

SHRI PILOO MODY : What is the use of having just a discussion about these matters ? I am sure the House has discussed this many times. The point is whether some action can be taken in the matter.

— — —

12.43 hours.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

Annual Report and Accounts of
Export Inspection Council

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY (SHRI CHOWDHARY RAM SEWAK) : I lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the Export Inspection Council for the year 1967-68 along with the audited accounts. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-589/69]

— — —

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Fifth-ninth Report

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot) : I present the Fifty-ninth Report of the Public Accounts Committee on Audit Report (Civil), 1968, relating to the Cabinet Secretariat (Indian Statistical Institute).

— — —

12.44 hrs.

STATEMENT UNDER DIRECTION 115

Removal of Control on Prices of
B. Twill Bags

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे अतारंकित प्रश्न संख्या तीन हजार सात सौ

पन्द्रह का 19 मार्च, 1969 को वैदेशिक व्यापार मंत्री ने जो उत्तर दिया वह असत्य भाषण और गलत बयानी की एक गुत्थी है। इस दलील में कोई दम नहीं कि यह गलत उत्तर कबिना के मंत्री ने नहीं बल्कि वैदेशिक व्यापार मंत्रालय के उप-मंत्री ने दिया।

मैं मन्त्री महोदय से मांग करना चाहता हूँ कि वह अपने गलत बयान को सुधारें, सदन से खेद प्रकट करें और बी-टिवल बँगज की बोरों की खरीदी को लेकर सरकार तथा निम्न सरकारी एजेंसियों और फुड कारपोरेशन आदि का जो एक करोड़ सत्तासी लाख रुपये का घाटा होने वाला है उस को तत्काल कार्यवाही कर के बचायें।

मैंने सरकार से पूछा था कि क्या बी-टिवल बोरों का दाम नियंत्रण हटाने का सरकार का इरादा है ? मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा कि इस तरह का कोई सुझाव उन के सामने नहीं है। यह सही नहीं है। असल में वैदेशिक व्यापार मन्त्री इस सुझाव पर विचार कर रहे थे, लेकिन मेरे 3 मार्च, 1969 के पत्र के आधार पर वित्त मन्त्रालय ने इस में जो दखल दी उसी को लेकर दाम नियंत्रण को हटाने का सुझाव फिलहाल रद्द कर दिया गया है।

मैंने सरकार से यह भी पूछा था कि उन का ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिलाया गया है कि बिरला और के० पी० गोयंका आदि जूट मिलों के गुट इस आशा से बी-टिवल बोरों की जमाखोरी कर रहे थे कि दाम नियंत्रण हटाने पर उनको ज्यादा मुनाफा मिलेगा ?

मन्त्री महोदय ने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा कि नहीं, उनका ध्यान नहीं दिलाया गया है। लेकिन यह भी सही नहीं है क्योंकि 3 मार्च, 1969 के मेरे खत में मैंने उपप्रधान मन्त्री तथा वित्त मन्त्री के सामने यह बात लाई थी कि दो सौ चालीस

[श्री मधु लिमये]

या उस से अधिक दाम से, नियंत्रण होने के बाद ये सारे बोरे बेचने की उम्मीद में इन लोगों ने बोरों को बड़े पैमाने पर इकट्ठा कर रखा है। 10 मार्च, 1969 को मैंने इस सम्बन्ध में सारी तफसील सरकार को भेज दी थी कि बेनामी तथा अपने नाम से इन मिलों के पास करीब करीब पचास हजार बेल्स बी-टिवल के बोरे जमा हैं।

मैंने यह भी कहा था कि इन बोरों को सरकार कंट्रोल दाम से अपने कब्जे में लेकर खरीदे।

क्या मन्त्री महोदय अब भी कह सकते हैं कि उनको, बोरों को इस तरह जमा किए जाने के बारे में कोई इत्तिला नहीं थी ?

चूंकि इस मामले में विदेश व्यापार, सप्लाई खाद्य तथा वित्त मन्त्रालयों का सम्बन्ध था भेरा प्रधान मंत्री या उप प्रधान मन्त्री को पत्र लिखना सरकार ही को पत्र लिखने के बराबर है। विभिन्न मन्त्रालयों के कार्य में एकसूत्रीकरण लाना यह मेरी जिम्मेदारी नहीं है।

मन्त्री महोदय का यह तीसरा बयान भी सही नहीं है कि नियंत्रित दाम के ऊपर गैर-कानूनी ढंग से सौदे हो रहे हैं इस की सरकार को जानकारी नहीं है, न ही इस बात की कि इसके बारे में जांच का प्रस्ताव किया गया है। मैंने स्वयं अपने 3 मार्च के पत्र में ही वित्त मन्त्री को विनती की थी कि वह डायरेक्टर, रवेन्यू इंटेलीजेंस को आदेश दें कि वह पिछले तीन-चार महीने के बी-टिवल जूट बैग्स के सौदे की जांच करें और पता लगायें कि क्या असल में इनके दाम दो सौ दस रुपये से लेकर दो सौ तीस तक नहीं थे, और साथ ही साथ इस बात का भी पता लगायें कि इन सौदों से जो आमदनी हुई है क्या उस पर ठीक तरह टैक्स लगाया जा रहा है। मेरी

समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि सरकार अपनी आवश्यकताओं के लिए नियंत्रित दाम से इन बोरों को जबर्दस्ती क्यों नहीं खरीद रही है।

इन बी-टिवल बोरों का उत्पादन बड़े जूट मिल मालिकों ने जानबूझ कर स्थगित किया था ताकि इन बोरों का दाम दो सौ पचास रुपये या उस से भी अधिक हो जाये और इस का बोझ सरकार पर तथा उपभोक्ताओं के ऊपर लाद दिया जाय।

साथ ही साथ मैं ताकत के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार नियंत्रण से छूटकारा पाने के लिए बी-टिवल बैगों की जगह पर डी० डब्लू फलावर बैग्स तथा अन्य बोरों को जिनके ऊपर इस वक्त नियंत्रण नहीं है खरीदने का काम न करें।

मैं वैदेशिक व्यापार मन्त्री का आवाहन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह अपनी गलत बयानी को सुधारने की हिम्मत दिखायें तथा सरकारी खजाने का जो एक करोड़ सत्तासी लाख रुपये का नुकसान होने वाला है उस से सरकार को और मुक्त को बचायें।

12.48 hrs.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT rose--

MR. SPEAKER : It Seems to be long statement running to some four or five pages. He may lay it on the Table of the House.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज (बम्बई दक्षिण) : इस मामले को आप एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी को रैफर कीजिये।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : We want that it should be referred to the Estimate Commuce.

MR. SPEAKER That is a separate question anyway.

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : I lay the statement on the Table of the House.

Statement

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in 1968-69 the jute crop was an exceptionally short one. In October, 1968, Government came to the conclusion that the production of jute goods should be adjusted to the availability of raw jute and that equitable distribution of available fibro among the mills was essential to maintain production and sustain exports. It was decided that in order to maximise our exports there, should be restraint on domestic consumption of jute goods. As a part of the arrangements, the mills were asked to produce larger quantities of carpet backing cloth which is entirely exported. As a measure of restraining production of items essentially required for domestic consumption, the maximum price, of B. Twill bags was fixed at Rs. 200.00 for 100 bags, taking into account the raw jute prices prevailing in the second week of October, 1969. Subsequently the price of raw jute rose to unprecedented levels. However, as the need for restraint on domestic consumption continued, the price of B. Twill bags was not revised with reference to the price of raw jute.

2. In February, 1969 the Food Department urged that the procurement of B. Twill bags for Food Corporation could not be deferred any longer and that some arrangement should be made for obtaining the requirements on an immediate basis. The D. G. S. & D. made efforts to purchase B. Twill bags but had received no offers. The position was, therefore, reviewed at an Inter-Ministry meeting held on the 28th February, 1969, which was attended by the officers of the Departments of Food, Foreign Trade and Supply and it was decided that the price control on B. Twill bags should not be removed or even revised upwards. The requirements of the Food Corporation, etc, should be obtained by other means within the controlled price. Subsequently, discussions were held with the representatives of the industry and, as a result thereof, a major proportion of

the industry has offered to supply the requirements of the D. G. S. & D. at the controlled price. Their offer is under examination and orders will soon be issued. As in the discussions with the representatives of industry, at different times, Government did not anticipate any difficulty in obtaining stocks of B. Twills within the controlled prices, requisitioning of stocks was not contemplated.

3. So far as Unstarred Question No. 3715 on the 10th of March, 1969, is concerned, I take full responsibility for the answer given by the Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade and Supply. I must, however, reiterate that the answer was correct in all respects.

4. As I have already pointed out, a decision that B-Twill bags will not be decontrolled, was taken on the 28th of February, 1969. The Honourable Member is not justified in contending that the decision was taken at the instance of the Finance Ministry and on the basis of his letter to the Deputy Prime Minister on the 3rd March, 1969.

5. There was no intention at any time to pay a price higher than the controlled price for the B. Twill bags. Therefore, the question of loss of Rs. 1.87 crores on account of purchases of B. Twill bags did not arise. These figures given by the Honourable Member may be the result of some imaginary calculation.

6. Shri Madhu Limaye had given notice of a Short Notice Question addressed to me on the 3rd of March, 1969. In this Question, he had asked whether Government's attention had been drawn to the fact that Birla-K. P. Goenka and other Groups had accumulated large stocks of B. Twill bags. The Ministry of Foreign Trade and Supply had no information in this respect and was also not aware of the fact that the Honourable Member had written to the Deputy Prime Minister on the 3rd March, 1969, as he had not chosen to endorse a copy for information to the Minister of Foreign Trade and Supply who was really concerned with the subject. In this letter, he appears to have stated that the

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

Birla-K. P. Goenka and other I. J. M. A. manufacturers had connered B. Twill bags and had held them Benami in anticipation of decontrol. In his second letter of 10th March, 1969, to the Deputy Prime Minister a copy of which was again not endorsed to me, he had stated that mills held about 55,000 bales benami or otherwise. These letters, therefore, cannot be deemed to affect the correctness of the answer given in the House on 19.3.1969.

7, Shri Madhu Limay has again referred to transactions in B. Twill bags at prices higher than the controlled price and has asked for an enquiry to find out whether the additional income has been properly assessed and taxed. Since this matter concerns the Ministry of Finance, they will, no doubt, be looking into it.

8 I regret to state that the allegations made by Shri Madhu Limaye are without any basis. Government had taken the decision not to decontrol B. Twills even before this question was raised by him. There was no occasion whatsoever for considering the payment of a price higher than the controlled price for purchase of B. Twills to meet the requirements of the D. G. S. & D. The industry has expressed its willingness to cooperate with the Government to meet the requirements of B. Twill bags within the controlled price, and it is expected that the arrangements will soon be finalised. In these circumstances, the statement made by Shri Madhu Limaye is unwarranted and is based on wrong assumptions.

MOTION RE : SUSPENSION OF PART OF CLAUSE (C) OF RULE 110 IN RELATION TO CONSTITUTION (TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : I move.

"That clause (c) of the rule 110 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the motion for

withdrawal of the Constitution (Twenty-second Amendment) Bill, 1968, as reported by the Joint Committee, be suspended in so far as that clause requires inclusion of additional provisions in the Bill to replace the said Constitution (Twenty-second Amendment) Bill, 1968. "

श्री कंचर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) :
 अब्यक्ष महोदय, मन्त्री महोदय ने रूल 110 के सस्पेंशन के बारे में कहा है। धारा 388 के तहत वह सस्पेंशन करना चाहते हैं। मैं आपकी आज्ञा से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस में जो सब से जरूरी बात है वह यह है कि इस में कंसेंट आफ दी स्पीकर इसके लिए जरूरी होती है। उसके बाद अगर हाउस एडाप्ट करेगा तब यह रूल सस्पेंड होगा, वरना नहीं होगा।

MR. SPEAKER : Let me say one thing. All these aspects were discussed yesterday in the Business Advisory Committee. Normally, the same Bill is not introduced in the same session. Never has it been done. I was told that when Panditji was alive, when the Constitution (Amendment) Bill was defeated, a special session was called for that. That was a tragic session when unfortunately we lost him for ever. So, when he was alive, a special session was called to have the Constitution (Amendment) Bill again introduced. But in view of the urgency, this was suggested. Yesterday, in the Business Advisory Committee meeting, Mr. Ranga was also there and others was also there. It was said that this should not become a precedent. You cannot bring it everytime, but this is done as a special case in view of the importance of the Hill Districts in Assam; it was therefore suggested that this may be specially permitted, but that it should not be repeated. This is what the Business Advisory Committee decided. In view of that, I thought my leave could be given. You need not read the rules. All of them were read there, and it is only after that, that the Business Advisory Committee asked me to give leave so that as a special case it may be done. So, do not take much time.