

**Need to augment storage facility to prevent post-harvest losses of foodgrains  
in the country**

SHRI S. SELVAGANABATHY (Puducherry): Thank you, hon. Chairman, Sir. India has made tremendous progress in the field of foodgrain production in the last two decades. Though we have become surplus, the loss of foodgrains, especially wheat, rice and coarse grains, until they reach the storage godowns of FCI or other market committees from the fields, is of grave concern. During the financial year 2020-21, the rice production was 122.2 million tonnes; wheat, 107.5 MT; coarse cereals, 47.15 MT; and maize, 31.5 MT. Of these, rice, wheat and cereals are staple foods and the coarse cereals have nutritive value. According to the Food Corporation of India, the food grain loss during the transit and storage is about 15 per cent. But the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nation puts it at a whopping 40 percentage loss.

A major area of concern is the loss of foodgrains at the time of purchase by the Marketing Committees. Unfortunately, almost all of them lack proper storage facilities, leave alone scientific storage. Thousands of bags of rice, wheat and maize are stocked in the open ground without any coverage for days and weeks together. There are so many instances where the untimely rains have dampened the open stocks.

This could be easily avoided by installing more sheds at the Marketing Committees which does not involve much expenditure, which the Government can afford to spend without any serious financial burden.

The situation is equally serious in the case of fruits and vegetables. We produce an average of 101.2 million tonnes of fruits and 189.52 MT of vegetables annually. Here also, the loss is estimated at 30 to 40 per cent. It can be solved by increasing the number of cold storage facilities on a war-footing. (*Time-bell rings*) I hope this august House would support my serious demand for augmenting the storage facilities in the Marketing Committees on a priority basis and also increasing the number of cold storage facilities by PPP mode. Thank you.

SHRI M. MOHAMED ABDULLA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I associate myself with the issue raised by the hon. Member.

DR. KANIMOZHI NVN SOMU (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I also associate myself with the issue raised by the hon. Member.

DR. FAUZIA KHAN (Maharashtra): Sir, I also associate myself with the issue raised by the hon. Member.

SHRI R. GIRIRAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I also associate myself with the issue raised by the hon. Member.

SHRI KANAKAMEDALA RAVINDRA KUMAR (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I also associate myself with the issue raised by the hon. Member.

SHRI SUJEET KUMAR (Odisha): Sir, I also associate myself with the issue raised by the hon. Member.

SHRIMATI SULATA DEO (Odisha): Sir, I also associate myself with the issue raised by the hon. Member.

DR. AMAR PATNAIK (Odisha): Sir, I also associate myself with the issue raised by the hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. John Brittas.

SHRI TIRUCHI SIVA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, we are not heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Tiruchi Siva, what do you have to say?

SHRI TIRUCHI SIVA: Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Indicate the point of order.

SHRI TIRUCHI SIVA: Sir, it is Rule 238, sub-rule (v), which is about rules to be observed while speaking. It says that a Member while speaking shall not reflect upon the conduct of persons in high authority unless the discussion is based on a substantive motion drawn in proper terms. Sir, the words 'persons in high authority', namely, using the President's name for the purpose, and so on — means the persons whose conduct can be discussed only on a substantive motion. Sir, this applies only to the rules and proceedings of the House. I need a ruling from you. Any expression that is made outside, will it not come under the freedom of expression in a democratic country?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me elaborate for your benefit. The observations were with respect to what I said from this Chair on December 8<sup>th</sup>, and the observations were to that extreme degree that “the Chairman, Rajya Sabha, and Vice-President can be enlisted by the ruling party to delegitimise judiciary.” Search your heart, the damning consequence of it. An impression is sought to be imparted that this Chair will become party to a pernicious, sinister design at the instance of the Government to delegitimize judiciary. Delegitimising judiciary means death-knell of democracy. These partisan battles have to be settled between them *inter se*. I have appealed with sobriety across the political spectrum to all the leaders, believing in their sagacity and wisdom, that they must keep high constitutional offices away from their political stances. My response in this House was at the lowest level of reaction. It was moderated by me. As a matter of fact, what I said inappropriate was extremely accusatory. I expected wisdom of the House to be affirmatively supportive of me. And you are raising a point of order! I am not making reflection on what has been said outside. What has been said in this House has been commented. Every word that I spoke on that particular day, I appeal to the hon. Members that you are more eminently-suited than anyone else to bring about congeniality between Judiciary, Legislature and Executive. I had indicated very firmly that these institutions have to work in togetherness and in tandem to blossom our democracy. I have been extremely alive, and I can assure the hon. Members, I engaged into massive homework, got in touch with everyone who knows the subject, interacted with the past Secretary-Generals and then concluded that ‘I will be abdicating my oath, I will be getting away from my constitutional obligations, if I do not react.’ My reaction could not have been more moderated; my reaction could not have been more reflective at a higher level. I have highest personal regard for every Member of this House, and the Chairperson of the UPA holds an elevated position like the Leader of the House in both the Houses. I, therefore, could not have averted it. If I were to show escapist route to such a statement, I will be creating a history that would ever shame me and shame this House. I seek your support. Dr. John Brittas, please.

**Recommendations of Parliamentary Committee on Official Language to implement  
Hindi as the medium of instruction in Central Universities and  
Institutes of National Importance like IITs, IIMs, etc.**

DR. JOHN BRITTAS (Kerala): Sir, let me just borrow your words that there is a pernicious and sinister design. That is what you said, Sir.