

[Shri.CG. K. Reddy] the Government have always been calculating at every stage one interest, namely, the interest of the sugar mill owners. The hon. Minister may say, "I am not aware of that". I will accept that contention. He is not probably aware of the fact that all this is going on in the interest of one particular group. But this has been going on for the last five years, if you study the events of the last five years. Last time when there was an increase there was an argument from the Congress Party that the price of cane was increased—I think one of the sugar industrialists himself mentioned it—that it was increased from Rs. 1-5-4 to Rs. 2-0-0 and nobody said "No" to that. But he forgot to mention that at the same time, Government increased the price of sugar from Rs. 21 to Rs. 39 whereas the increase in the price of cane was only from 1-5-4 to 2 (*Interruptions*). These are facts and no one can deny them and no amount of nodding of heads can show that they are not facts. When the price of sugar was increased by 86 per cent, the price of cane was increased only by 50 per cent. That is a fact which most of us are likely to forget. In the same manner, when you decrease the price of cane you also must keep the same proportion in the case of sugar. You may explain away this 86 per cent. increase by the increase in other costs, cost of production etc. I am aware of all those things. I question also the figures that may be made out in this regard. But when you bring down the price of cane from Rs. 1-12-0 to Rs. 1-5-0 it must bear some relationship to the price of sugar. Whatever the hon. Minister may say, whatever this massive array of heads and hands may say in this regard, in this particular matter as in fact, I feel in all matters, the Government has always been supporting one particular interest and it will continue to support it. All that I would say is that we will take this opportunity to condemn this Government for the policy that they have been following.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : As expected, the Government has come out as the champion of the consumers.

They have said that this reduction is made in order to safeguard the interest of the consumers. They say, had it not been for this Bill, the consumer would have had to pay higher prices for the sugar and because of the far-sighted and prompt action of the Government, by this additional levy of Re. 1 excise duty per maund of sugar, from December onwards the consumers are going to get sugar cheap. This is nothing but the usual song of trying to take cover behind the consumers when Government want to attack the growers and give help to the sugar mill manufacturers. This is what the Government has been doing. They have now a stock of 5 lakh tons of sugar in hand. The new season has also started and the new sugar will soon be coming out. If Government do not come with this Bill of levying Re. 1 extra excise per maund of sugar, then naturally in the market, both the new sugar and the sugar in stock now, will be in the market. Naturally the capitalist manufacturers have to sell the new quantities as well as the old ones and it would naturally reduce the prices for the consumers by reducing the profits of the manufacturers. Exactly to prevent this reduction, the Government comes and assures the manufacturers, acts on their behalf. It is going to sell the 5 lakh tons of sugar and even the new sugar that comes will not be released immediately for the market because consumption per month is only 1 lakh tons. Therefore, for the next 4 or 5 months the Government proposes to sell the old sugar at the high prices. Therefore, the argument of hon. Mr. Kidwai and hon. Mr. Tyagi that they have rushed in so as to put sugar on the market at cheaper prices for the consumer to buy, does not hold water whatsoever. In fact, they have rushed in so that the manufacturers who have been minting profits and who are likely to suffer with the possible reduction in the prices can be assured of their profits. It is for this purpose this Government has come with the Bill and for no other purpose. The Government is saying that the communists are forgetting the interests of the workers. It is a very strange argument. We ourselves have pointed that while the Government assures huge profits to

the mill magnates, it forgets the interests of the labour. We have given figures, quoted certain samples as to how one Director gets so much whereas the 1,000 labourers get only two-thirds of what the Director himself gets.

There is another point that was made in the debate. The Tariff Commission itself has said that Rs. 1-7-0 is the fair price for cane and Government, without proving that the yield has increased per acre, or the cost of production has been reduced, comes up suddenly and reduces the price to Rs. 1-5-0, going I against the Tariff Commission's proposals. As such, this Bill does not deserve to be supported and deserves to be totally opposed and we are going to oppose and vote against it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Have you anything to say, Mr. Tyagi ?

PROF. G. RANGA : I wish to say a few words.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have no objection if the House agrees.

SHRI M. C. SHAH : It is a money Bill and .....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We have to finish by 5. Time was fixed by the Chairman.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : There was no time fixed for the third reading.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : We have no objection to sit. It is already 5.

PROF. G. RANGA : I have only two points to make.

SHRI M. C. SHAH : Time was fixed for all stages.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If the House is agreeable, I have no objection.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : We have no objection, Sir.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE : In that case, Sir, this side of the House may be given some time.

PROF. G. RANGA : I have only a few points to make and after hearing it, you may not .....

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : I have already been called upon by the Chair and I give up to my friend, Prof. Ranga.

5 P.M.

PROF. G. RANGA : I have only to say this Sir, that I wish to express my satisfaction about the assurance given by the hon. Minister for Food and Agriculture that he would be writing to the Madras Government in order to see that the extra profits that the Madras millowners make over and above what other manufacturers would be making, should be allowed to split between the manufacturers and growers so that the higher cost of production that the cane growers will have to meet may, to some extent, be covered by the additional revenues that they may be allowed to get from the side of the manufacturers. I would also offer the suggestion that from the Finance Minister's side also strength should be given to this matter that the Madras Government might be persuaded to come to the rescue of the sugarcane growers.

Secondly, I would like to make this suggestion. What happens, if by any chance—and I expect that there will be a good chance indeed—the manufacturers will be able to recover from the exports as well as from the sales within the country, higher prices than the one according to which they had fixed sugarcane prices ? They have not fixed any ceiling price. Therefore, we can expect the manufacturers to get higher prices. If they get higher prices, then naturally they get greater profits than what they are expected to make. Is it not reasonable on the part of the manufacturers that a scheme should be evolved, between now and the next season, as a result of which, from out of the anticipated profits the manufacturers would be making over and above that which they are expected to make, to get a portion to be set aside either to the