

Mr. Chairman: There are only three or four minutes left before we take up other business. If the hon. Member can finish within three or four minutes, I will certainly call upon him.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Oh, yes. Sir...

एक आननीय सदस्य : हिन्दी में बोलिए।

पंडित के० सी० शर्मा : मुझे दो तीन मिनट में केवल यही बात कहनी है कि मुझे बहुत ही आश्चर्य हुआ कि मेरे लायक दोस्त ने एक ऐसी बहस की कि साहब मैं अपने बच्चे को पढ़ाता हूँ, किसी पर क्या जुल्म करता हूँ, क्या ज्यादाती करता हूँ। मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या कोई आदमी अपने बच्चे को पढ़ा सकता है यदि पुलिस उस की रक्षा न करे या बाहर के हुमले से फौज उस की रक्षा न करे। तो जो पुलिस या फौज जो सोसाइटी की रक्षा करती है तो यह बर्गर इस ब्याल से करती है कि किसी का धर्म क्या है। जिस तरह से आज समाज का संगठन फल फूल रहा है उस में किसी आदमी का यह कहना है कि मैं अपने बच्चे को पढ़ाता हूँ, या अपनी जाति के लिए काम कर रहा हूँ या अपने धर्म से सम्बन्धित आदमियों के लिए काम कर रहा हूँ मैं समझता हूँ कि समाज के हित में नहीं होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक है कि एक आदमी एक गांव में पैदा होता है, वहां रहता है, वहां रुपया कमाता है तो वह अपने गांव के लिए काम कर सकता है। लेकिन मैं पूछता हूँ कि जब वह गांव के बच्चों के साथ खेलता था तो क्या सिर्फ ब्राह्मणों के बच्चों के ही साथ खेलता था मुसलमान के बच्चे के साथ नहीं खेलता था। तो किसी को क्या अधिकार है कि जिस सम्पत्ति को उस ने सब की सहानुभूति और सहायता से पैदा किया है उस के लिए वह यह कहे कि मैं तो इस को केवल ब्राह्मण के लिए छोड़ सकता हूँ लेकिन मुसलमान के लिए नहीं छोड़ सकता। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसा सोचना और ऐसा करना समाज के संगठन पर कुठाराघात है

और जो आज कल समाज की नीति है, जिस तरह से समाज का संगठन चल रहा है उस की जड़ में कुल्हाड़ा मारना है। ऐसा सम्भव नहीं हो सकता। यह सवाल नहीं है कि यह उचित है या अनुचित, बल्कि मैं तो यह कहता हूँ कि यह सम्भव नहीं हो सकता। ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि देशमुख और भगत साहब के जो संशोधन हैं वह मान्य हैं और उन को मंजूर करना चाहिए।

Mr. Chairman: How can both the amendments be accepted at one and the same time?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: I meant the amendment of Shri Bhagat.

समाज का एक टुकड़ा, एक गांव या कोई दूसरी छोटी जगह एक आदमी के रहने और उस के रुपया पैदा करने में सहायता दे सकते हैं लेकिन हिन्दू या मुसलमान होना यह सहायता नहीं दे सकता और जिस की मदद से जो कुछ पैदा किया गया है उस को उस से लाभ पहुंचाना चाहिए। यह सीधी न्याय और धर्म की बात है। इस में कोई कुटिलता की, चालाकी की या खास शक्ल की बात नहीं है।

Mr. Chairman: This debate will now be adjourned and we will take up the next subject.

SUGAR AND SUGAR-CANE PRICES

Sardar Lal Singh (Ferozepur-Ludhiana): When I expressed the desire the other day for one-hour discussion, I found ready support from the leading Members of all parties in this House so that it is a matter of gratification that the subject is going to be discussed above petty party politics.

Further, I have the satisfaction of echoing the feelings of all the patriotic and intelligent classes of people who feel that justice ought to be done to the cultivators. (Interruption).

You might have read the other day news from U.P. and Bihar of the meetings that were held by the Chief

Ministers of U.P. and Bihar and they have supported the cause of the cultivators. Coming straight to the question of sugar-cane prices, I had said last time that there were only two ways of dealing with the problem, namely, (a) to guarantee to the cultivator the cost of production and leave him a reasonable margin of profit, a procedure which should be satisfactory to both the consumer and the grower or (b) to allow full play to the law of "Supply and demand" so that if the cultivators in years of over-production or in years of glut have got to accept a very low price, they may expect to get high prices in years of low production. But the present price-fixation policy is such which works always to the detriment of the cultivator because if there happens to be over-production, then, of course, he is allowed to go to the wall. For instance, only two years ago when the price of *gur* had gone down to rupees five a maund against the controlled rate of Rs. 20 in India and the prevalent rate of Rs. 25 in Pakistan, the Government did not care to do anything. While the cultivators were crying in agony some of the industrialists and some of the "high-ups" here had the hardihood even to issue statements expressing satisfaction at the lowering of prices. On the other hand, if there is low production in any year, then control price is fixed to deprive the cultivator of the chances of getting good prices in that year.

The third alternative is to fix the price one year in advance. In Canada the price is actually fixed 18 months in advance to enable the cultivator to decide what crops to grow and on what area. Here, in India as you know, the price is fixed at a time when the crop is ready, when the cultivator has incurred all expenses and when he has got no other alternative but to sell the crop at any price he can get. In this connection, what Pandit Pant, the Chief Minister of U.P. said, a few days back, is noteworthy. He said that if the price of sugar could not be reduced due to the then prevalent high prices of *gur* and *khandsari*, then there was no justification for reducing the price of sugar-cane last year. The cane-

growers were a weak party; cane being perishable could not be withheld from sale. They had, therefore, to agree to the reduced price. It cannot be denied that they deserved better and more sympathetic consideration. He said the Board should keep this in view while fixing the can prices. The House will agree that this is one-way traffic that is working all the time to the detriment of the cultivator; whether there is over-production or there is low production, it is the cultivator who is expected to suffer loss every time.

The report of the Tariff Board is frequently made use of in favour of reducing the prices, without realising the fact that the recommendations of the Tariff Board have turned out to be a pious wish, just as the Central Government thought that India would be self-sufficient in food by 1950 or 1951—a pious hope no doubt—but which has remained unfulfilled and may remain unfulfilled because of the present policy of the Government. The real question is, has the cost of production gone down since the Tariff Board recommended that price? It will not be denied that the cost of production, if anything at all, has gone up.

Secondly, if the Tariff Board recommendations were so sacrosanct, how is it that the Central Government, in consultation with the States, had fixed the price at rupees two per maund in 1948 and subsequently at Rs. 1/12 in disregard of the recommendation of the Tariff Board? (*Interruption*).

Last year there was a drastic cut of 25 per cent. as you all know. It was done in the face of the bitterest opposition from the cane growers who even observed a day of mourning. It was done against the advice of important cane-growing States like the Punjab, U.P. and Bihar; it was done against the warning of the Indian Sugar-cane Committee which is the highest body concerned with sugar, and which warned the Government that a sudden and drastic cut would prove disastrous to the industry. It was done against the advice of the sugar-cane experts who warned the Government that this low price would leave no incentive to

[Sardar Lal Singh]

the cane-cultivators to use fertilisers or insecticides. All these protests were ignored on the plea that the price of sugar had got to be reduced in the interests of the consumer.

Now, we have had the experience. Has the consumer benefited to the least extent? The cultivators were deprived of the hard-earned income of 20 crores of rupees on the cane that was supplied to the factories alone. But, has there been a corresponding decrease in the price of sugar? I am sorry to note—and all of you would agree—that it is not so. Then, are not the cultivators at present justified in demanding from the Government the *pro rata* share of the extra profits that have been earned by sugar mills?

In this connection, I got only the other day, very interesting data from Shri Krishnamoorthy and Mr. Ranga Reddy, one of whom is the General Secretary of the Hyderabad State Cane-Growers Association and the other is the Vice-President of the District Congress Committee there. I have no reason to doubt their statement because the Nizam Sugar Factory is practically a Government concern and the chairman of the board of directors is no less a person than the Minister himself. According to the statement that has been supplied to me, this factory crushed last year 392,000 tons of sugar-cane as against 396,000 tons in the preceding year, that is, 4,000 tons less than in the previous year. But the actual production of sugar on account of higher sugar recovery, was 40,000 bags more than in the preceding year which means an income of about 30 lakhs of rupees extra. Over and above that, the Control rate was only Rs. 1/5 per maund as against Rs. 1/12 in the preceding year; through this also they got another 40 lakhs of rupees or a total profit of 70 lakhs of rupees and no wonder that this factory is said to have declared a profit of Rs. 80 lakhs last year. When the sugar-cane growers approached the sugar mill and asked for *pro rata* share of the profits, a very interesting reply was received, stating that no doubt

there had been profit in sugar manufacture but there had been enormous loss—enormous is the word that is used—there had been enormous loss in the production of cane which the factory had to produce. Could there be a greater proof than this that the actual cost of production was more than the control rate of Rs. 1/5? This is the state of affairs of a sugar mill which grows cane on scientific lines and they are said to have suffered a loss of Rs. 200 per acre even though they have allowed Rs. 1/6/4 per maund for cane instead of Rs. 1/5 control rate.

Our public is sometimes fed on cheap slogans and mutilated statistics. For instance, they say that the fall in prices does not affect production; secondly that sugar production is at the expense of food production and thirdly, Indian sugar has got to be cheap so that it may compete in the foreign market. I feel I must expose the fallacy or hollowness of these statements.

Firstly, that the price does not affect production: the price of cane in 1946-47 was Rs. 1/4 and the production of sugar was nine lakh tons. In 1947-48 the price rose to rupees two and the production went up to 10.7 lakh tons. (*Interruption*) I have got limited time. If I am interrupted, the Chairman will have to give me more time.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Kidwai): If the price is raised this year, then will production rise?

Sardar Lal Singh: I am afraid that I cannot get into a discussion for I will lose my time. This time will have to be deducted, Sir.

In the following two years the price was reduced to Rs. 1/10; the production also fell down to ten and 9.7 lakh tons respectively. In 1950-51, price was raised to Rs. 1/12 and production went up to 11 lakh tons, with the highest figure in the following year that is 15 lakh tons. This definitely shows that the higher the price, the greater the sugar production.

It is sometimes said that the acreage under cultivation is not affected. Those who understand the elements of agriculture know that a fall or rise in prices cannot affect the acreage *at once* because the land for sugar-cane is prepared about a year in advance. The cultivator cannot do anything but to sow the same crop even though he may know that he is not going to get a higher price. Further, in the case of cane, the crop once sown, has got to be kept as *ratoon* for one or two years.

An Hon. Member: Three years.

Sardar Lal Singh: So some times these statistics are highly misleading. That is why some people strongly feel that we must not rely too much on statistics. In spite of this, however, when the price of cane was low in 1946-47, the acreage was about 34 lakhs, but with the rise in price of cane, the area since then has varied from 37 to 43 lakh acres, definitely showing increase in production.

A few days ago, in answer to one of my Short Notice Questions, the hon. Minister referred to a progressive farmer in Punjab, evidently referring to me. Personally, I feel that it is not advisable, it is not good taste, to enter into personal discussions. We are discussing general principles. But let me mention that, firstly, the information that he gave was wrong; secondly, instead of getting information through other sources, spending so much Government money, he could have asked me and I would have gladly given him the data. Thirdly, there are other cane-growers in the vicinity, including a retired Director of Agriculture, and another retired officer of the Agriculture Department, and their records will show that the area under cane on their farms has gone down greatly. We should always discuss matters on principle. It is bad taste to indulge in personal references; nor does it serve any useful purpose. It may be a good political tactic, but it is not conducive to the proper understanding of the problem, nor to the creation of a better atmosphere. So I would not like to further indulge in affairs of individuals.

The second slogan that has got publicity in the papers and also certain currency, is that sugar production affects food production. In this connection it should be remembered that sugar-cane occupies only one per cent. of the total cultivable area in India—to be exact 1.2 per cent. If there is an increase of even five lakh acres under cane, it will mean only one to two acres per thousand acres. Can it make any great difference in food production? Apart from this, there are 60 million acres, which remain fallow. The area is good, it is cultivable. In the face of this, increase of half a million acres under sugar-cane is not going to affect appreciably the food production. These are some of the statements which are taken at their face value by the public without being properly analysed. Further why should it be presumed that the increased production of sugar will be on account of increased acreage? It could as well be by better cultivation, proper manuring and by other methods. As is usually the case if the prices are good, people are inclined to use fertilisers, they are inclined to control pests and they are inclined to take other measures to get higher yield. Consequently, the area under sugar-cane need not necessarily increase. In this connection, if Government were to enquire they will find that the quantity of fertilisers purchased by the cultivators during periods of low prices would be small. On account of the low prices of their products, cultivators have no incentive to spend money on fertilisers. That is the experience of agricultural experts.

I have some other very important points to make, but as the time is short, I would skip over them. It has been said that the price of sugar has got to be reduced in order to enable Indian sugar to compete in foreign markets. Here again we must understand why the price of sugar in other countries is low. In Cuba, yield of cane is 62 tons per acre as against 13 tons in India; in Java it is 56 tons. Further, because of superior varieties, sugar recovery in other countries is also high. Apart from all that, another factor that contributes to the low

[Sardar Lal Singh]

price of sugar in foreign countries is that they utilise all the waste material of cane for the manufacture of by-products. For instance the sugar-cane leaves and bagasse are used for cardboard, packing materials, insulating materials and so on. Nothing is allowed to be wasted. If there is no by-product industry in India, is the cultivator to be blamed for it? Is it not the Government or the industrial interests which should be held responsible? Why should the lowering of prices be at the expense of the farmer alone? Government is taking something like rupees five per maund as excise duty and cess. Why can it not forego a small portion out of this? Why can the factories not be made to realise the necessity of improving their production methods? There is immense scope for it.

Then again another fraud is committed on the farmer. Government allows only four annas per maund for the molasses that it takes for the manufacture of potable alcohol and power alcohol, whereas the value of sugar in these molasses is of the order of rupees seven to eight per maund.

Shri Kidwai: Not now.

Sardar Lal Singh: These are the figures given in Government statistics. I am prepared to present it to the hon. Minister. This is nothing short of a fraud on the farmer—allowing four annas to the factory for molasses and expecting that sugar should be cheap in India! There is ample scope for the use of power alcohol. For instance, the total quantity of petrol used in India is 240 million gallons. If 20 per cent. alcohol is mixed in the same we shall require a something like 45 million gallons, whereas the total quantity of alcohol that can be produced from all the molasses that we produce here will be of the order of 25 million gallons only. So that you may convert all your molasses into power alcohol and still not be able to meet your internal demand.

Secondly because the price of molasses is so low, the cost of manufacture

of alcohol is very low in India. I have not got the latest figures, but the Indian Tariff Board in 1938 had calculated that the price of manufacturing alcohol in India was only six annas as compared to Rs. 2/8 in Italy; Rs. 2/8 in Germany; Rs. 1/8 in Australia and Rs. 0/12/0 even in the United States.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has already taken 20 minutes. After all the discussion is only for two hours. Very many hon. Members want to take part in it. Twenty minutes is the maximum time that can be allowed to the hon. Member.

Sardar Lal Singh: I shall take only two more minutes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Then I should have rung the bell earlier.

Sardar Lal Singh: I do not think I have exceeded my time-limit.

Mr. Chairman: This argument between the hon. Member and the Chair will itself take two minutes. I would ask him to finish his arguments within one or two minutes.

Sardar Lal Singh: There are so many important points to be discussed which would have enlightened hon. Members. But I want to say only this. If sugar has got to be cheapened to enable Indian sugar to compete in foreign markets, the reduction could also take place at the expense of Government: that is the Government and the industrial interests should also share in the sacrifice.

Coming now to the price: in 1951 the price of cane was fixed at Rs. 1/12 per maund as against Rs. 30/8 ex-factory price of sugar. Before that, the price was rupees two. This incentive had resulted in the highest production of sugar in India in 1951. Instead of making the best use of the happy situation and consolidating the sugar industry, Government thought it fit to kill the goose which lays the golden egg. What has been the result? The consumer has not benefited; the cultivator feels disgusted and the industry has got a severe set-back, with the result, that production of sugar

has gone down and the country has to import this year one lakh tons of sugar.

Shri Kidwai: Two lakhs.

Sardar Lal Singh: The production of one lakh tons of sugar in the country itself will provide employment for a large number of our countrymen, which is an urgent necessity. We should, therefore, not allow Government to import any quantity, especially when we can produce it locally.

There is a danger of the history of 1949 of worst blackmarket being repeated. There are other points which I wanted to discuss, but I am sorry there is no time.

डा० युगल किशोर सिन्हा (मुजफ्फरपुर उत्तरपश्चिम) : मैं आप को संक्षेप में शुगर इंडस्ट्री के इतिहास की ओर ले जाना चाहता हूँ। जब १९३२ में प्रोटेक्शन दिया गया तो लोगों ने समझा कि शुगर इंडस्ट्री को प्रोटेक्शन देने का मतलब यह है कि मैन्युफैक्चरर्स के साथ साथ जो ग्रोअर्स हैं, जो किसान हैं, जो मजदूर हैं, जो कन्जूमर्स हैं, सब को इस से सुविधा मिलेगी। लेकिन इस के बाद की घटनाओं से पता चला कि जो कुछ सुविधाएँ दी गईं उस का पूरा फायदा मैन्युफैक्चरर लोगों ने लिया और उन लोगों ने जो कुछ रुपया लगाया था, उस का दुगुना, तिगुना कुछ ही सालों के अन्दर उन्होंने कमा लिया। किसानों को लूटा, मजदूरों को लूटा और कन्जूमर्स को लूटा। जब सन् १९३७/३८ में कांग्रेस की सरकार बनी उस समय उस का ध्यान इस ओर गया और भूके किसानों और जनता की आवाज़ उस के कानों में गई। उस वक्त यह कंट्रोल यानी केन की मिनिमम प्राइस फिक्स करने का निश्चय हुआ। पहले तो किसानों के नाम पर, उन के हितों की रक्षा के खयाल से मिनिमम प्राइस की बात की गई थी किन्तु कुछ ही दिनों के बाद देखा गया कि उस से भी फायदा मिल मालिकों का ही होता था और जैसा पहले हुआ करता

था वैसे ही मिल मालिक की ही बात इस में चलने लगी।

बिहार और यू० पी० चीनी व्यवसाय की ७५ फी सदी चीनी पैदा करते हैं। इस लिये मुनासिब था कि बिहार और यू० पी० में एक कंट्रोल बोर्ड बने। और एक ज्वायंट कंट्रोल बोर्ड बना जिस कंट्रोल बोर्ड के जरिये ईख की कीमत की सिफारिशें भारत सरकार के सामने आती थीं और भारत सरकार उसी के अनुसार फैसला भी किया करती थी। लेकिन सड़ाई के जमाने में जब देखा गया कि मिल मालिकों को इस तरह के दाम से लाभ नहीं हो रहा है तो उन लोगों ने उस समय यह नारा लगाया कि फूड कल्टिवेशन के लिये अधिक जमीन चाहिए इस लिये कुछ जमीन रीलीज की जाय। किसानों को दाम कम दिया जाय। दाम कम देने से लोग ईख की खेती कम करेंगे और फूड के लिये जमीन मिलेगी। लेकिन इस इंडस्ट्री का काम नहीं चला। जब उन लोगों ने देखा कि जमीन इतनी कम हो गई कि शायद शुगर इंडस्ट्री ही बर्बाद न हो जाय और लोगों को ईख ही न मिले तो कंट्रोल बोर्ड के मिल मालिक ईख के दाम को आगे बढ़ाने की बात करने लगे और उन के प्रभाव से इस का दाम कभी बढ़ता था और कभी घटता था। अब हाल में जनता की सरकार हुई है। अब नया नारा कन्जूमर्स का लग रहा है उपभोक्ताओं के नाम पर दाम कम किया जाय। लेकिन उपभोक्ताओं के नाम पर दाम कम किये जाने में किसानों का ही सँकेफाइस होगा। और कन्जूमर्स को भी मदद नहीं होगी। चीनी का जो कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन है उस का करीब १६ परसेन्ट सरकार के टैक्स में जाता है। मैं ने अभी आप से अर्ज किया कि मिल मालिकों ने जितना रुपया लगाया है, अगर उन के बैलेन्स शीट का हिसाब देखा जाय तो उन्होंने ने उतना रुपया इंडस्ट्री से ले लिया है फिर भी आज दस परसेन्ट प्राफिट ब्लाक

[ठा० युगल किशोर सिंहा]

कंपिटल पर उन को दिया जाता है। मिल मालिक सारे के सारे अपना मुनाफा कर रहे हैं, इस में किसी तरह की कमी सरकार करने नहीं जा रही है। सरकार न चीनी का ही दाम कम करने जा रही है। सरकार भी अपना पूरा टैक्स ले रही है जब चीनी का व्यवसाय शुरू हुआ था तब जितना टैक्स था उस के दुगुने से भी अधिक है, एकसाइज ड्यूटी में प्रीर केन सेस में। उस में भी वह कोई कमी करने नहीं जा रही है।

जहां तक प्रोडर्स का मवाल है मेरे खयाल में कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन का अर्थात् ईल के उत्पादन का जो खर्च है उस का तो हिसाब लगा ही लेना चाहिये। आज तक जो भी दाम लगाया गया है उस में ईल के उत्पादन के खर्च का तो कभी हिसाब नहीं रक्खा गया। मूलतः वह बढ़ती ही गई। केन्द्रीय सरकार की तरफ से कोई नीति इस में नहीं रक्खी गई। कोई भी इस तरह की कोशिश सरकार की तरफ से नहीं हुई है जिस से उस के दाम का ठीक ठीक पता लगाया जाय कि किसानों का कितना खर्च होता है। हमारे सामने सेन्ट्रल शुगरकेन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है जिस में यह बताया गया है कि बिहार में, जहां में मैं आना हूँ, १०० सात आने १० पाई फी मन ईल उपजाने में खर्च होता है। जहां एक रुपया साढ़े सात आने मन प्रोडक्शन का खर्च है ईल के उत्पादन में, वहां एक रुपया तीन आने मन किसानों को दाम दिया जाय। यह कहां का न्याय है, यह में नहीं समझता।

अभी कुछ दिन पहले किदवई साहब ने यहां पर इस बात का जिक्र किया था कि किसानों को ईल के दामों में कमी होने के कारण किसी तरह की क्षति नहीं हुई है बल्कि उन को मुनाफा हुआ है। शायद उन्होंने ने चीनी के उत्पादन को देख कर ऐसा बयान दिया होगा।

लेकिन हमारे यहां प्रति बीघा खेत में किसी तरह से उपज नहीं बढ़ी इस लिये किसानों को फायदा नहीं हुआ। मैं नहीं जानता कि किन प्रांकड़ों के आधार पर किदवई साहब ने ऐसा बयान दिया है। अगर वे ठीक ढंग से प्रांकड़ों पर ध्यान देंगे तो पता चलेगा कि उन का बयान सही नहीं है। आज में बिहार से आ रहा हूँ, एक मीटिंग हुई थी जिस में केन प्रोडर्स के प्रतिनिधि थे, मिल मालिकों के प्रतिनिधि थे, सरकार के भी प्रतिनिधि थे। मिल मालिकों ने भी इस बात को महसूस किया कि अगर इस इन्डस्ट्री को जिन्दा रहना है तो पहले जिस तरह एक रुपया पांच आने प्रीर तीन आने का हिसाब लगाया गया था उस तरह का हिसाब रखने से चीनी का व्यवसाय नहीं चल सकता है। सरकार ने भी इस बात को महसूस किया। वहां के जो इन्डस्ट्री के मिनिस्टर हैं उन्होंने भी अपने वक्तव्य में इसी प्रकार की जोश में बातें कहीं। हमारे प्रोडर लोग प्रीर वहां के एम० एल० ए० थे। मुझे अगर इजाजत हो तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहां के एम० एल० ए० लोगों ने कहा, जिस तरह से पाकिस्तान में जिहाद की बोली बोली जाती है, कि यूनियन ने हमारे ऊपर जिहाद किया है, यूनियन से हमारा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं इस को भद्दी बात समझता हूँ लेकिन मैं दूसरे पहलू से शीर करना चाहता हूँ। जो लोग बोलने वाले थे मेरे दल के नहीं थे, आप के दल के थे, जवाबदेह लोग थे उन्हीं लोगों ने इस बात को कहा। इस लिये इस बात को गम्भीरतापूर्वक सोचने की आवश्यकता है। जो लोग आर्गोनाइजेशनली आप के साथ हैं, कान्स्ट्र्यूशनली आप के साथ हैं, वहां के जो अत्यन्त जवाबदेह लोग हैं, वे इस प्रकार की बात को कहते हैं तो समझना चाहिये कि बहुत गम्भीर समस्या उपस्थित हो गई है प्रीर इस पर शीर करने की जरूरत है। वहां बाढ़ आई हुई है। इस साल जो ईल की उपज थी

उस में हम बाढ़ से पहले करीब पांच करोड़ मन की उम्मीद करते थे, लेकिन बाढ़ के आने के बाद अब हम सिर्फ चार करोड़ मन की ही उम्मीद करते हैं। चार करोड़ मन से अधिक नहीं होगी। ईन्ड भी पिछले साल से इस साल कम होगी। इस लिये किसानों को बहुत कम रुपये मिलेंगे। अभी तक जो रिसर्च हुई है उस के बाद में यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि रिसर्च के बारे में क्वालिटी और क्वाण्टिटी दोनों का ही हिसाब होना चाहिये। मिल मालिक तो सिर्फ ज्यादा चाहते हैं कि वजन तो कम रहे और रस ज्यादा हो। लेकिन किसान चाहते हैं कि उस में रस भी ज्यादा निकले और वजन भी ज्यादा हो। इस साल वजन कम होने की उम्मीद है। इस लिये इस को भी ध्यान में रखना चाहिये। किसानों की मदद खत्म हो गई है, धान की फसल भी बरबाद हो गई। जितनी नदियां थीं सब में बाढ़ आयी है और सब कुछ किसानों का बर्बाद हो गया है। यही ईन्ड एक जरिया है जिस के जरिये हम उन को जिन्दा रख सकते हैं।

पिछले जमाने में बिहार और यू० पी० के लिए अलग अलग प्राइस रखी गयी थी। यह नयी बात नहीं है। यदि आप सभी का दाम नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं तो बिहार के लिए और खासकर उस एरिया के लिए जहां पर बाढ़ आयी है कम से कम दो रुपया मन के हिसाब से दाम रखें। शायद आप चीनी का दाम ३० रुपये के हिसाब से रखने जा रहे हैं और बाहर से जो चीनी मंगा रहे हैं उस का भी यही दाम होगा। ऐसी दशा में एक रुपया १२ आने से कम तो ईन्ड का भाव ही नहीं सकता। इस से यदि आप कम रखते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आप इंडस्ट्री के लिए मौत की घंटी बजा रहे हैं।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): It is good that we have an opportunity of discussing the

question of sugar and sugar-cane prices, for, we do not know where the cherubic self-satisfaction of our Food Minister is going to land us.

Shri Kidwai: To plenty.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The other day, he told a Bombay audience that for all practical purposes our food problem had been solved.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): So far as he is concerned.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: That was a preposterous statement. In any case, if that is so, sugar will be as dust in the balance and we shall be asked not to have a moment's worry on that account. In these days, the ideas of the Food Minister and his doings remind me of what Clemenceau once told an English diplomatist about the difference between an accident and a disaster. Clemenceau said that if President Wilson fell into a well, well, it would be an accident but if he got out of it, it would be a disaster. From the way the Food Minister goes on these days, I am tempted to say that when we see Mr. Kidwai admitting to have fallen into a pit of economic difficulty, it is a sort of an accident, a deviation from routine; but when he proclaims from the housetops his triumphant emergence into victory, then, more likely than not, it is going to be a disaster.

The story of sugar, the second biggest industry in our country as far as indigenous investment is concerned, is very bitter and very unsavoury. Supremely callous to the interests of the consumers and the cultivators, who number some 25 million, the sugar barons have, with Government assistance at every step of the sordid story.....

Shri Kidwai: I agree.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: specialised in a sort of unashamed racketeering. I am happy that the Food Minister agrees. It is necessary for the Food Minister to recall something of the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

past. I will not go deep into the past because I have not got the time for that.

Shri Kidwai: I know something of it.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: With de-control in 1947, this House ought to be reminded that the sugar interests pushed up the prices from Rs. 20-14-0 to Rs. 35 per maund despite the general assurance that the prices would not rise appreciably. They made a clean sweep and they netted out of the consumers literally tens of crores of rupees. Later, under pressure they agreed that the price of Rs. 28-8-0 should not be exceeded. But, once again, they did not make good their undertaking.

The Tariff Board examined this question later and said that these gentlemen were deliberately launching upon a policy of creating a psychology of scarcity in the market and the public was made to pass through a crisis of scarcity even when, by all available accounts, the supply in the country was adequate to meet the requirements of consumption. In spite of this very instructive history and in spite of the 1950 Enquiry Committee presided over by Mr. Justice Ganganath, which asked the Government "to consider whether any action should be taken"—I am quoting its words—against the non-co-operating and prevaricating sugar interests, in spite of all that history, Government went out of its way, at the end of the last season, to give the most favoured treatment to these notable benefactors of the human species in this country. The result of it was that the small cultivator and the manufacturer of *gur* suffered considerably. Government gave up control on prices in the future and at the same time reduced the price to be paid to the cultivator by as much as 25 per cent: from Rs. 1-12-0 to Rs. 1-5-0.

Shri Kidwai: How did it affect the *gur* producer?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It affected the cultivator, no doubt, and it did not benefit the consumer. The only people therefore who netted whatever advantage came out of the transaction were the people who are so unsavoury and whose record I have already referred to.

Production during the current year has been a little over 13 lakh tons, so that, together with the carry over, the total available was nearly 18 lakh tons. A little over nine lakh tons has been despatched from the factories up to May, as against about 670,000 tons last year. The amount still lying with the factories would be about nine lakh tons. Considerable supplies would also appear to have been spread throughout the country. Yet, the Government says that the price of sugar has shown a rising trend in the past few weeks. The prices are reported to have gone up to Rs. 32 per maund and they say that an ex-factory price which would be fair to the producer would be something like Rs. 27 per maund. This is what the Government point out. Obviously the benevolent sugar interests are once again busily engaged, as the Tariff Board said, in creating a psychology of scarcity in the country. Despite much public feeling, they do not seem to have been disturbed, in spite of the proclamations from time to time by the Food Minister.

Government has talked about taking firm action against profiteering and so on; but it does nothing worth while. I say that Government has been made to look intensely foolish. In a fit of insanity or very probably in a spirit of mischief, it has pitched upon this decision to import, the import of a commodity on which it has already reduced the existing duty to half. Normally, these imports are not necessitated by the stock position. The country does not need sugar from abroad. Though there is enough and

to spare to meet the present requirements, the much-needed foreign exchange about which the Finance Minister has to worry his heart out, seems to be thrown away on this commodity. There can scarcely be a better way of advertising the Government's pathetic importance when it is faced by the powerful sugar interests in this country.

In regard to this question of imports and punishing the recalcitrant sugar interests, Government roars like a lion at one time and bleats like a lamb at another. On the 10th of May, this year, we saw in the *Statesman* a report of the Government letter warning the sugar interests. Government warns the sugar industry that if prices continue to be higher and if that sort of thing goes on, Government would be constrained to take such steps as it might deem necessary to maintain them at a reasonable level. The Government asked the Sugar Mills Association of Calcutta to furnish information in regard to whatever action they proposed to take before 12th May, 1953. They said also that the present rise in prices was to be attributed mainly to speculative activity and an all-round hoarding tendency. This was said in the Government of India's letter. Now, we find from the *Free Press Journal* of 18th August that the Food Minister has changed his tune and says that India has to import at least one lakh tons of sugar not because of hoarding and the deleterious increase of prices, but because of the increased consumption of sugar by the people and the resultant shortage. This is most amazing. One day Government says that on account of hoarding and anti-social practices of these profiteers, this thing has happened. The other day, the Government comes down and says that the people are eating too much sugar and that is why this kind of thing has got to be done. If the Government was self-respecting and self-reliant, it would have made the sugar interests understand that it could not be played with. It would

have set up its own control of stocks everywhere and sold them to the distributors at a proper rate. On the other hand, in regard to imports, Government has now said that we are going to distribute these imports through our own agencies. At the same time, Government says, after having supplied the State Governments for distribution through ration shops and co-operative societies, Government would allow private merchants to take charge of a large share of these imports. This is an attitude which has got to be put an end to. Government ought to come forward and say that today it is very necessary and desirable to requisition all stocks and fix a statutory price and that sugar would not be imported.

If sugar is imported, the impost on our indigenous sugar ought not to be as high as it is. Today, the position is, the import duty on sugar comes to Rs. 5-2-0 per maund or Rs. seven per cwt., while the impost on home-made sugar is Rs. 5-10 per maund. We talk of buying *swadeshi*; at the same time, we are doing this kind of thing. We forget the cultivator altogether. We say that the cultivator should have higher prices fixed for his sugar-cane; we say that the consumer should be protected; we say that statutory restrictions ought to be placed upon the doings of these sugar industrialists and we say that efforts ought to be made to keep our economy going properly. What I fear is that our Food Minister has a kind of superb indifference to whatever is happening around us, and he is impervious to whatever does not suit his fancy. He delights in such Gilbertian situations as when he says food is plentiful while people are starving and stark, sheer starvation is stalking the land.

My time is up and I had so much other material which I could place before the House, but I cannot resist the temptation of ending my very small contribution to the debate this morning with a limerick which some of you might know, which seems to

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

fit the Food Minister to the "I", absolutely perfectly. The limerick says:

"A wonderful bird is the Pelican,

His mouth holds more than his belly can,

He takes in his beak, enough food for a week.

But I am damned if I know how the hell he can".

श्री मुनमुनबाला (भागलपुर मध्य) :

यह विषय इतने महत्व का है कि इस पर दस या पन्द्रह मिनट में कोई भी बात अच्छी तरह से नहीं कही जा सकती है, और सब बातें कहने पर भी कुछ न कुछ गलत फहमी रह जाती है। तो भी जो भी समय थोड़ा बहुत है उस में जहाँ तक हो सकेगा मैं कहूँगा। धारम्भ में मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यदि आप ईख की कीमत इस दृष्टि से रखें कि इस में जो चीनी के दाम हैं उस में से कितना गवर्नमेंट ले जाती है, कितना मैन्यूफैक्चरर ले जाता है और कितना वेस्ट हो जाता है, इस तरह से कि जैसे कि मालासंज में जो हम पावर एलकोहल तैयार करते हैं वह हम नहीं बना सकते, और जो कई दूसरी चीजें हम बना सकते हैं वह नहीं बनाते, यह सब चीजें दृष्टि में रखी जायें तब तो मैं जरूर कहूँगा कि जो मैन्यूफैक्चरर है, उन के विषय में हमारी सरकार की यह नीति रही है कि हमारे किसान भाई चाहे दिक्कत में पड़ जायें चाहे उन को कुछ भी पैसा मिले, यदि मैन्यूफैक्चरर को किसी भी तरह किसी भी समय में दिक्कत आई है तो कोई न कोई उपाय कर के उन के धर में पहुँचा देती है कुछ तो उस को कम्पेनसेट कर देते हैं और हमारी सरकार ने उन को खुश रखने की बराबर चेष्टा की है। इस चेष्टा के अलावा यह भी उनको सरकार की नीति रही है कि जितना भी पैसा किसान का हित दिखला कर हम

इस चीनी के ऊपर ले सकें उतना पैसा लें। सन १९३३ में मैं यह शुगर कंट्रोल जारी हुआ। उस समय में हम लोगों को प्रोटेक्शन मिला।

श्री किशोर्षी : यह हम लोग कौन हैं ?

श्री मुनमुनबाला : मैन्यूफैक्चरर को समझ लें, आप किसानों को समझ लें, कनज्यूमर्स को समझ लें, सब लोगों को, सब को प्रोटेक्शन मिला, और आप को सब से अधिक। मैं अभी बतलाऊँगा कि आप को सब से अधिक किस तरह से मिला है। परन्तु गवर्नमेंट को जरूर इस में से मिला है, यह मैं अभी बतलाऊँगा। जब शुरू शुरू में सँस लगाया गया तो पहले तो यह हुआ कि हम ने प्रोटेक्शन दे दिया। प्रोटेक्शन देते हैं, इसलिये अब शुगर इंडस्ट्री यहाँ पर अच्छी तरह से कायम हो, फिर तुरन्त ही सरकार ने छः महीने के अन्दर ही एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगादी। एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगाते समय उन्होंने ने क्या कहा? उन्होंने ने कहा कि हम इस में से कुछ हिस्सा ऐसा रखेंगे जिस से कि प्रोभर लोगों को फायदा हो और जो उन की ईख है उस को वे कम भाव में पैदा कर सकें। अर्थात् एक बीघा में अगर उन की उपज २५० मन पैदा होती है तो अच्छी तरह से मैन्योरिंग वगैरह कर के उस में से ६००, ७०० मन पैदा हो सकती है और कम दामों में हो सकती है। तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि उन्होंने ने यह कह कर वह रुपया लिया।

१२ मध्याह्न

उस के बाद उन्होंने ने एक पैसा सँस लगाया। यह ५० पी० गवर्नमेंट ने और बिहार गवर्नमेंट ने लगाया। वह सँस केन के ऊपर यह कह कर लगाया कि यह जो पैसा है यह तुरन्त ही बिल्कुल किसानों के हाथ में चला जायगा। अब देखिये कि वह जो एक्साइज ड्यूटी है वह करीब ५ रुपये की मन हो गयी और जो सँस है वह एक पैसे से साढ़े तीन

भाने हो गया, यह अब तीन भाने साढ़े तीन भाने हो गया है। अब हमारे किदवई साहब क्या कहते हैं कि अभी जो सैस दिया जा चुका है वह तो दिया जा चुका, समूची शुगर पर दिया जा चुका। अब मेरी उन से बातचीत नहीं हुई है, लेकिन मैं ने सुना है कि उन का यह कहना है कि यह प्रोभर्स से ले लिया जाय, यह जो तीन भाने पैसे का सैस है वह प्रोभर से ले लिया जाय। अब शुगर कॅन प्राइस तो रख दी एक रुपया या डेढ़ रुपया, सूकिन तीन भाने पैसे : कहते हैं उस में से दे दो। हम कहते हैं कि आप जो कोई भी काम करते हैं तो उस में यह इस तरह की एक दृष्टि रखकर जो पैसे किसानों से, कनज्यूमर्स से, सबों से लेते हैं, वह पैसा आप क्यों खा जाते हैं जिस से कि आज हमारी यह दशा हुई कि हम को शुगर बाहर से इम्पोर्ट करनी पड़ती है। आज इस को बीस वर्ष हो गये। क्यों नहीं बीस वर्ष में भी आज हम इस को इस तरह से पैदा नहीं कर सकते हैं कि हम जो बाहर से चीनी आई हुई है उस के मुकाबले में दामों में मुकाबला कर सकें। मैं कहता हूँ कि यदि गर्नेमेंट आज सही रास्ते पर काम करती, इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स करते और प्रोभर्स करते, तो आज यह दशा नहीं होती।

श्री किदवई : हम लोग नहीं करते।

श्री मुनमुनबाला : मैं आप के बारे में किदवई साहब को नहीं कहता, मैं गर्नेमेंट को कहता हूँ। किदवई साहब के पास तो कई प्रकार के महकमे हैं। मैं इस खास महकमे के बारे में कहता हूँ कि जो पैसा लिया जाता है वह कैसे खर्च होता है। यदि अच्छी तरह से उपाय किया जाता तो आज हमारी यह दशा नहीं होती कि हम को चीनी बाहर से मंगानी पड़ती।

अब समय कम रह गया है। हम को एक बात बहुत जल्दी से कह देनी है। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि कॅन की प्राइस बढ़े। मैं यह चाहता

हूँ कि कॅन की प्राइस और डॅंग से बढ़े, पर इस साल ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है और तुरन्त ही यदि आप ऐसा करेंगे तो इस में बड़ी भारी विवकत हो जायगी। (हंसी) कृपा कर के आप हंसिये मत। इस को ज़रा गम्भीरता से सोचिये। यह बड़ा भारी प्रब्ल है। मैं जब कहता हूँ कि कॅन की प्राइस न बढ़े तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि यदि हम कॅन एक बीघे में ६०० मन पैदा कर के यदि प्रोभर को १। रुपये से भी दें तो ६०० रुपये दे सकते हैं। लेकिन अगर ३०० मन पैदा कर के हम दो रुपये फी मन से दें तो ६०० रु० हुए यह हमारी समझ में गलत है। यह चीज ठीक नहीं है। ६०० मन पैदा करने की जो सुभीते आवश्यक हों वे देने चाहियें।

अब मैं इस साल के लिये खास कर के बिहार के वास्ते यह बात कहूंगा कि बिहार में इस बार बहुत तरह की आफतें आई हैं और जो भी कुछ खेती की गयी थी वह खेती हमारी बह गयी। उस के बह जाने की वजह से, जैसा हमारे किदवई साहब ने कहा, मैन्युफैक्चररों को गन वर्ष छः करोड़ रुपया हम लोगों से, कनज्यूमर्स से, यह कह कर कि हम कनज्यूमर्स का फायदा करते हैं, उन को दे दिया। उसी तरह से वह कोई ऐसा उपाय निकालें जिस से कि वहाँ के किसान मुसीबत में न पड़ें। मैं भी उपाय बतला सकता हूँ, लेकिन समय नहीं है। तो कोई भी उपाय वह निकालें, जिस से कि खास कर के जो हमारे बिहार के प्रोभर्स हैं, उन को एक रुपया दस भाना प्राइस मिले। आप यह कह सकते हैं कि यह डिस्ट्रिक्शन कैसे किया जा सकता है। कैसे एक रुपया दस भाना बिहार को मिल सकता है और दूसरे को कैसे कम मिल सकता है, तो मैं बतलाऊंगा कि उन्होंने ने चीनी के भी दाम बहुत बार इस क्रिस्म से तय किये हैं, ३१ रुपये और ३३ रुपये रखे हैं। कहीं पर ३१ रुपये रखा है और कहीं पर ३३ रुपये रखा है। कहीं पर उन्होंने ने ३५ रुपये

[श्री मुनमुनबाला]

भी रखा है। तो इस चीज़ पर दृष्टि रखते हुए भी आप किसानों को नहीं बांटना चाहते हैं। यदि आप यह चाहते हैं कि कैन उपजे तो उन को इस साल तो ठीक दाम दें। अगले साल के लिये मैं हमारे लाल सिंह जी साहब से भी यह कहूंगा कि गवर्नमेंट ले जाती है या कौन ले जाती है, इस के साथ यह देखें कि किसान कितना पैदा करते हैं। बस, मैं और अधिक न कह कर इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरदार लालसिंह का यह तर्क कि जब कि कैन की बेसिक प्राइस एक रुपये चार आने मन थी, तब प्रोडक्शन ग्राफ शुगर कम था, लेकिन जब ईख के दाम दो रुपये प्रति मन कर दिये, तो चीनी का प्रोडक्शन बढ़ गया, मैं इस से सहमत नहीं हूँ और जो आंकड़े उन्होंने दे दिये हैं उसी से उन का कहना गलत सिद्ध होता है। जब किसान ने १। रुपये मन की उम्मीद कर ऊख बोई तो प्रोडक्शन बढ़ी और उन्होंने २ रुपये के दाम की उम्मीद पर बोई तो कम हुआ यह श्री लाल सिंह जी के कथन से सिद्ध होता है। १९४६-४७ में ८.२ लाख टन हुई फिर १।) ६० ईख के दाम पर बोने से १९४७-४८ में १०.७ लाख टन हुई फिर २) रुपये ईख के दाम पर १० लाख टन हुई और १।।।) के दाम पर बोने से १९४१-४२ में १४.८ लाख टन हुई।

Prof. S. N. Mishra (Darbhanga North): May I suggest that at this stage we should have the pleasure of listening to the hon. Food Minister, so that we may seek clarifications from him on the points that may arise from the speech, because the issue is getting confused?

Mr. Chairman: The difficulty will be to see who is going to avail of the chance to speak last. Many hon. Members want to take part, and it may happen that their objections may not be answered if the hon. Minister speaks in the middle of the discussion. So it is always discreet to hear the

hon. Minister last of all. If the hon. Minister wants that some part of the time may be taken away by one of the other hon. Ministers, then the difficulty may be avoided.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: But what about the trio?

Mr. Chairman: If more than one hon. Minister wants to participate, I have no objection.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): One Minister can speak now, and the other can speak later.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister want to speak now?

Shri Kidwai: No.

Mr. Chairman: I cannot force an hon. Minister to speak. If he does not choose to speak, it is not right on my part to ask him to speak. The hon. Minister says he is a sugar expert himself and so he wants to have the entire time to himself. So, let us proceed with the debate.

Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West): I am sorry I was not in the House when the discussion started. I would like to remind the House that when the question of sugar excise duty was being discussed in this House, I made certain points, which I want to stress now, for they are particularly essential in the larger interests not only of the industrialists, but also of the cultivators.

An Hon. Member: What about consumers?

Shri Tulsidas: I would like to point out that unless the sugar industry as a whole is stabilised in the country, it is not possible to pay to the cultivator an economic price which would be considered as a fair price. I pointed out last time that the policy of our Government up till now has been to vary the price of sugar-cane from year to year. In one year, the prices of sugar-cane are put up, and the production of sugar-cane goes up. But the next year, the poor farmer is placed in a miserable position, because of the fact that the price of sugar

comes down, as also that of *gur*, and sugar-cane, even if its price is lower, is not released. Thus the sugar-cane grower is not able to get a fair deal.

Of the total quantity of sugar-cane, only 20 per cent. is given to the industry; nearly 80 per cent. is marketed for the production of *gur* or *khandsari*, or something like that. In Uttar Pradesh, the total production of sugar-cane was 58 million tons. Out of the sugar-cane consumed by the industries, for white sugar it is about 26 per cent. This was the figure in 1951-52. In the previous year, it was 19.61 per cent. Of this 26 per cent., Uttar Pradesh consumes about 15 per cent. I want to point out, the sugar-cane price received by the farmer must be based not merely on the sugar prices, but also on *gur* prices and *Khandsari* prices. I fully appreciate the point of view that the cultivator must have some stability in regard to sugar-cane production. It is so not only in the case of sugar-cane, but in the case of other commodities as well. Unless our agricultural economy is stabilised, and the cultivator is given a fair price, for a long number of years, in respect of each commodity, he will be at the mercy of others. Otherwise, if he produces more, he will get a lower price; or, if he produces less, the price will go up, with the result that he will produce more next year, to get a low price again. This is the case with almost every agriculturist in the country. I appeal to the hon. Minister, that he being a person from agriculture, he should see to it that the cultivators must have stability over a long number of years. Unless that is done, it will not be possible to maintain our agricultural economy in proper shape.

There is one other point which I would like to point out. Last year we had a stock of three to four lakhs of tons, and we had a very large carry-over. I had then appealed to the Government not to fritter away this stock, but to keep it as a buffer stock, so that whenever the prices go up they can

come out with this stock, and sell it in the market. When I said this last time, I was rather ridiculed, and I was told what are you going to do with this stock, if you are not going to export this stock. The position is this. If we were to export that sugar, we would have had to import a very much larger quantity of sugar from outside, as we are doing now.

So far as *gur* is concerned, the production of *gur* has gone down. In 1951-52, the area under cultivation was five million acres. In 1952-53, it has come down to 4.2 million acres. The result was that the price of sugar went up, and the *gur* price also went up along with it. This has been the position, and the cultivator had no stability of economy at all. I would request the hon. Minister to see that the cultivators are given a fair price, which will ensure for them an economic living.

I now come to the question of sugar, in respect of which I have to urge the same point again. This year, we are importing sugar. What is going to happen next year? The area under cultivation has been reduced further by nearly 25 per cent. and the prices therefore, will go up. The year after the next, the production will go up, the area under cultivation would go up, but the prices will be so less, that in 1954-55, the farmers will not be able to sell their products, even at the economic price. This will again result in lower production. Is all this fair to the cultivator? Even for the next year, I would request the hon. Minister, in the interests of increased production, to see that a minimum economic price is paid to the cultivator.

Now what does the price of sugar consist of? Sixty per cent. is sugar-cane price; 18 per cent. is the tax; ten per cent. is the manufacturing cost, while five or seven per cent. is the distribution cost. If that be so, what is the price that will have to be paid to sugar?

[Shri Tulsidas]

When I spoke last time, I was given the balance-sheet of the Decan Sugar Factory, showing the profits of the factory. In the south, the production of sugar-cane is about 45 tons on an average per acre. In Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, the farmer produces about 15 to 20 tons on an average. If we could create conditions whereby the farmers can be given an incentive to produce more, we will benefit to that extent. Otherwise, what happens is this. If the State Government takes about three annas per maund of cane, it comes to nearly rupees two per maund of sugar.

Nothing has been done for the development of the Sugar-cane product. The recovery has gone down; the quality has not improved and the farmer is not benefited. So I would request the hon. Minister to go into this problem and I would be one with him in this respect. The economy of the agriculturist as well as the consumer should be stabilised.

An Hon. Member: What about the prices?

Shri Tulsidas: I am not discussing prices here. My point is only about economic stability.

Mr. Chairman: I find that many hon. Members are anxious to speak. May I request the hon. Members to limit their speeches to five minutes, otherwise, it will be difficult to allow many Members to speak.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह (ग़ाहबाद दक्षिण): श्री मुझे कई एक साधियों से ईख का इतिहास सुनने का मौक़ा मिला और मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि किसी न किसी रूप में प्रायः सभी लोगों ने, एक भाषा भादमियों को छोड़ कर, इस बाब को स्वीकार किया कि ईख की कीमत बढ़ाई जानी चाहिये। यह भी चर्चा की गई कि बीस वर्षों से फ़ैक्ट्रीज को गवर्नमेन्ट की ओर से प्रोटेक्शन दिया जाता रहा है। लेकिन तो भी फ़ैक्ट्रीज आज तक उस कीमत पर चीनी नहीं पैदा कर

सकीं जिस कीमत पर कि बाहर से चीनी आती है। बाहर से जो चीनी आती है उस का दाम यहां पहुंचने पर करीब १६ या २० रुपया मन पड़ता है। लेकिन यहां पर जो चीनी तैयार की जाती है उस का दाम ३५ ६० तक है और दो चार वर्ष पहले तो ७० ६० तक चार्ज किया जाता था। लेकिन चाहे मिल मालिक हों चाहे सरकार हो, दोनों से जो गल्लियां हुई हैं उन सभी गल्लियों का बोझ किसानों को उठाना पड़ा है। पिछले साल ज़िम वक्त शुगर केन के दाम में २५ प्रतिशत की कमी की गई उस वक्त सरकार की ओर से ओर मिल मालिकों की ओर से यह जोरों से कहा गया था कि चीनी बहुत ज्यादा मात्रा में है हिन्दुस्तान में और इतनी ज्यादा हो गई है कि इस की खपत नहीं होने पाती और हम लोग चाहते हैं कि सस्ती चीनी बाहर भेजे और उस वक्त यह तय हुआ कि २००,००० टन चीनी, ५० हजार टन गुड़ और १० हजार टन खंडसारी बाहर भेजी जायेंगी और बाहर भेजने के नाम पर किसानों का गला काटा गया, और १ ६० १२ आ० से १ ६० ५ आ० उस की ईख की कीमत कर दी गई।

१९५२ के अक्टूबर नवम्बर में यह बिल आया कि प्रति मन १ ६० का सेस ले कर मिल मालिकों की क्षति की पूर्ति की जाय। पर उस वक्त यह ध्यान नहीं रहा कि अगर हम २५ फी सदी ईख की कीमत में कमी करते हैं तो उसी हिसाब से चीनी की कीमत में भी कमी करें। लेकिन किसान की क्षति की तरफ सरकार ने कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। मिल मालिकों ने भी, जो यहां हैं उन लोगों ने भी, ईख का दाम कम करने का ही समर्थन किया। पर जब एक्सपोर्ट करने की बात आई तो नवम्बर में कहा गया कि अगर बाहर भेजना है तो ज्यादा से ज्यादा ५० हजार टन चीनी हम लोग बाहर भेज सकते हैं। लेकिन दिसम्बर में जब चीनी

बाहर भेजने की बात आई तो कहा गया कि हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा सिर्फ १५ हजार टन चीनी बाहर भेज सकते हैं और उतनी ही भेजी गयी पाकिस्तान बगैरह देशों को। इस प्रकार जो बात उन्होंने ने नवम्बर में कही, गवर्नमेन्ट ने भी और मिल मालिकों ने भी, उसे दिसम्बर में नहीं माना गया। और जनवरी १९५३ में सरकार तथा मिलमालिकों ने एलान किया कि हमारे पास बाहर भेजने के लिये न गुड़ है, न खंडसारी है और न चीनी है। उसी समय यहां पर चीनी का मूल्य ज्यादा से ज्यादा बढ़ने लगा और यह भी नौबत आ गई कि चीनी मिलनी कठिन हो गई। हालत इतनी खराब होती गयी कि हाल में मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कोल्हापुर आदि जगहों में चीनी को कौन कहे गुड़ भी मिलना मुहाल हो गया है और उस का दाम ३२ रुपये से ज्यादा हो गया है। इसलिये मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारे किदवई साहब की नीति इस मामले में मिल मालिकों की चालबाजियों के चलते नाकामयाब हुई। मैं मानता हूँ कि वह ज्यादा से ज्यादा कठिन समस्या को हल कर सकते हैं, लेकिन जब इस मामले में उन की नीति को मैं देखता हूँ, जिस नीति को उन्होंने ने बताया था, १९५२ के अक्टूबर नवम्बर में, तो यह कहना पड़ता है कि वह नीति गलत हो गई। दिसम्बर में जहां बाहर भेजने का सवाल था वहां अब बाहर भेजने की तो बात रही नहीं, उन को उल्टे बाहर से मंगाने की नीति अस्त्यार करनी पड़ी और आज यहां एलान किया जा चुका है कि हम कम से कम २ लाख टन चीनी बाहर से मंगायेंगे। ऐसी हालत में उचित तो यह होता कि किसानों तथा मिल मालिकों को इस के लिए तैयार किया जाय कि बाहर से आने वाली चीनी के मूल्य के ही मूल्य की चीनी हम यहां भी तैयार करें। अन्यथा यह साफ एलान कर दें कि हम मिलों को अब कोई प्रोटेक्शन नहीं देंगे। यह हमेशा सरकार की नीति रही

है कि मिल मालिकों से मिल कर के किसानों का दाम घटावें और मिल मालिकों को प्रोटेक्शन दें। किसान ईख पैदा करते रह गये और चीनी मिलती है भारत के बाहर या बड़े बड़े अफसरों को। वह किसानों के लिये नहीं है।

ऐसी स्थिति में मैं यह कहूंगा कि अगर आप १ रु० ५ आ० मन ईख का दाम रखना चाहते हैं तो उसी अनुपात में चीनी का दाम भी रखिये १९ या २० रु० मन के हिसाब से। अगर आप इस में सफल नहीं होते हैं तो आप किसानों को उन की किस्मत पर छोड़ दीजिये और मिल मालिकों को उन की किस्मत पर। मिल मालिकों को तनिक भी प्रोटेक्शन मत दीजिये। चाहे चीनी का उत्पादन हो या न हो। अगर आप इस पालिसी को भी अस्त्यार नहीं कर सकते तो तीसरी चीज यह है कि सब कुछ नेशनलाइज कर दीजिये और खुद चीनी की फीक्टरीज चलाइये। इस तरह से अगर कोई प्रोग्राम गवर्नमेन्ट रखे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेन्ट की तारीफ खूब होगी और इस समस्या का भी इलाज हो जायगा। मिल मालिक जब तक वह कन्टिन्यू करेंगे तब तक ट्रबल क्रिएट करते रहेंगे। उन को ईमानदारी से किदवई साहब का समर्थन करना चाहिये था क्योंकि किदवई साहब ने तो उन के हक की बात कही थी, किसानों को घाटा रहा लेकिन मिल मालिकों को नफा रहा। लेकिन तब भी उन लोगों ने किदवई साहब को धोखा दिया। और उचित मूल्य पर चीनी उपलब्ध नहीं होने दिया। कहते हैं कि गत वर्ष १८ लाख टन चीनी पैदा हुई। आखिर यह १८ लाख टन चीनी कहाँ गई? किसी किसान के घर में जो पहले गुड़ खाता था, चीनी नहीं मिलनी है। जो उस की हालत पहले थी वही अब भी है। इस प्रकार से यदि गवर्नमेन्ट अपनी नीति अस्त्यार करे, जिस प्रकार से मैं ने बताया है तो बहुत अच्छा

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

होगा और ईख तथा चीनी के मूल्य की समस्या हल हो जायेगी।

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): It seems to me as if sugar is hardy annual in this House and the industry is completely a racket. Starting from 1947 the consumers and the cane growers have been fleeced by this industry and, strange to say, that it seems to be the pet son of this Government.

An. Hon. Member: Step son!

Shri Sarangadhar Das: No. Pet son. (Interruption)

The time allotted to me is very little. I wish to point out that there is a dispute about the price of sugar-cane or sugar. You take the cost of sugar-cane into consideration before you fix the price of sugar so that it will be profitable for the industry. Why do you not similarly find out the cost of raising sugar-cane and then fix the price giving a small margin to the grower—a margin that would be commensurate with the margin that is given to the industry? But you do not do that. All the time you fix a price arbitrarily according to the dictates of the sugar industry.

In this connection I wish to point out that I am rather surprised that all the Members who spoke before me did not go to the root of the matter. Unless the yield of sugar-cane is maintained at 45—50 tons per acre...

Shri Kidwai: Maintained as it is today!

Shri Sarangadhar Das: In U.P. and Bihar the average is no more than 15 tons per acre while in the south it is 40—45 tons per acre. Unless you raise the yield of sugar-cane per acre you can never lower the price of sugar nor the price of sugar-cane.

As it is now, according to my calculations, the price of sugar-cane should be Rs. 1-12-0 a maund and not Rs. 1-5-0. And, in order to do that, it is necessary that the Government

should go into the growing of sugar-cane, the climatic conditions necessary and all that, so that they can have a scientific basis for growing of cane and the manufacture of sugar. I say, scientific, particularly because our Prime Minister in everything nowadays says "scientific, scientific," and this sugar industry is the most unscientific thing in the world.

Hon. Members: In India.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: In no other country is the basis so unscientific. The yield of sugar-cane, the main raw material necessary for the industry, is only 15 tons per acre. You can never adjust the thing so that you will be just and fair to the grower and to the consumer as well. It is impossible. So, a scientific study of the sugar industry beginning from agriculture to marketing and the utilization of bye-products is very necessary.

In this connection, I want to say what kind of racket it is in this industry, and how the Government and particularly this Minister of Food and Agriculture patronize this racket. In Deoria District of Uttar Pradesh, there are 13 sugar factories which owe the cane-grower and the working men in the mill who have worked during the seasons, Rs. 60 lakhs. Out of these 13 factories.....

Shri Kidwai: May I know how I am concerned with this?

Shri Sarangadhar Das: You are concerned.

Shri Kidwai: No.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: Pardon me—you ask me a direct question. One of these factories is the Jagdish Sugar Factory at Kathkuian; another is Pandrauna; Ramkola is another; another is Lakshmiganj; another is Khadda; and the last one is Captainganj. And there are still seven more, but I cannot give the names now. Regarding particularly Kathkuian—the Government of Uttar Pradesh has given the control to the

same managing director who had mis-managed the factory. The Raja of Padrauna in the Gorakhpur district is the controller and under his management, it has become worse and worse, so that today, the factory owes Rs. 17 lakhs to the growers and about rupees two or three lakhs to the working men.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum-Purnea): If you accuse the U.P. Government he will agree with that.

Shri Kidwai: I agree. May I give further information besides this? The Kathkuian factory owes others about Rs. 16 lakhs.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I know that. There are other liabilities. I wonder why under these circumstances—there is nothing to laugh—the factories are not taken over by the Government under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. You have passed an Act, an amendment, lately, and yet you do not act and you let the growers and the working men suffer. When they say they can be taken over and be run in a cooperative manner, you do not pay any attention to that. What is this Welfare State you talk about? There is no welfare—nothing. It is the welfare of the money-bags—the mill-owners, not of the grower, not of the consumers, not of the workmen. You are sacrificing all of them in favour of the money-bags. This must be stopped, and the only way to stop it in this particular case is to take up these factories and find out why they are running at a loss.

Shri Kidwai: That is what we are going to do now.

श्री विश्वनाथ राय (ज़िला देवरिया—पश्चिम) : आज इस बहस को प्रारम्भ करते हुए माननीय सरदार साहब ने कहा कि ईस्त्र के भाव को सप्लाई और डिमण्ड पर छोड़ देना चाहिए। वह आज एक ऐसी बात कह रहे हैं जो कि आज से सौ वर्ष पहले की थी। और खास कर के ईस्त्र पैदा करने वाले किसानों के बारे में यह कहना तो उन को मिल मालिकों

के हाथ में बेच देना है। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश से और उस के उस भाग से आ रहा हूँ जहाँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में सब से ज्यादा चीनी की मिलें हैं। वहाँ पर बस्ती, गोरखपुर, देवरिया, और बिहार के चम्पारन और सारन में सब से ज्यादा चीनी की मिलें हैं और वहाँ सन् १९३७ का मंत्रिमंडल कायम होने के पहले का हम को अनुभव यह है कि अगर वहाँ पर इस नीति को लागू किया जाय तो वहाँ पर स्टारवेशन की हालत पैदा हो जायगी। उस समय लोगों को अपनी ईस्त्र जलानी पड़ी थी और दो घाने मन तक बेचनी पड़ी थी। आज प्लैन्ड और कंट्रोल्ड इकानमी के जमाने में यह कैसे किया जा सकता है। जब कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट आयी तो उस ने इस को कंट्रोल किया और ईस्त्र का भाव काफी बढ़ाया। यह जरूर कि जितनी जल्दी ईस्त्र की कीमत घटा दी गयी है उस से ईस्त्र के पैदा करने वालों को नुकसान हुआ है।

श्री किडवाई : कोई नहीं।

श्री विश्वनाथ राय : सन् १९४७-४८ में ईस्त्र का भाव २ रुपया मन था और चीनी का भाव ३५ रुपया सात घाना मन था। अब ईस्त्र का भाव एक रुपया पाँच घाना और एक रुपया तीन घाना रखा गया है। जिस रेशियो (अनुपात) से ईस्त्र का भाव गिरा है उस रेशियो से न तो गल्ले का भाव गिरा है, न कपड़े का भाव गिरा है न चीनी का भाव गिरा है। इस बात का भी सरकार को ध्यान रखना है।

दूसरी बात बिहार के जो नये सदस्य आये हैं उन्होंने ने यह कही कि बिहार के उस एरिया के लिए जहाँ बाढ़ आयी है ईस्त्र का भाव कम से कम एक रुपया बारह घाना या दो रुपया रखना चाहिये। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि देश के हर भाग में जहाँ भी बाढ़ आयी है वहाँ पर भी यही भाव कर दिया जाना चाहिए केवल बिहार में ही नहीं।

[श्री विश्वनाथ राय]

माननीय सारंगधर दास जी ने देवरिया के बारे में कहा कि वहां साठ लाख रुपया मिलों की तरफ बाकी है। इस में किसानों को बहुत नुकसान होता है। लेकिन यह कई महीनों की बात है। खड्डा की मिल पर सात लाख बाकी है और कठकुइयां मिल पर बारह लाख रुपया बाकी है। अगर सारे गोरखपुर-देवरिया को देखा जाय तो वहां दो दो साल तक के गन्ने का दाम मिलों पर बाकी है। इस के लिए चाहे यू० पी० सरकार को और चाहे केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रबन्ध करना चाहिए। खास कर हमारे जिले में जो कि स्कंयरसिटी एरिया है और जहां इस साल बाढ़ आयी है और जहां जनता की परबंजिग पावर बहुत गिर गयी है वहां के लिए गवर्नमेंट को स्पेशल इन्तिजाम करना चाहिए।

अब सवाल यह है कि चीनी का भाव कंसे कम हो। और विदेशों के मुकाबले में यहाँ चीनी कंसे सस्ती हो। इस के साथ ही प्रश्न यह है कि किस तरह से किसानों को लाभ हो और उन के पास दूसरी चीजें खरीदने के लिए पैसा हो। मिल मालिक कहते हैं कि इस इंडस्ट्री को स्टेबिलाइज किया जाय। इस इंडस्ट्री को सन् १९३३ से प्रोटेक्शन दिया जा रहा है और कृषकों को धक्का दे कर के इन मिल वालों को फायदा पहुंचाया गया है। किसानों का ख्याल नहीं रखा गया पर इन लोगों का ख्याल रखा गया है कि किसानों के बल पर चीनी पैदा करते हैं। अगर हम उन किसानों को भूख जायेंगे और इंडस्ट्री को स्टेबिलाइज करने में लग जायेंगे तो हम बुनियाद को भुला देंगे और ऊपर की ही बात करेंगे। उस हालत में हम को बाहर से भी चीनी मंगानी पड़ेगी और जैसा कि मेरे एक मित्र ने कहा हम को चीनी की मिलों को नेशनलाइज भी करना पड़ सकता है। जब तक इन्टेन्सिव कल्टीवेशन

नहीं किया जायगा सिर्फ एकरेज बढ़ाने से काम नहीं चल सकता और न ऐसा करने से चीनी सस्ती ही होगी। जब किसान के फ्री एक्ड में ज्यादा ईख होगी तभी यह इंडस्ट्री स्टेबिलाइज हो सकती है। और तभी किसानों को लाभ हो सकता है। जिस जगह सब से ज्यादा ईख की खेती होती है उमी जगह को प्लानिंग कमीशन ने पूरा महत्व नहीं दिया है। ईख ज्यादातर यू० पी० के पूर्वी जिलों में और बिहार के पश्चिमी जिलों में होती है। यहां पर गंडक बैली प्रोजेक्ट की तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया जा रहा है। जब तक वहां पर सिंचाई के लिए विशेष रूप से प्रबन्ध नहीं होकर तब तक न तो ईख की पैदावार ज्यादा होगी और न चीनी का भाव घटेगा। ईख का दाम कम हो रहा है इस से दिन पर दिन ईख की पैदावार गिरती जा रही है।

✓ **Shri Syammandan Sahaya** (Muzaffarpur Central): It is difficult to express oneself on a question like this in a short time. But I shall take whatever time I have in drawing the attention of the hon. Minister through you, Sir, to the special circumstances obtaining in my province of Bihar.

Firstly, I agree with the hon. Minister's general policy that it is necessary at this time, at this late hour of the life of the sugar industry that some attempt should be made at stabilisation of the price of sugar, of the cost in producing sugar, of the cost of sugar-cane and other allied matters—of the use of molasses, bagasse and so on and so forth. But, in doing so, all that I will try to impress on the hon. Minister is that it is a proposition which has suffered long and any attempt by him or anybody else to bring about these reforms in a comparatively short time might not only not achieve the object he has in view, but might perhaps be harmful. Take the question of the present state of affairs

in Bihar. First of all, it is an accepted figure of the Government of Bihar, that the acreage in Bihar under-sugar-cane has gone down by 15 per cent.

Shri Kidwai: I think the hon. Member has not been correctly informed. Indeed statistics we have received from Bihar show that there has been an increase this year instead of decrease.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I suppose sometimes figures also give erroneous impressions. All that I will request the hon. Minister is to confirm his statement, because what I am telling you is also a statement from the Government of Bihar.

Shri Kidwai: We receive our returns from the State Government and I find that last year the acreage was 3,36,000 and this year it is 3,61,000, an increase of 25,000.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Perhaps you know that when taking years into consideration, the State Governments consider a year to be a particular period. All that I will say is: please do not accept my figure; but I request you to get it confirmed, and no more. In any case, the position that I have before me—and I say so on good authority—is that there has been a decrease in acreage.

Then again you are aware that a large area of cane, particularly in North Bihar, and also in parts of South Bihar, has suffered from floods seriously. The cane to be crushed this year is not likely to be more than five crores or a little over as against seven crores last year. That is what we apprehend, if I may say so. Now, this aspect, in my opinion, ought to weigh, if not for a general consideration, for a special consideration on a special occasion, with the hon. Minister.

The second thing, in connection with Bihar, has suffered from floods seriously, is that there have been mills who had tram-lines put up for years and years, and in some cases when the tram-lines were put up, the mills had entered into an agreement with the District Board where they stated that they should not charge any transport

cost on sugar-cane. On this ground, the District Board permitted them the use of the lines. Now, under your present arrangement—I do know, specifically, but I understand that under the present arrangement—the cost of transport to the mills will be deduction out of the cane price which, I understand, you propose to fix at Rs. 1-8-0. I submit that that will be a procedure which will not be warranted by conditions obtaining in the province not now, but for years past, and therefore, I will request that this matter should receive your kind and favourable consideration.

The next thing I will draw your attention to is that it has been stated on more occasions than one—and perhaps that has been the impression going round—that the price of cane at gate and at rail-heads may be necessarily different. I say 'necessarily' purposefully. I feel that sometimes the cultivator, in order to carry his cane to the rail-head, has to traverse the same distance as when he has got to go to the gate. Therefore, this differentiation also, in my opinion is not justified.

The next thing I will draw your attention to is the addition of what is called a State cess in the price of sugar-cane. I know you have your difficulties in the matter. I know you have the difficulty of different systems obtaining in different provinces. I know also that in some provinces, on account of a lower cess the grower will get a higher price than in others perhaps where there is a bigger cess, and you want to use this method in order to bring about a similarity about it. While you may be doing so with an object which is all laudable, you will appreciate that the burden on the grower in one part will be very great. Therefore, I will request you to use your kind offices with all the States in India who are concerned so that there may be some kind of similarity in the matter of assessment of cess. If you are able to use your kind offices, I have no doubt that this matter will be settled in every way without in any way injuring the interests of the cultivators of Bihar.

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

Apart from these things, there are just two matters to which I would like to draw your attention. In a recent Control Board meeting—I do not know whether I am disclosing any secret, but that is my information and I have no doubt my information is authentic—in Bihar where the hon. Chief Minister of U.P. was also present—perhaps he presided at that meeting—the mill-owners expressed the feeling that it was not possible under the present trend of market conditions to reduce the price of sugar to less than Rs. 29 or Rs. 30 as it obtains now. If that is so, and with all your experience of the last two years or one and a half years in the Food Department, you feel along with them...

Shri Kidwai: I do not feel along with them.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Sometimes you feel. Therefore, we are apprehensive as happened last year. The price of sugar was not as you wished it to be. Now, even if you fix Rs. 1-8 without the cess and other things.....

Shri Kidwai: I did not fix it.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I do not say you fix it. What I say is that if you fix it, even then, as you yourself said in a statement, the price of sugar ought to be Rs. 27 or Rs. 27-4. You will find that in the past years, for instance, in the year 1948-49 when you fixed the price at Rs. 1-13, the price of sugar was Rs. 28-8. Again in 1949-50, it was fixed at Rs. 1-10 9 and the price was Rs. 28-8. In 1950-51 when the price was Rs. 31 for North Bihar—not for the whole of India; for the whole of India it was Rs. 29—it was fixed at Rs. 1-13. I, therefore, feel that our apprehensions may be justified, as happened last year. In order to bring down the price, even this year you go to the extreme length of importing sugar. No one knows better than you that we have not been successful in this. If that is so, our apprehensions do deserve consideration at your hands. There is no use making the sugar-cane

grower suffer, and as for the consumer, the remedy lies in the Government purchasing the stocks.

Before I resume my seat, I wish again to request the hon. Minister to consider the case, particularly of Bihar, sympathetically as it deserves sympathetic consideration.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North): I do not know how to begin.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Begin with sugar.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: However, there is one particular feature of the present policy of Government in respect of sugar to which I am going to confine my observations, and that policy is the present decision of the Government to import sugar. Just about ten days ago we were told that Government had taken a decision to import about one lakh tons. Subsequently, we are informed that the Government have now decided to increase the quantity to be imported to two lakh tons.

Shri Kidwai: The first announcement was 'two lakh tons'.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: Two lakhs. Very well. Now, on the basis of the facts that are already available to us, it is very difficult to imagine that this import of sugar is necessary for consumption in this country. In answer to a question we were told by the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture that 14.91 lakhs of tons had already been released from factories. We are also told that some 2.42 lakhs of tons of sugar are unreleased and are with the factories. That makes up a total of 17.33 lakh tons. By any calculation—even granting the new theory that is being put out that suddenly people in this country have started consuming sugar voraciously, even then—this quantity should be adequate. Of course, I must say that about 2.04 lakh tons could not be released for want of wagons. But still you are today possessed of this quantity of 17.33 lakh tons.

Shri Kidwai: The factories today have got only about four lakh tons; the others are sold.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: These are the releases that were made from the factories since December 1. Now, in the case of this situation, here we are importing two lakh tons and if my calculation is correct, it is going to cost this country something like Rs. 11 crores. By this policy of importing sugar we are going to pay this amount for sugar which is not necessary for our consumption.

Shri Kidwai: May I ask the hon. Member why it is not necessary? For the next four months we have got only four lakh tons.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: I will try to pursue my trend of argument. The country is going to be asked to part with something like Rs. 11 crores of its scarce foreign exchange.

Shri Kidwai: It is not scarce.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: I do not know who is responsible for this state of things. Some of us have begun to feel that there is some serious miscalculation somewhere; there is some facile optimism somewhere, there is some negligence to observe scientifically the facts before them and to study facts. A few months ago, on the 20th of November, when this House was considering the Sugar (Temporary Additional Excise Duty) Bill, we were told by the Minister of Revenue and Expenditure that he would like to export sugar and that foreign exchange was very scarce. Our Minister of Food and Agriculture then informed the House that he was not unwilling to subsidise the export of sugar as such export was being subsidised in all countries of the world. They were talking then about having a buffer stock of something like three lakh tons. They declared to this House that they had five lakh tons surplus on their hands. In the face of these things, today, only a few months after, to present this country with a decision that we should be asked to import and that his country should be asked to pay exchange, scarce exchange, to the

365 PSD.

tune of Rs. 11 crores is something which needs explanation. I would not say that there should be a committee to report on the whole situation, but at least I would certainly plead with the hon. Minister to issue some kind of a comprehensive statement, some kind of a White Paper, dealing with the whole question as to how his Ministry has been handling this question since the day decontrol was brought into effect.

Shri Kidwai: I shall deal with the last speaker first. The last speaker has presumed that whatever sugar has been released from the 1st of December is lying in store with the dealers; it has not been consumed. I think it is not correct. This year, as I have said again and again, in the first two or three months, the prices were as they should have been. Then they started rising. And we thought that there must be hoarding. Therefore, we undertook steps to have two releases. We released as much sugar as two lakh tons in one month. Each release was over two lakh tons. Yet the price was not affected.

Then we tried to find out the reason and we thought if there had been hoarding the best method to find that out would be from the bank credits. And we found that there had been no extraordinary advances.

Shri S. S. More: How is it the best method?

Shri Kidwai: I think it is the best method. If the hon. Member will suggest something else I will accept it.

If all the stock had been under hoarding, now that the season is about to end and the new sugar will be produced from 1st December, and two lakh tons are being imported, the hoarders would have thought twice before they continued hoarding. The hoarded sugar would have come out in the market, as many other things are coming in the market, and prices would have gone down. Therefore, that is also a proof that there is not any hoarding.

Much has been said about cane prices. But no one has taken the care to find out how the income from the

[Shri Kidwai]

cultivation of cane compares with the alternative crops that agriculturists can grow.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt. South): How does the cost price compare?

Shri Kidwai: I will tell you. I think the hon. Member knows there is no compulsion by law that anybody should grow cane; it is only when he finds it profitable that he does so.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: There is no compulsion that anybody should live.

Shri Kidwai: This logic will not do. The other day I gave an instance. When the wheat prices were high and there was black market, the person did not go in for cultivation of cane, although the price was rupees two. But when wheat prices came down to the present prices, he reverted to it. And as I have just said, in Bihar although Rs. 1/5 was fixed last year and people believed that the same price would continue, the cane area has increased. (*Interruption*) That is what the Bihar Government has said.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: That is no reason to fix starving price.

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. Minister should be allowed to proceed. These are the figures given by the Government, he has said. Why should anybody doubt those figures?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Is this a valid reason to give prices for the sugar...

Mr. Chairman: That is an altogether different matter. Let us not doubt the figures.

Thakur Jugal Kishore Sinha: We have also got figures.

Shri Kidwai: If the argument is that the cost of every raw material should be increased and for the consumer the price should be decreased, I do not know where the money will come from.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: Sir, may we know whether we would have another opportunity to discuss the subject

after the hon. Minister has spoken, because we find there are a number of points which require clarification. We request you to give another opportunity.

Mr. Chairman: When the request comes it will be decided on merits.

Shri Kidwai: As I said, U. P. is the largest cane growing area. The alternative crops to cane are two—wheat for some period and then jowar for the other period.

Shri Syamuandan Sahaya: And sweet potato in between.

Shri Kidwai: The income from wheat and jowar is less by Rs. 70 than the income from sugar-cane.

An Hon. Member: Per acre?

Shri Kidwai: Yes; per acre.

Sardar Lal Singh: What about the cost of production?

Shri Kidwai: The cost is also less. Then, I have got other figures regarding this progressive cultivator from the Punjab and I will show that price had no effect. In 1949-50, when the cane price was Rs. 1-10-0, this progressive cultivator sold his cane from 86 acres for Rs. 29,329.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: What is the source of these figures?

Shri Kidwai: The sources are the Punjab Government and the sugar mills to which the cane was sold.

In 1950-51, when the cane price was Rs. 1-12-0, he got from 90 acres Rs. 39,745. Last year, when the cane price was Rs. 1-5-0, the cultivation was not 90 acres, but one acre less, he realised Rs. 33,185.

Sardar Lal Singh: I contest the figures. These figures are absolutely wrong and I am prepared to show that I have got figures for the area. In 1950-51 and succeeding year, the area was about 80 acres and last year about 100; this year it is reduced to 60 acres. The figures of production given by him are also wrong.

Shri Kidwai: I am further supported in my view. If 60 acres have brought him up to this amount, I am all the more correct. We will see what has been the difference in the price of wheat in the last two or three years in U.P., and Bihar. So far as Punjab is concerned, if we make any differentiation between the cane prices in the different areas, then, we will have to take into consideration the recovery. In Punjab, the recovery is very low. Still, the cane grower is paid Rs. 1-5-0 per maund. While the recovery in South India is more, where it is up to 12 per cent, he is also paid Rs. 1-5-0 per maund.

Sardar Lal Singh: Here again, I am sorry to interrupt. In the South, they have got an organisation called SISMA—South India Sugar Mills Association—which have adopted a definite formula according to which they pay initially a price of Rs. 1-5-0 a maund and if the sugar recovery is higher, the cultivator is given the *pro rata* benefit of the same, with the result that the cane grower in South gets much higher price, a *pro rata* share of the profit. That is a concession that is not being allowed in the U.P. or the Punjab. That makes all the difference. I know that they actually get Rs. 1-12-0 instead of Rs. 1-5-0.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member has had his full say and he was over anxious not to give way. I would request him not to interrupt and if he raises any objection, not to make a long speech on it.

Shri Kidwai: I am glad that the hon. Member has again contradicted himself. He definitely gave us figures about a Hyderabad mill which is a member of the South Indian Mills Association.

Sardar Lal Singh: It is not.

Shri Kidwai: The two persons whom he has named, they have come here and given a memorandum that although it is a member of that association, it is not given that price. Therefore, it is not an universal formula. I have been trying for the last 1½ years to find out a formula which

will pay the cane grower a price in proportion to the recovery and which would be a scientific formula. I have not been able to introduce it because I cannot trust the mill-owners not to take advantage of that.

I will give you an example. Last year, there was so much cane that the mills refused to crush after a certain date. Then, the U.P. Government asked them to crush the cane and pay according to recovery. There are two mills in the neighbourhood. They were drawing cane from the same area. But one mill showed a decrease of only 0.2 per hundred maunds recovery, while the other showed a decrease of two point something per maund. Therefore, I have asked some scientists to give us some formula that will be fool-proof. Otherwise, I cannot leave them at the mercy of the mill-owners because you cannot trust them. In another area also ...

1 P.M.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: In the matter of recovery it is not merely the cane that matters, but also the efficiency of the mill. So, that cannot be the sole criterion. Because you are judging, it is my duty to draw your attention to that.

Shri Kidwai: Efficiency or no efficiency, we should find out some method.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Yes.

Shri Kidwai: That is what I want. I have asked our research men and others if they can give us anything. Similarly, I know that there is cheating of the agriculturists in the weighment machine. I am trying to fix some check on that. But, I think we should be careful in fixing up a price. I have been taking interest in this cane question since 1933-34 when in U.P. we found that whenever there was cane in abundance, the mill owner would harass the people who would come, and as Mr. Dhusiya has said, they would pay rupees two or Rs. 1/6 per maund. I was a party to this *Eekh sangh* which agitated for the fixing of minimum prices. But I have found that whenever a price is fixed which brings

[Shri Kidwai]

them much larger profit than alternative cultivation, then the cultivation of cane goes up, and the result is next year they have to destroy the cane; the people who have not been able to sell their cane suffer much loss. That was our experience in 1951-52. Therefore, we should avoid that.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: That is true.

Shri Kidwai: We have still to decide. Tomorrow, I am meeting all the interests. We have to fix the cane price. If we find that in spite of this Rs. 1/5 per maund the area in different States has gone up under cane cultivation, then I will not accept any figure that the cane cultivation is higher or lower. I say that cane prices are more favourable than alternative crops. That is the real test. Why should not we adhere to it? If we had forced a certain area to cultivate cane and supply it to the mills, then the price and other things should have mattered. When it is free, when it is open to him to cultivate cane, wheat or rice, our agriculturist should choose the best he can cultivate or the more profitable cultivation. Therefore, it is easy for us to say that the price should be raised to Rs. 1/12 or rupees two. I know that the mill-owners themselves were a party to this preposterous thing, raising the price to rupees two per maund, and then taking advantage of their stock and raising the price of sugar to Rs. 35. What was the result? As I have said, next year the cultivation did not increase. It decreased.

I have got the figure of this learned agriculturist. In 1947-48, the price was fixed at rupees two per maund, but did you expect that the area should go up now? He decreased the area from 330 to 260 acres, because alternative crops were bringing him better price. Therefore, the matter of fixing up the price is the matter of comparative prices of different crops, and I would be happy if people go away from cane to other things and say, if the mill-owner comes, "we are fixing a minimum price". As our friend

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh said, leave it to the cultivator.

Formerly in a certain area from which the mill used to get its supply, they were prohibited from manufacturing *gur*. All those restrictions have been removed. It is open to them, if they get a higher price for *gur*, to convert their cane to *gur*, or the mill-owners would be forced to offer higher prices. It is an open secret. Whatever they come across, the mill-owners will be prepared to pay. If they are to keep idle, it will not pay them. Therefore, they will pay the higher price.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I was not referring to reserves. I said that if you were unable to pay a proportionately higher price for sugar-cane, you better leave it to the farmers.

Shri Kidwai: There is no question of any reserved area. If there is a reserved area as between one mill and another, and if the producer wants to manufacture *gur* in a reserved area, it is now open to him to do so. Three years before, the restrictions were there, and so he could not manufacture *gur*, and the movement of *gur* was also prohibited, so that the prices would remain the same, and the mill-owners would get it at their desired price. Now all these restrictions have been removed. There is no restriction on movement from this factory to any other place, and there is no limit as to what extent they can manufacture *gur*. What we have done is only to fix the minimum price, whatever may be the maximum.

डाकूर पुगल किशोर सिन्हा : बिहार सरकार से कब आप को खबर मिली थी, एकरेज के बारे में ? हम लोगों की खबर २८ तारीख की है, जबकि बिहार के इंडस्ट्रीज मिनिस्टर ने एक लिखित बयान में हम लोगों की यह खबर दी थी। इस लिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आप की खबर पहले की है या बाद की। अगर पहले की है तो आप को हमारी खबर सही माननी होगी।

श्री किशवर्ध्नि: बिहार सरकार ने जो कहा तो वहाँ तो प्राइस बढ़ाने की बात थी, इस लिये एग््रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर ने कह दिया। लेकिन हमारे पास तो एक वक्त मुकरंर है कि हर जिले से और हर हल्के से फिगर्स आ जाते हैं। वह फिगर्स हमारे पास हैं। मैं आप से यह भी कहूँ कि यू० पी० स फिगर्स आय हैं जो कम हैं, लेकिन यू० पी० का सिस्टम जो पटवारियों का है वह हट जाने से एक ब्रेकडाउन सा हो गया है। तो यू० पी गवर्नमेंट ने कह दिया इस को हन रिवाइज करें।

All these things are there in every place. Two or three years ago, the *gur* prices were high. The sugar prices also were high. But now they say there is a discouragement to the cultivator of sugar-cane.

श्री विभूति मिश्र (सारन व चम्पारन): मैं एक प्वाइंट ऑफ़ आर्डर पर जानना चाहता हूँ कि बिहार गवर्नमेंट क किस दफ़तर ने आप को फिगर्स दिये हैं।

श्री किशवर्ध्नि: बिहार गवर्नमेंट के उसी दफ़तर न फिगर्स दिये हैं जिस ने पार साल दिय थे और जिन को सही माना गया है।

Shri L. N. Mishra (Darbhanga cum Bhagalpur): Is it a fact that the Government of Bihar has written in a recent communication to the Government of India that the acreage under sugar-cane has gone down?

Shri Kidwai: I have heard it for the first time in this House.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know whether they have sent a letter to that effect, and have the Government of India received that letter?

Shri Kidwai: I cannot accept any statement that the acreage under sugar-cane cultivation has gone down.

Shri L. N. Mishra: It is by the department concerned.

Shri Kidwai: It is always the department concerned that sends us the returns.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: We shall place it again before you.

Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Dist.—East): The price of sugar has not been fixed in 1952-53, but the price of cane was fixed, and the sugar merchants have been allowed to get extra prices for the reserve stock. What have the Government done to relate the prices of the two, as was their previous policy?

Shri Kidwai: In regard to fixation of price, our experience has been this. I do not know what the experience of hon. Members on the other side is. If you sell this sugar in blackmarket, the result is that sugar is not available in sufficient quantity in open market, and people have therefore to pay a higher price. Ordinarily the law of supply and demand is governing this. When there is larger consumption, what is the percentage of rise in the price of sugar, as compared with that in the case of *gur*? Sugar prices have risen by about ten per cent. only, whereas *gur* prices have gone up by about 120 per cent., from about Rs. 1 to Rs. 29.

Shri T. N. Singh: With what year as the base?

Shri Kidwai: I am talking of this year. I am comparing the sugar and *gur* prices. The sugar prices have not gone up by more than ten per cent. anywhere, while *gur* prices have gone up by as much as 120 per cent.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahawaz Khan): Out of these Rs. 29, how much does the cultivator get?

Shri Kidwai: The cultivator has got the option—and I think we shall have to deal with another cultivator of sugar-cane—of supplying it to the mill, converting it into *gur*, or consuming it himself. There is no fourth method

[Shri Kidwai]

open to him. Why should he cultivate, if he loses something in the end? We have not been able to understand that.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: It is their money crop.

Shri Kidwai: So they are getting money. I would not like the areas under wheat and rice crops to be diverted for money crops, because we are importing.

Shri T. N. Singh: May we know if the price of sugar is now to be regulated by imports of sugar and not by the old formula of relative cane prices?

Shri Kidwai: As I said again and again there has been no fixation of price except reservation of 25 per cent. of the produce to be released at the formula that was in operation, that is, the sugar price would be Rs. 27 per maund. Therefore, we have released to State Governments recently sugar at Rs. 27 per maund.

Now what do I find? State Governments are selling sugar at the same price at which sugar is obtainable in the market. That policy of control did not succeed. What is the price here in Delhi? It is 12½ annas per seer while the price at which it was released to the States was Rs. 27. Therefore, we should see all these difficulties of control. An hon. Member has said that sugar is sufficient in this country, why should it be imported? The reason for this has been given in the reply that was given earlier that from the very beginning of this year we have been releasing a quantity that was much larger than last years and yet the prices were not brought down. I find that today on the 1st of September there are only 445,000 tons of sugar available in the mills. The release in each month is about 1.4 lakh tons. Therefore, if at the close of the year we do not have any stock the prices will rise. Therefore, we have imported 2,00,000 tons of sugar to keep the stocks at the beginning of the year and if we find that next year the price

continues to be as high as it is this year, we may have to import some more sugar next year.

श्री विभूति मिश्र: मैं एक बात जानना चाहता हूँ कि चीनी २७ रुपये मन जून, जोलाई और अगस्त इन तीन महीनों में नहीं बिकी है, इस से अधिक में बिकी है, ३०, ३२ और ३३ रुपये, मन तक बिकी है। तो क्या रिलीफ आप किसानों को देंगे?

श्री किडवाई : जी नहीं किसानों को कोई फायदा नहीं मिलेगा इस लिए कि उन्होंने गन्ने के दाम अपने शुरू में नहीं बढ़ाए थे।

श्री स्यामनन्दन सहाय : इस साल जी कोशिश हो रही है, उस को सुनाइये।

Pandit K. C. Sharma: May I put a simple question: whether the basis of the price is what the cultivator would be forced to accept to part with his sugar-cane under the compulsion of events or whether it would be based on a sound economy and stability of agriculture?

Shri Kidwai: I think the hon. Member does not understand the question. He comes from an area which is a *gur* producing area. He also knows that formerly, say, two years ago there were all sorts of restrictions for the manufacture of *gur* in a reserved area and that the manufacture of *gur* remained banned till the crushing season for sugar-mills was over. Now that the price of sugar-cane is low I have given them complete freedom that they can supply the cane to the mill or can convert it into *gur* and get the best price in the market. Now we have seen, even when the cane prices were high, what was the *gur* price. The *gur* prices fell in Meerut to Rs. 5/8 per maund because sugar-cane was so abundant that the mills could not crush. We have to save the cultivators from all these calamities.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: May I know who was responsible, if not the Government, for reducing the *gur* prices to rupees seven? What was the reason that *gur* was selling at rupees seven per maund when the bullocks and the cultivators were starving to death? Had the Government no responsibility whatsoever? Was the hon. Minister sleeping then?

Shri Kidwai: *Gur* price was fixed at Rs. 19 previously.

The hon. Member does not know anything.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: The *gur* price went down to rupees seven.

Shri Kidwai: It went down because there was no purchaser, I say there are commodities that we can

purchase. I received information from Saurashtra only four days ago that the crops were so good that *bajre* is being sold at rupees six per maund. That is an uneconomic price and I authorised the Saurashtra Government to start purchasing at the Government rate of Rs. 9/8 per maund which is considered to be an economic price. Therefore, we have a price-support policy and we adopt it wherever we can. Where the price is proportionately high we have to check it.

ठाकुर युगल किशोर सिंहा : क्या इस क इकानामिक प्राइस की कोई भी जांच हुई थी ?

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Wednesday the 2nd September, 1953: