SHRI A, D. MANI: All the Members should get a chance as per the time limit.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION *RE.* APPOINTMENT OF MESSRS. PUBLIC RELATIONS ATTACHES INTER-NATIONAL INC., WASHINGTON. D.C., AS PUBLIC RELATIONS CONSULTA-NTS FOR THE INDIAN EMBASSY IN U.S.A.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi) : Madam, you will recall that many a time here many of my friends and myself had raised discussions, asked questions and expressed our dissatifaction with the way foreign publicity was being run. Every time we had been told by the Government here that everything was satisfactory, that the image being projected was all right, that the Indian case was being sold abroad to our satisfaction. Last time when I raised the issue, I said that the Director of Foreign Publicity should be a person with adequate knowledge, adequate qualifications and adequate training for this line. But unfortunately we ha\e been led to believe in this country that the bureaucracy can do anything— whether it is foreign publicity, running of the Foreign Service, running of a public enterprise or running of an industry, an I.C.S, or an I.A.S, is suitable for everything. Therefore, rather than reorganising the foreign publicity on scientific and correct fashion when we have to deal every day with enemies unscrupulous like Pakistan and undependable like China, we have never tried to meet the challenge in the correct fashion. And then one day suddenly from a reply to a question we come to know that, Io and behold, the Govern-ment of India has risen to its needs and last year it appoints a gentleman by the name of Mr. Ganju on $ 60,000 a year, to conduct what we are told our aid publicity or our foreign publicity. Who was this Mr. Ganju I asked. We were told : Mr. Ganju was in our service; we transferred him; he decided to resign; after three months we gave this company a contract. AU very innocent. I do not doubt it because many friends mentioned here that Mr. Ganju was an adequately qualified person, and I have no quarrel and I do not want to mention any names of those who are not present here to defend themselves.

But I ask tbe Government one simple question. If Mr. Ganju was very good, if Mr. Ganju was up to the mark, if Mr. Ganju bad created an impression in America that he was equal to the challenge, why was he transferred, why was order issued that from Washington he would be transferred to Colombo? I concede the point for argument's sake that Mr. Ganju was a good Public Relations Officer we had on our behalf in America. If he was so good, was it very necessary that the bureaucratic order must prevail that even if he-was good he should be transferred, which ultimately forced him to resign ? I know, here and abroad, those Public Relations Officers of Governments who are acquitting themselves well are not transferred for ever because they create their mark. *It* he was so good, he should have been allowed to continue. Now I concede the point that he was good. I concede the point for the sake of argument that he was doing his job well. I would like to know why the Government chose to transfer him. I would also like to know another point and it i* this. For the same job which he was doing, after three months we appoint his company which he formed there and start giving him $ 60.000 a year. I have not been able to lay my hand on any information as to whether it was for the first time that the Government started spending such a huge amount through specialised agencies or it was done before as well. K it was done before, who were the people through whom we were doing it ?

Were they doing a good job ? If they were doing a good job. what was tbe reason for not continuing them ? If they were not doing a good job, did we hav© sufficient reasons to believe that Shri Ganju would do it better and if Shri Ganju was doing it better—now it is about a year since he was appointed—has any comparative evaluation been made that Shri Ganja has done better than others should have done or could have done or have done ? I also like *to* know if we have any such earlier precedents where professional and specialised concerns—whatever their merits, I will not comment upon that point—have been appointed in America or elsewhere. Also, I would like to know whether tt h the Government of India alone which has chosen this golden path of appointing specialised agencies or other Governments have also done it sometimes, and if other

Governments have done it, on what typo of terms they have done it and on what type of terms we have appointed them. And I should also like to know—and then sit down —as to who took that decision about this Shri Ganju. Was it the Foreign Office ? Was it the Embassy ? Was il the Foreign Publicity ? CW anybody else ? And at what level was the decision taken ? That is very important. We must be told.

AN HON. MEMBER : Who initiated ?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Initiation is also understandable because a man gets some one to do a job, he wants certain goods to be delivered, he must justify his conduct. He wanted to do a particular thing. I am very keen to know and—the House should be taken into confidence—at what level it was taken. In a country like ours where foreign exchange is a problem, it is decided that 60,000 dollars a year will be spent. I would like to know if we have spent earlier too and who decided that one specialised agency shall be given 60,000 dollars.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Manswamy.

I do hope that Members will restrict their time so that everybody will hav* a chance to speak.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, आपने एक-एक जवाब की पहले वाली व्यवस्था नहीं रखी ? एक का जवाब हो जाये, तब सवाल हो ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is not the practice. This is a discussion.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madias) : Madam, I am grateful to you for giving *me* an opportunity to raise this issue once again. The other day when I asked the hon. Minister to give the full particulars about Shri Ganju. he read out a statement when it was found that Shri Ganju who was drawing a salary of Rs. 3,000 was suddenly given 60,000 dollars a year. It works out at the present rate of exchange to Rs 37,000 per month. Besides this, 1 have come to know that this Shri Ganju who is given a red carpet treatment in our Indian Embassy is also given some other additional sum, and that whenever he approaches the Indian Embassy with bills for having printed this and that, no check is made but the amount is immediately given. To illustrate this. Madam, I can given an instance. Very recently, it appears that he brought out a book and gave a bill to that effect to the Indian Embassy. Some important officer connected with the Accounts Department of the Embassy did not belie\e all that he had stated about the pamphlet and the bill. He questioned him whether he had printed 90,000 copies as he said or he had printed 30,000 copies. Shri Ganju could not reply to that. Also when there was a question whether the price of that pamphlet was a dollar and 25 cents per copy OT it was 75 cents again he could not reply. But somehow or the other he pulled wires and got
This bill pas'seci to the extent of 92,250 : dollars and got it sanctioned.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras) : 92,000 dollars?

■

SHRi S. S. MARISWAMY : 92 thousand I and 250 dollars, nearly 100.000 dollars. I Again on the day

SHRi M. RUTHNASWAMY : What a lucky man, what a lucky writer !

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : 92,000 does not make only 250 dollars.

SHRi S. S. MARISWAMY ; 92,250 dollars ... I am right. 92.250 dollars.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Rtrpees ?

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Dollars, I said dollars. The official said that there would not have been more than 30,000 copies of the pamphlet and that the cost also was very exhorbitant. My information is that the poor officer's objection was overruled and the amount of 92,250 dollars was paid or is about to be paid to kirn.

And another very important factor is, on the day when Shri Bhagat was replying to me, he said that his emoluments were to the tune of 60,000 dollars. Now, I understand that the Government of India is going to renew the contract at a remuneration of 100,000 dollars. My information is that the Government was about to sign it but for this question, they are delaying the file.

tShri S. S. Mariswamy]

The third point is about the corporation or the company which he is supposed to have in Washington. Nobody knows about the existence of that firm. Many enquiries were made by Indian journalists in Washington to find out the whereabouts of the company. Not even a name-board hangs at the address given by Shri Ganju. And then, whenever somebody telephoned the number there was a girl answering that call who used to say that he had gone to see the Vice-President of America, Mr. Humphery, and it has now become a standing joke that he is a 'phony' friend of Mr. Humphrey. This fact was given to me by some one who knows what is going on there in that place.

■Then I want to know the mysterious circumstances under which he is appointed and is given this treatment. My information is that he was working in the I. & B. Ministry some years ago. Later on, the External Affairs Ministry drafted him. And when he was working in the External Affairs Ministry as a Press Attache or under some junior post in our Embassy he was found to be doing more extraneous work outside than inside the Embassy. His immediate superior took action against him for that and God only knows how he was able to get good wishes or support of some of the higher-ups there and got the order almost revoked. Bnt luckily, our External Affairs Ministry stood in the way and they said, either you go out or go to Colombo. Then on the advice of some mysterious or superior higher-up he went on medical leave and after a few days he was given this contract, a contract under a false name. That company never exists. It is one question on which I want a full statement from the hon. Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Vajpayee.

I am giving five minutes to each one *whriir* nnmp is here.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदया, आज मैं पांच मिनट भी नहीं लूंगा। मैं सिर्फ इतना जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह सच बात है कि मिस्टर गंजू जब हमारी सेवा में अमेरिका में काम कर रहे थे, उसी समय उन्होंने अपना व्यक्तिगत काम शुरू कर दिया था जिस काम को आज उन्होंने इतना बढ़ा लिया है कि भारत सरकार को भी उनकी सहायता लेने की आवश्यकता अनुभव हुई है ? यदि यह बात सच है तो बड़ी गंभीर बात है क्योंकि सेवा में रहते हुए कोई कर्मचारी इस तरह से अपना प्राइवेट बिजिनेस खड़ा नहीं कर सकता।

मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या इस बात की जानकारी नई दिल्ली को मिली थी कि श्री गंजू की गतिविधियां आपत्तिजनक हैं और जानकारी मिलने के बाद भी कोई कदम नहीं उठाये गये ? उस दिन मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि श्री गंजू का तबादला सीलोन किया गया था। वे वहां नहीं गये। उन्होंने इस्तीफा दे दिया। क्या किसी सरकारी कर्मचारी का तबादला किया जाये तो वह वहां नहीं जायेगा, इस्तीफा दे देगा ? संकटकाल में इस तरह से तबादले का पालन न करना एक ऐसे कर्मचारी के लिये कहां तक उचित था और इस बात के लिये उस कर्मचारी की निंदा करने के बजाये सरकार ने उसके साथ एक गठबन्धन कर लिया, कांट्रैक्ट कर लिया, क्या यह कर्मचारियों में अनुशासन की निष्ठा की भावना पैदा करने का तरीका है ? मंत्री महोदय इसको स्पष्ट करें कि क्या उन्होंने श्री गंजू का इस्तीफा देने का आचरण एक उचित आचरण समझा है ? अगर नहीं समझा तो उसी स्तर पर, उसी स्थिति में उनके विरुद्ध कार्यवाही क्यों नहीं की गई ?

एक प्रश्न और है। श्री दिनेश सिंह जी यहां विराजमान हैं। वे इस पर अधिक प्रकाश डाल सकते हैं। ऐसा मेरा खयाल है कि लोक सभा में 1962 में एक प्रश्न हुआ था कि दो हमारे दूतावासों में काम करनेवाले कर्मचारी गायब पाये गये हैं। वे कर्मचारी गुम हो गये, उन कर्मचारियों का पता नहीं लगा कि कहां गये। क्या श्री गंजू उनमें से एक कर्मचारी हैं ? यदि यह बात सच है तो यह केवल पहला ही मौका नहीं है कि जब श्री गंजू भारत सरकार की आंखों में धूल झोंकने में सफल हुये हैं, लेकिन हमने उन्हें लम्बी रस्सी दे दी जिसमें

वे खुद तो नहीं डूबे, मगर हमारा बेड़ा फंसने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं ।

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Madam, we have been discussing a very serious affair. It is not only the affair of Mr. Ganju but when I think of ihe democratic traditions that we intend Io create in this country, I do not understand by what way we have been doing it. When we look at Delhi we find three types of embassies. One is the foreign embassy, the other embassies are created in this capital by the various States. They are having their public relations offices or information centres and the third type of sies are of the great industrialists and monopolists and they are having their relationships with our own Secretariat, with the I.C.S, and I.A.S. Secretaries. Immediately after their term, they become the public relations officers in these various centres created by the industrialists and now here it is the Government itself which is allowing its own Secretaries to create this another type of embassy in the foreign countries. Is this the way we intend going ahead ? Why should we allow it ? Who is responsible for this happening ? Who is responsible ? Why was his resignation accepted and when it was accepted, why had Mr. Ganju been allowed to go into a contract whereby we have been giving him 60,000 dollars per year ? The Minister said the other day that his pay or salary here was to the tune of Rs. 4,000

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : Rs. 3,000.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Sorry, it was Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 36,000 per year. I do not go into the details but if it was to the tune of Rs. 36,000 per year, the very man gets $ 60,000. Why has such an imme-diale change been made ? What were the merits in Mr. Ganju which rather created this feeling in the mind of the Government to give him 60,000 dollars ?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Rs. 36.000 per month.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I feel that it is u matter of serious concern. An enquiry should be held into this affair and those responsible for giving this appointment to Mr. Ganju are definitely acting detrimentally to the interests of this country. It should not be tolerated. When we have been facing a serious crisis in foreign exchange, when we have been struggling hard for rupees and pies, we have been spending 60,000 dollars per year on Mr. Ganju who had no qualifications to earn Rs. 3,000 per year. I would not take much of your time nor would I like to repeat the other points made by my colleagues but I feel that this is a matter where those who are responsible should be properly dealt with and (hey deserve good punishment.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : I am glad that the House is having an opportunity of discussing this matter because I understand that the contract with Mr. Ganju is due for renewal and any day the Government might sign the contract. So far no decision has been taken.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Can you enlighten us about this gentleman ?

SHRI A. D. MANI : I had met this gentleman many years ago as an Information Officer. He was not—and we did not consider him as—an outstanding Information Officer. I shall also speak about what a Public Relations Counsellor does in the U.S.A. Because I have seen some Public Relations Counsellors at work. They arrange dinner parties in theiY apartments, they call people and they supply all the drinks and so on. That is all billed to you. It comes from the 60,000 dollars. Then they try to introduce the man in a very favourable manner to some of the notables. I am told that as far as the Prime Minister is concerned, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, when she visited the U.S.A. this gentleman was asked to do public relations work, public relations counselling work. Mrs. Gandhi on account of her very name had to turn down many offers actually on the T.V. show. There was no need for Mr. Ganju whatever to do any kind of public relations work. I understand that the staff of our embassy at Washington was not very much in favour of this appointment or in favour of this gentleman. It was my good friend Mr. B. K. Nehru's personal choice. It was he who wanted this person to be appointed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I do not think you should mention the name.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Of course we should mention the Ambassador of India to the U.S.A. Otherwise

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta) it is impossible to function in the Parliament if we cannot mention. I will mention such names and I will say something more.

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. D. MANI : I wanted to say this. We have to keep our Ambassador and we spend as much as the British Government on its Ambassador and very rightly too. America is a very delicate and sensitive area and we must not starve our Ambassador for funds. Our Ambassador's salary, with all Ihe expenses' and so on, comes to about 80,000 dollars a year and this gentleman is getting 60,000 dollars. I am told that the question was raised in the External Affairs Ministiy here : 'If we are going to pay 60.000 dollars why not make him Ambassador also ?' This question was frankly raised in the Secretariat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Make him the President of India.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mr. Dinesh Singh knows that the matter was raised at the official level. Further this gentleman, I understandj was givien access to official documents in the Embassy. This gentleman had no connection with the Government of India. He was not under the discipline of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules. He was just on contract working as the Public Relations Counsellor. This gentleman started going to the Embassy, looking into the official records, calling for documents relating to what the Prime Minister might have said to the Ambassador and had a look at them. The staff of the Embassy objected to that also. Then this gentleman wanted to go to the Military Attachy's office to look into his papers and the Military Attache drew the line and said : 'Unless you get clearance from the Government of Tndia we cannot show you'. These are facts which I have checked up and verified. This gentleman has been given a position which is thoroughly unwarranted because he was not known as a very outstanding Information Officer. If the Government wants to spend money, I would like to know what is the extent of publicity done by this person. I have asked this question. How many articles about India has he got published in the American Press ? The American press is very chary of accepting articles from the Embassies. It is very difficult to get publicity done 'for any country unless tht ; newspaper believes in it or bas some interest in being posted with that country. This gentleman, I am told, was doing public relations work with the Senators.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All kinds of relations.

SHRI A. D. MANI ! Mr. B. K. Nehru is very well known. He is on first name calling terms. Where was the need for this gentleman to be appointed as a Public Relations Counsellor to go on contacting the Senators for the aid projects ? It was even made out in justification for the appointment that if he is not appointed the aid programme may fall through, that is to say, we would have been left without any dollar for our non-project aid and the U.S. would not have given. I hope if they want to appoint a man or if you want to do public relations counselling, there are competent men in India in the Secretariat itself who can do the job because we do not want this kind of cerson to work on a commercial basis at a fabulous cost of 60,000 dollars to India.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam, I would like to know from the Government why in the U.S. it thought it fit to employ Mr. Ganju to do its public relations paying such fabulous sums as have already been enumerated here. In the first place this gentleman was an employee of the Embassy and when he was transferred from the U.S. to a differ-

i ent country, he refused to get transferred and then resigned his job. When he resigned his job, the same Embassy went out of the way and tried to give him such business as he had been getting and he has been made the Public Relations Consultant. I do not know what expert know-

ledge he has. He might be doing public relations, Sometimes he might be indulging in paving the way for certain private relations also of which he seems to be quite an expert and I would like to draw the attention of the Government to two or three instances in which the Government of India has been made to pay exhorbitant sums in the course of the so-called public relationships.

Messrs Gilbane Construction Inc. C, New York, was given a contract. The original contract was for Rs. 3.28 lalchs.

but it went up to Rs. 8 lakhs. And this was arranged by Mr. Ganju and the difference in the contract was given on prorata basis. In another such deal Messrs. Messmore and Mamon Co., New York, was given a contract for $1.1 lalchs for decoration work and the overtime allowance in respect of the same came to $ 3.5 lakhs. Messrs. Reddar and Fin, Public Relations Consultants were paid $ 60,000.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : What are these contracts?

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): These contracts were given through Mr. Ganju by the Indian Embassy in the United States.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : For what purpose ?

AN HON. MEMBER: Decorating the Embassay probably.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Interior decoration.

SHRI G. MURAHARI : This firm Mestr.v Reddar and Fin was paid $ 60,000. This was approved by the Commerce Secretary. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, the then Finance Minister, had warned this Embassy about it. In spite of this such contracts were given. This only speaks of his influence in the Embassy and the persons concerned. He has not only been given fabulous sums for his own so-called services but also he has been given certain contracts by which he has not only made tons of money through the Government of India but is involved in such deals. I would like to know from the Government why the Government thought it fit to employ this gentleman, Mr. Ganju, and what are the great expert qualities of this gentleman which prompted the Government to appoint him as a consultant, and whether the contract has expired on August 9 of this year, and whether the Government intends fo renew this contract. If it is going to renew this contract, I would like to know why.

SHRr ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, my main objection to this appointment is not the amount but two objections in principle. First is that the Government employed an ex-employee who was so indisciplined that he refused to accept a transfer order, and when confronted with a transfer order he told the authorities, **I live in Washington as your employee or otherwise. I would not go to Colombo". If India is so poor in talent, is the world at large so poor in talent that the Govern-meni succumbed to' this blackmail and appointed this ex-employee on an exhorbitant salary ? The Government should have been able to withstand the blackmail and tell this man, "You either go to Colombo or we sack you." Instead they chose to reward him.

My second objection to this appointment in principle is that the Government should realise that offering whisky, as mentioned by Mr. A. D. Mani, is no publicity for India. Our real publicity is our achievement in our land. We cannot put all sort* of slippery customs as our public relation* work and expect them to impress the Americans, Russians or the British. I know there are more Americans in Delhi today than there were Britishers before 1947. Our real situation is known to them. Sometimes it is known to them more than it is known to our Ministers. Therefore, i this sort of false notion that if we have small young guys as our publicity agents we will get dollars etc. is all wrong and the sooner the Government gives it up and concentrates on achieving things in the country the better.

I want to know one thing from the Government. What was his salary when he was posted in India ?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Rs. 900 or Rs. 1,200.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Rs. 900 or Rs. 1,200. I should like to know how this man who was worth Rs. 900 or Rs. 1,200 in New Delhi became so important that he got somebody to telephone to people here that he had gone to see the Vice-President of the United States. Does our Govem-ment expect foreign aid on the basis of the correct estimate of our achievements-and our needs by a foreign. Government or on the basis of somebody who can enter somebody's house or somebody also can invite somebody to his own house 7 That sort of approach is very disappointing indeed. The salary offered to him i» enormous not only from the Indian standard but also from the standards in the United States. I am told that the Secretaries of

[Shri Arjun Arora]

State in the United States, Mr. Macnamara included, get only $25,000 per year and the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk gets $ 30,000 per year.

SHRJ A. D. MANI: He is doing work.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: He is doing more work certainly. Mr. Dean Rusk is running one of the two mightiest governments of the world and he is interfering in everybody's affairs. Now this man fails to get any publicity for anybody and gets a salary equivalent to two Secretaries of State of the United States.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He does a lot of other things.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Mr. Bhupesh .Gupta, my time is limited. I am allowed five minutes out of which four are already over. Only one minute is left and that I will devote not in meeting the interruptions of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and others but for telling the Government that it is no use a Minister of State rising at the end of these questions and reading out a typed statement written by somebody . . .

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am sorry, Madam, this is very unfair. What is the meaning of saying all this ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Do you not do that?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I can also say that the hon'ble Member is reading out from a brief given by others. What is he saying ? I never read from a typed script. I read only when it is necessary. This is not the way of respecting each other.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : You are very important. But I think this House thinks and this country thinks that there are more important people in the Government than the Minister of State here and who— I repeat— will only read typed statements and not meet all the points raised in the House. There is in this case a case for a thorough enquiry. The Government should be able to announce today that it will . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sack that man.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: ... enquire and fix the responsibility. If this Minister of State, who is paid about one-hundredth of the salary of Mr. Ganju, rises and makes that announcement, I will have the highest esteem for him and I will remember him for ever.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, according to the Budget Estimates of 1966-67 the allocation for the American Embassy is Rs. 25,79,800 by the existing rate of exchange. Out of this i Mr. Ganju accounts for Rs. 4,50,000. Therefore, he is a very important man, and I think in salary in Indian terms he gets more than the President of India gets.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : Four times.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Three times more than the President of India gets. If he is so favourite he should have been in the Rashtrapati Bhawan. Now, how did this man come in to occupy this position ? And now, how this man came to occupy such a position, that is most important. Now you know, some years ago, in 1958 or so, perhaps before that, he was working as a kind of Information Officer in the Pres's Information Bureau in charge of public relations work in the film world in Bombay. In 1958 he managed to get transferred to the External Affairs Division. In 1959 he was picked up by Mr. B. K. Nehru as his pers'onal public relations man in Washington.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: What is personal public relations man ? He cannot be his private public relations man.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Whatever relations they were, I do not know. Please understand what I have yet to say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What did you read first ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My note. And now that is the position, and you do not ask me to lay it on the Table of the House, because many of the things are here and I would not like to place them, because this is about internal affairs and I am not a crude type of man to lay them bare.

Now in 1964 what happened ? Mr. Ganju was ordered to be transferred from Washington to Colombo. Mr. B. K. Nehru tried very hard to get the order cancelled but did not succeed. He then got Mr. Ganju to resign his job and got him fixed up temporarily with Birlas' business house

in New York. Later he got Mr. Ganju fixed up as a partner with a chap named— I am using the American tern*—with a chap named Mr, Moss in New York. He became a partner with one who was functioning as public relations consultant in the Indian Embassy for the past five or six years. Previously Mr. Moss was being paid 50,000 dollars per year. Then Mr. Ganju entered the scene and is being paid 60,000 dollars per year. Now how does he get into such a position? Here I may tell you that he is a great favourite of Mr. B. K. Nehru, the Indian Ambassador, and everybody who lives in the United States, specially in New York around the Indian Embassy, knows it. He is a personal favourite of the present Railway Minis'ter, Mr. S. K. Patil. Let him come and deny it. He has also been once a favourite of a former Finance Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai. He dances attendance on the' high officers and Ministers when they go abroad, when they go to the United States of America, and does a lot of odd jobs for them. Now therefore he is an odd-job-man. Don't ask me to elaborate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Your time is over. You please wind up now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now that is how he wound his way and got into this position. Therefore I have only crossed the 't's and dotted the Ts of what many people have said about the rise of that man. Now we are concerned with the fall of that man. Therefore I say it is a scandalous thing. The Ministry should have known the public repercussions, should have anticipated the public repercussions of such an appointment where a man gets 37,500 dollars, or even, before devaluation, 25,000 dollars, and so on. Even if it was Rs. 25,000 per month, they should have known that the Indian people would never like it, that our public mind will be outraged when they come to know of such an appointment, that even from the point of view of public policy and public morality such an appointment was bad, that, however much they could gain through him— they could actually gain nothing through him—by way of so-called public relations, and so on, the country's morale will go down and there will be a big loss here. Therefore I charge the Government with favouritism because this man has curried favours with some of the Ministers and Secretaries, and so on, of the various Ministries in the country. I charge the Ambassador, Mr. B. K. Nehru, who has behaved in this irresponsible manner in this matter, and I charge the Ministry of External Affairs with not being vigilant about this well in time and stopping this kind of appointment. Therefore I demand that here the Minister should get up, and the Prime Minister should have been here, to tell us straightway that Mr. Ganhi'g appointment is cancelled here and now. His passport should be cancelled and he should be asked to return to the country and do whatever he likes here. And finally, before 1 sit down, I demand a thorough inquiry into the circumstances leading to his appointment to this position because, Madam, only before a court of inquiry, or an inquiry commission, can we possibly place the other facts that are in our possession. Some of them are very unsavoury and I would not even like to disclose them in public. But then an inquiry commission or an inquiry body should know what has happened It is a big scandal and I do not know how much we have lost in prestige in the Uaited States of America although many people must have come to know of it. As for Mr. Ganju's other personal matters. T have deliberately not gone into them. He does not seem to be a very reputable man. He has a very questionable character himself lacking in integrity. lacking in character, lacking in sense of honour, and everything good and he is an instrument of corruption and various other things, operating in New York for the convenience of some Ministers and some high officials. Sack that man at once.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes each, and everyone has to keep himself to that time. Mr. Rajnarain.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीया, भारतवर्ष में 7500 आदमियों की जितनी आय होगी कम से-कम उतना पा रहा है गंजू—नेहरू परिवार, कश्मीरी ।

उपसभापति : देखिये, पांच मिनट चले जायेंगे ।

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा निवेदन है · · · · मैं स्वत: इस समय अर्जुन अरोड़ा साहब को बहुत

[श्री राजनारायण]

ही धन्यवाद देता हूं । मुझे एक शेर याद आ गया :

जमाना आएगा जब इसको सब समझेंगे ऐ गालिब।
अभी तो आप खुद कहते हैं खुद तनहा समझते हैं ।।

अभी दो घंटे पहले मैं खुद कह रहा था और खुद समझ रहा था । मगर दो घंटे पहले मैंने जो कुछ कहा, ट्रेजरी बेन्च के जितने लोग बोले हैं, सब उसी को कह रहे हैं । केवल एवस्ट्रैक्ट जहां तक है तहां तक ट्रेजरी बेन्च हमारे साथ है, जहां कान्क्रीट हो जाता है ये उल्टे चले जाते हैं। जहां तक भ्रष्टाचार मिटाने की बात है हमसे आगे हल्ला मचाएंगे, जब हम कहेंगे कौन भ्रष्टाचारी को पकड़ेगा तब यहां पर चिनकेंगे । नेहरू शब्द का नाम लेकर चिनक गये । यह नेहरुआ एक रोग होता है, बाबू गंगाशरण जो इसको समझते हैं :

"अहंकार अति दुःखद डमरुआ।
दम्भ कपट मद मान नेहरुआ ।।"

गोसाईं तुलसीदास जी ने नेहरुआ रोग की चर्चा की, यह रामायण के उत्तर काण्ड में लिखा हुआ नेहरुआ रोग हमारे देश में शुरू से लग गया, हमारे देश को शुरू से ऐसा खा गया कि इस समय कोई चाहे, बिना इस सरकार को हटाए बचाना, तो बचा नहीं सकता है । क्या कोई मामूली बात है । भगत जी लेक्चर देंगे कि जैसा वे करते हैं वैसा हमारे लिये भी कह सकते हैं । यह कहना नहीं चाहिये । अगर माननीया भगत को संसदीय प्रणाली की स्थिति का ज्ञान होता तो उनको समझना चाहिये था कि एक सरकारी आदमी और एक प्राइवेट मेम्बर, दोनों में क्या फर्क है । हम नोट पढ़ सकते हैं, हमको दूसरे लोग इन्फारमेशन देते हैं, हमारे पास सारा सेक्रेटेरिएट नहीं होता । अगर सरकारी मंत्री कहेंगे, जिस ढंग से अर्जुन अरोड़ा को कह दिया, अगर भगत जी कहेंगे तो अपने कर्त्तव्यों की अवहेलना करेंगे । मैं जानना चाहता हूं, 900 से डाक कर 3,000 और 3,000 से डाक कर 37,000 जब एक व्यक्ति चला जाये . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Madam, there is another meeting going on there.

श्री राजनारायण : नौटंकी कर रहे हैं । माननीया, इस तरह चेयर के सामने पीठ करके नहीं खड़ा होना चाहिये ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why is he going away?

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा कहना है कि कहीं न कहीं कोई इतनी बड़ी हस्ती है कि एक व्यक्ति जो हमारी सेवा में है वह भी हमारी सेवा से अलग होता है । कब ? जब उससे कहते हैं सीलोन जाइये । नहीं जाता है । वहीं पर जम जाता है । उसी को हम 37,000 रु० महीना पैदा करने का प्राविजन कर देते हैं । इससे बड़ी लज्जा की बात, राष्ट्र के सम्मान को गिराने की बात और राष्ट्र के कैरेक्टर एसेशिनेशन की बात और क्या हो सकती है ? जो लोग हमसे यह पूछते हैं कि आप किस तरह से यहां कैरेक्टर असेशिनेशन कर रहे हैं तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि गंजू को अमेरिका में, वाशिंगटन में रख कर क्या इस राष्ट्र के कैरेक्टर का असेशिनेशन नहीं किया गया है ? जितना जबरदस्त असेशिनेशन इस सरकार ने किया उतना कोई नहीं कर सकता है । तो मेरा निवेदन यह है कि भगत जी मामूली उत्तर लेकर यहां न आयें । अगर भगत जी को "भगत" नाम को सार्थक करना है तो वे अच्छे तरीके से सदन का समय ले लें, मगर इस समय सदन के समय का दुरुपयोग न करें और इसके लिये एक जांच कमेटी बना दें जो बताये कि नेहरू परिवार से उनका क्या संबंध था । 37 हजार रुपया जो उनको मिलता था वह कहां और कैसे खर्च होता था और किस तरह से श्री बी० के० नेहरू बीच में आये ? श्री बी० के० नेहरू की आमदनी कहां और कैसे जाती थी, उसका पूरा-पूरा विवरण यहां पर आना चाहिये । मेरे पास

इतना समय नहीं है कि सब बात कहूं मगर मैं इस संबंध में बहुत कुछ कहना चाहता था ।

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, before the hon. Minister replies I would like to have a categorical denial from the hon. Minister that there is no proposal before Ihe Government for renewing the contract with Mr. Ganju on 60,000 dollars for the next year.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I hope the Minister has noted down all the questions that were raised here now.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I am very grateful to the hon. Members who demanded this discussion. I am grateful to the Chairman also for this discussion because in the very short period of time available during the Question Hour I could not do justice to this important question, and a wrong impression was created that something wrong had happened and Go\-ernment was on the defence. I therefore, very much appreciate this occasion that has been given to me to clarify the point.

At the very outset I can assure the hon. Members tbat during the period intervening I had gone into this question very carefully and collected all the materials from my own Ministry and also from the External Affairs Ministry and I also got certain facts from Washington through cable in order to assure myself whether in the impression that had been created there was any truth or not.

Sum BHUPESH GUPTA : From whom in Washington ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: From sources available to Government. My hon. friend will kindly hear me with some patience and not interrupt me. I heard him without interrupting him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I only ask from whom in Washington you got the particulars.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I can assure the House that after going into this matter in all details I find that there is nothing that I can think of as being wrong. I do not think that anything wrong has happened and though the hon. Member called this a big scandal according to him, I feel that it is a scandal to call this a scandal.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : First of all, I strongly protest against that statement of the Minister.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Let me say what the position is.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : This kind of thing I will not allow to go without a protest.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I am not yielding.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Is it not a fact that the man has a contract for so much ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am coming to that. I know the hon. Member is in the habit of describing every matter as important and a matter of high corruption. He describes every little thing as an important thing as if that is the way in which the affairs of the land should be conducted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Accept the thing and don't try *to* be brave.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Let me take the first of these questions. It is said that a very high remuneration was paid. I said the other day that 60,000 dollars were paid on a contract basis. But it is not to an individual but to a firm. It is 3,000 dollars as retainer per month.

(Interruptions)

I think, Madam, if am not interrupted, I can continue.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is it for?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Knowing the weakness of their case they are trying to interrupt me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member wants *to* know the details.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: This sum of 60,000 dollars was paid not *to* an individual but to a firm.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Who paid the money ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am not willing to be subjected to such interruptions after every sentence. It is unparliamentary.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : *Ur.* Gupta, if you want to know all the facts listen to hirn patiently.

. SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Of this sum of 60,000 dollars, 24,000 dollars was on the actual eost basis. This 24,000 dollars was under two categories. 12,000 dollars were for entertainment, travelling, telephones, telegrams, and contingencies on the actual expenses basis. And another category accounting for 12,000 dollars was for economic newsletter, press clippings, photographs, cyclostyling, distribution of speeches and press summaries, printing of news features etc. Of the remaining 36.000 dollars, 900 dollars per month represented the salary that he was being paid. What is the other break-up of this sum 7 A sum of 1,200 dollars per month was for two permanent employees of the firm—Mr. Ben Lee, and the author, and newspaper reporter and Mary Ellen, the Secretary-cwm-production asststant. Another 500 dollars were given to part-time employees, 300 dollars for office-rent, IOO dollars for rent of office equipment. Let us see the facts because facts speak for themselves. This leaves 900 dollars per month to Mr. Ganju. This is inclusive of the taxes and social security and it compares favourably with 840 dollars which he was getting last time when he resigned. So I think it compares well with that.

It is asked why he was given this contract and why some other person was not considered ? What are his special qualifications ? All these questions were asked. Another question that is asked is whether there was any precedent. There aTe precedents, not one but several. Commercial public relations consultants were engaged since 1951. That is to say, in 1951-52 Mr. Burney was engaged on a retention fee ' of 35,000 dollars. A sum of 35,000 dollars in 1951-52 is really higher in real value than this sum we have paid now. Then in 1958-59 another, Mr. Moss wa* retained on a sum of 72,000 dollars. This is much higher than the sum of 60,000 that is now given. And again the retention fee was 36,000 dollars. So this figure of 36,000 is relevant. If you had engaged an American firm, as facts are, you would have had to spend much more than this sum for getting a reasonably good firm to do this work for you. It might have been 100,000 dollars or even 150,000 dollars. Therefore, from a purely remunerative point of view it is not as if a higher amount is paid to this firm and a higher salary has been paid and this person has been' the beneficiary to that extent.

Why a person who resigned was given this task, is another question asked. The hon. Member said that he was taken in after only a few days. Now on the 1st of February he resigned and the contract was given to him on the 9th of August.

[That is not an interval of a few days. There is some difference between a few days and six months. It shows how the j hon, Member bases his arguments. He said that a sum of 92,000 dollars was paid. I put it to the House to see the contradictions in the hon. Member's statements. He said that a sum of 92,000 ! dollars was paid to this man and that too within a few days. Is there not a distinction between the two ?

SHW S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras) : You are in possession of all the particulars in the brief which your Secretary had supplied you. As for us, whatever we have been able to get by way of information we placed before the House. As for the breakup that you have given just now I don't think it is coirect.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : No more questions, please. The hon. Member has had j his say. He said 92,250 dollars. I en-I quired from him if he meant dollars and he said 92,250 dollars. Madam, it is an absolutely incorrect thing; no other payment j than this has been made to hirn.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: What about the many other deals that he has put through ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Well, I do not have that information with me. That is why I asked, which contract ? It does not relate to this contract about public relations consultancy. It is something else.

श्री राजनारायण : आपके लिये अच्छा है भगत जी, कि आप कह दें कि एक इन्क्वायरी बैठेगी । क्यों सदन का समय नष्ट कर रहे हैं ?

श्री अवधेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार) : इतने क्लीयर केसके लिये इन्क्वायरी कमेटी क्यों बैठेगी ?

श्री राजनारायण : क्योंकि मिनिस्टर कहता है कि उसके पास इन्फार्मेशन नहीं है ।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT ; Then a question was asked . . .

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : आपकी मिनिस्ट्री ने एक बार आब्जेक्ट किया है ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: By interruptions they want to take away the strength of my arguments.

श्री राजनारायण : सरकार डिसआर्डर क्रिएट कर रही है । आप कहती है "आर्डर, आर्डर", हम लोग तो आर्डर में हैं, मगर सरकार डिसआर्डर क्रिएट कर रही हैं ।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Now, as a result ' of this appointment there has been additional saving in the Embassy. Firstly, the post of the Public Relations Attache has been held in abeyance; that means a saving of 12,000 dollars per annum. The annually there is a provision in the Budget under which some expenditure is incurred for new publicity arrangements. On it 35,000 dollars per year is spent. This has not i been incurred now. Apart from all these, Ofl merits itself, it is not a high remunera- ' tion either to him individually or to the firm as such because if you had gone to i any other American firm you would have had to spend much more. So there is a net saving of 47.000 dollars in the Budget of the Embassy. Therefore if you look at this in this context no high remuneration is given. Then there was a point whether this is necessary at all. An hon. Member said that our achievements are such that (they will speak for themselves. This view of publicity, this view of projecting our ; image abroad has been rejected by both the Houses several times. Often times in the debates on external affairs

SHM ARJUN ARORA : You have no achievements to show.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : What is necessary in the- modern world is right public relations. Many times we have suffered on vital questions and it has been admitted in the House as well as outside that because of that we are not able to project our image abroad, we are not able to explain our case to the world. Why was it that a laige number of Members went to the various countries last year ? It was to explain things to these countries and their people. Therefore it is not right to say that this is not needed. Firstly they based their case- on the ground that high remuneration was paid. When that ground has fallen flat, now another reason is being advanced that this is not necessary. I think this argument is also baseless because it is very necessary that we should have right public relations in every country, much more so in import ant countries like the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and other places. It was asked why he resigned. Well, everybody has the right to resign under the Government rules.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Madam, the question was not whether he had the right to resign or not but after his resignation he was picked up by Mr. B. K. Nehru and appointed. Why was this done especially when he had refused to go to Colombo ?

श्री राजनारायण : उसने आर्डर को फ्लाउट करके रिजाइन किया । सीलोन न जाकर के रिजाइन किया ।

SHRI G. MURAHARI : He could not leave the night clubs of New York. That was the trouble.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Hon. Members may have private information which I may not have. He should be having information about night clubs and other things. I do not have that.

He was asked to go to Colombo. He was given a medical chit tbat he was suffering from hypertension and he took leave.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Can a hyper-tension man be appointed as Public Relations Officer?

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I will have my say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA . Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha has been a good public relations man. Will he appoint a hypertension man for maintaining public relations ?

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, ऐसा लगता है कि गंज केवल नाचने की कला में प्रवीण नहीं है, नचाने की कला में भी प्रवीण है और वह इस सरकार को नचा रहा है ।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: The point is, this gentleman resigned on the 1st February. He was allowed to resign and after resignation he can take up anything. It was said that he had private business earlier. I say categorically that he had no such business. He had never had any private business while he was in service. After resignation he took up this work and on merits the contract was given to this public relations consultancy. It was asked of me, who decided it. It was decided by the then Finance Minister. It is said that he was on good terms with Mr. S. K. Patil, Mr. Morarji Desai and some others. These persons, Mr. S. K. Patil and Mr. Morarji Desai, are well known and in many ways they are persons with opposite predilections, and a man who is on good terms with both must be a useful person.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the key to his success. I agree. Human relations are relations of opposites; you understand that of course; don't you ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I can understand if he says that the Ambassador in the U.S.A. likes him but I can assure him that the Ambassador may like him for his good qualities. We should not judge a man or pre-judge a man either out of sympathy or out of prejudice. Both are bad and both will lead to wrong judgments. Let us judge the man on his merits. I can assure hon. Members that the Ambassador in the U.S.A. had no final say in this matter.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Final say.

AN HON. MEMBER : Initially he suggested it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Of course, the final say was .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Do you mean to say that a person favoured by the Finance Minister of the country and the Ambassador. Mr. Nehru, will be treated unfavourably by anybody ? Am I to believe that?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : The responsibility is that of the party who finally decided a thing. In the parliamentary system the Minister is responsible. The Finance Minister in the light of all considerations before him decided

(Interruptions)

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Madam, we cannot follow anything.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Even if you think they are wrong, you must listen.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : That is deliberate; I am sorry to say that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : One single interview with the Minister and Mr. Amln-chand Pyarelal gets the order cancelled. Here this gentleman is friendly with Mr. S. K. Patil, Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. B. K. Nehru and are we to believe that still that man would not be given any favours in this regime ? Are we fools or what ?

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh): Why should the hon. Member stand up all the time and not allow the Minister to speak ? The business of the House fe governed by certain rules of procedure and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has never observed the rules. By doing this he is showing discourtesy to the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta. I hope you will not interrupt.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Madam, having repudiated that charge that he gets favours because he is the faumrite of some people, I can also repudiate strongly the unfair charge made that this gentleman is related to the Prime Minister, or related to the Nehru family. Madam, in season and out of season such baseless things are being said by hon. Members and I do not know how to deal with such matters. They have no respect for themselves and they go on making insinuations and allegations which are absolutely baseless. I do not know, how the hon. Member has come to sav this. I do not know if he has personal knowledge; may be somebody told him

that this gentleman is related to the Prime Minister and he has

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because he was the favourite of Mr. B. K. Nehru somebody thought that be may be related.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Madam, I am coming to the end of my arguments. As I said, this has been given to a firm and not to any individual, no high remunera-tion has been paid and about the special qualities that he was possessed of, I have said

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What are they 7

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: If we had gone to any other agency for this purpose the expenditure would have been much more and therefore the remuneration given to this firm was reasonable. In the public relations work the main elements are knowledge of the country and the environments and the special contacts one has.

Sum BHUPESH GUPTA: Contacts 7 Very special indeed.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Of course, yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I entirely agree that his contacts were spread so far and wide that . . . *(Interruptions)*

SHRI I. K. GUIRAL : Madam, is it open to a Member to do "Kathakali" when he stands up ? We are fed up with this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is provoking

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, Order.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA : This is not thf way of decent behaviour, I would request the Chair to please observe the rules and *(Interruptions)* see that the procedure is ob-served. Otherwise adjourn the house.

THt DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please take your teat. I am on my feet. I expect a certain amount of

L116RS/66—570—20-6-67—G.I.P.F.

general, ordinary decency. When the Minister speaks, it may not be palatable to you, but you must listen to him before yon stand up. You may ask for clarifications at the end of the speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA . Do not talk about decency.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Mr. Gupta, I think . . *{Interruptions)*

SHM BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, some suggestion you made, You remarked by implication and you are virtually calling up indecent.

(Interruption)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I waa asked tc deny categorically whether the contract il being renewed at a hundred thousand dollars. Actually there is a request for the renewal of the contract, but not for lOO.OOC dollars, but for another term on the same basis as 60,000 dollars. It has just come We are looking into it and we will deckle it on merits. So, I think, I have tried tc answer the points and clear the misunder standing that has been created. I repea again that this contract given to this Ara was on reasonable remuneration

HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : They have do* good work. It is on a reasonable remune ration. The firm as done a good piece 0 work during this one year. If at all, the have done a service to our public relation and they have spread our image abroad.

SHRI S. S MARISWAMY: Madam, want to seek a clarification.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I do n< think so. We have had a full discussio and we do not want anything further c this. The House stands adjourned ti 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned thirteen minutes past five of tl clock till eleven *ot* the clock c Thursday, the lit Septembc 1966.