

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): May I know what is the hurry about this measure? When since 1957 up to this day we have waited, is it necessary that it should be passed during this session? What is the hurry and why was it not brought before the House earlier?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: It is very necessary because there are some cases pending in courts and there will be difficulties if it is not passed now.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is not proper that this Bill should be rushed through at this stage and in such a hurry. It is better that it is taken up during the Budget Session.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Let Mr. Thomas make his statement.

STATEMENT RE. GUR SITUATION IN GUJARAT

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI A. M. THOMAS): Mr. Vice-Chairman, you were pleased to forward a copy of the proceedings of this House in the morning relating to the question that was raised by Shri Chandra Shekhar. Shri Chandra Shekhar appears to be very much worried about the position in the State of Gujarat. But, as is well known, Sir, his real eye is in U.P., not in Gujarat. In fact, why we imposed these restrictions on the movement of *gur* has been explained on the floor of this House by my senior colleague when the debate on this question took place the other day in this House. We have a dual purpose in imposing these restrictions on the movement of *gur*. One is that the *gur* must be made available in the producing States at a reasonable price. We have also the other purpose that between the competing users of sugarcane, namely, the

facturer, the *khandsari* manufacturer and the crystal sugar manufacturer, there must be an equitable scripply of sugarcane. As the hon. House knows, sugar prices are controlled; the minimum price of sugarcane is fixed, so that we have necessarily also to exercise some sort of control on the major user of sugarcane, namely, the jaggery sector also. It was only with the imposition of these restrictions, Sir that it has been possible to bring down the high price of *gur* in the producing States, and it had the necessary effect also—prices in the producing States are prevailing at a reasonable level. Now the *gur* manufacturer also can pay the same price that the crystal sugar manufacturer pays to the sugarcane grower on the basis of the existing level of prices of *gur*. Sir, having regard to the targets of sugar production that we have set, and having regard to the purposes that I have stated before this hon. House, I may make it clear that it is not possible to remove the restrictions on the movement of *gur*, as are existing now.

The hon. Member and some other hon. Members also saw me yesterday, and I explained the situation to them. Subsequently, the situation in Gujarat has also been brought to our notice by the Members hailing from Gujarat. My senior colleague and I had also discussions with the Supplies Minister of Gujarat also. We are fully seized of the position of Gujarat. In fact, among the importing States, Gujarat is the largest consumer of *gur*. We know the situation in Gujarat, and we are also taking the necessary steps to meet the situation. In fact, as far as Gujarat is concerned, Sir, for this month of December we have given them a quota of 10,500 tons, which is more than double the quantity which was moved by rail and river to the State of Gujarat in the corresponding period, last month. All the same, some difficulties are being experienced there, and we are aware of them. We have reviewed the situation and I we will be taking such steps as would

[Shri A. M. Thomas.] be necessary to ease the situation in Gujarat to the extent possible.

Now there are certain procedural delays in the matter of movement of *gur* from the producing States from which quotas have been granted to Gujarat. We have looked into that position and we are taking all the necessary steps to see that there would be no procedural delays in the matter of movement of *gur* to Gujarat. Apart from that, Sir, we have also decided that Gujarat should have, for the current month, the month of December another quota of about 5,000 tons for movement to Gujarat.

AN HON. MEMBER: Extra quota?

SHRI A. M. THOMAS: Yes, extra quota: additional quota, and with that, Sir, we hope that the situation in Gujarat will ease. We are seized of the situation and we are also aware of the difficulties experienced there. The hon. Members from Gujarat also had met me yesterday and explained the situation.

This is all that I have to say on this question.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): What about Rajasthan and Delhi people? They are also anxious that these restrictions should be removed.

SHRI A. M. THOMAS: With regard to the restrictions I made the position absolutely clear that there is no possibility of removing the restrictions.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the news item that I referred to this morning. The news item is from Lucknow, and it says:

"Gujarat has requested the U.P. Government to export 'a big quota' of *gur* to relieve the *gur* scarcity in the State.

Mr. Balwantrai Mehta, Gujarat Chief Minister, made the request in a telegram today to U.P. Chief Minister, Shri Sucheta Kripalani."

The news item further says:

"Mrs. Kripalani said she had been trying to persuade the Centre to lift the ban."

"This telegram emphasized the need for lifting the ban. I am immediately forwarding it to Mr. Swaran Singh (Union Food Minister)" she said.

This is the news. Now my contention is that in the Gujarat Assembly the Civil Supplies Minister assured that they were going to take up this matter with the Union Government, and Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani said in Lucknow that she was also forwarding this case to the Union Ministry.

Now the Food Minister said that there was one difficulty, that no adequate supply of sugarcane will be there for the sugar factories. But, Sir, there is a provision under the Defence of India Rules that in the reserved zone every sugarcane-grower will have to supply two-thirds of his produce to the sugar factories. *Gur* is produced not much in the reserved zone but outside the reserved zone. The Government of India says that only one-third of sugarcane is consumed by the sugar factories and two-thirds is utilised by the *khanasari* and *gur* manufacturers. So why should this restriction be imposed in order to see that supplies are adequate for the sugar factories when there are provisions for supply of sugarcane to the sugar factories under the Defence of India Rules? This is the point; that is number one. The other point is that Government made it clear that no shortage of *gur* will be there in the country, that there will be no fall of production, this year, in *gur*. So, if they are imposing this restriction, what is the purpose behind it? The third is: The hon.

the Food Minister again repeated that for the benefit of the consumers in the producing States he has imposed this restriction. Sir, I very humbly say that the Gujarat Assembly—this is the proceeding that I refer to; it is in Gujarati and so I asked my Gujarati friend to read it out—have said that U.P. has created an unnecessary bottleneck and 'we' are not going to send anything from Gujarat to U.P. So the Union Government is creating unnecessarily these tensions, between two States. The other point, the last point I want to ask the Food Minister very humbly is this. What Heavens will fall if the target of thirty-three lakh tons is not achieved? If, suppose, a few thousand tons less of sugar are produced in the country, what will happen? Will the whole country go to ruin? (*Interruptions*) because *gur* becomes an alternative to sugar for consumption in the country? They are going to export only three lakh tons of sugar, and the rest is to be consumed in this country. Now, if less of *gur* is produced, then the pressure on sugar will be all the more great, and the contention of the Food Minister will not prove true that sugar will be cheap in this country. Therefore, Sir, I very humbly request, through you, the Food Minister to revise his whole policy. And may I know from the Food Minister, may I ask him: Is it a fact that the Punjab Government requested them to create a zone? And if they are not going to lift the ban as a whole, are they thinking of creating a zone of Northern India comprising Rajasthan, Punjab and Delhi, something like that because, psychologically, *gur* manufacturers are feeling antagonised over this policy of the Government? Only half an hour before, I received a message from Ghaziabad that thirty people led by Shri Riyasat Hussain, Member of the U.P. Assembly, have again been arrested today, this afternoon, on the border of U.P. and Delhi. So what the Union Government actually wants to do? Do they want that they should throw a challenge, that we must accept it and there should be a

free fight? In the interests of the production, in the interests of the consuming States and in the interests of the manufacturing States, I request the Food Minister not to suffer from the hallucinations of a certain ghost created by his own Food Mini-stray. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I think, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, you have made your point clear. Yes, Mr. Desai.

SHRI D. B. DESAI (Maharashtra): My point of explanation is this. I am quite prepared to agree with the Government if the Government is going to safeguard the interests of sugarcane-growers, of the sugar factories and of the consumers, but here the present position in U.P. as well as in Maharashtra is that fifty per cent or more of *gur*—that is, jaggery—has been purchased by *arthis* or merchants. In spite of the quotas released from U.P. and Maharashtra, the prices of *gur* in Gujarat have gone up to such an extent as to give a margin of a hundred rupees in Maharashtra and Gujarat. So is it the intention of the Government to only serve the purpose of the merchant community which is dealing with *gur*? Another is this. After the banning or prohibition to crush sugar cane in the precincts of sugar cane factories, as Mr. Chandra Shekhar has pointed out, why actually ban on *gur* transport is imposed in Maharashtra and U.P.? So I expect explanation from the hon. Minister on these two points.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): I want one clarification. The hon. Minister said that they want to safeguard the interest of U.P., that is, the *gur*-producing area. But from the news item it appears that the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh has protested, rather sent her recommendation, to release *gur* from her State. Who is more interested, the Union Government or the Chief Mini-

[Shri R. S. Khandekar.] ster of that State, i_n the protection of the interest of *gur* producers?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): My simple question is: Has the Government received a request from the U.P. Government to remove the ban on the export of *gur* from U.P.?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have got one question. "While making the statement, the Food Minister said that they want to see that proper supply of sugar cane is made to sugar factories, and that they have already fixed Rs. 2 a_s the price in U.P. and Bihar. May I know, Sir, whether they are considering the question of fixing the same rate for sugar cane in the South?

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Gujarat): May I know, Sir, whether the hon. Minister is aware of the fact that the restriction on movement of *gur* has resulted, firstly, in the rise of prices of *gur*—it is not available even at high prices in sufficient quantities—and, secondly, whether it ha_s resulted in creating a feeling of disintegration? So, may I know whether the hon. Minister intends to remove the restriction for the sake of national integration and for giving *gur* at reasonable prices and in sufficient quantity to the people of Gujarat?

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH) : Sir, several questions have been raised. We had a long discussion here and some of the points, which my hon. friend opposite, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, has mentioned today, were raised by him in a lengthy speech lasting about an hour. I tried to meet those points. Apparently, he remain unconvinced. It is quite interesting that he is citing the imposition of certain restrictions under the Defence of India Rules and he is saying that we should take action under that rather than impose these restrictions.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I did not say that. I say that there is already a provision for that.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The provision has to be acted upon and I am not sure whether he is for that offer.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I am sorry that no provision is acted upon but this restriction is acted upon and some smugglers, some traders, are benefiting by that, I am sorry.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I know the hon. Member i_s feeling a little agitated and upset because I find that his party i_s carrying on an agitation and actually disobeying thi_s through offering arrests. That appear_s to be the main reason why he is so much agitated. I have every sympathy with that. But I will strongly advise him to suggest to them that they should not carry on this agitation because I do not know whose interest they are serving. It is a very simple proposition. We had this phenomenon last year when the sugar production in U.P. and Bihar fell down by about 7 or 7½ lakh tons, to the tune of about one-third of the production as compared to two years earlier. It was necessary to step up production and certain steps wer_e taken; they are not negative steps. Increased price to the sugar cane grower was given. But still the prices of *gur* that prevailed were so high that *gur* being a commodity upon which there is no price control—it is not easy to impose price control—other action had to be taken to ensure that it_s price did not shoot up. As a result of these actions the price has remained at a reasonable level.

I would like to add that the present prevailing price of *gur* in Uttar Pradesh, which is a surplus State,

ranges at a level which gives the grower sufficient price for that. It is not that the price has come down to a distress level. The price ranges from Rs. 23 to Rs. 26, depending on various things and that compares very favourably in favour of the grower manufacturer even as compared to Rs. 2 per maund of sugar cane price that is payable to the grower if he supplies sugar cane to the mill. So it is not a case where the price has come down in any large measure. Prices even in other areas, for instance Punjab, were mentioned did not first come down by these steps. In the initial stages, the trade, in the hope that some agitation will be built up and that they will work towards removal of that ban tried to keep the prices high. But we moved sufficient quantities on Government account and the prices in Punjab are ruling fairly easy. In fact, some of the gur that was moved from Uttar Pradesh is not being lifted because even there the production now has started. The two States where difficulty is being experienced at present are Gujarat and Rajasthan. Steps are being taken to move adequate quantities of gur to those areas. The State Governments are assuring distribution at a reasonable level.

Now a suggestion has been made by one hon. Member that the price of gur is ruling at Rs. 100 or something. Now that may be some blackmarket transaction. But whatever quantity moves—and thousands of tons have moved on, more or less, Government-to-Government account—that is being distributed at a fair price under Government supervision. So really we should not judge the actual result by the few odd transactions in the black market, so to say, and we are moving quantities which, I think, will improve the situation to a very large extent. We should not forget, Sir, that a large number of States are involved in this, and for the sake of moving a lakh tons or two lakh tons the whole 50 or 60 lakh tons produced in the country should not be subjected

to this upward spiral. And belonging to the Socialist Party as the hon. Member does, he should really cooperate in such regulatory measures which might be designed to keep the prices under check, to ensure favourable price to the grower also and also to ensure that at the consuming end the commodity is available at reasonable prices and the normal trade practices of unnecessarily pushing up the prices, both in the consumer centres as well as in the producing centres, should be resisted. So I would appeal to the hon. Member ————— if he has any influence with his party ————— that he should persuade them not to carry on this agitation. It is not in the interest of any one.

Another question was raised as to whether the U.P. Government has suggested the lifting of the ban. Now it is quite amazing that my friends opposite are greater advocates of their viewpoints. Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani also is here today and so is the Minister from Gujarat. I have had talks with both of them and we are seized of the situation. It is not correct that any proposal has come from the U.P. Government for lifting the ban on the movement of gur.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: May I appeal to my friend that in view of the explanation of the hon. Minister he would use his good offices to see that his Party withdraws Satyagraha and we have Prof. Mukat Behari Lai in our House.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: One point. The hon. Food Minister says that many States are not involved in the matter; only Rajasthan and Gujarat are involved or some more States. I make a suggestion to the Food Minister. What is the difficulty in creating a free zone of Punjab, Delhi and U.P., three States, and let us see what reaction there is on the prices of gur by creating such a zone? You create a zone and allow free movement in this zone and let us see the result. Another point is: what is the demand of Gujarat and what is your supply?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The points of smuggling will increase. I know from U.P. the most vulnerable point of smuggling was roundabout Agra. We have tightened that up and it has resulted in a fall of price in U.P. by Rs. 2 or Rs. 3. And if you enlarge this zone, you do not gain anything except that you increase smuggling. Therefore, it is necessary to enforce this and not be upset by these seeming difficulties that we appear to be facing today.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: On the whole of Punjab border smuggling is going on.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: There is no smuggling towards Punjab now because in Punjab the prices that obtain today are easy.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: What is the difficulty in creating a zone?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore) : I would appeal t'o the hon. Member, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, and his party not to make, political capital out of a particular situation that has been created fortunately or unfortunately. It does not serve any political purpose even though they are trying to make political capital out of this situation.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Sir, I want to give this information to Mr. Reddy that not only the P.S.P., but the Sarva Sewa Sangh has passed a Resolution, the Sarvodaya people have put up satyagraha at Ghaziabad. It is not a political question and I assure you that only four or five P.S.P. members are in the jail out of 'one hundred and seventy persons. All peasants are there and one hon. Member, a revered Member, Mr. Akbar Ali was there in the jail to see things himself. There are only three or four P.S.P. members. All are gur manufacturers and peasants So these cheap slogans are not going t'o serve this country. We also know something of patriotism something of nationalism

and the Fo'od Minister and the Members opposite should not always preach to us lessons in patriotism and social service and national service. I know better than they know it.

THE DELHI DEVELOPMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963—contd.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश)
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: This Bill may be postponed to the next Session. It is too late and we did not have lunch hour today.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHE M. P. BHARGAVA) : I will clear the position. The Business Advisory Committee had allotted three and a half hours for the Preventive Detention Act. Actually we have taken eight hours. For the Banking Companies' Act only two hours were allotted. We have been taking more time. So I hope the House will have no objecti'on to sitting longer hours to pass this Bill.

Mr. Ram Sahai, you go on with your speech.

श्री राम सहाय : जरूर बैठेंगे । मेरा यह निवेदन है कि यह बिल जिस उद्देश्य से लाया गया है वह बहुत ही अच्छा है । दिल्ली में इस बात की बहुत आवश्यकता है कि जल्द से जल्द डेवलपमेंट हो और मकानात वगैरह बनाये जायें । यहाँ बहुत सी हाउसिंग सोसायटीज बन चुकी हैं और अभी मुझे ऐसा मालूम हुआ है कि लगभग २०० सोसायटीज ऐसी हैं जिन को जमीन देना अभी बाकी है । उन को जमीन दी जानी है । इस बारे में पहले का जो तरीका था वह तरीका बहुत ज्यादा रिजिड था और उस को हल करने की गरज से यह बिल लाया जा रहा है । मैं समझता हूँ, यह बिल पास होना बहुत ही आवश्यक है और किसी प्रकार से भी