

MOTION RE FOOD SITUATION —continued

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, the Food Minister referred with great regret yesterday to the various factors that had retarded the execution of the plan proposed by the Planning Commission in the second Five Year Plan and he told us what steps he proposes to take in order to increase food production in the near future and to deal immediately with the situation that had arisen. His account of the situation was straightforward and the measures that he proposes to take to deal with the present situation also seem to be sound but I am frankly, Sir, somewhat sceptical of the success of this plan. There has never been any doubt in any quarter with regard to the importance of the food problem and the urgency of increasing food production. There have been conferences between the Planning Commission and the Food Minister and conferences between the Central Government and the Food Ministers of the States and yet, the result of all these efforts and conferences is practically nil. The Food Minister yesterday referred to a number of factors affecting the production of food but there is one important matter in this connection to which I wish to draw the attention of the Government. Sir, taking food production as a whole, that is, taking both cereals and pulses, the acreage under food crops was about 245 million acres in 1949-50 and the production was about 54 million tons. This meant that about $4\frac{1}{2}$ acres yielded a ton. Now, in the year 1956-57 which was admittedly a good year, the area under food crops, including pulses was about 275 acres and the production was about 68 million tons. This meant that about 4 acres yielded one ton. The yield per acre is, therefore, only slightly better than what it was in 1949-50. I do not think that anybody can regard this increase as in the least satisfactory. Now, take wheat. I will take rice and wheat separately. In 1949-50, the total acreage under food crops was

about 75 million and the production was about 24 million tons. This meant, roughly speaking, that about 3 acres yielded one ton of rice. In 1956-57, about 79 million acres yielded about 29 million tons of food. This means that slightly less than three acres in this particular year yielded one ton of rice. Here again, Sir, the result cannot be regarded as satisfactory.

Now take wheat. In 1949-50, the total area under wheat was about 24 million acres and the production was only a little over 6.3 million tons which meant, roughly speaking, that we could get one ton of wheat from about four acres.

Now let us take the year 1956-57. In that year there were about $33\frac{1}{2}$ million acres under wheat and the yield was about 9.3 million tons. Well, this again means that slightly less than four acres yielded one ton of wheat. Here again there is not much progress.

If you take pulses separately the result is far from satisfactory. The total area under pulses was about 49 million or, say, about 50 million acres in 1949-50 and the total yield was about 8 million tons. That means six acres yielded one ton of pulses. In 1957-58, the total area under pulses was 58 million acres and the yield was about $11\frac{1}{2}$ million tons, that is, about 5 acres yielded 1 ton of pulses. But this was in that particular year, Sir; I mean, if you take the current year in which the production has not been very good, naturally the comparison between 1949-50 and 1957-58 will not be to the advantage of the year 1957-58.

Now I mention these figures to show, Sir, that although we incurred a great deal of expenditure on agriculture during the First Five Year Plan and have spent appreciable sums during the first two years of the Second Five Year Plan, the average production per acre, broadly speaking, remains what it was nine or ten years ago.

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

In the First Five Year Plan, we spent about Rs. 181 crores on agriculture and during the first two years of the Second Five Year Plan we expected to spend about Rs. 60 crores on it; that is, the total expenditure in the seven years ending on the 31st March, 1958, amounted to about Rs. 240 crores. And yet we are as far off from **intensive farming** as we were when the First Five Year Plan commenced.

Now, Sir, there is one other point in connection with the production of food that I should like to place before the House. The Planning Commission, Sir, soon after its report was published, convened a conference of the State Food Ministers—I think that was towards the end of 1956. There was agreement between the Commission and the Food Ministers that the food production, which was to be increased by 10 million tons in the Second Five Year Plan, could be further increased by 5½ million tons, that is, the Food Ministers agreed that the total additional production of food during the Second Five Year Plan could be 15½ million tons instead of the 10 million tons asked for by the Planning Commission in its Second Five Year Plan. But shortly after that, when the Central Food and Agriculture Minister convened a conference of the Food and Agriculture Ministers of the various States, the States demanded Rs. 115 crores more to increase food production by another 10 per cent. Later on, Sir, the States told the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee, in contradiction to what they had said to the Planning Commission, that in the present state of things the total additional production would amount only to 60 per cent. of the present programme, that is, it was expected to amount to about 10 million tons only, which is the figure that was originally suggested by the Planning Commission.

Now, Sir, I cannot understand the position of the State Governments in this matter. If the Food Ministers of the States felt that without an addi-

tional substantial grant or aid from the Centre food production could not be increased any further, why did they not say so to the Planning Commission? Again, Sir, when the Food Ministers' Conference which was convened by the Central Food Minister asked for Rs. 115 crores more in order to increase the production by another 5½ million tons, what attention did the Planning Commission or the Government pay to their demands? So far as I remember, Sir, the Prime Minister said in this House that not a rupee more would be granted to the States for this purpose and that it was expected that without the least additional grant they would be able to fulfil the targets laid down by the Planning Commission.

Now it seems to me, Sir, that although the Food Ministers agreed to what the Planning Commission wanted, it must have been extraordinarily difficult for them to produce 5½ million tons more of foodgrains without additional aid from the Government of India. I do not say that the sum asked for by the States was a reasonable sum; they might have pitched their demands too high, but did the Central Government and the Planning Commission look into this matter and say that with additional funds to the tune of 50, 60, 70 crores of rupees the additional production could materialise? I have seen no papers, Sir, indicating that this demand was carefully considered, and I am not, therefore, surprised that the plan of making bricks without straw has on the whole failed.

Now, Sir, I come to the question of prices. The Planning Commission has pointed out in its Appraisal and Prospects of the Second Five Year Plan that there was a rise in prices of some 14 per cent. between April, 1956 and August, 1957. The Commission had in its Second Five Year Plan laid the greatest stress on the importance of not allowing prices to rise. Nevertheless, Sir, on account of the financial and monetary policies of the Government of India prices increased. I do

not think that the blame for it can fairly be laid on the Food Minister. The policy adopted in regard to deficit financing and so on was the policy of the entire Government. It was the business, therefore, of the Government as a whole which always recognised in theory that food production was the base of the Plan and, therefore, more important than what came to be called as the core of the Plan; yet, much less attention was paid than to the core. The general price index has, since August 1957 up to August 9, 1958, shown a further increase of about 4.9 per cent. That is, the index on 9th August, 1958 stood at 115.8. The Food Minister told us that a decline in prices had taken place in many places. Well, I suppose he meant that there had been a decline recently in wholesale prices but he did not tell us how far the retail prices had been affected thereby.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): He is not concerned with them.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Till the other day—I cannot say what the rate is today but I can say about a fortnight ago—both at Lucknow and at Agra wheat was selling at the rate of one seer and six chataks per rupee or nearly at Rs. 29 per maund. This, whatever fall there has been in prices recently, is due to the fact that the *kharif* crop is about to be harvested. We have seen such fall in prices on account of the near availability of additional food crops, on account of the prospects of the harvesting of a new crop, but this decline is not lasting. And I am not certain, Sir, that so long as things continue as they are doing at present, this decline in prices will continue for many months. As Nawab Ahmad Said Khan pointed out yesterday, as soon as the *kharif* crop is exhausted, prices will again rise and it is therefore this situation that has to be dealt with, for dealing which preparations must be done now.

Before I come to the measures proposed to be taken by the Food Minister, I should like to point out two

things. The Food Minister frankly admitted yesterday that the production of fertilisers on which to a large extent a substantial increase in the yield per acre will be possible was very small up to the present time. I have got, Sir, the exact figures with me and I find that in the year 1957, the quantity of fertilisers produced in this country in terms of Ammonium Sulphate amounted to about 3,80,000 tons. I understand, however, that this production will be rapidly increased in the next two or three years and that Government expect that by the end of the calendar year 1967 the production of nitrogenous fertilisers will amount to about two million tons. Now, surely if agriculture was the base of the whole Plan, if the availability of foodgrains and the keeping down of their prices were essential for the successful carrying out of the Plan, how is it that attention was not paid earlier to this very important question? We hear a great deal about arrangements made for the production of steel, of electrical goods and a number of other things. Could not a little money have been diverted from these things to the establishment of more fertiliser factories? The fact is that Government themselves cherish the hope that without incurring additional expenditure they could increase the production of foodgrains substantially. They have met with the disappointment that anybody except the members of the Government might have expected.

There is another point to which I wish to draw attention and that is the deficiency practically in every item that goes to the making up of the food programme. The Food Minister referred to several of these items yesterday. I do not want, therefore, to go into this matter in detail but there are two or three figures which will show to the House to what extent we have fallen short in our achievements as compared with the Plan targets. Sir, according to the Plan target in respect of major irrigation, the additional food potential was to amount to about 30 lakh tons in the

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

second Five Year Plan. But in the first two years the actual achievement or the actual achievement in 1956 plus the anticipated achievement in 1957-58 are expected to amount to 4.4 lakh tons only. Now, I can understand, Sir, a deficiency of an ordinary kind but here it seems nothing has been done. It is not merely failure in this small matter or in that small matter. It means—and the figures that I have given show it—complete neglect in respect of provision of adequate means for the utilisation of water that was available or that might become available by the end of the first Five Year Plan.

Now, I come to minor irrigation. The progress in this field is not unsatisfactory. The Plan target amounts to a food potential of 19 lakh tons and the achievement in 1956 plus the anticipated achievement in 1957-58 account for 7 lakh tons. This means that in five years if the progress is made only at this rate there will be additional production to the tune of about 17½ lakh tons. But I should like to know, Sir, whether the information that the Government have received with regard to minor irrigation is reliable. I put this question because during the last seven or eight years we have had reason on more than one occasion to doubt the accuracy of the figures supplied by the State Governments. I remember, Sir, that when Shri Kidwai was Food Minister, the situation in Bihar became serious, and he told us that he did not understand how the food production had declined beyond all expectations when the programme with regard to minor irrigation, that is the construction of wells, had, as claimed by the Bihar Government, been almost fully carried out. On an earlier occasion also when there was another Food Minister, we found that the information obtained with regard to minor irrigation needed correction. I would therefore like to know whether the officials of the Central Government and the Planning Commission who

visited certain areas recently, extended their investigations to this matter also.

Sir, there is only one other matter in this connection which I want to refer to, and that is the production of improved seed. Now the Plan target was an additional production potential of 34 lakhs of tons. By taking 1956-57 and 1957-58 together the total production is expected to amount to 3.7 lakh tons only. Here too the results are as starting as those relating to major irrigation. Now, Sir, how can we in these circumstances ever expect any plan for a rapid increase in food production or agricultural production generally to be fully carried out? That is why I said that I feared that although the Food Minister had been frank with us and proposed to take measures to meet the present crisis in a practical way, I doubted whether his plan would be fully carried out. This means that the urgency of producing more food in order to make the economic development of the country possible should be brought home to the State Governments. I have no doubt that in a general way everybody in India is aware of the importance of the food programme. But what I mean is that it should be brought home to the State Governments and the State Food and Agriculture Ministers that any slackness on their part or any deficiency in the means of producing more food would result in a serious setback to the country's economic development. It is not derogatory perhaps for the Food Minister to say that he may not be able to command the prestige that is needed to make the State Governments realise their responsibilities to a greater extent than they have done so far. But the Prime Minister happily does command that prestige.

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI A. P. JAIN): He has already addressed several letters.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I am glad to hear that he has done something in

this matter beyond saying that agriculture is the base of the Second Plan. But it is to be realised that the public is not aware of anything specially done by the Prime Minister to bring any nearer the realisations of our hopes with regard to additional food production. More definite steps have therefore to be taken to impress upon the State Governments to a greater extent the urgent character of their responsibilities, and upon the public the awareness and the readiness of the Government, the awareness of the importance of this problem by the Central Government and its promptness in taking adequate measures to increase our food supply. Unless this is done, I am afraid it will not be possible for us to gain our objective.

Sir, there are only two questions that I should like to put to the Food Minister before I sit down. We have heard in recent weeks a great deal about the unsatisfactory food position in the U.P. and Bengal. Now, Sir, the Food Minister contended the other day in the Lok Sabha that his Ministry had sent to the U.P. as much as had been asked for by the State Government. The State Government on the other hand said that its difficulties were due to the failure of the Central Government to supply it adequate quantities of more food.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): They belong to the same party.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: May I ask where the statement was made by the State Government that their difficulties were due to lack of enough supplies from the Central Government?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I believe that I read that in the papers. I think even in the debate that took place on an adjournment motion in the Lok Sabha it was pointed out that while the Central Government denied its responsibility for the present situation in the U. P., the U. P. authorities

thought that it was the Central Government that was primarily responsible for the deterioration of food supply.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Whatever may have been contention of the U.P. Government about the constitutional and other responsibilities, I am sure that neither the Chief Minister of U.P. nor the Food Minister there ever made a statement that their troubles were due to the inadequate supplies made by the Central Government.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: May I take it then that the statement made by the Food Minister or by somebody else on behalf of the Government of India in the Lok Sabha that the Central Government had sent the State Government whatever they had asked for stands?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Quite surely it stands, although in the future I cannot say that I will always be able to meet all the demands of the State Government. That depends upon the stocks available with us. That that will also depend upon demands from different States. But nonetheless it is a fact that so far as the U.P. is concerned, we have met all the demands that they have so far made upon us.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I am glad to hear that. At least one point is cleared up. Now I come to Bengal. In Bengal the deficiency in food supply was, I believe, estimated to be about 5,65,000 tons.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I shall give the information.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Let us have it from the Food Minister and the hon. Member can correct him.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Compared to 1956-57 production, the production of West Bengal was short by a little more than four lakh tons. The West Bengal Government calculated their requirements at seven lakh tons on

[Shri A. P. Jain.]

the basis of 15 ounces per adult per day. Actually, the availability of foodgrains is only 13·6 ounces per head in India. Even so, their calculation was that they needed seven lakh tons in order that they might be able to supply daily 15 ounces per adult.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I correct him? I thought it would need a little correction.

Sir, on the basis of my talks with the Chief Minister of West Bengal, where he was also present for part of the time, we understood that their calculation of deficit of seven lakh tons was an under-estimate, not according to me, but according to the Chief Minister himself. He told us, "We wrongly calculated our estimates and our assumptions went wrong. Therefore, I would require more." Then I understood that he required one lakh and fifty thousand tons for every month for the next four months or so. Therefore Sir, the deficit was originally estimated to be of the order of twelve lakh tons. Then it was brought down, on some assumptions which, according to their estimates, are now wrong, to seven lakh tons. The Chief Minister of West Bengal told me—he was here in Delhi also—that, "My estimate went wrong and I am putting up a claim, a demand, for bigger supply." Please tell the whole truth, not half truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are telling the whole truth.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I thought that I am a truthful person.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Instead of telling the whole truth, my friend is trying to create confusion.

Sir, the fact is, the assessment of the food requirements in a State is done by that State Government. In the beginning of the year, the West Bengal Government calculated that they would be needing seven lakh

tons from the Central Government, so that they might supply 15 ounces of foodgrains per adult per day. Not necessarily we accepted that figure, but that was their own calculation. On the basis of that calculation, so far we have supplied to them 6,30,000 tons and there are three more months to go. I have come to certain arrangements with the West Bengal Government which I shall explain. But it is totally incorrect to say that the figure was assessed at anything more than seven lakh tons.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I am glad that these figures have been given here, but the whole position is unsatisfactory. I cannot understand how the West Bengal Government agrees to reduce the deficit to one-half and then again wants to double it. What it means, I cannot understand. But there is no doubt that the Central Government has sent it a little more than what it had originally asked for. I do not think, Sir, that we can lay the blame on the Central Government or that it is blameworthy. But I think we are bound, in all fairness, to say that the State Governments also must realise their responsibility and not throw their entire burden on the Central Government. The West Bengal Government must give a much more satisfactory explanation for an increase in their demand than they have given so far.

What I have said shows that the present position is serious and that it spells a grave danger to the future economic development of the country. The Food Minister said yesterday in a general way that, while so far, the Government had largely depended on an extension of the cultivated area, it would have to pay more attention in future to intensive farming. This may be all right—in a general way, what he said was right. But the figures that I have given show that hardly any attention has been paid to this problem so far. What has happened to the additional water supplied by us, to the

fertilisers supplied by us, to the good seeds supplied by us? These things have not resulted in increasing the yield per acre to any extent that we need take account of. This has become, therefore, a live, a burning question. It is not a theoretical question to be admitted when debates take place in this place or in the other House, by the Minister, but a question of life and death for us, a question on the success of which depends our future progress. I hope that not merely the Food Minister who is, let me say again, only to a small extent responsible for the present state of things, but the entire Government will consider it its duty to take up this question and deal with it in the same way in which it has dealt with the question of industrialisation so far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister will reply at 4.30 today and you will go on sitting till then. I have got a long list of names here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why does the Minister reply at 4.30?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You see, not later, because he will have to clarify, he will have to answer, all the points. He may take an hour or one and a half hours. At 4.30, he will reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That means, there will be less number of speakers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why not? We know the problems. Only you want to give increased . . .

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): Through lunch-hour also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yesterday, I suggested that we should sit till 6.00 and hon. Members did not agree and I do not know why.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A majority.

Mr. Awadeshwar Prasad Sinha. I think you will be as brief as possible.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR (Bihar): All the Members may arrange about this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may arrange yourselves.

श्री अवधेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, खाद्य के प्रश्न पर कल से हम लोग बहस कर रहे हैं। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि यह सवाल बहुत गम्भीर है। अभी हम आदरणीय पं० हृदय नाथ कुंजरू का भाषण सुन रहे थे, जो बहुत ही विद्वत्पूर्ण और फ़ैक्ट्स से भरा हुआ था। फिर भी हम इस सवाल पर दो दिन से जो भाषण सुन रहे हैं उन पर और कम से कम एक बात पर मुझे बहुत बड़ा ताज्जुब हो रहा है कि हमारा इतना बड़ा देश है, इतनी बड़ी जनसंख्या है और उसकी पापुलेशन हर साल बढ़ती ही जा रही है। सिर्फ दस साल इस देश को स्वतन्त्र हुये हो गये तो क्या हम लोग यह समझते थे कि इतनी जल्दी हम दूध की नदी बहा देंगे और अपने देश में खाद्यान्न के इतने बड़े सवाल को हल कर लेंगे ?

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

हमारे बंगाल में चीन है, वहा पर भी देश को नये आधार पर बनाने के लिये बहुत भीरु प्रयत्न हो रहे हैं, बड़ा सराहनीय प्रयत्न वहां की सरकार कर रही है, वहां भी खाद्यान्न का सवाल विकट रूप में है। हमारे देश में सिवाय बंगाल या बिहार या उत्तर प्रदेश—अभी थोड़ा थोड़ा राजस्थान का नाम भी सुनते हैं—इसके अलावा पूरे देश में खाद्यान्न का सवाल जटिल नहीं है। एक दम सवाल ही नहीं है, यह मैं नहीं कहता, फिर भी काफ़ी गल्ला है ऐसा सुनते हैं और अच्छे ढंग से उसको हल करने का काम चल रहा है। मैं अपने सूबे बिहार से ज़िक्र शुरू करना चाहता हूं और थोड़े से आंकड़े देकर उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बतलाना चाहता हूं कि बिहार में क्या हालत

[श्री अवधेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह]

है। सन् १९५६-५७ में ३.७ मिलियन टन प्रोडक्शन हुआ। सन् १९५७-५८ में २.२ मिलियन टन प्रोडक्शन हुआ यानी १५ लाख टन कम प्रोडक्शन बिहार में हुआ। इससे हमें वहां बड़ी परेशानी हुई। फिर बिहार सरकार ने सेंटर से कहा और हमारे माननीय फ़ूड मिनिस्टर, श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन जी, वहां गये। उन्होंने हमारे लिये बहुत कुछ किया है और उसको हम कभी भूल नहीं सकते हैं। वहां पर बिहार गवर्नमेंट के साथ कॉन्फ़ेंस में सारी चीजें तय हुई और श्री टी० पी० सिंह रिलीफ कमिश्नर बनाये गये। उसके बाद काम शुरू हुआ और यह तय हुआ कि बिहार में सिंचाई के काम में वाटर रेट कम कर दिया जाय, जिनके पास खाने को नहीं है उनको फ्री कार्ड दिये जायें, जो मिडिल क्लास के किसान हैं उनको कर्ज दिये जायें, और मजदूर जो खेती में काम करने वाले हैं उनको काम दिया जाय ताकि वे अपने खाने भर का पैदा कर सकें। यह सारा काम हमारे सूबे में शुरू आ। सेंटर ने भी यहां से स्टॉक देना शुरू किया। मई महीने में ८९ हजार टन अन्न दिया गया, जून में ६८ हजार टन दिया गया, जुलाई में एक लाख टन दिया गया, और अगस्त में एक लाख १४ हजार टन दिया गया। इसके लिये हमारे यहां १५ हजार फेयर प्राइस शॉप्स खोली गईं। उनमें जो ऑफ़ टेक हुआ है वह इस प्रकार है:

मई में ९४ हजार टन,

जून में ८० हजार टन,

जुलाई में १ लाख और १ हजार टन,
और

अगस्त में ८५ हजार टन

जुलाई के महीने में एक लाख और एक हजार टन का ऑफ़ टेक हुआ क्योंकि उस महीने में खेतिहर मजदूरों को देने के लिये फेयर प्राइस शॉप्स से ज्यादा अन्ना लिया गया और इस

वजह से बिहार में खेती का काम बहुत बढ़ा है। इस प्रकार बिहार में १५ लाख टन की कमी थी जिसमें से ५ लाख टन मात्र सेंटर ने दिया, फिर भी बिहार में शान से काम चल रहा है। इसकी वजह यह है कि वहां १५ हजार फेयर प्राइस शॉप्स बहुत अच्छे ढंग से काम कर रही हैं साथ ही बिहार की जितनी पोलिटिकल पार्टियां हैं वे कंधे से कंधा मिला कर इस प्रश्न को एक राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न समझ कर हल करने का प्रयत्न कर रही हैं। कम से कम आदरणीय डा० हृदय नाथ कुंजरू के भाषण में हम इस अंश की बहुत उम्मीद करते थे कि सबको मिल कर काम करना चाहिये और वें केवल गवर्नमेंट की निन्दा ही नहीं करेंगे बल्कि इस ओर इशारा भी करेंगे क्योंकि हमारे गरीब देश में अन्न का सवाल, खाने का सवाल, सबका सवाल है, एक राष्ट्रीय सवाल है जैसा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी कहा है।

जहां तक यू० पी० का प्रश्न है, वहां इस साल पैदावार में ८ परसेंट की कमी हुई है और हर महीने ८५ हजार टन अन्न उनको दिया जाता है। इसके अतिरिक्त सबका यह खयाल है कि इस बार वहां खरीफ़ क्रॉप अच्छी होगी जहां तक बंगाल का प्रश्न है, वहां ७ लाख टन का डेफ़िसिट है और उसमें से साढ़े ६ लाख टन दिया जा चुका है और सितम्बर, में एक लाख पंद्रह हजार टन दिया जायगा और अक्टूबर में एक लाख दस हजार टन दिया जायगा। इस तरह से उनको ९ लाख टन दिया जायगा फिर भी वहां से कहा जाता है कि यह कम है, और मिलना चाहिये। अब सवाल यह है कि एक गरीब देश में चाहेगल्ले का सवाल हो, चाहे किसी चीज़ का सवाल हो, उसकी एक लिमिटेशन होती है। हम कहां से लायें, हम क्या करें, हम गरीब हैं और दस वर्ष में हम ऐसे तो नहीं हो गये हैं कि अपनी अवस्था को समझें नहीं और वगैर,

समझे हम कहें कि इतना खर्च करने के लिये तुम्हें देना ही पड़ेगा ।

इंडस्ट्रियालाइजेशन की भी बात कही जाती है । इंडस्ट्रियालाइजेशन के बारे में या एग्रीकल्चर के बारे में प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में या द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो कुछ तय हुआ था, उसे पालियामेंट ने और हम सबों ने कबूल किया है । इतने बड़े देश में खेती की पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिए करांडों आदमियों को इन्धुज करके इस काम में लगाना और उनको आगे बढ़ाना ऐसा काम नहीं है जो दो चार वर्षों में किया जा सके । उनके पुराने तरीके हैं जो हजारों वर्ष से वे करते आ रहे हैं और उनको सुधारने में समय लगेगा । इसलिये थोड़ा धैर्य से हमें देखना पड़ेगा । महज इसलिये कि खेती की पैदावार में उतनी वृद्धि नहीं हो रही है जितनी कि हम चाहते हैं, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता कि हम अपने इंडस्ट्रियालाइजेशन के प्रोग्राम को कम कर दें । उसे कम कर देने से हमें तरह तरह के नुकसान हो सकते हैं । हमें दोनों तरफ खयाल करना है । स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स से हमें कहना चाहिये कि वे खेती की पैदावार बढ़ाये और फर्टिलाइजर्स की तरफ और लैंड रिक्लामर्स की तरफ हमें इस तरह से देखना चाहिये कि खेती की पैदावार बढ़े । लेकिन गवर्नमेंट ने जो कुछ किया है, दो तीन सूबों के अलावा सभी जगह शान्ति है, सभी जगह खुराक मिलती है, दाम ज्यादा नहीं बढ़े हैं, उसके बारे में अब तक हमने किसी अपोजीशन मेम्बर की तरफ से कुछ नहीं सुना । बम, कमी है, कमी है, केवल यही बात कही जाती है । पंडित कुंजरू साहब जैसे बड़े लोगों की तरफ से भी जब ऐसा कहा जाता है कि परेशानी है, तो उसका परिणाम यह होता है कि सारे देश में परेशानी फैल जाती है । इसलिये ऐसे माननीय सदस्यों से मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि ऐसे विकट सवाल पर आपकी मदद मिलनी चाहिये और केवल समालोचना नहीं मिलनी चाहिये । इस सम्बन्ध में जैसी अनौपचारिक

कमेटी यहां बनी है, वैसी कमेटी बंगाल में पहले से काम कर रही है और हर सब डिवीजन में काम कर रही है, फिर भी कल वहां सत्याग्रह या दुराग्रह जो कुछ भी कहिये, वह आरम्भ हो गया । यू० पी० में चाहे जन संघ हो, चाहे सोशलिस्ट पार्टी हो, चाहे कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी हो, सभी आन्दोलन कर रही है । पहले प्रजा सोशलिस्ट मैदान में उतरे तो दूसरों ने कहा कि हम पीछे कैसे रहेंगे । बंगाल में फ्रेमिन रेजिस्टेंस कमेटी की तरफ से लोग मैदान में उतरे हैं और अब और पार्टियां भी उतरेंगी । इससे कैसे एग्रीकल्चर बढ़ेगा, कैसे खेती की पैदावार बढ़ेगी, कैसे गल्ले की कीमत कम ागी, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है । मैं यह नहीं कहता कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने जो कुछ किया है उससे ज्यादा नहीं करना चाहिये, फिर भी जो कुछ किया गया है वह सराहनीय है । यह ठीक है कि पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिए हमें और काम करने चाहिये और फूड पॉलिसी को कुछ बदलना चाहिये लेकिन सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने जो किया है वह थोड़ा काम नहीं किया है, शानदार काम किया है और इसको हमें मानना चाहिये । जो काम किया गया है उसको न मानना कृतघ्नता है और यह नहीं होना चाहिये ।

मैं सदन का और अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता । अन्त में हर पार्टी से मैं फिर यह अपील करना चाहता हूं कि हम सबको कन्धे से कन्धा मिला कर ऐसे दुरूह और जटिल सवाल में साथ साथ काम करना चाहिये ।

SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa): Sir, I feel certain that the discussion of a very important question on the floor of this House for only two days is not enough. The very fact that so many friends want to speak and have no time, and that the few who speak have to speak with limitations, goes to show the anxiety exhibited by the hon. Members on all the sides of this House. Sir, this is a national problem, and I feel that it should be treated as such. When Members of Parliament belonging to the Congress

[Shri Biswanath Das.]

Party met at Calcutta a few weeks back, Members representing the States of Orissa, Assam, West Bengal and Bihar, we discussed this question and we all felt that there was so much need for constituting a committee of Members of Parliament of both the Houses in each State, with the Chief Minister of each State as its Chairman and with either the Food Secretary or the Food Minister of the State as its Secretary, to watch the progress of the work undertaken by the various State Governments, and also to submit a half-yearly evaluation report of the work done in the different States. I would draw the serious attention of the Union Ministry to this aspect of the recommendations or the views expressed by the hon. Members of Parliament belonging to the Congress Party. Sir, this is a practical way of giving effect to the wishes of this House and keeping a watch over the progress so far made in the different States.

While speaking on this subject, Sir, I cannot forget the fact that in going to solve this serious problem, the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture and also the Prime Minister have appealed to all the Parties in this House for co-ordinated and co-operative effort in this regard. Sir, the Communist Party in the Opposition, and I believe my hon. friend, Dr. Ahmad also in his maiden speech, offered that co-operation to the fullest extent. But one has to realise in this connection that unless we accept this offer with all sincerity and also feeling that we mean what we say, our discussions in this House would become only academic. When I say this, I say it with certain feelings. While speaking very forcibly in his long speech, Dr. Ahmad put up a plea for the small holders and tillers of the soil as if the Communist Party believes in keeping the ownership of the primary means of production with the individual. I should like to have fullest clarification on this issue

If the Communist Party believes it, so far so good. If it does not, all the discussion in this House reduces itself to something unreal because it will serve more as a party propaganda than actual expression of the wishes of this House. Leaving aside the party propaganda and stunts, let us come to the real problem. What are the real problems before us today? My hon. friend said a lot about small holders and tillers of the soil and conferring occupancy rights and ownership rights on the small holders or tillers of the soil, as if that is the policy in which he believes or his party believes. I join issue with him, unless I am given clearly to understand that the Communist Party are out to change their mode of thinking and also the essential principles on which they stand. Referring to the Kumarappa Committee report, I say that our problem is really the small holder. Who is the small holder? It is the man who has less than 2 acres of land. In Madhya Pradesh the percentage is 49, in Orissa 50 and in old Madras (including Andhra and Kerala) 51. In U.P. it is 58 and for Bihar the figure is similar though it is not given. These are holders holding less than 2 acres. Coming to holders who have less than 5 acres, we have also a similar state. These two put together, we get in Orissa 77 per cent., in old Madras (including Andhra, Kerala and Tamil Nad) 82 per cent., and in U.P. 84 per cent. of the entire holders. Therefore you will please see the real problem and the problem of all problems is the question of small holders. If my hon. friend has gone round the mofussil and if he has anything to do with the village life and cultivation, he will please agree with me that even the small acreage of land is being distributed in the various blocks in each village into small plots. Therefore consolidation of holdings and co-operative farmings is really the problem which has to be faced in modern India. If the problem of cultivation and production has to be solved by the Government

1 P.M.

nothing more could be done except by resorting immediately by all possible means and finances to take positive steps in this direction. My strong protest and regret is that very little has been done on these two aspects, though from 1948, at conferences of Ministers every year resolutions have been tabled and passed and accepted that immediate and earnest efforts shall be made in the direction of co-operative farming and consolidation of land holdings. Nothing is being done.

Then we come to the question of fertilizers. Why talk of fertilizers? Are we really trying to help the agriculturists, the so-called tillers of the soil or the tillers who manage the soil whosoever it may be? Are we helping them even with the composts or the human waste even in the municipal areas? Very little has been done in this regard. A lot of waste is going on. It is being wasted and creating other problems in the country. Therefore I must frankly confess that we ourselves—the Governments at the Union and the States—have not been keeping ourselves properly alert to this all-important issue. This is a position that has to be admitted and accepted. My hon. friend the Minister has quoted a lot of figures. Figures are awfully puzzling. In the first place the figures given in one publication of the Government do not agree with that of others and secondly, despite all pleadings that may be put up by my hon. friend in the name of sample survey, I have to beg of him not to solely rely on these because sample surveys are not taken as widely, as scientifically and as accurately as they ought to be taken. They are in the infant stage. Therefore too much reliance on these official figures has brought us to this position and I am sure that that position will not be improved unless we change our outlook in regard to the acceptance of these figures. I have no hesitation to say that the official figures are incorrect. In this connection let me

refer to the note that I have submitted to my hon. friend and to the Planning Commission regarding defective planning. I refer especially to pages 11, 12 and 13. Here you will please see that the figures of the total food production from 1948 to 1957 as also the total imports for each of these years are given and they are added up. You will see that from 1948 to 1953 the figures ranged between 51 to 54 million tons. From 1954 to 1957 they range between 63 to 65 million tons. If you take up the position that we were able to have our way so far as 1956 is concerned with 61 or 62 million tons of food-stuffs till 1956' that means at the end of the First Five Year plan period' there is no reason why we should go in for imports with a production figure of 66, 65 and 68 million tons. There is thus no justification if our figures are reliable and accurate. Again I have to state in this connection that the findings of the Kurnappa Committee . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time Mr. Das. You have taken 20 minutes.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Have I finished 20 minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Could you give me 2 or 3 minutes for Orissa?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are 35 speakers. I have to satisfy all.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: I would like 2 or 3 minutes more if you can give, otherwise I will sit down.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Sir, the food position in Orissa is very, very acute. When I speak of acute food position in Orissa one may not feel, one may not believe readily. But you have to realise the standard of life.

[Shri Biswanath Das.]

and living in Orissa which is the minimum in India. There, the food price, the price of rice, the main food of the people is about Rs. 20 to Rs. 22 per maund. You can well imagine the difficulties and distress of the people in the mofussil. My further difficulty and anxiety is that all the irrigation potential of the State has not been utilised. I feel sincerely and I have no hesitation to speak to my friend that you should take immediate steps with the help and co-operation of the Government of Orissa has increased so much, I have to tell you that the works finished in 1950 and 1951 have not been completely utilised and used because branch canals and medium sized irrigation canals have not been constructed, with the result that three-fourth of the irrigation potential of completed works is kept waste and the water flows to the ocean. Therefore, I would beg of my hon. friend to take immediate steps in this direction to see that all these irrigation works are completed and utilised to the best advantage of Orissa and India. Thank you.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY

(Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, this problem of food has not been given the attention that it should have been given both by the Central as well as the State Governments. Even after eleven years of independence, the Government have not done much to improve the yield per acre. The steps or the methods that have been taken by the Government have not been appreciated and are not appreciable. It is a chronic disease which requires radical measures. The steps that have been taken by Government to improve production look as if they are half-hearted and halting and patch-up things will not help in solving this problem. I urge upon the Government that land reforms should be undertaken at the earliest possible hour and enforced. As long as you do not make the tiller of the soil the owner of the soil he will

not have much enthusiasm, he will not have much mind to put his whole heart and soul into it and give the maximum production to the country. As you all know, the ryot is burdened with heavy agricultural debt. The methods or measures that have been adopted by the State and Central Governments in liquidating this agricultural debt will not be enough and even if they take a hundred years they will not liquidate the agricultural debt. I would suggest a radical measure, that the entire agricultural debt should be wiped out by legislation. Then only he will be in a position to feel that he is not burdened with agricultural debt and that he need not go to the moneylender again for his daily needs. In addition to this passing of legislation, the Government should step in with agricultural credit to give him money for his implements and for his other needs. Then only he will be the sole master and he will do his best to see that the production in India is increased. Great dams are being built in certain parts of the country and especially in the north. It is regretted that the same facilities have not been extended to the southern States. And further, in addition to what is being done for constructing big dams, the Government should bestow more thought and give more finances for minor irrigation. I know they are doing something now, but it is pretty little. Minor irrigation if it is tackled properly and proper incentives are given and proper facilities are given, and if minor tanks are repaired, the benefit will be dispersed. So many villages in the districts in almost all the States will get benefited if this policy is pursued, instead of concentrating more on bringing big dams into being. The construction of wells, particularly in the southern parts of the country and especially in some of the districts in Mysore and Rayalaseema, is the only remedy, to give irrigational facilities to the famine stricken areas in the south. What is being done is not at all appreciable, because it should be done on

a large scale, on a scientific basis. Instead of giving some money or subsidy to the ryot to construct his own well, the Government, through its P.W.D. agency, should undertake construction of wells on a large scale and on a scientific basis. Then only this problem will be solved appreciably.

Regarding the distribution of food, the steps that have been taken by the Government are not at all satisfactory, knowing fully well that the food problem is not satisfactory, that the prices of foodgrains are soaring up not only in U.P., West Bengal or Orissa, but in almost all States. We have been reading statements issued by responsible leaders of political parties and if you want to verify the authenticity of their statements, if you refer to the price index, you will find that the prices of foodgrains have arisen abnormally and in almost all the States. The Government is callous to this problem. Before we got independence, the then Government was caring for public opinion. The very Congress leaders and organisations and units whenever they made certain statements criticising the policies of the Government, the then Government used to respect it and see that something was done. But today public opinion is nowhere to be seen. It is not respected. So, the other remedy that will be left to the people is, to bring it home to the concerned authorities, through direct action. What is being done in U.P. is only this, that through agitation they have tried to call the attention of the Government and tried to call the attention of the people at large. And because of this agitation that is being carried on in U.P. the hoarders have tried to realise their follies and the hoarders have tried to release their stocks. In addition to this, the Government fair price shops are selling foodgrains at cheaper rates and, therefore, the prices of foodgrains have come down in certain parts of U.P.

Sir, if the political parties in U.P. had not given this threat and had not carried on this agitation, I do not think Government would have realised the seriousness of the position in U.P. and in other parts of the country. The Food Minister was telling us yesterday that more than five lakh tons of foodgrains have been unearthed from the hoarders. What steps has he taken to put down or to take strict measures against hoarding and profiteering? Before independence, we used to hear statements from Mr. Nehru and others that the persons who were responsible for the great massacre, people who were responsible for allowing the masses to die because of want of food in Calcutta, would be hanged in the streets of Calcutta. Today, these statements have all gone to the winds and the persons who made such statements in those days are now occupying responsible positions. They seem to have forgotten what they said before they came to office. Sir, both with regard to production of food and with regard to distribution of food, Government have taken only half-hearted and halting steps and, therefore, they have not been able to solve this problem satisfactorily. Sir, the methods that have been suggested or the methods that have been adopted by the Government are not at all satisfactory. Private trading in foodgrains should be eliminated completely to the extent of wholesale trade. I do not mean to say by this that private trade should be eliminated in regard to retail trade also. It could also be undertaken by the Government as far as possible. They are doing it through the fair price shops. That is there but they must open more fair price shops and, in addition to that, the entire wholesale trade in foodgrains should be the monopoly of the Government. The State Trading Corporation or some other organization meant only for this purpose should be set up and they should monopolise the entire wholesale trade of foodgrains in India. Then only will the problem of food be satisfactorily solved.

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

Sir, to give an incentive to the ryot, it is but right that the Government should, before the harvesting season or before the commencement of the sowing season, declare floor prices for all important food commodities. Then only would the poor ryots feel secure that after they produce certain quantity of foodgrains, they are assured of a certain price. Otherwise, if they are left to the vagaries of the market or of uncertain demands, they might feel so depressed that in spite of their effort, they are put to losses. They ryots then will also realise that they should not make too much profit when people are in trouble. Both the floor prices and the maximum prices should be fixed. I do not know whether the Government have fixed any maximum price for any of the important foodgrains at present. If they had done so, so much of increase in prices, the price that we have to pay through our noses for most of the foodgrains, would not have happened. Sir, the remedy that I suggest is that a radical step should be taken and radical measures must be taken by Government. Then only will they be able to solve the food problem.

Lastly, Sir, I have to say that so much of agitation is going on in U.P., in Bengal and in other areas. People are starving to death in certain parts of U.P. There appears to be no response from the Government for solving the food problem satisfactorily. They are, on the other hand, trying to solve this problem through bullets, through oppression and suppression of the peoples right. People are being arrested today, hooted down and are beaten up by the Armed Police. Even the Legislators are not left out. If such a thing had happened in Kerala by now they would have seen the Presidents Rule but in U.P. because they are themselves ruling there, they are afraid to take any appreciable measure to solve this problem. I feel that the record of this Government for the last eleven years

is not at all satisfactory and I should say that they have lost the confidence of the people. The only way that this problem can be solved is that they should quit and others who are more interested in the larger masses of the people should come in. Then only will this problem be solved.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE
(Bihar): Including yourself?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY:
Yes, including myself.

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अनाज का सवाल हमारे देश के लिये बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। इस बहस के दौरान मैं एक सवाल यह उठाया गया कि इसकी जिम्मेदारी केन्द्रीय सरकार पर है या प्रान्तीय सरकारों के ऊपर। अनाज का संकट आज यू० पी० और बंगाल में ज्यादा है। बाकी और रियासतों में भी कीमत ऊंचा हो जाने से यह संकट हो गया है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : बिहार में भी है।

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय : बिहार में भी है। लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश की प्रान्तीय सरकारों ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कार्य किया है। डा० कुंजरू साहब ने यह शिकायत की थी कि प्लानिंग कमीशन और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस काम के लिये रुपया नहीं दिया। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बात ठीक नहीं है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी न शुरू में यह सोचा था और ठीक ही सोचा था कि प्रत्येक प्रान्तीय सरकार को कृषि उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये अपनी योजनाओं में जोरदार प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। यू० पी० सरकार ने पिछले सात सालों में एग्रीकल्चर विभाग में ७०

करोड़ रुपया खर्च किया है और अगर वह एक मन की एकड़ भी उत्पादन बढ़ा लेती तो अब तक १५ लाख टन उत्पादन हो गया होता। सात सालों से सरकार इस कार्य को कर रही है फिर भी यह संकट उत्पन्न हो जाता है तो यह एक बड़े अफसोस की बात है।

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
यू० पी० में उत्पादन गिर गया है।

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय : मैं यह बात चाहता हूँ कि यह बात साफ समझ ली जाय कि इस सम्बन्ध में केन्द्रीय सरकार की जिम्मेदारी नहीं है बल्कि प्रान्तीय सरकारों को स्वयं इसकी जिम्मेदारी उठानी होगी। प्रान्तों में इतने कम्प्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स खुले हुये हैं, सीड्स फार्म्स हैं और दूसरी सुविधायें दी गई हैं, फिर भी वे अपने अनाज का उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं तो यह बड़े अफसोस की बात है।

खैर, मैं इतना अवश्य कहूंगा कि केन्द्रीय सरकार और हमारे खाद्य मंत्री जी इस सम्बन्ध में जो प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं वे काफी अच्छे हैं। जो कुछ भी मुश्किलात आई व कुदरत की तरफ से या कुछ दूसरी बातों के सबब से हुई लेकिन दो तीन साल से यह संकट है। इतना होने पर भी अनाज की सप्लाई केन्द्रीय सरकार की ओर से बराबर जारी है। करोड़ ६० लाख टन अनाज यू० पी० को दिया जा रहा है। वेस्ट बंगाल को दिया जा रहा है। सप्लाई करने में कुछ देर हो गई है मगर स्पेशल ट्रेन अनाज ले कर जा रही है। पंजाब के व्यापारियों ने जो गल्ला होर्ड कर लिया था उसको सरकार ने अपने कब्जे में कर लिया है और प्रान्तीय सरकारों को ज्यादा अनाज जल्दी से भेजा जा रहा है। बहरहाल इस संकट के समय में विरोधी पार्टियों को चाहिये कि वे सरकार के साथ सहयोग करें। केन्द्र में जिस प्रकार प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस संकट को दूर करने के लिये सब पार्टियों की एक कमेटी बना

ली है उसी तरह से प्रत्येक प्रान्त में इस तरह की कमेटी जल्दी बन जायेगी। जैसा कि हमारे मित्र जैड अहमद ने कहा कि वे इस तरह का सहयोग देने के लिये तैयार हैं। तो मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि वे सच्चे दिल से सरकार को सहयोग देंगे। इसकी शुरुवात इस तरह से होनी चाहिये कि वहां पर इस समय जो सत्याग्रह हो रहा है वह बन्द कर दिया जाये ताकि इस राष्ट्रीय संकट को सब मिल कर दूर कर सकें।

उपसभापति महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जो प्रयत्न भारतवर्ष में कृषि उत्पादन बढ़ाने के हुये हैं वे बहुत ही नाकाफ़ी हुये हैं। कुछ समय पूर्व हमारे देश से चीन को जो डेपुटेशनस गये थे, उनमें एक में कुछ ऑफिसर गये थे और एक में हमारे पाटिल साहब गये थे। उनकी रिपोर्ट निकल गई है। हम लोग कुछ पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर भी चीन गये थे जिसको २ साल हो गये हैं। तो चीन के बारे में जो रिपोर्टें हैं उनसे यह मालूम होता है कि वाकई वहां के लोगों ने बड़ा कमाल का काम किया है। मैं उसका श्रेय दूंगा वहां के मेहनती किसानों को, लेकिन वहां पर जो लैंड रिफॉर्म हुये हैं उनका भी बहुत असर पड़ा है। पिछले कुछ सालों में चीन में जो गेहूं की पैदावार हुई है उसके कुछ आंकड़े मैं यहां पर देना चाहता हूँ। सन् १९४९ में चीन १३ मिलियन टन गल्ला पैदा करता था और उस वक्त अमरीका ३१ मिलियन टन गल्ला पैदा करता था। सन् १९५३ में चीन ने पैदावार बढ़ा कर १८ मिलियन टन पैदा किया और अमरीका ने ३२ मिलियन टन पैदा किया। सन् १९५७ में अमरीका में पैदावार कुछ कम हो गई और वहां २६ मिलियन टन गल्ला पैदा हुआ, लेकिन चीन में पैदावार बढ़ा कर २३ मिलियन टन पैदा किया। उसके बाद इस एक साल में चीन में बहुत ज्यादा कोशिश की गई और वहां के किसानों ने ५२ फी मर्द ज्यादा पैदा किया जो लगभग अमरीका के

[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

बराबर आ गया। अब आप यह देखिये कि दूसरे मुल्क अपनी जरूरत पूरी करते चले जा रहे हैं और हम पीछे रहे जा रहे हैं। इसके कई कारण हैं कि जिनकी ओर प्रान्तीय सरकारों को और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब बहुत दिनों से इस बात पर जोर दे रहे हैं कि कोआपरेटिव खेती बढ़नी चाहिये, लेकिन प्रान्तीय सरकारें इस ओर ज्यादा ध्यान नहीं दे रही हैं। लैंड रिफॉर्म और सीलिंग के मामले में भी जो काम होना चाहिये वह नहीं हो रहा है। जब देश में संकट उत्पन्न होते हैं तो जो काम हम कर सकते हैं वह भी नहीं कर पाते हैं। इसलिये यह सारा संकट आपका खुद का पैदा किया हुआ है।

आज नेहरू जी इस बात पर जोर दे रहे हैं कि हमारे देश में कोआपरेटिव के जरिये खेती करने का प्रयत्न होना चाहिये, लेकिन कुछ लोग इस बारे में मतभेद रखते हैं कि जमीन की मालिकियत काश्तकारों की होगी या नहीं। फिर यह भी सवाल है कि आजकल कोआपरेटिव के सम्बन्ध में जो कानून हैं वे भी ठीक ढंग के नहीं हैं। इसके अलावा अगर आजकल काश्तकार का कुछ रुपया चाहिये तो उसका अपनी हैसियत के मुताबिक रुपया मिलता है। अगर उत्पादन पर रुपया मिले, न कि हैसियत पर, तब काश्तकार उत्पादन बढ़ाने का अवश्य प्रयत्न करेगा। आज होता यह है कि बड़े काश्तकारों का रुपया मिलता है लेकिन छोटे और गरीब काश्तकारों को रुपया नहीं मिलता है। इसलिये कोआपरेटिव सम्बन्धी कानून में कुछ तरमीमें करने की जरूरत है ताकि छोटे किसानों को भी पूरा लाभ मिल सके। अभी हमारे देश के काश्तकार इस स्टेज में नहीं हैं कि वे सबके सब कोआपरेटिव में आ जायें। जैसे जैसे काश्तकार समझते जायेंगे कि मिल कर काम करने से क्या लाभ होता है, वे अपनी कोआपरेटिव बनाते

जायेंगे। इस तरह तीन चार स्टेज में हमारे देश के काश्तकार कोआपरेटिव में आ सकते हैं। एकदम कोआपरेटिव में आना उनके लिये मुमकिन नहीं है।

मुझे याद है कि एक बार मैं सेवाग्राम गया हुआ था तो वहां वर्कर्स की एक छोटी मीटिंग में गांधी जी ने अपने प्रवचन में यह कहा था कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान में हमें अहिंसात्मक समाज बनाना है तो काश्तकारों को कोआपरेटिव ढंग से काम करना चाहिये। उन्होंने बड़ी जोर से उसकी तारीफ की थी। मैं वहां मौजूद था और उन्होंने बहुत देर तक यह समझाया था कि जब सहकारी ढंग से काश्तकार काम करेंगे तभी हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर ठीक ढंग से खेती की उन्नति हो सकती है।

हमारे फूड मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक बहुत अच्छा फैसला किया है कि अगर जरूरत पड़ी तो हम सारे खाद्य व्यापार को कंट्रोल कर लेंगे। मैं इसको बहुत मुनासिब समझता हूं, जब कि देश में संकट है हिन्दुस्तान के व्यापारी गैर जरूरी तौर पर कीमतें बढ़ा रहे हैं और होड़िंग कर रहे हैं। ये देश के किसी शत्रु से कम नहीं हैं। मैं इन व्यापारियों को देश का बहुत बड़ा शत्रु समझता हूं। जब कि देश संकट में पड़ा हुआ है, लोग भूखी मर रहे हैं, ये लोग ऐसी परिस्थिति से लाभ उठा कर मुनाफ़ा कमा रहे हैं। मेरे खयाल में ऐसे व्यापारियों को सख्त से सख्त सजा देने का कानून बनना चाहिये। इन लोगों के होड़ किये हुये गल्ले को कब्जे में ले कर के, जनता को मुनासिब कीमत पर दिया जाना चाहिये।

अन्त में और ज्यादा बातें न कहने हुये फूड मिनिस्टर साहब की पॉलिसी की जनरल तारीफ करता हूं और मैं समझता हूं कि प्रान्तीय गवर्नमेंटों को और ज्यादा प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। प्रान्तीय गवर्नमेंटें अपने हिस्से

का प्रयत्न नहीं कर रही हैं। इसलिये हमारे देश में जितना अन्न का उत्पादन हो सकता है वह नहीं हो रहा है। इतना कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाफ़ खान (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : डिप्टी चेयरमैन महोदय, मैं अपनी तरफ़ से कोई नई बात पेश करना नहीं चाहता। जो बात हमारी तरफ़ से कही गई है मैं दो चार लफ़्ज़ों में उसको दोहराना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मेरी असली बात, जिसे मैं पार्लियामेंट के सामने पेश करना चाहता हूँ, वह मेरी स्टेट का मसला है। मेरी स्टेट में जो सूरत इस वक़्त चल रही है उसकी तरफ़ खास ध्यान दिलाना मेरा मक़सद है। जब से कल से यहां फूड पर, अनाज पर, गुप्तगू चल रही है, बड़ी अच्छी अच्छी बातें हो रही हैं। हमारे वैस्ट बंगाल में इसी १५ तारीख से एक ज़बरदस्त तहरीक चल रही है। आज आपने अख़बारों में देखा होगा कि वहां तकरीबन पांच मौ आदमी गिरफ़्तार हुये हैं। इसका हल मैं मांगता हूँ। इस पार्लियामेंट में जितनी भी बातें हुई हैं और जो भी कहा जा रहा है, उससे यह जो पेचीदगी है वह हल हो सकती है या नहीं, यह मसला मैं पेश करना चाहता हूँ। यह ठीक है कि यहां पर कोआपरेशन की दावत दी गई और उसे अपोज़ीशन की तरफ़ से क़बूल भी किया गया। लेकिन हुआ यह कि १५ तारीख को एक मूवमेंट बंगाल में शुरू हो गया। यहां एक मिलीजुली कमेटी बन चुकी है और उसको बाद हमारे फूड मिनिस्टर साहब बंगाल भी जा चुके हैं, लेकिन फिर भी कोई नतोजा नहीं निकला है। वहां अवाम की तरफ़ से जो मांगें पेश की गई हैं उनका कोई हल अब तक नज़र नहीं आया। उस मसले को छोड़ दिया गया और एक तरह से मजबूर किया गया कि १५ तारीख से तहरीक शुरू हो, मूवमेंट जारी हो, हज़ारों आदमी जेलखाने चले जायें और क़ानून तोड़ा जाये। खैर, उस पर मैं बाद को और तशरीह के तौर पर आऊंगा।

सबसे पहले मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूँ—जैसा कि हमारी तरफ़ से कहा गया है कि हम यह बहुत अफ़सोस के साथ महसूस करते हैं—कि पैदावार जैसी बढ़नी चाहिये वैसी बढ़ नहीं रही है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह कब तक चलेगा? कब तक आप बाहर से अनाज मंगाने रहेंगे? सूरत यह है कि एक तरफ़ आप बाहर से अनाज भी मंगवा रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ़ यहां कहत भी है। एक तरफ़ तो हमारा भविष्य बन्धक में पड़ रहा है, हमारे ऊपर कर्ज़ पर कर्ज़ चढ़ रहा है और दूसरी तरफ़ लोग ख़ाये बगैर मर रहे हैं। तो यह सूरत कैसे हल होगी? हम चाहते हैं कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ़ से कोई भी ऐसी सूरत पैदा की जाय—क्योंकि गवर्नमेंट के बिना कुछ हो नहीं सकता है—गवर्नमेंट कोई भी ऐसी सूरत पैदा करे जिससे हम सब मिल कर के इस मुसीबत को दूर कर दें और मुल्क के लोगों को इस मुसीबत से नजात दिलायें।

श्री जसपत राय कपूर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : डा० बी० सी० राय ने कहा कि मिल कर काम करो लेकिन फिर भी ज्योति बभु साहब ने क्यों यह तमाशा खड़ा कर दिया?

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाफ़ खान : मैं उस पर आऊंगा। वह सब हमें मालूम है हमारे फूड मिनिस्टर साहब के पास उस बारे में कापी भी आई है। १५ तारीख को मीटिंग बुलाई गई जब कि उनसे कहा गया कि एक दिन पहले १४ तारीख को फूड एडवाइज़री कमेटी की मीटिंग बुलाइये लेकिन नहीं १५ तारीख को ही मीटिंग होगी। जब एक तरफ़ उसी दिन मूवमेंट शुरू होता है तब दूसरी तरफ़ उसी दिन को आप मीटिंग की तारीख रखते हैं।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : १४ तारीख को पश्चिमी बंगाल के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर साहब यहां थे, इसलिये मीटिंग नहीं बुलाई।

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : जो बात है वह सब को मालूम है। उसकी कापी हमारे पास है। खर, मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि पैदावार बढ़ाने का जो मामला है उस पर गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से काफ़ी ध्यान नहीं दिया जा रहा है। हम यह महसूस करते हैं और इस पर ज्यादा कहने की जरूरत भी नहीं है। इस तरीके पर, एक तरफ तो हम मारगोज हो रहे हैं—हर साल १५० करोड़ रुपये का अनाज मंगवा रहे हैं—और दूसरी तरफ यह है कि उसकी जो तफ़सील होती है, उसका जो बटवारा होता है, उससे जो प्राइस कंट्रोल है वह तो कायम है लेकिन लोग मर रहे हैं, सारे मुल्क में अनाज अनाज की चिल्लाहट सब से ज्यादा हो रही है, सब जगह इसका शोर है, हंगामा है, जेलखाना है, बड़ी बड़ी तहरीकें हैं, ऐसी ऐसी तरहरीकें हो रही हैं जो कि ३० साल से नज़र नहीं आईं।

तो इस मुसीबत को दूर करने के लिये हमारी तरफ से जो भी कंआपरेशन का ऑफ़र दिया गया है उस पर हम कायम रहने के लिये तैयार हैं और कायम रहेंगे लेकिन आप यह बताइये कि कब तक पैदावार बढ़ेगी। प्लानिंग कमीशन ने हम लोगों को बताया कि हमको फूड की पैदावार बढ़ानी पड़ेगी और उसके साथ प्लानिंग कमीशन ने यह भी कहा कि यह मानी हुई बात है कि लैंड रिफ़ॉर्म भी करना पड़ेगा, इसके बग़ैर कुछ नहीं होगा। हमें अफ़सोस है कि फूड मिनिस्टर की तरफ से बड़ी अच्छी अच्छी बातें कही गईं लेकिन इस लैंड रिफ़ॉर्म के मुताल्लिक उन्होंने कुछ भी नहीं कहा।

श्री ए० पी० जैन : अब कहूंगा :

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : आपका शुक्रिया। लैंड रिफ़ॉर्म के बग़ैर आप अगर फूड प्रॉब्लम को सॉल्व करना चाहते हैं तो यह हो नहीं सकता है। मैं यह दरियाफ्त

करना चाहता हूँ कि कब तक आप यह करना चाहते हैं, कितने दिनों में आप इसको करना चाहते हैं। इसके लिये आप एक टाइम रख दें। सन् १९५४ में आप जानते हैं कि इसी हाउस में हमने एक तजवीज़ पेश की थी और उसमें कहा गया था कि प्लान की काम-याबी के लिये लैंड रिफ़ॉर्म जल्दी से जल्दी किया जाय। उस दिन से हम इस बारे में चिल्ला रहे हैं और उसे एक हद तक मान भी लिया गया है—एक हद तक मैं इसलिये कहता हूँ क्योंकि अमल में कुछ अक़दाम नहीं हुआ है—लेकिन वह मामला वहीं का वहीं है और कब तक इस तरह रहेगा यह मालूम नहीं है। तो यह अन्धेरे है।

अब, एक और सवाल है। डिस्ट्री-ब्यूशन का जो नया तरीका तजवीज़ किया गया है कि कंट्रोल किया जायगा, यह बड़ी अच्छी तजवीज़ है लेकिन पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिये लैंड रिफ़ॉर्म को छोड़ कर और कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है। अगर और कोई दूसरा रास्ता अस्तित्व में किया गया तो मैं यह ज़रूर कहूंगा कि यह कामयाबी की सूरत नहीं होगी।

आप रोज़मर्रा कीमत का बढ़ा रहे हैं : इस वक्त प्रॉब्लम यह है कि एक तरफ तो हम फ़ॉरेन एक्सचेंज की बला में फंस गये हैं और दूसरी तरफ़ कीमत बढ़ती जा रही है। आपके प्लान की कामयाबी के लिये जो कीमत का मामला है और प्राइस कंट्रोल की जो बुनियादी बात है वह दोनों खत्म हो गई है। उस चीज़ को हम मिस कर चुके हैं। अब आइन्दा होल प्लानिंग का क्या असर होगा यह मालूम नहीं है। हो क्या रहा है ? इस वक्त आप हमारे यहां जाइये तो आप देखेंगे कि किसान लोगों को ३० रु० और ३२ रु० मन चावल खरीदना पड़ता है। तो इस तरह से उनकी जो रही सही हालत भी थी वह भी बिल्कुल खत्म हो रही है। उनकी परचैजिंग पावर दिन बदिन खत्म हो रही है। ऐसी हालत में

आप उनसे क्या उम्मीद कर सकते हैं कि वे प्लान को कामयाब बनायें ? आज एग्रीकल्चर का, फूड का, अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ाने का सबाल जरा पेचीदा है । इसलिये हमको बहुत काफ़ी तशबीश के साथ बैठ कर इस पर ध्यान देना चाहिये और जो कुछ भी करना हो उसके लिये तैयार होना चाहिये ।

मैं आपको बताऊँ कि कंट्रोल के नाम पर व्हेस्ट बंगाल में क्या हाल हुआ । आपको मालूम होगा कि गुज्रिता साल व्हेस्ट बंगाल की फूड मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ़ से एक व्हाइट पेपर निकला था और उसमें कहा गया था कि १२ लाख टन का घाटा है लेकिन जब उनका बजट सेशन होने लगा तो गवर्नर साहब की तरफ़ से जो स्पीच दी गई उसमें कहा गया कि नहीं ७ लाख टन की कमी है । मालूम नहीं कि क्या हिसाब है ? कोई स्टैटिस्टिक्स भी है या नहीं ? मुझे तो ताज्जुब है कि मरकजी गवर्नमेंट की तरफ़ से हिसाब की जाच पड़ताल करने की और देखभाल करने की कोई कार्यवाही की भी जाती है या नहीं । अगर कोई १२ कह दे तो १२ है, कोई १० कह दे तो १० है और कोई ७ कह दे तो ७ है । हम खामोश हैं ।

खैर, सात लाख टन का डैफ़िसिट है और हमारे फूड मिनिस्टर की तरफ़ से कहा गया कि हाँ यह कमी हम पूरी कर देंगे, इतना चावल देंगे, इतना आटा देंगे । यह मुझे मालूम है । उस वक़्त तमाम अपोज़ीशन की तरफ़ से, जब इतना घाटा मालूम हुआ, एक फूड कॉन्फ़रेन्स हुई जिसमें यह तय किया गया कि गवर्नमेंट से यह कहा जाय कि आप खुद अपना कुछ स्टॉक बनाइये, अपने पास कुछ स्टॉक रखिये । बाज़ार में आप दूसरों को मना न कीजिये लेकिन आप खुद खरीद कर रखिए वरना सिचुएशन आप कंट्रोल नहीं कर सकेंगे । उन्होंने मुना नहीं । कहा कि नहीं, हम खुद खरीद नहीं सकते हैं, रुपया नहीं है । लोगों को बैंक से रुपया मिलता है, सरकार को नहीं मिलता । ताज्जुब है । खैर, उन्होंने

क्या किया, मझे यह अफ़सोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है, कि वहाँ के तमाम बड़े बड़े व्यापारियों को, महाजनों को और बड़े बड़े कारोबारी लोगों को लाइसेंस दिया और आम तौर पर यह मना कर दिया कि कोई दूसरा शक्म कारोबार नहीं कर सकता ।

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Sir, on a point of order. Are we discussing the doings of the West Bengal Government here? The West Bengal Government is not represented here and all these things are being said about the West Bengal Government. So, I would humbly request you to stop this reference.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are concerned with the general food situation in the country. We are not concerned with the West Bengal Government here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know, Sir, why he is asking you to stop this reference, because even in the Committee we are discussing the food situation in the States. Then what shall we discuss here?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may discuss it in general terms.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think we are precise in such matters. I submit to you, Sir, that I can understand your taking the position that everything detailed should not be said. But 'Food' is a concurrent subject.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Incidentally it may be relevant, but not in detail.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am only saying that we are prepared to draw the attention of Parliament as to how the supplies sent to the States are being distributed there, as to how the Essential Commodities Act is being administered.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a function of the Bengal Government. It is relevant in the Bengal Assembly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then what are we going to discuss here?

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

You say that food production is not a Central subject. My hon. friend was very rightly saying that this was not a State subject . . . (Interruptions.) . . . Then, Sir, we will have to decide, if we are shut up that way, whether we should co-operate even in such Committee, if we are not even allowed to speak in Parliament.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: May I be permitted to request my hon. friend to keep the debate in this Parliament at least on a high level?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very high level. I want to raise it still higher.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us not waste time. Mr. Khan, you have already taken twenty minutes. There is one more speaker from your side.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That time should not be calculated, I hope, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He can take the full time allotted to your party.

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : मैं अर्ज कर रहा था, मुझे वहां की बहस तो करनी नहीं है लेकिन चूँकि कंट्रोल के बारे में कहा गया है, इसलिए उसकी बात जो तजुर्बा वहां मालूम हुआ उसको मैं आपके सामने पेश कर रहा था। कंट्रोल के नाम पर वहां क्या हुआ यह मैं इस ऐवान के सामने बताना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One thousand people went to jail yesterday.

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : मैं अर्ज करूँ कि ज़रा आप गौर कीजिए कि वहां पर कंट्रोल के नाम पर क्या किया गया और उसका नतीजा क्या रहा। वैसा ही कंट्रोल यहां पर भी न हो यह मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

श्री हर प्रसाद सक्सेना : ऑनरेबल फूड मिनिस्टर यह ऐलान कर चुके हैं कि कंट्रोल

नहीं होंगे, तो कंट्रोल की बातें ही बेकार होंगी।

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : आपने उनको नहीं समझा। मैं समझता हूँ वे कुछ कंट्रोल करने की ही सोच रहे हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish your speech. There is one more speaker on your side. If you want to give time to him, you finish. Otherwise I have no objection to your continuing.

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : अगर मुझे वक्त नहीं मिलता तो मुझे क्या करना चाहिये? जल्दी जल्दी मैं तमाम बातें साफ नहीं होती। लेकिन फिर भी आखिर में चलकर मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ, यहां जो कमेटी बनी वह तो ठीक बात है। लेकिन वहां पर जो डिमांड है, वहां जो मूवमेंट चल रहा है उसको इस पार्लियामेंट की कमेटी के जरिये से किस तरह सुलझाया जाय। एक किस्सा मैं बताऊँ। अभी मैं गांव गया था वजीराघाट के इलाके में। वहां लोग भूखों मर रहे हैं। अखबारों में आपने पढ़ा भी होगा। मुझ से वहां के लोगों ने कहा, आप पार्लियामेंट में हमारे लिये क्या कर रहे हैं। मैंने बताया, पार्लियामेंट में हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने बताया है कि जितनी जरूरत है उतना अनाज सबको देंगे। वह तो साढ़े सात लाख टन को उन्होंने वायदा किया था, वही दिये होंगे। लेकिन हमारे यहां लोग कहते हैं कि हमसे कहा जाता है कि साहब, वहां आप जाओ अपने सब डिवीजनल आफिसर के पास, वहां मिलेगा। वहां भी वे गये, और वहां उनसे कहा गया "नहीं, बिलकुल नहीं है।" हम आपसे जो मांग रहे हैं उसका एक चौथाई भी नहीं पहुंचता, हम क्या करें। सब जगह उन लोगों से कहा जाता है कि तुम लोग ऊपर जाओ। यही वजह है कि जब यह सूरत है तभी वे लोग हमसे कहते हैं कि आप लोगों की यह पार्लियामेंट तमाम मजाक है हमारे लिये। इस तरह

से लोग अनाज के बगैर जिन्दगी के दिन गिन रहे हैं। कोई भी डिमोक्रैटिक इन्स्टीट्यूशन अगर उसमें सलाहियत नहीं है और वह लोगों की फलाही और बहबूदी के लिये काम न कर सके तो मेरे ख्याल में वह मुर्दा हो जायगा, वह जिन्दा नहीं रह सकता, वह चल नहीं सकता। इसलिये मैं अपील करूँगा इस वक्त कि वैस्ट बंगाल में और यू० पी० में जो तहरीकें चल रही हैं, उसमें उनकी तरफ से जो डिमांड है उसको मान लेने की तरफ ध्यान दिया जाय, उसको आगे चलने न दिया जाय, और फोरी तौर पर इसका इंतजाम किया जाय। यह कह कर मैं खत्म करता हूँ।

जानी जेल सिंह (पंजाब) : आदरणीय उप-सभापति जी, आज हम आजादी के ग्यारह साल और कुछ महीने बीत जाने के बाद हिन्दुस्तान की खुराक की समस्या के ऊपर सोच विचार कर रहे हैं। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि भारत सरकार और हमारी सूबे की सरकारों ने इस मसले को हल करने के लिये काबिले तारीफ काम किया है। लेकिन इसके बावजूद हमें फख्र करने का कोई हक हासिल नहीं है कि जिसमें हम कह सकें कि हमने अपने देश की खुराक की समस्या का कोई मुकम्मल हल निकाल पाया। हमारे मोहतरिम वजीर साहब के कहने के मुताबिक जहाँ पहले २४५ मिलियन एकड़ जमीन में काश्त होती थी वहाँ सन् १९५६-५७ में २७५ मिलियन एकड़ जमीन में काश्त होती है यानी अब और ३० मिलियन एकड़ रकब की जमीन में हमारी काश्तकारी बढ़ी। इसके अलावा हमारे कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स पर, हमारा अग्रिल्कचर डिपार्टमेंट जिस तरह से करोड़ों रुपये खर्च करता है और खेती की उपज बढ़ाने के लिये टेक्निकल एसिस्टेंस देना, ट्रैक्टर की आमद, मशीनरी का आना, ये सब बातें जो हमारे देश में हुईं वे काबिले तारीफ हैं। लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी हम अपनी खुराक के मसले को हल नहीं कर पाये। इसके लिये कहा जा सकता है कि आबादी

का बढ़ना, flood बाढ़ का आना, बारिश का ज्यादा होना या कम होना, ये तमाम बातें खेती की पैदावार बढ़ाने में रुकावट डालती हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ पलड़ का आना, बारिश होना या न होना, ये चीजें अकेले हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं हैं, ये सारे संसार में होती हैं और आबादी का बढ़ना भी सारे संसार में होता रहा है। हमारी आबादी की रफतार दुनिया की आबादी की रफतार में कोई इतनी ज्यादा तेज नहीं बढ़ रही जिसके लिये हमें परेशान होना पड़े।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) in the Chair]

मैं फेमिली प्लानिंग का हामी हूँ लेकिन इस बात का भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये जहाँ एक पेट पैदा होता है वहाँ दो हाथ भी, दो पांव भी पैदा होते हैं कमाने और पैदावार करने के लिये। इसलिये इस बात को 2 P.M. मोचना पड़ेगा कि क्या वजह है कि हमारी सरकार और प्लानिंग कमिशन ने इस काम को पूरा करने के लिये जब कोई कसर बाकी नहीं रखी तो हम अपने पांव पर क्यों नहीं खड़े हो सके। हमका बाहर से अनाज मंगाना पड़ता है और इतना मंगाना पड़ता है कि हमने दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में यह निशान २४० करोड़ रुपये का सन् १९६० तक रखा था। लेकिन हम आज तक ३७९ करोड़ रुपये का अनाज विदेशों से मंगा चुके हैं। इसलिये इस बात पर चिंता करना और सोचना हम सब लोगों के लिये जरूरी हो जाता है। मैं जनाब के जरिये भारत सरकार से कहना चाहूँगा कि वह सूबों की सरकारों को हिदायत करें कि वे देखे कि उनकी जितनी भी स्कीमें और प्लानिंग हैं उसमें वे कहा तक पहुंची हैं और उनको जल्द अज जल्द पूरा किया जाय। लेकिन मैं यह देखता हूँ कि हमारे फड मिनिस्टर साहब ने खेती के मामले में जो निशान तय किया था वहाँ तक हमारी सूबे की सरकारें नहीं पहुंच पाई हैं। इसकी वजह यह है कि

[श्री जैल सिंह]

सूबों में जो दरमियानी मशीनरी है वह दिल में काम नहीं करती है। जहां पर वह दिल से काम करती है वहां पर कुछ तरक्की हुई है। आज हम देखते हैं कि दुनिया के मुकाबले में हमारे यहां फो एकड़ पैदावार बहुत कम है। इसका कारण यह है कि हमारे किसानों में उत्साह बहुत कम है। वह किसान जो रात दिन सर्दी और गर्मी में काम करता है, उसको किसी तरह की मदद खेती के मुताल्लिक नहीं दी जाती है। जो कुछ भी तकावी कर्ज या टेकनिकल जानकारी किसानों के नाम पर सरकार की ओर से दी जाती है वह सब बड़े बड़े जमींदारों के पास पहुंच जाती है। हमारे देश में आज कितने ही ट्रैक्टर हैं। एक ट्रैक्टर ३० बैलों को खाली कर देता है और १५ आदमी बेकार हो जाते हैं। इस बेकारी की वजह से वे आदमी वहां से हट जाते हैं। बड़े जमींदारों का यह हाल है कि वे जमीन पर ट्रैक्टर चलाकर एक दफा बीज डाल देते हैं चाहे फसल अच्छी हो या न हो, इसकी उनको कोई परवाह नहीं रहती है। उनको तो यह दिखाना होता है कि हम खुदकाश्त करते हैं, इसमें किसी का अधिकार नहीं है। इस बीमारी का इलाज हम लैंड रिफार्म के जरिये करना चाहते हैं। लैंड रिफार्म एक डाक्टर की छुरी है जो तलवार की तरह किसानों और जमींदारों के सर पर हमेशा लटकी रहती है। जमींदार सोचता है कि लैंड रिफार्म के जरिये मेरी जमीन छिन कर किसान के पास चली जायेगी और किसान को जमीन न मिलने से वह बेकार रह जाता है। खेती में काम करने वाला जो तबका है वह इस समय सब से मुसीबतजदा है और उपको ही सब से कम मजदूरी मिलती है। इंडस्ट्री में जो मजदूर काम करता है, दुकान में जो मजदूर काम करता है या घरेलू नौकर जो घरों में काम करते हैं वे सब कम मजदूरी मिलने पर हड़तालें कर देते हैं लेकिन खेती में काम करने वाला मजदूर कम मजदूरी मिलने पर भी काम करता रहता है और किसी

तरह की हड़ताल नहीं करता है। अगर हिसाब लगाया जाय तो हमको पता चलेगा कि हमारे मुल्क में बहुत से एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट लेबर भूखे रहते हैं, उसकी तरफ हम लोगों का ध्यान नहीं जाता है। इसलिये मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि लैंड रिफार्म के संबंध में तीन महीने का टाइम मुकर्रर कर देना चाहिये और तमाम सूबों को यह हिदायत जारी कर देनी चाहिये कि उन्होंने लैंड के मुताल्लिक जो लॉ बना रखे ह उनके ऊपर जल्द अर्ज जल्द अमल करें। इसके बाद इस चीज का निश्चय कराया जाय कि कम से कम पांच साल तक लैंड के संबंध में कोई नया कानून न बनाया जाय ताकि किसान और जमींदार को इस बात की तसल्ली हो जाय कि इस समय वह जिस जमीन पर खेती कर रहा है वह उसी के पास रहेगी। अगर इस बात की उसको तसल्ली मिल जायेगी तो वह खेती पर लगन के साथ और मेहनत के साथ काम करेगा।

पार्टीशन के पहले हमारी नहरों की कीमत करीब ११० करोड़ रुपये की थी और सैकण्ड फाइव इयर के खात्मे तक हमारे यहां की नहरों की कीमत करीब ७ करोड़ तक पहुंचने वाली थी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I am sorry to interfere, but the hon. Member has exceeded his time limit. You know, Congress Members time are getting ten minutes each now. It may even be reduced further.

GIANI ZAIL SINGH: Ten minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You see, we have got a very large list of speakers. They are all anxious to speak. Therefore, you should co-operate with me.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: It is the national problem, not a party problem. Let the time be equitably distributed among all the members and not party-wise.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I should personally feel

glad if all could take more time in this debate, but I cannot help it. We have to get through this business today and therefore, I would like to have co-operation from Sardar Sahib.

ज्ञानी जन सिंह : मैं तो पहले ही यह सोचता था कि बहुत संक्षेप में अपनी बातें कहूं। आपको इस बात को चिन्ता नहीं करना चाहिए। जहूँ मेरा टाइम खत्म हो जायगा वहाँ पर मैं समाप्त कर दूँगा। मैं अर्ज कर रहा था....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Your time is already up. When I say, "Please co-operate with me" I mean, to say that you should finish your speech. Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor. Ten minutes.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, admittedly the food situation in the country is not satisfactory and through I have to offer some criticism of the policies of the Government and have also to make certain suggestions to improve the situation, I must congratulate the Government and also the Food Minister for the very firm and sgacious manner in which they have tried to solve our difficulties so far the immediate difficulties are concerned.

Sir, I would like particularly to congratulate the Food Minister for the very frank and straightforward speech which he delivered yesterday, admitting that the situation is rather difficult and also admitting some acts of omission and commission which were committed. Sir, this portfolio of Food and Agriculture has always been a rather difficult portfolio. It has never been a bed of roses; it has always been a crown of thorns. And yet, in spite of it, if we find that there has not been a very acute situation created in the country like the one that we had to face during the war period, when millions of our countrymen died of starvation in Bengal. It should be a matter of some satisfaction to us and of con-

Sir, this situation, difficult as it is, must be treated on a national basis, and though appeals have been made by our Prime Minister and by the various State Ministers to all the different Parties in the country, and though the different Parties do say that they are prepared to co-operate with the Government to meet the situation, still, in actual practice, their conduct has been just the reverse of it. Sir, yesterday my hon. friend, Dr. Ahmad, said that he saw the Food Minister and he saw the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, and he appealed to him to extend his co-operation to the other Parties, and he also assured him of other Parties co-operation. He said that he appealed to the Chief Minister to have a cease-fire. Now, Sir, so far as we know, the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh has been repeatedly extending his hand of co-operation to the other Parties. If my hon. friend, Dr. Ahmad, seems to think that there can be only one-sided cease-fire, that is something impossible.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The process must be simultaneous.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, while they want that the State Government should cease opening fire, they want their Party to be incessantly opening fire. Under these circumstances, it is natural that there cannot be that perfect co-operation between the Government and the other Parties. Sir, not only in U.P. have these Opposition Parties made the position from bad to worse, but now we find that this sort of tactics is being resorted to even in West Bengal. Our friend, Shri Abdur Rezzak, just informed us that in West Bengal too there is now going to be some direct agitation. But what for all this is going to be, we cannot understand. Only in todays Hindustan Times, Sir, we find that Dr. B. C. Roy, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, appealed to the various Opposition Parties to

[Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor.]

difficulties, whatever they be, and we are glad to find that the Praja-Socialist Party in West Bengal accepted the offer of co-operation and they withdrew from the agitation. Sir, we find in the 'Hindustan Times' of this morning a message quoted from the special Calcutta correspondent to the effect that.—

"The Praja-Socialist Party one of the important constituents of the Famine Resistance Committee, has decided to dissociate itself from the direct action campaign."

But at the same time, we find that so far as the Communist Party is concerned, their Leader in the Legislature, Mr. Jyoti Basu, told a press conference on behalf of the communists that so far as they are concerned, they are going to resort to direct action. And what that direct action is going to be. It will include defiance of law and all that. Now may I Sir, in all earnestness ask what all this means? On the one hand, they say that there should be cease-fire, and on the other hand, they are resorting to direct action. Now, Sir, obviously it seems that these Opposition Parties want to exploit the situation to the advantage of their Parties, and they are not earnest and sincere to see that this difficult food situation in the country is solved.

Now, Sir, so far as U.P. is concerned, the situation there is worse than in any other State of the country. And yet we find that the Food Minister, though he belongs to that State, is not treating the State of Uttar Pradesh in a fair manner.

श्री शीलमित्र याजी : "दिया तले अन्धेरा"

यह बहुत मशहूर कहावत है ।

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR:

दिया तले अन्धेरा तो नहीं है क्योंकि वे सब चीजे अच्छी तरह देख रहे हैं ।

But it appears to me, Sir, that he is acting in this manner very much like a good modest Hindu housewife, who when she has to feed a number of

persons, particularly if they are guests from outside the family, ignores her own husband.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You have two minutes more.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: And that seems to be the position, Sir so far as our present Food Minister is concerned.

With your permission, Sir, I will now point out in what discriminating manner the State of U.P. has been treated so far as the allocation of foodgrains is concerned. I would like to compare the allotment of foodgrains to Uttar Pradesh with the allotment of foodgrains to West Bengal and Bihar. Now, Sir Uttar Pradesh has a population of 6.32 crores; Bihar has a population of 3.87 crores; West Bengal has a population of 2.63 crores. The total population of West Bengal and Bihar comes to 6.5 crores, which is very much the same as the population of U.P. Now what is the food position in the State of U.P. and in the States of Bihar and West Bengal, both combined? Sir, our position is very much worse. I will quote some figures in this connection for 1956-57, for no subsequent figures have been supplied to us.

Now the production in 1956-57, in West Bengal, was a little over 44 lakh tons, and in Bihar, it was a little over 47 lakh tons, the total being 91.5 lakh tons. The production in the same year, in Uttar Pradesh, was 91.81 lakh tons. So the total production of foodgrains in West Bengal and Bihar was almost equal to the total production of foodgrains in Uttar Pradesh. But if we confine ourselves only to the wheat and rice production, Sir, then West Bengal had the total production of 43.30 lakh tons and Bihar 40.38 lakh tons, the total being 84 lakh tons. And so far as U. P. is concerned, in the same year, viz., 1956-57, the total wheat and rice production was only to the extent of 54 lakh tons. And so we see that the wheat and rice

production in U.P. was very much less than that in West Bengal and Bihar. But yet, what do we find? That in West Bengal and Bihar, they have 22,000 cheap grain shops.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The hon. Member must bring his remarks to a close.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Does time fly so soon? I beg of you to give me a few more minutes. I don't want it for myself but I do want you to consider that the State of U. P. is very badly off.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): We have got to be fair to every State. There are a large number of Members. So you must bring your remarks to a close.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I don't know. I must obey your directions but then I must appeal to you and also to the Government to see that if possible some more time might be allotted so far as U.P. Members are concerned. This is just the State where the trouble is the most and therefore Members from U.P. ought to be given a little more time. Anyway I will finish in a couple of minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How is it that he accuses us of trouble and he wants more time?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Let me finish this aspect of the case. Now what do we find? In Bengal and Bihar there are 22,000 cheap grain shops. In U.P. there were only 3,000 and now there are 3,700 grain shops. The total allocation of wheat and rice so far as U.P. is concerned has been 60,000 tons per month so far. It has been only recently increased to 85,000 tons but so far as West Bengal and Bihar are concerned they have been getting—you will be interested to see—1,60,000 tons of wheat per month in addition to rice. These are the figures which I have

got from the White Paper which has been circulated . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): They tell their own tale. Please wind up now. I cannot allow any further time.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Let me close the last sentence. What I mean to suggest is that our position being worse off than that of Bengal and Bihar, our State should at least get as much as they get. I don't grudge whatever is allotted to Bengal and Bihar they may have even more, if they need, but let us not starve. Let us have more shops and let more grains be allotted to us. This is my appeal to the hon. Food Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Shri Niranjan Singh. Please finish in ten minutes.

श्री निरंजन सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं १० मिनट में खत्म करने की कोशिश तो करूंगा लेकिन शायद एकाध मिनट और ज्यादा लग जाय ।

किसानी मुहकमे के मंत्री जी ने कुछ प्वाइंट्स बताये और यह आशा भी प्रकट की कि हम लोग जो कुछ सजेशन देंगे उसको मानने के लिये वे तैयार हैं। तो मैं उसी चीज को ध्यान में रख करके अपनी बात कहूंगा। मैं फ़ैक्ट्स और फिगर्स के झगड़े में भी पड़ना नहीं चाहता हूँ क्योंकि उन पर मैं विश्वास नहीं करता हूँ। तो सबसे पहले उन्होंने कैश क्राप के संबंध में जो बात कही उसके लिये मेरा सुझाव है। मेरा कहना है कि जब तक सरकार दो चीजों को दृष्टि में नहीं रखेगी तब तक खाने की चीजें कभी भी किमान पैदा करने वाला नहीं है। एक तो यह कि जिन चीजों से किसान को ज्यादा पैसा मिलता है उसी को वह ज्यादा से ज्यादा पैदा करता है और यदि खाने की चीजों की कीमत उर्मा, अनुपात में नहीं रहेगी तो वह खाने की चीजें पैदा नहीं करेगा। दूसरे यह कि आखिर वह

[श्री निरंजन सिंह]

भी अपना जीवन निर्वाह कहना चाहता है, वह भी अपनी जरूरतों को देखता है। दो साल पहले जब कि भाव कम हुए तब का मुझे याद है, मैंने मध्य प्रदेश में और यहां भी यह कहा था कि भाव का एक एवरेज बांध दिया जाय और उस पर भाव को लाया जाय। मेरा इस सरकार से कहना यह है कि वह कहती बहुत कुछ है पर करती कुछ नहीं है। चीज यह है कि जो बाजार में भाव होता है उससे कम भाव पर सरकार गल्ला लेना चाहती है। इसके अलावा जिन आदमियों को इस काम के लिये वह मुकदर करती है उनको यदि ८ आने या एक रुपये मन रिश्तत मिल गई तो भाव ज्यादा हो जाता है और अगर पैसा उनको नहीं मिला तो भाव कम हो जाता है। अगर गल्ला बाजार में ज्यादा भाव पर बिकता है तो सरकार की दुकान पर बेचने के लिये उसे कौन लायेगा? तो मेरा कहना है कि सरकार को देखना होगा कि एवरेज में फी एकड़ शुगर केन से जितनी इनकम हो सकती है, फी एकड़ कॉटन से जितनी इनकम हो सकती है उसी एवरेज के ऊपर, उसी अनुपात से चावल और गेहूं का भाव बांधे। अगर वह चावल और गेहूं का भाव उस अनुपात से नहीं बांधनी तो उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ेगा, प्रोडक्शन नहीं बढ़ेगा और आपको बाहर से गल्ला मंगाना पड़ेगा। जितना रुपया आप अमेरिका को और दूसरे देशों को गल्ला मंगाने के लिये देते हैं वही रुपया यदि किसानों को सबसिडी के रूप में दे दिया जाय तो किसान अपनी पैदावार भी बढ़ायेगा और आपका जो फूड का शॉर्टेज है वह भी कम होगा।

दूसरी बात सैम्पिल सर्वे की है। कल भी आपने कहा कि हम सैम्पिल सर्वे करते हैं। हमको मालूम है कि किस तरह से करते हैं। मैं किसानों करता हूं। हो सकता है कि यहां थोड़े बहुत भाई किसान हों लेकिन आप शहर के रहने वाले हैं आपका ज्यादा

वास्ता इस बात से नहीं है। जो सैम्पिलिंग आप करते हैं वह कैसे करते हैं? एक गांव में यदि एवरेज निकाल लिया जाय तो उससे ठीक बात मालूम नहीं होती है। एवरेज उसी तरह से निकाला जाता है जिस तरह से कि पटवारी का हिसाब हमेशा बराबर रहता है और कुनबा डूब जाता है। आप हमको बराबर मिलियन टन में बता रहे हैं कि हम इतना पैदा कर रहे हैं लेकिन वह मिलियन टन पैदा हुआ या नहीं, कुछ मालूम नहीं। किसान के घर में कितना पैदा होता है उसका वे भी नहीं जानते। हो सकता है कि आप मंडी की, बाजार की बात कह सकते हैं कि इतना बाजार में बिकने आया लेकिन हर गांव में एवरेज तरीके पर कितना पैदा हुआ है इसका अन्दाजा लगाना बहुत कठिन है। तो जो फ़िगरर्स के ऊपर आप जगलरी करना चाहते हैं उससे यह खाद्य-समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती।

तीसरी बात आपने इरिगेशन के सम्बन्ध में कही। जब मैंने फाइव ईयर प्लान की रिवाइज्ड रिपोर्ट पढ़ी तो मैंने देखा कि उसमें मध्य प्रदेश के लिये लिखा था कि आदमी अभी वाटर-माइंडेड नहीं हुए हैं, इरिगेशन माइंडेड नहीं हुए हैं। कल हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि यह सब जगह के लिये लागू है। मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि जितना पैसा आपने लगाया है उसके मुताबिक काम नहीं हुआ है। न तो कुएं बने हैं, न कुछ हुआ है। कुएं के लिये जिनको आप रुपया देते हैं, जिनको सरकार कुएं के लिये तकावी देती है वे कुएं नहीं खोदते हैं, वे उस रुपये को कहीं अपने यहां शादी-विवाह पर खर्च करते हैं या कहीं दूसरी बातों पर खर्च करते हैं। आपको रिपोर्ट मिल जाती है कि इतने कुएं खुद गये लेकिन वे सचमुच में खुदते नहीं हैं। इसके बाद विजली की बात आती है मैं अपने मध्य प्रदेश की बात बताता हूं कि वहां एक कुएं के ऊपर २५० ६० एलेक्ट्रिसिटी का चार्ज लेना चाहते हैं। कौन आदमी, कौन किसान एकदम से २५० ६०

देने को तैयार होगा ? एक कुएं से ज्यादा से ज्यादा ३ एकड़ या ५ एकड़ की सिंचाई हो सकती है और आप उनके ऊपर ५ एकड़ के लिये ५० रु० फी एकड़ के हिसाब से इसका किराया बांधना चाहते हैं। इस तरह से न तो आपको सिंचाई की योजना सफल हो सकती है और न किसान को फायदा हो सकता है। अब नहरों की बात लीजिये जब किसान को पानी की जरूरत होती है तो उसको नहर से पानी नहीं मिलता। आधे रात को नहर से पानी मिलता है। इस में अलावा थोड़ा बहुत मिल गया और फिर नहीं मिला। अगर गन्ने में पांच बार पानी देना पड़ता है तो दो बार पानी दे कर के गन्ना पैदा नहीं किया जा सकता है, इसी तरह से अगर गेहूं में दो बार पानी दिया जाता है तो एक बार पानी दे कर गेहूं पैदा नहीं कर सकते। जब गेहूं पकने वाला है तब अगर उसको पानी दिया जाय तो उससे उसको कोई फायदा नहीं हो सकता। तो मेरा कहना है कि जो बकिंग है वह डिफेक्टिव है और उसके लिये किसान को, देश को या दूसरों को गाली देने से कुछ काम नहीं चलता है, दूसरी पार्टियों को गाली देने से कुछ काम नहीं चलता है। आप खुद ठीक काम न करें और दूसरे के ऊपर बुराई मढ़ें तो यह भलमनसाहत नहीं है, यह काम करने का तरीका नहीं है। इस नाते से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यदि इरिगेशन का काम करना है तो उसको ठीक से करें। आपने रूल्स ठीक से नहीं बनाये। जो बड़े बड़े डैम्स के सब्सटीट्यूट्स बनाने थे, जो छोटी छोटी नहरें और कनाल बनानी थीं उसके लिये आपके पास साधन नहीं है। तो इसके लिये सरकार जिम्मेदार है, किसान जिम्मेदार नहीं है।

एक और नई चीज हमने देखी। हमें जो पैम्फलेट दिया गया है उसमें लिखा गया है कि आज कल ज्वार और बाजरा खाने वाले बहुत कम हो गये हैं, सब गेहूं खाना चाहते

हैं। लेकिन इसमें ही दूसरे पेज में लिखा हुआ है कि साढ़े छः मिलियन टन ज्वार कम हुआ। एक तरफ तो शिकायत यह है कि अब ज्वार खाने वाले कम हो गये हैं और लोग गेहूं ज्यादा खाने हैं लेकिन वहां ही दूसरी तरफ यह कहते हैं कि ज्वार ६ मिलियन टन से ६॥ मिलियन टन कम हो गई। इन दोनों चीजों का आप कैसे समन्वय करते हैं यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता। आप बरार में जायें तो बरार का आदमी गेहूं नहीं खायेगा, वह ज्वार खाना पसन्द करेगा। इसी तरह से जहां चावल खाने वाले आदमी हैं वहां वे गेहूं खाना पसन्द नहीं करेंगे, चावल खाना पसन्द करेंगे। लेकिन सरकार की नीति यह है कि अब अनाज का डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन करती है तो जहां गेहूं खाने वाले हैं वहां चावल भेजती है, ज्वार भेजती है और जहां चावल खाने वाले हैं वहां गेहूं भेजती है। इस तरह से सरकार डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन करती है लेकिन जहां पर भी जो आदमी खाता पीता है वह वहां पर अपने वातावरण के अनुसार ही खायेगा, पियेगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You have almost finished your time.

श्री निरंजन सिंह : क्या १० मिनट हो गये, श्रीमान्।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You have taken 8 minutes.

श्री निरंजन सिंह : फिर जहां तक ट्रैक्टर का सवाल है, मुझे यह मालूम है कि ट्रैक्टरों का किराया सरकार ने ६५ रु० एकड़ के हिसाब से चार्ज किया है। वैसे तो मुझे बहुत कुछ कहना था, लेकिन इतना मैं जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि ज़मीन में हम कितनी भी मेहनत करें और खास करके ये जो फर्टिलाइजर्स हैं उनका कितना ही इस्तेमाल करें और ट्रैक्टरों की सहायता लें लेकिन यदि हम ज़मीन को पानी नहीं देते, यदि वह ज़मीन बेट नहीं होती, तो उन चीजों का कोई फायदा नहीं

[श्री निरंजन सिंह]

है। यदि आप वहां सिंचाई की व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकते तो आप कितना ही खाद डालें, फर्टिलाइज़र डालें, कभी उतना पैदा नहीं होगा जितना होना चाहिये। इसी तरह से जहां वेट एरिया नहीं है वहां ट्रैक्टर के इस्तेमाल करने से भी कल्टीवेशन ठीक से नहीं होता। वहां अगर आप ट्रैक्टर चलायेंगे तो दो, तीन साल बाद कांस पैदा हो जाता है। इसलिये आप जो ट्रैक्टराइजेशन करना चाहते हैं उससे नुकसान होता है, किसान के जमीन की फर्टिलिटी चली जाती है, उसमें उत्पत्ति कम होती है। फर्टिलाइज़र डालने से जमीन की जो उत्पादक शक्ति है, जो रिटेंशन पावर है वह खत्म हो जाती है। एक तरफ आप चाहते हैं विदेशी ङग से आपकी किसानी हो, दूसरी तरफ आप उनको इस तरह का फायदा नहीं देना चाहते। जहां पर एक्सटेंसिव कल्टी-वेशन होता है वहां यदि धान की खेती होती है और समय पर पानी नहीं मिलता, तो यदि आषाढ़ में पानी नहीं मिले और खाद डाल दी गई तो आपकी जितनी फसल है वह खत्म हो जायगी। इसलिये जब तक आपकी ओर से इर्रिगेशन की व्यवस्था नहीं होती है, किसान को आप सिंचाई की फ़ैसिलिटी नहीं देते, तब तक आप चाहें कि उत्पत्ति बढ़ जाय यह अमम्भव है।

आज किसान की हालत यह है कि साल भर में एक फ़सल उसको मिलती है। अभी कल बताया गया कि पैंसठ परसेंट किसान पांच एकड़ जमीन के मालिक हैं, उनकी अनइकॉनॉमिक होल्डिंग है। उसके पास वे साधन नहीं रहते कि किसी तरह से अपना गुज़र बसर कर सके। किसान को जहां से जो पसा मिल जाता है उससे वह गुज़र बसर कर लेता है। इसलिये जब तक साल में दो या तीन फ़सल उसके नहीं हो जाती तब तक आप चाहें कि किसान खुशहाल रहे या तरक्की कर सके, खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन कर सके यह

असम्भव सी चीज़ है। इसलिए आप उसको सिंचाई के साधन दीजिये। उसके बाद खेती के औज़ार, ट्रैक्टर आदि दें और फर्टिलाइज़र उपलब्ध कराये। तभी खेती की पैदावार में वृद्धि हो सकती है।

बीज के सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह कहना है कि.....

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पी० एन० सन्नू) :
अब आप अपना गेटेंस ख़त्म कर दीजिए।

श्री निरंजन सिंह : सरकार यदि बीज इस तरह से देना चाहती हैं कि चार सालतक वह अपने फ़ार्म में एक्सपेरीमेंट करे, उसके बाद किसान को दे तो यह झूठी बात है। असली बात यह है कि जो बीज हमको मिलता है वह बीज समय पर मिलता नहीं है। जब हमारी बोवाई ख़त्म होती है तब हमको बीज मिलता है। फिर हम उसको बाज़ार में बेच देते हैं। जो बाद में बीज खरीदने को मिलता है वह बोया नहीं जाता।

मैं एक बात और आखीर में कह दूँ। मन्त्री जी ने ट्रेडिंग के बारे में कहा कि हम गल्ले की ट्रेडिंग करना चाहते हैं। जो सरकार ट्रेडिंग करना चाहती है वह कभी जनता को फलन फूलाने वाली सरकार नहीं हो सकती। ट्रेडिंग नहीं, आप स्टॉक को रिज़र्व कीजिये जो एमर्जेन्सी के वक़्त काम आये, जो आपकी क्रीमों को बैलेंस में कर सके, जिससे महंगाई में आप सस्ते दाम पर अनाज दे सकें और सस्ते में आप महंगा खरीद सके। जब आप ट्रेडिंग करते हैं तब आपको मालूम है कि आप अट्ठारह रुपये मन देते हैं, बाइस रुपये मन देते हैं, उसमें किसान को और खाने वाले को टोटा होता ही है लेकिन सरकार को भी टोटा पड़ता है, उसको चार, छः रुपया मन का टोटा पड़ता है, यानी सरकार १८ रु० के भाव से खरीदती है और २४ रु० पर बेचती है। इसलिये जब उसको टोटा पड़ता है तब ट्रेडिंग की बात ही छोड़ दीजिये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Mr. Jaswant Singh. I called you when you were away.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): I had gone for my food, Sir.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA. We have had no lunch hour today.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: But I had to eat something. I was prepared to forego my turn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Fifteen minutes.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): I was told that I would be given 20 minutes. Before I left I was told that I would be allowed 20 minutes. However, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I heard yesterday the speech of the hon. Food Minister with attention and interest. To his credit I must say that he was frank enough to mention the shortcomings in the administration of food, and also he assured us that he is taking steps both short-term as well as long-term, which will in due course of time meet the situation which has been created and which is before the country at the moment. As far as the shortcomings are concerned, we know that they are there, and the Government has failed to that extent. As regard the future steps, Dr. Kunzru this morning said that he was sceptical. As far as I am concerned, I feel that unless they radically change their policies they would never be able to fulfil the targets or deliver the goods. I do realise that the position of the Central Food Minister is unenviable as stated by Mr. Shiva Rao yesterday. He is responsible and answerable for acts of omission and commission over which he has no control either directly or indirectly. But this has to be admitted that as far as direction and policy are concerned, they emanate from the Centre and as such his responsibility is there. If the Central Government cannot see that their policies are implemented by the States, well, for the present there is only one State

which is not under their control directly. The remaining 13 States are directly under their control. But in due course of time when other States also go out of their control, it will be a matter for serious consideration as to how this problem of food will be solved.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You do not have the Food Minister here. He will lose his job.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I was a little surprised by the statement which the Food Minister made yesterday, that the Prime Minister had in the other House only the other day made a very significant statement. That significant statement, to quote the words of the Food Minister, is that the Prime Minister said that "it was unfortunate that we had not realised the importance of agriculture in our planning. We had not given it a sufficiently important place." It is a very damaging statement coming as it does from the Prime Minister.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: It is a frank statement.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is deplorable, therefore, that the Prime Minister and his Government, who were supposed to be the representatives of the people, had during the course of their eight years' rule, not been able to solve a problem of this nature. It is deplorable. And not only it is deplorable, but I feel that what has been stated is not correct.

(At this stage Shri A. P. Jam entered the House.)

I am glad that the hon. Food Minister is here in the House now. What I was submitting was that yesterday he referred to the statement of the Prime Minister and I quoted his words. He said that it was a very significant statement. But I stated that it is a very significant but most unfortunate statement, because it shows how a matter like food has been taken into consideration half-heartedly.

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

Secondly, Sir, I feel that it does not represent the correct state of affairs for the simple reason that soon after the Congress Government came into office, they put the senior-most members of their Party in charge of this portfolio. The first Five Year Plan was wholly and solely devoted to the enhanced production of food. It was then an agricultural plan. We were also told that the targets had been fulfilled. That was stated by the hon. Food Minister himself. He said that very nearly the target set for the First Five Year Plan so far as agricultural production was concerned had been fulfilled. Time and again we were assured by the Government that before long we would be able to export the food grains. I also remember to have heard the statement of the Prime Minister that if by 1955 we are unable to solve the food problem he and his Government would resign. From time to time, they have been making statements and appeals saying that they are taking this step, that step and so on and now, in the eighth year, to come forward and say that we had not given it a sufficiently important place is surprising. Certain targets have been fixed for the Second Five Year Plan and we understand that by 1960-61 an additional food production potential of 153.8 lakh tons will have to be created. If the result of the past two years is any indication, we feel that this target is also incapable of being fulfilled. Sir, in view of the shortness of time, I will deal with only two or three items.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): you can have five more minutes. Instead of fifteen, you can have twenty minutes.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Thank you very much, Sir.

I will submit, Sir, that the Government assumed responsibility for organising the economic development of the country eight years ago. It is really a matter of regret that it still seems unable to get going on an integrated and sufficiently intensive effort to expand our agricultural production.

Sir, I said that the Food Minister was frank enough to admit that in certain sections the improvement has not been as it should have been and he mentioned the multi-purpose projects as one of them. The potential created by these multipurpose projects was not properly utilised. As you know, we have spent colossal sums on these multi-purpose projects and one such big project has come to Rajasthan for which we are thankful. In this connection, I refer to the Rajasthan Canals. There is an eternal problem of famine in some parts of Rajasthan. The coming in of the Rajasthan Canals has created a great potential and we are very happy over this. We are also hopeful that millions and millions of acres will be available for cultivation. It will create a great potential both for landless farmers and for other purposes also if the Government wants to go in for big farms but at the rate at which work is being carried on, I am absolutely certain that it will be another ten years or more before this entire big scheme could be utilised. If the Government is serious about this matter and in solving this problem, I am certain they will not allow things to go on as they are going on now. These are things which are responsible for the shortage of food and for our being unable to get more food production.

The hon. Minister then referred to minor irrigation works and in that regard, we were told that we had succeeded to quite an extent. As stated this morning by Dr. Kunzru, we are not certain whether the figures supplied by the various States are correct. I stated before the hon. Minister came in that we realise that his portfolio is one of the most difficult portfolios, that the Minister has to be responsible for things over which he has no control directly or indirectly and that, therefore, he has my sympathies but Sir, all the same, as long as he occupies this post, he has to be responsible for this somehow or the other. In regard to minor irrigation works also, we know that something has been done; at least speaking for Rajasthan I can say that

but we also know that the old works which were doing a lot of good work have been completely neglected. While we are progressing in certain directions, in other directions, the old works have been completely neglected and production is at a standstill so far as minor irrigation works in Rajasthan are concerned. The land-owners, small or big, who are experts in this line and who are doing such a good job have been discouraged for some reason or the other and these people have taken all their investments from agriculture and have put them in other fields. I can say this at least so far as Rajasthan is concerned. I can say that from my personal experience. The Ganganagar Colony is the granary of Rajasthan and there, a large number of people, because they have no incentives and also because they do not get the worth of their produce, have taken away or are taking away all their investments from the holdings of agricultural lands and have invested or are investing them in urban lands.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Perhaps these jagirdars were afraid of the land ceilings and that is why they are withdrawing their investments from agricultural lands.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): Which colony?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Ganganagar Colony.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: They were afraid of land ceilings.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (**SHRI P. N. SAPRU**): You go on. Your time is limited.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Regarding the food zones, we were also told that practically these zones would stay. Well, they may stay; we have got no objection if the Government has come to a definite conclusion that these zones are doing good work but we have got certain problems which the Government will have to solve. Otherwise, these food zones also will do very great harm. I raised this question the other

day in the informal meeting but for some reason or the other, the Food Minister was not pleased to give me a reply then. My question is this: Take again the case of this Ganganagar Mandi which is one of the biggest grain mandis in India. The colony irrigated by the Gang Canal irrigation system is the main granary of Rajasthan and it supplies foodgrains and pulses not only to Rajasthan but to places as far away as Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and so on and so forth.

Now, here a very serious situation has arisen and that is this that because of this new zone—it links Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Bombay together, and the prices of foodgrains in Bombay being very high—all the foodgrains from Rajasthan, from the Bikaner Division are exported to Bombay and the people in Bikaner are supplied with imported foodgrains. Have you seen this absurdity, the extent to which absurdity can go that the thing produced in a locality should go away a thousand miles and imported food should come to that locality? The Government was very well in a position to supply Bombay with the food which has been imported, and the ships containing imported food are there in the harbour of Bombay. Instead of that, foodgrains from the Ganganagar area are supplied there and the places round about that locality have to depend on the imported foodgrains or on the foodgrains coming from elsewhere. The result is this. About this time, ordinarily the price of foodgrains should be near about Rs. 14 or Rs. 15 a maund, but today foodgrains are available only at Rs. 23 a maund and Rs. 24 a maund, and we receive imported food. So I have no objection if the Government feels that these zones are very useful, but then they should see also the wastage of money—which we have to incur—and the plight of the people who have been put to such a great difficulty. They say that in living memory in Bikaner the people do not remember that prices have gone as high as they have gone this year. Yet it may be said on behalf of the Government Benches: Why should Rajasthan or

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

that part of Rajasthan grudge it when the foodgrains in Bombay, Calcutta and other places are selling at as high a price as Rs. 40 or Rs. 45 a maund? But that is neither here nor there. The capacity of the people to pay the high price should be taken into consideration, and a majority cannot afford to pay the high price. We only see that those who agitate are looked after. Take the case of U.P. or Bengal or even Bihar. Well, we feel that if you agitate more, Government would come to your help, but if you do not agitate, certainly no help will be given to you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): In U.P. the prices are frightfully high; perhaps you are better off.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Step-motherly treatment will be given to you if you do not agitate. Therefore, Sir, this is the position as far as the zones are concerned.

Then, Sir, we feel that we have toyed with this problem for too long. Millions of our people are half-starving. Food is there but it is beyond the means of a very large number of people; there is dissatisfaction in the country, and public opinion broadly regards the handling of the food policy by the Government as inadequate both in regard to holding the price level and in the long-term aspect of raising food production.

Then, Sir, another brilliant idea by which to increase food production is the intensive rabi crop campaign that is presently going on. If Sir, college professors and teachers and students can deliver the goods by going to the fields I only can say: God help the country.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Of agricultural colleges.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: Agricultural students.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I know, maybe they are students and professors of agricultural colleges, but I can say this that our agriculturists

and farmers know more in practice than the theorists, than those professors, and how can the professors and students from the agricultural colleges go and teach them? They themselves will have to learn how to do this, of the time to cultivate, how to cultivate and all that. I feel they will make such a mess that we will have to regret it at leisure . . . (*Interruption.*) and probably, as my friend here says, they will go on a picnic at the cost of the agriculturists and they will enjoy themselves; they will have a little holiday from their colleges and after enjoying themselves and wasting the time of the agriculturists who know in practice much more than these theorists . . .

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is not quite so.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is my opinion.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is quite true that the cultivator in the beginning will never learn anything from these professors and students, but in three or four years' time he will begin to learn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I read, as a student, Dr. Harold Mann's book on Indian Agriculture; he thinks that the Indian agriculturist, though conservative, is teachable.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Then, Sir, there was a talk about the figures and the statements on which our Government largely depends, and quite rightly too; we cannot blame them.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Now you must bring your remarks to a close.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If you allow me two minutes, Sir . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I have given you twenty minutes; twenty minutes are over.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am just finishing, Sir; just two minutes; my other friend from my Party will take two minutes less. I am just finishing.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: When you have still a lot of speakers, time will be needed to accommodate them, and if you intend to accommodate them, you will have to enforce strict time limit.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My time is wasted, Sir. I would now say only one thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Please bring your remarks to a close.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: In two minutes I will finish, Sir.

We depend on our figures, and this and that. I would say that not only in different books there are different figures, but in one and the same taken there are different figures. Now to take all the cases up it will take too long a time, but only speaking of Rajasthan, here is the bulletin of food statistics, which has been supplied to us, and I would invite the attention of the hon. Minister to Table III on page 8 and to Table IV on page 13. Here the same cereals for the same period and for the same State have been given. Now as far as rice is concerned, the figure of difference is more or less the same, only there is difference of a thousand tons. In regard to wheat, in the year 1954, one statement says that it was . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The two minutes are over.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: All right, Sir. What I wanted to submit was this that if you turn to these tables you will find that the figures are very different accounting for a difference of thousands and thousands of tons. Therefore I do not know how much one can rely on the statistics. Thank you.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI (Bombay): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a sad state of affairs that we have to discuss the food problem in such serious tones. Food and agriculture are so vital to our economy. Agriculture holds a very important place in our politics as well as in our social and economic standards. Of the total annual national income of 11,000 crores of rupees, about 50 per cent is accounted for by the income from agriculture. Yet this country can neither be called agricultural nor industrial. For agricultural production we must look into the figures, and our production is so low as can be seen from what I am quoting. The average yield of rice per acre in Japan is 3,750 pounds; in U.S.A. it is 3,030 pounds; in China it is 2,387 pounds, whereas in India the average production per acre of rice is 750 pounds. Now in respect of wheat in Japan it is 1,860 pounds; in U.S.A. it is 1,200 pounds; in China it is 760 pounds, whereas in India it is 600 pounds. I do not consider it necessary to quote the figures of Canada, Australia and such other countries 3. P.M. (which are agricultural countries).

In the case of cotton and tobacco also we are the lowest. Now, Sir, let us go into the causes or the roots of such low production. Let me quote from 'Self-help in Agriculture'; it is stated therein:

"At the present low average level of production the major agricultural crops in India remove over 3.8 million tons of nitrogen from the land but the quantity supplied by way of manures and fertilisers is less than a million ton. Therefore no effort for improving total production will succeed unless the over-all deficiency of nitrogen is made good on cultivated areas."

Now while, as I have stated, we have low production we have to depend for foodgrains on foreign countries and that also to the tune of thousands of crores of rupees. In 1956-57 we imported foodgrains worth Rs. 111 crores and in 1957-58 worth Rs. 167

[Shri J. H. Joshi.]

crores. And before that in the years 1951-52 we imported foodgrains worth Rs. 228 crores and in 1952-53 worth Rs. 161 crores. Now, Sir, this is a very great drain on our economy.

I would now like to offer a few suggestions although the Ministry may have received hundreds and thousands of such suggestions. I feel that it is no use distributing the blame and placing it on any person or on any Department. It is only the state of affairs that is responsible for this. I would therefore suggest that each State should be made responsible for the production of foodgrains and the Central Government should be responsible for supplying only that part or that portion which is deficit. If the States do not discharge their duties properly and do not produce foodgrains according to the schedule or the plan, then I think the Central Government should pull up those States and try to see that action is taken by the States according to the plan. I suggest that each State, each District, each Taluka and each village in the State, and ultimately every field, must have its own plan and programme for increasing food production and a chart should be hung in every village panchayat office so that it can indicate how much progress has been made by each cultivator in his field.

There is also one more suggestion. There is a Talati whose duty it is to collect revenue and he is in charge of five villages on an average. We have got about five lakhs of villages in the country and that means in all we have a lakh of Talatis. That is a great army with us, with the Government. Now, if that army were properly trained and if they are made to discharge their duties properly, then I think the Government would be able to tackle this problem of poverty and this problem of food shortage. I feel that these Talatis or these small men consider themselves or they feel that they are very insignificant people in this gigantic machinery of the Government. So if their services are recognised, if their services are appreciated

and if they are honest, I feel that much can be done to step up food production in the country.

Then we have these big irrigation schemes. They have either been completed or they are on the verge of completion and I think the Government should now divert its attention towards small minor schemes. As far as possible each cultivator should have a well in his own field. After all, the cultivator at present has to depend upon the caprice of nature and where there are big schemes there also the cultivator has to depend upon the caprice and whims of the Department. The cultivator may be requiring water any time. If he had a well in his own field then he may water his crops at any time, even at midnight. Sometimes it so happens that because of short supply of water from the big irrigation schemes, the crops wither away and the cultivator is put to loss and ultimately the country is also put to loss. I therefore suggest that if the amount spent on one big irrigation scheme which may be costing Rs. 60 crores on an average . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You have exceeded your time.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI: I am finishing, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I am sorry I will have to enforce the rule rather strictly now.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI: Then I shall finish straightway, Sir. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Just say your last word.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI: As I was saying, if the amount of a big irrigation scheme—it may be Rs. 60 crores or so—is diverted to the digging of wells and if on an average a well costs about Rs. 600, out of that Rs. 60 crores ten lakhs of wells can be dug and we can make ten lakhs cultivators self-sufficient in respect of water and they

can stand on their own legs. Therefore I feel that the Government would do well to consider these suggestions of mine.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the hon. Food Minister has given us various figures which show that there has been a continuous increase in production both from the point of view of acreage under cultivation and also the quantity produced. Today Dr. Kunzru pointed out that acre per acre the increase has not been very much more than what it was before 1951. Therefore the problem should be looked at from the point of view of how we can increase production from the same acreage of land. Sir, the obvious answer, as has been given by various Members, is that we should take such steps as will help in the growing of more food from the same quantity of land. For that purpose there should be provision for better seeds, provision for supply of seeds in proper time, more supply of water, that is to say, more areas under irrigation, more fertilisers, and supply of such other requirements of the cultivators as they may be short of. Sir, these steps that I am mentioning are not new, they are all well-known facts, but the trouble is that in practice it is difficult to work them out and there is no machinery for seeing to it that these steps are carried out, so that when the farmers need them they may get them.

Sir, as has been mentioned by the Food Minister there is a shortage of fertilisers. The fertiliser that is needed in the country is not available. Moreover, so far as my information goes, the fertiliser that is available is mostly made available to the cash-crop producer. The fertiliser that goes to Assam is used mostly by the tea planters. Similarly the fertiliser is used very much more by the sugarcane growers than by producers of wheat or gram or rice. Tractors are also said to be not available, and from the Minister's speech I could understand that he is still thinking in terms

of import. There is a shortage of foreign exchange and my suggestion would be that, if instead of importing fertilisers we import the machinery for producing fertilisers, in the long run that will be much more helpful than spending money on the import of fertilisers. As a matter of fact . . .

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): What about the immediate problem?

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: The immediate problem has got to be tackled by intensive cultivation, as has been suggested by the Food Minister himself. For that purpose you have to make arrangements for the supply of proper seeds, more water, etc., and these minor irrigation schemes which have been very successful in some of the States . . .

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: For all these you would need fertiliser which is not available.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: If it is not available, it cannot be produced even if I say that an arrangement will have to be made. If you have no money, you cannot import it. At the same time if you spend money on the import of machinery, it may be that for two years you may have to tighten your belt, but in the long run you will be in a much better position than if you go on importing fertilisers year after year and not taking steps to set up the machinery which will be able to produce fertilisers. Moreover, in the present state of our industrial development, I think a large number of items of the machinery which will be required for producing fertilisers can be manufactured in the country. There will be very few items which will have to be imported, and the foreign exchange portion of the cost will be much less than what was the case with regard to the Sindri fertiliser machinery.

Sir, the same remarks apply to tractors. Why should we think of import of tractors which can be made in the country? There is capacity in

[Shri P. D. Himatsingka.]

some of the factories which are there for the manufacture of automobiles, and as a matter of fact tractors can be much more easily produced than you can produce a motor car. In tractors the engine is the most important part, and that is being manufactured in the country. Therefore, if the Government takes up the question of arranging to buy a certain number of tractors from these existing companies, I have no doubt that they will be able to supply those tractors, and very little foreign exchange may be needed for the manufacture of tractors. The capacity is immense, and because of the short supply of certain parts for motor cars and automobiles, they cannot manufacture more of them, and the additional capacity of those companies, of those factories, can be very usefully utilised in the production of tractors which will save ultimately a large amount of foreign exchange which we have to spend in the import of tractors.

Therefore, Sir, what is needed is some sort of a machinery, some arrangement, whereby the steps that the Government intend to take for extensive and intensive cultivation can be carried out. There may be officers or bodies which will see to it that what is expected to be done by those who produce food crops, cereals and everything else, do get the necessary help in proper time and at reasonable prices and as and when they need them. Otherwise I do not see what is the short-cut that can be possible to solve the difficulty which is facing us so far as this question is concerned. Sir, there is no doubt that if arrangements can be made for supplying water by carrying out small irrigation schemes in the villages, a lot of improvement can be made.

There is another thing that can be done. There is a large amount of fertiliser—I mean fertiliser in the shape of the cow dung and other manure which are burnt in the villages for want of fuel. If some arrangement can be made for the supply of

coal or some other fuel which can be used instead of cow dung being burnt, that will also help in the production of a large quantity of food. I do not know why the hon. Minister is laughing at this suggestion. I have seen with my own eyes thousands of maunds of cow dung being burnt in U.P., Rajasthan and other places, and if some alternative arrangement can be made for fuel for cooking and other purposes to replace the use of cow dung, a large quantity of additional manure will be available for the production of foodgrains. Sir, ultimately it boils down to this that we have to make some arrangement whereby the steps that will help in the production of foodgrains could be taken. You will find that in a large number of places the cultivator has not got bullocks by which he can cultivate his land. I know also from personal knowledge that a large number of them have not got bullocks. They have to hire them from other persons. But some arrangements can be made in the different areas, some persons may be put in charge to find out what is needed in the different areas, and the arrangements may be made by a Central organisation or provincial organisation or organisations at the district level. I think things will very much improve and a good deal of our difficulties may be solved by making these arrangements. So far as the case of West Bengal is concerned, as you know, it had to divert a lot of attention in increasing jute cultivation because prior to partition, jute was being supplied from areas which are now in East Pakistan and all the mills are in West Bengal. Therefore, in order that the Indian Union may not have to be dependent on Pakistan for the supply of jute, West Bengal has to extend the areas under jute. As mentioned by the Food Minister himself, India is now almost self-sufficient so far as the requirements of jute is concerned and therefore, it is that West Bengal needs more help now than otherwise, if it had not diverted its attention to this important crop which is one of the most important earners of foreign exchange. So, my humble suggestion is that

some arrangement should be made so that we can manufacture tractors in the country and produce more fertilisers here by setting up more factories in different States where the raw material is available in plenty. The only thing that has to be done is to set up a machinery for this as quickly as possible.

Thank you.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Bombay): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a matter of regret and I think, a matter of distress to everybody in this House that we have to discuss the situation of food in this country in this manner after ten years of freedom. I do not discuss it from any personal point of view. I have no personal ill-will towards the Food Minister. But I have to say something which is very relevant, but perhaps unpleasant, and I hope the House will understand it in the proper perspective. Let me make this clear because there are persons who always are willing to misunderstand.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I have no land at all, but I do come from a family that has understood agriculture, when so many people who talk of agriculture do not. Only two days ago, we had the Consultative Committee of the Planning Commission and I asked a member sitting there as to how many people of the Planning Commission understood agriculture themselves. There were seventy-five officers of the Government sitting behind. I asked them as to how many of them understood agriculture or had done anything in agriculture themselves. Out of the seventy-five officers, two raised their hands. This is the attention that we pay to agriculture.

The Prime Minister says that there will be no life in our Plan if we do not become self-supporting in food. What are we doing about it? We produce reports. I do not know whether it would be possible for any one to

go through all the papers that are produced and do justice to them in the little time that is allocated to the food debate. The little pamphlet on food is short. But there is a bulk of literature that has come, which has a great bearing on the subject. Dr. Kunzru fortunately lightened my task by quoting voluminously from the figures. So, I will not bother the House by repeating them. But the fact is blatant; it is staring us in the face. We have been saying for the last several years that our food deficit is only 10 per cent. This is what I have heard ten years ago. We have not been able to bridge the food deficit of only 10 per cent. We say, our agricultural output is going up; the food production is going up. Mr. Jain told us that it has been going up—12·2 per cent. We have had an increase in food production. Why are we short of food? I think that there is something very wrong with the figures that are produced before the Government. Many of the officers of the Government do not know what they are doing. Do the Government here know how the State Governments work? During the war period, there was a severe restriction on agricultural produce. A certain amount of land had to be left for food cultivation and not utilised for money crops. In Gujarat, in many places, tobacco was grown and when the officer went there, he was told, "This is cabbage." That is all. The officer went back. That is the knowledge that our officers have about agriculture.

We began very well after independence. We talked of many things. I understand that the Government of India sent fifty young men to the States to study agriculture, modern methods of agriculture, intensive agriculture. I think that is what the Food Minister meant. What did they do in America and Canada? Where are they? Are they working on any State farm or are they looking after the files in the Secretariat? My fear is, that is what they are doing. Why is it so? Because we have changed our

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

outlook. We have changed our outlook on many things too suddenly. We have not allowed the period of adjustment to go. Perhaps, a sort of a zamindari legislation was necessary in a place like Uttar Pradesh. I am not questioning it. Perhaps, a part of it was necessary in places like Maharashtra where there perhaps was a large zamindari area. There were the *koths* as they were called, besides the *sardars* of the Deccan. Why is that legislation bodily dittoed, adopted, in Gujarat? There is no zamindari in Gujarat. We have a robust peasantry that was the backbone of our struggle for independence. Our struggle for independence was forged on the struggle that the peasants of Bardoli and Kaira waged. They were agriculturists. The first thing that the Congress Government did, on coming to power, was to divest them of their lands!

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Whether they were the big agriculturists and small agriculturists?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee has got the conditions of Bihar in mind. I am just explaining to you that of all the lands that the Government tried to take away after this tenancy legislation, 80 per cent. or more land has remained with the original owner. The only result is that there is a lot of friction between the landless labour and the owners of the land. They used to be as of a family with the cultivators. They were looked after; their families were looked after; their children were looked after. After this propaganda of 'land to the tiller', they have been thrown out because a conflict has been unnecessarily created between them. The village officers have been told that the land must go to the tiller. Every tiller, whether he works there as a labourer for ten years according to law or not, says, "This is my land; you must give it to me". At harvest season, there is burning of crops. There are even murders. In Saurashtra, establishing peace in the coun-

tryside was necessary for agriculture. The legislation that has been adopted there is not agricultural legislation. It is merely a vote and election legislation. This legislation has come out of the fertile brains of some city Congressmen and, of course, the labour union. You think of the labour union in the city and the city Congress. You control 20 per cent. What will happen if the other 80 per cent. combine? Therefore, you drive a wedge between them and keep them quarrelling always. This is the basis of this legislation. There is no agriculture behind it; there is no economy behind it. It is only a vote-catching legislation. That is why the agricultural economy, particularly of Bombay State, has been so badly disrupted. I do not think that I need tell hon. Members of this House of the story of the prosperity of Gujarat that attracted attacks and that withstood successive waves of Muslim invasion from the time of Mohammad Gazni and they were able to rise again after that loot of the temples of Somnath and Girnar.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with the past history. Please come to food production and food distribution.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I say it is necessary, Sir, because that shows how the land there is fertile. I am coming to the point. Why does not ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please talk about land and land problems; not about Mohammed Gazni or the Somnath temple.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: If you are a little patient, Sir, you will understand that in so doing, I think, I am sufficiently explicit on my point.

I say, the land of Gujarat is sufficient to grow not only food, but enough cotton and tobacco for export. It is this legislation that has disrupted life completely there. During the recent war years, the peasants of Gujarat grew three crops of bajra because it grows quickly. There were five

thousand pumps working in the Kaira District. There are not five hundred working today because the attachment to the land is gone. Then we have seen large irrigation works. We hear a lot about them. I have been trying to get some information about them. I wish the Food Minister had at least co-operated with us in that respect. A little more vigilance on this point would perhaps help him. I know that there are certain rules by which you can avoid any question by saying that this is primarily the concern of the State Government. But I think that that can never be a right approach.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Have we denied any information?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, I have asked questions about the Tapti river scheme, I have asked questions about the Mahi river scheme. I have pointed out that in the Ratnagiri District the position is bad. That area is considered now to be the worst area from the point of view of agriculture. It has only 10 per cent. of land under cultivation. There have been river beds where previously large quantities of rice were grown. Why are they not grown now? The answer is that it is primarily the concern of the State Government. Now, Sir, I am trying to ask for this information from you. I want you to think about this problem. Of course, if you won't think about it, what can I do? After all, Sir, there are people in this country who know and can understand something about agriculture, and who have given some thought to it. Why don't you take their advice? If this is your attitude, if your mind is closed and if you are only thinking of one thing—how to remain in power—then I am afraid your approach is entirely wrong. And I say that the approach of the Government is already wrong, because the Ministry of Food and Agriculture is subservient to other Ministries.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Is he opposing the Land Ceiling Act?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I say that the Ministry is subservient to many other Ministries, in spite of its being such an important Ministry. If our Prime Minister has said that our Plan would become lifeless if we are not going to be self-sufficient in the matter of foodgrains, then I suggest that the Food Minister should have everything to say in respect of many other things also, for instance, in respect of imports and industries, because all these things depend upon agriculture, and agriculture also depends upon them. But what has been our policy in the matter of importing tractors and other thing. (*Time bell rings.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up. Your Party was allotted 45 minutes.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: But I have spoken only for five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have spoken for 9 minutes. First your Party was allotted 30 minutes. Then it was changed to 45 minutes after the time was enhanced. Now you have taken 39 plus 9, that is, 48 minutes. Please take two or three minutes more and wind up your speech.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I wish to say Sir, that the Food Ministry should be the most important Ministry in our Government, if at all we are going to solve our problem. It should not be made subservient to other Ministries as it is at present. Sir, we have been hearing a lot about manufacture of tractors. I know that one integrated scheme for manufacturing tractors and other engineering goods was submitted to the Government 10 years ago. What has been done about that scheme? Certain types of tractors are banned for imports, because somebody who has not got that pull with the Ministry or with the Secretary happens to be the agent, and as soon as that agency is transferred, the import is permitted. Same is the case with manufacture. That is why our

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

agriculture is in such a mess. This is not the way in which any Ministry which has a firm policy should go on. We are just drifting. Why should we allow things to drift like this? That is the reason why our agricultural production is going down. You are relying merely on figures relating to acreage. But what about the yield? How many acres are bearing crops? How many crops are there per acre? Sir, where there were three crops previously, we are having only two, and where there were two, we are having only one, and that too a poor crop. That is the reason why our agricultural production is going down. It is high time that the authorities should put their heads together and change the entire outlook of the Ministry, and if necessary, change the personnel too. Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain can manage things very well. I have no personal quarrel with him. But there must be somebody with a dynamic personality and with a drive, who can get his way with the other Ministers also, not that the other Ministers should impose their will and their policies on him. We are going to spend crores and crores of rupees for importing foodgrains from outside. I can tell you that it is going to be a matter of perpetual shame on our part.

(Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No disturbance. Let him finish.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, the hon. Minister pointed out that one of the remedies was large-scale cultivation. I agree with him there. But at the same time I would suggest to him that he should take the help of the army. After all, Sir, this is a very serious problem, and we have got the army at our disposal. Take the help of the army in this matter. Let us have more and more canals and better irrigation facilities. But I doubt very much whether that is being done. They know the method of mechanical cultivation; they know the operation of machines. They can give you much quicker and much better results than

what other officers can give you. If we are going to solve our food problem and if we are going to stop our imports, then let them take to agriculture, at least that part of it which concerns our large-scale irrigation. By that way only I think we may be in a position to relieve ourselves of much worry and trouble in regard to this foreign exchange problem that we are facing today. Thank you, Sir.

شری پیر محمد خاں (جموں)

ایلنڈ کشمیر) : جناب ذہنی چیرمین صاحب - جیسا کہ وہائیٹ پیپر اور فوڈ منسٹر صاحب کی تقریر سے معلوم ہوا ہے پیداوار کم ہے خرچ زیادہ ہے اور خرچ کو پورا کرنے کے واسطے باہر سے غلہ منگایا۔ جس پر بیشمار روپیہ خرچ ہوتا ہے - پیداوار کے بڑے دشمن فلد - خشک سالی اور تندی وغیرہ ہیں - جب تک ان کو روٹے کے لئے اقدام نہیں کئے جائیں گے تب تک یہ تسلی نہیں ہو سکتی کہ فصل تھیک طرح سے ہوگی - فی ایکڑ پیداوار بڑھانے کے لئے کھاد کی ضرورت ہے - کیمیکل کھاد کی اور اپنی دیسی کھاد کی بھی - ایک اور کوشش کی جائے اور اس کو ایک ہلکی چیز نہ سمجھا جائے کہ گوہر جو جلا یا جاتا ہے وہ جلا یا نہ جائے بلکہ کھیتوں میں ڈالا جائے اور کاشتکاری نئے طریقوں سے کی جائے - اگر یہ چھوٹی چھوٹی باتیں صحیح طور پر کی جائیں اور ایسے آدمی ان کے نگراں مقرر کئے جائیں جو کہ کسان ہوں تو پھر آپ دیکھیں گے کہ

پیداوار میں کیا فرق ہوتا ہے - ابھی پلڈت کلزرو صاحب نے کچھ فیکٹس اینڈ فیکٹس بتائے جن سے یہ معلوم ہوا ہے کہ فی ایکڑ پیداوار میں کوئی زیادتی نہیں ہوئی ہے - اور جب کہ دوسری طرف ہم قریباً ڈھائی عرب روپیہ فرسٹ فائو ایر پلان میں اور اس وقت تک سیکنڈ فائو ایر پلان میں ایکریکلچر پر خرچ کر چکے ہیں تو اس کا مطلب یہ ہے کہ کہیں پر کچھ نقص ہے - وہ نقص کیا ہے - وہ چیز یہ ہے کہ جو شخص خود ایکریکلچرسٹ ہے وہ اس کام کی نگرانی نہیں کرتا - اگر وہ اس کام کی نگرانی کرے اور دیکھے تو پھر ممکن ہے کہ یہ چیز ٹھیک ہو جائے -

کچھ گرین میڈیور کے متعلق کہا گیا - اس کے متعلق یہ ہے کہ اگر زمین سے دو فصلیں لینی ہیں تو یہ گرین میڈیور والا طریقہ نہیں ہوتا جا سکتا ہے کیونکہ کلک یا گندم جب نکل آتی ہے تو اس کے ایک مہینے کے بعد مکا لگایا جاتا ہے اور ایک مہینے کے اندر گرین میڈیور کیسے ہو سکتی ہے - پھر جب مکا کاٹا جاتا ہے تو اس کے بعد اسی زمین میں کلک لگائی جاتی ہے - ہاں اگر ایک زمین میں ایک سال میں ایک فصل ہی لینا چاہیں تو گرین میڈیور ہو سکتا ہے -

اس کے بعد اب میں اپنی ریاست جموں کشمیر کے کچھ حالات آپ کے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں - سنہ 1957 میں جو فلڈ اور بے وقت برف باری ہماری ریاست میں ہوئی اس کے نتیجہ میں ۸۰ فیصدی پیداوار تباہ ہو گئی - وہ ایک عجیب وقت تھا - خوش قسمتی سے اس وقت بخشی غلام محمد صاحب فوراً منسٹر بھی تھے اور ان کی مستعدی اور معاملہ فہمی سے یہ ہوا کہ کچھ لوگوں کو راشن دیا گیا - کچھ بے گھروں کو گھروں میں بسایا گیا اور چار آدمی میں سے تین آدمی ایسے تھے جن کو مختلف مقداروں میں راشن دیا جاتا تھا - اس وقت بڑی تباہی ہوئی تھی - اس کے علاوہ پچاس ہزار آدمی سرینگر سے جموں آ گئے تھے - ان میں سے کچھ کو کام پر لگایا گیا - کچھ کو پنجاب ڈورنمنٹ سے کہہ کر کام پر لگوایا گیا اور کچھ کو وہاں لگایا گیا - کچھ ایسے بھی تھے جو کہ کام ہی نہیں کر سکتے تھے تو ان کے لئے مفت لڈگر جاری کیا گیا تھا - ان کو کپڑا دیا گیا تھا اور ان کو دھات کی جگہ دی گئی تھی - ان سب چیزوں کے ہونے سے حالت کچھ پرسکون ہوئی - لیکن اس پر بھی اپوزیشن نے وھار شور مچایا - میں نے ابھی اپوزیشن کی تقریریں سنیں اور مجھے افسوس کے ساتھ رنج سے کہنا پڑتا ہے کہ اپوزیشن جو ہے وہ

(شری پھر محمد خاں)

بعض وقت ایسی چیزیں کہتا ہے جو کہ اسے نہیں کہانی چاہئیں اور جس سے دکھ ہوتا ہے - مثلاً ہماری ریاست میں پرچا پریشد اور قیمو کریٹک نیشنل کانفرنس ایوزیشن ہے تو انہوں نے یہ شاہی دی کہ بہ کہہ دیا کہ کچھ آدمی بھوک سے مر گئے ہیں اور جو تقسیم ہوئی ہے وہ نیشنل کانفرنس کے ذریعہ سے ہوئی ہے - راشن کی غلط تقسیم ہوئی ہے - ان کی یہ دونوں باتیں غلط تھیں - کوئی آدمی بھوک سے نہیں مرا بلکہ جن کے نام انہوں نے بتائے تھے کہ مر گئے ان میں سے ایک آدمی ایک دن جب کہ کشمیر اسمبلی میں یہی ڈسکشن ہو رہا تھا تو وزیٹر گھری میں بیٹھا ہوا سن رہا تھا - یہ ایک تماشہ ہے اور ایک لطف کی بات ہے - اس کے علاوہ گورنمنٹ نے یہ بھی صفائی وہاں دی کہ ہم نے کسی پولیٹیکل جماعت کے ذریعہ تقسیم نہیں کرائی بلکہ گورنمنٹ کے ذریعہ ہوئی -

اس کے بعد اب مجھے یہ کہنا ہے کہ وہاں اس وقت یہ حالت ہے کہ ہمارے ملک میں فصل بہت اچھی ہے - ہارویسٹ ہو رہی ہے اور ہم نے تارکیٹ مقرر کیا ہے کہ قریب ۲۰ لاکھ من تک اناج ہم پروکیور کریں گے - ہمارا یہ جو پروکیورمنٹ

کرنے کا ارادہ ہے اس کے متعلق ایک اور عجیب چیز میں ہاؤس کو بتلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ قیموکریٹک نیشنل کانفرنس کے متعلق مجھے معتبر ذرائع سے معلوم ہوا ہے کہ وہ اس پروکیورمنٹ میں روزے اٹکانے کی کوشش کر رہی ہے - تو ان چیزوں کے بارے میں ایوزیشن کی یہ حالت ہے جو بہت ہی رنج دہ ہے - ایسا نہیں ہونا چاہیئے - اس وقت تو سب کو مل کر کٹھالی کو دور کرنا ہے اور تکلیف سے نجات پانا ہے -

ہم نے گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا سے کوئی ۲۵ لاکھ من اناج کے لئے ریکویسٹ کی ہے - کچھ تو ہم خود وہاں پروکیور کر لیں گے اور کچھ ہمیں گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا دیدے جس طرح کہ وہ دوسری استیتوں کو دیتی ہے تو وہاں معاملہ بہت کچھ حل ہو سکتا ہے - ہاں اتنی مہربانی گورنمنٹ اور کرے کہ اس کو ذرا جلدی کر دے کیونکہ ہمارا دو سو میل لمبی پہاڑی سڑک کا جو ٹکڑا ہے وہ ہر وقت چالو نہیں رہتا - ایک روز کی بارش ہو گئی تو وہ سڑک دو دن کے لئے بند ہو جاتی ہے - اس واسطے اگر وہ جلدی مل جائے ؟ سردیوں سے پہلے مل جائے تو ہم بڑے اطمینان سے اس کو سرینگر پہونچا دیں گے - جموں پہونچانے میں تو ہم کو کوئی تکلیف نہیں ہے -

اب میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ سنہ ۱۹۵۶ میں ایگرویکلچر ڈیپارٹمنٹ نے بیل گاڑیوں کے متعلق امپروومنٹ کے واسطے کچھ تجویز کی تھی۔ بیل گاڑیاں لاکھوں کی تعداد میں ہندوستان میں ہیں اور وہ یہاں کام آتی ہیں۔ اناج ڈھونڈنے میں، چارہ ڈھونڈنے میں، زمیندار کے ہر کام میں وہ کام آنے والی چیز ہے۔ تو ایک بہت اچھا نمونہ کسی نے بنایا تھا جو کہ سنہ ۱۹۵۶ سے اس وقت تک پوسا انسٹیٹیوٹ میں پڑا ہوا ہے۔ اس میں کچھ ایسی چیز لگائی گئی تھی جس کی وجہ سے اس کی رفتار معمولی بیل گاڑی سے دوگنی یا تین گنی زیادہ ہو جاتی ہے۔ تو مہربانی کر کے اس کو دیکھیں اور اس کے متعلق کچھ فیصلہ کریں۔ اگر وہ چیز ایسی ہے جو کہ دو گنی تین گنی یا چار گنی زیادہ رفتار دیتی ہے تو کم سے کم اسے خریدنے والے بہت لوگ ہو جائیں گے۔ ایک چیز کہنے سے رہ گئی اور وہ یہ ہے کہ مکی کے متعلق اس وقت ہم تجویز کر رہے ہیں اور ہمارا تجربہ کامیاب ہوا۔ پنجاب میں بھی تجربہ ہو رہا ہے۔ ہمیں کوشش یہ کرنی ہے کہ مکی کی دو فصلیں لگائی جائیں۔ اگر مارچ میں مکی بوئی جائے تو تین مہینے کے بعد ایک فصل دیدے اور پھر اس کے بعد بوئی جائے تو تین مہینے کے بعد، ستمبر

تک دوسری فصل دیدے۔ تو اس طرح سے اگر چھوٹی چھوٹی کوشش کی جائے تو زیادہ فائدہ ہو سکتا ہے۔ اس طرح سے اناج زیادہ پیدا ہو گا اور اس کے لئے ملک کا پیسہ باہر بھیجنے کی ضرورت نہیں ہوگی اور وہی پیسہ ملک کی اور کئی مفید چیزوں کے لئے کام آویگا۔ میں اتنا ہی کہنا چاہتا ہوں۔ تھینک یو۔

†[श्री पीर मुहम्मद खान (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : जनाब डिपुटी चयर्मैन साहब । जैसा कि व्हाइट पेपर और फूड मिनिस्टर साहब की तरफ से मालूम हुआ है पैदावार कम है खर्च ज्यादा है और खर्च को पूरा करने के वास्ते बाहर से गल्ला मंगाया जाता है जिस पर बशुमार रुपया खर्च होता है । पैदावार के बड़े दुश्मन फलड, खुश्क माली और टिड्डी बगैरह हैं । जब तक उनको रोकने के लिये इकदाम नहीं किये जायेंगे तब तक यह तसल्ली नहीं हो सकती कि फसल ठीक तरह से होगी । फ्री एकड़ पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिए खाद की जरूरत है । कैमिकल खाद की और अपनी देसी खाद की भी । एक और कोशिश की जाय और इसको एक हलकी चीज न समझा जाय कि गोबर जो जलाया जाता है वह जलाया न जाय बल्कि खेतों में डाला जाय और काश्तकारी नये तरीकों से की जाय । अगर यह छोटी छोटी बातें सही तौर पर की जायें और ऐसे आदमी इनके निगरान मुकर्रर किये जायें जो कि किसान हों तो फिर आप देखेंगे कि पैदावार में क्या फर्क होता है । अभी पंडित कुजूरू साहब ने कुछ फ्रैक्ट्स एण्ड फ्रिगर्स बताए जिनसे यह मालूम हुआ कि फ्री एकड़ पैदावार में कोई ज्यादानी नहीं हुई है । और जबकि दूसरी तरफ हम क्लीबन डाई अरब रुपया फर्ट फाइव इयर प्लान में और इम वक्त तक मेकण्ड फाइव इयर प्लान में एग्रीकल्चर पर खर्च कर चुके

[श्री पीर मुहम्मद खान]

हैं तो इसका मतलब है कि कहीं पर कोई नक्स है। वह नक्स क्या है। वह चीज यह है कि जो शख्स खुद एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट है वह इस काम की निगरानी नहीं करता। अगर वह इस काम की निगरानी करे और देखे तो फिर मुमकिन है कि यह चीज ठीक हो जाय।

कुछ ग्रीन मैन्योर के मुताल्लिक कहा गया। इसके मुताल्लिक यह है कि अगर ज़मीन से दो फ़सलें लेनी हैं तो यह ग्रीन मैन्योर वाला तरीका नहीं बरता जा सकता है। क्योंकि कनक या गन्धम जब निकल आती है तो उसके एक महीने के बाद मक्का लगाया जाता है और एक महीने के अन्दर ग्रीन मैन्योर कैसे हो सकती है। फिर जब मक्का काटा जाता है तो फिर उसके बाद उसी ज़मीन में कनक लगायी जाती है। हां, अगर एक ज़मीन में एक साल में एक फ़सल ही लेना चाहें तो ग्रीन मैन्योर हो सकता है।

इसके बाद अब मैं अपनी रियासत जम्मू काश्मीर के कुछ हालात आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। सन् १९५७ में जो फ़्लड और बेवक्त बर्फ़बारी हमारी रियासत में हुई उसके नतीजे में ८० फ़ी सदी पैदावार तबाह हो गई। वह एक अजीब वक्त था। खुश किस्मती से उस वक्त बख्शी गुलाम मोहम्मद साहब फ़ड मिनिस्टर भी थे और उनकी मुस्तैदी और मुआमला फ़हमी से यह हुआ कि कुछ लोगों को राशन दिया गया, कुछ बेघरों को घरों में बसाया गया और ४ आदमियों में से ३ आदमी ऐसे थे जिनको मुस्तलिफ़ मिक्कदारों में राशन दिया जाता था। उस वक्त बड़ी तबाही हुई थी। इसके अलावा ५० हजार आदमी श्रीनगर से जम्मू आ गये थे। उन में से कुछ को काम पर लगाया गया, कुछ को पंजाब गवर्नमेंट से कह कर काम पर लगवाया गया और कुछ को वहां लगाया गया। कुछ ऐसे भी थे जो कि काम ही नहीं कर सकते थे तो उनके लिये मुफ़्त लंगर जारी किया गया

था। उनको कपडा दिया गया था और उनको रिहाइश की जगह दी गई थी। इन सब चीजों के हाने से हालात कुछ पुरसकून हुई। लेकिन इस पर भी अपोजीशन ने वहां शोर मचाया। मैंने अभी अपोजीशन की तकरीर सुनी और मुझे अफ़सोस के साथ रंज से कहना पड़ता है कि अपोजीशन जो है वह बाज़ वक्त ऐसी चीजे कहता है जो कि उसे नहीं कहनी चाहियें और जिससे दुःख होता है। मसलन हमारी रियासत में प्रजा परिषद् और डेमो-क्रेटिक नेशनल कान्फ़ेन्स अपोजीशन है तो उन्होंने यह शाबाश दी कि यह कह दिया कि कुछ आदमी भूख से मर गये हैं और जो तकसीम हुई है वह नेशनल कान्फ़ेन्स के जरिये से हुई है। राशन की गत तफ़सीम हुई है। उनकी यह दोनों बातें गलत हुई हैं। कोई आदमी भूख से नहीं मरा बल्कि जिनके नाम उन्होंने बताये थे कि मर गये उनमें से एक आदमी एक दिन जबकि काश्मीर असेम्बली में यही डिस्कशन हो रहा था तो विज़िटर गलरी में बैठा हुआ सुन रहा था। यह एक तमाशा है और एक लुप्त की बात है। इसके अलावा गवर्नमेंट ने यह भी सफ़ाई वहां दी कि हमने किसी पोलिटिकल जमायत के जरिये तकसीम नहीं कराई बल्कि गवर्नमेंट के जरिये हुई।

इसके बाद अब मुझे यह कहना है कि वहां इस वक्त यह हालत है कि हमारे मुल्क में फ़सल बहुत अच्छी है। हार्वेस्ट हो रही है और हमने टारगेट मुक़र्रर किया है कि करीब २० लाख मन तक अनाज हम प्रोक्योर करेंगे। हमारा यह जो प्रोक्योरमेंट करने का इरादा है उसके मुताल्लिक एक और अजीब चीज मैं हाउस को बतलाना चाहता हूं कि डेमो-क्रेटिक नेशनल कान्फ़ेन्स के मुताल्लिक मुझे मोतबर जराय से मालूम हुआ है कि वह इस प्रोक्योरमेंट में रोड़े अटकाने की कोशिश कर रही है। तो इन चीजों के बारे में अपोजीशन की यह हालत है जो बहुत ही रंजदेह है। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। इस वक्त तो सब

को मिल कर कठिनाई को दूर करना है और तकलीफ से निजात पाना है।

हमने गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया से कोई २५ लाख मन अनाज के लिए रिक्वेस्ट की है कुछ तो हम खुद वहां प्रोक्वायर कर लेंगे और कुछ हमे गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया दे दे जिस तरह की वह दूसरी स्टेटों को देती है तो वहां मामला बहुत कुछ हल हो सकता है। हां, इतनी मेहरबानी गवर्नमेंट और करे कि इसको ज़रा जल्दी कर दे क्योंकि हमारा २०० मील लम्बी पहाड़ी सड़क कम जो टुकड़ा है वह हर वक्त चालू नहीं रहता। एक जोर की बारिश हो गई तो वह सड़क दो दिन के लिए बन्द हो जाती है। इस वास्ते अगर वह जल्दी मिल जाय, सर्दियों से पहले मिल जाय तो हम बड़े इतिमिन्न से उसको श्रीनगर पहुंचा देंगे। जम्मू पहुंचाने में हमें कोई तकलीफ नहीं है।

अब मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि सन् १९५६ में एग्रीकल्चर डिपार्टमेंट ने बैलगाड़ियों के मुताल्लिक इम्प्रूवमेंट के वास्ते कुछ तजवीज की थी। बैलगाड़ियां लाखों की तादाद में हिन्दुस्तान में हैं और वह यहा काम आती हैं अनाज ढोने में, चारा ढोने में, जमींदार के हर काम में वह काम आने वाली चीज है। तो एक बहुत अच्छा नमूना सिमी ने बनाया था जो कि सन् १९५६ से इस वक्त तक पूरा इंस्टीट्यूट में पड़ा हुआ है। इसमें कुछ ऐसी चीज लगायी गई थी जिसकी वजह से उसकी रफ्तार मामूली बैलगाड़ी से दुगुनी या तीनगुनी ज्यादा हो जाती। तो मेहरबानी करके उसको देखे और उसके मुताल्लिक कुछ फैसला करें। अगर वह चीज ऐसी है जो कि दुगुनी, तीनगुनी या चारगुनी ज्यादा रफ्तार देती है तो कम से कम उसे खरीदने वाले बहुत लोग हो जायेंगे। एक चीज कहने से रह गई और वह यह है कि मकई के मुताल्लिक इस वक्त हम तजुर्बा कर रहे हैं और हमारा तजुर्बा कामयाब हुआ। पंजाब में भी तजुर्बा हो रहा

है। हमें कोशिश यह करनी है कि मकई की फसलें लगायी जाय। अगर मार्च में मकई बोई जाय तो तीन महीने के बाद एक फसल दे दे और फिर उसके बाद बोई जाय तो तीन महीने के बाद सितम्बर तक दूसरी फसल दे दे। तो इस तरह से अगर छोटी छोटी कोशिश की जाय तो ज्यादा फायदा हो सकता है। इस तरह से अनाज ज्यादा पैदा होगा और उसके लिए मुल्क का पैसा बाहर भेजने की जरूरत नहीं होगी और वही पैसा मुल्क की और कई मुफ़ीद चीजों के लिए काम आवेगा। मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं। थैन्क्यू।]

श्री दयाल दास कुर (मध्य प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, आज हमारे सामने खाद्य की समस्या है और वह विषय आज सदन के सामने विचाराधीन है। माननीय सदस्यों के विचार मुनने में आये और उनमें मुझे पार्लियामेंट की पार्लियामेंट्री टोन की एक बू देखने में आई। उमका एक नमूना यह है कि यहा पर, जैसा कि एक माननीय सदस्य ने बताया, सन् १९४९ से १९५७ तक केवल १ प्रतिशत खेती में तरक्की हुई है जब कि यदि सरकारी आंकड़ों को देखते हैं तो हमें १९४९ से १९५७ तक २० प्रतिशत खेती में तरक्की मिलती है। दूसरी चीज दुर्भाग्य से कहिये, यह कही गई, कि सन् १९५७ और १९५८ में खेती में कुछ गिरावट आई और उसके कारण कई स्थानों पर अकाल पड़ा और इसलिए हमें कुछ दूसरी जगहों से खाद्य-पदार्थ मंगाने की जरूरत पड़ी। जसा कि आंकड़े से मालूम पड़ता है, सन् १९५८ में चावल का आयात हमारे यहां ३३७ हजार टन और गेहूं का आयात १५२५ हजार टन का हुआ था। इन आंकड़ों से मालूम पड़ता है कि केवल यही वर्ष एक ऐसा आया जब कि हमें दूसरे देशों की राह देखनी पड़ी। एक माननीय सदस्य ने मुझे यह बात मालूम हुई कि यहां पर खाद्य पदार्थ के बटवारे का सिस्टम बिलकुल अच्छा नहीं है। हमें ये जो दो किताबें मिली हैं उनको देखने से मालूम पड़ा कि हमारे

[श्री दयाल दास कुरें]

देश में जो जोनल सिस्टम कायम किया गया है वह बहुत ही अच्छा है। नार्दर्न पाट, मदर्न और मध्य के भाग में, जैसा कि मध्य प्रदेश में मैंने देखा यह सिस्टम इतना अच्छा हुआ कि एक प्रदेश की उत्पत्ति दूसरे प्रदेश में नहीं गई। गवर्नमेंट ने अपने तई खाद्य पदार्थ की खरीद की और उसको जो आवश्यकता थी उस आवश्यकता की पूर्ति उसने अपने प्रदेश में ही की। इसी प्रकार मद्रास और कैरल, जैसा कि रिपोर्ट देखने से मालूम हुआ, उनकी सरकारों ने आपस में किसी तरह से अपने प्रदेश की आवश्यकता पूरी की यह हमें संतोषजनक ही मालूम पड़ता है। यहां पर जो यह कहा जाता है कि अन्न का बटवारा इन छः प्रदेशों में अच्छा नहीं है वह उपयुक्त नहीं मालूम पड़ता है।

दूसरी चीज फर्टिलाइजर्स की आती है। फर्टिलाइजर्स की विशेष आवश्यकता है। इसके लिये सरकार पूर्णतः प्रयत्नशील है जैसा कि मध्य प्रदेश में देखने में आया कि प्रत्येक जिले में खेतों के लिये जो खाद का बटवारा किया गया है वह बहुत ही संतोषजनक है। उसमें मुझे केवल इतना ही कहना है कि ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में जल्दी से जल्दी बरसात से पहले पहले उसका सुविधाजदक बटवारा होना चाहिये। यदि इस सम्बन्ध में मैं चंद शब्द सुझाव के रूप में रखू तो कोई अत्युक्ति नहीं होगी। पहली बात यह है कि प्रायः हर स्थान में ग्राम पंचायतों का निर्माण हो चुका है। यदि बटवारे की कार्य प्रणाली गांव पंचायतों को दे दी जाये तो ये कार्य बड़ी सुविधा से होने लगेगा। अभी तक यह ब्लाक डेवलपमेंट की मार्फत प्रायः हर स्थान में बांटा जाता है। ग्राम पंचायतों के माध्यम से किसानों को एक स्थान से दूसरे स्थान में उसको ले जाने में बड़ी सुविधा होगी और बरसात के पहले इसकी पूर्ति हो सकती है।

माननीय सदस्य से मुझे दूसरी चीज यह सुनने में आई कि जो बंजर और परती

जमीन है उसकी मीलिंग होनी चाहिए। मीलिंग ऑफ लैंड्स करने की बात उनकी तरफ से आई। मुझे इसका पूरा अनुभव है। यह सही चीज है कि बंजर और परती जमीन आज बड़े बड़े किसानों के पास, या बड़े बड़े जमींदारों के पास पड़ी है। यदि उसका उपयोग ठीक तरह से किया जाय तो हमारे देश के खाद्य उत्पादन में अधिक वृद्धि हो सकती है। इसमें मेरा एक सुझाव है कि बैसे तो मध्य प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट ने यह किया है कि बटवारे के सिस्टम के अनुसार एक वर्ष तक जिस किसी साधारण मजदूर ने या साधारण किसान ने उपज के बटवारे पर दूसरे की जमीन पर खेती की है तथा पटवारी में उसके रिकार्ड में अपना नाम दर्ज कराया है और पटवारी ने उसको शिकमी काश्तकार रजिस्टर कर लिया तो उसके दूसरे या तीसरे वर्ष के बाद वह जमीन उसकी खुद की हो जाती है। मैं अपना एक खुद का अनुभव बताता हूं कि मुझे किस प्रकार ४६ एकड़ जमीन का नुकसान उठाना पड़ा और मेरी जमीन पर जो किसान जोता करता था और खेती करता था उसके अधीन वह चली गई। मुझे इस बात की खुशी भी हुई कि मैं जिस जमीन पर खुद कंट्रोल नहीं कर सकता था वह मेरे हाथ से निकलकर सचमुच जो किसान है उसके हाथ में चली गई। मुझे इस बात से बड़ा आनन्द आया। हमारे यहां की प्रान्तीय सरकार ने यह नियम बनाया है कि जो किसान जिस जमीन में खेती करता है वह जमीन सचमुच में उसी की हो जायगी। एक प्रदेश ने जिस चीज को अपनाया है मुझे आशा है दूसरे प्रदेशों में भी उसी प्रकार का कानून लागू है और अगर न हो तो इसी प्रकार का कानून दूसरे प्रदेश भी बनाने का प्रयत्न करें तो बड़ा अच्छा है जैसा कि मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार ने शुरू किया है। उसके अनुसार जिसके पास खेत नहीं है उस काश्तकार को भी जमीन मिल रही है।

दूसरी चीज यह है कि भूमिदान में जो जमीन किसानों के द्वारा या जमींदारों के द्वारा

दी जाती है अक्सर यह शिकायत आती है कि उसमें बंजर जमीन मिलती है ।

श्री वी० प्रसाद राव (आंध्र प्रदेश) :
मुकम्मल जमीन ।

श्री दयाल दास कुर्रें : मेरी सरकार को यह मलाह है कि वह ऐसी जमीन को ज्यादातर उन्हीं किसानों को दे जो उसके लिये उपयुक्त हों और जहां तक हो सके उनको बैल और बीज आदि भी दे तो ज्यादा उपयुक्त होगा । जहां तक हमारे देखने में आया अब सरकारी कर्मचारियों का सहयोग भी उपयुक्त रूप से मिल रहा है । केवल एक ही चीज का मेरा सुझाव है कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों का, खास करके विकास खंडों में जो ग्राम सेवक और एग्रिकल्चरल असिस्टेंट होते हैं वैसे तो उनका ध्यान विशेषकर किसानों की खेती की ओर जाता ही है, लेकिन यदि वे विशेष रूप से खाद के बटवारे का, गोबर की खाद तैयार करने के उपाय बताने का कि किस प्रकार कचरा और कूड़ा इकठ्ठा करके खाद बनाई जाय इसका प्रत्यक्ष में प्रयोग करके दिखायें तो ज्यादा अच्छी तरह काम हो सकता है ।

(Time bell rings.)

इसी के साथ साथ मुझे यह कहना है कि जानवरों में बहुत सी बीमारियां होती हैं और वे मर जाते हैं । किसानों की खेती अच्छे बैल और बीज पर निर्भर करती है । यदि सरकारी महकमें इसकी ओर ज्यादा ध्यान दे तो यह बड़ा उपयोगी मिद्ध हो सकता है । मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने इस ओर विशेष रूप से ध्यान देने का प्रयत्न किया है और हमारे यहां सरकार की ओर से खास करके महाकौशल के किसानों को बहुत बड़ी सुविधा मिल रही है ।

एक चीज यह बताई गई है कि नहरों से सिंचाई ठीक तरह से नहीं हो पा रही है । जैसा कि माननीय सदस्य ने बताया है नहरों

की सिंचाई के बारे में, खास करके महाकौशल में उसकी व्यवस्था पूर्ण संतोषजनक है और वहां पर जितने बांध हैं उनका उपयोग ठीक तरह से किया जा रहा है । सरकार की ओर से जो तकावी मिलती है उसमें भी पूर्ण संतोषजनक कार्य हो रहा है और हम आशा करते हैं कि यदि सरकार का कदम आगे भी इसी तरह से जारी रहे तो एक दिन अवश्य आयेगा जब हमारी खाद की समस्या पूर्ण रूप से मुलज्ज जायेगी ।

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a very vast question and we have to travel a long way taking into account the various items, burning items, most important items which concern the food problem today. Fortunately or unfortunately I stand to speak at the last minute, when the clock has struck. I thank you that at least this much time has been allowed to me. There is no other way for me except that I should read out, that I should speak out to the hon. Food Minister the suggestions which I wanted to make to him in connection with the important food situation. I am thankful also to my colleagues on this side and that side for having very much lightened my burden, by placing so many facts and figures and by giving the House the information and the correct impression, which I could have also shared if these things had not been completed by them. Therefore, I need not go into the very intricate data, into the figures and facts which have already been mentioned in this House. In spite of this fact, as it is a very burning problem in the country nobody can spare expressing himself in the most burning tone, in spite of the best efforts that the Food Minister is making to relieve the situation. I understand the difficulties of the Food Minister. I realise that and appreciate whatever he has been doing for some time past and which he is still anxious to do to relieve the situation in the country. But the situation is such that the Food Minister can have

[Shah Mohamad Umair.]

no control over it, because the things have been so deep-rooted, that unless the Food Minister has got ample and sufficient time, it cannot be uprooted in the twinkling of the eye.

4 P.M.

Take the case of U.P. My friend, Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor, mentioned Orissa, Bengal, Bihar and compared these States with U.P. in connection with the food situation. Everybody has got a soft corner for U.P. Everybody has got a soft corner in his heart in regard to what is going on in U.P. but then, Sir, it was not necessary that Bihar and West Bengal should have been brought in, dragged into a comparison. I know that the Food Minister has come to the rescue of U.P. It is to be said to the utmost credit of the Food Minister that he has so creditably, so ably and so efficiently handled the situation in U.P. that the situation there has been lightened, very much relieved and I am sure that whatever further quantity of food is required in U.P. the Food Minister is fully ready to meet that and also to cope with the situation. He is prepared to make up the deficiency but at the same time all those persons who are sitting on this side and that side and the people, particularly the opposition party which is making a hell in U.P., instead of comparing Bihar, Orissa and West Bengal with the U.P. should have been a bit more generous and cooperative. Of course, lip sympathy is there, lip cooperation is there but the practical campaign against the U.P. people and against the U.P. Government is going on. These troubles are there and these troubles have been avoided very intelligently and very efficiently by the Food Minister. Of course, it was not necessary to have brought in Bihar and West Bengal into this argument. What is there, Sir? Bihar is deficit by 15 million tons.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Lakhs.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: Fifteen lakh tons.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: Fifteen lakhs as has been stated by the Food Minister but my information is this. What has Bihar got up till now? It has got only $5\frac{1}{2}$ million tons whereas in West Bengal, the revised estimate is $7\frac{1}{2}$ million tons.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: The figures are all in lakhs, not millions.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: Please correct me. I am very defective in mathematics and I always failed in it. West Bengal demanded $7\frac{1}{2}$ lakh tons and $6\frac{1}{2}$ lakh tons have been given and the Food Minister is still ready to offer whatever further quantity may be required. Such is not the case with Bihar. I say that Bihar, in spite of a deficit of $15\frac{1}{2}$ lakh tons, got only $5\frac{1}{2}$ lakh tons. I do not accuse the Food Ministry because I know that a further demand was not made. If no demand came from the Bihar Government it only reflects the modest attitude of the State in not wanting to embarrass the Food Ministry. But, Sir, I hope that the Food Minister will take into consideration the fact that Bihar is in need of more foodgrains than what has been supplied to it up till now. The Food Minister is being embarrassed by the problem of production. Unless the Irrigation Ministry, the Food Ministry and part of the Ministry dealing with the revenues of the State are integrated on certain points and on certain problems, this thing will not be solved. There is the question of production, the question of land reforms and so on. The land reform schemes have not yet been implemented in so many States in the country. The ceiling question has not been taken up. There are many hurdles in the way of land reform which are practical hurdles in the way of increased production. The Food Minister cannot help these things. There is also the question of minor and major irrigation works. The Irrigation Ministry has to look to various irrigation works which are, if not major, at least minor works which could have helped the production work a lot. This is also a

question which needs coordinated effort. The Food Minister cannot always be held responsible for less production especially when so many other departments are concerned. Without ceiling on lands you cannot manage the land. There are many big holdings consisting of lakhs and lakhs of acres. I know and the Food Minister also knows. Acres and acres of land are lying idle because they have not been cultivated for want of a ceiling. If a ceiling had been there, these lands would have gone to the landless people or other cultivators and the land would not have been allowed to remain idle resulting in production suffering. Similar is the case in connection with the land reform schemes. There are so many banjar lands lying idle and these are lying idle due to factors which are beyond the control of the Minister. At the same time, I may say that in my State, there is a river Poon Poon in the district of Gaya. Years back a demand was made for constructing an embankment but that was not taken up because the State Government did not have the power, I mean money, to carry on this work. If the construction of the embankment had been taken up, it would have been in the interests of production and in the interests of the people living in that district. If that had been done, at least five lakh acres of land in the districts of Gaya and Patna would have been irrigated and this would have meant an increase of a few lakhs of tons of foodgrains. This would have very appreciably increased our food production. In the same way, the reorganisation of the Agriculture Department is very necessary. The Food Minister may or may not be knowing but he is trying to implement the policy from top to bottom but there are persons at the lower level in the Agriculture Department who are sabotaging the whole thing. There are persons who ought to have been in the field but they are talking and walking in the bazar and these people are not doing any public service. Because of these instances, the cultivators and the

farmers in the rural areas are not being profited by such services. Under such circumstances, I would request the Food Minister, if he has got no control over the state management at least he can ask . . .

(Interruption.)

I mean, taking some pan and cigarettes also, enjoying a pan and a cigarette.

Sir, I must say one thing. Our farmers are very badly off on account of heavy, very shocking and very crushing irrigation taxes. I can say that in my State, in the canal irrigated area, the canal rate has been doubled. It was only Rs. 4/8 per acre previously but now it has been increased to eight or nine rupees per acre. Under such circumstances, the cultivators and the farmers in such canal irrigated areas are under a very crushing situation; their plight is very deplorable and, if you want to encourage all these cultivators to produce more, you will have to lighten their burden of taxation on irrigation. At least in my State it is very efficiently working, and I am proud of it. If the Chief Minister of my State, the Bihar State, would not have come to the rescue of the people of Bihar, the difficulty would have been the same in Bihar, what is going on today elsewhere. It is because of her efficient and able leadership that Bihar is getting on so happily, and there is no such trouble. But in that very Bihar State the canal irrigation rate is so much that I was compelled to mention it here for information and for some advice on this point. I say, Sir, that if you are not going to take into account these things the last resort for the farmers will be cooperative farming. If you are not going to give all these facilities to the farmers, the last resort for the farmers in India will be collective farming. If I would have been in power I would have introduced collective farming and brushed aside all this sort of difficulties and troubles, this sort of ceiling on land holdings, this sort of land reforms, division of land, this that

[Shah Mohamad Umair.]

and the other. So I say that the Food Minister is certainly to be congratulated that he is doing in such hard circumstances so ably and has saved the situation in U.P. from where my friend Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor comes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. You have got ten minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I did not like this that we could not sit yesterday till 6 o'clock in order to make it possible for many other Members to speak. Anyway, Sir, your dispensation and, I think, the dispensation of the House was that.

Now, Sir, in the ten minutes that I have got at my disposal I should only like to say a few things about West Bengal because our general policy, as we view the food situation, was explained yesterday by Dr. Z. A. Ahmad from our party. Sir, whenever we discuss the food question we are told, especially when we refer to certain matters falling within the geographical boundary of the States or perhaps the constitutional boundary, that these are State subjects and we should not discuss them. I wonder what we are going to discuss then. I think, Sir, if that is so, then there is no need for having a Food Minister, or at least we can call the Food Minister the Minister for food godowns because, if we are concerned with only supplies and stocks, then why should he be called the Minister for Food and Agriculture, I cannot see.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA): You can be called the Minister for raiding the godowns.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He spoke in accents of great self-satisfaction. When I listened to his speech I felt there was no such serious crisis in the country, there was no popular discontent which should have been expressed in the arrest of about three

thousand people in U.P. and in one day alone in Calcutta yesterday 600 including 125 women. These would underline the gravity of the situation, the importance of the matter before us and the great public discontent that is sweeping one State after another. Any Food Minister should sit up, rethink and come out with a new policy and should say something which is reassuring. The Food Minister, in this House, did nothing of the kind, trotted out antiquated, out-dated meaningless statistics, as if statistics would feed the people. Sir, we have no dearth of statistics; if you ask me, they have never been in short supply.

Now, Sir, before I come to the State of West Bengal, I would like to say only one or two things about the national approach. For the last few days we have been talking about national approach, and I do not know whether they meant this word sincerely at all. I take it that national approach is not a talking point for the Government or the ruling party. I hope they mean it seriously. If they mean it seriously they should do certain other things rather than talking about national approach and all that. We are not in need of homilies, speeches, or sentimentalities; what we are in dire need of today is deeds, actions. National approach would mean the policies and measures agreed to by the Governments and the Opposition. I underline the words "agreed to". Otherwise it will not be national approach at all. We have seen how the national approach had been evolved in England in the old days, when both sides of the House came together. Whether we like it or not, this is how they approach such a question and evolve a national approach. Have we got an agreement between us, with regard to the policies and measures, that we can say that we have evolved a national approach? I do not think we have such things. For this the Government is answerable, because they stick to their old policies; they stick to their old measures, and surely, Sir, national

approach cannot be evolved by using the big stick in West Bengal or in Uttar Pradesh by refusing to see the Opposition in U.P. and by trying to bluff the Opposition in West Bengal. That is no national approach at all. Therefore, Sir, this national approach cannot be evolved by brushing aside the demands and the suggestions of the Opposition and by calling upon the Opposition to toe the line of the Government. This is no national approach at all. National approach is something which does not boil down to committee meetings where we sit together over a cup of tea, express certain fine sentiments and disperse without clinching any issue at all. We have been talking for the last few days. Can we tell the country anything, that we on both sides of the House have come to some kind of a minimum understanding with regard to the policies and measures upon which we can call upon the people to act? No, we cannot, because for them it is mere talk, all moonshine talk. I say this thing therefore, Sir, I am not one of those who will take them for what they are saying, until and unless practical steps are taken, until and unless we jointly evolve a common line of action with regard to the food situation.

Sir, let me now come to West Bengal. I refer to West Bengal because this State will also give you some trouble, and West Bengal like U.P. is not going to live on its knees. If you refuse the demands of the people, they will fight and fight justly and rightly. They have already begun the fight. We did not want fight; we had been waiting for redress in that State and the people there have shown the maximum of patience. But nothing had been done. Today, Sir, the State is in heavy deficit, and you will be surprised to hear that the West Bengal State Government did not know exactly what its need was. I was struck when I sat in the Writers Building in conference with the Chief Minister and the Food Minister of West Bengal. They did not know actually what was their need. At the end of last year

they calculated that the deficit was of the order of 12 lakh tons. Then, suddenly, by some statistical jugglery it was reduced to 7 lakh tons, and then, only the other day, we heard the Chief Minister say that his assumptions went wrong and he would need more foodgrains. That is what the Opposition have been saying all these months there, that our West Bengal need was greater than what the estimates of the West Bengal Government did suggest and they were asking the Central Government to take the responsibility. It is no use now telling that you have met what West Bengal needs when everybody knows that West Bengal's need was miscalculated, as a result of the calculated and mischievous policy of the West Bengal Government, and it is not surprising today that the whole of the Opposition, large sections of the people are demanding the resignation of the Food Minister of West Bengal. I am not going into politics, but you see where you have driven the State, the people of the State. Is it the atmosphere in which we can sit, we can seek a solution of the problem? Sir, it clearly seems, according to the present estimates, that for modified rationing alone, for the three months of September, October and November West Bengal would require $4\frac{1}{2}$ lakh tons, for modified rationing alone, which is to cover $2\frac{1}{2}$ crore people, plus another $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakh tons for gratuitous relief, test relief and other things. All told, 6 lakh tons of foodgrains would be required for meeting the urgent needs of West Bengal in these three months, namely September, October and November. This is the position. The Central Government, I do not know what discussion they had with the Chief Minister, but I understood from the Chief Minister that West Bengal's need was much greater and he would like to have the necessary foodgrains from the Centre. Then, Sir, about popular co-operation. Nothing of the kind. An advisory committee existed at the provincial level; it was not consulted in many matters and it did not function. The unanimous decisions

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
of the advisory committee are not implemented and when they knew that the movement would start on the 15th they called a meeting on the 16th and later they advanced the date by one day and called it on the 15th when the movement had already started. This is how they behave; no difference; it is the same at every level, at the lower level, at the district level, everywhere. Is this how we are going to solve this problem? Many things have to be done; crop loans and other things would be required but I am not going into all those details. I think both in Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal bold measures are needed. As far as the food policy is concerned, I am not discussing it at all because the policy stands condemned by itself. It is a matter of disgrace that in ten years' time they could not have made the country self-sufficient but should have rendered the country so helpless and dependant on foreign bounties. I call it anti-national approach in that respect.

And when people rise against this approach, they are taking measures of repression instead of taking the path of mutual consultation, mutual agreement and mutual co-operation with a view to arriving at what we would understand, what every sensible man would understand, to be a national approach. So I would ask the hon. Minister when he speaks to tell us something about a new food policy if he has any. I would not like the House to be regaled with the old tale which means nothing. I would like to know what concrete steps he is going to take especially with regard to Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Bihar and other places as well because these three are much more in the food front now. Sir, there is no time. I would therefore hope that he would be concrete in this matter because the situation is grave, grave by all standards, grave by all means, and this situation calls for bold action

and imagination on the part of the Government.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, unfortunately food shortage is too true. We all wish that foodgrains could have been produced in factories so that the hon. Mr. Jain could have started a number of factories in the country—it would take two to three years to start factories—and there could have been large production ever afterwards. I am saying this because Mr. Ahmad was saying yesterday that if he asked the Minister to point out the cause of shortage, he would point out to something from God above to something below. Well, food production depends upon so many things, so many factors, many of which are not within human control. For instance, floods and droughts do not serve Mr. Jain with a month's notice so that he may prepare himself to meet them. These are things which are certainly not within his control.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Profiteers, I believe, give notice.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, I heard the speech of Mr. Dave yesterday. Mr. Dave is one of those friends on the Opposite for whose remarks I have a very keen ear but I am very sorry to note that he characterised the remarks of some Members on this side on the agitational approach of the Opposition parties in food matters as uncharitable. I did not see anything uncharitable in that.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: You do not have an approach at all.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Yes; I am coming to your national approach. When there is food shortage in the country, whether it is a shortage which is artificially created or politically engendered or whatever it is, there is trouble and the country expects the Opposition in this situation, as in every other situation, to behave with a sense of responsibility. What is this national approach that the Opposition has taken

up? They have asked the people to have hunger-strike marches and to raid food godowns and defy the law.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And you are feasting the people at Gaylords.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I am asking them honestly whether any responsible person will say that this is a helpful attitude to take. What are the consequences of such an attitude? You are not getting food by asking the people to disobey the law; you are only getting chaos. Do you want the people to get into chaos? Do you want the country to be plunged in chaos? How are you, I ask, by this method helping the Government to relieve the food shortage? They are welcome to point out the shortcomings of the Government and they are welcome to offer suggestions and as facts have proved, the Government is very keen to get their co-operation. I am surprised that Shri Dave explained this attitude as an attitude that was taken up in order to draw the attention of the public to this question. Well, I do not know if people are asked to disobey the law and court arrest in order only to show that they are . . .

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: We are learning from you in Kerala.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: You have to learn a lot yet. Sir, if this is the national approach which our friends there have been eulogizing upon. I am very sorry to say that this is not national but irrational and it also is anti-national, as he himself called it. Well, Sir, the Government have at least 15 years' experience in solving the food situation. I think the first time that food shortage showed itself in an acute degree was during 1943. Of course, in 1943 we did not have this Government; we did not have a popular Government but the Services were there. So I can say that the Services who had begun to tackle this question from 1943 are expected to have gained experience in this

matter. Unfortunately there is a factor of deficiency on the part of the Services in this respect. This question has been unfortunately tackled on an *ad hoc* basis. There perhaps never was any fear in the mind of the people concerned that there would be a shortage which would not be a temporary feature but which would be a permanent feature. They have not tackled it on a permanent basis. The entire attitude in my humble opinion has been governed by this attempt at solution on a temporary basis; thinking that tomorrow, the next year or year after that, it will solve itself. It is true that they took not only temporary short-term methods but also long-term methods such as constructing irrigation projects, reclaiming land, bringing more land under cultivation, setting up N.E.S. Blocks and Community Projects. That is all very good but in all these attempts the efforts made is half-hearted. For one thing the Services were mostly inexperienced. I am constrained to say that these Services should have been drawn from classes which had experience of rural conditions. There is some force in what Mr. Patel was saying. I do not go to the extent of saying that there is an officer who sees a tobacco plant and takes it for cabbage. Maybe, there are some such officers but I have not seen any. I won't go to that extent but most of the officers were drawn from non-agricultural classes. Even those who had training in agricultural colleges were people who were not frequently visiting the villages. So, unfortunately a right approach was not taken in regard to this matter. They thought that because we have multi-purpose small and large irrigation projects more land would come under cultivation. Unfortunately it takes some years after the completion of a project for land to be brought under irrigation and now the Government has found that it is true. It is such calculations on which perhaps the Services seem to have relied but which have belied their hopes.

Sir, I would point out some of the instances which show that a

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] completely theoretical approach has been made. In the last Food Ministers' Conference which was held at Mussoorie, the Food Ministers, the Heads of Agricultural and Food Departments all conferred together and after a good deal of deliberation came to the conclusion that with the allotment made in the Second Five Year Plan they could only step up the production of foodgrains by ten million tons. But there was the Planning Commission which gave the go-by to the experience of these Food Services of the States and said that within that allocation the target of 15 million tons could be stuck to. This is an approach which was completely devoid of practical experience and which was wholly theoretical. And now to our cost we see that this is not true. Even the figures that were collected have now after revision proved to be on the high side.

I shall give another instance. There was the Famine Enquiry Committee in which half the members thought that the reserve with the Government should be 15 million tons while the other half of the members thought it should be 30 million tons. I can understand if there is a difference of one or two million tons. But there was exactly cent per cent difference between the attitude of the two blocks of members. This shows that when the Government constitutes committees, they have not an eye to bringing experience, which is directly concerned with rural conditions, with agriculture, to bear on them. I happened to remark about the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee when it was appointed. I made this remark: We have community projects, we have community blocks, we have everything, and we have fertilisers and we are going to have more of them. But with all these, will the foodgrains be grown without the grower? There is the grower to be taken into consideration. I am sorry to say that these growers' many needs have not been attended to. For example, I would like to know if the Government cannot do anything to

bring down the cost of cultivation of the agriculturists. Not much has been done even with regard to the supply of agricultural implements. Even today in spite of the development of the co-operative movement, we do not have enough and adequate supply of credit and agricultural implements. I want to know why in the councils of the nation the agriculturist is not taken into consideration. My hon. friend Mr. Patel was referring to it. The industrial section or the business people, the professors, the economists of the country, the labour, everyone is taken into consideration in forming export councils, import councils, that committee, this committee, and so on. But I want to know whether a single agriculturist has been invited. It is not a necessity, Sir, that the representatives of 80 per cent. of the people who are engaged in this industry of agriculture should be consulted and should be taken into the councils? It may be replied that there are extension blocks, community projects, and so on, where we have associated the agriculturists, the rural people with them. But if one goes through the evaluation reports, they make a sorry reading. There is a clash between the executive authority and the advisory section. There is a clash, which is very well pointed out in the evaluation reports, between work programmes and production programmes. Even here voice of the one man with practical experience does not count.

Sir, if this state of affairs is to be remedied, we have to look deeper than our community blocks, deeper than our community projects and our irrigation and reclamation projects. We have to look deeper and see whether we are enthusing the masses of the people. The Foodgrains Enquiry Committee and the Committee on the 'Grow More Food' campaign have all come to the conclusion that there is not enough enthusiasm generated in the masses. That is a thing which we can do without much cost and effort.

Sir, since my time is up, I do not want to try your patience. I hope that

the Government will take a realistic attitude and try to enthuse the rural masses in every way so that the necessary psychology for growing more food may be created.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उपसभापति महोदय, आज मैंने अखबार में पढ़ा कि हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री श्री सम्पूर्णानन्द जी ने तीसरी बार—दो बार पहले की सूचना से मालूम पड़ता था, लेकिन अब तीसरी बार—जितनी भी विरोधी पार्टियाँ हैं उनसे यह प्रार्थना की है कि वे खाद्य संकट से बचने के लिये हर तरह का सहयोग करें। कल हमारे प्रान्त के अखिल भारतीय ख्याति के कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता डा० जैड० अहमद ने इस बात की शिकायत की थी कि श्री सम्पूर्णानन्द जी का रुख कुछ इस प्रकार का है कि दूसरी पार्टियों के दिलों के अन्दर उत्साह पैदा नहीं होता जिससे कि वे सहयोग करें। साथ ही साथ वह इस प्रश्न को एक नेशनल, राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न भी समझते हैं। अगर यह छोटी मोटी चीज होती तब तो नाराजगी का कारण समझ में आ सकता था। लेकिन राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न पर नहीं। श्री सम्पूर्णानन्द जी समझदार आदमी हैं, चीफ मिनिस्टर हैं और मैं नहीं समझता कि वे इनकी ओर दोस्ती का, सहयोग का हाथ क्यों नहीं बढ़ाते। लेकिन अगर स्वयं श्री सम्पूर्णानन्द जी ने मान लीजिये कि कोई गलती भी की हो तो उसके बारे में नाराजगी दिखाना जब कि डा० अहमद खाद्य की समस्या को स्वयं भी एक बड़ा राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न समझते हैं जो कि राष्ट्र के जीने और मरने का प्रश्न है, कहां तक उचित है। तब क्यों नहीं विरोधी पार्टियों के लोग समझौते का रास्ता अस्तित्व कर लेते हैं।

इसके साथ ही साथ अहमद साहब ने यह भी कहा कि वहां पर फूड के प्राइसेज हमारे आन्दोलन की वजह से गिर रहे हैं। एक तरफ तो वे श्री सम्पूर्णानन्द जी के रुख के बारे में यह कहते हैं कि वे नहीं मिलते हैं,

मिलने का समय नहीं देते हैं और दूसरी तरफ अपनी आन्दोलन की टैक्नीक पर वे नाज और गर्व करते हैं कि उनके आन्दोलन की वजह से फूड प्राइसेज गिर रहे हैं। इसका अर्थ तो यह है कि यह आन्दोलन ठीक है और अधिक कीमत गिराने के लिये इस आन्दोलन को और बढ़ाया जाय एक ओर सम्पूर्णानन्द जी से न मिलने की शिकायत दूसरी ओर इस आन्दोलन को ठीक व कारगर समझने की बात दोनों आपस में मेल नहीं खातीं। मुझे उनकी इस तरह की दो परस्पर विरोधी बातों से विरोध है क्योंकि इस तरह से काम नहीं चल सकता है। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कुछ बातें सुझाई हैं। मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि हर एक समझदार आदमी हमारी खाद्य समस्या को अच्छी तरह से समझता है और उसके हल निकालने की बात कह सकता है, लेकिन जिस तरह का तरीका इस समय उत्तर प्रदेश में विरोधियों ने अपना रखा है, उससे यह राष्ट्रीय समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है।

अभी हमारे माननीय सदस्य श्री गोविन्द रेड्डी ने इस चीज के ऊपर काफ़ी अच्छा प्रकाश डाला और कहा कि यह एक राष्ट्रीय प्रॉब्लम है और उसको बग़ैर दलीय आधार के तय करना चाहिये। मगर हमारे विरोधी भाई ऐसा न कर इस चीज को और भी ज्यादा खराब कर रहे हैं जिससे स्थिति बिगड़ रही है। मैं एक चीज सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि इस वक्त जो खरीफ़ की फ़सल बाज़ार में आने वाली है, उसके लिये हमारे दोस्तों ने जो आन्दोलन खड़ा कर रखा है उससे एक ख़तरा पैदा हो गया है। वह यह है कि लोग लूट पाट के आन्दोलन के डर की वजह से अपना ग़ल्ला बाज़ारों में नहीं ला रहे हैं। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि बाज़ार में ग़ल्ले के भाव दिन प्रति दिन चढ़ रहे हैं। इसके साथ ही साथ रबी की फ़सल के लिये गोदामों में बीज इकट्ठा रहता है, जो कि किसानों को बोवाई के वक्त सरकार की ओर से दिया जाता है। हमारे इन विरोधी भाइयों

[श्री नवाप्रसिंह चौहान]

ने अपनी हरकतों से इन सीड्स के गोदामों को भी लूटना शुरू कर दिया है। जब इस तरह की लूट होती है तो लोग लाठी के जोर पर उसे छीनकर ले जाते हैं, इस तरह की जहां जोर जबर्दस्ती होती है तो क्या वे समझते हैं कि वहां यह गल्ला गरीब लोगों के हाथ में पहुंच सकता है। इस तरह की उनकी कार्यवाही से एक और बड़ा भारी खतरा पैदा हो जाता है और वह है रबी की बुवाई के लिये बीज का। जब ये लोग अपनी हरकतों में बीज के गोदामों को लूट रहे हैं तो रबी की फसल के लिये किसानों को बीज कहां से दिया जायेगा। जहां पर उनके लोगों ने इस तरह की हरकत की हैं वे वहां पर जाकर अच्छी तरह से देख सकते हैं कि किस तरह से उनके लोगों ने बीजों के गोदामों को लूटा है। क्या वे यह समझते हैं कि इस तरह से की गई लूट का माल गरीब लोगों के पेटों में पहुंचा है। कभी नहीं, बल्कि इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि रबी की फसल के लिये जो बीज इन गोदामों में इकट्ठा किया गया था वह समाप्त कर दिया गया। आपकी इस हरकत का नतीजा यह हुआ कि आपने अगली रबी की फसल को भी लुटवा दिया। जहां तक खाने के गेहूं का सम्बन्ध है वह तो बाहर से यानी अमरीका इत्यादि से आया हुआ काम में लाया जा सकता है, मगर बीज के लिये इससे काम नहीं चल सकता है। बोने के लिये हम बाहर के गल्ले से काम नहीं चला सकते हैं क्योंकि वह यहां के जलवायु के अनुकूल नहीं होता है। इन सब बातों के होते हुए भी वे सब चीजों को जानते हुए भी वे यह लोग कहते हैं कि इनके आन्दोलन से यू० पी० में दाम गिर गये हैं। मुझे मालूम है कि जहां जहां उन्होंने "हंगर मार्च" किया और यह नारा लगाया "रोटी दो नहीं तो गद्दी छोड़ो", वहां वहां उसी दिन जब कि बाजार में नाज २॥ सेर का बिक रहा था वह फौरन दो सेर का हो गया। जिस दिन उन्होंने कहीं, गड़बड़ की उसी दिन से वहां पर बाहर से गल्ला आना बन्द हो गया। जब लोगों को इस बात का

यकीन हो गया कि अब आन्दोलन शान्त हो गया है तब गल्ला भी आने लगा और एक दो रुपया मन सस्ता भी हो गया। आप इस बात को ठीक नहीं कहते कि आपके आन्दोलन से बाजार में भाव गिर गया है और आपके आन्दोलन के पीछे लाखों जनता है। जो कुछ भी या जहां कहीं भी आपने आन्दोलन के पीछे तीन हजार या चार हजार आदमी हों—आखिर आप लोगों की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, इत्यादि की संगठित पार्टीज हैं वह सब विरोधी पार्टियों के जो मेम्बर है, कार्यकर्ता हैं वे ही जेलखानों में जा रहे हैं, बाहर की जनता नहीं जा रही है। मैं जानता हूं कि जनता दुःखी है, उन्हे तकलीफें हैं, उसे खाने को ठीक ढंग से नहीं मिलता है लेकिन फिर भी इस तरह की हरकतें वह पसन्द नहीं करती है चाहे वैसे वह गवर्नमेंट को गाली ही क्यों न देता हो।

हमारे दोस्त मि० जैड० अहमद ने अपने भाषण में एक चीज का जिक्र किया और यह कहा कि बड़े बड़े खाते अब भी मौजूद हैं यानी बड़ी बड़ी होल्डिंग्स अब भी मौजूद हैं जो करीब ३० परसेंट हैं। क्या वह यह समझते हैं कि इस वक्त इस चीज को छूने से या सीलिंग करने से यह सवाल हल हो जायेगा। यह सब मानते हैं कि यह सवाल ठीक होना चाहिये, सीलिंग होनी चाहिये और जमीन का उचित वितरण होना चाहिये यानी इकोनॉमिक होल्डिंग्स में। लेकिन इस वक्त जहां तक फूड की पॉलिसी का सवाल है, फूड का कमी का सवाल है, इस वक्त इस चीज का जिक्र करना खराब होगा। वह जानते हैं कि रूस में बेतहाशा जमीन पड़ी है। वहां सन् १९१७ में क्रान्ति हुई और क्रान्ति के बाद सैनिक इत्यादि ने जमीनों पर कब्जा कर लिया इस प्रकार जो छोटी छोटी होल्डिंग्स थीं वे डेढ़ गुनी बढ़ गई। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि ग्रास उत्पत्ति तो बढ़ गई लेकिन मार्केटबल सर्प्लस आधा हो गया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि सन् १९२१ में वहां बड़े जोर का अकाल पड़ा। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या हमारे यहां भी इसी तरह से

होना चाहिये। हमारे देश में जो एग्रीकलचर है वह कमर्शियलाइज्ड नहीं हुआ है, किसान अपनी जिन्दगी बसर करने के लिये पैदा करता है। इसलिये इस समय बड़ी जोतों को कम करने का बात करने से किसानों की तादाद बढ़ जायेगी। हमारे यहां पहले से ही छोटे छोटे अन्-इकोनॉमिक होल्डिंग्स हैं। इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि मुमकिन है पैदावार कुछ बढ़ जाय लेकिन इससे जो मार्केटबल सर्प्लस होगा वह कम हो जायगा और अधिक नाज बाज़ार में नहीं आ सकेगा इस प्रकार शहर वालों को नुकसान और तकलीफ होगी।

श्री उपसभापति : समाप्त कोजिये।

श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान : अभी तो बहुत प्वाइन्ट्स कहने बाकी रह गये हैं लेकिन समय थोड़ा होने की वजह से मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूं और अन्त में अपने दोस्त से कहना चाहता हूं कि वे अपने दूसरे चश्मे से, जनता के चश्मे से जो मूवमेंट हो रहा है उसको ज़रा देखें और कहें कि कहां तक यह ठीक है और कहां तक नहीं।

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव (राजस्थान) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, किसी भी राष्ट्र के उत्थान तथा उसकी योजना की सफलता के लिये वहां के निवासियों को पेट भर भोजन मिलना बहुत आवश्यक होता है। भारतवर्ष जो कि कृषि प्रधान देश है, यहां के निवासी, जब कि हम बाहर से भी गल्ला मंगाते हैं, फिर भी भूखे रहें और यहां अनाज की कमी हो यह हमारे लिये बहुत शर्म की बात है।

हमारे भारतवर्ष में जो खेती होती है उसमें दो, तीन खास चीजें हैं—उपजाऊ जमीन, खाद, पानी और अच्छे बीज। जहां तक मुझे मालूम है, पानी की समस्या बहुत कठिन है। यह हम जानते हैं कि हमारा देश प्रकृति पर बहुत निर्भर है और प्रकृति पानी दे या न दे इसमें हमारा कोई हाथ नहीं है। पानी की कमी हमेशा रहने से हर एक खेती को

नुकसान होता है। कई स्थानों में जहां खाद मिल सकती है वहां पानी की कमी रहती है और पानी सरकार द्वारा मंहंगा मिलता है। इसी वजह से बहुत से किसान उसको खरीद नहीं सकते और पूरा पानी न मिलने की वजह से कई दफ्ता खेती में नुकसान होकर उपज कम होता है। इसलिये मैं यह सुझाव देना चाहती हूं कि हम लोग अच्छी तरह से योजना बनायें और पानी का बटवारा अच्छी तरह से करके उपज को बढ़ायें।

हमारे यहां बहुत सारे डिमान्स्ट्रेशन फार्म्स हैं। उनके बारे में हमें मालूम है कि वे डिमान्स्ट्रेशन फार्म्स जो हैं वे स्वावलम्बी नहीं हैं, उन पर खर्चा बहुत होता है जिसकी वजह से उसको आदर्श मान कर किसान लोग उसको नकल करना नहीं चाहते। हमारे यहां के बैल भी मजबूत नहीं हैं। पहले से भी उनकी शक्ति कम होती जा रही है और वे हमारी जमीन में हल पहले की तरह नहीं चला सकते हैं। इसको भी हमें देखना है कि उनकी कमजोरी का क्या कारण है। क्या उनको पूरा भोजन नहीं मिलता या फिर कौन सा कारण है। इसकी वजह से भी उपज बढ़ने में दिक्कत होती है।

अभी हमारे भाई, श्री दाया भाई पटेल ने कहा कि कुछ वर्षों पहले सरकार ने यह कहा था कि हमारे यहां अन्न की केवल दस प्रतिशत कमी है और अब कहते हैं कि बारह, साढ़े बारह प्रतिशत बढ़ गया है। देखने में तो ये एक-दूसरे के विरुद्ध दीखते हैं कि उपज बढ़ गई और शार्टेज (कमी) में फिर भी कमी नहीं हुई है। लेकिन दाया भाई पटेल जी ने दो बातें कह कर उसके आगे उसके कारणों का नाम भी नहीं लिया।

श्री डाह्याभाई बी० पटेल : टाइम नहीं मिला। नहीं तो और भी बताता।

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : इसी के साथ मैं वह प्रश्न आता है। जो सच्चाई है उसको

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

उन्होंने नहीं कहा। हमारी जनसंख्या कितनी बढ़ रही है? दस प्रतिशत की कमी बारह प्रतिशत की बढ़ोतरी से पूरी हो सकती है जबकि हमारी जनसंख्या उतनी ही रहे? फिर जनसंख्या जैसा कि हम जानते हैं, रेखा-गणित के अनुसार बढ़ती जा रही है जहां हमारे खाने की संख्या केवल अंकगणित के अनुसार बढ़ती है। यह जानते हुए भी इतने विद्वान् और अनुभवी नेता न कहें, यह समझ में नहीं आता। खैर, हर आदमी इस बात को जानता है कि हमारी जनसंख्या बढ़ने के कारण हमारी अन्न की समस्या हल नहीं हो पा रही है।

यह भी कहना बहुत ज्यादाती है कि हमारे फ़ूड मिनिस्टर साहब कुछ नहीं कर रहे हैं या गवर्नमेंट कुछ नहीं कर रही है। यह मैं मानती हूँ कि कहीं इधर उधर भूल हो और उपज बढ़ाने में उनकी भी मदद हो सकती है, उपज बढ़ाने में उनका हाथ हो सकता है परन्तु जब हम यह कहते हैं कि सरकार ने यह नहीं किया वह नहीं किया तो हम अपने हृदय पर हाथ धर कर कभी नहीं सोचते कि हमने इस बड़े भारी राष्ट्रीय हित की चीज करने में कितना हाथ बटाय़ा। यहां पर भी जितने विरोधी भाई हैं, मैंने जितनों के व्याख्यान सुने, अधिकतर उन्होंने यह कहा : सरकार ने यह नहीं किया, वह नहीं किया। यह हम लोगों की एक नीति हो गई है कि हर राजनीतिक दल यह समझता है कि सरकार को हम क्रिटिसाइज कर लेंगे तो हमारा बड़ा भारी फ़र्ज पूरा हो जायगा। यह केवल यहां ही नहीं, म्युनिसिपैलिटीज में, प्रदेशों में, राज्यों में और केन्द्रीय सरकार में, सभी जगह सरकार को क्रिटिसाइज करना हमारा एक धर्म हो गया है। मैं जानती हूँ कि म्युनिसिपैलिटीज में जो हमारे नगर के निवासी हैं वे स्वयं तो बुरी तरह से गन्दगी फैलाते हैं लेकिन कहते हैं कि म्युनिसिपैलिटीज सफ़ाई नहीं करती। वही बात हम यहां पर भी

करना चाहते हैं। यदि हमारे विरोधी भाई समझे कि हमारा राष्ट्रीय कर्तव्य क्या है, केवल विरोध करना हमारा फ़र्ज नहीं है, तो मैं समझती हूँ कि अगर सरकार को सबका कोआपरेशन मिले तो बहुत जल्दी वह दिन आ सकता है जब हमारी खाद्य समस्या हल हो सकती है। मगर हमारे विरोधी दलों ने तो यह समझ रखा है कि हमारा सबसे बड़ा फ़र्ज यह है कि सरकार को बुरा कहें, उसको दोषी ठहरावें और हम स्वयं कुछ न करें।

राजस्थान के बारे में मैं कह सकती हूँ कि हमारे यहां राजस्थान के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर ने विरोधी दल के सदस्यों से बातचीत करना आरम्भ किया है और बहुत आशा व्यक्त की है कि वे उनके साथ कोआपरेट करेंगे, सुझाव देंगे। यदि सचमुच इस समस्या की गम्भीरता को समझ कर और देश के प्रति एक ड्यूटी समझ कर वे कुछ सहायता देंगे तो जरूर कार्य सफल होगा। मगर होता क्या है कि जो राजनीतिक दल है वे कोआपरेशन देने के बजाय यह समझते हैं कि सरकार को फ़ेल करने का यही तरीका है कि सही काम न होने पाये। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती। ठीक है, दल के हिसाब से आप सही काम करने दें या न करने दें, अपना दोष मानें या न मानें और केवल विरोध प्रकट करने के लिये विरोध करें। मगर जहां देश के जीवन मरण का सवाल है उधर भी विरोधी बन कर यह समझेंगे कि हमें कांग्रेस पार्टी को गिराना है, कांग्रेस को दोषी ठहराना है, हर एक दृष्टि से उसका बुरा करना है तो मैं समझती हूँ वे अपने कर्तव्य के खिलाफ़ काम करेंगे, एक बहुत बड़ा देश के प्रति शत्रुता का व्यवहार करेंगे। इसलिए मैं उनसे फिर प्रार्थना करना चाहती हूँ कि वे इस प्रकार न समझें कि हमारे देश के ऊपर कुछ भी बीते मगर सिर्फ़ हमारा दल दूसरे दल को गिराने के लिये मजबूत हो जाय। मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहती हूँ कि एक लकीर खिंची हुई है जो बहुत लम्बी है और एक दूसरी लकीर है जो छोटी है।

अगर हम लम्बी लकीर की लम्बाई को मिटा कर छोटी लकीर को बड़ी दिखाना चाहे तो क्या हम उस लम्बी लकीर को छोटा साबित कर देंगे ? चाहिये तो यह कि छोटी लकीर को इतना बढ़ायें कि वह बड़ी से भी लम्बी हो जाय तभी असली बड़प्पन होगा । मेरा मतलब यह है कि कांग्रेस गवर्नमेण्ट की कितनी भी कमियां हों, मगर वे जानते हैं कि इस वक्त उसकी लकीर लम्बी है इसलिये वे सोच में बैठे हुए हैं । तो फिर वे प्रयत्न करें—विरोधी पार्टी वाले—कि हम उससे भी ज्यादा देशहित के कार्यों को करेंगे, उससे भी अधिक अपने को मजबूत करेंगे । वे केवल विरोध करने से मजबूत नहीं बन सकते, देश हित के काम करने से ही उनको सचमुच में सफलता मिल सकती है और इस प्रकार शायद एक दिन आए जब उनकी लकीर सचमुच लम्बी हो जाय । मगर जो वे यह सोचते हैं कि कांग्रेस की लम्बी लकीर छोटी करने से उनकी लकीर लम्बी होगी तो इससे कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है सिवाय इसके कि देशहित के प्रतिकूल उनका कार्य माना जायगा । इसलिए इसको वह राजनीतिक समस्या न बना कर अगर एक राष्ट्रीय समस्या बनायें तो यह ज्यादा अच्छा होगा ।

बह भी मैं कहना चाहती हूं कि यह जो जनसंख्या की बढ़ोतरी है, इसको दूर करने में भी हमें पूरा सहयोग देना होगा और जब तक कि हमारी जनसंख्या जितनी बढ़ रही है...

(Time bell rings.) उतना

बढ़ना कम नहीं होगा और जब तक दूसरी तरफ़ अन्न नहीं बढ़ेगा तब तक यह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती । इसलिए हम सब का ही कर्तव्य है, प्रत्येक दल के व्यक्तियों का, प्रत्येक दल के नेताओं का, प्रत्येक भारत निवासी का यह कर्तव्य है कि वे अन्न की उपज में बढ़ोतरी करें, साथ ही साथ अपने शहर या गांव, जहां कहीं भी वे हों, वे कोशिश करें कि जनसंख्या जिस तरह से बढ़ रही है उस तरह से न बढ़ने दें और फैमिली प्लानिंग का प्रचार करें।

धन्यवाद ।

SHRI MAHESH SARAN (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is really heartening to find that things are improving, foodstuffs are being rushed from the Centre to the States, more fair price shops are being opened and there is also more stock. Now, Sir, after saying all this, I have with regret to say that the Central Government, the U.P. Government and the Bihar Government did not foresee how things were to shape later on. Both these States know that floods generally come there and when there are floods, it is difficult for goods to move from one place to another. Therefore, stocks should have been in the States before the floods and had they been there, this difficulty, this misery of the people, could have been avoided.

Sir, as the time is short, I want to hurry through my suggestions as regards the short-term policy and the long-term policy.

So far as the short-term policy is concerned, I think there should be enough stock in the fair price shops. Sometimes, we find that the shops are closed because there is not enough stock there. Then, Sir, side by side with the fair price shops we have other shops selling foodstuffs at high prices. I think it is up to the Government to see that people are not troubled in this way. The prices of foodgrains should be reasonable and they should not be very high. But I am afraid the Government is doing nothing in this regard.

Then, Sir, there is the question of hoarding. There are, of course, lots of foodstuffs in the country. But there is this hoarding problem, and I am afraid that the Government is not able to catch hold of the hoarders. It has not created fear in the hearts of hoarders that if they do not come forward with their hoarded stocks, they would be severely punished. I think that should be done. Then there is the question of realisation of taccavi loans and rent

[Shri Mahesh Saran.]

that have been advanced. This realisation of loans is going on, and it is going on vigorously, which is very very wrong. There must be remission of rent and realisation of these loans should be stopped for the time being.

Now, Sir, so far as the long-term policy is concerned, I think warehouses are absolutely necessary. They should be established all over the country, so that when the cultivators produce food-stuffs, they can be purchased by the Government at reasonable prices and kept for use whenever there is any difficulty. What happens now is that the cultivators have to sell their grains at very low prices after the harvest is over. Then, Sir, canals have not been fully utilised because the canal rates are high, and in addition to that, if some area falls within the canal area, the tax is collected although water may not be taken from the canal. My submission is that the charges for canal water should be reduced, and some channels must be constructed so that water can be taken from those canals to the different fields.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): These things are for the State Governments to do.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: Sir, we are always saying that these things are for the State Governments to do. But how can we go to the States and suggest these things? I think it is this Government which has to look after these things and see that things are properly done. If it is only said that it is the job of the State Governments and the Central Government has nothing to do with it, then I am afraid I do not agree with it. The real responsibility is that of the Centre to see that these things are properly carried out.

Now, Sir, so far as the community development is concerned—of course, this is a Central subject—I feel it

should have priorities. Much expense is being incurred on different items. When our country is so much in need of food, all our attention must be directed towards food production and all our energies must centre round this problem. We are having big buildings for the officers and for the staff. I think all this money should, for the present, go towards making agriculture more and more progressive.

Then, Sir, we have talked about chemical fertilisers. They require more water, and chemical fertilisers are not always easily available. Therefore attention should be directed towards green manure. Then, Sir, the most important thing is cheap credit. People may have fields and everything else, but if there is no cheap credit, poor people cannot buy all these things and cannot do any kind of good cultivation. Therefore cheap credit is absolutely necessary for this purpose.

Then, Sir, reclamation of waste land all over the country is very very necessary. I have had the occasion of moving about in the country, and I find that much land is lying waste, and if we could only make use of it, it will be very profitable. Then, Sir, embankments, wherever necessary, should be constructed in order to check floods, because floods are doing much damage to our crops. Then there should be some incentive to the farmer to produce more and more, and this can only be done when his produce fetches him a good price.

Now, Sir, I have a few words to say, as far as our Opposition Parties are concerned. I am sorry to do that. Of course, generally I do not like to indulge in making any criticism. But at present I feel it my duty to do so. The Opposition Parties claim to be the champions of our people and they claim to be the great champions of freedom and democracy. But actually what is it that they are doing? They are creating chaos and they are creating so many difficulties in the way of our Government which is trying to supply more and more food to the

people. Now, Sir, they are talking of raids on these various godowns. And what is the result of all this? In this connection, Sir, I will give you just one or two instances. I find in "The National Herald" that in a certain place in Etawah known as Kothara, on the 13th September, the villagers looted a cart-load of grains. Why is that so? Because our good friends are always talking about raiding and about surrounding these godowns, and things like that. Then again, Sir, what do we find in "The National Herald"? We find that the P.S.P. volunteers are squatting in front of the Government's godowns for the last so many days, and one of them managed to enter the godown. Then again, Sir, in "The Pioneer" of September 12, we find a unique method of courting arrest. It is done by riding over an elephant. What is all this? What is happening to the people who call themselves to be the champions of freedom and democracy? Is this the way to do things? I think they are only carrying on these things for their party purposes. They are trying to earn good name for their party. They are not doing all these things with any intention to help the country as a whole. And I am afraid that these things only go to show that their loyalty to the party is greater than their loyalty to the country. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I would like first of all to say that the Food Minister made a very fair and comprehensive speech. Now, Sir, you will permit me to consult my notes.

No one can deny that the food position is distressing in certain parts of the country. In my own State it has led to widespread agitation and conflict of political parties in opposition with the law of the land.

It is highly regrettable that the Opposition parties should have resorted to direct action. We cannot approve of that method of agitation in a democracy such as ours. I will

not, however, go into the question of that agitation and the way it is being conducted, but rather I would like to stress that there should be, as the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said, a national approach to the problem, and that we should all pull together and work to ease the situation. No one wants the opposition parties to approach Government in sack cloth and ashes but one could wish that they would realise that the time is such as to necessitate action based on national unity. Political agitation followed mainly by measures for maintaining order will not help us to tide over difficulties. What we need—both the opposition and ruling parties—to appreciate is that the country is above party, that the common people need food and that we must devise the means to help them to secure it at reasonable prices and in sufficient quantities for their needs.

In 1955, when we were nearing the completion of the Plan, the position regarding foodgrains appeared to be fairly satisfactory. We were calculating that there would be an increase of 15 per cent. or 10 million tons over an estimated production of 65 million tons in 1955-56. In fact, we thought that the increase might go up to nearly 15.5 million tons with rice, of 6.5 million tons with wheat, of 3 million tons with other cereals, of 3.5 million tons with grain and pulses of 2.5 million tons. Both in wheat 5 P.M. and rice the production has to some extent declined. This decline is due to several factors, the most important of which are natural calamities. The first lesson to learn is therefore to redouble our efforts to make agriculture independent of the monsoon. We have been making dams and irrigation works for that purpose. But perhaps more emphasis should now be placed on minor irrigation works including tube-wells. It may be that there is a case for further reducing irrigation dues. A second direction in which we need to revise our policy is that of providing greater incentive to efforts for increase in the yield per acre. My own inclina-

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

tion is in favour of large scale co-operative farming, arranged in such a manner as to make the agriculturist feel that he is a real partner in the big enterprise of improving agricultural methods. Ceilings on land are also necessary. The land must not be the monopoly of a few persons. We cannot however ignore the individual farmer. He needs better seeds, more credit, and more fertilisers. We should therefore set up more fertilizer factories. We have ignored these fertilizers far too much. The difficulty is that our population is increasing at a faster rate than our food production. It is only highly intelligent communities that know the art of family planning. We cannot neglect, however, the question of family planning. We need also to teach our people to diversify their diet. The whole diet in our country consists of either wheat or rice. We need to teach our people to take more vegetables and other protective food and even meat in communities which take meat. Our diets will not be diversified unless prices are lowered, and the central problem therefore is that of price control.

With the imports that we have obtained, there is probably enough food to go round but people cannot just afford to pay the price. In parts of U.P. wheat is selling at Rs. 27 or 28 per maund. Rice is selling in some places at about 1 seer per rupee. How can poor men and middle class men in the urban areas afford this price? It is not as if the cultivators have benefited by this price, it is the middlemen, the hoarders or the profiteers who are benefiting by it. What has been done to check hoarding and profiteering? We have no doubt opened fair price shops but how do we ensure that they shall be used only by those for whom identity cards have been issued? You have to ensure that they shall be only used by those to whom identification cards have been issued. My inclination is in favour of a policy of greater price control. We should purchase from the cultivators at a reasonable price, whatever is in

excess of their requirements and bring that to the market and undertake the task of distributing the food as far as possible ourselves. I saw something of rationing in war-time in Bombay because it was a very fine experiment that they had in Bombay in rationing. I am not personally convinced that greater control, more fair price shops and distribution by modified rationing will not help us to a certain extent in solving our problem. May I finally say that we need to create an atmosphere in this country in which the problems of our food production can be considered properly? I speak as a man without any party prejudices. I would make an earnest appeal to my friends of the Opposition because I know the spirit of dedication that they have in many matters and I have always admired that spirit of dedication. I make this appeal to them most earnestly that they should do everything that they can to co-operate with Government in this task of improving the food position in this country. We should set up All-India All-Parties Food Council and we should have provincial bodies to whom real power should be given and I agree with the view of Shri Ashok Mehta in the Committee that there should be a Price Stabilization Board. I will not go into the details. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I will begin with my friend Mr. Z. A. Ahmad. He made his first speech in this House. As he was speaking I was relegated to some 10 or 12 years ago when I was a Member of the U.P. Assembly. I began to dream and saw that Mr. Z. A. Ahmad was pleading with Mr. Sampurnanand for a union after divorce. Mr. Sampurnanand comes from Banaras...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I could not quite follow this conjugal expression.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: A bachelor never understands that.

SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA: There is no need also.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Mr. Sampurnanand, as a *Tilakdhari* from Banaras, said that the earthen vessel is used once and never a second time. If I can take the liberty, I would advise Mr. Ahmad not to rake up his domestic quarrels in a wrong place. Again, Mr. Ahmad during the course of his speech said, when I was dealing with certain statistics, that I was behaving like a Deputy Secretary. May be so. But Mr. Ahmad reeled out more of statistics than me. All I can tell him is 'Physician, heal thyself'. Again while winding up his speech, he said that he had said many things because he had to fulfil a formality. I accept his version. We need not take him very seriously.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Formalities of the debate to crash your case.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Coming to the issues raised during the debate, I say with a feeling of sincerity that I felt pained and grievously pained, over one aspect of the debate and that was the question of raising the provincial issues—U.P. *versus* Bihar, Bihar *versus* Bengal, Bengal *versus* U.P. I have been subjected to enough of criticism in the matter of food. I don't mind it. Anybody who carries the responsibility of a Minister, particularly when difficulties arise in good portions of the country, must be prepared for criticism and severe criticism. He must be prepared to accept where things have been remiss but nonetheless it has been painful for me to see that these State rivalries should have been raked up. Perhaps hon. Members would have done better if instead of raking up those rivalries, they had concentrated their attack on me. I would have welcomed it more. I had no intention of speaking on this subject, but as some questions have been raised, questions which are likely to affect the minds of the people, I would like to make the position clear. I carry a big responsibility in that respect. It is the Government of India which imports food from abroad. The Central Government has also been procuring some stocks inside the coun-

try. Now those stocks, the imported ones and those procured inside the country, have to be distributed between the different States. And it is my duty to see that they are equitably and fairly distributed between the States. If at any time I am unfair to any of the States I stand to be condemned in the strongest terms. I would say that if I show prejudice against one State or another, or if I show favour to one State or another, I would not be worthy to occupy the position where I am. Now, it is for that reason that I want to clarify the position. An hon. Member of my party, Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor, quoted the census figures, the population of U.P., the population of Bihar, the population of Bengal, and he urged that U.P. did not receive sufficient foodgrains on population basis, whereas Bihar and West Bengal received more of foodgrains. I was unable to understand it. If population . . .

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: No. Don't misrepresent me. I did not say that Bengal and Bihar got more than they needed. I said I would be happy even if they got more. What I said was that we got very much less than our needs. It was no State rivalry. I only expressed the needs of U.P.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: The population basis was raised. The population figures were given and naturally the inference is that the distribution must have taken place on the basis of population.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I quoted the production figures also, and our production was a little less than the production of Bengal and Bihar combined.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: I am coming to that. Now, Sir, if population is going to form the basis of distribution, why should not Madras get, why should not Mysore get, why should not Andhra get. So, I think, to determine the distribution on the basis of population is totally unwarranted.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: None suggested.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Now, Sir, I will give some figures to show as to what are the losses of the respective States. In U.P. the production of kharif cereals was almost normal. That is, in 1957-58, it was only two tons⁵ less than what it was in 1956-57. But U.P. suffered a big loss in the rabi crop.

(Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: The total production of cereals in U.P. was 84,76,000 tons in 1957-58, as compared to 92,26,000 tons in 1956-57. That is, there was a total shortage of 7,50,000 tons, or 8 per cent. shortage. In Bihar the total production of cereals in 1957-58 was 30,62,000 tons in 1957-58, as compared to 46,04,000 tons in 1956-57, the total loss being 15,42,000 tons or nearly 33 per cent. In the case of West Bengal the production in 1957-58 was 42,81,000 tons as compared to 46,94,000 tons in the year 1956-57. That is a total shortage of 4,13,000 tons or less than 10 per cent. Now . . .

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: With regard to U.P., did the Minister say that the total shortage there was only about 7½ lakh tons?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Yes.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Was it not much more than that?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: No. It is not so. These are the figures supplied by the U.P. Government. Now, Sir, that more or less determines the basis on which the distribution is to take place.

What are the supplies that we have made to different State Governments? To U.P. we have given so far, that is up to the end of August, 1,78,000 tons

Why was it so? The rabi crop starts coming into the market about the end of April and in the beginning of May. The kharif crop of U.P. was almost normal. And, therefore, the demand for foodgrains in U.P. did not arise until the month of June. In fact, in the month of February and March we had made some allocations to U.P., but the U.P. Government did not lift those allocations, because they did not need it. Their distribution from the fair price shops which they were running in eastern U.P. had very much gone down. U.P. had bought about 70 or 80 thousand tons of coarse grains and they had substantial portions of these coarse grains in stock with them. They had also certain carry-over stocks of wheat supplied by the Central Government. Now, at one time the U.P. Government was thinking of disposing of their stock of coarse grains, when I happened to talk with the Minister. And I said that it would not be a good thing to sell the coarse grain stocks, because the stocks may one day stand in good stead, as it has come to be. He had listened to my advice and those stocks were preserved. Therefore, I want to make clear that if the quantity supplied to U.P. is small, it is due to the fact that up to the month of May there was not much of a demand from U.P. and whatever demand there was could be met either from the stock of coarse grains or the stock of wheat which were given to them by us. In fact, even at the cost of repetition, I would say that the allocations made by us in the month of February and March were not actually availed of by the U.P. Government. The difficulty in U.P. arose about the end of May. It became quite acute in June. It was further aggravated in the month of July and August. During that period I made to them the supplies that they needed. Again, I want to make clear that I cannot undertake the responsibility of always making available the supplies which a State Government needs for the reason that I have also to look to the stocks available with the Centre. I have also to look to demands from others.

Hon. Members, the Nawab of Chhatari—Shri Ahmad Said Khan Saheb—and Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru, drew the attention of the House to the fact that we must look ahead. Because there is some fall in the prices now or because the new crop is coming, we should not become complacent. The situation might continue to be difficult later. So, whatever stocks I may have, shall have to be distributed keeping in view the needs that are likely to arise some months after. Then, Sir, there are demands from different States and those demands have been rising. If the sum total of the demands from the States exceeds the availability of the foodgrains at a particular time, some rationing will have to be done and some cuts will have to be applied. While I shall do my best and I am confident that with the present stocks and the arrangements for the imports which we have made, I will be able to meet the reasonable demands of the State Governments, yet if inflated demands are put up or if the sum total of the demands from the States becomes excessive, I shall have to exercise my judgment. Now, that judgment will be exercised honestly and equitably for all the States and I am prepared to undertake full and complete responsibility for the distribution of the foodgrains *inter se* as between one State and another State.

Then, Sir, I come to Bihar. As I said, the loss of foodgrains in Bihar was the heaviest, both in absolute terms and in percentage—a loss of 33 per cent. Up to the end of August we have supplied 5,60,000 tons of foodgrains to Bihar. All these supplies have been made after settling the quantities with Bihar. Just as in the case of U.P. I met all their demands, in the case of Bihar also I met all their demands. It is true that with good administration and with a large number of fair price shops Bihar has been able to maintain the distributive system in a fairly efficient manner, and they have been able to meet the situation with a comparatively small quantity. The credit goes to Bihar.

Now I come to West Bengal. There is no dispute about the figures. At one time the Government of West Bengal had calculated that their deficit was going to be of the order of 7 lakh tons. Now the basis of that calculation was not the comparison of the production in 1956-57 and in 1957-58. They thought that 15 ounces of cereals were necessary for an adult. I need hardly repeat that the availability of cereals *per capita* in India is 13.6 ounces. Making calculations on that basis they came to the conclusion that after making provision for seeds, wastage, etc. the shortage in West Bengal would be of the order of 7 lakh tons. I am not much of a believer in these mathematical calculations, and I have, in my dealings with the State Governments, said that the availability of the stocks, the level of the prices, the demand and the offtake from fair price shops are better criteria than any mathematical calculations. Now what we have done in the case of West Bengal? I was in Calcutta on the 9th and 10th of this month. Up till that time we had supplied 6,20,000 or 6,30,000 tons—might be one of these two figures—to West Bengal. There were yet 3 months and 20 days more to go. Now if I had gone by purely mathematical figures I could have said to West Bengal: Well, you have your 70 or 80 thousand tons, which was the balance left over, and you can get nothing more. But we have to meet a practical situation. I know that things are difficult in West Bengal; they need food. Am I to go by statistics? Am I to tell them, because your figure is fulfilled it does not matter what happens to West Bengal, I am not going to give you any quantity more? Well, Sir, I cannot take up that position. We discussed the whole question at a meeting where some Members of the Opposition, members of the West Bengal Government and I were present. Some Members of the Opposition in the West Bengal Assembly also met me. Finally I gave the Chief Minister and the Food Minister of West Bengal some idea of the quantities which we are supplying to other States and the

[Shri A. P. Jain.]

shortages in other States. I gave them the picture of the food position of India. I also gave them some idea of the stocks, and then we came to certain conclusions. We have agreed to supply them in this month of September 1,05,000 tons. Now out of this 1,05,000 tons 80,000 tons will be supplied by the Central Government, and the West Bengal Government had built up a stock of their own out of which they will draw 25,000 tons. Then for the month of October I promised to supply them 90,000 tons of wheat and rice. They will be left with a balance of 20,000 tons in their own stocks. I said: You draw on them and in the month of September you distribute 1,10,000 tons because it is the Pujah month. About the month of November I told them that I would maintain the supply of 55 to 60 thousand tons of wheat but I have yet to assess the rice position; we will discuss about it and then we will let you know the quantity of rice we can make available. About the month of December we did not discuss. It is a little too far off in the present context of things; we will discuss about it later on. When the Chief Minister of West Bengal came here, he had some talk with the Chief Minister of Orissa which has got some stocks, and the Chief Minister of Orissa was agreeable to sell these stocks to West Bengal. I said: Yes, this is something of a windfall; I am prepared to allow you to take this quantity from Orissa and this will not count against any quota.

Now I have given facts and figures at some length and I dare say, Sir, that I have acted honestly, I have acted justly and I have tried to be fair *inter se* the States.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Was the Chief Minister satisfied ultimately?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Yes, because the Chief Minister sees not only his own, he has to see the all-India position also. In fact, Sir, there is a disconcerting feature of our food policy;

there is not much of realisation of the all-India outlook. There are pressures, pressures by groups, pressures by political parties, in the States to have more from the Centre. But the Centre has a limited stock; that has to be distributed in a just manner to all the State Governments. If every State Government tries to exercise pressure, political pressure and other pressures, food administration will become impossible. And I want to make it clear that while I would be prepared to meet the just demands of State Governments, I simply cannot be hustled by pressures from whatever quarter they may come. I have to give satisfaction to all the State Governments. I have to make them feel that the Centre is showing equal justice to them; not that there is pressure from this State or that State, so the Centre is slipping away and giving it. If that impression goes about, there will be an end of the all-India outlook; it will be an end of the food administration; it will be an end of the Government. Now this is all, Sir, I want to say about it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, was it not pointed out to him that . . .

SHRI A. P. JAIN: I did not raise any questions when the hon. Member was speaking.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because I have to get answers; you do not need answers. Will you yield? Just one question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: At the end you can ask questions; not now.

Now, Sir, with regard to food two other questions were raised and I have already referred to one of them, that is, we must have a long-range perspective of demands on us, of the price trends and of the availability of stocks, and it is from these considerations that, whatever stocks I have, I have to spread, not only at present in

between the States, but I have to spread them over a period.

One question was raised by my friend Mr. Shiva Rao and he said that he was disappointed at the action taken against the hoarders by the Government. I am myself not satisfied with it; we should have done much more. I do not say that there is hoarding in all parts of the country, but there is certainly hoarding in some parts of the country, and the action which we took in the case of the Punjab is ample demonstration of that—a quantity of between 5 lakh and 6 lakh maunds of wheat, not a small quantity, and I have information that some of the speculators and profiteers in U.P. have purchased more of foodgrains in the Punjab. We are trying to lay hands on them and we hope to seize more of hoarded foodgrains.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Only if you could do it earlier.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Well, I think we did it at the proper time. When they had made their purchases we swooped down upon them.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): They must have hidden it very cleverly.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Now, I would like the State Governments to seize the hoarded stocks wherever they might be and for that purpose we have issued a notification applying the new law under which the State Governments are entitled to seize the stocks of wheat, gram, barley etc. at the average of prices prevailing during the last three months. I do hope that the State Governments will take action and we are going to ask them to do it.

Another question in this connection which was raised by my friend, Mr. Shiva Rao—and a very pertinent question—was whether the decline in the prices which had been visible for 65 R.S.D.—8,

the last few days was due to any action of the Government or whether it was due to the threat of raids. It would indeed be a dangerous thing if things are allowed to be determined by raids. In fact, raids have to be suppressed. Now, the biggest decline in prices has taken place in the Punjab where the food administration is not mixed up with politics. There are no raids there and inevitably—that is my opinion—this effect has been produced firstly by the categorical refusal of the Centre to lift the ban on the movement of wheat from Punjab to other regions. That is the most important factor because the evil-doers who had bought stocks and were hoping that as soon as this wall is broken the price of wheat in Punjab will go up and they will make profit. But when they were disillusioned and found that this is not going to be done, they had to reduce the prices; they had to bring out their stocks and I claim the credit for the Punjab Government for having brought about this reduction in prices. This was further accelerated by the prompt—but not much talked of—action of the Punjab Government in seizing stocks. There have been much talk by politicians even by some Ministers that there are hoarded stocks. If there are hoarded stocks, why don't they take them out? If a Minister says there are hoarded stocks, it is his duty to take them out. If there is hoarded stocks, I say, seize it. The Punjab Minister did not talk about it. One fine morning he quietly came to me and asked, 'what is your information? My own information is that the U.P. traders and speculators have bought 10 lakh maunds of wheat in the mandis'. I said my information is same. He asked whether I was agreeable to these stocks being seized. I said, cent per cent. He went back; he did not talk to anybody about it; nobody knew about it. One fine morning the papers gave the news that 3,50,000 maunds of wheat have been seized in the Punjab. Later on further operations were carried on. It is not the talk, it is not the boasting, but it is this method of working which can

[Shri A. P. Jain.]

hit the profiteer. He can be taught a lesson, not by talks, not by threats, but by action.

In the Uttar Pradesh also the prices have shown some decline. My friend, Mr. Z. A. Ahmad, claimed the credit for himself, as if raids can bring down the prices. I say, Sir, raids raise the prices.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: Not raids, but public pressure which the Prime Minister himself accepts.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Now, Sir, the parties in Uttar Pradesh have taken up an attitude—I do not mean any offence; I do not want to talk much about it—and the activities of those parties have helped in raising the prices and not in lowering them. There has been this decline in the prices in U.P. firstly because of the prospects of the coming crop and secondly because we have banned the export of coarse grains, rice and paddy, from Uttar Pradesh to outside regions. Things in Uttar Pradesh are difficult. All those people who had some stocks of rice left over from the previous year knew that now they could not send them outside and they will have to sell their stocks in U.P. When the new crop comes prices would go down. So they have started bringing out their stocks. The decline in the price of rice has been far larger than the decline in the price of wheat there. In one particular district of Uttar Pradesh—one of the major rice-growing districts—the decline has been of the order of Rs. 6 to Rs. 8 per maund. In my own District of Saharanpur, which is another big rice-growing district, the decline has been of the order of Rs. 4. Now, there is a sympathetic decline in the price of wheat also. The latest price of wheat in Hapur today is quoted at Rs. 21-8-0 whereas six or seven days ago it was Rs. 24.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: Why was this export not stopped earlier?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Yes, that is a question well worth asking. Because things in other States were difficult. I did not want to do anything in a State which might create difficulties for other States. When the prospects of the new crop came nearer, we stopped it. I did not want to take a parochial view. I have to take an all-India view. That is the reason.

Now, my friend, Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru, asked a very pertinent question: Has this decline in the wholesale prices reflected itself in the retail prices? In fact, the consumer is concerned with the retail prices and not with the wholesale prices. It may be of some consolation to me, it may be of some consolation to economists that the wholesale prices have gone down but not to the consumer. Experience has shown that once the wholesale prices begin to come down in time they reflect themselves on the retail prices. In fact my information is that retail prices are also going down and for that purpose I would like hon. Members to study from day to day the prices quoted in Kanpur market where they are quoted in terms of so many seers and chataaks for a rupee. In other places also the retail prices are going down. Maybe, the retail prices are not going down at the same speed as the wholesale prices because the wholesale prices may take a little time to reflect themselves in the retail prices. That is all that I have to say about food except that I might add that so far as food policies are concerned, I find that there is more or less a general acceptance. Some Members have pointed out that the implementation has been defective here or there and we must remove the defects in the implementation. I do not deny that defects are there.

Now, I come to the question of food production. Very rightly we have been criticised for not raising as much food as the country needs. I made it clear in the beginning; in fact there

cannot be a greater admission than what the hon. Prime Minister said in the other House. He stated in unequivocal terms that he had not fully realised the importance of agriculture in our planning five or seven years ago. Since then by experience he had become wiser. And our Prime Minister is not only the head of the Government, he is the biggest man in the country. If that realisation has come to him I think that the future of the country is bright. Well, some people have said, 'why do you talk of it now?' We talk of it now because we have realised it now. Probably it is our fault that we did not realise it earlier. Pandit Kunzru asked what the Prime Minister was doing to help in the increase of agricultural production. I know my limitations; I have never been unaware of them. I do not carry the same weight—in fact, no other person in the Government or in the country carries the same weight—as the Prime Minister does. It would be a folly on my part to think that I can achieve what the Prime Minister can do. But I can assure the hon. Member Pandit Kunzru that for more than one year the Prime Minister has been taking a very active part in food production.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Active interest in food production.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: In fact he has been acting as a sort of super-Agriculture Minister. I have been in the Central and State Government for ten years, and I have always been loath to pass on my burdens to the Chief Minister or the Prime Minister. The Chief Minister or the Prime Minister is very hard pressed. He has too much work to do, and any Minister possessed of any self-respect should not add to his burdens. But, of late, realising the position in the country, there hardly passes a day when we do not exchange telephone calls or write letters or discuss problems.

The Prime Minister called a meeting of the National Development

Council in the month of January last. He also invited all the State Agriculture Ministers to that meeting, and in that meeting all the schemes of agricultural production were discussed in detail for two days, not only with the Chief Ministers but also with the Agriculture Ministers. The Prime Minister presided over that meeting. He was present all through.

Now, the Prime Minister has also been dealing with the State Governments. He has been writing to them not only in a general way but about specific schemes, about improvement in administration, strengthening the State Departments of Agriculture, and so on. I do not think that any other Prime Minister or any other man who carries such a heavy burden could do more than what our Prime Minister is doing.

Then, the hon. Member, Shri Kunzru, raised another important point. He said that while the aggregate production in India had been going up, there was not the same increase in the yield per acre. I think his criticism was correct. But there is some explanation for that also, because every addition of new land means that some marginal lands are being added where the production is low, and the addition of the new land depresses the national average. Nonetheless I am not prepared to deny that there is ample scope for intensive cultivation and our future policy should be that from the same acre we should produce more. I made it clear yesterday that there are progressive farmers in this country who produce four times, five times, and sometimes seven or eight times, the average yield. Now, if one man can achieve it, surely others can achieve it, and particularly in the areas where irrigation is available or where there is an assured and well-spread rainfall, the prospects of increasing agricultural production are very good. We must accept the force of the criticism of Shri Kunzru and concentrate more and more upon intensive production.

[Shri A. P. Jain.]

Now, Sir, some questions have been raised about the reliability of statistics. I certainly gave some statistics. I cannot swear that our statistics can be treated as cent per cent correct. In fact agricultural statistics all over the world have severe limitations. They are not like industrial statistics where you can say, you have put in so much of cotton, you must have so much of cloth, you put in so much of jute you must have so much of jute product. This question of reliability of our statistics was very thoroughly examined by the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee presided over by Mr. Ashok Mehta, and the Committee have paid quite a tribute to our Statistical Department. They say that both the coverage and also the quality of the statistics have improved. Nonetheless I do not want to tell the hon. Members that they should accept these statistics as God's own truth. Yet they bespeak of trends, and the trend has been that by and large agricultural production has gone up. If I say 28 per cent, it may be 25 per cent or it may be 30 per cent. But in statistics there is always a certain margin of error and we have to allow for that margin.

A question was asked by my friend Mr. Shiva Rao: What is the Government going to do? I know that our statistics can be further improved. I know that sometimes different sets of statistics are published by the State Governments and the Central Government, and they come into conflict with one another. This state of affairs has to go. There must be one set of good statistics upon which we could rely. In a system of planning, statistics play a very important role. Whatever may be the limitation of statistics, no planning is possible without statistics. That matter is engaging the active attention of the Cabinet. One of our leading statisticians has prepared a scheme, and there are certain counter-suggestions. It is not a thing which we can decide easily within a few hours. The matter is being considered

and we hope that we shall start the system of having good and reliable statistics, though the establishment of the system may by no means be a short-term project.

Another question which has been raised by my friend Mr. Shiva Rao is about fertilisers. He asked me why I had not referred to green manure. I had not referred to many other things. In fact I wanted to refer to certain salient features. Even in referring to certain salient features I took about an hour or more. Not that I do not realise the importance of green manure. Green manure has played an important part particularly in the State of Madras. Green manure is also becoming popular in other parts of the country. But I join issue with him if he means that production in Madras is due only to green manure. I have collected some statistics of the yield per acre from year to year and also of the progressive use of fertilisers in the State of Madras. In 1950-51, the average yield per acre in Madras was 933 lbs. The use of fertilisers was 44,000 tons. I will not repeat all these statistics for all the years. In 1955-56, the use of fertilisers went up to 84,000 tons and the yield went up to 1,120 lbs. In 1956-57, the use of fertilisers went up to 1,08,000 tons and the yield increased to 1,304 lbs. I do not mean to say that all this increase can be attributed to fertilisers just as I am not prepared to accept that all this increased yield can be attributed to green manure. In agriculture, there are a number of factors. Irrigation is one of them. Agricultural practice is another. The use of fertilisers and green manures are other factors. Another factor is better seed. There are so many things which lead to increased production. It cannot be attributed to any one single factor.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU:
Judicious mixture of both.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Yes, judicious mixture of all these things. In fact,

the yields per acre in different States appear to have a direct relationship with the use of fertilisers. Orissa is one State where the use of fertiliser in paddy is the smallest and its yield is the lowest. Bihar is another State where the use of fertiliser in paddy is small and there, the yield is also low and it has been keeping more or less stationary. This also holds good to a considerable extent in Uttar Pradesh.

So far as fertilisers are concerned, I am fully convinced that unless we use more fertilisers, our production will not go up at the pace at which we want it to go. True, we must put up more fertiliser factories. But it takes a few years for a fertiliser factory to come up. What are we to do in the interval? Are we to sit with folded hands and wait till the fertiliser factory comes up? Or are we to make some arrangement for the import of fertilisers? Well, Sir, I have got a scheme worked out by a specialist who has considerable experience of fertilisers and agriculture. His contention is that, if during the remaining part of the Plan we import fertilisers worth a hundred crore of rupees, it will give us food-grains worth three hundred crores. We may be self-sufficient. But I am not hopeful that we can get such a big sum of about a hundred crores for the import of fertilisers. Nonetheless, it stresses the importance of fertilisers and we should get more and more of them immediately, not waiting for the setting up of any factory.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Has the Planning Commission seen that Report?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Yes. Then, I come to another matter on which considerable stress has been laid, that is, the question of land reforms. In fact, I am a very old enthusiast of land reforms. Many of the hon. Members who today talk of land reforms were

not in politics when I started the land reforms more than 22 years ago.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: It has become very old.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Yes, old but stronger.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Not always.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: In this case. My hon. friend, Nawab of Chattari used to curse me once for enforcing land reforms. I still think that land reforms are essential for increasing production. Not that we have not done anything about land reforms. The intermediary practically all over the country has been eliminated. There is fixity of tenure. All over the country fair rents have been fixed. What has not been so fully done are, firstly, imposition of ceiling; secondly, law of resumption and thirdly, consolidation. Of these I think consolidation is by far the most important. I know the importance of all these things. My Party knows the importance of all these things. The Government knows the importance of these things. And realising the importance of these things, a Committee consisting of the 'Big Three' of the Congress has been set up—the Congress President, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant and Shri Morarji Desai—to expedite the implementation of land reforms. I hope it will be done. But as the Agriculture Minister, in spite of all the faith that I have in land reforms, I today find myself on the horns of a dilemma. On the one side, I see the importance of land reforms; on the other side, I see that the schemes of land reforms are retarding agricultural progress. Both Mr. Ahmad and Mr. Naidu hold opposite views—one for land reforms, particularly, ceilings and the other opposed to ceilings. They both agree on one point—that is, that these land reforms are holding down the agricultural production. Mr. Ahmad said that if there is consolidation for some five or seven years, people do not put in any manure; they do not

[Shri A. P. Jain.]

construct a well or a bund, because there is no certainty where the land will go. I feel the same thing. Mr. Naidu also feels the same thing.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: Why should consolidation go on for five years?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: It is your estimate. It is a wrong estimate. It takes a few years. I know about things in my district where consolidation has been going on for one or two years. Prior to consolidation, as soon as information is received, the farmers are not interested in doing any work of development. He ceases to put any manure there.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: How many years has it taken in your district?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: The full implementation takes two years or so. It is a long period. But the point is, while consolidation is important, it has created an uncertainty.

I would like that these things should be done in the shortest possible period. Of course, the Committee to which I referred, is looking into this. If there is any delay, we should do something to expedite it. If there is going to be an indefinite delay in the implementation of land reforms, perhaps it is better to have a sort of peace so that production may not go down. These are all questions on which I am not expressing any final opinion; these are difficult questions with which we are faced.

Hon. Dr. Kunzru raised another question about the figures of the small irrigation works. He asked me whether those figures could be considered to be totally reliable. These figures have been supplied to us by the State Governments and I take it that they are correct, but they have not been checked up. We also feel that sometimes, the figures which we get from States are not correct. A Committee which was until recently presided over by Mr. Gadgil, was appointed to check up these small

irrigation works. This Committee has already visited some States and I hope that as a result of the findings of this Committee, we shall not only know what is actually the benefit which has accrued from small irrigation works, but also how the difficulties and shortcomings of the small irrigation works can be removed.

6 P.M.

Then, Sir, one hon. Member—I cannot for the time being locate his name—hinted that some old works were being neglected.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I raised that point.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: We also felt the same thing. And in one of our conferences at Hyderabad, where representatives of four or five State Governments were present, we discussed this question. It is a fact that while we are building some new works, some of the old works are not properly looked after. There were certain channels, certain drains and certain other things which were looked after by the zamindar. The zamindar has now gone, but no substitute has been found, and some of those channels and drains have been clogged. Therefore the State Governments have been advised and they are setting up organisations to look after the works. Smaller works are to be entrusted to the village panchayats mainly, because in the matter of these irrigation works it would be really tragic if these things are entrusted to an Executive Engineer or to a Superintending Engineer or even to a Chief Engineer. It should be the people of the locality who should look after these works and maintain them. The panchayat may even raise a levy wherever it becomes necessary. So, Sir, adequate arrangements for that are being made. Well, Sir, these are some of the important points which I thought I should deal with. Many other points also have been raised with which I do not think it is possible for me to deal. In fact, I have already reached the end of my time.

But before I conclude, Sir, I must thank the hon. Members of this House for the very dispassionate manner in which they have conducted the debate and for the valuable suggestions they have made. All I can say is that in administering this Department I shall bear their suggestions in mind. Maybe, I may not be able to accept all of them even though I may feel that some are desirable. But I shall make

effort to benefit from them. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 17th September 1958.