

1973 on behalf of 500 Factory Workers of Mackenzies Limited, Bombay;

- (b) if so, their main demands; and  
(c) the action taken thereon?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HEAVY INDUSTRY (SHRI DALBIR SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The main demands are to restart the factory as a Government Undertaking of a Cooperative venture.

(c) The demands have been carefully considered but not found feasible.

#### Chinese Reaction on Visit to European Countries by Dalai Lama

3739. SHRI RAJDEO SINGH: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether China lodged a strong protest with Government of India before Dalia Lama left on a tour of European countries; and

(b) whether anti-Indian propoganda and noisy broadcasts are the special features of Chinese displeasure since then?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH): (a) China expressed "profound regret" about Dalai Lama's visit to Europe before he left on his tour but did not describe it as a protest.

(b) Yes, Sir; news items and comments critical of India have increased in the past few weeks.

12 hrs.

RE: CALLING ATTENTION  
(Query)

श्री मधु लिमये (बांका) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो ध्यान दिलाने की सूचना आप के सामने है उस के सम्बन्ध में पहले एक जानकी री

चाहूंगा। आपने यहां करमाथा था कि नेपाल के बारे में . . . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह अभी उन्होंने भेजा नहीं मेरे पास।

श्री मधु लिमये : तो कल तो कम से कम आना चाहिये क्योंकि कल के बाद परसों तो छुट्टी है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आज उन से पूछ लंगा। अगर रुझा तो कल रख देंगे।

Has the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs got some information about the call attention notice on Nepal's policy regarding restrictions on foreign import-export houses? It was postponed the other day. Two days have already passed. Members want that it should come tomorrow. If he has got some information, we will fixed it up tomorrow.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): Yes.

12.01 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED LOSS DUE TO DELAY IN DELIVERY OF OFF-SHORE DRILLING PLATFORM 'SAGAR SAMRAT'

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): I call the attention of the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The reported loss of Rupees 18 lakhs due to delay in delivering the Rupees 12.3 crores off-shore drilling platform Sagar Samrat by Japanese firm."

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (Shri D. K. BOROOAH): Mr. Speaker, Sir, 'Sagar Samrat' built by Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha Limited of Japan was to be delivered on 30th September, 1972. Allowing for a

[Shri D. K. Borrooah]

grace period and permissible delays as per contract, it should have been delivered latest by 14th November, 1972. However, the vessel was delivered on 31st March, 1973 at Hiroshima and it arrived in India on 25th May, 1973. As provided for in the contract, 'liquidated damages' amounting to Rs. 53 lakhs (approximately) were recovered by ONGC from the ship-builders. This amount adequately covered the expenditure incurred by ONGC on certain preparatory steps taken anticipating that the vessel would arrive in India at the end of December, 1972. Mainly, the preparatory steps included charter hiring of two supply boats from USA which required 60 days notice for mobilisation. The hire charges on the two supply boats upto the date 'Sagar Samrat' arrived in India amounted to Rs. 30 lakhs approximately. It will not, therefore, be correct to say that there was any loss to ONGC directly attributable to the delay in delivery of the vessel by the ship-builders. But the delay of 127 days in the delivery of the vessel had a sequential effect which I shall explain.

In the normal course, upon arrival of the vessel in India on 25th May, 1973, eight leg sections were to be fitted to it after jacking it up at a preliminary shallow water location. Thereafter, the vessel was to be moved to the Bombay High structure where the first well was to be drilled. The drilling locations had all been surveyed by a French firm, C.G.G., to obtain information on the likely depths of penetration of Sagar Samrat's legs before striking firm ground. However, the penetration at the preliminary leg erection location was beyond the limits predicted by the French firm. The insurers had also imposed certain limits of penetration which had to be observed.

Sagar Samrat was then jacked up at a shallow location 15 miles West of Bombay and the 8 leg sections were fitted. But in the meantime, cyclone and monsoon condition set in with the sea getting rough. It may be mentioned here that the requirement of the design as well as the Insurance Company's stipulation, based on technical considerations is that

the mobile platform should not be jacked up in sea conditions of swell more than two metres and wind speed exceeding 15 knots. Whether satisfactory weather conditions were obtaining or not had to be determined in close consultation with the Meteorological Department. The rough weather continued till 19th September, 1973, when the vessel could be moved to the planned location on the Bombay High structure. However, at this location again, the leg penetration was excessive and jacking-up was not possible. After trying two more locations with similar results, Sagar Samrat was ultimately jacked up at H-12/1 on the Tarapore structure and the first well was spudded on 11th October, 1973.

Although the first location on Bombay High structure presented the problem of excessive penetration, there are a few locations on the Bombay High structure itself which are free from this problem. But Sagar Samrat could not be moved to those locations because the water depth at those locations is greater than 62 metres and according to the limitations imposed at that time by the Insurers, Sagar Samrat could not operate in water depths beyond 62 metres in the cyclone season following monsoon.

Lest an impression should be created that drilling at some of the locations in Bombay High would not be possible, it should be mentioned that the Insurers had undertaken studies in depth for relaxation in penetration limits as well as water depths. With the new limits now being prescribed, Sagar Samrat would return to the Bombay High structure after drilling the present wells.

It will, thus, be noticed that had rough weather conditions not intervened, a suitable location for drilling would have been available much earlier and the first well would have been spudded by the middle of June, 1973. In offshore drilling the world over, waiting on weather (WOW) is not uncommon. Expenditure which has necessarily to be incurred on supply boats, crew boats etc., standing by, becomes inevitable. It is all part of the total efforts to drill wells in the sea.

As I have mentioned earlier, Sagar Samrat is presently drilling on the Tarapore structure. The well is projected to a depth of 4500 metres and has, so far, been drilled upto about 2700 metres. Already, there have been gas shows at depths of about 1600 metres and 2500 metres and the stratigraphy so far penetrated is encouraging.

**SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY:**

The hon. Minister has given a very detailed statement. But there are some points on which I would like to seek clarification.

When was this survey conducted? When the forecast has indicated that the sea will be rough during this period why was this precaution not taken in advance? Secondly, we understand that this Sagar Samrat is equipped with second-hand machinery and re-conditioned machinery. I want to know whether this was not detected when it was being manufactured in Japan, when everything was being fitted there. When was this brought to the notice of the Government? Now they have asked for arbitration which means so much loss of time. It looks the Government is proceeding in a leisurely fashion in this matter. Had it been vigilant it would have started the work much earlier.

Every year we are importing oil worth crores of rupees from the Arabian countries. Those countries are restricting their production because they are afraid their reserves would be exhausted in less than a century, and then they will have only sand and no oil. So, apart from playing politics with oil those countries want to preserve their oil resources for some more times. In those conditions, we have to rely on our own wealth and we have to become self-sufficient. For becoming self-sufficient we have to produce another 16 million tonnes. The efforts we are making in that direction are not adequate. The amount we are paying to the Arab countries for the import of oil is enormous. In 1971-72 we paid Rs. 200 crores and this year we have paid about Rs. 460 crores. When we are paying to the foreign countries so

much in foreign exchange, why could we not invest a little more money for our own off-shore drilling. If this project is further delayed our shortage cannot be met even from imports. We have many shortages, like foodgrains for instance. But one good monsoon can wipe out that shortage of foodgrains. But, in the case of oil, the shortage cannot be made up in a year or two. It would be recurring.

I want to know from the Minister by what time this project will be completed and when the other schemes, which have already been explored, will be taken up. Unless and until the country is made self-sufficient in the field of oil, we have no future. Our war machinery will also be badly hit by the shortage of oil. So, we cannot depend on the sweet will and pleasure of other countries, so far as strategic materials are concerned. I hope the Minister will enlighten the House on these points.

**SHRI D. K. BOROOAH:** The hon. Member asked a question about surveys. In fact, there are two surveys. The first survey was by the Soviet Seismic Survey in 1964 and 1966. After that, another seismic survey was made by the well-known company CGG of France. Then, yet another study was made by the Geophysical Services International. The sea bed survey was done in 1972 and on the basis of that sea bed survey this drilling was tried.

In the Bombay High in the sea bed three locations were tried. It was found that these locations had, what is known as, slushy mud and not sand bank. Because of the monsoon conditions in the Arabian Sea the insurers and advisers in the earlier stage advised against taking any risk and did not allow us to go beyond the permissible limit of 58 f.. When they went upto 58 ft. they could not settle on sand bank. Secondly, the depth to which we were allowed to go at that time was only 200 ft. Now after a lot of meteorological study and scrutiny of the sand bed they have come to the conclusion that the penetration permissible would be 85 ft. instead of 58 ft.

[Shri D. K. Borooah]

originally fixed. The water depth has also been increased from 200 to 245 ft. After a detailed study of the meteorological conditions they have also stated that the work can go on in all conditions.

Until this clearance was given, we did not want to take any risk. I thought it would be risky to go against the advice given by the insurers, by the experts—I must plead guilty to that—and start drilling in the Bombay High straightway, especially when they have given us a list of the mishaps which have taken place all over the world. They have given a list of instances where major rigs have foundered due to bad weather in different parts of the world. In 1968 four rig platforms foundered because of bad weather. Burma had two rig platforms out of which one foundered in the Persian Gulf. BOC lost one expensive rig. All these instances were brought to our notice. Therefore, we thought that until a proper study was made it will be risky to go right into the Bombay High at that time, especially when the insurers had not permitted us to go beyond 58 ft. Now the insurers and experts have permitted penetration to go upto 85 ft. We can also operate upto a depth of 245 ft. of water in all weather.

This work will be completed by January. If we struck oil by that time, we will stick to that place. If oil is not struck by then, we will shift to the Bombay High, which is considered by the Geological Survey and also by the seismic survey to be more promising.

Coming to the machinery, the entire machinery is not old. What is second-hand or re-conditioned is only the electric installations, which form a small part, whose total cost would have been about Rs. 12 crores in terms of Indian currency at that time. Now it would be a little more because the Yen has been revalued upwards. Perhaps, we should have found this out earlier, but the explanation that was given to us was that it is not a rig where the electric installation would be working all the time; it would be used only intermittently when the rig is moved from one place to

another. So, it was argued, the second-hand machine will last as long as the rig. Anyway, these are highly technical matters. None the less, we did not accept their contention. We argued with them. I sent for the Japanese Ambassador and explained to him the position and said that it was wrong on the part of the company to have given us second hand machinery, whatever the good condition of the machinery might have been. Then they agreed at his instance to give us compensation of about Rs. four lakhs dollars, in terms of foreign exchange, which forms a substantial part of the secondary equipment. Perhaps it could be utilised for replacement of any parts which may be necessary from time to time.

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN (Kangra): Today India is facing great shortage in oil. All over the world there is shortage. The Ministry of Petroleum should have made a massive effort for exploration of oil in our country but I must regret that the Ministry has not come up to the job. We are facing a shortage of foreign exchange; we need foreign exchange for fertiliser, steel plants, even for feeding our people. The treatment by the Petroleum Ministry of this subject is extremely callous. It gives a feeling to most people that there is a deliberate attempt to sabotage the Prime Minister's programme of self-reliance. After all, there were three surveys which were done to find out the sea bed, what was the constitution and so forth. The whole point is that the survey was not correctly done. There was defective machinery; there was defect in the surveys. The defect arose in the final data compiled by the persons.

MR. SPEAKER: May I invite your attention to the subject matter of the call attention?

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN: There was delay in the setting of Sagar Samrat which had caused us so much loss and so much time-lag in the exploration of oil. Are you willing to have an enquiry into the survey which was done to find

out whether it was defective or not, whether the defective survey data was supplied to the Japanese and then we had defective machinery? Is it a fact that because of the defective survey and defective machinery, at present when there is no trouble in the sea, no tide or monsoon, this particular rig is being used in the periphery of Tarapur instead of Bombay High for which it was originally meant? Are you willing to have a parliamentary enquiry committee to look into the whole affair and fix the responsibility on the officers concerned? Fourthly, have you on your own made an enquiry and fixed the responsibility on the officers who brought this defective machinery?

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: I cannot help the feeling of the hon. Member that there has been sabotage of the policy of the Prime Minister by the Petroleum Ministry... (Interruptions) He said: Ministry; perhaps it includes the Minister also. All I can say is that he is free to hold his opinion as all hon. Members are; but certainly there is no basis for that opinion. All the surveys were made by well-known people.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): French company CGG for seismic survey and Dharm Teja's old friend Mitsubushi.

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: The first reconnaissance survey was made by the Soviet seismic party; then the survey was done by the CGG; it is a well-known company.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: All their friends in the Petroleum Ministry recommended them very strongly.

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: It was done in 1972. There was a further detailed study by the GSI early 1973. What was called the reflection study; it was done by the Geophysical Industrial Surveys of the United States of America. The sea bed survey in 1970 was done by the CGG. We are making another study of the sea bed survey by Offshore Dynamics. Mr. Bosu may be happy to know it is an English company.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: They are very great friend of yours; they gave you freedom.

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: They gave you job.

So far as these surveys are concerned, I have no reason to believe that there was any dishonesty about them. There might be difference of opinion about the surveys; maybe there was some inadequacy. So we are making another interpretation of the surveys Offshore Dynamics Limited of the United Kingdom.

श्री मधु लिमये (बांका) : अध्यक्ष महोदय मेरा प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर है। मेरी किसी को इंटरप्ट करने की आदत नहीं है, लेकिन कभी कभी कोई चीज़ जरूरी हो जाती है।

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I am not allowing it.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या आप प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर की अनुमति देंगे। क्या सारे रूल्स खत्म हो गये। मैं बहुत रिस्ट्रेंटेड एक्ससाईज करता हूँ, लेकिन प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर मना करने का क्या मतलब है। क्या मैं हमेशा प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर उठाता हूँ।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Have you suspended that rule? Have you made an announcement?

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या मुझ को प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर उठाने का अधिकार नहीं है? आप ऐसा कैसे कह सकते हैं? किस रूल की तहत आप को ऐसा कहने का अधिकार मिला हुआ है?

MR. SPEAKER: We will see to it when it is finished.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह क्वेश्चन अवर के लिये है, कालिग प्रॉटेशन के लिये ऐसा तय नहीं हुआ है।

MR. SPEAKER: Every thing does not go by rule. We have certain practices and conventions in this House. We have a convention that no point of order will be raised during the question hour and the call attention motion.

अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (शालियर) : कालिग अटेंशन के लिये यह तब नहीं हुआ है। मैं नहीं जानता हूँ कि श्री मधु लिमये क्या कहने वाले हैं, लेकिन अगर कोई मंत्री कालिग अटेंशन के समय गलत इत्तला दे तो आप को प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर अलाउ करना चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जब भी कोई बात होती है, यह मारे दिन खड़े हो जाते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कभी गलत खड़ा नहीं होता।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajpur): You can listen to the point of order and give a ruling. Mr. Limaye never raises a point of order unless there is substance.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं नहीं कहता कि मैं सब से अधिक अनुशासित सदस्य हूँ, लेकिन मसल से ज्यादा अनुशासित सदस्य यहाँ नहीं है।

MR. SPEAKER: There will be no limit if you allow points of order during the call attention and question hour. You will have to discontinue it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Generally during the call attention, nobody gets up unless there is a particular point that he wants to raise; even Mr. Madhu Limaye does not get up during the call attention unnecessarily.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जब भी कोई मंत्री जवाब दे खड़े होते हैं तभी यह खड़े हो जाते हैं।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Unless a strong point is there, he will not normally get up during the Call Attention. Please listen to his point of order.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Even during the Call Attention, the Members get up on points of order. Then, you may discontinue this practice. This practice was set up by your House. If you do not want it, it will not be operative in future.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): We cannot allow a Member to create disorder in the House. There is a healthy practice and convention established in the House. We cannot be bullied like this. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): May I make a submission? There is no doubt that the Chair has been trying to impose this practice that there will be no point of order raised during the Call Attention. But our difficulty is this. The Call Attention becomes a dialogue between those who give notice of the Call Attention and come in the ballot and the Minister and not a dialogue between the House and the Minister. We have to only look on...

MR. SPEAKER: We have to go by the rules.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: If we are not satisfied with the answers, what is the remedy open to the House to see that such answers are not given? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

May I explain it to you? During the Question Hour, we have accepted the practice that there will be no point of order raised. That has been the practice and convention established. We have accepted it since long that during the Question Hour there will be no point of order.

During the Call Attention, the Members whose names come in the ballot ask questions and the Minister replies to them. If a certain Member tries to intervene, I have been telling him that only the Members whose names have been balloted are to ask questions. Then, he comes with a point of order, a submission and all that. We have discouraged it. I have always

been saying that in case of such intervention, the whole object of the Call Attention is lost. Here, the Minister and those five Members have been given a chance. If everybody comes through this source of a point of order, then there is no meaning of balloting the name of this or that Member. If any Member is dissatisfied, he can ask for a debate or a discussion on it. It is for your convenience. I am not there to benefit by it. It is your time; it is not my time.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: And the entire House has just to listen to it.

MR. SPEAKER: We have to listen sometimes to many speeches as passive observers. We do have to have patience to listen to all, whether we like it or not. I would simply request you that in case you are dissatisfied, in case something goes wrong, you can ask for a discussion.

श्री मधु लिमये: नियमों के विपरीत कंवेनशन नहीं हो सकता। नियमों की रक्षा करने वाला, नियमों का विस्तार करने वाला कंवेनशन हो सकता है। अगर आप की इच्छा है कि इस के अंत में मैं व्यवस्था का मवाल उठाऊं तो मैं उसके लिये भी तैयार हूँ। अभी ही उठाने का मेरा कोई आग्रह नहीं है। इसी कालिग अटेंशन के बारे में मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, लेकिन अगर आप कहें कि इसके खत्म होने के बाद मैं इसके उठाऊं, तो मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है। मेरा यहाँ पर डिमण्डर करने का कोई इरादा नहीं है।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Limaye has been insisting that even at the close of the call attention he may be permitted to raise a procedural point as normally he does not get a chance during call attention motions.

MR. SPEAKER: I tell you that this will introduce another element in this. We discuss the call-attention motion for half an hour, sometimes for 45 minutes and even one hour and we even go into the lunch hour. If I permit this then there will be no limit. Let us try this also and you will see.

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: As I was replying to the points raised by Mr. Mahajan, this platform was made by well-known companies and it has been checked and re-checked and there is another check going on. So, I do not think that any investigation as to the *mala fides* is required.

So far as the delay is concerned, the delay was due to the fact, as I explained earlier, that the insurers advised against precipitously going into the Bombay High if we could not do it without taking grave risk, which, I thought, we would not be justified in taking because it is a very expensive platform costing about Rs. 15 crores and we could not take risk in the matter. Sir, off-shore drilling is a very serious matter. It takes time. It is time-consuming, it is resources-consuming and it is bound to take a little more time than some of us anticipate.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri R. V. Swaminathan not here.

Shri Sat Pal Kapur

श्री सतपाल कपूर (पटियाला) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पहले तो मैं इस बात पर श्री बरूआ से डिफर करता हूँ कि अगर हम मिनिस्ट्री या श्री० एन० जी० सी० के किन्हीं अफसरान के बारे में कोई बात कहें, तो यह मान लिया जाये कि मिनिस्टर ने भी सैंबोटज किया है। सारे हालात को देखते हुए, श्रीर इस मिनिस्ट्री के श्रीर श्री० एन० जी० सी० के कुछ अफसरान की तमाम एक्टिविटीज को देखते हुए, हम इस कानक्वून पर पहुंच सकने हैं कि इसमें कुछ सैंबोटज नजर आती हैं, लेकिन अगर यह कहा जाये, या यह मान लिया जाये, कि सैंबोटज मिनिस्टर ने किया है, तो वह गलत है। खाम तोर पर श्री बरूआ के बारे में ऐसी कोई शिकिग या ऐमा कोई विचार, पार्लियामेंट या पार्टी में नहीं है। (उपबधान) मिनिस्टर के काम को सैंबोटज किया गया है, यह मैं मान सकता हूँ।

[श्री सतपाल कपूर]

7 जुलाई, 1971 को मिनिस्ट्री आफ पेट्रोलियम की डिमांड पर डिस्कशन के दौरान मैंने यही क्वेश्चन रज किया था कि जब सरकार ने इस शिप की इनशोरेंस के लिए ग्लोबल टेंडर मांगे, तो कोई कंपनी आगे नहीं आई। अब मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपने स्टेटमेंट में कहा है कि इनशोरेंस कंपनी ने कुछ स्टिपुलेशनज लगाई हैं। 4 तारीख को जो है ड्राउट इस्यू किया गया, उसमें भी कहा गया कि एक कंपनी टम्पोरेरी इनशोरेंस के लिए तैयार थी और उसकी अपनी कन्डीशनज थी।

सारी प्रॉब्लम इसी से पैदा हुई है कि इसका डिजाइन डिफेक्टिव है। सरकार ने यह डिजाइन फ्रांस की एक कंपनी से तैयार करवाया और एक ब्रिटिश कंपनी से उसको एप्रूब कराया। लेकिन यू० एन० ओ० के एक रशन एक्सपर्ट डा० एन० ए० कालिनिन, 1966 में यहां आये थे और उनकी ओपीनियन इससे बिल्कुल उलट थी। उनकी रिपोर्ट मिनिस्ट्री में पड़ी हुई है। उन्होंने यह प्रिडिक्ट किया था कि इस प्लेटफार्म का डिजाइन डिफेक्टिव है, इससे काम चलने वाला नहीं है, अगर इस डिजाइन के मुताबिक प्लेटफार्म बनाया जायेगा, तो सरकार कभी भी इससे बम्बई हाई में तेल नहीं निकाल पायेगी।

उस वक्त श्री प्रकाशचन्द्र सेठी ने कहा था कि जितनी बातें मैंने कही हैं, वे सब गलत हैं। आज दो साल के बाद मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितनी बातें मैंने उस वक्त कही थीं, वे सब सच थीं, और आज मिनिस्टर साहब भी मानते हैं कि वे सही हैं। इसलिए आज यह कहने का कोई मतलब नहीं है कि हमें कोई सस्पिशन नहीं था। जापान की जिस फर्म ने यह प्लेटफार्म बनाया, उसी फर्म ने यह आफर दी थी कि आप हमसे कन्ट्रैक्ट पर ड्रिलिंग करवायें। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वजह थी कि सरकार ने कन्ट्रैक्ट करने के बजाये यह कम्पलीट काम्प्लेक्स खरीदा, जो डिफेक्टिव है। आज मिनिस्टर साहब के

स्टेटमेंट में यह बात मानी गई है। यह स्टेटमेंट, जो मिनिस्टर साहब के डिपार्टमेंट ने तैयार किया है, बिल्कुल नामुकम्मल है। उससे ज्यादा इनफार्मेटिव तो वह स्टेटमेंट है, जो 4 तारीख को डा० जी० रामास्वामी की तरफ से जारी किया गया है।

इसमें कहा गया है कि हमें चार महीने पहले पता लग गया था कि इसमें सैकंड हैं मशीनरी फिट की गई है। जब सरकार ने यह एसाइनमेंट जापान की फर्म को दी थी, उसी वक्त उसने अपना एक इंजीनियरिंग यूनिट वहां भेज दिया था। श्री रत्नलाल मल्होत्रा, श्री बी० मुकर्जी, श्री कमलजीत सिंह और डा० रामास्वामी और डिपार्टमेंट के दूसरे लोग कई बार जापान गये। तीन साल से सरकार की तरफ से रेगुलर विजिट्स वहां जा रहे हैं। उसका यूनिट वहां बैठा है। यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या फिर भी मिनिस्ट्री और ओ० एन० जी० सी० के अफसरान को यह पता नहीं लग पाया कि इस प्लेटफार्म पर सैकंड हैंड मशीनरी लगाई गई है। इस हालत में अगर हम इसको सैबोटेज न करें, तो मिनिस्टर साहब हम को डिक्शनरी में से कोई और बड बता दें।

जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, सरकार का रेगुलर यूनिट वहां बैठा है। श्री मुकर्जी और श्री कमलजीत सिंह न मालूम कितनी बार वहां गये हैं। हमारे कई दूसरे अफसर न मालूम कितनी बार वहां गये हैं। क्या तीन साल में उनको यह पता नहीं लग पाया कि जो मशीनरी फिट हो रही है, वह सैकंड हैंड है? जापानी अफसरों ने हमें इनफार्म किया कि इस प्लेटफार्म में सैकंड हैंड मशीनरी लग रही है, लेकिन उस तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। यह बहुत बड़ी नेग्लिजेंस है। इसको नेग्लिजेंस भी कह सकते हैं, लेकिन मेरे पास इसके लिए सैबोटेज से कम कोई लफज नहीं है।

ओ० एन० जी० सी० और पेट्रोलियम मिनिस्ट्री के आफिसर्स ने कुछ इंटरनेशनल आयल कार्टेल के साथ मिल कर इसमें सैबोटेज



किया है और इसकी एनक्वायरी होनी चाहिए। श्री विक्रम मंडाजने ने इस बारे में पार्लियामेंटरी एनक्वायरी की डिमांड की है। लेकिन मेरी डिमांड है कि इसकी जूडिशियल एनक्वायरी होनी चाहिये। मेरी राय यह है कि आफिसर ने मेवोटेंज किया है।

यह एक अजीब बात है कि श्री कलमजीत सिंह और श्री मुखर्जी बगैरह जिन आफसरों पर यह सब इन्जाम आता है, जिन की बदौलत मुल्क को इतना बड़ा नुकसान हुआ है, उनमें से किसी को एक सूबे में बिजिलेंस कमीशन का चेयरमैन बना दिया गया है, किसी को एक दूसरी स्टेट का चीफ सैक्रेटरी बना दिया है। सबको दिल्ली से निकाल कर प्रोटेक्टिड प्लेसिड पर लगाया जा रहा है। उनमें से एक को चेयरमैन बनाने की एटेम्ट हो रही है।

यह बड़ा सीरियस मॅटर है। हम 1971 में पार्लियामेंट के नोटिस में यह बात लाये थे। उस वक़्त मिनिस्ट्री के जो ब्रीफ़ आये, उनको श्री प्रकाशचन्द्र सेठी ने उसी तरह यहाँ पढ़ दिया था। उन्होंने कोई बहुत मेहनत करके इस मामले की जांच करने की कोशिश नहीं की। मैं श्री बरुआ को बताना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम मिनिस्ट्री या ओ० एन० जी० सी० के आफिसरों के बारे में कोई बात कहते हैं तो हमारा मकसद यह नहीं है कि हम श्री बरुआ पर कोई इल्जाम लगाते हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बड़ा वाइटल मॅटर है। मैं चाहूँगा कि इस पर हाउस में डिस्कशन किया जाये। जो पाइंट्स मैं ने तैयार किये हैं, उनको यहाँ पढ़ने का टाइम नहीं है। और यह कोई ऐसा डाकुमेंट नहीं है जो मैं यहाँ टेबल पर रखूँ। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को देता हूँ कि वह इंडिपेंडेंटली इसको देख लें। हमारा न तो मिनिस्टर बरुआ के खिलाफ कोई इल्जाम है न हम दिल में महसूस करते हैं कि वह इंडिपेंडेंटली काम नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन इसकी एनक्वायरी जरूर हूनी चाहिए और जूडिशियल एनक्वायरी होनी चाहिए।

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not repeat it.

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI (Bombay-North-East): Sir, this should be kept for discussion.

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: Sir, the genesis of the Sagar Samrat and all the details, I do not have. But, I shall certainly look into them and find out whether there is a correct decision taken or whether there is anything *malu fide*.

The hon. Member raised a point that so far as Sagar Samrat is concerned, large quantities of second-hand components were used. That is a fact. So far as electric motors and installations are concerned, the value is not very much. It would not be more than Rs. 2 crores. So far as electric installations are concerned, they used secondhand machinery which were re-conditioned. I have already said that.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The charge is that this was done with the knowledge of your officers.

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: I would look into it if there is anything *malu fide* or incorrect decision taken. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Sat Pal Kapur, I am not calling you. Are you interested in the Minister's reply or only in the interruptions? I am really very sorry that everytime you do this. Shri Sathe and Shri Unni Krishnan also do this everytime. Can't you sit down?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, we are agitated and so, we want full information.

MR. SPEAKER: Let him give out the facts. If he has not got the information, there are many other means available to you.

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: As I said, I shall look into this question very carefully and find out if there is anything *malu fide* or incorrect decision taken and whether there is any justification for an inquiry. I shall look into this very carefully.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** You are thinking of considering it.

**SHRI D. K. BOROOAH:** Certainly. As I said, so far as my information goes, that is based on facts. Only in electric installations second-hand components were used.

As regards the other points raised by the hon. Member, I shall go into them. The genesis of the information is not available at the moment. I shall give you all the facts after I look into it.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Will you make an inquiry—this is the question?

**श्री मधु लिमये :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बोलना नहीं चाहता था लेकिन कोई विशेष कारण हुआ इसलिए मैं बोलता हूँ। मैं आप का ध्यान इन के दाँव जाकियों की ओर दिवाना चाहता हूँ। इन्होंने यह कहा है :

“दि वेमेल” (गानी 8 लैग मेकशन लगने के बाद )

“Thereafter, the vessel was to be moved to the Bombay High structure where the first well was to be drilled. The drilling locations had all been surveyed by a French firm, CGG, to obtain information on the likely depths of Sagar Samrat's legs before striking firm ground. However, the penetration at the preliminary leg erection location was beyond the limits predicted by the French firm.”.

आप को याद होगा कि तीन चार महीना पहले एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय ख्याति के ज्योलोजिस्ट के कहने के आधार पर मैंने यहां इन से सवाल पूछा था कि क्या सी वैंट में सर्वेक्षण डिफेक्टिव है ? उन्होंने उस समय नां कहा। मैं इन को कोई दोष नहीं दे रहा है। सब चीजें यह

नहीं जान सकते। लेकिन आज यहां मजबूर हो कर स्वीकृति दे रहे हैं। तो कम से कम इन को थोड़ा सा तो थफलोस प्रकट करना चाहिए। इसी तरह रिफाइनरी लासेज का भी सवाल मैंने उठाया तो उसमें पहले नहीं कहा, लेकिन बाद में जांच कर के कहा कि आप की बात सही है। तो लगातार राष्ट्रीय हित के सवालों को हम यहां उठाते हैं। क्या मंत्री महोदय को उस का गलत जबाब आता है पहले और उस को बाद में वह महसूस करते हैं तो कहना नहीं चाहिए ? हमेशा डायरेक्शन 115 और प्रिविलेज मोशन के बाद आप करेंगे।

**श्री देव कान्त वरुणा :** नहीं नहीं, ऐसा नहीं है।

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is not a point of order. He only wanted to speak.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मैंने पूछा है, पहले भी पूछ चुका हूँ कि जब मंत्री महोदय गलत जबाब देते हैं तो क्या स्वयं उन को सुधारना नहीं चाहिए ? क्या हमेशा डायरेक्शन 115 का नोटिस देने के बाद करेंगे ?

**MR. SPEAKER:** He said that he wanted to get up on a point of order. But he has spoken like other Members.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मैंने कुछ उस के बारे में नहीं पूछा है। मैंने इतना ही पूछा है कि मंत्री जब गलत उत्तर देंगे उस के बाद हमेशा 115 का नोटिस जायेगा तब उसे दुरुस्त करेंगे या मंत्री महोदय को स्वयं गलती का एहसास होते ही वह उस की दुरुस्ती स्वयं करेंगे ?

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BESU:** Sir, Sir...

**MR. SPEAKER:** Let the hon. Member please sit down. After all, I am also a human being. Let him please sit down. He should not flare up on everything in this manner. He does not allow me to listen, nor does he allow me to address him. He is saying loudly, 'Sir, Sir' all the time. It is very difficult for me....

आप ने कहा पाइंट आफ ऑर्डर है लेकिन आप ने एक भाषण ही उस पर कर दिया ।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** क्या भाषण किया ? मुझे सब्त एतराज है । मैंने यह सवाल पूछा है कि क्या हमेशा डायरेक्शन 115 की नोटिस जानी चाहिए या आप मंत्री महोदय को आदेश दगे कि वह गलती करने पर स्वयं उसे सुधारने के लिए सदन के सामने आएँ ?

**MR. SPEAKER:** What is the point of order in this? This is no point of order.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** गलत जबाब देने के बाद उस को स्वयं दुरुस्त नहीं करना चाहिये ? तो आप 115 एडमिट करिए.....

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** यह बग बना रखा है 115 में है, यह है वह है ? इस में रूज यह है कि जिन मैम्बरों के नाम में आता है वही बोल सकते हैं । आप हर बात पर खड़े हो जाते हैं ।

**PROF. MADHU DANAVATE:** He is seeking your guidelines for the future.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मैं आप से पूछ रहा हूँ । आप डायरेक्शन दीजिए ।

**MR. SPEAKER:** Why should I do it? How do I know that....

**श्री मधु लिमये :** क्यों नहीं ? आप का कर्तव्य है कि आप उन से कहें कि मंत्री महोदय गलती महसूस करने के बाद स्वयं सदन के सामने आए ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं कैसे जानूँगा कि वह गलती है.....

**श्री मधु लिमये :** तो हर चीज के लिए नोटिस कैसे आयगी ? हर दिन हम नोटिस कहां से लाए आप दो फुल टाइम टाइपिस्ट दीजिए उस के लिए अपने खर्च पर ।

**MR. SPEAKER:** Let him come out with a written notice.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** May I seek a clarification on one thing with your permission?

**MR. SPEAKER:** There will be no end to this. I am not allowing it. Clarifications cannot be asked for on call attention-notices in this manner. May I tell him that the rules are very clear about it? Let him not try to go over and above the rules.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** I am a very rule-abiding Member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** He is to tell me? Will he please sit down? Calling-attention is only meant for those Members whose names are balloted. Why should the others come in? If others come in, there will be no end to it.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** When the hon. Minister withholds some information from the Chair, it is my duty to point it out and see that he does not do it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** There are other means if he withholds; but let him not try to distort the procedures.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** That is what I never do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You always do it and say 'I never do'.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Let us have a debate on this.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am not going to allow it.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** You won't allow a debate also.

**SHRI RAJA KULKARNI:** You had told me to wait till the Minister replied. Now that he has replied, may I say something? I am demanding a discussion on this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: If both sides are doing it, I will go out of the picture. Let them do it.

मुझे हँसना ही है जब इस तरह से भी इस तरह की बात की जाती है।

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Let there be a discussion.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You said I could ask afterwards. Otherwise, let us have a discussion. This is a fit subject for it. The State has been defrauded of crores of rupees. This is *prima facie* a clear case of sabotage by the officials.

श्री रामावतार शारदा (पटना) : हम इस पर डिस्कशन चाहते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर आप डिस्कशन चाहते हैं तो रूल तोड़ कर डिस्कशन नहीं होगा, उस के लिये अलेक्जेंडर नोटिस चाहिए।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Even I have to pay tax for this. The money will not come from heaven.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

12.52 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATION RE. DELIMITATION OF PARLIAMENTARY AND ASSEMBLY CONSTITUENCIES IN MANIPUR

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY): I beg to lay on the Table:—

A copy of Notification No. S. O. 667(E) (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 30th October, 1973 containing Order No. 7 of the Delimitation Commission in respect of the delimitation of parliamentary and assembly constituencies in the State of Manipur, under sub-section (3) of section 10 of the Delimitation Act, 1972. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5914/73].

MINERAL CONCESSION (FOURTH AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS) RULES, 1973 AND COKING COAL MINES (INTIMATION RE. MORTGAGE, CHARGE, LIEN, ETC., ETC.) RULES, 1973

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI SUBODH HANSDA): I beg to lay on the Table:—

(1) A copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (1) of section 28 of the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957:—

(i) The Mineral Concession (Fourth Amendment) Rules, 1973 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1010 in Gazette of India dated the 15th September, 1973.

(ii) The Mineral Concession (Fifth Amendment) Rules, 1973, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1011 in Gazette of India dated the 15th September, 1973.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5915/73].

(2) A copy of the Coking Coal Mines (Intimation regarding Mortgage, Charge, Lien or other interests) Rules, 1973 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 480 in Gazette of India dated the 31st October, 1973, under sub-section (3) of section 34 of the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1972. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5916/73].

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : (भवालियर) अध्यक्ष जी, अभी मणिपुर के डिलिमिटेशन के बारे में कागज रखा गया है, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश और उड़ीसा के बारे में कब रखा जायगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह से तो बड़ी मुश्किल है।