

[Shri Bedabrata Barua]

There were other forms of malpractices brought to notice. Sinecure posts are created and it has been alleged that these posts are created to berth the relatives and others connected with directors, and these posts take away a lot of profits. If at any time, Government seek to nationalise these companies, these sinecure-post holders may be a great burden on the common people.

Therefore, we have to see whether the powers given to the Controller of Insurance will be really effective to achieve the objects in view.

16 56 hrs.

[Shri Thirumala Rao *in the Chair*]

In the original Bill the Controller was given enough powers, but now it appears that a sort of consultative committee will be formed in regard to the management with people of experience and knowledge in the insurance line. When we say people with experience and knowledge we mean naturally people who have been in some way or other connected with the Insurance business. We should try to enlarge it in such a way that we are able to take in others, for example the employees of insurance companies who know the other side of the business, who would like to expose malpractices and advise how to correct things. There will be four members in this consultative committee with knowledge and experience of insurance. Knowledge and experience should not mean service in the insurance line itself, because we are aiming at not merely the regulation of insurance, but we have the larger and wider objective of using the resources that are available in this period when there is a lot of scarcity of resources for our planned development.

The biggest bottleneck in regard to the Fourth Plan has been lack of resources. We are even thinking of whittling down the Fourth Plan when resources amounting to Rs. 80 crores are controlled by people who may not have even Rs. 2 crores worth of shares in those institutions. The question is how to mobilise resources. If we want to mobilise resources, it will not be fulfilled by this social control unless it

seeks to advance in certain directions. I can say negatively that resources cannot be mobilised saying that these are not approved securities, but as a firm cannot by itself produce a picture on Rabindranath Tagore, but can only prevent a mini skirt from becoming smaller, this negative statement will not do. What is necessary is that this national objective of mobilising resources should receive greater emphasis and for that we should try to bring insurance not only under more social control but national control consistent with the objectives that the whole country has laid before itself in terms of resources and in terms of increasing concentration of wealth. General insurance, banking, and life insurance, which we have fortunately nationalised, are examples where vast economic power of the common people is concentrated in a few hands. This concentration can be done away with only when we not only give powers to the Controller but see that we are able to utilise the economic power not for the benefit of a few individuals but for the benefit of the whole country.

Any satisfactory regulation of the insurance system involves a question of control and relation of foreign insurance companies or the drain of foreign exchange resources. In this insurance business Rs. 20 crores, that is the latest figure, is the premium income of the foreign insurance company. That is a fairly big amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He may continue tomorrow.

17.00 hrs.

#### DISCUSSION RE. SUGAR POLICY

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now we take up the discussion under Rule 193. Shri Kashi Nath Pandey and Shri N. P. C. Naidu to raise a discussion on the sugar policy declared by the Government on the 28th September, 1968 for the coming season. The time allotted is one hour.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose—*

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) :** I am moving a motion that the time be extended by another 2 hours.

**SHRI SHEO NARAIN (Basti) :** 80% of this country are *kisans*. We should be given more time to discuss this matter.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Will you please allow me to say ? Here is Rule 193 which says :

"Any member desirous of raising discussion on a matter of urgent public importance may give notice in writing to the Secretary specifying clearly and precisely the matter to be raised :

Provided that the notice shall be accompanied by an explanatory note stating reasons for raising discussion on the matter in question :

Provided further that the notice shall be supported by the signatures of at least two other members."

The time allotted by the Business Advisory Committee is one hour. It is not in my hands to extend it.

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS rose—**

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Will you please resume your seat ? I have not completed my say. There is no use interrupting. I do not know how long I will be sitting here. After the Speaker comes, you can raise that matter. Let us proceed now and see what happens.

**SHRI BIBHUTI MISHRA (Motihari) :** The Speaker was of the opinion that the time should be extended.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Mr. Kashi Nath Pandey.

**SHRI K. N. PANDEY (Padrauna) :** The history of the sugar industry has been so far that when there was a shortage of sugar, higher price for cane was offered and when they found that the area under sugar cane was more and they are likely to produce more sugar, the price of sugar cane was reduced. This became the cause of the crisis in the sugar industry. Sir, in 1965-66 the production of the country was 35,32,359 tons. But in 1966-67 it went down to 21,58,946 tons. Now you see

that the production has fallen. Naturally it created an alarming situation and the Government thought of revising its policy and they came forward with a proposal so that the area under sugar cane may go up and the production of sugar could be increased.

When the Government revised its policy what was the result ? This policy was adopted not only to increase the cane price but to find a way as to how a stable price of cane could be fixed in the sugar industry. This policy was adopted also with a view to stabilise the industry. But when the policy was announced the same chain of reactions started to come again. What was the underlying idea behind this policy of Government ? The idea under this policy was that the cane cultivator should be induced to get more price, and the factory should be enabled to give more price to the cultivators. Then some relief in excise duty was also proposed ; what did they propose ? They proposed that if there is production over and above a particular level, that is to say, if the production in 1967-68 reached up to 80 per cent of the production of 1966-67 beyond that, out of the excess production beyond 80 per cent, 50 per cent of the excise duty will be remitted in favour of the factory-owners. This relief came to Rs 14.32 per quintal.

Then again they brought a policy of partial decontrol. The idea of partial decontrol was that sugar which was to be sold in the free market should fetch more price so that the factory-owners may pay to the cultivators a higher amount for the cane. Last year it worked well ; there is no doubt about it. But inherently, it had some defects which are now coming into the picture and the effect is that the industry has fallen again in an uncertain condition.

Last year, when the policy of partial decontrol was announced, what happened ? First, nobody knew as to what was going to happen in the future on account of this policy. So, they started cautiously so that they may not be put to a loss. First, they started West U. P. from Rs. 16, and when the free sugar was sold at the rate of Rs. 500 per quintal in the market, they paid to the cultivator at the rate of Rs. 17 per quintal. Similarly, in Uttar Pradesh, from Rs. 13.40 it went to Rs. 15, 16 and so

[Shri K. N. Pandey]

on in East Uttar Pradesh. In Bihar it was Rs. 12 to Rs. 12.73; in North Bihar, it rose from Rs. 10.72 to Rs. 12.73. In South Bihar, it was Rs. 10.72; Punjab, Rs. 12; Haryana, Rs. 12 to Rs. 15; Assam, Rs. 8.36; West Bengal, Rs. 9 to Rs. 16; Orissa, Rs. 8 to Rs. 14; Madhya Pradesh, Rs. 10 to 14; Rajasthan, Rs. 12 to 15; Gujarat, Rs. 7.37 to 11; Andhra Pradesh, Rs. 10 to 11; Madras, Rs. 8.15 to 10; Mysore, Rs. 11 to 15; Kerala, Rs. 7 to 9.50; and Pondicherry, Rs. 9. These are the payments made to the cultivators.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about Maharashtra ?

SHRI K. N. PANDEY : In Maharashtra, it was Rs. 7.50 to 16. Now, you will find that when the Government fixed 7.37 per quintal as the national price, the idea behind the Government's policy was that no cultivator should get less than Rs. 7.37.

No cultivator was willing to supply cane at that price. Why was the national price fixed so low ? I cannot understand.

Now, when the idea came into operation it produced good results. Cane area increased by 25 per cent. Government thought that now there will be a bumper crop and therefore, they again started fixing a low price for cane. When the free sale was started, the price of sugar was Rs. 500 per quintal but it went on coming down and in the end, after the close of the season, it reached Rs 255. This falling trend in prices caused a suspicion in the minds of the factory owners.

This year the concession given by the Finance Ministry was withdrawn. The ratio of levy sugar rose to 70 per cent and that of free sugar came down to 30 per cent. This treatment was given to this industry because the ministry thought that there was a bumper crop and growers are bound to supply cane at any price we like. That was the idea. But what was the result ? There was a steep fall in price. The factory-owners have no confidence in partial decontrol and they are not prepared to pay attractive price to the cultivators.

Now, what is the levy price and what is the free price ? The ministry thought

that even during this period when the ratio was 70 and 30, and there was no concession from the Finance Ministry, the factory can pay Rs. 10 per quintal for the cane. Levy price is calculated on the basis of payment of a cane price of Rs. 7.37 per quintal whereas the cultivators have got Rs. 5 to Rs. 7 per maund. This policy has created discrimination between the urban and rural areas. Out of the total population of 52 crores, 10 crores live in urban areas and 42 crores live in rural areas. The free sale of sugar to the extent of 60 per cent or 70 per cent is going to be distributed in urban areas for the sake of 10 crores of people, whereas 42 crores living in rural areas have to purchase sugar from free quota costing Rs. 3 to Rs. 4 a kilogram.

At present, in the market, the consumer is getting sugar from levy quota at the rate of Rs. 1.79 per kilo. But in the rural areas, the man who produces the cane, has to pay Rs. 3.50 or Rs. 4 per kilo for the sugar he requires on the occasion of his daughter's marriage or for some other occasion. How long can this discrimination be continued ? The House has to consider this matter seriously.

If you control the entire sugar, the result will be that a consumer has to pay a bit higher price at the ration shop. If you pay Rs. 10 per quintal of cane the cost price will go upto Rs. 190. The figures have been given here. It may vary—it may be a little less or a little more. I will give you one example here.

17.15 hrs.

[Shri R. D. Bhandare in the Chair]

The Government have fixed the levy price for East U. P. at Rs. 156.22. If the factory pays Rs. 10, they have to pay not only for free sugar but also for levy sugar. Then, the cost will come upto Rs. 190. What is the gain to the factory ? It is very easy to calculate also. Take 10 quintals of sugar and multiply 10 by 190. It comes to Rs. 1900. If you multiply 156.22 by 7, that comes to Rs. 1063. So they have to sell 3 quintals of sugar for Rs. 837; that comes to Rs. 279 per quintal of free sugar. Where is it going to be sold at this rate ? Last year it started falling. From 300 it

came down to 255. When there is more sugar production in the country, who is going to purchase sugar at the rate of Rs. 279? Some people said that there is consumers' resistance. But there is a limit to the capacity of anyone to buy sugar at Rs. 4 per kilo. All are not capable of purchasing sugar at Rs. 4 per kilo or Rs. 3.50 per kilo. Nobody was prepared to purchase sugar at that rate and the price started falling. I can tell Shri Jagjivan Ram that nobody can give an assurance that the sugar will sell at the rate Rs. 250 per quintal. If there is a real shortage of sugar in the market and the price of sugar goes up is it possible for the Government to hold up sugar? Will the Minister not order the release of sugar in order to bring down the price? Naturally the prices are not going to be always at 279. One will be a loser if one continues to pay cane price on the basis of free sugar at Rs. 279. This thing has affected the whole atmosphere in such a manner that the workers who used to come in the first week of November have not come so far to the factory. Out of 205 factories only 90 factories have started functioning.

I was told that Madras factories are opposing very much the increase in cane price. After all, this policy has been decided by the Centre. How can it be justifiable that in one part of the country the cultivator got Rs. 16 to Rs. 17 per quintal and in Madras they got Rs. 8 per quintal. I don't know what the Government is going to do in this matter. In Kerala from where the Left Communists are coming, the cane price was 7.37 to 9. This is the condition in the country. If a uniform price cannot be maintained in the whole of the country what is the meaning of a uniform national price. The meaning of the uniform policy was that every cultivator who put in labour could get proper and the same returns. If you want that the factories should solve the problem, we all know that they have failed to solve it and when people are losing employment opportunities. What is going to be the result of all this.

Only 44,000 tonnes of free sugar is available with the factories. Some is lying with the traders who got their quota previously when the rate of sugar was falling. Now it has gone up because no factory is working and they can charge any price.

Many people have said that the price of sugar has gone up. Which sugar? Sugar that was produced last year from cane for which Rs. 17 and Rs. 15 a quintal has been paid. If you produce new sugar and maintain the same price, then you are justified. But taking into consideration this position, this type of sugar policy ignoring the interests of the cultivators and also the workers is not justified. My request to you is that you control the sugar industry and sugar production. If you control it fully, I can tell you that in the whole of the country sugar will sell at not more than Rs. 2 a kilo. But now in the villages they have to purchase at the rate of Rs. 4 a kilo.

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH : (Parbhani) : If you decontrol it, it will sell at Rs. 1/50 a kilo.

SHRI K. N. PANDEY : May be, so.

SHRI K. N. TIWARY (Bettiah) : What will be the price of sugarcane?

SHRI K. N. PANDEY : I am coming to that.

What I have just now told you is on the basis of calculation of the Ministry. The price of cane is Rs. 10/- per quintal so far as my demand is concerned I demand that the cultivators should be paid the same rate at which they were paid last year. This is my demand. You make such a scheme so that the cultivators may get such price which may induce them to produce cane in future also. This is the problem and I think a proper solution will be found out.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Professor Ranga.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor) : Mr. Chairman, my name is second.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am sorry.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my hon. friend, Shri Kashi Nath Pandey, for having raised this debate. I agree with him that at least Rs. 10 ought to be paid to the *kisan*.

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH : Rs. 12.

**SHRI RANGA :** Who is going to pay how is it to be assured to him ; how is it to be paid ; what are all the manoeuvres that have got to be made by the Government of India in order to assure our *kisans* this particular price of Rs. 10 is a complicated matter, the solution of which I leave to my hon. friend, the Food and Agriculture Minister.

The manufacturers themselves have stated before the Tariff Commission that they want no controls at all, that all controls should be removed. My hon. friend, Shri Kashi Nath Pandey, who represents labour, also wants all the controls to go. I for one do not want these controls in this manner.

**SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY** (Cuddalore) : We also do not want them.

**SHRI RANGA :** But I certainly stand for a minimum price to be assured to our *kisans* and to the extent that this minimum price is assured to them, I want the rest of the controls to go. How is it justifiable that the *kisan* in Kerala should be capable of getting only Rs. 7 or Rs. 8 a quintal and Rs. 15 in UP ? How is it justifiable that our *kisans*, who insist upon a proper price being paid for their cane, should be forced to hand over their cane to the sugar mills at an arbitrarily fixed price by the local government and when they refuse to do so they should be sent to jail ? Hundreds of them have been sent, as admitted by Shri Pandey, and are being sent to jail. Till now we had been discussing the right of workers to go on strike, Government employees to go on strike and Secretariat employees also to go on strike. Are the *kisans* the only people who are to be denied the right to refuse to supply their cane when the price offered to them is not reasonable ? Therefore I raise my voice of protest against the policies of those State Governments who are responsible for taking our *kisans* to jail just because they have been exercising their elementary right, the right which they have not been exercising for such a long time, the right to refuse to supply their cane to the mills unless they are paid a proper price.

The South Indian mill-owners as well as the All-India mill-owners have supplied us with two memoranda.

They have also made their statement before the Tariff Commission. They want to be assured of a return of 12 per cent profit. They are not satisfied with it. They want more. I have no objection if the country is capable of assuring them even more than 12 per cent. Is the country in a position to assure them more than 12 per cent is the question that has got to be answered by everybody.

My hon. friend, Shri Kashi Nath Pandey as well as everyone of us, wants the price of sugar to come down. We want the consumers to be benefited : we want also the producers of sugarcane to be protected and, in between, comes a very well-organised mill-owners sector who have got plenty of capital at their disposal. All of them are not private mill-owners. More than one-third of them today are supposed to be cooperative mill-owners. They want more than 12 per cent according to their own statement before the Tariff Commission. Let everybody make their own demand. I have no objection. Let the consumers themselves go on asking for more and more of it. Is it not the duty of the Government to see that justice is done as between these various forces ?

Here are these workers, about 1,37,000 for whom my hon. friend, Shri Kashi Nath Pandey, is a special representative. I am glad he works for them. But how many *kisans* are there ? Most of them do not own more than an acre of land—some do own more than 2 acres—under sugarcane and that is their main means of commercial income or cash income. If that goes, they are finished. Even in Maharashtra, it must be the same position. In fact, the *per capita* land that is available in Maharashtra is not very much more than 1 acre, not to speak of area under sugarcane. 6 million and 287 acres of land are under sugarcane. Supposing we set apart 1 million and 287 acres of land which are being owned by cooperative sugar mills and these bigger land-holders and other people, 5 million acres of land under cane are owned by the smaller people. It is the smaller people who are interested in it ; 5 million families are interested in it. Are their interests not to be protected properly ? Are their interests being sufficiently and satisfactorily protected ? When Government is satisfied with fixing only

Rs. 7.37 as a kind of national figure, is it not high time they should raise the national figure from Rs. 7.37 to Rs. 9.37 or Rs. 9 at least ?

Last year, so many sugar mills lost who paid Rs. 15. That may be so. Have they taken into consideration the kind of prices that are being paid to our own growers in the first six weeks ? Later on, when the peak supply goes on, what are the prices that are paid ? Again, in the last two or three weeks, in May and June also, lower prices are being paid. If they were to take all that into consideration, would it be reasonable for them to say that *kisans* are being dealt with properly even within the same place, same area, of sugar mill ? Who are the *kisans* who supply cane in the earliest stage ? It is the weakest of them, the poorest of them, because they cannot hold on. They must necessarily cut the crop and they cannot go on spending money on power and then supply, keep the sucrose content within the cane and wait until a proper price is offered by the mill-owner. Therefore, the poorest, of them supply at the very beginning, in the first three weeks, and they suffer because during these three weeks, the price paid is very low.

Why is it all this speculation has come about ? It is because of the 'policy of the Government. What is the policy of the Government ? It is a confusing policy, it is a contradictory policy, a self-contradictory policy, and it is a very complicated policy also. They want the country to sacrifice in order to enable them to export sugar at less than the cost price. Millions and millions of rupees are being lost. From whom are they getting ? They do not want to contribute from the General Revenues. They have given up the earlier concession also in regard to excise duty. Why have they done it now ? Mr. Kashi Nath Pandey has given the reason. They know that the *kisans*, under the inducement of a higher price, have placed more of their land under sugarcane and they have been good enough to answer the call of the nation and produce more and more cane. Therefore, they want them to suffer ! Will they make any kind of sacrifice at all ? Will they get any kind of sacrifice from the millowners ? Millowners go on saying, "Last year, we were made to pay

Rs. 78 per tonne towards the subsidy ; we do not know how much we are going to be made to pay next year ?" I am speaking subject to correction. Why should the millowners be made to pay ? Government says, "No ; we have allowed you to sell in free market to the extent of 40 per cent and therefore, you must be making some profit from out of which you pay." Do they keep any accounts at all ? Do they maintain any honour between themselves and the millowners and see that the millowners do not lose by this transaction, do not suffer by this. Why should the millowners be made to suffer in this manner ? If the millowners are to be allowed to suffer at all, then necessarily the workers are going to be made to suffer ; then the mills will not function. The mills will anyhow function, our friend Mr. Pandey says, because the Government is powerful enough to see that the mills are made to work in order to provide employment for these 1,37,000 workers. So, mills will work. Then who are the people who are going to suffer ? The *kisans*. They are being made to suffer the most. About the millowners they are highly educated people ; they have got very good public relations and everything ; they produce wonderful documents which are capable of confusing even the Ministry and the Minister. These workers are also very powerful with their strike weapon.

Therefore, the only people who cannot make a case for themselves are the poor *kisans*. Out of exasperation, they go on strike and then they are put into jail.

I wish to give this challenge to the Government. I am not going to recognise any party differences or party loyalties here. If these *kisans* are not going to be protected properly, I would once again come into the field and lead the *Kisan* Satyagraha against the factory owners and against this Government. Let the Government and the millowners take this warning. We have no quarrel with the millowners. We want the mills, sugar or whatever it is, to make a decent profit because otherwise there would not be enough production. We want our workers to be employed in these mills. But at the same time we want the *kisans* to get a fair deal. I like Mr. Jagjiwan Ram as Mr. Jagjiwan Ram, but as a Minister I am not prepared to like him. I want Mr. Jagjiwan Ram to take

[Shri Ranga]

courage in both his hands and tackle the situation in such a manner that the Finance Minister would be able to play the game fairly by the *kisans*, by the millowners and by the workers and also by the consumers. It is for the General Revenues to make the necessary sacrifice. Let there be some concession made in regard to the excise duty. Let there be this kind of proportion that 70 per cent be given over to the Government at their procurement price and 30 per cent to the free market; and let them come back to 40 per cent if they find it uneconomical for the country as a whole. Let them reduce the excise duty. Let them help the people in every possible manner so that our *kisans* would be assured of at least Rs. 10/- per quintal and, in addition to that, I want something more also. A kind of scientific formula has to be developed. There is what is known as the 'Seisma' formula. But my fear is this. Till now there is no automatic control in regard to the discovery of this sucrose content; it may be manipulated, I do not know. I speak subject to correction. Therefore, I want a technique to be developed, so that no mischief could be played. Let them come to some kind of an agreement with the millowners, with the concurrence of the peasants and their leaders, and let them say that upto this particular sucrose content, *i.e.*, 8.5 or whatever it is, Rs. 10 would be paid and for anything more, for every decimal point, so much more would be paid. If they were to arrange a system like this and ensure that the millowners do not suffer at all and at the same time do not profiteer either at the cost of the consumers or at the cost of the cane growers, there would be some justice done.

But it is easier said than done. It is a very complicated matter. I wish my hon. friend will go into conference with the experts, with the representatives of the various interests and think of devising some scheme which would be less complicated than what it is today, so that it would be possible for him to give the maximum satisfaction to the non-*Kisan* interests and complete satisfaction to the *Kisan's* interests.

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU :**

In respect of sugar, the total production

in 1964-65 was 32.58 lakh tons. In 1965-66 it was 35.10 lakh tons. In 1966-67 suddenly the production has come down to 21 lakh tons. From 1965-66, when the production was 35.10 lakh tons, the production has decreased so much that in 1966-67 we find that there is total production of only 21 lakh tons. Sir, the reason is this; and everybody knows the reason. The cost of production has gone up. The cost of labour has gone up. The cost of manure has gone up. The cost of machinery has gone up. The land revenue has gone up. The charge for electricity rates has gone up, every year. Like this, every year the cost has been going up and so the agriculturists were not able to produce the sugar-cane and they discontinued to produce sugar-cane. So, in the year 1966-67, the figure of production has come down to such a low figure as 21 lakhs. In 1967-68, after seeing the trouble which has been felt all round, the Minister came forward with a new proposal—that is a good proposal—and he said that 40% of sugar can be sold in the open market and 60% can be sold at controlled price. 60% of controlled sugar is meant for the low income group, to be distributed to the low income group people; and 40% is for the rich people and they have to purchase it in the open market. That was the understanding, I think, which Government arrived at in this matter. But last year, when this scheme was successful, when people began to think that Government is fair and reasonable, they have increased the acreage of sugar-cane cultivation. So, in this year, the approximate total production will be between 28 and 30 lakh tons. But what has happened? This year, when they got the increase, the Government wants to bring down the cost of sugar. Suddenly, without any fore-warning, the Government announces that 70% of the sugar will be sold in the controlled market and 30% only will be allowed for free sale. Last year, when the production went down, the Government announced rebate on excise duty on sugar at Rs. 11 per quintal, on the total production of 80% of excess production of last year. Sir, the Government said that 40% of sugar can be sold in open market and again the Government said, the price would be Rs. 161 per quintal. As against last year, suddenly, it

has been announced that this year they have reduced the price. They have reduced the price to Rs. 153-85 per quintal.

**THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM) :** It has not been announced.

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU :** In Andhra it has been announced. (*Interruption*) Another phenomena is this. In Andhra State there are some sugar factories like Nizam sugar factory and Bodam sugar factory where they have fixed at Rs. 139. Why should there is this fifteen rupees difference? I cannot understand that. Is the sweetness in the sugar less? Not at all. But something is wrong with Government.

There is an Agricultural Price Fixation Committee. In that committee, consumers are represented, not the agriculturists. When consumers preside over the fate of agriculturists, what justice can the agriculturists expect? If this is going to be the fate of the agriculturists, if Government are going to do like this, we are not going to co-operate with them. Next year we are not going to raise any sugarcane and Government are going to face crisis. I am warning them. If you think that you can put out agriculturists, we can face you and put you down. We constitute 82 per cent of the population. The others are only 18 per cent.

**SHRI S. M. JOSHI (Poona) :** They will bring an Ordinance for him.

**SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peermade) :** Is he an extremist revolutionary?

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) :** He is a Naxalite among Congressmen.

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU :** When there was no cane, when people were not coming forward with cane to factories, Government came forward with the Sugarcane Control Order of 1966. Under that Order, they restricted the movement of cane, they restricted the supply of cane, they forced the agriculturists to supply cane to factories. Now when the factory people are not willing to pay the price fixed by the State Government, the Central Government are not coming forward to

force them. Are they afraid of the factory-owners? What is this? When they had the audacity to force agriculturists to supply cane to the factories, they had the power to do so. But what happened to that power now? Can it not be used to force the factory owners to pay a certain price fixed by the State Government to the growers? I cannot understand this attitude.

We have got high hopes in our Agriculture Minister. When we sit with him, he is very nice and has all sympathy for the agriculturists. But when he sits with the officers and when he hears the consumers, we are gone. We are forgotten. This is our fate. I only plead with him not to forget that he is Agriculture Minister before he is Food Minister. He is Food Minister after production, not before. But now he is Food Minister before production.

What is happening? In Andhra Pradesh, last year Government fixed the price at Rs. 110. We were demanding Rs. 125. The cane grower could convert it into jaggery and be able to get Rs. 200 per tonne. But Government forced the cane growers to supply cane to the factories at Rs. 110. In Maharashtra, they were gentlemen. Their co-operatives paid Rs. 160-200 per tonne. When Maharashtra co-operatives could do that, why not the same price be made available to growers in other States?

They may say the sucrose content is more in Maharashtra. If so, let the price be fixed according to that. But they are not coming forward with that proposition.

I will tell you one instance. In Madras, they have a consumers' Government. There the price was Rs. 85 last year because it is controlled by consumers. Agriculturists are not in the Government there. The consumers are there. In the next elections, if the agriculturists have any salt in their blood, they will teach them a lesson in Madras.

In Kerala we know there are mostly consumers. Even for the few producers they have reduced the price. The agriculturists will teach them a lesson next year.

**SHRI VADUDEVAN NAIR :** Why should you speak about Kerala? You are thoroughly ignorant. Speak about something else.



**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU :** I am not speaking of China or Russia, I am talking of India.

Does the Minister of Agriculture want that the agriculturists should suffer at the hands of other people? Is he not going to protect the agriculturists? When he wanted to protect the factory owner last year, why is he not coming forward to protect the agriculturists this year? I may be a Congress member, I may belong to any party, but as Prof. Ranga said, on this agricultural issue we are all one, agriculturists are all one. If they are going to help us we are going to try, otherwise next year we are not going to produce any sugarcane.

Last year in Chittoor district cases were filed against 53 people for not supplying cane to sugar factories.

**SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM :** Co-operatives.

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU :** May be anything. They were arrested and kept in jail. When you have got so much powers to harass the agriculturists, do you not have powers to harass these factory owners? I am not talking of co-operatives, but of private co-operatives.

If the Government is going to fix the price on sucrose content, I request them not to rely on these factory owners. I know what is happening in these private factories. If they purchase 100 tonnes they will write an account that they have purchased 120 tonnes. With the connivance of excise people, they show accounts for 100 bags, but they sell 120 bags, 20 bags without account. When these people are able to write false accounts, how can we get the correct sucrose content from them? So I want the Central Government to send their scientists, to get the cane crushed in some place, find out the sucrose content and fix the price according to that, and not on the figures given by these factory owners. If this is not done, I am afraid things will become very serious.

In Harayana, Punjab and other places many people have been arrested. If the Government is not going to come forward to help the agriculturists, if they are not going to be reasonable, I do not know what

will happen to next year's sugarcane crop. Government might be forced to import sugar from other countries. This will be the fate next year. I only request the hon. Minister of Agriculture to see reason and help the agriculturists to get at least a minimum price of Rs. 125 for cane.

**SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHU** (Cuddalore) : After listening to the speech of the leader of the Opposition, Prof. Ranga, I have no other go except agree with all the suggestions sponsored by that great kisan leader.

I do not want the Government to interfere too much in this particular industry. When the Government says that by assuming more and more power it is going to step up production, I do not believe it, because by their mismanagement, by their bungling in sugar policy, the production of sugar which was 35 lakh tonnes in 1965-66 has been brought down to 22 lakh tonnes in 1966-67. This is enough evidence to show that there has been a failure of policy on the part of the Food Ministry, on the part of the officials functioning in the Food Ministry. There has been a failure on the part of the officials functioning in the Sugar Directorate to protect this industry both in the industrial side and in the agrarian side.

I would like to say that the Governmental machinery should not be misused by the industrialists and the additional income or the windfall income, whatever it may be, cannot be exploited by the Government, by the industry in connivance with the Government. Mr. Naidu just a little earlier was saying that in Andhra Pradesh they paid Rs. 110 or Rs. 120 whereas in Madras they paid only Rs. 85. The answer to this I can give. Mr. Brahmananda Reddy has already given the answer. The moment you take up the responsibility of sugar industry, sugar cane control order and all the laws which were prevalent in the State Government till about 1949 come into operation and everything was good till 1949. Afterwards the Central Government has taken the power. The State Governments have become only a side-watcher or municipalities. The State Chief Ministers have no power at all. When Mr. Brahmananda Reddy as Congress Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh

wanted that the agriculturists should be given a minimum of Rs. 100, the private industrialists refused to budge and he has no power and he is appealing to the hon. Food Minister and that matter awaits a decision. I do not know what is going to happen. Our Food Minister, Mr. Mathialagan, has already demanded that the power on production of cane and fixing of prices should be given to the States as it was given to the States before. You control the production of sugar and whatever is produced in the factory, you absorb it in the Food Corporation of India and you fix the price. It may be said that the industrialists will suffer by the interference of the governmental policy. The Government of India constituted Gopalakrishnan Committee in 1957 or 1959—I do not remember exactly. It visited the factories all over India, studied the cost of production of sugar and the taxation prevalent then and it has given a finding which has not been accepted by the Ministry here. The Gopalakrishnan Committee recommended that the sugar cane growers should get 55% of the selling price of sugar and the factory should be given only 45%. There has been a fight between the sugar industrialists and the sugar cane growers. It helped the industrialists. We even agreed that we will have 50% of the selling price and if the price of sugar is Rs. 200 per quintal we will receive Rs. 100. The entire question has been gone into by the Gopalakrishnan Committee.

My friend, Mr. Shinde, who is also a sugar cane grower in Satara district, let him take time to kindly go through the price policy of sugar. As was suggested by my hon. friend, Mr. Pande, people can purchase sugar at Rs. 2 or Rs. 2.25 provided the Government does not interfere too much in the industry. I would like to appeal here that this industrial power which is controlled by the Government of India should be given to the States. The production of sugar cane and fixing of the sugar cane price should be given to the State Governments. You control the price of sugar, you control the distribution of sugar. As has been demanded by the Andhra Pradesh Government, as has been demanded by the Madras Government, these powers should be delegated to the States. We are helpless. He thinks that

Madras has got all the powers. That is why we do not have power to deal with it.

One more suggestion. In North India during the last year the sugar cane growers got Rs. 150 and or Rs. 160 also. But we got only Rs. 90 in the whole of Madras. In our State there are about 10 factories. The Madras Government brought about a settlement between these agriculturists and the factory owners to the effect that they will give a minimum of Rs. 90 and the Government will guarantee Rs. 350 per bag of sugar.

By this process, the factories in the south—Andhra Pradesh, Madras, Mysore and Maharashtra—and other places have earned more than Rs. 20 crores which is unearned income. I made all the calculations and I laid it before the Minister of Agriculture and I requested him saying, let this Rs. 20 crores of unearned income which was due to the policy adopted by this Government, not by any additional capital being put into the industry by the industrialists, be distributed accordingly to the growers, one-third to them, one-third to the workers and one-third to the industrialists. I suggested it to the Food Minister but he has written to me a letter after much delay, after consulting all the people in his department. He has suggested that the income-tax department will take into account this unearned income, the additional income. As you know, how much per cent does the income-tax department take from this? They will take only 20 to 30 per cent from this. What about the rest? The rest goes to the industrialists. Why? Because, when you adopt a bad policy, when your policy gives an unearned income to the industry, why not distribute it to the growers? Why not you distribute it to the workers and are you not having power to legislate? You are having the price fixation authority functioning in that defunct office there. They have all the power. But there is no mind, there is no intention on the part of the Food Minister here to distribute this unearned income to the growers, to the workers and to the industrialists.

I really concede that by this policy the production has increased from 22 lakhs to 25 lakhs or even 26 lakhs, but I make bold to say that our growers are prepared

[Shri V. Krishnamoorthi]

to produce even 40 to 45 lakh tonnes and we can even export 10 lakhs to foreign countries and earn foreign exchange, provided the Government of India ..

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU :** What is the production and what is the consumption here ?

**SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY :** The consumption in India is 25 to 30 lakh tonnes. You do not know; I know. The home consumption has not exceeded more than 30 lakh tonnes for the past four to five years, whereas the production has increased today; in 1965-66, there was a production of 35 lakh tonnes. There has been a carry-over of 7 to 8 lakh tonnes next year. I say that if the sugar policy pursued by the Government is correct, the country can produce more than 40 to 45 lakh tonnes.

So, I demand that the Government of India should decentralise this power and give it to the State Governments. Or else, let the Government of India fix a minimum price of at least Rs. 100 per tonne of cane to the grower. Secondly, let them implement the Gopalkrishnan Committee's report so that the consumer may also get the benefit and get sugar at Rs. 2 or Rs. 2.05 per kilo.

I am glad that at least now we have had the opportunity of discussing this after such a long time. I was thinking that the Food Minister himself will take the initiative to discuss this vital matter. At least now, there has been an opportunity. With these observations, I suggest let the Food Minister act to protect the agriculturists, let him not be slow in his action; let him act to protect the industry, let him act to protect the agriculturists and let him act to protect the workers employed in the industry.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS : rose—**

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** There are 20 Members wanting to speak.

**SHRI M. N. REDDY (Nizamabad) :** On behalf of the Government, the Minister will be speaking; so, it is better only one or two more Members speak now.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE :** I move that the time be extended by two hours. (Interruptions).

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Let us see. Shri Randhir Singh.

**SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) :** Let me speak, I have to go away with Shri Krishnamoorthi.

चेयरमैन महोदय, मैं बड़ा मशकूर हूँ आप का और खास कर श्री देशमुख का कि आपने मेरा नम्बर पहले लिया है जब कि बाद में मेरा नम्बर आता था ।

18.00 hrs.

असल बात यह है कि क्यादा अफसोस हमें दाम का नहीं है, दाम ठीक मिलें या न मिलें, लेकिन अफसोस यह है कि विधान की धज्जियां उड़ाई जा रही हैं। प्रियेम्बल में लिखा हुआ है कि ए और बी में इम्तियाज नहीं किया जायेगा, जब कि इस देश में आज किसान और गैर-किसान के दरमियान डिस्क्रिमिनेशन किया जा रहा है। किस से किया जा रहा है और किस से नहीं, इस को छोड़ दीजिए, लेकिन आज किसान यह महसूस करता है कि जो जिन्स वह पैदा करता है, गन्ना, अनाज, मिर्च या कामशल-क्राफ्ट, उस का पैदा करने वाला तो वह है लेकिन उस की कीमत पर उस का कोई बस नहीं है। आप मोटरकार लेंगे तो दुकानदार कहेगा कि यह एम्बेसेडर कार 21 हजार से एक आना कम में भी नहीं मिलेगी। आप फाउन्टेन पेन लेने जायेंगे तो दुकानदार कहेगा कि तेरी मर्जी ले या न ले मैं तो दस रुपये का ही दूंगा। मिठाईवाला भी यही कहेगा कि आठ रुपये में एक किलो मिठाई लेनी हो तो लो, वरना चले जाओ। गर्जें कि हर आदमी जो कि गैर-किसान है, चाहे बैंकर है, दुकानदार है, कारखानेदार है, वकील है या कोई और पेशा करने वाला है, उस को अपनी कीमत पर कब्जा है, जो चाहे ले ले, लेकिन किसान अपनी कीमत नहीं ले सकता ।

आज वह लकड़ी जी कि जलाने के काम

घाती है 25 रुपये क्विंटल के भाव बिकती है, लेकिन किसान अपने गन्ने का दाम 7 रु० 75 पैसे से ज्यादा नहीं ले सकता है। इस से बड़े जुल्म की मिसाल और क्या हो सकती है? किसान बोने के लिये गन्ने का बीज 16 रु० क्विंटल पर खरीदता है। आज कार बनाने वाले को कई गुना फायदा है, फाउण्डेन पेन बनाने वाले को कई गुना मुनाफा है, लेकिन किसान को अपनी खेती में नुकसान है, बल्कि कई गुना नुकसान है, उसको कोस्ट भी नहीं मिलती है। मैं यह बात बड़े दुखी दिल से कह रहा हूँ—

गाना इसे समझ कर  
न खुश हों सुनने वाले,  
दुखे हुए दिलों की  
फरियाद है यह।

यह किसानों के दिलों की फरियाद है। किसान जब गन्ने की फसल बोता है तो उस की बह, उस का लड़का, उस की बेटी और उस का बूढ़ा बाप, सारे खेत में लगते हैं—क्या निराई, क्या हराई, क्या पानी, सुबह से शाम तक सारे लोग लगे रहते हैं और साल में गन्ने की सिर्फ एक फसल होती है। एक क्विंटल ईख को पैदा करने के लिए, किसान के कम से कम तीस चालीस रुपये खर्च होते हैं। इस बात को मंत्री महोदय नोट कर लें। हमारी बदकिस्मती यह है कि इस देश के जो एक्सपोर्ट हैं, वे गैर-किसान हैं और हमारे फूड-मिनिस्ट्री के जो इन्वार्ज हैं, ना-खुदा हैं, मल्लाह हैं, सी फीसदी नहीं बल्कि 200 सी फीसदी टक्साली किसान हैं। लेकिन बदकिस्मती यह है कि वह बंधे हुए हैं। आखिर क्यों बंधे हुए हैं? कैबिनेट में आप मामले को ले जाइये, हम 80 फीसदी एम० पी० आपके साथ हैं। रंगा साहब ने जो बात कही, वह गलत नहीं है। अपोजीशन के 100 फीसदी एम० पी० भी आप के साथ हैं। आप के साथ इस मुल्क के चालीस करोड़ आदमियों की आवाज है। बाबू अजीबन राम जी चालीस करोड़ आदमियों के जख्मात और क्यालात की तर्जुमानी करते हैं। इसी लिए मैं कहता हूँ कि यह कोई बाणा नहीं है, लेखर नहीं है, बल्कि

किसान के बेटे का जो खून उबलता है, वह है। मैं कहता हूँ कि अब भी आपको मौका है। हम चाहते हैं कि जो हम कमायें, उस को दूसरे भाई भी खायें। लेकिन ऐसा हम को महसूस न करने दो कि फिर हम उस चीज को बोना ही बन्द कर दें। नायडू साहब ने सही बात कही कि अगले साल कोई भी ईख नहीं बोयेगा और किसान भी बनिया बन जायेगा। हम नहीं चाहते कि वह बनिया बने। लेकिन आप ऐसे हालात मत पैदा कीजिये कि वह गेहूँ, चना, मिर्च और वरसीम, जिसमें कि उस को मुनाफा हो वही बोना शुरू कर दे। जिसमें उस को टोटे का सौदा होगा, वह काम वह क्यों करेगा? इस लिए मैं आप की मारफत अपने किसान-नेता मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह हिम्मत करें। सारे किसान उन के पीछे हैं। जब आज लकड़ी का भाव 25 रुपये है तो आप 25 रुपये न सही, 20 रु०, 18 रु०, 15 रु० दे दो, लेकिन कुछ तो दो। हम तो लकड़ी से भी कम दाम मांगते हैं। इस से ज्यादा आप हम से क्या उम्मीद करते हैं। ... (अध्वचान)...

SHRI M. N. REDDY : You are doing a disservice to the *kisan*. Say Rs. 15/--

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : यह क्या कह रहे हो? ... (अध्वचान)

श्री रणधीर सिंह : कम से कम 15 रु० मैं कहता हूँ। लकड़ी के 25 रु० बतलाये हैं, 25 न सही 20, 18, 17 कुछ तो दो।

एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ कि हरियाणा में एजीटेसन चल रहा है। मैंने बाक-आउट भी किया था। बाबू जी से मिला भी हूँ। वहां किसान जेलों में जाने लग गये हैं। जिसका मतलब यह है कि हम गन्ना मिलों को नहीं देंगे। वहां जो यह तहरीक फँसी है, यह बहुत बुरी तहरीक है। इस से देश का और कन्स्यूमर का नुकसान होता है। हम इस को नहीं चाहते हैं। लेकिन हरियाणा में इस की पहल हुई है और हरियाणा में जिस चीज की पहल होती है वह अगले अगली हो बुरी, सारे देश में फैलती है। इस लिए मैं आप की मारफत

[श्री रणधीर सिंह]

मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि सब किसान के हित में यह बात है कि हरियारा में जो एटीटेशन चल रहा है, उस को वापस कराने का आप इन्तिज़ाम करें और किसान जो दाम मांगता है वह दाम किसान को दें और जो किसान वहाँ पर गिरफ्तार हुए हैं उन को छोड़ा जाय और उन के मुकदमें वापस लिए जायें। मैं बड़ा मशकूर हूँ कि आप ने मुझे टाइम दिया।

**श्री प्रदल बिहारी बाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) :** सभापति जी, चीनी उद्योग इस समय एक संकट की स्थिति में से गुजर रहा है। मिलें बन्द हैं और किसान गन्ना नहीं दे रहा है क्योंकि उन्हें गन्ने का उचित मूल्य नहीं मिल रहा है। मिलें बन्द होने से मजदूर बेकार हैं और यह उद्योग संकट में है और सरकार भी घाटे में है। आवश्यक है कि चीनी उद्योग के इस संकट को खत्म करने के लिए सरकार प्रभावी नीति अपनाये। मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार की चीनी नीति इस समय न तो गन्ना उत्पादकों के हित में है, न चीनी मिल में काम करने वाले मजदूरों के हित में है, न उपभोक्ताओं के हित में है और न कुल मिला कर चीनी उद्योग के हित में है। मेरा सुझाव है कि सरकार को मिल मालिकों पर दबाव डालना चाहिए, जिस से वे गन्ने का दाम बढ़ायें। मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि उन्होंने गन्ने के कम से कम दाम तय किये हैं और मिल मालिक उसे बढ़ा सकते हैं। लेकिन बिना किसानों के संघर्ष के कोई बढ़ाता नहीं है। संघर्ष में दिन बीत रहे हैं और चीनी का उत्पादन कम होने की आशंका है और इस लिए खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री महोदय से मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि वह मिल मालिकों को बुलायें और उन पर इस बात के लिए दबाव डालें कि गन्ने का दाम बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए। किसानों के प्रतिनिधियों के साथ बैठ कर के आपस में बात-चीत कर के इस प्रश्न को हल करना आवश्यक है। किसान आज गन्ना नहीं दे रहे हैं। वह असन्तुष्ट हैं और रुष्ट हैं। इस के अलावा मिलों के क्षेत्र में वह खंडसारी नहीं बना सकते हैं। गुड़ बनाने की भी एक सीमा है। उस में गन्ने

का नुकसान भी ज्यादा होता है। किसान अधिक दिनों तक संघर्ष कर सकें इस बात की संभावना भी नहीं दिखाई देती है इस लिए सरकार को हस्तक्षेप करना चाहिए और मिल मालिकों पर दबाव डालना चाहिए कि वह गन्ना उत्पादकों के साथ न्याय करें।

दूसरी बात यह है कि मिलमालिकों से यह भी कहा जाय कि किसानों का जितना बकाया है वह सब वापिस दें। उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में, मैं वहाँ की स्थिति बखूबी जानता हूँ, किसानों का लाखों रुपया मिलों पर बकाया है। मिल मालिक न किसान का रुपया देते हैं न सरकार का टैक्स देते हैं और न उस का सेस देते हैं। अभी तक कोई सुनने में नहीं आया कि किसी मिल मालिक को, मिल को इस लिए ले लिया गया कि उस ने गन्ना उत्पादकों को जो पैसा देना था या सरकार को जो देना था वह नहीं दिया। मालगुजारी न देने पर किसान की ज़मीन हस्तगत की जा सकती है मगर अभी तक मिल को लेने का कोई उदाहरण हमारे सामने नहीं आया है। इस बात के लिए मिल मालिकों पर दबाव डालना चाहिए कि किसानों के रुपयों का भुगतान तुरन्त करें जिस से वह रुपया लगा कर उत्पादन बढ़ा सकें और गन्ने की किस्म अच्छी कर सकें।

तीसरी बात यह है कि उपभोक्ता के हित में यह नहीं है कि चीनी पर लगा ढुंधा नियन्त्रण खत्म कर दिया जाय। मैं जानता हूँ कि इस आशय की मांग हो रही है लेकिन मंत्री महोदय को उस दबाव का सफलता के साथ सामना करना चाहिए। हम उपभोक्ताओं के हितों की उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते। अब चीनी का उपयोग कोई ऐशबयों की वस्तु नहीं है। चीनी शहरों में एक आवश्यक चीज बन गयी है। कम आदमी वाले बगों को चीनी थोड़ी मात्रा में भले ही क्यों न हो लेकिन वह चीनी उन्हें उचित दाम पर मिले। इसलिए चीनी पर नियन्त्रण रखना होगा और उस के विनियंत्रीकरण की मांग का ढड़तापूर्वक विरोध करने की आवश्यकता है।

चौथी बात यह है कि उत्तर प्रदेश और

बिहार का चीनी उद्योग एक प्रमुख उद्योग है। सारी ग्रंथ व्यवस्था इस उद्योग पर निर्भर है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से आग्रह करूंगा कि वह चीनी की समस्या को और चीनी मिलों की समस्या को सम्पूर्ण देश के नकशे में रख कर देखें। मैं यह समझने में असमर्थ हूँ कि एक और उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार की चीनी मिलें बन्द हो जायेंगी यह खतरा पैदा हो रहा है दूसरी ओर चीनी मिलों के नये लाइसेंस दिये जा रहे हैं। अगर चीनी के उत्पादन को बढ़ाने के वास्ते नई मिलें खोलते हैं और उन में पूंजी लगाते हैं तो मेरी समझ में उस से कम पूंजी लगा कर जो मिलें आज चल रही हैं उन से चीनी के उत्पादन की कमी की पूर्ति की जा सकती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि नई चीनी मिलों के लाइसेंस देना इस समय देश के हित में नहीं होगा। हमारे आंध्र और मद्रास के सदस्य मेरी बात का गलत अर्थ न लगायें। हम इस देश की ग्रंथ व्यवस्था को टुकड़ों में नहीं देख सकते हैं।

मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि इस चीनी के बारे में सम्बन्धित क्षेत्रों में कार्यक्षमता भी बढ़ाये जाने की आवश्यकता है। अब इस में न तो सरकार ने ही अपनी भूमिका ठीक तरह से भ्रदा की है और न ही मिल मालिकों ने भ्रदा की है। नई पूंजी लगा कर नई मिलें खोलने के बजाय आज जो चीनी मिलें पहले से चल रही हैं, उन में एकद्वयैसी लाई जाय और वहाँ पर गन्ने की किस्म सुधार सकें और उस से उत्पन्न होने वाली शर्करा की मात्रा में वृद्धि कर सकें व मिल मालिकों पर दबाव डाल सकें कि वह किसानों के लिए समुचित सिंचाई का प्रबन्ध करें तो चीनी की आवश्यकता पूरी हो सकती है। हमारे महाराष्ट्र और आन्ध्र के परिश्रमी लोग अपनी पूंजी, अपना सरमाया कुछ उद्योग में लगा सकते हैं, मगर उत्तर और दक्षिण में इस संबंध में संघर्ष नहीं होना चाहिए और देश के सीमित साधनों का इस बारे में दुरुपयोग नहीं होना चाहिए।

एक बात कह कर मैं खतम करूंगा। चीनी के सम्बन्ध में नीति निर्धारित करते समय हमें

सभी स्वार्थों का, सभी हितों का समन्वय करना जरूरी है मैं जानता हूँ कि यह काम सरल नहीं है। यह काम कठिनाइयों से भरा हुआ है। स्वार्थ आपस में टकराते हैं। और उन से रास्ता निकालना कठिन होता है। लेकिन एक संतुलित नीति का निर्धारण और दृढ़ता के साथ उस का कार्यान्वयन असम्भव नहीं होना चाहिए। मंत्री महोदय क्षमता रखते हैं, शक्ति रखते हैं, प्रभाव रखते हैं और वह उत्पादकों, उपभोक्ताओं और इस उद्योग इन तीनों के हित में ऐसा योग बिठा सकते हैं जिस से कि इस चीनी उद्योग का विकास हो और साथ ही उत्पादकों के साथ और उपभोक्ताओं के साथ अन्याय भी न होने पाये।

मैं एक बात फिर कह दूँ कि मैं ने उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार की चीनी मिलों की चर्चा की है। चूँकि मैं उस क्षेत्र से आता हूँ, मुझे कठिनाइयों का पता है। आज यह उद्योग गहरे संकट में पड़ा हुआ है। अगर उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में चीनी उद्योग संकट में पड़ गया तो वहाँ फिर जनता को काम देने के लिए और कोई उद्योग नहीं है। मैं उन कारणों में नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन मैं सरकार से इस बात का आग्रह करूंगा कि उसे इस क्षेत्र का विशेष ध्यान रख कर अपनी नीति का निर्धारण करना होगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have two announcements to make. One is that the 26th Report of the Business Advisory Committee would be presented now. The second is that this debate will go upto 6.30 P.M. and then it will be postponed for a day to be fixed.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

18.15 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Twenty-Tixth Report

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-  
TARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICA-  
TIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH) :  
I beg to present the twenty-sixth Report  
of the Business Advisory Committee.