

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Are proper arrangements made to keep watch?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Yes; there were proper arrangements to watch.

13.00 hrs.

STATEMENT UNDER DIRECTION
115 RE. INACCURACY IN STATE-
MENT AND REPLY THERETO

Shri Daji (Indore): Sir, during the discussion on...

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): Where is Mr. Sanjiva Reddy?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. S. K. Dey will make the statement.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Why? Mr. Sanjiva Reddy must be here to apologise.

Shri Daji: Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the discussion on the Indian Copper Corporation I had pointed out that the Indian Copper Corporation was under the technical management of New Consolidated Goldfields South Africa Ltd. and had referred to Bulletin of the Geological Survey of India, p. 55. In his reply, the Hon'ble Minister Mr. Sanjiva Reddy denied my statement as based on false information. A reference to the speech will show that he was silent on the question of the matter having been referred to in the Bulletin of Geological Survey of India and only denied my statement and held it up to ridicule.

I thereupon tried to get the copy of the Bulletin from the Parliamentary Library but I was informed that it had been withdrawn. My efforts to obtain the Bulletin from the other sources was met with a similar reply. However, I have now been able to find the relevant page and a photostate copy of the same is in my possession.

In the Bulletin of the Geological Survey of India, Series A, Economic Geology No. 23, Copper, by J. A. Dunna as revised and enlarged by

A. G. Jhingram, S. P. Nautiyal and M. K. Roy Chaudhuri, p. 55, it is mentioned "in 1924, exercising their auction the Cordoba Copper Company purchased the mining rights at Mosabani from the Cape Copper Company. Simultaneously the company was reconstructed as the Indian Copper Corporation.

"In 1931, the technical management of the Corporation was handed over to the New Consolidated Goldfields South Africa Ltd. under whose management operations still continue."

The year of publication, as given on the Bulletin, is 1965. I had therefore right and reasonable reason to believe that the technical management of New Consolidated Goldfields South Africa Ltd. continued on the day when I spoke in the House. If during the Africa Ltd. continued on the day when period after the publication and my speech in Parliament, the technical management had been changed the Minister could have made such a clear statement and the matter could have rested there. Instead he totally denied the whole of my statement regarding Indian Copper Corporation being technically managed by New Consolidated Coldfields South Africa Ltd. In this context the withdrawal of the relevant Bulletin from circulation is also very significant.

It is clear that the Government of India in their publication Bulletin of Geological Survey of India gave wrong information or the information given was correct but the technical management by the South African firm was terminated before I raised the issue in Parliament. The Minister's statement does not give any clear indication as to the actual fact. It is regrettable that the Minister instead of clarifying the position satisfied himself by a general statement denying what I have said and also went further to make some unsavoury remark about me. It is now clear that the Minister's statement amounts to *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*, and the statement made by me is correct as based on

information in the Bulletin of the Geological Survey of India.

The Minister of Mines and Metals (Shri S. K. Dey): Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the course of discussions on the Bill for the acquisition of the Undertaking of the Metal Corporation of India in the Parliament on 22nd November, 1965, the Hon. Member Shri Daji made a reference to the Volume on Copper "published in 1964" by the Geological Survey of India and said that according to the information contained in this book, "the Indian Copper Corporation apparently owned by Birlas is being managed by none other than the South African foreign companies, the bankers of Rhodesia's Prime Minister, Mr. Ian Smith". He went on to say "that in the Volume on Copper on page 55 there is a clear mention that the Indian Copper Corporation's technical managements are the New Consolidated Goldfields South Africa Ltd. It is a foreign company in South Africa belonging to the bankers of Rhodesia's Prime Minister, Mr. Ian Smith....." The Minister of Steel and Mines, Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy in course of his speech denied that the Indian Copper Corporation was being managed with the Rhodesian capital and stated that this company's consultants are an English firm and not the Consolidated Goldfields South Africa Ltd. as mentioned by Shri Daji. However, as the following statement appearing at page 55 of the G.S.I. Bulletin on Copper in India 1965 publication:

"In 1931, the technical management of the Corporation was handed over to the New Consolidated Goldfields, South Africa Ltd., under whose management operations still continue."

was at variance with the fact that the consultants of the Indian Copper Corporation are M/s. John Miles and Partners with registered office in U.K., a reference was made to the Director-General, Geological Survey of India. The Director-General has, after making necessary inquiries, confirmed that

the information in question as given in the above-mentioned Bulletin is incorrect and out of date. It seems to have been reproduced from an older publication without checking. The Indian Copper Corporation terminated their arrangements with M/s. New Consolidated Goldfields South Africa Ltd. in 1960 and appointed M/s. John Miles and Partners of U.K. as their consultants.

The misunderstanding and inconvenience caused to the Hon. Member and others from publication of wrong information in the Bulletin of the Geological Survey of India on Copper is regretted. Arrangements have been made to print and issue the appropriate errata slips incorporating the correct statement of facts regarding the present consultancy arrangement of the Indian Copper Corporation.

The Ministry of Mines and Metals has no knowledge of the reported withdrawal of the publication of Geological Survey of India from the library of Parliament. There has been no attempt at suppression of correct information on this subject. On the other hand, the factual position stated by the then Hon. Minister of Steel and Mines that the present technical consultants are a British firm viz. M/s. John Miles and Partners, is correct and cannot be controverted.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Sir, after hearing the statement I feel that, firstly, you must make a thorough inquiry how that particular bulletin of the Geological Survey of India disappeared from the library and who was responsible for it, as say that they are not responsible for it. Somebody else's unknown hand is there.

Mr. Speaker: It should be my responsibility.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Secondly, certain very unsavoury and unwarranted remarks were made by Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy in the course of his statement on this particular

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartny].

matter against my colleague and comrade, Shri Homi Daji. Since it was known that this question was going to be raised today, why is it that he is not present here. He should have been here since he has unwarranted spoken in such brash manner. He should withdraw those remarks and express regret.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I want to reinforce what my hon. friend has said, because you will appreciate that in the Library Committee we may be in a very embarrassing situation if it so happens that a Member of Parliament is precluded from using a document. I really want to know how it happened and I wish you lay down the law about it. I noticed Shri Sanjiva Reddy's presence here some time ago but now he has gone away. He may have very important business elsewhere which might warrant his presence there, but there are certain parliamentary proprieties which I am trying to stress with whatever strength I have. Is it not necessary and obligatory for a Minister of Government who is to be here because of this item being on the agenda—he does not always favour us with his presence—to inform you and to express to you his regret at his having to be absent for some unavoidable reason or is it that, being a member of the other House, he forgets the constitutional obligation that he is responsible to this House for his job, that it is at our good pleasure he holds his employment? It is very distressing that Ministers treat this House with contempt, particularly Ministers from the other House, who do not seem to know the Constitution at all.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I submit that the matter is serious in both its aspects? Firstly, the theft or disappearance—I do not know whether it is theft really—a certain vanishing trick performed by this document...

Mr. Speaker: Why does he make these comments of vanishing trick and so on?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am referring to the vanishing trick performed by this document, not by any person.

Mr. Speaker: He has said disappearance. That is enough.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I think this is the first time in parliamentary history that this has happened. If that has happened earlier, we are not aware of it. This is the first time this has happened, and it needs a thorough and sifting inquiry. Secondly, a rule might be formulated, that when a Minister has made a statement, which is called into question later on, objected to later on, and it is found to be incorrect and another statement is going to be made on that statement, if it is in the order paper of the House and the Minister is present in the House, you should kindly ensure that the Minister does not leave the House without your permission. If he has got some urgent business or if the portfolio has changed hands, that is all right but even then, he should not leave the House without getting your permission.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartny: He must apologise.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Apart from the impropriety by the hon. Minister, Shri Sanjiva Reddy, in just making himself scare on the very occasion when he had to listen to what is being said, the point that strikes me as the most important and which cannot be brushed aside is that such an ignorance that has been exhibited in the highest circles, by the heads of departments who govern the whole machinery of Government, existed. We, as outsiders, who had to move about in the Jawar mines and the Copper Corporation and all that, knew that certain things did exist and that the statement could not be true and the bulletin issued could not be true. How

could such a statement be issued in the bulletin itself and what action does the Government contemplate to take against the officer or officers concerned who issued such a statement?

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): All that has followed from the lips of my hon. friends, I am sure, has the support of almost all the Members of this House. I need only add one point. In the course of our parliamentary talks, it is true that we do make observations and indulge in a certain amount of...

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Polemics.

Shri Ranga: mutual criticism and making jokes; but when we are found to have made a mistake or an incorrect statement and all the consequences follow of asking for correction and when a correction is made, it is only proper on our part to withdraw all those parliamentary sallies, replies, criticisms and witticisms that we indulge in. That has not been done by my hon. friend. He has only regretted the inconvenience caused to Shri Daji. It is not specially the experience of Shri Daji alone; it is the inconvenience caused to every Member of this House when one Member is dealt with in that fashion.

Mr. Speaker: "To others also", he has said.

Shri Ranga: The remarks that the Minister had made following upon that particular question must be regretted and must be withdrawn. They have already said that we would like you to give a definite direction to the Leader of the House to see that the Minister, whose statement is called in question and who has to make a correction in the course of his own statement, must himself be prepared to do it in the House and not get it done through one of his deputies.

Shri Daji: Sir, my first submission is to you and, through you, to the House. The Rules Committee should re-examine the question of Direction

115. It has got to be re-examined because we are only permitted to make a statement, the Minister replies to that and the whole thing goes to rest. But, sometimes the matter must be gone into depth to find out ultimately who is wrong. This reply of the Minister itself has given an occasion for me to counter-reply. At the present moment I am once again submitting that the information given by the Minister to the House is wrong, that the information given by the concerned officers to the Minister is wrong, that the Geological Department had withdrawn it not only from the Parliament Library but also from the University Library and public libraries, wherever it was issued. It was withdrawn by the orders of this Department itself. Once again, the officers have misdirected the Minister.

Secondly, in such a case when we find that the Minister rests on the advice of officers and comes and says that it is wrong, is it not a contempt of the House committed by the officers who directly and deliberately mislead the Minister? On the last occasion also I read out from the Bulletin and pointed out the page number; but even then the Minister does not even consult the bulletin and says, "All your information is false and you are in the habit of giving such information."

Thirdly, I can understand that it can be withdrawn from other libraries by a Government directive, but can it be withdrawn by an executive direction from the Parliament Library? It is a very serious matter. It pained me more. If I do not get it in the Delhi University Library, I do not mind. But can a book be withdrawn from the Parliament Library which is in your custody?

Mr. Speaker: It was here with us. It was taken away for correction and it has already been returned.

Shri Daji: When was it returned? Whose permission was obtained to withdraw it?

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Why should they take it away for correction?

Mr. Speaker: It was taken in October and returned in November. In the beginning of December that was done.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: A long time for correction.

Mr. Speaker: The crucial point is that when under Direction 115, a Member has to make a statement asking for the correction of a reply or a statement made by a Minister, whether it is necessary for that Minister to be present in the House when that correction is to be made. I think, all of us should agree, that when that statement concerns one particular Minister, he ought to be present. That appeals to commonsense and should be a regular procedure. I hope, the Ministers would take note of that, that when it concerns a particular Minister, he ought to be present.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): He has ceased to be in charge of it.

Mr. Speaker: Even though the portfolio is changed.

Shri Daji: Who had withdrawn it? Who has corrected it?

Mr. Speaker: The Geological Department.

Shri Daji: The Minister just now said in his statement that his department did not take any book for correction. That statement is false.... (Interruption).

The Leader of the House (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Regarding your observation about the previous Minister in charge of steel and mines, I quite agree that the Minister concerned should be present; but, I tell you that he has not done it deliberately. Perhaps, it was because he was under the impression that the portfolio has changed; inadvertently he must have done it. It was nothing deliberate.

I think, in future we shall see that your observation is implemented.

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): May I ask, Sir, how a book from the Library can be taken? If the Department wants to make a correction, the normal procedure is to send a correction slip.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: How can a book be taken away for correction?

Mr. Speaker: I will find out how a book can be taken away.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Please make an inquiry and let us know.. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: I will convey it.... (Interruption).

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, what I wanted to know is: (a) when certain facts were disclosed on the floor of this House regarding that notorious Jorhat jeep accident on 7th March....

Mr. Speaker: How can that be asked now?

Shri Hem Barua: you were pleased to direct the hon. Minister to collect the information and give that information to us. I just wanted to know whether the information has been collected. (b) When it was disclosed that two delegations, one of Naga hostiles and another of Mizo hostiles, had gone to Dacca, the capital of East Pakistan, and met there Marshal Chen Yi and Dr. Bhutto, the Pakistani Foreign Minister, the hon. External Affairs Minister said that he did not have the information. We would like to have the information from him if he has collected it by now and enlighten us on that.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot ask him just now. If he has the information, he may give it sometime later when he speaks.
