

**Release of Greek Ship**

760. SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether a 1600 tonne Greek Cargo ship "Minilabor" captured by the Indian Navy during the Indo-Pak war has been released; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor and how many such ships are still in Indian custody?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM) : (a) and (b). The Greek ship "MINILABOR" was not captured by the Indian Navy. It was found abandoned and adrift off Chittagong, on December 9, 1971, was salvaged by the Indian Navy and, as such, had become the property of the Government of India under international law. Subsequently the Greek Government made a request for the return of the ship. This was agreed to as a gesture of our goodwill towards the Government and the people of Greece. No other such ships are at present in Indian custody.

12.01 hrs.

**QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE**

ALLEGED MISLEADING OF COMMITTEE  
ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS BY  
MANAGING DIRECTOR OF  
NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
CORPORATION

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : Sir, I shall read out an extract from the 63rd report of the Committee on Public Undertakings-April, 1970. This report is on the National Industrial Development Corporation. Apart from other things, the Committee says that the Committee are of the opinion that they have been misled by the statement of the Managing Director during the course of evidence held on 28-7-1969." It also says that the Managing Director of NIDC stated that the NIDC executed five projects in the public sector, that is, the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals, Hindustan Photo Films, Hindustan Organic Chemicals Ltd., the Bharath Heavy Electri-

cals-all projects in the public sector, and two projects in the private sector, namely, Synthetic Rubber and Tungsten Carbide. The Committee wanted to know the specific work the NIDC performed either in the completion or in the execution of these projects. The NIDC in its written reply have stated certain things which were wholly misleading.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is his name ?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : A man called Sethi. "The Committee are of the opinion that they have been misled by the statement of the managing director during the course of the evidence held on the 28th July, 1969. The Committee are convinced that the NIDC did not play any appreciable role either in the completion or the execution of the five projects in the public sector and two projects in the private sector except to some extent in the case of Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals."

It is a very serious matter that a responsible person like the managing director of a public sector corporation has the courage to mislead a Parliamentary Committee which is supreme in this country in the interests of the people of this country.

The report was published in 1970. Two years have now passed; we are now in May, 1972. After the report, I had given notice of a privilege motion. I was asked to wait, I have waited. Today, you were kind enough to allow me to raise this matter before the House. I also wrote to the Minister, in the mean time, asking him to tell us what he had done to the managing director. But I was most distressed to learn from other sources that instead of taking action against the managing director, he has been in fact upgraded and financially given some benefit, e.c., etc. They are making a mockery of the whole thing.

We remember that a couple of years ago, one Deputy Controller of Iron and Steel, Mr Mukerjee, who had similarly misled a Parliamentary Committee was brought to the Bar of the House and was made to apologise, or whatever it is. He was reprimanded. May I request you, under the appropriate rules, to refer the matter

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

to the Privileges Committee? Let the Privileges Committee to the fact-finding and do what is fair and right.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Bosu, the Committee was seized of this problem, but in the meanwhile, the term of the Committee expired, and a new Committee has been elected. I saw a note from the Chairman of the old Committee, Shri M B Rana. That note is dated 26th April, 1972. He has put this note after the Committee prepared the action-taken report and everything else. In the meanwhile, the term of the Committee had expired and a new Committee has been elected. He says that "I have discussed the question of this privilege motion by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu"

He has agreed to raise this question..."

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : I agreed to wait for ten days.

MR. SPEAKER : .. He has written : "It should be put before the new Committee" So the Committee is already seized of the matter and so I advise you to wait still further so that the Committee may come up with their findings because they are the proper authority to take action on it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : May I make a statement in the context of what you have said. The original report was published in April, 1970. Two years and one month have passed and nothing has happened. I also wrote to the Minister; nothing happened. Mr. Rana asked me when I pointed this out, to wait for about ten days, that is, till the 14th of May. Today it is 25th and you have been kind enough to allow it today. I would accept what you say but they should finalise the whole thing before the end of this session.

MR. SPEAKER : The end of the session is only next week. By the beginning of next session, would be better.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : There was a similar case in which Mr. Wanchoo and Mr. Mukerjee were involved. It was raised by Mr. Madhu Limaye and a

decision was taken in the House to refer the entire question of the Privileges Committee. If I remember aright, in that case Mr. Mukerjee was not given an opportunity for defending himself; he wanted to defend the case but he was refused.

AN. HON. MEMBER : He was given an opportunity.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : In this particular case, why should the new PUC take it up? It should be referred to the Privileges Committee.

MR. SPEAKER : The Committee were considering this question and in the meanwhile they were dissolved; it was not within their powers to extend their terms. I do not know how far it will be proper to take up this matter and bring it to the House. I do wish what they send me some report. I do not close the matter; it is pending; let us see what comes out of that.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : May I make a submission? If you send this matter back to the new committee, it is wholly irregular. That Committee is not constituted for that particular purpose. The previous Committee had a certain incident in which some evidence was given which they did not think was fair. Therefore, they have published it in a report; the report has been laid on the Table of the House. It is now public property; the Committee should not get have anything to do with it.

MR. SPEAKER : Action-taken report is still pending; they are seized of it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (A'ipone) : Action-taken report must have come six months after that.

MR. SPEAKER : It has not yet come

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : This man in the meantime is allowed to go around the capital trying to pressure; it is a dangerous thing you are doing. (Interrupts) The name is Mr. Seth.

AN. HON. MEMBER : It is somebody else.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** He has been allowed to start a new public-sector project called the Bharat Compressors... (*Interrptions*).

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :** Are we not locking our own goose ?

**MR. SPEAKER :** I am not used to this kind of question. After all, we have to go by certain procedures.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :** Two years have been spent; the man has been upgraded. He is moving around and the hon. Minister does not do anything. The Committee does not do anything. This Government is most reluctant to touch any bureaucrat .... (*Interrptions*).

**SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal) :** In the Action-Taken Report normally they confine themselves to certain recommendations made for implementation. With regard to certain remarks passed by the committee, unless there is a specific direction from the Chair, they may not go into this.

**MR. SPEAKER :** The remark of the Chairman are that they are already considering this matter.

**SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH :** That is the remark of the outgoing Chairman. The Chair should give a direction that this matter be gone into and a separate report submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER :** Mr. Rana is not here, I appointed the Chairman only this morning. I agree with Mr. Mody that this is a matter which needs careful consideration. We will be laying certain precedents which I do not want to lay off hand without examining the matter. The Committee is not functioning. The elections were held only recently and the Chairman was appointed only this morning. I just wanted to know whether the Committee is seized of the matter and whether the Action-Taken Report is pending. The Chairman says they are already seized of this matter and considering it.

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** Considering what they are not supposed to be considering!

**MR. SPEAKER :** I will have to take everything into account... (*Interrptions*). I cannot allow a debate on this. Anything that comes into your hands, you try to raise a debate over it.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :** Are we not unduly kind to this man ?

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** Think it over Sir, You can bring it up again on Monday.

**MR. SPEAKER :** I quite agree that more the time, more the latitude given to these people, because in the past also, we have been silent over certain matters and the result is, things went too far.

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East) :** Why is the Government mum? Do they want to hide under the cloak of formal legalism when all this kind of thing goes out to the country? Alligations are made and substantiated but nobody from Government gets up to say anything about it.

**MR. SPEAKER :** I am asking the new Chairman to look into it and give the exact position. Perhaps the intimation has not yet gone.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** It would not be correct for anyone to say that the ministers sitting here have no knowledge of this matter.

**MR. SPEAKER :** In a matter like this involving the question of privilege any observation by the minister perhaps may complicate the matter still further, till the new committee gives something to us in the shape of a report of direction.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** NIDC comes under the Ministry of Industrial Development. Only a few months ago, I personally brought it to the notice of Mr. Moinul Haque Chowdhary that this same man, Mr. S. Methi, against whom strictures were passed by PUC, has been appointed by him as a one-man committee to enquire into the affairs of Ashcock and Aldown, a concern which was being closed down. I wrote to the minister saying, "At least change the man. Don't appoint this man against whom strictures have been made."

Later Mr. Chowdhury met me in the lobby and informed me. "I have gone into your letter. I think that is something else not connected with this. Let him conduct this enquiry." The matter is getting further complicated because no action is being taken. He has started Bharat Compressors in Allahabad in the public sector—the same Mr. Sethi. He is being given all sorts of favours. He is being promoted and upgraded and nothing is done about the PUC report. We do not want a repetition of the Pipeline Inquiry.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Quite apart from what Shri Indrajit Gupta has said, the fact of the matter is that this evidence was taken by the old Public Undertakings Committee. The New Public Undertakings committee should proceed with its own work. As Shri Venkatasubbaiah has said, the Action Taken Report deals only with the recommendations by the Committee on Public Undertakings. It has nothing to do with any strictures or anything of that sort. The new Public Undertakings Committee has henceforth nothing to do with this case. This is a matter of which the House has been seized. This Report has been laid before the House, it has been printed and now it is for the House, and the House alone, to take action. Any attempt to send it back to the new Public Undertakings Committee would be a very wrong procedure.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : You have said that you want to refer the matter to the Public Undertakings Committee on the basis of the recommendation made by the former Chairman of the PUC. The former Chairman of the PUC, after having approved the draft of the report, after having the report approved by the whole Committee, has placed it before the House. Now he cannot have any right to make such a recommendation that the whole matter should be reconsidered by the new Committee. It is a moot question. It will create a very bad precedent.

MR. SPEAKER : He has not given any finding.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : He has made a passing observation that it should be reconsidered by the new Committee.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, since you have allowed Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu to raise this on the floor of the House, and he has raised it with your permission, you must have informed the Minister concerned because the usual procedure is that whenever a matter is raised, either you refer it to the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER : That is only when I give my consent. Here I have not given my consent.

SHRI. S. M. BANERJEE : I agree that you have not given your consent. But you have allowed him to raise the issue. When, for instance.

Shri Indrajit Gupta raised a point earlier. Shri Gokhale was there and he did reply to it. Here some serious charges are made against this gentleman, Shri Sethi, whose face I have not seen. I have nothing against him; let him be promoted; I do not mind it. But he has been given a new assignment, and when the point is raised here, the whole Cabinet is keeping quiet. Why should they behave like the three wise monkeys : "speak no evil, see no evil and hear no evil" ?

MR. SPEAKER : It is only when the privilege motion is admitted by the consent of the Speaker that information is sent to the Minister. In this case, I want to convey to you that the Committee on Public Undertakings have not yet submitted the Action-Taken Report. That Action-Taken Report contains what action has been taken on it. After that the position be entirely different.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : How ?  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Do not try to sidetrack the issue. Unless we have this report, it is very difficult to give any consent to this. I am asking the new Chairman to expedite the matter. If there is any difficulty about it later on, I shall inform the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Let the Minister make a statement on this the coming Monday.

MR. SPEAKER : This will go to the new Chairman

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Kindly direct the government to produce the Minister here.

MR. SPEAKER : I will not send it to the Minister until I admit it

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : I will raise it on Monday. I give you notice here and now.

MR. SPEAKER : Don't be loaded with so many things at one time.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : I am a beast of burden. What can I do ?

MR. SPEAKER : You are a very wise beast. I hope, all of you will agree.

12.20 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

STATEMENTS CORRECTING REPLIES TO USQs NOS. 2251 AND 3446 RE INVESTMENTS BY FOREIGN COMPANIES IN INDUSTRIES ETC

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN) : I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A statement correcting the reply given on the 7th April, 1972 to Unstarred Question No. 2251 by Kumari Kamla Kumari regarding investment by foreign companies in industries located in Bihar and West Bengal and giving reasons for delay in correcting the reply.
- (2) A statement correcting the reply given on the 21st April, 1972 to Unstarred Question No. 3446 by Kumari Kamla Kumari regarding investment by foreign companies and giving reasons for delay in correcting the reply. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—3051/72]

DELHI SALES TAX (FOURTH AMENDMENT) RULES

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH) : I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) A copy of the Delhi sales Tax (Fourth Amendments) Rules, 1972 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. F. 4 (80)/71-Fin, (G) in Delhi Gazette dated the 13th April, 1972, under sub section (4) of section 26 of the Bengal Finance (Sales Tax) Act, 1941 as in force in the Union Territory of Delhi.

(2) A statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the above Notification. [Placed in Library see No LT—3052/72]

REVIEW AND REPORT OF INDIA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, LTD.  
FOR 1970-71

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (DR. SARAJINI MAHISHI) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (1) of section 61A of the Companies Act, 1956 ;

- (1) Review by the Government on the working of the India Tourism Development Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1970-71.
- (2) Annual Report of the India Tourism Development Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1970-71 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—3053/72].

NOTIFICATION UNDER NATIONAL HIGHWAYS ACT

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI OM MEHTA) : I beg to lay the table a copy of Notification No.S.O.352 (E) (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 11th May, 1972, under Section 10 of the National Highways Act 1956. [Placed in Library See No. LT—3054/72]

STATEMENT ON FLOODS AND DAMAGE CAUSED BY HEAVY RAINS IN KERALA

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE