

One Union Minister was on the platform with the leader of the agitation.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow it.

Shri Vasudevan Natr: Such things have taken place.

SUPPLY OF SUGAR

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Braj Raj Singh, which reads as follows:

"Failure of the Government of India to regulate the distribution and supply of sugar and control the prices of sugar, as a consequence of which the consumers of sugar have been squeezed heavily by the sugar magnates during the last several days and the sugar magnates reaped undue profits to an extent of nearly ten crores of rupees."

Has the hon Minister to say anything?

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): May I submit a word on this?

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): May I point out that I have raised a different point?

Mr. Speaker: What is that?

Shri Khadilkar: I do not want to refer to the Proclamation. What I have said in my adjournment motion is this: If there is a violation of the Constitution, which is the supreme document, and the fundamental document of the State, is it not the duty of this House to take note of it, as to what led to the Proclamation, and how the Proclamation has been issued? For, there is no explanatory note along with the Proclamation which will enable us to judge it, when it will come up for discussion at a later date. So, what I suggest is this: If there is a violation of the Constitution, then, is it not a matter of urgent importance to be taken note of here? I am not saying whether that Proclamation is

justified or unjustified, but violation must be taken note of by the House immediately. Otherwise, is this House going to consider the Constitution a scrap of paper?

Mr. Speaker: Very well I shall consider this matter also. The hon. Member only says that from time to time, this House must be taken into confidence regarding the various steps, that is, step after step as to what Government are doing. If he thinks that this is a proper matter to raise, that instead of a Proclamation being suddenly issued, information must have been given to the House from time to time regarding the manner in which the administration is going on there, and whether Central intervention is necessary immediately or at a particular stage later on, he can raise this matter in the course of the discussion on the Proclamation. That was why I overruled it and withheld my consent to this adjournment motion.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: On the 9th May, I had voiced the feeling that there would be a sugar famine in India during these three months when Parliament would not be sitting. I had stated this only for this reason that last year also, while Government were pleased to issue an ordinance for the export of sugar, the sugar magnates with the complicity of Government reaped high profits. During this season also, I can tell you that some seven lakhs tons of sugar were released, that is, during the last four months; and at the rate of Rs 6 to Rs 8 per maund, undue profits have been reaped by the sugar magnates; to the tune of nearly Rs. 14 crores; the sugar magnates have taken undue profits from the consumers.

I want to ask why Government were not alert. You, Sir, were pleased to direct Government to inform the public while this House was not in session, as to what steps were being taken about the distribution of sugar, and if the prices rose, what steps were being taken by them.

[Shri Braj Raj Singh.]

to keep them down. But the Government did not do anything during the last two and a half months or so. And people had to suffer a great deal.

This matter is the responsibility of the Government, and I, therefore, submit that a discussion should be allowed on this, so that the country may know how Government have been negligent in dealing with the matter, and consequently, the prices went up and the people were squeezed.

Shri Sampath (Namakkal): The hon. Prime Minister had been stating more than once in this House that decisions arrived at by the Parliament should not be challenged in the streets. But, now, he himself, along with some of his colleagues, has openly supported an agitation in Kerala. Is it proper? Should we not be allowed to discuss it in this House on an adjournment motion?

Mr. Speaker: I am really surprised at this. Every hon. Member wants to make a speech regarding a matter which I have closed. As I said, if any hon. Member gets an opportunity, he can say all this, whether this was brought about by any particular individual or individuals responsible or other people.

Now, therefore, the same rule applies to the hon. Member also. His adjournment motion is not allowed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I wish to say something about the sugar prices. On 9th May, 1959, a statement was made by the Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture that it was some unscrupulous people who had created this scare. Even today, in U.P., the price in the open market is Rs. 1-4-0 per seer, whereas the controlled price is 0-95 nP. I want to know what action has been taken by Government, and what steps have been taken by Government. The sugar price has become a standing scandal in the whole of the country. I want a

definite answer from the Minister as to when the scandal is going to end.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): There is no doubt that there have been difficulties and troubles about sugar. I also concede that there must be a discussion on sugar. I am preparing a paper which I propose to place before the House shortly, in which I shall give all the details of the action which Government have taken. Incidentally, I may mention that now, in the controlled area, the sugar millowners are not allowed to sell sugar on their own account.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Why were they not allowed even during the last three months?

Shri A. P. Jain: All the sugar is being allocated by Government at the fixed prices. So far as the mills are concerned, they are fully controlled. We have also controlled the wholesale dealers. Now, the sugar situation has consequently improved. I do not say that it has become normal, there are yet difficulties.

Some Hon. Members: It has not improved.

Shri A. P. Jain: and I too hope.

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): It is an insult to the House to say that it has improved. It has not. Where has it improved? Which is the market where it has improved?

Shri Tangamani: Why always mislead the House?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: And hide facts?

Shri A. P. Jain: I hope that with the organisation of the market and with the organisation of the sales through co-operatives, and through better control of the ...

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The co-operatives are formed by the business magnates who are profiteers.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. All that will be discussed.

Shri A. P. Jain: So, all these matters will come before the House, and I would like that a discussion may take place. I hope I shall be able to place the paper before the House shortly on sugar.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I know why Government did not take over these stocks during the last three months?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. This is not the way to carry on the proceedings of the House. The hon Member has been here for quite some time, and he should know.

May I know from the hon Minister if he has any intention to place before the House, or first of all, circulate a statement to the Members before the discussion starts?

Shri A. P. Jain: That is my intention.

Mr. Speaker: As soon as the statement is laid on the Table of the House, I shall circulate copies of the same, and immediately, or as early as possible, have a discussion on this matter. Hon Members will have a full opportunity to discuss this matter.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Shall we have it this week?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): When shall we have that statement?

Shri A. P. Jain: In this week.

Mr. Speaker: During this week itself, he will place a statement on the Table of the House. Hon Members may be ready and be prepared for a discussion later on.

In view of this, I am not allowing this adjournment motion.

12.27 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

PROCLAMATION re KERALA

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): Sir, I beg to lay on the

Table, under clause (3) of article 356 of the Constitution, a copy of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 31st July, 1950, under article 356 of the Constitution, assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of Kerala. [Placed in Library See No LT-1455]

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): I want to raise one point. No doubt, already, it has been raised. The Proclamation reads

"Whereas I, Rajendra Prasad, President of India, have received a report from the Governor of the State of Kerala and after considering the report and other information received by me, I am satisfied that a situation has arisen "

According to article 356 of the Constitution

Mr. Speaker: What is it that the hon Member wants?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: What I want to point out is that if we are to discuss the Proclamation here, and to see whether there was any satisfaction on the part of the President, and if the Parliament has to approve of the satisfaction of the President, then it can do so only if it understands what the report is, and gets a copy of the report and other information received by the President. What is the information that he has received? What is the report that has been sent to him? For, it is stated here that on the basis of these things, he is satisfied that the Government of the State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

If we are to discuss this Proclamation at all, then, without the report of the Governor and without a copy of the other information received, this Parliament cannot approve or disapprove of it. What is the basis for approving or disapproving of the Proclamation by the President? The basis for it is the report of the