

Revamping of Public Distribution System

129. SHRI GANGADHARA SANIPALLI:
 SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN:
 SHRI MUMTAZ ANSARI:
 PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT:
 SHRI V.S.VIJAYA RAGHAVAN:
 SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:
 SHRI RABI RAY:
 SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE:
 SSHRI GOPINATH GAJAPATHI:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state.

(a) whether the Government is revamping the Public Distribution System;

(b) if so, the details thereof,;

(c) whether it is proposed to cover every Block and Village by a Fair Price Shop;

(d) the number of villages, State wise, covered under Public Distribution System and the number of villages left out so far; and

(e) the steps being taken to cover the remaining villages?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI KAMALUDDIN AHMED): (a) to (e). The Government has decided, in consultation with the State Governments/UT Administrations, to re-orient the PDS to improve its reach of the Public Distribution System on the basis of an area specific approach. It is proposed to cover population living in blocks which are covered by area development programmes such as Desert Development Programme (DDP), Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP),

certain Designated Hill Areas (DHA) and Integrated Tribal Development Projects (ITDP). These blocks have been identified in consultation with the State Governments/UT Administration. The thrust of the approach is to cover the population in these areas by issue of ration cards to all those who have not been issued such cards so far, opening of additional fair price shops and creation of adequate storage capacity.

Production of Sugar

131. SHRI GANGADHARA SANIPALLI: Will the Minister of FOOD be pleased to state:

(a) whether higher production of sugar is expected during the current crushing season;

(b) whether the internal demand and also the export commitments will be fully met; and

(c) the incentives, if any announced by the Government during the current season?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD (SHRI TARUN GOGOI): (a) Sugar production during 1991-92 season (October - September) is estimated at about 120 lakh tonnes.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Government announced an incentive scheme for early crushing under which sugar factories are to be granted 72% free-sale quota, as against normal 55%, on production achieved during the period 1st October, 1991 to 15th November, 1991.

Price of Different Food Grains

132. PROF. UMMAREDDY VENKATESWARLU: Will the Minister of FOOD be pleased to state:

(a) the price paid per quintal of different food grains procured in different States during 1990-91;

(b) the price charged per quintal from different States for the food grains supplied for distribution under Public Distribution System; and

(c) the reasons for disparity, if any?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD (SHRI TARUN GOGOI): (a) During 1990-91 rabi marketing season, wheat was procured at a uniform minimum support price (MSP) of Rs.215/- per quintal. The paddy was procured at uniform minimum support prices of Rs.205.00, Rs.215.00 and Rs.225.00 per quintal for common, fine and superfine varieties during 1990-91 kharif marketing season. The MSP of rabi and kharif coarsegrains in 1990-91 rabi and kharif marketing seasons was fixed at Rs.180.00 per quintal.

The procurement prices of levy-rice collected from rice millers in different States under statutory levy during 1990-91 kharif marketing season are indicated in the attached statement.

(b) Foodgrain were issued by Food Corporation of India from Central Pool for Public Distribution System to different States/ Union Territories at the uniform Central issue prices (ex FCI godown), which are as follow:-

<i>Foodgrain</i>		<i>Rs. Per quintal</i>
Wheat	-	234.00
Rice		
Common	-	289.00
Fine	-	349.00
Superfine	-	370.00
Coarsegrains	-	194.00

(c) Whereas the minimum support prices and the Central issue prices (ex FCI godown) fixed by the Government are uniform for all the States/UTs, the procurement prices of levy-rice payable to rice millers for delivery of levy-rice differ from State to state on account of variations in statutory taxes payable on purchase of paddy, non-statutory expenses payable to the rice millers and out-turn ratio for conversion of paddy into rice.

STATEMENT

	<i>States</i>	<i>Common</i>	<i>Fine</i>	<i>Superfine</i>
1.	Andhra Pradesh	338.55	354.30	370.05
2.	Assam	335.75	356.75	372.60
3.	Bihar	326.20	344.80	360.10
4.	Gujarat	313.00	327.50	342.00
5.	Haryana/Delhi	347.50	374.55	394.10
6.	Karnataka	322.20	337.15	352.10
7.	Madhya Pradesh	334.55	350.10	365.65

	<i>States</i>	<i>Common</i>	<i>Fine</i>	<i>Superfine</i>
8.	Orissa	345.05	361.10	377.15
9.	Punjab	347.25	374.30	393.80
10.	Rajasthan	341.25	365.00	386.98
11.	Uttar Pradesh	330.70	345.90	369.25
12.	West Bengal	323.15	341.55	356.70
13.	Maharashtra	330.05	345.35	360.60
14.	Pondicherry	313.90	328.20	343.00
15.	Chandigarh	338.20	364.55	383.50

Hudco Commercial Project

133. DR. ASIM BALA:
SHRI ARJUN SINGH
YADAV:

Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the news-item appearing in the 'Hindustan Times' dated October 7, 1991 regarding the award of HUDCO Commercial Project to a contractor without the approval of the board of directors;

(b) if so, the reaction of the Government thereto;

(c) the reasons for the procedural lapses.

(d) the detail of the action taken against the guilty persons; and

(e) the details of the other contracts and work orders awarded by HUDCO during the last 12 months without following the procedure laid down and the corrective measures taken to check such violation henceforth?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI. M.ARUNACHALAM): (a) to (e). Yes, Sir, The building project referred in the news item has been taken up by HUDCO at the instance of the Ministry of Urban Development for generation of office space and other commercial spaces. The award of work was processed as per normal procedure and vetted by the architectural and construction management team of the Corporation. Due to shortage of time approval of the HUDCO Board of Director could not be obtained, as expiry of the validity of the offer would have resulted in a considerable loss to the Corporation. The decision of the Management was, however, to be ratified by the Board or Directors. The delay in bringing up the matter for ratification by the Board was noticed later in a meeting of the Board of Directors. After taking all factors into consideration the Board observed that a final decision on the ex-post-facto approval of the work order could be taken after the transaction audit of the project accounts has been completed. Meanwhile, to avoid escalations in cost and its adverse effect on the economic of the project, the Board allowed the work on the project to continue.