

13.01 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST UNI

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barnou) : I want to raise a question of privilege under Rule 222.

This is a question of privilege against a Press Agency, UNI. Yesterday I read a news in the Indian Express with a very bold heading saying "Modern Bakeries selling stale, mouldy bread" Later on, it reads :

"NEW DELHI, March 25 (UNI)

The Committee on Public Undertakings of Parliament is concerned at the high percentage of defective, stale and mouldy bread put on the market by Modern Bakeries (India) Ltd., a Central public undertaking."

Sir, I am a regular buyer of bread sold by Modern Bakeries. Naturally, when I read this news, I thought I should discontinue buying this bread

Then, to-day's *Times of India* in its editorial comments, 'Current Topics' reads :

"The worst fault of Modern Bakeries, however, has been that they have unashamedly unloaded on the market 'a high percentage of defective and stale bread'. Technically, this may not be an offence under the Food Adulteration Act, but morally it is inexcusable. The Union Government would be failing in its duty if it does not punish those responsible for selling stale and mouldy bread."

Then, I thought I should go through the report of the Public Undertakings Committee which was placed before this House. Nowhere in this report it is mentioned that Modern Bakeries sell stale or mouldy bread. What the report says is this:

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) . You might not have slept last night and you must have studied all this.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : If you go through the report, you will find that the Modern Bakeries have fixed the norms. The permissible norm was 1 per cent defective bread. Then this norm has been reduced and it is 0.5 per cent. This is the percentage of stale bread which it accepts back from the dealers. The Committee, in its report, says that the Modern Bakeries still continues to take back more than the norm fixed but the stale bread or the mouldy bread or the defective bread is never allowed to be sold. It is taken back by the Modern Bakeries and the Public Undertakings Committee has expressed its concern and has suggested that this take-back should be further reduced to the minimum.

Here, I would like to read some of the recommendations of the Public Undertakings Committee .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER . Recommendations are different, what did the Committee say about the Modern Bakery ?

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA The Committee says :

"While the Committee note that the percentage of norm of defective production has been reduced from 1 to 0.5 . . . the Committee find that the percentage of defective production continues to be higher than the norm in several units of the undertaking. The Committee recommend that the system introduced in the head office in 1972-73 for an analytical study of the defective production of bread at various units should be made more effective and the results of such analytical study fed back to the respective units in order to take effective remedial measures to minimize the defective production so as not to exceed in any case the norm fixed therefor."

And then it says:

"The Committee were informed that while defective bread was utilised for cattle feeding and some percentage of it was also destroyed, it was also sold to the workers of the undertaking at reduced rates. The Committee need hardly stress that a careful watch should be kept to see that no manipulations take place in declaring any part of the production as defective."

Then it says:

"The Committee also find that in the case of Bangalore, Bombay and Kanpur units the percentage of return of stale and mouldy bread was more than 1 per cent during 1972-73 as compared to the norm of 0.5 per cent fixed by the management with effect from 2nd December 1972."

The Public Undertakings Committee in its report says all this about the return of bread from dealers of stale and mouldy bread. The Public Undertakings Committee has never said in its report that Modern Bakeries sell stale and mouldy bread.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have made your point.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA: I come to the main point. Therefore, this headline and this report is a deliberate misrepresentation of the report of a Committee of this House. It is not only deliberate, but it is a calculated attempt to attack Modern Bakeries. It seems to me that this sort of thing is backed by the assistance of foreign bakeries including Britannia. The Modern Bakeries have been doing very well and their profits have gone up steadily after the ICS officers were removed and a committee of public workers was put in charge. Its profits have increased; its sales have increased. I feel what has been done is a

deliberate attempt on the part of the private bakeries to bring disrepute to a public undertaking. Sir, I feel, UNI have played into the hands of the foreign bakeries. It is a deliberate, calculated, misrepresentation of the report of the Committee of this House. It is a very serious breach of privilege. It is a contempt of the Committee and of the House. It is so patently deliberate that I need not elaborate this any more. It is a misrepresentation of the report, a deliberate misrepresentation. I therefore request you, Mr Deputy-Speaker, to refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges. Thank you, Sir. (*Interruptions*)

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order. No discussion on this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Daman and Harbour): I rise on a point of order.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: Kindly sit down. The matter has been raised, I have allowed it. And in these matters, the first step to be taken is to write to the Press Agency and the papers concerned and ask them what they have got to say on this.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA: This can be done by the Privileges Committee.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the House takes a decision or before I take a decision, let us hear from them what they have got to say in the matter.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: They want to run down the public sector.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chennai): This is doing very well. Why do they use or misuse Parliament and Committee? They can do publicity for Britannia independently. (*Interruptions*)

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. I cannot follow who is saying what. All these things should come up in their proper order. He has raised the point. If

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

I had not allowed it, you may have reasons to disagree. Order please.

I have allowed him to raise it. We shall ascertain from this agency. We shall write to these papers as to what they have got to say. And, naturally, we shall come back to this House to know what happens after that. Why don't you wait ?

SHRI PILOO MODY . Sir, I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If you have a point of order, I shall listen to it. What is your point of order, Mr Mody ?

SHRI PILOO MODY : In raising the privilege issue Shri Nahata has alleged that some other company was responsible for planting this deliberate and malicious information in a press without, in any way, producing any evidence to the effect.

Therefore, I would like to ask you that, if this evidence cannot be produced by Shri Nahata, will it there-after be a privilege against him for having raised this matter and alleged that this was printed on behalf of somebody else ? (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order please. Shri Mody thinks that Shri Nahata has committed a breach of privilege. If you think so, then nothing prevents you from coming forward with a notice of privilege.

Let us not do irregular things. Now, item No. 4 on the Agenda. Shri Bosu.

13.11 hrs.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Hundred and second and Hundred and fifth Reports.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : I beg to present the following Reports of the Public Accounts Committee :-

(1) Hundred and second Report on action taken by Government on

the recommendations contained in their Eighty-fifth Report on posts and Telegraphs.

(2) Hundred and Fifth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their Ninety-fifth Report on Audit Reports on the Accounts of the Indian Institute of Technology, New Delhi for the years 1966-67 to 1970-71.

MATTER UNDER RULE 377

Reported atrocities committed by KPF rsonnel during recent disturbances in Bihar

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER . Now, matter under 377. Shri Madhu Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमाये (बांका) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं तीन बार गेज पहले बिहार गया था और जहाँ जहाँ गोली चली है उन इलाकों का मैंने दौरा किया। मैं जेल में लोगों से मिला अस्पताल में बायल लोगों से मिला। मैं इस बक्त निर्र्ण एक ही बातला उठाना चाहता हूँ और वह लक्ष्मीनाराय का मानना है। लक्ष्मीनाराय मैं गया था और वहाँ मुझे पता चला कि रेलवे प्रोटेक्शन फोर्स ने निहत्थी जनता पर गोली चलाई जिस में एक की मृत्यु हुई है। इतना ही नहीं, रेलवे प्रोटेक्शन फोर्स ने 12, 14 और 16 साल के बच्चों के पेट में बेरोजेंट से बार किया जिस से उनके पेट फटे हैं। उन की संतुष्टियां निकली थी। उन के नाम हैं—छोटे साग साहू जिन की उम्र 11 साल है। दूसरा है मौजूबाब मंडल जिसकी 12 साल उम्र है। तीसरा है बेबन राम नाम का प्रभाव लड़का। इन सभी बच्चों से मैं मिला हूँ। गोली से और बहुत से लोक बायल हुए हैं। लेकिन बहुसंख्यक बात यह है कि जो गोली चलाई गई इसके लिए मजिस्ट्रेट का कोई आरोप नहीं था और बाद में मजिस्ट्रेट को प्रचका कर प्री-सेडिड आरोप प्राप्त करने का प्रयास किया गया। अभी तक ही मैजिस्ट्रेट ने इन्कार किया है।