

जाएगा जब तक उसको उसका पूरा मुआवजा नहीं दे दिया जाता है या उसको स्विडिलिटेड नहीं कर दिया जाता है। कितना मुआवजा और कितने लोगों को मुआवजा दिया गया है? आप बर्डन को शिफ्ट नहीं कर सकते हैं यह कह कर कि यह स्टेट सबजेक्ट है। यह आपका काम है। दस साल के अन्दर कितने लोगों को बसाया है और कितने लोग अब भी बेकार फिर रहे हैं?

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:**

Sir, I can give the total amount released to the State Government. The other particulars as to how much amount is given to individuals and what is the total number of individuals etc., are to be collected from the State Governments. I have already stated that Rs. 7.42 crores is already released up to 31st March to the State Government.

**Import of oil in coloured stainless steel containers**

\*764. **SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULE, KAR:**  
**SHRI DHARAM DASS SHASTRI:**

Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state.

(a) is it a fact that some persons acting as agents of State Trading Corporation, imported oil in coloured stainless steel containers an item the import of which is totally banned and cheated the country of over Rs. 100 crores;

(b) whether attention of Government has been drawn to the article published in 'current' dated 14th March, 1981 under the heading "Rs. 100 crore loot by oil sharks"; and

(c) reaction of Government there-to?

**THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND STEEL AND MINES (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE):** (a) to (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

**Statement**

(a) No, Sir, Import of edible oils is canalised through State Trading Corporation of India Ltd. The canalising agency has not appointed any agents in India to handle import on its behalf.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) A case has come to notice in which M/s. Jain Sudh Vanaspati Pvt. Ltd., Gaziabad imported RBD Palm Oil against an import licence issued under the earlier policy. The import was made in 19,590 stainless steel drums. Since these containers could not be considered as normal trade packing for the imported RBD palm oil, they were liable to action under the Customs Act, 1962. The Collector of Customs, Bombay, therefore, initiated adjudication proceedings. The firm filed a writ petition in Delhi High Court on 11th February, 1980 and obtained an interim stay order restraining the Govt. from proceeding further in the matter. Subsequently, the Court set aside the proceedings on the ground that the notices issued under the Customs Act, in this case, were contrary to law. A special leave petition has been filed by the Government before the Supreme Court, which the Court has admitted and the matter is pending hearing. The said firm also claimed to have filed an import application for a licence for 20,000 MT of oil in pursuance of firm commitment made before 2-12-78 when the import was canalised. Since no such import application had been received by Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, the licence could not be issued. The firm has filed a writ petition in the High Court against the rejection of their application. The case is pending in the Court.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:**  
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I believe that you must have got the question and also the answer that has been given to it from which you can realise the importance of this question.

Through this question I have tried to bring to the notice of this august House how an open group of oil sharks have cheated this country of over Rs. 100 crores by adopting subterfuge methods in importing vegetable oil. It is reported in newspapers that vegetable oil is usually imported in tin containers. But a few months ago, these oil sharks, acting as agents of the State Trading Corporation, cleverly adopted the method of importing oil in stainless steel containers, an item the import of which is totally banned, by giving a yellow colour to these stainless steel containers and thus cheated the Exchequer to the tune of Rs. 100 crores.

The Government always speak of financial constraint when we raise any question of a particular project. I, therefore, ask the specific question which is Question No. (a) whether it is a fact that some persons acting as agents of State Trading Corporation imported oil. I like to put emphasis on the words "acting as agents".

The answer that is given by the Hon. Minister is "No, Sir".

"Import of edible oil is canalised through State Trading Corporation of India. The canalising agency has not appointed any agents."

I never suggested in my question the appointment of any agent. The thrust of my question is that some of the oil sharks act as agents of State Trading Department and they are doing this malpractice and they had imported oil. This is part (a) of my question.

Part (b) of the question is whether it is true or not whether this item of stainless steel import is totally

banned and what is the weight of the stainless steel of the imported 19,500 stainless steel drums and what is the value of the stainless steel and what would have been the tax required to be paid. Lastly, I would like to know . . .

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Your supplementary is over.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:**  
I am very sorry, Sir; you may kindly consider that the hon. Minister has tried to screen these offenders by taking shelter . . .

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** He has never screened.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:**  
The hon. Member has not gone through the statement. They have said in the answer that the matter is pending in the court and, therefore, it is sub judice. An effort is made to avoid the answer. The answer mentions that the High Court has held that the notices issued are irregular and, therefore, they allowed the petition. My question is this. When the High Court held that the notices were irregular, instead of correcting the notices, why did you go to the Supreme Court? Is it because you wanted to screen the persons and, therefore, you did not correct the notice?

These are my three pertinent questions.

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** I am sorry the hon. Member has not understood his question, what he wanted to put. The first point is whether these people acted as the agents of the STC and my answer is that the STC does not appoint any body as agent to import oil. Therefore, the question of these persons acting as agents of STC does not arise. I have mentioned that the STC does not appoint any agent. Therefore, where is the question of these people acting as the agents of STC?

Secondly, when these irregularities were found, their houses were raided, their premises were raided, and in reply to another question last March, the Ministry of Finance has mentioned in detail as to what was raided and what was the outcome of it. Thereafter, legal proceedings according to the Customs Act were initiated. These people went to the High Court. They got some order. Thereafter the High Court quashed the procedure followed under the Customs Act. Naturally, if a legal action is to be redressed, we shall have no other option but to go to the Supreme Court. That is why, we have gone to the Supreme Court. It is not because we wanted to screen some people. Therefore, there is to question of saving somebody. On this matter, we have already initiated action; action has been initiated.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: My request to Mr. Parulekar as a lawyer is this: do not take up these questions through lawyers; this is my request to you; tell your lawyers not to take up these cases in the court.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: What do you mean by saying 'Your lawyer', Sir?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Lawyer friends; you are a lawyer.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: The hon. Member has framed his question on the basis of a newspaper report. I have said in reply to part (b) of the Question that the attention of the Government has been drawn to the newspaper item and, thereafter in part (c) I have given the details of the various actions which we have initiated against the parties concerned.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: I am sorry I did not make myself clear. Instead of saying that he did not understand, I would put it that way. What I said was that the High Court held that the notices issued by you were irregular. Therefore, my question was, instead of correcting

the notices, why did you go to the Supreme Court? He does not want to answer that. So, I do not want to proceed with that.

I have asked in my question: 'What is the reaction of the Government to this article?' I invite the attention of the hon. Minister to this particular statement in this particular article. I do not believe that to be true, but if that is untrue, I am going to ask: if there is an effort to malign the Government and the Prime Minister, what action Government intends to take on it. The report is, "A few weeks ago, the authorities wanted to swoop on about 50 vegetable oil sharks who indulged in such activities in various parts of the country, particularly in Gujarat; some VIPs appealed to the Prime Minister not to order raids as those oil kings were the main contributors to funds for the kisan rally". This is the report. I want to know whether this is true, and if this is not true .. (Interruptions).

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No point of order during Question Hour. It is for the Minister to reply. You cannot raise a point of order during Question Hour. (Interruptions).

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Sir, it is irrelevant . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is for the Minister to reply.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Sir, putting a question on the basis of something which appeared in the press is not proper, Sir... (Interruptions) It is an irrelevant question, Sir.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: I am not making any allegation . . . (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Leave it to the Minister. He will reply to it, Mr. Tewari . . . (Interruptions) Why are you getting emotional? Please sit

down. I will not allow. It is for the Minister to reply.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** You disallow that supplementary. This is unfair.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Please sit down. Two people cannot speak at the same time . . . (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** The point is that you must disallow the supplementary. It is irrelevant. That is all.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** That is all right.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:** At the outset I must submit . . .

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** You need not repeat. . . . Now the Minister will reply.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:** What is it, Sir? I have not yet put the question.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** You have already put.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:** If it is not true and if some sections of the Press are going to malign the hon. Prime Minister, will the Government take action against that particular Press?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Please put your question. Don't bring in extraneous things . . . (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** This is highly objectionable . . . (*Interruptions*).

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I would like to tell you, Mr. Parulekar, you are a very learned person . . .

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:** Thank you.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** What has the Kisan Rally got to do with this question? . . . (*Interruptions*). Please sit down. This is not proper . . . (*Interruptions*) No, nothing doing. Please sit down.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:** What is my question, Sir? Did I make any allegation? I am asking a question that an allegation has been made in the Press maligning the Prime Minister . . .

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Any allegation can be made but it should not form part of your question . . . Please sit down.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:** What action did the Government take against the Press if it is a false report? You do not understand the question.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** You reply to it . . . (*Interruptions*) Don't bring in extraneous things. That way you lose the main question.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:** Sir, if this is not to be asked. What is to be asked then? . . . \*

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Nothing will go on record . . . (*Interruptions*). It will not go on record.

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** I am on my legs, Sir.

The hon. Member has framed his question on the basis of a newspaper report which is absolutely baseless, incorrect and which has nothing to do with either the Kisan Rally or

\*Not recorded.

instructing somebody. Sir, some types of newspapers are in the habit of bringing out this type of news. If the hon. Member gives credence to them, what can we do? It is for him to decide.

**SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:** That is not the case. What action have you taken?

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** We completely ignore them.

**श्री मोहन भाई पटेल :** मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो एडिबल आयल आ रहा है, उसमें स्टेनलैस स्टील के कन्टेनरों के बावजूद भी जिस पामोलीन आयल का लाइसेंस दिया गया था, उसके बजाय कोई दूसरा आयल उसमें आया, ऐसी कोई शिकायत आई है क्या ? पामोलीन आयल के बजाय कोकोनट आयल बहुत बड़ी क्वान्टिटी में लाया गया है और एक बहुत बड़ा प्लॉट इस तरह से चल रहा है, क्या ऐसी कोई शिकायत माननीय मिनिस्टर महोदय के पास आई है ? अगर आई है, तो क्या इसके बारे में सी० बी० आई० से तलास करा रहे हैं या नहीं ?

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** So far as the first part of the question is concerned, the moot question is that there is no doubt that these people try to play foul and they wanted to have some gains. That is why instead of bringing it in ordinary tin containers, they wanted to import it in stainless steel containers. But, it was rejected. Due action has been initiated against them when it was found by the customs people. According to the provisions of the Law—Customs Act action has already been initiated. In regard to the import of coconut oil also, we have received certain complaints against those persons. And we are investigating into them.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** Sir, would like to know from the hon. Minister if it is not a fact that from past experience whenever such mal-practices take place, some time there is collusion between certain authorities and those who commit the mal-practices. Therefore, knowing the loopholes in the law, sometimes the notices are deliberately framed in such a manner that some loopholes are left and therefore the affected parties take that to the cost of law. In that case, the court very often says that because there is a lacuna in the notice, the entire case is set aside. Have they investigated into this? According to his own statement, subsequently the court set aside the proceedings on the ground that the notices issued under the Customs Act in this case were contrary to law. So, have they investigated to see whether there was any element of deliberateness in leaving certain lacunae in the notices issued? If so, what are the findings of the investigation?

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** Sir, apart from their finding out, the High Court set aside the proceedings initiated by the Customs Department. That was why they had to go to the Supreme Court for getting it rectified. In regard to the question whether the lacuna was left deliberately, this is a matter to be looked into by the Department of Customs and I will pass on this suggestion to the Ministry of Finance.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** I asked whether the investigation indicates that some lacunae were deliberately left in the notices issued.

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** Regarding that question, I say that the matter is to be looked into by the Department of Customs which is under the administrative control of the Ministry of Finance. They have already answered. For the information of the hon. Member. I can say that all these licences were issued during their period when they were

in power—one was on 1st January, 1979, another was on 23rd January, 1979, another was on 21st May, 1979, another was on 21st January, 1979 and another was on 13th December, 1979.

**SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY:**  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Sir, Mr. Parulekar's party is depending upon the charity of the oil tycoons and not the peasantry of the country. I want to know from the Minister the names of the ministers who issued the licences to such parties. Is any action going to be taken against such ministers? Everytime Prof. Dandavate goes on blaming the authorities. I think the authorities are as sympathetic as we are.

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** Let me explain this position. The edible oil was under O.G.L. From 2nd December, 1979, it was decided that it would be canalised. But, when we take a decision of canalising a particular item, in between, certain people may have entered into a contract with foreign parties. These are usually termed as pre-banned commitments. Therefore, we give opportunities to the parties to establish that they have entered into a firm contract before the imposition of the ban. And their cases are treated as such; they are permitted to import the particular items for which a firm contract has been established. These cases come within that category. That is why I have given the dates also when the import licences were issued to these persons and, if any malpractice is being pursued by anyone, the law takes its own course of action.

#### Around-The-Globe Flight by Air India

\*765. **PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR:** Will the Minister of TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION be pleased to state

(a) whether Air India has decided to launch around-the-Globe flight:

(b) if so, the likely date by which the flight would be introduced and whether any concession in fare would be given for advance reservations; and

(c) if so, the nature thereof?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI CHANDU-LAL CHANDRAKAR):** (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

**PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR:** Sir, may I know from the hon. Minister whether Air-India is collaborating with any other world airline for the operation of the flights—International Airlines—around-the-globe?

**THE MINISTER OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI A. P. SHARMA):** Air-India, in this respect, is collaborating with the North-Western Airlines of U.S.A.

**PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR:** What is the pattern of collaboration? In view of this experience are we going to have a flight on our own?

**SHRI A. P. SHARMA:** No, Sir. The traffic on that route is not such that Air India could operate its own flight.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Will the hon. Minister kindly tell us, in view of the fact that in many routes the break-even load factor is not fulfilled by the traffic density and in view of the fact that some airlines like PANAM who have taken to standby ticket issuance whether Air India will consider taking recourse to such a method by which unfilled seats could be filled through issue of standby tickets?

**SHRI A. P. SHARMA:** Only the PANAM has got this practice of establishing the standby fare and no