

## **Advantages of Income transfer policy**

### **What is the issue?**

\n\n

Income transfer policy combined with direct cash transfer should be implemented to address farmers' issues.

\n\n

### **What are the possible solutions?**

\n\n

\n

- The most pressing problems facing the Indian farmer are the persistently low market prices.

\n

- The prices of many crops in India are much below expectations and normal trends.

\n

- Ideally, the solution lies in holistic and broad-based agri-market reforms like

-

\n

\n\n

\n

1. Removing APMC monopoly

\n

2. Reforming the Essential Commodities Act

\n

3. Scaling up negotiable warehouse receipt (NWR) system

\n

4. Innovations in building up value-chains

\n

5. Relaxation of land laws

\n

6. Promoting contract farming and agri-exports

\n

\n\n

\n

- However, these reforms entail a long gestation period and hence demands for quick-fix solutions are increasing.  
\n
- These quick-fix solutions lie in the form of higher minimum support prices (MSPs), loan waivers and direct income/investment support.  
\n

\n\n


### **Can MSP and loan waiver address farm distress?**

\n\n

- \n
- **MSP** - The MSP policy pertains to a limited number of farmers.  
\n
- As per NSSO 2012-13, less than 10% of the country's farmers sold their produce at MSPs.  
\n
- Moreover, MSP operations mostly benefit large farmers who have marketable surplus.  
\n
- These operations exclude much of country's marginal farmers who produce little surplus.  
\n
- Besides, the large inefficiencies and market distortions caused by a MSP-regime make it an unfavourable choice.  
\n
- For example, wheat and rice stocks with the government (45.4 MMTs) are more than twice its buffer-stock norms (21.4MMTs), reflecting massive economic inefficiency.  
\n
- Along with it, the problems of leakages and corruption in the MSP operations of procurement, stocking and distribution prevails.  
\n
- Also, there was a difference in the MSP increase formula (C2 cost or A2+FL) offered by the different states.  
\n

\n\n

## % agri-HHs who took loans from any source between July 2015 to June 2016



\n\n

\n

- It may be noted that C2 is about 38% higher than A2+FL and many states follow the A2+FL model.

\n

- **Loan waiver** - As per NABARD's Financial Inclusion Survey (NAFIS), between July 2015-June 2016, 43.5% of all agri-households took loans.

\n

- It also reveals that a total of about 30.3% of Indian agri-households took loans from institutions.


\n

- A loan-waiver is thus likely to benefit only this 30% and the remaining 70% of Indian farmers, who do not access institutional credit, will not benefit from this scheme.

\n

\n\n

## Sources of loan for those who borrowed (% agri-HHs)



Of the 43.5% agri-HHs who borrowed, 60.5% borrowed from institutional sources, 30.3% from NI and 9.2% from both institutional and NI sources

\n\n

\n

- Such high rates of exclusion must be the single-most important failure of our banking system with regard to financial inclusion.

\n

- Thus, it can be seen that, through higher MSPs or loan-waivers, one cannot reach more than 20 to 30% of Indian farmers.

\n

- This limited reach, therefore, cannot redress the widespread grievances of Indian farmers.

\n

\n\n

### **What should be done?**

\n\n

\n

- The problems can be resolved by income/investment support like the Rythu Bandhu Scheme (RBS) of Telangana.

\n

- Under the scheme, the government gave Rs 4,000 per acre to every farmer.

\n

- This transfer is made twice a year, coinciding with two cropping seasons to support the input purchases of farmers. Click [here](#) to know more.

\n

- The scheme is said to have reached almost 93% of landowners and also budget-friendly to the state government compared to loan waivers.

\n

- In terms of costs, a national farm-loan waiver is likely to cost about Rs 4 to 5 trillion.

\n

- An income transfer scheme is likely to cost about Rs 2 trillion, even while increasing the coverage to include even tenant farmers in the future.

\n

- Only a cost-sharing arrangement between the Centre and states is required to bear the financial burden of the states.

\n

- Thus, an income transfer policy for farm inputs should be rolled out on national scale combining with the existing direct cash transfer in case of fertiliser and power subsidies.

\n

- The government should acknowledge this reality of farm distress and tries to resolve it on priority.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Indian Express**

\n

