

Senior officers of the rank of Asst. Collectors of Customs have been posted to look after anti-smuggling work exclusively. Along the Indo-Nepal border, a number of mobile parties under the supervisory control of Asst. Collectors have been set up.

One company of C. R. P. has also been deployed on the Indo-Nepal border for assisting the Customs Officers in anti-smuggling measures. These measures are kept constantly under review.

As a result of the anti-smuggling measures taken, the value of the smuggled goods seized in Assam, Tripura, Manipur, NEFA and along the Indo-Nepal border showed a marked increase in 1969 as compared to 1968 as indicated below :—

Area	Year	Value of goods seized
		Rs. in lakhs
Indo-Nepal Border.	1968	24.71
	1969	47.95
Assam, Manipur,	1968	6.20
Tripura.	1969	10.00

Income Tax due from Film Stars

10144. SHRI BABURAO PATEL : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) the amount of Income tax arrears as on the 30th June, 1969 of the following film personalities ; Sarvashri K. M. Mody, Kishore Kumar Ganguly, Ashok Kumar Ganguly, A. R. Kardar, Mahomed Mumtaj Ali, Shiraj Ali Hakim, Dilip Kumar alias Yusuf Khan, Nasir Khan, Sarwar Khan and steps taken against each for recovery of the tax ;

(b) whether it is a fact that between Tolaram Jalan, his brothers, relatives and Filmstan (P) Ltd. the tax arrears exceed over Rs. four crores as on the 30th January, 1970 and if so, the exact amounts due in case of each assessee with steps taken to recover in each case ; and if not, the reasons therefor ; and

(c) the reasons how and why so much taxes are allowed to accumulate in spite of the provision in law to collect advance-tax ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C.

SETHI) : (a) to (c). The requisite information is not readily available. It is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House as early as possible.

12.29 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Reported Statement of the Minister of Foreign Trade

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : I call the attention of the Minister of Foreign Trade to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon :

“Reported statement of the Minister that India was willing to resume trade with China.”

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, on my return from Hong Kong and Japan I addressed a Press Conference regarding my discussions with the local authorities. I described the possibility of the State Trading Corporation setting up a Joint Company in participation with local Hong Kong businessmen in order to increase our present negligible exports to this rich market which imported over 2 thousand million dollars last year.

2. In the course of questions, a specific query was put to me as to whether this Joint Company might export not only to Hong Kong but to third markets. I replied that as Hong Kong was an important entrepot trade centre, the proposed company would naturally try to develop exports to third countries also. I was then asked whether India might export to China through Hong Kong. I stated that there was no question of trading indirectly or clandestinely with China through Hong Kong. We would prefer to trade directly and openly. My remark was thus made in answer to a limited and specific query.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Is this a Call Attention or personal explanation, Sir ?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : The hon. Minister has said that the possi-

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

bility of the STC setting up a Joint Company in participation with local Hong Kong businessmen is there That he has admitted. But, Sir, about mentioning regarding the third party, he was very very quiet about that and he was not at all specific about what he meant by third party. Now, Sir, is it not a fact—and everybody knows it—that Hong Kong does have a very vast amount of substantial trade with China? The hon. Minister has said that there is no question of indirect or clandestine trading with China. Now, may I know, if that proposal of the Joint Company has yet materialised, and if so, does it mean that that Joint Company will be under ban to trade with China? Because, the Hong Kong companies do have a substantial trade, import and export trade, with China. The hon. Minister says that there is no question of clandestine trading or indirect trading with China. That means, are you going to prohibit that Joint Company, if they want to have any trading relations with China? That is my question No. 1.

My question No. 2 is this. The hon. Minister made the remark that he would prefer to trade directly and openly with China. The hon. Minister was talking as a Foreign Trade Minister. Probably Mr. Mishra, the *Charge-de-Affaires* of India in China was perhaps there present in that Press Conference. I talk subject to correction. He has been in Delhi and he has been discussing with various Ministries about the possibilities as to what are the prospectives of trade of China *versus* India.

Now, in that situation, a remark has come from the hon. Minister that he would prefer to trade directly and openly. Does it mean that any initiative has been taken by India so far or whether Mr. Mishra was asked to report on that particular prospective and whether Mr. Mishra has conveyed to the Government of India about the possibility of resuming trade with China? If so, I want to know whether the initiative came from India or whether any hint was given by China about resuming of the trade relations between India and China? And, Sir, if any initiative was taken by India, does it mean that the attitude of the Government of India to China which is a hostile country has undergone a change?

And, last, Sir, does the hon. Minister realise that he has made this question look as if it was a very casual remark? This is not a casual remark at all. This is not a casual question at all. There is a background of the relationship between China and India. There is also a talk of some dialogue being opened by China to India. We do not know anything about it. We and the country are completely kept in the dark as to any such dialogue which is likely to be opened between the Government of India and China, because, Sir, from China, the response has been totally nil so far. The Government of India has been saying that they would like to resume the dialogue, but China has not responded to that at all.

Now, in view of this situation, Sir, does the hon. Minister realise that such remarks cause lot of misunderstanding in the country itself and in the world, because the hon. Minister is not expected to indulge in casual remarks in Press Conference, while coming from Japan?

Another significant factor is this. The hon. Minister was coming back from Japan. We do not know what kind of talk he had; with whom he had a talk. Did he talk with anybody who had any trade relations with China about this matter? How did he make this remark after coming from Japan, in terms of the prospective that third party trading will be allowed to Hong Kong Joint venture and may I know whether this trade relationship will be the normal trade relationship which the top big business people maintain with various types of people, including China?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: The question of my casual remark does not arise. It was a very carefully worded remark and it was in order to clear the position and not to create any misunderstanding. As I said, Hong Kong is a small place but its total trade is almost equal to that of India. It has a very large trade and obviously Hong Kong cannot consume all the trade. It goes to other countries.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: You will kindly confine yourself to the questions that I have asked.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I do not like you to interrupt me.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I have specifically asked about China.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I was not dealing with our relations with China. I was dealing with the possibility of our exports to Hong Kong Hong Kong trade, as I said, is almost as large as that of India both in regard to imports as well as exports.

Obviously, the trade is not for consumption in Hong Kong market. Also the trade is worldwide also to the other markets. The questions asked of me were : whether this will trade with the third country. I say "yes, it is bound to trade with the third country." The other question was that the third country may be China. My reply to this question was definite that this Government will not trade indirectly. There is also a clandestine trade through Hong Kong with China. The goods of many countries pass to China. I made it absolutely clear that there will not be any indirect or clandestine trade with China. If there will be trade at any time emerging, it will be a direct trade. I made that position absolutely clear. And it was a very carefully worded remark and not a casual remark that I made.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Sir, I rise on a point of order. My other part of the question was that Shri Mishra was here for two days. And he must have discussed this matter with the various ministries. And after that, the press conference had been held. I understand that the Foreign Trade Secretary has communicated to the newspaper people not to publish this reference about China in the papers. In view of that, the hon. Minister is completely silent about it. Let him come out as to whether any talk was held between Shri Mishra and the Minister of Foreign Trade.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : That has no relevance to the question that the hon. lady Member has asked. It is a routine visit of Shri Mishra to this country. Normally diplomats over a period come back and hold consultations. I do not know anything more about it.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Again I rise on a point of order. May I

submit to you, Sir, that you have to protect the interests of the Members of this House ? I had asked a specific question.

MR. SPEAKER : He has clearly answered that question.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I would seek your protection. If you say that it is not my right then I would sit down. I would submit that it is my right to put a specific question. He can say no or yes.

MR. SPEAKER : He said 'no'. He says that it is his routine visit. How can this be a point of order ?

Now, Shri Ranga.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : Let me also have an opportunity to speak when there is time.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : There were two aspects of the question which have not been answered. You thought that he had answered. He did not say 'no' to the first part of the question which related to the talks that Shri Mishra is having in regard to this particular matter. He did not also give any reply in regard to what happened in his talks with the Japanese authorities and whether it had any bearing at all with this particular matter. These are the two outstanding points still outstanding to be answered by him from the question put by Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.

Now, let me come to my own question. Here are these two newspapers—one is the *Indian Express*. Their version is different from the *Times of India's* version. These two differs from the version given by my hon. friend. The *Indian Express* says—He puts these words in the mouth of his Minister :

"We prefer to have direct trading with China. But, at the moment, China has shown no interest."

It means that they have been expecting interest from China. China has failed to do so and there must have been some approaches made to China and to those approaches, no answer has been given. No satisfactory answer has been given.

If so, since when have they begun to make any approaches, and through whom,

[Shri Ranga]

through the Embassy or the legation there or through some third party somewhere else ? And what have been the results thereof ?

In *The Times of India*, we find the report as follows :

"Talking to newsmen, he said that there was no need to trade clandestinely with China through Hong Kong. India was prepared to openly trade with that country if China agrees."

So, India was prepared to openly trade, but China has not agreed so far. If we had approached China, when was that done, and through whom ? Why did we approach China in regard to this trade, when the country has been assured not once but repeatedly that China is the enemy country so far as we are concerned ? China has invaded our country, insulted us, spat on our face, kicked at us, went back again and threw whatever she has cared to throw away in our face, and she is still in occupation of a good portion of our sacred land. Under these circumstances, why is it that the Government of India have changed their attitude and decided to resile from their earlier position and to trade with China ? When did they make these approaches to China and through whom, through what channels, and why had they done so ? Till today, until this information came to us, the country has been kept in the dark about this matter. Possibly, the Government has kept my hon. friend also in the dark except for this that Hong Kong, one of the great trading centres in goods as well as in sin in the world has been carrying on this business with China on behalf of England. England recognised Communist China, while all other countries were not recognising it ? Why did England do so ? England did so because England was interested in the trade and in the profits and in the sin of Hong Kong ; and we wanted to become partners with Hong Kong and its traders, whether they call themselves Indians or not, and, therefore, Government have now said 'We are prepared to float a company in co-operation with those businessmen there who are calling themselves Indians, and want to trade with a third country. What is that third country ? What else is that country except China ? We have been having direct trade relations with Japan;

there is a cultural and trade pact with it ; we have similar trade relations with Philippines, Indonesia, Australia and New Zealand and with all those countries in that area, including with Malaysia. So, what is that third country ? What else is it except China ? If that is so, if they wish to deal with China, as he says, directly, openly and honestly, then let them be honest with the country ; let them be opened-hearted with the country, get the sanction from the country for this unholy and deceitful change in their policy and attitude and posture towards China, so that they can thereafter proceed with it. But why should the hon. Minister make this kind of statement there and afterwards try to get out of the trouble by placing before us this colourless statement ? I am not prepared to accuse him of saying anything untruthful. He has not said the truth itself. There is something more than what he has said and that is the truth. What is that something ? Let him be honest and let him be frank with us. If he does not know, let him pass the buck to the Prime Minister and then say 'I do not know what has been happening ; I am only a businessman and I went there to trade with all those people also ; if what they are doing is a sinful business, since you have asked me to carry on this sinful business as a Minister, I have only dealt with it, but when I was warned about what I was doing by my secretary and other people, I have tried to get out of this big statement.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : What is the question ?

SHRI NAMBIAR : He wants a confession statement.

SHRI RANGA : He can consult my hon. friend because he seems to be his *alter ego*.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : The only question which I can answer is whether there is any other source to trade with China. I said that there was no other. The relations with China, the overall policy etc. have been very clearly stated by the Prime Minister often in this House and also by the External Affairs Minister. There is no change in it and there is no question of any change in it.

As for the question with whom I had talked for trade, I am not a businessman, although I have the honour to be in charge of the trade relations of this country with the outside world—that is an honour given to me. Hong Kong is an important market. There is a trade Council there which conducts the foreign trade relations of Hong Kong with the outside world. I invited a delegation. When I talk of businessmen, it is not businessmen of Indian origin—they are a very small percentage of the population; it is the Hong Kong businessmen who are resident there. It is in that connection the talks went on.

As to Japan, in Japan I had talks of our bilateral trade relations with Japan, not our trade relations with any other country.

SHRI RANGA : He had not answered the other question—about the earlier talks with China in regard to this matter.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I said no. If he asks a direct question, I am prepared to answer. When I said we have no offer of trade with China, that applies to today, yesterday and the day before.

SHRI RANGA : Did we make any offer to China ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I said no.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba) : From the statement made by the Minister as well as from press reports, it is clear that it is a change in policy, because the Minister wants to say that we would prefer to trade directly and openly. This being a change in policy, I would like to know whether the Minister through this interview is waving the flag of surrender to the Government of mainland China, but only agreeing to and acquiescing in the occupation of thousands of square miles of Indian territory but accepting that it rightfully belongs to China. If so, why has it been done in breach of a solemn pledge taken by this House and the country? Is it forgotten that this House under the leadership of the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, had with near unanimity expressed quite a contrary sentiment and pledged itself to liberate the occupied Indian territory from Chinese aggression, and these sentiments were echoed and reciprocated by

the nation as a whole? What is the inducement for such a *volte face*? Does the Minister hope to earn a lot of foreign exchange through this? Will he give the figures of trade for the period immediately before the trade was stopped? Does the Minister want to barter away the honour of this ancient land for a mess of pottage? Does the Minister know that the mainland Chinese Government have introduced a foreign trade currency of their own the acquisition of which is a must, and that the said currency not being quoted on any international exchange, its value could be varied at the sweet will of that Government?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : There is absolutely no question of any change in policy. If there been a change in policy, I would not have gone to a press conference to announce it; I would have come to this House and made a statement when in session.

Actually, there was no question of reference to China. When a question was asked about another matter, about this company, this came up. I can assure the House there is no question of any change in policy.

As for the pledge taken by the House and the country, I was also a member then and along with others, we are a party to that. We all stand by that.

The policy with regard to China has been clearly stated; whether it is trade or any other matter, it is related to the overall improvement in the political relations with China. Anything can follow only if the over-all relation improves. Therefore, there is no step today, nor has there been in the past, and there is no change in the policy.

Again, I would say that, when the hon. Member says that we prefer to trade directly and openly, it is our policy not only with China; we are not in favour of clandestine, indirect or switch trade. In all our agreements we have banned it.

What I said was just a statement of policy in our trading relations with any country in the world, and there is no question of any new policy or any new emphasis of policy to draw any such conclusion.

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

The trade with China in 1959 or 1960 was not very substantial. For examples, imports from China in 1960 were about Rs. 3 crores, and exports to China in 1960 were about Rs. 5 crores. But, since then, Chinese trade with the world has grown. The hon. Member is right in saying that they are quoting their own currency, and doing all their trade on a cash and carrybasis. I would only say that China, since then, has come out as an important factor in the world market.

SHRI M. N. REDDY (Nizamabad) : The hon. Minister has been very vague and equivocal in his answers to the questions put by the first two hon. Members. I would, therefore, request him to note down my specific points and reply to them.

He said that Hong Kong was an important trade centre, and that the proposed company would naturally try to develop export to third countries also. I would request him to specifically identify the probable third countries in the area, inasmuch as we have trade relations and standing agreements with almost all the countries, including North Vietnam. So, let him clarify what he meant about the third countries in his press interview.

Secondly, I would like to know what measures he would propose, after the floating of this company in Hong Kong, to prevent the possibility of switch trade with China, what specific provisions he would incorporate in the agreement with the proposed company. They may also be spelt out.

Thirdly, while it may be true that the hon. Minister wants to be very honest and open in his trade relations with other countries, China is doing a lot of smuggling and indirect trade with this country through the Indo-Nepal border. That is very well known, and even the Delhi market is flooded with Chinese goods like pens, transisters etc. The latest in the market is the Red Book of Mao's Thoughts in all the languages. So, I would like to know what further steps he would take to prevent this kind of smuggling or indirect trade with us, to prevent our currency going into their hands and being used for subversive purposes in our own country against our national interests.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : This joint company which the STC will float in

collaboration with a Hong Kong businessmen is yet to be formed. In what form it will come it is not yet known, because it is just an idea that was mooted in my talks there. If this company is formed, all these points put forward by the hon. Member will certainly be taken care of, but at this stage we can only say, as I have stated, that our policy is not to encourage indirect or clandestine trade with any country. Hong Kong trades all over the world. It is trading with almost every country in the world. We have only to look around the world to see what are the third countries in which this joint company will have prospects, and where trading advantages will accrue. All the details can be sorted out when the company is floated and safeguards can be taken at that stage; it is premature to speak about them now.

The later part of the question was : how we are going to prevent clandestine trade through a third country, say, Nepal. That is the relevance of my statement. We have said positively that we are against all such clandestine trade, of things coming from China through Nepal or any other third country. We speak from our experience. Where a country harms our economic interests through the land border, we have given a statement a number of times how we are trying to prevent that through our land customs and all that. We have a large land border. Even there we have strengthened the measures to prevent that. Again I shall say that is the relevance of the statement. We are not in favour of any such clandestine trade.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री जी ने जो सवालोंने के जवाब दिये हैं उनसे कोई गलतफहमी दूर होने के बजाये और बढ़ रही है। इस घ्यानाकर्षण सूचना की एक पृष्ठभूमि है। जैसा कि मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा वे जापान से हांगकांग होकर लौटकर आये हैं और उन्होंने संवाददाता सम्मेलन में संवाददाताओं से बातचीत की। उसमें उनके मुंह से निकल गया कि हम चीन के साथ व्यापार करेंगे तो खुला व्यापार करेंगे उस सम्वाददाता सम्मेलन में मन्त्री महोदय के सचिव,

श्री के० बी० लाल भी मौजूद थे और उन्होंने संवाददाताओं से कहा कि यह बात अखबारों में नहीं जानी चाहिए।... (व्यवधान)... आपको नहीं मालूम लेकिन मुझे मालूम है। इसीलिए आप देखेंगे कि यह खबर सभी अखबारों में नहीं छपी है और जिसमें छपी है अलग-अलग ढंग से छपी है।

मन्त्री महोदय कहते हैं कि हांगकांग एक ज्वाइंट कंपनी बनायेंगे। ज्वाइंट कंपनी बनाने का विचार अच्छा है लेकिन मैं समझता था वह ज्वाइंट कंपनी केवल भारतीय व्यापारियों के लाभ के लिए बनाई जा रही है। अभी मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा कि उसमें गैर-भारतीय व्यापारी भी रहेंगे। इसका अर्थ यह है कि उसमें हांगकांग में बसे हुए चीनी व्यापारी भी रहेंगे। वे चीनी व्यापारी कम्युनिस्ट चाइना, चाइनीज मेनलैंड से चोरी छिपे व्यापार करना चाहेंगे। मन्त्री महोदय की इस घोषणा के बावजूद कि हम चोरी छिपे व्यापार नहीं करना चाहते, चोरी छिपे व्यापार होगा। मन्त्री महोदय सदन को विश्वास में लेकर बतायें कि वे चोरी छिपे व्यापार को किस तरह से रोकना चाहते हैं? वे अपनी सीमा पर चोरी छिपे व्यापार को रोक नहीं पा रहे हैं तो हांगकांग में बैठे हुए चीनी व्यापारी जोकि चीन की मुख्य भूमि से चोरी छिपे व्यापार करेंगे, उनको कैसे रोकेंगे?

एक सवाल और है। कई महीनों से भारत सरकार के विभिन्न प्रवक्ता इस तरह का इशारा दे रहे हैं कि वे कम्युनिस्ट चीन के प्रति नीति बदलना चाहते हैं। पहले प्रधान मन्त्री ने कहा था कि हम चीन के साथ बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार हैं। बाद में विदेश मन्त्री ने उसका खंडन किया। अब विदेश व्यापार मन्त्री ने कहा कि हम अगर चीन से व्यापार करेंगे तो सीधा व्यापार करेंगे। उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा कि चीन के साथ व्यापार करने का कोई सवाल नहीं है जब तक कि चीन आक्रमणकारी है, जब तक कि वह हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा जमाकर

बैठा है, जब तक वह अपना भारत विरोधी रवैया नहीं बदलता और जब तक नकसलवादियों को सहायता देना बन्द नहीं करता, हम चीन के साथ व्यापार नहीं करेंगे। विदेश व्यापार मन्त्री के कहने का मतलब क्या है कि अगर हम व्यापार करेंगे तो सीधा करेंगे? चोरी छिपे व्यापार को आप रोक नहीं सकते हैं और सीधे व्यापार करने के बारे में सोच रहे हैं? मैं मन्त्री महोदय से एक आश्वासन चाहता हूँ। मुझे खुशी है कि उन्होंने कहा कि वह अभी बंधे हुए हैं 14 नवम्बर की प्रतिज्ञा से मेरा निवेदन यह है कि क्या मन्त्री महोदय सदन को यह विश्वास दिलायेंगे कि जब तक कम्युनिस्ट चीन हमारी भूमि खाली कर के नहीं जायगा तब तक उसके साथ किसी तरह का व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध नहीं होगा।

13 hrs.

श्री ब० रा० भगत : जहां तक चीन के प्रति हमारी नीति का सवाल है उस के बारे में प्रधान मन्त्री ने बयान देकर स्थिति को साफ कर दिया है जिसमें उन्होंने कहा कि चीन के साथ नेशनल भ्रानर और डिगनिटी को ध्यान में रखकर हम बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार हैं और उसमें व्यापारिक वार्ता भी आती है। इस लिए मेरे खयाल में यह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट नीति है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह आश्वासन नहीं दे रहे हैं कि जब तक चीन हमारी भूमि खाली नहीं करेगा हम उस के साथ व्यापार नहीं करेंगे।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : नेशनल भ्रानर और डिगनिटी से बढ़ कर और कोई चीज नहीं हो सकती।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : नेशनल भ्रानर का क्या मतलब है ?

श्री ब० रा० मगत : जो कुछ पार्लियामेंट में हमने घोषणा की है उससे हमारा पूरा कमिट मेंट है। इससे अधिक और क्या आश्वासन माननीय सदस्य को दूं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आपका बयान उससे खिलाफ है।

श्री ब० रा० मगत : जहां तक माननीय वाजपेयी जी ने यह कहा कि श्री के० बी० लाल ने ऐसा कहा था, मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूं कि वह वहां थे भी नहीं। दो दिन बाद आये थे इसलिए माननीय सदस्य को जो सूचना दी गयी वह गलत है। वह प्रैस कानफरेन्स में नहीं थे और सम्वाददाताओं से कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कही गई थी कि उसको छापें या न छापें ऐसी बात मेरी तरफ से कोई नहीं हुई।

एक बात माननीय सदस्य ने यह कही कि चोरी छिपे यह कम्पनी चीन से व्यापार करेगी इसके लिए हम क्या उपाय करेंगे यह बतायें। तो मैंने कहा कि जब कम्पनी बनेगी तब इन बातों पर ठीक से गौर किया जाएगा कि वहां ट्रेड करना है, कि कन्ट्रि से ट्रेड करना है। यह कहना कि भारतीय व्यापारियों से ट्रेड करें, तो मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि जो भारतीय ओरिजिन के लोग वहां हैं उसमें अधिकांश, 80 फीसदी लगभग भारतीय सिटिजन नहीं हैं, हांगकांग के सिटिजन हैं। वहां चीनी हों या भारतीय हों, भारतीयों की संख्या बहुत कम है और उनके हाथ में ट्रेड बहुत मामूली है जब तक वहाँ के स्थानीय व्यापारियों को ट्रेड काउन्सिल से सम्बन्ध नहीं करेगा तब तक व्यापार बढ़ने की कोई सम्भावना नहीं है। इन सब बातों को देख कर फैसला करेंगे कि जॉइंट कम्पनी का पैटर्न क्या हो। जहां तक रोक थाम का प्रश्न है, जो व्यापार हम नहीं चाहते हैं और जो हमारे देश के हित में नहीं है उसको हम कदापि नहीं करेंगे।

13.02 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Fourth Five Year Plan

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF FINANCE, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY AND MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of "Fourth Five Year Plan 1969-74". [*Placed in Library. See No. LT--3549/70*]

Annual Accounts of the Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND MINES AND METALS (SHRI D. R. CHAVAN) : On behalf of Shri K. K. Shah, I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy of the Certified Accounts of the Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, for the year 1968-69 together with the Audit Report thereon, under sub-section (4) of section 18 of the Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh Act, 1966. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT--3550/70*]

Report of the Indian Delegation of the W.H.O. Regional Committee

- (2) A copy of the Report of the Indian Delegation to the Twenty-second session of the W.H.O. Regional Committee for South-East Asia, held at Kathmandu from 29th September to 5th October, 1969. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT--3551/70*]

Review and Annual Report of the Lubrizol India Ltd., Bombay

SHRI D. R. CHAVAN : I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956 :—

- (1) Review by the Government on the working of the Lubrizol India Limited, Bombay for the year 1968-69.