

(ii) Statement (in English and Hindi) giving reasons for not laying simultaneously the Hindi version of the Report mentioned at I above. [Placed in Library. See No. LT— 8084/74 for (i) and (ii)].

II. A copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, (Department of Company Affairs) (Company Law Board) Notification G.S.R. No. 320 (E), dated the 12th July, 1974, publishing the Lube India Limited and Esso Standard Refining Company of India Limited Amalgamation Order, 1974, under sub-section (5) of section 396 of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT— 8082/74]. Railway (Notices and Inquiries into Accidents) Rules, 1973 and Related Papers

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) Notification G.S.R. No. 575, dated the 19th April, 1974, publishing the Railway (Notices of and Inquiries into Accidents) Rules, 1973, together with a statement (in English and Hindi) giving reasons for delay in laying the notification. [Placed in Library. See No. LT— 8129/74].

Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) Notifications

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Finance (Department of the Revenue and Insurance) Notifications G.S.R. Nos. 785 and 786, dated the 27th July, 1974, together with an Explanatory Memorandum thereon [Placed in Library. See No. LT—8115/74].

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Reported move to Abandon India International Trade Fair, 1974

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orisa): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Commerce to the reported decision of the Government to abandon the India International Trade Fair, 1974 which was scheduled to be held in Delhi in November, 1974.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA) : Sir, in pursuance of the successful completion of Asia '72 Government decided to hold Annual Trade Fairs beginning from this year. Accordingly the India International Trade Fair was scheduled to be held from 14th November, 1974 to 13th December, 1974, and encouraging responses were received from international and Indian participants. However, after considerable spade work, there have been economic developments which persuaded Government to reconsider their original decision to hold the Trade Fair this year.

Honourable Members are aware of the determination on the part of Government to contain the forces of inflation. The introduction of the recent Ordinances in this regard, the related monetary and fiscal controls and the steps leading to the presentation of a Supplementary Demand for Grants within 5 months of the presentation of the annual budget need not be elaborated in great detail. It is important, however, to emphasise that in a situation where the priorities of planned investment are undergoing a basic reappraisal, we did not consider it appropriate to incur substantial financial expenditure on the Fair, whose returns would be invisible in the short run, and whose impact on the inflationary pressures would be direct. Keeping all these considerations in mind, and on the basis of consultations with the Ministry of External Affairs and the

Ministry of Finance, I decided that the Trade Fair should be postponed *sine die*. I took this decision because I felt that my Ministry must function in consonance with the basic norms of economy and austerity necessitated by the difficult economic situation through which we are all passing.

Honourable Members may not be aware that the Fair involved participation by 11 Central Ministries, 13 Public Sector Undertakings, 24 Export Promotion Councils and Commodity Boards, 22 State Governments and 50 participants from the private sector. The total net additional expenditure on this account would come to over Rs. 10 crores. To this must be added the expenditure by the foreign participants, because, while this would not involve the resources of the exchequer, its inflationary impact on the economy would nonetheless be felt. Most State Governments have weak budgets, and their participation in a number of cases would have meant additional Central assistance. Besides, the provision in the budget for the Fair is less than the anticipated expenditure which would have meant a supplementary grant for the additional expenditure. The calculation of the rate of returns is uncertain. In fact, the projected revenue can be substantially offset by increased prices during the process of construction. Apart from the financial aspect, the Fair would have consumed considerable quantities of scarce inputs like power, steel, cement etc. Calculations have revealed that the consumption of electricity would have been of the order of 10 M.Ws. per day, and the construction would have involved 12,000 tonnes of cement, and 3,000 tonnes of steel, and so on.

An alternative course of action would have been to hold the Fair in a truncated form. We did not consider it desirable, because, if our effort is to successfully project the wide spectrum of industrial and economic progress

which has taken place in our country since Independence, a truncated Fair would have defeated this purpose. Besides, most people, especially foreigners, would have justifiably felt the holding of such a fullfledged Fair to be anomalous, against the background of the current acute economic hardships of the country. To the people of India, who are undergoing considerable strain on account of the sharp escalation in prices, this anomaly would have been even sharper.

Honourable Members would, therefore, appreciate the totality of considerations which led me to take the unpleasant decision to postpone this Fair. I am conscious of the unintended difficulties our decision would create for a number of foreign and friendly States, who were kind enough to agree to participate in the Fair. I have, however, no doubt that both foreign and Indian participants would understand the spirit which motivated our decision.

Conscious of these resultant difficulties, I have appointed a High-powered Committee under the Chairmanship of Secretary (Export Production and Internal Trade) to take effective steps for minimising their problems and to deal with the consequences and complications arising out of our decision to postpone the Fair.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh)
: How much money has already been sunk?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, I appreciate the stand taken by the hon. Minister in taking the responsibility, the final responsibility, for turning down the proposal to hold the Fair. Whether the decision has been right or wrong, is a different matter but, at least, he is one of those Ministers whom I should give credit for having taken the final responsibility even though he has taken the most unpopular measure and probably a measure which is against the interests of the country.

[Shri Lokanath Misra]

Whosoever has advised him in the matter, has to be looked into. He would not have taken the decision on his own because there would have been experts to advise him and, I am told, the official expert in the matter is the Deputy Secretary, who is in charge of this thing. I have a lot of things to say about him, which I will do later. But, initially I would request the hon. Minister to reply to certain questions so that hon. Members in the House may be informed about them.

Now, what was the total estimate initially for holding the fair and what is the amount of money that has already been spent for the holding of this fair? What was the reason to decide now at this late stage, when the fair is hardly two months ahead, to stop it? What are the countries that have already brought all the way their articles for exhibition in the fair and what would be the compensation that has to be paid to those foreign countries?

Sir, the hon. Minister has been advised to tell Us that there would have been an expenditure of about Rs. 10 crores in all, which would have added to the inflation. I do not know who has, again, wrongly briefed him in the matter. The total expenditure in 1972 was to the tune of Rs. 2 crores. If the money has gone down in its value during these two years to the extent that it would make Rs. 2 crores equal to Rs. 10 crores now, then I have nothing to say. But, if those figures have any basis for 1972, the maximum expenditure that would have been incurred in this fair probably would be to the tune of Rs. 3 crores or so.

Now, Sir, publicity, advertisements and propaganda by the different participating countries in the world have not been stopped on the advice of the Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of Commerce, who has advised the Minister. All other countries, all other projects and institutions are going on with

their publicity in spite of inflation. This particular fair of 1974 would have given tremendous publicity to whatever is being manufactured by India. And, if in that connection some money was to be spent as we spent in 1972, then that would have got its dividends, may not be in one year but may be in the course of two years or three years or spread over a number of years. But, stopping it altogether goes to tarnish the image of the country because the decision has not been taken in time. This would be a great national loss. If the decision was to be taken that there would be no fair at all, that should have been taken in time. I have nothing to complain against that because if the Government wanted, if the Government had a definite mind to stop all kinds of publicity in order to cut down inflation in the country that should have been done at the proper time. Now, foreign countries which came forward to participate in this particular fair would lose faith because they do not know what is going to be the position of the Government of India so far as commerce is concerned, so far as foreign trade is concerned. Countries like Poland are already going to reship their bag and baggage and that would not create a good international market for the productions of India.

Now, Sir, so far as the adviser is concerned, there is ample publicity already. In a section of the press, particularly a national newspaper says: According to notable sources a vital loot has been conducted by an organised group of the Commerce Ministry and the trade fair authority officials and I am told, to carry away the auctioned goods many trucks came to the fair grounds. Under clandestine arrangements made by these officials, government properties were also smuggled out in the same trucks for personal benefit of those officials who are incharge of it. Now, Sir, added to it there are many other reports which might appear to be personal but all the same

they hamper the interest of the country and the Ministry which is headed by our hon. friend. I do not want to go into personal matters but they have to be brought to the notice of the House, howsoever unpayable it might look because, may be our hon. Minister would not be in a position to know the antecedents of the gentleman in whom he has absolute confidence. He himself, the Minister, is very honest and, therefore, he would be looking from the glasses that he wears. So, this might throw some light on what the antecedents of the particular gentleman are. These are all reports sent to me, I have no personal knowledge about them but these are the reports that have been supplied to me.

Sir, I am told about six months back it came to light that seven and a half lakh of rupees were cashed on the false signatures and sanctions of Asia 72 by one Mr. K. S. Luthra, who is probably the Deputy Secretary incharge of the Department. There is another thing. Mr. K. S. Luthra obtained six letters in original written by Pandit Nehru and replies from Rabindranath Tagore from Nehru Museum in 1967 and sold three original letters in America as curios and made lakhs of rupees. The Nehru Museum has been repeatedly asking for these but Mr. Luthra managed to escape saying that these letters were obtained by the former Director of Exhibitions, Mr. B. R. Panikkar or whatever Panikkar, who was not even, alive when the letters were obtained by the gentleman. This is the antecedent of the gentleman who just decided that the fair should not be held. If the hon. Minister has trusted that gentleman and if on his advice mainly the trade fair has been postponed temporarily or permanently then it is a great mistake committed. Finally, I would like to know how many permanent structures are there in the exhibition grounds and what would have been the additional cost incurred for the new constructions by public sector undertakings or the

private enterprises? For the private enterprises I do not think the Government had to bother very much because they would have spent their own money and they needed self-advertisement and publicity very badly in order to have foreign markets, international markets.

So far as the public sector undertakings are concerned, they also need publicity for exporting things and the foreign exchange that they would earn is very much needed for the country. Now, Sir, under such circumstances, what was the special reason. It could not have been the reasons that have been enumerated by the hon. Minister that in the name of economy, he did all this, because if in the name of economy he has to do all that, then the complete life of the country has to be stopped because anything means expenditure. The Ministers going to Calcutta means expenditure and, therefore, he has to stop it, if it means that. There has to be a difference between productive expenditure and non-productive expenditure. The Ministers' tours all over the country are non-productive while expenditure to be incurred on a trade fair would have been productive. It would have brought back much more foreign exchange; it would have brought back much more goodwill in the international market. How was he advised to curtail expenditure which would have brought in much more in return, which would have been definitely productive expenditure while non-productive expenditure to the tune of crores of rupees is going on in this country un-curtailed.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : Sir, I appreciate the sense of disappointment under which my friend Shri Lokanath Misra is raising the question. But I must disabuse his mind — a very dilly mind otherwise — from some misconception at the beginning. One of these misconceptions is — and it is rather strange how his mind, otherwise a very discerning mind, should have

[Prof. D. P. Chattopadhyaya.] such misconceptions — that this decision has been taken at the instance of a Deputy Secretary. He is wrong in the sense that the decision has been taken in consultations with very senior officers not only of my Ministry but also of other connected Ministries whose names I have referred to in the main response, that is. External Affairs and the Finance Ministry and senior-most officers of those Ministries had been taken into confidence. Final decision was taken by me, as I have said, in consultation with the Finance Minister himself. But the decision, I repeat, is entirely mine. So this misconception I would like to remove first.

The second point is, Sir, the estimated expenditure was Rs. 10 crores and, as you know, this expenditure when actually we incur, in the process it goes up and rarely it comes down. So plus/minus it would have been around Rs. 10 crores, probably 10 plus.' Even in a truncated form if we had organised this fair, it would not only have defeated the purpose, but the purpose would have been counter-productive because a truncated fair would have projected a wrong and distorted image of our country, its achievement in the fields of industry, agriculture and technology, and of our national activities in the last 25 years which were scheduled to be organised and exhibited there. So a truncated fair in the name of austerity, which was imperative, would have been counter-productive. Because of that consideration, among others, we decided that it is better not to hold a fair than holding a truncated fair projecting a distorted and, therefore, wrong image of this nation.

He enquired about the actual expenditure. The actual expenditure incurred already is about Rs. 1 crore and 32 or 35 thousand. So by postponing the holding of the fair in time, we have saved some Rs. 8-plus crores and I

think that is very important. Now it is true that if we had effected savings in other spheres as well, as suggested by my friend, it would have been a very good thing but what we have done is not a bad thing.

SHRI SHYAMLAL GUPTA (Bihar) : The hon. Minister has said that about Rs. 10 crores would have been spent on this fair. As Mr. Loka-nath Misra put the question that about Rs. 2 crores were spent in 1972 and permanent structures are there...

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Probably he did not get the point. What I said was that in 1972 fair, only Rs. 2 crores had been spent.

That was the expenditure on the part of the Government. May be the private sector spent something, apart from what the Government spent.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : It was much more. My friend, Mr. George, was there and he is knowledgeable in the matter. He says the expenditure was Rs. 2 crores directly by the Commerce Ministry. This is not the full picture and a partial picture is dangerous and misleading. In holding the fair we did not take into account only the expenditure incurred by the Commerce Ministry. Some other Central Ministries would participate in it. State Governments would participate in it. The Export Promotion Councils will participate in it and also the private sector. Wherefrom is the money to come? Whatever may be the identity of the kitty the result is all the same inflationary.

SHRI SHYAMLAL GUPTA : Now, the hon. Minister has said that it would cost more than Rs. 2 crores, maybe Rs. 3 crores. They had constructed permanent structures in the last 1972 fair. The Government could have made use of them and could have spent less. According to the statement of the Minister more than a crore of rupees

has already been spent and according to newspapers several countries are demanding compensation for abandoning the trade fair. Two or three crores more could have been spent and that would have brought much more by way of exports from this country. Why do we have a trade fair? Why do we participate in a trade fair? It is because the country's image is well projected and we hope that in the future we would get better results. Here holding the fair is pivotal to India for gaining formal membership in international fairs. Abandonment of the fair is likely to jeopardise any hope of membership in the near future. The authorities should have considered this aspect, after having decided to hold this fair. The foreign participants have brought their goods and it is most illegitimate, in my opinion, that the Government, without any rhyme or reason, only for saving a few crores of rupees, according to the Minister, when they are wasting crores of rupees elsewhere, should have abandoned this fair. The image of India has been tarnished by this act of my philosopher friend, the hon. Minister. To be a professor of philosophy is one thing and to be Minister of Commerce is something else. A philosopher is a misfit in the administration. It would have been better if the Minister had taken some businessmen also with him to advise him on the advisability of either scrapping or holding the fair. My question is this. According to him about Rs. 10 crores would have been the expenditure. It is a very arbitrary figure and a high figure. Maybe, cement and steel are always stolen from the Government construction sites. If the country has to pay for the inefficiency of the public sector, including this trade fair, I do not think it desirable for a Minister of the rank of our Commerce Minister to stay in the Ministry. There is no justification for wasting the money of the nation, if he cannot bring to book the miscreants who steal away cement and steel which are so scarce in the country. There is no point in saying

that so much of steel and cement would have been wasted. This could have brought better results; we could have had better prospect of exports. And the abandoning of this Fair will bring a very bad name to our country.

I would like to ask a specific question : What would have been the total expenditure and what would have been the net return realised from the stallholders and through admission tickets that we would have sold? I am doubtful if his figures are correct; they must be wrong. The Minister said that it would have been a crore or two. At the last Fair, the expenditure was only Rs. 3 crores. After realising money from the stall-holders and through admission tickets, he said, it would be ten plus. How could it be so?

Then, are you going to reimburse the money which the foreign participants or the Indian participants have spent? In the interest of the country and to save our face, we should pay back the money that they have spent, to the foreign participants and others. Otherwise, we will have a very bad name in the international world.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : We looked into the estimated income from the Fair. If we would have held the Fair—not in a truncated form—then our estimated receipt, all taken together, would come to Rupees 1,90,00,000; I repeat, Rs. 1,90,00,000. But that certainly does not justify sinking of nearly Rs. 10 crores at this time, and the ten crore figure is not an arbitrary one. It has been looked into, and if the hon. Member...

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : One point. What would have been the expenditure of his Ministry? Those who would have participated, the public sector undertakings, they would have done it on their own basis because they would want a return on their money, and goodwill. What has been the expenditure by his Ministry? Let us know.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : The question is not only of my Ministry. It would have been also substantial. It would be Ministry Rs. 2 crores or something like that. Maybe, a little less. But the point is not that. It is not from which source the money comes but the inflow of money which is not immediately productive that is the main point. And besides, the other Ministries have a view. And an overall view has been taken in consultation with the Finance Ministry and the EA Ministry. And all things being equal, it is understandable. It is the EA Ministry which knows the plus or minus aspect of holding or not holding a particular fair at a particularly critical time of the country. It is the Finance Ministry which is in a better, advantageous position to make an overall assessment of the economic situation, not only looking into the figure the Commerce Ministry is going to spend, but also the other Ministries. And there are several State Governments which have asked us not to hold it. They told us, if you do hold, please be clear, we are not going to participate. What would have happened to the pavilions? You would have seen only islands of light and delight, vacated areas, scattered deserted green areas. There is not only the aesthetic aspect, but there is the commercial aspect also. We looked into the matter closely. We appreciate the sense of disappointment and we share it, and perhaps we feel it much more seriously because we have worked for it; our people have worked for it seriously and sincerely, and we would have been very happy if we could have staged it. But heavier and more serious considerations have to be taken into account. So, Sir, I was saying that the estimated receipts would have been Rs. 1,90,00,000, not more than that.

The question of timing has been raised. My submission is that it is true that if this decision could be taken

earlier, perhaps some money could be saved and some difficulty avoided. But there is the reverse side of the timing. But for this difficult time we would not have taken the decision. It is the difficulty of the time and assessment of the difficulty and its magnitude which has compelled us to take the decision. So time is not only against the decision. Time is also for the decision. So the timing question does not come in the way. Then he will kindly appreciate that because of this time I think it would not be proper from overall point of view of the national difficulty to hold this fair.

The question of compensation, if I may say so, legally speaking, does not arise because holding of the fair at the instance of a national Government and in response to other Governments is not a contractual affair. It is a serious understanding and important affairs. But the question of compensation has not been raised, has not been pressed. As I have said. Sir, we will certainly do our best to minimise the difficulties, financial or otherwise, experienced by the friendly foreign governments who have shipped goods and whose goods are on the high seas. That is why I have set up a high-powered committee headed by the Secretary of the Ministry of Export Promotion and Internal Trade who is in overall charge to look into these difficulties and to take appropriate measures.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : May I know which are the governments..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No, Mr. Kulkarni.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I seek a very simple clarification.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have given your name and you also want to interrupt. That is not fair. Mrs. Chunduv

SHRI SHYAMLAL GUPTA: The Minister has not yet finished.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : I have to add one thing. He asked me the purpose of the fair. I have already said that the purpose of holding the fair is image projection, of course. But, as I said, a truncated image projection is worse than, no projection at all of our trade and commerce. If I may add an unimportant thing, namely, apology. He has linked my alleged inefficiency with my professional affiliation to philosophy. There I would refer him to Plato's Republic when he said that Philosophers should be the ruler and the King. There I am a Platonist. If a lawyer could be a good Minister and if a book trader could be a good politician, then why not a philosopher a Minister of Commerce?

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूंडावत : श्रीमन्, अभी मंत्री महोदय ने इतना लम्बा जवाब दिया उसमें केवल एक पॉइंट के साथ मैं ऐग्री विद करती हूँ कि हमने आर्थिक स्थिति को देखते हुए इसको रोका । लेकिन इसी विचार से आप और आपके दूसरे कुलीग अनप्रोडक्टिविटी को रोकने के लिए और इकानामिक दृष्टि से दूसरे कदम उठाये तो कितना भला हो सकता है । लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि आस्टेरिटी और अनप्रोडक्टिविटी के हिसाब से हमारे मंत्रीगण दूसरे मामलों में रती भर भी नहीं सोचते हैं । मैं अब इस मामले में आती हूँ कि जो वर्ल्ड बाडी है उसके मैम्बर बनने के लिए अगर हम 3 साल बराबर इस फेयर को करते जाते तो हम उसके मैम्बर बन सकते थे । उसकी कड़ी में हमारा यह आखिरी फेयर था । अगर यह हम कर पाते तो हम वर्ल्ड बाडी फेयर के मैम्बर बन जाते । आखिरी होने की वजह से इसको न करके जो दो साल तक हमने परिश्रम किया वह सब निष्फल गया । अभी अभी आपने बताया था कि 2 करोड़ रुपया सड़कों की चौड़ाई पर खर्च किया । उसको खर्च करने की क्या जरूरत थी ? पिछले साल आपकी मिनिस्ट्री ने ही आंकड़े दिये कि 1972 वर्ल्ड फेयर से हमको कितना फायदा हुआ । 3 करोड़ रुपये

की आमदनी हुई और 60 करोड़ रुपये की ट्रेड रिटर्न जैनरेशन हुई । क्या इस तरह से हमको लाभ नहीं मिलता ?

तीसरे मंत्री महोदय का कहना है कि इसमें स्टील और सीमेंट बहुत बड़ी मात्रा में खर्च होगा । मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि सीमेंट को बचाने के लिए अगर आप उसी में यह फेयर लगा देते तो न स्टील का खर्चा करना पड़ता न सीमेंट का खर्चा करना पड़ता । आपने जितने जवाब दिये उनके साथ ऐग्री विद न होते हुए मैं यह मान लूँ कि आपने जो डिजिजन दिया वह ठीक था ? लेकिन फिर भी मैं यह सवाल पूछना चाहती हूँ कि आपकी प्लानिंग क्या है ? मेला शुरू होने वाला है और आप उसको बंद कर दें इसमें ऐसी कौनसी स्थिति पैदा हो गई थी । इसमें बाहर के बहुत से मुल्क भाग ले रहे हैं, करोड़ों रुपया खर्च किया गया तो ऐन वक्त पर इसको बंद करने की अभी आपकी कौनसी प्लानिंग है ? क्या आपको आर्थिक स्थिति पहले दिखाई नहीं दी । हम साल भर से देख रहे हैं हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति लड़खड़ा रही है । गवर्नमेंट ऐसे कदम नहीं उठा रही है जिससे हम अपनी स्थिति को सुधार सकें । आप जैसे प्रोफेसर को तो एक साल पहले दिख जाना चाहिए था कि यह हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति होगी और हमें इसको बंद कर देना चाहिए । हमारे मुल्क की इमेज बाहर खराब न होती । हमारी इमेज को धक्का न लगता अगर इस प्रकार की घोषणा 6 महीने से पहले हो गई होती । ट्रेड के मामले में जब एक बार धक्का लग जाता है तो वर्षों तक संभाल नहीं सकते । मेरा कहना यह है कि एक साल पहले या 6 महीने पहले आपने डिजिजन क्यों नहीं लिया, इन वक्त पर क्यों लिया । आपका कहना है कि वक्त कम था तो आपकी इतनी बड़ी मिनिस्ट्री अफसरों की इतनी बड़ी शिगेड क्या करती रही ? आपने पहले डिजिजन क्यों नहीं लिया, आपने इन ढंग में प्लानिंग क्यों नहीं बनाई ?

D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : Sir, to lake the last question first, I have already said that the argument

[Prof. D. P. Chattopadhyaya.] of timing has another aspect. The hon. Member has raised the question why we did not decide it earlier. I have already answered this question by saying that it is because of the cumulative effect of the difficulties of the last one year that we have come to this decision. And before we take a decision of such a magnitude, to whose importance, she herself has referred, we have to take into account the views of the External Affairs Ministry who know what will be the impact in foreign countries. We have to take into account the views of the Finance Ministry who take an overall view of the national economy from different standpoints. So the difficulty was there for quite some time. But this time is a very critical time, and the difficulty has come to such a pass that in these last few weeks, the Government has taken such extraordinary decisions and measures. So it is in the context of this cumulative effect of the hardship of the last one year or so that we have been taking certain very serious decisions. Whenever you take such important decisions, there are plus points and there are minus points. I have already submitted that there will be some difficulties. But the only question is whether by holding it, the difficulty would have been minimised or increased. Our considered opinion is that, taking the plus and minus points together and weighing them, by not holding it perhaps we are helping the country in a limited context.

श्री ओइम् प्रकाश त्यागी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे मंत्री महोदय के उत्तर से एक प्रकार से निराशा हुई। उन्होंने देश की प्रतिष्ठा को धन में आंकने की चेष्टा की है। मैं समझता हूँ कि किसी भी देश की प्रतिष्ठा को धन में नहीं आंका जा सकता। आपने इस मेले को स्थगित करके जो देश की प्रतिष्ठा को संसार में हानि पहुंचाई है उसका मूल्यांकन नहीं किया जा सकता। दूसरे, आपने 10 करोड़ की बात

कही है मैं समझता हूँ करोड़ों तो क्या अरबों में भी नहीं आंकी जा सकती। जो आपने 10 करोड़ की बात कही है इस बारे में मैं पेपर से एक कोटेशन कोट करना चाहूंगा :

"Rs. 8 crores investment in developing the Asia 1972 Fair ground was expected to be balanced by the Fair earnings up to the end of this decade. The year 1972 itself netted, in pavilion rents alone, apart from the Rs. 60 crores trade returns it generated . . ."

तो मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा—और अभी बहिन ने जो पूछा इसका जवाब आपने इवेड किया है—कि सन् 1972 के मेले में 60 करोड़ के व्यापार में से आपको प्राप्ति हुई और अगर इस तरह के निर्यात की आशा थी तो इसका अनुमान आपने स्थगन करते हुए क्यों नहीं लिया ?

दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ, जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है आपने यहाँ कहा है कि यह निर्णय मैंने लिया है परन्तु मेरी जानकारी यहाँ तक है कि आपका मंत्रालय और आप इस बात को चाहते थे कि यह फेयर, यह मेला, विश्व मेला, लगे। लेकिन वित्त-मंत्रालय इस बात के पक्ष में नहीं था कि यह मेला लगे और आप लोगों का इस तरह से आपस में मतभेद रहा। आज के समाचार पत्र में इस प्रकार का उल्लेख है कि आपके आफिशल्स समेत जो वहाँ 400 आदमी वहाँ काम कर रहे हैं उनको यह अचानक एक बाम्ब शेल जैसा मालूम पड़ा कि यकायक इस प्रकार का निर्णय कैसे ले लिया ? इसके मानी यह है कि आपने मिनिस्ट्री को भी कॉन्फिडेंस में नहीं लिया और अपने एक्सपर्ट्स की भी आपने सलाह नहीं ली है। तो इसका आप स्पष्टीकरण अपने जवाब में करें।

तीसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इतना ही नहीं है, आपने अपने पैविलियन के बनाने में खर्चा किया है, डेढ़-दो करोड़ 80 जितना भी लगा है वह तो लगा ही है, लेकिन

विदेशियों ने जो यहां पर मेले में भाग लेने के लिए व्यर्थ में ही उन्होंने अपने पैवीलियन बनाने के लिए निर्माण कार्य के लिए ठेके दिए हैं और मेरी यह जानकारी है उपसभापति महोदय, कि बहुत से आर्किटेक्ट्स इस मेले की तैयारी के लिए काम कर रहे थे फर्म्स की पेमेन्ट पर, यानी यहां तक कि जो सैलेरीड आदमी थे, बेतनभोगी, अपने यहां से त्यागपत्र दे दे कर उन्होंने ठेके लिए हुए हैं और जैसे जैसे उनका काम बढ़ गया उनके पास पैसा नहीं आया है और आर्किटेक्ट्स ने मुझे बताया कि हमारा क्या बनेगा, हमारा पैसा मिलेगा या नहीं मिलेगा ?

श्री राजनारयण : खर्च क्या मिलेगा ? सारा देश मर रहा है। आपको मेले की पड़ी है।

श्री ओइम् प्रकाश त्यागी : उन बेचारे गरीब आदमियों का जो कि आपके डिजीजन् के कारण कहीं के नहीं रहेंगे, जिनका जीवन ही बर्बाद कर दिया आपने, उनका क्या होगा ?

अगली बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि उन विदेशियों के जिनके पैवीलियन्स लगभग तैयार हो चुके हैं, उनका खर्चा यहां पर मालूम नहीं कितना हुआ होगा, अनुमानतः बहुतां का सामान भी आ गया होगा या समुद्र के रास्ते से आ रहा हो, तो उनको आप हर्जाना कितना दोगे ? *[(Time bell rings)]* अपनी जानकारी के लिए पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या आपने यह अनुमान लगाया है कि उनको हर्जाने के रूप में कितना देना पड़ेगा ?

इसके आगे भी एक बात मैं जानना चाहता हूं, खास तौर से अभी बहिन जी ने भी पूछा था, क्या इस तरह का नियम है कि अगर एक देश 3 वर्ल्ड फेयर्स, विश्व मेले, आयोजित करे तो वह वर्ल्ड फेयर का सदस्य बन जाता है। उन्होंने सन् 1972 के मेले को 2 मेलों के रूप में स्वीकार कर लिया और यदि आप यह तीसरा मेला भी यहां कर लेते तो आप उसकी सदस्यता प्राप्त कर सकते थे लेकिन

आपने उस अवसर को भी अपने हाथ से खोया है। क्या इससे कोई हानि हुई है या नहीं ?

एक बात मैं विशेष रूप से जानना चाहता हूं। क्या इस मेले के स्थगन होने से आपके व्यापार पर, विदेश व्यापार पर, इसका कुप्रभाव पड़ेगा या नहीं ? आपके मित्र देश तक भी भारतवर्ष का विश्वास नहीं करेंगे और आपके विदेश व्यापार पर इसका कुप्रभाव पड़ेगा ?

श्री ओइम् प्रकाश त्यागी : पहले हमारी प्रतिष्ठा का सवाल है। आप फिलासाफर हैं, पहले इसका जवाब दीजिए।

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : Sir, I appreciate the disappointment or rather the resentment expressed by the honourable Member. But I do not share his pessimism that the deferring of this expensive Fair business in the backdrop of the acute economic crisis will be much more resented by the other countries. I think they will appreciate our difficulties.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : The second point is about the goods. The goods which have been shipped could be disposed of because there are rules and regulations in terms of which the exhibits they bring in for this Fair can be disposed of as if the Fair itself has been held. About the question of image-budding, I have already responded to other honourable Members and I do not like to add to what I have already said.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : I say

श्री ओइम् प्रकाश त्यागी : इमेज के लिए मैंने नहीं कहा, प्रतिष्ठा के लिए मैंने कहा था।

that the standing of India as a trading nation does not entirely depend upon holding or not holding a fair, particularly in the context of the economic situation. I think he is right

[Prof. D. P. Chattopadhyaya.] when he says that by not holding this fair, we will be slightly at a disadvantage in getting the membership of the world body. I have already submitted that whenever we take decisions of this magnitude, there are some plus points and minus points to be considered. I do not deny there are some difficulties. We have to put up with these difficulties. The other aspects are even more serious.

श्री ओइम् प्रकाश त्यागी : उप-सभापति जी, मेरे विशेष प्वाइन्ट का जवाब नहीं दिया गया है। उन्होंने कहा था कि 72 के मेले में 10 करोड़ रुपये का लाभ हुआ, लेकिन उनको 60 करोड़ रुपये का लाभ हुआ। इस प्वाइन्ट को वे एम्बाइड कर रहे हैं। पिछले मेले में तो उनको 60-70 करोड़ रुपये का लाभ हुआ था और इस मेले में उनको 120 करोड़ रुपये का लाभ होने जा रहा था। इस चीज का आपके पास क्या जवाब है ?

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : The figures are not correct. As I have said immediate money we have to spend, but the term will be short-term and there too the figure he is indicating is not correct.

SHRI J. S. ANAND: First of all I want to submit that it is obvious from the press reports that this decision was taken in a huff, in two or three minutes, without proper deliberations. And the proof is that neither the Commerce Secretary was there when the decision was taken, nor the Chief Executive Director of the Fair was there. The decision was taken by some top officials of the Finance Ministry. This is not the first time that such decisions are left to the top bureaucrats. It is already well known that the decision for the DA freeze was also taken in a manner that two Ministers of the Government openly differed publicly about the nature of the decision. This is causing

some anxiety. The way decisions are taken by the top bureaucrats is really causing us some anxiety.

Secondly, why is it being called postponement when really it is abandonment? Why not call it by a proper name? The proof of this abandonment is that those employees who were there since 1972, their services have been terminated suddenly. According to the papers, they have no future. Why not call it by a proper name?

The hon. Minister said that our image has not been entirely damaged. What does he mean by 'entirely'? Then he said that there is a sense of disappointment because an occasion for the image projection has been lost. I want to submit humbly that it is not merely image projection. It is not for that trade fairs are held. There is no sense of disappointment because it is not a tamasha. This is an occasion when we get a lot of business from other countries and this is an occasion when we can show to other countries how our country has technically, scientifically and industrially advanced in various fields. We book orders not only for the current year, but we book orders even for future.

Then repeated references are made to our economic situation. I think this is the worst possible way of advertising our economic difficulties or, I would say, economic crisis. This way we are also lowering our economic credibility internationally by taking decisions in such a huff. Then it was said that it is wrong that the countries which have already sent their goods here are demanding some compensation. We have only newspaper reports to go by. It is not merely money compensation. Does it not impinge upon mutual relations, mutual trust and goodwill? Can that be measured in terms of compensation? Another thing I want to say is that the Government has been rightly concentrating upon export promotion because

of our balance of payment position. A very good opportunity for export promotion has been lost. We spend lot of foreign exchange and even allow private parties to go abroad in order to get orders for their goods.

All these factors should have been kept in view and I strongly feel that, on balance, it was a very wrong decision by the Government and it is going to cause damage to our country very much.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYA-
YA : Sir, first of all, I would like to state strongly that the report of taking a decision only at a junior level and in a huff is absolutely baseless and incorrect. The decision has been taken after due consultations spread over a few days and several meetings took place and I myself had several meetings. So, it is not correct even to suggest that there was any difference of opinion between the different Ministries. Actually, as I said earlier, the decision is mine. But the views of the other Ministries have been ascertained and in regard to these views, one Ministry is not expected to be the rubber stamp or the mirror reflection of another Ministry. They have their own assessments. But, Sir, the decision is, after all, collective and I own up the responsibility for taking this decision. Sir, you have appreciated the fact that if the decision is taken at the level of the Deputy Secretary, then it is said that it is a lower-level decision and that is incorrect. As I said, it was not taken at that level. I had myself a talk with the Finance Minister and also with the Commerce Secretary, the Finance Secretary and the External Affairs Ministry Secretary and the Chief Economic Adviser to the Government of India and there were these and other senior people in the several meetings that took place. So, it was not taken at a junior level and the alleged differences between the different Ministries are exaggerated

and dramatised. There are different assessments. But the decision is collective and unanimous and I have said that the ultimate decision has been taken by me.

Sir, he has mentioned about the question of compensation. As I have already said and explained also, the question, the legal question, of compensation does not arise. But we are not taking a legalistic view. But the real difficulties of the participant-countries will be taken note of and we will see that their exhibits are disposed of as we did the last time also.

Then, Sir, exports can certainly be promoted through exhibition. But it is not the only channel of export promotion. We have been promoting exports and our exports have not done very badly last year nor are they going to be very bad this year.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI
(Maharashtra) : Sir, I am one of those who think that the Government has come (o a right decision in not holding this Fair. The only point on which I differ is that the Government did not come before this House with the announcement that they are not going to hold this Fair. But it was through the efforts of an enterprising correspondent of the "Indian Express" that we came to know of it on the 31st July or so and also from other newspapers. It would have been better and it would have been in the fitness of things if the Government had announced the decision on the 31st July itself or whenever the decision was taken so that the Members could have been in touch with the thinking of the Government earlier.

Then, Sir, I would like to know how many countries started building their pavilions here and how many countries have completed their pavilions.

Then, Sir, I would like to know whether there is any intention on the

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai] 1 part of the Government of India to treat, in the case of the materials which have been moved by ships by the foreigners, as if import licences were given to them, so that they can dispose of them in this country. This was done in the past and there is nothing wrong in doing like that. The Government has done that earlier. The only point is that in the past this was allowed after the exhibition and now they will have to allow after they have landed here because the Fair is not going to be held.

Then, Sir, so many friends have said many things about the image and other things. I also personally feel that there may be some misunderstanding and there may be some heart burning also and we may be misunderstood by all those countries who were to participate in this. But there is a remedy always for this.

Our trade representatives in other countries, our Ambassadors in other countries, must go and explain to the concerned Governments that due to the abnormal times in this country, we had to take this decision. I am sure the hon. Minister will use his good offices with the External Affairs Minister and also with his own Trade Commissioners and others to see that our prestige does not suffer due to this decision. On the whole, I congratulate the Government for having taken, though late, the correct decision in the interest of the country and thus spare a lot of power, cement, iron and steel bars and other things and also a lot of inconvenience to others.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Member for kindly and fully appreciating the considerations and the causes leading to this decision. It is true that our enterprising press friends have brought this thing to the notice of

the public before I had the opportunity to come before the House. As you know yourself, our press friends are very enterprising and there is nothing wrong about* that. In a free society, if the press people tell us about something in advance, it is nothing wrong. And they have not said anything very bad either. But I would say that the first opportunity that I got of coming before the House was when I was shown the Calling Attention notice. I said "Please admit it. I have no objection because this is the first opportunity I get to take my friends into confidence and lay my cards before them." And I do not think my cards are very bad either.

श्री ओइम् प्रकाश त्यागी : लेकिन आप ने आफिशियली तो आज तक एनाउन्स नहीं किया ।

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : The point is, he will kindly appreciate that it is more or less in the category of what we call administrative decisions. But since it has been of interest to the Members of the House, at the first opportunity that I got, I have come before the House and told then everything. Regarding the question whether it has been deferred or postponed, Sir, I cannot improve upon parliamentary procedure. At the end of every session, you say "The House stands adjourned *sine die*." Therefore, the Fair is postponed *sine die*.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have not asked at all this question about postponement, etc. My most important question was, how many foreigners have started building here and my last question was whether the hon. Minister would use the good offices of the External Affairs Minister and the Trade Commissioners to explain the position to all those who were going to take part in the Fair so that there may not be any misunderstanding about India.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA: I am very thankful to him for again drawing my attention to the important points. Some of the foreign participants have completed their construction. Perhaps Poland is one of them. There are some other countries which have partially completed their construction. I cannot give the details just now, but if he is interested, I will let him know later on. But I am entirely one with him that the circumstances leading to this decision should be suitably and appropriately conveyed through our embassies and commercial staff abroad to the concerned Governments. But one thing that I would like to state in response to the point made by him, is that we had estimated that if he held the Fair, then we would have had to spend some 3,000 tonnes of steel, 12,000 tonnes of cement and 90 lakhs of bricks. But now we have spent only 850 tonnes of steel. The balance is saved. Out of 12,000 tonnes of cement, we have spent only 1,500 tonnes. In regard to bricks, we have not spent even one-third. So we have some saving on this account also. 1 P.M.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN (Kerala) : The honourable Minister's reply indicated that one of the compulsions of taking this decision is to combat inflationary pressures. I wonder whether this was not the advice given by the Ministry of Finance who just started cutting even productive investment, in the States. I would like to know whether the Ministry of Commerce had made any evaluation of the costs and returns of this Fair at the time of the original decision, whether the inflationary pressures in the last few months are so serious as to completely overshadow the entire, net returns on this project. I raise this because according to the press statement—I quote from the Indian Express of 1st August 1974—"The now cancelled INDFAIR would have been a third big fair in a row and

would have virtually clinched India's membership. . ." This was in reference to the International Fair. This report also talks about the credibility of the Government of India's claims of export promotion and so on. It says, "While the Government claims that we have been able to increase exports to a certain extent, thanks of course mainly to inflation abroad and partly may be due to our effort. . ." and so on. Nevertheless, at least it appears to me, this decision has come just at a crucial time, just because the Ministry of External Affairs and the Ministry of Finance recommended it. I would like to know specifically whether it is true that certain senior officers of the Ministry of Commerce were opposed to this move and the decision of the Minister. When the Minister repeatedly told the Rajya Sabha today that it is his business, does it imply that he overruled the advice of the senior officials and took it upon himself to take this decision just because some people in the Ministry of Finance suggested this? There is also an open press report that certain senior officials were opposed to this decision of the Minister. I would like to know whether it is true. In any case, the manner in which the decision was taken looks as if there was something fishy somewhere. In any case, so far as cement and steel at the Fair site are concerned, they are vanishing. While the Minister talks about the so-called savings on these items, a lot of cement and steel have already vanished. This is according to a very reliable information given to us. Therefore, there is something fishy about the whole arrangement, about the decision to conduct it, the publicity given to it, foreign Governments starting construction involving investment, and then this decision lastly in the name of combating inflation, and the vanishing of cement and steel. From all this it appears that there is something fishy about the whole arrangement. It seems to me that the whole thing is

[Dr. K. Mathew Kurian] an afterthought and the reasons advanced by the Minister are a kind of textbook reasons which do not convince anyone. I would, therefore, request the honourable Minister to tell us whether he would look into all these aspects of the problem. Since he has already taken a decision, naturally it is a *fait accompli*. But the manner in which the whole decision was reversed will adversely affect the credibility of the country, particularly in terms of export publicity and export effort. And I would like the honourable Minister to tell us whether it is not a fact that investment on publicity, particularly export publicity, is a productive investment. I am told that increasing production is a method by which the Government of India wants to combat inflation. If that be so, is this productive investment or not? If that is so, how could this be a method of combating inflation?

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : I understand the honourable economist Member's interest in the cost benefit formulations of the problem. I have already said that I cannot give it in a sophisticated form he is interested in, but I gave it in a lay man's form. I have already said that immediately we have to spend nearly Rs. 10 crores, but immediately we could not reasonably expect to get more than Rs. 1 crore and 90 lakhs. So it is a crude cost benefit analysis figure. I say 'crude' because invisible returns spread over longer years might be there, but they could not be quantified. So he will appreciate that we did not take the decision without looking into this cost benefit aspect. Yes. Trade Fair is a productive investment. But production, as the learned economist Member knows, may be of immediate significance or may be of long-term significance. Trade Fair is a sort of productive investment which does not yield re-

sults immediately. So, when there is an inflationary situation, does he advise me that we should invest or sink a disproportionate amount above all calculations? We have seen that this is not a warranted investment because its productive significance will not be immediately perceived.

Sir, I do not share that our credibility because of not holding this Fair has gone down before other countries. The credibility of our industry and trade has been established in terms of our performance. I think, our export figures do not indicate that we have fared very bad. The third point is and I have repeatedly said that it is not true that I had to over-rule my officers or I had to take a decision *suo motu* without consulting anybody. The decision is a collective one. But the responsibility in the final analysis is mine.

श्री रवी राय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने जिस प्रकार से उत्तर दिया उससे भारत सरकार का आर्थिक मसलों पर जो दिवालियापन है वह सामने आ गया है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि किस दिन चट्टोपाध्याय जी के मंत्रालय ने तय किया कि विश्व मेला बंद करना है। मंत्री महोदय को कब महसूस हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तान का आर्थिक जीवन इनफ्लेशनरी हुआ? मंत्री महोदय वधाई के पात्र तभी होते जब वे शुरू में फैसला ले लेते। अगर वे शुरू में फैसला ले लिए होते तो जो इतना बड़ा खर्च हुआ है वह न हुआ होता। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि 1972 का जो मेला हुआ था उसमें क्या सिर्फ कामर्स मिनिस्ट्री ने फैसला लिया था क्या 'उन्हीं' की रिसपोन्सिबिलिटी थी या अन्य मंत्रालयों के साथ भी सलाह-मशविरा किया गया था? आपने अभी कहा कि इस मेले के लिए आपने खुद फैसला लिया था और सारी जिम्मेदारी आप ही के ऊपर है तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब विश्व मेला करने का फैसला हुआ था उस वक्त आपका अकेला का फैसला था या दूसरे मंत्रालय भी इसमें शरीक थे?

तीसरे मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि कितने दुनिया के देश बायदा कर चुके थे कि वे हिस्सा लेने वाले हैं ? और जो हिस्सा लेने के लिए बायदा कर चुके, वचन बद्ध हो चुके उनको क्या यह खबर चली गई है कि सरकारी तौर पर कि हम वह बंद करने वाले हैं और जो खर्चा आप करने वाले हैं उसको बंद कर दीजिए ?

हम को यह पता चला है कि आप दिल्ली में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय डेरी कांग्रेस और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बुक फेयर वहाँ करने वाले हैं। इस बारे में मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह उनके अधिकार में आता है या नहीं ? अगर आता है तो मैं उनसे कहूँगा कि आजकल की देश की आर्थिक स्थिति को देखते हुए दिल्ली में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय डेरी कांग्रेस और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बुक फेयर नहीं करना चाहिए, उसको स्थगित कर देना चाहिए।

अंत में, मैं पूछना चाहूँगा कि डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री का जो पैविलियन बना हुआ है उस पर कितना खर्चा हो चुका है ? यह जो मंत्री जी ने बताया कि इसके लिए एक कमेटी बनाई है जो इसके बारे में सारी चीजों की देख-रेख करेगी, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो सीमेन्ट और लोहा अब तक खर्च हो चुका है और जो होने वाला है क्या सरकार इस बात पर भी गौर करेगी कि जो बच गया है वह लौटा दिया जाएगा क्योंकि इस बारे में कुरियन साहब ने कहा कि बड़ी ब्लैक मार्केटिंग हो रही है। मैंने जो सवाल पूछे हैं मंत्री सहोदय कृपा करके उन सब का जवाब दें।

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYA : Sir, I am not aware of any theft or misappropriations of building materials at the campus having taken place. If the hon. Member who has referred to this question bring specific allegations and informations, and not just press reports, to my notice, I shall be very glad to look into all those things.

Sir, the decision regarding the holding of this fair was taken on the 18th May, 1973. When this sort of a decision is taken, the Ministry itself can take

it as it does. But, when we postpone this sort of a thing, naturally we have to take into account the views of those Ministries, particularly Foreign Affairs and Finance because it has foreign governments' angle also. That is, there is nothing wrong in consulting those Ministries or having discussions with them. On the contrary, it is what is necessary.

श्री रवी राय : जब मई, 1973 में आपने मेला आयोजित करने का फैसला किया था तो क्या उस समय इनफ्लेशन का ध्यान आपके सामने नहीं आया था ?

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYA : But, even then, if I had not known at that time, how can I say that Governments have now been informed that we have postponed indefinitely the fair.

The second point which the hon. Member raised is that he would like to know the names of all the countries participating in this fair. There are many countries, the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., the 9 countries of the E.E.C., and many other countries totalling in all about 20. All of them conveyed their intention to participate in this fair. But, some countries like Burma, India, Afghanistan and Algeria have not been thinking of participating in this fair. So, it was going to be a grand fair. I do not think that the postponement of this fair has any bearing on the holding of Dairy Congress or the International Congress. On the contrary, we are of the opinion that this fair ground which has been structural facilities might be completely used for holding fairs. There is no relation between the proposals of holding these two fairs and the Congress. Rather, we welcome

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Nashik) : Sir, most of the questions have already been asked. I only want to draw the attention of the Minister to two or three specific points. One is—when I got up to introduce the

{Shri A. G. Kulkarni] the losses being incurred by various countries who have built their pavilions. Minister has already stated that Poland has built its structure. Similarly, G.D.R. has built its structure. I want specifically to know what action is being taken to protect the interests of Indian contractors. I was approached by various petty contractors who stated that they had completed their jobs. They wanted to know whether they would get their payments. There is ultimately a waste element in this matter. I want to know whether the Ministry of Commerce will ascertain through this Committee, which is going to be appointed, that these petty contractors who are working on behalf of various countries are being paid for. Indian pavilion is big, Polish pavilion is also big. The pavilions of G.D.R., the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. might be still bigger. The point is whether you are going to protect the interests of these petty contractors who have worked there. You have now postponed the fair and there is no provision under the Insurance Act or under the Contract Act that they can be compensated at a certain level. I would only draw your attention to this specific problem and ask for a specific assurance that their interests will be protected.

The second point which most of my hon. friends have raised is what has happened to steel and cement that might have been issued. I do not have such apprehensions as they have but the point is that this material was issued by the C.P.W.D. and they have charged 13 per cent more from these petty contractors because there were specific difficulties. They have thus charged 13 per cent extra while selling it to these petty contractors. Now, when the contractors approached the C.P.W.D. to take it back they have told them that a further cut of 13 per cent will be imposed and so the net loss will be 26 per cent to these small contractors. This is not justified. If the CPWD

rules provide that, they should be changed because it has happened because of Government's decision. I would request you to consult Shri Otm Mehta and take a proper decision.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : The point is Shri Om Mehta is not a trading organisation. After all, it is the Ministry.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: So, I appeal to you to look into this matter. I am putting a brief for the small people who are engaged in this work.

The third point is, you have to be very serious now about the STC. Mr. Tyagi and other people mentioned about the Rs. 60 crores business. These officers, these corporations, these organisations trumpet their achievement without any actual achievement. I know what predicament you are in here because they have trumpeted so much. (*Inter-ruption*) It is just like the HMT saying that so much business has been done but actually nothing is exported. It is all loss to the country. If they had exported the country would have been a little better. But leave that aside. The STC says contracts have been signed in the pavilion and so business has been done. Actually it is otherwise. But leave that aside.

SHRI OM MEHTA: Leave aside everything !

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Not everything. I want to congratulate the Government and I am one with all my Congress friends here who have suggested that you have taken a right decision. This is a lead which has been given by your ministry to other ministries and if all the ministries are wise enough and in the country's interest refrain from such ostentatious spending, there will be no problem and no country will misunderstand. I am quite sure every country is getting its worth by congratulating but, for heaven's sake, protect the interests of the petty contractors and settle their claims.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : Sir, I have already said that a high-powered committee has been set up under the chairmanship of Shri Bose Mullick, our Secretary of Export Production and Internal Trade, and these are precisely the problems that the committee will go into and they will, I am sure, give sympathetic consideration to the genuine difficulties of these people.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: The CPWD is charging 26% more.

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA : I will have a talk with the Works Minister, Mr. Om Mehta appropriately and then I will be in a better position to know that thing.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Direct Taxes (Amendment) Bill, 1974

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary-General 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 Direct Taxes (Amendment) Bill, 1974, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 1st August, 1974.

The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India." Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

REFERENCE TO INVOLVEMENT OF A POLITICAL LEADER IN AN ALLEGED RACKET OF COUNTRY LIQUOR SUPPLY

श्री ओउम् प्रकाश त्यागी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उपसभापति महोदय, मैं एक बहुत बड़े घोटाले
की ओर इस सदन का ध्यान आकषित करना
चाहता हूँ और वह यह कि केन्द्रीय जांच ब्यूरो
ने दिल्ली प्रशासन के कुछ अवकारी अधि-

कारियों के खिलाफ चल रही जांच के दौरान
में यह तथ्य सामने लाया है कि 20 लाख
रु० का जो अवकारी अधिकारियों के मामले
में घोटाला चल रहा है उस घोटाले में
राजनैतिक नेताओं का हाथ है—यह तथ्य
सामने आया है—इसके साथ साथ यह आया
है कि कुछ अवकारी अधिकारियों के पास
इस प्रकार के डायमण्ड्स मिले हैं जिससे
एक बहुत बड़े रहस्य का उद्घाटन हो रहा
है। इतना ही नहीं, केन्द्रीय जांच ब्यूरो ने
अवकारी अधिकारियों की जांच तो इस बात की
की थी कि उनकी आमदनी कितनी है और
उनके पास चल अचल सम्पत्ति कितनी है
लेकिन इस जांच के दौरान इस घोटाले के
बारे में दूसरे तथ्य भी उनके प्रकाश में
आए हैं और उनमें से एक चीज यह सामने
आई है कि एक राजनैतिक नेता ने बैठ कर
अधिकारियों के साथ मिल कर देशी शराब
विक्रेता को लगभग 20 लाख रु० का लाभ
पहुँचाने के लिए एक ठेका दिया जो कि यहाँ
के दिल्ली प्रशासन के बोदाम के लिए 5
लाख लिटर देशी शराब का ठेका उसको
दिया है और यह वही आदमी है जिस को
ठेका दिया गया था। टेन्डर मंगाने में और
टेन्डर को स्वीकार करने में भी बहुत बड़ा
घोटाला दिल्ली प्रशासन के अधिकारियों ने
किया है। जिस आदमी को ठेका दिया गया,
यह वही आदमी है जिस आदमी के करिश्मे
1971-72 में सामने आये थे। इस आदमी
के देश में देशी शराब के कई कारखाने चल
रहे हैं और इसकी शराब के पीने से ही
पिछले साल दिल्ली में बहुत से आदमी मर गये
थे, आज उसी आदमी को फिर से शराब का
ठेका दे दिया गया है। उप सभापति जी,
इस के साथ साथ इस घोटाले में जो
लोग मारे गये थे शराब शराब पीने की वजह
से, दिल्ली प्रशासन ने इस ठेकेदार के ऊपर
50 हजार रुपये का जुर्माना कर दिया था,
लेकिन वह जुर्माना आज तक भी वसूल नहीं
हुआ है।