But what are we doing about it? I know of several plans; I know the Health Ministry is trying its utmost to step up the progress of family planning, that a crash sterilisation programme' is being worked out but, Sir, I think for this particular programme we need the help and co-operation of every Ministry, and it is high time we thought of doing something; I won't suggest passing legislation yet; I would give it another five years and I hope I shall be here for another five years, but up till then we should make use of indirect pressure, welfare amenities, all facilities, and all the help that Government gives, even increments and promotions could be withheld from families who obstinately refuse to put a stop to the growth of their families beyond a certain limit. I think we will have to do this.

Our friends from Uttar Pradesh were agitated about the food scarcity in their State. I am very sorry about it. My State is no better; we are a deficit State also. But this family planning programme has made no progress whatsoever in Uttar Pradesh whereas Maharashtra is ahead of everybody in this regard. We talk of the population growth but nobody has referred to this point, at least while I was here, and that is as regards the method of cultivating our fields. We have talked about China, and we have talked about Japan which have tremendously advanced in this regard. I believe Japan has a larger yield per acre than any country, more than even any Western country. And why is it so? And this I have been told by a mission that went to Japan. This information was given not on paper but at a party. They said: "We use our night soil, every grain of it", and that is why they have four times or five times the yield we have from our fields. At least we could do that: that is a commodity that is increasing with the increase in population; we should certainly make use of it and see that our food production increases.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me the opportunity to express my views on the food situation of the country. I have gone through most of the speeches made in the Lok Sabha and I have listened to most of the speeches in this House also. I have however felt that the greatest concern which we, one and all, have is in connection with the rise in prices, which affects everybody, right from the smallest to the biggest, and the smaller income people feel the pinch a little more than others. It has posed a challenge not only to the ingenuity of the people with small incomes but also to the political stability and economic possibilities of the country. Whether the present situation is due to the accumulated neglect in planning and administration or to the general indifference of the agricultural community towards basic issues is a debatable point. But the fact is that the situation is explosive. To quote from the report of the UNESCO India I would say that, generally speaking, India will have to double its food output in the coming decade if the people are to be provided with the minimum standard of nutrition. Every four persons out of ten in the world are hungry, and one of them is an Indian. Fifty per cent, of Indians are 'hungry'. On an average an Indian eats three-fourths of what he has a right to expect. In the circumstances, Sir, it is but natural that the standard of nutrition in India has not shown any rise during the last twenty-five years. With the population increasing by ten million every year, India must increase its cereal output by 50 per cent, and milk output by 100 per cent, in the next decade or so. The per capita and per acre yield is low as compared to other countries, and as a result, the standard of earning of agricultural population is below national average.

Indian agriculture mainly comprises production of foodgrains, followed by commercial crops, animal husbandry, fisheries and poultry farming. There

are large variations in production from year to year. These cause uncertainty and fluctuation in other economic activity. Even in the best years production is not wholly enough to meet consumption and provide for carry-over of stocks for possible future deficit years. Taking the good years with the bad there would appear to be an overall deficit, which has been made good by imports, mainly under P.L. 480 Agreements.

The problem of agriculture will have to be tackled both from the short-term and the long-term aspects. True that the Centre has been taking measures to import foodgrains to meet the short-term situation and at the same time taking vigorous steps to bring into the open hoarded stocks. At the same time it is felt that greater attention should be paid to achieve self-sufficiency in foodgrains as early as possible. The Government has also thought in terms of opening of more fair price shops and setting up of a Foodgrains Trading Corporation. The Food Minister has also assured us that the zonal restrictions would be done away with as early as possible.

I would like to deal with only a few problems which, according to me, require greater attention. As regards the Foodgrains Trading Corporation it is too early to be sure what shape the Government's plans of buying and selling foodgrains would ultimately take. According to present indications the Government's Corporation is to be just a competitor in the market and an honest rival to private traders. If this would be so, perhaps there be very little to talk against the organisation. But very much depends on how the various States and the organisational advisers would look at the problem. The retail trade too should be done on the principle of fair competition with private retail-trade. If Government monopoly is introduced, it would result in certain unexpected situations. The basic issue is that no attempt should be made to abrogate the normal trade channels

[Shri Babubhai M. Ghinai.] on a permanent or semi-permanent basis.

So far as the production and distribution of foodgrains is concerned, the entire country should be treated as one. The zonal and other inter-zonal restrictions would result in distorting the price structure and create pockets of scarcity and plenty. This is certainly not fair to the consumers who have been disadvantageously put. Even if the abolition of zonal restrictions have to await the next harvest, inter-zonal restrictions might be removed straightway.

I would also like to make a few observations about land legislation. Almost all the States have passed legislations aimed at abolishing intermediaries, reducing rent, ensuring security of tenure and limiting the size of agricultural holdings. Whether these reforms have resulted in increased production is a debatable point. Unfortunately, however, land released or likely to be released after enforcement of ceiling legislation has been too inconsequential and insignificant vis-a-vis the total area under cultivation. The consolidation programme has been halting and somewhat slow. In this connection it is also necessary to study the inheritance laws which at present lead to fragmentation and make nugatory the policy of consolidation of holdings.

May I also draw your kind attention, Sir, here to the recommendations of the Planning Commission that certain types of farms like cane farms should be exempted from the purview of ceiling legislation? The recommendation has not been uniformly followed by State Governments, and in certain States even the efficient modern farms run by the sugar industry have not escaped the threat of the ceiling law.

Such farms had not only attained a very high level of yield per acre-

but also served as model farms for other cultivators in the surrounding areas. And as such the level of technology pursued by them had its wholesome impact in the vicinity. Besides, the farms were also serving as seed farms for the area in and around them, particularly in U.P. where due to climatic conditions seeds had to be replenished quite frequently. It is necessary that the Government should review the policy in this behalf and modify it on a production-oriented basis.

The essential aim of agrarian policy in general and land reforms in particular, should be to improve conditions of production and encourage management of agricultural land on a basis similar to the organisation of industry. A spirit of entrepreneurship has to be injected into the countryside and there was need to relate output to effort and investment directly. In this context, it is a heartening thing that in certain areas a new type of dynamic, progressive farmer had emerged as the main spearhead of improvements in agriculture.

The farmer who constitutes the new rural 'elite' should be given every protection and encouragement so that his potentialities are fully utilised in the national interest. This will only be possible when the climate of uncertainty and the sense of insecurity is removed from the minds of those who are striving to introduce newer technology and better skills in the agricultural sector. The touchstone of our entire policy should be sustained increase in production, based on steady and continuous rise in productivity, and any policy or legislative enactment which runs contrary to this paramount objective should be side-stepped and brushed aside.

PBOF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are all consumers and therefore the food problem touches us all. There is no question of party politics in this matter.



I am very happy, Sir, that even the Government have finally become conscious of the importance of agriculture in *our* economy and the Prime Minister is very enthusiastic about it and I am very happy that the present Minister of Agriculture has shown considerable amount of dynamism in facing the problems of the present day. I, Sir, share my hon. friend, Shri Deokinandan Narayan's hope that the present Food and Agriculture Minister will be allowed to continue there for some years because unfortunately we have found that there have been far too many changes in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and they have been the victims of political exigencies, and that is a very unfortunate thing. Now that the Food Minister has got some definite policy and plan before him, he should be allowed to do his best.

While saying this, Sir, I may also say that none of us can be blind to the fact that the present situation is to a considerable extent, due to the complacency of the Government in the past. I am afraid that they have allowed themselves to share Browning's optimism that "God's in Heaven and all's well with the world." We have our rivers, we have our monsoons, we have our fertile plains and we have our teeming millions of kisans. But we have forgotten or at least not taken due notice of the fact that our soil, however fertile it may be, requires the assistance of fertilizers. As my hon. friend, Shri-mati Paranjpye pointed out, the very precious manure which costs us nothing in India, has been allowed to be literally smoked away as fuel that should be used as manure. We have not yet enough fertilizer at the present moment. Then again, we have always been the victims of the vagaries of the monsoons and we cannot take for granted that every monsoon is going to give us a season of prosperity. We have got our peasants, but for half the year they *are* out of work and they are ignorant and they do not know the most

680 RS—7.

up-to-date methods of improving agriculture. Unfortunately they are far too fertile in the production of children which adds to the problem of agriculture and food at the present moment

On the whole I feel that the real weakness of Government is in its administration. Policies may be laid down and these policies may be very good in Delhi. But how are they going to be worked? That makes all the differences. Take for example the case of the fair price shops. We find in the report that was given to us that during the last one year the number of fair price shops has risen from 55,000 to 80,000. That is a very respectable number. But the problem is, how do they function? We have had the experience of a number of Members here that they do not get the right quality of stuff. They do not get the requisite amount of things that they require. And it also involves a tremendous waste of time because when there are long queues you have to wait there for hours before you get your things, and that certainly makes life miserable.

I submit that the most important thing to be noted is that there has to be a definite change in the Government's planning and outlook. In our earlier years we were dazzled by the possibilities of industrialisation. But the fact remains that India was an agricultural country, is an agricultural country and is likely to remain an agricultural country for years and years to come. Therefore, agriculture must find a dominant place in our plans. We have had to face crushing taxation. I do not think! it is possible to deny that we are the most heavily taxed country in the world, not in the quantum of taxation, which may be much more in the U.S.A. or England, but certainly in relation to our resources. Our public debt is mounting very heavily. I feel that our country is being mortgaged. Our future *ffene-ration<»* are being mortgaged. There is deficit financing to a very danger-

[Prof. A. R. Wadia] ous extent. Whereas the increase in production is 8 per cent., the increase in our deficit financing is as much as 31 per cent. Now the press at Nasik may be a very great blessing, but it can also become a great source of danger. It may lead to inflation and inflation means rising prices and we all suffer from it very badly.

We are very fond of slogans and as a people we thrive on them. It is rather unfortunate that even one of our Ministers has given us a slogan—"Export or die". Now, exports are very necessary to earn foreign exchange; but there must be some limit, some reasonable limit to it. I do not think there is any justification for the Government even to get increased foreign exchange, to export a necessary commodity like sugar. When we have not got enough of it in our own country it is no use exporting it to get foreign exchange. Last year when I alluded to the export of bananas to get foreign exchange, I said that the one fruit that the poor now enjoy they would be deprived of, and to a very considerable extent this has come true and bananas have become very costly; and all this to get foreign exchange. Well, Sir, I do not call it very wise planning. There is something definitely wrong about it. There is another slogan which was given to us by our friend, Mr. Gurupada Swamy. He said that the rise in price is a sign of prosperity.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Fantastic.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: It is a very dangerous slogan. It may be true in the case of rich countries like the United States of America or England. They have got the capacity to pay high prices but a poor country like India cannot go by this slogan. It would be a very dangerous thing; in fact, it is very dangerous and it is not true of India. We cannot afford to pay high prices. I am afraid when the Finance Minister imposed the

Compulsory Deposit Scheme or the compulsory Annuities he did not realise that in order to pay this so-called Compulsory Deposit people might have to borrow at a much higher rate than what the Government would be giving to them at the end of five years. This is the state of affairs and, therefore, we should not allow ourselves to be dominated by idle slogans.

Well, Sir, our agriculture is faced with definite difficulties. Increase in population is there and I know that in the beginning there was some opposition to birth control but the Government has changed its policy in this matter and now is anxious to encourage birth control as much as possible. It should be done. Japan also went in for it and benefited thereby.

We have unfortunately to deal with dishonest traders and it is only for that reason that I welcome the establishment of the Foodgrains Trading Corporation. As a general rule I am not in favour of these big corporations but where food is concerned I am prepared to make an exception because our traders have not been as honest as they should be.

Then there is the zonal system. By the figures given to us on page 8 of this pamphlet we note the variations in prices in the different States and I am glad that the Food Minister is fully conscious of it. He has pointed out the advantages of doing away with these restraints on transport of grains from one State to another in the South and when he wants to do the same thing done in the North unfortunately he has to meet the opposition of the States and I regret to say, judging from newspaper reports, even from some of his colleagues in the Cabinet. It is rather unfortunate. The zonal system has not proved a great success. After all, if we are one nation we have to take our country as one nation and not divide it into different States fighting one another.

Well, Sir, what are the remedies? We have to build up stocks. We have to have licensing and control over the wholesale trade for some time tmt on the- whole controls do more harm than good because they lead to corruption. That has been our experience and I am not very optimistic about the success of any licensing •ystem. I have already spoken about the Foodgrains Trading Corporation and I would welcome it, I am glad to find that new rice mills are planned. But the main point is that we have to look to the welfare of our villages. I entirely agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Govinda Reddy, when he emphasised this as the chief need, to rehabilitate agriculture. They must have fair remuneration. they must have timely supply of Beeds, they must have timely financial help and they must have better knowledge which they can get only through education. Our Constitutional provision about compulsory elementary education has not been fulfilled because we say that we have got no money for it but we have got money for so many other things most of which, or a good deal of which, goes into wrong pockets or is wasted. This better knowledge can come not merely from America; in fact, it is a criticism that We are trying to imi-tq\*e ve~" advanced and rich countries without any proper resources and I agree with my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai, that We can get good knowledge from smaller countries like Israel and Taiwan. There is not the slightest doubt that these two countries have made a tremendous amount of progress in spite of t:ieir small size because knowledge pays. Knowledge is always powerful. Both these countries are willing to help us and we should take advantage of their help and see what we can do to improve the condition of our villages.

Lastly, Sir, may I add one point? In these days, when there la such a scarcity of food there is n°ed .+0 rp-Tvisider th» whole problem of prohibition. God has given us

good, strong food in toddy and we have been wasting that vast resource. The poor people used to get food from it and used to get strength from it and we have deprived them of it because of our fads, because of our ignorance of the scientific contents of such an important food as toddy. So, Sir, in conclusion I would plead that the first things must come first. Agriculture must always be in this vanguard. It must be our chief concern and only then will the problem of food be solved.

SHRI J. S. PDL.LAI (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the outset, I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister for his boldness in taking up this portfolio. Perhaps somebody may say that he was not taking it up but that it was thrust upon him. Whatever it may be, it requires very great boldness on the part of the Minister to take up this portfolio which is a very difficult one.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, you know it for a fact that w; depend upon agriculture for our food and agricultural eco-nomy depend, upon nature more than anything. I will explain what I have in my mind. For instance, we can bring a piece of land under cultivation scientifically by having good seeds and also giving good manure and other things but unless we have got good rain and proper rain at the proper time our plan will not succeed. We should not only have rain but it should be at the proper time. At the same time, you must have a sufficient quantity of rain; too much rain will spoil. So, crop and so also too little rain. So, agricultural economy depends more upon nature than any other economy. That is why I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister who has shown his boldness in taking up this portfolio.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, in this pamphlet, quoting the report of the Food-grains Enquiry Commi'tee, he says that as a result of the National Sample Survey undertaken, there has

[Shri J. S. Pillai] been an increase in the consumption of 'foodgrains per capita'—this has increased substantially in the lower income group while remaining fairly stable in the other groups. I do not subscribe to this view. You know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the belly is a peculiar thing. It will not accept two days' food nor will it starve for two days. Whatever it is capable of taking, only that it will take. There is a poetry to that effect in Tamil. So, I do not subscribe to this view. What the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee meant was perhaps the change in food habits. Some people used to take ragi and *kambu* and now they have taken to rice. There is this change in habit. I do not complain about this because it shows that the standard of living has increased. This is what it means. Then he says that the growth of population is there but the Minister has not given us any remedy by which we can reduce the population or make it static. I will give the House one way by which we can keep the population static. Mr. Vice-Chairman, our ancestors used to follow four *ashrams*. Brahmacharya. Grihastha, Vanaprastha and Sanyasi.

I think by legislation this should be enforced. Perhaps hon. Members may ask me why we should not do it voluntarily. Human beings are strange animals and I will explain what I mean. Birds and animals have got mating seasons whereas human beings have no mating season as such. Every day is a mating season. I hope you will not consider me vulgar; all the 365 days are mating season for human beings. When a bitch is pregnant no other dog will go near it but it is not the case with human beings. Man is always prepared for procreation of children. That is why I say Voluntarily it is not possible to enforce these four *ashramis* of life. We can do it only by legislation. Till a boy attains the age of 30 and a girl attains the age of 25 they should not be allowed to marry. From 30 to 50 years of age

he can be a *grahastha* and during that time he can produce children but there should be a limit. Nobody should produce more than three children. This should be laid down by legislation. If he produces more than three children he should be asked to pay a penalty or a tax to the Government. From 50 to 60 years of age he should be a *vanaprastha*. By *vanaprastha*. I do not mean that he should go to a forest or do anything of that sort. He can live in the house with his wife but he should treat his wife as his sister and his wife in her turn should treat him as her brother. After 60 he can take to *sanyasa ashrama*; again he need not go to the forest; he can live in the house but he should think more of God and less of mundane things. This can be brought about by legislation only; voluntarily it is impossible.

The second thing that I want the hon. Minister to do is that he should advocate monogamy. As you know, Quran allows six wives, I think.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No; four.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: May be four, I do not know. But Hindus can have any number of wives. There is no limit at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no. It is not correct.

< Interruptions.>

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Let him continue please.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: Buddhism also allows a number of wives; so also Jainism, Sikhism and I think Zoroastrianism also allows a number of wives. A man should have only one wife.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, he is making a wrong statement. He is probably not even aware of the Hindu Code Bill that his own party got passed.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: I am not speaking of legislation; I am speaking of religion now. So what I would say is, if a man wants to have more than one wife he should pay a tax to the Government. This should be enforced by law. By these methods we can keep the population static.

Thirdly I would say this. Nowadays! there is a tendency for people to grow cash crops. In Madras areas that were under paddy cultivation are now under sugarcane cultivation. I would not blame anybody; if I had land probably I would do the same thing because paddy will not give me as much profit as sugarcane.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, twenty years ago when the State of Madras was much bigger than what it is today— at that time, as you know, Madras consisted of not only Tamil Nad but parts of Andhra, parts of Kerala and parts of Mysore—at that time there was only one sugar factory but now there are more than six sugar factories. Naturally in order to get more money people have given up the old idea of growing paddy; they are now growing sugarcane. I do not object to that but one thing they can do. I am glad that the hon. Food Minister belongs to Madras. He can produce a substitute for sugar. If you go to Madras, Vice-Chairman, you will find there are crores and crores of palmyra trees, coconut trees and date palm trees. From the juice out of these trees we can get good sugar, sugar-candy and jaggery. This would be a good substitute for sugar from sugarcane. So the Government should try to produce this substitute sugar from these palmyra and other trees. It will be a good substitute and it will also provide work for those who are unemployed nowadays on account of prohibition.

The last thing that I want to tell you is this. The other day the hon. gentleman sitting there, Mr. Patel, told us that there are two ways of increasing food production; one is the method followed in America and the

other that is followed in Formosa. The method adopted in Formosa is none other than what was enunciated in 1917 by Lenin, namely, the tiller of the soil is the owner of the land.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): As usual you are completely confused.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: I did not hear him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You carry on.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: That is what I grasped. Perhaps I may be wrong or he may be wrong. What I say is, this idea that the tiller of the soil should be the owner of the land is a maxim enunciated in 1917 by Lenin. Though it smacks of Communism I think we must take whatever is good. Our economy is not a capitalist economy; nor is it a communist economy. It is a *kathambam*—in Tamil we call it *kathambam* for a mixture—of both capitalist and communist economy. It is a mixed economy. So we can adopt that policy.

In case they are not able to succeed in getting increased production by all these means, then they can have rationing. Rationing is a good thing.

Now, I will recapitulate what I have said.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): We have all noted. It is all there. You need not recapitulate.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: You need not tell me what I should do. Please just listen.

What I say is, firstly, they should keep the population static by bringing in legislation by which they can enforce monogamy as well as the four *ashrmas* of life. Secondly the palmyra and other trees should be tapped for a substitute for sugar.

[Shri J. S. Pillai] from sugarcane. Thirdly they should introduce the maxim that the tiller of the soil is the owner of the land. And the last one is rationing.

Thank you.

SHRI J. H. J6SHI (Gujarat): Mr. "Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the motion moved by the Food Minister, Mr. Subramaniam. I find from the review of the food situation that he has placed before this House that he has shown reason, dash and realism and I find that he has struck a note of optimism also. As you know, food is our problem today. It concerns all of us. The food situation is very explosive and we are sitting on the edge of a volcano. Food is life; food is nutrition; food is strength and just as it applies to a man or an individual it also applies to the whole nation. But if not well administered it becomes the cause of loss of life. During the last three years we have been keeping vigil on three fronts. One is the front of treacherous China; the other is the unfriendly Pakistan and the third front is that of natural calamities resulting in such an explosive food situation. Sir, we have maintained all along that the food situation should be tackled on a war basis. When there is a threat of a war all the groups, all the parties, unions and associations meet together and lend their patriotic support to the Government. My humble suggestion in regard to the food situation is that the Government should invite "honest, serviceable and loyal people belonging to other groups and parties also to join in fighting this common and fierce battle of the food situation. We all know there were some agitations; we know of Gujarat Bandh, of Maharashtra Bandh and there was also a threat of Bharat Bandh. All these agitations must have no place in a critical condition like the one in which we are placed today. Food is a more serious problem from the international point of view. For the last seventeen years the Government is trying, but we

must confess that we have not become self-sufficient in food. We get food from the USA, from Canada.

We import foodgrains from Australia, Burma and many other countries. Now, what would happen if a spark were ignited somewhere in any part of the world? If a war were to break out, then an embargo would be imposed. Transport arrangement\* would be upset. And if, by some circumstance, we were also involved i» a war, how are we to fight on the food front as well as on the war front? If we cannot feed our people we will be inviting discontent in the country itself. How can we expect our defence forces to be strengthened? How caa we expect our soldiers to fight the external enemies while their wive\* and children may be starving in their homes? Too much dependence o» other countries for foodgrains—the most primary necessity of life and of a nation—would end in an economic subjugation of the people. I should say that there is not much difference between economic subjugation ant political subjugation.

Now, how are we to overcome this difficulty? We know that it is a State subject and the States have to tackle this problem. The Centre may make grants, may give all sorts of assistance, but ultimately it is the States which have to overcome this difficulty. The Central Government should give a directive to all the States to concentrate all their attention on the production of foodgrains. They should be asked to draw up a plan for five years and also they should see that the plan is executed according to schedule. Non-production programmes should be cut down. The panchayats in the States, the community development, irrigation, transport, co-operatives, banks, all should combine to accelerate the programme of food production. The Minister has rightly suggested that remunerative prices should be given to the agriculturist. He has also suggested that the agri-

culturist should be given implements which should be cheap. We have heard all these theses for the last so many years, but I feel that the Minister has shown some tact about how to implement all these factors. When I am travelling from place to place I find large areas of fallow land lying uncultivated for a number of years. The States should be asked to use tractors to till the land by means of those tractors and bring that land under cultivation. This should be under a responsible Minister in the State or more preferably the Chief Minister of the State should be in charge of the portfolio of agriculture.

Prices are rising high. It is very difficult for the common man to make both ends meet. The prevailing price of wheat in Gujarat is about Rs. 60 to Rs. 70 per quintal. The price in Punjab is from Rs. 37 to Rs. 40 per quintal. In Maharashtra it is about Rs. 120. These are wholesale prices. If we look into the retail prices there is much more variation. Now, the Government should see that the prices are kept at a level beyond which the price should not be allowed to run high. We have created some artificial walls by creating zones. (*Interruption*). We have created artificial walls between the States by creating zones. We hear that in European countries, artificial walls, which were standing between independent countries, have been razed to the ground, so that trade could flow smoothly and easily. Israel can provide us a good model to follow. They have raised production and have turned a whole desert into a green area. (*Time bell rings.*)

Thank you very much.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a sad commentary on the debate on the food situation that after the Minister's confident assurance of controlling the food situation by setting up a Food-grains Corporation and taking necessary ancillary measures, this morning's papers report that wheat prices have

shot up in the city of Delhi itself under the very nose of the Union Government. I find here that on August 20 farm wheat price stood at Rs. 55 per quintal and at the present moment, that is, on September 15, wheat prices went up to Rs. 64.50. It has also been stated, according to today's papers, that the wholesalers are not announcing their fixed prices. The practice was accepted by them two or three weeks ago, but this has been discontinued. I have further information that the price of broken pulses is Rs. 65. It was selling at Rs. 37 on 20th July and in August they were selling it at Rs. 50. Now, the prices of the whole range of food articles are going up, in spite of all the measures taken by Government to control the food situation. Sir, the Food Minister requested the Members of the opposition not to have a political approach towards this question. I entirely agree that we should not make any politics out of the food scarcity in the country, but Government must be frank enough to admit that the present situation has been caused by the complete failure of the agricultural plans. We have so far spent Rs. 2000 crores on agriculture in the last three Plans, and what has happened is that production which went up to 80 million tons in 1960 is gradually falling. Now we do not know to what extent Government will be dependent on food imports for remedying the situation. My hon. friend, Mr. Niren Ghosh, for whom I have great respect, spoke very scornfully about the PL 480 programme. I will say as a Member of the opposition that there will be very few who will agree with him in his criticism about the aid we are receiving from the United States to whom this country is under a debt of gratitude for coming to our help in the emergency.

The main problem as the brochure on the food situation has made clear is the problem of production. Unfortunately our State Chief Ministers have not shown that they are very earnest about tackling the food problem.

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

blem in their own States. The previous speaker referred to the recommendation of the Estimates Committee that the Chief Ministers of States should be made the Ministers of Agriculture. I think that this should be done without delay, and the failure or success of the agricultural plans in the States should be made the condition of confidence or absence of confidence in a Ministry. Unless some such step is taken, it is impossible for us to expect that there will be an improvement in the production situation.

Sir, I have been repeatedly stating on the floor of this House that there ought to be greater co-ordination in the agricultural plans between the Central Government and the State Governments. There is no point in appointing an Agricultural Prices Commission at the present moment. The Commission may report, but the report (may become out-of-date on account of the spiralling of prices. What is required is in even' State there should be some agency of the Central Government. There should be an Agricultural Production Commission which will continually supervise the agricultural plans of the States.

Sir, the Minister has referred to the problem of hoarding in the country. There is no doubt that the wholesale trade and also the retail trade are responsible for a good part of the hoarding. But then hoarding has started from the cultivator also. This is due to the diminishing confidence in the Government's economic policies. I do not know, and this matter has got to be studied as to how far the Gold Control Orders have shaken the confidence of the people in the Government. The people find that they cannot invest their money in gold, that they cannot put their money in the banks because of stringent income-tax measures, and this leads consequently to hoarding. It is necessary for Government to remember that the first thing they ought to

do is to restore the confidence of the country in their economic policies. I am one of those who believe in agricultural land reforms, and a United States team which visited this country has pointed out that land reforms have got to be effected if we have got to improve agricultural production. But the haphazard manner in which land reforms have been tried to be introduced in the States and the attempt of Government to bring about by Constitutional Amendments a validation of many laws which have been struck down by courts of law have created an atmosphere of uneasiness in the country and the countryside.

I think therefore that the Government should now give a firm guarantee that at least for a period of 29 years there shall be no further land reform legislation undertaken in any State. In this connection I may mention that Mr. Shriman Narayan, a member of the Planning Commission made a speech the other day that he did not want any further land reform legislation for a period of ten years. Ten years are too short a period, and we should try to see that the period is extended to twentyfive years.

I would like to mention that in regard to the Foodgrains Trading Corporation the Government has not estimated the impact in respect of expenditure on foodgrain prices as a result of their entering the trade. It has been estimated—and this estimate may vary from individual to individual—that 'to enter the distribution trade, Government will have to spend as much as Rs. 100 crores all over India. This Rs. 100 crores will finally have to be paid by the consumer out of his pocket, and my fear is—and I share my fear with other Members—that the cost of foodgrain distribution by the Corporation will be a little higher than the cost of distribution by the Corporation will be a little higher than the cost of distribution made by the wholesalers. I am not pleading that the Foodgrains Trading Corporation should not take up this business. I only want to say that m



this matter they should go slowly and try to perfect the machinery. We have had our experience in the State Trading Corporation and I can tell you that when we were getting newsprint from private dealers, it was much

cheaper in price than what we are getting from the State Trading Corporation. I do not want the Foodgrains Trading Corporation to be another inflationary factor in the situation.

Finally, I would like to mention that the food problem cannot be tackled piecemeal. It is not only the Minister of Food and Agriculture who is responsible for the food situation in the country. The Government's taxation policies have also got to be overhauled. It has been made clear that in April 1961 the money supply was of the order of Rs. 2878 crores. In May 1964 the money supply available to the public is Rs. 3833 crores, which means that in a period of three years the money supply has increased by about Rs. 450 crores. This naturally has an impact on the price level, and even though Government may fix a remunerative price for the farmer, that remunerative price must have a relation to the cost of living at present, which means the consumer will have to pay more for whatever the Government does. Government should try to see that the credit agencies which are at work now do not impose a burden on the cultivator. Though the Reserve Bank gives credit to the Co-operative Banks at concessional rates of interest, at the cultivator's end the loan is available only at 9 per cent interest. Unless Government sees to it that in the course of the loan being transmitted from the Reserve Bank through the Co-operative Banks to the cultivator the loan does not bear a high rate of interest, the cultivator will not get any relief. It shows that the problems have got to be tackled from all angles.

I would make another appeal. The Prime Minister's advice to the Planning Commission that those projects

which are contemplated by the Planning Commission but have not gone into production should be postponed, should be implemented. I was surprised the other day when the Finance Minister made a statement in this House that the Planning Commission is not going to postpone any projects. We have got to cut our coat according to the cloth available, and unfortunately the situation today is that unless there is a major shift to agriculture in the Fourth Plan, in spite of all that the doctrinaire socialists may say on this side or that, it is not possible for us to retrieve the very alarming situation of food shortage and scarcity with which this country is going to be faced for the next few years.

SHRI P. CHETIA (Assam): Sir, I rise to say a few words on the motion regarding the food situation. Sir, the other day in this House the Minister was good enough to announce some important measures which are under contemplation by the Government for tackling the present situation in the country effectively as far as possible.

5. P.M.

Before coming to discuss any point as referred to by the Food Minister, I would like to deal with one fundamental aspect of the problem. It is said that the present food situation in the country is due to such causes as the hoarding of foodgrains by the traders as well as by the farmers, together with the cause of the circulation of unaccounted money or, in other words, black money in the market. While admitting that these factors have undoubtedly contributed, to a considerable extent, to the rise in foodgrain prices, these are not the only causes. In this respect, I am constrained to say that there is another important factor which has also contributed to the rise in the price of foodstuffs—that is the inflation. This is a factor which is quite logical or natural in a developing economy as ours.

1943 Motion regarding [ RAJYA  
SABHA ]

[Shri P. Chetia]

In regard to the expenditure incurred in respect of the execution of the various projects as formulated in the Plan, we have found that the figure is about Rs. 6,000 crores or so. This circulation of money has increased the purchasing power of the people to a very considerable extent. But on the other hand, various factors, such as natural calamities, chief among them being floods, have affected the production of foodgrains and so there is an increase in the price level. So long as there is more circulation of money in the market and so long as there is an increase in the purchasing power of the people in our developing economy, there is bound to be a rise in the trend of price level which is reflected not only in foodgrains but also in other commodities.

Sir, to arrest the high prices of foodgrains, the primary and essential factors must be taken into consideration. These factors are: increased production, an equitable distribution and stabilisation of the price level. We are glad to note that the Government has formulated an integrated policy in this regard as announced by the Minister the other day. There is another important aspect which I would like to point out. It is my apprehension that in some States, especially in Assam, Bengal, Bihar and U.P., where jute is grown, many farmers have converted their food crop land into jute cultivation on account of the high prices of jute obtaining at present. This must have also contributed to the shortfall in food production which was reflected in the overall food situation in the country as a whole.

Sir, Government should make a thorough enquiry and cause a survey to be made into this matter and find out the actual position and if it is revealed that more lands have been converted by farmers into jute cultivation, then there must be a ceiling fixed on jute cultivation. However, I do not minimise the importance of

SABHA ] Food Situation 1944  
Food Situation 1944

jute production in the country since this is a principal item of our foreign exchange earnings.

There is another aspect of the problem, an important aspect, that is, we must launch a vigorous campaign in the country for the production of more foodgrains, as we did in the past. When there was an acute food shortage in the country just after our independence, at that time we launched a vigorous campaign of 'grow more food', with the result that we could tide over the difficulties. With the same intensity and in the same way, we must at present launch such a campaign for growing more food so that the country can tide over the present difficulties.

Coming to the present mode of agricultural operations, admittedly our policy should be to take full advantage of modern technology and science in our agricultural economy to increase food production. But it does not envisage that we should resort to mechanised cultivation on a big scale which is, for obvious reasons, an anathema to our agricultural economy and hence unsuitable for our country, because for centuries our agricultural economy is rooted in the principle of peasant proprietorship, while at present 'land to the tiller of the soil' is our aim. Hence, to give more incentive to the farmers and the peasant proprietors and advance the food production, the various land reform laws which have been passed by all the States should be implemented without further delay. Then again, ways and means should be devised to improve the age-old agricultural implements used by the farmers along with the use of other devices, such as the large-scale use of chemical fertilisers, improved variety of seeds, intensive cultivation, etc. so that the farmers are brought into the periphery of modern technology.

Over and above these measures, the crop competition scheme which is now in operation and practically con-

fined to the group of big and well-to-do farmers should be extended to the weaker sections of the farmers so that they may be also enthused to grow better crops with better yields.

There is another vital problem which arises in the context of the Increased food production in the country. That is the flood control schemes. Although this subject does not fall under the purview of the Food and Agriculture Ministry, this is a correlated subject with food production in the country and hence Should be viewed and treated as a long-term programme of the Government. Our agricultural production, and specially the foodgrains production, more or less depends on the Tagaries of nature. Among them flood happens to be the most important and conspicuous by its constant and perennial visits is a result, there is a colossal loss of foodgrains in the country every year. It would be desirable on the part of the Government to formulate an integrated scheme of flood control.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Thank you. Your time is up. Mr. U. S. Patil. Please take ten minutes.

श्री उद्धवराव साहबराव पाटील (महाराष्ट्र) : आज वजीरे जरायत से एक करार पेश हुआ है कि इस मुल्क में खाद्यान्न की परिस्थिति पर चर्चा की जाय और यह भी उन्होंने कहा कि इस अन्न के प्रश्न पर पोलिटिक्स, सियासत, को न लाया जाय । हुकूमत या कोई पार्टी मुल्क के जो मसायल या प्राबलम्स होते हैं उन को हल करने के लिए सियासत का जरिया ही इस्तेमाल करती है । यह अन्न की परिस्थिति को मुल्क पैदा हुई है यह कोई आसमानी चीज नहीं है, यह हुकूमत ने चौदह साल से जो धारणा रखी है उसी का नतीजा है, उन की पालिसी का ही यह नतीजा है कि हम इस संकट में

आज आ चुके हैं । इस प्राबलम पर मुख्तलिफ़ कान्स से अपनी अपनी रायें रखो गईं, लेकिन मैं हुकूमत से यह कहूंगा कि पहले वे अपने किसान की होल्डिंग, किसान की माशी हालत और उसकी पैदा करने की कुव्वत को समझ लें । हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनी तकरीर में किसानों को जो सहुलियत देने का वायदा किया है कि बैंक से रूपया दिलाया जायेगा । सिचाई के लिए सुविधा दी जायगी । लेकिन आज हालत यह है कि ५ एकड़ से कम होल्डिंग रखने वाले किसानों की तादाद ५० फीसदी है और ३० से कम एकड़ होल्डिंग रखने वाले किसानों की तादाद ७० फीसदी है और ये ही ७० फीसदी किसान आज अनाज पैदा करते हैं । इस मुल्क में जो दौलतमन्द किसान है वह ज्वार और गेहूं पैदा करने में कोई इन्टरेस्ट नहीं लेता है । वह तो कैश क्राप पैदा करना चाहता है । मिसाल के तौर पर वह अंगूर, गन्ना और केले की पैदावार करना ज्यादा अच्छा समझता है जिस में उनको फी एकड़ जमीन पर दो हजार से ले कर १० हजार रुपये तक आमदनी हो जाती है ।

देश के स्वतन्त्र होने के बाद से आजतक जो किसान मुल्क को अनाज देते आया है वह गरीब ही किसान है जिसके पास मैन्यूअरिंग के लिए, बीज के लिए, खाद के लिए, बैलों के लिए और दूसरी दीगर जरूरतों के लिए पैसा नहीं होता है और यही कारण है कि आज मुल्क में ज्यादा अनाज पैदा नहीं होता है। इस किसान की हालत आज ऐसी है कि वह अपने खेत से अपने ही अखराजात के लिए पैदा नहीं कर सकता है । जो भी वह पैदा करता है वह सब सरकार के टैक्स तथा साहूकारों के कर्ज में अदा कर देता है या दीगर कर्ज के लिए अपने अनाज को बाजार में बेच देता है । इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि मौसम के आने से दो महीने के बाद उसके पास खाने के लिए अनाज नहीं रह जाता है और वह साहूकार से अनाज इस भाँति पर

[श्री उद्धवराव साहेबराव पाटिल]

मेता है कि जिससे उसको एक क्विन्टल की जगह ६ महीने के बाद २ क्विन्टल देना पड़ता है। इतना ज्यादा प्राफिट और इन्टरेस्ट किसी और दूसरे पेशे में नहीं देना पड़ता है। आज इस मुल्क में ऐसे ही किसानों के ऊपर देश को अनाज देने की जिम्मेदारी है। आज इस तरह के किसानों के पास खेती करने के लिए पैसा नहीं है और जो दौलतमन्द किसान हैं वे कैशक्राप के सिवाय और कोई चीज पैदा नहीं करते हैं क्योंकि अनाज पैदा करने में उन्हें ज्यादा पैसा नहीं मिलता है।

नियोजन के इन १४ सालों में गरीब किसान को किसी प्रकार की इमदाद नहीं दी गई है क्योंकि उसके पास कर्ज में रहन रखने के लिये जायदाद नहीं है। महाराष्ट्र में मैंने देखा है कि अगर एक कुआँ खोदना होता तो बैंक से दो हजार से चार हजार रुपया तक कर्ज मिलता है और इस कर्ज के लिए कम से कम उस किसान के पास १५ एकड़ जमीन होनी चाहिए। १५ एकड़ से कम जिस किसान के पास जमीन होती है उसको कुआँ खोदने के लिए और दीगर कामों के लिए हुकूमत से इमदाद नहीं मिलती है।

प्लानिंग के १४ सालों में किसानों की जितनी जरूरियात जिन्दगी की चीजें हैं वो उसे खरीदनी पड़ती हैं व सब महंगी हो गई हैं। कपड़ा, सीमेंट, और तेल वगैरह इन सब चीजों के दाम बढ़ गये हैं और इन सब चीजों को रयूमिनरेटिव प्राइस देते बन्त खयाल रखा जाय। इस मुल्क के जो गरीब किसान हैं वे ज्यादा अनाज पैदा करने के लिए ज्यादा इन्वेस्टमेंट नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिए यह जाहिर है कि पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिए उनकी ज्यादा से ज्यादा इमदाद की जाय। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे भी ज्यादा पैदावार नहीं होगी क्योंकि उसकी होलिडिंग कम है। हमारे स्वतन्त्र पार्टी वाले का यह खयाल है कि उनका कहना है है कि जिस तरह से अमरीका में बड़े बड़े

फार्म्स हैं वैसे ही फार्म यहां पर बना दिये जाने चाहियें और इन गरीब किसानों से कहा जाय कि तुम कारखानों में मजदूर हो जाओ। लेकिन इससे किसानों में रिवोल्यूशन हो जायेगा क्योंकि उन्होंने जमीन कमाने के लिये काफी जद्दोजहद की है और उन्हीं की जद्दोजहद की वजह से मुल्क में थोड़े से लैन्ड रिफार्मस के कानून बने हैं। मेरा यह सुझाव है कि अनाज या खेती में उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए हम छोटे छोटे किसानों की को-ऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग कर दें। गो, नागपुर में कांग्रेस ने इसके बारे में एक प्रस्ताव भी पास किया था लेकिन उसको अमल में लाने के लिए बड़े बड़े उद्योगपति, बड़े बड़े जमींदार और वेस्टेड इन्टरेस्ट वाले आड़ में आ रहे हैं। सरकार ने अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए इन १५ सालों में कोई खास कोशिश नहीं की और जो किसान अनाज पैदा करता है उस पर इस बीच काफी कर्जा हो गया है, जिन्दगी के अखराजात बढ़ गये हैं और व्यापारी ने भी उसका खूब एक्सप्लायटेशन किया। हुकूमत के भी अप्रत्यक्ष कर उसके ऊपर ६ गुना हो गये हैं। इसलिए मेरा यह कहना है कि इस मुल्क में वे छोटे छोटे किसान जो अपनी जरूरत के लिये भी पैदा नहीं कर सकते हैं उनको टैक्स में रिलीफ मिलना चाहिये ताकि वे अपनी खेती में ज्यादा पैसा लगा सकें।

प्लानिंग के इन १५ सालों में अनाज का उत्पादन किसी साल तो २५ फीसदी बढ़ जाता है और किसी साल १० ही फीसदी रह जाता है और उसमें मुसलसल एक सा सिलसिला नहीं रहता है। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि किसान को ज्यादा पैसा अनाज पैदा करने से नहीं मिलता है और वह कैश-क्राप पैदा करने की ज्यादा कोशिश करता है। अगर किसान को कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन और कास्ट आफ लिविंग के हिसाब से अपने अनाज की प्राइस मिल जाय तो वह भी ज्यादा अनाज पैदा करने की

कोशिश करेगा। इसका एक कारण और भी है और वह यह है कि खेती में इन्वेस्ट करने के लिए उसके हाथ में बैंकिंग कैपिटल नहीं रहती क्योंकि उस पर केन्द्रीय सरकार, राज्य सरकारों, लोकल बाडीज, पंचायत और जिला परिषदों के टैक्स का बोझ पड़ जाता है और वह बेचारा इन टैक्सों से बच नहीं सकता है और यही वजह है कि किसी भी किसान के पास ब्लैक मनी नहीं आता है और न इसका सवाल ही उठता है। मैं आपके सामने एक मिसाल देना चाहता हूँ। महाराष्ट्र राज्य में पंचायती कानून लागू है और किसानों पर लैन्ड रेवेन्यू और लोकल फंड १०० फीसदी बढ़ा दिये गये हैं लेकिन उनकी आमदनी १०० फीसदी नहीं बढ़ी है। मेरा कहना यह है कि किसानों के ऊपर जो भी टैक्स लगाया जाता है वह उनकी आमदनी के लिहाज से ही लगाया जाना चाहिये और छोटे किसानों को टैक्स से बरी रखा जाना चाहिये।

प्लानिंग के इन १४ सालों में सरकार ने इन्डस्ट्रीज को ही ज्यादा पैसा देने की कोशिश की है। मिसाल के तौर पर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर शूगरकेन पैदा करने वाले किसान अगर कोआपरेटिव बनाकर १० लाख रुपया जमा करें तो उन्हें मुश्तलिफ जराए से २ करोड़ तक रुपया ढुकूमत से मिल जाता है। लेकिन जो गरीब किसान है उसको खेती में तरमीम करने के लिए इस रेट से पैसा नहीं मिलता है। अगर खेती की पैदावार ज्यादा करनी है तो जिस फिरोकदिली से सरकार उद्योगपतियों को कर्जा देती है उसी तरह से इन गरीब किसानों को भी कर्जा मिलना चाहिये।

वजीर साहब ने हमें जो पुस्तक दी है जिसमें उन्होंने प्रोडक्शन इन्डेक्स, प्राइस इन्डेक्स और मार्केट अराइवल के जो आंकड़े दिये हैं। उसी प्रोडक्शन इन्डेक्स और मार्केट अराइवल का कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। यह कोई जरूरी नहीं है

कि अगर प्रोडक्शन इन्डेक्स बढ़ जाय तो ज्यादा मार्केट अराइवल हो और अगर प्रोडक्शन इन्डेक्स गिर जाय तो मार्केट अराइवल कम हो जाय। ऐसा कोई सिद्धान्त इन आंकड़ों से नहीं निकाला जा सकता है क्योंकि इस मुल्क में १० फीसदी किसान ऐसे हैं जो मार्केटबिल सरप्लस के लिए फसल पैदा नहीं करते हैं। वे अपनी जरूरियाँ जिन्दगी के लिए जितनी जरूरत होती है उससे भी कम पैदा करते हैं। वे अपनी जरूरियाँ जिन्दगी के लिए न रखते हुए पूरी की पूरी खेती की फसल को बाजार में बेच देते हैं और मैं इसको मार्केटबिल सरप्लस नहीं समझता हूँ। जब वह अपनी पैदावार बाजार में लाता है तब कीमत गिर जाती है और जब यह माल बड़े व्यापारियों के हाथ में जाता है तो १॥ गुना और दुगुनी कीमत बढ़ जाती है जिसका फायदा सिर्फ मुट्ठी भर बड़े व्यापारियों को ही मिलता है। ये व्यापारी होर्डिंग करके इस मुल्क के लोगों का खून चूसते हैं लेकिन ढुकूमत इन होर्डिंग से अनाज निकालने में नाकामयाब हुई है और ढुकूमत ने अनाज के स्टॉक को बाजार में लाने के लिये कोई कदम नहीं उठाये हैं। वजीर साहब ने अपनी पुस्तक में साफ कहा है कि होर्डिंग या व्यापारियों से गल्ला नहीं निकाल सकते तथा जनता को सरकार ने सलाह दी है कि नई फसल आने तक भूखे रहें। उद्योगपतियों के कारखानों का जो माल बिकता है, मिसाल के तौर पर कपड़ा है, सोमेन्ट है, तेल है, और दीगर चीजें हैं, उनकी कीमत वे तय करते हैं और जो कच्चा माल इन कारखानों को जाता है, जैसे काटन है, मूंगफली है उसकी भी कीमत यही तय करते हैं किसान जो कच्चा माल पैदा करता है वह अपने माल की कीमत कभी भी तय नहीं कर पाता है। इस तरह से आज हमारे मुल्क में समाज की रचना है और यही वजह है कि उद्योगपति हर वक्त अपने कारखानों की चीजों के दाम बढ़ाने के लिए ढुकूमत पर दबाव डालते रहते हैं लेकिन जो रा मॅटिरियल है वह उनको

[श्री उद्धवगव साहेबराव पाटिल]

सस्ता मिलता है, उस हिसाब से एक भी नया पैसा अपने माल के दाम में कम करने के लिए वे तैयार नहीं होते हैं।

देश के स्वतंत्र होने के बाद इस मुल्क की इकोनोमी पर बड़े बड़े उद्योगपतियों व व्यापारियों की पकड़ ज्यादा बढ़ गई है और वे हुकूमत को डिक्टेट करने की पोजीशन पर आ गये हैं। वे इतने ताकतवर हो गये हैं कि अपनी मर्जी के माफिक पालिसियों को चलाने के लिए सरकार को मजबूर करते हैं। अग्राम की जद्दोजहद को भी ये व्यापारी मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। मिसाल के तौर पर महाराष्ट्र सरकार ने दो हुकम निकाले एक था दाल और चावल पर कि व्यापारियों को इन पर एक फीसदी से १।१ फीसदी तक मुनाफा लेना चाहिए ऐसी पाबन्दी डाली गयी थी। लेकिन इस हुकम की महाराष्ट्र के व्यापारियों ने मुखालिफत की और एक दिन सारे महाराष्ट्र में हड़ताल करा दी और हुकूमत को हुकम वापस लेने के लिए मजबूर किया। जब हम अनाज मांगने के लिए प्रदर्शन करते हैं तो कांग्रेस वाले उसे पसन्द नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन महाराष्ट्र में जिन व्यापारियों ने एक दिन पूरी हड़ताल कराई उससे क्या मुल्क को नुकसान नहीं हुआ? और इस बात को हमारे कांग्रेस वाले मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं होते हैं क्योंकि वे उनके दोस्त हैं और ये व्यापारी खदर पहन कर देशभक्त के लिबास में आते हैं। हमारे कांग्रेसी मित्रों का इस तरह के लोगों से प्रेम है और यही वजह है कि हुकूमत भी व्यापारियों के लिए साफ्ट कारनर रखती है।

दूसरा हुकम यह था कि जो व्यापारी अनाज का व्यापार करता है वह अपने स्टॉक की इतिला हुकूमत को दे लेकिन दो दिन पहले मैंने अखबार में पढ़ा था कि डी० आई० आर० के मातहत जितने फार्म देने पड़ते हैं वे उनकी तामील नहीं करेंगे। यह व्यापारियों की हुकूमत को चैलेंज है। ये व्यापारी और

उद्योगपति लोगों की जद्दोजहद से नहीं दबे और हुकूमत से भी नहीं दबते हैं तो एक दिन इस देश में ऐसा आयेगा कि उद्योगपति ही इस हुकूमत को खा जायेंगे और उसका खात्मा बना देंगे। इसलिए एक तरफ यह जो चीज है कि जो व्यापारी हैं उनकी इस तरह से अनारकी है और जो प्रोडक्शन करने वाले किसान हैं उनकी माली हालत खराब है। दूसरी तरफ यहां उद्योगपतियों और व्यापारियों की ओर कूबत बढ़ी है उनको डिक्टेट करने की ओर और हुकूमत के लिये यह ताकत बढ़ती जा रही है और बीच में जो ७० फीसदी या ८० फीसदी खाने वाले हैं उनके हाल को पूछिये नहीं। इसलिये १५ साल से कोई नई चीज उसमें नहीं है।

जो निवेदन किया है मिनिस्टर ने स्टेट ट्रैडिंग या रेग्युलेटिव प्राइसेज का बैसा १९५१ से आज तक बराबर हर यहां का इकोनामिस्ट कहता आया है और प्लानिंग कमिशन ने भी उसको मान लिया था और नेशनल डेवलपमेंट काउंसिल ने भी मान लिया था। हुकूमत का भी कोई आदमी यह नहीं कहता था कि ऐसा होना आवश्यक है, लेकिन ऐसा क्यों नहीं किया गया आज तक। यह जो हमारे मुल्क में ऐसी हालत पैदा है कि ६० फीसदी आज के अग्राम को खाने को नहीं मिलता है, चाहे हुकूमत अमेरिका से मंगाये, चाहे कहीं से मंगाये, आदमी भूख से मरेगा या डायरिया से मरेगा यह दूसरी बात है, लेकिन ६० फीसदी लोग आज अनाज खुद का नहीं खाते, किसी न किसी जॉरिये से उनको लेना पड़ेगा। आज हुकूमत अपनी इस जिम्मेदारी को लेने के लिये तैयार नहीं है और वह खामोश है।

हॉडिंग कहां हुई है, इसके लिये कोई जांच करने की जरूरत नहीं। जहां हॉडिंग हुई है, वहां से निकालने के लिये बोले कि बहुत तादाद है। बहुत तादाद है तो क्या किया हुकूमत ने? मैं इतना कहता हूं कि

हमारे लोगों को मालूम है कि अनाज किस दूकान में है, किस किसान के पास है। चलिए आप इतना भाव कीजिये कि जिस मकान या जिस दूकान पर हम अनाज के लिये जायेंगे, वहां आप ला ऐंड आर्डर के लिये अपनी पुलिस बड़े व्यापारियों के प्रोटेक्शन को नहीं देंगे। हम पैसा दे के लेंगे, लूट के नहीं लेंगे। लेकिन ऐसी बात करते वक्त आप बोलेंगे ला ऐंड आर्डर, पुलिस, प्रोटेक्शन, होर्ड्स के लिये प्रोटेक्शन देंगे। दुर्भाग्य को जब मालूम नहीं होता है कि कहां अनाज है और दुर्भाग्य में हिम्मत भी नहीं है कि वह उसका अनाज निकाले, तो मैं यह कहता हूँ कि हम ही दो जिलों में यह ट्रायल कर लेते हैं। सिर्फ आप इतना ही कीजिये कि ला ऐंड आर्डर के बहाने से आप हमारा सिर फोड़ने के लिये न आइये। हम पैसा दे के लेंगे और लूट के नहीं लेंगे। लेकिन यह चीज नाजिबा है आज दुर्भाग्य जनता में कॉन्फिडेंस पैदा करने की कूबत नहीं रखती। लोक सभा में मिनिस्टर की तकरीर होती है सरप्लस स्टोक्स में भी दाम बढ़ गये हैं। दुर्भाग्य की हर धारणा को नाकाम करने का व्यापारियों ने निश्चय किया है। व्यापारियों ने कहा कि हम तुम्हारा कोई हुक्म मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। डी०आई० आर० का भी कोई असर नहीं हुआ। लोक सभा में मिनिस्टर स्टेटमेंट करते हैं, लेकिन कीमतों पर उसका उलटा असर हो गया है। क्या आपकी यही धारणा है या आपकी पालिसी का यही असर है। अगर आज दुर्भाग्य ठीक कदम नहीं उठाती है तो उसका नतीजा यही नहीं होगा कि व्यापारी लोगों का खून चूँते रहेंगे बल्कि दुर्भाग्य के लिए भी यह धोखा होगा। आज यह दुर्भाग्य अपने को उनका दोस्त मानती है। दुर्भाग्य उनको प्रोटेक्शन देना चाहती है क्योंकि वह उनका दस्त है, उनके साथ है। दुर्भाग्य के लोग सिर्फ बोट के लिए अबाम के पास जाते हैं, लेकिन आज इकोनामिक पालिसी पर वे डिक्लेट किये जाते हैं उद्योगपतियों से।

लिहाजा मेरा यह कहना है कि जल्दी

जल्दी होई। जहां कहीं हैं उन में देखिये कैसा ऐंसी रिक्शनरी रेवोल्यूशन होता है, उसका तजुर्बा भी कर लें हम। १५ दिन में स्टॉक बाहर लाने की प्राइम मिनिस्टर की अपील पर भी कोई खास गल्ला बाहर नहीं आया है। जरा हुम्मत यह तो कहे कि कोई और तरीके से निकालने का सोच-विचार करती है।

दूसरी चीज रेस्पुनरेटिव प्राइसेज की है। वह तफवील की बात है और उसके लिए १५ साल से मांग करते आये हैं, उसके लिये जन आन्दोलन हमने किया है। उसका कास्ट आफ लिविंग और कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन हमें गजरअन्दाज नहीं करना चाहिये, नहीं तो इंडस्ट्रीज के सामान की प्राइसेज बढ़ जाती हैं और किसान अगर रा मंडीरियल कम प्राइसेज पर बेवेगा तो उसको नुकसान होगा। खेती की पैदावार और औद्योगिक उत्पादन इन दोनों की कीमतों में एक सम्बन्ध जोड़ना बहुत आवश्यक है।

तीसरी चीज यह है कि सिर्फ फूड ग्रेन्स की, पूरे एग्रोकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन की स्टेट ट्रेडिंग आप न करें, इंडस्ट्रियल गुड्स की सप्लाइ पोलेण्ड्री के लिये एक माफिक होनी चाहिये और इसी तरह रा मंडीरियल की सप्लाइ एक माफिक होनी चाहिये। पूरे एग्रोकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन की आप स्टेट ट्रेडिंग करिये, लेकिन रेस्पुनरेटिव प्राइसेज दिये बगैर यह मसला हल नहीं होगा। थैंक यू।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): There are two speakers now who are leaving Delhi. One is Mr. P. S. Patil and the other is Mr. Chengalvaroyan. I hope the House will kindly accommodate them. Ten minutes each. Mr. Patil.

श्री पटेलनाथ सीतारामजी पटील (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन के सामने खाद्य मंत्री महोदय ने जो अनाज की परिस्थिति के बारे में प्रस्ताव



[श्री पंडरीनाथ सीताराम जी पाटिल]

रखा है, उसके ऊपर मैं अपने कुछ विचार आपके जरिये सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। आज अपने देश में अनाज की बड़ी नाजुक परिस्थिति है। देश के कोने कोने से अनाज की मांग हो रही है और यह परिस्थिति बड़ी भयावह जैसी मालूम होती है। कुछ जगहों पर तो छोटे पैमाने पर बलबे या लूट-मार के भी होने की खबरें समाचारपत्रों में कभी कभी पढ़ने को मिलती हैं। इससे आगे जो एक बड़ा संकट हमारे देश में आना संभव है, उसकी यह पूर्व सूचना हो सकती है।

दरअसल देखा जाय तो हमारे देश में अनाज की जो कमी है वह कोई आज नई बात नहीं है। पिछले कई सालों से यह अनाज की कमी महसूस हो रही है। ऐसा होते हुए भी इसी साल इसका इतना शोर क्यों हो रहा है। मुझे याद है कि कुछ महीने पहले हमारे केन्द्र के माननीय कृषि मंत्री महोदय ने एक भाषण में कहा था कि देश में इस साल की फसल अच्छी आई है। ऐसी सूरत में आज फिर वह अनाज कटा गया? और हर साल के जो अनेक फिगर्स या आंकड़े हमारे पास हैं, उससे भी पता चलता है कि हर साल के अनुसार इस साल भी हमारे देश में गल्ला उतना ही पैदा हुआ है, कम नहीं। जितना हर साल कम पैदा होता है, उतना ही इस साल हमारे यहाँ शार्टेज है। उसकी पूर्ति के लिये उतना ही अनाज इस साल भी शासन ने निदेशों से मंगाया है। ऐसी अगर परिस्थिति है तो फिर यह जो आज चिल्लाहट हो रही है, उसकी वजह क्या है? मैं ऐसा समझता हूँ कि इसकी वजह यह है कि यह सारा अनाज छिपा हुआ है। गत मौसम में किसान जब अपने खेतों की फसल काट कर घर में लाये और बाजार में अपना गल्ला ले गये व्यापारियों ने वह खरीद लिया, तब तक तो कीमतें बढ़ी नहीं, तब तक अनाज की कीमतें साधारण स्तर पर थीं। पिछले

अप्रैल के बाद जब किसान के घर की सारी फसल और सब अनाज व्यापारियों के घर में चला गया, तब से ये कीमतें और दाम बढ़ने शुरू हो गये और जब सरकार ने दाम बढ़ाने के ऊपर रुकावट डालने का फैसला किया तब तो यह अनाज गायब ही हो गया यानी भूमिगत हो गया, छिप गया। इस लिये यह बड़ी चिल्लाहट आज अनाज के लिये हो रही है। दरअसल यह अकाल नहीं है यह कृत्रिम अकाल है। मुनाफाखोरों और जमाखोरों ने इसे पैदा किया हुआ है। इसलिये हमारी सरकार को कठोरता के साथ इसका मुकाबला करना चाहिये। व्यापारियों और मुनाफाखोरों के भंडारों में जो अनाज छिपा हुआ है, उसको हर सूरत से बाहर निकालना चाहिये और उसके ऊपर तुरन्त कब्जा करना चाहिये। इस तरह के जो अनाज भंडार छिपाये हुए हैं, उनकी सही खबर देने वाले लोगों को पाँच तोषिक भी सरकार की तरफ से मिलना चाहिये।

बैंकों में बहुत से व्यापारियों ने अपना अनाज मार्टगेज रखा हुआ है। उसकी भी खोज बैंकों वे जरिये करनी चाहिये। बैंकों के कागजों की जांच करके ऐसे भंडारों की तलाशी करनी चाहिये और पता लगाना चाहिये। और वह भंडार सरकार अपने कब्जे में ले कर बाजार में लाए। ऐसा करने से ही यह सवाल कुछ हल हो सकता है।

इसके साथ साथ अनाज का जो बंटवारा होता है उसमें भी कुछ दोष है। यह जो वितरण है यह व्यापारियों के हाथ में नहीं रहना चाहिये, अगर उनके हाथ में इसे रखा गया तो फिर वे घूसखोरी और काले बाजार का सहारा लेकर गरीबों के जेब का पैसा अपने जेब में लाने की कोशिश करेंगे। इसलिये अनाज का वितरण सहकारी संस्थाओं और ग्राम पंचायतों के जरिये किया जाना चाहिये।

इतने से ही काम नहीं होगा। हमारे देश में जो अनाज की कमी है उसको हमें



के लिये दूर करने का कोई ऐसा तरीका निकालना चाहिये, ऐसा मार्ग ढूँढना चाहिए जिससे कि हमारे देश में ज्यादा अनाज पैदा हो सके और यह जो अनाज की कमी है इसको हम पूरा कर सकें। आज हम बाहर के देशों से, अमेरिका, आस्ट्रेलिया और दुनिया भर से अनाज मांगते हैं लेते हैं और तब अपने देश के लोगों को खिलाते हैं। इससे हमारे देश का काम नहीं चलेगा। आजादी मिलने के बाद हम आशा करते थे कि भारत में सब लोगों को पेट भर अनाज मिलेगा लेकिन वह बात तो हमें दिखाई नहीं देती। यह कैसी स्वाधीनता हमारे देश की है? हम तो आज भी पराधीन हैं, दूसरे देशों के अनाज के बिना हम अपना जीवन नहीं बिता सकते, यह हमारे देश के लिये बड़ी लज्जा और शर्म की बात है। जब चीन ने हमारे देश के ऊपर फौजी आक्रमण किया था उस वक्त शासन द्वारा संकट-काल घोषित किया गया था उसी तरह आज देश में अनाज की कमी है इसलिए भी शासन को संकट काल घोषित करना चाहिए और अगले पांच सालों तक एक बड़ा आन्दोलन खड़ा करके इसका पूरा मुकाबला करना चाहिये। सरकार की सारी मंत्रणा इसमें लगनी चाहिये और सरकार की सारी साधन सामग्री सारा पैसा और लोगों की सारी शक्ति अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़ाने में खर्च करनी चाहिये। देश में इसका रात-दिन एक भारी आन्दोलन होना चाहिये तभी इसमें कामयाबी हो सकती है।

इसके साथ एक बात और मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि आज अनाज की उपज की तरफ किसान का पूरा ध्यान नहीं है क्योंकि उसको अनाज का इतना कम दाम मिलता है कि उसमें वह न घर बना सकता है, न अच्छे कपड़े पहन सकता है, न बच्चों की शिक्षा का प्रबन्ध कर सकता है, न दवा-दारू कर सकता है, यहां तक कि खेती के लिये बैल, खाद आदि भी नहीं ले सकता और न कोई दूसरी अच्छी जीवोपयोगी चीज़ खरीद सकता

है। जब उसका इतना कम कामत मिलता है तो इसकी तरफ हमारी सरकार को गौर करना चाहिये, ध्यान देना चाहिये। जिस बुनियाद, जिस प्रमाण के आधार पर कृषेतर दूसरी वस्तुओं की कीमतें बढ़ी हैं उसी बुनियादी प्रमाण पर अगर अनाज की कीमत सरकार मुकर्रर करे तब ही किसान अनाज को बोलने में दिलचस्पी लेगा नहीं तो दिन ब दिन हमारे देश में अनाज की पैदावार घटती रहेगी और जो मनी-क्राफ है, पैसा देने वाली फसल है उसकी तरफ किसान आकर्षित होता रहेगा। यह एक भारी संकट है जिसकी तरफ सरकार को अविलम्ब ध्यान देना चाहिये। आवश्यक वस्तुओं की तथा किसान द्वारा पैदा की हुई वस्तुओं की कीमतों में संतुलन रहे और किसान को उससे कुछ मुनाफा मिले इस आधार पर कृषि उत्पादित वस्तुओं की कीमतें मुकर्रर होनी चाहिये।

आखीर में, मैं आपसे यही कहूंगा कि जैसी योजना मैंने बताई है वैसी ही अमल में जल्दी से जल्दी सरकार लाए तो उससे किसान का भी भला होगा, हमारे देश में पूरा अनाज भी मिलेगा, जो हम अनाज के लिये दूसरे देशों की तरफ देखते हैं और उसके ऊपर करोड़ों रुपया हमारा व्यय होता है वह बच जायगा और हमारे देश का भी उत्कर्ष होगा। इतना कह कर मैं अपनी जगह लेता हूँ।

SHRI T. CHENGALVAROYAN (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I owe an apology to you and to this House for intervening at this late hour, but I shall be very brief indeed in my submissions on the very important questions of the discussion on the food situation. I am indeed very grateful to the several sections of this House for having not imported any political slogan or party shibboleths into the assessment of the very alarming situation that has arisen on the food front. Nevertheless, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are indeed very gratified to know that the hon. Food Minister has come to titanic grips

LShrj T. Chengalvaroyan.j with the special problems of the food situation.-Coming as he does from the Steel and Iron Ministry, he possesses a steel frame and an iron will to tackle the problems arising out of the food situation. He has been very modest in the very important survey of the food situation that he has made, but he has really pointed out to us that in the consideration of the food situation it is not thr politics of food but it is the economics of fosd that we have to consider, and in that light the hon. Food Minister has taught us the very important question that the whole examination of the food situation has to be on a comprehensive basis.

It is not a question, Mr. Vice-Chairman, as to who is at fault; the question for our consideration, the question for our examination is, where is the fault, what is the fault and how has that fault come about.

If in this examination of the food situation, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we could find the answers to these questions, I am sure we would solve the problem of the food situation. Now there are two important considerations that certainly overwhelm our thoughts; one is with reference to production, whether there has really been a miserable fall in the production output. Some hon. Members were pleased to point out that the production was miserably low. I should submit with very great respect, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that during the period of the plan endeavour, both in the first, second and third year, our production output has always been on the increase though the marginal output was not very comfortable, but at the same time, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the whole difficulty arises not because of want of production up to the optimum level, but because of the system, or the pattern of the distribution that we are in today.

In fact, in the whole food situation, Mr. Vice-Chairman, distribution is the diabolic aspect, and that we have

to tackle, and the bon. Food Minister has taken great pains in trying to put his finger very sternly on this aspect of the food situation when he envisaged instituting the Foodgrains Trading Corporation. I may only say this with regard to this Foodgrains Trading Corporation, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that it is going to step into the market not as an alternative to, but, in a large measure, as a substitute for the present entire distributive system, and I am sure this House will have an opportunity to know the constitution, the powers, the functions, the duties, the scope and the ambit of this Foodgrains Trading Corporation that is going to be ins.ituted.

I will only touch one more point with which I will close, and that is with reference to the economics of the price of foodgrains. There are important considerations there; the effort is to stabilise food prices both with reference to the cost of production of the farmer, and the fair price chargeable to the consumer. The history of the world has shown, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the resolute difficulty in the stabilisation between the cost of production and a remunerative,^ incentive price to the farmer, and a fair and reasonable price to the consumer. In fact, it cannot at all be said that one has to be sacrificed at the altar of the other. Both of these factors are of great social and economic importance, and the great trouble which any Ministry of Food will have to undetarke is to reconcile between these two extremes.

May I submit for the very earnest consideration of the Food Ministry what had been done in a very similar critical situation in the United States of America? When the late lamented President Roosevelt was in charge of the New Deal Programme in America there was assuming a tremendous crisis on the food front. Farmers were very much agitated at the falling prices; the consumers were

equally agitated over the rise in prices according to the economic standard at that time, and it was the Food Secretary, I remember, Mr. Vice-Chairman, one Mr. Brannan, who brought forth a very bold Plan<sup>ari</sup> by which he reconciled both the demand of the farmer for a remunerative, incentive price, and of the consumer for a fair and reasonable price. The plan evolved was called the Brannan Plan, which meant that Government issued what was called price coupons to the farmers in *asaec* to enable them to make up the deficiency in the production cost and the price that would be available at the consumer's end so that these price coupons could be cashed by the farmers for the purchase of any other commodity. This will enable a kind of a balance between the production spot and the consumer's end through any kind of distributive channels, thereby ensuring a remunerative incentive to the farmer and a fair and reasonable price to the consumer.

In fact, these marginal adjustments, this kind of a reconciliation between the two ends of the food scheme, I may submit, merit serious considera-

tion at the hands of the Food Minister, I have not the necessary time and I am sure, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you will forgive me if I am not able now to further explain the Brannan scheme. I only submit to the hon. Food Minister that he may consider this suggestion. I can only conclude with the words of the poet—

"Though the mills of God grind slowly, Yet they grind exceedingly small.

"Though with patience we be waiting, Yet with exactness grindeth for all."

I am sure the hon. Food Minister will do that and with this hope and faith I most heartily endorse the statements of the hon. Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI  
AKBAR KHAN): The House stands adjourned til] 11  
A.M. tomorrow

The House then adjourned at forty minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 18th September, 1964.