

been under consideration. The idea is to introduce it in the State of Punjab in certain selected districts.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: May I know whether the States have agreed to implement the scheme that is proposed to be introduced and whether Rajasthan is one of the States to give effect to a scheme of crop insurance in that State?

Shri Shinde: The scheme was circulated to all the States some years back. But only the State of Punjab agreed to accept the scheme as a pilot scheme. As far as Rajasthan is concerned I think, due to the financial difficulties involved, they could not come forward.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ranga.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Have they not accepted?

Shri Ranga: May I know what has happened to the Government of India's own scheme for insurance against natural calamities on an inter-State basis and State basis also?

Shri A. M. Thomas: In fact, in course of time, the scheme would perhaps cover the entire country. We want to make a beginning in the State of Punjab. Of course, the necessity for this insurance is being felt. But you have also to take into account the financial implications too. We want to make a beginning in Punjab because that State has come forward with this and it is prepared to implement the scheme.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : हमारे देश में खुराक के प्रबन्ध की जिम्मेदारी केन्द्र पर है और किसानों की हालत यह है कि कभी सूखा पड़ता है और कभी बाढ़ आती है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार और सभी स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स ने क्राप इन्शोरेंस के सिद्धान्त को मान लिया है ; यदि हाँ, तो सरकार इस बारे में क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है ?

Shri Shinde: As far as the principle is concerned, that has been accepted

by the Government of India, and there is no difference of approach, as far as even the State Governments are concerned, but the problem is one of the magnitude of the financial outlay involved and other such things. All these technicalities are being examined, and after the pilot scheme has been successful in a particular area, it would be extended all over the country.

गुड़ में मुनाफाखोरी

+

{ श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :
श्री यशपाल सिंह :
श्री धवन :
श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ :
*२७६. श्री भी० प्र० यादव :
श्री दी० चं० शर्मा :
श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा :
श्री बछ्वाय :
श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी :
श्री नाथपाई :

क्या खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या दिल्ली सेन्ट्रल कोऑपरेटिव स्टोर द्वारा गुड़ में मुनाफाखोरी की जाने की जांच पूरी हो गई है;

(ख) यदि हाँ, तो इस के क्या परिणाम निकले;

(ग) क्या उक्त स्टोर के कार्यबहन के बारे में अन्य अनियमितताओं का भी सरकार को पता लगा है; और

(घ) क्या सरकार इन भारी अनियमितताओं के होते हुए भी इस स्टोर को चालू रहने की अनुमति देगी ?

खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री के सभा-सचिव (श्री शिन्दे) : (क) जी हाँ ।

(ख) कानूनी विशेषज्ञों द्वारा रिपोर्ट की जांच की जा रही है ।

(ग) जी हां ।

(घ) जब कथित अनियमितताएं सिद्ध हो जायेंगी तब इस मामले पर विचार किया जाएगा ।

[(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The report is being examined by legal experts.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) The matter will be considered when the alleged irregularities have been proved.]

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि दिल्ली के सेन्ट्रल कोआपरेटिव स्टोर की मुनाफ़ाखोरी के सम्बन्ध में जो जांच दिल्ली पुलिस ने की है, उस में विशेष रूप से किन किन व्यक्तियों को अपराधी पाया गया है और उन के खिलाफ पुलिस की रिपोर्ट क्या है ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Swaran Singh): I would appeal to the hon. Member that the matter having been investigated by the police, is a judicial one which will go before the court, and it will not be fair to give out the result of the investigation or to discuss the result of the investigation.

Mr. Speaker: Have they come to any conclusion to put up certain persons before the court? In that case, the names of the persons whom they are putting up before the court may be disclosed; as to whether they are guilty or not is a different matter; whatever the pronouncement of the court may be on that matter, the names of those persons may be disclosed.

Shri Swaran Singh: I need hardly point out to you with your vast experience of courts that whatever is the *chalaan* that will be put before

the court will become public property, and before that is done, to comment on what is proved or to disclose the persons against whom something has been proved will only be ...

An Hon. Member: The hon. Minister may state the facts.

Shri Swaran Singh: ... a *prima facie* thing. ...

Mr. Speaker: But there is one thing. If the police has completed the investigation and come to the conclusion that they are putting up such and such persons for trial, then the only question which can be asked at this stage is this: Who are the persons who are being put up for trial before the court? That is the information which the hon. Member wants.

Shri Swaran Singh: The police have not yet come to that stage.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : इस बात में कहाँ तक सच्चाई है कि दिल्ली पुलिस ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में जिन प्रमुख व्यक्तियों को दोषी पाया है, उन में सेन्ट्रल कोआपरेटिव स्टोर के चेयरमैन सब से प्रमुख दोषी पाए गए हैं और केवल उन को बचाने के लिये यह केस ला मिनिस्ट्री को रेफर किया गया है और उस ने यह कहा है कि उन का नाम वहाँ से हटा दिया जाये ?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह कहना वाजिब नहीं होगा कि किसी को बचाने के लिये ला मिनिस्ट्री को कोई चीज भेजी गई है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी चालान ही नहीं भेजा गया है, तो पहले ही इसे बारे में इन्फ़ॉर्मेशन निकालना ठीक नहीं होगा ।

Shri U. M. Trivedi: On a point of order. The hon. Minister was heard to say that it would be improper on his part to disclose the names of the persons against whom investigations had been carried out for it was likely that they would have to be prosecuted before a court of law. Which

particular provision of law is there by virtue of which he can refrain from disclosing the names for fear of being hauled up for contempt of court?

Mr. Speaker: That fear might not be there, but the police go on investigating the case. Today they might have some evidence, and tomorrow they might find that that is not enough. So long as the investigations go on. . .

Shri Ranga: The difficulty is that it might go on for years and years.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different thing altogether.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: My point is this. If the hon. Minister has this fear that something might leak out, which he desires should not take place, then it might be quite another thing, I cannot say; but if the fear is that it will offend against the provisions relating to contempt of court, then. . .

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member might take it as that fear, which appeals to him.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I want to know whether what the hon. Minister says is right or not.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा : श्रीमन्, एमेशनल कामोडिटेज एक्ट का धारा १० में कहा गया है कि अगर कोई गोलमाल डायरेक्टर की मलाह या उस की जानकारों से हो, तो डायरेक्टर पर भी कानूनी कार्यवाही होनी चाहिये। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब दिल्ली पुलिस ने चौधरो ब्रह्मप्रकाश का बयान ले लिया है और गोलमाल का आरोप सिद्ध हो चुका है, तो फिर उन के खिलाफ कार्यवाही न करने का क्या कारण है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह तहकीकात कर रहे हैं।

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा : बयान हो चुके हैं। उन के ऊपर जुर्म साबित हो चुके हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह हम यहाँ नहीं मान सकते हैं कि साबित भी हो चुके हैं। पुलिस

को चालान देने दीजिये। अगर उन पर कुछ नहीं करेगे तो बहस हो सकती है। लेकिन उन के खिलाफ कार्यवाही नहीं की गई है, उन को छोड़ दिया गया है, इस तरह की जो बातें हैं

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा : उन को छोड़ा जा रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उन को छोड़ा जा रहा है तो इस के दम्यान में मैं नहीं जा सकता हूँ, आप इसको समझेंगे।

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: On a point of order. What we want to know is whether investigations have been held; if they have been held, against whom have they been held, and whether they have been completed. The plea that this is a matter which cannot be disclosed is contrary to the precedents known to this House. You would recall that when investigations were held against certain film stars, the names were disclosed in this House.

Under no provision of law can a Minister refuse to disclose the names of persons against whom investigations were held.

Mr. Speaker: If the question was about a particular fact, what are the names of persons against whom that complaint or FIR has been made, that would be a different thing altogether. But so far as the investigation goes, besides the names mentioned, during the investigation some others might be involved or some might be exculpated. Therefore, I am not going to allow that course.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: In that case, we should know at least the names of those against whom a complaint was lodged and whether investigations were held against each one of them.

Shri Swaran Singh: There is nothing to hide. If the hon. Members have formed any other impression, I am very sorry. The facts are well known and they have been extensively mentioned on the floor of the House

and in the press also. The FIR in this case related to a particular transaction. There was no name as such when the FIR was recorded. As is quite common in such cases, as a result of the police investigation, inquiries were made by the police against everyone who came within the ambit of law as a result of the investigation, either directly or constructively. They have more or less finalised their inquiries and the matter is almost at the final stage. After consulting the Law Ministry, a final paper will be put before the court against those persons against whom there is a *prima facie* case.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Do not hush up.

Mr. Speaker: Is Shri Nath Pai rising to a point of order?

Shri Nath Pai: I wish to ask a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I will call him later. Shri Yashpal Singh.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री: एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मूल प्रश्न के उत्तर में माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि पुलिस की जांच पूरी हो चुकी है और कानूनी जांच के लिये कानूनी सलाहकारों के पास उस को भेजा गया है। जब पुलिस की जांच पूरी हो चुकी है तो यह बतलाने में सरकार को क्या आपत्ति है कि पुलिस की जांच के परिणामस्वरूप किन किन व्यक्तियों को दोषी पाया गया है? इस को सरकार क्यों छिपाना चाहती है?

अध्यक्ष महोदय: जब तक पुलिस अपनी रिपोर्ट न दे दे और पुलिस के ऊपर जो उन का लीगल डिपार्टमेंट है उस से भी मसिवरा कर के आखिरी चालान पुट न कर दे तब तक इंटरमिडियेरी स्टेजिज में जो नाम हैं, जिन को आखिर में शायद उन के अप्रसर जो हैं वे एप्रूव न करें, उन को बताना ठीक नहीं है।

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा: एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, अध्यक्ष महोदय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: व्यवस्था का प्रश्न कहाँ उठता है?

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा: जो पुलिस ने बयान लिया है, क्या वह भी सभा पटल पर रखा जायेगा या नहीं?

अध्यक्ष महोदय: पुलिस का बयान नहीं रखा जाता है।

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा: उन के खिलाफ कानूनी कार्यवाही हुई है।

श्री यशपाल सिंह: क्या सरकार को पता है कि पी० एम० पी० के पांच सौ वर्कर इसलिये गिरफ्तार किये गये हैं डिफेंस ग्राफ इंडिया रूज में कि वे अपने साथ सवा पांच किलो गुड़ ला रहे थे जिन में एम० पी० और एम० एल० ए० भी शामिल थे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार ने इतने बड़े स्कैंडल के लिये जिम्मेदार किसी भी व्यक्ति को डिफेंस ग्राफ इंडिया रूज में गिरफ्तार किया है?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह: एक ऐसा मामला जो जेर तफतीश हो, उस के मुताल्लिक यह कहना . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय: सवाल इतना ही है कि डी० आई० आर० के नीचे किसी को गिरफ्तार किया गया है या नहीं?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह: मुझे मालूम नहीं है कि कौन से कानून के नीचे उन के खिलाफ एक्शन लिया गया है।

Shri Nath Pai: Is it not a fact that in the first week of February the Delhi Police submitted a report stating that five persons, in addition to the three already prosecuted, whose names were preferred by them, should be prosecuted not for breach of the Essential Commodities Act but under sections 34, 120B and 477A, IPC? If that is true, who are the persons against whom the police have recommended that charges should be preferred under the sections I have referred to? I want to know specifically,

I am repeating, whether the police completed their enquiry in the first week and made this report or not, and the persons against whom....

Mr. Speaker: Not so many questions. He will not be able to reply.

Shri Nath Pai: You have been trying to defend us. When a specific question has been asked, the reply has been evasive. So, I am asking whether there are persons against whom the police demand that charges should be preferred or not, and if these are the sections or not. What more specific questions can we ask?

Shri Swaran Singh: So far as the police recommendation is concerned, I have not seen the recommendation at all, and it is not customary to see the police diaries, about what they do. Even in courts of law, it is well known that the statements made before the police can be used only for a specific purpose. What I say is these are internal processes. Whether it is the Law Ministry or the police, they are wings of the same Government, and it is quite customary for police investigators to take the advice of either the Public Prosecutor or some officer of the Law Ministry. I do not know what their recommendations are, unless the case is put up before court.

Shri Nath Pai: On a point of order. They are two specifically different matters. I have asked whether the police have made such a report or not. I want to know whether the report was made and if the report was made, what were its contents, what were the charges against the individuals, whether the Government....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Report to whom?

Shri Nath Pai: The police were directed by the authorities of Delhi to investigate into the matter. I claim that they completed the investigation and they submitted a list of persons who, according to the police, should be prosecuted under sections 34, 471 and 120B. I want to know who

those persons are. The Government can later on take the Public Prosecutor's or the Law Ministry's opinion as to whether they should proceed or not. I am asking: at the police enquiry, where do we stand? What is the difficulty in giving this specific information?

Mr. Speaker: There is this difficulty, he has said he cannot go into the police records and find out how the diary is kept.

Shri Nath Pai: The police have submitted a report.

Mr. Speaker: To whom?

Shri Nath Pai: To the Administration.

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not know whether they have made any report, but in my experience of the functioning of the police, there is no question of a report to any authority.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a report submitted to the Administration by the police?

Shri Swaran Singh: I will find out. I have no information at the moment.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Apart from this transaction of blackmarketing in *gur*,.....

Shri D. J. Naik: On a point of order. How many minutes should be given to one question? More than fifteen minutes have been taken.

Shri Nath Pai: Is it an insinuation against the Chair? This remark may be expunged.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Will they not allow me to proceed with the question?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Apart from this particular transaction in *gur* by this co-operative society, I want to know whether this cooperative society has indulged in other shady deals, and if so, whether Government propose to give the entire transaction of this co-operative society to the Special Police

Establishment and not to the local police?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): I do not think there is any necessity to entrust the case to the Special Police Establishment. In fact, it has been enquired into by the Crime Branch of the Delhi Police. Voluminous records have been scrutinised and a large number of persons have been interrogated and the investigation is coming to a final stage.

With regard to the other question put by the hon. Member, in fact, there are no cases which justify reference to the Special Police Establishment. Cases are referred to them concerning officers generally, not of private individuals. As a result of the audit report of the Delhi Central Co-operative Stores Limited for the period ending 30th June, 1962, there are certain irregularities that have been pointed out which are being enquired into by the Delhi Administration.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, अध्यक्ष महोदय। पिछली बार मैं ने इस सवाल को सदन में उठाया था। सबको मालूम है कि मेरे पास इस सम्बन्ध में सामग्री ज्यादा होगी। तब क्या ऐसे एक सदन के सदस्य को एक पूरक प्रश्न पूछने का मौका नहीं मिलना चाहिये। ऐसा न हुआ तो नतीजा यह होगा कि जिन लोगों की किसी तरह से तकदीर कुछ अच्छी है उन का नाम वगैरह आ जायगा, बाकी के सब लोग तो दर्शक और श्रोता भर रह जायेंगे। पिछली दफे मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि दिल्ली प्रशासन पर यह काम छोड़ दिया गया है। जब हम ने जोर दिया कि केन्द्रीय सरकार इस के ऊपर पहल करे, और दिल्ली प्रशासन का काम अब खत्म हो गया है, तब केन्द्र क्यों अड़गा डाल रहा है। मैं आप से कह दूँ कि साजिश और हिसाब गलत रखने के सम्बन्ध में जो इस सदन के माननीय सदस्य हैं उन के खिलाफ तक आरोप लगाये गये हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस सारे बयान से व्यवस्था का कोई प्रश्न नहीं निकलता इस लिये मैं इसे नहीं ले सकता।

Buffer Stock of Wheat

*280. {
Shri A. N. Vidyalkar:
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:
Shri P. C. Borooah:
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
Shri Himatsingka:
Shri D. J. Naik:

Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether India has sounded U.S.A. for import of wheat to create a buffer stock; and

(b) if so, the reactions of the U.S. Government thereto?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Shinde): (a) and (b). At the time of the review in May, 1963 of the working of current PL 480 Agreement, the Government of U.S.A. were sounded on the question of continuing imports under a fresh PL 480 Agreement after the present Agreement came to an end in June, 1964. There was an indication of the general desire of the U.S. Government to assist India. No decisions were taken. The Government of India have now under consideration formal proposals for a fresh PL 480 Agreement covering imports for current consumption as well as for building up buffer stocks.

Shri A. N. Vidyalkar: Has the Government examined the reasons why the buffer stocks which are primarily meant to check the price rise have failed to check it?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): There are limitations with regard to the building up of buffer stocks of rice. We have got adequate stocks of wheat and we release large quantities in areas which are