

the Defence Minister promised it last week. We have read in the newspapers... (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please allow Mr. Salve to raise the matter. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: There is a war cry given by Pakistan and the Government of India is keeping quiet. There is no reaction from the Government of India. Therefore, I would like to know what is the stand of the Government. I would like to know what is the defence preparedness of this country to meet the challenge posed by Pakistan (*Interruptions*)

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैडम, यूनिवर्सल पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन में सतोश चन्द्र कमेटी बिठाई गई थी की भारतीय भाषाओं में... (*व्यवधान*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I request Members to allow Mr. Salve to speak. His matter is there in the list for the last three days (*Interruptions*). I won't allow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will not go on record. I said I will not permit anybody to raise it now. (*Interruptions*).

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY:*

SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN (Uttar Pradesh):*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not going on record. I have told hon. Members that if Mr. Salve finishes his half-an-hour discussion, then I will permit others. If you cannot understand, it is not my problem. It is yours.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : साल्वे साहब के बाद हम बोलेंगे ।

उपसभापति : साल्वे साहब के मैटर के बाद, उनके बाद नहीं ।

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION POINTS ARISING OUT OF THE ANSWER GIVEN IN THE RAJYA SABHA ON THE 14TH MAY, 1990 TO STARRED QUES- TION 161 REGARDING FAIR PRICE OF PARAXYLENE

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Madam, what is raised in this discussion is a matter in which two business houses in the private sector are involved. At the outset, it is my duty to make it clear that we do not support anyone of the two. We do not want to oppose any of the two. They will be left to themselves. They will be dealt with fairly by the Government. We are sitting here in the Opposition and it is necessary for us to do our duty. Being in the Opposition, Madam, as someone said in the British Parliament, the duty of the Opposition is to oppose, expose and depose. In this discussion we want to expose the extremely dishonest and corrupt attitude and approach which this Government, supposedly value-based Government, has adopted for purposes of benefitting one business house, which is alleged to have financed certain foreign activities of Fairfax, Hershman, etc. I only hope that all the norms which they have given to themselves were not thrown to the winds purely to be able to repay the kindness and benefits of one business house. Madam, I will start.

There are three aspects of the matter which they are violating. They are violating the long-term fiscal policy which they have given to themselves. Then, Madam, in respect of certain facts which have been given, it is regrettable that the Minister has not been very straight with the House. Finally, I want to point out to them, I want to lead some evidence here in this House before the Minister which shows how utterly unworthy has been the

*Not recorded.

[Shri N.K.P. Salve]

haviour of his Ministry and that of the Finance Ministry.

I will take up the long-term fiscal policy. The Minister himself sets out the long-term fiscal policy. *Inter alia* I will read out from his answer at page 11 of the proceedings of the 14th May 1990. Madam, this is how the policy has been described by the Minister.

"Paraxylene is an important commodity and when the prices of local manufacturers rise abnormally and the requirement is large we do import and now the international market is cheap. To equalise the prices of the manufacturers here and the international prices, we impose duties as well."

The crucial words are "to equalise the prices of the manufacturers and the international prices, we impose import duty". May I know from the Minister if he is aware that the duty on Paraxylene was as much as 80 per cent when the international price was 900 dollars per metric ton? Is it true that when you gave your import licences to Bombay Dyening, the international prices had fallen to 380 dollars per metric ton, and unless you raised the duty to 250 dollars per metric ton, you would not be able to equalise the prices of imported material with that of the Indian manufacturers? Is that correct or not? And, in accordance with this very policy, did you or did you not allow import of another petrochemical, MEG? It was raised from 90 to 150 per cent. What is the special reason for this? Why, despite your policy with regard to the import of other petrochemicals, you raised the duty when the international prices have fallen and why, in this respect, you have been keeping quiet, that is, price, availability and bogus disputes?

Madam, the Minister also replied and gave certain figures of supply and demand and was trying to make out that the supplies were less than the demand and that was why imports to be permitted. Madam, I

regret that a Minister of the stature of Mr. Gurupadaswamy should have made such a statement because as a fact he knows it. Is or is it not true that not earlier than November 1989, the price of the commodity of paraxylene was fixed at Rs. 22,000/- per tonne for internal consumption to manufacture DMT and PTA with the consent and concurrence of the Secretary of the Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals? This was on par. Is it also true that thereafter, on the 5th of May, 1990, 20,000 tonnes were offered up to June 1990 and the Ministry was aware of the fact that the prices offered were the prices which were given with the concurrence and consent of the Ministry? Firstly, they are not raising the import duty. Secondly, there is clear availability of 20,000 tonnes of paraxylene and the price is fixed with the consent and concurrence of the Ministry. The question is why import is being allowed unless the motivation is to favour a particular person.

In the end, I would like to submit one thing, and this is something which is most important. Is the Minister aware of the fact that a public sector undertaking, IPCL, on 19th May 1990, has purchased paraxylene for Rs. 18,500/- per tonne? This is with the concurrence of the Ministry. If this be so, the price is fixed for the public sector undertaking and they are allowed to purchase in the month of May and paraxylene is available in India. Is there any reason why they are allowing import unless they wanted to favour a particular person? Is it true that you are raising the import duty and because you are allowing imports, a business house in the private sector is likely to be benefited to the tune of fifty to sixty crores of rupees? How much you lose in foreign exchange? You go against the very ethos, the very principle, of your Long-Term Fiscal Policy. More than anything else, Madam, they are criminally guilty of trying

to run down the indigenous produce which is being purchased by one of the public sector undertakings.

Therefore, on these three points, I want the Minister to tell us whether or not, in respect of all material which will be imported here, he will raise the import duty. That is number one.

No. 2 : Will he assure us that no further imports will be allowed?

No. 3 : Will he agree to appoint—it is a value-based political decision that they are taking—an appropriate committee in his Ministry itself to find out how this kind of an import licence is given in violation of the policy, in violation of the Long-Term Fiscal Policy and in violation of the norms about availing first of the indigenously available material, and without any warrant, they import foreign material, frittering away valuable foreign exchange when the material is available indigenously and purchased by a public sector undertaking ? Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
Now, Mr. Malaviya.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीया उपसभापति महोदया, 14 मई, 1990 को प्रमोद महाजन ने जब सवाल पूछा, जैसा कि अभी श्री साल्वे जी ने कहा कि उनका सवाल था:-

“The problem today is that import is costlier than the domestic price and the Government is allowing imports when it is available in the domestic market. This is surprising.”

यह जो मूल प्रश्न था और उसका जो उत्तर था, इससे बिल्कुल साफ जाहिर हो गया है कि जो पैरिसीक्लीन है, वह इस देश में काफी मात्रा में, पर्याप्त मात्रा में उपलब्ध है। अब सवाल

यह है कि जो चीज पर्याप्त मात्रा में उपलब्ध है, उसको विदेश से मंगाने की आवश्यकता क्या है या उसको विदेश से मंगाने की क्यों अनुमति दी जाती है ? जबकि विशेषकर के इसी विषय पर लोक सभा में 20 अप्रैल, 1990 को वित्त मंत्री श्री सधु दंडवते ने एक सवाल के जवाब में कहा था कि:-

“It is reported that the international prices of paraxylene have been showing a downward trend and the Government has taken note of the same.”

इन हालात में आयात क्यों किया जाता है ? क्यों उसकी अनुमति दी जाती है ? इसके संबंध में मेरी अपनी समझ में यह जो सरकार की नीति है, उसको रिवाइज करने की जरूरत है।

दूसरे जो फॉरेन एक्सचेंज है, उसका भी नुकसान हो रहा है। अभी कुछ दिन पहले प्रधान मंत्री जी का वक्तव्य मैंने समाचार-पत्रों में पढ़ा था कि हो सकता है कि फॉरेन एक्सचेंज की कमी के कारण इस देश में पेट्रोल की राशनिंग करनी पड़े, कंट्रोल करना पड़े।... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एन० के पी. साल्वे : खाने का तेल आपने नहीं कहा।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : जो खाने का तेल है, उसको मंगाने के संबंध में भी कुछ मंत्रियों का वक्तव्य था। तो मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या इस सिलसिले में सरकार अपनी नीति पर पुनर्विचार करेगी ?

यह बात बिल्कुल साफ है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मूल्यों में इसमें गिरावट हुई है और मैंने भी उस दिन प्रश्न पूछा था कि सरकार की ओर से इसका जो दाम है, उसमें कोई प्राइस कंट्रोल की नीति नहीं है, तो मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या सरकार फिर अपने इस फैसले पर

[श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय]

पुनर्विचार करेगी और ऐसी नीति की घोषणा करेगी जिससे कि जो इसका दाम है, उसका मूल्य नियंत्रित हो और मैं यह भी चाहूंगा कि यह जो पैरेक्सीलीन है, इसका उपयोग कितनी ऐसी संस्थायें हैं या कितने ऐसे व्यापारिक संस्थान हैं जो करते हैं ? और क्या यह सही नहीं है कि केवल एक व्यापारिक प्रतिष्ठान इसका उपयोग करता है, उसके अलावा इस देश में कोई भी ऐसा दूसरा व्यापारिक प्रतिष्ठान नहीं है जो इसका उपयोग करता हो । मैं इस संबंध में मंत्री जी से मांग करूंगा कि वे हमारी मांग को स्वीकार करें और इस संबंध में चाहे संसद की समिति हो या पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग से संबंधित कोई भी समिति हो, उससे इस मामले की जांच कराने की कृपा करें ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

Mr. A. G. Kulkarni. Not here.

Mr. Subramanian Swamy, Not here.

Mr. Pramod Mahaja . Not here.

Mr. Vajpayee. Not here. Now, Mr. Gopalsamy.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR

JAIN (Madhya Pradesh) : Madam, my name is also there.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

All right. But let him speak first. Yes, Mr. Gopalsamy.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu) : Madam, our honourable friend, Mr. Salve, has raised an important discussion. Paraxylene is a raw material for producing PTA and DMT which are raw materials for the production of polyester fibre and polyester filament yarn.

Madam, paraxylene is not adequate in supply and, therefore, this question arises. The total requirement of the country, according to my information, is 1,65,000 ton-

nes per year. But the captive production, inclusive of IPCL and BRPL and also of Reliance is 1,16,000 tonnes. Therefore, the deficit is 49,000 tonnes. The Cost Accounts Branch of the Ministry of Finance has indicated that Reliance has got 1,28,000-tonne capacity. When their optimum capacity was only 67,000 tonnes, the distressing question is how Reliance comes forward to supply 50,000 tonnes. My honourable friend has raised the question of foreign exchange and protection of the indigenous industry. All right. When the price in the international market crashed, naturally, when it is compared with the international price, it is higher than the international price. The question arises : Would the other industrial houses come forward to purchase from this particular industrial house ? But my point is when 67,000 tonnes was fixed as the maximum production capacity for the Reliance industry to produce paraxylene—of course, it was permitted to sell outside—suppose the machinery of PTA plant is under repair for some reason or other, though they could sell outside, that cannot be taken for every year that they will supply a certain amount of paraxylene. It is a very important question....

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA : On a point of order. Madam, sub-rule (5) of Rule 60 says :

“There shall be no formal motion before the Council not voting. The member who has given notice may make a short statement and the Minister concerned shall reply shortly. Any member who has previously intimated to the Chairman may be permitted to put a question for the purpose of further elucidating any matter of fact :....”

My submission is first Mr. Gurupadaswamy should reply and thereafter Mr. Gopalsamy may speak. Mr. Gopalsamy is not one among

those who gave notice. It was Mr. Salve and I who gave notice. Mr. Salve spoke and after that I have spoken. Now it is for the Minister to reply.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have no objection if the Minister replies now.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : I want to make a submission over what Mr. Malaviya has said. He has quoted the rule. But in this House there were occasions, there were precedents, when Members desirous of putting questions and seeking clarifications gave their names and spoke in a half-an-hour discussion and the Minister replied finally. But if the Chair directs I will sit down. I only request you to let me complete since I am in the midst of my submissions. It is up to you. If you direct, I will sit down.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Malaviyaji, in any case the Minister will have to reply in the end also. It is only to save time that I am calling other Members also.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA : The purpose of this rule is if the Minister replies now the other Members putting questions subsequently would be in a position to know the Minister's reaction or the Minister's mind. That is the idea of this rule.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If the Minister wants to reply just now, I have no objection.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : In a half-an-hour discussion there were occasions when all the Members were permitted to speak first and the Minister replied finally. This is my own experience in this House. Now Shri Malaviyaji rose when I was in the midst of my speech....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You finish your speech. Then if the Minister wants to reply, he can do

so and then the rest of the Members will speak, whichever way is convenient to the Members. I have no objection.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : Therefore, my point is when the optimum capacity for Reliance is only 67,000 tonnes, how does Reliance come forward to supply 50,000 tonnes or more than 1 lakh tonnes? I would like to get an answer from the honourable Minister on this point. The track record of Reliance shows that the needle of suspicion now hangs on them. Their track record is they get licences to produce a certain optimum capacity but exceed that capacity and bring in machinery. All this raises many questions. It would be very appropriate on my part to quote the Public Accounts Committee Report about the track record of Reliance which comes forward to supply more than 67,000 tonnes of paraxylene.

I quote—this is from the 4.00 P.M. Hundred and Sixty-fourth Report of the PAC :

“This Report of the Committee deals with a case of unauthorised importation of plant and machinery, mis-declaration and under-invoicing of goods involving customs duty of Rs. 119.64 crores by a textiles manufacturer (Reliance Industries) for their project at Patalganga in Maharashtra for the manufacture of polyester filament yarn as alleged in a show-cause notice issued by the Customs Department on 10th February 1987.”

Now, this is from the Hundred and Fifty-first Report :

“This Report of the Committee deals with a case wherein a big

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

textile manufacturer (Reliance Industries Ltd.) had earlier obtained stay from the Delhi High Court against payment of the disputed customs duty on imported polyester and nylon filament yarn. However, on vacation of the stay order by the High Court, the illegal mode of payment of the differential duty of Rs. 31.28 crores made by the party in 138 instalments spread over a period of two years was irregularly accepted by the Customs Department. There being no provision in the Customs Act, 1962 to recover the duty in instalments the irregular action of the department resulted in loss of revenue by way of interest amounting to Rs. 3.03 crores calculated at the notional rate of 12 per cent per annum."

My question is, why this Department, this particular Department or Ministry has been encouraging and supporting this particular industrial house? I don't know about the support to any industrial house whether it is of Mr. Ambani or Mr. Nusli Wadia. But my question is, why has the Reliance Industry been given this patronage all these years when they have evaded duty of more than Rs. 100 crores? This is the track record of Reliance Company. When their capacity of Paraxylene was 67,000 tonnes, they came forward and said: we will supply more than 1 lakh tonnes. I would like to know from the Minister whether any such machinery has been imported or whether any such project other than the project for which the Government has given licence has been started. Why has the Reliance Industrial house been getting this patronage from this Ministry all these years? Because there was a powerful lobby? Because the arms were very strong and stretched up to the corridors of Parliament, up to the corridors of the Government?

The whole country is agitated

over the evasion of customs duty by the Reliance Industry? For the supply of Paraxylene also when they come forward to supply more than the maximum capacity which has been granted by the Government, the moot question arises: how are they able to supply?

I would like to know whether this Ministry would probe into this. I would like to get an answer from the Minister.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, when the question came up last time I wanted to know only one thing, about which the Minister was not able to reply. The core question is not whether Mr. Ambani was being favoured by the previous Government or whether Mr. Nusli Wadia is being favoured by this Government. The question was that since the Government was going to the extent of even thinking of rationing petrol and the Prime Minister boasted that the extent of sacrifice that he is going to impose on the people of India would be such that even edible oil imports will not be allowed, why, when the price of Paraxylene had fallen so sharply—I don't remember the exact figure—why are you not adjusting the duty accordingly, particularly in view of the fact that there is a crisis before the country?

[The Vice-Chairman (Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur) in the Chair.]

Originally, the duty was reduced to compensate for the increase in the international price. Subsequently, the price has come down sharply and that means a windfall profit of Rs. 50 crores for Mr. Nusli Wadia's unit. The question is this. If you want to save foreign exchange, why don't you adjust the price? If Ambani has imported this and got this favour from the Congress Government, you hang Ambani separately. That is a separate question

altogether. (*Interruptions*) I am not bothered whether Ambani is prepared to give more or not. That is not the issue. You fixed the price of Paraxylene when it was very high. You fixed the duty when the price of Paraxylene was very high. The price has come crashing down. That duty was fixed by the previous Government. There is no great sanctity about that duty rate. In fact, this Government should not be committed to anything they did. The previous Government fixed the import duty at a lower rate because the international price of Paraxylene was high. Now it has come down. If the same duty continues, then Mr. Wadia makes Rs. 50 crores as windfall profit. That goes into his pocket instead of the pocket of the Exchequer of the country. Therefore, the central question is this. Will you raise the duty to the extent to which the international price has fallen so that Mr. Wadia neither makes a windfall profit nor he makes a windfall loss. I do not want Mr. Wadia to be crushed. In fact, I know him very well. I have known him for many years. But I do not want him to profiteer on the basis of the duty that is fixed by them. That is the only question I want to ask. The other things are irrelevant. I want to know whether you will raise the duty on Paraxylene in view of the crash in the price of Paraxylene. Thank you.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN : Sir, it is obvious that an inter-corporate war is on. There are only four companies which are involved in the whole controversy. Reliance and Bombay Dyeing are the two private sector companies and the other two are the public sector companies. I wish to seek some clarifications from the hon. Minister which are neither in favour of the one nor against the other. I do want that the Government come out with truth and the Government stand should be such which neither patronises any particular company

nor castigates the interests of another company. In other words, the Government should maintain fairness, justice and equi-distance with all private sector companies. It is a well-known fact that the previous Government was known to be favouring the Reliance company. I believe that the present Government has decided to put a stop to that policy. But it does not mean that the present Government should now favour Bombay Dyeing at the cost of national interest. Two wrongs do not make one right. My clarifications are these. The allegation is that the Government has favoured a particular firm by importing a luxury item like Paraxylene. Is it a fact that if import of Paraxylene is not allowed, the DMT plant of Bombay Dyeing would have to be closed? Is it a fact that the plant was closed four times in the year 1989-90? My next question is this. Has the Government fixed any fair selling price for the Paraxylene produced in India? If so, what is the price now? Next question. What is the installed capacity and production capacity of Reliance plant at Patalganga?

Next, is it a fact that the import of Paraxylene was allowed by the previous Government? If so, why objection is being taken to the import of the raw material now? After all, everyone must appreciate that Bombay Dyeing cannot be left at the mercy of the Reliance, specially when they are engaged in an inter-corporate war. But, there is the other side of the story and I wish to ask those clarifications also from the hon. Minister. What is the general policy of the Government in allowing imports of raw materials if the indigenous supplies are available? If the indigenous supplies are available but at a higher price than the international price, what is the Government policy in such matters? One can give an example of steel. The local

[Dr. Jinendra Kumar Jain]

rices have always been double the international prices. What does the Government do in such cases ? How does the Government propose to protect the indigenous industry if it allows the imports in competition with the indigenous production ? There is another thing. What initiative does the Government propose to take to bring about peace in the inter-corporate war going on between two private companies when one is the manufacturing company of paraxylene and the other is the user company of paraxylene ? There is another thing, Sir. Is it true that the Government of India or its subsidiary, the Indian Oil Corporation exports naphtha, but imports paraxylene which is a value-added product of naphtha ? And is it also true that while we are exporting naphtha, we are also importing naphtha ? I do not understand these imbalances in the items which relate to your Ministry, Mr. hon. Minister that you import as well as export naphtha. And what is your proposal to correct the imbalances in your policy ? What is the general policy of the Government towards encouraging the excess production ? Sir, a Government circular has been brought to my notice dated 6th April, 1988. I have been told that this is a circular of the Ministry of industry citing the policy statement of the Government, in which they encouraged the excess productions by the companies, meaning thereby that they can produce more than what is their installed capacity. What is the policy of this Government on this issue because that can settle some of the points which have been raised in this House, specially one important point raised by my friend, Mr. Gopalsamy.

Sir, a point has been made by Mr. Salve and by Mr. Malaviya also that IPCL, a public sector undertaking under the administrative control of this Ministry is buying paraxylene from the Reliance at the rate of Rs. 18,500 per metric tonne

while the Bombay Dyeing is being allowed to import paraxylene with the landed price of about Rs. 12,000. If it is correct that you make a public sector undertaking buy paraxylene from the local market at the rate of Rs. 18,500 per metric tonne and allow a private sector company to import paraxylene with a landed price of Rs. 12,000, then it becomes obvious that you are giving preference to a private company over a public sector undertaking. Is it true or not, I would like to know from the hon. Minister. And if it is true, then such allegations will come from everybody. Mr. Salve belongs to the Opposition benches, Mr. Malaviya belongs to the Treasury benches. But then....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : You also belong to the Treasury benches.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN : I do not.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR (Uttar Pradesh) : With your support, the Government survives.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT (Madhya Pradesh) : That is entirely different.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN : I appreciate your recognising our might that we can destroy and make Governments. Now, Sir, my contention is....(Interruptions) As I said in the beginning, I am not trying to speak in favour of one or the other industrial house. If you see the questions which I have put some of them might appear as if I am speaking for Bombay Dyeing and another set of questions...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : you need not give any personal explanation here. Stay on the questions.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN : I bow to your wishes. I want to conclude by saying that the Government should not only be fair, but it should also appear to be fair because the very credibility of the Government, which was gravely eroded at the time of the previous Government, is at stake.

I want the hon. Minister to take such action that you are not only just and fair, but you also appear to be just and fair to all the companies in the country. As I said in the beginning, the Government should be at equidistant from all the companies.

Thank you.

श्री सुरेश पचौरी (मध्य प्रदेश) : महोदय, पैराजाइलीन एक ऐमा बेसिक मैटीरियल है जो पी०टी०ए० और डी० एम०टी० बनाने के काम में आता है और एक कैनलाइज्ड आइटम है। हमें इस बात से सरोकार नहीं है कि सरकार की एक विशेष कम्पनी पर इतनी अमीम कृपा क्यों रही। लेकिन सदन में बैठ कर हमारा दायित्व यह हो जाना है कि सरकार की जो नीति है, सरकार के जो कदम हैं उससे आम आदमी पर कितना प्रभाव पड़ रहा है।

मान्यवर, पी०टी०ए० की डा०आई० सी०पी० ने जो कास्टिंग की और उसके हिसाब से लगभग 28.34 प्रतिशत इसके रेट कम किये। यह पालीस्टर यार्न बनाने के काम में आता है और चूकि ये रेट कम हुए तो इसके हिसाब से लगभग 13.60 प्रतिशत मूल्य कपड़ों का कम होना चाहिए था। मैं कह रहा था कि आम आदमी पर इस प्रकार की नीति का क्या प्रभाव पड़ा। यद्यपि यह दो प्रौद्योगिक घरानों की बात है लेकिन मेरा सीधा प्रश्न यह है कि आम आदमी को सरकार के इस प्रकार के कदम से क्या फर्क पड़ा है। मान्यवर, कपड़ों के मूल्य कम नहीं हुए बल्कि उतने ही रहे, जबकि कपड़ों के मूल्य इसके हिसाब से 13.60 प्रतिशत कम होने चाहिए थे। तो मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या सरकार इस पी०टी०ए० की जो डी०आई० सी०

पी० ने कास्टिंग की है। उसको आधार मानते हुए कपड़ों का मूल्य कम करने पर विचार करेगी और करेगी तो कब तक करेगी?

दूसरा एक्साइज ड्यूटी से संबंधित बात की गयी है कि पी० टी० ए० पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी रेट 4.4 रुपये प्रति किलोग्राम लगा दी गयी है। इससे सरकार को तो फायदा हुआ, एक्सचेंजर को फायदा हुआ, इंडस्ट्री को फायदा हुआ लेकिन कज्यूमर को कोई फायदा नहीं हुआ। क्या सरकार इस ड्यूटी के बारे में कोई विचार करेगी यह मेरा दूसरा प्रश्न है।

तीसरा, मंत्री जी ने अपने उत्तर में उस दिन यह बताया था कि डिफिसिट पूरा करने के लिए पैराजाइलीन इम्पोर्ट कर रहे हैं जबकि इम्पोर्ट करने से सरकार को फारेन एक्सचेंज कापी लूज करनी पड़ती है। तो मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या ऐसी कोई पब्लिक सेक्टर यूनियट है जिसका ऐमा कोई प्रोपोजल था कि वह पैराजाइलीन मैनुफैक्चर कर सकत है। क्या सरकार ने उसके उस प्रोपोजल को अमान्य कर दिया था और यदि अमान्य कर दिया था तो उसका क्या कारण था? क्योंकि इससे हमारे देश की फारेन एक्सचेंज प्रभावित हुई है।

मेरा चौथा प्रश्न है कि क्या सरकार उन लोगों के खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही करेगी जिन्होंने फुलर कैपेसिटी के लाइसेंस मिलने के उपरान्त भी उसका यूटिलाइजेशन सही ढंग से नहीं किया और यदि आधिक नीति का उल्लंघन हुआ है जैसे कि आदरणीय साल्वे जी ने बताया तो क्या उस उल्लंघन की जांच करने के लिए सरकार किसी समिति का गठन करने जा रही है?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Mr. Vishvjit Singh. He is not here. Dr. Ratnakar Pandey.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं भ्रमण न करके मूल मुद्दों पर आना चाहता हूं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. चन्द्रेश पी. ठाकुर) : बड़ी कृपा।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : पेरॉक्सलीन देश में बहुत अधिक मात्रा में इस समय उपलब्ध है। जब यह पर्याप्त मात्रा में देश में प्राप्त है, तो इसका आयात क्यों किया जाता है? जो चीज देश में उपलब्ध है, उसका आयात नहीं किया जाना चाहिए, क्योंकि इससे विदेशी मुद्रा की हानि होती है।

यह भी सही है कि पेरॉक्सलीन की कीमत में इंटरनेशनल जगत में गिरावट आई है। मंत्री जी बतलायें कि क्या यह सच है कि नहीं कि इंटरनेशनल जगत में इसकी कीमत में गिरावट आई है?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : You want to promote Reliance.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Do not disturb him. He will get provoked. (Interruptions).

SHRIN. K. P. SALVE : Pandeyji is in favour of swadeshi.

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY : I am not related to any business house like you people are. (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : I cautioned you not to provoke him. You are buying trouble for yourself.

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY : You have taken the name of two businessmen. I am not related to any businessman. I am related to this House. इस देश में पेरॉक्सलीन की सप्लाई किस-किस को आप करते हैं, यह आप साफ बतायें? क्या यह सही है कि यह केवल नस्लीवाडिया को ही सप्लाई किया जाता है? इसका दाम आप नियंत्रित क्यों नहीं करते?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चन्द्रेश पी० ठाकुर) : नस्लीवाडिया है कि कोई दूसरा नाम है? आप कोई गलत नाम तो नहीं कह रहे हैं?

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : बाम्बे डाइंग से संबंधित है। मैं मंत्री जी से पूछ रहा हूँ। मेरी जिज्ञासा है, अगर हमने सत्य नहीं कहा, तो वह उसका सुधार करें। वह विदेशी नागरिक है, लेकिन एक विशेष कम्पनी को, जिसमें उसका मालिकाना हक है, उसको सप्लाई किया जाता है। इसका दाम नियंत्रित करने में सरकार को क्या कठिनाई है?

बहुत सी चीजों के दाम आप नियंत्रित करते हैं, इसका दाम नियंत्रित करने में आपको क्या कठिनाई है। इसकी कीमत एक हजार डालर से चार सौ डालर नीचे आई है तथा और भी नीचे आने की संभावना है।

क्या यह सही है कि यह आपकी नीति है कि विदेशी मुद्रा बचत के लिए आप जो चीज हिन्दुस्तान में बन रही है, उसकी कीमत विदेशों में सस्ती हो जाती है, तो उसकी ड्यूटी बढ़ाते हैं? अनेक वस्तुओं की ड्यूटी आपने बढ़ाई है, परन्तु पेरॉक्सलीन की ड्यूटी आपने क्यों नहीं बढ़ाई?

क्या यह सत्य है कि वित्त मंत्री जी ने लोक सभा को आश्वासन दिया था कि इसकी ड्यूटी बढ़ाई जाएगी? परन्तु आज तक इसकी ड्यूटी नहीं बढ़ाई गई है?

क्या यह सत्य है कि बारह हजार टन इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस पेरॉक्सलीन के लिए आप दे चुके हैं और आगे और भी देने का प्रयास आपकी सरकार का जारी है?

श्री बिहूलभाई मोतीराम पटेल (गुजरात) : तीस हजार टन दिया है।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : इसमें कितनी विदेशी मुद्रा लगेगी, यह मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ। इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस बाम्बे डाइंग को दिए जा रहे हैं। एक ही पार्टी को आप फेवर क्यों कर रहे हैं?

क्या यह सत्य है कि आपकी सरकार के पहले बाम्बे डाइंग यही सामग्री हिन्दुस्तान की कम्पनियों से खरीद रही थी ?

क्या यह सत्य है कि अभी-अभी आई० पी० सी० एल० देशी कम्पनी ने ही पेराक्सलीन खरीदने का ठेका किया है और खरीदा है ?

अगर बाम्बे डाइंग को इम्पोर्टेड पेराक्सलीन की जरूरत है, तो पब्लिक सैक्टर में आई० पी० सी० एल० के जरिए इम्पोर्ट करके विदेशी कीमत पर आप बाम्बे डाइंग को विकवायेंगे, ताकि लाभ सरकार को मिले, बाम्बे डाइंग को न मिले। यह पेराक्सलीन भारत में उपलब्ध है। तो इसके लिए कोई इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस आपको नहीं देना चाहिए।

अंत में मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि इसके पीछे मंत्री महोदय के चरित्र पर इस देश में कोई शंका नहीं कर सकता, क्योंकि यह जवाहरलाल नेहरू के डिप्टी मिनिस्टर रहे हैं और इनका चरित्र साफ-सुथरा रहा है, चाहे वह सदन के नेता के रूप में उधर बैठे या इधर बैठे लेकिन अभी जब वह जमीन सुधार की बात चल रही थी, उस समय मैंने, माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी.....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चन्द्रेश पी० ठाकुर) : इसका जमीन सुधार से संबंध नहीं है।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : तब मैंने सदन से निवेदन किया था.... (व्यवधान)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : Is it connected with paraxylene ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : It is not.

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY : Why are you agitated, Mr. Gopalsamy ? You are a party to the supply.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : Then I will be the happiest person. (Interruptions)

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY : Why are you standing like a *

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : I am not offended because only people who are guilty will get agitated. Should I then tell you how *

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY : I am telling you that you are *

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : My record is an open book. I don't need any certificate from you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : No personal allegations will go on record. (Interruptions)....

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY : I know you are a man of character but why are you *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Allegations by both Shri Gopalsamy and Dr. Ratnakar Pandey will not go on record. (Interruptions)... Nothing will go on record; none of these things will go on record. Let me make this point clear. (Interruptions)....

SHRI N. E. BALARAM (Kerala) : Sir, I am on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : What is your point of order ?

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY : Sir, I am concluding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Let him conclude and then you raise your point of order. .. (Interruptions).... You will get your point of order.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM : Sir, This House is conducted on the basis of certain rules and regulations.

*Not recorded.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : What is the point of order ?

SHRI N. E. BALARAM : I am coming. Why should you ask me to run fast ? I am an old man, I cannot run fast.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Who told you so ? You are such a young man !

SHRI N. E. BALARAM : Is it proper on the part of a Member to accuse another Member in this House as being * It is highly wrong. It should be removed and he should apologize for that. We must have decent debate. *..(Interruptions)...*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : I have heard you, Mr. Balaram. Please take your seat. No such personal allegations should be levelled and any such allegation or charge levelled by one Member or the other will not go on record.

I would suggest, honourable Members, let us accept one thing. *..(Interruptions)...* That will not go on record. Let us accept one thing. *..(Interruptions)...* As Members of Parliament we are on the payroll of only one master, that is, the tax-payer of this country and we owe the responsibility that we should protect the interests of the tax-payer. Nothing other than that should be kept in our mind and, I am sure, no insinuation should go on record.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : Sir, I must correct you. Our only masters are the people of this country, not the tax-payers. It is the people of this country. Every man does not pay taxes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : I respect your seniority, but there is

no need for correction. That is an addition. For votes, voters—for salaries and allowances, tax-payers. Please accept my submission.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि :

अब मैं अंत में जानना चाहता हूँ कि एक विदेशी नागरिक नुस्लीवाडिया को मदद पहुंचाने के लिए हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर वी० पी० सिंह इनवाल्व हैं और इनके प्रधान मंत्री होने के बाद पैरोक्सलीन हो या और कोई चीज हो, उस घराने को, उस बिजनेस हाउस को फायदा पहुंचाने के लिए यथा-शक्य प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है। इस कंपनी को इस रूप में रसायन मंत्रालय से मदद दिलाई जा रही है। मैं मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या प्रधानमंत्री के निर्देश पर उन्होंने यह कार्य किया है, जिससे कि एक खास कंपनी को, जो विदेशी कंपनी है, जिसका मालिक बांबे डाइंग है, उसको फायदा हुआ है और करीब 56 करोड़ रुपये का उसे फायदा हुआ है ? जो वर्तमान प्रधानमंत्री है, वह कारपोरेट्स बार फेयर में एक दूसरे से लड़ने का काम कर रहे हैं और हममें अपना फायदा शामिल कर रहे हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री महोदय से यह भी जानना चाहता कि दीपक सरीन नाम का जो आदमी है, जो आपको और आपके पुत्र को बदनाम कर रहा है और घूम-घूम कर पैरोक्सलीन के संबंध में वाम्बे डाइंग के लोगों से आर्थिक शोषण कर रहा है, हालांकि आपके चरित्र पर किसी को कोई शंका नहीं है, आपके खानदान के चरित्र पर भी नहीं, लेकिन यह दीपक सरीन कौन है और क्या आप इसे जानते हैं ? क्या यह सरकार और इस कंपनी के बीच म दलाल का काम कर रहा है ? क्या यह प्रधानमंत्री घराने को फायदा पहुंचाने का काम कर रहा है और सरकार को विवश कर रहा है पैरोक्सलीन के मामले में ? इस पर आपका क्या वक्तव्य है ? यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। *... (व्यवधान) ...*

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

*Not recorded.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : This is too much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : No, it should not be mentioned. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : He is going beyond reasonable limits. Whatever he said should be expunged. (*Interruptions*)

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN : Sir, a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : You would not have occasion to get agitated if you listen to me.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN : I am not agitated. I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : We will look into the record. If there is anything which should not have been mentioned, if there is any aspersion on a person who is not in a position to defend, it will be expunged.

Mr. Rajni Ranjan Sahu. Not present. Mr. Ish Dutt Yadav.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar) : A point of order, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : What is that?

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : Not on this issue, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : It should be on this issue. What is the point of order?

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : इस पर क्या पाइंट आफ आर्डर होगा ।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : एक बार सुन तो लीजिएगा, फिर रिएक्ट कीजिएगा । सर, पंजाब जल रहा है, वहां दिन पर दिन घटनाएं बढ़ रही हैं । कल रात को गवर्नमेंट ने एक प्रेस-रिलीज दिया, जो कि आज सुबह अखबारों में छपा है कि पंजाब का गवर्नर बदला जा रहा है और पी. के. कौल यहां गवर्नर बनकर जा रहे हैं । अभी तक जो मुझे खबर मिली है, वह यह है कि पी. के. कौल ने सरकार के अनुरोध को ठुकरा दिया है । . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : How is it relevant to this discussion?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Mr. Ahluwalia, what is your point of order? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am on a point of order. The Half-an-Hour Discussion is on Paraxylene.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : सर, यह इम्पॉटेंट इश्यू है, आप मेरी बात तो सुन लीजिए । पंजाब की जनता की आवाज है यह । पंजाब के लोग एक तरफ आतंकवादियों की गोलियों में भून रहे हैं . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

विपक्ष के नेता (श्री पी. शिव शंकर) : वह यह पूछना चाहते हैं कि पैरेक्सीलीन पंजाब में क्यों नहीं बनाई जाती है ?

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : Don't make it light, Sir.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : How do you permit him to raise it? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : Mr. Gopalsamy, I am talking about the people of Punjab. They are suffering. They are being killed.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : There is a procedure.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : There is no law and order in Punjab.

[Shri S. S. Ahluwalia]

What is the reaction of the Government, I want to know. On the one hand they are announcing the name of a new Governor.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Please take your seat.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: On the other hand they say that he has refused to take up this assignment. (Interruptions)

महोदय, मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सच है कि और दूसरी तरफ यह संदेश जाता है कि यह सरकार निर्मल मुखर्जी को पंजाब का गवर्नर नहीं रखना चाहती है, जिससे पंजाब का प्रशासन, पंजाब के आफीसर... (व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Wait a minute. That is not relevant. There is no point of order. (Interruptions) These details will not go on record.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : महोदय, मैं इस सरकार का रिएक्शन जानना चाहता हूँ इस पर । लीडर आफ दि हाउस बैठे हैं । ... (व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Please sit down. None of these noises will go on record.

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : जिस गवर्नर के बार-बार बदले जाने भी चर्चा हो रही है, वह गवर्नर गवर्नमेंट कैसे चला सकेगा ? ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : This Government is not concerned with the situation in Punjab. This Government is not thinking.... (Interruptions)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : The discussion is on price rice. We are deliberating the issue of prices. How is it relevant here?

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Mr. Gopalsamy, try to understand the voice of the community in Punjab.**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): This will not go on record. All of you please sit down. (Interruptions) There is nothing. You please sit down. (Interruption) These things will not go on record. (Interruptions)

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : **

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): This will not go on record.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : **

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: If he wants to raise it, he can raise it after the Short Duration discussion. He should come in a proper manner.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA:**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Mr. Ahluwalia, please sit down. Kindly cool down. (Interruptions) Please sit down. (Interruptions)

डा० अब्दुल अहमद खान (राजस्थान) **

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : **

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चन्द्रशेखरी ठाकुर) इस सदन में हल्ला मचाने से पंजाब की समस्या का समाधान तो नहीं होता है । इसलिए इस बहस में न पड़िए, छोड़िए । ... (व्यवधान)...

Nothing will go on record.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA:**

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He is casting aspersions on the Chair. He must apologise.

**Not recorded.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA:**

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He has cast aspersions on the Chair. How could he come and say so?

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA:**

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, he should apologise. He is casting aspersions on the Chair. He should apologise. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Please sit down.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA:**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Let me perform the role of the Chair.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN: Sir, I am on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): When I am standing, how can you stand? Have patience.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN: After you speak, you please listen to my point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): How can you put your words in my mouth.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN: I know, but you please listen to me also. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): The whole question is do you want to help in bringing order to the House or not? If you want the House should be in order, then let us cooperate with each other. The point is very simple. Ahluwaliaji. Don't make me wrong. There is no question of hurting minority interests as far as I am concerned or any Member of the House is concerned.

**Not recorded.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am very much pained over the reaction. He has cast aspersions on you, on the Chair. *(Interruptions)*. He has cast aspersions on the Chair itself. He should apologise.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): We will look into the record. If he has cast any aspersion on the Chair, it will be expunge ... *(Interruptions)* ... I am sure, Mr. Ahluwalia knows the rules of the game in spite of his enthusiasm, exuberance... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Flouting all the rules and norms... *(Interruptions)*. ... He has cast very serious aspersion on the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): I am the custodian here at the moment. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am very much pained. Should you plead with the member? He should be pulled up ... *(Interruptions)*..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Have you heard me? I simply said, these are not going on record. ... *(Interruptions)*... No Member has the right to cast aspersion on the Chair.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He has cast aspersion just now. He should apologise for what he has said against the Chair... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Please sit down... *(Interruptions)*... As far as I am concerned, I have only one thing in my hand, to expunge from the proceedings if there is any aspersion cast on the Chair. Beyond that I leave it to the good judgement of the Members... *(Interruptions)*... Please sit down.

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur]

Everybody gets agitated and that does not help.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is the cause for that?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): I am the cause because the House is still running... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We abide by your ruling.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): I appreciate that.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: But when a Member has cast aspersions against the Chair, he should apologise for what he has said.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): I am making a request... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: I am raising the voice of the minority community to which I belong... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): These things will not go on record. Let me repeat what I have said. First, if you really mean that the Chair has to be respected, all of us should cooperate with each other because the business of the House starts only when the House is running in order and it ends the moment the disorder starts. Let us accept that reality. This would help each other. Only then the House can work, Chairman, Deputy Chairman or the Vice-Chairman can work. As regards the question of the minority rights and respect, I think nobody here and certainly not the Chair, whosoever is occupying the chair, can accept this kind of a comment that the minority concerns are being neg-

lected. I am sure this is not the intention and if he has said then it is an unfortunate expression and it will be expunged and it must be expunged... (*interrupt-tions*) ... Now the matter is over.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: They are throttling the voice of the minority community.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Now, Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Sir, I committed a slight mistake in the question I asked you. With reference to the long term fiscal policy, I referred to the import of another chemical in which the prices fell by about 40 per cent and the duty was raised. I said, it was EMG. In fact, it is not EMG, it is Mono Ethylene Glycol, M.E.G. in which the duty on fall of the international price by 40 per cent, in pursuance of the same long term fiscal policy was raised from 90 per cent to 150 per cent and why under similar policy, by similar Government, similar Ministry and same Minister, identical treatment is not given so far as import of Paraxylene is concerned.

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, though the debate was short, it was quite illuminating for me. I thank all the Members of the House for participating in this Short Discussion and raising some issues. A few criticisms have been made, a few comments also have been made and a few suggestions also have been made by the hon. Members. It is my endeavour to clarify any doubts or misgivings on the part of the hon. Members. I would like to say one thing that this Government is not interested to favour this party or

that party or any party for that matter. We follow a policy not keeping in view any particular interest. We have an open mind. We are receptive and responsive to any suggestions that are made by the hon. Members on any issue for that matter. I do not claim absolute infallibility to what we do as a Government. Nobody can claim. The Government policies are always amenable for changes, subject to compulsions, subject to suggestions and comments made by various quarters. Having said that, I would like to give a clear picture of the story of Paraxylene which is under discussion now. Paraxylene is the key input for DMT, and PTA. At present as per the licensed capacity of existing plants, there is a gap of 49,000 tonnes per annum of Paraxylene. Paraxylene has been under OGL for a number of years. In 1989-90, the imports have been shifted to canalisation through IPCL. IPCL is under my Ministry. IPCL, as a canalising agency, has imported about 42,000 tonnes during the year. Out of this, about 38,000 tonnes was imported during the earlier Government rule. Only 4,000 tonnes have been imported after the present Government has come to power. In fact, 27,000 tonnes out of 38,000 tonnes imported by IPCL under the then Government had been allowed to Bombay Dyeing. Your Government had allowed 27,000 tonnes to Bombay Dyeing. The earlier Government had already approved the foreign exchange for import of 45,000 tonnes of Paraxylene on a value of Rs. 60 crores equivalent to 40 million US Dollars while the actual imports through IPCL have been less than this, that is only 42,000 tonnes with foreign exchange outgo of 28.4 million Dollars. Over and above the import mentioned, M/s. Bombay Dyeing were also given permission to import another 8,000 tonnes under the import policy provisions. In April 1990, Paraxylene

243 RS—6.

has been shifted from canalisation to Appendix 3-A, that is limited permissible list. Under the present policy, the actual users, M/s. Bombay Dyeing, have been given further permission for import of about 14,500 tonnes. IPCL has also been given permission for import of 1500 tonnes recently. (Interruption). Please wait. As mentioned, M/s. Reliance have set up Paraxylene production facility for captive use. Captive use only. Subsequently, they have been given permission to sell Paraxylene when it is not consumed in PTA plants for operational reasons. The licensed capacity of the PTA plant is one lakh tonnes which has been endorsed on the corresponding Paraxylene capacity of these 67,000 tonnes and which has been endorsed on their licence. For the first time, in mid-1989, M/s. Reliance have made an offer of supply of Paraxylene to the canalising agency for the domestic market. From time to time, they have made varying offer of supply of Paraxylene. In fact, the domestic consumers—there are three DMT manufacturers—have bought Paraxylene from M/s. Reliance in November-December 1989, to the extent of about 8,000 tonnes. IPCL has also agreed for purchase of 1,000 tonnes. As M/s. Reliance are producers of Paraxylene mainly for their PTA plant, their supply at best can be taken as intermittent and not regular. The fair price of Paraxylene has been worked out by the Cost Accounts Branch of the Finance Department around Rs. 18,500 per tonne based on the data of Reliance Industries Limited, while the fair price of Paraxylene as worked out by BICP on certain assumptions as per the IPCL data works out to around Rs. 13,000/- to Rs. 14,000/- per tonne. Landed cost of Paraxylene at present also works out to around Rs. 14,000/- per tonne. This is based on the CIF price range of 400 to 450 U.S. Dollars per tonne and existing import duty of 18 per

[Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy]

cent. This landed cost compares well with BICP's recommended price. That is the point you have raised. The history of Paraxylene supply, demand, production and imports is a legacy from the earlier Government. The present Government is not interested in favouring any party. Issues like price, supply and import should be settled by the business houses on commercial consideration as per the prevailing policies announced by the Government. This Government is interested in enunciating a clear policy to enable them to do so. We do not have any statutory control. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: I have made a specific allegation. On the 5th February. *(Interruption)*

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY: Please do not disturb me. I am not yielding. I am covering many of the points raised by hon. Members. I will reply to you also. *(Interruption)*. Please listen to me first.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Will you refer to the meeting of the 5th February 1990?

SHRI M.S. GURUPADA-SWAMY: Please listen to me first. We do not favour any statutory control over prices of Paraxylene. But it is necessary to work out one single set of selling prices of indigenous paraxylene irrespective of any manufacturer. This would need the BICP to undertake the exercise of reconciling the various things and recommend one single set of fair selling prices of indigenous paraxylene.

I propose to direct—these are my proposals—the BICP to do so within a short time. It would then be necessary to prescribe a tariff structure which, with appropriate import duties, would ensure that the landed prices are near

about the fair selling price of indigenous paraxylene as determined by the BICP.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Do it quickly

SHRI M.S. GURUPADA-SWAMY: This step would ensure that the DMT manufacturers would buy indigenous paraxylene as it would be near about the same price as the imported one since it is available before importing paraxylene. To further ensure that no monopolistic suppliers take advantage of the situation, we will initiate steps to refer to the OGL so that there is pressure on the indigenous manufacturers to supply material at reasonable prices. These steps would free the users and producers of paraxylene from any inference. *(Interruption)*. from the Government and would allow them to operate in the market place within the overall framework.

My friend, Mr. Salve, has raised an issue I am replying to your question, Mr. Salve—that with regard to the import of MEG, the prices have fallen recently from \$ 14,400 to \$ 375. It is very sharp. So, the duty was increased from 90 per cent to 150 per cent. That is correct. I am meeting your point Mr. Salve.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Why did you wait for so long then?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY: Just wait. I am giving you the figures. The fluctuation in case of Paraxylene is from 900 US dollars to 400 US dollars, and the BICP has formulated a price, and fixed the price tentatively—it is not final—and they have said that the landed cost of paraxylene should be almost equal to the price worked out by it on the basis of IPCL Cost. So, when this percentage was fixed in the past by your Government—I am not making any

adverse comment; I am only saying that they fixed it—it was because the landed cost at that time and now should almost be equal to the domestic price.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: That is the rationale?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY: Yes, that is the rationale. Therefore, on that basis, the 180 per cent duty on import of paraxylene will be justifiable. Now, IPCL and Bombay Dyeing have purchased 8,000 tonnes of paraxylene at Rs. 22,000/- per tonne earlier.

At that time, this rate of 5.00 P.M. duty was prevalent. At that time the international price of paraxylene was very low. So to equate it this duty was considered rational. Even now our objective is to see that this duty plus the international price of paraxylene should be equal almost to the price fixed by the BICP. The BICP has fixed a price of Rs. 14,000 per tonne. Reliance is quoting Rs. 22,000 per tonne. So keeping Rs. 14,000 per tonne as the basis, as the landed cost of paraxylene, we have maintained this. We can vary it, we can change it. It is not a duty fixed for ever. And we are only continuing your duty, what you fixed.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Why?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY: Because, the BICP fixed Rs. 14,000 as the price for paraxylene per tonne and with this duty the landed cost of paraxylene will be almost equal to that amount. That is how it has been fixed.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: One thing should be clear. The price to Bombay Dyeing should not be less than what it is to a public sector undertaking. Be fair. We appreciate whatever you said. That is

our grievance, that it should have been done earlier, without the necessity of a debate of this type. The grace is lost because you are doing it after the debate. However, better late than never. (Interruption) I seek your indulgence for half a minute. At whichever price the public sector undertaking is buying, the price to the private sector undertaking should not be less than that. In other words, please so fix your duty that whatever is the price at which a public sector undertaking is forced to buy that is the price at which Bombay Dyeing will buy and so your duty would be adjusted accordingly.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY: That is all right. I am not quarrelling with that..

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: There is no quarrel. That is the end of the matter.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY: I only say that the price quoted by the BICP was based on IPCL information (Interruption) That is why the duty has been maintained. As I said earlier, the Government is very responsive and there is no question of fixity in these things. Our approach is to see that production is not hampered in any manner but at the same time nobody is favoured. Production also should not be hampered; it should go on. We are not interested to go against the norms, against the standards or moral principles that my friend raised. We are interested in maintaining those standards, those norms, in the administration.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: What is the time-frame within which you will do it?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY: I have already suggested

[Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy]

three things: One is the duty structure should be such as to take care of these variations, these differences, between the landed cost of the imported material and the domestic cost of the material. The second is there should be a fair price for indigenous paraxylene produced here. There has got to be a fair price. That has got to be fixed. I would be asking the BICP to fix a fair price so that we can have a rational duty structure...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Nobody should be allowed to make a profit out of it.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: Nobody should be allowed. And moreover, paraxylene is not a luxury thing. Paraxylene, as I said earlier, is a feedstock for raw material for PTA and DMT and it will go along with MEG for production of fabrics. And there are a lot of weavers who depend on it, on this material. There are very many poorer sections of people who are buying these fabrics and the weavers are being benefited. Therefore, it is not a luxury item at all. Let me assure the House, we are trying our best to follow a very enlightened policy...

SHRI V. GOPALASAMY: I put a specific question and the honourable Minister has not at all replied to it. I have been carefully listening to his reply. I raised a specific question: What about the optimum capacity fixed for reliance to produce paraxylene and how do they come forward to supply more than a lakh tonnes? Therefore, I would like to know, from where are they getting a certain amount of Paraxylene? That is the moot question.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN: You say that there are two

prices which have been determined. Both are determined by Government agencies, one by wing of the Ministry of Finance on the basis of the data provided by Reliance; Another is by BCIP on the basis of data provided by the ITCL. Now, both companies may have a vested interest in supplying the figures.....(Interruptions) When two different companies having a vested interest in a project are giving you two different kinds of data, I want to know is how have you decided which one is correct? What parameters have you taken. Both the agencies are Government agencies. And the data is supplied by the two companies who have a vested interest in that. There may be some scientific method of having data on the basis of which you should arrive at the conclusion. I want to know, what is the basis on which you have arrived at the conclusion?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Madam, there are two sets of figures, one by the BICP, and the other a branch of the Finance Department. Their conclusion is on the basis of the material available. That is why one common fair price should be fixed! These contradictions have to be reconciled. That is why I am saying this. This is the state of affairs now. Therefore, I am asking the BCIP that within a short time they should fix... (Interruptions) ...I cannot give the time frame--but as early as possible. Do not ask about the target date.

About this question, Sir, I will just say that it is true that Reliance on record has got 66,000 tonnes capacity plant, and it has a captive plant. I have said already that it is meant for their own PTA. And the PTA plant capacity is 1 lakh tonnes. Paraxylene should be used both to produce one lakh tonnes of PTA. Therefore, they have no supplies. It is a captive plant. For operational reasons they may have a surplus left. There may be a break-down or strike or something like that. There will be no regular supply of Paraxylene. There cannot

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : what have you done about what was pointed out by the PAC?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : It is a captive plant for their own use.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : Kindly bear with me. When the Reliance comes forward to supply more than 50,000 tonnes per year. I am asking the Minister: would you make a probe in to this whether they have again committed another fraud, because one fraud has been committed as pointed out in the PAC Report? This is a specific question. I am very very sorry. This is my basic question. You are evading my question. I am very sorry. Sir.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : I am not evading anything at all. I am only stating a fact. I have said that it is a captive plant meant for their own production. If there is any surplus, then they will sell it. But Reliance cannot offer Paraxylene on a large-scale because they have got a very limited capacity. They have to use it. If there is large-scale surplus, as my hon. friend said, it gives scope for suspicion. Therefore I am not going into that at all. They have got limited capacity for their own purpose. If they have any surplus available with them, they have to sell it and we are prepared to purchase it. The IPCL is prepared to purchase it. I don't think Reliance has got a large capacity. It will be an intermittent supply. Even if a little surplus is available with them, it will be an intermittent and irregular supply. Therefore, our interest is to see that production is not hampered. Anyway we will see that production is carried on as smoothly as possible. As I said earlier, I am not interested in getting caught in the crossway between the two business houses. I am not interested in it at all.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi) in the chair]

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : The Minister has not answered my question. (Interruptions) Only one minute Sir. The honble Minister has not answered my question. What I would like to know is whether the Minister or his Ministry has made a study of the reason for which the Reliance Company was being patronised by the previous Government.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : I would like to tell my hon. friend that the capacity of a plant, any plant for that matter, has to be enquired into or studied or investigated by the G. D. T. D. and not by my Ministry because they control the import of machinery and all that. Just now, I cannot give that information.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra) : I am not interested in the big houses. But I am interested in the public sector. I would like to know from the hon. Minister why they have changed the policy of channelising. It was given to IPCL earlier and now it has been given to private parties under OGL. Now this Government has started privatisation. They have done air taxis. I am seeing that this Government wants to go in for privatisation. I would like to know the reason as to why they are changing the channelising procedure and why you have brought it now under OGL for the private sector.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY : If he had followed my statement, he would have known it. I have already said that for many years Paraxylene and D.M.T. etc. were under OGL. It was brought under channelising procedure only last year.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI) : That is not the way. You are getting up every second.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: Earlier it was under OGL. It was brought under channelising only last year. I do not want to go into the question as to why it was brought under channelising. I do not want to do that. I do not want to question the *bona fides* of the previous Government. They brought it under channelising. They should have kept it under OGL.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: It appears that you want to go in for privatisation.

REG. CERTAIN MATTERS RAISED BY MEMBERS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI): Now Mr. Nitish Kumar, Minister of State for Agriculture, will make the *suo moto* statement.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, Mr. Ahluwalia wants to make a point. Mr. Ahluwalia wants to know who is the Governor of Punjab.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया :
(बिहार) : मैंने अभी सवाल उठाया था कि पंजाब का गवर्नर कौन है । यह मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि आज के अखबार में ... (व्यवधान) ... पंजाब में लॉ एण्ड आर्डर दिन-प्रतिदिन गिरता जा रहा है । मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ कि आज सुबह के अखबारों में छपा है कि पी.के. कौल मुखर्जी की जगह गवर्नर बनकर जा रहे हैं । ... (व्यवधान) ... कौन हैं ?

... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): We came to know through the press that the Governor of Punjab has been changed.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया :
हम जानना चाहते हैं कि पंजाब का गवर्नर कौन है ?

डा. रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश):
पी.के. कौल गवर्नर हो गए हैं ? कौन गवर्नर हैं ?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: The House is in session. The Government is not disclosing any information to the Members. This is a very serious matter. It shows the inefficiency of this Government that we come to know of the change through the press.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: We want to know: Who is the Governor of Punjab.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: We want to know whether the Governor has been appointed or not. The Government should react. I want the Leader of the House to react. Punjab is a Centrally-ruled State. Therefore, we want to know through Parliament. (Interruptions) Who is the Governor of Punjab, Mr. P.K. Kaul or Mr. Nirmal Mukharji? Sir, you direct the Leader of the House to react.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI): I cannot ask anybody to reply.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: If he is not answering, let the Home Minister come and reply.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Sir, price rise should be taken up. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Let the Home Minister come and tell who is the Governor of Punjab.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI): The Government has taken note of it. You cannot force the Government to reply. (Interruptions) No, please, you cannot force the Government to reply. The Chair cannot direct the Government.

(Interruptions)