

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : मैं बहुत ज्यादा तो अभी नहीं बता सकता हूँ, लेकिन हम ने जो स्कीम बनाई है, उस में लगभग 23, 24 करोड़ रुपये के खर्च का सवाल है।

**Shri M. L. Jadhav:** What are the important duties assigned to Home Guards?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** It is difficult to say what their duties precisely are. They will perform the functions of the police and assist in the civil defence work.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I would like to know whether it is a fact that Government employees who have volunteered for training as Home Guards are not given some facilities like leave by the departments concerned. If so, may I know whether clear instructions have since been issued to the departments to give them those facilities?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** When they go for training as home guards they will be treated as working on duty.

**Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda:** May I know whether the Home Guards will be given rifle training or not?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** They will be given rifle training.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार ने राज्य सरकारों को ऐसे आदेश दिये हैं कि होम गार्ड्स के सदस्यों को बन्द कर दिया जाये। अगर नहीं, तो कौन से आदेशों के अनुसार उन को बन्द करना शुरू कर दिया गया है?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : होम गार्ड्स को बन्द करने का आदेश तो नहीं दिया गया है, लेकिन अगर होम गार्ड्स—क्या कोई बड़े से बड़ा आदमी भी—कोई अपराध करे, तो वह बन्द होगा ही।

### Special Audit Report on Orissa Government Transactions

+

\*725. **Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:**  
**Shri Yashpal Singh:**  
**Shri Gokulananda Mohanty:**  
**Shri Jena:**  
**Shri P. C. Borooah:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that in the last few months several newspapers have published the document laid on the Table on the 3rd March, 1965, referring to it as the C.B.I. report on Orissa affairs and further booklets have appeared in several languages reproducing the aforesaid document as the C.B.I. report on Orissa affairs;

(b) whether Government have contradicted or denied the authenticity or genuineness of those publications; and

(c) if not, the reasons for not taking action against those newspapers and publishers of booklets under the Official Secrets Act?

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi):** (a) to (c). The question makes certain assumptions about the nature of certain papers. Government therefore regret their inability to express in any way any opinion about those assumptions. The attention of the Honourable Members is also invited to the reply given to Starred Question No. 862 by Sarvashri Jashvant Mehta and H. C. Mathur in the Lok Sabha on 14th April, 1965. Government have nothing to add to the position indicated in that reply.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Sir, on a point of order. I have made no assumptions whatsoever in my question. It is the Government which has got a knack for ambivalent evasion. Now, Sir, if you kindly read the question, what assumptions have I made? I have asked for facts. In part (a) I have asked whether it is a fact

that booklets and newspaper articles appeared about those papers laid on the Table on the 3rd March referring to them as CBI Report. What is the assumption there? Then I asked whether Government have contradicted the genuineness of those publications. Is there any assumption there? Thirdly, I asked why no action has been taken. There is no assumption. Where is the assumption? What is the assumption here? I asked whether it is a fact. They are simply trying to evade the question.

**Shri Hathi:** That they were published as CBI reports and whether they are CBI reports or not is itself..

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Sir, it is wholly scandalous and atrocious for the Government to take that stand. They are taking advantage of your ruling in a cowardly manner and they are not coming out with facts; they are not making a clean breast of the whole matter. Sir, it is high time that you took them to task and brought them to book. (*Interruptions*).

12.00 hrs.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** They may not say whether this is CBI Report or not.. (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Speaker:** I cannot give them this privilege that all three of them should speak together.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** They may not say whether it is the CBI Report or not, but they should say whether such booklets or leaflets have been published on the basis of the document placed on the Table of the House, known as the CBI Report. This is a fact to which they have to say 'Yes' or 'No'. (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Speaker:** The Question Hour is over.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Sir, I rise on a point of order.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Sir, in regard to this question you have the discre-

tion to extend two minutes perhaps because this was reached and a point of order was raised. He could not even ask a supplementary.

**Mr. Speaker:** There was only one minute left when Shri Kamath was just putting pressure on me that that question should be called.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** He was saying, 'There is one minute, one minute left yet'.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** We are thankful to you.

**Mr. Speaker:** I called that question. How can I continue that now?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Sir, I rise on a point of order.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Sir, I speak as a private Member; I am completely unaware of the pressures that are possible of being put upon you by X or Y. That is not my concern. I am concerned about the question which appears to me rather important. You did call it and you did even call him for a supplementary, but he chose to raise a point of order. A point of order, surely, is a matter of some importance, I take it, and presumably a Member of Shri Kamath's standing would not raise a point of order unless he thinks that there is some reason for it. What I feel is that this is a question on which supplementaries should be allowed particularly because Government try to prevaricate by making all kinds of statements.

**Mr. Speaker:** When there is only one minute left and the Member chooses that his question must be called, I give him that concession that it is called and even I allow him one supplementary to be put though almost the time is over, then instead of putting the supplementary he raises a point of order. If that point of order is raised and he foregoes that opportunity which I have provided him so that he might put a supple-

mentary, how can I help him in that. . . (Interruption)?

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It is under the Rules. . . (Interruption).

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Sir, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Deo has raised another question; that is a different thing altogether. That might be raised in some form.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** You have not given your ruling on the point of order. Those are not assumptions. They have not said anything; they have not said 'Yes' or 'No'.

**Mr. Speaker:** I did ask the Minister to answer as to what were the assumptions and he has answered it.

**Shri Nath Pal:** What was the answer?

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** As far as we are concerned, you have rightly ruled that we should be precise, concise, to the point and all that. Does that not apply to Ministers also?

**Mr. Speaker:** I should say that they should not claim that they always abide by that.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** We try our best; they do not at all.

**Shri Nath Pal:** But where are the assumptions?

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Here is a question which you permitted and which asked the Government whether it was a fact that certain things purporting to be the CBI Report had been published or not. Government ought to tell us 'Yes' or 'No'. Government need not tell us that all these are presumptions.

**Mr. Speaker:** Has the Minister anything to say to that?

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It might be answered tomorrow.

**Shri Hathi:** If we look at the question, it means that certain documents

have been published. They were referred. . .

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** In various languages—English, Oriya etc.

**Shri Hathi:** Yes. They were referred to as the CBI Report on Orissa affairs and further booklets appeared in several languages reproducing the aforesaid documents as the CBI Report. Now, these are all presumptions, whether it is the CBI Report or not. . . (Interruption). The question, therefore, is whether these documents, which appeared as the CBI Report, or whether Government is aware—the whole presumption is that the documents were CBI Report and that they were published. . . (Interruption). That is a presumption and, therefore, Government cannot reply to anything on these presumptions.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will request the hon. Minister to look to the question.

**Shri Shashi Ranjan:** The question Hour is over.

**Mr. Speaker:** I can settle it, even if the Question Hour is over; I cannot leave it in the middle; that responsibility is on me.

**Shri Shashi Ranjan:** On previous occasions, you had disallowed this.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Minister may say whether it is a fact that, in the last few months, several newspapers have published a document laid on the Table of the House on 3rd March, 1965. . . (Interruptions).

Order, order.

The question is whether it is a fact that they were published in those papers as purporting to be—or those papers supposed or gave out or referred to them as—the C.B.I. report. That question is not an assumption.

**Shri Nanda:** It is true that the assumption is not on the part of the hon. member. It may be an assumption on the part of the newspapers.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then the Government should have said that these were

facts that they had so appeared or such and such newspapers had published them, but these were assumptions on their part which the Government did not concede.

**Shri Nanda:** Yes, that is so.

#### SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS

**Dastur and Co.**

+

**SNQ. 7. Shri Tridib Kumar**

**Chaudhuri:**

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:**

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:**

**Shri Yashpal Singh:**

**Dr. Ranen Sen:**

**Shri Shinkre:**

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta:**

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:**

**Shri Gauri Shanker Kakkar:**

**Shri N. Shroekantan Nair:**

**Shri S. C. Samanta:**

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:**

**Shri B. K. Das:**

**Shri Dinen Bhattacharya:**

**Dr. U. Misra:**

**Dr. S. K. Saha:**

**Shri P. C. Borooah:**

Will the Minister of Steel and Mines be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to a news item published in the 'Statesman' dated the 28th November, 1965 to the effect that M/s Dastur and Co., the steel consultants, have been selected by Government as the sole Indian Company for the work concerning the Bokaro Steel Plant, and that a final decision in this regard has already been taken by Government; and

(b) if so, whether the effect of this step on the timely execution and completion of the Bokaro Steel Project has been considered in consultation with the Soviet collaborators for the Project?

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Steel and Mines (Shri P. C. Sethi):** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Subject to a satisfactory agreement on the precise scope of the work

to be carried out and the fees therefore, it has always been Government's intention that such work relating to the setting up of the Bokaro Steel Plant as will not be the responsibility of the Soviet Organisations and as it will be necessary to carry out in India through private Indian consulting engineering firms, should be assigned to Messrs Dastur & Company. The precise scope of the work will be settled only after consultation with the Soviet Organisations concerned. In taking the above view all relevant factors, such as the timely execution and completion of the project, were taken into consideration.

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:** May I know what are the special considerations that have led the Government to appoint a single firm of consultant engineers, namely, M/s. Dastur & Co., as their sole consultants for such designing, supervisory and consultancy services as are to be entrusted to Indian engineers. When as the report of the British-American Steel Consortium for India has pointed out, we have several engineering firms doing this kind of work, why preference was shown, or special favour was shown to one firm only and why no open tender was called?

**The Minister of Steel and Mines (Shri Sanjiva Reddy):** I have not known anything about the British-American Consortium saying something. But there is a background for this . . .

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:** He does not know even about the basic . . .

**Shri Sanjiva Reddy:** That is a separate report. We are talking of Bokaro and Dastur & Co. Dastur & Co. have nothing to do with the Anglo-American Consortium nor Bokaro has anything to do with it.

There is a background for this. My predecessor, the Minister for Steel and Heavy Industries in those days, announced on the floor of this House that the Indian consultants, M/s. Dastur & Co., would be associated with the