

own assessment on the working of this Act and what steps has it suggested for removing the delay, including the filling up of the vacancy of the Chairman?

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, certain recommendations were made by a high-powered committee, popularly known as the Sachar Committee. The recommendations were made in 1978 for amendment to the MRTP Act. Most of the recommendations of the Committee have since been implemented by the Amendment Acts of 1982 and 1984. Sir, the Government is not going to dilute the thrust, the basic genesis of this Act. And in any trade or any business, we will not allow any liberalisation to give any Company any monopoly. And that is the thrust of this Act. And at the moment the Government is not going to dilute this Act.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: What about delay? Eliminate the delays.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Delay means, Sir, the whole thing is in the procedure. You know the bureaucratic delays are there. But we are trying our best not to make any bureaucratic delay.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Sir, there are two very simple clarifications which I would like to seek from the hon. Minister. One is about the necessity to increase our exports and updating the technology if it is outdated. If the MRTP Act comes in the way of export promotion or for moderation of the industry with a view to introducing the new technology, are there any considerations which the Government has in view with a view to see that both these aspects are not being hampered by the MRTP provisions?

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, the MRTP Act does not stand in the way of export at any time.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Sir, I must say it is disappointing to hear the Minister say that they will not consider any changes in the MRTP Act.

Sir, at the moment the MRTP Commission can take cognizance only when the Government refers the case to the Commission. I want to know (a) whether the Government is prepared to amend the Act so that the Commission can *suo moto* take notice where violations are taking place or dangers of monopoly are there, and (b) by which date the Chairman of the Commission would be appointed.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, about the appointment of the Chairman, at the moment, I cannot say the exact date. And I think Swamiji will agree with me, as I have clearly said that the thrust of the MRTP Act should not be diluted at any point of time. That is why, the Government is not going to dilute this.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Sir, that was not my question. What I asked was this. At the moment, the Government has to refer cases to the MRTP Commission. I wanted to know whether the Government would consider empowering the Commission to take notice, *suo moto*, of such violations.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: The commission can take cognizance, *suo moto*. The provision is there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Such a provision is there? Good. Question No. 367.

Concessional import duty benefit to Hindustan Photo Film Manufacturing Company Limited for import of Jumbo rolls

*367. **SHRI PRAVAT KUMAR SAMANTARAY:** Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state how the Hindustan Photo Film Manufacturing Company Limited is enjoying concessional import duty benefit for import of Jumbo Rolls under Notifications No. 252/88 of the 16th September, 1988 and No. 216/88 of the 7th July, 1988, when no specific licence has been issued to it for slitting and confectioning of photo-sensitised material from jumbo rolls?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SMALL SCALE

INDUSTRIES AND AGRO AND RURAL INDUSTRIES IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI SRIKANTA JENA): M/s. Hindustan Photo Films Ltd. (HPF) have been granted an Industrial Licence No. L/20(1) (1)-NU/CH.1/61 dated 22.2.1961 for production of various photo sensitive goods. Concessional rate of customs duty is being availed in terms of Customs Notification No. 216/88-Cus. of 7.7.88 and 252/88-Cus. of 16.9.88.

SHRI PRAVAT KUMAR SAMANTARAY: Sir, my question has not been replied to properly. My question was, how can this company, which is a Government undertaking, without licence, go in for the production of slitting and finishing of photo-sensitised products from jumbo rolls? This has not been replied to.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: They have been given licence for the production of slitting and confectioning of photo-sensitised products. How can a Government company go in for this without being licensed?

SHRI PRAVAT KUMAR SAMANTARAY: My second supplementary is, the Government has invested nearly Rs. 350 crores for transfer of technology through this company. But till date, neither transfer of technology has taken place nor production of this in the domestic market. My question is, why the Government is not encouraging those small-scale units which are possessing technology of their own, in the domestic market?

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, you know about the foreign exchange position. We cannot just open the floodgates for anybody to drain the foreign exchange. That is why, the Government decided to keep it in the public sector only.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I would like to know whether, in view of the widespread and large number of representations given to the Ministry on the

monopoly nature of the HPF, Government would consider delicensing this sector so that small-scale units can also participate?

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: It is not a question of monopoly.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: It is a monopoly

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Apart from the HPF, another company in the public sector, namely, the New India Industries Limited, has been given licence for the integrated manufacture of black and white photographic paper. Licences have also been given to ten private parties for conversion of colour paper and colour film rolls from imported jumbo rolls. Messrs. Garware Plastics and Messrs. Picup have also been given letters of intent for manufacture of polyester-based medical x-ray films, industrial x-ray films, graphic art films, colour paper and colour film rolls. The question of monopoly...

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Have they been given licences after the question was admitted?

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: No. It was given previously.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the HPF, which is a public sector undertaking, is doing all its best. At the same time, some of the big monopoly houses under the guise of small-scale units want to get the same concessions which the HPF is enjoying. In such a case, this public sector undertaking will be ruined. Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister not to consider any such pressure from any quarter, supported by vested interests. My suggestion is that the interests of this public sector undertaking should be protected.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, I fully agree with Shri Gopalswamy. That is why in this sector Government has decided to keep it in HPF only. As I have already said, we will not encourage to open the floodgate for this.