

**REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON WEL-  
FARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND  
SCHEDULED TRIBES**

SHRI B. R. MUNDA (Bihar): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Twenty-fifth Report of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes on the Ministry of Home Affairs— Socio-economic conditions of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Arunachal Pradesh.

**SYNOPSIS OF PROCEEDINGS OF COM-  
MITTEE 'E' ON DRAFT FIFTH FIVE-  
YEAR PLAN**

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table Synopsis of Proceedings of Committee 'E' on Draft Fifth Five Year Plan (Implementation and Public Co-operation).

**CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER  
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

**Delay in expansion Project of Bokaro and  
Bhilai Steel Plants**

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Steel and Mines to the delay in the expansion projects of the Bokaro and Bhilai Steel Plants from the original schedule and the reported statement of the Soviet Counsellor of Economic Affairs in this regard.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA): Sir: The capacity of the Bhilai Steel Plant is 2.5 million ingot tonnes. Government have taken a decision to expand the capacity of the Plant to 4 million ingot tonnes. As originally scheduled, this expansion is to be completed by December, 1976. As regards Bokaro, it is proposed to expand its capacity to 4 million ingot tonnes in continuation of the first stage of 1.7 million ingot tonnes. The coordinated construction schedule of Bokaro for expansion to 4 million ingot tonnes capacity, finalised last year, envisages completion of entire construction

and erection work (except 5—Stand Cold Rolling Mill Complex) by December, 1976 and commissioning by March, 1977. 5—Stand Cold Rolling Mill is expected to be completed one year later. It is proposed to further expand this capacity to 4.75 million ingot tonnes by the end of the Fifth Five Year Plan. Both these schemes for expansion are being implemented with Soviet cooperation and assistance.

A number of problems have been encountered in the implementation of the schemes for expansion. It is likely that some of these will have the effect of delaying the proposed schedules for completion of the expansion. However, it has always been our practice to attempt to settle these problems by discussion with the Soviet agencies and authorities cooperating with us and not to attempt to apportion blame in any manner. It is unfortunate that there should have been reports in a section of the press suggesting that the blame is attributable to one side or the other. I have no doubt that such problems as there are will be settled by mutual discussion and that every attempt will be made by all parties to minimise whatever delays become inevitable. We have always received the fullest cooperation from our Soviet friends in our schemes in the steel sector and I have no doubt that with this continuing cooperation we shall be able to overcome the difficulties that might crop up.

I would like to state in unequivocal terms that it is not correct to say that there has been any attempt by any one to thwart or in any manner delay the expansion programme of Bokaro Plant.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT. Sir, in his statement the Minister has not mentioned at all about the statement made by the Economic Counsellor in the Soviet Embassy. He has not said whether he has seen that statement or not. In the whole reply that he has given, he has not mentioned about that statement at all. And it was in that connection that we wanted to know information as to whether, as was said in the statement the Economic Counsellor of the Soviet Embassy, there was delay of two years. And the Economic Counsellor also made certain specific remarks. The whole statement can

be divided into two parts: One is advising the people of India to be patriotic. The Soviet representative even went on to appeal to the patriotic fervour of the Indian people to ensure that steel targets were met. We know the Soviet Union is our friend and I think there can be no doubt about it and the Soviet Union Counsellor should not feel that there will be anything lacking in that friendship and all that. But is it diplomatic etiquette to talk in this way publicly to the press? Tomorrow suppose there is something happening in the Soviet Union and our Ambassador or our Embassy Counsellor makes some statements how would the Soviet Union, or for that matter, any other country, like it? Supposing tomorrow the American or American representative says something about implementation of various collaboration agreements. Therefore, the hon. Minister has not mentioned anything at all about seeing these reports. This is what has been commented upon by many newspapers that this is transgressing diplomatic niceties, and friends should be much more cautious about these things, because I think whatever mistakes we make in this country, whether we move slowly or with lethargy, we correct our mistakes. As I. ok Manya Tilak sard if we make mistakes, we will correct them and go ahead. But this type of patronising approach will not be liked by the people of this country. I would like to know from the honourable Minister what the reaction of the Government thereto is. About delays the Minister has tried to give the picture which he had given in his reply to the debate on the Ministry of Steel and Mines. Here the Economic Counsellor of the Soviet Union has made specific points about the delays. After visiting the Bokaro and Bhilai steel plants recently, he said, he was satisfied that coal, coking coal and power have not been made available in sufficient quantities; coke-oven batteries were not working to their full capacity, and so on and then he made certain remarks which are worth noting. First he says that the shortcomings are because of the heavy engineering plant not being able to deliver the equipment in time, and secondly, that the MECON had undertaken designing job much above its present capacity and so the delays are taking place. Is it not a fact that the Steel Ministry, . . . (Time-bell rings) Let me

Public importance

please take a few more minutes. Sir. These are very important points.

The detailed review of causes in reaching the target of 4 million tons capacity, made a mention of delays in the receipt of technical data from the USSR for equipment to be manufactured in Ranchi. I want to know whether it is a fact. An assessment was made and the report indicates that there was delay in receiving technical data, there was delay in the supply of technical documents for that part of the design work for the project which falls within the sphere of MECON responsibility and including the works. May I know whether it is a fact that there have been delays on the part of the Soviet Union as well? As far as Soviet Union collaboration is concerned, both the HEC and MECON, they are the back-up consultants. So I want to know whether some delays have taken place or not.\*

Is it not a fact that in Bhilai, when it was designed, we had agreement with United Engineering of America Also? United Engineering, an American firm, could design 200" plate mill which Russians could not do. They can design only upto 140". That would have helped Bhilai. But Russians did not want that mill to be manufactured with the help of United Engineering probably because it is an American firm, though Russians would be having collaborations with Americans. That would have facilitated quicker expansion of Bhilai and would have yielded better results. I want to know whether the Government also thinks that the MECON has been burdened. If it is burdened, are they trying to get the help of other Indian consultants which can also be useful? They have approved the expansion of Bhilai and Bokaro. What about Vizag and Hospet? Only Rs. 3 crores have been given to Salem. I want to know whether in view of these rational distribution of work will be taken up. Mr. A.C. Banerjee of SAIL is giving everything to MECON and he is not giving anything to anybody. I want to know whether they will see that work goes on in an intergated way in order to fulfil our targets of steel production, steel designing and manufacture as early as possible. I would also like to know whether the Government is having discussions with the

delegation of the Soviet Union which had visited the steel plants sometime back? Have they given any report to the Government of India?' If so what are your reactions?' Are there discussions taking place between the Soviet delegation and the Government? What suggestions are made by the Soviet delegation. What replies have been by the Government of India and what steps are being taken to streamline the production of steel plants so that this type of unseemly public controversy between the Soviet Union and the Indian Ministry does not take place?

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: A large number of questions have been raised by my hon. friend. I want to answer some of them, in the background that the development plans of these two steel mills—Bokaro and expansion of Bhilai—are a long-term process. Whether we approach the Soviet experts or American experts or any other experts who are knowledgeable in these works, they have also to take a pretty long time in giving us advice and our accepting their advice. It is not a fact that we tried to apportion blame on each other. A certain statement was made in the press. I saw the report in the press. But it has not been possible for us to secure a copy of this either from the Soviet Embassy or from the press . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Vah! Vah!

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: Not Vah. Vah. I am giving facts . . .

SHRI O. P. TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh): See the hopeless condition of the Government.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: Facts are facts and the fact is that I have not been able to get a copy of the report from the press, The statement that I have made is on the background of exchange and consultations that have taken place between the Indian party and the Soviet party. It is also a fact that we have not been able to stick to the schedule either of bringing out the feasibility report or the techno-economic study. Once a delay occurs, then the chain reaction starts and it is not proper for us to identify the point from where those delays have started.

It is no use entering into these details and I do not know where the delay has started, because we are learning from experience and we are now becoming more experienced by trying to build up our chain of programmes with a view to expediting the schemes of expansion of the Bhilai project and the Bokaro from 1.5 million tonnes to 4.7 million tonnes.

Now, Sir, the Press report in the "Financial Express" says that the Economic Councillor's statement was a reaction to the official side, official view, which leaked out from the Steel Ministry. So far as I am concerned, as I have already stated, I made an inquiry and there was no leakage from the official side and there was no deliberate effort by anyone from our side. But it is quite possible that in our serious discussions amongst ourselves and the Soviet party we might have felt that we did not hear this or they have not heard this and we have heard this or they have heard this and these are all part of the game and here it will not be serving any purpose, even for expediting the programme, to apportion blame to each other. We do not do it and it is not our practice and we are getting the maximum co-operation from the Soviet side and we hope that in spite of the fact that we have had to revise our plans of the feasibility study and the techno-economic survey, we would be able to minimise the delays that are occurring unfortunately in this.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Sir, he may not attach any importance to the reports, etc. But he must say what his reaction or the reaction of the Government is. Otherwise, some other Embassy will be interested in these things.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Minister, do you want to add anything?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Sir, tomorrow the American Embassy may be interested in this and some others also will be interested. So, let him say something.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Evidently, he does not want to say anything.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Delhi): Sir, I can understand his not wanting to say any-" thing. But the House wants to know some-

thing about this and we want to know what the position is. Let him say something.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: What does the House want me to do?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Did you ask for an authentic version of the statement?

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: Sir, the House is aware that the representatives of the foreign governments do make statements in our country according to their own views and according to their own wishes and this is not the first time that something has been said . . . (Interruptions) . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, he has said, "I am not able to procure the statement". This is what he has said. I do not know whether he asked the Embassy to give a copy and the Embassy refused to give it. I do not know what happened. What happened?

SHRI K.D. MALAVIYA: Considering the background of the seriousness of the work in which we are involved, we do not attach any importance to a small remark being made here and there because it is not a thing which is very relevant.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Subramanian Swamy.

**श्री लाल झाडवाणी : यह तो सोवियत एम्बेसी का डिफेंस हो रहा है ।**

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I was shocked to hear the Minister saying that the reports in the Press were unfortunate. He did not say that the outburst of the Soviet Economic Councillor was equally unfortunate. Obviously, the maximum that we could expect was "equally" since "more" would be too much.

Sir, I want to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that there is something wrong, as they say in Hindi, "dal me kuchh kala hai." I have gone through the history of these two plants. Today we are discussing not only the brashness and the misuse of hospitality by the Soviet Councillor, but also we are discussing

the delay in these two steel plants. Now, Sir, the Minister has admitted that there has been a delay and everybody knows that. Why has there been this delay? Sir, we are only producing 6 million tonnes of steel. But China produces 21 million tonnes and the most developed countries produce about a hundred million tonnes of steel. Then, why is this country lagging behind? This nation has been very generous with the money for the steel projects without making the Ministers accountable. We can see the cost estimates for the expansion programmes for Bhiliai. The original estimate stood at Rs. 230 crores and within four or five months it rose to Rs. 265 cores and within another four months it went up to Rs. 360 crores. I do not know what the estimate of the expansion programme today is. Now the expansion programme is delayed and is going to be taken to 1978-79. The estimate for Bokaro has gone up front Rs. 590 crores to Rs. 859 crores.

Original estimate was 590 crores; then it was raised to 680 crores. Now in the fourth Plan it is 1053 crores for steel plants expansion. The Government managed to spend only 867 crores. This Government, whose non-developmental expenditure is increasing by 14 per cent per year, is not able to spend money on steel plants. Now when the cat is out of the bag, the Ministry leaks; the Minister is not leaking but the Ministry is leaking. They say that the Russians are delaying it. The management talks in a different direction. In the past this has happened once before. In July 1969, the BSL press release said that the indigenous suppliers were defaulting and this was the reason for the delay. Refractories and HEC mentioned. But four months later, in November, Mr. K. C. Pant, then Minister, said in Ranchi that it was due to the delay in receipt of plants from Russia. On 29th January, 1970, the Hindustan Times quoted Ministry officials holding the same view. On 31st March, 1970, Mr. K. C. Pant told the Lok Sabha that construction programme was slow because the Soviet supply of steel structures was not received in the sequence in which they are required for erection; that is, the roof was supplied first and the foundations later.

Naturally, everything is held up. But then suddenly something happened. Mr. V. E. Dymshits—I am sorry I may be pronouncing his name wrongly—arrives in India and puts the blame on the Indians. Mr. Pant gets transferred. Then, Mr. M. Sondhi says on the 12th May, 1970, that the Indians are responsible and the Minister. Mr. B. R. Bhagat, says that Russians are not responsible but the H I O is responsible. Then, everything becomes silent and everything is forgotten.

Now, what happens is that Dr. Blinlta-charya has resigned: some allegations are made . . . (Time bell rings). And the issue is up again. The Government of India does not have an impeccable record, but what about the USSR! But I can tell the Russians that if they threaten this country, then we are all one. Look at the Russians' performance in this regard. Look, at the document, which the Government would not supply, but I got hold of that document Contract No. 7622-OC, dated May 3, 1966. Equipment, steel structurals, pipes and other goods from the USSR have to be delivered "within 50 months", i.e. by the end of June, 1970-50 months from the signing of the Agreement. I have not seen a single document giving 50 months to western countries . . . (Time Bell). But anyway, by the end of June, 1970, the Russians were supposed to deliver every single equipment and structural and pipes and other goods from the USSR, whatever they agreed to. But by that date, the USSR supplied 67% of equipment, 36% of structurals, 44 of refractories and 50% of pipes and other things. The other equipments were not supplied. The Russians have gone back on their contract. We can take them to the International Court and demand compensation. The Government, if it has the guts, can stand up and do so. Look at the document presented on the working of the Public Undertakings. Till 31st July, 1973, the equipment promised was 102,265 tonnes and that given was 101,120; refractories promised were 81,250 tonnes and given 69,561 tonnes; 25% has yet to be supplied. We all know that the Russians charge us three or four times the market price from India . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will have to wind up now . . .

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: This is an extremely important matter . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know, but now you will have to conclude.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: The agreement is heavily loaded in favour of the USSR.

The Indian consultants pointed out that 109 crores of rupees could be saved. The Government said no to it and they agreed to Rs. 9 crores only. Rs. 100 crores have naturally gone to the Russians as consultancy fees and for other junk equipment that they have sold to us. Now, I would like to know whether this is not a naked fact. There is an import lobby in this country which warns us to be dependent on the Russians. It is a kind of assassination of the Indian engineers. It is an attempt to see that a climate is created so that the people who take their cue from Moscow in this country step up pressure on the Government and say, "Import from Russia; import from Russia." They want this chorus to start. I fully agree with Mr. Krishan Kant when he raised these fundamental issues. I demand that Gordopolov should be kicked out of this country. He had no business to give a press conference on the soil of India. He is misusing the hospitality.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: The hon. Member has made a long speech, with little relevance to the question that is before us, if I may be allowed to say so. I refute the allegations that have been made by him with regard to the activities that are being sought by us with a view to expand our steel mills. So many questions have been put by him, Most of them were uninformed.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): What about the facts given by him?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I mentioned the contract number. Tell me if it is not true.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: I am here only to say that such attacks should not be made on a friendly country which has.

of its own, offered co-operation to us and which co-operation never came to us from any other country before. Sir, steel mill making is a long process in which we have originally learnt lots of things from them. Even if the Americans had come here, we would have had to learn many things from them, (Interruptions). There has been an element of delay. Once the delay starts, it is very difficult to identify the point from where the delay could have been drawn. The whole process has got to be completed. There has been a delay of about 6 months or one year in the Bhilai Steel Plant as well as in Bokaro steel plant. We are now determined to see that his delay is eliminated and if they are not able to do it, then it will be partially due to our people not working to schedule and also because of the many tensions that have been growing in the area front where we have to bring inputs and in which we have to persuade the workers to put in more work. All these points are very much before us. It is not only because of the structures that had to come here which have caused delay. There are many other factors which have caused delay.

"In an extraordinary statement, the Soviet Economic Counsellor, Mr. V. N. Gordopolov. today accused certain persons without naming

**श्री रबी राय (उड़ीसा) :** उपसभापति जी, अभी माननीय मंत्री जी ने जो जवाब दिये हैं उस से ऐसा लगता है कि माननीय मंत्री जी जानबूझ कर सदन को गुमराह करना चाहते हैं। पहले तो तो वह बतायें कि सोवियत कांसिलर ने जो बयान दिया है उस के बारे में शायद उन को पूरी तरह से पता नहीं है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी की खिदमत में वह बयान पढ़ कर सुनाता चाहता हूँ कि जो अखबार में निकला है। वह इस प्रकार है :

them for thwarting the expansion of the Bokaro steel plant to the 10-million-tonne stage. He also I warned that the manner in which the Bokaro and the Bhilai steel plants, were being run at present might at any moment damage their equipment."

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने जो अभी पढ़कर सुनाया उससे साफ जाहिर है कि इकानामिक कोसलर,

सोवियत यूनियन, जो कि हमारा दोस्त है, ने हम लोगों की परफारमैस की आलोचना की है, उसको हम नजर-अन्दाज नहीं कर सकते। मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप सोवियत यूनियन के इकानामिक कोसलर की राय के साथ सहमत हैं और अगर सहमत हैं तो कैसे उसको मंशोधन किया जाए यह सदन को बताया जाए। यदि सहमत नहीं है तो कहना चाहिए जो यहां कहे हैं वह गलत बयानी किए हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय से साफ करना चाहता हूँ कि सोवियत यूनियन ने आलोचना की है उस पर आपको सख्त एतराज है या नहीं ?

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि आप पब्लिक अंडर-टेकिंग कमेटी में सदस्य रह चुके हैं। मैं 70 की पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग कमेटी की, जो बोकारो स्टील प्लांट के बारे में रिपोर्ट है उसे पढ़कर मुनाना चाहता हूँ। क्योंकि सोवियत यूनियन की जो सहायता है उस मिलसिले में सरकार का कहना है कि पहली स्टेज में विलम्ब हो चुका था और 90 करोड़ इसके चलते बढ़ोतरी हो गई थी। बोकारो स्टील प्लांट के बारे में पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग कमेटी जो कहती है वह मैं पढ़ता हूँ:

"It has pulled up the Government for not yet approving the revised estimate of Rs. 620 crores (an escalation of Rs. 96 cores) for the first stage of the Bokaro Steel Plant. The Committee has rejected Government's explanation that the inclusion of a delivery schedule in the contract of supply of plant and equipment by the Soviet Union was not considered important as the Soviets being the principal consultants, were equally responsible for commissioning the Plant as per schedule. It has asked for the exercise of due vigilance so that the supplies were made in accordance with the stipulated delivery schedule although the schedule did not form part of the contract."

मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बहुत गम्भीर मामला है। मंत्री महोदय बताएं कि सोवियत यूनियन के साथ जो करार हुआ

4495 का तो उस करार का कांट्रैक्ट सरकार को मिल चुका है या नहीं और इसके बारे में कोई गड़बड़ है या नहीं ।

तीसरा सवाल यह है कि मेटरोलाजिकल एंड इंजिनियरिंग कंसल्टेशन लिमिटेड, जो पूरा हमारा इंजिनियरिंग काम चलाते हैं क्या उसमें कोई स्टेज है ? क्योंकि दूसरी स्टेज मेटरोलाजिकल एंड इंजिनियरिंग कंसल्टेशन लिमिटेड के हाथ में रखी गयी और पहली स्टेज मांविगत यूनियन के कौंसलर के हाथ में, तो क्या इसमें कोई रोश पैदा नहीं होता ?

चौथा सवाल गैरा यह है कि जो विलम्ब हो चुका है और 90 करोड़ ज्यादा खर्च हो चुका है इसको देखकर जो भट्टाचार्य साहब हैं जो कि मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर, बोकारो हैं और भिलाई की टेक्नीकल एक्सपर्ट कमेटी के हेड का काम कर रहे थे, उनके बारे में जिज्ञासा हुआ है कि उनका कुछ लोग नहीं चाहते हैं । जो स्वयं अथोरिटी है वह नहीं चाहती कि गति से काम हो भिलाई का । जिस तरह से अफसर काम करना चाहते हैं उसको स्वयं अथोरिटी के लोग नहीं करने देते हैं । मंत्री महोदय साफ करें कि बोकारो के मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर भट्टाचार्य जो भिलाई गए हुए हैं उनके उपर एतराज क्यों किया जाता है ?

**श्री के० डी० मालवीय :** जहां तक भट्टाचार्य का संबंध है वह बोकारो में थे और उन के जाने का प्रश्न बहुत पहले से ही था । जहां से वह आए थे डिफेंस डिपार्टमेंट से वहां जाने का प्रश्न था और वह बहुत दिनों से था और मेरे मंत्री बनने से पहले का सवाल था । इसमें मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ कि उनकी निन्दा हुई ।

साधारण तरीके से वे जाना चाहते थे, वे चले गए, उनकी जगह पर श्री बनर्जी आ गए जो पास्ट टाइम अभी इसमें काम करते हैं ।

जो पहली बात कही थी माननीय सदस्य ने कि इकानामिक कौंसलर साहब ने कहा था कि

वहां नुकसान हो सकता है, वह बात उनका इशारा था जो आजकल इस समय कोयला नहीं पहुंच पा रहा है, बिजली नहीं आ रही है, कोयले के न पहुंचने से रेलों के अंदर जो हड़तालें हो रही हैं; इसका उन्हें बहुत डर था कि वे भट्टियां अगर नियत तापमान से नीचे चली जाएंगी तो बड़ा नुकसान हो जाएगा और भट्टियां भर सकती हैं एक दफा भट्टी शांत हो गई तो । एक बार नष्ट होने के बाद फिर करोड़ों रु० लगाकर चार-छः वर्ष बाद वह भट्टी चालू हो सकती है । स्वाभाविक है कि जिन लोगों ने सहायता की थी भिलाई स्टील प्लाण्ट के खड़ा करने में, बोकारो स्टील प्लाण्ट के खड़ा करने में उन्हें ऐसे समय में जब कि रेलवे की स्ट्राइक से उनका डर था कि कहीं संचित मात्रा में कोयला, लोहा, लाइम स्टोन न पहुंच सके, तो उन्होंने राय जाहिर की जो अखबारों में आया । वह बयान अपना एक स्थान रखता है अपनी जगह । उसका इसमें कोई संबंध नहीं, विलंब होने से ।

अब देर तो हुई बोकारो के कारखाने में, जगह जगह, जो हर स्टेज की कार्यवाही है, उसमें देर तो हुई । उस देर में, यह बात भी सही है कि "मैं कौन" जो हमारा संगठन है, उसके पास जितना काम है, वह काम समय में पूरा नहीं हो पा रहा है । जैसा मैंने शुरू में कहा और फिर कहता हूँ माननीय सदस्य से कि इस सबका हमको समय समय पर इस तरह का ज्ञान हासिल करने में जो दाम देना पड़ता है, समय का दाम या पैसे का दाम देना पड़ता है, उसके लिए हमें तैयार रहना ही चाहिए । वह अन्वैवाएडेबल है, इन्वैडेबल है, उसको छोड़ कर नहीं रह सकते । कोई भी देश जो इतना बड़ा लोहे का कारखाना खड़ा करेगा और अपने यहां उसकी शिक्षा हासिल करेगा तो जिससे वह शिक्षा हासिल करता है, उसका उसे कृतज्ञ होने चाहिए और स्वयं अपनी गलती को दूर करने की चिन्ता रहनी चाहिए । इस पृष्ठभूमि के ऊपर अगर उस बयान को आप देखें तो उसमें कोई ऐसी बात नहीं पाएंगे जिससे कोई बड़ी चिन्ता व्यक्त हो । मैंने अपने बयान में

साफ तौर से कहा कि जहाँ तक मुझे मालूम हुआ है कोई जानबूझ कर किसी ने कोई ऐसा बयान हमारे यहाँ नहीं किया है मानो यह बोकारो इस्पात की प्रगति को हम डीला कर रहे हैं, और न कहीं मैंने सोवियत की तरफ से ऐसी उनकी आलोचना देखी। अगर ऐसी बात हुई कि अनजाने में कहीं किसी ने कोई बात अप्रिय, संबंधित लोगों के प्रति अपनी असमर्थता में, कह दी तो मुझे उसका ज्ञान नहीं है। अगर ऐसी बात होगी तो आपस में हम मिल कर, सरकार से, बातचीत में, दूर कर लेंगे।

**श्री रबी राय :** जो 4,495 टन इक्विपमेंट का अग्रिमोंट में जो करार था क्या वह हाँ चुका है ?

**श्री के० डी० मालवीय :** उसके बारे में मालूम नहीं है। मैं बात करूँगा।

**श्री नवल किशोर :** (उत्तर प्रदेश) श्रीमन् मैं कभी यह उम्मीद नहीं करता कि मेरे दोस्त के० डी० मालवीय साहब कोई ऐसी बात कहेंगे, चाहे वह सच भी हो, कि सोवियत रशिया को नागवार हाँ जाए....

**श्री के० डी० मालवीय :** क्या आप चाहते हैं हम ऐसी बात कहें जिससे वे नाराज हों ? क्या उनको नाराज करना मैं अपना पेशा समझ लूँ ?

**श्री नवल किशोर :** मैं श्रीमन्, इतिफाक करता हूँ कि सोवियत रशिया हमारा दोस्त है मगर उनको भी अहसास होना चाहिए कि हिन्दुस्तान हमारा दोस्त है। वह कोई बात नहीं है। जब कभी कोई 2 सावरेन कंट्रीज का कोलेबोरेशन होता है तो ईक्वल स्टेटस के ऊपर होता है। मालवीय जी ने, कहा मुझे कोई ऐसी बात महसूस नहीं हुई। श्रीमन् यह महसूस करने की बात नहीं है। मैं यह नहीं कहता वे थिक स्किन्ड आदमी हैं। मगर सवाल यह है—और एक बहुत बड़ा सवाल है—कि हमारी दोस्ती है यह ठीक है मगर कुछ डिप्लोमैटिक डीसेम्सी होती है, डिकोरम होता है, प्रोप्राइटी

होती है। जो बयान मैंने अखबारों में पढ़ा—या तो मालवीय जी कहें यह बयान जो अखबारों में, आया है गलत है, उस इकानामिक कौंसलर ने यह बयान नहीं दिया है। लेकिन जब बयान दिया है—और श्रीमन्, मैं अपनी जगह कांविन्सड हूँ यह मानते हुए कि हम अहसानमंद हैं सोवियट रशिया के, वह हमारा दोस्त है, मैं फिर भी यह बात मानता हूँ, ये जो एक नामिक कौंसलर है He is guilty of diplomatic impropriety indecorum and indecency. अब मैं नहीं जानता, उन्होंने पढ़ा कि नहीं पढ़ा, मैं सिर्फ 3-4 लाइनें पढ़ूँगा जो इकानामिक कौंसलर का मेन कांटेन्शन है :

That the Indian Engineering Services as well as the manufacturers of equipment, notably among (hem, the Metallurgical and Engineering Consultants of the Steel Authority of India and the Heavy Machine Building Plant at Ranchi were not able to fulfil their share of the job. But, he ignored the inconvenient fact that the Soviet organisations hold the positions of consultants not only for the construction of these projects but also hold commanding positions in MECON and H.M.B.P.

यही नहीं, यह जो अपनी स्टील मिनिस्ट्री है, जिस के आप इन्चार्ज हैं, उसने अपने रिब्यू में कहा है और खुद यह कहा है :

"It made a mention of the delays in the receipt of technical data from USSR for equipment to be manufactured at Ranchi. In addition it mentions the delay in supply of technical documents for that part of the design work for the project which falls within the sphere of MECON's responsibility including its works."

तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ आप से और आपकी मिनिस्ट्री से कि अगर वे चाहते हैं कि आप में कमी है, तो क्या आप इस से इतिफाक करते हैं ? मेरे कहने का आशय यह है कि हम एक दूसरे पर दोषारोपण न करें और कोशिश इस बात को करें कि जो देरी हो गई है, उसको किस तरह से दुरुस्त किया जाय। श्री स्वामी ने भिलाई के बारे

में एक खास सवाल पूछा था कि इसके एक्सपेंशन का जो खर्चा था, वह 230 करोड़ रुपये से 360 करोड़ रुपया बढ़ गया है। इस तरह से 130 करोड़ रुपया बढ़ गया है जो कि करीब 60 प्रतिशत तक आता है और इतना बढ़ गया है। बोकारो के लिए 1969 में 590 करोड़ रुपया खर्चा गया था, लेकिन अब तक उसमें 859 करोड़ रुपया खर्च हो गया है और अभी वह कमिशन के आसपास नहीं है। इस तरह से करीब 269 करोड़ रुपया उसमें ज्यादा खर्च हो गया है, जो कि 60-70 प्रतिशत ज्यादा पहिले के अनुमान से मालूम होता है। इस तरह से उसके कार्य में इतनी कास्ट बढ़ जाय, तो इसकी जिम्मेदारी किस पर है।

मुझे एक बात की हैरानी है कि मालवीय जी ने कहा है कि आगे चलकर अगर हम चैक न करें तो जिम्मेदारी हमारी होगी। तो एक माने में इन्डियरेक्टली आपकी जिम्मेदारी इस बात के लिए होगी कि अगर आप इस चीज को पूरा नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन मैं बड़े अदब से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो कास्ट-आफ कास्ट्रक्शन बढ़ता ही चला जा रहा है, उसके लिए जिम्मेदार कौन हैं।

दूसरी बात मैं उनसे यह दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस बात में आपके साथ हूँ कि सोवियत रूस हमारा एक दोस्त है और हम उसकी इज्जत भी करते हैं तथा उसकी कीमत भी जानते हैं। लेकिन दोस्ती के यह माने नहीं हैं कि जो हमारी सोवरेनिटी है, उसको गलत रूप से प्रोजेक्ट किया जाय।

**श्री के० डी० मालवीय :** हमारे रूस के साथ जो राजनीतिक और डिप्लोमैटिक सम्बन्ध हैं, वे एक अलग अपना स्थान रखते हैं, उसका एक इतिहास है और उसके बारे में सब माननीय सदस्यों को मालूम है। इस वक्त इस चीज के सम्बन्ध में जरूरत से ज्यादा नाता जोड़ना ठीक नहीं होगा। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि सोवियत संघ के टैक्नीशियनों के साथ जब मैं आयल मिनिस्ट्री में था, सम्बन्ध रहा है और अक्सर हम एक दूसरे-से अस्हमत रहते थे, लड़ते और झगड़ते थे।

L/B(N)9RSS-5

जहां जहां टैक्नीशियन्स में आप में बातचीत होती है, यह जरूरी बात नहीं है कि उनके आपस में एक राय हो जाय। कभी कोई किसी विषय पर अपनी अलग राय रखता है। तो कभी दूसरा अलग राय रखता है। इस तरह की बातें अखबारों में आ जाया करती है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि इस तरह की बातें अखबारों में नहीं आती। लेकिन किस-अनुपात से आती हैं, किस सेन्स आफ प्रपोर्शन से आती हैं, उन सब चीजों को देखना चाहिये। एक और आपको यह देखना चाहिये कि हम एक बहुत बड़ी ताकत के साथ सहयोग कर रहे हैं जिसका स्टील मिल के सम्बन्ध में बहुत ज्यादा ज्ञान है और उसकी सहायता से हम अपने यहां मिल खड़ी कर रहे हैं।

**श्री लाल अडवानी :** It is insulting Sir. आप तो उस देश की तारीफ करत चले जा रहे हैं। दोनों देश बड़े हैं। वह देश हमारा मित्र है और उस की हम कद्र करते हैं। लेकिन यह कहना कि हम उनके बिना काम नहीं चला सकते हैं। It is humiliating.

**श्री के० डी० मालवीय :** माननीय सदस्य जरा धीरज देकर सुनें। मैं अपने देश की महानता को कम करने वाल नहीं हूँ। मुझे इस तरह की बात सुननी नहीं आती है। मैं यह कह रहा था कि एक बड़ा देश है जिसको स्टील कारखाने को खड़े करने का अनुभव है और उनकी सहायता से हम अपने यहां एक-दो कारखाने खड़े कर रहे हैं। इस चीज के लिए हम उनका कृताज्ञता प्रकट करें, अपने देश को छोटा बनाना नहीं है। इस तरह से कुछ कारखाने...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Specific delays . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot have it both ways, Mr. Advani. Let him proceed.

**श्री के० डी० मालवीय :** दूसरी बात जो श्री नवल किशोर ने कही, वह खर्च की बात है। जहां तक बोकारो में खर्च का सवाल है 4 मिलियन

टन स्टील बनाने के लिए 1340 करोड़ रुपये आज कल के हिसाब से लगेंगे।

आज कल तेजी से बढ़ते हुए दामों को हम रोक नहीं सकते, वह एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय फेनोमेना है, दाम बढ़ते हैं और दामों के बढ़ने के बावजूद लोहे के कारखानों को खड़ा करना पड़ेगा। जो हमारे पहले अनुमान थे, उनसे अनुमान बढ़ गए और अब वह 1340 करोड़ रुपया है जबकि उत्पादन का लक्ष्य भी 4 मिलियन टन है।

मैकॉन के पास काम ज्यादा है, लेकिन मैकॉन एक बहुत योग्य संगठन हो गया है जिसका डिजाइन करने में दुनिया के अच्छे से अच्छे यूनिट्स के साथ कम्पेरिजन किया जा सकता है उसके पास काम बहुत ज्यादा जरूर है। हिन्दुस्तान में जो दूसरे डिजाइनिंग यूनिट्स हैं उनमें भी हम काम ले रहे हैं। सेलम से काम ले रहे हैं, होस्पेट से काम ले रहे हैं, जरूरत पड़ेगी तो यहां भी लेंगे। जो यूनिट देश के अन्दर बन गई है और जो उपयुक्त हैं उनमें काम लेते हैं, खाली मैकॉन के ऊपर काम नहीं छोड़ते, लेकिन हमारी या पोलिसी है कि मैकॉन को बहुत तेजी से इतना बढ़ा बना दें कि हर तरह के कारखानों को डिजाइन कर सकें।

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): I would like to put certain specific questions. I do not accept the Minister's statement about Dr. Bhattacharya. My report is that he was doing his best to keep the expansion scheduled and he was ahead of the schedule. That is why Mr. Wadud Khan, a Tata man, was put in charge of SAIL and in collusion with certain conspiratorial group it was arranged that he should be removed so that the expansion of Bokharo can be delayed. Meanwhile Tata's expansion to 4 million tonnes is being speeded up. This is one thing. He was a competent person for the job. And that competent person has been removed. We are not sure that the person who has replaced Dr. Bhattacharya is equally competent. No; he is not.

Now, has there been any delay in the supply on the Soviet part also? There has  
^B(N)9RSS—5(a)

been some delay on our part you said. Has there been any delay on their part also?

The third question I would like to ask is this. China is expanding her steel plants on her own with full technical know-how, fabricating, designing, everything. I do not expect the Britishers or the West Germans in Durgapur or Rourkela to train us and equip us with the full technical know-how but we are in collaboration agreement with the Soviet also for a pretty long time and how is it that we are not yet fully equipped with the technical know-how and have to depend on them for running the plants and for the import of spare parts and components? And what is the percentage of construction that we have been able to put up? HEC is also in collaboration with Soviet Russia and Czechoslovakia. If that is so why do you require further collaboration? If there is technological agreement on the subject with the socialist countries and if we had asked them they would have equipped us full technical know-how so that our technical experts can themselves deal with the whole thing. This is a thing which is surprising to me. And how many Soviet people are here? If throughout this long period we have not learnt anything then it is either our fault or somehow or other our socialist friends have not helped us perhaps because we have not asked for it. The whole thing is a bungle. Sir, China was behind us. It has advanced and now it is able to do everything on its own whereas we are still dependant on others for everything. Even spares and components we have to import. This is the sorry state of affairs. Sir, this sort of thing should end; the time has come for it.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: So far as Mr. Bhattacharya is concerned, what I said before and even today should be accepted by my friend. He is a very competent man and I have never said that he is not. But when some responsibility is put on SAIL it is common knowledge that interchange of functions or interchange of persons from one place to another will take place and necessarily it has to be left to the people who are already doing it. There is no question of any reflection on the ability of Mr. Bhattacharya, for whom we have all very high respect.

With regard to the failings or the supposed failings of the Indian counterparts or technicians to do the job on a self-sufficiency basis, well I would certainly not say that we have learnt all that we could have learnt in the time that was given to us. It would also appear that the Soviet people may not have sent, within their schedule, all the parts that they had to send. It does happen once we make mistakes they take more time and when they make mistakes we take more time. The whole system derails from one point to another. So, it is quite possible both of us made mistakes. I do not deny that we did not delay or they did not delay. This is part of the game, where both parties have had to suffer either on account of rising prices or on account of delay in the arrival of equipment or parts or delay in designing . . .

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra): How they suffer I do not understand. We have suffered.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: It is because they have not been able to fulfil their part and thereby a reflection is cast on them, just as hon. Members are trying to do. It is a whole gamut of complex problems. All of us sometimes are not able to do what we all want. I am deliberately trying to persuade hon. Members to appreciate the view point that in such a large and complex nature of work, prices and scheduling cannot be struck to according to a conference decision. Once we take a decision so many elements come in and it is modified. It has been modified perhaps three or four times and there is a delay of about four to ten months in respect of one of the plants. The hon. Member compared our situation with China. I do not wish to say anything about the Chinese advance or our not being able to advance, but I do submit that the technical knowledge that has been attained by our own boys and the capabilities that have been developed in our country through MECON are worthy of appreciation. They have done a very nice piece of work. I do not think even China can claim to have gone far more ahead than what we have done. I do not know how the Chinese have been able to produce their steel mills, with whose help and from where co-operation is coming to them. I know what we have done

and we can say that we are fast moving to a situation where an entire steel mills, all the parts of it, will be designed by our own institutes and it will be fabricated in HEC. HEC did have the objective of producing a one million tonne steel plant every year, but we have not been able to stick to that schedule. When we put that objective before us we did not visualise or realise or appreciate all the difficulties and complications and the changing situation in the world with regard to availability of raw materials and also our own inability to put up power plants. There are so many constraints which we are facing today. At that time when we put this objective before us, we did not envisage it. There is no harm in introspection. We want to see that our boys make rapid progress and soon we are going to reach a stage when we can build steel plants in other countries. As a matter of fact we are preparing ourselves to set up steel plants in other countries. It is a combined process, where we learn and at the same time we are trying to help others.

SHRI S.S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu): My colleague has dealt with the first part of the question. I would like to deal only with the reported statement of the Soviet Counsellor. He has reacted very sharply to the official leak from the Steel Ministry. But unfortunately the Minister in charge has not reacted sharply to the observations of the Comissar. He has been very mild. Is it because of his age or is it because of any other reason? I would be very glad to know about it.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: I could not follow. What does he want to know?

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: This is in relation to the performance of the Steel Ministry. The Soviet officer has reacted sharply to the official leaks from the Steel Ministry, whereas our hon. Minister has not reacted in the same manner, that is sharply, but he has reacted very mildly. And I wonder whether it is because of his age or for any other reason. If there is any other reason, we would be glad to know about it.

Sir, the officer while discussing this Bokaro expansion has said that he had formed the impression that in the construction of this plant there was unwillingness from certain persons to go ahead with the work. It

is a clear-cut, direct interference in the working of our Ministry by someone an outsider. You know that the convention is that any outside country should not interfere in our internal affairs, whether it is a friendly country or a hostile country, it does not matter. So far as Russia is concerned, I am one with the hon. Minister— it is a friendly, good country; it has stood "by us at the time of our stress and strain, etc., etc., etc. These are all shibboleths, and I do not believe in them. What I would like to know here is this. Here is a clear-cut charge levelled against the Ministry headed by my good friend, Mr. Malaviya, and what is his reaction? Suppose our own Vice-Consul or somebody in our Moscow Embassy had made an observation like this would he not be declared immediately as persona non-grata and sent by the next Aeroflot that flies from Moscow to Delhi? I want a categorical answer from the hon. Minister.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: I have already answered this in so many words.

(Time bell rings)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Am I disqualified from asking?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: See the time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Others have been allowed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not fair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will ask questions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It does not look fair. You cannot come at the fag end of the motion and say that you should ask questions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can have your own ideas, I have my own ideas. I can come whenever I wish.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Why don't you allow him.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: I have already answered the question which has been put by Shri Mariswamy. I am not here to

attribute motives to any foreign representatives here whose authoritative statement I have not got before me.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Sir, on a point of order. The officer concerned has cast reflections on the Ministry, has attributed motives.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot rise up like that on a point of order.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: To the extent that I saw in the paper, I have already made my reply and have said that I have nothing more to say.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: It is very unfortunate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I have a statement here. It is for you to decide. Well, if anybody's diplomatic susceptibility has been offended, I have nothing to say. Well, you have your own ideas of saying things or accepting things. I am not going to debate over it. But from the report which has appeared, two things seem to stand out. One thing is, reply to a leakage or an alleged leakage, whatever you call it. (Interruptions). I do not know. I am not holding it up anyway. You had yourself said certain things have been leaked out, whether they were leaked out or not, you can find it out. Now, obviously, when from the Ministry certain things leak out to the press, it is some people who are involved in that transaction or who are cooperating with that. If they are to be blamed, they have to clear up their position. It applies to all. I would do the same thing in the Soviet Union if our Embassy is put in that position. We should certainly tell the Soviet public where we stand. There is nothing wrong, nothing undiplomatic. It applies to others, it applies to us. In fact, it happens.

Therefore, I do not see as to why there should be objection. Since attempt has been made to put accusation on others, obviously they have tried to reply to it according to what has appeared in this paper. You may or may not like it. But do I understand that ideological philosophies are to be brought in in order to run a campaign or to start a kind of Soviet-baiting here as

has been done by my friend, Mr. Swamy who spoke more in anger than by way of seeking clarification? He went even to the extent of kicking out Russians. You will go on saying this for six years. But you have started it too soon. You could have waited for a few days. I have heard it being said over the years, "Kick out the Russians". We know what happens. Life has shaped in a different way. May I ask Mr. Swamy if the Soviet citizen . . .

1 P.M.

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS: Ask the Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I ask the Minister whether he can at all imagine any one of the 22 crores of Soviet citizens in any part of the Soviet Union making a statement of the kind with regard to India which Mr. Swamy has made, above all, from the Supreme Soviet? This is a defilement of Parliament, I say. I ask him whether he shares my view in this matter.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: There is no freedom there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You had your say. Nobody can imagine any Soviet citizen anywhere, not to speak of the Supreme Soviet, to have made such a statement which is clearly hostile, unfriendly and vulgar statement as Mr. Swamy has made. Therefore, all these things should not be used in this manner. I can imagine Mr. Krishan Kant asking something. He can do it . . .

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I can understand your anguish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will understand because I have to make you understand my point. How do you reconcile between the two positions, on the one hand kicking out Russians and on the other saying that Russians are their friends.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It was with reference to the Soviet Counsellor of Economic Affairs who made that statement. Sir, he is trying to generalise the whole thing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Swamy is a young man.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: He made it in reference to the Soviet Counsellor who said that. I am afraid. Sir, he is trying to generalise. He is trying to distort it deliberately.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If Mr. Swamy is satisfied with kicking out only one Russian he can say so.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: He is satisfied.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Even so, I would say( it does not show a very decent political culture. Of course, Mr. Swamy can go on kicking out one, Two or twenty Soviet citizens if he gets his chance. And that is why we are against them because they do not want friends; otherwise how would Mr. Vajpayee go to America to convey the message of Mr. Golwalkar asking Mr. Eisenhower to be our saviour?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Here is an authentic statement on behalf of the Soviet Counsellor. The Minister could not procure an authentic statement. Now we have heard the authentic reply.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN (Tamil Nadu): On a point of order. May I know if Comrade Bhupesh Gupta is making his statement here as an Indian national or a Soviet national?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I need not tell the D.M.K. friend which national I am, D.M.K. which wanted to separate from the Indian Union and who are even now thinking of doing so. (Interruption). Do not tell me about it. I am speaking on my behalf. I am not at all defending anybody here. I am neither . . .

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: On a point of order. I want your ruling on my point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. It is unfair on your part to insist on your point of order.

SHRI T. K. SRINIVASAN (Tamil Nadu): We are not asking for separation from India. (Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am glad one good thing has come out. (Interruptions) I

have not said anything about you. It appear! that he had not said anything as reported by this paper, the "Financial Express". You may or may not like it. but I was objecting to the statement he has made because you are talking about a friendly country and you should not distort anything over a matter like this. I was just asking him whether he can imagine anybody in the Soviet Union anywhere making the kind of statement he has made about India or about one Indian citizen. They would not say one thing even about the Jan Sangh. Finally, is it not a fact that some very vicious anti-Soviet and downright reactionary elements, planted in Bokaro and other plants, are interested in sabotage also? Everybody knows about it. If some of them had leaked out this thing, they are damaging the interests of the country by bringing the controversy into the open. The Government should, therefore, hold an inquiry to find out how the leakage was made. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Malaviya, do you want to say anything?

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: Two simple things. Number one, the statement which was made by Mr. Swamy was not proper, was very improper . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: It is not for you to rule. (Interruptions).

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: Why do I say so?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said so. Half-an-hour after the statement was made . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: I must be heard.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: The time element is important. If he had said this immediately after Mr. Swamy made the statement, I could have understood it (Interruptions)

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: Will you please sit down and listen? Thank you very much for sitting down. I did not refr

to all those things which were mentioned by Mr. Swamy in my answer, but when a definite question was asked by my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, with regard to the adjectives that he had used, I say it is unworthy of him and he should not have done it. On the second point with regard to sabotage in Bokaro, I want to assure all the hon. Members of this House that no attempt at sabotage in our steel plants will ever be allowed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Niti Raj Singh Chaudhury.

#### **MOTION FOR ELECTION TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICES OF PROFIT**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI NITI RAJ SINGH CHAUDHURY): Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do elect two members to the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit in the vacancies caused by the retirement of Sarvashri S. A. Khaja Mohideen and Sanda Narayanappa from the membership of the Rajya Sabha on the 2nd April, 1974, and resolves that the House do proceed to elect, in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, two members from among the members of the House to the said Joint Committee to fill the vacancies."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

#### **MOTION FOR ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ram Niwas Mirdha.