

श्री ओम् प्रकाश त्यागी: मेरा दूसरा प्रश्न है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब डकोटाज बिका तो इन कम्पनीज ने जो खरीदा है और गवर्नमेंट ने खरीदा है तो वह आपने बेचा क्यों ! इसी काम के लिये, इसी प्रयोग के लिये, उन्हें अपने पास ही क्यों नहीं रखा। इनको बेचने की आवश्यकता क्यों पड़ गई आपको !

डा० (श्रीमती) सरोजिनी महिषी : डकोटाज बहुत अनैकानमिक हो चुके हैं और इंडियन एयर लाइंस उनको रखना नहीं चाहता है। अब उनके पास सात बाकी हैं और वह भी एक के बाद एक बेच रहे हैं। कोई एक-दो रुट्स हैं जहाँ कि वह चल रहे हैं नहीं ताँ जो एच० एस० 748 है वही चलता है।

श्री ओम् प्रकाश त्यागी : इसे खरीदने वाले क्या लास के लिये खरीदते हैं।

डा० (श्रीमती) सरोजिनी महिषी : खरीदने वाले जो हैं उनका जो ओवरआल एक्सपेंडीचर होता है वह बहुत कम होता है और यह उनकी फिक्स्ड है इंडियन एयरलाइंस की फिक्स्ड नहीं है कि क्यों खरीदते हैं वह।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : एक छोटा क्वेश्चन मेरा है।

डा० (श्रीमती) सरोजिनी महिषी : डकोटा भी छोटा है।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir I want to put a small question. In all cases, the Government auctions its articles. Why in this particular case was there a negotiated sale for the Dakotas ?

DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI : Sir, as long as the Air Force were purchasing them, there was no difficulty. But, later on when it was advertised, no party came forward because it was very uneconomical to use it for the Air Force and also for the other companies. So, when there was nobody, the Indian Airlines tried to negotiate the sale at the private company level also on some occasions, because, Sir, the book value of the Dakota, as the

honourable Member knows, has gone down to Rs. 120.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes, next question.

¹¹449. [The questioner (Shri M. K. Mohta) was absent. For answer vide col. 37 infra.]

ASIAN CABLES

*229. SHRI A. G. KULKARNI :
SHRI V. R. PARASHAR :
SHRI S. B. BOBDEY :

Will the Minister of FOREIGN TRADE be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government have seen a press report in 'Economic Times' dated the 20th August 1972, that Asian Cables have been allowed to sell 2200 tonnes of Polyethylene powder and if so, the details thereof; and

(b) whether Government have received the report from CBI on Asian Cables and if so, whether the firm has been black listed ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI A. C. GEORGE) : (a) and (b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

Asian Cables Corporation had a stock of about 375.59 tonnes of Polyethylene Powder imported by them against a licence dated 2-9-1967. On investigation it was found that the firm could not use the same within a reasonable time. Hence this raw material was diverted to 71 other Actual Users on the recommendations of the Directors of Industries of the States concerned on no profit basis' in accordance with the Import Trade Control Act and orders issued thereunder. The list of 71 allottees together with the quantity allotted to each is given in the Annexure.

2. Government have received report of the C.B.I. on Asian Cables. The same contains three charges, namely:—misutilization of (i) Copper (ii) Aluminium; and (iii) Polyethylene moulding powder; all

transferred from the 23rd November, 1972.

The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri A. G. Kulkarni.

imported under Actual User Licences. Prosecution has been sanctioned in respect of the first two charges. Action regarding the third charge is under examination. The firm has not been black-listed by the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports as they are being proceeded against in a Court of Law.

ANNEXURE

Name of the Unit	Quantity allotted (Million Tons.)
1. Vinayak Industries Corpn., Yeyyadi, Bangalore-8	2.994
2. Premier Plastic Industries, Bangalore-10	5.988
3. Do.	
4. Sab Plascons, Bangalore-4	2.994
5. Ganesh Polyethylene Industries, Bangalore-26	3.493
6. Mysore Plastikrafts, Bangalore-26	0.998
7. Nandi Plastic Industries, Bangalore	2.994
8. Mysore Manufacturers & Traders, Bangalore-10	2.994
9. Diamond Plastic Industries, Bangalore-2	2.994
10. Suresh Plastic Industries, Chikmagalur, (Mysore State)	2.994
11. Thermo Plastic Moulders, Bangalore-27	2.994
12. Karnatak Plastic Industries Bangalore-21	2.994
13. M.G. Metal Industries, Bellary (Mysore State)	2.994
14. Sha Umedraj Sampathraj, Bangalore-10	2.994
15. Gayathri Industries, Bangalore-10	3.992
16. Shri Krishna Industries, Bangalore-23	2.994
17. Paxal Corporation, Bangalore-2	2.994
18. Marudhar Industries, Bangalore-10	2.994
19. Poly Plastic Industries, Bangalore-11	2.291
20. Sanathnagar Polythene Inds., Hyderabad-12	4.990
21. Mysore Plastic Industries, Bijapur	2.994

Name of the Unit	Quantity allotted (Million Tons)
22. Plastobag Industries, Bangalore-24	0.998
23. Art Pak Industries, Bombay-28	4.536 & 13.358
24. Techno Plast Industries, Bombay-28	1.179
25. V.K. Engineering & Plastic Industries, Bombay-1	14.379
26. Maharashtra Plastic Inds., Bombay	8.392
27. National Plastic Industries, Bombay-57	12.792
28. Avon Industries, Bangalore-2	0.998
29. Gandhi Industries, Bombay-63	2.994
30. Prince Plastics, Bombay-59	12.996
31. Chawla Plastics, New Delhi	2.994
32. Arun Plastics, Bombay-67	9.798
33. Nilkamal Plastic & Allied Industries, Bombay-72	37.989
34. B.R. Industries, Bombay-71	1.996
35. Everest Packagings, Bombay-2	8.392
36. Modern Packagings, Bombay-2	17.396
37. Perfect Plastics, Bombay-34	0.295
38. Advance Plastic (P.) Ltd., Bombay	5.283
39. U. P. Cane Works, Bombay-11	0.181
40. Delta Plastics, Bombay-15	1.066
41. Vadera Plastics Enterprises, Bangalore	5.000
42. Anjana Plastic Products, Bombay-60	0.091
43. Biochem Plastics, Bombay-57	0.159
44. New Pack Industries, Bombay-12	0.794
45. Pure Plastic Industries, Ulhasnagar	0.295
46. Plastic Processors, Bombay-60	11.998
47. Ajay Industrial Corporation, Daryaganj, Delhi-6	2.994
48. Oyatape Fibres Pvt. Ltd., Bombay-70	10.183
49. Maharashtra Plastic Industries, Bombay-60	6.486 & 0.614

Name of the Unit	Quantity allotted (Million Tons)
50. Premier Plastic Works, Bombay-28	1.250
51. Premier Inds. Works, Bombay-16	1.000
52. Shiv Shakti Plastic Products, Bombay	0.794
53. Raj Plastic Industries, Ulhasnagar	0.499
54. The Pearl Thread Mills Pvt. Ltd., Bombay	4.241 5.259
55. Plastic Extruders Pvt. Ltd., Bombay	18.424 5.676
56. Tarun Plastics, Bombay-59	3.000
57. Jai Singh Plastic Industries, Bombay-69	11.975
58. Mehta Framse, Bombay-1	1.900
59. Rolex Plastic Ltd., Bombay-1	1.000
60. P. C. Girdharilal Jain, Lohi (Meerut Dt.)	3.992
61. Montana Sports (India) Pvt. Ltd., Bombay-1	7.300
62. Seth & Co., Bombay-59	3.000
63. Jyoti Plastic & Allied Ind., Bombay-67	3.992
64. Bhojson Plastic Industries, Bombay-31	2.790
65. Ashok Traders, Bombay-67	9.980
66. Jai Singh Plastic Industries, Bombay-69	3.371
67. Polyplex Industrial Corp., Bombay-69	5.000
68. Jai Singh Plastic Industries, Bombay-69	2.319
69. Sheth & Co., Bombay-58	3.000
70. Polyplex Industrial Corporation	5.000
71. Ergen Plastic Industries, Jodhpur	2.100

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir, this is a classic example of the bungling by the Foreign Trade Ministry and also of the favour shown to the monopolist party. You see, Sir, that the present statement says that permission had been granted to the Asian Cables Corporation, owned by Goenka, earlier and later the stock was diverted to other Actual Users. The statement is dated 5th December, that is, today. Now, here is

the reply given by Prof. Siddheshwar Prasad on 2nd August in the Lok Sabha. The question was the same, that is, whether the polyethylene had been sold, etc., etc.. They that the CBI has been asked by the Foreign Trade Ministry to investigate into the allegations whether the company has sold it illegally and the reply given by Prof. Siddheshwar Prasad is this :

"Yes. A *prima facie* case has been established and the CCIE has been asked to proceed with the case."

Sir, today, a clean chit has been given by the Ministry of Foreign Trade through the CCIE to the Goenkas who own the Asian Cables to sell it to the Actual Users. I only appeal to you, Sir, that the reply given by Prof. Siddheshwar Prasad and the reply given by the Foreign Trade Ministry are fit cases for being gone into and examined by a committee of the Members of Parliament. I feel, Sir, that the present reply is going to give a clean chit to the Goenkas. On the contrary, the CBT feels that there is a *prima facie* case and the Industrial Development Ministry has written to the Foreign Trade Ministry to impound all the licence, issued to the Goenkas while the Ministry has given a clean chit. May I know, Sir whether there is any divergence of opinion in the replies given by Prof. Siddheshwar Prasad and by the Foreign Trade Ministry and what is the reason for this?

SHRI A. C. GEORGE : Sir, the reply given by the honourable Minister, Prof. Siddheshwar Prasad on the 2nd August in the Lok Sabha and the present reply are not in divergence and we are not giving a clean chit to any company at all. Sir, if you go through the reply carefully, it will be found that it contains three charges, namely, misutilisation of copper, aluminium and polyethylene powder, all imported under Actual Users' Licences. Prosecution has been sanctioned in respect of the first two charges. So, it is obvious that we are not giving any clean chit to anybody. About the third charge, Sir, there are certain proceedings still going on and it is only because of that that a proper charge has not been made for prosecution. Therefore, there is no question of any clean chit being given to anybody.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Sir, the point that he has raised is why a clean chit is being given to certain people. I want to know why black-listing is not being done. The reply says that they have been found to be misusing copper, aluminium, etc. and all those items are imported items. Still they are permitting them and they are not blacklisting them. Is this not a favour being shown to them ? Sir, you kindly see the reply that he has given. I want to know why no action is being taken against them and why no black-listing is being done in spite of the fact that the reply says that they have been found to be misusing them ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Krishan Kant, I did not call you.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Why is this _ favour shown to them ?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, I want to bring these two replies to your notice so that you can say whether they are divergent or not. It is not for Shri George to say that the replies are the same. It is for you to say, Sir. I will submit to you, Sir.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: I did not say that they are same. I said that they are not in divergence.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Then, why has the Asian Cables been allowed to sell them to the Actual Users ? It is an item, which has been imported by them. Actually, they were allowed 2,200 tonnes. But, Sir, they say in the reply that it is about 340 tonnes. Whatever it is, I say, Sir, a special favour has been shown and the Industrial Development Ministry wrote to the Foreign Trade Ministry to impound all those licences. What action have you taken ? You say you have not shown any favour.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: Sir, about the first part of the question of the honourable Member, I can say that in the statement itself the reply is given. The firm has not been black-listed by the CCUE as it is being proceeded against in a court of law. That itself is the answer.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Where is the court of law if they are going to get all the licences ?

SHRI A. C. GEORGE : I have said that we have not shown any favour to anybody. We have taken the best possible efforts. We have to have proper proof.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: You have the proper proof.

SHRI AC. GEORGE: Sir, about the second part of the question, I can say that it is not 2,200 tonnes, but it is only 370 tonnes. About the allegation itself, it is not the Asian Cables who are going to sell it. As per the advice of the Director of Industries in the States concerned, a list is attached, and that too at a price lower than what is existing..... (*Interruptions*). In fact, I may answer that the prevailing price of this particular powder is Rs. 7 charged by the indigenous producers. . . .

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Question Hour is over. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Let there be half-an-hour discussion on this and the dealings of Shri L. N. Mishra...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Question Hour is over.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

CENTRAL HELP TO ORISSA, FOR RELIEF AND REPAIR WORKS

*443. SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the Chief Minister of Orissa submitted a memorandum for Central aid to the Prime Minister during his recent visit to Orissa;

(b) whether it is also a fact that Orissa Government has asked for Central assistance of Rs. 14 crores to meet expenditure on relief and repair works in areas which were affected by cyclone, floods and heavy rains; and

(c) if so, the decision of Government thereon ?

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir. This estimate however, was subsequently increased to Rs. 20.33 crores.

(c) The Central team deputed to make an on-the-spot assessment recommended a ceiling of Rs. 5.28 crores which was accepted by the Central Government for pur-