

1. A copy of the Central Excise (Fourth Amendment) Rules, 1985 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. GSR 333(E) in Gazette of India dated the 30th March, 1985 under sub-section (2) of section 38 of the Central Excises and Sales Act, 1944. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-659/85].

2. A copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 :

- (i) GSR 329(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 30th March, 1985, together with an explanatory memorandum extending the validity of Notification No. 111/84-Customs dated the 21st April, 1984 upto the 31st March, 1986.
- (ii) GSR 330(E) and 321(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 30th March, 1985, together with an explanatory memorandum regarding exemption to prizes, won by any member of an Indian team participating with the approval of the Government of India in any International tournament of competition in relation to any sports or games, when imported into India from the whole of the basic, auxiliary and additional duties of customs leviable thereon.
- (iii) GSR 337(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 1st April, 1985 together with any explanatory memorandum regarding exemption to lead glass tubings and rods imported for the manufacture of components for electrical lamps and fluorescent tubes from basic customs duty in excess of 45 per cent and valorem.
- (iv) GSR 338(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 1st April, 1985 together with an explanatory memorandum regarding revised rates of exchange for conversion of certain foreign currencies into India currency or vice-versa.
[Placed in Library. See No. LT-660/85].

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES SUMMARY OF WORK

[English]

SECRETARY GENERAL : I lay on the Table a copy of the 'Parliamentary Committees—Summary of Work' (Hindi and English versions) pertaining to the period 1st June, 1984 to 31st December, 1984. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-661/85].

12.07 hrs.

MONOPOLIES AND RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES (AMENDMENT) BILL*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Vcerendra Patil has asked for special permission to move his Bill before the Business at item No. 8 is taken up. I have given him special permission.

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS AND INDUSTRY AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL) : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969."

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajpur) : Sir, I rise to oppose the introduction of this Bill at the very introduction stage. Sir, the Bill seeks to extend the scope of the MRTP Houses from Rs. 20 crores to Rs. 100 crores. So, even some greedy industrialists expected that this Government may rise the limit from Rs. 20 crores at the most to Rs. 50 crores. Now, it has gone to Rs. 100 crores. The most objectionable part is that this Government which is committed to the interest of the common man on the one side—leave aside the consumers and the workers—and on the other hand even in relation to the small scale industries which have been insisting that in Tariff Item No. 68 they should be able to have the exemption

*Published in Gazette of India extraordinary, Part II, Section 2, dated 9-4-1985.

limit increased from Rs. 30 lakhs to Rs. 40 lakhs has not given such exemption to them. But when it comes to the MRTP houses, they are going up right from Rs. 20 crores to Rs. 100 crores. This will lead to greater and greater concentration of wealth and also economic power. This runs totally counter to the concept of dispersal of industries. This also runs counter to the concept of de-concentration of wealth and therefore the basic objectives which have been laid in our planning are sought to be defeated by this particular measure. of course, this is only a by product of the policy announced by the Finance Minister during his budget proposal. During his budget proposal, he has already announced that they want to increase this MRTP House exemption limit from Rs. 20 crores to Rs. 100 crores and the Bill that is being brought forward now is only the consequential Bill to give only a legal shape to the pronouncement of the Finance Minister in the Budget. I am totally opposed to it from the point of view of egalitarianism, from the point of view of decentralisation of the industry, from the point of view of de-concentration of wealth and also from the point of view of avoiding an unhealthy competition between the MRTP houses and the small-scale and medium-scale industries. Therefore, I totally oppose the Bill at the very introduction stage and I feel that sanity will down on the Ministry even at this stage withdraw the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : I think you have done it for the second time now. The first one was in the budget discussion.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL : I would like to submit that the convention of this House has been that at the time of introduction of the Bill, generally no discussion takes place. I am sure the hon. Member and the entire House would agree that whatever proposal I have brought forward in this regard is not in the interest of the MRTP houses or big capitalists. I can convincingly argue. But that stage has not yet been reached. At the time of consideration of the Bill, whatever the hon. Member and the Members on the opposite want to know, I will prove that it is in the interest of not those people who are already having a monopoly, but it is in the interest of the nation, it is in the interest of the dispersal of industry

and a proper methodical growth of industries in the entire country. The hon. Member mentioned about the small-scale units. As we have raised the limit of the MRTP houses, we have also raised the limit in the case of small-scale units.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : How much ? I am interested in knowing the limit.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL : From Rs. 20 lakhs, it is raised to Rs. 35 lakhs in the case of small-scale industries, and in the case of ancillary industries, it has been raised to Rs. 45 lakhs. If there is a case for further increase, Government is proposed and has got an open mind with regard to this.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : The hon. Minister has mentioned about the MRTP houses not gaining by this. Why not give an inkling of this proof at the introduction stage itself so that I may change my mind even now ?

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : If it is done today itself, what shall we do tomorrow ?

[English]

The question is :

"The leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL : I introduce the Bill.

12.12 hrs.

HIGH COURT AND SUPREME COURT JUDGES* (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI A. K. SEN) : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the High Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Act, 1954 and the Supreme Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Act, 1958.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :