

even after independence it has been tolerable and tolerated and we are not ashamed to say that it still exists. May I know whether Government have taken any steps to find out what are the causes for the Indian society to observe untouchability, and if so, have they found out any remedy?

Mr. Speaker: In the Question Hour you are making a speech. I think I will go to the next question now, Mr. Limaye.

श्री मोलहू प्रसाद : इस प्रश्न को आपने पांच मिनट ही दिये हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसके लिए सात घंटे दिये गये हैं ।

श्री मोलहू प्रसाद : पहले आप एक घंटे में तीन प्रश्न ही खत्म करते थे । आज यह इतना जरूरी प्रश्न है और इसको आप पांच मिनट में ही खत्म कर रहे हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: I am not able to understand. We have given seven hours. Immediately after the Question Hour we are going to discuss this. Every-day members are doing this, it is impossible to continue like this. Yesterday we have already discussed and we have another 6-1/2 hours today. Hon. Members do not understand. I do not know what to do.

श्री मोलहू प्रसाद : तब यह प्रश्न उसी में ट्रांसफर क्यों न कर दिया गया ।

श्री एस० एम० जांशो : जो चर्चा चल रही है उसमें तो समय का बटवारा होता है । हो सकता है कि हम को उस चर्चा में भाग लेने का अवसर न मिले । लेकिन अब इसमें तो हम सबाल पूछ ही सकते हैं ।

Shri Madhu Limaye: 1558.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: 1584 may be taken up with this.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri K. C. Pant): That is different.

M/s. Aminchand Pyarelal Group of Firms

*1558. **Shri Madhu Limaye:**
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:
Shri George Fernandes:

Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 76 on the 3rd November, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the penalty imposed on M/s. Aminchand Pyarelal for importing steel after the expiry of the import licences and for presenting forged cross border certificates has since been recovered; and

(b) whether the firm exercised the option given to it to redeem the goods for home consumption?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri K. C. Pant):

(a) Out of the total penalty of Rs. 2,28,000 imposed on M/s. Aminchand Pyarelal in respect of three importations, penalty amounting to Rs. 1,28,000 relating to two of the three cases has since been recovered. The firm has filed a writ petition in respect of the third case in the High Court at Bombay.

(b) Only in one of the three cases has the firm exercised the option and redeemed the goods for home consumption on payment of a fine of Rs. 1,00,000.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: 1584.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different question.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं मन्त्री महोदय का ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि 1951 और 1959 के बीच श्रीमती चन्द प्यारेलाल कम्पनियों का बड़े पैमाने पर विस्तार

हो रहा था, उनका मुनाफ़ा बढ़ रहा था, लेकिन यह ताज़्जुब की बात है कि उनका ग्रामदनी टैक्स, जो पहले करीब करीब 9 लाख था, घटते घटते करीब करीब 1,28 हजार या 1,29 हजार हो गया। उसका सबसे बड़ा कारण यह है कि इस अवधि में इनकम टैक्स के अधिकारियों पर और सरकार पर भी उनका असर बढ़ता गया। सरकार ने इस अवधि में उनकी ग्रामदनी 1 करोड़ रुपये मानी है और 75,000 रुपये का टैक्स लगाया है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस खत्म होने के बाद स्टील इम्पोर्ट करने और फोर्डे फ़ॉस-बार्डर सर्टिफिकेट पेश करने के लिए उन पर जुर्माना लगाया गया, उसी तरह ग्रामदनी टैक्स की चोरी करने के कारण उन के ऊपर कोई जुर्माना क्यों नहीं लगाया गया, क्योंकि छाड़िकार ये सारी चोरियां करके ये लोग ग्रामदनी छिपाते हैं।

Shri K. C. Pant: The supplementary relates to the other question. Have you allowed that question? That relates to income-tax and this is customs; these are two different matters.

Mr. Speaker: Both relate to the Finance Ministry.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं बताता हूँ कि ये दोनों मामले कैसे सम्बन्धित हैं। एक चोरी पकड़ में आई, लेकिन पचासों नहीं आई, इसलिए ग्रामदनी को छिपाने का मौका मिला।

Shri K. C. Pant: If you allow that to be answered. I should like to say that it is not correct that the income-tax had been reduced. That statement is given in reply to the other question which makes the position absolutely clear. There is no question of reduction of income-tax in 1958-59.

Shri Ranga: Under-assessment?

Shri K. C. Pant: That also is given.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे सुझाव करने कीजिए। मैंने पिछली लोक सभा

में एक प्रश्न पूछा था, जिसके उत्तर में एक टबल दिया गया था। उस में साफ़ लिखा था कि 1952-53 में 9,13 हजार रुपये का इनकम टैक्स एसेस किया गया था और 1957-58 में वह घट कर 1,28 हजार हो गया। ये खुद सरकार के आंकड़े हैं उसके बाद दोबारा एसेस किया गया तो 1 करोड़ रुपये की इनकम मानी गई और 75 लाख रुपये का टैक्स लगाया गया। उस वक्त उन्होंने बताया था कि कोई जुर्माना नहीं किया गया। लेकिन जब फोर्डे फ़ॉस-बार्डर सर्टिफिकेट्स को लेकर 2,28 हजार रुपये का जुर्माना किया गया तो क्या वजह है कि इनकम टैक्स की चोरी को लेकर कोई जुर्माना नहीं किया गया है ?

Shri K. C. Pant: In regard to the other question 1584...

Mr. Speaker: You place the answer on the Table of the House.

Shri K. C. Pant: I thought that we were dealing with this question.

Mr. Speaker: That is also concerned with M/s. Aminchand Pyarelal group of firms. You have laid it on the Table. Supplementaries can be asked.

Shri K. C. Pant: It is laid on the Table. In that statement we have given the figures for each of the years from 1951-52 to 1958-59 from which it will be seen that the tax levy has gone up from Rs. 8.91 lakhs in 1950-51 to Rs. 10.69 lakhs in 1958-59.

Shri Madhu Limaye: Re-assessed. But originally?

यह साफ़ कीजिए कि यह रीएसेस्ड है. प्रारिजिनल नहीं था।

Shri K. C. Pant: Who is to take credit for this? The income-tax department has done it.

श्री मधु लिमये : बहुत हल्का होने के बाद ऐसा किया गया।

Shri K. C. Pant: Therefore, the original figures quoted by Mr. Limaye refer to realization of tax, not to the levies. The levy has increased over the years.

श्री मधु लिमये : जुमनि के बारे में जवाब नहीं दिया है।

उप-प्रधान मंत्री तथा वित्त मंत्री (श्री मोरारजी देसाई) : स्टेटमेंट में है।

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या मन्त्री महोदय का ध्यान इस बात की ओर गया है कि उन्होंने तीन कानसाइनमेंट्स में से केवल एक ही छुड़ाया है; यदि हाँ, तो बाकी दो कानसाइनमेंट्स के बारे में क्या किया गया है ?

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र पन्त : तीन कानसाइनमेंट्स में से एक तो उन्होंने छुड़ा लिया है। चूँकि बाकी दो कानसाइनमेंट्स के बारे में उन्होंने फ़ाइल नहीं दिये इसलिए उनका छोड़ा नहीं गया है। एक केस में उन्होंने बम्बई हाई कोर्ट में रिट फ़ाइल की है और दूसरे केस में उन्होंने सेट्टल बोर्ड के सामने प्रपील की है। जब तक उनका फ़सला नहीं हो जाता है तब तक कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की जा सकती है।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My question pertains to the reply given to question No. 1584—income-tax assessment. From the statement given in reply to this question, it appears to me something strange; in the assessment year, the income shown in the case of the firm and tax levied in the case of the firm, right from 1951-52 to 1958-59, are like this: the income shown was Rs. 12,50,000; and then, it is all 'ditto', 'ditto', 'ditto', as if there was no rise or fall in the income. It was always Rs. 1,50,000. It is also said in the statement that the income determined in the case of the firm was on the basis that the income for the period of assessment, from 1951-52 to 1958-59, was Rs. 1 crore. On the basis of this static income and the income of Rs. 12,50,000, it has been calculated. This was on the basis of the agreed

assessment. What was the agreed assessment? It was agreed with the connivance of the particular firm by the income-tax officer that the yearly income will be only Rs. 12,50,000 and nothing more!

श्री मधु लिमये : मन्त्रियों के सहयोग है।

श्री स०मो० बनर्जी : मन्त्रियों के सहयोग है। I want to know what was the agreed assessment and what was the assessment before the agreement.

Shri K. C. Pant: Assessments are agreed to sometimes. When the department feels that there are various items which they may not have been able to establish, and if the other party agrees, the higher amount is arrived at. (श्री मधु लिमये :

हायर कहाँ है ? प्रत्यक्ष महोदय, यह गलत बयानी क्यों करते हैं ?)

They cannot question the facts. I can only give the facts as I know. The facts are that in this case, the concerned officer exercised his discretion. He felt that it was in the interests of the department and the revenue of the Government to accept this figure of Rs. 1 crore which is evenly distributed over these years. So he exercised his discretion, and in the exercise of his discretion, he has fixed this figure. I do not think there is any objection.

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रत्यक्ष महोदय, भैरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

Mr. Speaker: In the Question Hour, there cannot be any point of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, on a point of clarification.

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रत्यक्ष महोदय, प्राथमिकी महोदय को ठीक जवाब देने के लिए कहें। वह दूसरे कालम—“इनकम एंन्यूअल इन दि केस प्राफ दि फर्म”—को देखें।

किया जाता है उसके अन्तर्गत क्या किया और क्यों नहीं किया ? क्या इसलिए नहीं गिरफ्तार किया कि किसी मंत्री का कोई हाथ है ? (अध्यक्षान) ठीक है मंत्री को छोड़ दीजिये लेकिन पहले भाग का जवाब मिलना चाहिए ।

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र पन्त : उन का सारा केस यह है कि वह कहते हैं कि फलां लाइसेंस नम्बर के मातहत हम ने गुड्स मंगाए और कस्टम्स वाले कहते हैं कि दूसरे लाइसेंस के अन्दर मंगाए । इसी पर तो सारा झगड़ा है ।

श्री जार्ज फर्नेंडोस : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आपका संरक्षण चाहिए । मामला यहाँ तक गया है कि 2 लाख 58 हजार रुपया फाइन किया गया और 2 लाख 28 हजार रुपया पैनाल्टी लगाई गई जिसमें से 1 लाख 28 हजार पैनाल्टी कम्पनी ने दी है । इसलिए प्राइमफेसो यह बात बिल्कुल साफ है कि कम्पनी ने गलती की है । तो फोर्जरी के कानून के अन्तर्गत आपने उनको क्यों गिरफ्तार नहीं किया ?

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): The matter is not so easy as hon. members think. Wherever possible, we would certainly like to prosecute them and also recover all this money. In such matters and even in the other matter of income-tax, it is asked why only this particular sum is kept. Unless these people agree, the thing will not stand in appeals or in courts. We will lose even the money that we can recover. Therefore, one has to see the balance of convenience as to what should be done. It is said that it is done by the minister. I do not think this was seen by any minister. How can a minister look into all these things?

Shri Ranga: It was not brought to your notice. That is the pity.

Shri Morarji Desai: I know about it only now. Instructions have been issued now that wherever prosecutions can be made, they should be made. There is no question of not making prosecutions. In addition to penalty, if prosecutions can be made, they should be made. Not only that, I propose also to consider whether even forfeiture of property can be made.

Shri Sonavane: What was the total value of the goods imported and what was the percentage of penalty imposed on that?

Shri K. C. Pant: Taking all the three consignments together, the value of the goods was Rs. 7,73,363. On this, fine in lieu of confiscation comes to Rs. 2.58 lakhs and personal penalty Rs. 2.28 lakhs.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is really extraordinary that for 10 years, the income, which has been assessed, remains the same amount. Can the minister give us any other case in which agreed assessment has been made in the manner it was done in the case of Aminchand Pyarelal? I would also like to know whether this Committee which was appointed to go into the entire steel deal by Messrs. Amin Chand Pyarelal submitted an interim report specially in regard to the Steel Controller's Office?

Shri K. C. Pant: I would like to clarify the first part of the question. The sum total of the income returned by this company for the years 1951-52 to 1958-59 comes to a few lakhs—below Rs. 5 lakhs. As against this return of below Rs. 5 lakhs the Government made them agree for the same period to Rs. 1 crore....

श्री वधु लिवये : करोड़ों का है । घाट दस करोड़ से कम नहीं है । मैं घटा कर बोल रहा हूँ ।

Shri K. C. Pant: If you have information which can help us to take more

tax from them we will willingly accept that information.

श्री मधु लिमये : आठ दस करोड़ से कम नहीं है। लेकिन आपने तो एप्रोमेंट किया।

Shri K. C. Pant: I am trying to put the matter in its proper perspective. The returns filed gave us an income of below Rs. 5 lakhs. We made them agree to Rs. 1 crore to be recovered in equal instalments over a period of seven years.

श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु : दुर्गापुर सेशन में 5 लाख चन्दा दिया था ए० आई० सी० सी० को।

Shri K. C. Pant: So far as the Committee's findings are concerned, I have no information with me at present.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो सवाल इसके बारे में किया गया है कि लगातार सात साल से एक ही इनकम टैक्स बताया जाता है, असेस्ड इनकम एक ही बताई जाती है तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कुछ बारगन होता है और फिर बाद में एप्रोमेंट होता है कि चलो इतनी रकम डालो और फिर जितना दोगे उतना ले लेंगे ? तो यह ऐसा कैसे होता है ? क्या तरीका है ?

Shri Morarji Desai: This is not the equal income shown by him. He had shown a lesser income before and the Income-tax Officer reopened this case. After they are reopened we have got to prove that he has got that much income, otherwise it will be remitted in appeals. Therefore, when they were prepared to pay on an income of Rs. 1 crore, Rs. 75 lakhs—that is what is said in the statement that they agreed to pay Rs. 75 lakhs—it was said that the amount by which the income came to be less and the tax came to less than Rs. 75 lakhs, we will levy that much penalty to make it equal

to Rs. 75 lakhs. The bargain was on their side. It is a bargain, I do not deny that. I do not see anything wrong in it. It is all right to say academically....

श्री मधु लिमये : दस करोड़ से कम आमदनी नहीं है, एक करोड़ आप मानते हैं। अच्छा बारगन है।

Shri Morarji Desai: If I can prove, then it is all right. That is why I am saying that the only preventive penalty will be forfeiture of property in such cases, because then there is no question of anything else coming in.

श्री मधु लिमये : वही कम से कम लीजिए जो गैर कानूनी ढंग से बताया है
(व्यवधान) अध्यक्ष महोदय, करोड़ों का मामला है, एक करोड़ कौनसी चीज है ?

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I will allow only one or two more supplementaries on this. We have already taken twenty minutes on this.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह करोड़ों का मामला है

Mr. Speaker: One or two questions take away the whole Question Hour. If it is a matter where crores of rupees are involved you can have a half-hour or one-hour discussion. But during the Question Hour if one question takes away the whole time, what happens to the other questions. That is why hon. Members were objecting yesterday also.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: They gave Rs. 5 lakhs to the AICC session at Durgapur. Shri Atulya Ghosh negotiated and got the money.

Mr. Speaker: They can never satisfy you as long as Atulya Ghosh is in your mind.

श्री मधु लिख्ये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस दिन से हम लोगों को तसल्ली और सन्तोष होगा उस दिन देश का पतन होगा। हम लोगों को तो हमेशा अतन्तुष्ट रहना चाहिये।

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : अमी चन्द प्यारे लाल का मामला चार साल से लोक सभा और राज्य सभा में चल रहा है और डिप्टी प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने फरमाया कि इसमें किसी मिनिस्टर का हाथ नहीं तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सच नहीं है कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह और मिस्टर मुब्रह्मण्यम दोनों ने कभी उसको ब्लैक पर किया कभी व्हाइट पर किया ? यह कहते हुए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह ठीक है कि आपके जो कंसन्ड्र आफिसर्स हैं उन्होंने डिपार्टमेंट के फायदे में

[असि जल्द प्यारे लाल का मामले चार साल से लोक सभा और राज्य सभा में चल रहा है और डिप्टी प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने फरमाया कि इसमें किसी मिनिस्टर का हाथ नहीं तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सच नहीं है कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह और मिस्टर मुब्रह्मण्यम दोनों ने कभी उसको ब्लैक पर किया कभी व्हाइट पर किया ? यह कहते हुए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह ठीक है कि आपके जो कंसन्ड्र आफिसर्स हैं उन्होंने डिपार्टमेंट के फायदे में

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : मैं यह मानते हुए—जैसा कि वह फरमाते हैं कि हमारे कंसन्ड्र आफिसर्स ने डिपार्टमेंट के भले में, देश के भले में या वे बड़े भोले लोग हैं कि पांच लाख की जगह एक करोड़ मान गये, इसलिए हमने उनको मान लिया, तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस सारे प्रसे में उन्होंने कितना माल इम्पोर्ट किया और जो माल 300 फी सदी पर बिकता था, उस में से कितना कन्स्यूम किया, कितना ब्लैक में बेचा ? क्या यह सही नहीं है कि उनको इस में सात करोड़ से ज्यादा का फायदा हुआ ?

[मैंने यह सवाल पूछा -]
 वह फरमाते हैं कि हमारे कंसन्ड्र आफिसर्स ने डिपार्टमेंट के भले में, देश के भले में या वे बड़े भोले लोग हैं कि पांच लाख की जगह एक करोड़ मान गये, इसलिए हमने उनको मान लिया, तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस सारे प्रसे में उन्होंने कितना माल इम्पोर्ट किया और जो माल 300 फी सदी पर बिकता था, उस में से कितना कन्स्यूम किया, कितना ब्लैक में बेचा ? क्या यह सही नहीं है कि उनको इस में सात करोड़ से ज्यादा का फायदा हुआ ?

Mr. Speaker: How can he say how much was sold in the blackmarket? I will be very happy if the Minister knows it and answers it.

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : अब स्पीकर साहब, इस में किसकी मदद लें, यह मामला चार साल से तड़प रहा है।

[अब स्पीकर साहब, इस में किसकी मदद लें, यह मामला चार साल से तड़प रहा है।]
 अब स्पीकर साहब, इस में किसकी मदद लें, यह मामला चार साल से तड़प रहा है।

श्रीमती जयश्रीकान्तम्मा : आपका प्रोटेशन चाहिए मिनिस्टर लोगों को।
 The hon. Member cannot go on making wild allegations against everybody.

Mr. Speaker: Let the Minister reply how much was gold in the black market, if he can, I will be very happy.

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : सम्माननीय सदस्य ने पहले दो मिनिस्ट्रों का नाम लेकर जो कुछ कहा, वह उचित नहीं है। उनका इसके साथ कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। वैसे वह इस मामले में कुछ भी कह सकते हैं, उन को अधिकार है, पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर होने की वजह से, लेकिन यह उनको शोभा नहीं देता— इतना मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ।

जहाँ तक दूसरी बात का सम्बन्ध है कि ब्लैक मार्केट में क्या बेचा

Shri Abdul Ghani Dar rose—

Mr. Speaker: He cannot get up whenever he chooses and begin to speak. He has asked the question. The Minister is answering it. He has to hear him, whether he likes it or not.

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : उन्होंने कहा कि हम मानते हैं कि वह भले हैं। हम ने कभी भला नहीं माना। भला माना होता तो इतना पैसा क्यों वसूल करते। वह भले नहीं हैं—इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। सम्माननीय सदस्य भी भले नहीं हैं—इसमें भले का सवाल ही नहीं है। ब्लैक मार्केट में कितना बेचा, यदि यह मुझे मालूम होता, तो उनको सवाल ही न पूछना पड़ता।

श्री अब्दुल गनी दार : सरकार को होशियार करो और मालूम करो।

[سرکار کو ہوشیار کرو اور معلوم کرو -]

Shri Indrajit Gupta: In the matter of the irregular import of steel and alleged resale at blackmarket prices by this firm, the Finance Ministry is naturally interested to see that pro-

per penalties are imposed and realised. When this matter is also being further investigated by the Asok Sarkar Inquiry Committee, does the Government consider it proper that before that committee has concluded its investigation, the then Iron and Steel Controller who was involved in this deal, Shri Bam, should be permitted by the government to take up a United Nations assignment and leave the country? Especially when he is one of the key witnesses in this whole matter, is it considered proper.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it is relevant.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Sir, what is the reply?

Mr. Speaker: Shri Hem Barua.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Please tell me why you are disallowing it.

Mr. Speaker: It has nothing to do with the main question. You are only asking about the Iron and Steel Controller and not about the realisation of duty.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: The first part of my question was about the import of steel. At that time the Iron and Steel Controller was Shri Bam. An inquiry has been ordered by government in the matter and the chief witness is allowed to leave the country.

Shri Morarji Desai: The question here is not about that inquiry. That is a separate question. If that question had been asked, a question about that particular officer would have been relevant. Here the question is about the collection of customs duty levied. How does the officer come into the picture here?

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: It is all intermingled; don't try to tell us all the stories.

Shri Hem Barua: Since the hon. Finance Minister gave us an assur-

ance on the floor of this House that he would tighten up the tax collection machinery and would mop up all the taxes evaded by certain people, in the context of that, may I know whether he has tried to find out the taxes evaded by Aminchand Pyarelal group of firms and, if he has found out the taxes evaded by them, what steps has he taken against this particular firm or, as is alleged in some section of the press, he is reluctant to take any steps against this firm because of the substantial contribution it has made to his party funds?

Shri Morarji Desai: Again an insinuation is made by the hon. Member.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: What a pity!

Shri Morarji Desai: I do not want to enter into it. I do not want to take up that matter. He can do what he likes. I never promised in this House at any time that I will mop up all the evasion of taxes. It is not possible for anybody to do so. What I said was that I am trying to devise a machinery and a method whereby this will be lessened to the minimum. That has not yet been done. I have not yet been able to find it out. If the hon. Member can help me to do it, I shall be eternally grateful to him. Therefore I want suggestions from him.

Shri Hem Barua: He has not replied to the latter part of my question.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

Shri R. Barua: Question No. 1559.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Sir, question No. 1575 is also connected with it.

Mr. speaker: That has been transferred to the 11th.

Fabrication of Fertilizer Plants

+

*1559. **Shri R. Barua:**

Shri D. N. Patodia:

Shri D. C. Sharma:
Shri Kameshwar Singh:
Shri A. Sreedharan:

Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the country is likely to be in a position to fabricate her plants for production of fertilizers within 4-5 years time;

(b) if so, whether Government purpose to revise its policy on fertilizers and stop further erection of new plants with foreign assistance and expedite the process of fabrication of plants in India; and

(c) the economy of postponing further erection under foreign assistance and importing additional quantity for the next 3-4 years?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Planning and Social Welfare (Shri Raghuramajah): (a) It is expected that a major portion of plant and equipment for fertilizer factories can be manufactured in the country progressively in the next five years.

(b) Government will naturally do all in its power to expedite the indigenous fabrication of plant and equipment. It is entirely because of our expectations in this matter that Government has agreed to consider new proposals with foreign assistance only if they can be finalised by the end of this year and could come into production in 3 to 4 years from now. The present policy is consistent with the objective of major self-sufficiency in the next few years and does not require any change in the meanwhile.

(c) If projects now contemplated are not proceeded with, indigenous fertilizer production that will be lost to the country upto 1973-74, when the first plants built from mainly local equipment may be expected to be ready, will be valued at about Rs. 500 crores. This may be compared with foreign assistance for investment on these plants of about Rs. 150 crores.