

**CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER
OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—Contd.
IMMEDIATE NEED TO PAY REMU-
NERATIVE PRICES TO SUGARCANE
GROWERS FOR THEIR PRODUCE IN
VIEW OF FALL IN PRODUCTION OF
SUGAR**

श्री अश्विनी कुमार : माननीय उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने आज 6 बजे मुझे इस विषय पर बोलने का समय दिया इसके लिए मैं आभारी हूँ, सौभाग्य है मेरा। इस समय केवल एक बात मैं आपके माध्यम से इस सदन में रखना चाहता हूँ कि 20 नवम्बर को इसी सदन के अंदर एक शार्ट ड्यूरेशन डिबेट हुआ था "सिचुएशन अराबिजिंग आउट आफ स्टीप राइज इन प्राइसेज आफ इसेंशियल कम्पोजिटीज", जब यह उप-भोक्ताओं का प्रश्न था तो उस डिबेट के लिए सदन ने लगभग 4 घंटे का समय दिया था और आज संयोग ऐसा है कि यह किसानों के मसले का प्रश्न है, डेढ़ घंटे का समय प्राप्त मिला है और अब शायद मेरे बाद कोई बोलने वाला है भी नहीं यह प्रश्नवाचक चिन्ह है। यह विचित्र संयोग हमारे सदन के और हमारे देश की उस चीज को परिलक्षित करता है, सरकार के कार्यक्रम को परिलक्षित करता है कि जब किसान का विषय आता है तो उसके लिए समय नहीं है, समय अचूरा है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार वासन) : आप पूरा ले लीजिए।

श्री अश्विनी कुमार : और जो सरकार की पद्धति चल रही है (व्यवधान) आज जो स्पष्ट हुआ है उसके आगे से अनुभव हो रहा है और जो नीतियां भी दिखती हैं, जहां तक किसान का प्रश्न है, किसान के पिछड़ेपन को दूर करने के लिए आज सरकार की नीतियां कारगर नहीं हो रही हैं। आज गन्ने के दाम का प्रश्न है जिस विषय पर चर्चा हो रही है सबको पता है, आम आंके सब लोग जानते हैं, पिछले 3 वर्षों में मंहंगाई लगभग 50 प्रतिशत बढ़ गयी है, अन्य जो खाद्यान्न हैं उनके दाम बढ़ते गये, सरकार उनको बढ़ाती गयी है परंतु जब

चीनी, शूगर केन का प्रश्न आया तो उसके लिए सरकार मौन रही। कुछ सरकार ने खेती के ऊपर ध्यान दिया 80-81 में गेहूं का दाम 117 था, 84-85 में 152 हो गया, धान का दाम 105 था, 137 हो गया और गन्ने का 13 से 14 हो गया अर्थात् गन्ने के किसान के लिए कोई सुविधा प्रदान नहीं की गयी और जब यह नहीं सरकार बनी तो इस समय नये साल के अंदर आपने एक काम जरूर किया कि एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस कमीशन का नाम बदलकर फास्ट एण्ड प्राइस कमीशन रख दिया। इससे आशा जगी कि शायद फास्ट देखी जायेगी कि किसान की कितनी लागत आती है। परंतु आज ऐसा लगता है कि उस ओर कोई भी सरकार का पक्ष नहीं उठाया गया है और बड़ी कृपा करके 14 से 16 करने का एक दान दिया गया है, किसान को दान दिया गया है। देश की 70 प्रतिशत जनता को इस प्रकार से दान देना जो सबको खाना खिलाते हैं केवल किसान ही नहीं है।

6 P.M.

मैं आपके माध्यम से सदन को यह भी स्मरण कराना चाहता हूँ कि 70 प्रतिशत किसान देश का सब से बड़ा उपभोक्ता है। अगर इसके पास सम्पन्नता आयेगी तभी आपका कपड़ा बिकेगा और बाकी चीजें बिकेंगी। परंतु ऐसा लगता है कि उस ओर महान दुर्लक्ष होता चला जा रहा है। इसी बीच गन्ने का दाम तो बढ़ाया गया, पर साथ ही साथ चीनी मिर्च व लों को भी सुविधाएं प्रदान की गईं। उनका दाम लेव का जो परसेंटेज था 65 से 55 परसेंट कर दिया गया, 40 पैमे वहां दाम बढ़ा दिए गए खुले बाजार में बेचने का छूट दौ। कई माननीय सदस्यों ने भी कहा है, पखवारों में निकला है कि एक आर्डर से दाम बढ़ाने से चीनी मित तालियों को लगभग 500 करोड़ रुपये की आमदनी हो सकती। किसान को कितना दिया, यह सोचने की बात है पिछले तीन वर्षों के अंदर जो फार्म की इ गृहस हैं जो चीजें किसान के उपयोग आने वाली हैं जो आपने हाथ में हैं, पानी का दाम, बिजली का दाम, फार्मज इन्पुट्स फर्टिलाइजर, पैक्टर, डीजल इंजन इन के दाम कि बार बढ़ें ? अगर उन के सबका

[श्री अश्विनी कुमार]

अनुपात जोड़ा जाए तो शायद ऊंट के मुंह में जीरे के सप्ताह ढाई रुपये आपने दिया है। आपके माध्यम से मंत्र महोदय ने मेरा निवेदन होगा कि वह एक ऐसी एक्सपर्ट कमेटी बनाएं जिसमें किसानों के प्रतिनिधियों हैं। आज जो देश के अन्दर किसानों के प्रतिनिधियों हैं, जिसकी बात करते हैं जो स्वयं खेती करते हैं उन्होंने स्वयं मांग की है कि 33 रुपये क्विंटल इसका दाम होना चाहिए। मिल मालिक कहते हैं कि 18 रुपये होना चाहिए। जो उसमें से पैसा कमाता है वह भी 18 रुपये से कम करने को तैयार नहीं और जो मिल मालिक देने को तैयार है सरकार उससे भी कम देने को तैयार है। यह बड़े बुर्गम्य का विषय है। आज एक और बड़ी विचित्र बात है, सरकार अन्दर गन्ने और चीनी का जो संबंध आता है, ये दोनों अलग-अलग विषय हो जाते हैं। गन्ने का चला जाता है एग्रीकल्चर के पास और चीनी का चला जाता है फूड के पास और दोनों का कोई सम्बन्ध बैठता नहीं है। ये दोनों अलग-अलग हैं। अगर ये दोनों विभाग एक जगह रहें तो शायद ज्यादा अच्छा काम हो सकता है। इनपुट्स और आउटपुट्स के अन्दर कुछ सुविधा हो सकती है। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि जो उन्होंने दाम बढ़ाया है बहुत अच्छा किया है, परन्तु इसको 33 रुपये किया जाए। इस पर एक बार फिर विचार करने की आवश्यकता है तब जाकर किसानों को कुछ सुविधा होगी। जो भी देश के अन्दर किसान ने थोड़ा परिश्रम किया है, आपने गेहूँ और चावल का दाम थोड़ा सा ज्यादा दिया है तो यह देश का सब से बड़ा सौभाग्य हुआ है कि जो हम दुनिया से अनाज मंगाते थे आज हम सरप्लस हो गए हैं। जो दाम आप दुनिया को दे रहे हैं बाहर दे रहे हैं वह शायद आप अपने किसानों को देंगे तो उस गन्ने से इतनी चीनी बन सकेगी कि भारत दुनिया को चीनी खिलाने में समर्थ हो सकेगा। आज भी हमारे देश में प्रति हेक्टेयर उत्पादन दुनिया के मुकाबले में कम है। खासकर उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में जो कि चीनी के मुल स्थान रहे हैं। वहाँ प्रति हेक्टेयर उपज

जो है वह करीब 30 टन के करीब आती है और यहाँ यील्ड पर हेक्टेयर 57 टन होगी, परन्तु अपने ही प्रदेशों में अपने ही देश में, महाराष्ट्र में और जहाँ नई किस्म की सारी सुविधाएं प्रदान की गई हैं वहाँ यही यील्ड 80 टन तक जाती है। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि सरकार को जो गन्ने का मूल क्षेत्र है उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार इसके लिए विशेष सुविधाएं प्रदान करके जैसे खेती के लिए पानी की सुविधा है और बिजली की सुविधा है और किसानों की जो आवश्यकताएं हैं उनकी पूर्ति वह करेगी तो शायद दुनिया में आज जितना उत्पादन होता है उससे बहुत ज्यादा उत्पादन हमारे यहाँ किसान कर सकते हैं और बहुत ज्यादा चीनी बन सकती है। आज हम विदेशों के बाजार से खरीदने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं। शायद आज हमारे पास अन्न का भंडार है, शायद हम इस फूड फार वर्क की योजना लागू कर रहे हैं। तो हम फूड फार वर्क की तरह की योजना लागू कर रहे हैं। कल हमारे पास चीनी होंगी तो दुनिया के बाजारों में चीनी देकर के हम चीनी की महत्ता प्रदान कर सकते हैं। आज जब हमारी नीति है, चीनी के सम्बन्ध में लाइसेन्सिंग-पालिसी भी आ जाती है। चीनी मिलें जो हैं उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार की, यह अधिकांश 1930-35-40 के बीच की बनी हुई मिलें हैं। जो उसके बनाने वाले उद्योगपति थे, उन्होंने सबसे पहले चीनी की मिलें बनाई, उससे लाभ करेडों, अरबों रुपये कमाया और दूसरे उद्योगों में लगाया और इनमें से सारा पैसा चूस करके इनको जंक करके रख दिया और जब यह मिलें नहीं चलती तो सरकार इन सिक मिल को ले लेती है। यह कोई ठीक इलाज नहीं है। इनमें पूंजी लगाने की आवश्यकता है, इसमें आधुनिकीकरण करने की आवश्यकता है। प्रदेशों के अन्दर आज जो मिलें हैं, विशेषकर उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के अन्दर अधिकांश सरकार के पास हैं कुछ कोआपरेटिव सेक्टर में है और कुछ थोड़ी प्राइवेट सेक्टर में हैं। इसके अन्दर पूंजी लगाकर किस प्रकार मिलों

में उत्पादन आप बढ़ा सकते हैं। और लाइसेंस के लिये जो वर्षों से एप्लीकेशन पड़ी हुई है, उसी अंदर सुविधा प्रदान कर सकते हैं, देखने की आवश्यकता है। आज नयी-नयी सारी चीजें मिलने बनाने की बात आती है। जो वर्तमान में सुगर-फैक्टरी हैं उनकी कंपैसिटी बढ़ाने की बात करके, उसके अंदर जो साढ़े तीन हजार टन की सीमा लगा रखी है, उस सीमा को बढ़ा दें तो शायद इसी एस्टेब्लिशमेंट के अंदर, इसी इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर के अंदर ज्यादा उत्पादन की सुविधा प्राप्त हो सकती है।

आज दुनियाँ के बाजार में जो चीनी के दाम हैं वह बराबर घट रहे हैं और हमारे यहाँ चीनी के दाम बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं। सन् 1983 के अंदर लन्दन में चीनी का दाम 231 रुपए था, बम्बई में 351/- रुपए और आज लन्दन में चीनी का दाम 187/- रुपए है, जबकि हमारे यहाँ 506/- रुपए है। आज विदेशों में हमारा चीनी के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं और हम विदेशों से सस्ती चीनी लाकर बेच रहे हैं, जो कि किसानों के साथ अन्याय है और हमारे देश के उपभोक्ता के साथ अन्याय है। इसके लिये सरकार को विचार करने की आवश्यकता है।

बिहार के अंदर चीनी मिलों की स्थिति अत्यन्त खराब है। वहाँ गन्ना उत्पादक परेशान है, मजदूर परेशान है। सोलह मिलें पहले सरकार के पास थीं, पांच मिलें और आज उन्होंने ले ली हैं। परन्तु उससे भी निस्तार नहीं है। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार में यह निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि यदि गन्ने का उत्पादन बढ़ाना है, चीनी का उत्पादन बढ़ाता है तो यह जो पुरानी जंक मिलें हैं, इनका नवीनीकरण करें, मोडर्नाइजेशन करें, अधिक धन लगाकर इसका आधुनिकीकरण करें, तब चीनी की उत्पादकता बढ़ेगी। आज जो रिकवरी आ रही है, दक्षिण की 80 मिलें 9.6 की रिकवरी दे रही हैं और यहाँ 1.0 की रिकवरी दे रही हैं। अगर यही

डेढ़ पाइंट बढ़ जायें तो कितनी चीनी का उत्पादन बढ़ जायगा 150 मिलों के अंदर। इसको आप सोच सकते हैं।

इसके बाद कुछ और चीजों की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ और आपसे निवेदन करूँगा कि यह जो प्राइस एंड कास्ट कमीशन आया है, इसके माध्यम से एक बार फिर से स्टडी कराएँ और पूरे जो आंकड़े हैं, किस प्रकार से कास्ट कलेक्ट की है, एक बार सदन के सामने आने दें, जनता के सामने आने दें कि किस प्रकार से कास्ट आपने की है। Why is it a closely guarded secret? किस ढंग से आप सीक्रेट रखे हुए हैं कि दाम दे रहे हैं। आप जब उत्पादन के, इंडस्ट्री के उत्पादन के दाम तय करते टेबुल पर बैठकर बात होती है, लेबर यह है, इनपुट यह है, पावर यह है, उसके बाद प्राफिट इतना है, दाम इतना है। यह आप किसानों को साथ लेकर, उनके प्रतिनिधियों को साथ लेकर भी कर सकते हैं। अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो तभी किसान को विश्वास होगा कि आप जो कर रहे हैं, आपने जो किया है, वह उचित है। मैं पुनः यही आग्रह करूँगा कि जो देश का सबसे बड़ा उपभोक्ता है, 70 प्रतिशत जनता जहाँ रहती है, जो किसान से जुड़ा हुआ है, जब तक उसकी समृद्धि नहीं होगी, आप सारे देश की समृद्धि ले आये, देश की समृद्धि अधूरी ही रहेगी क्योंकि यह देश का सबसे बड़ा उपभोक्ता बनेगा, तभी देश की प्रगति हो सकती है। अगर आप देश की प्रगति चाहते हैं, देश को 21वीं शताब्दी में ले जाना चाहते हैं तो इन 70 प्रतिशत किसानों को, और गन्ना किसान, जो एक महत्वपूर्ण है, इसकी ओर ध्यान देना आवश्यक है। आज गन्ने का प्रश्न है। मेरे मित्रों ने और प्रश्न भी उठाए। जूट का प्रश्न है, जूट के दाम इतने घट गये हैं, किसान परेशान है; उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार और बंगाल के जूट के किसानों में लाहिमाम् लाहिमाम् हो रहा है। जो जूट पिछले साल एक हजार रुपये बिका, इस बार 250/- रुपये में भी खरीददार नहीं है। जूट कारपोरेशन खरी देने के लिये आगे नहीं आ रहा है।

[श्री अश्विनी कुमार]

मैं केवल यह उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ कि किस प्रकार से सरकार किसानों की अपेक्षा कर रही है, जिनकी अपेक्षा करने से देश आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता। मैं पुनः उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपके माध्यम से सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि किसानों को उचित मूल्य दे ताकि देश की प्रगति हो सके। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am first of all happy that this year the Honourable Minister and the Agricultural Cost and Prices Commission has increased the rate of sugarcane by Rs. 2.50 at least. If we see the price of sugarcane, for the last four or five years there has been no increase at all. I feel that the Ministry is very seriously thinking to give some boost to the development of this sugarcane industry.

Sir, I will not go critically into what other hon. Members have said. But at the same time, I must see what is the requirement of our country in the case of sugarcane? What is the requirement of sugar at the end of the Seventh Five Year Plan? What would be the requirement of sugar for our country at the end of 2000 A. D.? The internal consumption of sugar today is 80.64 lakh tonnes. The internal demand for sugar for the terminal year of the Seventh Five Year Plan, it will be 96 lakh tonnes. The maximum sugar produced in 1981-82 was 84.36 lakh tonnes. The consumption of sugar by our country will be 16 lakh tonnes more than what we produce. This is the condition of sugar production prevailing in our country. Now the requirement of sugar at the end of the Seventh Five Year Plan is 96 lakh tonnes. The internal production of the country today is 70 lakh tonnes. I do not know how far the production will be stepped up because this year our Ministry is forecasting that the production of sugarcane may go up. But I am just opposite of this view. You all know that Maharashtra is the main sugar producing State in the country. Last year there were no rains and the area under sugarcane cultivation has

been reduced considerably. If we expect some more sugar from Maharashtra, it will not be able to contribute though previously it had got the highest recovery and highest tonnage yield. We have expected more yield this year, I feel, it will not come out. If we think that at the end of five years, it may go up by giving several incentives upto 80 lakh tonnes, even then there will be a deficit of 16 lakh tonnes of sugar. That means, we are going to spend every year more than Rs. 500 crores for the import of sugar. It can be very easily produced by our farmers every year. We can even export the sugar.

Sir, in 1980-81 when there was a shortage of sugar and jaggery, the prices of these commodities went up very high. Then all the farmers had taken up cultivation of sugarcane and they could establish the maximum record sugar production which has gone to 84 lakh tonnes. Now, the same thing has occurred this year. So, I feel by 2000 A.D. our requirement will be 120 lakh tonnes. Then the internal consumption of the country will be 120 lakh tonnes.

Today, we are having about 320 sugar mills in our country. Out of that 50 per cent sugar mills are in the cooperative sector, that is 167, and the remaining are in the private sector.

Some hon. Members from my side and the other side have said that if we increase the price of sugarcane, the private people will be benefited. If the Agricultural Cost and Prices Commission decides to give Rs. 16.50, it is actually the cost of production of sugarcane that must be taken into consideration.

My hon. friend has brought this Calling Attention regarding the remunerative prices for sugarcane growers. But so far I have not heard any hon. Member talking about the remunerative price to these growers. The remunerative price of the sugarcane are those prices which will depend upon the cost of production of sugarcane either on per hectare basis or per acre basis. Today, what is the cost of production of sugarcane in our country?

Sir, four of the Agricultural Universities have come together and they have calculated the cost of production sugarcane per acre and it comes to about Rs. 300 per acre.

When we take 40 tonnes average yield per acre, that is about 100 tonnes per hectare, in Maharashtra, even though the prices are not quite adequate. If we give the farmers Rs. 26 or Rs. 27 per quintal, then alone, we are having the recovery of 10 to 11 per cent which is highest in the country. Then and then alone, we can feel that remunerative prices for agricultural produce has been given by the Government of India because we have given the promises to the farmers in our manifesto that we are going to give them remunerative prices. Sir, it is not a question that some people are complaining that sugar is very costly in our country. I do not understand from where they have collected the figures. Yesterday, in the Economic Times, a detailed article has come about sugar. I will read as to what is the cost of sugar in different countries.

"In Japan, sugar is sold at the cost of Rs. 14 to 15 per k. g. in South Korea, it is sold at the cost of Rs. 10 per k.g.; in West Germany, it is sold at the cost of Rs. 8 per k.g.; in United Kingdom, it is sold at Rs. 7.50 per k.g.; in Malaysia, it is sold at Rs. 7 per k.g.; in Bangladesh, it is sold at Rs. 9 per k.g.; in France. It is sold at Rs. 7.25 per k.g. and in U.S.A., so many people, who raise the bogey of USA, sugar is sold at the cost of Rs. 12 per k.g. and in India, the controlled sugar is sold at the cost of Rs. 4.92."

So, these are the figures which have been given in the Economic Times. Sir, in the month of October-November in 1985, in Bombay, which is the costliest market of this country, sugar was sold in the open market at Rs. 6.36 to Rs. 6.72 per k.g. in the month of November, sugar was sold in Bombay market at the cost of Rs. 6.55 to 6.86 per k.g. That means, sugar is cheapest in our country. When we buy other things the general price index is 360 per cent which is based upon 370-371. And what was the price of sugar in 1970 and

1971 and what was the price of sugarcane in 1970-71? It was just Rs. 130 to Rs. 140 and it has gone up today. The sugarcane factory can give the farmer Rs. 194 as price for their sugarcane. So, in Maharashtra, last year also, when the Government of India had declared the sugarcane price as Rs. 14 per quintal, the Maharashtra Government had give Rs. 118 per tonne, i. e. is Rs. 13/- per quintal. Now this time I am sure, the Maharashtra Government may give Rs. 23 or Rs. 24 per quintal. Another very important aspect about my State is there are some 49 proposals lying with the Central Government for sugar industry in the cooperative sector; because I know that the cooperative sugar factories are given more prices to the farmers than what the private sugar factory owners are giving and also because the Government of India have announced their policy that they are going to sanction one sugar factory for one district. Out of 30 districts, now 26 districts are having either the licence for the sugar factory or they are under reinstallation, but this policy is wrong. Our country is an agricultural country. There are different agro-climatic zones and yield of sugar in Maharashtra is as high as in any other countries of the world. It has been given by Mr. M. S. Marathe in the Economic Times that Maharashtra is situated in the tropical belt between 25 degrees north and 22 degrees north latitude. This belt is famous for all over the world as the most suitable area for growing sugarcane and it encompasses areas such as Taiwan, Brazil, Cuba, Queensland, and Australia but this favourable climatic factor is not the end of the success of Maharashtra. In fact, it was only the beginning and there were many formidable factors unfavourable for the cooperative enterprise and important among them are as follow", and the factors have been given. The most important factor is the recovery. In Maharashtra the average recovery last year was 11.13 per cent. which was the highest in the country.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: U. P.?

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: For U.P. it was 9.5 per cent

[Shri Vitthalrao Madhavrao Jadhav] or something like that. So Maharashtra is the only suitable State to produce more sugarcane and more sugar. The area under sugarcane is not more than three lakh hectares in Maharashtra and with this small area, we produce 35 per cent of the total sugar that is available in the country.

Sir, the other important thing is that sugar is the largest industry in India next to the textiles, with an investment of Rs. 2,500 crores. There are about 167 sugar factories in the cooperative sector and they account for 55 per cent of the sugar production in the country, and Maharashtra is having 75 sugar factories.

The most important and relevant point is about Maharashtra's difficulties in regard to sugar. I will give only four points and then I will conclude my speech. The most important thing is that the Government must change its licensing policy and the 49 projects which are lying with the Central Government for clearance should be cleared as early as possible. I can assure you in this house that if these 49 projects are cleared quickly, at the end of the Seventh Five Year Plan, Maharashtra alone can meet 50 per cent of the entire demand of the country and we will be self-reliant in sugar production. The other thing is about loans for new sugar factories. The Central financial institutions should, therefore, be in readiness to provide funds to new sugar factories at the time of their clearance by the Government of India, and a time-limit of four months should be adhered to for clearing loan proposals to new sugar factories by the Central financial institutions.

The second thing is about the levy sugar price zone. In North India, in U.P. and Bihar, you have three different sugar zones. I have gone through the recovery percentage also. Bihar and U.P. are also having a recovery of more than 9 per cent. In Maharashtra, Marathwada and Vidarbha are having recovery of 9 to 10 per cent. Ahmednagar, Jalgaon, Khandesh and some parts of Pune are having a recovery of 10 to 11 per cent. And Sangli, Satara and Kolhapur are having a recovery of 11 to

12 or 13 per cent. That means, we are also having different sugar zones. The Government of Maharashtra is constantly demanding of the Government of India: please accept our three different sugar zones. But in spite of several efforts by the Government of Maharashtra and the efforts we have made in Parliament, the Government of India did not accept our demand. So I request the hon. Minister—he is very dynamic—to go through our proposals and declare that Maharashtra has three different sugar zones.

Another important thing is that the Sampath Committee has given some incentive to new sugar factories but there is a condition that a new sugar factory must be installed within a period of 39 months. But, Sir, several times the financial institutions, the Government of India and the Government of Maharashtra, for 12 months or 18 months, could not release their share of the finances and so the sugar factory could not be completed within the time-limit of 39 months. Then the condition given by the Sampath Committee would apply. So I request the hon. Minister that this time-limit of 39 months must be extended up to 60 months. The reasons why the new sugar factory could not come up in time should be taken into consideration.

Another thing is about amendment of the Sugar Development Act, 1982 and NCDC assistance. Sir, the Government of India is taking some share from the Sugar Fund. But from whatever amount they are taking from the sugar factories, no amount is being spent on Maharashtra. We are contributing a lot of amount for the Sugar Fund to the Government of India, and our sugar factories also require some money for modernisation, for research and development and for many other things.

So, an equal share of the Sugar Fund which is given by Maharashtra must be given back to Maharashtra for the development of sugar factories. With these words I request the honourable Minister to place clear all the 49 licences of the

Maharashtra Government so that Maharashtra can do a fantastic job in producing sugar so that we can make India export-oriented in the world. (ends)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बंसल) :
श्री मलिक जी, आप दो मिनट में खरम कोजिये ।

श्री सत्यपाल मलिक (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
श्रीमन में बहुत वक्त नहीं लूंगा, मैं सिर्फ इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम जिस मुद्दे पर बहस कर रहे हैं उसमें चीनी और गन्ने के बारे में नये सिरे से एक कम्प्रेहेंसिव पालिसी सरकार को तय करनी चाहिये । इसमें सिर्फ यही मंत्रालय इन्वोल्व नहीं है । कई चीजे इसमें इन्वोल्व है । मैं इस संबंध में निवेदन यह करना चाहता हूँ कि इस बात की बहुत गम्भीरता से लिया जाना चाहिये । हमारे देश में गन्ने का क्षेत्रफल घट रहा है और देश में गन्ने की प्रति हेक्टेयर ईल्ड भी घट रही है और गन्ने का किसान भी बहुत परेशान है । माननीय मंत्री जो ने बहुत अच्छा किया, गन्ने के दाम बढ़ाये है । लेकिन देखना यह है कि क्या ये दाम वाजिब है ? मेरी राय यह है कि ये दाम उचित नहीं है, बहुत कम है । मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले पांच साल में गेहूँ का, धान का और अन्य चीजों के जो दाम नियत किये गये है, क्या उनके मुताबिक गन्ने के दाम भी बढे है ? मैं इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि सदन में इस बात पर बहस चले कि किसानों को रिम्पुनरेटिव प्राइस मिलना चाहिये । मैं समझता हूँ कि किसान की यह मांग नहीं है । किसानों की मांग बढ़ी है । किसानों को फसल का रिम्पुनरेटिव प्राइस नहीं बल्कि समता मूल्य मिलना चाहिये । जो चीजे यह इस्तेमाल करता है उनके दाम पिछले 10 साल में, 12 साल में या 15 साल में जितने बढ़े या घटे है उसी हिसाब से किसानों की फसल के दाम भी घटने या बढ़ने चाहिये । दुनिया की तरफ अगर आप देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि वर्ल्ड बैंक की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार पेरू को छोड़कर हिन्दुस्तान नम्बर दो पर है जहाँ पर टर्म ऑफ ट्रेड किसानों के सबसे ज्यादा खिलाफ है । हमारे यहाँ एक किलो

गेहूँ या एक किलो धान या एक क्विंटल गन्ने के मुकाबले जो चीजे किसान इस्तेमाल करता है वह दुनिया में सबसे ज्यादा असंतुलित है । मैं आपको एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ जिससे आप स्थिति का अन्दाजा कर सकते हैं । मेरी भतीजी ने शाहनाज हुसैन का काजल मंगाया । कहा जाता है कि वह जड़ी बूटियों का बना होता है । वह छोटी खड्की है, कालेज में पढती है । 25र में काजल की एक डिब्बिया आती है । इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि एक बुगी गन्ने में काजल की चार पांच डिब्बिया आ सकती है । एक बुगी गन्ने में घाटा का एक जुता आता है । चार बुगी गन्ने में टेरीकोट की एक दमोज बनती है और चार बुगियों में एक सूट बन सकता है और एक बुगी में लखनऊ के राम भरोसे हलवाई की एक किलो मिठाई आती है । इससे आप अन्दाजा लगा सकते हैं कि हमारे यहाँ कीमतों में कहां पैरिटी है । इसलिये मैं सरकार से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से शिक्षा के मामले में देश में खुली बहस चल रही है उसी तरह से गन्ने के मामले में भी बहस चलनी चाहिये । चूंकि हमारे देश के अर्थशास्त्री ज्यादातर कर रहे हैं, इसलिये इस मामले पर गम्भीरता से विचार करने की आवश्यकता है । अखबारों में हम पढते हैं कि अगर किसान की फसल के दाम बढ़ाये जायेंगे तो महंगाई बढ़ जायेगी । मैं इससे सहमत नहीं हूँ । मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस पर देश में बहस होनी चाहिये । अगर किसानों के फसल के दाम बढ़ाये जायेंगे तो ज्यादा मजदूरों को रोजगार मिलेगा । कस्बों में खरीद फरोख्त बढ़ेगी । हमारे देश में एक छोटा सा सेक्शन है, शहरों में थोड़े से पढ़े लिखे लोगों का तबका है जो इन बातों से तसल्ली कर लेता है । किसान को फसल के दाम तो नहीं बढ़ाये जाते हैं, लेकिन उसकी दूसरी खाने पीने की चीजों के दाम बढ़ा दिये जाते हैं । आपको यह जानकर हैरत होगी कि कुल गन्ने का 40 सैकड़ा चीनी बनती है और 60 सैकड़ा खंडसारी और गुड बनता है । मैं आपको ध्यान एक नई समस्या की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि मिलें जब गन्ने नहीं पिरासी है तो किसान को उस जमीन पर गेहूँ

[श्री सन्धपाल मलिक]

बोना होता है। उस वक्त किसान को कोई खरीदार नहीं मिलता है। जो क्रेशर वाले होते हैं वे बहुत शरारती लोग होते हैं। वे 22 रु० का गन्ना 10 रु० में लेने के लिये किसान को मजबूर कर देते हैं। खंडसारी और गुड़ बनाने पर आपने पाबन्दी लगा रखी है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आपको इस पाबन्दी को तोड़ना चाहिये। आपको कहना चाहिये कि किसान अपने गन्ने को कम दाम पर न बेचे बल्कि उसको गुड़ और खंडसारी बनाने की इजाजत होनी चाहिये। अभी सिर्फ गुड़ की इजाजत है। इससे छोटे उद्योग पनपेंगे और किसान खुद उद्योग की तरफ चलेगा। इसलिये मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहूँगा कि उत्तर प्रदेश में बहुत ज्यादाती हो गई है किसान के साथ, यह कई साल पहले जनता सरकार के समय से हो गया था कि किसान गन्ना खरीदकर खंडसारी नहीं बना सकता है। अगर आप किसान को खंडसारी बनाने की छूट देंगे तो उसको मजबूरी में डिस्ट्रेस सैल में गन्ने को नहीं देना पड़ेगा, यह आपको देखना है। इन दो तीन बातों के साथ मैं अपनी बात को खत्म करते हुए माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि फसल के दाम, जो किसान गन्ना पैदा करता है उसको धान और गेहूँ के मुकाबले कम दाम मिले हैं, पिछले पांच सालों में ऐसी मेरी जानकारी है। धान, गेहूँ और गन्ना इसको पैदा करने वाला किसान है लेकिन उसके दाम की जो नीति है वह समता मूल्य के आधार पर नहीं है। आखिर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यहां सदन में बोलते वक्त गलत जानकारी दे दी जाती है। मंत्री महोदय को कि, जो चीजों का दाम तय करता है आपका एग्रीकल्चर प्राइस कमीशन, वह रिस्क फैक्टर ध्यान में रखता है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कहीं रिस्क फैक्टर काउंट हुआ है तो बतायें? आज उत्तर प्रदेश के 22 जिलों में 50 सैकड़ा गन्ने की फसल पाइलेरिया से नष्ट हो गई है, क्या वहाँ रिस्क फैक्टर काउंट किया गया? दाम देते वक्त उसको काउंट करने का क्या-क्या आपका मान दंड है? इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बांसल) :
श्री मुख्तियार सिंह। सिर्फ 2 मिनट।

श्री राम चन्द्र विकल (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
हमने भी इस पर अपना नाम दिया है।
सुबह से बैठे हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): I cannot help that, but you will speak later.

श्री राम चन्द्र विकल : इतने महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर हमें बोलने का अवसर नहीं दे रहे हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): I feel you are saying this wrongly presuming that you will not be called afterwards. Please sit down.

श्री राम चन्द्र विकल : मुझे सबसे बाद में रखते हैं। किसानों का सवाल है और यहां कोई भी सुनने वाला नहीं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बांसल) :
बैटिंग प्लीज।

you will speak after Mr. Malik.

श्री मुख्तियार सिंह मलिक (हरियाणा) :
विकल साहब नाराज क्यों होते हैं।
मेरा नाम पहले था।

वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं तो लम्बी चौड़ी बहस के अन्दर नहीं पड़ना चाहता। यह आज का जो कालिग अटेंशन मोशन है यह सिर्फ गन्ने की रेमुनरेटिव प्राइस के बारे में है। लेकिन सदन के अंदर माननीय सदस्य उसके ऊपर बहस करने लगे कि महाराष्ट्र इतना प्रोड्यूस करता है, गुजरात इतना प्रोडक्शन होगा। मेरा इन चीजों से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। मैं मोटा हिसाब जानता हूँ। मैं इन बातों में नहीं जाता कि गुजरात अमेरिका में क्या भाव बिकती है और फलों मुक्त में क्या भाव बिकती है और हिन्दुस्तान में गुजरात जो है सबसे सस्ती है। इसमें गुजरात का क्या ताल्लुक है। क्या आपने पर कैपिटल इनकम देखी है। दूसरे मुक्तों की क्या है और हिन्दुस्तान की क्या है। मैं इन चीजों के अंदर नहीं

जाना चाहता। आज जो बहस है वह सारी की सारी गन्ने के प्राइस के बारे में है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान एक बात की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि 1981-82 के अंदर जो सपोर्ट प्राइस थी वह 13 रुपये थी और किसान को गन्ने के भाव क्या दिये जाते थे, 26 रुपये। प्रोडक्शन क्या हुआ, 84 लाख टन। 1981-82 के अंदर 84 लाख टन सुगर हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर पैदा हुई जब कि 13 रुपये सपोर्ट प्राइस थी और 26 रुपये किसान को उसका भाव दिया गया। 1981 से लेकर 85 तक, पांच साल तक सपोर्ट प्राइस 13 से 14 हुई एक टपका बढ़ा दी। पांच साल के अंदर एक रुपया बढ़ाया और अब सरकार ने एकदम ढाई रुपये बढ़ा दिया और साढ़े सोलह रुपया कर दिया और माननीय सदस्य जो हैं वे सरकार को बधाई दे रहे हैं कि सरकार ने एकदम ढाई रुपये बढ़ा दिये और यह सरकार ने बहुत अच्छा भाव किया है। ज्यादा रेमनेटिव प्राइस गन्ने का दिया गया है यह मैं मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ यह जो साढ़े सोलह रुपया है इसमें ढाई रुपया जो एकदम बढ़ाया है एक साल के अंदर जब कि पांच साल में एक रुपया बढ़ाया था, यह ढाई रुपया, यह मांग का सारा सुगर की कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन में लगेगा और जो शुगर मैनेज है यह इससे 300 करोड़ रुपया मुनाफा कमायेगा। इस हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर जब 13 रुपया सपोर्ट प्राइस था तो किसान को 26 रुपया दिया गया और आज जब साढ़े सोलह रुपये सपोर्ट प्राइस है तो 33 रुपये किसान को दिया जाना चाहिये तब जा कर हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर शुगर का मसला हल हो सकता है। मैं बहुत लम्बी चौड़ी बात नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं तो माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसान को आज एक स्टेट ने 24 रुपये दे दिया अभी एक माननीय सदस्य कह रहे थे कि हमारी स्टेट 22 रुपये दे देगी, इसमें किसान का क्या होता है? आज का ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव जो है वह गन्ने के प्राइस के बारे में है शुगर की प्रोड-

क्शन के बारे में नहीं है। अगर शुगर के ऊपर जाओ तो 10 फीसदी एकदम उम के ऊपर मार्किट के लिये उनको दे दिया। 1981-82 में क्या था। शुगर का लेवी प्राइस 3.75 पैसे था, उसके बाद चार रुपये हुआ, इसके बाद 4.40 पैसे हुआ और अब 4.80 पैसे कर दिया है। यानी यह लेवी शुगर प्राइस है मार्किट के अंदर फ्री सेल शुगर का क्या होगा यानी 65 लेवी में चला जायेगा और 35 परसेंट फ्री सेल में चला जायेगा तो यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है कि आप हिन्दुस्तान में गन्ना कैसे उगवाना चाहते हैं। अगर हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर शुगर का मसला हल करना चाहते हैं प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो किसान को उसका भाव जो है वह देना चाहिये। साढ़े चौदह रुपये जो इन्होंने किया है वह हर्डबिकिंग है, किसान के साथ धोखा है। लोग सरकार को बधाई दे रहे हैं। एकदम बड़े खुश हैं, सत्यपाल मलिक जी ने, यादव जी ने भी यह कहा कि ढाई रुपये बढ़ाने पर सरकार को बधाई दी। यह तो किसान के साथ हर्डबिकिंग है बड़ा भारी धोखा है। यह ढाई रुपये किसान को देने के लिये नहीं है यह मारा का मारा वह कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन आफ शुगर में लगा कर फिर शुगर का प्राइस बढ़ाएंगे और बाजार के अंदर इस भाव के ऊपर बेंचेगे और इसका रिजल्ट इफेक्ट उपभोगता पर होगा वह भी माननीय मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि माफ माफ बता दें कि इसका रिजल्ट अफर जो है क्या होगा? जो इन्होंने फ्री सेल शुगर कर दी है इधर इस का दाम 4.80 पैसे कर दिया है, इसका क्या होगा। इधर उपभोक्ता मरेगा और किसान को इस तरह से कभी रेमनेटिव प्राइस नहीं मिल सकता है। इसलिये किसान को सही मायने में लाभ पहुंचाने वाली हमारी सरकारी की नीति होनी चाहिये जो लोग दूसरा कलर दे कर किसानों की आमदनी को बताना चाहते हैं यह सारी धोखेबाजी है। मैं तो यह कहूंगा, मंत्री जी से अर्ज करना चाहूंगा कि जो बातें मैंने पूछी हैं उसको साफ तरीके से बाजे तौर से हमें समझाने की कोशिश करें कि 13 रुपये के ऊपर 26 रुपये,

[श्री मन्त्रियार सिंह मलिक]

साढ़े चौदह के ऊपर 24 रुपये, 22 रुपये 20 रुपये, यह भेदभाव क्यों है? आपका बहुत बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्री राम चन्द्र विक्रम : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बड़े दख के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि जहाँ किसान के साथ धन्यता है वहाँ किसानों की बात कहने वालों के साथ भी धन्यता नहीं होता है। सदन कुर्सी से चलाया जाता है इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है मगर सदन सदस्यों की भावनाओं से भी चलाया जाता है। मैं मुवह नाजमा जी से बात कर रहा था, पालिया-मेंटरी प्रफेसर्स मिनिस्टर से भी बात कर रहा था, सभापति जी से मान्यता दिलवाने के लिये मैं तीन दिन तक दौड़ता रहा। मुझे जो आपने समय दिया क्या मैं समय की भीख के लिये बार बार कुर्सी पर जाता रहूंगा कि मुझे समय दिया जाये। मेरा नाम उस में मौजूद है, नाजमा जी भी कहती है, नाम को चलाने के लिये जरूरी है कि माननीय सदस्यों की भावनाओं की भी कद्र की जाये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बासल) : मुझे बहुत अफसोस है जैसे ही आपका नाम मेरे पास पहुंचा तो मैंने लिखा माननीय सदस्यों की बारी-बारी से ही बुलाया जा सकता है एक समय में दो आदमी डकट्टे नहीं बोल सकते। आपने यह कैसे कह दिया कि आपको नहीं बुलाया जायेगा।

श्री रामचन्द्र विक्रम : मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विषयों पर ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव को जरूर नियम से चलना चाहिये लेकिन कुछ नियम में ऊपर उठ कर भी बातें होती हैं कुछ मान्यतायें होती हैं। नियम भी अगर आड़े आने हैं तो नियमों को बदन देना चाहिये। लेकिन सदस्यों की भावनाएं सही होंगे वे व्यक्त होनी चाहिये, यह डेमोक्रेसी की सत से बड़ी पूंजी है। अगर सदस्यों की भावनाएं व्यक्त करने का मौका नहीं है तो डेमोक्रेसी जैसी चीज का मजाक हो जायेगा। मैं किसानों का दुर्भाग्य समझता हूं कि इस किसान के राष्ट्रीय सवाल को केवल किसान का सवाल समझा जाता है।

यह सवाल राष्ट्रीय सवाल है और जब तक किसान के सवाल को राष्ट्रीय स्तर का सवाल नहीं समझा जायेगा तब तक इस देश का आर्थिक, सामाजिक सुधार नहीं हो सकता है किसान इस देश की आर्थिक रीढ़ है। उसको समझा नहीं गया है। आज यह किसान के गन्ने पर बहस चल रही है, गन्ने के दो रुपये बढ़े हैं कोई दो राय नहीं हैं, पहले से बढ़े हैं लेकिन यह सच है कि जो लागत मूल्य किसान को हर चीज का देना पड़ रहा है जैसे अभी मलिक साहब कह भी रहे थे स्याही, कलम कागज तो इसमें दवा को भी जोड़ लेते, दवा के कैप्सूल कितने गन्ने में आयेंगे। किसान की खरीद के हर चीज के दाम बराबर बढ़े हैं जरूरत में ज्यादा बढ़े हैं लेकिन किसान की हर फसल के दाम उसके मेहनताने या लागत के मुताबिक नहीं बढ़े हैं। एक उसूल है, इस पर सभी चिंतन करते हैं सभी लोग कहते हैं नरकार भी कहती है, सदन भी कहता है, विरोधी दल भी कहते हैं कि किसान को लागत के मुताबिक मूल्य मिलना चाहिए लेकिन जो गन्ने का मूल्य तय हुआ है वह लागत के मुताबिक तय हुआ है? मैं सच्चाई से कहना चाहता हूं कि लागत का मूल्य किसान को नहीं मिल रहा है जो आज दिया जा रहा है। उद्योगगति की जो मिलें हैं उनको कहीं बहुत बड़ा फायदा कर दिया गया है। अगर हम सिक मिलों को लेते चले जा रहे हैं तो कितनी मिलें और रह जाती हैं, पूरे राष्ट्रीयकरण में क्या दिक्कत है, वे राष्ट्रीयकृत हो जानी चाहियें। इन राष्ट्रीयकरण से और बहुत से काम चल रहे हैं, रेल राष्ट्रीयकरण से चलती है, राष्ट्रीयकरण नाम की चीज से डरना नहीं चाहिए, कर देना चाहिए मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं। किसान की लागत के मुताबिक उसको गन्ने का दाम नहीं मिल रहा है और गन्ने के दाम किसान को नहीं मिलने की वजह से आज हमको विदेशों से चीनी मंगानी पड़ती है, हम आत्मनिर्भर नहीं रह गये हैं। जैसे मलिक साहब ने आंकड़े बताये, परमेंटेज भी गिरा है, बैल्यू भी गिरी है और फी एकड़

किसान की पैदावार भी गिरी है, खाली भाव से ही नहीं घटी हैं।

पाइराला की बीमारी बतायी गयी लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि सारी देवी आपदाएँ किसान को प्रभावित करती हैं जैसे आना है, सूखा है, बाढ़ है, साने चीजें किसान को प्रभावित करती हैं। किसान की फसल के बीमे का सवाल बहुत दिन से उठ रहा है नहीं हो पा रहा है। ये सारे चीजें हैं जिन पर गम्भीरता से चिन्तन करना चाहिए मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसान को गन्ने का उचित मूल्य नहीं मिला तो किसान केवल आत्मनिर्भर चीनी में ही नहीं और चीजों में भी नहीं हो पाएगा। गन्ने का अच्छा दाम मिले तो दूसरी फसलें भी अच्छी उग सकती हैं, गेहूँ में खाद डाल सकता है दूसरी फसलों में खाद, बीज पानी सबका ठीक से इंतजाम कर सकता है। यह गन्ने का जो हिस्सा है इससे एक साल भर किसान का खेत घिर जाता है। साल भर में फसल कटती नहीं है और फसलें तो 6 महीने में कट जाती हैं, कुछ 2-3 महीने में कट जाती हैं लेकिन इसमें एक साल भर के लिए किसान का खेत घिर जाता है।

किसान जो मर्बदाता है, अन्नदाता है, वस्त्र दाता है, चीनी, गुड़ शक्करदाता है, मसालादाता है, घी दाता है, दूध दाता है वह भिखारी बना हुआ है इस देश में, हर बात के लिए, भाव की भीख मांगेगा, बिजली की भीख मांगेगा, रेट की भीख मांगेगा क्या क्या भीख मांगता है। यह किसान के साथ न्याय नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि किसान के गन्ने की और अन्य सबकी कीमत उसको उचित दिलाई जाये, लागत के हिसाब से किसान की चीजों के भाव तय किये जायें और किसान की बातों पर चाहे मूल्य आयोग बन गया है लेकिन उसमें कितने लोग हैं जो किसानों की बात कहने वाले हैं वे सब ऐसे अधिकारी बना दिये जाते हैं जो किसानों के बारे में जानते नहीं हैं

बल्कि उल्टा जानते हैं, किसान को कैसे घाटे में रखा जाये। ये चीजें बुनियादी हैं जिन पर उपसमाधेय महोदय को बहुत चिन्तन करना चाहिए। मूल्य आयोग में और इसमें किसानों के तुमाइंदे को रखना चाहिए, किसानों के हमदर्दों को रखा जाये मुझे इसमें आपत्ति नहीं है लेकिन जब तक किसान का सवाल राष्ट्रीय सवाल नहीं होगा तब तक किसान और राष्ट्र की अधिक दवा नहीं सुधर सकती है, यही मुझे कहना है।

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, first and foremost I would like to take this opportunity to thank the hon. Member of both sides of the House for their very incisive observations and remarks and the thought-provoking points which they have made. I would like to thank Shri Kalpnath Rai ji especially for having raised this very important discussion which the hon. Member, Shri Vikal, said is a national problem—I agree with him; it is a national problem—and for giving the House an opportunity not only to discuss but also to give us guidance which the Government can consider. And I can only reiterate that the highest consideration will be given to the views expressed by the hon. Members both in letter and spirit. Sir, a lot of strong words have been used. In fact I was a bit worried that just only ten days back, we had a Calling Attention here. The same very Members were waxing eloquent against the price rise, and the same very Members have been again saying that more remunerative prices should be given ...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: They are two different issues.

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: So, it is running with the hare and hunting with the hounds. I will have to stay clear of both of these. But anyway, the strong words, the strong terminology used by the hon. Members is a reflection of their deep and abiding interest in the cause of the farmer. I

[Shri K. P. Singh Deo]

thank them for that, and I congratulate them for that, and I value their suggestions in the cause of the farmer.

Sir, I am really impressed that Shri Kalpnath Raiji, belonging to this part of the House could manage to inspire people from the CPM and from the Telugu Desam. The entire Opposition was with him. That is a very good augury for the country. At least, for the cause of the farmer, we are together. And he has been a catalyst in trying to get the views of the House to agree with him.

Sir, in the initial answer to the Calling Attention, I had mentioned certain things and I would not like to repeat everything. There have been quite a few points which the hon. Members have made. But, broadly, there are four or five main points which are common. The first one is the remunerative prices to the farmer. The second is the reduction in the levy. The third point is that there should not be so much of imports. Fourthly, there should be more sugar mills. And the fifth point is that we should be self-reliant, self-sufficient, and there should be research and development in this field so that productivity increases and the acreage also increases. And Shri Kalpnath Rai also mentioned about the CACP—the Commission on Agricultural Costs and Prices. As I said earlier, in order to safeguard the cane growers from exploitation by the sugar factories in a year of glut in sugarcane production, the Central Government has been fixing the statutory minimum price of sugarcane every year. Now Sir, I would like to mention that most hon. Members have been saying that the Central Government has been paying them Rs. 13 or Rs. 14 and we have jumped to Rs. 16.50 per quintal. I would like to clarify that this is a statutory minimum price, which is a statutory requirement which the Central Government has fixed so that no miller or nobody can pay the farmer less than Rs. 16.50 per quintal in the proportionate higher-premium for higher

recovery this sugar year. It is not a question that the Central Government is going to pay the farmer. The Central Government does not pay the farmer. After the statutory minimum price is fixed, then the States also take into consideration various factors and they announce or advise the millers what is known as the State advised prices. And this is what was being referred to as Rs. 26 and Rs. 30 and Rs. 33 and Rs. 35 and so on and so forth. So, it is not as if the Central Government is paying. The Central Government is safeguarding the interest of the farmers by putting a statutory minimum price, specially when there is a year of glut. The point made by Shri Mukhtiar Singh Malik that it was Rs. 26 what was paid and therefore the production of sugar was 84 lakh tonnes in 1982-83. At that time if one looks at the figures, the statutory minimum price was only Rs. 13 and there was good agro-climatic condition and therefore sugarcane and sugar production had gone up. But that also in its wake started a chain reaction that there was so much of sugar that it had an adverse effect on the millers and their liquidity and they could not pay the farmers in time and the arrears went up and there was diversion by farmers from sugar to gur and khandsari. So, this is a vicious circle and, therefore, the Government has to skilfully manage and keep a harmonious balance between the producer, the consumer and the cane growers, who are the real backbone of the country.

Now Sir, two main items of import as far as the food sector is concerned are edible oil and sugar. I need not go into the edible oil portion because this is primarily on sugarcane although coconut and all sorts of other matters and the entire gamut of planning and industry of welfare activities, has been brought into it, including democracy and democratic institutions. But I will not refer to all that.

Now, Sir, while fixing the cane prices, the Central Government here I repeat, while fixing the cane prices,

the Central Government does not pay, it fixes a statutory minimum price, the minimum price which must be paid. It is not the maximum price. It is the minimum price, less than which no farmer can be paid by anybody. That is the statutory requirement. It consults the Commission on Agricultural Costs and Prices, the CACP, the sugarcane producing State Government, the associations of sugar manufacturers and sugarcane growers and pays due regard to a number of points and factors. First is the cost of production of sugarcane. Second is the return to the grower from the alternative crops and the general trend of prices of agricultural commodities... Third is the availability of sugar to the consumer at a fair price. Fourth is the price at which sugar produced from sugarcane is sold by producers of sugar and Fifth is the recovery of sugar from sugarcane. Therefore, it needs a lot of skilful management keeping a balance between the farmer, the producer, i.e. the manufacturer and the consumer.

Sir, I am at a discount because hon. Members have the right, it is their democratic right. It is their Parliamentary right to express their views. quote from various magazines, quote from various papers not always substantiated, need not be substantiated, need not be asked to be placed on record or on the Table, but as a member of Government whatever I say in this House, I have to substantiate it and I have to quote from authoritative sources. Therefore, I would not like to try to score a debating point or try to join issues. But I would like to place before the House a factual position and a factual record. I know some of the statistics are revealing and some Members in the last debate did not want me to place the statistics although statistics do not lie like photographs do not lie. Statistics based on expert bodies like the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices, like the CACP, there are other expert bodies also. they are manned by experts and their study is based on certain para-

meters. So, if I do quote certain figures which are authoritative, I hope I will have the indulgence of the House.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): There is a saying: lies, white lies, and statistics.

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: I shall remember it. I shall take it down in my diary.

This year, the Commission on Agricultural Costs and Prices has recommended a minimum price of Rs. 16.50 per quintal linked to a recovery of 8.5 per cent. Now, hon. Members wanted to know the cost of the sugarcane production, and asked as to why it was so secretly kept, why it is like a Defence secret or even more than that. We have got nothing to hide and I will give you the calculations how they have arrived at it and how it is having an effect on the consumer price index as well as wholesale price index, as well as the prices about which the entire House was agitated only about a week and a half back, including people from this side of the House. Of course, when there is a price rise, it hurts everyone, and therefore, rightly so they were agitated, and I would now come to that. Firstly is the cane cost. Cane cost depends on three main factors. One is the cane cost at the statutory minimum price, that is, Rs. 16.50 that we have fixed, calculated at peak average recovery, that is 8.5 per cent; then purchase tax cess as applicable on the cane in that zone. Thirdly is the drriage on cane as applicable to the zone.

Secondly is the conversion cost. Conversion cost is recommended by the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices for various zones, adjusted to the estimated recovery and duration in a particular year. This is an expert body, not bureaucrats, but experts, and the main constituents of conversion cost are salaries and wages and other benefits, consumable stores, repairs, maintenance, power and fuel, administrative expenses, depreciation etc.

[Shri K. P. Singh Rao]

Third is the return on investments, interest on working capital required for day-to-day running of the factory, interest on long-term loans invested on the fixed assets in the factory, and also on equity invested in the business. Some hon. Members referred to baggase and molasses. Baggase is also a byproduct which in most factories is consumed as fuel. This is per quintal statutory minimum price and the retail price would be Rs. 4.80 in the market which is 40 paise increase over Rs. 4.40 which we are paying. It is worked out this way. Firstly, the cane cost with average recovery of sugar, including tax and cess works out to— and this is according to peak average recovery—Rs. 217.94 per quintal. The conversion cost comes to Rs. 131.48 as calculated by the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices. The figure of return of 41.58 is again calculated by the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices and this gives the cost or the ex-factory levy price. If you add up all these three, it comes to Rs. 391. Then there is additional price for weak units which is Rs. 3; there is excise-duty which is fixed by the Ministry of Finance—Rs. 38 per quintal; Development cess which is credited to the Sugar Development Fund—Rs. 14, and then transport and handling charges Rs. 33 which is again calculated by the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices. This comes to Rs. 479 a quintal rounded off it comes to Rs. 480 which per Kg comes to Rs. 4.80 paise. This is a simple calculation and there is nothing to hide or conceal. Now there was a suggestion by Shri Kalp Nath Rai and others to make a payment of Rs. 30 7 P.M. per quintal. Obviously, he meant the State advised price should be Rs. 30 per quintal, because the Central Government does not pay. It only recommends the statutory minimum price. If we are to go by Rs. 30 per quintal as the State advised cane price, then, the retail free sale price of sugar to break even for the factory would be between Rs. 8 and Rs. 9. Although my friend, the young and dynamic MP, Shri

Satya Pal Malik—he has left—was saying that we should not be bothered about this bureaucratic approach to price rise—there was heated argument in the Rajya Sabha on the 20th, on this subject—this will hike the price to Rs. 8-9, at a time when we have to pay in the open market between Rs. 7 and Rs. 7.30 in Delhi. Of course, my Marxist friends here as well as in the other House have the uncanny knack of going to the most expensive shop and purchasing sugar at Rs. 8 and above, when the rest of Delhities are purchasing at Rs. 7 or Rs. 7.30. Anyway, Sir, as I said, this would be the implication if the State advised price were to be Rs. 30 per quintal. Mr. Kalp Nath Rai says, it should be Rs. 30 per quintal. I read in the papers that the Marxist Party have, in a resolution, demanded Rs. 35 per quintal. Somebody else says, it should be Rs. 50 per quintal. Sky is the limit of such suggestions. But the Government will have to take a balanced view of the entire thing, keeping in mind the interests of all the three sectors, namely, the producer, the manufacturer and the consumer.

Sir, I had mentioned that one of the reasons why there was high incidence of cane arrears, arrears of payment to cane growers, was the liquidity position of millers. Although there was 84 lakh tonnes of production in 1982, it came down to 59 lakh tonnes only two years back and it was 61 lakh tonnes last year. Therefore, certain steps have been taken by the Central Government as well as by the State Governments. They had been advised. As a result, the arrears have come down to Rs. 26 odd crores, which comes to about 2.1 per cent as against 4 per cent last year.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: What about the industrial licensing policy?

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: Steps have been taken by the Government in regard to the arrears. As you know, Sir, the responsibility for ensuring expeditious payment of cane price lies primarily with the State Governments who have the necessary power as well as the

field organisations to ensure such payment. The Central Government, on their part, have not only been advising the State Governments from time to time to give special attention to cane price payment, but they have also been taking steps from time to time aimed at improving the liquidity position of the industry to enable it to make expeditious payment. The Ministry of Finance has been persuaded during the last two-three years to allow enhanced credit facilities to the sugar industry. During 1982-83, the industry was allowed bank credit at 125 per cent of their previous year's maximum utilisation. In 1983-84, this was further enhanced to 110 per cent of their maximum utilisation during 1982-83. For 1984-85 season, however, the limit was brought down to 80 per cent of the maximum utilisation in 1983-84 in view primarily of the falling trend of production. Besides, the method of valuation of sugar stocks for credit purposes was modified to the benefit of the industry. Now levy stocks are valued at the levy price fixed by the Government and free-sale sugar, including buffer stocks, if any, at the average price realised in the preceding three months or the current market price. Besides, the Reserve Bank of India allows sufficient discretion to the banks to fix interest rates on the basis of objective requirements of individual accounts and certain units get bank loans at 16 per cent though the range of interest for this industry is 16.5 to 18.00 per cent.

The Ministry of Finance had also constituted a Standing Committee for Co-ordination of Institutional Finance for the sugar industry. The financial problems of the industry get discussed at this forum from time to time.

Prices of free-sale sugar are also monitored through the mechanism of regulated monthly released so as to maintain adequate level of price in open market, thus ensuring liquidity of the industry. Rebate in excise duty for early and late crushing to compensate for drop in recovery is also granted when considered necessary. For 1985-86 season, excise duty rebate for early crushing in the months of October-November 1985, has been granted by the Department of Revenue. The rebate is

applicable to excess production in the two months over the average production in the corresponding periods of previous two seasons. The amount of rebate, both on free-sale and levy sugar is Rs. 19.45 per quintal. Ways and means advances have also been given in the past by the Ministry of Finance to a few State Governments with a view to having the arrears cleared. A five-lakh tonne buffer stock had been created in October 1982, which was later raised to 10 lakh tonnes in October 1983. On the buffer stock, the mills were entitled to one hundred per cent credit in addition to holding costs. For the current sugar season, the SMP of sugarcane has been fixed at Rs. 16.50 per quintal linked to 8.5 per cent recovery which marks an increase of Rs. 2.50 per quintal over the 1984-85 statutory minimum price. In addition, the ratio of levy: free-sale sugar has been changed to 55 : 45 from the existing 65 : 35. These changes in policy should help the sugar mills to clear the cane dues more expeditiously.

Now I will give a slight clarification on this. Many of the Members have said that the levy and non-levy ratio from 65 : 35 has been changed to 55 : 45 and this will only give the sugar industry, the sugar magnates anything between Rs. 125 crores to 500 crores, and the figures just go on mounting of you add zeros after the decimal point. So, any figure is good enough without substantiating any thing. Now we give 425 grams per capita per month sugar quota to the States and this comes to about 3.13 lakh tonnes per month. Annually it comes to 37 lakh tonnes. Plus, there are defence requirements, there are festivals and then there are certain operating stocks which are necessary and, therefore, it comes to about 40 lakh tonnes. This 65 : 35 ratio has been kept for a long time specially till last year and up to this year because our production was around 60 lakh tonnes, 40 lakh tonnes against 60 lakh tonnes is two thirds, hence the ratio of 65:35. Due to certain steps having been taken by Government, both at the Centre and in the States and the concerted action, it is expected that the yield will be 65 lakh tonnes and with the carry over of our sugar stocks of last

[Shri K. P. Singh Deo]

year we will be able to manage this, levy sugar which is committed to the public distribution system at a ratio of 55 : 45. At the same time this 10 per cent extra sugar into the open market will help in stabilising the market and the prices in the market because there will be more sugar supply. This will help the liquidity position so that the farmers will get their arrears quickly and they will get better remunerative prices from the factories. It is not to line the pockets of the industry, as has been mentioned, nor to line the pockets of the sugar tycoons or sugar barons, but this is a means to enable the farmer who is not being given timely payment and a remunerative payment to get this. That is why this step has been taken.

As I mentioned earlier, two of the important sectors of imports in the food sector are edible oils and sugar and we are committed to an economy of self-sufficiency. The twin objective of the previous Plan and this Plan is to achieve self-sufficiency and self-reliance. In fact one of the hon. Members did mention that from the PL 480 days, today we are in a position of food security wherein we have full food self-sufficiency and self-reliance and we are in a position also to be able to help our less fortunate brethren in Africa and other countries as well because of hard workput in by our farmers and scientists and by following correct policies, although some of the Members said that we are not following the correct policy and that our policy is wrong. This was also very emphatically mentioned by our Prime Minister when he had gone for the Festival of India to the United States. When the Secretary of State in his luncheon banquet praised India's performance in the last three decades, our Prime Minister had this to say: "From a country which has received a lot of aid from your country through PL 480 and although you had given us many good advices, we took our own counsel, and today happily we are not in the company of Ethiopia and other countries which had taken your advice. But we took our own counsel and today we are in a position not only to achieve self-sufficiency but also to feed and render help to people who are not as fortunate as we are." Therefore we have followed the

correct policies, we have pursued the correct policies and we have given right priorities. There is nothing wrong with our priorities or policies—neither long-term nor short-term. Therefore, today we are in a position to have this liberty to achieve self-sufficiency and self-reliance even on the food front.

Some projections have been made in the Approach to the Seventh Five Year Plan. Some figures have been quoted. I do not know what source they are from. But I am not trying to join issue on that. But from the Approach to the Seventh Five Year Plan, our emphasis would be on increasing productivity of the sugarcane. And the projection for consumption of sugar which has been steadily rising is expected to be 9.8 million tonnes or about 10 million tonnes in 1989-90. And the steps which are sought to be taken in this Seventh Plan would give a projection for production of capacity of about 10.7 million tonnes by 1989-90. This is expected and envisaged because one cannot guarantee from today. There are agro-climatic conditions, there are vagaries of weather and there are various other factors. There is the world factor also. The long-term solution to the problems of sugar industry lies in the harmonious blending of the interests of sugarcane growers, manufacturers and consumers of the sweetening agents—sugar gur and khandsari—through a rational pricing policy for sugarcane and sugar. This is in the Approach to the Seventh Five-Year Plan.

Mr. Gurupadaswamy also wanted that we should have a long-term perspective plan for sugar, may be a five year plan. This is exactly what we are doing at the moment and when we have finalised our policy we shall come to the House, we shall take the House into confidence and we shall have the benefit of the suggestions, observations and advice of the hon. Members. As I have said, whatever has been said today, both in letter and spirit, I shall have it examined by my Department. I have accepted it in letter and spirit, although not the thunder. I will have the lightning part of it examined and see how we derive benefit from the counsel of the hon. Members.

So, we are committed to a food security which will give us self-reliance and self-sufficiency, and we are committed to reducing our imports. Honourable Members today mentioned—I think one hon. Member quoted from a newspaper—that Rs. 6,000 crores is the balance of payments. We would like to reduce our dependence. It is for this reason that last week or the week before that, when I was facing the House on the price rise of essential commodities, I had mentioned that Government has taken a deliberate and conscious decision to raise the price of certain items because we would like to give remunerative prices to our farmers—the producers—so that the production and availability increase. Therefore our dependence on imports has to come down. I had given various figures and various items and I need not repeat them and waste the time of the House.

I have already answered about the diversion of sugarcane. There has been a diversion, as mentioned by some of the Members, of more than 4 lakhs hectares as well as some diversion from the available sugarcane production to other unorganized items like khandsari and gur because of the upward trend in prices in khandsari and gur as well as the delay in payment of dues by vacuum pan sugar factories. These are some of the reasons which compelled the Government to take a look and see how the farmers could get a more remunerative price and, therefore, from Rs. 14 a quintal as the statutory minimum price, it was raised to Rs. 16.50 a quintal at the recommendation of the Commission on Agricultural Costs and Prices.

Now, Shri Kalpnath Raj Ji wanted to know about it. It was only in March this year that our present Prime Minister had announced that the Agricultural Prices Commission would undergo a metamorphosis and it would be converted into a Commission on Agricultural Costs and Prices, because that would be the ideal thing. There are no bureaucrats there, as Mr. Kalpnath Raj has said. The Chairman has to be an economist. The Chairman is an economist—Dr. Bhalla from the Jawaharlal Nehru University.

The other Member is Dr. Tyagi, who is also another economist. There are no bureaucrats at the moment.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We wanted farmers' representatives.

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: There will be various other representations and, I am sure, the honourable House would want that we have eminent people to serve on this Commission so that we get the benefit of their advice and expertise.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: By what time will it be constituted?

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: Their conditions of service, other perquisites—everything—are being looked into. Their terms of reference are being looked into so that we get the best in the country to advise us because, as you said, this is a national problem which will affect every individual Indian as well as outsiders. So, it takes some time. But I have been informed that both the Department of Finance and the Agriculture Ministry are closely looking at this and very shortly we will have the Members.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Farmers' representatives.

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: As you know, from the irrigated areas as well as non-irrigated areas the farmers will be there. It will not be a bureaucratic committee as the apprehension is. It will be a bureaucratic committee as the apprehension is. It will be a Commission of experts.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: By what time will it be constituted?

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: I cannot give that. As I said, if I say something, if I give a date, I will have to stick to it. Otherwise, you will bring a privilege motion against me.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You give the outer limit.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: One minute, Sir.

आदरणीय मंत्री जी, एक साल पहले

[श्री कल्पनाथ राय]

बम्बई में आदरणीय राजीव जी ने घोषणा की कि एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस कमीशन की जगह एग्रीकल्चरल कास्ट एंड प्राइस कमीशन बनाने की हम घोषणा करते हैं। एक साल बीत गया है एक साल के बाद भी एग्रीकल्चरल कास्ट एंड प्राइस कमीशन नहीं बना। मैं हाथ जोड़ कर प्रार्थना कर रहा हूँ कि केवल यहीं बता दीजिए कि एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस एंड कास्ट कमीशन आप 6 महीने में, एक साल में बनाएं, पर टाइम बाउंड कर दीजिए।

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is difficult for me to give a cut-off date.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It is a very pathetic appeal.

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: But the hon. Member's observation has been noted by me. I shall convey it to my colleagues. I am sure, they are also equally keen that we should have all the members of the Commission functioning and that the Commission functions. But at the moment it has two members. We have to fill up two other members, and then it is expected to be expanded. So, they are trying to locate two right persons for the Commission, and, therefore, their conditions and various modalities are being worked out. I shall convey the feelings of the House. I am sure, my colleagues will not be impervious to this.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It will be appointed by the Agriculture Ministry.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Some scientists from agriculture side should also be appointed.

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: Many Members wanted sugar mills in their respective states. They have been saying that their States alone would be able to meet India's entire requirements and that we would not have to import anything at all. Sir, I would like to share some information with the House, that as on 7th November, 1985 the installed capacity of sugar mills was 73.48 lakh tonnes. The utilisation of licensed capacity has been assumed to be 95 per cent. And the

average capacity utilisation in the last three years has been : 1982-83 it was 124.92 per cent. That was the bumper year. In 1983-84 it was 85.66 per cent. In 1984-85 it was 84.17 per cent. The capacity utilisation of sugar factories depends on cane availability. The position as regards the cane area, production and cane utilisation by sugar factories which have been commented upon by the Members, the diversion and going to other areas, which also has been coming down, is that in 1982-83 the cane area hectares was 33.57 lakh hectares; the total cane production was 189.5 million tonnes; and the percentage of cane utilised by factories was 43.60. In 1983-84 the cane area was 31.10 lakh hectares; the total cane production was 174 million tonnes, and the percentage of cane utilised by factories was 33.30. There is a marked diversion from this because of the fact that there was a glut, and the farmers did not get a remunerative price. Neither were they paid in time and adequately. In 1984-85 it further decreased to 29.92 lakh hectares. The total cane production came to 173.60 million tonnes, and the percentage of the cane utilised by factories was 35.67. Therefore, the recent step taken by Government is in totality of the entire thing. To reverse this trend we have taken the course to suggest a statutory minimum price of Rs. 16.50 per quintal to which the State Governments will also be adding various other factories to give a State advisory price which, I have already mentioned, in certain States, it is Rs. 24, and in certain other States it is Rs. 23. There is nothing to prevent getting a higher price.

We have only suggested a statutory minimum price to safeguard the interests of the farmers but not the mill-owners.

There was some mention about the productivity of sugarcane. Let me give authoritative figures which will be a revealing factor. Our productivity was 56.44 tonnes per hectare in 1983. The world's productivity is 57.73 per hectare the highest is the United States, 86.75 Mauritius 78.57, and Australia 73.53. There are many countries which are below our productivity. The productivity of Pakistan is 36.68 per hectare Brazil's

productivity is 61.80 per hectare which is higher than ours. Cuba's productivity is 53.66 less than ours. Then coming to the productivity State-wise, the highest is Tamil Nadu 92.24 then followed by Maharashtra with 90.30. The All India average is 55.9 in 1983-84 season.

SHRI KALPANATH RAI: What about Uttar Pradesh and Bihar?

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: Uttar Pradesh is 46.34 and Bihar 30.44 per hectare.

Therefore, in the Seventh Plan, the strategy is that the productivity of sugarcane which has remained stagnant during the last five years the aim would be to stabilise its area which is slightly at lower level and concerted measures will be taken for increasing the average yield of sugarcane. The record production achieved in 1982 was entirely due to area expansion I agree which some hon. Members that the sugarcane occupies the field for a long time and requires lot of water and fertiliser. The production of sugarcane is influenced, to a large extent, by sugar policy and the price paid for sugarcane by sugar factories. An integrated approach to sugarcane development to meet the requirements of sugar, khandasari is, therefore, quite crucial. Therefore, this is exactly what...

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: What about economic development?

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: I am coming to that. I will answer all your points.

The hon. Member, Shri Kalpnath Raiji had also mentioned about price parity. Now, I would not like to go into the entire economics of the entire price policy. Regarding parity between industrial and agricultural sector, enough has been said. There are no two opinions about that. I would just like to give certain indices and figures, which will, I hope, satisfy my hon. friend. Now, the list of commodities sold by the agricultural sector is wheat, jowar, bajra, maize, barley, paddy, rice, grain, milk and milk products, fruits and vegetables and gur. For intermediate consumption, groundnut, rapeseed/mustard, linseed, sesamum, castorseed, jute,

cotton, sugarcane, tobacco, rubber are sold by the agricultural sector.

Now, I will give the list of commodities purchased by the agricultural sector for final consumption—cycles, paper and paper products, tanned, cured and finished leather, tobacco (manufacture), textiles, drugs and medicines, cosmetics, soap and detergents, metal products, utensils, edible oils, sugar, salt, kerosene, matches, electricity, coal, services. The commodities purchased for intermediate consumption are: fertilizer, services and repairs, electricity, insecticides, diesel (HS), oil cakes, drugs and medicines. The commodities purchased for capital formation are: cement, lime, transport, equipment, machinery and machine tools, iron steel and ferro alloy, logs and timber, agriculture powder, bricks and tiles. If these indices are taken as 1971-72 as the base year end 100 being the index number then the prices received and the prices paid, the percentage would be 88.4 per cent. This figure is arrived at, prices received over and prices paid multiplied by 100 that is the ratio.

If 1979-1980 is taken as the base year, 100 being the index number then the prices received from 1980 to 85 and the prices paid comes to 99.7 per cent. In 1983-1984 it was 100.1 per cent.

So from these figures, you may like to draw your own conclusion whether there is parity or not or whether the Government has taken any steps for parity or not. Now, Sir, most of the points I have answered. There is nothing new in this debate. This was answered to by my distinguished predecessor on the 30th of January when my friend, Shri Kalp Nath Rai, had raised a similarly worded Calling Attention in this very House. Not even a comma or a fullstop has been changed. So there is nothing new in it. He also wanted to know about research and development. We attach the highest importance to research and development. In this field also right from panditji, science and technology has been given a very eminent position in our country's planning and it reached its highest during late Smt. Indira Gandhi's time when a big boost to

[Shri K. P. Singh Deo]

R and D was given after the shabby treatment it had received from 1977 to 1979. The Indian Council of Agricultural Research has organised through a number of institutions and a number of private sectors many research and development projects. One is the Sugar Breeding Institute, Coimbatore, one is the Indian Institute of Sugarcane Research, Lucknow, All India Coordinated Research Project on Sugarcane with the Coordinated Unit of IRSR, Lucknow as well as 25 Research Centres, spread all over the country. Then, there are *ad ad hoc* research schemes for specific problems on this subject where the allocation is to the tune of Rs. 3.47 crores on sugarcane research during the Sixth Plan which was also carried out. This is going to be augmented and apart from sugarcane, on sugar belt also, as I have said, Approach to the Seventh Five Year Plan wants that the productivity and the acreage are to be one of the prime factors in the production of sugarcane as well as production of sugar to achieve self-sufficiency and self-reliance. So, with this background, the statutory minimum price has been fixed and it is hoped that the State Governments will also take this into consideration for their various zones, and I am sure, the Hon'ble Members, who have been so vocal and so alert in the cause of farmers will also held in this regard by convincing their State Governments to give a better deal to the farmers.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:

Sir, what we pointed out was, there is a fundamental defect in fixing these prices. One is: there is no relation between the statutory minimum price and the actual price. You fix it at Rs. 16 whereas the actual price is Rs. 26 or Rs. 27 and who actually is paying the difference—whether the State Government or so many factories taking loans from the Government and the Banks? How you reconcile this thing? Second thing is; while fixing

even this statutory price, you are not taking the cost of production of the farmer or what he would have got by the cultivation of another crop, you are only taking the levy sugar price, what it should be, and working backwards as to what should be the cane price. That is the fundamental difficulty. How will you solve this?

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO: Sir, I think, the Hon'ble Member did not hear me correctly or probably. I was not audible to him. When the statutory minimum price is fixed, this is one of the criteria. The cost of production and also the return to the grower from the alternative crops is taken into consideration. This is what I said in the beginning. These are taken into consideration and also in consultation with the State Governments, Sugarcane growers as well as at the millers. Then the Bureau of Industrial Cost and Prices and the Commission on Agriculture Costs and Prices. After consultation with these agencies, this figure is arrived at. It is not something by guess work. It is not emotional, sentimental or guess work. It is based on consultation with the various sectors as well as the experts that this thing has been arrived at and after doing arithmetics, mathematics and economics. Thank you.

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : रिसर्च सेंटरों पर लागत मूल्य क्या है । सरकार का जो रिसर्च सेंटर है वहाँ पर लागत मूल्य क्या है ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): The House is now adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow, the 3rd December, 1985.

The House then adjourned at thirty-six minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 3rd December, 1985.