

Dr. M. M. Das: It is premature to answer that question.

डा० गोविन्द दास : यहाँ जो यह खुदाई राजकोट के चारों तरफ चल रही है, क्या गुजरात सरकार ने द्वारिका और द्वारिका के चारों तरफ खुदाई के सम्बन्ध में सरकार के सामने कोई प्रस्ताव रखा है ?

Dr. M. M. Das: I would like to have notice for this question. But this much I can tell the hon. Member that Dr. Sankhalia of the Deccan College Post-Graduate Research Institute has carried out some excavations near about Dwarka.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : ये जो चीजें यहाँ प्राप्त हुई हैं, इनकी एज क्या होगी, पचीस हजार साल पुरानी होंगी, तीस हजार साल पुरानी होंगी या कितनी पुरानी होगी ?

Dr. M. M. Das: It is expected that the exhibits that have been found belong to the Indus Valley Civilisation, that is, about 2,000 to 2,500 years before the birth of Christ. Dr. Sankhalia has found some palaeoliths, that is, old stone implements used by primitive man in areas adjacent to this particular place. It is difficult to find out the exact age of those stone implements; it may be 5,00,000 to 6,00,000 years.

श्री शिव नारायण : जो ऐतिहासिक वस्तुएँ प्राप्त हुई हैं, वे क्या क्या वस्तुएँ हैं, क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ ?

Dr. M. M. Das: I have already said that we have not received a detailed report of these excavations.

Grant of Mining Lease for Manganese and Chrome Ore

*912. **Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Will the Minister of Mines and Fuel be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 692 on the 3rd April, 1963 and state:

(a) whether the firm Serajuddin & Co. was permitted mining lease for Manganese and Chrome Ore after 1956;

(b) if so, how many leases were granted to the firm and in which years;

(c) whether this firm was one of the parties whose lease was revised by the Central Government and whether Government of Orissa was opposed to this revision; and

(d) if so, on what grounds the revision was permitted?

The Minister of Mines and Fuel (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) and (b). The Government of India do not grant any mining lease. Under Section 5(2) of the Mines & Minerals (Regulation & Development) Act, 1957, the State Government is required to obtain prior approval of the Central Government to the grant of mining lease for minerals specified in the First Schedule to the Act. Two proposals for the grant of mining lease (one for manganese and the other for chromite) in favour of M/s. Serajuddin & Co. were received from the Government of Orissa one each in 1957 and 1958 and approval of the Central Government thereto was conveyed to the State Government. Information as to whether these two leases were actually granted by the State Government after obtaining Central Government's prior approval, is not available.

(c) No Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The Industrial Policy Resolution has clearly prohibited these mining leases being granted after 1956. It is the policy of the Central Government that whenever any recommendation comes from the State Government in this matter, automatically it will approve it? Is it not a fact that, so far as the particular mining lease to Messrs. Serajuddin and Company is concerned, except Messrs. Serajuddin and Company no other private party was given the mining lease for chrome ore since 1959?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Sir, the latter part of the question is not correct. But I might explain that since 1956

when the Industrial Policy Resolution laid down the control of special mineral ores by the Government, the Ministry of Mines and Fuel examined this question through the expert committee and surveyed the whole country for major minerals which were coming under the Schedule A. There are several minerals which are not major for which I am also making an enquiry as to what specific rules or regulations may be laid down for distribution. Throughout the country, thousands of applications were received after the expert committee had completed its report and recommendations and carved out major ores which had to be controlled by the public sector, or worked by the public sector either through the Central Government or through the State Governments. The rest isolated chunks of areas were left back. They were given back to the State Governments to be treated as if they were like other non-Schedule minerals. Now, those small isolated areas according to our Ministry and also according to the Planning Commission were advised to be left out for the private sector. On that basis, on that background policy, thousands of applications were received from the rest of the country. The number, perhaps, I have also got. Since 1956, there have been 2,618 references from all State Governments seeking the approval of the Central Government to the grant of mineral concessions to private companies relating to scheduled minerals. Of these 2,618, 2,382 have been approved by the Central Government in the normal course, 218 have been rejected and 18 are still pending.

So far as the chromite leases are concerned—I speak from memory because they are still being examined and they have to be placed on the Table of the House in response to the wishes of my hon. friend Hem Barua—there were two leases granted to Serajuddin & Co. from Orissa. One was for manganese and the other was for chrome. They were given on the sponsoring of the State Governments and their initiation. All that we had to do was

only to approve them in the formal way.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He has not replied to the first part of my question, whether in spite of the Industrial Policy Resolution it is incumbent on the Government of India, whenever they get a recommendation from State Governments, to simply approve it and that they have nothing to do in the matter so far as the implementation of that particular policy is concerned. He has also not clarified whether this particular chrome ore for the area which was given was the isolated area about which the experts had opined.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I think I clarified the position. But I would again try to do so. About those areas which were isolated, the State Government were expected to treat it as if it was normal non-scheduled minerals and they could have sent their recommendation and all that we had to do was to send our formal approval. This chrome area was not in that reserve area. The State Governments were required not to send any recommendation to us from areas which were reserved for private sector and wherever such areas were recommended by the State Governments which lay in the reserve area, the Government of India took special care to see that they were not thrown open to private sector unless the public sector, the State authorities and the Central Government authorities had clearly decided not to work that area in the next few years. I do not think there are too many areas which are being taken out from the reserve area to be left out for the private sector.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: About the revisions of the mining leases, is it not a fact, as the Minister has stated earlier, that there were six cases which were revised in 1962 and there were cases which were revised in 1959 and 1961 and may I know whether these revisions of the mining leases that were made were those that were obtained from the Government of India prior to 1956 or whether new mining leases

that were granted after 1956 also came for revision from the Government of Orissa?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I do not know with regard to the specific details.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You promised to give more particulars on that day.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I said there are many other cases and, as an assurance to the questions put by Shri Hem Barua, that papers will be laid on the Table of the House. But, in order to assure my friend, I would like to state that in this latter period from 1956 to 1962, so far as chrome leases are concerned, there was not one single case where the Government of India took any initiative.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There is no question of initiative.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: All these mining leases that were sponsored, whether they were pre-1956....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: They were in league. As far as this firm is concerned, both are involved.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I do not know what he insinuates.

Shri Hem Barua: Both the Centre and the State Government.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There is no question of initiative. Do not take the plea that the State Government recommended. There is no question of initiative. *(Interruption)*

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I do not know. I say, whether it was pre-1956 or post-1956, no chrome mining lease was initiated by the Government of India. All the details that are still to be laid on the Table of the House in response to Shri Hem Barua's query will be there, which will perhaps satisfy hon. Members that the Government of India did not take any initiative.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That is a different question altogether. I put

the question with regard to a previous question to which a reply is asked for. In reply to the original question, the Minister said that one was revised in 1958, the second in 1959 and the third in 1961, and in 1962 six were revised. When I asked could you not give us the names of the parties, he said, I will check up. That was the question which was put. He says something.

Mr. Speaker: In the statement, he will supply all the information. I hope that would be done.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: All the details will be supplied.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know if it is not a fact that an application from Messrs Serajuddin & Co. for the export of manganese ore against machinery to be imported for the Oil and Natural Gas Commission on a barter basis was forwarded by the Mines and Fuel Ministry to the Commerce and Industry Ministry on the 29th of March, just a day earlier or the day before which Mr. Serajuddin was arrested, and if so, may I know what are the special considerations on account of which this application of Messrs. Serajuddin & Co. was forwarded to the Commerce and Industry Ministry because this firm was already in disgrace and discredited....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. This question is not relevant.

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit, it is relevant?

Mr. Speaker: The original question was about mining lease for manganese and chrome ore. Serajuddin & Co. is not under discussion.

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit, according to my simple understanding, ...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order . . .

Shri Hem Barua: . . . may I submit to you with all humility the purpose of this question is to pin-point the shady negotiation or the shady deal with Messrs. Serajuddin & Co.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hem Barua: My question springs from this. I want to pin-point

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Would he kindly resume his seat? I have to look to this question that is before me. It is not an enquiry, whole of it, against Messrs Serajuddin & Co, or any shady deals that might have been entered into or not entered into. I am not concerned. During this particular question, I am confining myself to this. The question is clear, whether the firm Serajuddin & Co. was permitted mining lease for manganese and chrome ore after 1956.

Shri Hem Barua: What is the purpose behind the question?

Mr. Speaker: I do not know what is the purpose behind it.

Shri Hem Barua: The whole thing is in connection with

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Shri Kamath.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Arising out of answer to part (a) of the question about mining lease given to Serajuddin & Co., is it a fact that not merely was the matter taken to that stage, but also he was recommended a lease for the export of manganese ore by the Minister to the Commerce and Industry Ministry at the same time as Mr. Serajuddin's brother or relation Shamsuddin was given an import licence for the import of machinery for the Oil and Natural Gas Commission?

Mr. Speaker: Again, it is the same thing.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I want to reply to that question.

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary that because he wants to reply, therefore, I should permit him.

As far as I have been able to follow that question, it is just the same question as was put earlier but in another form.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This is different.

Mr. Speaker: Then too, what objection

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I threw a challenge to the hon. Member sitting opposite. Is he prepared to accept it? (Interruptions).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: A specific question is put but replies are not given. What is this challenge? Does the hon. Minister accept the challenge? He does not resign but throws a challenge. It is a disgrace.

Shri Hem Barua: I made some charges against this Ministry but he could not reply to those charges. (Interruptions).

An Hon. Member: He has to resign.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member had asked the same question in another form.

Shri Hem Barua: He did not reply to some charges which I had made in the course of my speech on the Demands of his Ministry.

Mr. Speaker: After making his observations, the hon. Member must resume his seat. I am crying again and again that he should resume his seat, but I find that he still continues.

Shri Hem Barua: As soon as you stood up, I resumed my seat.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Minister wants to reply, he may reply now.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: What my hon. friend Shri Kamath has said is incorrect. He should correct himself by accepting my statement that all that he has said is not correct. No Shamsuddin's or Serajuddin's proposal has been forwarded for recommendation by the Ministry of Mines and Fuel to the Commerce and Industry Ministry for exchange on barter basis.

Re: S.Q. No. 910

श्री यशपाल सिंह : मेरा सवाल नम्बर ९१० नहीं बुलाया गया ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह २३ तारीख के लिए रख दिया गया है । आपको छपने कागजों में नोटिस मिला होगा । शायद आपने उसको पढ़ा नहीं है ।