

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR : It is a vague answer. What is the extent of their business in their own country ? That was the specific question which I had put.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : Did they any sales for these drills ? That is more important.

MR. SPEAKER : I am sorry that does not arise out of the main question which relates only to the exchange of technical personnel.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR : The hon. Minister has stated that there is an agreement between West Germany and India in regard to the exchange of technical personnel between HMT and Messrs. Hermann Kolb. May I know whether the Abs delegation in their talks with the representatives of the Government of India insisted that the West German experts and technicians wanted to stay here in their posts irrespective of the period stipulated for training and maturity of the Indian cadres and wanted unlimited right to export of profits ? These were the reports that appeared in the press, regarding the talks between the Abs delegation and the Indian representatives regarding the West German technicians and experts. May I know whether this report is correct and whether Government will give unlimited facilities to the German technicians and what the attitude of the Government of India is in regard to this matter ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I have already stated that this will be a sort of joint venture and that they will give up production in their own country, and the entire production and manufacturing programme will be in our country and the export will be from our country to other places.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR : May I know whether special facilities would be given to the West German experts, to those who are in the HMT or in other industries ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Not for all time.

SHRI RANGA : I am prepared to accept what my hon. friend has said that they have made sufficient inquiries and satisfied themselves that it would be to our

advantage, till further facts become available to us. But when he says that they are giving up production in their own country and they are going to start it in our country it makes one feel a bit suspicious about it. Why is it that they are giving it up in their own country ? what are the advantages that they seek to derive by setting up production in our country and by being so altruistic towards us ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : The answer is very easy that because it is a labour-intensive industry and they are short of labour there and they want to utilise their technology and our labour here, they want to have the manufacture here and this will help us to have a better export in the world.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : This is treacherous. Government are making our people work for the Germans. What sort of leaders have we got ? What sort of Ministers have we got ?

Shifting of Barrel Plant from Sewri to Trombay by M/s. Standard Drum and Barrel Manufacturing Co.

*333. **SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES :** Will the Minister of INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT INTERNAL TRADE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be Pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question no. 1313 on the 25th November, 1969 regarding the shifting of Barrel Plant from Sewri to Trombay by M/s. Standard Drum and Barrel Manufacturing Company and state:

(a) when the standard Vacuum Refinery Co. had Confirmed to the Iron and Steel Controller that M/S. Standard Drum and Barrel Manufacturing Co. did not manufacture and supply and oil barrel since May, 1959, as their entire manufacturing Capacity of oil barrels was shifted from Sewri to Trombay and Converted for the manufacture of bitumen drums for them (Refinery), then the reasons for continuing allocations of steel sheets to the firm for manufacturing oil barrels at Trombay;

(b) when the industrial licence for manufacturing bitumen drums was granted to this firm only on the 20th July, 1959, then how they could manufacture and start supply

of bitumen drums to the standard Vaccum Refinery Co. from May, 1959? and

(c) whether it does indicate that they had converted their oil barrel plant for the manufacture of bitumen drums ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT INTERNAL TRADE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY) (a) to (c) : According to available records and also a, ascertained from M/s. standard Drum and barrel manufacturing Company Bombay, they had been manufacturing oil barrels at Sewri till June, 1959. They shifted their oil barrel plant from Sewri to Trombay in July, 1959 but they produced bitumen drums at Trombay with the additional machines purchased. Production of oil barrels and bitumen drums started at Trombay from July 1959. It has also been ascertained that delivery of bitumen drums to Standard Vaccum Refinery Company commenced from July, 1959 only. The conversion of the oil barrel plant for the manufacture of bitumen drums could not arise as the firm was in production of oil barrels before and after the shift to Trombay and the production of bitumen drums started only from July, 1959 at Trombay with the additional machines purchased.

The facts about the correspondence between the standard Vaccum Refinery Company the Iron and steel Controller, are, however, being ascertained.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले 3 वर्षों से इस कम्पनी के बारे में हम यहाँ पर प्रश्न पूछ रहे हैं, लेकिन हर प्रश्न का यही उत्तर मिल रहा है कि और जानकारी हासिल कर रहे हैं। 25 नवम्बर, 1969 के प्रश्न सं० 1313 के उत्तर में भी यही कहा गया था—

"Complete information is expected to be available soon."

1967 में भी हम को यही उत्तर मिला, लेकिन सब बात यह है कि मंत्री महोदय सही जानकारी को छिपाने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं। इस लिये मैं मंत्री महोदय से प्रश्न पूछने के पहले यह इशारा देना चाहता हूँ कि पुराने लोगों के द्वारा

हुई गलती को छिपाने का काम करके इस सदन का अपमान मत कीजिये। मनु भाई शाह, बाबू या रसिक लाल पारीख कोई भी हो, उन को फंसने दीजिये, लेकिन आप उन को बचाने का प्रयास कर के सदन का अपमान मत कीजिए, क्योंकि फिर आपके ऊपर भी मुझे यहाँ कार्यवाही करनी पड़ेगी। यह इशारा देकर मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ—क्या यह सही नहीं है कि आपके पास वह पत्र है जिसमें स्टैंडर्ड वैक्यूम रिफाइनरी कम्पनी ने आइरन एण्ड स्टील कंट्रोलर को लिखा था कि जब से यह कारखाना सिवड़ी से ट्रोम्बे में आया है और अपने ही कम्पाउण्ड में या उसके आसपास जहाँ भी उन्होंने कारखाना लगाने का जगह दी है, कारखाना लग जाने के बाद से उन्होंने आयल-बैरल नहीं बनाये, सिर्फ बिटुमेन-बैरल ही बनाये और इन तमाम बिटुमेन बैरल को उस ने सिर्फ स्टैंडर्ड वैक्यूम रिफाइनरी कम्पनी को ही बेचा, अन्य किसी को नहीं बेचा ?

औद्योगिक विकास, आंतरिक व्यापार तथा समवाय-कार्य मंत्री (श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद) : जहाँ तक पहले सवाल का ताल्लुक है, आनरेबल मेम्बर को मालूम है कि यह मामला एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी के सामने है

श्री हरदयाल बेबगुण : उम्मेद फसला दे दिया है।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : उस ने रिपोर्ट दे दी है, आप उस को दबा रहे हैं।

श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद : एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट हमारे पास आई थी, लेकिन उस पर हम को जो कुछ कहना था, वह लिख कर उनको भेज दिया है। अब एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी उस पर जो फैसला करेगी, उसी तरह से हम कार्यवाही करने के लिये तैयार हैं। हम ने लीगल ओपीनियन ले कर एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी को भेज दिया है.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: On a point of order Yesterday in our agenda, the same

question was dealt with in the Report of the Estimates Committee which was to be Presented to us. But it was not laid on the Table. I have also sent some question on this. I would like to know what is the reason for this. It arises out of this question.

Mr. SPEAKER : He may write to me his objection. Let the previous question be answered.

श्री फल्लूहून अली अहमद : जहाँ तक दूसरे सवाल का ताल्लुक है, मेरे इल्म में यह बात है कि जब सिवड़ी से यह कारखाना ट्राम्बे में आया, उस वक्त भी वहाँ आयल-वैरेल ही मैन्यूफै-क्चर कर रहे थे, लेकिन उन्होंने वहाँ और मशीनरी लगाई और उस के बाद विटुमेन वैरेल बनाने शुरू किये।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : अब मैं स्टैंडर्ड वैक्यूम के एक पत्र का जिक्र यहाँ पर करना चाहता हूँ। इस सदन में 12 अगस्त, 1969 को श्री सीताराम केसरी और श्री एस.एम. बनर्जी के एक प्रश्न का जवाब देते हुए मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि मई, 1959 और जून, 1959 में इस कम्पनी ने स्टैंडर्ड वैक्यूम आयल रिफाइनरी कम्पनी को 7069 और 1256 वैरेलज दिये हैं लेकिन मेरे पास इसी स्टैंडर्ड वैक्यूम कम्पनी का एक पत्र है जिसमें वे कहते हैं -

“Messrs. Standard Barrels have not supplied us any 40-45 gallon capacity lubricant barrels since they shifted their factory to Trombay for manufacture of asphalt barrels on our behalf.”

एक दूसरे पत्र में वे कहते हैं -

“The manufacture of asphalt drums on our behalf has utilised the Standard Drum and Barrel Co's entire manufacturing capacity and they, therefore, are unable to effect supplies of 18 gauge drums to us”

इन परिस्थितियों में जब कि ये दो दस्तावेज आपके सामने हैं और जिनको सामने नहीं लाया जा रहा है, मैं, अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपसे आज्ञा चाहता हूँ कि इन को सदन के टेबिल पर रखूँ-

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : How did he get this confidential document ?

I want to rise to a Point of order. Here is a confidential record which has been obtained by a member. I have a right to enquire from the Minister whether he will hold an inquiry to find out how this record came into his hands.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : These People are shielding the black marketeers. you put a question to him whether he is not shielding black--marketeers (Interruptions) .

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : आपको क्यों चिन्ता है, हम चाहे जहाँ से लायें। हम ने आप से लिये हैं। तापड़िया की दलाली यहाँ मत कोभिडे
..... (व्यवधान)

मैं आपकी आज्ञा से चाहता हूँ कि दोनों चिट्ठियों को भदन के सभा पटल पर रखूँ
..... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो सर्वेचन आपने दिया है वह आ जायेगा। .. (व्यवधान) ..

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : ये दोनों चिट्ठियाँ हैं* (व्यवधान) .. आप देख लीजिए.. (व्यवधान) ..

अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं देख लूँगा।
.. (व्यवधान) ..

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : मुझे प्रश्न पूरा करने दीजिये।

जब यह मामला वहाँ से आया है तो मंत्री महोदय मुझे बतायें कि इस कम्पनी की कैपेसिटी पूरे तौर पर विटुमेन बनाने के लिए इस्तेमाल की गई तब आपने इनको स्टील कैसे दिया ?

और क्या यह सही नहीं है कि जितना स्टील आपने स्टैंडर्ड ड्रम ऐंड बैरल कम्पनी को दिया उसको उन्होंने बम्बई के काला बाजार में बेचा।
.. (व्यवधान) .. क्या आप सारा मामला सी बी आई की जांच में देने के लिए तैयार हैं ?

श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद : मैंने जो पहले जवाब दिया था वही जवाब फिर दे रहा हूँ आपके पास क्या खत आये हैं और उसमें मैन्युफैक्चरर ने क्या लिखा है, उसकी वाक्यियत मुझे नहीं है। मैं आपके सामने पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ :

It has been ascertained from the DGTD that the firm shifted their oil barrel plant from Sewri to Trombay in July, 1959 but they produced bitumen drums at Trombay with the additional machines purchased. Production of oil barrels and bitumen drums started at Trombay from July, 1959. The firm was in Production of oil barrels before the barrel plant was shifted to Trombay and therefore the question of converting the oil barrel Plant for the manufacture of bitumen drums before July, 1959 did not arise. The firm has also confirmed that Production of bitumen drums started in July 1959 only and delivery of the same to Standard Vacuum Refinery Company commenced during July, 1959.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : मेरे प्रश्न का उत्तर कहाँ आया ? मेरे दो प्रश्न हैं। आपने उनको स्टील शीट्स कैसे दिये ? और क्या यह सही नहीं है कि उन्होंने स्टील शीट्स को काला बाजार में बेचा ? आप सी बी आई की जांच के लिये क्यों तैयार नहीं हैं ?

श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद : अगर ज़रूरत होगी इन्वारी की तो ज़रूर इन्वारी करायें।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : यह तो मेरा उत्तर नहीं हुआ। ... (व्यवधान) ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह जो बैरल्स का सिलसिला शुरू हुआ है इसमें कमी एक कम्पनी का बैरल आ जाता है और कमी दूसरी कम्पनी का बैरल आ जाता है। तो आप जरा दूसकी सारी पोलीशन को साफ कीजिए वरना मुझे इसपर डि कशन एलाऊ करना पड़ेगा। ... (व्यवधान) .

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : मुझे मंत्री जी के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज मोशन लाना पड़ेगा। ... (व्यवधान) ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बैरल्स बहुत टाईम ले जाते हैं।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : इसमें बहुत मामला है।

श्री समर गुहा : मैंने भी एक-साल तक इसपर सवाल पूछे थे। ... (व्यवधान) ..

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : इस पर बहस के लिए आप मौका दीजिए।

श्री सीताराम केसरी : अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं जानना चाहूँगा कि 1959 की जुलाई से जन 1961 तक जो स्टैंडर्ड ड्रम मैन्युफैक्चरिंग कम्पनी ने आर्डर लिया स्टैंडर्ड वैक्यूम रिफाइनरी कम्पनी से १५ लाख ब्रिटिश सप्लाय करने के लिए तो इसके लिए रिफाइनरी को जो लोहा मिला उसका उन्होंने स्टैंडर्ड ड्रम कम्पनी को सप्लाय किया उसको मैन्युफैक्चर करने के लिए लेकिन इसके अलावा सरकार ने स्टैंडर्ड ड्रमको स्टील क्यों दिया ?

श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद : इसकी इन्वारी करेंगे ?

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : A very important Point has been raised, namely, whether the Members of this House can overlook the official Secrets Act.. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : The House is not as strict as the official Secrets Act. You must know that. I think You are used to that. You must get used to this also. There have been rulings on this at different times.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : I am grateful for your advice. Still this is very important If we Members of Parliament set an example in disrespecting the law which we pass... (Interruption) Those who do not respect the law Which they themselves enact do not deserve a hearing in this House. I should like the Minister to hold an enquiry how this information was passed on to Mr. Fernandes... (Interruption.)

MR. SPEAKER : The Position is entirely different in this House.

SHRI HEM BARUA : There is no law like this, that a Member is entitled to have information from Some Particular Source.

SHRI. K. LAKKAPA : Can hon. Members shield Corrupt officers by putting questions in the House ? Is that allowed under the rules of Procedure. I Want a clear ruling.

MR. SPEAKER : You should have clearly understood what I said.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Two letters had been quoted by my hon. friend Mr. George Fernandes and Mr. Lobo Prabhu has taken exception to that.

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you mentioning him again.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : When an ICS Officer leaves service or retires he still thinks that he is an ICS officer.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : I have been elected Member of this House just like Mr. Banerjee by votes larger than him. I am as good a Member of this House as he... (Interruption.)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I never impute any motive.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : I only say that you respect the law which you yourself enact here... (Interruptions.) That is not the way to speak for a dismissed officer.

SHR S. M. BANERJEE : He is a retired officer.

SHRI RANGA : Are we discussing only these personal matters here ?

MR. SPEAKER : I may have to ask Mr. Banerjee to sit down if he goes on like this. Why should he unnecessarily make reference to other gentlemen ? He does not seem to be serious about the question.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I shall put the question on drums. If you search any drum you will come across some ex-Minister. When the Estimates Committee has definitely recommended certain action

against a particular firm, Hind Galvanizing and Standard Drum company, why was it again referred to the Committee and why straightaway no action had been taken and when action will be taken ? After all this if it is found that some officers and ex-ministers were responsible, will the whole question be referred to the CBI, with due apologies to Mr. Lobo Prabhu ?

MR. SPEAKER : He replied to this question of MR. FERNANDES..... (Interruptions).

SHRI F. A. AHMED : We have already said so. We have referred it to the Estimates Committee and whatever be the decision of the Estimates Committee, we shall be bound by it.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : This barrel and drum company is a big racket. It is very interesting to study it. I do not go further because you said that we should not quote the names. The hon. Minister is not taking action against this company because of these things, inspite of repeated demands by the Estimates Committee to probe into the mystic and nefarious activities of the drum and barrels company; Fictitious names were used to sell all the steel that has been taken by this company; all the steel has been misused. The Government is not coming forward with an enquiry because one Governor is involved in this shady deal. Would the Government of India scrutinise who are the persons involved and take action in the matter ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I have already replied to this question.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : I have got information here and if you give me permission, I shall give the names of persons who are involved. One of them is a Governor. Will they conduct an enquiry and examine all the persons involved in this deal ? I want an answer from him.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : He must give the name; he cannot withhold names like this... (Interruptions.)

MR. SPEAKER : Question Hour should not be converted into a debating

hour. That has been my request for the last few days continuously. There are certain rules. Hon. Members should confine themselves to those rules.

SHRI RANGA : There seems to be one point.

MR. SPEAKER : Do you think we should allow speeches, introductions and preambles to questions ?

SHRI RANGA : That is not the point. After all the Estimates Committee spent a lot of time in going into all these matters and made some recommendations. The hon. Members want to know: why is it that the Minister had thought it fit to send it back again to the Estimates Committee ?

MR. SPEAKER : You know the procedure; for sometime you have also worked in the Committee. The report goes to the Ministries and the action taken report comes back.

SHRI RANGA : I know that procedure and what you have said is correct. The additional fact is that when the report goes to the Government, the Government accept it and implement it. If they find that a particular recommendation cannot be implemented, then they state the reasons and there it stops. This is not what they have done: they want a recommendation of the Estimates Committee to be re-considered by the Estimates Committee. Why ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : We have placed all the facts to be considered by the Estimates Committee so that they can take a decision after considering all those.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, Order. Next question. Shri Muthuswami.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : Sir, let the Minister reply to my question. In para 29 of the report of the Estimates Committee, they have raised a query which has not been answered by the Central Government, because an ex-Minister, and a Governor are involved in it, and Shri Manubhai Shah is involved in it. That is why they are suppressing all this. I want a categorical answer. My question should be answered,

with your permission. The Minister is shielding them. He should not shield all those blackmarketeers. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER : He may repeat the same answer. What else can be done ?

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM : The Minister has said that the Government pointed out the difficulties to the Estimates Committee. May I know the nature of the difficulties ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : It is not proper for me to disclose it here. (*Interruption.*)

DR. RAMSUBHAG SINGH : He should disclose the nature of the difficulties here.

MR. SPEAKER : The procedures are laid down by this House. The procedure laid down is, they are re-submitted with the report and the action taken on the proposals back to the Estimates Committee, and this is not considered final unless it is laid on the Table of the House, unless it is laid before the House. After all, this is the Committee's work and all of you must have gone through it.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी इस सदन की ही एक कमेटी है और मंत्री महोदय को यहां इस सदन में उसे बताना में कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए। वह यहां नेचर आफ डिफिकल्टीज बतायें।

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : Let him answer the question. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Lakkappa, that is enough.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Sir, this is an important matter.

We know the Procedure. What they say to the Estimates Committee, at the same time, may not be disclosed by them here the entire facts are there if they are secret documents. But the Minister said that in trying to implement the report of the Estimates Committee, they came across certain difficulties which have been pointed

out. We would like to know—not the entire document what are the difficulties in their way of implementation. We want to know the nature of the way of implementation. We want to know the nature of the difficulties. We do not want the entire record. (*Interruptions*) SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS. ROSE

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: If it is not clarified, naturally, the impression created by Shri Lakkappa would be corroborated here that because some dignitaries are involved in it, there were some difficulties which they do not want to disclose here, and which were pointed out to the Estimates Committee, showing reasons why they cannot implement these things. But let us at least know the nature of the difficulties.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS ROSE.

MR. SPEAKER: May I say again that it is up to you, because, if he discloses those objections here. I hope the House should give him an assurance that nobody will come with a privilege motion against him. (*interruptions*) SOME HON. MEMBERS ROSE.

MR. SPEAKER: Shouting cannot add logic to the matter. By just this loud talking you cannot add logic to the matter. This is to go to the Committee, and then, after the examination by the Committee, it is to be laid on the Table of the House. Suppose some thing comes here and before laying it on the Table of the House, the Chairman of the Committee or any Member takes an objection to it, asking why was it disclosed before we took a decision on it, you must go into the implications of it.

DR. RAM SUDHAG SINGH: It must be disclosed here.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: What is the nature of the difficulties?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, I was trying to draw your attention to a particular matter, but you did not permit me. I do not know what happens. It is a question of privilege, it is the privilege of Members to ask certain questions.

MR. SPEAKER: I have followed your objection and if you have any objection regarding the matter, you can write to me.

SHRI SAMARA GUHA: That is not the question. I was trying to draw your attention to yesterday's list of business. Against item No. 8 in that list, there was the report of the Estimates Committee concerning this matter. It was to be placed on the Table of the Houses, but it was not placed. At the last minute, it was withdrawn. We have, as Members of the House, the right to ask why it was withdrawn at the last moment though it had been included in the list of business for the day. I was trying to draw your attention from the very beginning, it is a relevant point.

MR. SPEAKER: You should have enquired about it in my Chamber.

I need not tell the reasons. The Chairman of the Committee, and Members, asked me that it should be delayed. They are going to lay it, at some other time, on the Table of the House. Why are you raising it? These are ordinary matters.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Let us hear the minister.

SHRI F. A. AHRLED: So far as the withdrawal of the item is concerned, I am not to be blamed. We have sent an explanation to the Estimates Committee and I personally feel that till the matter is discussed by the Estimates Committee, it will not be proper for me to lay it. But I am prepared to lay it after the whole matter is discussed by the Estimates Committee.

SHRI A SREEDHARAN: The Action Taken Report of the committee was not placed on the Table of the House because the Chairman and Members of that committee approached you and asked you to defer the placing of the report on the Table. That is what we are told. I am the Convener of the Action Taken Committee and I have not made any such request. I repudiate it on the floor of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It goes to the Chairman always, not to the Convener.

SHRI A SREEDHARAN : The report was finalised and it should have been placed on the Table. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. SPEAKER : There are certain papers which are purely with the office and on such matters the hon. members can get information from me. Why do you confront me here as if you are confronting the ministers sitting here? After all, this is a question pertaining to the Order paper. (*interruptions*).

In spite of best efforts, we are not able to cover more than four questions. What is the use of having a Question Hour? Why not have a regular debating time? I tried to regulate it, but I could not. Every time the hon. leaders in the opposition ask me to increase the number of questions. Do you think it will be possible? You render me completely helpless. (*Interruptions*).

Question Hour is over. Short Notice Question.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

Service of Warrant on Station Master, Dhrangadhra for attachment of Railways Property

S. N. Q. 3 **SHRI R. K. BIRLA :** Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state :

(a) Whether it is a fact that a salt merchant of Dhrangadhra near Surendranagar Railway station got a warrant served on the Station Master, Dhrangadhra for the attachment of all properties at the station to realise a decree of Rs. 1,008:

(b) Whether it is also a fact that the salt merchant secured the decree against the Railway authorities 18 months ago but the authorities did not take notice of the same:

(c) if so, the details thereof: and

(d) the action taken by the Railway Administration in the matter?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI R. L. CHATURVEDI) (a) It is a fact that a warrant for the attachment of the Railway property at Dhrangadhra station, namely

chairs, tables, wall clocks, hard cash and other articles which the Plaintiff could show was presented on 28.1.1970 by the bailiff, at Dhrangadhra Station on behalf of a salt merchant of Dhrangadhra for the realisation of a decree of Rs. 1005 and Paisa twelve.

(b) The decree under reference was secured by the merchant on 12.7.1968, but remained unsatisfied till 5.2.1970 due to utter negligence on the part of the Railway.

(c) A consignment of 145 bags of salt booked from Kuda Salt Siding to Kawapur, a station on the North Eastern Railway, failing to reach destination, Messrs. Prashant & Company lodged a claim therefor on the North Eastern Railway. The claim was not entertained by the Railway as the Original Railway Receipt, the Original Beejuck and a Disclaimer letter from the consignee of the consignment were not furnished. Thereupon Messrs. Prashant & Co. filed a suit against the Railway for recovery of the value of the consignment in the Court of Civil Judge, Dhrangadhra and this suit was decreed against the Railway on 12.7.1968 for Rs. 750 with costs plus 6 per cent running interest from the date of filing of the suit. The Western Railway had to satisfy this decree, but, due to inattention in the Railway's Claims Office, the decree remained unsatisfied till a warrant for execution of the decree was issued. When the bailiff appeared for attachment of Railway property at Dhrangadhra station on 28.1.1970, the Station Master made an application in Court seeking one month's time to satisfy the decree. This application was accepted and finally the decree was satisfied on 5.2.1970.

(d) An enquiry by Senior Administrative Officers was ordered immediately after this case came to notice. The report of the enquiry has just been received and is under scrutiny. The enquiry committee has held six officials as well as the Railway Advocate responsible for dereliction of duty in this case. Stringent action will be ensured in this case.

SHRI R. K. BIRLA : The attachment of one's property is the last thing that one would like to have in his life. It is supposed to be the greatest humiliation for anyone. The hon. Minister has admitted that there has been gross negligence on the part of the