

behalf of Prof. D. P. Chattopadhyaya, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Prevention of Food Adulteration (Amendment) Rules, 1972 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 553 in Gazette of India dated the 6th May, 1972, under sub-section (2) of section 23 of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—3121/72].

BUDGET ESTIMATES ETC, 1972-73 OF AIR INDIA AND INDIAN AIRLINES

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers (Hindi and English versions) under sub-rule (5) of rule 3 of the Air Corporations Rules, 1954 :—

- (1) Summary of Budget Estimates for Revenue and Expenditure of Air India for the year 1972-73.
- (2) Summary of Actuals for the year 1970-71, Budget Estimates and Revised Estimates for the year 1971-72 and Budget Estimates for the year 1972-73, of Air India.
- (3) Summary of Budget Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure of the Indian Airlines for the year 1972-73.
- (4) Summary of Actuals for the year 1970-71, Budget Estimates and Revised Estimates for the year 1971-72 and Budget Estimates for the year 1972-73, of Indian Airlines. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—3122/72].

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO USQ No. 1471 RE. INTRUSIONS OF PAK CITIZENS INTO INDIA; AND SIXTH AMENDMENT TO IAS (PAY) RULES

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN): On behalf of Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha, I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A statement correcting the reply given on the 24th November, 1971 to Unstarred Question No. 1471 by

Shri Hukam Chand Kachwai regarding intrusion of Pak citizens into India and giving reasons for delay in correcting the reply.

- (2) A copy of the Sixth Amendment of 1972 to the Indian Administrative Service (Pay) Rules, 1954, (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 281 (E) in Gazette of India dated the 20th May, 1972, under sub section (2) of section (3) of the All India Services Act, 1951 [Placed in Library, See No. LT - 3124/72].

I—Statement Correcting the Reply to Unstarred Question No. 1471 Answered on 24-11-1971.

In para 2 of the reply to Unstarred Question No. 1471 I had, on the basis of the information furnished by the Assam Government, given the figures of intruders from Pakistan as 12818 out of whom 11452 were arrested and deported. It has now been intimated by the State Government that on re-checking it has been found that the correct figures are 12717 and 9136 respectively.

II—Statement (showing reasons for delay in connection with Unstarred Question No. 1471 Answered on 24-11-1971)

On 24 11 1971 in connection with reply to Unstarred Question No 1471 the information regarding the intruders from Pakistan arrested and deported was given on the basis of the figures furnished by the Government of Assam. Thereafter it was found that there were some discrepancies in the figures given by the State Government. That Government was, therefore, asked to reconcile the figures. They have accordingly re-checked the figures and supplied the revised figures now. Hence the delay in correcting the statement already made in the Lok Sabha which is regretted.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO SQ. NOS. 942, 943 AND 947 RE. MISUSE OF ACTUAL USERS LICENCE, EXPORT OF NON-TRADITIONAL ITEMS, AND QUALITY CONTROL FOR EXPORT ORIENTED GOODS

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI L. N. MISHRA): I beg to lay on

[Shri L. N. Mishra]

the Table two statements correcting the replies given on the 23rd May, 1972 to Starred Question No. 942 by Shri Annasaheb Gotkhinde regarding misuse of Actual Users Licence and Starred Question No. 947 by Shri Indrajit Gupta regarding increase in Export of Non-Traditional Items and Starred Question No. 947 by Shri Nawal Kishor Sinha regarding steps to enforce better quality control for export-oriented goods.

I—Statement re. Starred Question No. 942 on the 23rd May, 1972.

As on 31.12.1970, 188 cases were pending final disposal by the C.B.I., some under investigation and some had been recommended for prosecution or departmental action or both. From 1.1.1971 to 31.12.71 the C.B.I. had registered 84 fresh cases on the violation of one condition or other of the Imports and Exports (Control) Act. This makes a total of 272 cases for disposal from 1.1.1971 to 31.12.71. The C.B.I. had sent 64 cases for trial and 13 cases were filed in a Court of Law and also recommended for departmental action. In addition, they had recommended 36 cases for departmental action only. 13 cases were dropped for want of proof and at the end of the year 1971, 13 were awaiting complaint or sanctions. 57 cases were under legal scrutiny to decide what type of action should be taken against the offending parties. 76 cases were pending investigation at the close of the year. During the year 1971 the number of cases which were decided by the Courts was 31, of which 26 resulted in conviction. 5 cases were acquitted.

2. After the amendment of the Imports and Exports (Control) Act in 1966, a compulsory imprisonment of 6 months has been prescribed unless the Court for reasons recorded, chooses to give lesser sentence. The maximum punishment that can be given by way of imprisonment is 2 years. In addition to imprisonment a suitable fine is also levied. However, it has come to notice that punishment has mostly been fine plus a short term of imprisonment. The minimum period of 6 months has been seldom given as the Courts have been taking into consideration the penitential attitude of the accused, age of the accused etc.

3. Debarment of a firm which has been

proved guilty of violation of the provisions of the Impex Act and orders issued thereunder, normally vary from one year to five years depending on the gravity of the offence.

4. Information from 1.1.72 to 31.3.72 is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

II—Statement re. Starred Questions No. 943 and 947 answered on 23rd May, 1972.

It is no doubt true that export statistics of engineering goods in the two statements laid by me on the Table of the Lok Sabha in reply to the Starred Questions No. 943 and 947 on 23rd May, 72 are not identical. The statement relating to Question No. 943 contained statistics of engineering goods as compiled by the Director-General of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics, Calcutta while the statement attached to Question No. 947 contained figures compiled by the Engineering Export Promotion Council. For the sake of ready reference, the two set of figures are reproduced below :—

(Rs. Crores)

Export of Engineering Goods			
Question No.	943	947	Difference between DGCI&S & EEPC figures
Source	DGCI&S	EEPC	
1968-69	67.42	84.97	—17.55
1969-70	89.52	106.50	—16.98
1970-71	116.47	116.59	— 0.12

As is well known, the export statistics of engineering goods as compiled by the DGCI&S do not normally tally with export statistics published by the Engineering Export Promotion Council. This does not mean that either figure is incorrect. The difference between the two sets of figures is due to differences in the definition/classification used in compiling the figures by the two agencies.

Export statistics are compiled by the DGCI&S in accordance with the Revised Trade Classification and these are given in their publication entitled Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India Volume I—Exports and Re-exports. Under the classification there is no separate Code No. for Engineering Goods. However, for purposes of analysis, both the DGCI&S and EEPC add up figures of specified products to get the figures for engineering goods as a group. Certain products are included in the category of engineering goods both in the DGCI&S as well as the EEPC figures. However, certain other items classified as engineering products by the EEPC are not so classified by the DGCI&S. Besides, there are some items which are included as engineering goods by the DGCI&S but not by the EEPC. It would appear that in compiling its statistics, EEPC is guided by the desire to include only those items whose export promotion is the responsibility of the Council.

As question No. 943 related to the general progress of exports of non-traditional items, reliance was put on the statistics published by the DGCI&S in the reply. As the House knows, this is the standard source for foreign trade statistics. However, for a detailed analysis of exports of engineering goods whose promotion is the responsibility of the EEPC, we often use statistics published by the EEPC. Since Question No. 947 related to the operation of quality control on export oriented engineering goods, the figures used in answering it were those published by the EEPC.

I do recognise that the existence of two sets of figures for exports of engineering goods can cause unnecessary confusion. It would be the endeavour of the Foreign Trade Ministry to see that these figures do reconcile by adoption of uniform classification of engineering goods by the Export Promotion Council as also by the DGCI&S.

STATEMENT ON FARAKKA BARRAGE PROJECT

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR. K. L. RAO) : I beg to lay on the Table a statement (Hindi and English versions) on the Farakka Barrage Project. [*Placed in the Library. See No. LT-3126/72*]

ANNUAL REPORT OF PRESS COUNCIL OF INDIA

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI DHARAM BIR SINHA) : On behalf of Shrimati Nandini Satpathy, I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy of the Annual Report of the Press Council of India for the year 1971, under section 18 of the Press Council Act, 1965
- (2) A statement (Hindi and English versions) explaining the reasons for not laying the Hindi version of the above Report simultaneously [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-3127/72*].

CERTIFIED ACCOUNTS ETC. 1970-71 OF TEXTILES COMMITTEE

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI A. C. GEORGE) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Certified Accounts (Hindi and English versions) of the Textiles Committee for the year 1970-71 and the Audit Report thereon, under sub-section (4) of section 13 of the Textiles Committee Act, 1963 [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-3128/72*].

TARIFF COMMISSION'S REPORT ETC. ON FAIR SELLING PRICE OF AUTOMOBILE ANCILLARIES, AND REVIEWS AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF CEMENT CORPORATION OF INDIA LTD., NEW DELHI AND HINDUSTAN MACHINE TOOLS LTD., BANGALORE

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सभा पटल पर निम्नलिखित पत्र रखता हूँ—

(1) टैरिफ आयोग अग्रिनियम, 1951 की धारा 16 की उपधारा (2) के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित पत्रों की एक-एक प्रति—

(क) (एक) मोटर गाड़ियों के पुर्जों की उचित विक्रय कीमत के सम्बन्ध में टैरिफ आयोग का प्रतिवेदन (1968)।