

## 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

- \n
- The government recently approved a [hike in MSP](#) (minimum support prices) for kharif crops.
- \n
- The objective is to offer MSP at 50% higher than the cost of production.
- \n
- This exercise would get a legal backing with the suggestion of 'Right to Sell at MSP'.
- \n
- It would help ensure crops are not purchased below fixed price.
- \n
- The move would also instil confidence among farmers.
- \n

\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.
- \n
- 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.
- \n

- This is an inherently loss-making mode of price support.  
\n
- **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

- Also, the piling up of stocks of food grains, such as rice, wheat and even pulses, which are difficult to offload.  
\n
- **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

- i. middlemen in the mandis run by the Agricultural Produce Marketing Committees (APMCs)  
\n
- ii. traders in rural haats (informal local markets)  
\n

\n\n

- **Mandis** - The network of mandis has not grown in proportion to agricultural production.  
\n
- 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
- But it has kept them outside the purview of the APMC Acts.  
\n

\n\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 [price deficiency payment](#) scheme introduced in Madhya Pradesh and few other states.

\n

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

\n

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

\n

- 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.

\n

- Its suggestions are not binding on the government.

\n

\n



**SHANKAR**  
**IAS PARLIAMENT**  
*Information is Empowering*