

to be made available from the amounts that are deposited with the banks. Therefore, though he has not been able to quantify the advances to the richer sections because of obvious difficulties, I would at least like to know qualitatively whether it is not a fact that whereas the major portions of the deposits in various banks come from the agricultural sectors, a substantial portion of the advances and loans are given only to the industrial groups and big business.

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:**  
(SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN) :

I would not be able to substantiate that statement because the deposits come from several classes. The depositors, particularly, are the middle-classes. The richer classes are the borrowers. The deposits are always coming from the middle-classes. They are spread over not only the agriculturists but also over the salaried classes, the urban middle-classes and so on. This statement that the deposits come from the agriculturists and they are given to the industrialists may not be correct.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:**  
Sir, you are an agriculturist. You must protect our interests. Even facts and figures are available that major portions of the deposits are coming from the agriculturists. Why does he deny the facts?

**MR. SPEAKER :** He does not deny the facts.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN :**  
To say that it comes from the rural areas is to say that it is coming from the agriculturists. There are other people in the rural areas who say this.

**श्री राज नाथ सोनकर शास्त्री :**  
अध्यक्ष महोदय, कर्ज लेने वाले लोग जब ऋण के लिए अप्लाई करते हैं तो वे प्रायः किसी निश्चित कार्य के लिए किसी निश्चित उद्योग के लिए या किसी फसल में सहायता प्राप्त करने के लिए अप्लाई करते हैं।

प्रायः दस-बीस हजार रुपये के लोन के लिए भी, फसल देने के बाद भी साल-डेढ-साल तक बैंक वाले उन्हें दौड़ाते रहते हैं और कहते रहते हैं कि कागज पूरा नहीं हुआ है। यह सारी की सारी बात होती रहती है। मेरे एक जानने वाले व्यक्ति ने 25 हजार रुपये के लोन के लिए अप्लाई किया और आज तक उन्हें लोन नहीं मिला। अतः मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ये जो अनियमिततायें और भ्रष्टाचार बरता जा रहा है, इन को दूर करने के लिए आप क्या कार्यवाही करने जा रहे हैं ?

**SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT :**  
So far as giving the guidelines in time is concerned, the Reserve Bank has given directions not only for the small amounts but even for the amounts upto Rs. 25,000. In that event, the direction is that such applications are to be disposed of within a period of four weeks and applications are to be disposed of within eight to nine weeks where the amount varies from Rs. 25,000 to Rs. 1 lakh. Now these guidelines are there. I request the hon. Member that if he finds that the banks are not carrying out those guidelines, he may please bring them to our notice.

**Misuse of import licence by  
M/s Parle Bottling Company**

+  
\*249. **SHRI DHARAM DASS  
SHASTRI :**

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA :**

Will the Minister of **COMMERCE** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is true that M/s Parle Bottling Company imported bottling machinery as Actual Users but sold it to some other firms and if so, full details thereof ;

(b) whether this violation is dealt under clauses 4 (d), (g) and (j) of the Import and Export Control Act, 1947

and if so, whether any action had been taken under these clauses against the firm ;

(c) if not, the reasons therefore;

(d) whether it is proposed to confiscate the goods now and impose penalty ; and

(e) other action contemplated against the company ?

**THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND STEEL AND MINES (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE) :**  
(a) to (e) . A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

(a) M/s. Parle Bottling (P) Ltd., imported three bottle filling machines for their own use in their factory, but sold the same without obtaining prior permission from the licensing authority as explained below:—

(i) One machine was sold to M/s. Chandigarh Bottling Co., Chandigarh on 30-8-69 for Rs. 1,18,450/-. This machine was installed and utilised in the factory of M/s. Chandigarh Bottling Co. till 1978 and, thereafter, sent to Bombay for disposal. The machine was seized by CBI on 2-7-80 at Bombay.

(ii) The second machine was sold to M/s. Hyderabad Bottling Co., Hyderabad for Rs. 1,50,000/-. This machine was used by M/s. Hyderabad Bottling Co. (P) Ltd. from October '70 to March '80. This machine was also seized by CBI in July, 1980 from Bombay where it had been sent for disposal.

(iii) The third machine was sold to M/s. Gujarat Bottling Co. (P) Ltd., Ahmedabad in 1969. The machine was used by this company from March, 1970 to 1972. Thereafter, it was sold to M/s. Amritsar Bottling Co., Amritsar who sent the machine to Nagpur for disposal in May, 1980. This machine was seized by the CBI on 30-6-1980.

(b) and (c) . Provisions of seizure and confiscation of imported goods were incorporated in the Imports & Exports (Control) Act on 4-11-1975. The 3 machines were imported and disposed off long before this date and are, therefore, not liable to seizure and confiscation under the new provisions of the Act.

(c) The machines have been seized by CBI and the case is before the Court.

(e) The question of taking Departmental action against the company is under consideration.

**श्री धर्मदास शास्त्री :** आदरणीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आदरणीय मंत्री महोदय से बड़े अदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सत्य है कि रमेश चोपड़ा, जिसका पार्ले ग्रुप के साथ सीधा संबंध है, यह आदमी इन्कम टैक्स की चोरी करता है, एक्साइज ड्यूटी की चोरी करता है ...  
(अवधान)

**MR. SPEAKER :** You cannot mention the name of a person who is not present in the House and cannot defend himself.

**श्री धर्मदास शास्त्री :** मैं पार्ले ग्रुप की बात कर रहा हूँ ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** पार्ले ग्रुप की बात ठीक है ।

**श्री धर्मदास शास्त्री :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, ये एक्साइज ड्यूटी की चोरी करते हैं, इन्कम टैक्स की चोरी करते हैं, मशीनें इम्पोर्ट करके बेचते हैं, क्या यह सत्य है ? विभाग ने जो "बी" और "सी" में जवाब दिया है वह सरासर गलत है । इम्पोर्ट-एक्सपोर्ट एक्ट 1947 जो कि 1955 में अमेंड किया गया, उसकी धारा 4-बी, 4-सी, 4-जे एण्ड 5 के अधीन ये सारी बातें मौजूब हैं कि इनके तहत इनकी सारी

मशीनों सीज होनी थीं, इनको अरैस्ट करना चाहिए था। न ही इनकी मशीनों सीज की गई थीर न ही इन्हें अरैस्ट किया गया और न कोई जुर्माना किया गया।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप सवाल पूछिये।

**श्री धर्मदास शास्त्री :** मैं सवाल पूछ रहा हूँ कि उनकी मशीनरी क्यों सीज नहीं की गई। इन्होंने कहा है कि सी० बी० आई० द्वारा मशीनें सीज की गई हैं यह बिल्कुल गलत है। दूसरी बात यह है कि 1969 में ये मशीनें बेची गई थीर 1980 में जाकर एक्शन ले रहे हैं, 11 वर्ष बाद एक्शन ले रहे हैं, इससे पहले एक्शन क्यों नहीं लिया गया ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप सवाल कर रहे हैं या आपषण कर रहे हैं। आप सवाल करिये।

**श्री धर्मदास शास्त्री :** मैं यह पूछ रहा हूँ कि 1969 में जब मशीनें बेची गई तब एक्शन क्यों नहीं लिया गया ? (अध्वधान)

**प्राचार्य भगवान देव :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, वाजपेयी जी खडे क्यों हैं, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ। (अध्वधान)

**श्री धर्मदास शास्त्री :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब इम्पोर्ट-एक्सपोर्ट एक्ट में यह प्रावधान है तो इन्होंने जो मशीनें 1969 में बेची थीर 1980 में इनके खिलाफ एक्शन लिया गया, इतना डिले क्यों किया गया ?

**MR. SPEAKER :** If you cannot frame a question then I am going to disallow it.

**श्री धर्मदास शास्त्री :** डिले क्यों किया गया और इन्होंने "बी" में जवाब दिया है

कि मशीनें सीज की गई हैं, वे नहीं की गई हैं और अभी तक बोटाला चल रहा है।

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE :** Sir, so far as the question is concerned as to why these machines were sold in 1969 and no action was taken till 1980, the answer to that is that so far as my Department is concerned they came to know of this fact of April 5, 1980 when CBI *suo motu* registered a case. Thereafter necessary action was instituted and the CBI completed the investigation. They sent their report to us and we authenticated it. They sent their investigation report to us on the 3rd of October, 1980. On the 11th of November we authenticated it. And the case has been filed in the Bombay High Court. In regard to the seizure of the machines, Sir, the information which I have given in the second part of the statement is based on the CBI investigation report.

**श्री धर्मदास शास्त्री :** सी. बी. आई. ने अभी तक मशीनें सीज क्यों नहीं की हैं। सीज नहीं की हैं यह मेरी परसनल नालिज में है। यह एक धोखा है। इसको बचाया जा रहा है। क्यों बचाया जा रहा है ? इस आदमी को शील्ड क्यों किया जा रहा है ? क्यों इस को शैल्टर दिया जा रहा है ?

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE :** Sir, I am not giving shield to anybody. I have informed the hon. Member that I have reproduced the information which I have received from the CBI. I have just reproduced that information. If the hon. Member has got more information, I will take that information from him and I will look into it. But the present information which I have got is on the basis of the report which I got from the CBI.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, several questions have been posed in this honourable House to Finance Minister and the Commerce Minister. There is this question per-

taining to the misuse of the imported machines by Parle Bottling company Private Limited. The answer given by the Hon. Minister not only confuses us, but it is not relevant to the facts of the case. In 1947 you have got the rules under the Act. These Import and Export Licensing Rules have been framed then. In 1955 there was an amendment made to it. That is what I would like to know from him. He has given the answer saying that three machines were imported and disposed off long before this date.

MR. SPEAKER : Please put the question.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : In 1947 you have got these rules under the relevant provisions of the main Act.

MR. SPEAKER : You kindly ask a straight question.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : He said, he said he has no power of confiscation, or seizure. I would like to read out the relevant rule.

MR. SPEAKER : You don't read it. You may please put a straight question.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : The provisions have been misquoted by him. Sir, under section 4D you have got 'Power to seize imported goods or materials' under section 4G you have got the power of confiscation.

MR. SPEAKER : Unnecessarily you are delaying. Please ask a question.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : These powers relate to confiscation, seizure and so on. The penalty provisions have been mentioned in the Act. In answer to Mr. Dharam Das Shastr's question the Hon. Minister stated that this Company has come to notice in 1980. He has stated in his the main reply that provisions of seizure and confiscation of imported goods were incorporated in the Imports and Exports (Central) Act on 4-11-1975.

On the other had he has also stated that there has been no seizure or confiscation of these imported goods. Therefore, there is a contradiction in the statement of the hon. Minister. The Parle Bottling Company has looted Rs. 4 crores in this way, before the case has come up before the House. The Commerce and Finance Ministries have not taken any action against certain violations of this company. Ever since 1955 you have got these provisions relating to seizure. I do not know why such action should be delayed. I would like to know why no action was taken in spite of all these irregularities indulged in by this Company.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : As far as the question of the Hon. Member regarding what action has been taken is concerned, I have explained the position clearly in my answer. There was a CBI investigation. Thereafter the case has been filed in the Court. In regard to departmental action also, I have stated that this is under consideration. The Hon. Member probable in his excitement has not read part (e) of my reply. So that is also under consideration. Now Sir, regarding the question 'What action you are going to take', I am not going to disclose it on the floor of the House and give a help to them to strengthen their case. No, that is not possible.

Secondly, the moot point is this, namely, whether, before the amendment of 1975 there were provisions, which the hon. Member has referred to, under which we could have confiscated the machines. Here I have got the information specifically and I had a discussion with the officers dealing with the various provisions of the Act. They specifically brought to my notice that only two types of actions could be taken before 1975 when an amendment was made. One is 'debarring'. The second is 'prosecution' which comes under Section 5 of the Act. Prosecution has already taken place. With

regard to the question of de barring, when such types of complaints come and something is under investigation or adjudication of the court, the normal course of action takes place. That is being contemplated. But whether this power was there before the 1975 Act is a matter of fact. One can examine the relevant provisions and get the true picture.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : My second supplementary... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Next Question.

भाचार्य भगवान देव : अध्यक्ष जी, सी० बी० आई० के लोग गलत बयानी कर रहे हैं। हमें इस पर सवाल पूछना है, आप हमें बोलने का मौका दें।

(Interruptions)\*\*

MR. SPEAKER : What is this, Mr. Acharya ? Not allowed.

श्री के० लकप्पा : मेरा दूसरा सवाल है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दो सवाल पहले नम्बर वाला सदस्य कर सकता है। दूसरे नम्बर वाला सदस्य केवल एक सवाल ही कर सकता है।

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : I seek your protection. The hon. Minister has given his reply and I would like to know.

MR. SPEAKER : You have asked one supplementary ; no more supplementry.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : My question has not been answered... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You give notice under Rule 155 if you are not satisfied. Not like this. Twelve minutes have already been spent on this question. I am not going to allow any more supplementaries.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : Why are you shielding this question ?

MR. SPEAKER : No question of shielding ; I have already given 12 minutes for this question.

भाचार्य भगवान देव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस पर चर्चा होनी चाहिए। माननीय रतन सिंह राजदा और माननीय बाजपेयी जी खड़े हो कर उस कम्पनी की वकालत कर रहे हैं। वह कम्पनी राजनीति के अन्दर प्रवेश कर रही है।

(Interruptions\*)

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : We are not going to agree to this.

MR. SPEAKER : Question No. 251. Shri G.Y. Krishnan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : rose

अध्यक्ष महोदय : 12 मिनट से ज्यादा एक सवाल नहीं चल सकता।

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : Let us have half-an-hour discussion.

MR. SPEAKER : You cannot demand like this. I am not going to be cowed down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : rose.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. I know my job. Question No. 251.

### Charging of Different Rates of interest by Banks

\*251. SHRI G. Y. KRISHNAN : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state ;

(a) whether Government have examined the performance of the Banks in the context of the fact that some of the Banks are charging different rates of interests in compari-