

## RAJYA SABHA

Thursday, the 15th June, 1967/25th  
Jyaishta, 1889 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the clock. MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

### ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

\*487. [The questioner (Shri V. M. Chordia) was absent. For answer, vide cols. 4016—4022 infra.]

#### COTTON PRICES

\*488. SHRI NIREN GHOSH:†

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE:

Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the statement made by the Chairman, Mill Owners' Association on April 21, 1967, to the effect that cotton prices continued to be higher than the ceiling prices despite assurances of the Government of India; and

(b) if so, what is Government's reaction thereon?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI M. SHAFI QURESHI): (a) and (b) A statement is placed on the Table of the House.

#### STATEMENT

The problem of prices of cotton ruling above the ceilings has been engaging constant attention of the Government. As a result of two successive droughts, cotton crop during 1965-66 and 1966-67 suffered a considerable decline giving rise to an upward surge in cotton prices. A number of measures including movement control, stock control, credit control and requisitioning of cotton and also curtailment of machine activity have been taken to keep the prices as near the ceilings as possible. These measures have been effective in checking the rising trend to an appreciable extent. Such further

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Niren Ghosh.

measures as may be necessary and found feasible will continue to be taken in the future. However, it should be borne in mind that it is equally in the interest of the mill owners to keep their purchases within the ceiling.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, when the ceiling price of cotton was fixed, the Government assured that cotton would be available at the ceiling price but nowhere in the market is cotton available at the ceiling price. That being the position, may I know the amount of cotton that has been requisitioned by the Government and the amount of the hoarded cotton seized by the Government and also whether, in view of the persistent rise in prices, the Government would nationalise the entire raw cotton trade?

SHRI M. SHAFI QURESHI: Sir, as against the expected production of 6.2 million bales in 1967 we had only about 5.3 million bales during 1966-67. This shortfall in cotton was due to the drought conditions prevailing in the country and naturally the Government is aware that the ceiling price cotton was not maintained and cotton was selling above the ceiling price but our effort has all along been to maintain the ceiling and to make the cotton stocks available to the mills at the ceiling price. This has been our effort.

So far as the question of nationalisation of cotton trade is concerned, there is no such proposal before the Government at present.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, as far as my information goes, the S.T.C. entered the raw cotton trade to keep the prices down but after the S.T.C. entered the cotton trade the prices went up, because they did not purchase from the growers but from the traders and thus added to the speculative activities which, in turn, pushed up the prices. So persistently the Government is evading the position of nationalisation of the raw cotton trade. Unless they do it, they cannot keep down the prices and the country and

the workers are unnecessarily being forced to suffer as a result of the Government's present policy. Is it true or not?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: As my colleague mentioned just now, we have no proposal at this stage to nationalise the distribution of raw cotton in this country. So far as the S.T.C. is concerned, it did not enter the cotton trade this year.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, I would like to know from the Minister whether it has come to the notice of the Government that cotton is sold below the ceiling price in some regulated markets in the Mysore State, that most of these mill-owners have conspired to bring down the prices and the agricultural co-operative societies who are in the field are not in a position to buy cotton, because they have no finance. What steps is the Government taking to see that the ryots who produce cotton get fair price for the cotton that they produce?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Sir, I am not aware of any large-scale sale of cotton below the ceilings. It may be that a particular person or a group may be selling below the ceiling for some special reason but, as the House is aware, there is also a floor price and cotton is not sold below the floor price.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Sir, the Government has issued an order that these millowners should not stock cotton for more than two and a half months. Is it not a fact that the Government has received a complaint that all the companies of Birlas are storing cotton for more than four months? So, why does the Government not seize the stocks stored by the Birlas for more than four months, resulting in higher prices of cotton?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: The hon. Member is quite right. We have got stock restrictions so that there is no hoarding of cotton. But we are not informed of any hoardings of cotton

beyond the permitted quantities either by the Birlas or any other group. There have been insinuations of this kind, from time to time that Birlas and others have entered into some *benami* transactions. I have been very anxious to find about it myself and if any hon. Member gives me information, I will certainly have it looked into.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, he did not answer the point I raised with regard to the amount of cotton requisitioned by the Government.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: The total amount that has been requisitioned by the Government this year is, I think, about 80 to 90 thousand bales.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, the Government at all desiring to go into the basic problem with regard to cotton? What I am finding is that these are all palliatives. Whether the prices have gone down or gone up, as you will see, the cotton acreage is going down and this is due to the non-incentive prices being given to the grower. Actually the point should have been studied by the Commerce Ministry to encourage the cotton grower by giving him better incentive prices. Is the Government aware that there was recently a conference in Bombay where the cotton growers from all over the country including the co-operatives requested the Government to decontrol cotton? Sir they . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please put a question; do not make a speech.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Yes, Sir. May I know whether the Government has got any intention to go into the basic problem of cotton to be grown on an incentive basis where by proper incentives are given to the growers? Sir, the prices of foodgrains have gone up by 400 to 500 per cent. while the cotton price has only risen to the extent of double the price and the millowners are making unnecessary grouse against the cotton growers because the prices have been increased. So, I want to ask the Minister

whether he has got a proposal really to go into the problem of the basic needs of the cotton grower in this respect. The information given by the Minister is that 88 thousand bales were actually requisitioned and out of that 22 thousand bales have been actually delivered. But, Sir, I want to maintain and bring it to the notice of the Minister that the millowners are refusing to take delivery of the cotton because they are really not in need of it; they wanted only to pressurise the Government to exercise some more cotton on the cotton grower. Is it a fact, Sir?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I am not aware of the fact that the millowners are refusing to buy cotton. If there is any specific case, I shall very gladly have it looked into. So far as the question of basic difficulties with regard to cotton is concerned, of course it is the Government's intention to go into it and it does go into it. The whole point is that our yield per acre of cotton is very low. I think it was in this House the other day that I gave the figures of yield in different countries. Although we are about the fourth largest cotton-producing country in the world, our yield per acre is about the lowest.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: That is because you do not give incentives to the growers. That is why the yield is low.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: It is not the question of incentives so much as the question of giving him the inputs which will increase the yield.

(Some hon. Members rose to put supplementaries)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am trying to see that every section of this House gets an opportunity. I am trying to distribute as much time as possible. Sometimes not knowing the names I am a bit in confusion but, I think, it will be all right. Shri Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, in reply to an earlier question with regard to the Birlas hoarding the stocks, the hon. Minister seems to have evaded the question. He said there are certain insinuations about the Birlas hoarding stocks. May I know if that is an insinuation or it is in the nature of an allegation and, if that is so, or even if that is not so, why the Government, in view of what has been stated, is not asking its Central Intelligence Bureau and the other intelligence agencies of the Government to carry out investigations to find out whether the Birlas have got stocks? It is common knowledge in the market that Birlas are hoarding stocks for many, many months violating the directives by having *benami* transactions. Why in that case is the Government not using its intelligence and other agencies to find out the facts? As you know, Sir, our telephones are tapped and shadowed all the time. If that is so, why are Messrs. Birlas and others spared in this matter, when crores and crores of rupees can be saved?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: The hon. Member knows very well that if there had been any allegation beyond the stage of insinuation, I would have certainly had it looked into by now. The point that I am trying to make is that the Birlas are conforming to the rules as other mills. Now it is said that they are hoarding cotton for more than four months. It is also said that there are *benami* transactions, in others' names. Unless we have some details or some information about it, it is very difficult for me to find it out.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Chairman, I want your protection because I am the person who has made certain allegations against the Birlas, and I submitted those allegations more than a month back to the Government with proof. I have given samples of Birlas' textiles. I have given certain facts. I have given the names of the mills where stocks had been hoarded

Also, Mr. Chairman, they are manipulating the whole Textile Commissioner's office. My information is that in spite of my complaint the Textile Commissioner's office changed the order, which was contrary to the rules, and the Government is passing on every information to the petty officers. Is it possible to get any evidence against Birlas if for two months the investigation is made by a petty inspector of the Textile Commissioner, and the hon. Minister says it is just an insinuation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, it is for you to decide. It is a serious matter. Here is the Minister. He said there is no allegation. If there were, he would have ordered an investigation. Here is another hon. Member in the House, within his hearing and your hearing, Sir. He says that he had made allegations precisely on this matter giving particulars, more particulars than perhaps an initial allegation would warrant. Sir, you should ask Mr. Chandra Shekhar to come and show you and you should also ask what he means by insinuation and allegation. If that is not so, the hon. Minister should be called upon to change his statement and you, Sir, will be entitled to ask him to make amends and order investigation on the basis of Mr. Chandra Shekhar's allegation and the C.B.I. or the Central Intelligence Department should be directed by you through the Government to carry out an investigation. There are two statements made on the floor of the House by the Minister and by an hon. Member. I assume that both are on equal footing as far as these matters are concerned. Tell us by which statement we should go by.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: The hon. Minister said that there are some *benami* transactions. If after receiving the complaints or the allegations, had the hon. Minister through his Department taken care to seize all the accounts of Birlas, it would have been possible for the Government to see from whom they have pur-

chased cotton. It would have been possible for the Government to see where are these *benami* transactions. In spite of this, when these serious allegations have been made by hon. Members, may we know from the Minister why Government has not taken proper steps in the matter? How long is the Government going to take for this investigation?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: It is not only the Birlas but all the textile mills are in connivance with the Commissioner and hiding the facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All the Members have made similar allegations. I would like the Minister to say something.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I quite appreciate that the Birla question is very emotional in this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. I take serious exception to that. What does he mean by that?

(Interruption)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: It is a personal reflection on Members. We are not going to put up with that.

(Interruption)

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, you should direct the Minister to apologise to the House for making an insinuation against a Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are creating such confusion that I am not able to hear at all.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Mr. Chairman, unless the House lets me say what I have to say . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: He said in the House that the Members are emotional on the Birla issue. Why the hon. Minister should not withdraw those words?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have raised your point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here is the word 'emotional'. An accusation

is made against a Member of the House. In fact it will apply to them more.

**SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA:** The way they behave shows that he is correct.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** May I say with all respect to the hon. Members and to this House, with all due respect, that I have not cast any aspersions against any hon. Member, and I would beg of the hon. Members to kindly listen to me, and unless . . .

**SHRI M. M. DHARIA:** He said that the hon. Members are emotional on this issue. Sir, on a point of order. By saying that the hon. Members are emotional . . .

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** I have not said that.

**SHRI M. M. DHARIA:** The hon. Minister said that and he has cast aspersions, which was unreasonable. That was the argument made by the hon. Member. He has no business to cast aspersions. He should first withdraw the word and then he should speak. We will not allow the Minister to speak if he does not withdraw.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** May I say a word?

**SHRI TRILOKI SINGH:** The hon. Minister by saying that the House is emotional . . .

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** I did not say that.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Let the record be sent for.

**SHRI TRILOKI SINGH:** The hon. Minister has a right to question my statement, the correctness of what I have submitted just now, but he should have patience and listen to what I have got to say. If I have heard correctly and if there is no defect in my sense of hearing . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Unlike me.

**SHRI TRILOKI SINGH:** The hon. Minister said the House is emotional. Listen, listen. He has got every right to question, to correct me. I am open to correction. The hon. Minister said that the House is emotional so far as Birlas are concerned. This, Sir, amounts to a reflection on the conduct of the House. Therefore, if the hon. Minister insists, I would most respectfully submit that this House do proceed to take the statement made by the hon. Minister as a breach of privilege. If you like, I can quote ample authority in support of my submission from May's Parliamentary Practice. Casting reflection on the House, a Member or a Committee thereof is a breach of privilege.

**SHRI B. K. P. SINHA:** This is really a serious matter. We are very conscious here of the rights of the House and the rights of the hon. Members, and rightly so.

But a Minister does not cease to be a Member of the House because he is a Minister. On many issues our emotions are roused and it is usual to say on those occasions, say, when the Chinese issue flares up or when the issue between India and Pakistan comes up—that the nation's emotions are roused. Parliament also reflects that emotion. To say that Parliament is emotional or that some issues arouse the emotion of Parliament or of the hon. Members is not to cast a reflection on them. And I am prepared to take up the challenge of Mr. Triloki Singh. Let there be a debate. Let him quote instances where 'emotion' or 'emotional' has been adjudged to be unparliamentary. Mr. Chairman, there is a list of words which are considered unparliamentary and also a list of words which are considered to be improper. If the House considers it improper . . . (Interruptions) Let me finish. I am not going to yield to your shouting. The point is . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Why is Mr. Pande laughing like that?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Parliament is always very jealous of its right of freedom of expression, is very chary of adding to the list of those words. It is unusual to conceive that the word 'emotional' is of such an evil odour that hon. Members would like it to be expunged. Therefore, in view of that right of freedom of expression which all of us have here, I do not consider any impropriety in the use of that language by the hon. Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Our contention was not that at all that Mr. Dinesh Singh has used an unparliamentary expression. We know it very well, Sir, it is for you to judge in the context of the interpellations whether this word 'emotional' was derogatory to us. That is all, (*Interruptions*) let me finish. Now, Sir, the issue should not be confused. Suppose I have a daughter and she is raped. And when I ask a question, will you say, "What an emotional question are you asking?". I will take this matter seriously. It depends upon the context. Birlas are committing crimes and when we raise this thing, we are accused of being emotional. And the Birla papers also call us emotional, irresponsible, excited and all that. The word 'excited' is quite correct from a parliamentary point of view. But if Birlas say that the Members are getting excited, they mean it in a particular way. Here, Sir, you see the interpellation, the sequence of things, how the question came to be put, how the answer was given, how an attempt was made to deny the allegation and evade the answer. Then, when the question was being pursued, Mr. Chandra Shekhar confronted him with a personal charge that he had submitted allegations. But the hon. Minister instead of saying, "I would look into the matter. I am very sorry. I have got it" or "I have not got it", said that we are being emotional about Birlas. Well, this is. . . (*Interruptions*) No, no. I am not concerned. Sir, this kind of thing the 'Hindustan' writes; this kind of thing the

Hindustan Times says. This is the language of Mr. Mulgaokar, not the language of the Minister here. That is what I say. I should like to know whether we are having Mr. Mulgaokar too answer our question or a Minister of the Government of India.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am one of those who have not heard the expression 'emotional' . . . (*Interruptions*) No, I want to know what he said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will inform you.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Let him complete his sentence; then we will pass our judgment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am just stating what has been said by the hon. Minister: "I quite appreciate that the Birla question is very emotional in this House." That is what he has said. So. . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It is a contempt of the House.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: My difficulty was . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I think, Sir, that this House should consider this matter in a dispassionate spirit. And I would say that the word 'emotional' in the context in which it has been used is not unparliamentary. We know, as a matter of fact, that emotion plays a large part in politics. Those of us who are acquainted with a book like Graham Morrison's 'Human nature in politics' would know what part emotion and sentiment play in determining attitudes. Now, I do not think that he has said anything which reflects upon our intelligence, which is a reflection upon our integrity, which reflects upon our capacity to judge things clearly. All that he says is, well, that a certain emotion, a certain sentiment, has gathered round this issue, and it is in that spirit that the hon. Minister used the expression, and I would ask him to adhere to what he has said. (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR:** Sir, I rise on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, it is in a particular context. While replying to the supplementaries, the hon. Minister said that certain insinuations had been made against Mr. Birla. I submit to you, Sir, whether the Minister is emotional about Mr. Birla or I am emotional about Mr. Birla. (*Interruptions*). I am quoting from the representation that I have made to the Government. The paragraph about this particular case runs as follows:—

“According to the Textile Cotton Control Order, no mill is allowed to hold stocks for more than two months’ consumption. . .”

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** What are you reading from?

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR:** It is the representation that I have made to the Government.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I request that it be laid on the Table of the House.

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR:** It says:

“According to the Textile Cotton Control Order, no mill is allowed to hold stocks for more than two months’ consumption. But the mill . . .”

That is the Birla Mill—

“ . . . is holding stocks. . .”

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Which mill?

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR:** I shall name the mill.

“But this mill is holding stocks in the name of various firms like Messrs. Ghevlal Balchand, Abohar, lasting for more than 4 months in the premises of Messrs. Hindustan Gum and Chemicals, Limited, Bhiwani and Old Tent Factory of TIT. Mills. A sudden raid will establish these facts.”

May I know from any member of this House whether there can be any

more definite allegation against any firm and can any Member claim or even the Minister can claim that any private Member can give better information than what I have given? But nothing has been done, Mr. Chairman. And even the Minister says that it is only a vague insinuation. Mr. Chairman, I feel it because every time I raise the matter whether about Messrs. Aminchand Pyarelal or about Birlas, people try to propagate in the whole country that there is an emotional man, here is a cynic who wants to bring everybody into disrepute. Sir, I want that Members like me should be protected from this insinuation on the part of the Minister.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I protect all; you are subjected to my protection.

**SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE:** Mr. Chairman, it is now clear to this House that the Minister used the word “emotion”. Mr. Sapru said a little while ago that as far as the word “emotional” is concerned it meant that, politics is sometimes emotional. But, Mr. Chairman, Sir, I say that the allegations and the imputations against the House which the Minister has just now made are not so innocuous as that because when he said that the House is emotional about the Birla question he meant it and there cannot be any other meaning which can be attributed to those words,—namely, that the House is not a balanced House, meaning thereby that the House is unbalanced as far as the Birla question is concerned. That is what he meant when he used the word “emotional”. As soon as he says that the House is unbalanced, immediately he commits contempt of the House. Mr. Triloki Singh has placed his views before you that this is a question of breach of privilege and it should be immediately considered, if I may say so with respect.

**DR. ANUP SINGH:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I regret to say that Mr. Sapru and Mr. Sinha, one an eminent Judge and the other an eminent lawyer, have tried to defend the Minister

with trying to be too technical. I think what really matters is in what context the word has been used. Nobody is arguing that the word "emotional" is unparliamentary. Mr. Sinha said there are so many words and we are trying to add one more word. That is not the point. The question is that not only this House and the other House but the people at large are really concerned and deeply disturbed about the allegations that have been made against the Birlas. Those allegations have not been made recklessly or carelessly. They were made by responsible Members of this House. When the hon. Minister got up, I regret to say, he was being very casual, and very ironical about it. He got up and said that this House is "emotional" on the Birla question. What does it mean? I said the other day that we are not masters of the English language. But we know the language well enough to appreciate the implication. The implication is that this House has not been discussing the Birla question rationally, logically, sensibly and with some kind of intellectual detachment. This, to my mind, Sir, is an aspersion on the House. The hon. Minister in a second intervention said that he did not caste any aspersion or reflection on any individual Member. That is perfectly correct. But whether he has cast reflection on the whole House or not, I for one would insist on the hon. Minister to withdraw his remark. Unless he honourably withdraws his remark he should not be allowed to speak. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. I have to say. . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, before you say anything I would like to say something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. There is so much feeling in the House. I would request the hon. Minister to pour oil over troubled waters.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to you that you have kindly given me this opportunity to make my position

clear. A little while ago I was making an effort to say that while speaking earlier I had no desire—it was farther from my mind—to cast any aspersion either on any individual Member or upon the House. My misfortune was that I was trying to agree with the hon. Member and this House. I was assuring this House that since this is a matter which has exercised the mind of this House I shall do everything on my part to have every possible investigation made to the satisfaction of the hon. Member. My misfortune, as I have said, was that just before even I was able to complete the sentence which would have satisfied every hon. Member of this House, I was stopped. These things were discussed out of context and certain motives were attributed which were farthest from my mind. I hope the House will appreciate that it was my intention to give every possible satisfaction to the House in regard to any doubt raised in this House. I did not use that word in any other context. I say that it is my desire, in view of the great concern of this House in this matter, to give them every possible satisfaction.

Now I do not know if you would like me to answer. . .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: This is not enough.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: The hon. Minister has used the word and he should withdraw it.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: He should withdraw the expression.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU: On a point of order, Sir. Sir, you have said and you have directed that the hon. Minister would pour oil over the troubled waters . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: It was kerosene.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU: It will be insulting our intelligence and the intelligence of the whole House if the feelings of the House aroused by the use of the word "emotional" can be satisfied by the explanation that he

has given. If he has used the term generally, it has been misunderstood by a large section of the House and the feeling is that he should withdraw. I do not know the reason why he should not have withdrawn.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Is he withdrawing or is he not? That is the simple question.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, since Mr. Triloki Singh was the first man to raise the question let him have his say.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: The question has been raised whether the word "emotional" used by the Minister . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: I want this to go to the Privileges Committee.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: . . . is parliamentary or not. This question has to be decided by the Chair and by no one else. May I ask you to give your decision whether it is unparliamentary or not?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nobody has said it is unparliamentary.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: Sir, I am glad that the hon. Minister, on reconsideration, has accepted that he had used the word "emotional" in relation to the feelings prevailing in this House over Birlas. With your permission, Sir, from the 17th Edition of May's Parliamentary Practice, at page 456—Have you got the book, sir, I suggest that the leaders of all the parties represented over here should be supplied with a copy of May's Parliamentary Practice and that a copy should also be made available on your Table, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall keep a copy on my table hereafter.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: I have got half a dozen authorities in support of what I have said:

"Imputation of false or unavowed motives".

The hon. Minister by saying that the House was emotional in matters relating to Birlas . . . (*Interruption by Shri Dinesh Singh*) Please listen, I am on my legs. I think the hon. Minister should be patient enough to let me have my say. I am quoting from the May's Parliamentary Practice for Mr. Sinha. This has been held to be unparliamentary:

"Imputation of false of unavowed motives."

There are half a dozen authorities. I would pass on this book to you, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because it will take time for you to decide. I suggest, Sir, that meanwhile Mr. Dinesh Singh need not answer any question at all in this House and you may consider it . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . We have given you some authority and commonsense has to be applied. We are asking for a ruling from you. If you can give it immediately, we have no objection. But the point is if you want time, you may take time. But the best course would be for Mr. Dinesh Singh—So many people have taken it in a particular way. We are not unintelligent people—that he may withdraw.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Mr. Chairman, What I was trying to explain was that unfortunately the word that I had used has acquired a meaning which it was far from my mind to do so. That is why I said that I have not meant any disrespect either to the hon. Members or to the House.

So far as the particular word is concerned, I have no special attachment to it. I only wanted to say that I did not mean any disrespect. I am sorry if there has been any misinterpretation. . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw. Withdraw.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Mr. Chairman, Sir . . .

**SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:** Mr. Chairman, nobody said that the word "emotional" was unparliamentary. That was not our intention. What I said was that it was a question of privilege. It amounted to the contempt of the House. It was derogatory, to the House, and therefore a question of privilege has arisen. We want you to give your ruling in clear terms. We have said that the Minister should withdraw. . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do you not think he has made sufficient amends? I think we should accept what he said.

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA:** Mr. Chairman, I have just to ask one simple question, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what action was taken after the receipt of the allegations from Mr. Chandra Shekhar, and if no action has been taken, is the House right in assuming that either the Government wants to shield the Birlas or the Minister is himself in league with the Birlas?

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** Sir, this matter . . .

**SHRI AWADHESWAR PRASAD SINHA:** Can no objection be taken to these words? Has the Minister no honour? In my humble opinion this is a defamatory statement.

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA:** Let him reply. Why action was not taken?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Bhargava has a right to put a question.

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA:** Mr. Chairman, I repeat, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what action has been taken by him after the receipt of the letter from Mr. Chandra Shekhar, and if no action has been taken, is the House correct in assuming that either the Government is trying to shield Birlas or the Minister is in league with Birlas? I repeat it again.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** As for the second part of the question . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Mr. Sinha is in league with the Birlas.

*(Interruptions by hon. Members)*

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Allow the Minister to reply.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** Sir, I would beg of the House . . . *(Interruption)*.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Please allow the Minister to reply.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** The moment this was brought to my notice that the hon. Minister, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, handed over the paper and sample to my colleague, the Deputy Minister, we asked the Joint Secretary who was in charge of the Textile Division to go into it and I have asked the Special Secretary of the Ministry to personally look into this matter and let me know the position.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** I have two questions . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I cannot allow people more than one opportunity. That I have decided yesterday. The questioner will have two opportunities.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Do not make it a ruling, Sir . . . *(Interruption)* Generally we accept your suggestions.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** You are very good . . . *(Interruption)*.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** I have one question more. Whether the Birla Textile Mills at Pilani . . . *(Interruption)*.

**SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY:** Sir, you have said the matter was closed. It cannot be re-opened. . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It cannot be re-opened. That question is closed.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** My question is whether the Birla Textile Mills at Pilani had produced sub-standard

varieties of cloth, less than the specifications according to which they were to produce. A raid has been made on their premises. Why have the Birlas not been prosecuted on that score? That is what I want to know clearly and distinctly.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: All these matters are being looked into.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: For any other question, you can meet the Minister . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Meeting will not help. If Mr. Chandra Shekhar's meeting could not get for, how can . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I would like to say is that the Minister has stated that he received the complaint from Mr. Chandra Shekhar and he has sent it to Bombay or somewhere, where the office is, and he is expecting a detailed reply. And I can assure you that the hon. Minister will give sufficient material to know exactly what action has been taken by Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point is not that. The point is the initial answer that he gave was no allegation has been received. Now on his own admission, a clear, definite allegation has been received. The hon. Minister will explain to you why he gave such an answer earlier. Secondly, Sir, I should also like to know, when these allegations came from such a source as a member of their party and Member of Parliament and a member of the Executive of the Congress Parliamentary Party, why orders were not passed for immediate search or sealing or some similar action and why the letter was sent somewhere, when everybody knows the thing will leak out and steps will be taken to forestall action. All this, Sir, is for you to consider and see how public interest can be

protected. Sir, I tell you if Mr. Chandra Shekhar, being situated where he is, is not in a position to activate the machinery in the hands of the Government, how difficult it is for us to activate it. Therefore, I think you should go through the proceedings and come and tell us tomorrow whether this is the right way of handling public matters on the part of the Government or on the part of one of the Ministers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

SELLING AGENTS OF H. M. T. LTD.

\*489. SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: Will the Minister of INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd., have appointed a private company as their sole selling agents; and

(b) if so, what are the reasons therefor and the terms of appointment?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI BHANU PRAKASH SINGH): (a) The Company have appointed Messrs. Mahindra and Mahindra Limited, Bombay and Messrs. Hindustan Export and Import Corporation Private Limited, Bombay, as their sole selling agents for sale of automatic lathes, horizontal boring machines, respectively.

(b) At present H.M.T. do not have the necessary Organisation for rendering effective after-sales service for these machines, which are to be manufactured for the first time and it will take them at least 3 years to build up an efficient organisation for this purpose. They have, therefore, considered it necessary that the parties who have hitherto been representing in India, the foreign collaborators and have been attending to the after-sales service of the imported machines, should be appointed as the company's sole-selling agents for at