

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

copy of the Report of Assessment Committee on Vijnan Mandirs (Volumes I and II). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2783/61].

NAVAL SERVICES (ARMY AND AIR FORCE
COMMAND) REGULATIONS ACT

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Raghuramiah): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Naval Services (Army and Air Force Command) Regulations 1961 published in Notification No. S.R.O. 80 dated the 11th March, 1961 as corrected by Notification No. S.R.O. 106 dated the 25th March, 1961 under Section 185 of the Navy Act, 1957. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2784/61.]

MADHYA PRADESH RICE PROCUREMENT
(LEVY AMENDMENT ORDER)

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Madhya Pradesh Rice Procurement (Levy) Amendment Order, 1961 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 345 dated the 10th March, 1961, under sub-section (6) of Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2785/61.]

12.15½ hrs.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

HUNDRED AND TWELFTH AND HUNDRED
AND THIRTEENTH REPORTS

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): I beg to present the following Reports of the Estimates Committee:—

- (i) Hundred and twelfth Report on Posts and Telegraphs Department—Part III—Telecommunications;
- (ii) Hundred and thirteenth Report on Posts and Telegraphs Department—Part IV—Work-

shops and Stores Organisations.

12.16 hrs.

STATEMENT BY MEMBERS RE:
OIL WELL AT RUDRASAGAR

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, I have already submitted a copy of this statement.

Mr. Speaker: I wanted him to make a smaller statement.

Shri Hem Barua: I have left out some sentences.

I have gone through with the necessary care and caution, the statement made by Shri Malaviya on 14th March, 1961 on the reported defects in Well No. 1 at Rudrasagar, Assam vis-a-vis the details given by Shri L. P. Mathur, Director of Geology in the Oil and Natural Gas Commission in the course of his talk on the 'Hazards of Test Drilling' on the morning of 16th March, 1961.

The Minister of Mines and Oil (Shri K. D. Malaviya): Is he making any modified statement? I have got a copy of the statement here. Is it the same statement that he is making now?

Mr. Speaker: He has removed some passage; he has not added any.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: He had not given notice to me.

Mr. Speaker: I told him that the statement was long and therefore he should make a condensed statement. He says that he has removed certain sentences and has not added any or altered any.

Shri Hem Barua: Because, Sir, I was instructed to be brief.

Mr. Speaker: We are racing against time; and there is so much business.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, if you persue the two statements you will be con-

vinced not only of the discrepancy in the two statements but also of the fact that the hon. Minister has denied this august body the opportunity of knowing the truth about this oil well at Rudrasagar.

In response to an adjournment motion, Shri Malaviya stated:

"the report is absolutely baseless in all its details... In fact there is no mishap whatsoever."

On the other hand, Shri Mathur, Director of Geology, said in the course of his talk, thus:

"On increasing diameter of the bore in this well, it was noticed that there is ingress of water into the hole along with sand, which tends to choke and obstruct the flow of oil."

Further, Shri Mathur revealed that—

"the cement plug placed between this and the lower water producing horizon (3726—3708 metres) may not be quite tight."

Sir, this statement of Shri Mathur spotlights the fact that there was a defect, major or minor, which compelled the suspension of further drilling in the well till the arrival of a workover rig, presumably from Russia.

Over and above this, Shri Malaviya said in his statement:

"The position is that the Rudrasagar well No. 1, as is usual, after the completion of drilling, was awaiting to be tested for determining its potentialities."

On the face of it, may I quote what Shri Mathur said:

"A cement plug was put between 3137-3101 metres and the next higher horizon in the Barail series between 3086.6-3101 metres

was perforated.....The perforation was completed on 15-12-1960. This horizon came up with production of oil in commercial quantities."

Sir, if this statement of Shri Mathur that oil came up in commercial quantities is correct, and in the face of what this statement establishes,—that out of six, four horizons were already tested,—then how does Shri Malaviya's statement, that the well was "awaiting to be tested for determining its potentialities", fit in against the background of facts revealed by Shri Mathur? I cannot understand.

Then, Sir, the question of workover rig and the main rig referred to in Shri Malaviya's statement raises another issue of vital importance. If the four horizons of the well that were tested,—and it was established, as revealed by Shri Mathur, that they were capable of making oil available in commercial quantities—could do without a workover rig, why was a workover rig necessary for the remaining two horizons of the well? This naturally makes one apprehensive of the fact that there must be something wrong at that point of the well, which of course Shri Mathur admits, that there must be something** which Shri Malaviya tried to conceal. I am sorry, from this House lest it stinks.

Mr. Speaker: Is that Shri Mathur's statement?

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): May I know, Sir.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Is it Shri Mathur's statement?

Shri Hem Barua: No, Sir; that is my statement.

Mr. Speaker: I would advise the professor not to indulge in statements in his name. I allowed him to make corrections here and not to make observations regarding this matter. Let that portion be deleted.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I am coming to it. Sir, I have consulted "A Primer of Oil Well Drilling" and it says that a workover rig is meant for "remedial operations".

Sir, the main rig, Shri Malaviya says, was shifted for drilling of additional exploratory wells. The need for a workover rig was felt as early as 15th December, 1960, but then, the main rig was allowed to remain there till recently and was not shifted to the next site. May I say, Sir, that the Oil India working in adjoining fields in Assam shift their rigs from one place to another within three weeks at the most.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: They are your informants?

Shri Hem Barua: This only proves that the technicians working at this well did their best to the last moment and only gave up when they discovered that nothing further could be done.

This is a fact, Sir, that there was no "caving in" at this well though "water and sand gushed in" at a particular point of the well making it necessary to be "shut in". Notwithstanding this, the fact remains that Shri Malaviya denied this House the opportunity of knowing about the actual position in relation to the Rudrasagar oil well which however was brought to light by Shri Mathur, Director of Geology in the Oil and Natural Gas Commission, in the course of his talk to Members of Parliament on the 16th March at a meeting presided over by Shri Malaviya. It is with a desire to vindicate the rights of the House that I make this statement and that too with animus towards none.

I may add, Sir, that I have great admiration for our Oil and Natural Gas Commission as also for Shri Malaviya who presides over the destiny of oil in this country.

Mr. Speaker: We will take up the next business.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Sir,.....

Mr. Speaker: Does he want to say something?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Surely, Sir, because the matter has been taken up by the Speaker and this House.

Mr. Speaker: The procedure is this. Whenever any hon. Member says that a mistake has been committed by a Minister or a Minister says that a mistake has been committed by any Member I ask the individual concerned to submit a statement and I pass it on to the other side. If the other side wants to make a statement in reply, that is allowed. I looked at the hon. Minister after the hon. Member concluded. He was keeping quiet. If he wants to say something he may do so.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Certainly. I have at this stage a statement which is wholly incorrect made by the hon. Member from the P.S.P. Party which should be challenged in his own interest, not in my interest, because whatever statement I have made.....

Mr. Speaker: He need not give any preamble. He is entitled to say what he feels.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I am also entitled, and you as judge.....

Mr. Speaker: He is entitled to say what he thinks to be correct. He will have an opportunity to do that. I looked at him, but he did not get up. Therefore, I passed on to the other work.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I am sorry, Sir, I did not catch your eye.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Sir, is it not the practice that the Minister also prepares his statement in reply and a copy is forwarded to you?

Mr. Speaker: Because the copy of the statement is sent to me I would like that a copy of the statement in reply is also sent to me. It does not matter now. Hereafter, when a statement is made in the House of which an advance copy is already given to the other side, that side also will be ready with a copy of the statement instead of making any oral statement.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I would like to submit one thing in my case. I was asked to submit an advance copy and at the same time I was instructed to be very brief and, what shall I say, good in my language. I have tried to be very polite and very nice in my language. Here is the Minister who starts with a preamble. That was an attack on me. I too could have used strong language. I am capable of that.

Mr. Speaker: This is a mere statement of fact.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Sir, I thought I was on the defensive. I have to be on the defensive because I am standing in the dock defending a certain conduct of mine which is now going to be examined by my hon. friend Shri Hem Barua. He sent a copy of his statement to you and a copy was sent to me. I am fully prepared to answer his charges against me.

Now, Sir, obviously I thought that the intention of this statement was to prove that I had made some incorrect statement, that I had given some incorrect information to the House as a result of the statement that I made when certain allegations were made by an English daily of New Delhi which is a very prominent paper.

Mr. Speaker: The simple point is, he quotes Shri Mathur against the hon. Minister.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I will explain everything. Here is a headline charge against the Oil and Natural Gas Commission on the front page of that paper, a seven-column banner headline in which it is said that the oil exploration had been abandoned and Rs 30 lakhs wasted. It also said that the mishap was of an "extremely unusual nature" and that there is great demoralisation and all that. In answer to that I said that the charges were wholly baseless. Obviously, Sir, I could not have said that they were not baseless or there was some basis because there was no basis for those charges. Now, if some inaccuracies had been found out in my answer to

these allegations, they should have been clearly and specifically pointed out. That was not done. My hon. friend has given a long statement saying where those inaccuracies lay. I will not refer to many points except three or four which he has mentioned. He refers to Shri Mathur's statements that there was a certain defect in the oil well. I think he does not now agree with the *Hindustan Times* that "caving in" occurred and all that. I do not see anywhere anything in the statement of Shri Mathur where he has tried to show that there was any inaccuracy in my statement. I will read out what Shri Mathur has said.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): His was a statement of fact.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I will read out one part of Shri Mathur's statement which is relevant. He said:

"This being our first well in a new area we decided that the other horizons which do not appear to be very good on the electrologs but have given some indications of presence of oil should also be tested for the sake of obtaining complete information in this test well.

In pursuance of this policy the 5½" casing was cemented at bottom and the lowest sandstone bed between 3722—3725 metres was tested first. However, this produced only salt water. After putting a cement plug above it, another horizon at about 3625 metres was tested. As this also produced salt water we skipped Eocene horizons with similar characteristics on the electrologs and on 5th December, 1960 perforated a third horizon which is in the Barail series and which appeared to be slightly better. We found some oil from this horizon on testing but more water was produced. Testing of this horizon was continued up to the 16th December. After that we put a

[Shri K. D. Malaviya]

cement plug against it. Having tested the cement plug by physically feeling it by probing as well as by applying pressure at about 250 atmospheres (3700 lb. per sq. inch) and having satisfied ourselves with the soundness of the cement plug we perforated the 4th horizon on 27th December, 1960. It came up with the production of satisfactory quantity of oil and it was established that we had made a discovery. We have two more horizons above this which have similar thickness and apparently similar characteristics."

This one is now to be tested—I want Shri Hem Barua to understand this. They were not tested by a rig. Later on he says:

"In the case of Rudrasagar well when the larger beans were used there was ingress of some water and also of sand into the well with the result that there was a choking of the tubing with sand which had to be cleared by circulation."

The flow of water and sand into the well was stopped when smaller beans were used. It is just possible that the cement plug separating this horizon from the lower horizon which produced water may have developed a slight leak which is not active when there is big back pressure above it as would be the case when a small bean is used, but with the larger bean and consequent lowering of back pressure the leak becomes active and water from below starts rising up.

These are, I beg to say, small normal difficulties of a well when it is put to test. If you wanted me to quote all these small defects of the oil well which is under production on the background of a libellous charge against the Oil and Natural Gas Commission—a baseless charge—I had no alternative but to say that these are all baseless charges. If my hon. friend had asked me for this infor-

mation, I would have collected all this and placed it before him. I could have, if he liked, put before him all the details and all the difficulties that the Oil and Natural Gas Commission has in the usual course to face when the Cambay and Ankleshwar oil-wells were tested. Every well has its own problems, and these problems are recorded by the actual technicians who do it on the Oil field. Even the records do not come to us in the Government. Only broad basis of the information is reported to the Government. The Oil and Natural Gas Commission do not always give all the details at the Oil and Natural Gas Commission's headquarters. They are kept at the oil fields. Therefore, I beg to say that these are normal occurrences of a well which are not reported to me and which are not likely to be reported by me on every occasion, and yet such things are thrown on my face, saying that I have flouted Parliament or I concealed information from the House. I do hope that this will satisfy you and the House that I did not conceal any information, but that certain small troubles which always usually arise are not in the usual course quoted, when some big charges are made against the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

Mr. Speaker: The matter is closed.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): No, Sir. It is a point of order that I am raising. It is not a question between the hon. Member and the Minister, just a matter of allegation and defence. It is a question of ascertaining facts from both sides, because it is a technical, big matter. So, we are not concerned now with what a paper said and whether it is libellous or not. The question is one where a serious allegation is made that he has not given proper information to the House. I feel that some written statement from both sides must be placed before the House to make up our own minds on the matter. It is not a question of any quarrel between a Member and a Minister or something

like that. It is a very serious matter; whatever lapses there are, whether an officer of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission could make a statement of this nature is one thing. House, therefore, would like to know full facts; before it could make up its mind.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: What statement has he made? He has not made any statement which is libellous.

Shri Khadilkar: I see from press reports that it is a serious matter. So, both sides must give written statements giving the facts. Then we shall ascertain whether they corroborate with the situation as it is.

Shri D. C. Sharma: My difficulty is this. Here is one Mr. Mathur who is being quoted against the Minister by an hon. Member there and is being quoted, in his favour, by the Minister. Who is this Mr. Mathur? I want to know. We must get a complete copy of the statement to know what he has been talking about, because he is being quoted in favour of the Opposition and is also being quoted against the Opposition. Therefore, I would submit respectfully that the statement of Mr. Mathur and a complete statement of the Minister should be circulated to us so that we can make up our minds. It is very wrong that we should bring charges against anybody in this House based upon a statement which has been published in a newspaper. I am not talking about the Minister. I do not distinguish between a Member and a Minister. But I submit that we should not bring charges against any Minister or Member which are based upon newspaper reports. Therefore, I want to say that in considering this matter, this aspect of the problem should also be taken into account.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I may inform the hon. Member that Dr. Mathur is the Director of the Geological Department of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission. The statement that he made there—the full copy is there—if you so desire, I will place it on the Table of the House or circulate it to the

Members as you desire. My statement also—of course it has been recorded here—may be circulated. The statement made by Shri Ram Barua may also be circulated.

Mr. Speaker: Very well.

Shri Khadilkar: Why was not that statement repudiated authoritatively by issuing a counter statement on behalf of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Which statement? It was contradicted. A certain report appeared in the name of Mr. Mathur and it was contradicted on the 24th March—this month—by Mr. Mathur himself. He corrected the statement.

Shri Hem Barua: When I brought this matter to your notice, it was not my intention to underline the news given in the press. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister now makes a reference to the banner-line news appearing in that particular newspaper. I am not concerned with that, and as a matter of fact, I have nothing to do with the banner-line news item and I do not support those facts, as stated in the new item. But what happens is, I brought certain facts—and I have the full text of Dr. Mathur's speech with me—and from that I quoted. It is not from the newspaper reports that I have quoted. When I quoted from Dr. Mathur's statement, I said that there were defects—Shri Malaviya has also admitted by quoting from Dr. Mathur's statement that there are defects. He says that they are minor defects. My contention is, to judge whether these defects are major or minor we should have been allowed to have a glimpse into the defects. At the same time, the Minister said: "I would have collected this information". That shows that he did not collect this information at that time. These are the words he had used. Whatever that might be, my intention is misunderstood. My intention is to focus attention to the point. I feel that our rights as Members

[Shri Hem Barua]

which, you, Sir, have so meticulously tried to preserve and promote, are being violated to a certain extent.

Mr. Speaker: I will treat the matter as closed now. But I would make one observation. Normally, hon. Members have no access to any of these matters. In a democracy the newspaper is one of the very ingredients or organs from which we can draw news. No doubt, an alarmist item with respect to this matter appeared in a newspaper. What is the other source that hon. Members have in order to bring such things to the notice of the House. The hon. Member tabled an Adjournment Motion. The Minister can certainly come to the House and say, "It is being exaggerated; but there are small inconveniences which occur from day to day" and so on. On the one hand, there is an alarming news item saying that the whole well has been closed; that there is nothing more to be done; that it is impossible to revive the well. I would ask hon. Members once again to read the report. If it is so flagrant and if such a great damage has been caused, the Minister may say, "No, no. It is not so much." But he merely says that the whole thing is bunkum and that there is nothing! The House must know where the truth lies. A meeting was called in one of the committee rooms, over which he hon. Minister presided. When Mr. Mathur made a statement. Now, Shri Hem Barua quoted a number of statements made by Mr. Mathur. (*Interruption*). All that I want to say is this. As has been rightly pointed out by Shri Khadilkar, when a certain thing is quoted, there must be a categorical denial that Mr. Mathur did not quote like that. Otherwise, how are we to know the facts? Therefore, it will be well if the statement of Mr. Mathur is placed on the Table of the House, and the Minister may take his own time to contradict everyone of the statements or correct them. He started saying "Mr. Mathur did not say so" and so on. The House may then have an opportunity of look-

ing into both the statements and may come to a conclusion as to what exactly has happened. I do not normally allow exaggerated statements appearing in the press to be referred to. But I would advise hon. Members to see to this, namely, as soon as something appears—each one has been provided with a telephone in his residence—he can ring up the Minister and know what exactly has happened. I would not ask them merely to go by the Statement of the Minister. That must be the corrective. The Minister says there is no such thing. There is no meaning in bringing it forward by way of an Adjournment Motion. That would cause damage. At the same time, that is a source of information. The Minister also, if some information is sought, may tell the Members what exactly has happened, so that the House may have a proper and correct appreciation of the events from time to time. I would request both the Ministers and also hon. Members to exercise caution. The Minister also must say frankly what exactly has happened. I do not mean to say that anything has been wanting in frankness, but we got the impression that the whole thing is a fake. Somewhere in the *Hindustan Times* the man wrote something . . .

Shri K. D. Malaviya: When any enquiry is demanded from the Minister, the Minister is bound to give his reply. I do not think anything has happened here which has given any cause to Shri Hem Barua. . .

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow even a responsible Minister to say like that. What can poor Shri Hem Barua do? I could not table an adjournment motion, but if I had been in those benches, I would have been the first to table an adjournment motion.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: What for?

Mr. Speaker: When the well was sunk . . .

Shri K. D. Malaviya: How am I to blame for a news that has appeared in the Press? If somebody had asked, surely I would have given a reply.

Mr. Speaker: The point has been misunderstood by the hon. Minister. Any hon. Member looks into the newspaper and brings it to the notice of the House. No doubt alarming news had appeared. Of course, if the Minister had no information, he could have said, "Tomorrow or the day after I will give the information". The information that he has now given might have been given then, instead of merely saying, the whole thing is alarming. He goes to the length of saying, "I quote from Shri Mathur". Except one piece that has been read by Shri Malaviya, so far as other matters are concerned, his statement is a little different. There has been some hole there and water flowed; it might cause some damage. I would request the hon. Minister to answer item after item and then place a statement on the Table of the House.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): There is another important matter. Where there is a difference of opinion between the head of the department and the Minister himself, may I know whether the Minister's opinion will prevail or the opinion of the head of the department will prevail?

Mr. Speaker: There is no such difference.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): That depends upon the quality of the difference.

12.42 hrs.

DELHI (URBAN AREAS) TENANTS RELIEF BILL

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): On behalf of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide relief to the tenants

of land in the urban areas of the Union territory of Delhi.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide relief to the tenants of land in the urban areas of the Union territory of Delhi."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Datar: I introduce the Bill.

12.43 hrs.

ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Essential Commodities Act, 1955.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Essential Commodities Act, 1955."

The motion was adopted.

Shri S. K. Patil: I introduce the Bill.

12.44 hrs.

ORISSA BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up general discussion on the Orissa Budget for 1961-62. I may inform the House that we must also pass the Orissa Demands for Grants on Account and also the Orissa Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill today.

An Hon. Member: What is the time allotted?

Mr. Speaker: What is the time that may be necessary?

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Is it absolutely necessary that the House should take up the Orissa budget just now

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II—Section 2, dated 28-3-1961.