

बनाये जाने वाले बूट कीमत में बाहर का लगा खा सकेंगे और पायदारी और वजादारी में बहतर होंगे ।

(घ) जी हा । निर्णय लेने से पहले, छोटे पैमाने के निर्माताओं से आने वाला शिकायतों पर विचार कर लिया गया था ।]

श्री नवार्बसिंह चौहान : ये जो छोटे उत्पादक हैं, स्माल प्रोड्यूसर्स हैं, जिन से आप ये जूते खरीदते हैं, क्या उनसे कोई रिप्रेजेंटेशन आपको प्राप्त हुआ था ? अगर हाँ, तो उसका आशय क्या था ?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: As I replied to part (d) of the question, representations were received. They were duly considered and after considering them, we came to this decision.

श्री नवार्बसिंह चौहान : क्या यह सच है कि उन के रिप्रेजेंटेशन में यह कहा गया था कि ये जूते जो आप अपनी फैक्टरी में बनवायेंगे काफी तेज पड़ेंगे और अच्छे भी नहीं होंगे ?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: I have already said in my answer that the boots that will be produced will be superior in quality and endurance. So far as the price is concerned, it will compare very favourably.

श्री नवार्बसिंह चौहान : जब ये जूते अभी तक बने नहीं हैं और एस्टीमेट तैयार हुए नहीं हैं तब क्या माननीय मंत्री जी यह बतायेंगे कि उनहोंने कैसे जान लिया कि ये जूते उनसे ज्यादा मजबूत होंगे जो आजकल बन रहे हैं ?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: It is common knowledge that whatever the Defence Department produces is of an exceptionally fine quality. Apart from that, it is not one manufacturer who produces the shoes. There are a large number of them and therefore the quality varies and it is not of a uniform quality. On the other hand, the ones that are going to be pro-

duced by the Defence Department will be of a uniform quality.

DEPARTMENTAL ENQUIRY AGAINST EXECUTIVE OFFICER JABALPUR CANTONMENT

*414. **SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA:** Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to refer to the answers given to supplementaries put on Starred Question No. 483 in the Rajya Sabha on the 17th December, 1958 and state:

(a) whether the departmental enquiry against the Executive Officer, Jabalpur Cantonment has since been completed; and

(b) if so, what are the findings of the enquiry and what action has so far been taken thereon?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA):

(a) and (b). The attention of the Hon'ble Member is invited to the statement laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 13th March, 1959 in fulfilment of an assurance given in reply to a supplementary arising out of Starred Question No. 483 on the 17th December 1958.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: May I know who conducted the departmental inquiry against the Executive Officer and where was the inquiry held?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: I am repeating the answer although it was answered not once, but at least three times before. It was the G.O.C. of Southern Command.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: May I know whether any charges were framed against the Executive Officer who admitted that he had tampered with the records?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: Do you want me to answer all those questions again although they have been answered on the floor of this very House earlier?

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: This question was not answered.

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: Yes, it was.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: The question is whether . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whether any charges were framed against him. That is the question.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: . . . any charges were framed against him because he had admitted that he tampered with the evidence and the record.

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: That is exactly what I am saying. The G.O.C. reported and a charge-sheet was given to him. He replied to that charge-sheet, admitting that he had tampered with the records. Subsequently, the G.O.C. made certain recommendations on which action was taken.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: May I know whether it is a fact that instead of any punishment being given to him, he has been sent to a higher post as Executive Officer, Lucknow Cantonment?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: That too I have replied. It was replied last time that it was not a fact that he had been sent to a higher post.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: May I know if it is not a fact that he has gone on a higher salary of Rs. 150 per month?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: I have already said, "No" to that.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: May I know what action the Government took when they found that the Executive Officer was guilty of tampering with the records, which would have proved something against him?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: It was only in connection with the impounding of the cattle, and he had subsequently released that cattle on the intervention of the Vice-President

who is a civilian. It is a grave error of judgment that he did change those figures, for which he has been duly punished.

DR. R. P. DUBE: Did he only change the figures? Since the hon. Minister has mentioned civilian Vice-President I want to ask exactly what he did. Why did he tear those pages? Did he say that he tampered with the pages of the Pounding Register? Just because he gave a wrong answer to Parliament that the cattle has not been impounded . . .

BABU GOPINATH SINGH: How can this sort of behaviour be regarded as an error of Judgment?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: As I have said; after considering his explanation carefully, the Government came to the conclusion that the Cantonment Executive Officer intended to cause no wrongful gain to himself or wrongful loss to others and to that extent, he was not guilty of moral turpitude, that his action was only the result of a grave error of judgment on his part and that the ends of justice would be met if the severe displeasure of the Government was communicated to him and that amounts to a censure. And that has already been done.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: May I know if tampering with a public record by an officer is only a matter for communicating the displeasure of the Government or taking prompt action against the officer? The Deputy Minister himself in reply to a question said that a thorough inquiry would be made.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: This officer is not a military officer, and the communication of the severe displeasure of the Army Chief of Staff is considered a heavy punishment for tampering with the record.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: May I know whether the Executive Officer is a military officer or a civilian officer?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: He is under military control.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Is he not a civilian officer who is in the military employ?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: He is a civilian officer.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I cannot follow the answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is a civilian officer under military control. That is what he says.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: He has admitted to have changed the record which he was bound to keep and the Government considers that that was not a grave mistake that he did.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: The Government does consider it as such; that is why he is punished.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: What is the punishment?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: The punishment is censure. That enters into his record. It affects his career.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Does the recent transfer which was made reflect this displeasure in any way, either by way of decrease in his emoluments or by his being transferred to a lower job? What is it that has been done in the transfer?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: Punishments are of various kinds. It does not necessarily mean demotion. Punishment must meet the requirements of justice and the volume of the crime. There has been a Court of Inquiry. It pointed out that the officer did not simply gain for himself, he committed what was wrong, what was against proper conduct, and therefore he has been censured and that censure will go against him. But it may be presumed that he might have gone to a higher job but for this.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: May I know whether it is a red entry or a black entry in the official papers? On the fact whether it is a red entry or a black entry depends very much the ultimate judgment in any further action that might be taken by the Court-Martial or the Court of Inquiry any time later.

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: As has been answered by the Defence Minister, the Government is satisfied that the ends of justice have been met by entering this entry in his records.

DR. ANUP SINGH: Could we know from the hon. Minister what position the concerned officer is occupying now and what salary he is drawing compared with what he was getting before?

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: So far as his position is concerned, he is still a Cantonment Executive Officer. He has not got any promotion and so far as his salary is concerned, I will have to check it up to find out what he is drawing.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Is it a fact that this person is drawing Rs. 150 more than what he was drawing in Jabalpur?

AN HON. MEMBER: He said, "No."

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: I have already said that he did not go on promotion.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: No, the question is whether he is drawing more emoluments than what he was drawing at Jabalpur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Had he any increment in salary? That is what he wants to know.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Or some other emoluments.

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: So far as his salary is concerned, I may say that I will have to check it up. All I can

say off-hand is that I do not think he has got any increase.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Last question, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No more last question.

EXCISE LEVIES ON ART SILK

*415. **SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:** Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) what revision has been made in respect of excise levies on art-silk after the passing of the Indian Finance Bill, 1959;

(b) what is the estimate of reduction in revenue as a result of the revision; and

(c) how much of this is in organised industry and how much in cottage industry?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): (a) to (c). There has been no revision of the standard rate of duty after the passing of the Indian Finance Bill. A statement is, however, laid on the Table indicating the changes made in the rates of compounded levies with effect from the 21st April and the 15th May, 1959. [See Appendix XXVI, Annexure No. 21].

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Is the Minister in a position to state how many looms are in the organised industry and how many are functioning in the cottage industry?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: If the definition of cottage industry is that it covers units employing not more than 9 looms, if such a unit is taken as a cottage industry, then I can give the figures that the number of units in such cottage industry is 566 with a loomage of 2,892.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: How many units are organised as a large-scale production unit and not as cottage industry?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: The other figure is, the number of units employing more than 9 looms is 381 and the loomage is 15,113.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Is it not a fact that as a result of the revision in the duty the organised industry, which also enjoys the benefit of processing plants and the export promotion benefits, has benefited much more than the cottage industry of smaller units?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, I would not hazard an opinion like the hon. Member. I am not as free as he is.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am only asking a question; I have not expressed any opinion, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you are not in a position to answer that question, you cannot hazard an opinion on that. Is it not?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: He said that the export industry has benefited more than the cottage industry, and it is a matter of opinion. But I can say this that so far as the cottage industry is concerned, well, it has benefited to the extent of Rs. 21 lakhs.

SUPPLY POSITION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

*416. **SHRI BABUBHAI CHINAI:** Will the Minister of STEEL, MINES AND FUEL be pleased to state:

(a) the present supply position of petroleum products in the country;

(b) whether there is any proposal to close petroleum pumps at night in any State in India;

(c) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(d) whether the State Governments have consulted the Central Government in regard to this proposal?

THE MINISTER OF MINES AND OIL (SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA): (a) The present supply position of petroleum products in the country is satisfactory.