

[श्री क० मि० मधुकर]

16hrs.

आज जो कानून आप सिल्क बोर्ड के लिए लाये हैं—वह ठीक है जहाँ तक इस का विस्तार जम्मू-काश्मीर में होने जा रहा है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। इस कानून से जम्मू-काश्मीर के सिल्क उद्योग को विकसित होने में मदद मिलेगी, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ़ आपको इस उद्योग में पनप रही अफसरशाही की तरफ़ भी ध्यान देना होगा। आप को ऐसी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये जिससे इस उद्योग में काम करने वाले श्रमिकों के जीवन-स्थिति में सुधार हो, उन के लिये कर्ज़ की व्यवस्था कीजिये, मार्केट की व्यवस्था कीजिये, प्रचार की व्यवस्था कीजिये। यदि आप इन चीज़ों की तरफ़ ध्यान देंगे तभी इस उद्योग में उन्नति हो सकती है, अन्यथा इस कानून के यहाँ पर पास करने का कोई मतलब नहीं है !

सिल्क बोर्ड के हिसाब-किताब की तरफ़ भी आपको ध्यान देना चाहिए, इस का हिसाब-किताब पार्लियामेंट में पेश नहीं होता है, एक तरह से उस पर कोई नियन्त्रण नहीं है, जिसके कारण उस में गड़बड़-घुटाला होता रहता है। इसलिये ज़रूरी है कि आप बोर्ड को अपने नियन्त्रण में लाइये ताकि उसका हिसाब किताब सरकार को मिले, पार्लियामेंट को मिले और उस पर हर साल यहाँ पर बहस की जाये और यह देखा जाये कि सिल्क बोर्ड क्या काम कर रहा है, वह ठीक से काम कर रहा है या नहीं कर रहा है। आप उस को अनुदान देते हैं, सुविधायें देते हैं, इस लिये आपको यह भी देखना चाहिये कि कैसे हम उस पर नियन्त्रण रख सकते हैं जिसके ज़रिये आप उसकी प्रगति का लेखा-जोखा प्राप्त कर सकें। आपकी रिपोर्ट में उस का कोई लेखा-जोखा नहीं है और जो है, वह भी सही ढंग से नहीं है। सही ढंग से उस का लेखा-जोखा समारे सामने आना चाहिये।

16.2hrs.

[MR SPEAKER in the Chair]

इसलिये, सभापति महोदय, मैं चाहूंगा कि यदि सरकार सिल्क उद्योगका विकास करना चाहती है तो सिल्क उद्योग में लगे हुए लोगों, श्रमिकों की स्थिति को सुधारने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिए, उनकी समस्याओं का समाधान करना चाहिये, उनके लिये मार्केट बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये, नये नये अनुसंधान करने के लिये हम ऐसी व्यवस्था करें कि यह उद्योग उन्नति कर सके। इस उद्योग में लगे हुए श्रमिकों को महाजनी लूट से बचाने का यत्न करना चाहिए। आज तक वे लोग महाजनी लूट के शिकार होते रहे हैं, विदेशी कम्पनियों की लूट के शिकार होते रहे हैं—उन के चलते ये लोग पनप नहीं सकेंगे।

इन सब चीज़ों की व्यवस्था करते हुए यदि आप इस बिल को लाते तो इस का समर्थन करते हुए मुझे खुशी होती। फिर भी इसके विकास के लिये आपने जो कुछ किया है—जैसा आपने दावे के साथ कहा है—वह प्रशंनीय है, लेकिन उस विकास से आप सन्तुष्ट न हो जाइये, उस को आगे बढ़ाने पर ज्यादा ध्यान दीजिए, उनके लिये कर्ज़ की व्यवस्था कीजिये, उनके माल की खपत बढ़ाने के लिये न केवल विदेशों में बल्कि देश में मार्केट बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न कीजिये ताकि सही मायनों में उन को राहत मिल सके।

16 04 hrs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY  
MEMBER

(Shri R. K. Birla)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I  
was on my legs when the House adjourned.

May I invite your kind attention to rule 357 which says that a Member may with the permission of the Speaker make a personal explanation although there is no question before the House. In which case no debatable matter may be brought forward and no debate shall arise. I emphasise the words 'no debatable matter'.

Usually when something is said in this House by any hon. Member in regard to any other hon. Member the Chair always gives him a chance to offer a personal explanation. In this case, where Mr. R. K. Birla is giving a personal explanation, Mr. Madhu Limaye has said something. What has he said? I have searched the proceedings of the House. Mr. Limaye is present here and he has not said anything in this House regarding Mr. R. K. Birla. Mr. Birla was elected in 1967. Since 1967 also he has not said anything. Since you read something from the report of the Estimates Committee, I took care to read certain passages of the Estimates Committee report. This is the report of the Estimates Committee, 1968-69—fourth Lok Sabha—87th Report. Shri Madhu Limaye had made a reference to the delegation which went abroad for importing wool top. You know this is actually about the import of wool top, nylon and woollen yarn and other woollen products for the woollen textile industry and their allocation to the various units since October, 1962. After the Chinese aggression we wanted jersey because we were short of jersey and you know there was much trouble and the Government was accused of not providing adequate uniform to our jawans for the battle which took place. Naturally, we went in for the import of some woollen tops.

You have read Shri Madhu Limaye's letter dated 6th September, 1967. This is Annexure to Appendix II: Copy of the letter dated 6-9-1967 to Shri Dinesh Singh, Minister of Commerce, by Shri Madhu Limaye. The name of Shri R. K. Birla has come in, in the report of the Estimates Committee, only once. I will read from the report, page 215.

"Dear Mr. Dinesh Singh, this is in continuation of my letter of 26th August, 1967, in regard to the charges

against the Textile Commissioner, Bombay."

Mr. R. K. Birla was never the Textile Commissioner, Bombay.

"I wish to bring to your notice three additional matters in which the Textile Commissioner is personally implicated. This relates to the import of raw wool after the declaration of national emergency in 1962, licences for which were issued in the name of Woolen Mills Federation as per the advice of the Textile Commissioner and four Wool Advisers, namely (1) B. M. Grover (Model Woollen Mills), (2) G. K. Singhania (Raymond Woollen Mills), (3) R. K. Birla (Digvijay Woollen Mills), and (4) V. Galloway (Lal Imli Woollen Mills, Kanpur)."

Now, there are certain pertinent questions on the basis of which personal explanation can be given; the question whether it is a debatable matter can be raised, and if this is a debatable matter, why not have a regular debate on it? This House is entitled to have a full-dress discussion on the Public Accounts Committee Report or the Public Undertakings Committee Report or the Estimates Committee Report. There are instances when questions were asked of the Chairman of the Committee on Estimates, Shri Venkatesubbaiah, and the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, Shri M. R. Masani. Questions had been put to them by some Members. Similarly, questions can be put in this matter also under the rules of procedure. Mr. Birla did not care to read the rules carefully. He has mentioned page 77 of the report.

MR. SPEAKER : Which para ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : On the top first line. It says : "It has been added by the CBI, 'From a scrutiny of the bills of entry...'"

MR. SPEAKER : What do you want to aim at ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am coming to it, Sir. My questions are : whether a

[*Shri S. M. Banerjee*]

debatable matter can be raised ; secondly, whether a statement made, not on the floor of the House, can be a subject-matter of personal explanation ; third, whether the statement before the Estimates Committee, which had nothing to do with Mr. R. K. Birla's activities, as a Member of Parliament can be a subject-matter for personal explanation; four, will Mr. R.K. Birla be allowed to quote the Estimates Committee out of context, when the whole report is before the House. Why only an extract is quoted ?

Sir, my point of order is this. Mr. R. K. Birla was entitled to give a personal explanation had Mr. Madhu Limaye quoted him inside this House and said that Mr. R. K. Birla was associated with, and was responsible for, something. But then Mr. Madhu Limaye has charged the Textile Commissioner with something. The whole question went to the Estimates Committee and the Estimates Committee had said in its report at page 77 :

"The Committee note that from the enquiries made in India by the CBI they could not establish that the prices at which wool top was imported by the Federation in 1963 were higher than the market rate."

They have further said :

"From a scrutiny of the bills of entry, it was found that they did not contain full description of the goods imported and therefore did not furnish fool-proof data for comparison."

Sir, there were strong criticisms about the drum-barrel industry. Suppose some of those fabricators become Members of Parliament in 1972, can they say, "The Public Accounts Committee have made these remarks. Please give me a chance for personal explanation." Sir, the sanctity of the House would be spoiled. This is the House of the People, not the House of Birlas. There are rules governing this House. Under no rule, by no stretch of imagination can this be allowed. If Mr. Birla wants to have a discussion on the Estimates Committee's report, he can table a proper motion and we can have a discussion. By mentioning I imply his name, it does not become a matter for personal explanation. What is

he going to say in this personal explanation ? Is he going to say, "My name is not R. K. Birla" ?

I, therefore, request you to give your ruling and keep the dignity of the House. I am sure you will keep the banner of Lok Sabha flying and allow Mr. Birla to make his statement in the Chamber of Commerce meeting.

**MR. SPEAKER :** The matter before the House was whether Mr. R. K. Birla should be allowed to make a personal explanation about anything said about him about the period when he was not a Member of Parliament. I thought that could not be done and that was why I reserved my ruling this morning, because I thought he was not a member at that time.

Now, Mr. Madhu Limaye's first letter to the Speaker is dated 5th December 1967. It is there mentioned in the introduction in the first page. The Speaker—my predecessor—referred it under Rule 310 to the Estimates Committee. At that time, Mr. Birla was a member of this House. You have already made a reference to the allegations in page 77 and I need not read that again. Then, Mr. Limaye addressed another letter to the Chairmn of the Estimates Committee. That letter is dated 18th March 1968. It is given at page 207. Along with it, he has also enclosed a copy of the letter which he addressed to Mr. Dinesh Singh. That letter is dated 6th September, 1967. At both times in 1967 and in 1968, Mr. Birla was a member of this House. In that letter to Mr. Dinesh Singh, Mr. R. K. Birla's name is mentioned. It goes to the Estimatee Committee. If the Estimates Committee record had been left there with no mention of any names, I do not think anything could be raised in this House. But when this report is presented to the House, with the name of Shri R. K. Birla there, it becomes a property of this House. These allegations have been mentioned in the report of the Estimates Committee which has been laid on the Table of this House and the name of Shri R. K. Birla is mentioned there.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE (Monghyr) :** If he wants a discussion, let him bring a

proper motion. He cannot raise debatable points here.

MR. SPEAKER : You cannot divest him of his position as a member especially when his name is mentioned in the Report.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : But he cannot raise debatable points.

MR. SPEAKER : A discussion of this subject was rejected at the last session because of some opposition.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Let us have a discussion now.

MR. SPEAKER : That was already rejected. If notice is given of another motion, it will be considered on merits.

When the conduct of a member is mentioned, whether inside the House or outside, and if it becomes the subject matter of a report which is laid on the Table of the House, I cannot refuse him leave for making a personal explanation. He is entitled to make it.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात का खुलासा नहीं हुआ। क्या विवादास्पद बातें वे इसमें रख सकते हैं ?

श्री रवि राय (पूरी) : यह दो साल के बाद क्यों आया ? 67 के बाद ढाई साल बीत गए हैं।

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Let him not raise any debatable point.

SHRI R. K. BIRLA (Jhunjhunu) : With your permission, Sir, under rule 357 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Lok Sabha I beg to make a personal explanation.

On the 30th November 1967 in response to a call attention notice by Shri Madhu Limayya....

श्री मधु लिमये : नाम ठीक उच्चारण कीजिए।

श्री रा० कृ० बिड़ला : नाम का उच्चारण नहीं आता।

MR. SPEAKER : Let him not get involved in these interruptions.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Allpore) : If somebody calls him Birlayya, how will he like it ?

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : ये रुपया-रुपैया कहते-कहते मधुलिमैया कहने लगे।

श्री रवि राय : आप नाम ठीक से क्यों नहीं पुकारते हैं।

SHRI R. K. BIRLA : On the 30th November 1967 in response to a Call Attention Notice by Shri Madhu Limayya... ..

MR. SPEAKER : Let him pronounce the name correctly. Is he making a fun of this House ? What is this ?

श्री मधु लिमये : अगर ये अनपढ़ हैं, ठीक से नहीं पढ़ सकते हैं तो सिर्फ मधु ही कहें।

SHRI R. K. BIRLA : On the 30th November 1967 in response to a Call Attention Notice by Shri Madhu Limayye, the hon. Speaker on the 6th of December 1967 referred the matter to the Estimates Committee for examination and report. The Estimates Committee appointed a Sub-Committee which submitted its report to the Estimates Committee. The printed report, which is the 87th Report, was already placed on the Table of the House.

One of the allegations made by Shri Madhu Limayye was that the Purchase Mission headed by me and consisting of three other representatives of the Woollen Industry arranged to purchase raw wool abroad at very much higher than the international prices and the quantity imported was also less than the total foreign exchange allowed for the purpose. The said allegation appears on page 216 of the Report of the Estimates Committee under reference. The Purchase Mission headed by me and consisting of three other representatives of the Woollen Industry was specially appointed by the Government of India to assist the Government in meeting the clothing requirements of all the three defence forces during the Chinese aggression.

[Shri R. K. Birla]

Referring to the findings of the Estimates Committee, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. House to a secret letter addressed by the High Commissioner of India in New Zealand to the Joint Secretary of the Ministry appearing on p. 266, Appendix XII, of the Estimates Committee Report. The relevant extract from the said letter reads as under :—

"They were stiff bargainers, as one would expect from a group of hard-headed businessmen, and left highly satisfied with the prices at which they were able to secure wool on a rising market."

Sir, I now come to the main point of the findings of the Estimates Committee which has dealt in detail with the enquiries in the matter held earlier by the C. B. I. also. The unanimous findings and conclusions of the Committee appear on p. 77, para 357 and reads as follows :

"The Committee note that from the enquiries made in India by the Central Bureau of Investigation, they could not establish that the prices at which wool was imported by the Federation in 1963 were higher than the market rate, and that, on the other hand, enquiries made by them from International Wool Secretariat, New Delhi, and a comparison of some of the bills of entries pertaining to the past import by individual mills with the bills of entries in regard to the wool purchased by the Wool Mission had shown that the prices paid by individual mills for import against their licences were in fact, in some cases, higher than those paid by the Wool Advisers."

Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members of the House...

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : On a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : Let him finish.

श्री मधु लिमये : खत्म हो जायगा तो आप कहेंगे कि मामला सामने नहीं है।

SHRI R. K. BIRLA : I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members of the House that I and my colleagues have been totally exonerated from the allegations made by my hon. friend, Shri Madhu Limaye...

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : This is absolutely debatable. That is why I was rising on a point of order.

SHRI R. K. BIRLA : ...and have in fact been complimented as is evident from the para quoted above.

Sir, I thought it necessary to place the facts in their true perspective before this hon. House and I now leave the matter in your hands to deal in a suitable manner as you think proper.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने इनका स्पष्टीकरण पहले पढ़ा नहीं था लेकिन मैंने ऐंटीसिपेट किया था कि सेल्फ सर्विंग परपज के लिये ऐस्टीमेट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट से एक ग्राफ पैराग्राफ उद्धृत करेंगे। ऐस्टीमेट्स कमेटी का जो आवश्यक हिस्सा है वह उन्होंने पूरा नहीं पढ़ा है, क्योंकि इसके पहले ही तुलना करने के लिए जो आवश्यक जानकारी चाहिये थी वह ऐस्टीमेट्स कमेटी के सामने नहीं थी, यह स्वयं ऐस्टीमेट्स ने कहा है। पेज 77 का अखिरी हिस्सा पढ़ें। यह सी० बी० आई० का हवाला देते हैं :

"It has been added by the C. B. I., from scrutiny of the bills of entry, that it was found that they did not contain full description of the goods imported and, therefore, did not furnish full proof, data, for comparison."

जब कम्पेरीजन के लिये डाटा नहीं था तो उनके सामने जो बातें थीं उस के आधार पर जो निष्कर्ष निकाला जाता है कि मधु लिमये का आरोप सत्य है कि नहीं यह ऐस्टेवलिश हम नहीं कर सकते हैं। उन्होंने इनको एग्जोनरेट नहीं किया, न मेरे बारे में कहा है कि मेरा आरोप गलत है। बल्कि ऐस्टीमेट्स कमेटी ने

कहा है कि सी०बी०आई० रिपोर्ट कहती है कि हमारे पास पूरी जानकारी नहीं थी जिसके आधार पर दामों के बारे में तुलना की जा सकती थी और ठोस निष्कर्ष निकाला जा सकता था। ऐसी हालात में विवादास्पद मामला इन्होंने नियम 357 के अन्दर उठाया है। इसलिये मैं दो दिन से प्रार्थना कर रहा था कि विवाद के लिए मोशन रखा जाय क्योंकि मोशन में अपनी बात रखते तो मैं जबाब दे सकता था। लेकिन अफसोस है कि इस तरह की बात कभी इस सदन में नहीं हुई थी, और ऐस्टीमेट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को तोड़ मरोड़ कर रखा। ऐस्टीमेट्स कमेटी के मेम्बर यहां होंगे, उसके सभापति यहां इस समय नहीं हैं, मैं माननीय तिरूमल राव और माननीय वेंकटसुबैया को देख रहा था, इनमें से कोई भी नहीं है, उनकी गैरहाजिरी में बिड़ला साहब ने यह चालाकी की है, जिसकी मैं घोर निन्दा करता हूँ।

SHRI R. K. BIRLA : Mr. Speaker, Sir...

MR. SPEAKER : No more ; you may kindly sit down. Every time, you insisted so much—of course, you have the right of giving personal explanation—and because your name was brought in, you brought facts before me. What satisfaction have you got now by just reiterating what the Estimates Committee has said? Anyway, I do not want to make any further observations.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar) : May I submit that the evidence before the Estimates Committee should be laid on the Table of the House?

MR. SPEAKER : It should come.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Let us have a discussion.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Let it be laid on the Table of the House. Let us have a regular motion and a discussion thereon.

मेरे मॉरैन्डम के आधार पर इतनी बड़ी रिपोर्ट आयी है। मेरे लिये यह इज्जत और

प्रतिष्ठा का प्रश्न है। किसी एक बिग बिजनेस हाउस के दबाव में आकर दबने वाले नहीं हैं बिड़ला जी। इस चीज को याद रखिये। मैं तैयार हूँ बहस के लिये। आप तैयार हैं?

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) ; a Mr. Speaker, Sir ...

MR. SPEAKER : No debate on a Member's personal explanation.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : I am not debating it. Do I take it that you are having the matter committed to the Estimates Committee for final determination of whatever the position is?

MR. SPEAKER : There is one thing. When a Member wants to give a personal explanation, I cannot deny him his right of giving a personal explanation in his capacity as a Member. I had gone through it and I advised him. But he did not do it..... (Interruption).

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : We do not have an opportunity of discussing the Estimates Committee Report.

MR. SPEAKER : That cannot be denied to you.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : I am not denying Mr. Birla or Mr. X from giving a personal explanation.

MR. SPEAKER : The discussion on the Report of the Estimates Committee cannot be denied to this House.

श्री मधु लिमये : लेकिन इसके बारे में एक प्रक्रिया है। माननीय मुकर्जी साहब ठीक कह रहे हैं। मैंने कई दफा इसके ऊपर प्रस्ताव दिये हैं और अन्त में आपके दफ्तर और हमारे बीच में यह समझौता हुआ है कि ऐस्टीमेट्स कमेटी हो, पी० ए० सी० हो या पी० यू० सी० हो, इसके बारे में सरकार की सिफारिशों और निर्णय आयेंगे। इनको अगर कमेटी मानती है तो बात अलग है। वरना अगर मतभेद है तो मतभेद है, और जो हिस्सा है उसी के ऊपर यहां पर बहस की गयी है।

[श्री मधु लिमये]

माननीय सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी के प्रस्ताव पर 55वीं रिपोर्ट में अमीन चन्द प्यारे लाल और सुब्रमन्यम के मामले में यहां बहस हुई थी। उसके बाद पी० ए० सी० की रिपोर्ट पर 1967 में, वही अमीन चन्द प्यारे लाल के मामले पर बहस उठायी थी। अभी रोड रोलर का मामला पड़ा हुआ है, मेरा एक अर्स से उसका मोशन आपके सामने है। तो इस रिपोर्ट पर बहस किस शकल में उठायी जा सकती है? आप उसके लिए अपवाद करेंगे तो बात दूसरी है।

MR. SPEAKER : I am going to seriously consider this matter. I have myself been the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committees earlier. I was feeling exactly like you when I was a Member. I fail to understand what satisfaction would a Member derive by just quoting the Estimates Committee Report. Of course, he has the right.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Why don't you expunge the whole thing ?

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. You just distract my attention. I am also of the view that it is a compact Report as a whole. If some favourable parts are taken out of it...

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Out of context. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER : Of course, I cannot deny any Member of his right of personal explanation when there is something in the Report which relates to the conduct of a Member during the period when he is a Member. When the Report is there, and some parts of it are quoted—of course, it is not possible in a brief personal explanation to take up everything—on such occasions, it does need a thorough discussion. I am going to discuss it with the leaders of the Opposition parties. I am going to take it up at my own level also as to what is the way out when the recommendations of the Go-

vernment come. I have been myself feeling like that when I was the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee. We have to find a way out.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : The Estimates Committee has not exonerated him fully and the Wool Mission.

MR. SPEAKER : You can quote another part where he is not exonerated and I will allow you.

— — —  
 CENTRAL SILK BOARD (AMENDMENT) BILL—*contd.*

MR. SPEAKER : We now continue the general discussion on the Central Silk Board (Amendment) Bill. Shri Lakkappa.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, while speaking on the Central Silk Board, I would like to say that the silk industry in the country is the oldest one. The Board is running a racket and not running any silk industry in the country. I am representing a State, the state of Mysore, from where three-fourth of the national output of silk is coming. Mysore State produces the finest silk which has got international reputation. But it is most unfortunate that the Government of India is not looking into all the aspects of the silk industry and it has constituted a Silk Board which is controlled by pen-pushing bureaucrats. This is in the hands of the Textile Commissioner who has no elementary knowledge of silk industry and also rearing of silk worms and cultivation of mulberry. Here, I would like to say that the Board has not served the purpose for which it has been constituted, namely, promotion of sericulture in the country. Even to-day the method of mulberry cultivation is outmoded and even the gradation of the silk worms is not upto the international standard. That is why in the international market where once upon a time our silk was famous, we are not able to compete now because of the deterioration of the quality of our silk and we have lost the market to other countries like Korea and Japan. I would quote instances where this Board has failed in its function of pro-