

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH): (a) It has been agreed in principle to set up an Inter-Governmental Joint Commission for Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation.

(b) The composition and other details of the Commission are under consideration.

Jobs Lost by Workers in West Bengal in Retrenchment Closure and Lock-out in Factories and Industrial Establishments

4123. SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Will the Minister of LABOUR AND REHABILITATION be pleased to state:

(a) how many workers lost their jobs due to (i) closure (ii) lock-out of factories and industrial establishments in West Bengal since March, 1972 and due to retrenchment; and

(b) how many of such workers got back their jobs?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI G. VENKAT-SWAMY): (a) and (b). Information is being collected.

12.02 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED INSTRUCTIONS TO NETAJI INQUIRY COMMISSION NOT TO SEEK ANY HELP FROM TAIWAN

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Samar Guha.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): It is Mr. Samar Guha's day to-day.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, it is his day, Prof Samar Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

"The reported instructions issued to the Netaji Inquiry Commission by the Ministry of External Affairs not to seek any help from the Government or any non-official organisation in Taiwan."

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): The Netaji Enquiry Commission is an independent body which decides on its own procedures. When the Commission proposed to visit Taiwan, it sought Government's advice in the matter. The Government of India informed the Commission that it did not recognize Taiwan and, therefore, neither the Government nor the judicial bodies appointed by it could enter into direct or formal contacts with Taiwan Administration. It was, therefore, natural that the Government should suggest to the Commission to avoid any formal approach to the Taiwan authorities and to make an independent enquiry on its own.

Normally, the Commission, during its visits to foreign countries, had conducted its enquiries with the assistance of the Indian diplomatic missions abroad. In the case of Taiwan, this avenue was not available and the Commission had necessarily to rely on informal arrangements and assistance of private parties; Shri Samar Guha, we learn, actively assisted the Commission.

The Government has not received any indication from the Commission that Government's advice had, in any way, impeded its work of investigation in Taiwan. In fact, during its

[Shri Swaran Singh]
9 days' stay in Taiwan, the Commission visited all the places it wanted to and examined all the witnesses who came to offer evidence including those produced by Shri Smar Guha. According to our information, the Commission is satisfied with its work in Taiwan.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: During my eleven days' stay at Taipei on an effort to investigate into the issue of disappearance of Netaji at Taipei, I found no positive proof whatsoever of Netaji's reported death in the alleged plane crash at Taipei. From all the available facts, information, records and documents that we could get hold of, I have come back with the conviction that Netaji did not die in the alleged plane crash at Taipei. I met the Prime Minister and have indicated my views and the reasons for that, to her.

If the Minister of External Affairs did not issue any instruction to the Netaji Enquiry Commission and allowed it a free hand to investigate as it liked in Taiwan perhaps the Netaji mystery would have been finally resolved. Wherever I went they asked me one question. They asked me, "why have you come to Taipei after 27 years"? They told about this, whenever there is any incident, at any place, the first task of any committee, any commission, any Government, would be to see that they first visit the place of the occurrence of that event. When they asked me that question, why have you come after 27 years. I knew the answer, the political answer of it, but I did not tell that answer in that country, because, I did not want to discuss our international issues in a foreign country. Just, a few minutes back I have got along reply, a letter from the hon'ble External Affairs Minister because I wrote a long letter to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister directed that letter to

the External Affairs Minister, and I received this long letter from him. When I asked the Prime Minister why this instruction was given, she expressed her surprise. She told me, "I don't know anything, why they have done so, I don't know." There is no question which is more paramount than the question of doing every thing possible to enquire into the issue of the disappearance of Netaji at Taipei. For our country no question can be more paramount, more important, than to know what happened to one of our most beloved, one of our dearest leaders of the nation. The Minister was very kind in his reply to me. I quote from his letter to me. He says:

"It was through your effort and advice that the Commission was able to make a visit to Taiwan and hold its sittings there in a satisfactory manner."

Then the letter says:

"It was at your initiative that a formula was worked out which would make the visit possible on a private basis."

In that letter, he has further said. I quote:

"I understand that the question of obtaining evidence and witnesses was discussed with you extensively by Mr. Justice Khosla before the departure of the Commission for Taiwan."

Then it says:

"He had stressed to you that the Commission was relying on you and your friends for help in gathering the available evidence."

I want to make it very clear to you, Sir, that the Commission did not seek any advice from me at all. It is a fact that they wanted some names as witnesses and I gave some names. Justice Khosla did not have

even a syllable with me, what to speak of discussion, Sir. He did not have even a syllable with me about the modalities or the programme of the Commission's visit to Taiwan. I want to make it clear that I did not **take any other initiative** except that I wanted the visit of the Commission to the place of the occurrence of the plane crash. The hon. Minister has used very kind words and very nice words, "I have given my advice, my time, etc. etc." But I want to draw your attention to this matter, Sir. I sought the help of Dr. Karan Singh.

Sir, I sought the help of Dr. Karan Singh for just giving us the concessions to travel by Air India for three persons who were accompanying us. That was refused. Sir, I know that hundreds of such concessions were being given to the people who were attending the international conferences. I had to beg or borrow—not steal—Rs. 25,000 just to complete this task which I undertook.

I was also surprised, when I sent a telegram to my friend there—a Taiwani—who is the President of a Taiwan—Indian Association, to receive it two or three days after my arrival there. When we were going along with the Commission to Hong Kong, the High Commission people did not even recognise me. They were taking interest even for the clerks who associated with the Khosla Commission.

I went to Taipei earlier than the Khosla Commission to do a little bit of my preparatory work for which I am thankful to the press and the people there. They made elaborate arrangements. And in almost three to four columns of their English and Chinese papers in Taiwan there appeared news about our leader, Netaji Subash Chandra Bose—Netaji Inquiry Commission. They covered the news in their television about Netaji. There I held a press conference. I want to draw your kind

attention to what I said to the press. I quote:

"We are in Taipei not for any political purposes but to discharge a sacred duty on behalf of the people to find out from all available sources as to what exactly has happened to our beloved leader, Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose."

When I met Taiwan leaders, they never raised any diplomatic or political issue. They did not even ask the Commission to write to their Government. But they pointed out that for holding the court proceedings in a foreign country, permission from their Government would be necessary. There was a little bit of legal technicality here. The Commission was required to write to the Foreign Department of that country to seek their permission to hold a court proceedings there. I say they were eager to give all the necessary help to us. I suggested to the Commission, when it reached Taipei, that they might write a letter to Government for holding the court proceedings there. But, I was surprised to know that there was instruction from the Government of India not to seek for permission either directly or indirectly for any assistance either from the government or even seek any help from the non-official bodies there. I now quote what the hon. Minister wrote to me in this connection. He wrote in his letter to me.

"...neither the Government of India can enter into direct or formal contacts any time with the Government of Taiwan and its departments."

Look at the words used—not to have contact with not only official but also with non-official directly or indirectly. What in the same letter has been written to me is:

"In the political context mentioned above, however, it was natural that we should suggest to the

[Shri Samar Guha]

Commission not to make any formal approach to the Taiwan authorities and to make an independent enquiry without enlisting the formal cooperation of any official or non-official body there."

I contacted the authorities there. And I did a little bit of my work there. I came to know that they were not going to reserve a place in a hotel for holding the court proceedings there. I told them that "is a very patriotic and sentimental issue for the Indian people. Do not stand in for any technicality for getting the permission for the above purpose. Let the Commission be allowed to held its court proceedings there." But, they told us that the Commission will not get any official cooperation from their, government. Informally, they assured some cooperation from some Members of Parliament. In the same letter, the hon. Minister has congratulated me on the fact that I had approached the Government there, the authorities there and get some help from them.

- I want to draw your attention to another point also. They said 'Do not contact with authority in Taiwan.' On 17th and again earlier on the 13th August, in reply to two of my questions it was said that during the last few months, 69 Indian ships of both the public and private sectors were at Taipei. Directly, our Government had also their export-import trade with the Government there, of transport equipment, ores, concentrates, mica, silicon etc. Our officials of the Railway Board and our officials of the STC and MMTC regularly visit that place. I know something more but I do not want to disclose that in the interest of the nation. Are these not contacts with the Taiwan Government? If a judicial body contacted them indirectly, that would amount to contact. But when our officials regularly visit the place, is that not contact? As I have

said, I know something more, but I shall not disclose it here. What kind of logic is this? It is just a difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

The hon. Minister has admitted that what was told to the Commission was just a suggestion. But what is that suggestion? The secretary to the Commission told me, and the Government counsel told me that they had a written suggestion. I know that only to obviate certain legal difficulties, the Government used the word 'suggestion'. But the written suggestion is nothing but a directive. They said that the Commission was the creature of Government, and as such they were bound by the Government instructions. But I would like to point out that a judicial body may be a creature of the Government, but as soon as the creature is born, as a judicial body, it assumes its own independent authority.

I want to conclude by saying that I was not satisfied with the work of the Commission. The commission acted like a passive inert body there. If I did not accompany them, they would have come back without doing anything except perhaps doing a little bit of shopping there.

The hon. Minister has said in his letter that the work of the commission was not hampered. I would like to point out how the work was actually hampered. The Commission did not take any initiative whatsoever. The commission did not take any initiative to visit any place. But it was I who insisted with the help of my friends and some Members of Taiwan Parliament, and in fact everything was done by me, and I forced the Commission to go to the different places.

The most important place to be visited was the runway there. It is an important aspect, and I am pointing this out in order to show why I

am not satisfied and to show how the work was actually hampered. This is very important. The picture of the runway did not agree with the pictures that were given by Col. Habibur Rehman to the Japanese.

I beseeched Justice Khosla to look at the topography of the hill surroundings. I also said that if he could write to the Government of Taiwan, they would have allowed the commission to take a photograph of that place.

Again, the meteorological report is totally against the alleged plane crash. The reported place where the alleged plane crash occurred is such that it cannot occur there. So, the meteorological report is totally against the crash. It cannot occur inside that area.....

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. Member please listen to me?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I am just pointing out how the work was hampered. I am just coming to it..

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a question of his coming to it or not.

Let him kindly listen to me....

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I shall take only two or three minutes more. /

MR. SPEAKER: These are matters which are under inquiry, and the Commission is sitting already, and the Commission is going to give its findings. Why does the hon. Member now make a speech on these things?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Please allow me. This is an important issue. I asked the meteorological officer there, and I requested the Commission to take the report from him. But the Commission said that they

could not take any official report from them. Therefore, no chart could be taken from them.

I shall also give you two sensational documents. One of them I get from an old file there. Another sensational document is the death certificate of Netaji from the crematorium. I beseeched the commission that if they could write to the Government of Taiwan, they could have the death certificates authenticated by them. But the Commission refused. I have get here the photostat copy. After translating it from the Japanese language, do you know what we found? I would like to tell you, Sir, that these are the certificates of a Japanese soldier and not of Netaji. What greater proof can there be than this that two British investigating officers, Mr. Young and Mr. Wright who were sent by the British in 1946 said that it was a "master deception plan"? I requested the Commission to continue to stay there for another three days. I told them that I could get ten men who could testify that it was in September, 1944 that a plane crash occurred at that place.

One man came to me. He said he could bring 10 or 15 men to testify. I requested Mr. Khosla: "Please prolong the sitting for a few days more. I will bring all of them to testify that the 'plane crash occurred not in 1945 but a year earlier in that place." Such a vital evidence, such a material particular, such an important documentary evidence could not be placed before the Commission.

This book *Gallant End of Netaji* by Harin Shah which greatly influenced Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others contains some names and pictures which were found either to be fraud or fabricated.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. You are discussing the conduct of the Commission which is not permissible under the rules.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: What happened to our great leader? Was anything done to find out during all these 27 years? We could not hold an independent inquiry. We owe it to the nation, we owe it to posterity to find out what has happened. We owe it to the conscience of the nation to find out....

MR. SPEAKER: Will you please sit down?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I would like to know whether the text of the letter that was sent would be published. I would like to know whether they are going to write to the Commission to get all the documents.

I repeat that the object of the visit has been frustrated by this instruction. We owe it to the nation, we owe it to posterity, we owe it to ourselves, we owe it to anything that is in the conscience of the nation to find out what happened to our great leader. But the government did not care to hold a proper inquiry into this. For this the nation has to answer to posterity

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The hon. member perhaps could have done better to give a press interview and explain all this because he has said a number of things. He has points which he thought he urged before the Commission and the Commission did not accept them. A great part of what he has said in a very agitated manner relates to that matter.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: You do not feel agitated?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I did not interrupt you. Let me proceed.

This posture, as if he really is the only person in this country who has reverence for Netaji Subhas Bose is, if I may say so, completely misplaced.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I protest. I have not taken that posture. This is adding insult to injury.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I do not know if he has asked me anything. He has quoted from my letter. If he wanted to have it placed on record, the best thing was to place the whole of it on record. I have no objection.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I will do it.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: There is nothing in that letter which is different from what I have said in my reply. To save the time of the House, I made a briefer statement. I thought that my longer letter would satisfy him and he would not trouble the House by asking all these questions over again.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Troubling the House? Look at the attitude of the Minister.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: But he chose the forum of the House and has made a statement. He has not asked anything from me. There is really nothing I should answer, but probably he wanted to unburden himself, which he has done.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This is unburdening the conscience of the nation.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: This attempt to monopolise the conscience of the nation is, if I may say so, much too pretentious and this posture is, I suggest in all humility, best achieved, not to pose as if the entire conscience of the nation is concentrated in his lips or in his brain. All of us have the highest respect for Netaji....

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: For all those 27 years what did you do? Did you care to hold an inquiry? Did you care to visit the alleged place of occurrence of the plane crash?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: We can discuss these things in the Central Hall or Lobbies because I think it is better that here we confine ourselves to relevant material. As he has not asked me any question, I cannot answer any.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Is the Government going to place the text of the suggestion on the Table of the House, the suggestion issued to the Netaji Enquiry Commission?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: No, Sir, we have no intention.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: How can he say that he has no such intention?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मंत्री महोदय ने कोई चीज सदन को बताने से मना कर दिया है। उन्होंने यह दावा नहीं किया कि यह बताना पब्लिक इंटरेस्ट में नहीं है या उससे देश की सिक्योरिटी खतरे में पड़ जाएगी। किस ग्राउंड पर वे इस इनकारमेशन को विदहोल्ड कर रहे हैं ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is not a suggestion; it is actually a directive. I seek your protection, Mr. Speaker. It is upto you to ask them to place it on the Table of the House.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I have already mentioned in my statement and I have also communicated it to the hon. Member in the letter the substance of what was suggested to the Commission. It is not customary that the entire correspondence is made public; it is not done.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let there be no debate on this now.

श्री मधु लिमये : यदि सार्वजनिक हित में नहीं है तो बात प्रलग्न है। कस्टमरी से क्रिया मतलब है। क्या छोटी सी चीज में आप झगड़ा कर रहे हैं ?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): On a point of order. There may not be very precise questions clearly posed by the hon. Member, but there are certain issues which require clarification and that clarification depends upon the correspondence which the hon. Minister is withholding from us. Unless we see that correspondence, we cannot say, whether those issues have been clarified or not.

MR. SPEAKER: He has said that the substance had been given in the letter.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : कारेस्पोंडेंस का सवाल नहीं है। आप इनके स्टेटमेंट को देखें। विदेश मंत्री की चिट्ठी को देखें। मैं उद्धृत कर रहा हूँ :

"It was therefore natural that the Government should suggest to the Commission to avoid any formal reach to the Taiwan authorities to make an independent enquiry on its own."

हम कारेस्पोंडेंस की मांग नहीं कर रहे हैं सरकार ने कमिशन को सजेशन दिया है वह किस रूप में है ? गुहा साहब मांग कर रहे हैं कि यह सजेशन टेबल पर रख दिया जाए, उसकी कापी रख दी जाए ताकि देश को पता चल जाए कि सरकार कहां खड़ी है।

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: An enquiry is being held in response to a public demand. The public would demand what correspondence is coming in the way of an objective enquiry?

श्री मधु लिमये : आप उनको आदेश दीजिए। मामला खत्म हो जायेगा।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: My submission is a very simple one. It is about the attitude of the Government. We do not recognise the Government

[Shri Swaran Singh]
of Taiwan. We have from the beginning recognised the People's Republic of China and we have always recognised Taiwan territory as part of the People's Republic of China... (Interruptions). That is the main question. Because we did not recognise Taiwan we suggested to the Commission that if you want to go there, Government does not recognise any governmental authority in Taiwan.

Therefore, it was our suggestion that just as Government does not approach the Government of Taiwan because we do not recognise them, therefore a body created by Government, a judicial body, also should avail dealing with them in an official manner. This is all that is contained there. I have mentioned it already. It is a question of substance and not of words.... (Interruptions).

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह मामला आप को तय करना है, मंत्री महोदय को नहीं। क्या मंत्री महोदय बिना किसी वजह के कोई चीज सदन की टेबल पर रखने से इन्कार कर सकते हैं ? उन्होंने क्वेश्चन नहीं किया है कि यह बताना पब्लिक इन्स्ट्रुट में नहीं है।

MR. SPEAKER: The Rule, practice and convention that we have observed up to this time is that Government correspondence, if the Minister does not want it, is not laid on the Table. He can quote a part of it or give a summary. It is already accepted in this House. There are a number of cases on it. The House has been following it. Suppose tomorrow he makes a reference out of a certain document and you demand "please lay the whole file on the Table", it will be a very bad practice and against the rule. He says that he has given the relevant part. Rule 368 says:

"If a Minister quotes in the House a despatch or other State paper which has not been presented to the House, he shall lay the relevant paper on the Table:

Provided further that where a Minister gives in his own words a summary or gist of such despatch or State paper it shall not be necessary to lay the relevant papers on the Table."

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not a summary.

MR. SPEAKER: He has given a summary or gist. The rule is very clear on the point.... (Interruptions)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Sir, I rise on a point of order. When this particular Calling Attention Notice was admitted by you in your wisdom, we expected that some information about the enquiry, some documents, will be placed before us. The hon. Member, Shri Samar Guha, read certain documents to prove that his visit to that particular area in Taiwan has clearly proved to him that the accident did not take place there. In support of that he has read out certain documents and made some statements. The Minister has made a reply to that without giving us any documents.

Sir, you will remember that on an earlier occasion Sardar Iqbal Singh, a member of this House, moved a Resolution in this House that the ashes of Netaji should be brought here. The late lamented Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said that there is some controversy on this subject and so that resolution was dropped, because this was a very delicate subject. It is true that under rule 368 the Minister can give a summary. He is entitled to do so. But in this particular case I want a ruling whether in a particular matter, which is agitating crores of people in this country, whether you consider it adequate that a summary of a document is given. It is something strange that there is hush hush about it.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: So far as documents are concerned, that is a matter for the Commission. If there is any evidence, oral or documentary, nothing prevents any party, not even Shri Samar Guha, from going to the Commission and presenting those documents to the Commission. I cannot arrogate to myself the function of the Commission and I cannot pronounce my own opinion about the admissibility of any document or what value should be attached to any document. It is for the Commission to decide.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: The hon. Minister has been pleased to say that we do not officially recognise Taiwan. That is in fact the position. But, in spite of that, what has been happening is that we have been carrying on trade merrily with Taiwan. During the course of the last one and a half years 69 of our ships have called at Taiwan. For some of our conferences the representatives of Taiwan have been invited. In spite of all this, why does not the Government think it necessary, even for the purpose of such an inquiry, to have some kind of contact with Taiwan? They are already having some contact with Taiwan?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order in it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: You are taking it lightly. Please do not laugh it away. It is a serious matter which has to be considered.

MR. SPEAKER: Where is the point of order?

MR. SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: You go on speaking simultaneously while I am on my legs.

MR. SPEAKER: It does not mean that I should not argue with you.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: A unique kind of relationship is existing between you and me.

My submission is that this State has been carrying on some kind of activities with Taiwan. So, why is this State not also allowing the Commission to have some contacts with the Taiwan Government for the purpose of an inquiry of this kind?

MR. SPEAKER: This is a question which you are addressing to the Minister.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Sir, may I...

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. Do not lose your temper all the time.

Is this a question addressed to the Minister or to the Speaker?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order can be about the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure. What you have said just now has nothing to do with the interpretation of rules. It is just a question you are addressing to the Minister. I would request Shri Mishra not to get into an argument with the Chair. This has become a habit with him.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: The Chair does not want to give a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not appreciate this at all. You are a very senior member. I did not expect it from you.

श्री मधु लिवडे (बांका) : अध्यक्ष महोदय मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आपने नियम 368 के दूसरे प्रोवाइजों का हवाला दिया है, जो इस प्रकार है :

"Provided further that where a Minister gives in his own words a summary or gist of such despatch or State paper it shall not be necessary to lay the relevant papers on the Table."

[श्री मधु लिमये]

मंत्री महोदय ने अपने बयान में यह वाक्य कहा है :

"It was, therefore natural that the Government should suggest to the Commission to avoid any formal approach to the Taiwan authorities to make an independent enquiry on its own."

मैं इस पर आप का निर्णय चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह जिस्ट या समरी या सारांश है। इस का रास्ता यह है कि आप स्वयं वह पत्र और इस बयान को देख कर मिलायें। और अगर आप को संतोष हो जाय तो आप सदन को बताइए, नहीं तो सदन के सामने पत्र आना चाहिए।

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): I want to make a submission.....

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate it. You are not on a point of order but on a point of submission.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: This is a sentimental question. This question is coming up in the House and outside again and again. Now, you have admitted this Calling Attention Notice and the Minister comes half-hearted before the House. He keeps something in his pocket and places something before the House. That will create a worse confusion. Therefore, my appeal to the Minister and the Prime Minister is that let them make it clear, once and for all, what was the suggestion to the Commission.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं ने आप से सवाल पूछा है। आप बताइए। मैं ने नियम के अनुसार, पूछा है।

MR. SPEAKER: The rule is very clear. The Minister can give a summary. If you think, he did not give a summary, I will see the relevant letter from the Minister. If I find it is not a summary, I will tell the House.

Papers to be laid.

12.42 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER & AUDITOR GENERAL FOR 1970-71

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following parts of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1970-71—Union Government (Commercial), under article 151(1) of the Constitution:—

Part IV. Appraisal of the working of the Central Warehousing Corporation.

Part V. Appraisal of the working of the Hindustan Housing Factory Limited.

[73]
Placed in Library. See No. LT-5463]

STATEMENTS re. ASSURANCES BY MINISTERS IN VARIOUS SESSIONS OF LOK SABHA

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on