

[Mr. Speaker]

spite of my direction not to do so. The hon. Members from this side were speaking, three or four or five of them. What has the Leader of the House said? All that he said was that "in accordance with the rule take action against such of the hon. Members who defy your order and make it impossible for us to proceed". It is not a question of omnibus motion. The rule is there, and that applies to everyone who causes disturbance. I am really surprised at the conduct of the hon. Members. I look to the leaders of each group to control his following, and see to it . . .

Shri Raghunath Singh: They have failed to control.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Mukerjee has come here to defend their cause. I agree with him, so far as the particular points that have been raised are concerned. There is no general order asking all of them to vacate. But he must equally take notice of the fact that some hon. Members here, in spite of our having gone to some other subject, went on getting up and going on loudly protesting. When I said that I will proceed to the next item, he raises a point of order. A point of order can be raised, and abused also. After all this disturbance, when I did not allow him to proceed, he says "On a point of order". It is open to me to see whether the point of order is based upon something, or merely is a ruse to get an opportunity to get the other point adjourned. It is open to me to find out that. If once, twice or thrice I call upon an hon. Member to order and then he suddenly gets up and says "A point of order, Sir", am I merely to yield? Have I no discretion in this matter to see how did the point of order occur? After I have asked him to sit down once, twice and thrice, he says "On a point of order, Sir" as though I ought not to have asked him to sit down. It is rather strange. A per-

son who wants to defy my order wants to evade it by saying it is a point of order, and if I do not admit it, immediately all hon. Members get up and say "you have not acted properly". I do not know how I can get on. If it is a regular defiance, I am afraid, I will have to take more serious action than what has been suggested to me by the Leader of the House. The Leader of the House has not gone out of his way. On the other hand, it is I that suggested that I want some help, and he came to my help today. He has kept quiet all these two-three years and it is only now that he offered help, lest he be misunderstood; otherwise, it may be misunderstood, because he is the leader of the party also. Under these circumstances, he has not done anything wrong. On the other hand, he has assisted me and the House. I would welcome such reasonable assistance from all hon. Members of this House, as all of us are jointly interested in keeping order in this House.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Your orders about action against members have gone completely unattended to.

Mr. Speaker: Sardar Amar Singh Saigal, I find he is not here. Shri Jhulan Sinha.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FIFTY-FOURTH REPORT

Shri Jhulan Sinha (Siwan): I beg to present the Fifty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

MINERAL OILS (ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF EXCISE AND CUSTOMS) AMENDMENT BILL*

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha): On behalf of Shri Morarji Desai, I beg

to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Mineral Oils (Additional Duties of Excise and Customs) Act, 1958.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Mineral Oils (Additional Duties of Excise and Customs) Act, 1958."

The motion was adopted.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: introduce the Bill.

12:18 hrs.

DELHI LAND HOLDINGS (CEILING) BILL—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the motion moved by Shri B. N. Datar on the 15th December, 1959 that the Bill to provide for the imposition of a ceiling on land holdings in the Union territory of Delhi and for matters connected therewith be referred to a Joint Committee.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): Today was allotted for the food debate.

Mr. Speaker: The time so far taken for this is 1 hour 18 minutes. This is partly over. When this is over, the food debate will be taken up. There is nothing sacrosanct about the food debate, and no time will be curtailed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What about the time for food debate?

Mr. Speaker: It will have five hours.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): May I know how long we will continue with this?

Mr. Speaker: We will have two hours at the most.

Shri Amjad Ali (Dhubri): Originally five hours were allotted, and I understand the time has not been changed.

Mr. Speaker: When we wanted to discuss and pass it here we allotted five hours. Now it is a motion for reference to the Joint Committee. Now, it stands on the same footing as the other two, with some variations here and there. We can have two hours or, at the most, two and a half hours. If more hon. Members want to speak and there are more points, I will allot more time.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): These three land reform Bills which have come before this House one after the other in the course of the last few days raise some very important points. In the course of the debate Shri Ranga has raised certain fundamental concepts which go against the entire idea as formulated by the Planning Commission. The aim, of course, has been the shaping of a new pattern of land ownership and cultivation that will have in it the germs of future development and that is why the question of ceilings has been put forward with so much emphasis and it has also been fought bitterly by those who oppose land ceiling.

There is, of course, also the question of ends of social justice. If we want co-operation and if we want the development of co-operatives, there must be a lessening of the wide disparities which have developed in our rural economy, because without a narrowing down of the big disparities that are there in the villages, it is not possible to have effective co-operatives which we are to develop as a future pattern of community life. That is why that question is being debated on a very wide scale.

The question of distribution of land to the landless is now being combated