

Shri Alagesan: This has been done as per the adjudicator's award and it has been enforced. There is no such intention.

SEIZURE OF RICE STOCKS

*234. **Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** Will the Minister of Food and Agriculture be pleased to state:

(a) whether rice produce in India in the year 1952 is in excess of the last year's produce or it has fallen down;

(b) whether it is a fact that rice stocks with merchants have been seized in some States;

(c) what are the reasons for these seizures;

(d) whether the purchase price of the rice seized is lower or higher than the price Government has paid;

(e) what is the difference between the purchase price of Government and the price at which rice is sold to consumers, giving reasons for the difference; and

(f) what are the reasons for permitting such a large percentage of difference?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa): (a) Perhaps by "1952" the Member means the agricultural year 1952-53. Production figures for this year are not yet available. The information so far available, however, shows that the production of rice this year is likely to be better than that of 1951-52.

(b) to (d). Government of India are not aware of any seizure of merchants' stocks by State Governments. In U.P. some rice stocks with licensees were procured by the State Government.

(e) and (f). Both the procurement and issue prices vary from State to State. A Statement showing the procurement and issue prices of rice in each State is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix II, annexure No. 33.]

Generally the difference between the procurement and issue prices is accounted for by the incidental charges incurred by the State Governments.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : क्या मंत्री महोदय बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या कारण है कि उत्तर प्रदेश के केवल कानपुर रीजन में ही चावल को पकड़ा गया है ?

साद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री (श्री किंवदई) :
यह सवाल तो उत्तर प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट से पूछा जा सकता है ।

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : अभी माननीय मंत्री ने उत्तर दिया था कि कहीं सीजर नहीं हुआ है, लेकिन उत्तर प्रदेश में चावल पकड़ा गया है, ऐसा एक छोटे इलाके में ही हुआ और अधिक जगह में क्यों नहीं हुआ ?

श्री किंवदई : यह तो वही बतला सकते हैं ।

Shri P. T. Chacko: May I know, Sir, what is the price per maund which the Government of India is charging the Travancore-Cochin Government ?

Shri Kidwai: Rice is supplied to that State from different regions and the price charged is the price prevailing in that region plus transport charges.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : जो बयान मेरे सामने है, उसमें मैंने देखा कि करीब करीब पांच रुपये मन का कीमतों में फ़र्क है जो कि प्रोक्योरिंग प्राइस और बेचने की प्राइस है, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इन्टीडेन्टल चार्जेज पांच रुपये प्रति मन बैठता है ?

Shri M. V. Krishnappa: There are some instances where we have allowed them to charge a slightly higher issue price and the profit made out of it is used to subsidise the coarse grain which is the poor man's grain. So, though the incidental charges are high, it is not the incidental charges alone. It includes some profit also which goes to subsidise the poor man's grain.

Shri A. M. Thomas: May I know whether any principles are kept in view in the distribution of locally procured grain and whether Government is aware that great hardship is caused by distributing imported grain to highly deficit areas like Travancore-Cochin?

Shri Kidwai: Travancore-Cochin is distributing foodgrains, rice particularly, by heavy subsidy and the same price is charged both for the imported and the locally procured rice. I may inform the hon. Member that in locally procured grain also the State is losing—at least not making any profit.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : क्या मैं पूछ सकता हूँ कि जिस वक्त उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में यह चावल ज़बर्दस्ती लाया गया, उस समय प्रोक्योरमेंट प्राइस में और बाजार प्राइस में क्या फ़र्क था ?

श्री किदवाई : मुझे इस का कोई इल्म ही नहीं, सिवाय उसके जो बानरेबुल मੈम्बर ने अखबार में पढ़ा है, वह मैंने भी पढ़ा है ।

Shri Gopala Rao: May I know, Sir, what is the difference between the purchase price of Government and local market prices?

Shri Kidwai: Hon. Members on the other side always proclaim that the open market prices are very high, while the procurement prices are not high.

Shri N. M. Lingam: May I know the reasons for the high prices of Uttar Pradesh rice allotted to Madras as compared with that of imported rice, or rice supplied from other States?

Shri Kidwai: I think that is a very old question. It has been debated here again and again. It has not occurred recently. Therefore, I am not in a position to give an answer.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: I understood the hon. Minister to say that the rice allotted to provinces is charged on the basis of the actual price plus transport charges. Does it mean that each province is charged separate prices for rice?

Shri Kidwai: Yes.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: Will Government consider the advisability of pooling these things and fixing a common price?

Shri Kidwai: In some States rice prices are higher and have always been higher. So the difference prevails.

Shri N. M. Lingam: May I know whether the Madras Government have refused allotment of rice from Uttar Pradesh on account of the prohibitive price?

Shri Kidwai: Prices in Uttar Pradesh are generally high. Therefore every State is reluctant to accept it. But it is inevitable.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether there has been any increase in procurement price in any of the States and if so to what extent?

Shri Kidwai: It has been the practice for the last few years that for four months in the year the procurement prices are kept high so that the margin may go to the producer. This year it has been increased from the beginning of the season.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know the names of the States in which procurement price has been raised and the extent of the increment?

Shri M. V. Krishnappa: In Mysore it has been raised and in Bombay it has been raised. In Mysore it has been raised by Rs. 2 per maund of paddy and in Bombay by an about similar amount. If the hon. Member wants more details I am prepared to give it on a later occasion.

INTERNATIONAL SUGAR CONFERENCE

*235. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of Food and Agriculture be pleased to state whether India was invited to the International Sugar Conference held in London in November, 1952?

(b) If so, was any delegation or observer sent to that conference?

(c) What was the main object of that Conference?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): (a) Yes.

(b) Yes, an 'Observer'.

(c) The main object of the Conference was to consider a proposal whether the United Nations should be asked to convene an International Sugar Conference in London in April, 1953, to consider the conclusion of a new International Sugar Agreement.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know, Sir, whether the conference to be convened by the U.N.O. is likely to upset the position of India in the world sugar market?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: No, Sir; it has not yet been decided. There is going to be a meeting in the month of April and it is then that this question, whether to hold an international conference, will again be considered. That subject is on the agenda. India has not joined this as a member because of the fear that there will be certain restrictions, and because of their insistence that India should be styled as an importing country. They are not prepared to accept so far the position of India as an exporting country.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: What is the position of India's sugar export at present?