

set up. Survey operations have been intensified. The drive for educating the tax-payers has been intensified. The machinery for collection, collation and dissemination of useful information both for discovering new assesseees and for locating concealment in the cases of already existing assesseees is being streamlined.

MR. SPEAKER: You can send it to him.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: I will lay it on the Table of the House.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: Sir, your anticipation has proved to be correct about the collusion. Mr. Lakappa did not put a probing question as far as this is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: You put a supplementary to his supplementary.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: This incident is of the year 1972-73 and permit me to say that a big scandal is involved. Therefore, I want to take two minutes of the House.

This work was given to the Company in the year 1972 which needed import of machinery worth Rs. 6 crores. The Company was not in a position to bring this machinery. Therefore, the Port Trust of Vizag brought this machinery and this machinery was to be given on hire to the Company. If the machinery is given on hire, the Company is not entitled to a deduction on account of depreciation charges. Therefore, this Company in league with the Government officials, in the year 1973, to be more exact, on 2nd March, 1973, got the agreement changed and for the word 'hire', they put the word 'provided'. That is what the report mentions. It is because of this that they claimed a rebate of Rs. 4.5 crores. You will be surprised to know that the Board of Directors of the Vizag Port Trust gave a debit note for deduction of this particular amount in the year 1972-73 and it is because of this debit note that this concession

was granted. In the year 1973, when a new Board came, they detected this fraud. Another claim was made which was negated and this debit note was withdrawn. That is how all this came to light.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister what steps the Government propose to take against the persons in authority who prompted, assisted and abetted this contractor to cheat the Government to the tune of Rs. 4.5 crores and whether any effort is being made to bring pressure on the Government by the high-ups in Delhi to see that the entire matter is hushed up.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): The Port Trust originally perhaps intended to sell this machinery to the contractor and actually the contractor said that he was buying and he had the debit note also made. Subsequently, he could not buy or the Port Trust refused to sell, whatever the reason. The Port Trust cancelled the debit note which the assessee cancelled it from the assessment and continued to claim the rebate. The crime was committed by the assessee by concealing the fact that the debit note was cancelled and there was a hire only, and not sale. He continued to claim the rebate as if there was a sale in spite of the fact that the debit note was cancelled and it was made into hire. Therefore, if there is any more information about any person, I am willing to examine. The Government is not interested in shielding anybody but, as the facts stand, this is the position.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: The facts are mentioned in the report.

#### Decline in Tea Production

\*290 SHRI G. Y. KRISHNAN: Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there has been continuous decline in tea production during the current financial year; and

(b) if so, to what extent and the reasons thereof?

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND STEEL AND MINES (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): (a) Though there has been a decline in the production of tea from April to October, 1981 (both months inclusive), production has again picked up in September and October, 1981.

(b) A detailed statement indicating tea production from April to October, 1981 is laid on the Table of the House. It would be seen from the statement that there has been an overall decline of 13.59 m.kgs. in tea production compared to the corresponding period of the previous year. The principal reason for this decline has been unfavourable weather conditions.

#### Statement

(Figures in m. kgs.)

Months	1981-82 (Estimated)			1980-81 (Provisional)			(+) or (-) in 1981-82 over 1980-81
	NI	SI	Total	NI	SI	Total	
April	18.92	14.89	33.81	22.99	13.01	36.00	(-) 2.19
May	43.32	13.98	57.30	47.81	19.05	66.86	(-) 9.56
June	55.28	9.83	65.11	55.28	12.33	67.61	(-) 2.50
July	72.50	9.59	82.09	73.56	8.76	82.32	(-) 0.25
August	64.19	7.60	71.79	66.93	7.04	73.97	(-) 2.18
September	68.10	7.72	75.82	65.21	9.10	74.31	(+) 1.51
October	58.28	14.30	72.58	56.56	14.46	71.02	(+) 1.56
April to October	380.59	77.91	458.50	388.34	83.75	472.09	(-) 13.59

SHRI G. Y. KRISHNAN: In view of the decline in production, was there any claim for relief? If so, what are the steps taken by the Government?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: As I mentioned, it is mainly because of the weather conditions, particularly erratic monsoon in certain regions, that production declined.

We hope that the over-all production will remain at the same level. The Hon. Member can find from the statement that from September onwards production started picking up. Production picked up in September. In October, it is picking up. The over-all introduction may remain at the

same level round about 574-575 million KG. But the question is not of over-all production.

The question is of cost of production which is increasing per hectare. We have announced a number of measures in connection therewith. For instance, I would like to mention the increased development allowance which we are giving to the plantations.

The development allowance is given as follows:

Rs. 30,000 per hectare	Plains gardens.
Rs. 35,000 per hectare	Hills gardens.
Rs. 40,000 per hectare	Darjeeling gardens.

Even the replantation subsidies have been increased. Some recommendations were made at the last meetings which I had with the representatives of the producing centres and the planters' organisations and Government officers. Some of them are to be implemented by the Government of India. We have done it. Some have to be implemented by the various producing State Governments and they have started implementing. One or two recommendations have already been implemented. Other recommendations are in the process of implementation.

**SHRI G. Y. KRISHNAN:** Has it affected the export position and, if so, to what extent?

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** There is an effect in export position but not quantity-wise. It is price-wise because we are exporting a little more, but we are getting in value terms a little less because unit value realisation has gone down.

### Restructuring of Public Sector Enterprises

\*291. **SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE:** Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are considering a proposal to restructure public sector enterprises; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA):** (a) Presumably, the Hon'ble Member is referring to organisational restructuring of public enterprises. There is no such proposal for general restructuring of the organisations of public enterprises under consideration of Government. Restructuring of public enterprises is taken up as and when required.

(b) Does not arise.

**SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE:** The hon. Minister presumes that I

have asked only about organisational restructuring. I would like to inform him that I surely mean organisational restructuring as well as certain economic policies such as pricing. He says that there is no proposal for general restructuring, but, at the same time, says that it is done 'as and when required'. In view of the big IMF loan—I believe, that is one of the circumstances of 'as and when required'—is it a fact that the Government has decided that the public sector units are no longer going to be subordinated to their social objectives and if the pricing policy comes in conflict with the social objectives, it will invariably be resolved in favour of normal free market economy and the cost escalation effect in future will always be passed on to the consumers as happened in the case of the recent price hike in steel, coal and several other commodities? And may I know whether this policy coincides with the IMF demands?

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN):** Our pricing policy has nothing to do with the IMF. Our policy about pricing is that the consumer must pay the legitimate cost of production. It is not proper to ask a consumer of sugar and textiles to subsidise a consumer of steel and coal. Every person who consumes that particular commodity must pay the reasonable cost of production. If the hon. Member says that we must increase our efficiency, that we must reduce the cost by increasing efficiency, I am one with her. But to say that somebody else must subsidise the purchaser of some of these commodities which are used by certain groups, I believe, is not acceptable to us.

**SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE:** The hon. Minister very well knows that there are different kinds of public sector undertakings and that certain undertakings are meant particularly for public utility. Therefore, all cannot be dealt with by the same yardstick. The sugar-wala may not subsidise the steel-wala: that is