

(H. A. H. Dis.)

[J. Mohamed Imam]

factories where they are. That is how the public sector projects are failing. That is how they are working at a loss. They have no idea that it is advantageous to expand existing factories rather than to move to some other places.

Lastly, I say, I am only speaking in the interest of the country that the nation must be united. I think, the Home Minister must take a strong hand on the activities of the Shiv Sena. In fact, I am sorry that he has been kept in an embarrassing position by entrusting him to decide the issue. He has kept it for two years. If the same subject had been handled by some other Minister, he would at least have brought the Mahajan Commission Report before Parliament and implemented it.

17.30 hours.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

EXPORT OF MANGANESE ORE TO NORTH KOREA

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Before we start the half-an-hour discussion, I would like to remind the hon. members that we would follow the procedure that has been laid down. That is, the hon. member who raises the discussion will get his time, about 10 to 12 minutes, and then the hon. Minister will reply. Then the other hon. members, whose names have come in the ballot, will be permitted to put questions for further clarification.

श्री शिब चन्द्र भा (मधुवनी) : माननीय सदस्य इनिशिएट तो करें लेकिन उनके बाद जिनके नाम हैं, उनको सवाल पूछने की इजाजत दीजिये। जवाब के बाद अगर आपने दूसरों को सवाल पूछने का अवसर दिया तब रैपीडीशन हो जायगा।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is the procedure that is laid down. If the hon. Member wants any change, he may take up the matter in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Patodia.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, sometime back, one

more country has arisen in the trade horizon of India, a country with whom trade relations had been suspended at the time of Chinese attack because that country was a close ally of China. According to the facts and figures that we have got, that country, North Korea, has started trading with India, and in 1967-68 India exported as much as 10,000 tonnes of manganese ore to that country.

There could be no objection to any normal trading activities with any country. But trading with North Korea causes suspicion, causes doubt, on account of several factors involved. The first consideration is what induced India, what were the factors that impelled India, to trade with a country with whom India suspended trading activities at the time of Chinese attack, a country which is known for its alliance and sympathies with our enemy.

Secondly, the very pattern of trade with North Korea, the very pattern of agreement, gives us a suspicious feeling as to what is boiling within the pot.

17.32 hours

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR in the chair]

Even in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1 on which this discussion has been raised, the hon. Minister was conspicuously confusing. Before I raise my points, please permit me to quote from the reply given by the hon. Minister. The question was :

- “(a) Whether it has been decided to allow the export of manganese to North Korea; and
(b) if so, the quantity of manganese ore likely to be exported, the price charged for the same; and
(c) how this price compares with the prices in the world market.”

The answer was small and simple. It says :

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) & (c) : Contracts have yet to be concluded.”

This is the answer given to the question on 18th February, 1969. The first instalment of shipment—10,000 tonnes of manganese ore—was done in October, 1968. I do not think that any Government or any institution worth its name could possibly export any quantity to a foreign country—this was done just five months back—without knowing the terms and conditions, the prices charged and the various terms and conditions.....

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : This is about this year. That was about last year.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : It is about 1968-69. As far as I understand, the financial year of all the Government departments is from 1st April to 31st March. If I am mistaken, the hon. Minister may correct me.

First of all, I want to make this point that this new pattern of trade that we are developing with North Korea is on rupee payment. Mind you, North Korea is purchasing various other commodities, including manganese ore, from the world over; India is not the exclusive supplier.

Most of these commodities purchased by N. Korea are on the basis of free convertible foreign exchange. By purchasing them from India, N. Korea did not show us any favour. Look at the mining map of the world. Who are the principal suppliers ? India, USSR, S. Africa and Australia. India is the only country geographically most suited for N. Korea to purchase. It will be economical for them from the freight point of view and also for the time factor consideration. Therefore, N. Korea wants to purchase from India as a matter of economic convenience and not as a matter of conferring any favour on us. In spite of this, whereas N. Korea had been purchasing these commodities the world over against free convertible foreign exchange, India thought it fit and wise to sell this commodity to N. Korea against rupee payment.

What are the considerations that would decide whether this deal with N. Korea was proper or not ? What induced India to enter into this deal ? There were so many factors. I have dealt with a few of them and I will explain the others.

Before I proceed further, let me say that it is a recognised fact in India, recognised by various economists, some sections of Government and various industrialists and anybody who knows and understands economics well that rupee payment trade agreements entered into by India with the East European countries have done great damage to our economy. It is in three ways.

It has resulted in higher cost for our imports and components, it has been responsible for losing us our traditional markets for most of these traditional commodities, and it has been responsible for earning a bad name for these commodities of ours in view of the switch trade indulged in by most of these East European countries. In spite of this bad experience, in spite of what we have suffered in the course of the last 7-8 years, India thought it prudent to once again enter into a rupee payment agreement with another country, N. Korea with whom we had discontinued trade relations since the Chinese attack.

As I said earlier, the first consignment of 10,000 tonnes of manganese ore was exported in Oct. 1968. We do not know the terms, what price was fixed, and if it was against rupee payment, what were the items that were to be imported, and in fact, what did we import; and in respect of the import items, what are the terms for fixing prices, what are the terms for fixing payment ? As far as I understand, there was a specific agreement that N. Korea will in return export to us various non-ferrous metals at international prices, like tungsten, copper, lead. But so far N. Korea has not fulfilled this commitment. And in spite of this, we now understand from the hon. Minister that a further agreement is in the offing. We came to know about it for the first time in *March of the Nation* issue of 1 February which clearly said that India is likely to export 30,000 tonnes more. On the basis of

[Shri D.N. Patodia]

that information, further questions have been raised.

Therefore, it would be necessary for the hon. Minister to explain what are the terms of payment, what are the items to be imported against the export what are the items imported against the previous export of 10,000 tonnes, what are the terms thereof, and if these have not been imported yet, why not? Also, what will happen if the export value is more than the import value? That is, if the export is worth Rs. 20 lakhs and our imports are worth Rs. 10 lakhs, are the N. Koreans going to convert the balance into free convertible foreign exchange for us?

Are they going to keep our money blocked with them until we find some commodity to be imported at a price convenient for them? These are pertinent questions and unless they are satisfactorily answered, these deals which had been entered into in a suspicious atmosphere should not be permitted to go through.

My last point is this. Have the Government of India ensured that the manganese ore which we export to North Korea will not ultimately find its way to China? I hope the Government have taken due care about this possibility. The House would like to know how they had obtained this clarification and whether they are satisfied about it.

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): I am glad the hon. Member has raised this discussion because it gives me an opportunity to clarify the issues regarding this question. The reply was with respect to the current year. It is true that in 1968 manganese ore was exported at Rs. 185 fob per ton.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: Is October 1968 not part of the current year?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am now giving figures for the next year, 1969. I was saying that the answer related to current negotiations. For the contract already signed the price is Rs. 185 fob per ton, for 46-48 grade.

Why have we entered into a trade agreement with North Korea, an ally of China? This political question has been raised. Actually the rupee arrangement with North Korea was in vogue since 1961 when the trade agreement was concluded for the first time. This is not a new trade agreement.

This was, however, suspended during 1962 through executive instructions. As the hon Member knows, we have trade relations with many countries including both Koreas. We have extensive trade relations with South Korea which, I think, the hon. Member welcomes. Similarly, with North Korea also we are having trade relations; there is no harm in it. Many countries which do not see eye to eye with China on political matters are having extensive trade relations with China, leaving aside any ally of China. To deny trading opportunities with countries because they have certain political alignments is not in the commercial interest of India; this is our judgment.

I was asked why we are selling manganese ore. Manganese ore could be used for making high speed steel or some other things. We do not consider it as strategic material.

It does not come under that category so that we should restrict its export, nor is it the case in many other countries including the United States of America. They do not describe this manganese ore in such a way as to say "do not sell the manganese ore to communist countries." It is not only India but many other countries which do not by any stretch of judgment describe manganese ore as what may be described as a strategic raw material. Therefore, the natural restrictions on trading in such strategic materials do not apply.

Secondly, there is the point about it being purely for commercial reasons. The hon. Member knows more than I, I am sure, that in manganese ore, the market has become competitive. Better ores and captive mines have sprung up in many countries, and he himself mentioned Australia and some other countries which

are in the market. Therefore, if we want to sustain export, and earn foreign exchange, we should not allow this trade to fall. We have to export and explore new markets, and therefore, it is absolutely necessary that purely for commercial transactions, this item should find a place in the trade agreement.

Then, the hon. Member raised another objection saying that although it is a trade with North Korea, the commodity may be diverted to China, and that may not be to our advantage. The hon. Member should know that China itself is a producer of manganese ore.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : China is a big country. (*Interruption*)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : May be; China is a big country and there may be certain things.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Just as in the United States, in China, from one part of the country they import and from another part of the country they export.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Well, in all such agreements, there is this clause of re-export. These goods are not re-exported to any other country. There is this clause and, as the hon. Member knows North Korea has a very developed steel industry, and particularly, alloy steel or high-speed steel may be required. But as I said, the chance of the possibility of its being exported to China is remote, because China itself has a big production, about a million tonnes annually, so far as our information goes. Ours is a little over a million tonnes. China is producing a million tonnes. But that possibility is remote. I do not rule out that possibility and I cannot say what one country will do or any other country will do. But there is a clause preventing such re-export to any third country.

Then, the hon. Member pointed out the imports from North Korea. It is true that we have not so far imported anything from North Korea although the items listed in the trade agreement give this, the items which he has mentioned like non

ferrous metals, alloy steel or high-speed steel or some other metals which we require. But certainly we look forward to importing some of the goods which we need for our economy. So far, it is true we have not imported.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: What about the money that is lying there ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : It is not disappearing. It will be used. The hon. Member knows the mechanism in which the rupee trade goes on. We will use that and we will import from North Korea.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: It is blocked, does it carry interest ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: It is not blocked; it will be used for importing goods.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: Does it carry interest ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: It is not free exchange. About these details, I will have to look into them.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: It does not carry interest ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Well, what the hon. Member suggests is that we should import goods as the money is lying idle and is unused, as he says. The arrangement is not that automatic. Certainly, this question is a very significant one. Certainly the question of importing these commodities from North Korea which we need will be examined earnestly.

These were some of the points raised, which I have answered,

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: How does he justify this rupee payment agreement in view of the fact that North Korea could have purchased this manganese ore from us by paying us in free convertible foreign exchange ? He has not answered it.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I do not see any need for justifying it. We have rupee

(H. A. H. Dis.)

[B. R. Bhagat]

trade arrangements with other countries and we have free foreign exchange arrangements also with other countries. It is a question of convenience and exploring the possibilities of more trade both ways. But for this rupee payment arrangement, the trade between the two countries will not move freely.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: What convenience does he find in rupee payment agreement ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a general question, not concerning North Korea alone.

SARI B. R. BHAGAT: I can answer that.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: He admitted that against the exports made in October 1968, we have not imported anything from there. So, in these rupee payment arrangement the money is blocked and we are in their hands completely. We have to import items of their choice at their price.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: We can discuss the advantages and disadvantages of rupee payment arrangements separately. As I said, but for this arrangement, our trade would not have expanded with these countries. There is an inherent advantage. With free foreign exchange countries we are in a heavy deficit. But with rupee payment countries, our trade is balanced.

श्री कंबर खाल गुप्त : मभापति जी, यह जो ट्रेड एग्रीमेन्ट हुआ है या होने जा रहा है वह मिस्ट्रीरियस सर्कम्सटेंसेज में हुआ है। वैसे तो यहां पर जो डेलीगेशन आते हैं उनकी बड़ी पब्लिसिटी होती है लेकिन यह जो डेलीगेशन आया था, उसके बारे में बिल्कुल चर्चा नहीं हुई जब तक कि वह एग्रीमेन्ट नहीं हो गया इसलिए पहली बात तो यह है कि एक पोलिटिकल डिसेजन है, ट्रेड एग्रीमेन्ट नहीं है। जिस देश की हम हमेशा हिमायत करते रहे लेकिन चीन जिससे हमारा भगड़ा हुआ, इस देश ने हमारा साथ

छोड़कर उसी चीन का साथ दिया और खुल्लम खुल्ला साथ दिया और आज उसके वाद भी हम रूस के दबाव में आकर इस देश के साथ अपना ट्रेड एग्रीमेन्ट कर रहे हैं क्योंकि उसकी स्टील मिल्स बगैर इस मैटीरियल के चल नहीं सकती हैं। मन्त्री महोदय कह सकते हैं कि यह कोई स्ट्रेटेजिक मैटीरियल नहीं है लेकिन यह बहुत ज्यादा स्ट्रेटेजिक मैटीरियल है। मेरा पहला सवाल तो यह है कि आपने इस बात की कोई गारन्टी क्यों नहीं ली कि स्वीच ट्रेड न हो? एग्रीमेन्ट के अन्दर क्या आपने ऐसी कोई गारन्टी ली है जिससे यह मैटीरियल चाइना या दूसरी जगह न जा सके? चाइना हमारा एनिमी कन्ट्री है और दूसरा होस्टाइल है। फारेन एक्सचेंज कमाने के लिए, डालर कमाने के लिए वह इस तरह में ट्रेड कर सकते हैं जैसे कि रूपी पेमेन्ट की बेसिस पर ट्रेड होता है, उसमें बहुत सारा स्वीच ट्रेड हुआ है, यह तो सरकार ने भी माना है तो क्या एग्रीमेन्ट में सरकार ने इस बात की कोई गारन्टी ली है कि मँगनीज ओर के बारे में या जिससे स्टील बनेगा वह चाइना में नहीं जायेगा? क्या इस बात की गारन्टी सरकार ने ली है? यह मेरा पहला सवाल है।

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि मन्त्री महोदय ने अभी कहा कि हम बिजनेस एग्रीमेन्ट करते हैं, उसमें कोई पोलिटिकल कमिड्रेशन नहीं होता है। जिस देश ने हमारे साथ शत्रुता की उससे तो हम रूस के दबाव में आकर ट्रेड एग्रीमेन्ट करते हैं लेकिन इजरायल जिसने कि हमारे साथ होस्टिलिटी नहीं की उसके साथ ट्रेड करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। वहां के लोगों ने चिट्ठियां लिखी हैं, वहां की गवर्नमेंट ने भी लिखा है लेकिन उनकी चिट्ठियों का जवाब तक नहीं दिया जाता है जबकि वे बहुत सारी चीजों में, टेक्निकल नो-हाऊ में, एप्लीकलर में, इन्डस्ट्री में हमको मदद देने के लिए तैयार हैं।...

(व्यवधान) ...तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि बिजनेस का जो एग्जीमेन्ट होता है वह बिजनेस कन्सीड्रेशन से ही होना चाहिए लेकिन इसके बजाय उसमें पोलिटिकल कन्सीड्रेशन ज्यादा होता है।

इजरायल के केस में हम उनसे ट्रेड करना नहीं चाहते तो मेरा सवाल है कि क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बतलायेंगे कि अभी तक जब से दुवारा ट्रेड शुरू हुई है नार्थ कोरिया के साथ तब तक कितना मँगनीज ओर्स आपने वहाँ पर भेज दिया है और भी आपने क्या क्या चीजें भेजी हैं और दूसरा सवाल है कि कितना आपने भेजा है ?

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज (बम्बई दक्षिण) : मंत्री महोदय ने उत्तर देते हुए यह कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान में हम 10 लाख टन से कुछ ज्यादा के मँगनीज ओर्स का हम उत्पादन करते हैं जबकि चीन में करीबन 10 लाख टन उत्पादन होता है। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय को यह भी जानकारी होगी कि हिन्दुस्तान में जितनी फौलाद की पैदावार है उसके मुकाबले शायद चार, पांच गुना ज्यादा चीन में फौलाद की पैदावार है। अब जिस मँगनीज ओर्स से स्टील का उत्पादन होता है वह एक तो इनफीरियर क्वालिटी का हो सकता है जोकि उनके काम में नहीं आता हो या उनके लिए पूरा न पड़ता हो उनकी स्टील इंडस्ट्री को चलाने के लिए तो इमलिए मैं चाहूँगा कि मंत्री महोदय कहीं गलतफहमी में न रहें और न हम लोगों को कोई गलत मालूमता दें और वह असलियत को जरा ठीक तरीके से समझ लें।

मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर कोरिया का जो व्यापार मंडल नवम्बर महीने में पिछले साल हिन्दुस्तान में आया था जो उस व्यापार मंडल ने जब यह मँगनीज ओर्स के बारे में आपसे बातचीत चलाई तब उत्तर कोरिया से हिन्दुस्तान को कहीं न कहीं से

माल देने का आपके पास सुझाव आया था और उस सुझाव के बारे में आपने उन्हें क्या उत्तर दिया था ? इसमें क्या तथ्य है कि उत्तर कोरिया वालों ने ऐसी मशीनरी इत्यादि देने के लिए कबूल किया कि जो चीजें हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा होती हैं और जिनकी कि हमें उत्तर कोरिया से लेने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है ? आप इस प्रश्न का भी साफ और स्पष्ट उत्तर दें कि खुद अपनी जानकारी से, या दूसरे देशों के जरिए दी हुई जानकारी से अथवा दूसरे कोई भी तरीके से आपने इसकी जानकारी ली हो कि क्या आपको निश्चित मालूम है कि हिन्दुस्तान से उत्तर कोरिया के साथ व्यापार का जो सम्बन्ध होगा वह चीन के फायदे के बास्ते नहीं किया जा रहा है ?

श्री शिवाचन्द्र भ्वा (मधुवनी) : मेरा पहला सवाल है जैसा कि मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि व्यापार नार्थ कोरिया से सन् 1962 से पहले भी चलता था और 62 से जो सस्पेंशन हो गया है उसको फिर से जारी किया जा रहा है तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि 62 के पहले जो नार्थ कोरिया से व्यापार होता था हिन्दुस्तान का वह रूपी पैमेंट में था और यदि वह रूपी पैमेंट में था तो उस वक्त क्या सुविधा मिलती थी फौरन एक्सचेंज के जरिए जो कि अभी आप नहीं पा रहे हैं ?

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस सस्पेंशन के पहले आपको क्या कनवीनिअंस था ? दूसरा सवाल है कि यह जो आपका रूपी पैमेंट में होता है उसको आप इस्तेमाल नहीं कर रहे हैं अभी कुछ इम्पोर्ट नहीं कर रहे हैं और वह एक तरीके से आपका ब्लाकड है। अब नार्थ कोरिया का सम्बन्ध चीन के साथ तो है ही और रूम के साथ भी नजदीक का सम्बन्ध है तो क्या आपने यह कोशिश की कि वह जो रूपी पैमेंट आप का ब्लाकड है वह रुबेल्स में चेंज हो जाय

[श्री शिवचन्द्रभा]

और तब तक आप रूस के साथ उसको इस्तेमाल कर सकें और अपना व्यापार बढ़ा सकें और साथ साथ आपको जो रूबल्स आते हैं उनसे आप अपना व्यापार बढ़ा सकते हैं तो क्या आपने उसको रूबल्स में बदलवाने की कोशिश की ?

18 hours.

तीसरा सवाल यह है कि नार्थ कोरिया से जो यह व्यापार का सिलसिला शुरू हुआ क्या उसके लिए हम यह समझें कि नार्थ कोरिया और चाइना के साथ व्यापार और डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशन्स के सम्बन्ध में डायलाग के लिए कदम उठाया जा रहा है ?

SHRI SHRI CHAND GOYAL (Chandi Gharh): The Minister has stated that we enter into these contracts on purely commercial considerations and not on political considerations. On February 1967 we entered into a contract with East Germany to supply 10,000 tonnes of manganese ore. I want to know whether that experiment of exporting manganese to East Germany was not a success and, if so, why did we divert our trade channels from East Germany to North Korea. We also made serious effort to year earlier to export manganese ore to USA and Japan. I would live to have a clarification whether our effort have proved successful. Thirdly Shri Netrawala, Chairman of the Indian ferro-Alloy producers' Association, made a statement in November 1966 that India has capacity to export manganese ore to the tune of Rs. 8 crores and that will be possible only if we reduce our cost of production. May I know whether some serious efforts are being made to reduce the cost of production, which at present does not compare well with those of other countries, to enable us to boost up our export of manganese to the tune of Rs.8 crores?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : To answer the last point first, in 1968 our total export of manganese ore to all the countries was of the value of Rs. 11.7 crores.

अभी कई माननीय सदस्यों ने यहां पर जो सवाल उठाये हैं मैं उनका जवाब देने की कोशिश करूंगा। श्री गुप्त ने कहा कि ग्रह पोलिटिकल डिजिजन है और रूस के प्रेशर में हुआ है, यह कामर्शल डिजिजन नहीं है श्री गोयल ने कहा कि यह कामर्शल डिजिजन है।

श्री श्री चन्द गोयल : मैंने पूछा है।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : श्री गुप्त ने जवाब दे दिया है। मैं तो कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज की दुनिया में कभी भी कामर्शल डिजिजन और पोलिटिकल रिलेशन्स को अलग-अलग करना सम्भव नहीं होता है। यह कहना कि रूस के दबाव में यह सब हुआ है, यह ठीक नहीं है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जापान आज चीन के साथ बड़ा ट्रेड करता है, नार्थ कोरिया के साथ करता है, रूस के साथ उसका बहुत बड़ा ट्रेड है, तो क्या यह किमी दबाव के कारण है ? क्या वह अमरीका के दबाव के कारण करता है ? अगर ट्रेड में दबाव का नाम लिया जाय तो उनका कहना है कि रूस के दबाव में नार्थ कोरिया को 14,000 टन मैंगनीज भेजा गया। अरबों का ट्रेड जापान का होता है इन तीनों देशों से, तो क्या यह अमरीका के दबाव में आकर होता है ? जितनी वेस्ट कंट्रीज के लोग हैं, बेल्जियम है, इंग्लैंड है, और भी दूसरे देश हैं सब व्यापार करते हैं चीन से, तो क्या यह रूस के दबाव में होता है ? इस लिए इन बातों का यहां लाना ठीक नहीं है।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मैंने सवाल किया कि इजराइल को क्यों नहीं देते ?

श्री ब० रा० भगत : वह अलग सवाल है। अगर उसमें आप इजराइल का सवाल लायें, चीन का लायें, रूस का लायें, तो कहां तक जवाब दिया जायेगा ?

मैं यही कह रहा था कि हमारा रूपी

ट्रेड पहले से था कन्वीनिअंस के ब्याल से । आज सब वार्ता को उठाना और सारे इतिहास में जान्म कि रूपी ट्रेड कैसे हुआ, इसका यह अवसर नहीं है । आज दस बारह सालों से यह व्यापार चल रहा है । यह जरूर है कि अगर रूपी ट्रेड न होता तो इन देशों के साथ अपना व्यापार बढ़ता नहीं । यह व्यापार 1961 में भी था और आज भी है ।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : क्या सुविधा थी ?

श्री ब० रा० भगत : सबसे बड़ी सुविधा तो आप जानते हैं कि पेमेंट मैकेनिज्म जो होता है, उसकी है । उनकी इकोनोमी दूसरी तरह की है । तपसील में जाने का समय नहीं है । माननीय सदस्य जानते ही हैं कि सोशलिस्ट कंट्रीज की इकोनोमी कंट्रोल्ड होती है, प्लांड होती है और अगर इस तरह का कोई अरेंजमेंट नहीं होता तो व्यापार होना मुश्किल होता ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : We cannot discuss a policy matter during this half-an-hour discussion.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I am glad. Then, you should have prevented him from asking this question.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : स्विच ट्रेड नहीं होगा इसकी क्या गारंटी है ।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : जो माल लेते हैं उसका रिएक्सपोर्ट तीसरी कंट्री को बिल्कुल न करें, इसको बिल्कुल गारंटी तो नहीं किया जा सकता है लेकिन जहां तक दो देशों के बीच समझौते की बात है, उस समझौते की पूरी तरह से हम हिफाजत करते हैं ।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : क्या उपाय किया है ?

श्री ब० रा० भगत : यह जो एग््रीमेंट हुआ है, इसमें एक क्लॉज नम्बर 11 है, जिस में यह लिखा हुआ है :

"The commodities exchanged between the two parties shall be for consumption in their respective countries and shall not be re-exported"

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: What about steel ?

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : In spite of this clause, you know, things are done.

श्री ब० रा० भगत : माननीय सदस्य ने स्टील की बात की है । अब स्टील से जो प्रोडक्ट्स बनेंगे उसकी गारंटी नहीं हो सकती है । जो ट्रेड होता है उसमें जो आइटम्ज होती है, उनके बारे में ही यह हो सकता है ।

जहां तक आइटम्ज के बारे में पूछा गया है कि एक्सपोर्ट में कौन-कौन सी आइटम्ज हैं, उसमें सतरह आइटम्ज हैं जिसमें एलाय स्टील है, नान-फैरम मैटलज बगैरह हैं ।

माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि अभी यह पहला आइटम था । दस हजार टन के लगभग हमने उनको मँगनीज आंर बेचा है । अभी तक तो देखना है कि कैसे ट्रेड चलता है । दोनों तरफ से माल चलेगा, आएगा । इसमें घबराने की कोई बात नहीं है ।

श्री आर्च फरनेग्बीज : उत्तर नहीं आया है । मैंने पूछा था कि कौन-कौन सी आइटम्ज हैं । उनको सारी आइटम्ज को पढ़ना चाहिये था ।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : मैंने कहा तो है कि सतरह आइटम्ज हैं । उसमें हार्ड स्पीड एलाय, एलाय स्टील बगैरह हैं ।

श्री आर्च फरनेग्बीज : इसकी क्या गारंटी है कि यह माल चीन को नहीं जाता है ।

(H. A. H. Dis.)

श्री ब० रा० भगत : अभी तो यह माल भेजा गया है। मैंने कहा है कि हमने एक क्लॉज में गारंटी दी है। लेकिन तीसरी कंटी की हम गारंटी कैसे ले लें।

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House stands

adjourned to meet again at 11 A. M. tomorrow.

18.10 hours

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, February 25 1969 Phalguna, 6, 1890 (Saka)