

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

[Prof. G. Ranga.] Madras or to any Government you might think it necessary, in order to compensate the growers or the producers of sugarcane so that they may be able to get a little more than what the Government wishes to offer them ? Therefore, I would like my friend, the Finance Minister, as well as the whole of this Government, to give the fullest possible consideration to the suggestion and see to it that the House is not obliged once again to throw the blame on them that they have not foreseen these things. They have allowed exports. They have given good prices. All these are desirable objectives. They have tried their best to help the growers also to some extent. Having made these two suggestions, I do not want to say anything more at this stage than that I cannot support the Bill.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Sir, I have nothing more to add except that my sympathy goes out to the cultivator. I can give this assurance that the cultivator, as much as any other class, would be given as much benefit as is needed. The question in this case is what the Tariff Board has said. I have already made it clear that the Tariff Board had said that after two or three years after the recommendations were made, the prices would go down to Rs. 1-4-0 and according to the information laid before the House, the development has proceeded as was expected by the Board. Now Sir, my friend has just mentioned a Bill to check further profits being made by the industry by selling sugar at a higher price. This is not possible. If at any time Government find

the prices artificially pushed up, they have a buffer stock of 3 lakh maunds always in their reserve to be thrown into the market as and when they think that the consumer is being exploited or is being made to pay more than what is necessary. Our expectations however are that the sugar prices will go lower than what you expect, and we want price of sugar to go down so that it may be available for exports.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : On a point of information. Is the Government guaranteeing any price in respect of the future output of sugar from these factories ?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : There is no price control, but our attempt shall be not to allow sugar prices to rise higher than what our calculations are and, therefore, the guarantee in respect of that will be the buffer stock of about 3 lakh tons.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill be returned.

(On a division being challenged, a count was taken.)

Ayes : 48.

Noes : 17.

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The Bill will be returned*

The council then adjourned till a quarter to eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 2nd December 1952.