

needs complete all requisite formalities. LPG trade at this station will be handed over to them. No applications for award of the agency were invited, since the appointment of distributors from amongst defence personnel is made on the recommendations of the DGR.

**Use of Nuclear Explosion in Oilshab Exploitation sought by O.N.G.C.**

3735. SHRI P. GANGADEB:  
SHRI D. D. DESAI:

Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS be pleased to state

(a) whether Oil and Natural Gas Commission is collecting information from the U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and other foreign countries on nuclear based oilshab exploitation;

(b) whether any information has been obtained so far,

(c) if so, the broad outlines thereof, and

(d) whether Oil and Natural Gas Commission is going to pool its knowledge and resources in making experiment to extract oil from dismantled oil wells in Gujarat?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI SHAHNAWAZ KHAN) (a) Yes Sir, the developments are being followed from published literature.

(b) Yes, Sir

(c) In U.S.A. and Soviet Union nuclear explosions for the stimulation of oil and gas reservoirs have been done on experimental basis. Improvements in flow rate of oil and gas have been reported from both countries. American reports indicate that the process is still in an experimental stage and it is not known whether it will be economic

(d) Since there are no dismantled oil wells in Gujarat, the question of making experiments to extract oil from them does not arise.

12 hrs.

**QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE**

**FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO LAY BEFORE THE HOUSE MEMORANDUM OF ACTION TAKEN ON SUGAR INDUSTRY INQUIRY COMMISSION REPORT**

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I had raised a privilege issue last time and on the technical ground that the report that was submitted on 15th May 1973, happened to be an interim report according to the Minister, with which you agreed, that issue was not pressed then. I am not raising that same issue, because I cannot challenge your ruling. But now again another privilege is attracted by a further development.

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not come under privilege motion every time. I fully appreciate your point. I have seen this. When the Government fails to fulfil certain legal or constitutional obligations, it is not always a matter of privilege. It can be the subject of censure or other discussion, not as a privilege. Do not come under this always. Otherwise, you can make your point.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Yesterday the Minister of Agriculture, Shri Subramaniam, laid on the Table what he considers as the final report of the Sugar Industry Inquiry Commission. Again I want to point out that another important provision of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952 has been violated, and contempt of the House committed. According to Section 3(4), they are obliged to place before the House not only the report of the Inquiry Commission but also the memorandum of action taken. Unfortunately, after submitting this report, simultaneously they have also submitted what they describe as a memorandum of action. In reality, this memorandum is like the holy Roman empire which is neither holy nor Roman. It cannot be described as a memorandum of action. Even

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

by the dictionary meaning, memorandum of action on the report means if any action is taken on the recommendations made in the report. In that case, that action has to be mentioned in the memorandum. But strangely enough and probably under certain pressure, they have submitted a memorandum. It is a very interesting thing.

MR SPEAKER: In my own opinion also, this is not a memorandum.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am very happy you have made that observation. In order that the House should also know, I will quote. In the so-called memorandum on p 3, it is stated:

"In view of the sizeable financial outlay and complex administrative issue involved, Government would need some more time to examine the matter in detail and arrive at a decision".

Sir, as far as nationalisation is concerned, the report was submitted and admitted by Mr. Subramaniam on 15th May, 1973. More than a year has lapsed and, after that, they want from you more time not only to take a decision, but even to examine the report. Even for examination, they want more time. They want more time for a decision. Sir, I would like to submit, if ordinary reports are withheld and no decision is taken, perhaps, there may be no loss to the economy. But, this is an important matter. I do not want to go into the merits of the case for nationalisation just now. Even my friends like Mr. Pilloo Mody, in spite of their attitude towards nationalisation, will be able to agree to this particular fact that we should have either nationalisation or have a firm decision not to have nationalisation. But, when you keep the issue pending then there is neither the state of private entrepreneurship in running the sugar industry nor those who are interested

in nationalisation of the industry get justice. As a result of this suspension, the actual productivity of the industry suffers. Through this indecision of the Government and through the contempt of the House that they have committed, it is not merely that some Constitutional technicalities have been harmed, but even nationalisation will be impaired. Therefore, Sir, since they have committed a contempt of the House, at least this time you should announce in the House, that they have committed a contempt of the House, that they have violated the Act, and therefore, they must come forward with an unqualified apology. Otherwise, in spite of your observation that it does not attract privilege, I feel, contempt of the House is really a breach of privilege and therefore privilege is attracted.

SHRI H N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta—North-East): What is the response of the Government? Government must respond.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: When Mr. Subramaniam's name was announced, he should have had the courtesy to remain in the House. I have all respect to Mr. Shinde. Perhaps, he may be able to give a better reply. But, I would have very much liked Mr. Subramaniam to be present in the House, when his name is involved.

MR. SPEAKER: I think he may not have received the notice—I understand notice has been sent. I think he will see these things all right.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Sir, I rise on a point of order. Mr. Shinde cannot speak on this. The privilege motion has been moved by my hon. friend against Mr. C. Subramaniam and it is he who should reply. He cannot depute somebody by proxy.

MR. SPEAKER: I think he should reply.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN  
THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE  
(SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE):  
I would request him.

MR. SPEAKER: I will send it to  
him. He will be given the notice.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:  
Do I take it that you feel that there  
is a *prime facie* case that the require-  
ment of Section 34 of the Commission  
of Inquiry Act, 1952 has not been  
fulfilled?

MR. SPEAKER: Either you ask  
for my observation or you say that he  
should come and explain. This will  
be sent to him. Then, I will come  
with my observations.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Dia-  
mond Harbour): My information  
is, hon. Minister Mr. C. Subramaniam  
has duly received the notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Your information  
is wonderful information.

12.10 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REVIEW AND ANNUAL REPORT WITH  
AUDITED ACCOUNTS OF OIL AND NATU-  
RAL GAS COMMISSION FOR 1972-73

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM  
AND CHEMICALS (SHRI D. K.  
BOROOAH): I beg to lay on the  
Table—

- (1) A copy of the Annual Report  
together with the Audited  
Accounts (Hindi and English  
versions) of the Oil and  
Natural Gas Commission for  
the year 1972-73 and of its  
subsidiary company Hydrocar-  
bons India Private Limited,  
New Delhi, for the year 1972,  
under sub-section (3) of  
section 23 read with sub-  
section (4) of section 22 of

the Oil and Natural Gas  
Commission Act, 1959.

- (2) A copy of the Review (Hindi  
and English versions) by the  
Government on the above  
Report. [Placed in Library.  
See No LT-8294/74].

#### ORDER OF DELIMITATION COMMISSION IN RESPECT OF TAMIL NADU

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN  
THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE  
AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI  
NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY):  
I beg to lay on the Table a copy of  
Order No. 21 (Hindi and English  
versions) of the Delimitation Com-  
mission in respect of the State of  
Tamil Nadu, published in Notification  
No. S.O. 463(E) in Gazette of India  
dated the 31st July, 1974, under sub-  
section (3) of section 10 of the  
Delimitation Act, 1972. [Placed in  
Library See No LT-8295/74].

REVIEWS AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF  
INDIAN DRUGS AND CHEMICALS LTD.,  
NEW DELHI, ENGINEERS INDIA LTD.,  
NEW DELHI, PYRITES PHOSPHATES AND  
CHEMICALS LTD., DEHRI-ON-SONS AND  
FERTILIZERS AND CHEMICALS. TRAVAN-  
CORE LTD., ELOOR FOR 1972-73

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN  
THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM  
AND CHEMICALS (SHRI SHAH-  
NAWAZ KHAN): I beg to lay on  
the Table a copy each of the follow-  
ing papers (Hindi and English ver-  
sions) under sub-section (1) of section  
619A of the Companies Act, 1956:—

- (1) (i) Review by the Govern-  
ment on the working of the  
Indian Drugs and Pharma-  
ceuticals Limited, New Delhi,  
for the year 1972-73.
- (ii) Annual Report of the Indian  
Drugs and Pharmaceuticals  
Limited, New Delhi, for the  
year 1972-73 along with the  
Audited Accounts and the  
comments of the Comptroller  
and Auditor General there-  
on.