

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri C. Subramaniam): There were two committees—one to consider appointments to gazetted posts and another to consider appointments to non-gazetted posts. I do not think these pulls and stresses were there in making these appointments.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो सरकारी कर्मचारी इसमें लगाये गये हैं इन में से अधिकांश ऐसे लोग हैं जिन्हें करप्शन के मामले में निकाला गया था या जिन पर कोई आरोप लगाये गये थे ? यदि हाँ तो ऐसे कितने कर्मचारी हैं और उनके लिए जाने का क्या कारण है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप को इतला है कि ऐसे लोग लिये गये हैं ?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मेरे पास प्रमाण हैं, वह इस का उत्तर दें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह जनरल सवाल है । क्या मिनिस्टर साहब जवाब दे सकते हैं ?
Among those recruited are there any who previously were charged or convicted of corruption?

Shri C. Subramaniam: Not to my knowledge.

Duncan Stratton & Co.

+

*684. **Shri Madhu Limaye;**
Shri Kishen Pattayak:

Will the Minister of Law be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 48 on the 4th November, 1965, and state:

(a) whether the Company Law Board have completed the investigation into the affairs of Duncan Stratton & Co.;

(b) if so, the result thereof; and

(c) the steps which the Company Law Department propose to take to protect the shareholders and the pub-

lic from interference by Shri Mundhra?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Law (Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman): (a) Not yet fully completed.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The affairs of M/s. Duncan Stratton & Co. were being examined under section 209(4) of the Companies Act and that so far has not revealed any irregularity suggesting immediate action on the part of the Department of Company Affairs. Further examination is, however, necessary, specially in so far as the accounts of certain other companies which have business dealings with this company are concerned, before a full picture can emerge. Such further examination is now being undertaken.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार का ध्यान उन पत्रों की नकल की धोर गया है, जिन पत्रों में मूंदड़ा के द्वारा इन कम्पनियों के मामले में अनुचित ढंग से जो हस्तक्षेप किया जाता था उस का सबूत मिलता है ? सबूत के तौर पर एक ही वाक्य मैं पढ़ता हूँ :

"We have today paid to Commercial Combines Limited, Calcutta, a sum of Rs. 10,000 in cash under instructions from Mr. H.D.M."

इस भी यह पत्र पिछले साल मैंने आप के प । भेजा था । इसी तरह एक और वाक्य है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : एक मिसाल हो गयी, आप सवाल कीजिये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : वह वाक्य इस प्रकार है :

"Kindly also advise me what action I should take, for my future guidance, as such transactions are becoming a regular feature."

बिधि मन्त्री (श्री गोपाल स्वरूप पाठक) : कई पत्रों की तरफ सरकार का ध्यान गया है, और सरकार उन सब बातों की, जो कि उन पत्रों में लिखी गयी है, जांच कर रही है। कुछ बातों की जांच हो गयी है, कुछ की और होगी। मैं तारीख वार उन पत्रों के नाम अगर आप चाहें तो बता सकता हूँ, मगर जरूरत नहीं है . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरे पास हैं, मैं ने दिये थे। आप की इजाजतसे उनको सदन पटल पर रख सकता हूँ।

श्री गोपाल स्वरूप पाठक : मैं ने कहा कि जांच हो रही है, कुछ की जांच हो गयी है और बकाया जांच की जा रही है, और, जैसा बताया गया है, जांच करने से यह जरूरी है कि और बिजनैस वाजों के हिसाब की भी जांच की जाये वरना पता नहीं चल सकता कि क्या हुआ है उसमें।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, तीन साल हो गये मैंने यह प्रश्न छोड़ा था, तीन दफा इस पर प्रश्न हुए हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि हरिदास मुंदड़ा के जो कारनामे इस वकत चल रहे हैं, मेरे पास सूचना है कि 10 लाख स्टर्लिंग उनकी बीबी के नाम से विलायत में पड़े हुए हैं, इस तरह के काम वे बराबर करते रहते हैं। सरकार की जांच धीमी गति से चल रही है, यह कब तक पूरी होगी और कब तक कोई ठोस कार्यवाही होगी ?

श्री गोपाल स्वरूप पाठक : मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि अगस्त, 1965 में इनकम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट ने किताबें इस कम्पनी की अपने कब्जे में कर ली थीं। उन किताबों की जांच की गई थी। जहां तक मालूम हुआ है किताब भ्रमी कम्पनी को वापस नहीं हुई है और उसकी और तहकीकात की जायेगी।

Shri Daji: Has it come to the notice of Government that in the £1 million sterling deposit in England in the

name of his wife some money belonging to this very company also figures; if so, why is the enquiry being delayed so much?

Shri G. S. Pathak: This question of sterling does not arise out of the question which I am answering because the question which I am answering relates to a particular company and not to Hari Das Mundhra.

Shri Daji: I am referring to this company. This company comes in.

Mr. Speaker: He connects it by asking whether in that someone of this company is also connected.

Shri G. S. Pathak: The question of foreign exchange and any contravention of foreign exchange regulations does not appertain to my Ministry.

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

Mr. Speaker: He might ask his question.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is about the reply to this particular question.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. He might ask his question. That will be better.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to know whether in regard to the holdings worth £1 million in London in respect of which an inquiry was held by the Company Law Administration, the company law administration deputed the Deputy Director and an Under Secretary of the Company Law Administration who stayed in England and spent about Rs. 5 lakhs in foreign exchange in collecting evidence in collaboration with the Scotland Yard and the British Board of Trade; whether it is a fact that one particular inspector of the British Board of Trade submitted a report in May 1965 as to how Shri Hari Das Mundhra was operating this through SP Industries, Duncan Stratton and Company Limited, which my hon. friend has said is one of these

Brahmaputra Tea Company and Hoare Miller and Company Limited, whether there is a report submitted by an inspector of the British Board of Trade, Mr. William, to the Government of India in May 1965; if so, what action has been taken and whether it is a fact that an ex-Cabinet Minister

Mr. Speaker: So many questions cannot be jumbled together.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That is why I wanted to raise a point of order.

Shri G. S. Pathak: I want notice on this question whether any report has been received from any British official or not. I have no information. As soon as I get the information, I can supply it to the hon. Member or I can place it on the Table of the House.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I rise on a point of order under rule 366 (2).

Mr. Speaker: Yes; he might formulate his point of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My point of order is pertaining to the supplementary that was put by Shri Homi Daji in which he particularly mentioned Duncan Stratton and Company—this question pertains to Duncan Stratton and Company. This question is a continuing one. It was first tabled on 4th November, 1965 and this question is arising out of the reply given to starred question No. 48 of 4th November, 1965.

Mr. Speaker: Did he say rule 366?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Rule 366(2) re: point of orders relating to the business of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I am reading rule 366. It reads:

"A member shall not speak on a question....."

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am sorry, Sir, rule 376 (2). I am so sorry.

Mr. Speaker: "...after the Speaker has collected the voices both of the Ayes and of the Noes on that question".

Shri S. M. Banerjee: There was a mistake. There may be so many mistakes. You must appreciate my memory that the difference was only of ten. I mean rule 376(2).

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My point of order is that this question came up in this House on the 4th November, 1965 and this particular question tabled by Shri Madhu Limaye and Shri Kishen Pattnayak regarding the same company, Duncan Stratton and Company... (*Interruption*), has been tabled arising out of the reply given to starred question No. 48 of 4th November, 1965. As such, we expect the Minister to be prepared with all the probable supplementaries arising out of it. So, my point of order is whether on a Question which has been tabled in continuation of a particular Question can the Minister conceal the facts from us. I am afraid, because an ex-Cabinet Minister is concerned with it, he is concealing the facts from us.

Mr. Speaker: I am not concerned with all these things. If the question is put....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is a continuing question.

Mr. Speaker: Whether it is continuing or discontinuing, if a question is put and the Minister answers that he wants time, then I have no further powers to just compel him at that very moment or to extract any answer from him at that very moment. Shri Ram Sewak Yadav. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Daji: About my question....

श्री मधु लिमये : दाजी के प्रश्न के बारे में जिन्होंने यह नहीं कहा कि उन्हें नोटिस चाहिए।

Mr. Speaker: Much of the time of the House is consumed in these wrangles and these disputes of points of order and we cannot cover many Questions.

Shri Daji: We want your protection, Sir. The Minister said that my question does not pertain to his Ministry. But the fact of the matter is that the Deputy Secretary of his Ministry, of the Company Law Administration, went to England for making an inquiry about this very company. If this is so, my question is pertinent to his Ministry.

Shri G. S. Pathak: At that time, the Company Law Administration was part of the Finance Ministry. It is true that some officer of this Department, that is, the Company Law Administration, was sent to England. What I said was that any breach of foreign exchange regulations does not pertain to my Ministry. That is what I said.

Mr. Speaker: That is all right. Shri Ram Sewak Yadav.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी सदन में माननीय सदस्यों ने मूंदड़ा द्वारा विदेशों में 10 लाख स्टलिंग की विदेशी मुद्रा इकट्ठी होने की बात कही। इसी तरह से, श्रीमन्, एक्स-मिनिस्टर के सम्बन्धियों की जो एंग्लो-थाई कारपोरेशन है, उसके नाम में भी विदेशी मुद्रा जमा है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को क्या दिक्कत हो रही है—ये मूंदड़ा या मूंदड़ा जैसे पूँजीपतियों या दूसरे राजनीतिक नेताओं की जांच कराने में जिनका विदेशों में रुपया जमा है ? सरकार इनकी जांच कराने के लिये क्या कर रही है ?

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

मछली उत्पादन

+

*685. श्रीमती सावित्री नि म :

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी :

क्या लाख, कृषि, सामुदायिक विकास तथा सहकार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) पहली, दूसरी और तीसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजना की अवधि में मछली उत्पादन

के लक्ष्यों की पूर्ति न होने का क्या कारण था; और

(ख) इस अवधि में सरकार को विभिन्न अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संस्थाओं में कितनी रकम मिली और इसमें से कितनी रकम वास्तव में व्यय हुई ?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri Govinda Menon): (a) The target of production during the First Plan was fully achieved and there was a significant rise in production during the Second Plan period. There has been a further substantial rise in production in the last two years of the Third Plan, but although the final position is yet to be assessed the indications are that there will be a shortfall from the targeted figure. The main reason for the shortfall is the non-availability of an adequate number of mechanized boats and sufficient quantities of nylon fishing twine.

(b) During the first two Plan periods, assistance received from international agencies amounted to Rs. 172.02 lakhs and Rs. 117.13 lakhs respectively and was fully utilised. During the Third Five Year Plan, the corresponding figure is Rs. 239.11 lakhs of which Rs. 238.28 lakhs are likely to be utilised.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: May I know how much investment has been made on inland fisheries and how much on sea fisheries during the Third Five Year Plan and what results have been achieved in respect of both?

Shri Govinda Menon: During the Third Plan period, on inland fisheries, the expenditure was as follows:—

	Rs.
1961	.. 277 lakhs
1962	.. 329 lakhs
1963	.. 390 lakhs
1964	.. 459 lakhs
1965	.. 453 lakhs