

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

Engineer, Mr. Peterenko. Mr. Peterenko was one of the principal deputies of the Soviet Chief Engineer responsible for the construction of the Bhilai steel works. He was in charge of the erection of steel structures and the installation of machinery. In the course of his duties he had gone, on the morning of the 22nd February, 1960 at about 8 o'clock, to the rail and structural mill where erection was in progress. He was supervising the erection of equipment along with three other Soviet experts. He was standing near a heavy steel door which had recently been placed in position and held by temporary fastenings. While he was watching the work of erection of the machinery with his back towards the door, the door was moved by some of the workmen to facilitate the erection of the equipment. During this movement the door got dislodged from its temporary fastenings and fell on to the side on which Mr. Peterenko was standing. The three other Soviet experts and the Indian workers who were facing the door heard the shouts of the men who were working on the door, saw the door tilt and were able to run away in time. But before Mr. Peterenko could get out of the way of the falling door a corner of it hit him on the head. He fell into one of the foundations and received injuries on the head and chest. He was immediately removed to the hospital but he expired on the way. The police were informed of the accident and necessary investigations carried out. In deference to the wishes of the members of the family of the deceased, the body has been preserved and is being flown by a special air-craft today to Delhi from where it will be taken to Moscow.

The late Mr. Peterenko leaves behind him a wife, a son, a daughter and her husband. The wife, daughter and her husband who are all in Bhilai will accompany the body to Moscow.

Unassuming and cheerful in disposition, the late Mr. Peterenko was able to harmonise the work of Soviet tech-

nicians and Indian Engineers. The Government of India have lost in him a hard working, conscientious and devoted senior Engineer.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** A reference may be made from the Chair, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** We are exceedingly sorry that this accident should have occurred and one of the engineers who had come from a foreign country and doing very good work here should have passed away under these circumstances.

CORRECTION OF REPLY TO STARRED QUESTION NO. 604

**The Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Shri Humayun Kabir):** I beg to make a statement correcting the reply given on the 4th December, 1959 to part (c) Starred Question No. 604 asked by Shri Ram Krishan Gupta and some other Members. The figure of expenditure "Rs. 45,09,273/- (upto 31-10-1959)" may please be corrected to read as "Rs. 37,90,952/- (upto 31-10-1959)".

APPROPRIATION BILL

**The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai):** I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1959-60.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh):** Why was the Bill not circulated before introduction? I raised this point on a previous occasion and you were pleased to rule, Sir, that 2 days before introduction of the Bill should be circulated. I find your directions are being flouted by the Minister. How are we to know whether any preliminary objection is to be raised or not?

**Shri Morarji Desai:** The supplementary demands were passed only yesterday.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** The introduction must be held over.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is only an Appropriation Bill.

The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1959-60".

The motion was adopted.

12:00 hrs.

STATEMENT OF PERSONAL  
EXPLANATION

**Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I am sorry I was not in Delhi . . . .

**Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir) rose—**

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** Is it on a point of order? Why cannot he wait, Sir?

**Shri A. M. Tariq:** On a point of order . . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** Without notice, no hon. Member can speak in this House on any subject, which is not brought up by me. If any hon. Member wants to raise any point, he must give me notice. Hereafter, whenever any hon. Member rises and says "Sir . . .", I am going to say "notice".

I have allowed Acharya Kripalani to make a statement.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I am now rising to offer a personal explanation. I am sorry, I was not in Delhi when the Prime Minister replied to the debate on the Motion of Thanks to the

President. I was unavoidably absent due to previous public engagement in Calcutta, as I had not expected this debate to continue so long.

I have read with pain and sorrow what the Prime Minister said about me on the strength of the press reports of my speech, made at a public meeting in Calcutta some three days back. He has himself often deprecated criticisms based upon press reports. I was speaking in Hindi in Calcutta. I was criticising the Chinese policy of the Government, and particularly the remarks recently made by the Defence Minister. In that connection, I have said that the country was being betrayed by its leaders. This has reference to their policies, and not to their persons. This would be clear if the full text of my speech is called for. My criticism of the policy, all the same, remains. My remarks were not directed at all against the hon. Prime Minister. I am positive, I did not, as reported in the papers, say that the country's honour is in the hands of dishonourable people. When I read this sentence in a Calcutta daily I referred the matter to some of those who were present at the meeting, and they confirmed that I had not made this particular statement.

I am sorry that the Prime Minister often takes any reference to any of his Cabinet colleagues as meant for him. It is true that he has the overall responsibility for what goes on in his Government. But he cannot be held responsible, or hold himself responsible, for any individual expression of opinion, or action of his colleagues, nor can he be held responsible if any one of them gives a twist to his general policy, which was not intended by him. With all that, I am sorry that the particular words, not used by me, should have found a place in any paper. It had only remote connection with the discussion here, or the policy, or the propriety of the letter of invitation to the Chinese Prime Minister.