

RAJYA-SABHA

Thursday, the 3rd March, 1994/12
Phalgun, 1915 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr.
Chairman in the Chair

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Landed Cost of Imported Fertilizers

*121. DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI : Will the MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state what is the landed cost of different categories of imported fertilizers ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (Shri Euduro Faleiro) : Stat-meht is laid on the Table of the House.

The major fertilizers imported by the country are Urea, DAP and MOP. The average C & F cost (overseas cost plus ocean freight) of Urea, which is imported by Government, is Rs. 3813 per tonne during the period from April, 1993 to January, 1994. The imports of DAP and MOP have been decanalized. No record of these imports is maintained by Government. As per the available information, the C & F cost of imports of DAP between April, 1993 to January 1994 is in the range of Rs. 4900—6100 per tonne and MOP Rs. 3300—3740 per tonne.

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI : Sir, the hon. Minister, in the course of his reply, has stated that the landed cost of urea is Rs. 3,813 per tonne whereas the sale price in this country is more than Rs. 6,000 per tonne. The Government, time and again, mentions that a lot more subsidies on fertilisers are being offered to the farmers, and the media as well as the intellectuals in the urban area also propagate the same but, Sir, my contention is that this subsidy percolates to the feriiiliser industry under the guise of farmers subsidy. So, the Government is firing its guns on the shoulders of the farmers. What I would like to know from the hon. Minister is that when the imported cost is only Rs. 3,000 and odd, why it is that, in spite of offering a heavy subsidy to the indigenous industries, our larmer has to pay at least five times more than his counterparts in Japan and two or 95-
M/B(N)16RSS—1

three times more than his counterparts in the neighbouring countries of Pakistan and Bangladesh for the same quantity of fertilisers So So, how does the Government propose, to, rationalise this on this so-called subsidy to the farmers instead of allowing it to be pocket ted by this industry ?

रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्री (श्री राम लखन सिंह यादव) : महोदय, चूंकि यह प्रश्न ऐसा है जिसमें कई स्टेड्स में कई तरह के डिसी-जन्स आते हैं तो ऐसी स्थिति में थोड़ा समझ लगेगा। मैं चाहूंगा कि इस चीज को सर्वेक्षण समझ अपने समझ से एक्सप्लेन कर दें। अभी जो लैंडेड कॉस्ट यूरिया का है वह 3813 रुपए प्रति टन है। डी०ए०पी० का आता है 4900 रुपए से लेकर 6100 रुपए प्रति टन, डिफर करता रहता है। एम०ओ०पी० का आता है 3300 रुपए से लेकर 3740 रुपए प्रति टन। यह सी०आई०एफ० मूल्य हैं। इसके अतिरिक्त भारतीय बंदरगाह पर आने पर माल उतारने, बंदरगाह का शुल्क इत्यादि में भी पैसा लगता है और वह सब मिलाकर जो मूल्य आता है उसे हम लैंडेड कॉस्ट कहते हैं।

महोदय, 25-8-92 से फॉस्फेटिक तथा फोटोशिक उर्वरकों पर कंट्रोल समाप्त कर दिया गया है। इसी तरह 17-9-92 को डी० ए०पी० का आयात कैंनेलाईजेशन के बायरे से बाहर कर दिया गया है और 17-6-93 को एम०ओ०पी० का आयात कैंनेलाईजेशन से बाहर कर दिया गया है। महोदय, 1993-94 के प्रारंभ में आयातित यूरिया का मूल्य 115 डालर यानी 3630 रुपए था। इसका कारण सोवियत यूनियन, में खपत की कमी था। यह बढ़कर 113 डालर यानी 4995 रुपए हो गया। यह आयात मुख्यतः सोवियत यूनियन, खाड़ी के देशों तथा पूर्वी यूरोप के देशों के साथ होता रहा है। हाल ही में बंगला देश से रेल द्वारा यूरिया लाने की व्यवस्था की गई है। वर्ष 1993-94 में 4000 टन यूरिया आयात

किया गया और 1994-95 में एक लाख टन यूरिया प्रति वर्ष बंगला देश से लाने का प्रावधान है। चूंकि यूरिया प्रतिधारण मूल्य, रिटेंशन प्राईस के अंतर्गत है और इस पर सब्सिडी दी जाती है, अतः आयात किया गया माल इस देश के उत्पादकों पर कोई प्रभाव नहीं डालता। अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार में डी०ए०पी० को जो दाम है...

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Minister might like to conclude so other questions could be asked.

श्री राम लखन सिंह यादव : मैं तो पूरा विवरण बता रहा हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि मैबर्स को इन बातों की जानकारी है, इस बारे में बहुत बार प्रश्न आए हैं, सब इस से बाकिफ है, इसलिए मैं इस प्रश्न पर अधिक समय नहीं ले रहा हूँ।

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI : Sir, any how the hon. Minister did not reply to my question. In reply to one of the questions on 10th December given on the floor of this House, the Minister said that the cost of imported urea was as low as \$89 per metric tonne. Now the hon. Minister says that is something else and he is quoting the figure which is at least double the figure that was said in reply to a question during last December. There is a distortion in the answers and I don't want to blame the Minister. The distortion has to be corrected. The entire subsidy is being utilised and pocketed by the fertiliser industry and it is not percolating to the lower levels, to the farmers for whom it is intended. I would like to seek the indulgence of the hon. Prime Minister to clarify as to what effective steps the Government proposes to take so that the envisaged subsidy percolates down to the deserving persons, to the farming community in his country. The (b) part of the question which I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister is that in the last year' Budget proposals, some *ad hoc* subsidy was offered in the case of MOP, DAP, Single Super Phosphate, etc. But no mention has been made in the current year's Budget proposals in regard to this *ad hoc* subsidy. What are the proposals with the Government and

how does the Government want to tackle this problem? I would like this to be clarified by the hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Sir, let me first clarify the points. The hon. Member says that the farmer is not getting the benefit of subsidy and that the farmer here is worse than the farmer in the neighbouring countries. To these points I would like to say that in none of the neighbouring countries or in the countries mentioned by the hon. Member does the State do so much in terms of subsidy to the farmers as in this country as far as fertiliser is concerned. That is number one point. I may clarify the point number two by saying that the prices that we have given here are the average prices for the year and, therefore, they vary from time to time. Even these figures are not very accurate because they are also the average prices. The present price of indigenous urea is Rs. 5,078 per MT including freight. In the case of imported urea, it is Rs. 5,095, including landing and handling charges, freight etc. What we really pay is Rs. 5,078 but it is sold at Rs. 2,760 per MT. This price at which we are selling to the farmers is nearly half the cost price. It is the result of subsidy. This much of subsidy is available nowhere in the neighbouring countries or for that matter nowhere else ... (interruptions)...

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI : But it is going to the industry. It is not going to the farmers.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : No, it is going to the farmers... (Interruption)... The cost of imported urea is Rs. 5,078. I am sorry the cost of indigenous urea is Rs. 5,078 and the cost of imported urea is Rs. 5,095 per MT including handling charges, transportation charges, etc. The sale price is Rs. 2760 per MT. This is the price. This sort of concession is available nowhere in the neighbouring countries or for that matter, nowhere in the countries mentioned by the hon. Member. As for the question, 'What steps have been taken?', I don't want to take the time of the House because the hon. Minister has already clarified this question. As for the question of special concession for DAP, I may say that the matter—There is a point in what the hon. Member says—is under the active consideration of the Government.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : सभापति महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो इम्पोर्टेड डीएपी है उसके दाम के मुकाबले में और सरकार ने जो दाम तय किये हैं भारत के कारखानों के, उस कीमत पर डीएपी तैयार नहीं कर पा रही है और उसके उत्पादन पर विपरीत असर पड़ रहा है। अब विदेशों से आने वाली डीएपी के बारे में संदेह पैदा होने लगा है कि क्या हम उतना प्राप्त कर सकेंगे? इसके अभाव में किसान अन्य प्रकार के खाद का उपयोग कर रहा है जो जमीन के लिए नुकसानदेह है। तो क्या सरकार स्थानीय कारखानों की मदद के लिए कुछ ऐसी व्यवस्था करेगी कि उनकी बंद न होना पड़े और उनका डीएपी का उत्पादन बराबर बना रहे?

श्री राम लखन सिंह यादव : इस तरह की व्यवस्था बराबर सरकार करना चाहती है और करती रहेगी। लेकिन जो सामग्री हमारे पास उपलब्ध है उसके अनुसार विदेश से जो हम को मंगाना पड़ता है इस तरह का खाद उसका मूल्य ज्यादातर विदेशों के मूल्य पर निर्भर करता है। जब वहाँ दाम बढ़ जायेंगे तो अमूमन हमें ज्यादा लगेंगे और जब घटेगा तो हम को कम लगेंगे। इससे मूल्य का नियंत्रण हमारे हाथ में नहीं है।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : यहाँ के कारखानों की कुछ ऐसी मदद करिये कि उनके डीएपी का उत्पादन बना रहे। इस समय बंद हो रहे हैं।

श्री राम लखन सिंह यादव : यहाँ के कारखानों को स्वावलम्बी बनने के लिए इस देश में माननीय सदस्यगण हम को जो सुझाव देंगे... (व्यवधान)... उसको हम एकजामिन करेंगे। (व्यवधान)]

डा० बापू कासबाते : सरकार क्या कर रही है?

श्री राम लखन सिंह यादव : सरकार सब से विचार करके ही काम करती है।...

(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती कमला सिंह : पालिसी क्या है इस दिशा में?

श्री राम लखन सिंह यादव : आपके विचारों से लाभ उठाया जायेगा यह मैं जरूर आपसे आग्रह करना चाहता हूँ।

DR. MURLI ^MANOHAR JOSHI : Sir> there is a very specific question as to what the policy of the Government is with regard to the production of this fertilizer so that the prices of the Indian producers remain competitive and also the production does not stall and the chances of these units going out of production and getting ultimately closed are nowhere because there are about 20 fertilizer units which have been closed down and the Paradip factory which is one of the big-gest fertilizer factories in the whole of Asia has been closed. So, if this policy is going to influence the normal production and employment and also the availability of the fertilizer to the farmer, we would like to know what the Government is doing about it.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Sir, in regard to DAP, I would like to clarify here that the average indigenous cost of DAP comes to Rs. 7,800 per tonne with special subsidy which is there at this point of time, as of today. This is Rs. 1,000. The cost comes to Rs. 6,800 which is competitive internationally and, therefore, our indigenous industry can compete, can clearly compete, can comfortably compete with this Rs. 1,000 subsidy. And I have already answered the other question whether we will continue with this Rs. 1,000 which is as of today. I said that the matter is under active consideration and the point made by him is well taken.

श्री राम नरेश यादव : माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि हमारा जो इंडिजनस का फर्टीलाइजर है जो हमारे देश में उत्पादित है वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मार्केट में भी कम्पीटीशन की क्षमता रखता है जबकि एक हजार सबसिडी भी दे रहे हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ, यह बात

स्पष्ट है कि सचमुच में आयात अधिक कर रहे हैं और हम विदेशी मुद्रा भी दे रहे हैं, जब सरकार इस बात को जानती है कि ग्रीन रेवोल्यूशन के पश्चात जिस तरह से फर्टीलाइजर का इस्तेमाल करके किसान ने खाद के उत्पादन को बढ़ाया, 51 मीलियन टन से इस बात को बढ़ा कर काफी आगे पहुंचा दिया है, ध्यान में रखते हुए सरकार इंडिजनस यानी जो अपनी खाद है उसका उत्पादन करने के लिए क्या ठोस कदम उठाने जा रही है ताकि जो हम इम्पोर्ट कर रहे हैं और जो अपने यह प्रोडिक्शन है उसका अन्तर कम कर सके ? इस दिशा में काम करने के लिए सरकार ने क्या प्रयास किया है और क्या आठवीं पंच-वर्षीय योजना में सफलता प्राप्त कर सकेंगे ? यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं ।

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Sir, our problem is not of our industry but of raw materials—where it is a question of urea and nitrogenous fertilizers, gas is in short supply in our country and where it is a question of DAP, phosphoric acid and rock phosphate are not available to the extent of 95 percent of our requirement. In the case of MOP, potash is just not available to any extent whatsoever. Our problem is of raw material supply, I would like to make it clear that in the case of urea, the installed capacity of our urea industry has gone up tremendously. If we take 1983-84 as the base year, from 9167.9 metric tons, in 1992-93—for which I have the figures—it has gone upto 15,025.6 metric tons, and so on. Not only the installed capacity, but also the actual production has gone up tremendously and it is more than double. From 6029 metric tons, it has gone up to 13,122.9 metric tons in 1992-93. Also for the capacity utilisation, again taking 1983-84 as the base year, from 65.8 per cent, the average capacity utilisation has gone up in 1992-93 to 87.3 per cent. So, our industry, particularly in nitrogen and urea sector, and even otherwise across the board, is doing quite well. Our production is quite well. Our companies are doing well. But the raw material is not there. We are subject to grave and sharp upswings in the costs. Therefore, there are two things

that we can do. One is to get the raw materials, here, subject to cost fluctuations, and secondly, to make an attempt to go to the joint ventures where raw materials are available. We have a good experience with Senegal as far as phosphoric acid is concerned. We are on the pipeline. Our discussion is at the primary stage with different types of joint ventures, particularly where gas and raw materials are available, that is basically the Middle-East, Iran, Brunei, etc.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I would like to know whether the Minister is aware of the complaint that DAP is being dumped on India at an uncompetitive rate. If so, what action is contemplated by the Government ? Part (b) of my question is, whether the Government is also aware of the fact that many fertilizer units of Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation have been closed down. What are the steps that Government proposes to take to see that these factories are opened again ?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : As far as dumping is concerned, we do not deal, with it. There is a legal procedure, in fact a quasi-judicial procedure, in the Commerce Ministry.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM : Are you aware ?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : For dumping, there must be a finding of dumping. There is no finding about which I can report to the House. The finding is given by a judge...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Yours is a nodal Ministry. You must have made a study. You must be able to take the House into confidence.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : I am taking the house into confidence. As I recall, there was complaint of dumping made by the industry. Incidentally, complaints of dumping are not made by any Government department but by the industry. Therefore, the complaint is there. But a decision is not there. The decision is of a quasijudicial nature by an authority in the Commerce Ministry. Until a decision is there, obviously my Ministry cannot give any finding. On the second point of closure, this is not a thing that has happened now. In fact, there is no closure

Practically all the units are working now. In HFC itself, as on today, they are working. You have things like Haldia which never opened. So there is no question. It never worked for a single day. The point about HFC in short is that this was at the beginning. Actually when the industry was set up, we had problems at that point of time of a financial nature. We relied on credits. For instance, in the case of Haldia, there are 13 different credits. There are problems, therefore, resulting in imbalances, in the plant and machinery. There are technology deficiencies of such a grave nature that the plant could not be commissioned, as I was saying. And similar things happened to the HpC generally. It is not a question of power supply. In the case of Haldia, for instance, with due respect I may say that the West Bengal Government themselves, their electricity boards, did not supply power at that point of time. This is just a minor element. I do not want to make an issue of it. But there are a number of complex elements which have made the plant nonviable in most cases and, therefore, we are having problems. But the plants are working at this point of time, by and large.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Question No. 122.

(Interruption*) we have taken twenty minutes on this question.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM : This is a very important question, Sir.

MR- CHAIRMAN : It could be taken up through some other way, not spending time during Question Hour.

*122. [The questioner (Shri Sukomal Sen) was absent. For answer, vide Col.....]

Amorphous Nature of Crystalline Solids

123. SHRI JAQNNAT SINGH: will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government are aware of the technology known as Amorphous nature of Crystalline Solids developed¹ by Ms. Seema Kaila of Roorkee University; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and what action is being taken by Government in this regard ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS

OF ATOMIC ENERGY, SPACE AND MINISTER OF STATE; IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY (SHRIBHUVNESH CHATURVEDI) (a) and (b) Government are not aware of the technology developed by Ms. Seema Kaila of Roorkee University. She left the University in 1984 after post-graduation in Chemistry.

श्री जगन्नाथ सिंह : सभापति महोदय, संत्री जी ने जो मुझे उत्तर दिया है, उसके अनुसार इस प्रौद्योगिकी के संबंध में जानकारी सरकार को नहीं है और 1984 में उन्होंने इस विश्वविद्यालय को छोड़ दिया। 1984 के पूर्व जब सुशी सीमा कौला जब वहां पर थी तो इस प्रौद्योगिकी के संबंध में विश्वविद्यालय को जानकारी थी, मेरी जानकारी इस संबंध में यह है लेकिन क्या सरकार की ओर से विश्वविद्यालय से इस संबंध में जानकारी चाही गई थी ?

श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी : सभापति महोदय, जैसे मैंने निवेदन किया है, ऐसी कोई सूचना हमारे पास नहीं है। रुड़की यूनिवर्सिटी से भी-मालूम किया, वहां भी सूचना उपलब्ध नहीं है। लेकिन इसके लिए जानकारी करेंगे और बतानीय सदस्य को सूचित करेंगे। अगर माननीय सदस्य के पास कोई जानकारी उपलब्ध हो तो वह पूछने की कृपा करें।

श्री जगन्नाथ सिंह : सभापति महोदय, मेरे की बात यह है कि किसी नवीन प्रौद्योगिकी के संबंध में यदि कोई रिपोर्ट अपनी ओर से नागरिकों द्वारा की जाती है तो उस संबंध में सरकार किस प्रकार से उदासीन है, यह सरकार द्वारा दिये गये उत्तर से स्पष्ट होता है। मैं सरकार से अपेक्षा करता हूं और आश्वासन चाहता हूं कि इस संबंध में जानकारी एकत्र कर के सदन को अवगत कराया जाए। मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूं कि यह जानकारी किब तक उपलब्ध कराई जाएगी ?

MR- CHAIRMAN : The hon. Minister has said that even the University has no information about it. Therefore, if the hon.