

for the rural areas, it has been repeatedly recommended that the Government should sponsor a large rural works programme costing Rs. 11,000 crores which should create jobs for meeting minimum public consumption needs of 24 million families or about 130 million people during the Fifth Plan which should imply the construction of roads, construction of hospitals, schools and housing also and furthermore, utmost importance be given to providing drinking water in rural areas.

A great deal has been talked about the crash programme and I do not have time to dwell on it now. I would like to say that there is no government in the world which has ever provided jobs to all. Whatever you may do, you may extend the public sector, you may nationalise all the industries, but, even then, this Government cannot provide jobs to all. Therefore, the solution lies in producing a scheme of self-employment and that is the only solution. At the moment, I know a large number of unemployed go on looking to the Government for providing them jobs. This sort of attitude on their part is not very helpful...

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** We are approaching 5.30. We shall have to take up another item.

**SHRI VIRENDRA AGARWAL:** I know there are certain difficulties and, the Government knows it, which do not encourage our youth to engage in self-employment. So, I suggest that the Government should direct all its energies to such avenues so that the Indian youth can engage themselves in such projects which can provide self-employment.

There is a widespread unrest going on. At the moment, there is an impression in this country that there is only one employment exchange and that is the biggest one and that is the Prime Minister of India. The Prime Minister of India to-day is not interested in providing jobs to the

people or unemployed either in the rural or in the urban areas. She is interested in providing jobs to the defeated politicians. That is the trend. That is the outlook of our Government while they have got no policy or scheme for providing jobs either to the rural or the urban unemployed.

With these words, I would request the Government to have an integrated scheme so that we can really develop something specific and concrete in every district where the rural unemployed can get gainful employment.

**SHRI R. D. BHANDARE** (Bombay Central): The problem of unemployment is a problem which has created not only head-ache to the Government but the Government has to pass through and the country has to pass through critical times. The intensiveness and the extensiveness of this problem can be understood properly if we see as to what extent this problem is assuming disproportionate dimensions. If I am to quote some figures, in 1950 we had on the live registers of the employment exchanges 3,30,743 job-seekers. Then, from year to year the figure has increased. Now, I am coming to the figure of 1966. The Committee on Unemployment has given its interim report on short-term measures for employment and that committee has given certain figures from 1966. But, so far as the register of the employment exchanges is concerned...

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Mr. Bhandare, you can continue on the next occasion.

17.30 hrs.

#### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

##### NATIONALISATION OF SUGAR INDUSTRY

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, in your absence there was a suggestion that, in order to give more time to the discussion of this resolution, if you agree, your half-an-hour discussion may be shifted to some other day.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): On Monday, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If you agree, they would fix.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Why?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Somebody has suggested. So, I am putting it to you. If you do not agree, that is all right.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Let us finish this to-day, Sir.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I would like this to be taken up to-day.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All right, we will now take up the Half-an-hour discussion.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The sugar industry affairs and sugar production are the subjects which have become one of the worst rackets in recent history in our country. The remedy that was suggested by the Prime Minister was this. She said, go without sugar, don't consume sugar, consume less sugar, etc. Sir, the other day when you were in the Chair I raised this point about the closure of textile mills. If there are shortages of dhoties and sarees, how can people get on? Is it the remedy to the problem? I wish to quote from the *Deccan Herald* which says:

"The sugar mills have not worked in the national interests and their activities have in the last one year earned them, according to a conservative computation, over Rs. 200 crores by what is euphemistically called market sale of sugar. That this is considered exploitation of the people in their distress none would doubt. But what is shocking is inactivity of the Government. There have been repeated appeals, threats and pless made to the sugar industrialists not to profiteer on the one side and also mulct the

cane growers on the other by depressing recovery rates of the cane. More than a mere suspicion exists in public mind that such activities openly conducted and acquiesced in by the administration could not have happened unless there is official connivance at higher levels....

....In effect, all the methods adopted by the Government to distribute sugar to the people at fair prices have only helped the sugar magnates to reap high profits on the 30 per cent share they are entitled to sell in the open market in days of scarcity."

17.32 hrs.

[SHRI R. D. BHANDARE in the Chair]

That is the picture of the sugar industry and the Government today. The sugar industry is fleecing the exchequer on the one hand and the cane-grower and the consumer on the other. Cane prices have remained static. The cane prices in 1967-68 remained at Rs. 2.75; the recovery rate was 9.4 per cent. In 1968-69 the figure was Rs. 2.75 against the same recovery. In 1969-70 it is the same recovery and same price. In 1970-71 also, it is the same recovery and the same price. The recovery manipulation is done by the sugar industry in collaboration with the excise inspectors. Excise inspectors are paid at the rate of Rs. 2,000 a month and the recovery rates are under-stated. It is brought down in order to deceive people all around. Recovery is declining. It was 10.4 per cent at one time, then it has come to 9.4 per cent. Why is it that recovery is not declining in gur and khandsari?

I suggest that a team of M.Ps. should go and do the work of physical verification and check to find out the actual recovery of sugar from sugarcane.

The statistics of the Reserve Bank of India reveals how the cost of sugarcane has gone up. Cultivation of sugarcane has become unattractive.

I will quote from the Report on Currency and Finance of the Reserve Bank of India. It says:

"The fall in sugarcane production is attributed mainly to unfavourable weather conditions and partly to diversion of area under sugarcane to alternative crops in view of the rising cost of sugarcane production."

Then, what is the position in regard to the canegrowers' arrears? Here is a news item from *the Times of India* which says:

"Arrears of payment to canegrowers by sugar mills in the country total over Rs. 40 crores. For UP alone, the millowners have been in default to the extent of Rs. 16 crores."

Increase in sugarcane price and making it unremunerative for the cultivators is the final outcome of the whole thing.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (PROF. SHER SINGH): To which year is he referring?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The date of this clipping is 25th July, 1971.

PROF. SHER SINGH: It is old.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Since then, the position has worsened. They are fleecing the people's exchequer. The sugar industry has grown at the cost of the State exchequer. Let me give you some figures to show the export subsidy that they have got. In 1961, it was Rs. 5.50 crores, in 1962 it was Rs. 14.20 crores, in 1963 it was Rs. 3.42 crores, in 1964, it was Rs. 2.10 crores, in 1965 it was Rs. 17.50 crores, in 1966, it was Rs. 20 crores and in 1967, it was Rs. 7.46 crores, making a total of Rs. 70.18 crores by 1967. This is the report that I have got, and the source is the reply given on the floor of the House.

As regards borrowings in 1965-66, the borrowing was Rs. 62.64 crores and in five years' time, that is, by 1970-71, it has jumped to Rs. 152.61 crores. From the nationalised banks alone, Rs. 47.48 crores was the debt in 1965-66 when it was in the private sector, but today in 1970-71, the latest figure for which I have got in my hand, it is Rs. 128.12 crores.

The balance of the money was taken from term financing institutions. There are other interesting figures to show that the total assets rose from Rs. 160.14 crores to Rs. 290.44 crores in 1970-71 in five years' time. Net fixed assets rose by about 50 per cent. Net sales and rebate and discount rose by about 50 per cent in five years' time. The total income rose from Rs. 104.74 crores in 1965-66 to about Rs. 154.12 crores. Managing directors' and managers' remuneration was Rs. 30 lakhs, and that has increased considerably. Selling commission itself has gone up from Rs. 75 lakhs to Rs. 99 lakhs and so on. They are making hay while the sun is shining.

Actually, the shortage as made out by the industry is untrue, and the consumption has been magnified. Here is a clipping from the *National Herald* of January, 1972. It says:

"There is no shortage of sugar as the industry is trying to make out, although the season's output is expected to be 34 lakhs tonnes against Rs. 37.50 lakhs tonnes last season. The total available supplies will be 48.50 lakhs tonnes including last season's carry-over, and this quantity is sufficient to meet the requirements of the country during the current season. The latest price hike is not the result of just market forces but of manoeuvring the industry. The Government, therefore, should act immediately to check the industry. The monetary measures which the Government have taken have not yielded the desired results during the last five months. The minimum margin on

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

bank advances against sugar has been changed thrice to reach as high a level as 65 per cent."

I shall now show how powerful these magnates are and how the whole thing is concentrated I shall give some figures to show the investment of some big business-houses. In the case of Birlas, it is Rs. 1606 lakhs, in the case of Dalmias, it is Rs. 367 lakhs, in the case of J & K, it is Rs. 209 lakhs, in the case of Kanodias, it is Rs 288 lakhs, in the case of Parrys, it is Rs. 755 lakhs, in the case of Ruias, it is Rs 446 lakhs, and in the case of Surajmal Nagarmal, it is Rs. 342 lakhs and in the case of V. Ramakrishnan, it is Rs 484 lakhs. These are to be found in the Monopoly Inquiry Commission's report.

The licensed capacity of the sugar industry is 53 million tonnes, but the installed capacity is 3.9 million tonnes. So, they are not deliberately producing the quantity which they ought to have produced. This is in the hands of monopolists, as I have explained just now.

A Congress MP, Shri Suryanarayana, once said in the Congress Parliamentary Party meeting that in Andhra Pradesh, the value of assets of sugar companies is Rs. 14.48 crores while profits in white money—forget about the black—is about Rs. 10.75 crores. Dr. Rangnekar has in a very recent article said:

"A large number of licensees of sugar mills have not taken any steps to instal the capacity sanctioned to them. Against a capacity of 5.87 million tonnes licensed, so far, the installed capacity was only 3.9 million tonnes in 1971-72. There is thus a gap of 1.4 million tonnes which if not covered in the next two years might lead to a serious shortage of sugar in the country".

The Bhargava Commission which was supposed to have submitted its report before this session has not done so. We are told an interim report has been submitted. We want

Shri Sher Singh to tell us here and now why the interim report has not been laid on the Table and circulated to members.

We have been reading about the UP Chief Minister's statements about nationalising the sugar industry in UP. We want to know what has happened to that. Or are these just vote-catching gimmicks?

I will conclude by saying why the industry should be nationalised. Sugar is an essential and sensitive commodity. Secondly, during the last two decades the mill owners have taken no steps to modernise or enlarge their activities. Money provided by the exchequer and other financing institutions have been swallowed for wrong purposes. During the last 20 years, the mill-owners clamoured for subsidy from Government and at the same time fleeced the consumers and the cane growers. The sugar millowners have not done any research to improve the quality of cane; nor have they paid the arrears to the growers. Government have already through advances given nearly Rs. 200 crores and have thus become a shareholder. That being so, there is no reason why the industry should not be nationalised.

As regards the question of payment of compensation, it should not deter Government from taking a decision. Parliament has assumed powers in this regard and it can fix the rate of compensation. There should be no difficulty about it.

What pains me most is that all these misdeeds of the sugar industry have been possible because of the lavish and liberal political donations a particular Minister in this Government\*\* had been collecting. They had been collecting crores of rupees. I am told the total exceeds Rs. 8.64 crores. That is why....

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is making a vague allegation.

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Do you want me to name him?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No, do not mention name.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** I say \*\* Rs. 8.64 crores were collected.

**SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY (Gorakhpur):** On a point of order.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** This is why the sugar millowners have been allowed to plunder the exchequer, a fleece the cane growers and the consumers. There is an editorial in the *Deccan Herald* which says that the fleecing by the sugar tycoons had been possible because of the Congress being hand-in-glove with them. They have collected money from these tycoons at the cost of the consumers and the cane growers.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The name he mentioned will be deleted.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** What about the others?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Both.

**SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra):** You are the only one that mentioned the name. Therefore, you will have to expunge your own remarks because Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu did not name him.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do not accuse the Chair.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** What is expunged?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The name is expunged.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** \*\*

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** You are a legally educated person, Sir. How can you do it under the rules?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You should have given notice.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** I have not mentioned names; I have said\*\* I did not mention the name.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Whatever you have mentioned later on must be deleted.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** You are exceeding your jurisdiction. You cannot do that.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** This is going to lead to a very serious situation in this Parliament. I have very strong views on this subject and therefore I plead with you to let me say something. He has not mentioned the name. If he has mentioned the name you may delete the name. You may not delete any allegation he might have made against the Government. We are here to make those allegations.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Names may be deleted.

**SHRI S M BANERJEE:** Names have been mentioned in this House and it is open to the Minister to contradict it. Why should not names be mentioned here?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** As your name is here, you ask your question.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Suppose I mention some names. What will happen?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** They will be deleted.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** I have great regard for \* \* Charges were made against him; he can contradict them. He is a Minister of the Government; his name can be mentioned and he can contradict it...

**SHRI P. M. MEHTA (Bhavnagar):** \*

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Nothing will go on record, since names have been deleted.

\*\* Not recorded

\* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** On a point of order. You will appreciate that I am not mentioning the name of a person who cannot come to the House. I am mentioning the name of a person who should remain present here throughout the proceedings, throughout the day... *(Interruptions)* I said that \* \* had collected Rs. 8.64 crores from sugar mills....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It cannot go on record; I rule it out....

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** This is parliamentary democracy, this is killing parliamentary democracy.

**SHRI P. M. MEHTA:** \*

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Nothing will go on record.... *(Interruptions)* You are making an allegation against a Minister without writing to the Minister. If you are to make such an allegation, you have to give notice.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** If somebody wants to praise a Minister, does he also give notice in advance?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The rule is very clear. Convention and usages are also clear. If any allegation is to be made against any Minister in any discussion, notice must be given to that Minister to enable him to come here and explain his position. In the absence of that procedure, that procedure not being followed, the names mentioned are deleted.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** I rise on a point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do not challenge the ruling;... *(Interruptions)* There are other methods of challenging the ruling.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** I have nothing against him. My point of order is this. Based on newspaper reports some proceedings took place

in the other House and I raised it in this House. I moved a call attention notice stating that two Ministers of the Central Government were in the pay rolls of the Birlas. This was mentioned here. When somebody provoked me, I mentioned two names. A privilege motion was moved against me by Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee and ultimately one minister made a statement that he was in Birla's employment but after becoming minister, he has given up the job. I have all regard for \* \*

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That does not entitle you to make allegations without giving notice. *(Interruptions)*.

**SHRI NIMBALKAR (Kolhapur):** Last year after the 25th March, some hon. members of this House who were not ministers any more made some radical statements and I had criticised them for making radical statements when they were no longer ministers, whereas when they were ministers, they behaved sensibly. At that time, the entire opposition, including Mr. Banerjee, got up and said "You should not criticise people unless they are in the House." Now they are doing it.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** On a point of order, under Rule 353, Sir. It says:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person.."

How do you describe \* \*. Any person, or an hon. member of this House? As a member of this House, \* \* is expected to remain present here throughout the day. If I said something which he thought was not right, he gets a chance to get up and repudiate it. If he chooses not to remain present, it is not my responsibility. Therefore, you cannot expunge it. If you are doing it, you are doing it outside your authority

\* Not recorded.  
\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

and jurisdiction. That is how parliamentary democracy is being butchered. I will keep on saying here and outside that \* \* collected Rs. 8.64 crores from the sugar industry. You cannot shut me out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not challenge my ruling.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You are going outside your authority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I am going beyond my jurisdiction, follow the procedure. So long as I am here, do not challenge my ruling. If I am not functioning within the framework of the procedural rules, you can challenge it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is what I am doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not the method.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: When and how do I challenge it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Read the rules.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have read it. I read it once a week. (Interruptions).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Let them collect the money also within the framework.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are more mischievous. Kindly ask the question.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I wish to know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that a tentative decision was taken by the Centre on the basis of a Congress resolution, or various resolutions in Bombay and other places where the AICC met, demanding the nationalisation of the sugar industry. The Government of Uttar Pradesh, headed by Shri Kamalpathi Tripathi, who is also a Congressman and who

has an eye on the Centre, has also recommended that the sugar industry in U.P. should be nationalised. That was the view point expressed by the Bihar Government also. Up to this time it was mentioned by the hon. Minister that a particular committee is sitting and until that committee submits its report it would be difficult for the Centre to take a decision. I am told that that committee has submitted its report. In the meanwhile the sugar prices have gone up. The sugar mill magnates are behaving in a very shabby manner and they are making profits even out of molasses and bagasse. Sugar industry is an industry where nothing is wasted. I know this because I have worked in the sugar industry for five years. I want to know why the sugar prices have been increased again. Secondly, why has no decision been taken yet to nationalise the sugar industry in the whole country? Is it due to the fact that there is terrible pressure on the Central Government by the sugar magnates not to nationalise this industry? May I know when a final decision is likely to be taken on this issue, after this government has got a massive majority, especially when even the Congress members have recommended the nationalisation of the sugar industry?

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) : सभापति जी, चीनी के सवाल को लेकर पूरे देश के अन्दर तुफान मचा हुआ है और भारतीय जनता का विशाल बहुमत बार-बार--जिस में कांग्रेस के भी बहुत सारे लोग शामिल हैं-- यह आवाज़ लगा रहा है कि चीनी मिलों का राष्ट्रीकरण होना चाहिए। लेकिन दुख है कि सरकार इस सिलसिले में अभी तक कोई भी कार्यवाही करने से इन्कार कर रही है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि चीनी मिलों के बारे में जांच करने

[श्री रामावतार शास्त्री]

के लिये जो जांच-समिति बनी थी, जिस की चर्चा संबंधित प्रश्न में भी है, उस ने कौन कौन सी सिफारिशें की थीं ?

(ख) उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने चीनी मिलों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के बारे में जो सिफारिश की है, उन के सिफारिश करने का आधार क्या है और उस आधार को स्वीकार करने से सरकार क्यों कतरा रही है ?

(ग) क्या यह बात सच है कि बहुत सारी चीनी मिलों के पास अपने गन्ने के फार्म हैं क्या यह भी सच है कि ऐसी चीनी मिलों के मुनाफे का रेशियो अन्य मिलों की बनिस्वत ज्यादा है ? अगर है तो उस का क्या व्यौरा है ?

(घ) क्या यह बात सच है कि सरकार चीनी मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने से इस लिये कतरा रही है कि कांग्रेस समेत जो पूंजीवादी व्यवस्था में विश्वास करने वाली अन्य पार्टियां हैं, उन तमाम दलों को इन चीनी मिलों से चन्दा मिलना है ?

18 hours.

(ङ) क्या सरकार ने चीनी का उत्पादन खर्चा और मुनाफे का तुलनात्मक अध्ययन किया है? यदि हा, तो वह किस परिणाम पर पहुंची है यानी मुनाफे का रेशियो क्या है ? क्या सरकार चीनी मिल-मालकों पर उनके बेतहाशा मुनाफे को देखते हुए कोई विशेष टैक्स लगाने का विचार रखती है ? यदि नहीं, तो क्यों ?

(च) क्या यह बात सच नहीं है कि किसानों को ईंधन का उचित मूल्य न मिलने के कारण ईंधन की खेती में विनोदित कमी हो रही है ? यदि हा, तो इसे रोकने के लिये सरकार क्या कर रही है ?

प्रश्न में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसानों का विश्व मालकों पर ईंधन की कीमत का कितना टोटल बकाया हिन्दुस्तान में पड़ा हुआ है और किसानों को उस बकाये को विलंबाने की दिशा में सरकार ने कौन से कदम उठाये हैं या उठाने का विचार रखती है ?

डा० लक्ष्मी नारायण पांडे (मंसौर): सभापति जी, यद्यपि चीनी नीति के बारे में सरकार ने बार बार उनके प्रचार की घोषणाएं की हैं, कभी 40 प्रतिशत की फ्री मेल, कभी 30 प्रतिशत की फ्री सेल, कभी पार्ल कन्ट्रोल और कभी फुल कन्ट्रोल। इस के बावजूद यदि किसी को सब से ज्यादा हानि हुई है तो वह है उपभोक्ता और गन्ना उत्पादक। उपभोक्ता को महंगी चीनी मिलती है और गन्ना उत्पादक को उचित मूल्य नहीं मिल रहा है। यद्यपि सरकार द्वारा कहा गया कि हम रिकवरी के प्रतिशत के आधार पर गन्ने का मूल्य तय करते हैं लेकिन वह किसान के लिए ठीक प्रकार से व्यवहारिक मूल्य नहीं कहा जा सकता। कृषि मंत्री जी ने यहां पर 14 नवम्बर को जो वक्तव्य दिया उसमें स्वीकार किया है कि वास्तव में गन्ना उत्पादकों को जो मूल्य दिया गया है या दिया जाने वाला है उसके अन्दर हमारे देश में विभिन्न प्रदेशों में काफी अन्तर है। दक्षिण भारत में एक मूल्य दिया जाता है तो उत्तर भारत में दूसरा मूल्य दिया जाता है। यदि मध्य प्रदेश में एक मूल्य दिया जाता है तो बिहार में दूसरा मूल्य दिया जाता है। मैं मानना चाहता हूँ कि रिकवरी समान है, यदि



काम करने के दिन समान है तो उत्तर भारत में गन्ने का मूल्य अधिक और दक्षिण भारत में मूल्य कम या मध्य प्रदेश में मूल्य कम और बिहार में मूल्य अधिक—इसका क्या कारण है? क्या मंत्री जी यह बतायेंगे कि सरकार ने यह घोषणा की थी कि चीनी का मूल्य बढ़ने नहीं देगे, दो रुपये प्रति किलो मूल्य रहेगा लेकिन उसके बाद लगातार चीनी के दाम बढ़े हैं तो उमका क्या कारण है? और अभी तो अंतरिम रिपोर्ट के आधार पर 20 पैसा प्रति किलो दाम बढ़ाया गया है, आगे और भी दाम बढ़ाये जा सकते हैं। तो क्या सरकार इस अपने उस वक्तव्य पर दृढ़ है कि चीनी के दाम दो रुपये प्रति किलो से अधिक नहीं बढ़ाये जायेंगे और जो दाम बढ़े हैं उनको घटाया जायेगा? इसके साथ साथ विभिन्न राज्यों में गन्ने के मूल्य में जो अन्तर है, गन्ना उत्पादकों को जा कीमत दी जाने वाली है उसके अन्तर को मिटाने की दिशा में सरकार क्या करने वाली है?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (PROF. SHER SINGH): Mr. Chaitman, Sir, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu has raised several points. The first point is about profits made by the sugar mills. I agree with him—I do not know the figure exactly, whether it is Rs. 200 crores or less—that there have been profits.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Wind-fall money.

PROF. SHER SINGH: Some mills have made profits. As was stated by the Minister of Food and Agriculture the other day in this House, we are going into this question, how to mop up the extra profits earned by some mills; we are thinking whether we can impose some special tax to

take that money, if it is not paid to the cane-growers.

About the rise in the cost of production of sugar, as he has said—he quoted from the Reserve Bank report—there is rise in the cost of production of sugar....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sugar-cane.

PROF. SHER SINGH: Sugarcane and sugar also. If the price of sugarcane increases.. (Interruption) the cost of production of sugar goes up.

We announced here the new policy on 29th August; the hon. Member must remember that we increased the statutory minimum price of sugarcane from 7.37 to 8; previously it was linked to 94 per cent recovery; now it will be linked to 85 per cent recovery, there is a difference of 20 per cent.

About the recovery rate, we are now thinking of ways and means how, in addition to the machinery that we have got now, the excise inspectors, to know how much production has been done and what is the recovery, we can have some other machinery also which would be more effective, so that we can know every time what is the real recovery.

About the arrears in respect of sugarcane, I may inform the hon. Member—he was quoting the old figure of July 1971—of the latest figures as on the 30th September 1972: the total cane price was Rs. 280.98.00,000 and the price actually paid was Rs. 277.22,00,000; therefore, the arrears are only Rs. 3,75,00,000; it is about 12 per cent....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I do not believe it.

PROF. SHER SINGH: These are the correct figures. We have verified. In 1971 the arrears amounted to Rs. 49 crores. Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu said that in 1971 the arrears were Rs. 40 crores. The arrears were even

[Prof. Sher Singh]

Rs. 49 crores, but then they were brought down. We took some measures. I have informed the House more than once that the Reserve Bank now, while giving loans to the mill-owners, have opened a separate account for the price of sugarcane to be paid and that is adhered to, and as a result of that, the total arrears have come down considerably and now it is only 1.2 per cent.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Only in letter and never in spirit. (*Inter-ruption*)

PROF. SHER SINGH: He quoted from *National Herald*. He said that the estimated production of sugar in 1971-72 was 34 lakh tonnes and that the total, adding to that the carry-over of the last year, was 48 lakh tonnes. It is not so. The total production was only 31.12 lakh tonnes and so, the total availability of sugar was about 45 lakh tonnes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The *National Herald* is your Party paper.

PROF. SHER SINGH: The consumption was a little more than 39 lakhs tonnes. So, there was carry-over of about 5.8 lakhs tonnes on the 30th September when the present sugar year began.

The hon. Member made a remark about the licensed and installed capacity. The licensed capacity is 5.3 million tonnes and the installed capacity is 3.9 million tonnes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why is it so?

PROF. SHER SINGH: All the new licences which are issued are in the co-operative sector....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am only wanting to know if there is a parallel of such a thing in any other industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have exceeded your right to ask questions.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Under what Rule?

PROF. SHER SINGH: I am giving reasons. All these new licences have been given in the co-operative sector, to the co-operative societies. Now, sometimes, it is difficult for them to collect all the money that is needed from the share-holders. Then, there was some difficulty due to shortage of steel. We are now not importing any machinery. We are manufacturing all the machinery in the country and because of shortage of steel now....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We want a specific reply to the arguments that are placed. Why should not the industry be nationalised?

PROF. SHER SINGH: The Reserve Bank is making more money available so that the co-operative societies can put up these factories. And the machinery manufacturers also have been asked to manufacture at least 12 machineries a year. Now they are doing four or five. We have taken it up with the Steel Ministry to make more steel available.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What about nationalisation?

PROF. SHER SINGH: As per the interim report of the Bhargava Commission that was received, I have categorically stated in reply to a question.... (*Interruptions*) There is no question of evasive or partial reply. I have stated that they have not given the report about nationalisation.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why not circulate the interim report?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The UP Government has said that it should be nationalised. The Bihar Government has said that it should be nationalised.... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SHER SINGH: I am saying that they have not given their report about nationalisation of sugar industry.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: But about profit-sharing they have given the report.

PROF. SHER SINGH: Yes, about profit-sharing, about stability, about sugar cane prices they have given. We are examining all these things. As I said, as soon as we have examined it, we will place the report on the Table of the House.

About nationalisation by the States, legal view was given by the Attorney-General and the Solicitor General that the States are competent to nationalise it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I rise on a point of order. It is the State Government of UP that has said that if it is the question of compensation, the UP Government is not in a position to pay the compensation. He is trying to shove; the responsibility on the State Government. Will they allow the State Government to nationalise the sugar industry without compensation?

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: This is the report of the Attorney-General. This is the report of the Advocate-General. This is the report of the Law Secretary. I wanted to know categorically from the Minister as to what he is doing about nationalisation. This is the report submitted by the Government of India. Why is he not doing?

श्री सतपाल कपूर (पटियाला) : यह भी बतलायें कि यू पी गवर्नमेंट ने कम्पेन्सेशन के लिये 100 करोड़ रुपये मांगे हैं ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly take your seat. This is not the way you can raise questions.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The UP Government's explanation is clear. This Government is colluding with the mill-owners. So, they are not willing to nationalise the sugar industry. What is the use of hearing all this? We walk out. We are not going to hear what they are going to say. We know their reply. They are hand-in-glove with the mill-owners. Shame on you.

Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Ramavatar Shastri and Shri C. K. Chandrapan then left the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU. Are you going to nationalise or not?

PROF. SHER SINGH: By 28th February 1973 we will get the report of the Commission. After that, this question will be decided. It is only 3 months from now on. The Commission is also meeting the hon. Members of both the Houses, of all the parties, and they will take evidence on this point about nationalisation. They are doing this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I gave you certain points. Most of the finances of the sugar industry has come from the public financial institutions and nationalised banks; in actual fact, Government has contributed most of the money for the sugar industry. Why are you evading this? There is this amount of Rs 8.64 crores which is what is playing havoc. (Interruptions) I cannot hear these cock-and-bull \*\* They are all hogus stories.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, that word is unparliamentary. It will be expunged.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We walk out in protest against this Government's attitude of complete surrender to the monopolists and the sugar magnates from whom they have taken heavy donations; on be-

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

half of the party \*\* has taken an amount of Rs 864 crores of the poor country's money A kilo of sugar which costs one rupee is being sold to the consumer at Rs 4 Shame on you It is a consumer item You are plundering You are joining hands with monopolists You talk about socialism Shame on you I hate all these\*\* (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) Kindly order its expunction

MR CHAIRMAN This will be expunged

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu then left the House

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र पांडे (खलीलावाद)

सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य गलत आरोप लगा कर जा रहे हैं। मैं आप के माध्यम से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह मेरी बात सुने। मुझे विश्वस्त सुनो। स सूचना मिली है कि श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु गन्ना मिल-मालिकों के पास चन्दा लेने के लिये गये थे और उन लोगों ने देने में इन्कार कर दिया। \*\*और इस तरह से अपनी पार्टी की स्तुति बढ़ाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं।

डा० लक्ष्मीनारायण पांडेय सरकार की चीनी सम्बन्धी नीति बिल्कुल असफल रही है। चीनी के दाम निरन्तर बढ़ रहे हैं। गन्ना उत्पादकों को भी ठीक मूल्य नहीं मिल रहा है। उपभोक्ता भी परेशान हो रहे हैं। उन्हें भी अधिक दामों पर शक्कर मिल रही है।

सरकार अपनी नीति को ठीक करने में असफल रही है। इस कारण से सरकार की तरफ से जो बक्तव्य दिया जा रहा है वह समुचित नहीं है। हमें उस को सुनने से लाभ नहीं है।

Dr Lavmanaram Pandeya then left the House

श्री ईश्वर चौधरी (गया) †

MR CHAIRMAN This will not go on record

Shri Ishwar Chaudhry then left the House

प्रो० शेर सिंह एक दा बातों का जिक्र डा० लक्ष्मीनारायण पांडेय ने किया। उन्होंने कहा कि नीति ऐसी बनी कि उपभोक्ता को लाभ नहीं हुआ, किमान को लाभ नहीं हुआ। हमने जो नीति बनाई है उस में तीन बातों का ध्यान रक्खा है। पहली बात यह कि किमान को ज्यादा पैसा मिल सके। पार्श्व कंट्रोल में जो पैसा प्रायः 30 परसेंट फ्री सेल का उस में से किमान को मिले और वह मिल रहा है। आज उत्तर प्रदेश में 12 25 २० मिल रहा है, पंजाब और हरियाणा में 12 50 २० मिल रहा है, ईस्टर्न यू०पी० में 11 25 २० मिल रहा है।

श्री इय्यान्नरत्न मिश्र (बेगूसराय) मुख्य बात यह है कि किसानों को मिल रहा है इस से हम को खुशी है। लेकिन उपभोक्ताओं को जो ज्यादा देना पड़ रहा है उस के बारे में आप का क्या जवाब है। प्राफिट्स में आप क्यों इस को ऐंजाबं नहीं होने देंगे ?

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair

†Not recorded

MR CHAIRMAN This is not a regular discussion This is only Half-an-hour discussion You cannot ask a question unless your name is there

श्री इश्वरानन्दन बिभ्र वह कुछ बतला नहीं रह है ।

श्री० शेर सिंह मने बतलाया कि डम से तीन लाभ हुए । एक तो इस पॉलिसी के मुताबिक किमाना को ज्यादा पैसा मिल रहा है, दूसर उपभोक्ता का भी कम पैसा देना पड़ेगा 70 प्रतिशत के लिये ।

एक स्थानीय सदस्य बिहार के बारे में बतलाइये ।

श्री० शेर सिंह बिहार में भी किमाना को 11 25 रु० मिल रहा है । मैं कह रहा था कि उपभोक्ता को कम देना पड़ेगा जो एग्जुअल कान्ट्रॉल प्रोडक्शन है उम से कम देना पड़ेगा क्योंकि हम 8 रु० के हिसाब से कान्ट्रॉल प्रोडक्शन लगायेंगे और मिल वाले 11 25 रु० के हिसाब से लगायेंगे । कान्ट्रॉल प्रोडक्शन जो हम लगायेंगे उम के आधार पर लेवी प्राइस फिक्स की गई है जो कि 2 20 पैसे आनी है । चूकि केन की प्राइस 7 37 रु० से 8 रु० हमने फिक्स की इस लिये मिनिमम स्टैट्यूटरी प्राइस भी उस की बजह से थोड़ी सी बढ़ी । मिलप्रोवर्स गन्ने का भाव 11 25 रु०, 12 रु० और 12 25 रु० दे रहे है

उमके कारण चीनी का भाव 20 पैसे प थोड़ी ज्यादा होगा, यह मैं मानता हू । लेकिन जो उपभोक्ता है उमको हम कम में दे रहे है सत्तर प्रतिशत । जो तीस परसेंट है और जो खले बाजार में बिकती है वह जिम में पैसा ज्यादा पैसा देने का है वह उमको खरीद सकता है । यह जरूर है कि बिहार वगैरह प्रदेशों में, कुछ प्रदेशों से ऐसी मित्रायत आनी है कि वहा चीनी के वितरण का जो मिलमिला है वह ठीक नहीं है । जिन प्रदेशों में बाट का मिलमिला, वितरण का मिलमिला, ठीक है, जहा मशीनरी अच्छी है वहा कोई दिक्कत नहीं है । जैम वैस्ट बंगाल, केरल, महाराष्ट्र में, तथा दूसरी जगह जहा वह कमजोर है, वहा मशीनरी को मजबूत करने की कोशिश कर रहे है

श्री इश्वरानन्दन बिभ्र जो यह कह रहे है कि उपभोक्ताओं को ठीक कीमत पर चीनी मिल रही है वह बिल्कुल गलत है ।

श्री० शेर सिंह तीसरा लाभ यह है कि इसकी प्रोडक्शन भी बढ़ रही है । पार्शाल कंट्रोल जो किया है उम में कुछ इसैटिव दिए गए है और उमका नतीजा हम देख रहे है । पंद्रह नवम्बर तक इस साल ढाई लाख टन के करीब चीनी की पैदावार हुई है । जबकि पिछले साल एक लाख बारह हजार हुई थी, उपभोक्ताओं को कम दाम देना पड़ेगा, किसानों को ज्यादा पैसा मिलेगा, पैदावार बढ़ेगी, यह तीनों चीजे हो रही है ।