

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, Order.

श्री ललित नारायण मिश्र : मुझे अभिमान है कि वे हमारी नेता हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : तुम्हारी सरकार की नेता हो सकती हैं, कांग्रेस पार्टी की नेता हो सकती हैं, देश की नेता नहीं ।

श्री ललित नारायण मिश्र : मेरी बात सुनिये, नाराज न होइये ।

भूपेश जी ने कहा योजना के सम्बन्ध में मुझे पूरा व्यौरा नहीं मिला है । मैं आज इतना ही कहूंगा कि बिना विरोधियों के सहयोग से इतनी बड़ी योजना चल नहीं सकती । उनके सहयोग की अपेक्षा करता हूँ और उनसे दरखास्त करता हूँ कि वे सहयोग दें । अमीचन्द प्यारेलाल की बात कही गई । हर व्यक्ति को अमीचन्द प्यारेलाल का बुखार चढ़ गया है । उस विषय में मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता क्योंकि इन्क्वायरी होगी, सारी बातें साफ हो जायेंगी ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

THE JAYANTI SHIPPING COMPANY (TAKING OVER OF MANAGEMENT) BILL, 1966

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now we pass on to the next item on the agenda—the Bill about the taking over of the management of the Jayanti Shipping Company. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : Madam, before calling upon the Minister to move

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What do you want before that ? Let him move his motion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Before that, Madam, . . .

THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT, AVIATION, SHIPPING AND TOURISM (SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY) : The motion has to come before the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you going to say anything concerning this Bill?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Yes, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then I think the House should first get seized of the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Not concerning the Bill, but . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How do you know his mind ? Yes, Mr. Reddy.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Regarding the discussion of this Bill, Madam, . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On this, Madam, I have to say something.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : About this Bill?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is in connection with the . . .

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: Madam. Mr. Gupta can say it later.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of order, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What point of order ? There is no point of order now. (*Interruptions.*) Order, order. I would request hon. Members not to have this kind of delaying tactics. There is nothing before the House now. There is a vacuum. The business has to begin now and I call on the Minister to begin the business with the next item on the agenda.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Madam, I beg to move :

"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

[Shri Sanjiva Reddy].

same, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Certain things have to be brought to the notice of the House, Madam.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : This matter with which the Bill deals has been very much in the public controversy and I think there is some mistaken notion also in the mind of the public and also in the minds of hon. Members opposite. I would, therefore, like to place the facts before the House so that the discussion may be directed on the proper lines. For instance, Madam, there are some people who think that the Government granted a sum of Rs. 20 crores to some individuals. This is a wrong notion. It is not so. Rs. 1.5 crores was raised by the company for them to get a loan granted. It is said that some people with Rs. 200 capital got a loan of Rs. 20 crores. It is not so. They had to raise the capital and the proportion of equity capital was 1 to 4. That is to say, if they raised Re. 1 then they got a loan of Rs. 4. For other concerns the proportion is 1 to 6. Mr. Teja also was demanding it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He is Dr. Teja.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The whole thing is a hoax. That "Doctor" is also a hoax.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: Sir, some hon. Members' in the other House took objection when I referred to the person as Dr. Teja. Now Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is taking objection if I call him Mr. Teja. I do not know which one is correct.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I say it is all a hoax.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Mr. Teja was asking Government also to raise the equity loan proportion to 1 to 6 because other companies were getting it. But in

the case of Mr. Teja it was only 1 to 4.

if he put one rupee he got a loan of Rs. 4. Therefore for any loan to be given to him it was a condition imposed on him that he should raise the share capital of Rs. 150 lakhs. It was only after he raised the capital that the loan was given to him. There seems to be some mistaken notion. The loan was not given to him the moment he negotiated. A ship was handed over and a representative of the Government went there and took charge of the ship and paid one-tenth as the first instalment. Later on of course it was to be paid in seven years in annual instalments*. The whole thing would be a loan but all the ships for which loan has been given are there in our possession today. They are earning foreign exchange; they are on the high seas, carrying material to other countries and bringing material from other countries.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh : Are there 11 ships ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Yes; 11 ships'. But he has got other ships also, about ten of them, for which loan has not been given by the Government. They are through banks or financial corporations or from somewhere else. I do not know how he managed to get all of them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But he was given huge salaries . . .

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: Those details about scales of pay, etc. can come later on. Now I am only placing some facts before you so that . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Madam, on a point of order. He says that he is placing facts but he is withholding facts. That is what I wanted to raise. He has kept back the documents which are . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : But you have not allowed him to finish.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Documents which are very much necessary for the discussion of the Bill have been withheld. The point is, Madam, in the Board of Directors there were differences of opinion. Even the Sukhthankar Committee Report says that . . .

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: AU that can come in the debate.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, is he giving the ruling ? It is you who have to give the ruling.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I do not know what your point of order is.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Why should he get up when I am raising the point of order ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What is the point of order ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I should be allowed to explain.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : First listen to the point of order and then everything will be all right.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Madam, it was discourteous on the part of the Minister to get up when I was making my point.

SHRI N. SANHVA REDDY: No, no.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The point is that even the Sukhthankar Committee in its Report has" mentioned that they have not been posted with all the facts. Information was withheld from them because they did not have ample powers. That is point No. 1. Secondly the Minister should have circulated to the Members or at least placed on the Table of the House the proceedings of the Board of Directors. Because two of the Directors were Government Directors they could have access to the proceedings of the meetings of the Board of Directors. My information is that there were serious differences of opinion between the Directors—I would rather say among the Directors—about the management of the company.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please be brief.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The second point is. the quarterly return which each Company has to submit to the Company Law Administration should be made available to the Members. I say that that has been intentionally withheld.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes; the Minister will continue.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Madam, you should say somethin gon this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have given information from your side. Now iet the Minister say what he has got to say.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Madam, I would like to give all the information available. All the information I have I wiH place before the House. During their speeches they will naturally make some points and I will then have time to get further information if necessary. I can assure the House and the hon. Members that nothing will be kept back from them.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): You have given Dr. Teja a certificate; how can we believe you?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: My friend, Mr. Patel, was a good friend of Dr. Teja. He was also using his chartered planes. I know he was getting all! privileges from him.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I have never used his hospitality. It is the Congress Ministers who have been his friends. I have never used his plane. Madam, he should withdraw it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Dahyabhai Patel is an intimate friend of Dr. Teja; it is a well known fact.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: He must withdraw it.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: I am not going to withdraw that; I am going to prove it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It is a well known fact.

{Interruptions}

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I would not like allegations and counter-allegations to be made at this stage when the Bill is heing moved. As the debate goes on we shall see .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: How can these Congressmen make allegations like this when they themselves have been doing all these things ? They are the friends of Dr. Teja and now they come here . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sit down. We have .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Mr. Arora cannot shout me down. I am not

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel] going to be shouted down by these Congressmen.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : We have got proof. I have got photostat copies which I can place on the Table of the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I do not want anyone to interrupt the Minister just now. Will hon. Members please take their seats ? Let us have decency and decorum. Let us hear what the Minister has to say.

Sft TTSnTTTOT : JTRrftar *ftff ^
r>3T ^IT ^T ftt ^ftt •

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have already appealed to Members not to make allegations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point now is, whose friend is Dr. Teja. That is the point. We are interested to know because such people have divided affections.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : I have been saying that the loan is granted only when he raises the capital and the loan was granted to him when the ship was taken charge by the Government representatives. And only 10 per cent of it has been given to the Company. No money is given to Dr. Teja or Mr. Teja, in whatever way Mr. Bhupesh Gupta would like to address him. Whatever it is, the money was given when the ship was taken in charge. And the ships are there and they are earning money. They will repay. The ships are in charge of the Government, the Shipping Corporation, which is managing the Company. And about Rs. 8.0 crores has been given as loan and the ships are there. Therefore if at all Mr. Teja has swindled, he has swindled the Company's money and I would like to emphasise here that the Government money, the loan which was given by the Government, is quite safe. The ships are there; they are in our possession and there is not even a rupee of public money lost in this deal. Of course we have a number of instances where he has made money by illegal methods; being Chairman by not bringing things to the notice of other Directors of the Company. I can give you instances. I have I think already placed one or two examples before the House when I came last time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, we are told that Mrs. Teja is a beautiful lady.

AN HON. MEMBER: How are you interested ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: How you are interested, I do not know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are told that the ships begin to sail at the very sight of her without a pilot.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: I would like to emphasise that the money that was given as loan is not lost. We have got it; the ships will continue giving us very good returns.

Madam, it was asked why we have taken over for five years and then made it 15 years and why we could not nationalise it. That is a point which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is likely to raise in the discussion. Therefore I would like to place before him a few points so that he may be convinced. Madam, it was on 24th January that a new Ministry came into office. The Prime Minister and myself as the Minister concerned studied this case and it took us about eight to ten days to make a firm decision that something was wrong in this Company and that somebody must go into it; not the Minister, not a Deputy Secretary or somebody from the Department but somebody who is highly-placed who can go into the accounts and who can send a report to the Government. This decision was taken within ten days of the new Government being sworn in. Many scandals were there in the bazar and nobody knew the truth about it. And it is not as though I took the decision. The Prime Minister was aware of the whole thing. I went to her and took her permission for the step. And we did not want some X, Y or Z to take this up. We wanted a senior official. Mr. Sukhthankar is a senior official and a retired Governor and along with Mr. Sukhthankar we wanted some representative of the Auditor General to be associated in this so that they can go into the accounts properly and give us a report. The Auditor General gave us a name and the person was appointed. But unfortunately Mr. Teja did not co-operate. He was always out of India and his staff here did not give the Committee their cooperation. Therefore, I say that in the

course of my talks with Mr. Sukthankar and also Mr. Bhalla, who was then the representative of the Auditor-General, I was told by them that they were not getting co-operation. Whenever they sent for papers, the staff of the Jayanti Shipping Company had to send a telex message to Dr. Teja, wherever he was, and soon after they got his consent, they were given the papers. Therefore, there was some difficulty about it, but we were fairly convinced that there was something wrong with the Company, something smelling, something which should be caught hold of. To that extent at least we were convinced, though details were not available to us. It was at this stage we had a high-level Cabinet Sub-Committee consisting of the Law Minister, the Finance Minister and the concerned Minister. We sat together with all the officers of all the three departments and then decided : "Now, we should not waste time. No more committees, no more commissions. Let us take over the Company. Till then the truth will not come out." This decision was taken after a long discussion. Why is it then that we decided to take it over for five years and then five more years ? We could have taken it over straightaway, as we nationalised other companies. We had experience of the Metal Corporation, when we took them over. The compensation clause was not very much appreciated by the High Court. Therefore, a stay order was given. The whole thing is there. Of course, the Government has gone on appeal. There is a legal difficulty about it. With this experience we thought that if we took it over only for a limited period, the legal difficulty might not arise. You know what is what. What are the assets of this Company ? How many ships are there ? What is their condition ? What is their debt ? How much money is to be given to the creditors ? If all these things are known later on, after all, we can take a decision, whether to take it over completely or not. This was the decision reached after very careful consideration and on the advice of the legal department. So, this Company has been taken over for a particular period.

Now, there are a number of cases. I will place them before the House. Nothing will be kept back. It is now calculated that the Chairman of the Company has, may I say, swindled round about Rs. 2.9 crores

without the directors of the Company knowing anything about it. This came to light after we took it over. Absolutely nothing was known, except wild allegations. After the Company was taken over the Shipping Corporation's officers have been tabulating the accounts and they took some time because the accounts were not up to mark. They were behind by some months. Therefore . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : There was a Government director also. Was he not in touch with it?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : The Government director knew nothing about it. Several ships were purchased. About twenty ships were purchased .

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA (Madhya Pradesh) : Why should we appoint such persons ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Please hear me. It was not brought to their notice and it was not posted in the accounts. Ships are purchased, for instance, but how do you know without examination, that he is taking some commission in Japan ? The directors are there, the board meeting is there. Eleven ships are purchased there, you have got a few ships also, without anybody knowing anything. The gentleman, who is supposed to be the Chairman of the Company, takes two per cent.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Who were the auditors ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: Chopra and Company are the auditors. (*Interruption*). Please hear me. I have promised to give you all the information necessary. The two per cent commission, which he took on each ship, the directors could not have known and the Government director could not have known. That way, by way of two per cent commission on these ships he got Rs. 81,30,000, just 2 per cent, commission, without anybody knowing it. And also in the name of the Company he forged a resolution somewhere outside. There is no such resolution of the Company. It is not in the books. No one knows, not even the Government director. He went to the Mitsubishi International Corporation, a finance corporation, and took Rs. 90 lakhs. He forged a resolution saying that this

[Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy]

money may be given to Dr. Teja, who was the Chairman of the Company. He took the money and deposited it in his personal account—not the Company's account—and out of it fortunately when we took over the Company, there was still a balance of about Rs. 70 lakhs with the State Bank of India, London.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That has been frozen.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Fortunately the present Managing Agents took action. A case was filed in the court here and a stay order has been given. The sum of about Rs. 70 lakhs is frozen. It is now safe with the State Bank. Now, it will come to the Government. Not only that. Some other things came to light, which we would have never known, for instance, chartering ships from London. For chartering ships he credited the Amindo Company somewhere in America. To get hold of the accounts, there was nothing in India. The branch office is in London. He was dealing with it in London. They were keeping the accounts in America. They were keeping the accounts. In the case of chartering of ships, the chartering fee was 16 shillings per tonne, but only 15 shillings were credited. One shilling must be credited to his private account. This was the condition which he imposed. Some foreigners accepted it. That way, he took it for nineteen months and the amount was . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : The agreement was not signed with the directorate.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: Only 15 shillings were credited and under the agreement it was supposed to be 16 shillings. The condition imposed on the foreign companies was that one shilling shall be paid to him. But from the date we took it over, I am glad to announce that the same companies pay us 16 shillings from the 10th day of June, 1966. Finally they admitted that they have been paying him one shilling per tonne.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab) : What is the amount?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: The amount is Rs. 6,64,000. Also, the Amindo Company, the representative of these people in America, is supposed to have paid Mitsub-

bishi Heavy Industries Rs. 36,50,000. Now, absolutely nothing was paid to them. This money was also swindled. And then we have to send our representatives to America so that we may take legal opinion there and file a suit in America itself. Another amount is said to be given to Mitsubishi, but not received by Mitsubishi, involving Rs. 7,13,000. So, we sent our representatives to different countries and after taking legal advice we are going to file civil suits. About £ 1,10,000 or Rs. 23.1 lakhs is the part payment which Dr. Teja ought to have paid for the purchase of "Adi Jayanti" to the sellers, but it was not actually paid to them. The accounts show as if it has been paid. We find, after the taking over, that he has taken the money for himself and he has not paid it to this company.

One or two other things are there. Now, Madam, these Mitsubishi people have given us all the papers. I am very happy to say that all the foreign companies, with which he had dealings, have now given us total co-operation. They have given the originals. They have given the contracts whereby he took his commission and all that. Not only the ships are all there and the crew has given complete co-operation, but the foreign companies also, from which he got these monies and commissions, are co-operating and we have been given all these details. It is with the co-operation of these people that the Shipping Corporation and we have been able to roughly estimate it. That way he swindled about Rs. 2.9 crores of the Company's money.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : Whether the estimate is correct?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: It may be much more. We do not know, but within the short period from whatever we have been able to discover and get it confirmed, it is that. We cannot go on wild allegations. We cannot do it. Naturally there must be some evidence. On a mere allegation we cannot take it that this is the money. Then, people ask : What are you going to recover? He has no money here. He has no property. He is a non-resident Indian national. He is somewhere else. Therefore, he has not got any property, no immovable property, no assets and all that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL • A -nry patriotic Indian you call him.

SHW BHUPESH GUPTA : Mzy J inform you this ? He has yielded. He is a good man. On the 18th March, you -aid in this House :i—

"Dr. Teja, whom I happened to have met socially both in India and abroad, happens to be a very patriotic Indian. and with all the success he r.us made abroad, it is his dedicated des'ire ..."

Now, have you checked he print ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY; Is it my speech ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes. Such sacred words fall only fro"r> the lips of Ministers.

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY ■ I do not know. I have met him in India, but never outside India luckily. It is only in India that I have met him. Anyway. I am saving he has swindled this money. Fortunately for us, though he has not got any immcv able property here, he has got his share money. His share money is supposed to be Rs. 2.12 crores.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : How long - would the Minis'ier take ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Two or three minutes. His share money is supposed to be Rs. 2.12 crores. Also we have already frozen his deposit of about Rs. 65 lakhs in the bank. That is there with us now. If we wanted that money, we can attach that. Apart from that I may also state for the information of my friends that criminal cases have already been instituted against him for cheating. Government has not been soft with him. Government has taken action. Madam, since the day we took over this company he has not set his foot on the soil of this country. After all it is not that we can arrest anybody anywhere. He is in France. The case has to be proved here. Ultimately the Court has to give the verdict and then only we can go to a foreign country and ask them to hand over this man. A number of things have been raised and I do not want to go into all of them. I would only say that no money is lost. The Government money is quite safe. The company has also been taken over and if only we run the company properly in the coming five or ten years, the company can be put on firm leg".

! Ultimately when we attach his sharei, it becomes the property of the public sector. We need not take it today. The money automatically becomes the property of the public sector.

DR. D. R. GADGIL (Nominated) : I* he the sole private shareholder ?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY: He ia supposed to have Rs. 2.12 crores of shares. and Mr. Kulukundis, a foreigner, is supposed to have Rs. 70 lakhs of shares. Local people have nothing except two people having Rs. 1 lakh or so each.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about Mr. Thirumala Rao?

SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY : Except for Rs. 4i lakhs or so there is nobody in India other than these two people, Dr. Teja and Mr. Kulukundis. Other people have about Rs. 4i lakhs; this is the maximum belonging to others. Therefore, the money of both these people is there. Nothing is lost. I may tell one thing more. Within eight days we took a decision. It took eight days to study the file. The moment there was a *prima facie* case we naturally appointed a Committee. The Committee took a couple of months. When we found that the Committee was not effective, we immediately took action to take over the company. It is only after taking over that we can take action, criminal and civil. I do not know what more we can do than this.

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All questions and clarifications are to be asked tomorrow, because we have fixed some other business at 4 o'clock. I exceeded this only by three or four minutes.

So, we go to the next business, Short ! Duration Discussion. The time given for this discussion is one hour and I have eleven names here on this motion. Therefore, five minutes for each Member.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Madam, how can it be done ? There are Indian names which cannot be pronounced in five minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Then all the Members may not get a chance to speak on this.

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 dissatisfaction 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 have 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, lo and behold, the Government 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 the Government one simple question. If Mr. Ganju was very good, if Mr. Ganju was up to the mark, if Mr. Ganju had 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 is* 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 the reason for not continuing them? If they were not doing a good job, did we have 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 it is 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