

THE JAYANTI SHIPPING COM-
PANY (TAKING OVER OF
MANAGEMENT) BILL,
1966—*contd.*

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR (Madras) : Madam Deputy Chairman I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Jayanti Shipping Company Bill. We have had a great deal of material on this very very difficult situation which our Government has got itself into. I do not propose in the limited time given to me to cover the entire ground, for, whatever I might say here will be only a repetition of what both the Opposition Members and Members on behalf of the Government as well as the Minister have stated very explicitly. As I look at it, I think the whole story is not told as yet. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy ought to be congratulated, and Mr Poonacha for that matter for giving the available facts to the House. In fact I was very happy when the hon. Minister said that he had no intention of—and in fact he is not—hiding anything and whatever material had come to his knowledge he has placed before the House. I have a suspicion that the moment we start taking over and running it we will get more and more skeletons in the cupboard to be rattled up and I think as we go along we are going to be shocked more and more by finding more shady deals, that this gentleman has been foisting upon us.

Now, as I look at it there are three parts of the story. The first is the Government by which I mean the Minister beginning with the late Prime Minister Nehru, then Mr. Raj Bahadur and then our present Ministers, both Mr. Sanjiva Reddy and Mr. Poonacha. From a dispassionate and objective assessment of the story as has been told both by the Opposition and as we were able to gather, it is simple and very clear that the Government is not responsible for any of the misdeeds. Now all that the Government has done is—I am taking even from the late Prime Minister—owing to a desperate desire and an intense aspiration to extend the shipping and enlarge our shipping facilities, finding a man and taking his credentials at the face value, hoping that he means busi-

ness, that he is a very big man, that he is interested in business, that he wants to help India, that he has patents, that he is a Ph. D., that he has got scientific empires being built in the United States, and all that is wanted is a little loan from the Government of India with which he will put the shipping proposition of our country on the map of the world, we believed in him—and there is nothing very wrong about it—and conceded and then we have been lost. Looking at the Ministers—I am coming to the present Ministers—I do not think there is any case made out against Mr. Sanjiva Reddy. The things started long before. In fact I ought to congratulate them because the moment they found that something was wrong—here I refer particularly to Mr. Sanjiva Reddy—he immediately appointed a Committee to look into it. When the first balance sheet did not balance and when he found that something was wrong, he did not hesitate. On the pretext that he is a fellow—Andhra he was not trying to do any good to him or anything like that; he did not try to shield him but he appointed the Sukthankar Committee to see what can be done and even Mr. Sukthankar must be congratulated because he also said that things were wrong and something must be done and if I remember correctly he went and suggested that the available evidence is not enough and therefore a further probe is necessary so that we may get all the data out of it.

Now, I come to the second part of the story, *viz.*, the Board of Directors. I see my friend, Mr. Mani, is not here.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : I am here.

3 P.M.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR : I am sorry. Mr. Mani was right in one sense that it is the Board of Directors who were specifically charged with the task of protecting the interests of the Company and the Government's money in it by applying all the rules and regulations the Companies Act has given us. Here I think, if I read the situation correctly, they have not risen to the occasion. We have found several companies which do not issue their balance-sheets and do not comply with the regulations. They are immediately taken up

[Dr. S. Chandrasekhar.]

and reminders are sent, telegrams are sent and prosecutions are launched and so on. But something has happened here which I think demands a closer and fuller scrutiny. Even then we do not want to frame charges against the members of the Board of Directors, because I think the people who are responsible under the law are supposed and ought to have informed the Ministry and the Government, in the course of discharging their duties, that the Jayanti Shipping Company has not met the rules and regulations as per the Act. If they had informed the Minister, the Minister certainly would have taken action immediately and even this two or three years' delay would not have happened.

Now, I come to the Company proper and say that there are several ways of looking at it. One common sense way is: All right, you gave them Rs. 20 crores. The Company has been mis-managed and the Government are interested in taking back their Rs. 20 crores. You sell the Company in the open market and the moment you receive the Rs. 20 crores, you simply say goodbye and wash your hands off. But the difficulty is—if Mr. Mani's speech is correct and I have not checked it—there are a number of financial institutions in India and abroad and then it is equally right to demand that their money should also be paid from the sale proceeds of the Company or such assets as the Company has today, in which case I am afraid we may not receive the Rs. 20 crores and the Government might lose.

The second way of looking at it is as Prof. Gadgil has said it. Is there any point in taking over and administering the Company, rehabilitating it and putting the Company on its feet, and letting these people, who have been trying to defraud the Government and the common taxpayers of the country, to take back the Company? There is just one man, one shareholder, who, I believe, is a British national, residing abroad, whose share is about Rs. 64 lakhs or something like it. He is going to raise it some day when the assets have been realised. When the Company is put on its feet, saying that they should

give back the Company to him and that according to law you have no right to take it.

Now, the third point which I think the Government has done and which is a very sensible thing under the extraordinarily difficult situation is it shall maintain the fleet both for the purpose of food and ore and for plying the vessels in international waters, thereby certainly guaranteeing employment to these people thereby recovering as much as possible or at least—fifteen years' is the period—re-examine the question to see whether the Company can be ultimately nationalised in the interests of the nation. I think the Government has done very well in bringing forward this Bill before the House and we ought strongly to support it without casting aspersions on the Minister.

Thirdly, we come to the individual. Here I had the privilege of not knowing the individual and I have a personal apology to make to Shri Dahyabhai Patel. When the debate first started I tried to defend Mr. Teja. I, was correct because a man does not acquire the citizenship of another country, when he is living there, just because of his marriage. I referred to the Act again and I find that I was very correct. When I defended him, of course, he misunderstood that I was socially his friend. I must tell very frankly in the House that fortunately I have not met Mr. or Shri or Dr. Teja. On many occasions I have been invited but many circumstances prevented me from meeting him—not that deliberately I did not want to meet him. I had been to France, England, America and all that, but it so happened I had no time and it did not coincide. Even here in Delhi I was invited to a meal. Unfortunately I had another engagement and, therefore, I did not go. I am putting this on record for the benefit of my good friend, Dhayabhaiji.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Did you meet Mrs. Teja?

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR: That does not arise.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Old men should not ask such questions.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR : Then, coming to this, I was intrigued, I forget the name of the hon. Member in the Opposition, but I think it was Shri Rajnarain who said that this man was not entitled to call himself a doctor because he has not taken that degree, not even an honorary degree from any American University, neither from the Purdue University, which I happen to know, nor from the University of Chicago, and I think we ought to start it right from there and begin an enquiry on this gentleman. We happen to know his birth place. We know that he comes from Andhra, that he went to the Loyola College, that he was certainly serving as a clerk ...

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO (Andhra Pradesh) : May I correct him ? He said Mr. Teja is an Andhra, but I know that his birth-place is Berhampore, which is a part of Orissa.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR : I thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : It is part of the Chicago underworld.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR : I hope Mr. Das is not disowning him. When I said that, I meant a Telugu-speaking gentleman, because Berhampore was a part of Andhra before in the sense that Vijayawada is a part of Andhra now.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : If they return Berhampore to us, we do not mind owning him.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please continue.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR : So, the question is we still do not know anything about the individual. All that we know here from the available evidence presented yesterday by the hon. Minis-

ter is that the man is, if I may use an unparliamentary expression, a first-class, very clever crook and really deserves a Ph.D. degree for this thing. Unfortunately we fell for it and this could have happened to any individual anywhere. I think there is also no parallel in any business administration, the kind of deals he has done, about depositing money in his personal account. The Chairman of a company taking commission and depositing it in his personal account, without informing the Board of Directors, to say the least, if charitable, is an extraordinary criminal. And then we do not know anything about this personal life. (Time bell rings) I am coming to his wife and, Madam, you should not stop me. Then, there is a lot of suspicion about the way things have happened, about his marriage. Now, he has married a national of another country and all along even this seems to be going on the rock. Both publicly and privately this gentleman's conduct has been extremely reprehensible. While speaking on this Bill we simply say that both the Government and the friends not only in the Opposition but also on our side have many lessons to learn from this, that we shall not be taken in by what looks like good from its spurious outside appearance. All that glitters is not gold, and even here...

SHRI A. D. MANI : How does the Opposition come in ? They have never been taken in.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR : They did not have the chance to be taken in. If Mr. Mani were on this side, he would have advanced him Rs. 50 crores, I am sure, because of his influence.

The other day a foreign gentleman gave the whole account of this gentleman, a dossier from the Embassy of another country, which I happened to look into and with this little story I shall finish. This gentleman was a very high level individual, a millionaire, not a spurious millionaire but really a millionaire. He was asked to come and meet Mr. Teja. While he was meeting Mr. Teja in one of the Indian cities, in an air-conditioned, big office, Mr. Teja had instructed half a dozen of his newly recruited

assistants, recruited only twenty-four hours before, to come and interrupt him every five minutes. One of the assistants came and said during the meeting: "Excuse me for interrupting you. Moscow is calling you." He told him: "I am so busy. I am in the midst of a business deal." After another five minutes another assistant came and said, "Excuse me, the Vice-President from Washington is calling you." He said, "Don't you know that I am very busy? Do not interrupt." A few minutes later another assistant said: "The Prime Minister wants to speak to you." He said: "I am very busy, not now" This went on for half an hour. The man kept a periodical watch on his wrist watch. Then, he found out that the whole thing was a humbug. He put his own men to find it out. These henchmen who were put on the wrong job came and solemnly declared that they had been asked to interrupt him, when he was talking, every five minutes. To make a few rupees they had to do that.

Thank you very much, Madam. We want to support the Government on this Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT, AVIATION, SHIPPING AND TOURISM (SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY): Before he begins, Madam...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am correcting it. I am very sorry for it, Mr. Reddy. I am very sorry, Madam, before I start my speech, that I referred to the speech, by mistake, of Dr. Chandrasekhar when it was hurriedly passed on to me. The remarks were made by our friend, Dr. Chandrasekhar—he comes from Andhra also—and not by Mr. Sanjiva Reddy.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I wish Mr. Bhupesh Gupta also comes from Andhra.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Who made it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The record is there. Dr. Chandrasekhar made a speech and a very interesting one at that, and some kind of glowing refer-

ences were given to us. He said: "That does not mean that he has become an American citizen at all. Dr. Teja, whom I happened to have met socially both in India and abroad, happens to be a very patriotic Indian"

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR : Madam, I have found at least...

SHRI A. D. MANI : He cannot challenge the correctness of the record.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You cannot say that. You were given time to correct your speech. Whatever is there stands.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR : The last speech I am still carrying with me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not bothered about all that.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR : It is a matter of personal explanation. I told Mr. Dahyabhai Patel that I had not met him, and that was not correctly taken. I had not seen the report of it and therefore I had not had the chance of correcting it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I think your memory is failing in this respect. Government has its own definition of patriotism. Mr. Asoka Mehta defines it. We do not understand the definition. Therefore, I am not blaming it. I am a big game hunter. Therefore, let me deal with the Minister.

Now as far as the Jayanti Shipping is concerned, Dr. Teja, the great international crook who used to masquerade here some six years ago as the great favourite of the ruling Congress Party, of the men on the Treasury Benches—his game is up. It is quite clear. But the trouble here is that this Government does not own up a mistake unless it is caught redhanded. This Government does not wake up to its acts of omission and commission unless it brought the economy in our country to a very serious, difficult and embarrassing situation. This Government does not realise its folly unless the folly becomes a public scandal. This Government would not see how its misrule is encouraging the gangsters of the monopolist class,

those people who throw up wonderful parties and spend a lot of money, unless these people commit open, daylight robbery. This Government does not have even the elementary humility to get up here and say that all that they had done in regard to Dr. Teja—whether he is a Doctor or not I do not know, probably he is a doctor in gangsterism, a 420 doctor or some such thing—even they do not say, “we have been at fault, we have committed an error”. Up till now not a word of remorse is coming from the Treasury Benches. All that they tell us is that the country will not lose any money because we have got the properties. Is that how a responsible Government should function? After allowing a bandit to run away with our money, allowing him to disgrace our public life, allowing him to secure concessions and favours from a very obliging Government, they come and tell us, “No, we have not lost anything”. No, we have lost in prestige; we have lost in our good sense; we have lost in our public standard, we have lost in public morality; and these losses are irreparable losses. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy and Mr. Sanjivayya may come and go, but certain standards in public life are supposed to remain unsullied and untainted. Therefore, I say the first thing for the Government to do here is to apologise to this Parliament for misleading the House in 1960-61, for brushing aside all that we said in this House and in the other House about this gentleman who moved about in social circles and who immediately rose to height doing all kinds of things in high quarters. I think that should be done first. Otherwise what is the use of listening to these people?

Madam, Deputy Chairman, I am not going to the other House. Here are the proceedings of the Rajya Sabha and I refer to you the 1962 proceedings and exactly I shall show you now. Here there was a question in this House about this gentleman on August 6th, 1962, and the question was put not by a Communist like me who is untouchable to them—and I am happy that I am hated by the monopolists—but was put by one of the monopolists in the country, Mr. Babubhai Chinai, question No. 48. What was the answer?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL :
Question No. 420 ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : 420 is our Government. Mr. Babubhai Chinai who maintains the 420s in authority put the question—individually Mr. Sanjiva Reddy is not a 420; he may be 450 or something or PL-480. Here the answer given was that there was nothing wrong. Then we returned to the subject again. Here are the proceedings again in this very House.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh) : May I know from the hon. Member what was the idea of referring to the question? Neither the question was given nor the answer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am giving the reference number of the question. I am glad that Mr. Bhargava was very helpful. Now I shall read this thing. Here a question was put, Mr. Bhargava sometimes also came into the picture but in a good way. Here the question was put about the Jayanti Shipping. At that time my humble self put the question, question No. 90.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : No. 420 ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All the 420s belong to you. They are with you. The 420s operate in your market. I cannot enter it. The question was put on the 23rd of March, 1962. The question was whether the Government had given a loan, etc., etc., if so, what were the conditions. Everything was given. They gave certain facts. Then Mr. Raj Bahadur who spoke so eloquently about this gentleman, Teja, what did he say?

“No detailed enquiries about the financial and commercial connections of the Jayanti Shipping Company have been made by us. But from such information as we have gathered, it appeared that Shri J. D. Teja is a very enterprising businessman. Shri M. Tirumal Rao is a person well known in the public life of the country”

Lieutenant Governors are always well known in the country :

“... and Kulukundis is a well known name in the shipping world. The main consideration which influenced the Government was the fact

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

that under the terms of the agreement, no risk was involved to the Government and the advantages that would accrue to India were considerable. As the loans are advanced to the Company, security for them is assured.

The Shipping Development Fund Committee have stipulated", etc. Then he gave the terms of the agreement. What does our friend, Shri Raj Bahadur, say? Mr. Kulukundis is good, Mr. Teja is good, everybody is good. Only Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who asked the question was bad. That is what his idea was. Then again on the 23rd March, the following question came, Shri Raj Bahadur answered it. See how he was answering the question.

"SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : It is a fact that Mr. Teja himself has not had any experience of shipping as such but he is a businessman with a good deal of acumen and standing, and is reported to have quite a substantial business abroad elsewhere."

Then I pursued this matter and Shri Raj Bahadur asked me not to pursue it in this manner. And then I made the usual remarks about that man. The Chairman was pleased to expunge them. But the truth is hidden in the expunged words. If those words had not been expunged, the truth would have come out. I said, "You allow a half-an-hour discussion over this."

"MR. CHAIRMAN : You have had nearly half an hour on this here. Next question. Mr. Gilbert.

"SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : * * *

Words were expunged. Money went after that. Firstly, you lose all the words and then you lose Government money. Madam Deputy Chairman, Chairman said "Expunge all those words" and you have expunged all those words. What I had said had been expunged. But, unfortunately, as I said, the truth is hidden in those words. If you see the tape-recording of the speeches that were made, you will find that what I said there was correct. But one thing was not expunged, well, the truth. And

sometimes I feel very happy when my words are expunged because I feel that perhaps I have told the truth. But after this series of expunctions, the Chairman said, "I can exercise my discretion". Very well. I cannot question your discretion. But then, I said, "I will ask you not to exercise your discretion. I charge the Government with suspicious behaviour here in this matter." These words remain. I charged the Government with suspicious behaviour on the 23rd March, 1962. Do I stand vindicated in this House today or does the Government stand vindicated? Is my charge proved to be correct to the hilt or is what the Government said belied by experience and facts admitted even by Government? Therefore, Madam, when you order any expunction, exercise your discretion, keeping always this in mind.

Now, let me come to some of the points here. As you see, they were trying to tell us that Mr. Teja was a very good man because another man of the Congress ruling party, Mr. Thirumala Rao, well known in public life, was telling us that he was a good man. But then we have got the Jayanti Shipping Enquiry Committee Report. Annexure 'A', page 41. May I read out from that Report? "Top-heavy but incompetent management"—that is the headline.

"The Vice-Chairman, Shri M. Thirumala Rao, M.P., is paid Rs. 4,000 per mensem. This is a sinecure. His son is given, besides, a very lucrative job in the Company's office in London."

Then in the footnote it is said—

"Shri M. Thirumala Rao was Vice-Chairman from 26-6-61 to 30-11-65."

It is not so simple as the hon. Member would like to make out. If I make certain remarks in this House about Mr. Thirumala Rao, they will also be expunged. Mr. Thirumala Rao was the Vice-Chairman; his son was also appointed to a high post on a high salary. I am an MP, I do not know how to spend my money, whatever I get.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Congress MP. We are all MPs. Say 'Congress MP'.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I admit 'Congress MP'. Well, I am dealing with the Congress Party, I am not dealing with my Opposition. I am dealing with that party which has so much of corruption, which preaches corruption; every pore of the administration permeates with corruption. Mr. Thirumala Rao, a highly favoured man of the party and still a Member of the Lok Sabha—he was the man who was the go-between between the Government on the one hand and Teja and Co. on the other hand, and he was given Rs. 4,000 per mensem. Well, then it was increased, it seems, to Rs. 4,500. Now, an MP gets Rs. 500 as salary. May be at that time it was Rs. 400 initially. He got Rs. 21 as daily allowance before. Now it is Rs. 31. Then telephone and other things are there. And I do not know how much he saved as Governor and so on. Dr. Teja gave him Rs. 4,500 and the Janyti Shipping Enquiry Committee Report says that he did not play any part as such, that he did not have any work assigned to him. I should like to know from the hon. Minister whether there has been any enquiry as to what Mr. Thirumala Rao, a Congress Party Member, an important Member of that party, was doing, especially after the revelations made in the Jayanti Shipping Enquiry Committee Report that he was practically doing nothing. Why was he getting the money?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras) : For doing the work of a Director.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Capitalist class . . .

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : On a point of information. I would like to know from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta whether he is aware that Mr. Thirumala Rao was a Deputy Minister and that he was a Lieutenant-Governor, and what was he getting in those posts?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know but in none of these posts was he

getting Rs. 4,500. And as Deputy Minister . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI : For doing nothing, he was given Rs. 4500.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : . . . at that time he was answering questions, begging the questions; and Lieutenant-Governor's is a useless show. But sometimes . . .

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : That may be your opinion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : . . . he may be raising hoes or god dogs at home. Sometimes we keep Governors and so on. These are unnecessary questions. I am not saying that. Sometimes he does constitutional . . .

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Dogs cannot be compared.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sometimes, we keep them privately.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think you should not indulge in that kind of language.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is about private life. Some spend money. You do not bother why you should spend it. Therefore, in constitutional, political life, we also spend money. We do not bother about the way in which we spend money. Certainly, I do not compare Governors with dogs. But then dogs will start barking on seeing Governors. Therefore, it is a very important Report.

You object to the Committee's Report. It is not my Report. Your Committee says that he was doing nothing. The Committee did not understand what he was doing getting Rs. 4,000 as salary and it was increased later perhaps. Why was it so? Take it as it is made out here. No expunctions will be there. My position is quite clear. See the way in which the Congress Government behaved in this matter because of its tie-up with the big monopolists. That is the trouble. When workers come to them for a little redressal of their grievances, when the small employees ask for a little rise, when somebody else asks for a little betterment of his living standards, when the teachers stand in the queue for something more in order to make their life

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
worth while, they are brushed aside, treated with contempt and disdain. But at the moment these people come, when a high up from the United States appears on the horizon of Delhi and asks for favours, Rs. 20 crores are sanctioned without even having a proper enquiry into the antecedents of the character of that man or his business capacity and so on. That is what has happened.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab) : Did any of the directors sign the balance sheet ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mr. Thirumala Rao signed the balance sheet.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is a gangsters' company. But the trouble is this. I am not concerned with only that man, Mr. Teja I read in the Times of India on the 30th that Mr. Teja is now living in south of France with motor cars, villas and so on like a lord and our Government is talking about arresting him. Well, may be, I know why he was not arrested when he was here from March this year till August. What happened ? Is it not a fact that he went to attend the wedding ceremony of a Minister's daughter ? Was it not possible for him to be arrested ?

SHRI A. D. MANI : It has been denied.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : It has not been denied.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If it is denied, I accept the denial. But it is a fact that he was here. I am not quarrelling over the denial. He was here not to meet Mr. Mani or Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or Mr. Rajnarain. (Time bell rings) No I will speak. Here he was not meeting us. He was meeting the Government people. Everybody knows it. Why was he not arrested ? An hon. Member of this House said that he was here to attend a marriage.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Did you say that he was here till August ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes. He came in August. But you tell us when

he came. He was not here in 1966 at all ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : In April and July.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You keep their records. You are invited to their party, you partake of the meal. You are friendly with them, I mean. Therefore, you can find out when he came.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : He came in March. He came in April and he came in July.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You should tell us when he came. I will accept your word. I ask you why he was not arrested when he came here. Here is our friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, whose politics are poles apart from mine. The Swatantra Party would not like the Communists to come anywhere near them. Would you like, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel ? Similarly, I would not like the Swatantra Party to come anywhere near us. I can tell you they are poles apart. But here you are dealing with a subject where we agree with each other. He said he wrote a letter on May 27 to the Home Minister. He met the Home Minister and told him about Dr. Teja and so on. I am not going into that. The Home Minister wrote to him.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I gave him photostat documents.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes, and a number of photostat documents.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I would reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : His arguments and my arguments will not be the same, Mr. Sanjiva Reddy. He looks at you and wants to make you a monopolist. When I look at you I try to make you a public sector man.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I stand for free enterprise and clean enterprise.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He stands for free enterprise and clean enterprise. He stands for Birla enterprise. He stands for Tata enterprise. Therefore,

you see that in that letter it was written, I would like to point out after consulting the Prime Minister that he looked for that kind of thing. But nothing was done. May I know, Sir, why the Home Minister was not acting in this matter? I am told that the Home Minister has an Intelligence branch. Our telephones are tapped. Our houses are watched. The other day I went to Midnapore to speak at public meetings. I had six watchers sitting before my house, looking not after my security, I believe. But Dr. Teja was here. Surely the Home Minister knew something about him, or his Ministry should have known it or his Intelligence branch should have known about. I should like to know why action was not taken, why he was not arrested.

Madam, the Jayanti Shipping Co. Report came on the 11th July, 1966. Assuming that Dr. Teja was not here in August, but certainly he was here a few months before August. Immediately when the report was under consideration, matters were being investigated. Certainly, it is unbelievable that the Government did not know that Mr. Teja has been a swindler and that he should be apprehended here, that he should not be allowed to go out. Why was that not done? I should like to know what would have happened if he were a political opponent of the Congress Party. What would have happened if that man did not have connections with people like Mr. Thirumala Rao? What would have happened if that man did not have the resources and other means of getting so much favour with the ruling party? Therefore, I charge this Government not only of negligence, not only of dereliction of duty, but of conscious, clear connivance in the interest of their connections and collusion with the big business. That is why Dr. Teja was not arrested and called to book. And today, when they know that he is out of their reach completely in France, they are indulging in brave talks that Dr. Teja will be arrested and so on. Therefore, I say, this Government is entirely responsible for this whole thing.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I just want to bring to

your notice that you have taken 25 minutes. We must finish his Bill today.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Let me finish.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Others also have to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I will keep your word in mind. Here again, you see, Mr. Raj Bahadur said in the other House that they have taken more than ordinary care and caution to ensure that no loopholes are left. It is in these circumstances that this loan was advanced. That is what was said. Certainly the loans were not advanced to a man who deserved it.

Now with regard to another matter, all the names are there, but the real person who produced wonderful results by wonderful contacts—and I must say to the credit of our women that they are very persuasive—was a woman in this case—Mrs. Teja. Everybody knows that she is a beautiful lady. I have not seen her. Madam, a thing of beauty is a joy for ever, and Mrs. Teja is a beautiful lady. (*Interruption by Shri V. M. Chordia*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have monopolised him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But a thing of beauty should not result in loss of public money. It is something which should be understood in another context. Therefore, I say that the whole thing was wrong. It is said that she is a person who wants kingdoms. Wherever she went, she went, she saw and she conquered, all that kind of thing. Well, all the ladies are smiling. But I may tell you that Government need not go near a very beautiful lady. This is my friendly advice to the Government, Mr. Sanjiva Reddy. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy is nodding his head. I am grateful to you that you accept my advice. After all, human weaknesses are there. We are a civilised people. We like culture and beauty, song and music. Therefore, if a good-looking woman comes and speaks, we may soften and melt. Let me tell our Ministers that sometimes such things happen.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Therefore, Madam, I may tell you that as far as the Government is concerned, it is at fault. (*Time Bell rings*) Two or three lessons emerge from this. This is a typical case. Amin Chand Payrelal, Mundhra and Teja, all these cases fall in the same line. They underline the connections of the Government with the monopolists in the country which is a source of corruption, which is a source of dereliction of duty. If it is not open collusion, what else is it? That is No. 1.

Secondly, private sector should not be enocured in this matter. Mr. Teja came and told all kinds of stories to the Government of India, who for their love for the organised element in the private sector, that is to say monopolist element, led them into believing things which they should never believe.

Thirdly, shipping concerns and shipping companies are matters which cannot be and must not be left in private hands; they must come within the national sector.

Fourthly, Ministers should give up their connections, as far as possible, with big money. They must not main'tain this kind of social relations which can be exploited by these people. I know that a person like General Kaul was appointed by the Jayanti Shipping Co, after leaving the Army. He went to Japan as an official of the Jayanti Shipping Co. and the report says that they are not satisfied with the kind of work that he was doing. Then, again, one Mr. Seghal, of the CIBA Co. also was appointed as an officer of this company. They are all highly connected people. Therefore, I say that these are very bad things. And unless these things are removed you cannot improve matters.

Finally, as to what the Government should do, as far as Dr. Teja is concerned, he should be extradited to this country. His extradition should be expedited. They should ask the French Government or other Governments, if they want to maintain friendly relations with us, to extradite him. They should be told that Dr. Teja should be sent back

and the Government should be everything in their power to get Dr. Teja back to enable him to stand trial in this country. All his assets should be seized. Mr. Thirumala Rao should be subjected to a thorough, open enquiry and all his property should be treated as vicariously responsible for what has happened, for what Mr. Teja has done. Mr. Thirumala Rao cannot get away just because he belongs to the Congress party. I say this and I am sorry to say this thing about a colleague but Mr. Thirumala Rao has not, up till now, apologised even publicly for what he has done. Therefore I say this. I suppose he will get nomination for the Lok Sabha again but now be that as it may.

Then the Jayanti Shipping Company should be completely taken over. There should be no question of temporary management or taking over. It should be, with their assets, made a public property, a State property, never to be returned either to Mr. Teja or Mrs. Teja or Mr. Thirumala Rao or anybody of that kind. Therefore it should be nationalised. These are the demands that I make.

Finally, the Management Board should not be allowed to enquire into this matter. What are they? They are managing the Company affairs and all that and this board should not be asked to enquire into this. There should be a separate body for investigating into this. I am not saying anything for or against the Management Board but it is impossible for them to discharge both the responsibilities. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy should get up and tell us, if he wants us to maintain certain norms and behaviour, that whatever the Government had done in the past was wrong and mistaken and the Government had committed grave errors in this matter and they should express some regret here to-day; otherwise I will not allow them to get away without expressing regret for what they have done. It is not a question of money. You may have recovered some money, I agree, but what you have done has set a bad example in our public life and exposed the scandal to the detriment of our system and we share the shame

together with you. Therefore you should express regret in such a manner that people feel that you are really repentant. You cannot be the monopolists' friend and yet avoid corruption and 420 deals like the ones you have seen. I think there has been a clear collusion between some men in the Government and Mr. Teja and that is a matter for enquiry and I do not know whether such an enquiry will be held but I would have suggested that a Parliamentary Commission should be appointed to go into this question of allegations of collusion between the Government people and Mr. Teja and more especially when the Opposition made serious allegations in 1960-61 which were brushed aside peremptorily by the Government. This is my final demand.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: Madam, I was expecting Mr. Gupta at least to speak in a more controlled way because he is a seasoned parliamentarian. He has been in the Rajya Sabha for a long time. Evidently yesterday's demonstration of a few thousands of people seems to have inspired him and he went on talking as though he was talking to the audience there and not in the Rajya Sabha chamber or building. Anyway I do not think there are many points...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not whisper as you whisper to Mr. Teja and to Mrs. Teja.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: I know, it was Mrs. Teja this time? I do not know. He went on making allegations as they were made yesterday in a public meeting. Therefore I am only saying that there is no point in my answering them. I wanted to thank him at the outset. He made an allegation which was baseless, began reading somebody's speech and when I pointed out that it was not my speech, he said: 'Yes, it is your speech and your friend Mr. Teja' and then I am very glad that in a sportsmanlike way, he corrected himself before I pointed out that he made a mistake. I congratulate him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That day I got up three times.

L118RS/66-6

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has some good qualities.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: very many good qualities. Personally he has good qualities but the very fact that he corrected himself when he found out that it was a mistake is something which was very remarkable and I wanted to thank him but then he has made other allegations again which I am sure he is going to correct in the near future when he verifies them. Then 'The Observer', a weekly paper—I do not know it, I have never seen it—wrote something and it was read in Parliament, in the Lok Sabha, that somebody attended my son's marriage. It was published there in 'The Observer', some weekly. We have got so many yellow papers in this country. Then it was read there in Parliament. When I said 'No, my son is yet to be married, he is a student' now they say, 'No, it is only your daughter'. My daughter was married long ago. Lal Bahadurji came, Shri Kamaraj came, a number of Chief Ministers of half-a-dozen States were there and all of them were there. They were married long ago, not in the recent past 2 or 3 years ago. I think the youngest was married in 1963.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why did you not invite me?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: If 'The Observer' writes, I have absolutely no objection.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will never quote that filthy paper 'The Observer'. When you say that it is not a fact, I accept that.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: I am very thankful to Mr. Gupta. I thought he knew me and with his three colleagues in my State, the Communist Party is one of the strongest parties in Andhra and the Swatantra Party also is there I know the Jan Sangh is not there, the S.S.P. is not there and the P.S.P. is not there. I think one or two are there in the Assembly but these friends have a strong party there and they have been working with me and if they do not

know, they could get the information from their own colleagues in Andhra. I have been in politics for 33 years, not a recent man coming into politics and power. I had been a Minister in Madras, in the composite Madras, 18 years ago. Never did I care for Ministership. I had never been in office for more than 3 years in any Ministry, I had kicked off Ministership so quickly and so easily.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Knowing that you would be in office...

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : No. I have been in office as easily as I quit the office. They should get some information and not go on throwing word like this. I do not expect at least from a seasoned parliamentarian like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta this. Anyway I leave it at that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I did not say anything against you because you were not here.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I know, we forget.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : When Mr. Teja came here you were not here and now do not hold somebody's baby.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : It is not a question of holding. I am going to defend them, it is not a question that I am going to condemn my own colleague and the Government. If Jawaharlal did something, he did it with the best interests of this country at heart. He wanted somebody to build up the tonnage. It is not only Mr. Teja. If anybody else is prepared to come, they will get the loan. Mr. Teja got a loan of Rs. 20 crores but it was not paid to him. About Rs. 7.5 crores was paid and not to Mr. Teja. When the ship was handed over to the Government representative, one-tenth of the money was paid to the company, not to Mr. Teja. Every pie was given to the company.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : Mr. Teja is the company in this case.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : For every pie we have paid to this company, all the 11 ships are there with us.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : Each ship was mortgaged to the Government.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Yes, completely. They are in our possession. All this I have made clear but still, in spite of all that, as though somebody has given a gift to Mr. or Mrs. Teja friends begin talking about it. How many precautions were taken when the money was given? Before the money is given the company must float so much money and for every rupee that is there, the Government will give Rs. 4 to the company and that too to the company which is building ships, not to this company. This way they took every ship got through the loan and it is mortgaged to the Government. About the sum of Rs. 5 crores odd which was paid to the company, every security has been taken and not a rupee is lost. Let me assure my friends Mr. Patel and Mr. Gupta and others that the Government money is not lost. It is with us. Mr. Mani was saying that Rs. 27 crores was borrowed by him here and there. Yes, in addition to the 11 ships he has other ships also for which the Government has not given any guarantee, any loan or anything. There are 10 ships and for those ships he has taken loans from the State Bank and wherever he could lay his hands on, he took loans and began purchasing ships. If he did a little more carefully without this swindling of a few crores, it would have been a very good company. I am not paying a compliment to Mr. Teja. It is not Mr. Teja that counts for us but the company. He built up the shipping. If without the Director's knowing anything, in the foreign countries he got into illegal ways of earning money naturally the poor Directors—I know many of them, they come from Andhra and Dr. Teja is supposed to be a non-resident Indian but he is also a non-resident Andhra living in Orissa and therefore the compliment can be shared by both Mr. Lokanath Misra and myself.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : 420s are citizens of the world.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : May be. Anyway even to-day if anybody is prepared, on this account to come forward

and build up a company to purchase ships and build up tonnage, we are going to give him also money. Let anybody come. We want tonnage. We are not able to carry our goods to other countries nor are we able to carry goods from other countries to our country. If anybody is prepared to do it we welcome. See the discrimination. The share equity proportion was one to four in the case of The Jayanti Shipping Company but now it is one to six. They get six times for every one rupee.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : May I know whether, before the floating of the company Mr Teja got a prior assurance from the Government about advancing him **some money?**

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Assurance in the sense that if you build up this capital we give you this, if you bring a capital of Rs. 15 crores we will give you this, that if one rupee is there we will give you four rupees. Therefore he has to build up. For instance, Madam, he built up a total share capital of Rs. 28 crores, according to him, but we did not accept it. We said, "It is only Rs. 22 crores we accept; the other Rs. 6 crores we are not prepared to accept. Therefore we give a loan only to that extent four times that." The moment it was exceeding that we told him, "You don't deserve any more loan. We are not giving you any more capital unless you build up your own share of the capital." Thus, Madam, strict precautions were taken even when the loan was granted. And after all why bring in those big names? Those were the people who served the people, the Mahatma, the Sardar, the Jawaharlal, and so many others built up this country. If somebody swindles, even presuming Jawaharlalji believed Teja, believed in his good conduct, in his nationalistic qualities, and all that, because he was speaking so high if even presuming Jawaharlalji believed him to be an honest man what was the favour shown to him? It was after all giving a loan which we are giving to every other company. Why bring in Jawaharlalji's name here a person who began thinking in a big way, all for India, also to build up the shipping of India? There-

fore, Madam, it is not as though I am going to condemn anybody, but I am going to support stoutly my leader, our late leader, and my predecessors in office who were doing this job. I wish the day will come when some truth is given which even Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will applaud and about which I am sure. Now it is the election year, but next year he will do that. I have got very many applauses even from my communist friends as Chief Minister of a State. They might have condemned me, they might have criticised me, but I do know that they did also give me some compliments at times when I did something.

Shri Dahyabhai Patel said one or two things and I must really be thankful to him. I was expecting him to be much more angry with us, but he really brought out some points only. He said, "Why did you not tell us that you took the decision on the 2nd February?" Immediately I took charge, within one week I have said that. It is in the speech on the 18th March. I do not think I should read it. I would only request Dahyabhai Patelji to go into the debates. I did say that 'the committee had been appointed. I did say that Sukthankarji was there and another will be a representative of the Auditor-General. I asked him also specifically whether he had any faith in Sukthankarji or whether he had any doubts about him. He said "No, Sukthankarji is a gentleman. I have absolutely nothing against him." This was on the 18th March Madam. But he says I never told anybody, and asks, "Why didn't you tell us in advance?" I did say Madam. He must have forgotten. After all, we forget I myself did not remember it until I again went through the reports and verified whether it was really a fact that I did so. Now it is a fact that I did so, that a committee had been appointed and nothing more than that. And he was also saying that some Ministers went and stayed in France in the Riviera and all that. I do not know, Madam and so I cannot answer for all that, and I do not think anybody would care to stay in that villa of his. After all, when we go, the respective Governments give us such a good reception . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : There is the question of conducting an inquiry.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : There is the question of conducting an inquiry into what? Shall we appoint a commission of inquiry into whether you have taken your lunch or not? Conducting an inquiry into all this? I am not prepared to be bullied like this. What is there after all if somebody goes somewhere? Luckily for me I had not met him and the question does not arise in my case.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You don't get excited over the Teja affair.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : No, but it is a scandal only. Otherwise I would have replied. Anyway, Madam, I do not know; I do not know who has gone and stayed where. Anyway I am not answering for everybody; I mean, I do not know who has stayed and who has not. Presuming, Madam, that I get a cup of coffee from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I take his hospitality. For that am I going to be a communist tomorrow? I have been very close with many of the communists, but they have never been able to convert me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I can tell you that Bhupesh Gupta would never offer you a cup of tea thinking that you would become a communist although your own brother is secretary of the Communist Party . . .

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I know that. Madam, suppose I meet Dahyabhaiji a number of times—I do meet him. He is a very good friend of mine. Outside this House he is a good friend of mine. Here and there, at a lunch party or a dinner party or on some other occasion we do meet each other—does it mean to say that I can ever be converted to the reactionary Swatantra programme? It can never be possible.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The best member of your family is in the Communist Party. Your younger brother is a leader in the Communist Party.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Therefore, Madam, it does not arise. Even assuming somebody had contacts, I do

not think they would have fallen so easily. Fortunately for me I was never in such close touch with . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : May I ask the hon. Minister one question?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Yes, I am ready to answer any question.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : You said that you appointed a committee of inquiry. How is it that, with all your Government machinery and all your resources, you were not able to trace the letter of Mr. Teja of November, 1964, which I quoted and of which photostat copies I gave you? And the letter says this :

“The above receipts are issued by us at your request solely for your convenience and we acknowledge not to have received any actual payment regarding above receipts from Am-Indo Shipping Inc.”

These receipts are from the Japanese ship-builders dated November, 1964. I was able to get at it, and he could not get it with all the resources.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Did you find out that Mr. Teja entered into certain agreement with Mr. Hanumantha Rao of Hyderabad and started a number of companies and had many shady deals? Have you enquired into Mr. Hanumantha Rao's affairs?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : It is all right. I know that he attempted to start a number of things. I have personal knowledge only; I have nothing to do with them. From personal knowledge I know that he offered the Andhra Government a thermal plant without taking any money immediately and agreeing to take it slowly. I felt they would never come, this and others he offered, and they have never come. I enquired into them, but nothing has happened. Therefore Mr. Bhupesh Gupta need not have any worry on that account.

Now Mr. Dahyabhai Patel was saying about some letter which he had sent, the photostat copies of which he had sent, and all that. Yesterday I gave,

before the debate began, chronological dates also. He wrote on the 9th. The meeting was held in the Home Minister's house. All of them were there. They examined the material.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think you have said that.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I have said that, Madam, but they are repeating it again. What am I to do? They examined the material but could not arrest him on the material available on that day. All the senior police officials, all the rest of them, after taking legal opinion on the material available, well, they could not arrest him.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Was there not great suspicion about his conduct? Was there no suspicion about his conduct?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You are not here the legal adviser.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I am only narrating the facts. If they want me to arrest somebody, Government has got the power to arrest anybody. But that is a different matter. I am only narrating facts as they were. On the 9th he wrote and on the 15th a meeting was held; it was held on the 15th of May, a few days after he wrote, Madam, and on the 10th of June we took over the company. That means, we thought there was no legal basis to arrest him and to put up a case against him, and all that. To do all that there was not enough material. Yesterday I gave all the dates, how we rushed into the Cabinet Sub-Committee meeting, into the Cabinet meeting and all that at an interval of twenty-four hours between two meetings for each action. So that way we took over this company and then, it was only after the taking over all the original copies could be had. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel says he has got photostat copies but we have got the original copies, and all of them have been acquired after the taking over, not before. Mitsubishi has come forward, and every foreign company has come forward.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Why didn't you get it through your in-

quiry committee or through your resources until I got the letters?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Your sending a photostat copy does not convey anything. We got the firm's originals and then only prosecution was launched. I may give you the dates also.

श्री राजनारायण : हमने 1961 का लैटर पढ़ा था जो बम्बई से

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I know; I saw your letter, some Ramaswami's letter.

श्री राजनारायण : Yes. जो भेजा गया था मोरारजी भाई को ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I personally think that the Minister should continue his speech and not yield to interruptions.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Yes, Madam. I did go through very carefully some Ramaswami's letter. Both of them seem to have been friends and then fallen out. It is none of our business but it came to my notice when I looked into it. The decision was taken on the 24th July. The case was also registered.

4 P.M.

श्री राजनारायण : 1961 में अमेरिका में एक इन्क्वायरी हो रही थी जिस पर सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने मना किया था ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You please continue.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Yes, yes. But I don't know but to the extent I know, I think they must have disagreed with him. Some Ramaswami addressed something to the Ministry and they must have disagreed and felt it was not worth taking seriously or that information was not enough.

As I was saying, a case has also been registered and if it is proved in court that he has committed fraud then in whichever country he may be, there is a method for getting him back to India and the Home Ministry, I am sure, will take the necessary steps to bring him

[Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy.]

to India so that he may appear in a court of law.

I am really unhappy that other names were brought in, the name of Gen. Kaul and so on. He may be employed by this company. But then many other companies employ many other retired officers. Gen. Kaul's is not the only solitary case. If an officer gets Rs. 3,000/- or Rs. 4,000/-, the moment he goes to another company he gets Rs. 10,000/-. This is being done by other companies also. It is unfortunate that Gen. Kaul should have been mentioned in this connection. I will say that, though I am not taking a brief for him. There is nothing wrong in his having been appointed. And then about our Ambassador in Russia, Mr. T. N. Kaul, there was something said. I have verified the facts. The two gifts were given to a club, not to the Embassy, but to the Embassy Club where the officers of the Embassy and also the wives of officers meet. But after all these two things given by Mrs. Teja were found useless and they were returned. But even that becomes an allegation here.

One thing that pained me most was this reference to the public sector, the private sector and the Nehru sector which Mr. Dahyabhai Patel discovered. I do not know on what basis you can condemn a man who devoted his whole life to the service of the country. Let us not bring in the names of such great leaders who are no more with us. They are great. Even if he believed in a crook, even though a crook deceived him, to say that it was Mr. Nehru's fault or that it was a Nehru sector, is not proper. Anyway I do not want to go into those things now.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said that there must be some standards in public life. Yes, I entirely agree with him and the greatest need of the day in this country is that every one of us, of each and every party, whether of the Communist Party or of the Congress Party or any other party, must maintain a certain standard. I am sure the country will progress and if not today tomorrow, you may have another party in power. In democracy you do not believe that

permanently one party will be in power. So some day, say 20 years or 30 years later some other party may come to power. So a proper standards must be maintained. I do agree. If any one is bad then punish him, hang him, whether it is Dr. Teja or somebody else. But let us not go about doing this kind of mud-throwing at everybody just because some mistake was committed. If we do that then it becomes impossible for honest men to come to public life and this will drive away all good people, good and honest people who are sensitive. They will not care to enter public life or become Members of Parliament. I entirely agree with my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that we must maintain standards.

Then it was said that there was suspicion in the behaviour of the Government in 1962. I say there is nothing suspicious or wrong. Under the same conditions we are prepared to give a loan to any person who would come forward to increase the tonnage.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : In the same way ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I am talking of loans for increasing the tonnage of the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The issue is not whether you can give a loan or not. The issue is whether without proper inquiry and in such circumstances, that is to say the circumstances in which Dr. Teja came, you would offer a loan to an individual.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I am not talking of any individual. Dr. Teja may be a swindler. But he has not swindled government money. He swindled the company's money. How could anybody know what was happening? There may be the Directors. But how could they know? Prince Mukarram Jah, the grandson of the Nizam, was one of the Directors. He is a nice young man. But how could he know what was happening in the company? Then something was said also about the dealings with this Japanese company, the Mitsubishi concern. How can anyone know if he takes one

shilling from somewhere and puts it somewhere else in Norway or somewhere else? How can the Directors know? There were 15 Directors of the company. But nobody could know what was actually happening in these matters. But when we got the telex, message and after the company was taken over, we got all the records and now this company has agreed that they gave one shilling to him.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : But why should the Government advance him a loan to the extent of 90 per cent of the actual cost?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : It is a policy matter. I will come to that. I have got this point that you had raised. It is a policy matter. Now, I am really glad that Mr. Govinda Reddy and other friends of the Congress benches, like Shri Akbar Ali Khan and others gave me very good support and clarified the case, because they have been in this House much longer than myself. They know the details of this case. Mr. Bhargava also spoke very well and Mr. Sinha also gave me support.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes, they will all support you.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : They have known the whole case much longer than I. I have been in charge of this subject only for seven months or so. Therefore they have placed all the facts before the House. I am specially happy because Dr. Gadgil here gave me a number of very constructive suggestions. They are being examined. It was pointed out that it is not desirable to take over the company for 15 years. Others said that it should be taken over completely. I was advised by the Legal Department that if I took it over completely, there may be litigation. We took over the Metal Corporation and we got into trouble. So after consultations we were advised not to take it over completely but to take it over for a short while.

(Interruptions)

Please hear me completely and then ask me questions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please let him go on.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : They say to us : You take it over completely. But first of all we have to find out whether he had swindled much more than what we know. We should see what are the assets and what are the liabilities of this company. If the assets come to only Rs. 30 crores and the liabilities amount to Rs. 60 crores, then by our taking it over we will be making ourselves responsible or liable for the loss of another Rs. 20 crores that had been lost by this mismanagement. We will be putting ourselves in that position. Therefore, we have to find out what the position is. We can, if we want it, take it over tomorrow. There is nothing to prevent us. But let us first of all find out how much he has swindled, what are the assets and liabilities. After finding out all that, if we want we can take it over. Parliament is here. If it is the desire of Parliament and of the Government the necessary legislation can come later, say next year. Dr. Gadgil has said that we should be careful because after this short period we have to give it back after putting things in order. About giving it back there is difference of opinion. We wanted the period to be 10 years. The Lok Sabha changed it to 15 years.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You take another 5 years and make it 20 years. Give us that concession.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : When you become a shareholder he will do that.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Therefore, that is the position now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : How much more time you need?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I will go over a few more points without going into details. Therefore in taking it over there is danger. After consulting the Law Ministry we now take it over temporarily. Later on let us see what more we can do.

I am told—I am not making any well considered statement—there may

[Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy.]

be civil suits. Suppose some civil suit is there against Dr. Teja and there is a decree for Rs. 2.5 crores or so. How are you going to recover that amount from him? He is a non-resident Indian and there is no property here. So the only thing you can do is to attach his shares by going to a civil court. We have prevented a sum of Rs. 70 lakhs which is there in the State Bank in London from going away. It cannot be touched and we have got a stay order and we are getting that amount. In his personal account the amount was there. That means the balance will be two crores odd. And the shares are there. I do not know the legal aspect of it. Naturally it is not going to be handed over to Mr. Teja again any way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That I hope you will not do.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Is he an Indian national and has he . . .

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : No. He is . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Have you finished ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : The elder Member here was asking a question as to whether he was an Indian national. He is a non-resident Indian citizen and he has got an Indian passport. And some people say he has also got British passport. That I do not know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I think he carries all the passports.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I have a few more points. Mr. Rajnarain also referred to Mr. Ramaswamy's letter and said I was giving a loan when he had only a capital of Rs. 200. Mr. Rajnarain is making a mistake. The capital is not Rs. 200. It was only Rs. 200 he would not have got the loan. Only if he increases his capital to 1.5 crores loan will be given. That is part of the agreement. I hope Mr. Rajnarain will again verify and find out whether this condition is there or not that Rs. 1.5 crores must be built up as share capital and then only loan will be given.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : That he could do by collecting commission on ships.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Again a crook might have done so many things. I am not responsible for that. I am talking only about the condition in the agreement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We are all concerned with the fact that the crook fooled all of you.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar) : Now they are fooling you.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : One important point I would like to make about Mr. Narayana. I think Mr. Rajnarain mentioned about Mr. Narayana. He is the General Manager. I want Mr. Rajnarain to hear me.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : I am hearing.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Mr. Narayana was his nephew. He was put as General Manager on a few thousands of rupees. He was hawking khadi in Andhra Pradesh or somewhere on 200 to 300 rupees a month. That man gave a bundle of papers in Lal Bahadur Shastri's house just before Lal Bahadur Shastri died containing a number of allegations unsigned. The moment Lal Bahadur Shastri died the papers were naturally transferred to the Secretariat and at that stage we saw the papers and I said, even if they are unsigned let us verify and find out what is wrong. They may not be signed; that man Mr. Narayana was intelligent.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : They had fallen out.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I am coming to the main point. He gave all the papers. They contained specific allegations and though they were unsigned I said that they could be examined and had it referred to the Sukthankar Committee. In a month's time Mr. Narayana writes to the Government officially duly signed that he never gave any papers to Lal Bahadur Shastri. And that is the man who is quoted in evidence. So we have to be very careful. If one man is a crook the other may be a bigger crook.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Don't you know that Mr. Srivastava, an important official of your Ministry was present when the papers were presented to him personally? Don't you know that?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He has said that.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : That is what I say. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel is a hasty person. He does not hear. Everybody knows he has given them but it is he who says that he has not given. That is the point.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : It is an untruth.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We are living in the midst of crooks. Which one is bigger I cannot say.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Madam, I have nothing more. Dr. Teja or Mr. Teja, whatever he is, left India. The moment he knew that an ordinance was going to be passed he went away. He came here to ask for a loan. We refused the loan. He came with a new proposal—he brought in some friends from London—to sell some ships outside.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : When did he come here last?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : May end. He came here with this proposal and asking for permission to sell ships outside India. If it were inside India we were prepared to permit him. After all it was only change of hands; it did not matter but not outside, because we would then lose the tonnage. The tonnage had to be built up; we have to increase the tonnage. Therefore we refused permission. He knew perhaps that we were taking these steps and he must have left. Even some of his friends did not know by which plane he had left. One fine morning it was found that he was missing from the hotel. I do not know if the hotel people knew anything about it. Anyway the world is very small today, and I think the other Governments also would be helpful to our Government. We have instituted criminal cases and the Home

Department will take all the action that is necessary to bring him back.

There are a number of other points—some of them raised by Mr. Chordia and others—but I do not think I need go into all of them—personal relations and all that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Nothing personal. Nothing against anybody.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : In spite of all these we have been very good friends here and I hope we will maintain the same relations, whatever our political differences might be.

SHRI A. D. MANI : What about the auditors?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I am extremely sorry I forgot about it. Mr. Mani raised that important point. Mr. Niren Ghosh also raised another important point about 90 per cent. Why do you give a loan up to 90 per cent and leave 10 per cent capital with the private people? Why don't you put that 10 per cent also and make it into a public sector? The public sector is there. We are expanding the public sector also but the public sector—the Corporation—alone cannot meet the national requirements. Public sector is being encouraged; so also loan is given to the private sector. If you say that you differ in the matter of policy, I entirely agree with you that you have a right to differ and you can say it must be entirely public sector, cent per cent. That is your argument and I have no quarrel with that.

Now, Mr. Mani made many suggestions. About auditors we are ourselves worried about it even before he mentioned it. The audit carried on by Messrs. Chopra & Co. is not satisfactory. It was known to us earlier also. We were taking some action for investigation by the Company Law Administration. We have already placed the whole matter in their hands and necessary action will be taken against him. We have already under clause 13 made it obligatory for a person to produce the documents that may be in his possession when called upon to do so and if necessary later on we can take it up

[Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy.]

with the Institute of Chartered Accountants. For all that it must be proved that he is guilty. We are taking steps about that. We will take whatever action is necessary.

I am really thankful for the number of suggestions which have been made by our friends in Parliament to keep the Company going and make it earn well, and also to bring him to book in a court of law.

DRWAN CHAMAN LALL : What about the Directors who signed the balance sheet.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Those names I do not have with me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That the Bill to provide for the taking over of the management of the undertaking of the Jayanti Shipping Company Limited for a limited period in order to secure the proper management of the same, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3—(Board of Control to take over the Management of the Undertaking)

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Madam, I move :

1. "That at page 2,—

(i) in line 15, the words 'or any part' be deleted; and

(ii) in line 16, the words 'in respect of the whole or any part thereof' be deleted."

SHRI A. D. MANI : Madam, I move:

2. "That at page 2, for lines 18 to 20, the following be substituted, namely :—

'(2) The Board of Control shall consist of a Chairman, two members of Parliament, one from the House of the People and one from the Council of States, to be nominated by the Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman of the Council of States, respectively and such number of other members not exceeding eight as the Central Government may think fit, to be appointed by that Government;'

3. "That at page 2, after line 31, the following proviso be inserted, namely :—

'Provided that a member of Parliament shall be entitled to receive such allowances as are admissible under the provisions of the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 for attending a Committee of Parliament.'

(The amendments also stood in the name of Shri Banka Behary Das)

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA (Madhya Pradesh) : Madam, I move :

6. "That at page 2, for lines 18 to 20, the following be substituted, namely :—

'(2) The Board of Control shall consist of a Chairman, two members of Parliament, one from the House of the People and one from the Council of States, to be nominated by the Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman of the Council of States, respectively, one member from amongst the shareholders of the company to be elected by them, one member from amongst the employees of the company to be elected by them and such number of other members not exceeding six as the Central Government may think fit to be appointed by that Government.'

The questions were proposed.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Madam, on this amendment I have only one word to say. Clause 3 says here in the Bill :

"The Central Government may, by notified order, appoint a body of persons (hereinafter referred to as the "Board of Control") to take over the management of the whole or any part of the undertaking or to exercise in respect of the whole or any part thereof such functions of management as may be specified in the notified order."

What I say is, once the Board of Control has been constituted it is virtually a Board of Directors for all practical purposes and why does the Government want power to entrust either the whole of the management or a part of the management? My point is once you appoint the Board of Control the entire management should be given to them and that is why I have suggested the deletion of the words 'or any part' in line 15 and 'in respect of the whole or any part thereof' in line 16.

Now I come to the next amendment. It says :

"The Board of Control shall consist of a Chairman, two members of Parliament, one from the House of the People and one from the Council of States, to be nominated by the Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman of the Council of States, respectively and such number of other members not exceeding eight as the Central Government may think fit, to be appointed by that Government."

In view of all these controversies that have arisen during this period we want in the Board of Control two members of Parliament one from the other House and another from here so that Government money could be safeguarded and the mismanagement that has been going on there can be looked into. And we want them to be nominated by the Speaker and the Chairman and whomsoever they think fit to serve on this Board of Control may be appointed by them.

SHRI A. D. MANI : I am speaking on my amendment No. 2 and I will be very brief in my remarks. The amendment says that the Board of Control shall consist of two representatives of

Parliament, one from the House of the People and one from the Council of States. I have been told that even though the Government may like to accept this amendment, it would not be possible for them to accept it on the floor of the House today because the Ordinance is expiring tonight. I for my part—I cannot speak for Mr. Banka Behary Das—am prepared to withdraw the amendment, provided the Minister gives an assurance that out of the five persons who are yet to be nominated on the Board of Control, he would see to it that two Members of Parliament, one from the House of the People and one from this House, are appointed. And naturally the appointments should be made on the basis of the recommendation of the Speaker of the Lok Sabha or the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha. If the hon. Minister is prepared to give that assurance, I can withdraw it. I feel that he should give that assurance because crores of rupees are invested in this concern and, in view of the fact that in the past they have not managed the affairs of the Company properly, it is necessary that Parliament should have representation on this Board and I would like the Minister to give his generous consideration to my suggestion.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं इसके विरोध में खड़ा हुआ हूँ। माननीय मणि जी ने जो अमेंडमेंट दिया है

उपसभापति : किस पर ?

श्री राजनारायण : अमेंडमेंट तो पता नहीं, विषय से मतलब है।

मेरा निवेदन यह है कि लोकसभा, और राज्य सभा के सदस्यों को रखने का जो संशोधन माननीय मणि जी ने दिया है मैं उसका घोर विरोध करता हूँ फंडामेंटल पाइन्ट को सामने रखते हुए। माननीया, आपको यह बात तो मालूम ही होगी कि लोकसभा के एक सम्मानित सदस्य इसके एक डाइरेक्टर थे। अभी बताया गया कि कहीं राज्य के गवर्नर भी रह चुके हैं। क्या हालत उन्होंने पैदा की, थिरुमल राव ने—इसका अनुभव सदन के

[श्री राजनारायण]

लोगों को है। इस रपट में उनकी अच्छी चर्चा की गई है, उनके लड़के की भी की गई है।

उपसभापति : रिपोर्ट की जरूरत नहीं है, अमेंडमेंट पर बोलिए।

श्री राजनारायण : इस रपट से ही सारा विधेयक आया है।

उपसभापति : स्पीच नहीं देनी है, थोड़ा बोलिए।

श्री राजनारायण : आप बीच-बीच में टोक देती हैं, मैं तो आपसे बहुत डरने लगा हूँ। मेरा निवेदन है कि मैं मणि जी के सामने ब्रिटिश पार्लियामेंट की जो स्थिति है उसको भी रख देना चाहूंगा। ब्रिटेन में पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर सरकारी कमेटी का मेम्बर नहीं होता। अगर वह सरकारी कमेटी का मेम्बर हो तो वह डिस्क्वालीफिकेशन मानी जाती है। क्यों मानी जाती है? कहने के लिए आसानी से कहा जा सकता है कि वह सरकारी कमेटी में चले गए तो क्या सरकार हमें खरीद लेगी। लेकिन उसकी यही वजह है कि इस तरीके से सरकारी मेम्बरों को सरकारी कमेटियों में ले लेकर एक तरह से इन्ड्यूस् करती हैं, लालच देती है, लुभाती है, और उनकी जो तीव्रता और प्रखरता होती है विरोध करने की उसको कुंठित कर देती है। यह सही बात कहने की जो प्रकृति होती है उस पर रोक लगा देती है। बिल्कुल निश्चित रूप से मैं आपके द्वारा निवेदन करूंगा और मणि जी से करवद्ध प्रार्थना करूंगा कि अपने संशोधन को वापस लें। इससे लोकसभा की प्रतिष्ठा नहीं बड़ेगी। राज्य सभा की प्रतिष्ठा नहीं बड़ेगी। लोकसभा का मेम्बर हो जाने मात्र से या राज्य सभा का मेम्बर हो जाने मात्र से हर समस्या का इलाज हमको नहीं समझ लिया जाना चाहिए; ऐसी स्थिति हो गई है कि जितने डिपार्टमेंट्स हैं उनके आवेदन पत्रों में एक कालम रहता है कि विधान सभा,

विधान परिषद्, लोक सभा या राज्य सभा के मेम्बर की रिकमेंडेशन हो—इसका इतना दुरुपयोग हो रहा है कि बिना जाने मेम्बर लोग दिल्ली में सर्टिफिकेट दे देते हैं। किसी ने कहा रिकमेंड कर दीजिए, हमने कहा हम तो जानते नहीं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do.

श्री राजनारायण : मुझे इतना ही निवेदन करना है, विनम्रता के साथ कि अगर सदन को डिसरिप्यूट बदनामी में जाने से बचाना है तो मणि जी अपने संशोधन को वापस ले लें।

श्री विमल कुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया : उपसभापति महोदय, जो अमेंडमेंट माननीय मणि साहब ने और बांका बिहारी दास ने दिया है मैंने उसमें कुछ और जोड़ा है।

जहां तक राजनारायण जी ने मणि साहब के प्रस्ताव का विरोध किया, उसके बारे में मुझे केवल यही निवेदन करना है कि हमारे यहां पर और भी कारपोरेशन्स हैं, कम्पनियां हैं जिनमें कई माननीय सदस्य डाइरेक्टर हैं। जहां तक प्रिंसिपल की बात आती है कि गलत है या सही है, मैं नम्र निवेदन कर दूँ कि हमारे यहां पर कई बोर्ड चलते हैं, आटोनामस वाडीज हैं, कम्पनियां हैं जिनमें जनता का पैसा लगा रहता है। अब कुछ लोग केवल यह कहना चाहते हैं कि सारा काम नौकरों के जिम्मे कर दें और शासन उन नौकरों के माध्यम से सारी व्यवस्था चलाए। हम तो इस मत के हैं कि संसद के सदस्य शासन की आखों का काम करते हैं।

श्री थिरुमल राव का जो इसमें वर्णन किया गया है वह शासन के प्रतिनिधि के रूप में नहीं थे। यदि वे शासन के प्रतिनिधि के रूप में डाइरेक्टर होते तो सम्भवतः उनका दृष्टिकोण दूसरा होता। उनको अपने स्वार्थ के लिए डा० तेजा ने रखा, उनको हमेशा प्रसन्न रखने का प्रयत्न किया और इसके परिणामस्वरूप अपने आराम और अपनी प्रसन्नता

के चक्कर में क्या हो रहा है क्या नहीं हो रहा है इसके बारे में उन्होंने देखा नहीं, मगर यदि उनको स्पेसिफिक ड्यूटी गवर्नमेंट की ओर से दी जाती तो सम्भव था कि थिरुमल राव भी इन घटनाओं को सामने लाते, चाहे वे थिरुमल राव होते या कोई और होते । (interruptions) हमारे माननीय राजनारायण जी उनको भले ही थिरुमल पावर की सजा दे, मैं उनको थिरुमल राव मान कर चलता हूँ । हमारा निवेदन इस दृष्टि से यह है कि सदन के सदस्यों को भेजा जाना चाहिए, वे हमारे शासन की आखों का काम करें और शासन को बतलायें, सदन के सदस्यों को बतलायें कि किस तरह की गड़बड़ियाँ चल रही हैं जिससे व्यवस्था ठीक हो सके ।

एक पक्ष और है उपाध्यक्ष महोदय । उदाहरण के लिए इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड में सदन के सदस्यों का या विधान सभा सदस्यों का प्रतिनिधित्व न होने के कारण इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड के कर्मचारी व्यापारिक ढंग से काम करने की अपेक्षा शासकीय ढंग से काम करते हैं और परिणामस्वरूप जो सुविधाएँ मिलनी चाहिए वे नहीं मिलती । इस दृष्टि से मैं चाहूँगा कि हमारे बाकी के जो पाँच सदस्य होने वाले हैं उनमें दो सदन सदस्य होने चाहिए ;

इसके अलावा मैंने एक सुझाव और दिया है कि जो कम्पनी के शेयर होल्डर्स अमेन्डमेंट में हैं—to be elected by them, मैं इस पक्ष में नहीं हूँ कि उनका इलेक्शन हो । अगर इलेक्शन किया गया तो सबसे ज्यादा शेयर डा० तेजा के हैं, इसलिए उसका प्रतिनिधित्व होगा । मैं उसके पक्ष में नहीं हूँ, मगर इस पक्ष में जरूर हूँ कि बाकी जो शेयरहोल्डर्स हैं उनमें से किसी एक आदमी को इसमें नियुक्त किया जाना चाहिए जिससे शेयरहोल्डर्स के नाते उस कम्पनी में उसको जो ज्ञान प्राप्त हुआ या अज्ञान में रखा गया या उसको जो कोई भी जानकारी हुई उसका लाभ यह बोर्ड ले सके । इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय से अनुरोध करूँगा कि इस सशोधन

को स्वीकार करे कि शेयरहोल्डर्स में से किसी एक आदमी को इसमें लिया जाय ।

एक और सुझाव दिया है । इसमें मैंने कहा है *“one member from amongst the employees of the company”* जो वहाँ के कर्मचारी हैं उनका प्रतिनिधित्व होना चाहिये । मैं यह नहीं कहूँगा कि जनरल कौल को उसमें रखा जाय जिससे कि जितने पाप हुए हैं उनमें लीपापोती हो । मैं यह चाहूँगा कि इम्प्लाइज में से चुने हुए किसी एक को रखा जाय । हमारे मंत्री महोदय मजदूरों के बड़े हिमायती हैं और वह चाहते हैं कि मजदूरों को मैनेजमेंट में हिस्सा मिलना चाहिए अगर ठीक काम करवाना चाहते हैं । तो इस दृष्टि से मैं सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ के जितने इम्प्लाइज हैं उनमें किसी एक आदमी को उनके द्वारा चुना जाय और उसके चुने जाने के बाद यहाँ उसके लिये व्यवस्था की जाय ।

तो ये दो विशेष सुझाव मैं दे रहा हूँ । आशा है कि मंत्री महोदय इसको स्वीकार करेंगे और अगर इसको अस्वीकार करते हैं तो अस्वीकार करने का कारण बतायेंगे । यह हमारे काम को सुचारु रूप से चलाने में सहायक होगा और इस आशय से हमने यह सशोधन किया है । आशा है कि मंत्री महोदय इसको स्वीकार करेंगे ।

SHRI N SANJIVA REDDY : Madam, I will only say a few words. These points were raised in the other House also. Mr Rajnarain has answered the question of Mr Mani and he has made my position easy. Let us not put it as Members of Parliament or Rajya Sabha I am prepared to give an assurance. There are five seats. Let us put non-officials and Members of Parliament come under that. Not that I can assure the House that I will take them, but the non-official element will be there so that there may be a check on the five officials.

Mr Chordia has made a suggestion about shareholders. I think it is a very good idea. I am not able to accept the amendment. Other than Teja and Kulu-

[Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy.]

kundis there are one or two people who have got small amounts of Rs. 1 lakh. I do not want an election again and all that. I will consider that also but I cannot give any promise. If there are good names, we certainly would like to have them. But I must request my friends to please see, for heaven's sake, that amendment means that the whole of what you have done will become illegal tomorrow or day after tomorrow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Are you accepting the amendment ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : No

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

1. "That at page 2,—

(i) in line 15, the words 'or any part' be deleted; and

(ii) in line 16, the words 'in respect of the whole or any part thereof' be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

2. "That at page 2, for lines 18 to 20, the following be substituted, namely :—

'(2) The Board of Control shall consist of a Chairman, two members of Parliament, one from the House of the People and one from the Council of States, to be nominated by the Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman of the Council of States, respectively and such number of other members not exceeding eight as the Central Government may think fit, to be appointed by that Government;'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

3. "That at page 2, after line 31, the following proviso be inserted, namely :—

'Provided that a member of Parliament shall be entitled to receive such allowances as are admissible

under the provisions of the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 for attending a Committee of Parliament.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Amendment No. 6 of Mr. Chordia.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
उपसभापति महोदया, आधा हिस्सा इसका अस्वीकार हो ही गया है इस सभा से, और मंत्री महोदय यह विश्वास दिला रहे हैं कि शेयरहोल्डर्स से से किसी को इसमें लेने की कोशिश करेंगे, तो मे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह यह करें। दूसरे यह कि इम्पलाइज के बारे में भी वह विचार करें। इस आश्वासन के साथ मैं इसे वापस लेता हूं।

'Amendment No. 6 was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 5—Power of Board of Control to appoint managing agent

SHRI A. D. MANI, Madam, I move :

4. "That at page 4, for the existing clause 5, the following be substituted, namely :—

'5. The management of the undertaking shall be carried on pursuant to any directions given by the Board of Control in accordance with the provisions of the notified order issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 and any person having any functions of management in relation to the undertaking or any part thereof shall comply with such directions.'

*For text of the amendment, vide col. 5360 *supra*.

Madam, I will be very brief. The purport of the amendment is that this Board of Control shall not at any time hand over its function to a managing agent. The Government have provided in the Bill that when circumstances arise they might hand over the control of the company to the managing agent. I personally think that on account of the heavy encumbrance of the Jayanti Shipping this concern will become in effect a nationalised concern. I do not want any loophole to be given to allow some Government of the day to be influenced by some other Teja. This ought to be run as a nationalised undertaking. It is for this purpose I am moving this amendment.

The question was proposed.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Madam, I am not prepared to accept it as it stands.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

4. "That at page 4, for the existing clause 5, the following be substituted, namely :—

'5. The management of the undertaking shall be carried on pursuant to any directions given by the Board of Control in accordance with the provisions of the notified order issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 and any person having any functions of management in relation to the undertaking or any part thereof shall comply with such directions.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 6 to 8 were added to the Bill.

Clause 9—Power of Central Government to cancel order notified under section 3.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS :
Madam, I move :

5. "That at page 5, line 32, for the words 'any shareholder' the words 'the majority of the shareholders' be substituted.

Madam, the clause reads like this :

"If at any time it appears to the Central Government on the application of any shareholder of the company or otherwise that the purpose of the notified order made under sub-section (1) of section 3 has been fulfilled or that for any other reason it is not necessary that the order should remain in force, the Central Government may, by notified order, cancel such order and on the cancellation of any such order the management of the undertaking shall revert to the shareholders of the company."

My amendment is to the effect that instead of 'any shareholder' the words 'the majority of the shareholders' may be incorporated. The purpose of my amendment is this. When this Bill was discussed in the other House, there was only a ten-year term for taking over the management, and there was pressure and the Government agreed to the proposal of fifteen years. I cannot understand it. When this Government has made up its mind to take it over for at least fifteen years, if they do not nationalise it within this period, why should there be any clause saying that if anyone of the shareholders applies, whether Dr. Teja or anybody else, the management should go back to them; if the Government is satisfied—we know how the Government is satisfied—then the management can be handed over to them. What will be the net result? I want to refer here to what Prof. Gadgil said, because we know yesterday that Prof. Gadgil told categorically that within this period we will be financing this concern, we will see that it is revived, and then afterwards the self-interested swindlers may think that they should have the company back and try to influence as they have influenced so many times. The net result will be that

[Shri Banka Behary Das.]

if one shareholder wants to take back the company after the company has been set on its proper footing with all the help from the state exchequer, the company may go back to them. I wish that this clause had not been there at all. I would like that position if the clause is omitted. But if the Minister is not prepared to omit it, I would at least say that if at least the majority of the shareholders want it and the Government is satisfied, then only the company may go back to them, though I again say that that industry should be nationalised. But as a lesser evil, for protecting the interests of the state I want that this amendment should be accepted by the Minister.

The question was proposed.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Madam, after all it is the Government that ultimately decides. He says that instead of one man it must be the majority of shareholders. I see no difficulty because one man, Teja, applying for it will be majority of the shareholders. The Government has taken it for fifteen years and no assurance can be given now that we are not going to give it back. Since we have taken it over for a short period the point that we are going to return it must be there; it is Government's decision. Suppose we will not give it back; then it becomes a point of law. There will be legal questions. Since we have taken it for a limited period, this clause will be necessary. Saying majority of shareholders does not mean anything. Mr. Teja alone will be majority of shareholders.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

5. "That at page 5, line 32, for the words 'any shareholder' the words 'the majority of the shareholders' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 9 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 9 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 10 to 21 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Madam, I move :

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, this is the Third Reading and I would request Members to be brief and those who have expressed their opinion need not repeat them unless they have something new. Mr. Lokanath Misra,

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I am happy that the hon. Minister has realised that Dr. Teja was a swindler. But he cannot escape. I do not mean him personally because he came only recently to the Ministry. But the Government of India cannot escape because they were the abettors to the swindling.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : May I just make an announcement to the House that we will have to sit a little longer because there is going to be a statement on the Gold Control Order as soon as this is finished ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : After that, we will take up private Members' business ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Now, for the last 15 years, we have planned and I presume that this was a part of that planning. So far, it was a planned plunder of the public exchequer in which the Government were definitely the abettors.

Now, Madam, in this connection, I would like to have some clarifications from the hon. Minister; they have been raised also but he has very conveniently evaded them. The point is, have you booked the Directors ? I mean the Directors who signed on the balance sheet. They are supposed to know about the financial condition of the com-

pany in so far as they lent their signatures by virtue of their being Directors in the company. The big part of the swindling may not have received the attention of the Directors, that part which took place outside India but there was definitely a certain misuse of funds here in India, so far as it relates to income-tax collections and provident fund. To that extent, the Directors are definitely responsible. Did he refer the matter to the Company Law Administration who have themselves defaulted because they have not taken any action yet against the company? And they now pounce upon him because it is found out that he is a swindler and one of the most rotten men that India could have. All the same, I would say that the Company Law Administration has also defaulted, and what action has been taken against the Company Law Administration for not taking action in time?

Now, since Mr. Thirumala Rao who is referred to by Mr. Rajnarain as Thermal Rao . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: Thermo-nuclear Rao.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Because of the speed with which he managed to get concessions for the company he must be called Thermo-nuclear Rao. Now, if no action is taken against the Directors, naturally people in the country would think that because one of the Congress Members of Parliament was involved in this and he also put his signature in this balance sheet, no action was taken. Under the law, they have to take action against any other company having defaulted like this, they would have taken action. But in this particular case, they did not take any action. It would mean that action was not taken because the Vice-Chairman of that company was a Congress Member of Parliament.

Now, Madam, I would also like to have some elucidation from the hon. Minister whether Dr. Subbaroyan, when he was Minister, had submitted a report to the Cabinet and in the course of the discussion, why that report was kept away from the Members. That was a very revealing report, a very relevant report in this connection. But the hon.

Minister has kept that away because it would have revealed so many things. He had submitted the report sometime in the year 1960 or 1961.

AN HON. MEMBER : Which report?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Dr. Subbaroyan was Minister of the particular Ministry and he had submitted a report to the Government against Dr. Teja. You do not know about it?

SHRI A. D. MANI : It was said by Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think it was mentioned earlier.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : This is the last question, Madam.

I want to know whether it is not a fact that the last act of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari who proclaims himself as one of the greatest socialists was to sanction funds to this company. Was that not one of the last acts of his before going out of the Ministry, without reference to the Transport Ministry even?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am going to allow only five minutes on this Third Reading to each one because I find that there is repetition of what has been said. Mr. Niren Ghosh.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : The hon. Minister's laboured explanation leaves me cold . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI : You are always warm.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : . . . because it is not convincing. The scheme was submitted by Mr. Teja to the Government. Money was sanctioned even before the company was floated. And after it was floated favourable terms of loan were made, and its dealings with the Government—from all the e, the charge that we made of Government's collusion with these gangsters stands, I am not satisfied with the explanation. I am not concerned with the particular Minister who is piloting the Bill. He might not be involved. And there are reports also . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : He was not at all there.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : So, I have said that I am not concerned with him. But the Government is concerned. I drag the Government as a whole.

There is a report also about this Mr. Teja taking Minister's sons holidaying to south of France . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All those things have been said. This is the Third Reading.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I do not name the Minister. I do not make . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : This is the Third Reading. You know what Third Reading means.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : This is a shipping Bill. I would also say that all those Directors should not be appointed to any position in connection with the Jayanti Shipping Company. They should be prosecuted, they should be proceeded against. The next suggestion of mine is that all those employees whether it is Mr. Thirumala Rao or Mr. Narayana Rao whose jobs could not be traced by the Enquiry Committee should at once be removed from the employment of the company—those who are still in employment there.

Since it is a shipping Bill, may I suggest that you take over the Apeejay Lines also when the enquiry proceeds? That would be very relevant. And unless you do that, all your protestations in this regard will not hold any conviction for others.

उपसभापति : पांच ही मिनट है आपके लिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : अभी तो साढ़े पांच बजे तक है ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Only five minutes to everyone on the Third Reading.

श्री राजनारायण : इसमें माननीया, आप कितना समय ले लेंगे । मैं निवेदन करूंगा — निवेदन नहीं । मझे आपसे यह निवेदन

करना है कि माननीय मंत्री जी ने बहुत ही मेहनत करके तेजा और तेजा के जरिये किये गये कुकर्मों पर पर्दा डालने की कोशिश की है ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : गलत बात है ।

श्री राजनारायण : उस पतली चादर को हम फिर से फाड़ना चाहते हैं ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : फाड़ दिया हमने उसको ।

श्री राजनारायण : देखा जाय, तीन चार सवाल हमारे थे । एक का जवाब माननीय मंत्री जी ने नहीं दिया और यह कहा गया कि कोई अग्रिमेंट था, वह अग्रिमेंट यह कहता था कि जब डेढ़ करोड़ रु० "पेड अप कैपिटल" हो जायगी तब यह जो 20 करोड़ का लोन है वह दिया जायेगा । इस रिपोर्ट में इस अग्रिमेंट का कहीं कोई चर्चा नहीं है । जो यह कहते हैं कि उसकी जो ऑरिजनल 'पेड अप कैपिटल' केवल 200 रु० का था, यह मैंने पहले भी कल पौइन्ट रोज किया था कि महज 200 रु० की पेड अप कैपिटल के साथ 20 करोड़ रु० देने का गवर्नमेंट कोई अग्रिमेंट करे यह 'अन्वर्ड' है, यह अनसुनी है ।

उपसभापति : यह मिनिस्टर साहब ने समझाया है ।

श्री राजनारायण : सुना जाय । गलत समझाया । लोन देने की बात हुई है, नवम्बर 1961 में यह जो रोज होकर के डेढ़ करोड़ रुपया हुआ है वह हुआ है सन् 1962 में । लोन देने का जो एग्रिमेंट वह नवम्बर सन् 1961 में हुआ था ।

श्री अकबर अली खान : इस शर्त से हुआ था ।

श्री राजनारायण : शर्त इसमें नहीं है इसका भी जवाब शर्तनामे में है और मैं यह चाहूंगा कि वह शर्तनामा हमारे सामने रखा जाय । मैं यह भी चाहूंगा कि आज इस बिल

को पास न किया जाय क्योंकि नियम के मुताबिक बिल से संबंधित जितना मेटरियल है वह मेटरियल प्रस्तुत होना चाहिये—एट दी टाइम आफ डिबेट । माननीय मंत्री जी ने एक नई चीज बतलाई है । माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि एक एग्रीमेंट था । तो मैं आपके द्वारा अदब के साथ अर्ज करूंगा कि नियम का उल्लंघन नहीं किया जाना चाहिये । अब वह एग्रीमेंट था, जो एग्रीमेंट माननीय मंत्री जी ने यहां पर कहा है कि एग्रीमेंट हुआ था कि जब डेढ़ करोड़ रुपया रोज हो जायेगा तब जाकर 20 करोड़ रुपया का कर्जा दिया जायेगा । उस एग्रीमेंट की कापी यहां आनी चाहिये, यह एक वैधानिक प्रश्न है । उसको आप . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : In the 1961 report the agreement is there.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Have you finished ?

SHRI RAJNARAIN : The agreement is there. He will show me. I have also read each and every line of the report.

माफ कीजिये, मैंने बड़ा पाप किया कि मेरे मुंह से अंग्रेजी निकल गई । अब मैं दूसरी बात यह कहना चाहता हूं और आपके जरिये माननीय मंत्री जी से निहायत अदब के साथ यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जब लाल बहादुर जी यहां से मास्को जाने को थे तो उस वक्त से कुछ पहले तेजा यहां आया था या नहीं ? तेजा के बारे में मेरी जानकारी है कि उसने श्री लाल बहादुर से मिलने की कोशिश अनेक बार की । एक बार तो वह मिल पाया था मगर मेरी जानकारी यह है कि लाल बहादुर जी उसको समझ गये थे कि वह किस तरह का आदमी है । इसलिए लाल बहादुर जी ने उसको जरा भी एनकरेजमेंट नहीं दिया और वे उससे नहीं मिले । फिर जब लाल बहादुर जी ताशकन्द गये थे, दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा मंत्री महोदय से कि क्या मास्को में उस समय तेजा था या नहीं ?

श्री अकबर अली खान : ताशकन्द में . .

श्री राजनारायण : मैं ताशकन्द की बात नहीं कर रहा हूं, मैं नई बात कह रहा हूं मास्को अकबर अली खान साहब । मैं कहूंगा मास्को तो अगर कहीं उनके दिमाग में ताशकन्द रहा तो मास्को को समझकर ताशकन्द की बातें करेंगे, तो गलत बात करेंगे । मैं मास्को कह रहा हूं जो कि एक नई चीज है और जब यह तेजा गया हुआ था, तब पता लगाया जाय कि वहां पर वह टी० एन० कौल के साथ ठहरा था । यह बात सरकार को पता लगाकर बतानी चाहिये ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि लाल बहादुर जी की मृत्यु के बाद जब श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी प्रधान मंत्री हुई, तो मेरा सवाल यह है कि क्या तेजा यहां आया था या नहीं और यह तेजा आकर मंत्रियों से मिला था या नहीं ? बड़े बड़े अधिकारियों से मिला था या नहीं ? उसने प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से मिलने की कोशिश की या नहीं ? इन सब का जवाब आना चाहिये और उन्हें छिपाने की कोशिश नहीं की जानी चाहिये । डा० तेजा ने जो कुकर्म किये हैं और उसके जरिये जो कुछ हुआ है उसको छिपाने की कोशिश माननीय मंत्री जी न करें ।

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, at the fag end of the debate . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not the fag end. It is the third reading. But do not make a speech that you should have made earlier.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Anyway, I know my limitations at this stage of the consideration of the Bill. Madam, we are now going to enact the Bill, "The Jayanti Shipping Company (Taking over of Management) Bill, 1966". I am constrained to remark that the Bill might have been properly entitled had it been entitled, "The Jayanti Shipping (Nepotisation) Bill". That means I owe an explanation why I make this suggestion to this House.

Madam, during the whole debate it has been made clear by a host of

[Shri Chitta Basu.]

speakers that this company was born out of nepotism, this company flourished under the sunshine of nepotism and this company is bound to meet its natural fall out of nepotism. Therefore, what we are enacting is a nepotisation Bill.

Madam, I do not like to dilate much at this last stage of consideration of this Bill. I want to draw the attention of the hon'ble Minister to the Financial Memorandum which has been given to us in which he has expressed his hope that the expenditure which is likely to be incurred by way of payment of salaries, honorarium and others to the members of the Board and the Chairman of the Board of Control will be met from the Consolidated Fund and will be recouped from the Company's fund itself. Madam, this is quite misleading and misdirecting the House, if I may be permitted to say so, I do not have much time at my disposal. But I want simply to draw the attention of the House to the particular observation made by the hon'ble Minister in the statement which he submitted to the House itself. Regarding the financial position of the company he says :—

"... it appears that the total liabilities of the Company as on June 10, 1966 exceeded the total assets by about Rs. 4.38 crores."

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think that is enough. You have taken five minutes.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : I have not even spoken.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That is all right. I have given you five minutes.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : I think the company's financial position is such that there is no possibility of the Government money which is likely to be spent in the taking over of the management, being recouped out of the company's funds itself. And the company is going to be handed over to Dr. Teja or some other private person after the company's financial position becomes sounder. In view of this, even at this last stage of consideration, I should like to know whether the hon'ble Minister can reconsider that the Bill should be made a Bill for nationalising the company itself so

that the Government money may not be misspent. With this observation I finish.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Madam, some points have been made. Mr. Chitta Basu was making a point. They have been clarified. But Mr. Lokanath Misra was mentioning one or two points. Madam, the Cabinet discusses so many things. After a discussion the decision is taken. Now, Dr. Subbaroyan, when he was Minister in charge of Transport, says something in the Cabinet and he writes something to the Cabinet. Can all that be placed on the Table of the House? Can there be any Government functioning at all? The democracy would come to a standstill if the Ministers go on placing everything on the Table of the House. There is the end of democracy.

Now about T. T. Krishnamacharji sanctioning some money without the Transport Ministry knowing it. Meanwhile he resigned. I was not the Transport Minister then. I do not know, Madam. I am not able to answer those charges offhand as demanded at the last minute. I did not have time to verify. So many other things have been said. I do not know, Madam, what I should say about them.

Can you bring to book all the Directors? That was another point which he made. If anybody is found guilty he can be brought to book. But you cannot bring to book somebody because he is there. And Dr. Teja also you cannot bring to book. If they had committed the slightest mistake, whether it is Mr. Thirumala Rao or somebody, you try to catch hold of them. Nobody is going to be stopped from that.

Mr. Rajnarain again made the same point about Rs. 200-crore capital. I have already explained it at length. If you want any further clarification you can look into the agreement. These are not secret documents. The agreement was entered into long ago with the Government. These are the conditions. If you fulfil the conditions, the amount will be given. This was about four or five years ago. There is no secret document. Let him satisfy by looking into it. I do not think there is any other point.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We come back to the non-official business. There are two Bills for introduction.

5 P.M.

MOTION RE NOMINATION OF SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE BILL TO AMEND THE INDIAN PENAL CODE

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is a motion to be moved by Diwan Chaman Lall.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab) : I move the following motion :

"That Shri D. P. Karmarkar be appointed to the Select Committee of the Rajya Sabha on the Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha from the membership of the said Committee."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN . There are two Bills to be introduced.

THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966 (to amend section 139).

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE (Maharashtra) : I move :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE : I introduce the Bill.

THE HINDU MARRIAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966 (to amend section 5).

SHRI R. K. BHUWALKA (West Bengal) : I move :

"That permission be granted to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI R. K. BHUWALKA : I introduce the Bill.

THE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND STATE LEGISLATURE (IMMUNITY FROM DETENTION) BILL, 1964—contd.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Madam, I resume my unfinished speech about the immunity to Members of Parliament and the State Legislatures. Now that our other colleagues are present here, they will speak on the subject and I hope only after we have discussed this the statement on the Gold Control Order will be made because practically we have surrendered the non-official day, the whole day, to accommodate the Government. That shows our consideration.

After I had moved the Bill and spoken on the last occasion we get from the newspapers and otherwise the report of arrests of Mr. Dasarath Deb, a Member of the Lok Sabha in Agartala. He had been taken into custody under the D.I.R. or some such measure. Also four other Members of the Legislative Assembly had been arrested similarly and detained without trial. I may tell the House frankly what I feel. Last time also I mentioned similar things that Comrade Dasarath Deb, who lives here with me in the same House, although we belong to two different parties, went to attend a meeting there on 30th and he was to have been here on the 1st night. Everything was arranged and something happened there. He had hardly been there for 4 or 5 days and something happened there and he was taken into custody. Now of course a statement has been made in the other House that he had been arrested and so on. A funny statement has been made that the Chief Minister of the Tripura Government was forcibly taken out of the Assembly House and so on. First of all