

Notifications of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue)

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table:

I. A copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue), under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962, along with the Explanatory Memoranda on the Notifications:—

(i) G.S.R. Nos. 669(E) to 671(E) dated the 29th November, 1980.

(ii) G.S.R. No. 1222, dated the 29th November, 1980.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1523/80 or (i) and (ii).]

II. A copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue):—

(i) G.S.R. No. 668(E), dated the 29th November, 1980, along with the Explanatory Memorandum thereon.

(ii) G.S.R. No. 668(E), dated the 29th November, 1980, along with an Explanatory Note thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1524/80 for (i) and (ii).]

Notification of the Ministry of Civil Supplies.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI BRAJMOHAN MOHANTY): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Civil Supplies. Notification G.S.R. No. 635(E), dated the 5th November, 1980, publishing Corrigendum to Notification G.S.R. No. 487(E), dated the 16th August, 1979, [Placed in Library See No. LT-1510/80.]

STATEMENTS OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

SHRI TIRATH RAM AMLA (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, on behalf of Shri Patitpaban Pradhan, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following statements of the Public Accounts Committee:—

(1) Statement showing action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in Chapter I and final replies in respect of Chapter V of 106th Report (Sixth Lok Sabha) on Defence Services.

(2) Statement showing action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in Chapter I of 120th Report (Sixth Lok Sabha) on New Lines and Line capacity works.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Reported delay and difficulty in establishing two fertilizer factories in Maharashtra and Gujarat due to the withdrawal of World Bank aid for the purpose, resulting in the scarcity of fertilizers

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन् महाराष्ट्र तथा गुजरात में दो उर्वरक कारखानों की स्थापना के लिए विश्व बैंक की सहायता के वापस ले लिये जाने के कारण इन कारखानों की स्थापना में जिस विलम्ब तथा कठिनाई के फलस्वरूप उर्वरक की कमी हो रही है, उस के समाचार की ओर मैं पेट्रोलियम, रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्रों का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI P. C. SETHI): Sir, with the discovery of natural and associated gas off the West Coast of India, Government decided to set up four large sized gas based fertilizer plants—each with a capacity of 1350 tonnes per day of ammonia—two at Thal Vaishet in Maharashtra and two at Hazira in Gujarat.

2. The Thal Fertilizer complex is being set up by Rashtriya Chemicals & Fertilizers Ltd., a public sector undertaking wholly owned by the Government of India. Government approved on 28th May, 1979 the setting up of this complex at an estimated cost of Rs. 511.34 crores including a foreign exchange component of Rs. 230 crores. To meet the bulk of the foreign exchange needs of the complex, Government of India negotiated a loan with the World Bank. By the time the negotiations for the loan were finalised, Government had received the report of the Negotiating Committee recommending the selection of M/s. C. F. Braun as consultants for the ammonia plant but had not taken a decision in the matter. The World Bank was kept informed of the recommendation of the Committee. The loan agreement between the World Bank and the Government of India was signed on August 20, 1979, under which the World Bank agreed to provide loan assistance upto \$ 250 million (Rs. 200 crores approximately). When the loan agreement was signed, the selection of the consultant for the ammonia plants had not been finalised. Therefore, the appointment of ammonia consultants has been made a condition precedent for the effectiveness of this loan. The time limit within the loan should become effective has been extended from time to time by the World Bank and is now set at 31st December, 1980.

3. Before the appointment of consultants for the ammonia plants at Thal Vaishet could be finalised, there was a change in the Gov-

ernment in January, 1980. The present Government decided to have a second look at the selection of the consultants and it took some time before Government could take a final decision. Government finally selected in September, 1980. Messrs. Hal-dor Topsoe of Denmark as the consultants for the ammonia plants at Thal Vaishet and Messrs. Pullman Kellogg as consultants for the Hazira Project. The factors which weighed with the Government were the experience of the party in building and operating plants in Indian conditions, provenness of technology in Indian conditions and the terms offered for transfer of technology.

4. The decision of the Government has been communicated to the World Bank. The World Bank has asked for information as to the basis for the selection of M/s. Hal-dor Topsoe as consultants for the ammonia plants at Thal Vaishet. This has been communicated to the Bank and the matter is under correspondence. Therefore, any question of delay in establishing fertilizer plants due to withdrawal of World Bank aid for this purpose does not arise.

5. Meanwhile, RCF and Hal-dor Topsoe have finalised the draft agreement and submitted the same to Government for approval. RCF have also finalised an agreement with M/s. Snamprogetti for the urea plants and submitted it to Government for approval. These agreements are being processed for approval by Government.

6. The Hazira complex is being established by Krishak Bharti Cooperative Limited (KRIBHCO), a new cooperative society sponsored by the Indian Farmers Fertilizer Cooperative Ltd. (IFFCO). This project was approved by Government in December, 1979, at an estimated cost of Rs. 622.9 crores including a foreign exchange component of Rs. 221.8 crores. The World Bank, Japan and UK have shown interest in financing bulk of the foreign exchange requirements of this project and their app-

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

raisaal of the project is in progress. Since the loan is yet to be negotiated with the World Bank, the question of the project being delayed because of the withdrawal of the aid by the World Bank does not arise at all.

7. KRIBHCO is carrying out negotiations with Pullman Kellogg for finalising the contract. KRIBCHO has already finalised a contract with Snamprogetti for the urea plants and submitted the same to Government for approval.

8. According to the present indications, the Thal Vaishet project is expected to be completed by 1984 and the Hazira project by 1985.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन् मंत्री जी ने बड़े चातुर्य के साथ सच्चाई को छिपाने का प्रयास किया है लेकिन सच्चाई इस तरीके से छिप नहीं सकती। 1978 में गवर्नमेंट ने ग्लोबल टैंडर्स इन्वाइट किये। इस मामले को इस परिपेक्ष्य में देखिए कि इस समय हमारे देश को फर्टिलाइजर इंपोर्ट करने पर करीब एक हजार करोड़ रुपया खर्च करना पड़ रहा है और आज जैसी फारेन एक्सचेंज की स्थिति है और जैसी अपने विदेश व्यापार की स्थिति है कि हमारा इंपोर्ट एक्सपोर्ट से ज्यादा ही हो रहा है, उस परिपेक्ष्य में हमारे लिये आवश्यक था कि हम अपने यहां फर्टिलाइजर जितनी जरूरी हो पैदा करें और उसका बाहर से इंपोर्ट बंद करें। 1978 में ग्लोबल टैंडर्स इन्वाइट हुए और उसमें 6, 7 पार्टीज ने टेंडर दिये, दुनिया भर की। उन सब को इक्जामिन करने के लिये गवर्नमेंट ने जितनी फर्टिलाइजर फैक्टरीज देश में है इन्क्लूडिंग इफकों उन सब के एक्सपर्ट्स की एक कमेटी बनायी उस कमेटी ने सर्वसम्मति से ग्रान के नाम को रेकमेंड किया। उस के बाद वह मामला गवर्नमेंट के सेक्रेटरीज की कमेटी के पास गया। उस कमेटी ने भी सर्वसम्मति से ग्रान को रेकमेंड किया और जून, 1979 में एग्रीमेंट साइन हो गया। सरकार ने स्वीकार कर

लिया उन दोनों कमेटीज की रिपोर्ट को और उस में दो, तीन चीजें खास थीं। एक तो जो टेक्नालाजी ग्रान की थी उस में इनर्जी सेविंग का भी सवाल था। जो बिजली की हालत देश में है, बिजली की कमी के कारण हमारी फर्टिलाइजर फैक्टरीजें आधी कैपैसिटी पर भी नहीं चल पाती, उस हालत में इनर्जी सेविंग की टेक्नालाजी बहुत महत्वपूर्ण थी। दूसरी बात यह थी कि इसमें टाइम फैक्टर भी है। जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ था उस के अनुसार थाल का प्रोजेक्ट 37 महीने में कंप्लीट हो जाना था और हजीरा का 41 महीने में, यानी 1982-83 में दोनों प्रोजेक्ट उत्पादन शुरू कर देने और दोनों के उत्पादन शुरू करने से लगभग 5000 टन अमोनिया और लगभग 10 हजार टन यूरिया रोजाना उत्पादित होने लगता। दोनों के उत्पादन से करीब एक हजार करोड़ रुपये की फारेन एक्सचेंज की वचत होती लेकिन सरकार ने किस उद्देश्य से किस इरादे से एग्रीमेंट को ग्रानर न करने का फैसला किया, शायद संठी साहब इसको नहीं बताना चाहते हैं।

इसके साथ ही साथ एक और गम्भीर सवाल हो गया है। इफको ने एग्रीमेंट साइन कर दिया है। एग्रीमेंट साइन करने के लिये उसके बोर्ड का ऐसा रेजलूशन पास हो जाने के बाद ही ऐसा एग्रीमेंट साइन हुआ। गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने भी वर्ल्ड बैंक में एग्रीमेंट साइन कर दिया सब साइन हो जाने के बाद इफको कैसे पीछे जाएगा। बोर्ड आफ डाइरेक्टर्स को किस आधार पर रद्द करेगा और गवर्नमेंट जो एग्रीमेंट कर चुकी है उसको किस आधार पर रद्द करेगी ?

श्रीमन् इसके एक कांफ्लिकेशन और पैदा हुई है। अभी तक हिन्दुस्तान के बड़े प्रोजेक्ट्स को फाइनेंस करने में वर्ल्ड

बैंक का मेजर हाथ रहा है और वर्ल्ड बैंक के लोन में पिछड़े हुए देशों में जिनको की वहा से ऋण मिलता है, हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा बढ़ता आ रहा है। अब चाहे अमरीका की सहायता से हो, चाहे जैसे हो, अब चीन भी उस लिस्ट में आ गया है। पहले चीन वर्ल्ड बैंक से लोन पाने के लिए इंट्राइटल नहीं था। अब चीन भी इंट्राइटल हो गया है और वह हिन्दुस्तान के मेजर शेयर को कम करना चाहता है वर्ल्ड बैंक के लोन में। वह हिन्दुस्तान के कंपिटिशन में आ गया है। दूसरी तरफ यह भी फ़ैक्टर है कि वर्ल्ड बैंक के फाइनेंसिंग को कंट्रीव्यूट करने में यू० एस० ए० का बड़ा हिस्सा रहता है और यू० एस० ए० उसमें टालमटोल भी कर रहा है। यह प्रावलम वर्ल्ड बैंक के सामने है। तो आपने वर्ल्ड बैंक से ऐग्रीमेंट करने के बाद अब क्यों पीछे हटाने का फैसला किया है? वर्ल्ड बैंक कंसल्टेंट्स को इंडिकेट नहीं करता। वह कभी नहीं कहता कि फलों को कंसल्टेंट रखो अपने प्रोजेक्ट के लिए लेकिन वह उनको अप्रूव जरूर करता है मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि अभी यह फाइनेल नहीं हुआ है। जो मुझे सूचना है उसके अनुसार आपने जब कंसल्टेंट को चेन्ज करने की सूचना वर्ल्ड बैंक को दी तो वर्ल्ड बैंक ने आपसे कारण पूछा कि आपने क्यों कंसल्टेंट चेन्ज किया। वर्ल्ड बैंक ने उसके लिए 31 अक्टूबर तक का समय दिया था और आप से कहा कि आप एक्सप्लेन कीजिए। आपने अपना एक्सप्लेनेशन नहीं भेजा और दो महीने का समय और मांगा अगर आपने ईमानदारी के साथ इस मसले पर फैसला किया होता, कोई जैन्पूइन आउड होता कंसल्टेंट चेन्ज करने का तो आपको जवाब भेजने में क्यों देर होती? आप टाइम क्यों मांगते? आप जवाब नहीं भेज रहे हैं और टाइम मांग रहे हैं तो यह इस बात का सबूत है कि आप दूसरे अल्टीरियर रीजन्स से

ऐसा कर रहे हैं और आपने कंसल्टेंट चेन्ज किया है। श्रीमान्, यह खाद के कारखाने किस के बनने हैं जो कि रोजाना बरबाद हो रही हैं, जलाई जा रही हैं, वाम्बे हाई को गैस बरबाद हो रही है। जितनी जल्दी उसका उपयोग हो जाता उतना राष्ट्र के हित में और फायदे में होता। मगर आपने केवल अल्टीरियर रीजन से राष्ट्र के हित को ताक पर रखकर इस मामले में गोलमाल करने का फैसला किया। जैसा मैंने कहा कि सरकार का फैसला हो गया, एग्रीमेंट हो गया उसके बाद जब नई सरकार आई तो उसने कैबिनेट सब-कमेटी बना दी। इसको एकजामिन करने के लिये कैबिनेट सब-कमेटी ने एक्सपर्ट्स की राय नहीं ली और सर्वसम्मत से भी फैसला नहीं किया। अब मेज्योरिटी ने यह फैसला किया कि एग्रीमेंट को रद्द किया जाए और नई कंसल्टेंट्स अप्पॉइंट की जाए।

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप सवाल पूछिए।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं सवाल ही पूछ रहा हूँ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस कम्पनी को आपने सलेक्ट किया है वह इटेलियन-स्वीडिश कम्पनी है। इसमें इटली भी है। वह इटली जहाँ से कि आपने लखनऊ में लगाई गई स्कूटर की मशीनरी इम्पोर्ट की, अब जो बैठी है चल नहीं रही है। इसको इस लाइट में देखें कि सरकारी पार्टी के एक बड़े जिम्मेदार संसद् सदस्य ने क्या कहा है। उन्होंने यह कहा है कि अभी कुछ महीने पहले धीरेन्द्र ब्रह्मचारी जी यूरोप में जाकर विभिन्न कम्पनियों से यह बात कर रहे थे कि यदि वह चाहें कम्पनी चाहे तो भारत सरकार से उनके लिये कोला-बोरशंस आर्डर और परचेज आर्डर दिलवा सकते हैं। इस संसद् सदस्य ने यह बात कही। मैं नाम नहीं लूंगा।

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्यों ।

श्री उपसभापति : क्योंकि विवाद खड़ा हो जाएगा इसमें ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : माननीय कमलनाथ जी ने यह कहा है । तीन-चार महीने पहले धीरेन्द्र ब्रह्मचारी यूरोपियन कंट्रीज के दौरे पर गये थे । उन्होंने वहां लोग से, कम्पनी से यह कहा कि उनकी अप्रोच प्राइम मिनिस्टर हाउस तक है । उसके बल पर उन्होंने वहां प्रभावित करने की कोशिश की कि वह गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया से सौदा तय करा सकते हैं । यह सरकारी पार्टी के जिम्मेदार सदस्य हैं जो कंसलटेस चेज हुई उस कांटेस्ट में आप देखें । वह कम्पनी जो कि ऐसे बड़े कारखानों को बनाने के लिये सबसे अधिक सक्षम है और योग्यता रखती है उसको चेंज करके ऐसी कम्पनी को दिया गया जिसके बारे में एक्सपर्ट्स की ओपिनियन है कि यह कम्पनी हलधर कम्पनी जिसके बड़े कारखाने थाच में और हजिरा में हैं

श्री उपसभापति : यह थाल के लिए है हजिरा के लिये नहीं है ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : ठीक है यह थाल के लिये है । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं धीरेन्द्र ब्रह्मचारी गये थे उन्होंने सौदा पटाय़ा था ।

श्री उपसभापति : धीरेन्द्र ब्रह्मचारी इसमें कहा से आ गये ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : यह मैं नहीं कह रहा हूं यह सरकारी पार्टी में एक जिम्मेदार संसद सदस्य कह रहे हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : सब कुछ कह चुके अब आगे बलिये ।

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी (महाराष्ट्र) : आप बीच में क्यों आते हैं ? झगड़ा उनके बीच का है ... (Interruptions)

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : जहां लूट का माल आता है वहां झगड़ा होता ही है ।

श्री उपसभापति : श्री कुलकर्णी जी, आपको टाइम मिलने वाला है, तब आप बोल लीजिये ।

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: He is casting aspersions, on wrong information. I am correcting him.

श्री उपसभापति : बाद में करेक्ट हो जाएगा ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : आप अन्दरूनी बात जानते होंगे, मैं नहीं जानता हूं । आप उनके नजदीक रहते हैं मैं उनके नजदीक नहीं रहता ।

श्री उपसभापति : आप प्रश्न उठिये

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : इन दोनों कारखानों की कंसलटेन्सी फीस लगभग 45-47 करोड़ रुपये है इसमें एक अच्छी रकम कमीशन में आ सकती है । इसलिए मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जिस नई कम्पनी को, जिसके पास इतना बड़ा कारखाना बनाने का टेक्नीकल नो हाउ भी नहीं है, उसको आपने किस अल्टीरियर रीजन से यह कंट्रैक्ट दिया है ? मेरा दूसरा सवाल यह है कि क्या यह सही है कि अब जो कारखाने 1982-83 में—एक कारखाना सन् 1982 में और दूसरा कारखाना सन् 1983 में—आप बनाने जा रहे थे, उसमें लगभग तीन साल की देर हो जाएगी और तीन साल की देर होने से लगभग तीन हजार करोड़ का फारेन एक्सचेंज का नुकसान होगा ? एक चीज मैं और पूछना चाहता हूं । क्या

यह बात भी सही है कि वर्ल्ड बैंक की जो प्रोजेक्शन है उसमें आपके यह चेन्ज करने से क्या यह असर नहीं होगा कि वर्ल्ड बैंक भी लोन का कौंसल कर देगा, लोन देने में वर्ल्ड बैंक हिचकिचाएगा ! मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उसकी पूर्ति आप कहां से करेंगे, किस दूसरी एजेंसी से करेंगे ?

श्री यो० सी० सठो : माननीय उप-सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य ने अपने बयान में बहुत सारे प्रश्न उठाये हैं और कुछ बिलकुल गलत जानकारी के आधार पर उठाये हैं। उसमें सबसे पहले निवेदन तो मैं यह करना चाहूंगा कि यह बात सही है कि जहां तक रिसीट आफ बिड्स का सवाल है, 31 अगस्त, 1978 को बिड्स मांगे गये थे। लेकिन स्पेशियल कमेटी की रिकमैण्डेशन के पश्चात् उस समय के जो मिनिस्टर आफ स्टेट थे मि० नरसिंह, उन्होंने 9 जुलाई, 1979 को यानी तब तक यह मामला किसी हद तक तय नहीं हुआ था, यह रिमार्क लिखा था कि ये चारों प्लान्ड्स एक ही कम्पनी को देना ठीक नहीं होगा। It would not be wise, he said, to put all the eggs in one basket. These are the remarks of the Minister of State of the previous Government. And, therefore, this matter remained pending. And it was only some time in August, 1979 that Mr. T. A. Pai took over charge...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gujarat): Sir, on a point of order. The hon. Minister has quoted a former Minister of State. It is an established convention in both the Houses that in case any quotation is cited, the document has to be laid on the Table. So I would urge that the file containing this specific remark that it would not be wise to place all the eggs in one basket, quoting Mr. Narsingh, be laid on the Table of the

House. It is an established practice; there is no dispute about it. Either it should not have been quoted. But since it has been quoted, the file should be laid on the Table of the House so that the entire House may see what exactly is the content. He may be quoting entirely out of context. How are we to judge. इस पर मुझे आपकी रूनिंग चाहिए।

SHRI P. C. SETHI: As far as these remarks of Mr. Narsingh are concerned, I have not quoted him exactly. I have only cited what is already known to practically all the Members of this House and also to the hon. Member, Mr. Advani, who was a senior member of the Cabinet. Therefore, I have passed on information which is already with him.

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : उपसभापति जी, मेरा आपसे निवेदन है कि मैंने जो प्वाइंट उठाया है उस पर आप निर्णय कीजिये।

श्री उपसभापति : आप क्या इस पर..

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : आपका कहना है कि मुझे पहले से पता है मैं सरकार का सदस्य था। यह सवाल नहीं है।

श्री उपसभापति : आपने जो कहा है आप ने उसको अब्सट्रेक्ट पढ़ा या आपने कोटेशन पढ़ा, आपने क्या किया यह जानना चाहते हैं।

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I have nothing to read.

श्री उपसभापति : आपने कोटेशन दिया या नहीं दिया ?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: He has quoted. "It would not be wise to put all the eggs in one basket." He has quoted it.

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

यह भाव बताना नहीं है। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं कोट करता हूँ अब वह बदल गये कि मैंने कोट नहीं किया।

SHRI P. C. SETHI: The papers which I have got do not contain any quotation either from Mr. Narsingh or from anybody else. The hon. Member who raised this question has brought in the previous Government so many time that it was necessary for me to give detailed information and the correct information is that the previous Minister of State was of this view.

श्री उपसभ्यपति : जैसा मंत्री जी बता रहे हैं कि उन्होंने कोटेशन नहीं दिया है न उनके सामने कोई कोटेशन है ...

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : आप देख लीजिये कि कोटेशन है कि नहीं और अगर आपको लगे कि उन्होंने कोट किया है तो फिर हमारा, सदन का अधिकार है कि फाइल यहां रखवायें। आप देख लीजिये।

श्री उपसभ्यपति : यह बात ठीक है, कोटेशन है तो ...

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : यह आप देख लीजिये। लेकिन पहले उन्होंने कहा कोटेशन, और बाद में बदल गये जब मैंने इसको प्वाइंट आउट किया। इसलिये मंत्री जी को यह अधिकार नहीं दिया जा सकता है कि जब उन्होंने कोई बात कह दी, कोट कर ली और बाद में जब कोई सदन का सदस्य प्वाइंट आउट करे तब वह कहें कि कोट नहीं कर रहे हैं। Therefore, I leave it to you to call for the file and to examine whether what he has said is a quotation or it is just an observation. If it is a quotation, then my

point is valid. If it is not, then it is naturally up to you. But you must call for the file.

मंत्री जी कह रहे हैं कि यह उन्होंने कोटेशन नहीं दिया और न उनके सामने कोई कोटेशन है। इसलिये प्राइमरी फ़ैसी... (Interruptions)... वह बात मैं मानता हूँ लेकिन आपने जो ... (Interruptions)

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : आससे निवेदन यह कहूंगा कि आप रिकार्ड देख लें मंत्री जी पहले बोल रहे थे तो उसमें वे कोटेशन दे रहे थे।

श्री उपसभ्यपति : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपका कहना है कि मंत्री जी कोटेशन दे रहे थे और मंत्री जी का कहना है कि कोटेशन नहीं दिया। इसलिये मैं इसको देख लूंगा।

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I would again assert that unless I read from any paper or from a file, it is not necessary. I have not quoted the Minister. I have only cited the example giving out the details or facts which are already known to everybody.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर। मंत्री जी ने कहा कि जुलाई में नरसिंह जी का आदेश है। ...

श्री उपसभ्यपति : वह तो ठीक है, तारीख दे सकते हैं।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मंत्री जी यह भी बता दें कि क्या कैबिनेट का फैसला इस पर हुआ था या नहीं हुआ था। कैबिनेट का फैसला होने के बाद किसी स्टेट में स्टार को अपना नोट लिखने का अधिकार नहीं होता। तो कैबिनेट का फैसला हुआ था या नहीं?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I would like to enlighten the hon. Member that when Mr. Narsingh went into this

matter, the Cabinet had not taken a decision.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमान्, मंत्री ने यह नहीं बताया कि कैबिनेट का कोई फैसला हुआ था या नहीं ?

श्री उपसभापति : उन्होंने कह दिया इस बात को ।

SHRI P. C. SETHI: आप सरतिह
दिल रहे हैं

Therefore, as far as the delay in taking a decision regarding these two plants is concerned, it cannot be entirely in our account, i.e., the account of the new Government. As a matter of fact . .

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कैबिनेट ने कोई फैसला किया या नहीं किया और अगर किया तो तो कब किया ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has already said it. The Cabinet decided on that date.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : उसके बाद कैबिनेट का फैसला हुआ या नहीं हुआ ?

श्री उपसभापति : उसके बाद बताया है कि कैबिनेट का फैसला हुआ या नहीं हुआ ।

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I am relating all the facts if the hon. Member would listen to me. I would not like to try to hide anything from him. Therefore, Sir, as far as the question of delay is concerned, the entire quantum of delay which has occurred in this matter cannot be put to our account. What I would like to say is that as far as the previous Government is concerned, the Ministry did appoint two committees. One was the Negotiating Committee and which also formed an evaluation committee of their own officers. Then there was a

Committee of Secretaries. And both these Committees had recommended the Braun which went to the Ministry during Chaudhury Charan Singh's Prime-ministership. And the Government approved as far as the Braun is concerned, may be accepted, and the RCF may be allowed to carry on negotiations. Therefore, when the negotiations were carried out by the RCF, their report was again submitted to the Committee of Secretaries. After receiving which was sometime Secretaries Committee said that the final approval of the draft which was discussed between the RCF and the Braun should be left to the new Government. And, therefore, from that point of view, no decision was taken up to that point of time, and the new Government was seized of the matter in January, 1980. Sir, I would only like to emphasise that...

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: If no decision was taken by the Government, how the World Bank was informed that the Braun has been selected as the consultant?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is quoting the dates...

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: I am putting the question that if the Government of India had not taken a decision, how the World Bank was informed.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, as far as the World Bank is concerned, as Government, at every stage, we were in constant communication with them, whether it is the present Government or the previous Government. And, therefore, when the Secretaries Committee recommended the Braun, the World Bank was informed. Not only that, Sir. Much before the Secretaries Committee approved the Braun, even when out of 12 or 13 parties, six parties were short listed by the Negotiating Committee, even that short-listing of the six parties—these parties were included—was also informed to the World Bank. Therefore, the World

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

Bank was constantly kept informed about the various stages of development that took place. Therefore, Sir, I made this point clear. And I have also made it clear that as far as the Government is concerned, there was no approval earlier than August, 1979. It was only approved later on when the new Ministry was formed under Chaudhury Charan Singhji. But even after that, as I have said earlier, the matter went to the RCF again for negotiation. And when they submitted the report to the Secretaries Committee, the Secretaries Committee did not take a final decision. They did not submit it to the then Government because they said that this matter should be left to the new Ministry and the new Government. And this is how it stands, Sir.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: If what the Minister says is a fact, why has the World Bank enquired about the change of consultants?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I am coming to that Sir, when the new Government came, when I was in charge of this portfolio sometime in February-March, it was thought wise that a new Committee should be appointed and that they should go into the matter. So, a new Committee of experts was appointed. This new Committee went into the whole matter, and the new Committee came to a conclusion that it would be not desirable to take this risk that we should put all the plants to one technology. And, therefore, with a division of opinion, they opined and recommended that for one set of plants, the Braun may be selected, but for the second plant, a new technology or technology should be selected. This matter was referred to the Cabinet Committee. And by that time, the Cabinet Committee was appointed.

It is not again a fact to say that there was difference of opinion in the Cabinet Committee. The hon. Member is going by what has appeared

in the press. And, therefore, I would only like to say, Sir, without saying anything as he has said about us, that he is going either by the press reports or he is carried away by the massive propaganda which is being carried out by the Braun because, Sir,....

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: Press reports.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I am saying that either you are going by the press report or you are carried away by the massive propaganda of the Braun.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: Not of the Braun.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him complete.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Therefore, Sir, as far as this understanding of the hon. Member that the Cabinet Committee was divided on this issue is concerned, this is not a fact. The Cabinet Committee, including the Minister of Petroleum who have been referred to in the press report—saying that there was a difference of opinion, decision.

The Cabinet Committee and the Cabinet Committee decided that we should have two consultants and two technologists instead of one and, therefore to that extent, there was a unanimous opinion.

Then, Sir, we also went further into the question on merits. Sir, I feel that even on the basis of reports and recommendations of any inquiry commission which are appointed by the Government, the Government has the right either to accept or not to accept recommendations of the inquiry commission. Therefore, it is not correct to say that the Government did not go into the matter thoroughly. We went into the matter very thoroughly and we came to the conclusion that not only should we have two consultants, but we also came to the conclusion that we should not accept the Braun technology and we should

accept the Haldor Topsoe and the Pullman Kellogg technology. Now, as far as the Haldor Topsoe and Pullman Kellogg technology is concerned, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Member to this fact that in the last two years in the world bids, which have been taken by the various companies, I think the Haldor Topsoe has gone into about 17 bids and they got all these 17 projects in the various parts of the world and the Pullman Kellogg got about 11 to 13, while the Braun got only one. Therefore, Sir, from this point of view it was not correct to say that the Haldor Topsoe and Pullman Kellogg, which have been selected, have not done this technology, and he has unnecessarily drawn the name of the Italian company. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Member and clarify that the Haldor Topsoe are a Danish company and not an Italian company.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: With 50 per cent Italian shares.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: So what?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh): It means that it is half-Italian.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Why are you so allergic about it? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): I thought that an Indian company never ceases to be an Indian company even if it had 20, 30 or 50 per cent British or American shares.

SHRI PP. C. SETHI: Therefore, it is wrong to say that we have selected some consultants which are not up to the mark.

Sir, I would not like to stop here but go a step further and say that as far as the Braun technology is concerned, it suffered from many deficiencies. Firstly, the Braun technology has reached its plateau and there is no scope for any further technological development. There is no research

and development properly done as far as fertilisers are concerned. Not only that, now the company has been taken over by one of the oil companies and its basic interest lies in oil and not in fertilisers.

Sir, as far as Haldor Topsoe is concerned, they have got the catalyst technology and they have got a very good research and development department and their research and development department is quite competent and they have obtained so many bids from the world market.

Sir, as far as the question of Braun's low energy is concerned, this again suffered from a severe legal lacunae, because the Brauns were not prepared to take any responsibility with regard to the optimum use of this. They only said that if there is any deficiency in what they are claiming to be, then we will have to legally prove that this is because of their negligence. Therefore, to the extent, on that point, there were legal lacunae and their offer was not complete in the sense that it was not backed up by a proper guarantee. Apart from that, there was one basic difficulty in acceptance of Braun and that was that they were not prepared to transfer the technology if they were offered only one plant and, therefore, even with regard to transfer of technology, their offer was not complete because they were prepared to transfer technology only if all the plants went to their favour. Therefore, Braun's offer suffered from so many things and we thought it proper to take that technology which was best suited to our conditions.

Lastly Sir, Braun was not selected because it had no experience of putting up a plant in India. As far as the other parties are concerned, they had the experience of building up plants in India while Braun had none and, therefore, unless their technology is found suitable in the Indian conditions and unless they have got experience of putting up a plant in India, it was considered that it would not be a worthwhile risk to take and from all

Lastly, as far as energy is concerned, when originally Topsoe was taken into consideration by the committee, their 200 series development in the ammonia processing plant was not taken into consideration; only 100 series was taken into consideration and, therefore, now they have come forward with the 200 series which they are going to give to us which is already there in some other parts of the world. We have come to the conclusion that even as far as energy is concerned, they are fairly matching Braun, and if they are not more, they are practically not

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: What about the time factor? When will the projects be completed by the new consultants?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has mentioned this in the statement.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: He has not given.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This has been mentioned in the last para. 1984-85.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: What about the World Bank?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I have said it.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Sir, I am only motivated by the intention that the Thal Vaishet Project or the Hazira project, whatever it is, should go on stream as early as possible. Sir, apart from the various statements which my colleague, Mr. Shahi, has made, and the statements made by the hon. Minister, I would only ask him some questions. Particularly, he has stated about proven technology, experience, transfer of technology and so on. Only on the basis of merits, I would like to draw his attention and I would like to seek some clarifications from him. Sir, I am really surprised at what Mr. Sethi has said, at the outset, about the observations of Mr. Narsingh, the ex-Minister of State. He has quoted him. But it is for you to decide about this, whether quoted or not.

The point is, in July, 1979, the observations of Mr. Narsingh were there. I would only ask Mr. Sethi, if it was in July, 1979, how did the World Bank agree on 28-6-79 to offer a loan of 250 million dollars to the Thal Vaishet Project. This is beyond my imagination. Why should the World Bank be so hasty in offering a loan and the RCF was advised by the Government to go into it. My information goes, previous to this, after the various committees had gone into it, like the Loveraj Kumar, Pothan committees and so on, the Government advised the RCF and the IIFCO to go into this agreement with Braun.

If this is so, how Mr. Narsingh was justified in observing in the file that all eggs should not be put in one basket?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You miss the link. When Mr. Narsingh made a note, the Cabinet had not taken a decision. This was later on.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: You have perhaps not followed me. (*Interruptions*) I would make myself more clear to you.

My question is, how did the Government advise, before July, 1979, RCF and FCO, to negotiate the loan as well as the terms of agreement with Braun? As far as my information goes, the World Bank had already agreed, on 28-6-79 to grant the loan. There should have been some application on which the World Bank would have given the reaction. Only in the air or on the All India Radio, whatever it is, World Bank cannot grant a loan. My question is, what is the discrepancy in these two... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Not C.F. Braun?

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी : आप कृपया करके ठंडा रहिए । So Sir, another aspect of this very question is that the Minister says that as far as his knowledge goes, Braun technology is superior to Haldor Topsoe or Kellogg. (*Interruptions*)

श्री कल्याण राय : आप कैसे जानते हैं ?

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I have visited Haldor Topsoe facilities in Denmark. I am not disclosing anything of the Board meeting or whatever. Of course, I am duty bound not to disclose anything. I am not using a single information provided at the Board meeting. But, on my own, as a cooperator, I have visited Denmark. Particularly, Dr. Topsoe took me to his laboratory and

[Shri Arvind Ganesh Kulkarni]

the facilities, because the Maharashtra Cooperative Fertilizer Society, of which I was a Vice-Chairman, was negotiating with Dr. Topsoe for a plant in Maharashtra on cooperative basis. So, Sir, I know this facility. I know, Dr. Topsoe is an intellectual. But for Mr. Sethi's information—he knows very well, though he may say that he does not know, he is a very clever man, Sir, he is putting his arguments very nicely, and I know that Dr. Topsoe as an intellectual might have earned many laurels in world for Ammonia Catalyst technology—for Mr. Sethi's information, I may, tell that Topsoe technology facility is limited to a selection item of producing the best catalyst, as far as I know, because two years ago I visited him. Sir, Dr. Topsoe has no facilities whatsoever for engineering. The problem in the selection of consultancy is a different problem. It is not a problem of engaging any Nobel laureate to give what you call it new invention; it is not that. Since he has made a point of consultancy of proven merit, Sir, I want to know from him if it is a proven technology. As far as I know, Sir, the Braun technology was 7 per cent efficient other than energy saving. Now, Mr. Sethi says something about second generation or 200 system or whatever it is. Even compared with 200 system or whatever it is, the modification of ammonia production systems offered by Braun are mostly suitable and are most attractive than what Mr. Sethi has explained weaknesses. Now, I want to know specifically from Mr. Sethi, compared with C. F. Braun's original tender and the original quotation given, how much saving is still possible. Sir, to my knowledge, crores of rupees would have been saved if C. F. Braun would have been selected.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : यच्छा !

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Why don't you sit silent, my dear friend? Why do you unnecessarily make a noise? Don't make a noise. This is a technical subject. It is not

political gimmicks what we are discussing here. What I want to know, Sir, is, whether taking this 200 system, the modification of ammonia production system, as offered by Braun, is suitable, more economical. I claim that it is giving 7 per cent more efficiency than... (Time bell rings)

Sir, I have to make three points I am only on one point. Then, Sir, the point is about the information given by the Minister. As far as I know, Montecatini, Italy, had also quoted but they are not short-listed; and that is also a very famous technological firm in the world erecting fertilizers plant. They themselves have purchased a plant of 1700 tonnes from C. F. Braun. And when I had an occasion to know the discussion from another friend then Montecatini as to the reason for purchasing Braun Technology they said that this is a proven technology and once in a life-time any country should be proud of this plant, so that this technology can be repeated, got multiplied, and so on. Now, Sir, the die is cast. I do not want to abuse. What is the use of abusing? Already the die is 1 P.M. cast. The country has lost.

This type of technology should have been brought. Perhaps the Minister knows that the then Government had discussed this matter with the Planning and Engineering Division of the Fertiliser Corporation and Engineers (India) Ltd. when it was decided that foreign technology should be associated with these plants. Then he said that 17 bids were given for Haldor Topsoe. Those bids are only for catalysts. It is not for a complete engineering project of the type envisaged by the Government of India. As far as my information goes, Dr. Haldor Topsoe has up to now completely built and erected as a technical consultant only one plant in Pakistan and nowhere else. I have got deep respect for him. I do not want at all to blame Dr. Topsoe. But this is my information. Toyo has built 34 plants and Kelloggs 7 plants. IFFCO plants at Kalol and Kandla are with

the Kelloggs. Phulpur is also with Kelloggs. This is 50 per cent by Snamprogetti and 50 per cent by Topsoe. Out of that Snamprogetti is an engineering firm while Topsoe is a firm giving chemical catalysts. I want to specifically know what economics are there even with this new system and whether Braun stands high above by gaining a 7 per cent efficiency in the operational costs of the plant.

Then, Sir, about the transfer of technology, the Braun has agreed to transfer technology if you give them four plants. In Europe, America and other developed countries, the shares are always transferred. Dr. Topsoe could not survive; so he sold shares to Snamprogetti. Similarly, Braun could not survive in the present world with the high level of technology; that is why the oil company was brought in because oil companies are now a days very rich and they can undertake Research of sizable magnitude.

I want to make the last two points.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only one point you have covered. This way, the whole time will be taken by you. It is lunch time; so please conclude.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Two officials of the World Bank...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On one point, you have taken ten minutes. It is a Calling Attention.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I am making my last point. For heaven's sake, allow me to make my last point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He was saying that this was his first point and he was going to the second point. This cannot be allowed.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Mr. David Hopper of the World Bank has cast doubts and he has said that they cannot allow this. That is why I am doubtful that the Thal Vaishet project will be delayed.

The hon. Minister says whether Mr. Hopper says or not, they can go without the World Bank loan. I agree with his statement because he is the ultimate master. But Mr. Young, who is Executive Director of the World Bank, has stated that Mr. Haldor Topsoe has no experience in this sort of things and, lastly, he says that in this case, apparently the decision was so foul and irregular that the Bank which ordinarily might have closed its eyes to it could not close its eyes to this and that it is not only fishy but rotten. So I want to know from the Minister in the interest of Thal Vaishet that if the World Bank raises difficulties and doubts what will be the fate of Thal Vaishet and Hajira projects. Particularly now that he has stated very recently that there will be a naphtha-cracker or a gas-cracker plant in Ussar as well as in Gujarat, whether it is also a fact that there gas will be profitably utilised.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, as far as the first question which the hon. Member has raised with regard to the World Bank is concerned, negotiations with the World Bank started somewhere in May, 1979 and therefore there is nothing wrong if the negotiations started much earlier. What he has said with regard to the Minister of State when he gave his opinion like that, is that it is somewhere in July. But the negotiations with the World Bank had started much earlier, and consideration and approval of the Board of the World Bank was obtained in June, 1979. By June, 1979 the Government of India had not taken any decision with regard to selection of the consultants.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Approval was taken.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: It is approval on the basis that the World Bank was giving loan for the project of Thal Vaishet and therefore this loan was negotiated, signed and approved by the World Bank Board of Directors in June, 1979 before the Government of India took any decision in this matter.

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

Then the signing of the loan agreement was also done on 20th August and till such time . . .

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Until then why should not you give the order? Then what type of Minister was he?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is a different matter.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: When the agreement was signed, in July Narsingh says aid should not be put in one basket. I asked you. You cannot give an opinion. Your ex-colleague or predecessor, what type of Minister was he?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You draw the conclusions.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: There is nothing wrong. I do not know how he is confusing the World Bank and the honourable the previous Minister's remarks. As far as the World Bank is concerned, they have agreed to give a loan for the Thal project and not for all the four ammonia projects and therefore the World Bank's loan was signed in August. They started negotiations in May, 1979 but the matter had not been clinched or decided by the then Government by that time.

With regard to the question of engineering, I would like to point out again that the hon. Member's information that Topsoe have not done so many plants is not correct. I would again like to say that in the field of ammonia consultancy, according to the information available, out of 19 ammonia projects around the world . . .

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: It is a catalyst.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: It is not only a catalyst. For ammonia projects, in the last two years Braun was invited only once, Kellogg eleven times and Topsoe sixteen times. Then the hon. Member mentioned about Montecatini going in

for Braun technology. We have no information like that. On the contrary, we have information that the Ferrara plant—15,000 tonnes ammonia per day—of Montecatini was put up by Topsoe and Snam, and, therefore, the hon. Member is perhaps not having correct information.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: My information is correct. They had put one order with Braun for technology purposes.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Are you denying all the information I am passing on to you?

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Why should I?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Then that is all right. Then why say that Topsoe and Snam have not done it and a company like Montecatini which the hon. Member has quoted also has done it?

With regard to the question of engineering, now, Sir, originally Topsoe had offered to go in with Chiyoda and another American company as far as engineering is concerned. Later on they changed over and they have now entered into a contract, as far as the engineering part of the project is concerned, with Snam. Snam have also done so many projects in India and their engineering technology is a proven technology. And, therefore, to say that there will be difficulty is not correct. On the contrary, because they are already running urea plants there, the Government's consideration in choosing this was that there will be a better co-ordination and better decision in the matter. Therefore, we are quite sure that, though the Thal Vaisht plant was unfortunately delayed to some extent on account of the previous Government's delaying it and to some extent here on account of these various considerations due to which a decision had to be delayed, the project will come up. Sir, with regard to the economy, I have already said and I would like to repeat it for the hon. Member's information that, as far as the gas economy is concerned, according to the negotiated contract now which RCF has negotiated with Topsoe

per tonne of ammonia it will be 7.85 mm KCAL while in the case of Braun it comes to about 8.10mm KCAL. Therefore, after the 200 series, as far as the economy in terms of the saving of the gas is concerned, it is not only equivalent but is also competitive, rather, to some extent, less. Therefore, from all points of view..

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT (Uttar Pradesh): Please give these figures again

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, according to the negotiated contract with Topsoe the total gas requirement per tonne of ammonia is 7.85 mm KCAL and in the case of C.F. Braun it comes to 8.06 mm KCAL of the contract negotiated. Therefore, from all points of view, this is going to come up.

As far as the World Bank is concerned, we are still hopeful that the World Bank will not take a position where they will say that they will give the loan only if an American company is given the contract. That would be an unfortunate position not only for us but also for the World Bank even, if in the comity of nations, European and so many Asian countries, who are all partners in the Reserve Bank, the Asian countries are denied the right of selection of consultants based on their own opinion. Therefore, we are still hopeful that no such thing will be done. But, Sir, if at all a situation like that come up, we will stand on our own and carry on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Calling Attention will continue after lunch.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Jute Companies (Nationalisation) Bill, 1980

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha,

signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Jute Companies (Nationalisation) Bill, 1980, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 3th December, 1980."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

श्री उपसभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही दोपहर दो बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirteen minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at four minutes past two of the clock. **Mr. Deputy Chairman** in the Chair.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

The successful completion of the demonstration Sponge Iron Plant Project at Kothagudem in Andhra Pradesh

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister. He will make a statement. Then we will take up the Calling Attention.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND STEEL AND MINES (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, with your permission I would like to make a statement.

I am very happy, Sir, to inform the House that the demonstration sponge iron plant which was being put up by the Government of India at Kothagudem in Andhra Pradesh with the assistance of UNDP/UNIDO has been completed and the results achieved during the trial runs have been highly satisfactory. The capacity of the plant is