

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU** (Diamond Harbour): It would have been better if the Minister had clarified it. Firstly, I would like to know whether this wrong reply is the result of bungling in his Ministry, or it is a lapse on his part. He has not clarified that this amount involves only Rs. 29.27 lakhs, although the main amount is about Rs. 1.7 crores. This firm, Maruti Heavy Vehicles Ltd., in their letter dated 27th January 1976 had stated that they desired to compete with their competitors for this order, and as such they have foregone their entire commission in this transaction. The other day I have given enough evidence; and I have categorically stated, taking the whole thing on my shoulders, that an amount of Rs. 13.16 lakhs came to the Central Bank of India, Bombay on 27th June 1977 which, I reckon, is the commission out of the purchase of the 8 cranes for which ONGC had placed orders on Demag through Sanjay Gandhi's Maruti Heavy Vehicles Ltd. I would like the Minister to clarify this: on the one hand they accepted the statement that they will not have any commission at all; on the other, we see that an amount of about Rs. 14 lakhs is coming on 27th June 1977 which, I expect, is the commission on the Demag purchase from Germany. Let the Minister clarify it.

**SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA**: I am sorry I have no information on that part. The written reply on that day, was wrong. It is not through supplementaries that this mistake occurred. When those people checked up with the ONGC, they found that the spares had not yet been imported. (Interruptions) The rigs have been accepted; and I do not know what behind-the-scene transactions had taken place.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU**: Are you going to look into the matter?

**SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA**: The matter is already in proper hands; and it is being taken care of.

12.32 hrs.

**CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO SUPPLEMENTARY ON STARRED QUESTION NO. 314 DATED 4-7-77 RE OFFICERS IN MINISTRY OF WORKS & HOUSING HAVING OWN HOUSES AND LIVING IN GOVERNMENT QUARTERS**

**THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT)**: With your

permission, Sir, I wish to make an admission before the House and seek its apologies.

On 4th July, 1977, in course of the reply to a supplementary to Starred Question No. 314, the Minister for Steel and Mines gave the following replies on my behalf:

- (i) "They had made some representations and the matter is under review and Government will come to conclusion very soon." In this regard I have to submit that a decision has already been taken by Government to allot Government accommodation to house-owning officers, subject to certain terms and conditions, which, *inter-alia*, include charging of market rent for Government accommodation occupied by such officers, who are getting, for their own houses, a rent of more than Rs. 2,000/- p.m. The market rent is the same as penal rent.
- (ii) It was also stated in reply to a supplementary "If such an instance is brought to our notice, Government will see that not only they vacate quarters but they will institute other enquiries." The correct position is that house-owning officers are not required to vacate Government quarters.
- (iii) It was further stated "But steps are being taken to see that those who have houses leave their Government quarters very soon. Till such time as they are able to vacate, they will have to pay market rent" and "Efforts are being made to see that they vacate". Sir, house-owning officers are not required to vacate Government accommodation so long as they pay prescribed rent. The question to make them vacate Government accommodation arises only when they fail to comply with the prescribed terms and conditions.

Any inconvenience caused to the House is very much regretted.

**DR. SUSHILA NAYAR (Jhansi)**: Sir, I would like to have a clarification. A large number of Government servants are without houses and they are in terrible difficulties. It was in view of this that the Government had decided that those who have their own houses

[Dr. Sushila Nayar] should vacate Government accommodation so that Government servants without houses can be accommodated in Government accommodation. What is the reason which has led the Government to change that accepted policy? Now these well-to-do people, high officers are earning good rent on the one hand and are living nearby their offices so that they need not spend on transportation, while the poor small people are being put to terrible inconvenience, living miles away from their place of work. Why has the Janata Government taken this decision?

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि गर्बमेंट के कितने मकान हाउस-प्रोनिंग आफिसर्स के पास हैं, और उन में से 1,000 रुपये से कम तन्खाह वाले कितने लोग हैं।

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : यह जो सवाल पूछा गया है, उस का प्राजेक्शन इस तरीके से हुआ है कि उस में कुछ यह साबित करने की कोशिश की जा रही है कि हायर इनकम बैंकट के आफिसर्स को फायदा पहुंच रहा है। पोसीशन यह है कि जेनेरल पूल में गर्बमेंट आफिसर्स के लिए कुल 41,594 मकानात हैं। उन में से इस बयत हाउस-प्रोनिंग आफिसर्स के पास 1523 मकानात हैं, जिन में से 1287 मकानात उन लोगों के पास हैं, जिन की इनकम 1,000 रुपये से कम है। जहां तक हायर इनकम बैंकट के आफिसर्स का सवाल है, उन में से टाइप 8 के 3 मकानात और टाइप 7 के सिर्फ 16 मकानात है। मैं यह भी ब्रॉच करूंगा कि 1977-78 के बजट होने तक 6811 में से बेमतलब मकानात उन आफिसर्स के लिए होंगे, जिन की साहवार तन्खाह 1,000 रुपये के कम है।

12.35 hrs.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO SUPPLEMENTARY ON STARRED QUESTION NO. 209, DATED 27-6-77 RE. REGULARISING OF UNAUTHORISED COLONIES IN DELHI.

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHA

BILITATION (SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT: With your permission Sir, I wish to the House and make an admission before myself for the factual errors mentioned in my replies to the above question.

On 27th June, 1977, in the course of the reply to the supplementary arising out of Starred Question No. 209 regarding the regularisation of unauthorised colonies, I had said that these colonies are being regularised but on two occasions I said that these colonies have been regularised. Now, it is a more question of language than of facts. Orders have been passed for the regularisation of the unauthorised colonies. There can be no going back on this. Only certain formalities have to be gone through. Even then I want my statement to read as 'are being regularised' in place of 'have been regularised' wherever it occurs in my reply, to set the record straight.

Also I had said that 103 colonies which came prior to September 1962 were regularised, but it is now reported that actually 110 such colonies were regularised. Further I had said that out of the colonies which came up between September 1962 and January 1967, 68 colonies had been regularised. But only 64 such colonies had been regularised. These corrections could not be made earlier as the discrepancies came to notice subsequently and verification had taken some time.

I really regret the inconvenience caused to the House.

12.38 hrs.

#### Re. QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chitravinkal): I beg to move, under rule 222, a motion of breach of privilege against the Home Minister regarding his statement made in this House in which he had stated that there was think, "vihar", in the Government to kill the opposition leaders.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : How does it become a matter for a privilege motion? I rise on a point of order in the submission that he is making. (Interruptions).

I am here since 1967 and we have known it, not through one day's experience but repeated experiences, that if a Member says something which, is not, in the opinion of another Member correct.... (Interruptions)