

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT
Price of Sugarcane

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Khushwaqt Rai and Shri S. L. Saksena relating to:

"the decision of the Government of India to make payments for sugarcane purchased after 8-5-55 not at the minimum fixed price for the year but on the basis of recovery which will fall down below the average in the month of May on account of drying for which the cane-grower is in no way responsible while higher prices were not paid during the months of January and February when the recovery was the highest and much above the average and this decision will result in causing loss to the extent of crores to the cane-growers for no fault of theirs and is now causing great unrest and resentment in them."

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): This is the normal practice that has been followed for several years.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajanj): Only one year.

Shri A. P. Jain: No, four or five years.

Shri S. L. Saksena: Only last year.

Shri A. P. Jain: No, that is wrong.

An Hon. Member: Two years.

Shri A. P. Jain: At a certain time when the heat increases, the sucrose content of the sugarcane goes down, and mills generally refuse to crush the cane. The device which has been followed for several years is that the price of the sugarcane is linked with recovery.

You would recollect that last year this question was raised by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, and there was a half-hour discussion on the 25th May 1956. Nothing new has been done. In fact, this has been done in the interests of the cane grower because if the

price is not linked with the recovery the factories will not crush the cane and the cane will either stand until the next year when its recovery will further go down or it will go rot. I do not think that this is actually a matter for an adjournment motion. There is nothing new about it and this is a practice which has been followed for long.

Shri S. L. Saksena: Will the hon. Minister consider the advisability of doing it in February or January when it is higher?

Shri A. P. Jain: The House should be aware that there is a formula for giving bonus to the cane growers when the prices are above a certain level. That bonus also takes account of the recovery and if the recovery is higher the bonus is higher.

Shri S. L. Saksena: When is that given?

Shri A. P. Jain: It has been given for 1953-54. Some calculations were made for 1954-55, I believe, and it was known that in that year not many factories—or perhaps no factory—were in a position to give the bonus on account of the prices. That formula is there and a committee was appointed to review that formula and that matter is under consideration.

Shri S. L. Saksena: But there has been no payment in U.P. so far for any year.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): If there has been no payment made in U.P. what is the use of fixing the minimum price of sugar if it is to be linked with the sucrose content?

Shri A. P. Jain: That is the normal practice; but when abnormal conditions prevail, the recovery goes down and the mills are not in a position to crush it. Then, it is linked with the recovery.

Mr. Speaker: I am not allowing this adjournment motion. This is a practice which has been followed. Whether it has been followed all the years or not, it has been admitted by Shri S. L. Saksena that it was followed at least last year.

Shri A. P. Jain: It has been followed for the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. Speaker: For the purposes of the adjournment motion, it is enough if it was followed last year—and it has been admitted by Shri S. L. Saksena.

Shri S. L. Saksena: It was protested against last year.

Mr. Speaker: So far as the adjournment motion is concerned, the protest was as old as one year. Therefore, there is no urgency for this. There are other remedies. Not that I am barring other remedies; but adjournment motion is not the remedy. Normally, adjournment motions are to be so serious as to necessitate the suspension of other normal work before the House. Under these circumstances I am not called upon to give consent to this motion for the adjournment of the House.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Audit Report (Civil), Part I

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Audit Report (Civil) 1956—Part I, under Article 151(1) of the Constitution. [placed in Library. See No. S-38/57.]

Amendments to Mining Leases (Modifications of Terms) Rules

The Minister of Mines and Oil (Shri K. D. Malviya): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under section 10 of the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1948, a copy of the Notification No. 29(5)/57-MIV, dated the 6th April, 1957, making certain amendments to the Mining Leases (Modification of Terms) Rules, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. S-39/57.]

Amendments to Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation Rules.)

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section

40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, a copy of the Notification No. S.R.O. 1487, dated the 11th May, 1957, making certain amendments to the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955. [Placed in Library. See No. S-40/57.]

Medicinal and Toilet Preparations (Excise Duties) Rules

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (4) of section 19 of the Medicinal and Toilet Preparations (Excise Duties) Act, 1955, a copy of the Medicinal and Toilet Preparations (Excise Duties) Rules, 1956, published in the Notification No. S.R.O. 891, dated the 23rd March, 1957. [Placed in Library. See No. S-41/57.]

STATEMENT RE: DISPUTE BETWEEN BURMAH SHELL OIL STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTING COMPANY LTD., AND PETROLEUM WORKERS' UNION

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): On the opening day of this Session, Shri Anthony Pillai gave notice of an adjournment motion arising out of a strike which had been started by the workers of the Burmah Shell Company. I informed the House that I was willing to intervene in the dispute. Accordingly, I invited representatives of both sides to meet me that afternoon. I will not take up the time of the House with the facts of the dispute. Both parties agreed before me that the dispute was one of interpretation of an earlier agreement and that the question of interpretation should be referred to adjudication. It was also agreed that the strike would be called off immediately and that pending the decision of the adjudicator, the company would maintain the existing position.

I am glad that this dispute has been solved in this manner but looking back on the course of events ever since the dispute started, I cannot help