

Right to Sell at MSP

Why in news?

 $n\n$

Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices (CACP) has recommended making access to MSP of crops a legal right of farmers.

 $n\n$

What are the benefits?

 $n\n$

۱n

• The government recently approved a <u>hike in MSP</u> (minimum support prices) for kharif crops.

۱'n

- \bullet The objective is to offer MSP at 50% higher than the cost of production. $\ensuremath{^{\text{h}}}$
- This exercise would get a legal backing with the suggestion of 'Right to Sell at MSP'.

۱'n

- It would help ensure crops are not purchased below fixed price.
- The move would also instil confidence among farmers.

 $n\n$

What are the concerns to be addressed?

 $n\n$

\n

- **Procurement** Access to MSP alone would be insufficient, given the procurement system shortfalls.
- The present open-ended procurement-based system is less likely to be the appropriate way.

\n

- Evidently, despite expansion, it has not reached producers satisfactorily.
- This is an inherently loss-making mode of price support.
- **Relevance** It is relatively more beneficial to big farm owners with marketable surpluses.

\n

• The ill-effects of the system are price distortions and skewed cropping patterns.

\n

 $n\n$

\n

- Also, the piling up of stocks of food grains, such as rice, wheat and even pulses, which are difficult to offload.
- **Marketing** Post-harvest price crash is chiefly due to market infrastructure inadequacy and inefficiency.

\n

 So unless agricultural marketing is reformed, farmers would continue to be exploited by

\n

 $n\n$

\n

i. middlemen in the mandis run by the Agricultural Produce Marketing Committees (APMCs)

۱'n

ii. traders in rural haats (informal local markets)

\n

 $n\n$

\n

• **Mandis** - The network of mandis has not grown in proportion to agricultural production.

۱n

- \bullet Nearly 80% of small and marginal farmers dispose of their produce in village haats due to absence of mandis in their vicinity. \n
- This year's Budget proposal of upgrade for 22,000 haats with proper link roads is a welcome move.

\n

 \bullet But it has kept them outside the purview of the APMC Acts. $\ensuremath{\backslash n}$

What are the alternatives?

 $n\n$

\n

• CACP and NITI Aayog have proposed alternatives to procurement-based market support.

\n

• A better option is the <u>price deficiency payment</u> scheme introduced in Madhya Pradesh and few other states.

• Under this, only the price loss is reimbursed directly to the farmer.

• It is done without affecting rest of the market dynamics.

• It is found to be cost-effective and has been recommended by CACP for pan-India adoption.

\n

 $n\n$

 $n\n$

Source: Business Standard

 $n\n$

 $n\n$

Quick Facts

 $n\n$

CACP

 $n\n$

\n

• The Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices is a panel under the Ministry of Agriculture.

\n

- It makes recommendations for MSPs for 23 kharif and rabi crops.
- Its suggestions are not binding on the government.

\n

