

1	2	3	4	5
15.	Andaman . . . . .	1	100	32
16.	Chandigarh . . . . .	11	54480	17434
17.	Delhi . . . . .	89	397519	127206
18.	Goa . . . . .	22	5299	1696
19.	Lakshadweep . . . . .	1	11	36
20.	Pondicherry . . . . .	6	850	272
21.	Nagaland . . . . .	1	3504	1121
22.	Haryana . . . . .	142	571600	182912
23.	Punjab . . . . .	303	1584375	507000
24.	Uttar Pradesh . . . . .	788	8134375	2603000
25.	West Bengal . . . . .	285	5187500	1660000
<b>TOTAL :</b>		2749	19193788	6142014

**Production of ghee and butter etc. by Delhi Milk Scheme**

1242. DR. MOHD. HASHIM KIDWAI: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) the production of milk, ghee and butter under the Delhi Milk Scheme during the last three years, year-wise;

(b) the price of milk ghee and butter during these years; and

(c) the profit or loss incurred by the Delhi Milk Scheme during these years?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): (a) The production of milk, ghee and butter by Delhi Milk Scheme during the last three years (year-wise) is indicated below:

Year	Production of		
	Milk (In lakh Litres)	Ghee (in Tonnes)	Butter (In Tonnes)
1986-87 . . . . .	1375.67	616.30	121.40
1987-88 . . . . .	1379.17	348.70	63.00
1988-89 . . . . .	1445.90	533.20	56.40

(b) A statement indicating the price of milk ghee and butter during the last three years is annexed [See Appendix (i), Annexure No. 63]

(c) The losses incurred by Delhi Milk Scheme during the last three years are indicated below:—

Year	Loss (Rs. in crore)
1986-87	Rs. 7.40 (Provisional)
1987-88	Rs. 12.03 (Provisional)
1988-89	Rs. 18.50 (Estimated)

#### Procurement and distribution price of rice

1243. SHRI SOHAN LAL DHU-SIYA: Will the Minister of FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES be pleased to refer to replies to Unstarred Questions 390 and 455 given in the Rajya Sabha on 24th February, 1989 and state:

(a) whether inspite of declaring the price of rice (Superfine) as Rs. 325 per quintal w.e.f. 25-1-1989, the food card holders are getting the rice from Fair Price Shops @ Rs. 3.35 per kg. irrespective of the quality of rice being superfine, fine or common;

(b) the qualitywise quantity of rice supplies to Fair Price Shop No. 7805 and the price on which it was sold to the consumers food card holders from 1-7-1988 to 31-3-1989 ; and

(c) the reasons for which the price of superfine quality of rice was being charged @ Rs. 2.89 w.e.f. 1-10-1987 and @ Rs. 3.35 w.e.f. 25-1-1989 per Kg. by the Fair Price shops?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI SUKH RAM): (a) The price of Rs. 325/-per quintal for superfine rice is the central issue price. The State

Governments/U.T. Administrations fix the end retail price, taking into account incidental charges, such as, transportation, handling, octroi duty, margins for Fair Price Shops etc. In Delhi, these charges are fixed at Rs. 10/-per quintal and hence the consumer price is Rs. 3.35 per Kg.

Delhi Administration has also stated that only superfine rice is distributed to the food-card holders in the Union Territory.

(b) Fair Price Shop No. 7805 distributed more than 932 quintals of rice from July 1, 1988 to 24th January, 1989 at the pre-revised price of Rs. 2.89 per Kg. and more than 435 quintals of rice at the revised price of Rs. 3.35 per Kg. from 25-1-89 to 31-3-89 to food card holders attached to this Fair Price Shop.

(c) The price was raised to Rs. 3.35 per Kg. for super-fine rice w.e.f. 25-1-1989 because of the increase in the central issue price of this quality of rice from Rs. 279 per quintal to Rs. 325 per quintal from that date.

#### Study of agricultural economy

1244. SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have made any critical study of the present agricultural economy in the country;

(b) if so, to what extent, the planned objectives for the removal of the regional growth imbalances as also narrowing down income differentials had been achieved and what are the main impediments in sharing the growth equitably by various States in the country;

(c) the actual areas which have either remained unaffected or have gained marginally with the agricultural growth in the country; and