

LOK SABHA DEBATES

18081

18082

LOK SABHA

Thursday, August 10, 1967/Sravana 19,
1889 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Road Rollers

+

*1706. **Shri Indrajit Gupta:**
Shri Madhu Limaye:
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri George Fernandes:
Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:
Shri Kameshwar Singh:
Shri A. Sreedharan:
Shri S. M. Joshi:
Shri P. M. Sayeed:
Shri Sequeira:
Shri Nitiraj Singh Chaudhary:
Shri Kashi Nath Pandey:
Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta:

Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a large consignment of Road Rollers manufactured by M/s. Agrind Fabrications Ltd. and ordered by the Director-General, Supplies and Disposals from M/s. United Provinces Commercial Corporation Ltd., Calcutta has not been delivered in time or as per specifications;

(b) if so, the total value of the order;

(c) whether any part of it was paid as advance; and

(d) the action, if any, taken against the defaulting firm?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Iqbal Singh): (a) to (c). Against a large number of contracts placed by the Directorate General of Supplies and Disposals on M/s. United Provinces Commercial Corporation (Private) Ltd., Calcutta, from time to time, valued at Rs. 6 crores approximately, for the supply of Road Rollers manufactured by M/s. Agrind Fabrications Ltd., 403 Road Rollers have so far not been supplied by the firm against which they drew 90 per cent. payment on proof of inspection which works out to approximately Rs. 1.80 crores.

(d) The following action has been taken:—

- (i) the matter has been reported to the Central Bureau of Investigation for a detailed and complete investigation. Their report is awaited.
- (ii) the firm has deposited Rs. 15 lakhs which has been credited to the Government account.
- (iii) all payments due to the firm from the DGS&D have been stopped.
- (iv) the Reserve Bank has been requested not to allow foreign remittances by this firm.
- (v) the firm and its allied concerns have been black-listed.
- (vi) the case has also been referred to Arbitration as provided for in the contract and an Arbitrator has been appointed.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Mr. Speaker, Sir, since this question was tabled, as you know, the PAC Report has been published on this subject. I would like to know whether it is a fact, as has been stated, that at one stage—1963—

this company offered a four per cent. discount which, if it had been accepted, would have meant a reduction in the price of about Rs. 1,900 per roller and a total saving of Rs. 20 lakhs, but that offer, as stated in the PAC Report, was not accepted; it was rejected; I would also like to know, although not stated in the PAC Report, whether it is a fact that last November—1966—the company made, in lieu of a bank guarantee, a further offer of Rs. 15 lakhs in cash, and was willing to deposit shares worth Rs. 40 lakhs with the Government, and both the offers were rejected. I wish to know, if this is true; who is responsible for having rejected these offers, because now the country is very much concerned over the loss which the exchequer has suffered. Who were the officers responsible for this and what action is proposed to be taken against them?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Jaganath Rao): In 1961 this firm offered a reduction of four per cent., but that related only to the supply of 30 road rollers. This offer was not repeated by this firm, later, in 1963. Regarding the other question about the offer of some shares in lieu of bank guarantee, this offer could not be accepted by the Government because the shares were not quoted in the share market and one share relating to the Assam Sillimite company was quoted much below par. That is why the Government could not accept it, whereas Rs. 15 lakhs was accepted and credited to Government. That offer by the firm was accepted.

Shri Ranga: What about the first question? It was stated in the PAC Report. Why was the first offer made in 1961 not accepted so that it was not repeated in 1963?

Shri Jaganath Rao: That was a conditional offer. The firm offered a reduction of four per cent., a discount, provided certain other conditions were also fulfilled. It was a package deal and, therefore, it was not accepted.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Sir, my question has not been answered properly. The

report of the Public Accounts Committee says that an amount of Rs. 20 lakhs would have been saved if this 4 per cent. discount that was offered had been accepted.

Mr. Speaker: That was in respect of about 30 road rollers in 1961 and not in 1963.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Whenever it had been, it would have saved Rs. 20 lakhs. Rs. 20 lakhs is not a matter of joke. The answer is not at all satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member wants to know as to why it was rejected in 1961, why it was not accepted and who was the officer responsible for it.

Shri Jaganath Rao: That offer was conditional on certain favourable terms demanded by the firm. Those terms were not acceptable to us. That was why that offer could not be accepted.

Shri Buta Singh: At what level was this rejection done?

श्री मधु लिमये : इममं कुठ घायली हे वनां पी० ए० सी० कयां लिबरी यह वात ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Mr. Ram was the Secretary. He rejected it.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Further, according to this report of the Public Accounts Committee, at the end of December 1966 419 rollers—the figure is a little different from the figure given just now—had not been delivered. I would like to know whether subsequent to this date—December, 1966—any of these rollers have been delivered or not, and whether Government has got any means by which the remaining rollers which are due from this company can still be recovered; if so, what steps are being taken for that, or is the company stipulating any condition? What I mean to say is, is this loss, what has been publicised in the Press, particularly, an irrecoverable loss or is it still possible to recover something out of it and these remaining road rollers can still be procured?

Shri Jaganath Rao: I still hope there is possibility of these road rollers being recovered. In May 1967 this firm supplied 4 road rollers. Therefore, I still hope there is possibility of recovery.

श्री ष्ठ लिमये : मैं मंत्री जी का ध्यान श्री ० ए० सी० की रिपोर्ट के जो निष्कर्ष हैं कनकनयूशंज है उनकी धीर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उनके 8 (2) में कहा गया है :

"In order to set the matter in proper perspective it may be worthwhile listing briefly the serious lapses that have been taken note of in the earlier chapters."

आगे पैरा 2 में कहा है :

"The granting in July 1963 of a relaxation in the standard terms of payment which enabled the firm to draw 90 per cent. of the cost of a road roller on inspection without any proof of despatch."

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जुलाई, 1963 में जो रेलवे रिसीट या डिसपैच के आधार पर पहले पेमेंट किया जाता था उसके एवज में क्या वजह थी कि केवल इन्स्पेक्शन के आधार पर 90 परसेंट एडवांस पेमेंट का आपने इंतजाम किया ? आप देखिये कि इन्स्पेक्शन करने वाले लोग धीर जो कंसाइनी होते हैं दोनों को अगर "समझाया जाय", मैनिपुलेट किया जाएगा तो महीनों या वरसों तक पता नहीं चलेगा क्योंकि कंसाइनी की इन्स्ट्रक्शंस नहीं आएंगी और उसके बाद माल अगर नहीं भी मिला, कोई शिकायत भी आई तो उसको भी दबाया जा सकता है और इन्स्पेक्शन को भी मैनिपुलेट किया जा सकता है। मैं साफ जवाब चाहता हूँ कि यह जो नियम में परिवर्तन हुआ यह किन फर्मों के कहने पर हुआ है सब से पहले, और इसका कारण क्या है। सरकार ने अपने हितों की रक्षा करने के लिए इस नियम परिवर्तन के साथसाथ कौन सा दूसरा इंतजाम किया था ? हो सकता है कि अन्य फर्मों के

बाद में भी इस तरह की शिकायतें हुई हों। उनका मैं साफ जवाब चाहता हूँ।

Shri Ranga: Who was the Minister and who was the officer in charge at the time of this relaxation?

Shri Jaganath Rao: It is true that some relaxation in payment terms was made in July 1963.

Shri Madhu Limaye: Who made the change?

Shri Jaganath Rao: The DGS&D.

Shri Madhu Limaye: Why?

Shri Jaganath Rao: I am explaining it. In 1962 after the Chinese aggression the demand for road rollers rose up to 1,300 whereas the production capacity in the country was only 500. There were three firms in the country who were manufacturing road rollers—Jessops, Britannia Engineering and UPCC. When the demand for road rollers rose so high, a meeting was convened to which the representatives of these three firms were invited. The other firms also demanded certain concessions to be shown to them so that they could increase their production. The production capacity of UPCC then was only 10 road rollers a month. They said that they would increase it to 30 road rollers for which they wanted concession in payment terms and also a little foreign exchange. The other two firms also wanted some concession.

Shri Ranga: The same concession?

Shri Jaganath Rao: Not about payment but about foreign exchange. These concessions were given to the three firms in the hope that they would increase production so that the demand in the country could be met. This concession was only for a period of six months.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह पूछा था कि सब से पहले नियम-परिवर्तन किस फर्म के लिए हुआ : क्या केवल इन तीन फर्मों के लिए हुआ या कोई दूसरी भी एसा

क्रम है, जिनके लिए यह नियम परिवर्तन हुआ। पब्लिक एकाइन्स कमेटी ने कहा है कि एडवांस पेमेंट न तब तक देना चाहिए कि उनको जो 29 लाख रुपये का मूद देना चाहिए था, वह उनको नहीं देना पड़ा माफ़ हो गया, क्योंकि दो-तीन करोड़ रुपये का कर्जा ऐसे तों मिलता नहीं है, बैंक आठ नौ परसेंट मूद लेते हैं।

Shri Jagannatha Rao: This was done in respect of UPCC. The UPCC was perhaps wanting more finances. They wanted payment. Here I may say that a similar concession was shown to TELCO some years ago.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने पहले तो तीन फर्मों का नाम लिया, लेकिन अब वह टेलको को भी ले आए हैं। क्या और भी कोई ऐसी फर्म है, जिन के लिए यह नियम-परिवर्तन हुआ ?

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या इन्वेस्टमेंट आक्टर में इस तरह का क्रास-एग्जामिनेशन करने दिया जायेगा ? केवल एक सदस्य की सवाल पूछने की मानोपत्ती तो नहीं होनी चाहिए।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बारे में माननीय सदस्य से कोई बहस नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। जब प्रश्न साफ़ है, तो जवाब भी साफ़ होना चाहिए। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सब से पहले नियम-परिवर्तन किन फर्मों के लिए हुआ ?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister is capable of answering the questions.

Shri Jagannatha Rao: I have mentioned the circumstances in which these concessions were made. I have also mentioned that, perhaps some years ago, the same concession was offered to TELCO. I have no other information with me at present. If a separate question is put, I will collect the information and supply it.

श्री बूढासिंह: मिनिस्टर साहब जिसको का नाम क्यों नहीं लेते हैं ?

श्री इसहाकसाम्बली : मिनिस्टर साहब डायरेक्टर-जनरल का नाम तो लें।

[**مستتر صاحب ڈائریکٹر جنرل**]

[**نام تو لیں**]

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It appears that there is some discrepancy between the report of the PAC and what appeared in the press communique. The press communique has given a feeling of 300 and odd road rollers which does not exist at all and which does not find a place in the report. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that the firm has genuinely offered for the appointment of two Government directors in the board to see that the road rollers are delivered in time. Now that the CBI inquiry is going on and the firm has been black-listed, what further action has been taken? We are seriously interested in recovering the amount or the road rollers. I would like to know whether the offer of this firm that they are willing to have two Government directors in the Board of Directors was agreed to by the government and, if not, why not. What are the reasons?

Shri Jagannatha Rao: This offer was very carefully considered and we came to the conclusion that the appointment of two government directors in the Board of Directors would not improve matters, because there are 7 directors in the Board of Directors and these two Government directors will be in a minority. They cannot have any controlling interest in the firm.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Then how will you recover the road rollers from the company?

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): May I explain? I cannot understand how my hon. friend entertains such a proposal.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: To recover the road rollers.

Shri Morarji Desai: I do not understand it. The proposal is that two directors may be appointed. It is not merely that two directors be appointed but first they should be removed from the blacklist and then they say that 20 rollers will be given every month. If we remove them from the blacklist, what will be the result of it? The same thing will happen again. They will be removed from the blacklist, they will have another contract and we will have no other method to recover it. As it is, there is nothing to be recovered. Therefore that has been rejected.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My suggestion was.....

Mr. Speaker: You have asked your question and the answer has been given. **Shri George Fernandes.**

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The money has to be recovered.

Mr. Speaker: No argument, please. **Shri George Fernandes.**

श्री जार्ज फ़रनेन्डीस : मंत्री महोदय ने अपने जवाब में यह व्यंग दिया है कि इस कम्पनी के खिलाफ़ क्या क्या कार्यवाही की गई है। यह इतना बड़ा मामला है, जिसमें करीब दो करोड़ रुपये की बदमाशी की गई है, कि इस बारे में सिर्फ़ कम्पनी की बात करने का कोई मतलब नहीं है, बल्कि इसमें डायरेक्टर-जनरल और मंत्री, और केवल एक मंत्री नहीं, बल्कि कई मंत्रियों, का हाथ है। इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस बारे में डायरेक्टर जनरल और मंत्रियों के खिलाफ़ क्या कार्यवाही की जा रही है ?

श्री सु० प्र० झा : भ्रान ए व्वाइंट ग्राफ़ आर्डर, सर ।

Mr. Speaker: No point of order during Question time. The Speaker will take care of himself. Do not worry.

श्री जार्ज फ़रनेन्डीस : मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि एक महीना पहले दिल्ली स्टेशन से एक रेलगाड़ी दस मिनट लेट छूटी, जिसमें रेल मंत्री, श्री पुनाचा, जाने वाले थे ।

Mr. Speaker: Come to the question please.

श्री जार्ज फ़रनेन्डीस : यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बात है। मैं आपको बताता हूँ कि यह कितनी महत्वपूर्ण बात है। चूंकि वह गाड़ी दस मिनट लेट छूटी, इसलिए एसिस्टेंट स्टेशन मास्टर को सस्पेंड कर दिया गया ।

Mr. Speaker: Will you ask a question about this? I am not interested in the railways at the moment. The railways have nothing to do with this.

श्री जार्ज फ़रनेन्डीस : आप को मेरी बात सुननी पड़ेगी—बराबर सुननी पड़ेगी। चूंकि गाड़ी दस मिनट लेट छूटी, इसलिए ए सिमटेंट स्टेशन मास्टर को सस्पेंड कर दिया गया ।

श्री लक्ष्मि लिये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य रेल के बारे में सवाल नहीं पूछ रहे हैं। वह पूछ रहे हैं कि जब एक रेलवे कर्मचारी के खिलाफ़ इतनी जल्दी कार्यवाही हुई, तो मंत्रियों और डायरेक्टर-जनरल के खिलाफ़ क्यों नहीं होती है ।

श्री जार्ज फ़रनेन्डीस : आप मेहरबानी कर के मेरे प्रश्न को समझ लीजिए ।

Mr. Speaker: It is not to be raised during Question Hour. This is Question Hour, not the debate.

श्री जार्ज फ़रनेन्डीस : मैं डीबेट नहीं कर रहा हूँ। यह कह रहा हूँ कि दस मिनट देर से गाड़ी

Mr. Speaker: Please do not take down the supplementary. No answer is to be given.

श्री जार्ज फ़रनेग्डीच : **

Mr. Speaker: You are not asking a question at all.

श्री जार्ज फ़रनेग्डीच : **

Shri Virendrakumar Shah: He has asked a very relevant question..... (Interruption).

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रश्न का जवाब आना चाहिए कि मंत्रियों और डायरेक्टर-जनरल के खिलाफ़ क्या कार्यवाही करने जा रहें? क्या उप-प्रधान मंत्री मेहनतानी करके इसका जवाब देंगे ?

Mr. Speaker: Will Shri Shah kindly sit down?

Shri George Fernandes: **

Mr. Speaker: This is not being taken down, the whole thing. Nothing is to be taken down. If you want to answer the question, you can answer it.

श्री सु० प्र० झा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, ये सवाल पैदा ही नहीं होते हैं। रूल 41(2) (10) में साफ़ लिखा है कि पर्सनल करेक्टर के चार्ज किसी मवाल में नहीं लगाए जा सकते हैं।

Mr. Speaker: Do you think that nobody else knows the rules and you alone know the rule? I myself said, "Do not take down the question" and this gentleman thinks he alone knows the rule book! That is my difficulty. They do not know anything, either the rules or anything.

Shri Morarji Desai: The whole question has been gone into very thoroughly and the moment we are able to locate it we will take action. They cannot escape it.

श्री जार्ज फ़रनेग्डीच : उन को सस्पेंड कीजिए, जैसे कि एसिस्टेंट स्टेशन मास्टर को किया गया है।

Shri Sequeira: Here is a case of a firm which appeared to have been very much in favour in as much as it managed to get contracts when it was not registered with the DG S&D, managed to get payment terms that were not available to others and for three or four years was able to draw 90 per cent. advance on rollers that were not being delivered over this period of four years. On one day, suddenly, for some reason, the action has been taken.

I wish to enquire of the Minister whether the investigation that has been ordered refers only to what has happened to these 400 and odd rollers that are not there or whether it includes also (a) the reason why this was not detected earlier and (b) the reason which led to the action that is now being taken, whether it is purely detection or there are some other factors involved.

Shri Jaganath Rao: It is a comprehensive enquiry being conducted by the C.B.I. We have requested the C.B.I. to expedite the enquiry so that suitable action can be taken.

श्री नीतिराज सिंह चौधरी : पी० ए० सी० की रिपोर्ट से यह मान्य होता है कि इस कमेटी को आर्डर देने के पहले उस की फाइनांशियल स्टैंडिंग के बारे में जांच नहीं की गई और न उस से बैंकर्स सर्टिफिकेट लिए गये और मार्च 1960 में यह जानकारी हो जाने के बाद भी कि इस की आर्थिक हालत ठीक नहीं है इसने छः बार आवेदन पत्र दिया लेकिन रिलैक्सेशन नहीं हुआ था सातवीं बार क्यों रिलैक्सेशन किया गया और यह रिलैक्सेशन छः महीने के लिए था तो छः महीने के बाद उस को रिब्यू क्यों नहीं किया गया ?

Shri Jaganath Rao: It is true that there are serious lapses on the part of the D.G.S.&D. in not following up the supplies. Therefore, the matter is

under investigation. As I said earlier, after the investigation is completed, suitable action will be taken.

Shri Banga: Will it be placed before the House?

Shri Jaganath Rao: Yes.

Shri K. N. Pandey: Is there any machinery to see that if the contract is given to a firm, the capability is also ascertained as to whether the firm is in a position to fulfil or to discharge the obligation and, if so, whether that machinery was applied in this case that the firm was in a position to supply others in time?

Shri Jaganath Rao: The D.G.T.D. gave a licence to this firm and they said that this firm can produce 144 road rollers in 1960. Beyond that, I do not think any capacity inspection was done.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : अभी मंत्री महोदय ने यह कहा कि यह जो रोड रोलर्स बनाने वाली कम्पनियां थीं उन्होंने कुछ कंसेशन मांगा था कि इन्स्पेक्शन की बेमिस पर पैसा दिया जाय और उसमें एक यू० पी० सी० सी० कम्पनी भी थी जिसने कंसेशन मांगा तो क्या यह सही बात है कि पिछले पांच छः बार कंसेशन की रिक्वेस्ट टर्न डाउन कर दी गई यू० पी० सी० सी० की और जिन्होंने टर्न डाउन किया पांचवीं और छठी बार मिस्टर राघवाचारी, उन्होंने सातवीं बार ऐक्सेप्ट कर लिया ? पहले पांचवीं और छठी बार रिक्वेस्ट किया और सातवीं बार ऐक्सेप्ट कर लिया और उन्होंने कोई रीजन भी नहीं दिया कि मैं क्यों ऐक्सेप्ट कर रहा हूँ, पांचवीं और छठी बार नामंजूर किया और सातवीं बार क्यों मंजूर किया इसका कोई रीजन नहीं दिया और उसमें उन्होंने लिखा है कि यू० पी० सी० सी० के अधिकारियों और मिस्टर राघवाचारी इनकी प्राइवेट मीटिंग हुई उस की बेसिस पर यह कंसेशन दिया गया, क्या यह सही है ?

यह जब प्राइमा फेसी केस साबित हो गया, आपने कहा कि कुछ लेप्सेज हैं तो कौन-कौन से लेप्सेज हैं सारे डील में ? क्या आपने मिस्टर राघवाचारी के खिलाफ और दूसरे अधिकारियों के खिलाफ भी कोई कार्यवाही की जब कि प्राइमाफेसी केस साबित होने पर उन्हें मस्पेंड होना चाहिए था, तो आपने कोई कार्यवाही की ? की तो किस किस के खिलाफ की और नहीं तो क्यों नहीं की ? और क्या यह फाइल उस वक्त के मिनिस्टर के पास भी गई थी ? यदि हाँ, तो उन्होंने क्या किया ?

Shri Jaganath Rao: As I said earlier, the very fact that six earlier requests were turned down and the seventh request was accepted clearly shows the circumstances in which the seventh request was accepted. Because the demand had risen in the country for 1,300 rollers, the Director-General, Mr. Raghavachari, thought that by giving the facility to this firm, the production will be increased to 30 rollers per month. That was the reason that compelled him to give the concession. But the fact remains that, subsequently, there was no follow-up in the D.G.S.&D. That is a serious lapse on their part. I myself say that. The Report has since been received and we are investigating it.

Mr. Speaker: Another question asked by the hon. Member was whether the proposal was put up to the Minister at that time, whether any Minister saw that.

Shri Jaganath Rao: That. I will have to check up.

श्री मधु लियये : चूँक अप करने के बाद में बयान दीजिए ।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने सवाल यह भी पूछा था कि इस डील में क्या क्या लेप्सेज हैं और उन लेप्सेज के लिए अफसरों के खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही की ? यदि नहीं की तो क्यों नहीं की ?

Shri Jaganath Rao: The lapse would be this. The concession was there only for six months. After six months, they should have reviewed the position. Every time some rollers were shown for inspection, 90 per cent. were drawn. It was the duty of the officers of the D.G.S.&D. to see whether the rollers inspected were despatched to the consignees. This is a serious lapse. All these are being investigated by the CBI. Till then, I am not in a position to say who are the officers who were responsible.

Shri Ranga: What is the use of having Ministers here?

श्री बट्टा सिंह: अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने बताया कि कौन कौन ने स्टैप्स गवर्नमेंट ने फर्म के खिलाफ लिए हैं लेकिन पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी ने अपने कन्क्लूजन में लिखा है :

"The Committee would be failing in its duty if they did not draw attention to the gravity of these lapses which in their cumulative effect indicate either collusion or gross negligence of a culpable kind on the part of the officers concerned. The Committee expects that these lapses will be investigated and severe disciplinary action taken against all who are guilty of failure to safeguard the financial interests of the country."

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि कमेटी के इस कन्क्लूजन के होते हुए दोनों मंत्री महोदयों ने एक भी बात साफ नहीं की कि वह कौन कौन से डिसिप्लिनरी ऐक्शन या कौन कौन से प्युनिटिव ऐक्शन लिए जा रहे हैं अफसरों के खिलाफ जिनके कारण पब्लिक के इतने बड़े पैसे का नुकसान हुआ है ?

श्री अशु लिनये : राघवाचारी के खिलाफ भी ऐक्शन लिये हैं ?

Shri Jaganath Rao: Proper action will be taken only after the CBI's investigation has been completed. Till

then, what we have done is that we have taken the explanations from the officers who were serving in the various capacities. Whether there should be criminal proceedings or departmental proceedings will depend on the final report of the investigation by the CBI. We are awaiting that report.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: From the answer of the hon. Minister, it becomes clear that the lapses are there and they are admitted. Therefore, before the CBI's inquiry, the House would like to know, what specific actions have been taken in regard to the lapses that have been admitted.

Mr. Speaker: On the lapses admitted.

Shri Jaganath Rao: The lapse is gross negligence. If there is any criminal intent or criminal content, certainly it will be a matter for criminal prosecution. We are awaiting the report of the CBI.

Mr. Speaker: The CBI's report need not be awaited for this. What they want to know is this. Even before the CBI's inquiry, certain lapses have been accepted. What action has been taken on those lapses?

Shri Jaganath Rao: We have called for the explanation of the officers concerned and the explanations have been received. The CBI suggested that we might not take any further action till their report was received. I do not know what material they have. If they have any material, then proper action will be taken. (Interruptions).

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: He has not answered the question at all. Will the hon. members please sit down? I am not able to follow him at all. The question is very clear and simple also. The CBI's report need not be awaited. Here are some lapses which are accepted by the Government and no further proof is necessary for them. Has any action been taken on those lapses?

Shri Jaganath Rao: Two courses are open: either departmental proceedings

against the officers or if there is any culpability or collusion as is noted in the PAC's report, criminal prosecution would lie. What action would be taken against the officers is a matter to be determined and that is why we are awaiting the CBI's report. We have called for the explanation of the officers.

Mr. Speaker: We have already spent half an hour on this question. I do not think that even another half an hour will give satisfaction to hon. Members. There is absolutely no point in asking further questions now. If at a later stage hon. Members want to have a discussion, I think they should have a discussion. I do not mind giving another half an hour to this question, but hon. Members would not still get any satisfaction. They will be only losing the other questions without getting any benefit at all on this question.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी मंत्री जी ने कहा कि कई अफसरों में जवाब मांगें गये हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि श्री राषवाचारी भलावा और कितने अफसरों में जवाब मांगे गये हैं ? दूसरी बात—सी० बी० आई० जांच कर रही है—मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि जब सी० बी० आई० की जांच खत्म हो जाय और हम मांग करें कि जांच की रिपोर्ट सदन की मेज पर रखी जाय तो मंत्री महोदय यह कह दें कि यह गुप्त जांच है, इसको सदन की मेज पर नहीं रखा जा सकता क्या मंत्री महोदय वायदा करने को तयार हैं कि सी० बी० आई० की रिपोर्ट को सदन की मेज पर रखा जायेगा ?

Shri Ranga: The CBI is not a law officer.

Shri Jaganath Rao: The police reports are not placed on the Table of the House, but if a charge-sheet is filed, we shall certainly place it on the Table of the House.

An hon. Member: Why not place the report also?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मंत्री महोदय ने मेरे पहले सवाल का जवाब नहीं दिया। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि कई अफसरों से स्पष्टीकरण मांगे गये हैं, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि वे अफसर कौन हैं और उनकी संख्या कितनी है ?

Mr. Speaker: Has any action been taken against officers other than Shri Raghavachari?

Shri Jaganath Rao: Explanation has been called for from 17 officers.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : जिन अधिकारियों के जिम्मे कोई काम होता है, उन पर यह जिम्मेदारी होती है कि वह काम ठीक से करें। मंत्री महोदय ने यह मान लिया है कि उपेक्षा पाई गई। अब उनका इरादा क्या था—उस के बारे में वह कुछ नहीं कहना चाहते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उनका इरादा कुछ भी रहा हो, लेकिन अगर उपेक्षा हुई है तो ऐसे अफसरों के खिलाफ कार्यवाही करने में क्या दिक्कत है ?

Shri Jaganath Rao: I have said that it is as a result of gross negligence that Government are standing to lose about Rs. 1-84 crores. I have said that appropriate action will be taken on receipt of the report of the CBI. Explanations have been given by the officers. I shall again contact the CBI. I contacted the CBI two days ago, and I requested them to expedite. If there is going to be further delay, we shall proceed with departmental proceedings.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि इन तीनों फर्मों को कुछ विदेशी रियायतें दी गई हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इन तीनों फर्मों को क्या क्या विदेशी रियायतें दी गई हैं और उसका ब्योरा क्या है ? यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि इन तीनों फर्मों को कितनी रकम की विदेशी मुद्रा के लाइसेंस दिये गये और जो लाइसेंस उनको दिये गये—क्या आप ने तसल्ली कर ली है कि वह रकम

ठीक तरह से इस्तेमाल हुई है ? अगर इसकी जांच हुई है तो इसका व्योम क्या है ?

Shri Jaganath Rao: As I have said, the other firms also wanted some concessions in regard to the release of foreign exchange etc., and that was given to them.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा सवाल मीधा था कि इन तीनों फर्मों को कितनी रकम की विदेशी मुद्रा की गियायतें दी गई हैं—मंत्री महोदय जवाब क्यों नहीं देते हैं ?

Shri Jaganath Rao: I have said already that foreign exchange was given to them. I cannot give the exact amount now.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : हमें डिटेल् चाहिए ।

Shri Hem Barua: Now that the PAC report has pointed out certain heavy losses in money, may I know whether Government proposes to write off this loss or create conditions whereby the rest of the road rollers, about 403 according to the Deputy Minister, would be recovered? Since the PAC report has categorically pointed out the loss suffered by Government, which has been accepted by Government, and the lapses committed by certain officers, which also has been accepted by Government, may I know why Government have not considered it proper to suspend those officers immediately pending all sorts of reports? I want to tell Shri Morarji Desai that he should function with a very firm hand. Unless he does it, he cannot do away with corruption from this country.

Shri Jaganath Rao: I have already said that we are awaiting the CBI report. If there is going to be further delay, we shall certainly take action.

Shri Hem Barua: He has not replied to my question. I wanted to know whether Government had written off the loss.

Shri Jaganath Rao: No.

Shri Hem Barua: What steps is Shri Morarji Desai going to take to see that corruption is rooted out from this country?

Mr. Speaker: That is a big question.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): From the moment this came to my notice, we are taking steps to find out how much money we can recover. That is one thing. Secondly, whatever money can be recovered will be recovered. Therefore, there is no question of writing off anything just now.

Shri Hem Barua: What about the road rollers?

श्री रवी राय : उन अफसरों की जायदाद एटैच कीजिये ।

Shri Morarji Desai: If the rollers are there, we will attach them. If they are not there, what is one to attach? Therefore, we have got to attach the properties. Then we have also got to take action against the officers responsible. It is not difficult to suspend any officer.....

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: Do it.

Shri Morarji Desai: But once an officer is suspended, he has to given some maintenance allowance also. If it goes on for a long time and if it is done before a *prima facie* case is made, then also it becomes absolutely infructuous.

Therefore, we have got to be very careful in this matter. But we do not want to have any more delay. As soon as possible, we will take action.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: Is it a fact that the DGS&D used to cancel orders after inspection and payments and also used to issue new A/Ts in lieu thereof without demanding return of money advanced for cancelled A/Ts? What action is proposed to be taken against the officer who gave the transaction, the shape of running A/c?

Shri Jaganath Rao: I have answered this question.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: No, he is trying to shield a particular set of officers.

Mr. Speaker: He has said he has answered it.

Shri Piloo Mody: There are three alternatives before Government: the first is to write off the rollers, the second is to write off the officers and the third to write off the Minister. Which of the three will Government prefer?

Shri Jaganath Rao: This does not arise at this stage.

Mr. Speaker: We have spent nearly 40 minutes on this question. The Deputy Prime Minister has promised some quick action. I am sure that when we meet next we are going to hear of something being done.

Next question.

गर्भपात को कानूनी करार देना

+

*1707. श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री श्रीकार सिंह :

क्या स्वास्थ्य तथा परिषार नियोजन मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या गर्भपात को कानूनी करार दिये जाने के प्रस्ताव के विरुद्ध धार्मिक, सामाजिक अथवा राजनीतिक संस्थाओं से सरकार को कोई आपत्त प्राप्त हुए हैं;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उनमें मुख्य रूप से क्या बात उठाई गई है; और

(ग) इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Health and Family Planning (Shri B. S. Murthy): (a) to (c). A statement containing the requisite information is laid on the Table of the Sabha. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1394/67].

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : आपने बताया है कि इस अध्ययन दल ने अनेकों राजनीतिक संस्थाओं, सामाजिक संगठनों या धार्मिक संगठनों से बातचीत की थी। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह अध्ययन दल कब बना था, इन्होंने अपना काम कितने रोज में शुरू किया तथा किन राजनीतिक, सामाजिक तथा धार्मिक संस्थाओं से बातचीत की, उन संस्थाओं की ओर से जो सुझाव आये—उन सुझावों को देने का तरीका क्या था?

Shri B. S. Murthy: The Central Family Planning Board in its 16th meeting at Bombay on 21 August 1964 passed a resolution to the effect that this matter has to be gone into. In pursuance of this, on 29 September 1964, the Committee under the chairmanship of Shri Shantilal Shah was constituted. The report of the Committee was submitted on 31 December 1966.

Seven religious organisations have been consulted and interviewed and 37 social organisations also have been interviewed. Many political personalities, MPs, MLAs, Deputy Speakers and others also have been interviewed.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : बयान में जो कहा गया है कि अथ रोग और कोड़क रोग वालों को गर्भपात में अनुमति नहीं दी जानी चाहिये, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि वह कौन सा दल था जिसे यह सुझाव दिया था? दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार के पास कोई ऐसी शिकायत आई है कि कितनी अविवाहित लड़कियों ने गर्भपात करवाया और कितनी विधवाओं के द्वारा गर्भपात कराने की घटनाएँ हुईं? ऐसी शिकायतों की संख्या क्या है?

Shri M. S. Murthy: By and large all the persons who met the committee gave evidence that illegal abortion was on the increase and therefore they suggested that it was