

Fourth Series Vol. VIII - No. 62

**Saturday, August 12, 1967
Sravana 21, 1889 (Saka)**

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Second Session)



(Vol. VIII contains Nos. 51-62)

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

Price : Rs. 1.00

CONTENTS

No. 62—Saturday, August 12, 1967/*Shravana* 21, 1889 (*Saka*)

COLUMNS

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Oral Answers to Questions — | |
| *Short Notice Question No. 46 | 19095—19105 |
| Re. Business of the House | 19105—18 |
| Calling Attention to Matter of Urgent Public Importance— | |
| Reported occupation of 10 sq. miles of Indian territory by Pakistan | 19118—26 |
| Papers Laid on the Table | 19126—36 |
| Estimates Committee— | |
| Minutes | 19136 |
| Committee on Public Undertakings— | |
| Minutes | 19136—37 |
| Financial Committee, 1966-67 (A Review) | 19137, 19138—44 |
| Messages from Rajya Sabha | 19138 |
| President's Assent to Bill | 19138 |
| Demands for Excess Grants (General), 1964-65 | 19144—45 |
| Public Accounts Committee— | |
| Fifth Report | 19146 |
| Estimates Committee— | |
| Twelfth and Thirteenth Reports | 19146 |
| Committee on Public Undertakings— | |
| Second Report | 19146—47 |
| Statement <i>Re.</i> Sale of Helicopters by U.S.S.R. to Pakistan | |
| Shri M.C. Chagla | 19146—50 19146 |
| Bills Introduced | |
| (1) Patents Bill | 19150—56 19150 |
| (2) Bihar and Uttar Pradesh (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill | 19150 |
| (3) Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill | 19151—56 |
| Statutory Resolution <i>Re.</i> Levy of Export Duty on Iron Ore— | |
| <i>adopted</i> | 19156—66 |
| Shri Dinesh Singh | 19164—66 |
| Shri Virendrakumar Shah | 19158—60 |
| Shri Madhu Limaye | 19160—63 |
| Shri S. Kundu | 19163—64 |

*The sign + marked above the name of a Member indicates that the question was actually asked on the floor of the House by that Member.

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Central Industrial Security Force Bill | 19166—97, 19260—83 |
| Motion to concur in Rajya Sabha recommendations to join Joint Committee | 19166—97, 19260—83 |
| Shri Vidya Charan Shukla | 19166—68 |
| Shri Sheo Narain | 19276—79 |
| Shri D.N. Patodia | 19279—81 |
| | |
| Motion <i>Re.</i> Report of Dearness Allowance Commission— <i>Negatived</i> | 19197—19254 |
| Shri M.L. Sondhi | 19197—19203 |
| Shri S.A. Dange | 19203—08 |
| Shri George Fernandes | 19208—13 |
| Shri Nath Pai | 19213—20 |
| Shri K.N. Pandey | 19220—23 |
| Shri S.M. Banerjee | 19223—27 |
| Shri N. Dandekar | 19227—30 |
| Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterjee | 19232—34 |
| Shri V. Krishnamoorthi | 19234—35 |
| Shri Nambiar | 19235—37 |
| Shri G. Venkatswamy | 19237—38 |
| Shri J.B. Kripalani | 19238 |
| Shri Abdul Ghani Dar | 19238—42 |
| Shri Morarji Desai | 19242—51 |
| | |
| Statement <i>Re.</i> Security of Passengers in Howrah-Kharagpur Section of S.E. Railway | 19254—60 |
| Shri C.M. Poonacha | 19254—56 |
| | |
| Indian Official Secrets (Amendment) Bill | 19283—19306 |
| Motion to consider, as passed by Rajya Sabha | 19283—19303 |
| Shri Vidya Charan Shukla | 19283—84 |
| Shri Randhir Singh | 19284—85 |
| Shri Chand Goel | 19285—86 |
| Shri S.M. Banerjee | 19286—89 |
| Shri Nambiar | 19291—94 |
| Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj | 18294—95 |
| Shri M.L. Sondhi | 19295—96 |
| Shri Srinibas Misra | 18296—98 |
| | |
| Clause 2 to 13 and 1 | 19303—06 |
| Motion to Pass | 19306 |
| | |
| Motion <i>Re.</i> Situation arising out of working of Sugar Industry for shorter period during the crushing season | 19306—16 |
| Shri K.N. Pandey | 19306—14 |
| Shri D.N. Patodia | 19314—15 |

19095

19096

LOK SABHA

Saturday, August 12, 1967/Sravana 21,
1888 (Saka)

*The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

Lay-off of Workers in Jute Mills

SNQ. 46. Dr. Ranen Sen:

Shri Indrajit Gupta:

Shri Jagannath Roa Joshi:

Shri M. L. Sondhi:

Shri Virendrakumar Shah:

Shri D. N. Patodia:

Shri Hem Barua:

Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to a news-item appearing in the Hindustan Times, on the 25th July, 1967 that the Indian Jute Mills Association is contemplating to lay-off workers in the Jute Mills one day a week from August, 1967 for 4 months; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Attention is invited to the Statement laid on the Table of this House on the 10th August, 1967 regarding the policy Government propose to follow in respect of the problems of the Jute industry. It will be observed therefrom that Government do not consider the proposed curtailment of production of jute goods necessary in the present circumstances.

Dr. Ranen Sen: The Jute industry is 100 years old, if not more. It has been a common phenomenon for the Indian Jute Millowners' Association to close down mills partially or reduce working hours. This

year there is the prospect of a bumper jute crop. It is widely believed in the jute growing areas that this move to close down mills for the coming four months one day a week is with a view to bring down the price of raw jute. Besides the step he was suggested in the statement given to us earlier, what actual step has been taken to see that the Jute growers are not cheated of their rightful price for raw jute?

Shri Dinesh Singh: So far as the earlier part of the question is concerned, we are aware of this problem. That is why I said we do not feel there is any justification for any closure just now. As for the second part, I announced sometime ago that we have raised the support price of raw jute from Rs. 35 to Rs. 40. I had mentioned in that statement that Government would purchase all jute at this support price, if it became necessary.

Dr. Ranen Sen: Sometime back IJMA had approached the West Bengal Government also and that Government have set up a commission of inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act. What is Government's reaction to such an inquiry instituted by the State Government?

Shri Dinesh Singh: It is difficult for me to give reactions; I can only give facts.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: In the statement which the non Minister laid on the Table the other day, he had stated that 'it has been decided to suspend futures trading for a period of one week to begin with'. Is it not a fact that the difficulty from which the jute export trade is suffering at the moment is basically due to the excessive speculation that is going on in the futures market? And has his attention been drawn to the speech made at the East India jute and Hessian Exchange's annual meeting by the president of that body, Shri S. K. Ghosh, where he said about the futures market:

'There was excess of speculation which by grossly exaggerating price .

movements did serious harm to the export trade".

Does the Minister consider that suspension of futures trading for one week is really adequate to cope with such a deep-rooted malady as this kind of speculation, without eliminating which the export trade will never recover ?

Shri Dinesh Singh: I think in that statement later on I have said that we shall keep it closed so long as it is necessary. We have already extended the closure.

श्री चगन्नाथ राव जोशी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जूट उद्योग में पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा कम्पिटेशन है, हिन्दुस्तान के माल के मुकाबिले में पाकिस्तान का माल काफी सस्ता बिक जाता है, इसके कारण कई तकलीफें हमारे उद्योगपति महसूस कर रहे हैं, इसलिए पाकिस्तान के मुकाबिले में अपने माल की ज्यादा खपत हो इस दृष्टि से क्या सरकार के सामने कुछ सुझाव रखे गये हैं ? यदि हाँ, तो कौन कौन से और सरकार की उन पर क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

श्री बिनेश सिंह : जी हाँ, अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बात सही है कि पाकिस्तान का जो जूट का सामान है, वह कुछ सस्ता बेचते हैं, हमें से बेचते धाये हैं। वह पहले हमारा दाम जान लेते हैं और उसके बाद उससे थोड़ा सा कम करके बेचते हैं। थोड़ा सामान वह बनाते हैं। ज्यादा सामान हम बनाते हैं। खाली उनसे दाम कम करने के कम्पीटीशन में हम पड़े तो उन्हें न हमारा फायदा है न उनका फायदा है, बल्कि जो बाहर वाला खरीदार है उसको सब फायदा मिलता जायेगा। तो हम तो कोशिश में हैं कि एक मुनासिब दाम होना चाहिए, मुनासिब दाम पर हम बेचें, इसी आभास पर हम बेचते आये हैं।

Shri Virendrakumar Shah: The hon. Minister said just now that he does not

want to enter into a price war with Pakistan and that there is the question only of price reduction. May I know if it not a fact that, whatever be our flour price, the effect of excise duty high India has levied is retarding our exports and the effect of incentives which Pakistan is giving is encouraging Pakistani exports and whether these factors have not led in the last two or three years to an imbalance, that is, Pakistan's exports increasing and India's exports decreasing; if so, what specific steps we suggest, apart from the fact that we do not want to enter into a price war with Pakistan, to reduce this imbalance? What is it that we want to do by which we can reduce this imbalance?

Shri Dinesh Singh: The imbalance can only be narrowed by some action that Government may take. We have reduced the export duties to some extent. But we are actually the price setters in the jute industry and it should be possible for us to sell jute by proper unit values of jute goods that we are selling abroad. There is still considerable profit in this industry to absorb Pakistan's reduction of price from time to time. The whole point in this is that we must move into new items of production and new items of export; just as we developed carpet bagging more new lines must be developed for our products.

Shri D. N. Patodia: The suggestion for closing down the mills arises out of the shrinkage of demand for Indian jute goods in the world. May I know, therefore, from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that in the course of the last nine years the share of India in the world export of jute goods has dropped down from 32 per cent to 58 per cent and the share of Pakistan has increased from 7 per cent to 33 per cent and it is expected that by 1970 Pakistan's share will come to 50 per cent? The export of sackings particularly has gone down from 4,45,000 tonnes in 1955 to only 1,73,000 tonnes in 1966. Therefore, will the hon. Minister admit that the entire imbalance arises out of the fact that in spite of the conversion cost in India being lower it is the export duty imposed by India and the incentive allowed by Pakistan which create this imbalance?

Shri Ranga: Hear, hear.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I do not know what hon. Member, Professor sahib, was chbering.

Shri Rang: You cannot even understand what he has said just now.

Shri S. K. Tapuriah: It is beyond him.

Shri Dinesh Singh: May I give you some figures which may be of interest to this House? Let us take the last four years. In 1963-64 the export of Pakistan has been about 244,000 tonnes and our export quantum then had been 913,000 tonnes. Then again, if we take the last year where we had difficulty because we were short of raw jute, our exports were 734,000 tonnes as against Pakistan's 379,000 tonnes. So, there is still a big gap between what we are exporting and what Pakistan is exporting. The main point is that the jute industry is not facing competition only between India and Pakistan but also from synthetics that are coming in. That is why I said that the whole secret of success lay in our exploring of new markets and not banking on sacking only because sacking is being produced by Pakistan in large quantities. We should go into new channels like carpet bagging. It is a very important industry and we are in continuous talks with leaders of this industry to see that they can find new markets for it.

Shri D. N. Patodia: Sir, I seek your protection. My question was whether it is a fact that our percentage in world export has gone down from 82 per cent in 1957 to 58 per cent in 1966. Is it a fact or not?

Shri Dinesh Singh: Without working it out how can I say? But I have given the figures.

Shri Hem Barua: Since in competition with Pakistan India is losing her international markets in jute, may I know what positive steps Government propose to take to resurrect and revitalise the declining market for India, may be by exporting to new markets? Do the Government think that the buffer stock for manufactured jute

good proposed by the Government is going to solve the problem in any way?

Shri Dinesh Singh: I mentioned that we felt that the main thing that we have got to consider is exploring new avenues for this. May I again give a figure to give an example? Look at the position of hessian. This is not a very new item in that sense, but here again we have a certain advantage. We did not have the advantage we had in the past in sacking because Pakistan has gone into production of sacking considerably and they have increased their production. Therefore the advantage for our industry is in going into new avenues where they will face less competition.

Shri Hem Barua: We must know that we have been beaten back by Pakistan and the Minister did not enlighten us on that. What we are interested in is what steps the Government has taken or proposes to take to resurrect and revitalise the declining market of India. That is what we are interested in. He can give us the steps taken by Government as a, b, c, d.

Shri Dinesh Singh: There is some difference in the approach and that is why I think there is a misunderstanding. My point is only this that it is not a question of resurrection but it is a question of moving into new avenues. That is what we have constantly been bearing in mind.

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार का ध्यान इस बात को धोर गया है कि इस साल जूट की फसल काफी अच्छी होने की आशा है और अगर अभी तक सरकार ने इस बात के बारे में कोई निर्णय नहीं किया है कि किसान को दाम अच्छे मिल सकें तो अगले साल जूट की फसल में कमी हो सकती है, और कारखाने बन्द हो सकते हैं तथा राज्य व्यापार निगम ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो व्यवस्था की है वह अपर्याप्त है? यदि मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान इस बात को धोर गया है तो उन्होंने इसके लिये क्या प्रबन्ध किया है?

श्री विनेश सिंह : मैंने अभी कहा कि पिछले साल जो सपोर्ट प्राइस 35 रु० तक थी उसको हम ने 40 रुपया कर दिया है । मैंने यह भी कहा कि जितना जूट खरीदने की जरूरत पड़ेगी सरकार दस दाम में खरीदेगी ।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : The Minister, in reply to Dr. Sen. said that they would give price support to jute growers, if necessary. May I know whether it is not a fact that Rs. 40 for Assam bottom jute fixed at Calcutta is too low considering the increased cost of production and will they review the position because actually jute growers in Orissa and Assam do not get that rate because it is fixed at Calcutta ?

Shri Hem Barua : We are neglected.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : Will there be a review and will they take any step to see that this price is available to growers in Assam and Orissa as well?

Shri D. N. Tiwary : Bihar also.

Shri Dinesh Singh : We do not consider that Rs. 40 that we have fixed is low. In fact, the Agricultural Prices Commission went into this question and without giving out any secret I might say that we fixed a higher price than was recommended. We have taken all this into account and we have said that we shall have Rs. 40 as the support price at which Government will buy jute as it becomes necessary.

Shri M. L. Sondhi : The Minister has been urging the industry to take steps to find new avenues but surely as a way of evading his own responsibility. Since direct and indirect employment provided by jute mills runs into lakhs and there is need for maintenance of employment opportunities in West Bengal for political and economic stability there, what are the urgent measures which he himself and his ministry propose to take to develop these new areas and new products on a very urgent and immediate basis ?

Shri Dinesh Singh : I request you to consider whether it is desirable for me to discuss in detail what new avenues the

industry may be wanting to enter. There will be no surprise left if we tell that in advance.

Shri H. P. Chatterji : May I know whether it is a fact that the Central Jute Committee fixed a parity price of raw jute with paddy, and that is three times? Now, I come from a jute-growing province. There, in the mofussil paddy is being sold at Rs. 100 per maund. If we fix the price at Rs. 40 for jute, how can the Minister expect that the production of jute will be again coming just like this year, because the parity price should be three times, that is what the Central Jute Committee has recommended. That should be the parity price between paddy and jute. My question is : what is he going to do to bring that parity price between jute and paddy ?

Shri Dinesh Singh : This matter had been taken into consideration, the parity between paddy and jute. As I mentioned, the Agricultural Prices Commission had gone into all these matters. Bearing this in mind, we fixed, as I said, the price of jute slightly higher than that recommended by the Commission.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji : Is the Minister aware of the fact that most of the very important jute mills are situated in Howrah, the constituency which I represent. I would say that this IJMA is there always hanging as the Domocle's sword on the workers, that they will lay off the workers and stop the mill for a few days in the week. This has been going on for a long time. Is the Minister prepared to take effective steps to see that this constant threat is not there on the workers: because of which they are in a state of consternation all the while and production is thereby hampered ?

Shri Dinesh Singh : My statement should remove any misunderstanding on this account.

Shri M. Amersey : In consideration of the bumper jute crop which is expected, will he consider exporting raw jute?

Shri Dinesh Singh : We can, consider if it become necessary.

श्री बलराज मधोक : विमाजन के समय से हो देश में पटसन के बारे में एक सी सा पालिसी चल रही है। कभी कहा जाता है कि जूट कम है इस लिये हमारी मिलें काम नहीं कर रही हैं और कभी कहा जाता है कि चूकि जूट अधिक है इसलिये मिलें ठीक प्रकार से काम नहीं कर रही हैं और उन्हें ठीक कीमत नहीं मिल रही है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार ने कोई अन्दाजा लगाया है कि हमारी प्रोडक्शन कैपैसिटी कितनी है और हमारा जूट प्रोडक्शन कितना है और उनमें कहां तक ताल मेल है। चूकि हम को पाकिस्तान से कोई जूट नहीं मिलता है इसलिये हमारे देश की मिलों की जितनी आवश्यकता है उसको पूरा करने के लिये कितना जूट पैदा होना चाहिये, क्या इसका कोई अन्दाजा लगाया गया है और क्या उतनी जमीन पर जूट पैदा करने का कोई प्रबन्ध किया गया है ताकि जूट प्रायर्स का कीमत मिलती रहे और मिलों को रा मटीरियल मिलता रहे और हम वर्ल्ड मार्केट में अपनी जगह न खोयें ?

श्री विनेश सिंह : जी हां, यह सब आंकड़े हमारे पास हैं। माननीय सदस्य को पूरी सूचना यहां पर देना तो कठिन है, लेकिन अगर वे चाहेंगे तो मैं उनके पास उन्हें भेज दूंगा। इसके बारे में मैं एक बात का जिक्र कर देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां आज जो भी जूट की पैदावार है वह फी एकड़ उतनी अच्छी नहीं है जितनी और जगहों पर है। हम इसका और बढ़ाने को कांशिस कर रहे हैं।

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी : बराबर यह देखा गया है ईख और जूट के सम्बन्ध में कि जब कभी पैदावार ज्यादा हो जाती है तो भाव गिर जाता है। कलकत्ता में जूट का रेट 40 रु० रखने से बिहार के प्रोप्रर्स को 30 रु० से अधिक नहीं मिलता। क्या इसके लिये गवर्नमेंट ने कोई उपाय सोचा है ? जिस समय बंगाल के लोग जूट खरीदने

आते हैं तो बिहार के कल्टिवेटर उनसे बंगला में बात नहीं कर सकते हैं, उड़ीसा और असम के लोग बंगला में बात करके दाम ठीक करा लेते हैं, लेकिन बिहार के लोग जो देहाती भाषा में बोलते हैं ठीक नहीं करा पाते हैं। इसलिये क्या इस पर विचार किया गया है कि उनको भी 40 रु० कीमत मिल जाये ताकि जूट की पैदावार कम न हो ?

श्री विनेश सिंह : इसके बारे में मेरे पास कोई शिकायत नहीं आई है। लेकिन माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है इसको और हम इस पर देखेंगे और बिहार सरकार से कहेंगे कि वह कुछ इसके बारे में इंतजाम करे।

Shri S. K. Tapariah : It is an established fact that the conversion cost of jute in our country is about fifty per cent lower than in Pakistan. Conceding that the price of raw jute is the same in both countries, may I know why our export prices are nearly thirty per cent higher than the export prices of Pakistan? What would he attribute this to—higher taxes, higher excise duty or what?

Shri Dinesh Singh : I am sorry the hon. Member has for the second time not given the correct things. Jute prices in India and Pakistan are not the same; they are very much cheaper in Pakistan.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : श्री मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि कुछ जूट के ऊपर इप्टी कम की गई है और कुछ और एवेन्यूज, माफिट बगैरह बूंदो है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले तीन सालों में जो स्टेप आपने लिये हैं एक्सपोर्ट को ज्यादा करने के लिये इस जूट की उनसे कितना फर्क पड़ा है। आंवर आल पोजिन जूट के एक्सपोर्ट की बढ़ी है क्या और अगर बढ़ा है तो कितनी ?

श्री विनेश सिंह : इसके बारे में मैं यह सूचना दे सकता हूँ कि 1963-64 में हमारे जूट के एक्सपोर्ट्स का मूल्य 326.8 मिलियन डालर थी, 1964-65 में 354.5

मिलियन डालर या श्रीर 1965-66 में 383.1 मिलियन डालर था। पिछले साल यह जरूर गिरा है और यह इस कारण से है क्योंकि हमारे यहां जूट की कमी थी। पिछले साल यह 334.4 मिलियन डालर था।

11.23 hrs.

RE : BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Secundarabad): Sir, on a point of order about the business. The Education Commission report....

Mr. Speaker: No, please, not now Shri Hem Barua. The order of business is not fixed by me.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: After call attention notice, I will say that.

Mr. Speaker: All of us may have to say about that. Somebody else may want to discuss something else. The whole of the day we will discuss the order of business. I have no objection. Let us see by evening what we can do. If you want, you can discuss in the evening. If you raise that point now, there are a number of people. They have come to my chamber, not here, as you are rising now; they wanted to include this and that. I have not been able to oblige them.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: It is an extraordinary situation, a revolutionary measure which is going to affect millions. I want it to be taken up first before any other business. He says he is going to announce on the 15th of August.... (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: Will you please sit down when I am on my legs? Let us follow that principle at least. Other members also suggested some other things. I would have myself proposed it before the House if you had at least discussed it with me. I want the hon. members to give up the practice of just standing up and raising any question. If you want to raise any point, Mr. Nath Pal or other hon. members, I have absolutely no objection. I will just sit here and everybody can raise everything. I want only the rules to be changed

to enable me so that I will be free to sit here seeing everybody raising anything. If the Ministers are able to reply, I will be very happy to hear them also I only say: let us follow some procedure.

One should not simply raise anything here. That is what I say. Now, Shri Hem Barua.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Peermade): Will you kindly allow us to convey what we wish to say through you to the Minister of Education? The situation is this. The Minister has said that on the 15th August, the Government of India is going to declare its policy. Now, before the Lok Sabha discusses the report, if the Government is going to declare its policy on the 15th of August, it looks very odd. It is really unfortunate that they are doing it. We will at least request him through you that they will postpone the declaration till the Lok Sabha gets an opportunity to discuss it.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri Bakar Ali Mirza has begun it. He has set the ball rolling. So, I must now hear every body!

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: It is a very important thing, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I know it is a very important thing; I agree with you.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: It is abnormal

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): About the report of the Education Commission, this question has been—

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: One by one; not all of you together.

श्री रामावलतार शास्त्री (पटना): मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आज के ग्रांडर शीट को देखने से पता चलता है कि आपने अधिलम्बनीय लोक महत्व के दो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार किया है। मैंने भी एक कालिग एटेंशन नोटिस दिया था और वह मध्य प्रदेश की जनता जो बिहार और

नेपाल के बोर्डर पर रहती है और हजारों की तादाद में है उनके साथ किये जा रहे अत्याचारों के सम्बन्ध में था। भ्रष्टाचारों में यह छात्र है कि मध्य प्रदेश के हजारों व्यक्ति अत्याचार के शिकार हुए हैं। इसके तिलसिले में मैंने एक अल्प सूचना प्रश्न दिया था लेकिन उसको एलाऊ नहीं किया गया। इसके बाद मैंने आपकी कार्लिंग एड्रेशन नोटिस दिया, आप ने भी उसको एलाऊ नहीं किया। अतः मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इतने महत्वपूर्ण सवाल के बारे में कहां बात की जाये? शार्ट नोटिस ब्रेशचन को सरकार स्वीकार करने को तैयार नहीं है, कार्लिंग एड्रेशन मॉशन को स्वीकार करने के लिये आप तैयार नहीं हैं। मैं आपकी व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जैसे सदस्य इस सवाल को ले कर कहां जायें, किसके सामने इनको रखें और किस तरीके से रखें। मैं आपकी रुलिंग चाहता हूँ। आप हमारे अधिकारों की रक्षा कीजिये . . .

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (मधुवनी) : ऐसा देखा जाता है कि पीछे बैठने वाले जितने सदस्य हैं उनको आप नजर भ्रंदाज करते हैं। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये।

श्री रामावतार शाशत्री : उनकी सम्पत्ति लूटी जा रही है।

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communication (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): Regarding the report of the Education Commission, you have rightly observed that the matters should have been ironed out there in your Chamber. The Business Advisory Committee, as you know, had considered all aspects of the matter, and finally decided 10 hours for its discussion. The agenda for today does indicate that it would not be completed today. The apprehension that many hon. Members are having is, how could the policy announcement be made on the 15th August. It is really a point which might be gone into, and we will convey the sense of the hon. Members on this matter to the Education Minister for his consideration.

Shri Srinivas Misra (Cuttack): We four of us had raised on Adjournment Motion

about the situation in Orissa. It has become a reign of terror; women are being assaulted; their baggages are being looted and there is organised hooliganism and goondaism. When we go to the police stations to register the complaints, they are not receiving them. The Railway Minister has failed to give us security.

Mr. Speaker: Please sit down.

Shri Srinivas Misra: What has happened to our Adjournment Motion?

Mr. Speaker: Will you please sit down? I think they are going to make a statement about it. I presume the hon. Member is referring to Orissa affair.

Shri Srinivas Misra: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; yes.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Bhubaneswar): I had brought up the matter to you. I have raised it earlier.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. You raised it in the same way, without proper permission. At 11 O'clock it came to me. You made the mistake. At two minutes to 11, you came to my Chamber and demanded that something must be done about the matter. I was about to step into the House, and he came in and asked that this matter must be taken up. (Interruption).

The minister himself is perhaps considering it as important and he will make a statement today at 5 O'clock in the evening.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: The question of education has been hanging fire for such a long time. Education is the most important thing and we are handling it in a cavalier way. Now the universities have been opened and whatever decisions have been taken, they have to be implemented now. If you postpone it for 4 months, that means this year is wasted. Therefore, this question of education, and medium of instruction should have been given priority above everything else, but it is being postponed. It is not fair to the House, to the public and to the country.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Today it is free for all. I will call everybody. Today all rules are suspended. Any body can get up. (*Interruption*). Mr. Banerjee. I will come to this side later after finishing that side.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Yesterday when we met after lunch, the Deputy-Speaker was in the Chair and I pointed out to him that about the proposed *dharna* by the West Bengal Ministers in front of the Prime Minister's residence. He promised that he will convey this to the hon. Prime Minister and Food Minister. I hope some statement will be made about that. Secondly I invite your kind attention to the news item in the *Times of India* today "Talks on AIR broadcast code fail".

Mr. Speaker: I have read it also. I am helpless. All the items in newspapers can be taken up today. That is the rule!

Shri S. M. Banerjee: According to this news item, the West Bengal Ministers are not making any broadcast on the 15th August. I want the Minister to clarify it.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour): You have no doubt got a copy of this letter that I have written making a very modest request that the Prime Minister may confirm what has come out in the papers, whether the Central Government is going to give an extra 10,000 tons of foodgrains every month to West Bengal in addition to the commitment already made. If that statement which has come out in the papers is confirmed, it will go a long way to help the situation in West Bengal. I kindly request you to direct the Prime Minister to confirm it.

Shri Samar Guha (Contai): I have come from Calcutta today morning. Till Yesterday evening I know the situation there. The civil life in West Bengal is going to be almost deadlocked. All the trains have been completely dislocated. They are not able to transport petrol to Calcutta. It may so happen that within a day or two all buses and motor cars will stop plying there. As a result of supply being stopped from the rural areas to Calcutta, the prices of all vegetables and other things are soaring very high. There have been demonstrations almost everywhere. Schools

and colleges in mofussil areas are indulging in strikes. Almost all suburban areas are completely dislocated. During the food debate I told in this House that the situation in West Bengal has almost reached a flash point. I also said that the situation in West Bengal should not be allowed to be exploited by interested people. Sir, the situation has become very serious. It may overtake the whole civil life of West Bengal. Therefore, I request that either the Food Minister or the Prime Minister may make a statement today, otherwise you will not be in a position to tell us that we have not given you prior warning of what is going to happen.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: The hon. Prime Minister is present in the House. She may make a statement assuring us that she will see to it that the additional quantity of rice will be sent to West Bengal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may resume his seat. There are other hon. Members also who want to have their say. He should not repeatedly get up and start talking like this.

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are all conscious of the fact that there is this trouble, this food shortage in Kerala as well as in West Bengal and several other States like Bihar. I would certainly be speaking for myself, very happy if the Prime Minister or the Food Minister would be in a position to send not 10,000 tons only but even 15,000 or 20,000 tons of rice to West Bengal. Only day-before-Yesterday the Food Minister made his statement indicating what he was trying to do, how much he was trying to send from Orissa and other areas also. If in addition to that another statement is needed and could be made we would certainly not have any objection to the Food Minister or the Prime Minister making a statement. What I am concerned about is just this. This morning I have also read in the papers that the Prime Minister had been reached, and also the Food Minister, by the Chief Minister of West Bengal to inform them that in case these things are not done some of their ministers are thinking of coming over here to stage the same kind of demonstration that some of our colleagues had staged at

her house. I felt very unhappy when I found that some of my own colleagues were doing it, because that is not an ordinary thing that Members of Parliament are expected to do when they have to deal with the Prime Minister and other Ministers. We are in session. We are entitled to reach them, write to them, telephone to them, go to them, talk to them and make all representations that we like. Therefore, I did feel it rather strange for Members of Parliament to feel themselves compelled and impelled to go and do this dharna at the Prime Minister's place. It is undignified for Members of Parliament. It is also undignified for the House. That was bad enough. I had the honour of writing to you about the way in which the policemen should be instructed and we also should be instructed so that there would not be any unhappy relations between the police and ourselves when we are forced to do this dharna... (Interruptions). Where is democracy I want to know? I thought hon. Members would hear me. What I am concerned with is this. Where would be our democracy? Where would be our Constitution when some ministers also form the States want to stage demonstrations here before the Prime Minister's house? Is it not the duty of the ministers to maintain law and order in their respective States? (interruptions). Are they not responsible for maintaining law and order? Should they not observe constitutional proprieties? If the Ministers also resort to strikes, to dharna, to gheraos, then I can only say that it will be the last day for our democracy..... (interruptions). This is not the kind of attitude to be observed by the Minister, if they are observing the Constitution.... (interruptions).... if they are true to democracy.... (interruptions). Therefore, I would appeal to the Ministers in the States and all our Members here to show some minimum respect for our Constitution, for our democracy and not to bring democracy to contempt by allowing these Ministers to indulge in unseemly, unconstitutional, indecent and immoral practices.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri. J. B. Kher): I agree with what Professor Ranga has

said. If rice or wheat could be produced by a dharna, I would welcome it. But, unfortunately, we cannot increase the availability of these foodgrains by dharnas. I want to state clearly that I have not had any news of these dharnas except from what hon. Members themselves have seen in the newspapers; from no other source has any news come. I do not know whether I need mention the figures again, because Jagjivan Ramji has mentioned them. We are doing our utmost to increase the allotment, if we can. But the real difficulty is in getting these foodgrains moving. It does not make much difference if there is a little delay in our promising further stocks. We are trying to get the foodgrains anyhow, but the important thing is to get them moving. The Food Ministry is doing its utmost and the Bengal Ministry is also sending an officer to expedite the movement. I am sure all sides of the House share the concern of the Members from West Bengal regarding the difficulties which the country is facing... (interruptions).

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) :
 आप सब कुछ कर रही हैं, लेकिन लोग भूखों मर रहे हैं। आप सब कुछ करते रहिये और लोग भूखों मरते रहें ?

Shri Samar Guha: I assure the Prime Minister on behalf of the people of West Bengal that if she makes a firm commitment that an extra 10,000 tons of foodgrains would be allowed to West Bengal, the trains would be moving, there would be no dharna, there would be no dislocation of traffic and there would be no strike. Let her make that firm commitment that extra 10,000 tons of foodgrains would be immediately despatched to West Bengal.

श्री रामसेवक दास (दाराबंकी) :
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप के द्वारा गृह मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। आप जानते हैं श्रीमन्, हमारे देश की राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी मानी गई है और . . . उत्तर प्रदेश की राजभाषा भी हिन्दी है . . . (व्यवधान)

[श्री राम सक्क यादव]

अध्यक्ष महोदय, रिजर्व बैंक ने यह चिट्ठी लिखी है उत्तर प्रदेश के वित्तमंत्री को :

"Our Nagpur office had received a letter from your Department written in Hindi language vid ecopy of the letter enclosed. As you are aware, all transaction and correspondence in the Reserve Bank of India are in English and it will be difficult for our offices to take prompt action on a letter written in Hindi. . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I told you in my chamber that there will be trouble about it. What can I do? Shri Govind Das also came to my chamber. (Interruptions).

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: It further says:

"Specially those which relate to monetary transaction involving debit and credit to the Government account.

Under these circumstances, we shall be glad if you will kindly address all your correspondence to the offices of the Bank in English. If, however, your Government chooses to use Hindi language for their official correspondence, such letters should be accompanied by a translation in English duly attested by the signing officers as approved by Central Government. So far as the Bank is concerned, correspondence in English language will be taken as authentic for all purposes."

श्रीमान् गृह मंत्री नन्दा जी ने यह कहा था कि यह जरूरी नहीं होगा कि जो पत्र हिन्दी में भेजे जायेंगे उनका तर्जुमा अंग्रेजी में दिया जाय। यह रिजर्व बैंक का आदेश एक तरह से अंग्रेजी लाहने के समान है। यह संविधान के विपरीत है। संविधान की धारा 343-344 के बिलकुल विपरीत है।

श्री० मोबिन्द दास (जबलपुर) : अध्यक्ष जी, मैं आप के कैम्बर में आया था और इस

प्रश्न को मैं बहाना उठाना चाहता था। कार्यवाही के नियमों में 377 ऐसा नियम है कि जिसके अनुसार कोई भी प्रश्न जो प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर का न भी हो, वह आप की अनुमति से उठाया जा सकता है। अभी जो भाई राम सेवक जी ने बात कही है वह बड़े महत्व की बात है। 29 मई, 1966 को जब कि श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा हमारे गृह मंत्री थे उस समय उन्होंने इस बात को स्पष्ट कर दिया था कि क्योंकि हिन्दी हमारी राष्ट्रभाषा है और राजभाषा है इसलिए उसके सम्बन्ध में कोई भी लिखापढ़ी हिन्दी में नहीं रोकੀ जा सकती है और हिन्दी में चिट्ठी भेजी जाय तो उसके अंग्रेजी अनुवाद की आवश्यकता नह है

Mr. Speaker: Don't make a speech now.

श्री० मोबिन्द दास : ऐसी हालत में रिजर्व बैंक के मैनेजर को इस प्रकार का पत्र उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार को 'लिखने' का क्या अर्थ है ? राष्ट्रभाषा हमारी हिन्दी है और उत्तर प्रदेश की भाषा भी हिन्दी है। ऐसी हालत में रिजर्व बैंक का इस प्रकार का पत्र जाना हमारे संविधान की धक्केलना है।

Shri Anbazhagan Tiruchangode: The hon. Member has raised an important issue that the correspondence, whatever it is, which is in Hindi should be answered by the Reserve Bank as well as the Central Government offices in Hindi. I want to say that as long as English also continues to be as one of the official languages of this country and as long as the people in the south do not agree for Hindi to become the sole official language of this country, the correspondence should be accompanied by a translation in English. As long as this Hindi-dominating feeling continues, the problem will not be solved. The Government have given the assurance but they have not yet honoured it. They have not yet come forward with the Language Bill. I want the Prime Minister to take note of the feelings of the

people in the south. It is in no way less than the feelings of the hungry people. It is the feeling of the people, which is more ancient. Unless and until English also is accepted and continued as the official language of the country, the problem will not be solved. I want the Prime Minister to bring forward the Language Bill as early as possible. They are evading the responsibility. I want to accuse the Government for it. They have given the assurance but they are not going by the assurance. They want to cheat the people. I want the Prime Minister to take note of the feelings of the people in the south and bring forward the Bill as early as possible.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Will all of them kindly sit down?

About language, no further, I am not going to allow anybody to talk. I thought that each one of them was raising some point, but instead of that, they have started a regular debate. It was raised by Mr. Ram Sewak Yadav and then the others also have started... (Interruptions).

Dr. Ranen Sen (Barasat): Food for West Bengal was being discussed, but in the meantime the language issue has been raised... (Interruptions).

Shri J. H. Patel (Shimoga): Spoke in Kannada.

Shri Raj Raj Madhok: Mr. Ram Sewak Yadav has raised a point. Let the hon. Minister reply to it... (Interruption).

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. What is his point of order?

Shri Hem Barua: The Zero Hour starts only after the Call Attention Motion is disposed of and before the papers are laid on the Table. There is a Call Attention Motion admitted by you and which is on the agenda paper. Before that is taken up, you have allowed the Zero Hour to start.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a question of my allowing. All the things which were rejected by me in the Chamber have been raised here.

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit that it is never too late for anybody to correct a mistake?

Mr. Speaker: I would very much like them to follow the proper procedure and that is why I said that nothing should be raised in the House which has not been accepted by me. But they are raising.

Today being the last day of the session. I allowed them; otherwise, I would not have allowed; otherwise, with this discipline in the House, we can never function; we can never function if that is the order of the day; I will never allow it. But having allowed a few members, I cannot now tell the others that they should sit down.

Therefore, I call Mr. Venkatasubbaiah.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah rose—

श्री पद्म लिमये (मुंठेर) : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

Mr. Speaker: Yes. What is his point of order?

Shri J. H. Patel: Spoke in Kannada.

Mr. Speaker: Spoke in Kannada.

Shri J. H. Patel: Spoke in Kannada.

Mr. Speaker: What is Mr. Limaye's point of order?

श्री पद्म लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आप ने यह उचित समझा कि चूंकि आज आखिरी दिन है इसलिये सब लोगों को अपनी बात कहने का मौका दिया जाये। लेकिन इसके तभी कुछ माने होते हैं जब जो मुद्दे यहां उठाये जाते हैं उनका कोई जवाब मंत्री लोग दें। जैसे बंगाल के बारे में कुछ कहा गया। सन्तोष तो उससे नहीं हुआ क्योंकि बिल्कुल रद्दी बात कही गयी। लेकिन कुछ तो कहा। श्री रामसेवक यादव ने मुद्दा उठाया है वह रिजर्व बैंक के सम्बन्ध में है। मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से जनता चाहता हूँ...

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. Will he kindly sit down now?

श्री मधु लिमये : फिर उठाने से फायदा क्या है ? सही स्थिति क्या है इसके बारे में वह बतलायें, नहीं तो इस तरह से बोलने का मतलब क्या है ?

Mr. Speaker: He has raised the point of order already. Now he should sit down. It is not as though every Minister can be ready on every subject and give an answer on the spot. I do not think even if Shri Madhu Limaye happens to be the Foreign Minister or Finance Minister, as is expected, I do not think he will be able to answer it off hand, so very cloquently.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मधु लिमये इतने बेवकूफ कभी नहीं हुए, यह मैं आप से कहता हूँ ।

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Nandyal): I have been compelled to raise this point. You may remember, that I had given a Calling Attention Notice two days back regarding the harassment that was being meted out to the linguistic minorities in Berhampore of Orissa. In this connection, I had also written to you a letter with the request that the Home Minister may make a statement. I had also written a letter to the Home Minister. I am not here to create any bitterness among the various linguistic groups residing in that State. But the situation is that for the last two or three months, the linguistic minorities are held to ransom, and they have not been able to come out; cinema-houses that are displaying Telegu pictures have been closed, and one cinema proprietor has been taken away and has been kept in unlawful custody. The Telegu newspapers are not being received there for the last three months. These are the difficulties that I want to bring to your notice.....

Shri Chintamal Panigrahi: I just want to say something in reply to Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to reply to him? I thought that the Home Minister would reply.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: He has misreported it. So, I must have my submission. You have allowed a free-for-all day.

An hon. Member: Let him speak in Oriya.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: My hon. friends want me to speak in Oriya. So, I shall speak in Oriya. Today is a free-for-all day. That is why I also want to raise this.

(Spoke in Oriya).

Shrimati Lakshmi Kanthamma (Khammam): *(Spoke in Telegu).*

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh, (Parbhani): We had tabled a calling-attention notice about the Krishna-Godavari water dispute, signed by 50 Members of this House, and we had expected that it would command at least ten per cent of your attention, but I am sorry to say that we could not claim even that. It had already been discussed in the Rajya Sabha, and we had given you a copy of the calling-attention notice that had been discussed in the Rajya Sabha, and yet our calling-attention notice has been rejected. Then, on your advice, we had tabled a short notice question,.....

Mr. Speaker: I cannot help it. Government have given whatever answers they could. The Prime Minister has answered it already.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Then, we had given notice of a short notice question, but I am sorry to say that the short notice question also has not been admitted.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I think we may go on to the agenda.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): We do not want this kind of thing any longer.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Please, kindly, stop this kind of thing.

12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCEREPORTED OCCUPATION OF 10 SQ. MILES OF
INDIAN TERRITORY BY PAKISTAN

Mr. Speaker: Calling attention notice
(Interruption).

Shri Hem Barua (Maugaldai): Spoke in
Assamese—

The trouble is, may I tell you point-blank, that you have departed from the convention....

Mr. Speaker: Today I have.

Shri Hem Barua: Parliament has unhappily been reduced to a pandemonium, to a mockery.

Mr. Speaker: Let him read out his notice.

Shri Hem Barua: How can I read it out when there is so much noise all round?

I call the attention of Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

Reported occupation of 10 square miles of Indian territory by Pakistan in Ichaichari-Patichari maujas of Tripura.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Since partition, Pakistan has been raising a territorial claim on an area of about 5 and not 10 square miles situated on the headwaters of the Fenny river on Tripura-East Pakistan border. This area lies between the Fenny river (Asalong channel) on the east and the Ranga Fenny on the west. The boundary in this area has not yet been demarcated. Pakistan claims that her boundary is upto Ranga Fenny whereas we maintain that Asalong channel forms the boundary between East Pakistan and Tripura.

This question was discussed at the Minister level conference between India and Pakistan held in 1959 wherein it was agreed that both the Governments should

further study the records relating to this problem and indicate their respective positions for further discussion between the two Governments. The examination of the records on both sides was made but the representatives of the two Governments could not arrive at a mutually acceptable position.

With the object of maintaining peace on the border in this sector pending demarcation of the international boundary, it had been decided by the civil authorities on both sides on 20th April, 1958 that *status quo* should be maintained in respect of the disputed portion of the land. Pakistan, however, did not honour this agreement. Their Police personnel began intruding into this area soon after the signing of this agreement. There were frequent troubles including armed clashes due to the aggressive attitude of the East Pakistan Rifles personnel. Following some serious incidents, a cease-fire agreement was arrived at on 15 October, 1962. The agreement also provided that all the border forces of both sides should withdraw from the disputed area. The Government of Pakistan again did not honour the agreement. They not only concentrated East Pakistan Rifles personnel in this area but also started inducting their nationals into the area and collecting land revenue and Gharchukti taxes from the people in the disputed territory. The matter was taken up with the Government of Pakistan at various levels but without any success.

After the signing of the Tashkent Declaration the GOC-in-C, Eastern Command (India) and GOC, 14 Infantry Division (Pakistan) met on February 1, 1966 to devise measures for reducing tension on the borders. In pursuance of these decisions arrived at this meeting, the Sector Commanders of the two countries met in Belonia town on 13th February, 1966. At this meeting the two sides agreed to maintain the *status quo* in this area. There have been no further developments in this regard so far.

This matter was first discussed in connection with Lok Sabha Starred Question No. 837 answered on 12th April, 1965. A statement giving a list of areas held

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

in adverse possession by Pakistan which included the Ichaichari-Patichari Mauzas was also placed on the Table of the House on 10th March, 1966.

Shri Hem Barua : Prior to the occupation of this portion of Indian territory on the Tripura-East Pakistan border by Pakistan there was a sort of a shooting war between India and Pakistan. Then a cease-fire agreement was signed by both the parties on the 15th October, 1962 and the cease-fire agreement stipulates that pending settlement of the problem or the dispute, *status quo* shall be maintained both by India and Pakistan. Now what has happened? Since 15th October, 1962 Pakistan has not only occupied the entire territory of five square miles but has extended her jurisdiction over ten square miles and, at the same time, imposed her civil administration there, built roads and houses and established schools. True it is that the Tripura State Government has sent protest notes to Pakistan but as usual Pakistan has consigned those protest notes to the waste paper basket. In that connection may I know why is it that our Government have not told Pakistan pointblank that by violating the *status quo* Pakistan has violated the cease-fire agreement and that if she continues to violate the cease-fire agreement India will have no other alternative but the painful alternative of sending her troops in the area to re-occupy this territory because according to the Radcliffe Award this territory belongs to India and not to Pakistan?

An hon. Member: Well said.

Shri M. C. Chagla : We have protested to Pakistan and pointed out in no unmistakable terms that she has violated both the *status quo* and the cease-fire agreement. Our position is quite clear. We say that if it is a disputed area, the *status quo* must be observed and the cease-fire must be there till the dispute is resolved. But, unfortunately, as I have pointed out, Pakistan has intruded into this and occupied it.

Shri Hem Barua: What about Pakistan violating the cease-fire agreement?

Shri M. C. Chagla : That is what I am pointing out. We have pointed out to Pakistan that she has violated the cease-fire agreement.

Shri Hem Barua: The hon. Minister has said that he has pointed out to Pakistan that Pakistan has violated the cease-fire agreement. That is a patent fact. Everybody knows it that Pakistan has violated the cease-fire agreement. Would he rest on his oars and would he rest on the fact that he has pointed out the violation of the cease-fire agreement to Pakistan or would he go and move a step further to reoccupy the territory? That is what I wanted to know from him.

Shri M. C. Chagla : We are still trying at the diplomatic level to persuade Pakistan to withdraw from this area which she has unlawfully occupied.

श्री मधु लिमवे (मुंगेर) : क्या कर्मा मंत्री महोदय इस बात पर सोचते हैं कि इस देश को आवादी 51 करोड़ है और पाकिस्तान को आवादी 10-11 करोड़ है? आपको लोक संख्या करीब पांच गुना है। साधनों में आप ज्यादा शक्तिशाली हैं। ऐसा होते हुए भी पिछले बौस वर्ष में एक एक करके हमारे देश के कई टुकड़े पाकिस्तान के हाथ में चले जा रहे हैं। उसका विवरण भी दिया गया है। आजाद काश्मीर को आपने नहीं जोड़ा था। लेकिन उसके बगैर यह जितना सारा इलाका है जोकि पाकिस्तान के हाथ में चला गया है इसके बारे में मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह नपुंसक नीति, जो आपकी है, इसको आप कब छोड़ेंगे और जितना इलाका पाकिस्तान ने लिया है उतना ही उसका इलाका जहाँ आपके लिये सम्भव होगा, उसको आप कब लेने का फंसला करेंगे? क्या कितना दिन आप यह काम करेंगे कि जितना इलाका उन्होंने लिया है उतना आप भी लेंगे? भ्रमर आप से लेते हैं उनका ताँ क्या आप नहीं समझते हैं कि वे बातचीत के लिये तैयार हो जायेंगे और तब कोई सम्मानपूर्ण समझौता हो जायेगा? मैं अपने प्रश्न का सीधा जवाब चाहता हूँ।

यह नपुंसक नाति आप कब छोड़ेंगे कि हमारे देश के लिये लड़ेंगे है . . .

Mr. Speaker: You need not repeat it. Once is all right. Repetition is not going to help.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह मामूली सवाल नहीं है। चागला साहब ने तो नहीं हमने वचन से ही आजादी का लड़ाई लड़ी है। हमने कभी नहीं सोचा था कि इस तरह की चीज होगी।

Mr. Speaker: Repeating 'napunsak neeti' half a dozen times is not going to help.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा यह सवाल है कि जितना इलाका उनके कब्जे में चला गया है क्या उतना ही इलाका आप उनका ले लेंगे ताकि कोई सम्मानपूर्ण समझौते का रास्ता खुल जाये ? प्रॉटेस्ट नोट में या राजनीतिक स्तर पर बातचीत करने में यह नहीं होगा।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am painfully conscious of the fact that during these years Pakistan has intruded into our territory and occupied some portions of it. No one feels it more than I do. My hon. friend is not right when he says that. I have been thinking about it.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप खाक फोल करते हैं।

Shri M. C. Chagla: The question is as to what policy we should pursue. My hon. friend suggests a military conflict. He wants us to occupy territories of Pakistan commensurate with the territories which Pakistan has occupied. This is his suggestion for a policy. It would be a drastic change from the policy that we have been pursuing.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या इनकी पालिसी, नाति घपना इलाका छोड़ने की है ? क्या इनकी पालिसी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भूदान यज्ञ की है ?

1926 (A) LSD—2.

Shri M. C. Chagla: No, Sir.

श्री मधु लिमये : ये वचन खाते हैं मुल्क की प्रभुता और भार्वाभिकता की रक्षा की और अब कहते हैं कि इससे पालिसी में बेंज होगा। इसका क्या मतलब है ? देश की प्रभुता और प्रादेशिक अक्षुण्णता की रक्षा करना इनका कर्तव्य है। इसमें कहीं कोई नई नीति नहीं है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: He is not suggesting taking back our territory; he is suggesting occupying the territory in Pakistan.

श्री मधु लिमये : हाँ, घपनी सार्व-भार्वभिकता की रक्षा करने के लिये।

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): Without reciprocal action you cannot deal with Pakistan.

Shri Piloos Mody (Godha): What is the purpose of your policy?

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : मैं मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान इस बात की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने 31 जुलाई, 1967 को यह सवाल पूछा था कि हमारे कौन कौन से एरियाज पाकिस्तान के एडवर्स पोजीशन में हैं और कौन से डिस्पूटिड एरियाज हैं। माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने बताया कि त्रिपुरा-ईस्ट पाकिस्तान बार्डर पर इच्छाचारी-पटीचारी विलेज डिस्पूटिड टैरीटरी है। उन्होंने उसको एडवर्स पोजीशन की सूची में नहीं दिया। उन्होंने भागलपुर विसेज नियर भगरताला एयरोड्रोम को एडवर्स पोजीशन में बताया। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी केवल छः गज जमीन पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है। लेकिन आज वह कहते हैं कि पांच मील है, जब कि चीफ मिनिस्टर कहते हैं कि हमारी दस मील जमीन पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह जान-बूझ कर हाउस को मिसगैड करना चाहते हैं या जो पाप उन्होंने किया है, उसको छिपाना चाहते हैं और इस तरह अपने देश के हिस्सों को दुश्मनों की लकरी में देते जाना और

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त]

उसको लोक सभा तथा देश से छिपाना कहाँ तक उचित है। इस बारे में स्पष्टीकरण दें।

क्या मंत्री महोदय बगैर लोक सभा को बताए, बगैर यहाँ स्टेटमेंट दिये, बगैर कोई व्हाइट पेपर निकाले पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौता कर सकते हैं कि वह हमारे किसी हिस्से पर कब्जा किये रखे ? यह इलाका एक बार हमने वापिस ले लिया था, लेकिन पाकिस्तान ने जबदस्ती दोबारा उस को ले लिया है। क्या सरकार की यह पालिसी नहीं है कि वह पाकिस्तान के साथ रिसीप्रोकल बेसिस पर व्यवहार करे—जो पाकिस्तान करे, उसके बदले में हम भी वैसा ही स्टैप्म लें, अगर नहीं है, और अगर हमारे प्रोटेस्ट नोट का कोई असर नहीं होता है, तो सरकार क्या कार्यवाही करेगी ?

Shri M. C. Chagla : My hon. friend is not fair to me. If he will look at the statement which he refers to, the heading clearly points out the disputed areas on the India-China and Indo-Pakistan borders under possession of foreign countries. When we deal with Pakistan we have mentioned this very area, that is, Ichai-chari and Patichari Mauzas in the Fenny River area. The position with regard to areas in possession of Pakistan is that certain areas are in dispute and we have pointed out which of these areas are in possession of Pakistan. About other areas there is no dispute; Pakistan admits our claim but Pakistan has not handed over to us those areas because she says not till the final settlement takes place. We have some areas also which we admit belong to Pakistan.

Shri Hem Barua : Do not forget one thing, that Pakistan has occupied all the disputed areas.

Shri M. C. Chagla : There are areas, as I said, which are in possession of Pakistan about which there is no dispute.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok : How do you call them disputed ? Because Pakistan disputes them ? You have yourself said that according to the Radcliffe Award this area belongs to us.

Shri M. C. Chagla : I cannot help Pakistan disputing it; can I ?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok : Then, any area disputed by Pakistan will become Pakistan's, is it ?

श्री भृगु लिभये : क्या दिल्ली भी डिस्पूटिड एरिया है ?

Shri M. C. Chagla : As I said, Pakistan disputes some areas (Interruption).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok : It is not an ordinary matter. The Minister must be clear about this.

Shri M. C. Chagla : This particular village, Bhagalpur village, comes in an area which is not disputed. But pending a general settlement where there will be exchange between Pakistan and India of territories which are not disputed, they remain either in possession of Pakistan . . . (Interruption).

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta : How does he define the term "disputed" ?

अगर कल पाकिस्तान यह कहे कि दिल्ली भी उसका हिस्सा है, तो क्या वह भी डिस्पूटिड टैरीटरी हो जायेगा ?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok : I want the Prime Ministry to say something about it. We expect, the whole country expects that. Pakistan is in a murderous mood and we expect some kind of an adventure in the next two or three months. If she takes over some more of our area, you will come after two or three months to tell us that more area has been disputed. We want a clear assurance that no part of the country will be allowed to be taken over by Pakistan. This assurance must come from the Prime Minister (Interruption).

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे सवाल का जवाब नहीं दिया गया है। मैंने कहा था कि

Mr. Speaker : No, please. Nothing to be taken down.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : ***

12.51 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

INCREASES IN EXCISE DUTY ON SIZED SUPERFINE AND FINE YARN

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I beg to lay on the Table a statement regarding the increase in excise duty on sized superfine and fine yarn and the estimated additional revenue therefrom. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-1442/67.]

DELAY IN EXECUTION OF RUSSIAN AIDED PROJECTS

Shri Morarji Desai: I beg to lay on the Table a Statement regarding delay in the execution of Russian aided Projects. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1459/67.]

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नोज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। श्री देसाई ने जो वक्तव्य सदन-पटल पर रखा है, मैंने उस विषय के सम्बन्ध में आपको दो तीन पत्र लिखे, जिनमें श्री देसाई की शलती बताई। मैंने श्री देसाई के मंत्रालय के लोगों से बातचीत भी की। अब सदन में जो तरीका अपनाया जा रहा है, उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि मेरी बात को सदन के सामने बाद में अकेले प्रायेगी, जब कि श्री देसाई का वक्तव्य सदन-पटल पर रख दिया गया है—जैसा कल हुआ है, वैसा ही आज भी हो जायेगा और किसी को कुछ पता नहीं चलेगा। इसलिए श्री देसाई को चाहिए कि वह कम से कम अपने बयान का सारांश इस सदन को दे दें। तब तो मेरे जवाब का कुछ मतलब होगा। वैसे मैं आपसे कहूँ कि कायदे के अनुसार आपको मेरी बात या तो पहले और या बाद में पूरी तरह से सुननी चाहिए। अध्यक्ष के निदेश 115 के अनुसार पहले सुननी चाहिए, लेकिन अगर किसी तरह से आप ने उस नियम को तोड़ दिया है, तो मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि श्री देसाई अपने बयान का सारांश बता दें और उसके बाद मैं अपनी बात कहूँ, वना

रंगा साहब या दूसरे माननीय सदस्य इस मामले को बिल्कुल साफ समझ ही नहीं पायेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या आप इसी वक्त इस स्टेटमेंट को डिसकस करना चाहते हैं ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : डिसकस करने का सवाल नहीं है। वित्त मंत्री अपने बयान का सारांश बता दें और उसके बाद मैं अपनी बात कह दूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सारांश बताने का नतीजा यह होगा कि कई दूसरे मेम्बर सवाल पूछने लग जायेंगे और यह मामला चलता रहेगा।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप मुझे अपनी बात कहने का अवसर देंगे न ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : किस बारे में ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : फ़ाइन और सुपरफ़ाइन यार्न पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी के बारे में, जिस पर श्री देसाई ने अपना वक्तव्य सदन-पटल पर रखा है। आप जानते हैं कि यह वक्तव्य कई पत्रों के बाद आया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उन्होंने आपको लिखा है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप मुझे बोलने का अवसर देंगे न ?

Mr. Speaker: You are corresponding with him. Why don't you continue that? Why do you want to raise it here?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस लिए कि शलत बयानी फिर भी रह जाती है। यह वित्तीय मामला है। यह खाली एक टैक्स का मामला नहीं है। मैंने यह शलती बताई या कि सरकार ने इस ड्यूटी की जो घामवनी दी है, वह उससे चार पाँच सौ सैकड़

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

घटिका है। मैंने बहुत सोचा विचारा है। वह तीन सौ सैकड़ा तो है ही। अगर वित्तीय मामलों में असावधानी होगी या ईमानदारी की कमी होगी, तो फिर राज्य नहीं चल सकता है, राज्य खत्म हो जाता है। इस लिए जब आप वित्त मंत्री को अपना बयान सदन-पटल पर रखने का मौका देते हैं और मुझसे यह मौका छीन लेते हैं, तो आखिर आप किस नियम के अनुसार चल रहे हैं ?

Mr. Speaker: After all, there are a number of papers being laid on the Table of the House. If you want every thing to be read out and then a discussion on it started, I do not know whether we will be able to do any thing at all in this House today, because a number of papers are there to be laid on the Table of the House. You are pointing out some mistakes to the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, form your point of view, and he is also replying to you, and he is laying it on the Table of the House. If through correspondence you can do it, it is all right. Or else, you can raise it next time, but not now.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप अध्यक्ष के निदेश 115 को तो देखिये।

Mr. Speaker: But it is not put in the agenda. Adhyaksh has got so much of power but it cannot all be used.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह बिल्कुल साफ़ तौर से फ़ैसला हो चुका है कि जब किसी सदस्य ने किसी मंत्री के बयान में कोई ग़लती बताई हो तब अकेला मंत्री ही उस पर बयान नहीं कर सकता है। यह बिल्कुल निश्चित नियम रहा है। तो फिर केवल वित्त मंत्री ही अपना बयान कैसे कर सकते हैं ? इस सदन में दोनों तरफ़ का बयान आना चाहिए। आपने अकेले श्री देसाई को बयान करने की अनुमति देकर पुराने नियमों को तोड़ा है। अध्यक्ष के निदेश 115 के अनुसार आप यह नहीं कर सकते हैं।

Mr. Speaker: It has been done a number of times.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I submit that I have laid the statement on the Table at the request of Dr. Lohia. I would not have put it if he had not requested me to put a statement before the House. It is not right to say that I am taking away his right.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : हाँ तो फिर मेरा जवाब भी तो होना चाहिए।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अब अध्यक्ष महोदय मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न सुनिए। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

CENTRAL BOILERS BOARD (NOMINATION OF MEMBERS) RULES, AND ANNUAL REPORT OF HINDUSTAN CABLES LIMITED, BURDWAN

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Industrial Development and Company Affairs (Shri Raghunath Reddi): I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy of the Central Boilers Board (Nomination of Members) Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1094 in Gazette of India dated the 22nd July, 1967, under sub-section (2) of section 28A of the Indian Boilers Act, 1923. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1443/67.]
- (2) A copy of the Annual Report of the Hindustan Cables Limited, Burdwan, for the year 1965-66 along with the—
 - (i) Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956.
 - (ii) Review by the Government on the working of the above Company. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1444/67.]

STATEMENT ON MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS
CONTAINED IN THE REPORT OF THE ENERGY
SURVEY OF INDIA COMMITTEE

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals and of Planning and Social Welfare (Shri Raghu Ramalah): On behalf of Shri Asoka Mehta I beg to lay on the Table a statement on major recommendations contained in the report of the Energy Survey of India Committee 1965 along with the details of action taken or proposed to be taken thereon. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1445/67.]

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ENQUIRY
COMMITTEE ON SMALL NEWSPAPERS

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri K. K. Shah): I beg to lay on the Table a statement of thirty-four recommendations of the Enquiry Committee on Small Newspapers and Government's decisions thereon. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1446/67.]

INDIAN TELEGRAPH (FOURTH AMENDMENT)
RULES

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Indian Telegraph (Fourth Amendment) Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1124 in Gazette of India dated the 29th July, 1967, under sub-section (5) of section 7 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1447/67].

ANNUAL ADMINISTRATION REPORT OF THE
DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FOR
1965-66

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Jaganath Rao): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Administration Report of the Delhi Development Authority for the year 1965-66 under section 26 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1448/67.]

EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS (FIFTH
AMENDMENT) SCHEME

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilita-

tion (Shri L. N. Mishra): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Employees' Provident Funds (Fifth Amendment) Scheme, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1103 in Gazette of India dated the 22nd July, 1967, under sub-section (2) of section 7 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1449/67.]

NOTIFICATION UNDER THE CUSTOMS ACT

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri K. C. Pant): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 1176 published in Gazette of India dated the 5th August, 1967, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1455/67.]

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं नुर्गे ?

Mr. Speaker: Half a dozen items have been covered. I am not going back to cover them again.

श्री मधु लिमये : नेक्स्ट आइटम के पहले मैंने कहा है कि मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । आप व्यवस्था का प्रश्न सुनिए । इस पर आप ने निर्णय भी नहीं दिया है ।

श्री रबी राय (पुरी) : वह देखिये मोरारजी देसाई चले जा रहे हैं ।

श्री मधु लिमये : इस सदन में कोई नियम या कानून चलेगा या नहीं ? अगर चलेगा तो मैं आपका निर्णय चाहता हूँ । जो आपको निर्णय देना है वह दीजिए उस से मुझको मतलब नहीं लेकिन मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न सुन लीजिए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कहिए, कहिए ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा आपसे इतना ही निवेदन है और व्यवस्था का प्रश्न मेरा यह है कि क्या अध्यक्षीय निर्देश 115 को और उसके अन्दर जितनी प्रक्रिया चलती है इस

[श्री मधु लिमये]

सदन की, इसके अलावा इस सदन की परिपाटी है, निर्णय है, सभी को क्या आपने आज खत्म किया है ? मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि पिछली बार मैंने अध्यक्ष महोदय, 115 के मातहत (व्यवधान)

श्री म० प्र० खां : (कासगंज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह वक्त खराब कर रहे हैं . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं नियमों और काननों को छोड़ कर कभी नहीं बोलता हूँ (व्यवधान) बिलकुल नहीं। कानून और नियम और संविधान के आधार पर बोल रहा हूँ। अगर आपकी समझ में बात नहीं आती है तो आप मत सुनिए। (व्यवधान) . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप बैठ जाइए।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप इस तरह बिटाने वाले कौन हैं ? मैं बिलकुल नहीं बैठने वाला हूँ। आप कौन बिटाने वाले होते हैं ?

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप बार बार इनको क्यों खड़े होने देते हैं ? . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मेरी बात सुन कर निर्णय दीजिए। अगर आप को नियमों को खत्म करना हो तो वह कहिए कि मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। लेकिन कोई साफ निर्णय आना चाहिए। मैं आप से कह रहा था कि तीसरी लोक सभा में मैंने दो दफ़ा इस सवाल को उठाया कि अगर सरकार की गलतबयानी को सब से पहले अगर कोई सदस्य पकड़ता है और उसके बाद कोई बयान आता है तो उसको लेकर मंत्री महोदय प्रकेले "सु मोटो" बयान नहीं दे सकते हैं। पहले जिसने गलती पकड़ी है उसका बयान होगा और उसके जवाब में ही मंत्री का बयान होगा। मैंने भी आपके सामने लाठी टोला डूमा बारी के बारे में एक बयान दिया था, लेकिन उसका सवाल

इस समय नहीं उठा रहा हूँ। आप इस पर व्यवस्था दीजिए कि क्या आज से 115 खत्म हो गया ? अगर आप कहेंगे कि 115 खत्म हुआ तो ज्वामुखाह हम मेहनत नहीं करेंगे, अपना वक्त बरबाद नहीं करेंगे। आप कहिए कि आपने खत्म कर दिया। आपको इस पर व्यवस्था देनी है।

Mr. Speaker: The statement has been laid on the Table of the House. I need not give my decision now.

डा० राजेंद्र नोहर लोहिया : आप कुछ कह नहीं रहे हैं ?

Mr. Speaker: I have nothing to say now.

ANNUAL REPORT OF INDIAN CENTRAL COTTON COMMITTEE FOR 1965-66 ETC.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri Annasahib Shinde): I beg to lay on the Table--

- (1) A copy of the Annual Report of the Indian Central Cotton Committee for the year 1965-66. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1451/67.]
- (2) A copy of the Annual Report of the Indian Central Coconut Committee for the year 1965-66. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1452/67.]
- (3) A copy of the Annual Report of the Indian Central Jute Committee for the year 1964-65 (Hindi Version). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1453/67.]
- (4) A copy of the Annual Report of the National Seeds Corporation Limited, New Delhi for the year 1965-66, along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the

Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1454/67.]

REVISED STATISTICAL INFORMATION
REGARDING WORKING OF THE PREVENTIVE
DETENTION ACT

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Revised Statistical information regarding the working of the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, during the period 30th September, 1965 to 30th September, 1966. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1455/67.]

ANCIENT MONUMENTS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL
SITES AND REMAINS (AMENDMENT) RULES

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Sher Singh): I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Amendment) Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 663 in Gazette of India dated the 13th May, 1967, under sub-section (4) of section 38 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958.
- (2) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the above Notification [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1456/67.]

NOTIFICATION UNDER ESSENTIAL
COMMODITIES ACT

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Commerce (Shri Shafi Qureshi): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. S.O. 2774 published in Gazette of India dated the 8th August, 1967, issued under section 12A of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1457/67.]

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): Sir, three times I have raised the question about Lothal Museum and the Minister had replied that about Rs. 2.41 lakhs had been set apart for the museum. About eight years back the foundation stone had been laid, and the Government has been saying that the contract has been given

to the CPWD. The CPWD says that tenders have been invited, but for the last eight years nothing has been done; the roads have been laid, the hotel has been built but the museum is not there. 17,000 Harappan antiquities are lying idle in the Baroda museum.

Mr. Speaker: You want a discussion on that also!

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I endorse what he has said.

STATEMENT *re* PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF
EX-INDIAN ARMY OFFICERS WHO HAD
JOINED INA

The Minister of Defence (Shri Swaran Singh): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement about the restoration of the balance of forfeited pay and allowances of the ex-INA personnel. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1458/67.]

12.25½ hrs.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Naudyal): I beg to lay on the Table, minutes of the sittings of the Estimates Committee relating to the Tenth Report on the Ministry of Railways—Commercial and other Cognate matters relating to Indian Railways.

12.26 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDER-
TAKINGS
MINUTES

Shri D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj): I beg to lay on the Table, Minutes of the sittings of the Committee on Public Undertakings relating to:—

- (1) First Report of the Committee on Action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Forty-seventh Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha)—Exports Risks Insurance Corporation Limited, Bombay (Now Transformed into

[Shri D. N. Tiwary]

Export Credit and Guarantee Corporation Limited, Bombay).

- (2) Second Report of the Committee on Action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-fifth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha)—Heavy Electricals (India) Limited, Bhopal.

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): I should like to draw the attention of the Speaker, as also the Chairman of the Public Undertakings Committee and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to this very important point. The Estimates Committee, so far as the work of the Public Undertakings Committee is concerned, had finished this work five years ago, even more than five years ago, when the Public Undertakings Committee came into existence. It made certain recommendations at that time. Now, the statement is being placed today on the Table of the House about the action taken on the recommendations made by the Estimates Committee which became defunct so far as this particular work is concerned five and a half years ago. The Government, and the Department of Parliamentary Affairs also, have neglected their duty to inform the House in regard to the action taken for five and a half years. It is a criminal neglect of the recommendations made by the Public Undertakings Committee, which is a miniature of this Parliament itself. I hope in future at least the Department of Parliamentary Affairs would take care to see that these reports are placed on the Table of the House in regard to the action taken on the recommendations made by the financial committees, especially this Public Undertakings Committee, much earlier, at least within one year after the recommendations are made and not five years hence.

12.28 hrs.

FINANCIAL COMMITTEES, 1966-67
(A REVIEW)

Secretary: I lay on the Table a copy of "Financial Committees, 1966-67 (A Review)."

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

- (i) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Tea (Amendment) Bill, 1967, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 31st July, 1967 and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."
- (ii) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 1967, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 4th August, 1967, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

12.29 hrs.

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILL

Secretary: I lay on the Table the Finance (No. 2) Bill, 1967, passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current session and assented to by the President since a report was last made to the House on the 4th August, 1967.

FINANCIAL COMMITTEES, 1966-67
(A Review)—Contd.

श्री मधु लिमये : (मुंबई) : 17 के बारे में कहना है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, 17 नम्बर है

Secretary to lay on the Table a copy of "Financial Committees, 1966-67 (A Review)."

आप जानते हैं कि इन में से एक वित्तीय कमेटी है पब्लिक एकाउंटस कमेटी और इसके बारे में मैंने एक प्रस्ताव दिया था कि पब्लिक एकाउंटस कमेटी ऐक्शन टेकन रपट सरकार के द्वारा दी गई है या नहीं दी गई है उसके बारे में और जहां दी गयी है वहां सरकारी कार्यवाही पर सोच कर भ्रगले सत्र के पहले दिन तक अपनी रपट पेश करें। इसकी चर्चा यहां पर हुई थी और जब कुछ पूरक प्रश्न में पूछने लगा पब्लिक एकाउंटस कमेटी के चेयरमैन से उस वक्त चेयरमैन साहब ने भी कहा और आपने भी कहा कि आपका प्रस्ताव आने वाला है और उस समय आप इसके बारे में अपने विचार रख सकते हैं आप प्रोसीडिंग्स निकाल कर देख सकते हैं। यह चेयरमैन साहब ने कहा था और आपने भी कहा था। अध्यक्ष महोदय, उसके बाद इस एक सब-कमेटी की बैठक हुई और उसमें डा० राम सुभग सिंह थे, पी० ए० सी० के चेयरमैन मीनू मसानी साहब न्यौते पर आए थे इसी पर फैसला करने के लिए। मेरे प्रस्ताव को प्राथमिकता दी गई और उनकी राय से कब तक रपट दी जाय उसके बारे में जो तारीख मेरे प्रस्ताव में थी उसमें परिवर्तन करके उनकी सुविधा के अनुसार यह कहा कि भ्रगला सत्र जिस दिन शुरू होगा उस दिन तक वह रपट आये। आघा घंटा इस के लिए मुकर्रर किया गया था। आज आखिरी क्षण तक मैं इन्तजार करता रहा कि मुझको आघा घंटा दिया जायेगा। दो रपट अभी-अभी आई। एक रपट तो यू० पी० सी० सी० रोड रालर्स के बारे में और डिफेक्टिव टायर्स के बारे में चौथी रपट आई। आप जानते हैं कि इन चीजों को लेकर मुल्क में इस सदन के सदस्यों में कितना असन्तोष है। यह कोई पार्टी का मामला नहीं है क्योंकि पी० ए० सी० में कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्य भी हैं और विरोधी दलों के भी सदस्य हैं। पी० ए० सी० के सम्मान और इज्जत की रक्षा के लिए और स्वच्छ रूप से शासन चले, फुजूल खर्ची, अनियमिततायें घाघलियां, और घोटाले खरम हों इसके लिये मैं यह चर्चा चाहता था।

क्या मैं आपसे भ्रजं कर सकता हूं, पूछ सकता हूं कि इस प्रकार से वचन भंग किया जाता कहां तक उचित है? मैं सभापति से लड़ना तो पसन्द नहीं करता, लेकिन जम कोई वचन दिया जाता है तो उसको पूरा करना चाहिए। केवल आधे घंटे का सवाल है। यह वचन भंग क्यों किया गया क्या इसका कोई खुलामा दिया जायेगा?

संसद्-कार्य तथा संचार मंत्रा (डा० राम सुभग सिंह) : जहां तक फुजूलखर्ची और अनियमिततायों का सवाल है, असल में इसमें कोई दा रायें नहीं हों मकरतीं। हम लोग इस का विरोध थोड़े हो करेंगे क्योंकि श्री मधु लिमये ऐसा कहते हैं। लेकिन जहां तक आधे घंटे का सवाल है उस पर चर्चा करने की बात मैं आप पर छोड़ता हूं या हाउस पर छोड़ना चाहता हूं क्योंकि भ्रजंडा बहुत है। सदन इसके बारे में अपनी सुविधा देख ले।

Mr. Speaker: Next time, we can take it up in the beginning itself.

श्री मधु लिमये : कम से कम इसको भ्रगले अधिवेशन के पहले दिन रक्खा जाये। मैं इस पर झगड़ा नहीं करना चाहता।

Mr. Speaker: I have said it. Even last time when the question came up, we spent 40 minutes on it. That shows, the whole House is very anxious about it.

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): It should cover all the three committees—Estimates Committee, PAC and PU Committee.

Mr. Speaker: We can fix it up on the first day or in the first week. Anyway, we shall give top priority for that.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय मुझे 19 के बारे में कुछ कहना है। आप नियम 95 देखिये :

"Whereas a Bill is passed by the House, the Speaker shall have power to correct patent errors and make such

[डा० राम मनीहर लोहिया]

other changes in the Bill as are consequential upon the amendments accepted by the House."

इस नियम के अनुसार मैं आपका ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो आंकड़े एक तरफ वित्त मंत्री जो ने इस्तेमाल किये हैं चुंगी के बारे में और दूसरी तरफ जो रई या दूसरे आंकड़े हैं उन में भारी असंगति है। हमारे देश में कुल मिला कर के 60 लाख गांठ रई इस्तेमाल होती है जिस में से 1.4 लाख फाइन और सुपर फाइन है जिसका मतलब हो गया चौथाई हिस्सा। लेकिन जिसके आधार पर वित्त मंत्री ने फाइन और सुपर-फाइन पर जो पावर लूम है, बिजली के करघे, उन पर चुंगी लगाई है उनसे ऐसा लगता है कि वह मुश्किल से 1/6 यानी कुल मिला कर 7 अरब मोटर कपड़ा हमारे यहां पैदा होता है उस में से 1 अरब 10 करोड़ मोटर पर उन्होंने चुंगी लगाई है, मिन वालों और पावर लूम वालों को जाड़ जाड़ लेंगे। लेकिन जब मैंने हिमाचल अभी बतलाया उसके अनुसार 1/4 रई इस्तेमाल होती है, जो महीन कपड़ा है उनके लिये। इसके माफ मतलब होंगे कि इसके मोटर बहुत ज्यादा होंगे। वह एक तिहाई हो जायेगा। तो कहां एक तरफ एक तिहाई का अनुपात है और कहां दूसरी तरफ 116 का अनुपात होता है।

इसके अलावा मैं इस वक्त उन के मंत्रालय के आदमियों का नाम नहीं लूंगा, लेकिन वह लोग कल रात मेरे पास आए थे और उन्होंने खुद बतलाया था कि करोड़ 26 करोड़ किलोग्राम सूत महीन और सुपर-फाइन साल भर में पैदा होता है। लेकिन जिस तरह से उन्होंने चुंगी लगाई है, चाहे बिजली वाले करघे हों चाहे मिल वाले करघे हों, दोनों मिला कर के मुश्किल से 4 या 5 करोड़ पर आती है। 2 करोड़ के करोड़ तो जो उन्होंने गणपको जो खत लिखा है उस में बतलाया है। 1.4 और .8। यानी 2.2। उन्होंने खाली 2 करोड़ बतलाया है

आप के खत में। इसके अलावा मान लिया कि 2 करोड़ और है मिल वालों का। तो 4 करोड़ हो गया। उन्होंने खुद कहा था, टेक्मटाइल कमिश्नर की रिपोर्ट में, कि 26 करोड़ मोटर महीन और आधा महीन सूत होता है। समझ लीजिए थोड़ी सी गलती भी हो, थोड़ा इधर उधर करके सरकार छापती है, तो 20 करोड़ मोटर तो होगा। कहां 20 करोड़ और कहां 4 करोड़। चार पांच गुने का फर्क पड़ जाता है।

मैं यह सवाल इसलिये उठा रहा हूँ कि राज्य के वित्तीय मामले ईमानदारी और मादगी के ऊपर हानि चाहियें। इस मामले में बड़ी अभावधानी हो रही है। यह सही है कि वित्त मंत्री ने अपने बयान में खाली मुझको थोड़ी सी मांटो बात कर कर खुश करना चाहा है। लेकिन वास्तव में इन प्रश्नों का जवाब नहीं दिया है। एक तरफ तो रई की कुल गांठें और दूसरी तरफ जितना महीन सूत आता है उतने में जो चुंगी लगाई है उन में बड़ी असंगति है मेरा तो बिल्कुल यह विश्वास बन गया है कि जो चुंगी 3 करोड़ रुपये की पिछले साल इन बिजली के करघों के ऊपर लगाई गई थी राज्य के पास आई उसकी जगह पर कम से कम 10 करोड़ आनी चाहिए थी, और जो उन्होंने अब की बार 6 या 7 करोड़ रखी है उसकी जगह पर कम से कम 18, 20 करोड़ हो जायेगा, या हो सकता है कि 40 करोड़ हो, लेकिन मैं अपनी बात कम करके रख रहा हूँ और इसके द्वारा नतीजे निकालता हूँ। या तो यह रुपया ज्यादा आयेगा और फुजूलखर्ची होगी—माननीय वित्त मंत्री ने कहा कि हम खर्च नहीं होने देंगे, लेकिन एक आदमी पर कोई एक करोड़ सरकारी नौकरों का काम नहीं चलता है इस लिये उनके यह आश्वासन देने का कोई मतलब नहीं रहता है—और या फिर चुंगी इतनी लगेगी और जो कलेक्टर वगैरह हैं तथा जो दूसरे करघों के मालिक हैं उन दोनों का बड़बन्दा रहेगा। वह पैसे ले लेंगे और इसी तरह से अछूता चार चलता रहेगा। यह दूसरी सम्भावना मुझको

ज्यादा मालूम होती है कि करषे वाले और चुंमी जमा करने वाले लोग प्राप्त में पड़यंत्र करके राज्य का पैसा ले लेंगे।

इसलिए मैं आप से निवेदन करता हूँ कि इस वित्त को आप सुधारें। ऐसी गड़बड़ हो सकती है हर एक टैकम में। मेरा मन तो हिल गया है कि हां सकता है कि हर एक टैकम के मामले में, हर एक खर्च के मामले में 20, 30, 40 या 50 सैकड़ों को गलती हो। हां सकता है कि राज्य का वित्त बिल्कुल सड़ गया हो और यह राज्य अपने अन्तिम दिनों तक पहुँच गया हो। मेरा मन तो इतना हिल गया है इस टैकम के बाद से। मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि आप इसका सुधारें।

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri K. C. Pant): Sir, the points that have been made by Dr. Lohia are the same points which he had made earlier when he had referred this matter to the Deputy Prime Minister and written to you. A long statement was laid earlier on the Table of the House by the Deputy Prime Minister. In this statement he has explained the detailed position and he has come to this conclusion; "After looking into the matter from all possible angles, I am satisfied that there is no underestimation of revenue receipt as it is based on the figures of actual clearance of sized superfine and fine yarn in the year 1966-67". But, certainly, the remarks made by Dr. Lohia now will be brought to the notice of the Deputy Prime Minister later.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या आप इससे सन्तुष्ट हो जाते हैं ?

Mr. Speaker: असन्तुष्ट कैसे होऊंगा? What else can I do ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप इस मामलेको पी० ए० सी० का क्षेत्र दीजिये। यह एक तरीका हो सकता है।

श्री मधु सिन्घे : उसको दे दीजिये और इस बात को मान लीजिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आपका क्या उदाहरण है, वस यही खाली मामला है।

Mr. Speaker: I will be very happy if it is resolved.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्या दे दिया है पी० ए० सी० को ?

Mr. Speaker: No.

12.40 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS (GENERAL), 1964-65

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri K. C. Pant): I beg to present a statement showing Demands for Excess Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1964-65.

श्री मधु सिन्घे (मुंघेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आपका ध्यान संविधान की धारा 115 और नियम 308 की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। बात यह है कि एक्सेस ग्रांट के लिए अगर कोई मन्त्री आता है तो इसके बारे में यह परिपाटी है कि इस तरह की चीज को बहुत खराब माना जाता है। एक विद्वान लेखक लिखता है :

"Exceeding a grant is a serious irregularity. As such, when an excess expenditure has been incurred, the Government should be under some compulsions to see its early regularisation so that the Public Accounts Committee may be able to suggest correctives for future."

अभी जो डाक्टर लोहिया ने सवाल उठाया था उससे यह जुड़ा हुआ है। पहली बात तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या पी० ए० सी० को मन्त्री महोदय ने सूचना दी थी। मैं इसके बारे में पूछ रहा हूँ

Demands for Excess Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1964-65.

साथ साथ मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो सवाल इन्होंने उठाया है...

श्री रघुवीर सिंह (रोहतक) : जो चीज पास हो गई है उसको ये इस तरह से कैसे उठाते जा सकते हैं ?

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रश्न यह है कि क्या पी० ए० सी० को इसकी इत्तला दी गई थी ? उसी तरह जो डा० साहब ने मामला उठाया है अभी उस पर आप अभी फैसला बेशक न दीजिये लेकिन इस पर आप सोचिये। एक्साइज ड्यूटी के मामले में एक रकम दिलाई गई है और कहा गया है कि इतनी आमदनी होगी लेकिन असल में चार पांच गुना से ज्यादा बढ़ होने वाली है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या पी० ए० सी० की सलाह इसमें ली जाएगी ?

12.43 hrs.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
FIFTH REPORT

Shri Dattatraya Kunte (Kolaba) : I beg to present the Fifth Report of the Public Accounts Committee on Action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their Forty-first, Forty-second and Fifty-fourth Reports (Third Lok Sabha) relating to Civil Accounts.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

(i) TWELFTH REPORT

Shri K. C. Pant : First I must explain that the excess in the statement constitute only 0.14 per cent of the total amount sanctioned in the capital account.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Nandyal) : I beg to present the Twelfth Report of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Defence—Defence Research and Development Organisation.

श्री मधु लिमये : एक पैसा चाहे हो, वह मतलब नहीं है। कुछ नियम होते हैं।

(ii) THIRTEENTH REPORT

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) : अगर एक पैसा प्रतिशत भी बढ़ जाता है तो उसका असर बहुत ज्यादा होता है।

Shri P. Venkatasubbalah : I beg to present the Thirteenth Report of the Estimates Committee regarding action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Seventy-fourth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Home Affairs—Directorate of Manpower and Institute of Applied Manpower Research, New Delhi.

Shri K. C. Pant : That is why we have brought it before the House.

12.45 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : दूकानें बन्द हो जाती हैं दिवाले निकल जाते हैं।

SECOND REPORT

श्री मधु लिमये : इनका जल्दी निकलने वाला है।

Shri D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj) : I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings on Action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-fifth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha)—Heavy Electricals (India) Limited, Bhopal.

Shri K. C. Pant : The excesses have been scrutinised by the Public Account's Committee and the Committee has in paragraphs 41, 1.1.5 and 2.1.7 of their Sixty-ninth, Seventy-second and Seventy-first Reports respectively recommended their regularisation.

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam) : When was the Thirty-fifth Report submitted and how long did it take ?

Shri D. N. Tiwary : It was submitted by the Estimates Committee before this Committee came into being.

Shri Ranga : For five years the Department of Parliamentary Affairs has been sleeping and the Public Undertakings Committee did not take sufficient action. You have got to pursue it.

Shri D. N. Tiwary : When the answers of the Government came, we prepared this Report and we have submitted it at the earliest moment.

12.46 hrs.

STATEMENT RE-SALE OF HELICOPTERS BY USSR TO PAKISTAN

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in regard to the point raised by Mr. Nath Pai yesterday about certain communication made to the press, I have made an enquiry and the position is this.

The *Washington Post* report appeared in the Indian newspapers on Monday, the 7th August, 1967. During the day a P.T.I. correspondent called on the official spokesman of this Ministry to enquire whether he had any information on the *Washington Post* report. At the time this enquiry was made, the official spokesman was not aware that this matter had been raised in the Parliament by any hon. Member. He gave the P.T.I. correspondent the following factual information and made no statement of policy.

He said that the ML-6 helicopter was sold by the Soviet Trading Organisation "Aviaexport". When questioned about the reported supply by the Soviet Union to Pakistan of surface-to-air missiles, the spokesman said, "We have no information". When asked to comment on the report that the Soviet Union was supplying military equipment to Pakistan, he drew the attention of the correspondent to the statement made by the Foreign Minister in the Parliament on this matter.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): I am glad, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that you complied with my request to direct the Minister to make an enquiry. So far as the substance of the matter is concerned, I have nothing to say. If Mr. Chagla is satisfied with the assurance that the helicopters, if they are for military

purpose, will never be used against India but only against China and America, it is upto him, and, if they are for private use, they will be used for supplying milk bottles or whatever it is, it is upto him.

My point was about a different thing. You must help us in the matter. Now, his defence is that the official who spoke did not know that the matter was pending before the House. I think, that is the essence of it. The hon. Minister was present in the House. I am not in the habit of dragging in officials so far as this Parliament is concerned. We do not recognise their existence. To us the only person who is answerable is the hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker : That is why he has answered.

Shri Nath Pai : I want to plead with you. Some of us are very pliable so far as rules are concerned in the sense we agree to cooperate with you. That day you restrained me and I agreed with you. But see the disastrous consequences that followed. The whole House was in ignorance as to what was the privilege motion. Even Mr. Chagla did not know it. Naturally, his official did not know it. May I venture to suggest that in future, if some of us come with an important matter like this, you may have a little patience to bear with us and allow us to raise a matter properly so that the plea will not be raised, "We did not know it, the official did not know it and, therefore, the disclosure was made." In future, whenever we come with such an important matter, you kindly allow us to raise it.

Mr. Speaker : In future, anybody can get up any time and raise any matter, if that is what the House wants, I have no objection. We did it today. Mr. Hem Barua was a little angry, because there was a Call Attention Notice in his name, over me. I do not mind it. Even on that day, without the item being included in the agenda, everybody, not only Mr. Nath Pai, raised it. Will it be proper? We had it today, for half an hour, free for all.....

Shri Nath Pai : I did not join it; I refused to join it.

Mr. Speaker: Because you wanted to be heard exclusively, not in the crowd; you did not want to be in the crowd.

Shri Nath Pai: I had written to you about three matters. I did not raise them.

Mr. Speaker: I agree you wrote to me. It is not that. Mr. Ram Sewak Yadav and Mr. Govind Das wrote to me; they came and argued. I requested them not to raise it because the other members also would rise and there would be shouting. I requested them, but they did not hear me. They raised it here and we saw the consequences. I would request Mr. Nath Pai and other hon. members not to raise, in future, those things which are not permitted. That is the only thing I would like to say.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय विदेश मन्त्री ने जो बयान दिया है क्या आप उस पर कुछ कहने की इजाजत देंगे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : नहीं ? जैसे आप कहें ।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) :
हमारी यह भी शिकायत है कि जिस आइटम को आप यहां परमिट करते हैं उसको भी जल्दी डिसपोज़ आफ़ करने की कोशिश करते हैं ।

Shri Nath Pai: My intention was not to defy you.....

Mr. Speaker: I did not say that you defied.

Shri Nath Pai: You are so careful about your language. You will never say such things. But I do not want that implication also.

Mr. Speaker: I have always paid him compliments that his language is so good.

Even when I was a Minister, I paid compliments to him that his language was so good. He is now returning me the compliments. I thank him for that.

12.52 hrs.

PATENTS BILL*

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Industrial Development and Company Affairs (Shri Raghunath Reddi): On behalf of Shri F. A. Ahmed, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to patents.

Mr. Speaker: The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to patents."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Raghunath Reddi: I introduce the Bill.

12.52 1/2 hor.

BIHAR AND UTTAR PRADESH
(ALTERATION OF BOUNDARIES)
BILL*

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the alteration of boundaries of the States of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh and for matters connected therewith.

Mr. Speaker: The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the alteration of boundaries of the States of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I introduce the Bill.

*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 2, dated 12th August, 1967.

*Of Introduced with the recommend action of the President.

12.53 hrs.

SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES ORDERS (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals and of Planning and Social Welfare (Shri Raghu Ramalal): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the inclusion in, and the exclusion from, the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, of certain castes and tribes, for the readjustment of representation, and re-delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly constituencies in so far as such readjustment and re-delimitation are necessitated by such inclusion or exclusion and for matters connected therewith.

डा० राम नारायण (कन्नौज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय इस पर एक बात कहने दीजिये। यह सरकार जात पर पहली दफ़ा लोक सभा में हारी है और मैं कहे देता हूँ कि इस सरकार का ख़ात्मा जात को लेकर ही होगा।

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi) : These Bills were circulated to us only today morning. If we have to oppose or support the Bills, we must have time to read them. They could have been circulated earlier.

Mr. Speaker : Again this will come and he can oppose it. This is only asking for leave to introduce the Bill.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप नियम 72 को देखिए, जिसके मातहत हमको किसी भी बिल का इन्ट्रोडक्शन स्टेज पर विरोध करने का अधिकार है, लेकिन यह गार्डर पेपर और बिल आदि हम को करीब साढ़े नौ बजे मिले हैं। बिल बहुत लम्बा चौड़ा है। हमें उनको देखने का मौका नहीं मिला है। इसलिये...

Mr. Speaker : Normally the convention is that at the introduction stage...

श्री मधु लिमये : ऐसा नहीं है। आप नियम 72 को देखिए।

Mr. Speaker: What is the number?

श्री मधु लिमये : 72 ये हमारे अधिकार को छीन रहे हैं। इस लिए आप इस बिल को इन्ट्रोड्यूस करने की इजाजत न दीजिए। मुझे इसका विरोध करना है।

Mr. Speaker: Special permission was given. What is his suggestion?

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा सुझाव है कि आप इस बिल को इन्ट्रोड्यूस न करने दीजिये। इस को अगले सत्र के पहले दिन इन्ट्रोड्यूस किया जाये, ताकि हमें इन्ट्रोडक्शन स्टेज पर विरोध करने का मौका मिले।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur) : About this particular Bill which has been introduced, here under item 27 of the agenda, it is said :

"Shri Asoka Mehta to move for leave to introduce the Bill to provide for the inclusion in, and the exclusion from, the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, of certain castes and tribes.....and for matters connected therewith."

You know, Sir, that we have been agitating on this point and we have been demanding a clear answer from this particular Ministry about the fate of the Lokur Committee's report, but we do not know anything about it. It is known only to certain Scheduled Caste Members who were taken into confidence by Shrimati Chandrasekhar who is no more a Minister now. Nobody else was taken into confidence. I know that certain Scheduled Castes, especially the castes of those Scheduled Caste Members who voted against the present Congress regime, are being excluded. This is not proper. I, therefore, submit that this Bill should not be introduced today. I want to oppose the introduction of this Bill.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार के पास बहुमत है और उसके बल पर वह इस बिल को इंट्रोड्यूस कर सकती है, लेकिन चूंकि हमें इस बिल का अध्ययन करने का समय नहीं दिया गया है, इस लिए मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप इस को इंट्रोड्यूस करने की इजाजत न दीजिए ।

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh) : Now, it is only a question of leave being granted. They can oppose leave being granted.

Mr. Speaker : I shall put it to vote, and the hon. Members can oppose it.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, किसी भी बिल का विरोध करने के लिए उसका अध्ययन करने की जरूरत होती है। हमारी ऐसी तो आदत नहीं है कि ऐसे ही उठ कर विरोध कर दिया। इस लिए मेरी विनम्र प्रार्थना है कि आप इस बिल के इंट्रोडक्शन की इजाजत न दीजिए। लोकूर कमेटी का मामला एक भ्रसे से चल रहा है। क्या फर्क पड़ता है, अगर आज यह बिल इंट्रोड्यूस न हुआ ? मेरा विरोध कुछ जातियों के समावेश को नहीं, छांटने को है।

श्री राम चरण (खुर्जा) : कुछ शिडयूल्ड कास्टस और ट्राइब्स को एक्स्क्लूड किया जा रहा है। यह बिल बहुत लम्बा है, जिसको स्टडी करने की जरूरत है। इस लिए आज इस बिल को न लिया जाये, बल्कि अगले सेशन में लिया जाये।

Shri Ranga (Srikulam) : There are certain things which the Chair also can be expected to do. For instance, the Chair could direct Government to circulate these Bills sufficiently in advance so that Members would be able to decide for themselves whether they would like to oppose it even at the introduction stage.

Shri S. M. Banerjee : We oppose the exclusion of any caste.

Mr. Speaker : I entirely agree with the suggestion made. I agree that some notice must be given so that Members may know what Bill is coming and what Bill is not coming. At the last minute if the Bill is circulated, I am also obliged to do it, and naturally when Government want to introduce it, it is delicate for me to say 'No'. It will be good for the hon. Members in the House and also the country if the Bill is gazetted earlier, so that they will know what the Bill is and they can decide whether to oppose it or not.

For the present, I think it will be useful to have it introduced now so that hon. Members may read the Bill and they can come prepared to oppose the Bill more vigorously next time. Therefore, I shall now put it to vote.

Mr. Speaker : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the inclusion in, and the exclusion from, the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, of certain castes and tribes, for the readjustment of representation, and re-delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly constituencies in so far as such readjustment and re-delimitation are necessitated by such inclusion or exclusion and for matters connected therewith."

Those in favour may say 'Aye'.....

Some hon. Members: Aye.

13 hrs.

Mr. Speaker : Those against may say 'No'.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker : The 'Ayes' have it.....

Shri Madhu Limaye : The 'Noes' have it.

Mr. Speaker : All right, let the Lobby be cleared.

श्री मधु लिमये : आज मैं सिद्धान्त के लिए विभाजन चाहता हूँ। मैं स्पष्ट करना

चाहता हूँ कि चूँकि कुछ लोग सूची से निकाले जा रहे हैं, इसलिए यह विरोध है।

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta (Delhi Sadar): What is the use of this division? We are not interested in a division. We protest against the way it is being done. We can have voice vote.

श्री मीठा; लाज मीना (सवाई माधोपुर): जो बिल भेजा गया है, वह अंग्रेजी में है। हिन्दी में भी बिल भेजा जाना चाहिए।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं केवल सिद्धान्त के लिए विभाजन चाहता था। हमारा विरोध इनक्लूजन से नहीं है, बल्कि कुछ जातियों के एक्सक्लूजन से है। इस लिए आप इस विभाजन को छोड़ दीजिए।

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: No, we want division.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the inclusion in, and the exclusion from, the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, of certain castes and tribes, for the readjustment of representation, and redelimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly Constituencies in so far as such readjustment and re-delimitation are necessitated by such inclusion or exclusion and for matters connected therewith".

Those who are in favour of the motion will please say 'aye'.

Several hon. Members: 'Aye'.

Mr. Speaker: Those who are against the motion will please say 'no'.

Some hon. Members: 'No'.

Mr. Speaker: The 'ayes' have it; the 'ayes' have it.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: We want division.

Mr. Speaker: When I have said 'ayes' have it, 'ayes' have it, there is no question of division. Leave is granted.

The motion was adopted.

1926 (A) LSD—3.

Shri Raghu Ramalah: I introduce the Bill.

13.03 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for lunch till fourteen of the clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch at five minutes past fourteen of the clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: LEVY OF EXPORT DUTY ON IRON ORE

वाणिज्य मन्त्री (श्री द्विनेश सिंह) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं संकल्प पेश करता हूँ कि :

"भारतीय प्रशुल्क अधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का संख्या 32) की धारा 4क की उपधारा (2) के अनुसरण में, यह सभा लौह अयस्क पर निर्यात शुल्क लगाने के बारे में भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मन्त्रालय की दिनांक 24 जुलाई 1967 की अधिसूचना संख्या एस० प्रो० 2461 का अनुमोदन करती है।"

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। कानून, नियम और संविधान। मैं आपका ध्यान.....

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : कार्रवाई में रोक लगाना चाहते हैं? यह क्या है?

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या मैं कोई गलत बात कह रहा हूँ?

श्री रणधीर सिंह : मैंने समझ लिया।

श्री मधु लिमये : बड़े समझदार आदमी हैं। मेरे बोलने के पहले ही समझ लिया।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The free-for-all style debate is over now. We are abiding by the rules and the procedure. We want to conduct business.

श्री नरु तिनये: मेरी व्यवस्था फ्री फार प्राल, डिबेट नहीं है। नियम और संविधान के अनुसार है। मैं आपका ध्यान निर्देश संख्या ७ (ए) की तरफ दिखाना चाहता हूँ। यह जो संकल्प है...

Shri Randhir Singh: These are dilatory tactics.

श्री नरु तिनये: यह कानूनी संकल्प है, और इसके लिये आपके द्वारा यह निर्देश है। मैं पहला छोड़ता हूँ कि बिलट न किया जाये। दूसरे में यह है कि:

"If the Speaker admits notice of such a resolution, it shall be immediately notified in the Bulletin under the heading 'Statutory Resolution' and a copy thereof sent to the Government."

मुझे पता नहीं कि यह बुलेटिन में आया था या नहीं। हो सकता है कि मेरे ध्यान में न आया हो, लेकिन आया है ऐसा मान कर मैं चलता हूँ। अब आप (3) को देखिये:

"The Speaker may after considering the state of business in the House and in consultation with the Leader of the House allot a day or days or part of a day for the discussion of any such Resolution."

मैं आप की इस पर व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ कि (७) (ए) (3) के तहत क्या इस संकल्प के लिए कोई समय निर्धारित किया गया है ताकि हम इस पर बोलें? इस लिये जानकारी के लिये मैं यह सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ।

संसद कार्य तथा सार मन्त्री (डा० राम सुभाष सिंह): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसमें जो चर्चा का विषय था वह हो चुका है। जैसा आप जानते हैं, अध्यक्ष महोदय ने कहा था कि आज यह अधिवेशन समाप्त किया जाये और जो कागज पेश किया गया था वाणिज्य मन्त्री की ओर से उसको पन्द्रह दिन के अन्दर

आना चाहिये। ऐसी हालत में मैं निश्चयतः प्रदब से श्री मधु लिमये जी से निवेदन करूँगा कि यदि आज यह पास हो जाय तो अच्छा होता। हाँ, इस पर एक एक दो दो मिनट कोई कुछ कहना चाहे तो बात दूसरी है।

श्री मधु लिमये: क्या एक एक दो मिनट का समय अब मन्त्री महोदय निर्धारित करेंगे? मैंने नियम बतलाया है। आप सुनिये: "स्पीकर इन कन्सल्टेशन्स विथ द सीडर आफ वि हाउस"। मन्त्री महोदय ने तो स्पीकर हैं और न सीडर आफ वि हाउस हैं। प्राग् बनें तो मुझे ऐतराज नहीं है, लेकिन आज नहीं हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Minister of Parliamentary affairs has accepted your contention. But we are pressed for time. Several members have written to me. I will allow you two or three minutes to make a few observations.

श्री मधु लिमये: मुझे को सात-आठ मिनट चाहिये।

Shri Virendrakumar Shah (Junagadh): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would have expected the Minister to give us some reasons as to why he wants to increase his excise duty and I had expected from him some more information how government proposed to expand this trade and increase iron ore export. Instead of that, it seems the hon. minister is interested only in getting a little more excise duty. I would rather suggest that he should concern himself much more with development of mining and development of export. We are exporting ten million tons of iron ore and our target is to export 25 million tons a year by the end of the Fourth Plan.

The team invited by his own ministry one year ago. Batelle Memorial Institute, U.S.A. report suggested that the way in which the Government is going it will not be able to reach even 18 million tonnes of export.

These are the things which should exercise his mind rather than increase of

excise or export duty. Our share in the Japanese market has come down from 20 per cent to 12 per cent. I will just read out one or two extracts from the Batelle Memorial report to the Government. It said :—

"For India to face this competition successfully, there should be a change in the organisational structure of the iron ore mining and export programme."

It also says :—

"The team has stressed that the export programme will not be successful unless the element of transport cost is drastically reduced."

Here they are trying to increase the cost by first bringing the duty of Rs. 10 and then of raising it to Rs. 10/50. It further says that you need a capacity of handling at least 2,500 tonnes of iron ore per hour etc. This facility should be given or developed.

Similarly, the National Resources Committee of the Planning Commission urged the Government a year ago that the price of Indian ore should be competitive in the world market. Instead, by having this duty we are making it more un-competitive. I would suggest that there should be no duty and more money should be made available to mine-owners so that they could develop their mines, buy sophisticated equipment and stand in the world market. Just as in the case of jute the hon. Minister evaded the issue—he has rather developed the practice of giving evasive replies—he has avoided the issue here also. We are losing the market, for iron ore and that is why we should develop iron ore mining as recommended by the Batelle Memorial team and their own National Resources Committee of the Planning Commission. For that the mine-owners should have more money.

I am told that even to modernise the mining equipment, for which they are exporting millions of dollars worth of iron ore, it takes months before there is approval coming from the Ministry of Commerce or the Ministry of Industry of whatever the Ministry is.

I am also told that there is a consultative committee of mine-owners and the MMTC for manganese ore exports but there is no such committee for iron ore exports. I do not know whether the MMTC thinks itself so highly qualified that it does not need to consult the mine-owners.

So, I would rather submit to the Minister that instead of going ahead with the idea of levying further duty he should do two things—firstly, totally eliminate the duty and, secondly, immediately exercise his mind and concern himself—he is going to have a respite from tomorrow—in finding out how the mining of iron ore could be further developed and how our exports can increase.

श्री मधु सिन्हा: मेरे सामने यह 23 मई का इकानॉमिक टाइम्स है।

व्यापार मन्त्री श्री दिनेश सिंह के जो सुझाव हैं उनके बारे में इस में लिखा गया है।

श्री दिनेश सिंह ने कहा है:

"The STC and MMTC should evolve suitable norms so that they could measure their efficiency."

मेरा खयाल है कि यह गलत रपट नहीं है। मेरे पास कई दिन से शिकायतें आ रही हैं। मैं केवल यह लोहे की जो मिट्टी होती है उसके निर्यात के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। मेरे पास शिकायतें आई हैं कुछ दिन पहले—एम्. एम्. टी. सी. जो कि एस. टी. सी. का पुत्र है और एस. टी. सी. के सारे दुर्गुण और दोष इस पुत्र में भी आ गए हैं उसके बारे में। लोहे की मिट्टी के निर्यात के बारे में अभी जापानियों के साथ इन्होंने जो करार किया था उस में दाम निश्चित करते समय जो सावधानी बरतनी चाहिये थी उसको एम्. एम्. टी. सी. के द्वारा नहीं बरता गया है जिसके फलस्वरूप दस करोड़ से ले कर ग्यारह करोड़ का घाटा हिन्दुस्तान को हुआ है। उसके बाद मैंने इसे प्रखबारों में देखा है। खाम कर जो

[श्री मधु लिमये]

वित्तीय भ्रष्टाचार है उन में भी इस बात की चर्चा हुई थी। मेरा खयाल था कि इस सत्र के भ्रष्टाचार के पहले व्यापार मंत्री जो इस तरह की गम्भीर शिकायतें होती हैं उनके बारे में कुछ न कुछ सफाई करेंगे। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि इसी तरह की सफाई पेश करने के बजाय आज वह एक संकल्प ले कर आए हैं और गजट में मैंने इसके बारे में देखा है कि शायद पचास पैसे की एक्सपोर्ट ड्यूटी वह बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय से जो बातें पूछना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात तो यह है कि क्या लोहे की मिट्टी के निर्यात के बारे में इस तरह की धांधली या इस तरह का घोटाला एम० एम० टी० सी० के द्वारा हुआ है ?

मैं मानता हूँ कि पब्लिक अडवर्टीकिंग कमेटी इसके बारे में जांच करेगी लेकिन क्या मंत्री जी का फर्ज नहीं है कि वह स्वयं इस बात की जांच करें और इस सदन को उस जांच के नतीजों से अवगत करायें, असली बात को बतायें ?

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ड्यूटी बढ़ाने के बजाय अगर मंत्री महोदय एम० टी० सी० और एम० एम० टी० सी० के जो खर्चे बढ़ रहे हैं उनकी ओर ध्यान देते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता। मैं एक छोटी सी मिसाल देता हूँ। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि एम० टी० सी० के जो चेयरमैन हैं या एम० एम० टी० सी० के जो चेयरमैन हैं उनको विलायत से मंगाई हुई गाड़ी में बैठ कर अपना काम करने की क्या आवश्यकता होती है ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान में जो गाड़ियाँ पैदा होती हैं, स्टैंडर्ड हैं, फियेट है, एम्बसेडर है...

श्री बीरेन्द्र कुमार शाह: मिनिस्टर उन्हीं में बैठते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये: मैं अगर मिनिस्टर की चर्चा करूंगा तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय कहेंगे कि आप बात जो है उससे दूर जा रहे हैं।

श्री बीरेन्द्र कुमार शाह: वहीं से तो सीखते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये: इसलिए मैं इन दोनों संस्थानों के जो चेयरमैन हैं उनकी चर्चा करता हूँ। दिनेश सिंह जी यह न समझें कि वह इन में शामिल नहीं हैं वह भी हैं। हमारा जो यह सरकारी क्षेत्र है उसको देख कर कभी कभी हम को ऐसा लगता है कि भूतपूर्व व्यापार मंत्री और वर्तमान व्यापार मंत्री और एम० टी० सी० और एम० एम० टी० सी० आदि सब के जो व्यवस्थापक लोग हैं क्या ये स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के छिपे हुए मॅम्बर तो नहीं हैं ? मैं कारण बताता हूँ। निजी क्षेत्र के एक आरोप यह रहता है कि सरकारी क्षेत्र निकम्मा होता है, उसमें कार्यक्षमता नहीं होती है, फिजूलखर्ची होती है। कभी कभी हम को ऐसा लगता है कि व्यापार मंत्री और सरकारी क्षेत्र के जो मैनेजर आदि लोग हैं, चेयरमैन आदि हैं, डरेक्टर आदि लोग हैं इन सब ने मिल कर कहीं स्वतन्त्र पार्टी की या फोरम अफ फ्री एंडरप्राइज की सदस्यता तो नहीं ले ली है ? क्या सरकारी क्षेत्र को बदनाम करने के लिए और हमेशा के लिए समाजवाद और सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र हिन्दुस्तान में बदनाम हो जाए उसके लिए इन लोगों ने अपनी ट्रेड यूनियन तो नहीं बना ली है।

इसलिए इस भ्रष्टाचार पर मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय यह बतायें कि ड्यूटी बढ़ाने का नतीजा क्या निकलेगा निर्यात व्यापार पर, विदेशी मुद्रा जो हम कमाते हैं उसके ऊपर क्या असर पड़ेगा। आप यह भी देखें कि पब्लिक अडवर्टीकिंग ने एक सुझाव दिया था कि इन दो को एक किया जाय इन संस्थानों को मिला कर क्या किया गया ? प्रतिष्ठानों को मिला करने का मतलब होता है कि हर एक के मैनेजिंग डिरेक्टर और बोर्ड आफ डिरेक्टर और अधिकारी रहेंगे और जो बड़े अफसर हैं उनकी संख्या बढ़ जाएगी, खर्चा बढ़ जाएगा और

उससे घाटा हो सकता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसकी सफाई हो।

Shri S. Kundu (Balasore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this Resolution seeks to increase the levy on export of iron ore. The export of iron ore, as I feel it, faces a serious crisis from the new challenges which it is receiving in India and from outside. The Japanese and the American teams have come to India and have said that the price of iron ore is not competitive. They have said that there is no facility in India to load 4,000 tonnes of iron ore per hour and that there is no port which can take in ships of about 60,000 tonnes. Also, they have said that there is no assurance for continuous supply.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that export which increased during the last few months to 18 per cent is likely to fall down largely because Brazil, Australia and other countries are going to supply it to Japan on competitive price and give a continuous supply of quality ore. Therefore, I would like to say without increasing this export levy, the Minister could have made some sort of internal economy and tried to reduce the cost per head which in turn could have given some sort of boost to our export; but I am afraid this will not promote our export possibilities.

Secondly, I would like to say one thing. During the six months, out of the total iron ore that has been exported or mined, the largest supply has been from Orissa. About one-third of the total production comes from Orissa. The Orissa Government has been writing to the Central Government to increase its tax or levy at the mining head, and the Central Government is not doing that. Thereby, the revenue to the Orissa Government is also decreasing, and so, the entrepreneurs are not enthusiastic. The enthusiasm of the people of Orissa who could gain by boosting the export of iron ore from Orissa is not forth coming.

Incidentally also, I would like to refer to the port of Paradeep. It is a strange thing in the planning.

Where you have a port, but you do not have the rail link. There is a recommendation that Paradeep is the only good port where 60,000 ton ships could operate. It is therefore necessary that a road and rail link should be taken up along with the port project. But it is not that a road and rail link should be taken up and the American team are not assured of the quantity of supply that can be made to them. In India, in regard to food-grains, we live from ship to mouth; so they say. In Japan, in regard to iron ore it is also from ship to factory. They have no iron ore; so, unless they get a continuous supply of iron ore, they are not going to take iron ore from us. So, I would like the hon. Minister to consider these points and give a good reply.

श्री बिनेश सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सम्बन्ध में अभी जो वाद-विवाद हुआ है, उससे मालूम होता है कि इस बारे में कुछ शलतफहमी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह भ्रष्टा है कि आपने मौका दिया कि मैं उसको साफ़ कर दूँ।

आप जानते हैं कि जब हमारे रुपये का भ्रवमूल्यन हुआ, तो डालर में जो पहले मिलता था, वह भ्रवमूल्यन के बाद 57½ परसेंट बढ़ गया। उस हिसाब से यह सोचा गया कि जो लोग प्रायरल प्रोर का निर्यात करते हैं, उनको बहुत फायदा हो रहा है, इसलिए उसमें कुछ कमी की जाये। इस दृष्टि से सब तरह के प्रायरल प्रोर पर 10 रुपये प्रति टन इयूटी लगाई गई। उसके बाद जब लोगों ने काफ़ी रिप्रेजेंटेशन दिये कि बहुत ज्यादा इयूटी लग गई है, उसको कुछ कम किया जाये, तो सरकार ने इस की इयूटी कम की।

उप-प्रधान मन्त्री ने इस सदन में 24 जुलाई को भाषण देते हुए इस सम्बन्ध में पूरा विवरण दिया था और इस सदन में इसके बारे में पूरी चर्चा हो चुकी थी, इस लिए मैंने इस पर कुछ कहना मनासिब नहीं समझा। उन्होंने इस सदन में बताया था कि जिस प्रायरल

[श्री दिनेश सिंह]

घोर में 62 फ्रीसदी से ज्यादा आयरन है, उसकी ड्यूटी 10 रुपये से 10 रुपये 50 पैसे प्रति टन बढ़ाई गई। लेकिन उसके साथ साथ निर्यात ड्यूटी में यह कमी भी की गई कि जिस आयरन घोर में 60 फ्रीसदी से 62 फ्रीसदी आयरन घोर है, उसकी ड्यूटी 10 रुपये से 9 रुपये कर दी गई और जिस आयरन घोर में आयरन 60 फ्रीसदी से कम है, उसकी ड्यूटी 10 रुपये से 7 रुपये 50 पैसे कर दी गई। इसी तरह 62 फ्रीसदी से कम आयरन वाले घोर आयरन घोर फ्राइन्च की ड्यूटी 4 रुपये से 3 रुपये कर दी गई।

इसलिए मैं माननीय सदस्य, श्री मधु लिमये, को बताना चाहता हूँ कि विलायती मोटरों के लिए या तनख्वाहों के लिए ड्यूटी बढ़ाई नहीं गई, बल्कि वह कम कर दी गई। यह अन्दाजा लगाया गया है कि पिछले साल की तुलना में इस साल ड्यूटी से रवेन्यु 123.23 लाख रुपये कम होगा। मैं माननीय सदस्य को बताना चाहता हूँ कि वह अच्छी तरह से समझ लें कि जो प्रस्ताव मैंने रखा है, उसमें कोई मोटर नहीं आने वाली है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं जानता हूँ, लेकिन अपनी बातों को कहने का यह अवसर था।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : माननीय सदस्य ने तो इस अवसर से फायदा उठा लिया। अब मैं भी इससे फायदा उठाने की कोशिश में हूँ।

जहाँ तक ड्यूटी का सवाल है, वह कम हुई है और फिनांस मिनिस्ट्री ने उसका एलान कर दिया है। ड्यूटी बढ़ाने का काम मेरे दिमन में पड़ा है, जिस को मैं आज कर रहा हूँ।

जहाँ तक एम० एम० टी० सी० और एल० टी० सी० के काम का सम्बन्ध है, उसके बारे में पूरी बहस हो चुकी है। मैंने उसके सम्बन्ध में पूरी तरह से बताने की कोशिश की है।

माननीय सदस्य, श्री मधु लिमये, ने कहा कि शायद हम लोग स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के छिपे हुए सदस्य हैं। मैं उनसे यही कहूँगा कि प्रदेशों में उनके जो नये नये मिनिस्टर बने हैं, वे किस पार्टी के सदस्य हैं इस बारे में वह जरा उससे बात कर हम लोग जिस पार्टी के सदस्य बहुत दिनों से हैं उसके ही सदस्य बने रहेंगे हम उन की तरह वक्ती सुभ्रिते के लिए इस प्रकार के अवसरवादी गठबन्धन नहीं करेंगे।

धन्यवाद।

श्री मधु लिमये : दस करोड़ रुपये के घाटे के बारे में मन्त्री महोदय ने एक शब्द भी नहीं कहा है।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : उसके लिए अलग अवसर आयेगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That in pursuance of subsection (2) of section 4A of the Indian Tariff Act, 1934 (32 of 1934), this House approves of the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 2461 dated the 24th July, 1967 regarding levy of export duty on iron ore."

The motion was adopted.

14.27 hrs.

CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL SECURITY FORCE BILL

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): Sir.....

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him move the motion. I will give you an opportunity to raise it.

Shri S. Kundu (Balasore): He cannot make the motion. I strongly object to the introduction of this motion.

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): There is no 'business' before the House. What is the point of order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At the initial stage, he wants to object to the very consideration of the motion.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I have not moved the motion, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought you moved the motion. Let him formally move the motion. Otherwise, there is no business before the House.

श्री मधु सिंघे (मुंबई) : मैं एक रास्ता बताता हूँ, मंत्री महोदय अपना भाषण बाद में करें।

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): From the order paper, we can know what is coming.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Because an item is included in the order paper it does not mean that it is before the House.

Shri Shri Chand Goel (Chandigarh): Kindly hear our point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let something be before the House.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly see rule 376(2).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have read it. Something must be before the House. At present there is nothing before the House.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: On behalf of Shri Y. B. Chavan, I beg to move:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the constitution and regulation of a Force called the Central Industrial Security Force for the better protection and security of certain industrial undertakings made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 6th June, 1967 and communicated to this House on the 8th June, 1967, and resolves that the following thirty members of Lok

Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely:—

Shri Vidya Dhar Bajpai, Shri D. Balrama Raju, Shri Rajendra-nath Barua, Shri Anil K. Chanda, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri J. K. Choudhury, Shri Ram Dhani Das, Shri George Fernandes, Shri Indrajit Gupta, Shri Narain Swaroop Sharma, Shri S. Kandappa, Shri Kinder Lal, Shri Srinibas Misra, Shri J. B. Singh, Shri Vikram Chand Mahajan, Shri A. Nesamony, Shri Duhya-bhai Parmar, Shri Manibhai J. Patel, Shri Manubhai Patel, Chaudhuri Randhir Singh, Shri S. K. Sambandhan, Shri P. G. Sen, Shri Shashi Ranjan, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, Shri S. M. Siddayya, Shri N. K. Somani, Shri Fayappa Hari Sonavane, Shri R. Umanath, Shri Ponnati Viswanatham, Shri Y. B. Chavan.

This House recommends to Rajya Sabha that the Joint Committee be instructed to report by the first day of the next session of Rajya Sabha."

Shri S. Kundu: Sir, I rise to a point of order (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Shri Kundu had written to me about this. Let us hear him first.

Shri S. Kundu: I object to this motion very strongly, very vehemently, because this hits against the Constitution. Anything that hits against the Constitution cannot be introduced in the form of a Bill. This is called "Central Industrial Security Force Bill". In the garb of "force" actually the activities of the police are supposed to be introduced here. Sir, kindly look at Seventh Schedule, List 2, item (2) of the Constitution. This is: "Police including Railway and Village police". This is purely a State subject under the Constitution.

[Shri S. Kundu]

Now, Sir, after the defeat of the Congress Government throughout the States, they feel insecure and if there is some sort of workers' movement against industrial enterprises run by State Government they want to give police protection.

Shri Randhir Singh : What is the point of order ?

An hon. Member : Are you the Speaker?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I must look to the objects also.

Shrimati Lakshmi Kanthamma (Khammam) : Why should a point of order take so much time ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : It is a constitutional objection. Let us hear him patiently.

Shri S. Kundu : Nothing should be done here in the form of a Bill which will amount to colourable piece of legislation the misuse of power of legislation. Instead of the word "police" they have used the word "force" because if they use the term "police" they cannot enact this legislation, because police is a State subject. So, in the guise of "force", an attempt has been made to usurp the power of the State Government to establish a big army of security force. It is a colourable exercise of the legislative power which cannot be permitted under the Constitution. This Parliament has no authority to pass this Bill.

I will explain how it has been done. Look at clause 11 of the Bill. Under the Criminal Procedure Code the police has the power to arrest without a warrant and also to search and seize property. The same power has been given to this force. They have deliberately used the word "force" and not "police" because some official in the Ministry has advised them that if they use this term "force" they can hoodwink Members. As it is a State subject, the Parliament cannot enact this legislation. Moreover, it is an obnoxious piece of legislation, a black Act which should be opposed with all the force (Interruptions.)

Kindly read the proviso to rule 72, which says :

"Provided that where a motion is opposed on the ground that the Bill initiates legislation outside the legislative competence of the House, the Speaker may permit a full discussion thereon."

Therefore, this motion of the hon. Minister cannot come before this Parliament as it is a colourable legislation which offends the very fundamental basis of our Constitution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I will point out only one thing. According to the Statement of Objects and Reasons, this Bill only substitutes the words "industrial security force" for the term "watch and ward department" (interruptions). I am pointing this out because several hon. Members want to raise the point of order on the basis that this falls within the purview of List 2 of Schedule 7. So, I would request all hon. Members who are up in arms against this Bill to go through the Statement of Objects and Reasons, which makes it very clear that what is being done is substituting the term "watch and ward department" by the term "industrial security force".

Shri S. Kundu : It is only a cover.

Shri Randhir Singh : Sir, on a point of order. My point of order would remove all doubts of hon. Members. I am trying to save your time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Merely because you have got inspiration, I cannot allow you. I now call Shri S. M. Banerjee.

Shri S. M. Banerjee : I rise on a point of order under Rule 376 which says :

"A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment."

I have quoted the Rule also.

The motion before the House is this obnoxious Bill. My objection is both constitutional and moral. May I invite your kind attention to article 246 of the Constitution ?

Shri Randhir Singh : He is an authority on labour, not on Constitution.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Article 246 says:

"(1) Notwithstanding anything in clauses (2) and (3), Parliament has exclusive power to make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List I in the Seventh Schedule (in this Constitution referred to as the "Union List")."

(2) Notwithstanding anything in clause (3), Parliament, and, subject to clause (1), the Legislature of any State also, have power to make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List III in the Seventh Schedule (in this Constitution referred to as the "Concurrent List")."

(3) Subject to clauses (1) and (2), the Legislature of any State has exclusive power to make laws for such State or any part thereof with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List II in the Seventh Schedule (in this Constitution referred to as the "State List")."

My submission is this. I have gone through this Bill where the name of Mr. Y. B. Chavan is not there—the Statement of Objects and Reasons has been signed by Shri G. L. Nanda who is no more the Home Minister.... (Interruption).

Shri Piloo Mody (Godhra): This has now become a Private Member's Bill.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The Statement of Objects and Reasons says:

"The Force will primarily be responsible for the watch and ward of industrial undertakings owned by the Central Government and may be deployed at the request and cost of the managements, for security duties of industrial undertakings in public sector."

The Defence Ministry has a corps called the Defence Security Corps. But they have not got the functions of the police. Wherever there are ordnance factories or ordnance depots or any defence establishment.....

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Railways have also got it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am coming to that. I am going to cover all the points.

Shri Namblar (Tiruchirappalli): The Bill is *ultra vires*. (Interruptions).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is known as the Defence Security Corps. They do not have the powers of the police. Supposing this legislation becomes an Act, what will be the function of this Force?

Shri S. Kundu: The Supreme Court will declare it as *ultra vires*.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What will be the the function of this Force? The function of this Force will be, according to the hon. Minister, to protect the property belonging to the Central Government, if there is a public undertaking, and it may be deployed at the request and cost of the managements for security duties of industrial undertakings in public sector.

If you read the provisions of the Bill, they can arrest people without warrant.. (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At this stage, we are not concerned with the provisions of the Bill. Let us be very clear about it. The only question is whether the House is competent to undertake this legislation.

Shri Namblar: It is *ultra vires* the Constitution.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The home Minister may take shelter, as he took in the other House, under Article 73. What does Article 73 say? It says:

"Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the executive power of the Union shall extend.—

(a) to the matters with respect to which Parliament has power to make laws; and

(b) to the exercise of such rights, authority and jurisdiction as are exercisable by the Government of India by virtue of any treaty or agreement...."

I say that they do not have the power, They do not have legislative competence..

Shri K. N. Tiwary (Bettiah): Are you allowing him to make a speech on a point of order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already pointed out that it is a point of order whether the House is competent to undertake legislation. This must be thrashed out at the outset.

Shri K. N. Tiwary: They should have raised it when the Bill was introduced. What is the use of raising it now?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We cannot deal with the matter in a perfunctory manner.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: They will take shelter under Act 73 (Interruptions)

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. members may please sit down.

Mr. Sheo Narain may please sit down.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Mr. Sheo Narain is my friend. He has got grey hair and I have also got grey hair, but my grey hair is due to experience and age and his grey hair is due to Sun.

Shri Sheo Narain (Basti): What is this? Is it a point of order?

I can teach him Constitution. I am a student of Constitution. I can teach Constitution to Mr. Banerjee. What does he say? I can teach him Constitution....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I apologize to him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has apologized. He may now sit down.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Parliament does not....

Shri Randhir Singh: He has taken so much of time. We have also to raise points of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him finish.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Parliament does not have the competence to legislate on this. Many of the State Governments have objected to this. So many times the

hon. Prime Minister and the hon. the Home Minister have said that they would never clash with the State Governments. It is a law and order situation, whether it is a question of burning the Centre's property or the State Government's property, and it is the primary duty of the State Government. If this is done here, then the State Governments may decide not to help the public sector undertakings in various States. So, this is something very wrong and I object to this Bill and I feel that this Bill has been brought in order to have another police force in the name of defending the public sector undertakings, and they are going to shoot the public of the State. That is what they are going to do. Therefore, this Bill should be rejected totally.

Shri Nambar: This should not be allowed at all. (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The only question, as I have said, is the competence of this House to legislate. We are now not concerned with the provisions of the Bill. I have permitted the point of order only on the question of competence and I will ask the hon. members to be very brief and to that point only.

Mr. Limaye.

Shri Randhir Singh: You may call one from that side and one from this side.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will call him after Mr. Limaye.

Shri Randhir Singh: Why everybody from that side only?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Some of them have written to me saying that they want to raise the point of order. I will give an opportunity to every one.

Mr. Limaye.

Now, Shri Mahdu Limaye. Other Members may kindly resume their seats. First, I want to dispose of this point of order.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: We have been requesting you to permit us also, but you are not allowing us to have our say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will also get the opportunity.

श्री श्रीराम गोयल: हमने भी आपसे प्रार्थना की थी

Shri Sheo Narain: It seems that Shri S. M. Banerjee and Shri Madhu Limaye only have the monopoly to control the House. You do not seem to recognise the existence of other Members here. A Member from the Jan Sangh has been wanting to speak, and some Members from our side also have been wanting to speak. But you are allowing only those two Members. I do not understand this.

श्री मधु लिमये: सब से पहले मैं आपका ध्यान नियम संख्या 72 की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। जो मेहनत करने वाले लोग हैं

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): The question is one of legislative competence. You have to give your ruling now on that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, Shri Madhu Limaye. Let him be brief.

श्री मधु लिमये: चूंकि यह बिल सब से पहले राज्य सभा में पेश किया गया था इसलिए लेजिस्लेटिव कॉम्पिटेंस के बारे में जो आक्षेप उठाने का इस सदन को अधिकार है, उसका इस्तेमाल उस वक़्त नहीं किया जा सका था। पहली बार यह विधेयक हमारे सामने आ रहा है। इसलिए हमारे लेजिस्लेटिव कॉम्पिटेंस को लेकर जो आक्षेप हैं उन्हीं के बारे में कुछ कहूंगा।

सब से पहले मैं संविधान की दो धाराओं की ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। एक धारा का उल्लेख बनर्जी साहब ने किया है। इसलिए उसको पूरा म नहीं पड़ता हूँ:

"Subject to clauses (1) and (2), the Legislature of any State has exclusive power to make laws for such State or any part thereof with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List II in the Seventh Schedule."

साथ साथ अध्यक्ष महोदय 162 आप देखिये:

"Extent of executive power of State: Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the executive power of a State shall extend to the matters with respect to which the Legislature of the State has power to make laws:

Provided that in any matter with respect to which the Legislature of a State and Parliament have power to make laws, the executive power of the State shall be subject to, and limited by, the executive power expressly conferred by this Constitution or by any law made by Parliament upon the Union or authorities thereof."

मैंने जानबूझ कर यह इसलिए पढ़ा है क्योंकि केवल आपको इस बात का फैसला करना है कि यह जो इसमें प्रोविजो है क्या यह विधेयक इस प्रोविजो के तहत आता है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The other hon. Member had already mentioned that.

श्री मधु लिमये: प्रसल में फेरिश्त II में नम्बर एक महत्वपूर्ण है। सब से महत्वपूर्ण नम्बर एक है, लिस्ट दो, स्टेट लिस्ट:

"Public order (but not including the use of naval, military or air forces or any other armed forces of the Union in aid of the civil power".

यह पब्लिक आर्डर की व्यवस्था मुश्रीम कोर्ट के द्वारा की गयी है। अब

"...but not including the use of naval, military or air forces or any other armed forces of the Union."

एनी अदर आर्म्ड फोर्सिस में इंडस्ट्रियल सिक्योरिटी फोर्स नहीं आ सकती है। टेरि-टोरियल आर्मी इसमें आ सकती है क्योंकि किसी भी परिभाषा में इसको आर्म्ड फोर्सिस नहीं माना जा सकता है।

गिरफ्तारी का जो अधिकार है

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him not refer to the Bill. The only point at issue is that of legislative competence.

श्री मधु लिमये : डिटेल् में, तफसील में, मैं नहीं जा रहा हूँ। सिद्धान्त को इलस्ट्रेट करने के लिए मैं बता रहा हूँ।

आप यूनियन लिस्ट I देखिये। उसमें आपने सब अधिकार दिये हैं। केन्द्रीय सरकार को जहाँ तक प्रिवेंटिव डिटेन्शन का सवाल है:

for reasons connected with defence, foreign affairs for the security of India'.

कहीं भी मुझको इस विधेयक का जो आधार है, जो बुनियाद है उसका उल्लेख नहीं मिल रहा है। बिल की जो धारारें हैं उन में से आप धारा 10(बी) को देखें :

cl.10(b) "to protect and safeguard the industrial undertakings"

यहाँ लिस्ट दो, आइटम एक पब्लिक आर्डर और आइटम दो में यह पूरा कवर हो जाता है, इसलिए वह राज्य के तहत आता है। अब 11(1) देखिये :

cl. 11(1) "Any superior officer or member of the Force may, without any order from a Magistrate and without a warrant, arrest...."

एरेस्ट में यह जो पब्लिक आर्डर है, ला ऐंड आर्डर है, कवर हो जाता है।

फिर 12(2) आप देखिये। उस में कहा गया है :

cl. 12(2) "The provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure relating to searches...."

जहाँ तक मंचिज का सम्बन्ध है उसके लिए क्रिमिनल प्रोसीजर कोड बना हुआ है। मेरा

Shri Randhir Singh: This is all irrelevant. He is taking away the time of the House.

श्री मधु लिमये : इस विधेयक के जितना उद्देश्य है, जितनी धारारें हैं, प्रोटेक्शन, एरेस्ट, संचिज ये सारी लिस्ट दो आइटम एक और दो के मातहत आ जाती हैं। इसलिए यह ग्राम्ड फोर्स नहीं है, यह सेना नहीं है, यह नाविक बेड़ा नहीं है, यह हवाई दल नहीं है। इसलिए केन्द्रीय सरकार को इसके बारे में कोई भी कानून पास करने का अधिकार नहीं है।

अन्तिम एक बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह राज्य सरकारों के अधिकारों का अतिक्रमण है। इसलिए आप इसकी इजाजत न दें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Constitution should be read as a whole. You cannot read it by sections and interpret.

Shri Chavan.

Shri Randhir Singh: Kindly allow me a minute. You agreed to give me time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is all right. Let the Minister explain the position.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: You promised me time. I stood up so many times.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In order to save time, we will hear the Home Minister.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: There is no question of saving time.

This is very unfortunate. How can you deny me an opportunity?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please resume your seat. Shri Indrajit Gupta will also please resume his seat.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: I will resume my seat. But I must have my say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Will he resume his seat or not?

Shri Shri Chand Goel: This kind of threat won't work.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not a question of promise. I have to regulate discipline in the House. Let the Home Minister explain the position.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: Why have you allowed two or three Members and not us? Why this discrimination?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not the question before the House.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: You must hear our point of view also.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Sir, it is already 3 P.M. Let us take up the item on the agenda scheduled at this time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If that was the purpose, there is nothing left!

The Home Minister (*Interruptions*).

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker. May I draw your attention to item 33 of the agenda which has to be taken up at 3 P.M?

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore): Kindly hear what we have to say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let the Home Minister explain. After that, we will take up the other item.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: You will hear us after that?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If necessary.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: How do you presume what we are going to say?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will compensate. I will give you full two hours.

श्री नयु लिये : इन लोगों को भी सुन लिया जाए। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ।

Shri Shri Chand Goel: We are very sorry that you are adopting this procedure.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Limaye can not say that every Member should be listened to.

15 hours.

Shri Shri Chand Goel rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will not give you an opportunity.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: We have a different point of view.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him clarify the position. We are wasting the time relating to an important discussion.

Shri Nambiar: This is a very controversial legislation. There are different view-points.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called the Home Minister. Let him explain the position. He has a right to explain when objection has been taken.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Can we not raise a point of order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Later on.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): If it is merely a question of convincing you and convincing this hon. House about the competence of this august body to consider this Bill, it is a different matter, but if it is merely the intention to resort to some sort of filibuster tactics (*Interruptions*)

Some hon. Members: No.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Very objectionable.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I have not said you have done it. I have said if it is so.

Shri Umanath: You considered it just and allowed the discussion. He calls it filibuster.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: If the intention is merely to obstruct the progress of the House, this is very unfair.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: In that case, I have every moral right to make an appeal to the elderly member on the other side, Mr. Ranga, to advise the opposition.

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): Why don't you give the member of the Jan Sangh an opportunity?

Shri Shri Chand Goel: He has been saying he would give me time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him finish.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Certainly, under rule 72 you had to allow a full discussion. That full discussion means presentation of the points of view on both sides. There are, really speaking, not many points of view in this. What is the scope of this Bill? Whether this is a police force as it is interpreted by some of the members on the other side....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there is an encroachment on the rights of the States.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am explaining that. This is exactly what I am explaining.

Our claim is that this Bill is within the competence of this hon. House under two items of list No. 1. One is item No. 2 and the other is item No. 32 in List No. 1. Our case is that this is not a police force. When I say it is not a police force, even supposing it is a force and it takes a position in charge of certain public sector industries....

Shri Umanath: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him finish. He is explaining the constitutional competence.

Shri Umanath: I am on a point of order relating to the business of the House, against the Minister continuing.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: As long as I am allowed by the Chair, I have every right to speak.

Shri Randhir Singh: My point of order is against the point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already ruled that whatever time is taken up will be compensated later on.

Shri Umanath: It is not a question of compensation. I rise on a point of order against the hon. Minister continuing his speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already said he will finish in five minutes.

Shri Umanath: No. Otherwise the agenda will have no meaning. Why should we specify the time in the agenda?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Many times we have extended the time.

Shri Umanath: I am rising on a point of order objecting to your continuing. I have got every right to raise a point of order in regard to his continuing his speech. I am entitled.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Anticipating....

Shri Umanath: It is not anticipating. On the basis of the agenda, and on the basis of the rules, I am rising on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You will resume your seat.

Shri Umanath: I am raising a point of order. You have not heard my point of order. My point of order is against the continuation of the speech in the light of continuation of the speech in the light of what is stated in the agenda.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No discussion will be taken up unless his reply is finished.... (Interruptions.) I know your point.

Shri Umanath: You cannot anticipate what I am going to say.

Shri Randhir Singh: My point of order is against all these points of orders.... (Interruptions).

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
प्राप मेरी प्रार्थना सुनिये ।

Shri M. L. Sondhi: At 3 O'clock the discussion on D. A. should start. It is a very important discussion.... (Interruptions.)

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): May I suggest that after the Home Minister finishes his speech.... (Interruptions). They shout without understanding what I say. Let him raise his point of order after the Home Minister finishes his reply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I was saying the same thing. Let him finish his speech.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The point I was making was a simple one. The question

was raised whether this House has got competence to pass this Bill. This Bill, I was saying, was within the competence of this hon. House on the basis of items 1 and 32 of List I. We think that this is not a police force as it is contemplated under the State List, because this armed force or security force is supposed to protect the property.

Somebody asked, whether they are going to take the law and order situation in their hand. The answer is, "No". If, suppose, there is, any offence under the Indian Penal Code or under any other Act of the State or of the Centre, the proper investigation under the Criminal Procedure Code will be done by the regular police of the State. In that sense it is not a police force. This is a protection force of the employer, of the owner of the property.

Some hon. Members: Ah, ah!

Shri Umanath: Arrest without warrant.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I really do not understand why some people should object if the owner of a property protects his property, unless they have got ill-will about that property.

So, there is a basic distinction in the concept of the police force and the concept of the armed forces that are mentioned in item No. 2 of List I. This is a protection force as the Railways have a protection force. Many other things have got their protection forces. This is a force of the Central Government to protect the Central Government's properties as they are in the undertakings. Really speaking, there is a very, very strong case for allowing this Bill to be proceeded with further.

The other House has also gone into this question and they have passed the motion for referring the Bill to the Joint Committee.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: They took three days.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The three days were taken for different reasons. There also the discussion went on or the consideration motion and they made a suggestion, as we made a suggestion about the

other Bill, here, that the Bill be sent to a Joint Committee. In response to the wishes of the Opposition we have accepted this motion for reference of the Bill to a Joint Committee.

Here I am coming and I am facing this type of an attitude. I must say that this motion must be allowed to proceed further.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will allow only Shri Umanath—I had promised him—and none else... (Interruption).

Shri Ranga: We have wasted five minutes over his right to speak or not to speak.

Shri Umanath: Sir, I am raising the point of order under rule 376 which says:

"A point of order shall relate to the interpretation or enforcement of these rules" etc.

and then sub-rule (2) says:

"A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment:"

Just now the business before the House is the Central Industrial Security Force Bill, but under rule 31 with regard to the List of Business it is said:

"A list of business for the day shall be prepared by the Secretary, and a copy thereof shall be made available for the use of every member.

Save as otherwise provided in these rules, no business not included in the list of business for the day shall be transacted".

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It is included in the List of Business.

Shri Umanath: This has been included in the List of Business but that very agenda says about item 33, namely,—

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Dearness

[Shri Umanath]

Allowance Commission on the question of the grant of Dearness Allowance to Central Government Employees in future, laid on the Table of the House on the 6th June, 1967."

to be moved by Shri M. L. Sondhi and others:-

"To be taken up at 3 P.M. or as soon as the preceding items of business are disposed of, whichever is earlier."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have followed your point of order.

Shri Umanath: I will finish it soon.

"Whichever is earlier" means that if the Central Industrial Security Force Bill or subsequent items before this motion were finished, say, at 2.30, this will be taken up at 2.30 and if they were not finished by 3 o'clock, this will be taken up at 3 o'clock. So, this must be taken up at 3 o'clock. This is the meaning of "whichever is earlier". I think, Shri Randhir Singh will understand this simple thing.

My point is that under rule 31(2), namely,—

"Save as otherwise provided in these rules, no business not included in the list of business for the day",

beyond 3 o'clock the other items are not included in the business of the day. That is the meaning. Since 3 o'clock is already past and we have already violated the at least now the DA motion must be taken up.

Shri Randhir Singh rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I entirely agree (Interruption.)

Shri Randhir Singh: Sir, ten people have spoken from that side.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You do not want the next item to be taken up?

Shri Randhir Singh: Why not allow one or two from this side?

Only one minute... (Interruption).

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh rose—

Shri Randhir Singh: I am supplementing the legal position... (Interruption).

Shri M. L. Sondhi: **

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nothing will go on record. Shri Sondhi, you ought to behave yourself.

Shri Umanath: Sir, you said "Next item".

श्री मधु त्रिभुवे : आपने कहा नेक्स्ट आइटम तब उन्होंने बोलना शुरू किया ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What I said was that I will take up the next item after disposing of this. I wanted to reply to him. As I said earlier, if a little time is taken up in this argument, I will compensate for that. So many Members wanted to raise points of order. I am clear in my mind regarding the rule but I do not want to prevent others from having their say. Therefore, let us postpone this discussion for the next time and go to the next item.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: This has to be finished today... (Interruption).

Shri M. L. Sondhi rose—

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I want to submit that after the disposal of the business entered in the List of Business for the day this item of business may be taken up. We will all sit till late in the night and dispose of this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have no authority. You can make a request to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. If he were to make a request and if it is acceptable to the House, I can take it up.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: After the business of the House is over, this matter may be taken up and finished today... (Interruption).

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Sir, under rule 388, I move:

"That the Rules be suspended."

Shri Randhir Singh: We must discuss it.....(Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As I have observed, on my own I cannot change the order of business but if there is a regular motion made here, as it has been made, I will take the sense of the House.

श्री मधु लिख्ये : कहां प्रस्ताव है, मोशन है ? अगर मोशन है तो मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है । यह कोई मजाक है ।

Shri Randhir Singh: Please allow us also. You allow everybody there, on that side, but not on this side..(Interruption).

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The House is competent to do that.....(Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is your point of order? I am going to take the sense of the House: whether this should be postponed or not. (Interruption). His motion is that the present discussion should continue and the next item on the agenda should be taken up later on after disposing of the present Bill. This is the motion before the House. (Interruption) What is the sense of the House?

Several hon. Members. rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is your objection?

Shri Namblar: Let him move after Mr. Sondhi's speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His motion is that the Bill should be disposed of first.

Several hon. Members No, no.

Shri N. Dandekar (Jamnagar): No, Sir, (Interruption)

There is some confusion.

श्री मधु लिख्ये : क्या इसके मुताबिक इन का मोशन है ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I formally move that the item under discussion should continue and the other item be taken up later after disposing of the Bill.

Several hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Namblar: As per your ruling, let him move the motion after Mr. Sondhi's motion is disposed of.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not taken a decision; I am going to take the sense of the House.

श्री मधु लिख्ये : क्या इस पर बोल रहे हैं ?

Shri N. Dandekar: You have given your ruling earlier that the item put down for 3 P.M. should start now. Now, the other motion, if I heard him and understood him aright, is that the debate on the Bill should continue and after that business is over, the motion of Shri Sondhi should be taken up. Now, Sir, you have already given your ruling that when the matter is due for 3 O'clock, it should be taken up at 3 O'clock.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already said we shall take up the next item on the agenda immediately after this, because it was mentioned that at that hour, it should be taken up. The hon. Member rose in his seat, and the hon. Member on this side said that it should be postponed. I cannot postpone on my own; I cannot postpone anything on my own. I will take the sense of the House.

Shri Namblar: After Shri Sondhi's motion. (Interruption).

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Let the motion be put before the House.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Yes. (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There was an objection. How can I over rule that? When there is an objection, I cannot over rule it.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

When a motion is made, there is a point of order.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: How can there be any point of order, Sir, when we have have moved the motion? (*Interruption*).

Shri N. Dandekar: Sir, I would like you to refer to the record.

The record is there. You had first given your decision and then the motion from the other side was moved. You kindly refer to the record. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let us be very clear. It is a very delicate matter. I can assure the House that nobody wants to flout the procedure. Nobody wants that. (*Interruption*).

श्री मधु लिमये : मोशन के ऊपर मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I know it. I was present.

Shri P. K. Deo: You have given your ruling; so you call him. (*Interruption*).

Shri Randhir Singh: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How can you raise it now?

श्री कर्बूर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर)
सरकार को डी० एन० कमीशन को डिस्कस करने से भागना नहीं चाहिये । अगर इस तरह से एम्प्लोयेमेंट को फ्लाइंग किया जायेगा तो (अवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Randhir Singh has raised a point of order.

Shri Randhir Singh: Can you allow me one minute? It is something which is very substantial, and very crucial.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Have you got anything on this?

Shri Randhir Singh: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then you define it. It is not a crucial thing; it is a definite motion.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है डा० राम सुभग सिंह ने जो प्रस्ताव किया उस सिलसिले में बाद में उसको वापस लेकर दूसरा रखना । अब प्रस्ताव वापस लेने के बारे में सबसे पहले मेरी व्यवस्था नं० 1 है । आप देखिये रूल 339 :

"(1) A member who has made a motion may withdraw the same by leave of the House.

(2) The leave shall be signified not upon question but by the Speaker taking the pleasure of the House. The Speaker shall ask: "Is it your pleasure that the motion be withdrawn?" If no one dissents—

हम लोग डिसेंट करने वाले हैं ।

the Speaker shall say "The motion is by leave withdrawn". But if any dissenting voice be heard or a member rises to continue the debate, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question.

Provided that if an amendment has been proposed to a motion, the original motion shall not be withdrawn until the amendment has been disposed of.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने कहा कि मैं संक्षेप में कहूँ । तो सब से पहले मेरा आक्षेप यह है कि जो प्रस्ताव उन्होंने रखा है उस को उन्होंने गैर-कानूनी ढंग से, अनियमित ढंग से वापस लिया । यह वह नहीं कर सकते हैं ।

मेरा दूसरा प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर है कि यह मूल प्रस्ताव भी नहीं रख सकते हैं क्योंकि आप नियम 332 देखिये । उस का नाम है नोटिस । :

"(1) Every notice required by these rules shall be given in writing

addressed to the Secretary and signed by the member giving notice, and shall be left at the Parliamentary Notice Office, which shall be kept open for this purpose between the hours to be notified from time to time on every day except Sunday or a public holiday.

धन मैं यह झगड़ा नहीं कर रहा हूँ कि यहाँ दिया या वहाँ दिया। मैं हलकी बात नहीं कहूँगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a question of adjustment of business.

श्री मधु लिमय: नहीं, नियमों के अनुसार जो उनका मोशन है वह केवल 185 के मातहत हो सकता है। और कोई धारा इसमें नहीं है। प्राप 185 को देखिये :

"Notice of a motion shall be given in writing addressed to the Secretary". Every notice required by these rules shall be given in the Secretary.

और समय समय पर हर एक नियम के मातहत जो नोटिसेज होती हैं, उन का समय निर्धारित किया जाता है। प्रिविलेज का नोटिस कब प्राये, काल प्रटेंशन का नोटिस कब प्राये, क्वेश्चन कब दिया जाये, शार्ट नोटिस कब दिया जाये, प्रमेंडमेंट कब दिया जाये और दूसरा मोशन कब दिया जाये। मोशन के लिये साढ़े 10 बजे का समय है। क्या डा० राम सुभग सिंह ने यह मोशन साढ़े 10 बजे दिया था? नियम है, निर्देश है और संविधान है। मैं डा० राम सुभग सिंह का धादर करता हूँ, चप्हाण साहब का भी धादर करता हूँ, श्री मोराजी देसाई और सभी लोगों का धादर करता हूँ। लेकिन मेरी धापसे यह गुजारिश है कि इस सदन में कोई भी व्यक्ति ऐसा नहीं है, मैं तो यहाँ तक कहूँगा कि राष्ट्रपति भी नहीं, जो संविधान, कानून, नियम और निर्देश से भी ऊँचे उठ कर मनमानी कर सकें। मेरी धापसे प्रार्थना है कि 3 बज चुके हैं और यह प्रस्ताव दो कारणों

से गैर-कानूनी है। एक तो गैर-कानूनी ढंग से वापस लिया गया और दूसरे मूल प्रस्ताव नियम के अनुसार नहीं है। नोटिस उसकी नहीं है। इसलिए धन समय बरबाद न करते हुए श्री सोंवी को मौका दिया जाये।

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Sir,

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Unless I dispose of this motion that has been moved by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, I cannot take up any other motion.

Shri K. Narayana Rao (Bobbili): Sir, this relates to the business of the House. What is the business of the House. Shri Umanath read out the first foot-note. On the basis of his contention you upheld his point of order. I oppose his contention.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, I rise to a point of order.

15.31 hrs.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Shri K. Narayana Rao: Mr. Speaker, Sir,

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir I was allowed by the Deputy-Speaker to raise a point of order.

Shri K. Narayana Rao: Sir, I was speaking when you took the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: I can hear one at a time. I will hear Shri Dwivedy later.

Shri K. Narayana Rao: Sir, the point at issue is this. According to the business of the House the motion before the House was for reference of the Central Industrial Security Force Bill to a joint committee. Shri Umanath raised a point of order that according to the first foot-note on the Order Paper which says: "To be taken up at 3 P.M. or as soon as the preceding items of business are disposed of, whichever is earlier". This foot-note relates to item 33 on the Order Paper. My contention is that according to this if the preceding items are disposed of before 3 P.M. this item may be taken up. This

[Shri K. Narayana Rao]

is more in the permissive nature (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I can hear only one at a time. This is where the whole thing fails. Only one should speak at a time.

Shri K. Narayana Rao: Mr. Speaker, item 33 is to be . . .

Mr. Speaker: I have understood you. What you say is that if the other items are completed then this must be taken up.

Shri K. Narayana Rao: Sir, this a very subtle thing, a very important thing.

Mr. Speaker: It is not as subtle as that.

Shri K. Narayana Rao: According to this if the preceding items are disposed of before 3 P.M. then this must be taken.

Mr. Speaker: I know. I have understood you.

Shri K. Narayana Rao: This is permissive and not prohibitive. My contention is, if the other items are not disposed of before 3.00 P.M. then this cannot be taken up; it should follow in the order laid down there.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, that question has been disposed of. Now there is a motion by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh. I rise to a point of order on that motion. That motion cannot be moved at the present moment. I draw our attention to rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure. Rule 25 relates to arrangement of business. It says:

"On days allotted for the transaction of Government business, such business shall have precedence and the Secretary shall arrange that business in such order as the Speaker may, after consultation with the Leader of the House, determine."

The proviso says:

"Provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal

unless the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation."

The term "such order of business shall not be varied" is important. So, it is very clear that it is left to your discretion. It is not left to the Minister. It is very clearly laid down that the arrangement of Government business is decided after discussion and consultation with the Leader of the House. But, in the course of the day, if the Government wants to change the order of business, it cannot be done by a majority vote. It is only if the Speaker is satisfied that the situation is such that it should be varied that it can be done. I would say that under the present circumstances the Speaker would not permit such a variation to be accepted in the order of business because already at 3 O'Clock another discussion is to take place. The Bill for which they want extension of time was originally allotted three hours. Now there is no time left with us. If it is a question of some 15 minutes or even 20 minutes. I can understand the Speaker extending that much time so that this discussion could come to an end before the next item is taken up. But, this Bill cannot be disposed of in another 15 or 20 minutes. Further, if you will look at the Order Paper, it is clearly stated that at 3 P.M., or earlier if the other items are disposed of, a new item is to be taken up. Therefore, the motion for extension of time for this Bill is completely out of order and the question has to be decided by you in your discretion.

Mr. Speaker: We have already lost about 40 minutes on this. Perhaps by this time we would have finished half of it if this discussion were not here. Today is the last day of the session and for the next three months we would not be here. Naturally, it would be difficult to exhaust the entire business of the House today unless, of course, we sit till 9 O'Clock or so. I do not know whether the House is prepared for it . . . (*Interruptions*).

Shri M. L. Somdhi: Sir, you promised me earlier that at an 3 p.m. this discussion will start.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. It is not if I am ignoring it. You raised it in the morning and enquired whether it will be reached. I said that since it is put in the agenda, you will get the time. I did say that. But the other items are also equally important. This Bill has to be referred to the Joint Committee. They are not passing it. How best we can adjust all the items is the point which we have to consider now.

Shri Ranga: There are two points. One is, what you have said here, how best these things could be adjusted within the time that we have so that we can co-operate with the government and help them. That is your anxiety. There is also the other aspect. Actually, before you came up some of these points were raised. We also drew the attention of the Chair to this particular proviso, that this item of the agenda should be taken up at 3 O'Clock, or earlier if the other items in the agenda are disposed of. The Chair was pleased to realise the force of the argument raised by our friends. Therefore, he said, if it is found necessary, this particular Bill may be taken up later on—that is how I understood it—but now the discussion on that should be stopped and the discussion on dearness allowance should be taken up. He has already said so definitely and categorically. There can be no other interpretation on the decision of the Chair. If you dismiss that decision of the Chair, that is a different matter. Thereafter, my hon. friend, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, wanted to suggest that the House should agree with him in the proposal that he has made that we should continue the discussion on the earlier Bill, giving go-bye to the ruling of Chair. That means that the House should give up or should over-rule the ruling given by the Deputy-Speaker or the Chair. (Interruption). It means that the House should go back again to the question which had already been discussed and which could not be completed. If that is to be considered at all by the House, there must be unanimity. Otherwise a thing like that cannot be done. If anything like that is to be done, it can be done only by the unanimous decision of the House, not otherwise. Therefore, I request the Chair to sustain the earlier ruling and if the Chair so wants, the Chair

can ascertain the view of the House, not by majority but by unanimity.

Shri R. K. Khadilkar (Khed): When the earlier motion was before the House, there were a number of points of order and the questions of competence was raised. I heard some and I asked the Home Minister to clarify the position. Other Members were rising in their seats and I said that I was clear in my mind but I would like to give an opportunity to others till we take up the other item. I called Mr. Sondhi and as soon as I called Mr. Sondhi, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs got up to say that this debate should continue and that the other item should be taken up after that. I told him that I could not change the order of business and that I will have to take the sense of the House. Then, some points of orders were raised and I was going to listen to then and give my ruling.

Shri Namblar: We are now on Mr. Sondhi's motion.

Mr. Speaker: We should not waste any more time on this. I think we should find a way out. The Report of the Dearness Allowance Commission should also be given some time. There is no doubt about it. That is why we have put it from 3 P.M. to 5 P.M. We have already lost 45 minutes. The Central Industrial Security Force Bill is also for reference to the Joint Committee. After all, they are not going to pass the Bill now. Can we not possibly take up both of them and finish them? Should it be difficult for the House to agree to that? This is also important.

Shri Namblar: The House is already on Mr. Sondhi's motion. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: It is all right, whether this is first or that is first.

It is not a question of my giving a ruling (Interruption).

श्री सुकून चरह कक्षबाय (उपजन) ।
आप रिपोर्ट को रंगा कर देविये कि श्री सौदी
ने अपना भाषण भी शुरू कर दिया था ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री कठाय को कम से कम प्राज्ञ तो पूरी तरह साइडेंट रहना चाहिए ।

I would say it is not a question of a point of order or rules. We have, unnecessarily lost about 45 minutes. This Bill is also to go to the Joint Committee.

Shri Namblar: There is no hurry.

Mr. Speaker: Why not we sit an hour more? There will be no difficulty at all.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a question of 'No'. Those who are not prepared to sit may go. Now, Mr. Sondhi will begin and we will have this up to 5 P.M. Then, we will take up the other Bill.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: It is already 3-45 P.M. time will not be enough.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot help it. I have called Mr. Sondhi.

15.45 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF THE
DEARNESS ALLOWANCE
COMMISSION

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Dearness Allowance Commission on the question of the grant of Dearness Allowance to Central Government employees in future, laid on the Table of the House on the 6th June, 1967."

I submit that this subject assumes a special importance today, and in requesting the House to consider this question, I am aware that there is pending a decision of the All India Railwaymen's Federation and of other Government Employees Associations to go on strike, on a full day strike, on the 11th September. **Mr. Speaker,** I feel that this House will agree that this is the most grave matter that, if this strike takes place, valuable

resources will be lost to this nation which it can ill-afford at this juncture. But I wish to submit that the strike is not directed against the public; it is not directed against the public interest. I would submit that in Delhi itself this strike, if it takes place, will be supported by the public. An important journal of opinion has urged the Opposition members the other day to realise their responsibility for maintaining harmonious relations between the Government and their employees. We, on the Opposition, are fully mindful of this responsibility and it is in keeping with this responsibility that we feel that the Government should trust their employees. Trust begets trust. We certainly champion their cause, not because they are government employees, but because they are the people who are engaged in the work of nation-building; they are the people who represent, by and large, the enlightened section of our society, and all that this section of our society wants is a reasonable degree of comfort in order to engage themselves in nation-building activities. This enlightened section of our society, if properly looked after, spells hope for India, the India of our dreams, but if they are made to feel that their interests have been ignored, then they will feel frustrated and out of that frustration will arise consequences which will be most unfortunate for our country.

The hon. Finance Minister and Deputy Prime Minister is known to have in his mind a certain type of calculations, in which there is, as it were, a process of unlimited addition: Rs. 30 crores for the Central Government employees plus Rs. 32 crores for the States plus Rs. 11 crores for public sector corporations plus Rs. 14 crores for municipal sector, coming to a total of Rs. 87 crores, and then multiply it by two, because it is felt that another slab rise will take place, making a total of Rs. 175 crores.

I submit that this is the version of a rather discredited theory in international politics, the theory of Domino Effect. Mr. Mc Namara has been thinking of South-East Asia in terms of Domino Effect, one thing giving rise to a failure and further failure and so on. The hon. Minister, in

his thinking on the Gajendragadkar Commission's Report, seems to have fallen a prey to this sort of panic thinking that one thing will lead to another and then to the final disaster. I submit....

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri K. C. Pant).

Another slab is also due. It is not something in future.

An hon. Member: He can reply later.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: I would submit that one of his professors in office, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, gave assurances galore, and, in fact, I would say that the Resolution of the Ministry of Finance itself refers to the fact that the matter was referred to the Commission for impartial settlement. These are words to be noted. The employees expected a certain impartiality in settlement. That was the whole purpose of referring the matter to the Gajendragadkar Commission. What do we get from the Commission? We get perhaps one recommendation which seems at least to spell hope. That is, that after the expiry of two years or when the price reaches a certain figure, revision of the pay scales is recommended and Government are advised to give interim relief. This proposal may be considered as a positive aspect of the otherwise gloomy and uncreative situation.

But what are the substantive recommendations? They consider the range from Rs. 70 to Rs. 575 and they think in terms of these 10 point rises which the hon. Minister referred to. But may I ask what is the subsistence level and the upper limit of vulnerability? Can anybody deny that the upper limit of vulnerability is actually not what the Commission agree to, but in fact much above it? Rs. 750 do not mean much as far as vulnerability goes. And then what is the lowest rung? Can anybody deny that Rs. 300 is in fact the lowest rung today in places like Delhi?

Therefore, I would say that the refusal of the hon. Minister to consider, as it

were, sympathetically whatever recommendations have been made by the Gajendragadkar Commission is, in fact, a refusal to mitigate the hardships being faced by a very important section of the population, a section of the population which is engaged in the work of national construction.

In fact, we are not even left with a definition of 'dearness allowance' in the manner in which thinking has proceeded in Government so far. It was supposed to be a device to protect the real income of wage earners and salaried employees from the effects of rise in prices. But whatever Justice there was in this definition is also sought to be taken away. In fact, the Gajendragadkar Commission themselves say that 'the rates of dearness allowance sanctioned in 1965 were regarded as inadequate by employees and they demanded revision or arbitration'. Government seem to have suffered a lapse of memory. They seem to forget that we in this House are aware of certain principles, certain definitions, certain norms of conduct. Instead, a very dubious argument is raised of rising to help the country and making sacrifices. Indeed, sacrifices should be made.

The other day in a very, I would say almost frivolous way—I use this word regretfully but deliberately—it was said that dearness allowance payment would cost the exchequer several hundred crores of rupees and it would contribute to price risk. I would challenge the Minister to ask an independent body like the Institute of Economic Growth to investigate the money flow involved in dearness allowance. I would submit that when the last slab of dearness allowance was given in December 1966, there was in fact no perceptible rise in the price spiral. I would submit that the delay in giving DA, not giving what the people were fully entitled to, has not resulted in any price policy success. There has been no holding of the price line by not giving DA.

Therefore, they should think of what lies behind this dearness allowance. It is not always useful to think in terms of macro-economic concepts, taking these magnitudes, what lies behind the dearness allowance which the employee gets is only

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

a chance to invest in the education of his children.

In other words, it is investment in man which the Finance Minister seeks to deny us by this measure.

He talks of economies, and I think that in considering the Gajendragadkar Commission's report, he was concerned with economy above all; and he is known to be an economic expert amongst the statesmen in the world. Therefore, is it difficult to expect him to think in terms of real economies, not superficial economy in terms of retrenchment but economy in giving up hare-brained schemes and wasteful schemes and schemes like the revolving tower on the Ashoka Hotel?

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): And also Bokaro.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should be very brief and he should give some time for Members from the other parties also.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: He expects a good monsoon, and we not only expect a good monsoon but we pray for a good monsoon also. And we hope, therefore, that in our country where the price structure depends upon food, since a good monsoon is expected, if they take other commensurate steps, there is no reason why for the sake of maintaining the price-line, they should bring so much human suffering on the white-collared employees and the other Government employees. This very negation of the definition of dearness allowance is something that we on this side of the House will never allow.

He has been known to ask for savings and greater savings. May I assure you and assure him through you, Sir, that we in the Bharatiya Jan Sangh would like to do everything to foster public savings but not under threat, not under duress? Let him give the dearness allowance. Then we shall go to the Government employees and ask them to subscribe to public savings in as large-hearted and full-hearted a manner as he would wish us to do. But let him feel the pulse of the nation. Let him feel the pulse of the people. Principles, I submit, should not be sacrificed

in an emergency. Promises have been given by successive Finance Ministers. These should not be thrown away. This domino theory of dearness allowance must be discredited because it depends upon certain archaic economic ideas.

What about the effect, on efficiency, of denying people their right to a subsistence level of living? Why has there been a rise in defence expenditure? Why the closure of the Suez Canal which has harmed us so much? Why our isolation from the European Common Market? Why our incrustation in the Commonwealth, a defunct organisation? Why should all these sins of Government be visited upon Government employees? What of the ideal employer-thesis that Government should be the ideal employer?

Therefore, I submit that hundred per cent neutralisation is justified. If there are any shortages, these are man-made shortages. Our country has been endowed by God with all those requirements of good living. Therefore, the question is about the capacity to bear and the capacity to pay.

I submit that Government have the capacity to pay the amount in cash and I submit that the Government employees do not have the capacity to bear price rise.

Finally, I would say, and I say it in all humility, that for a person who belongs to the Gandhian tradition, it ill behoves him to wail about the state of the economy. Gandhiji never used to wail; he never used to despair; he used to work for economic salvation.

We in the Jan Sangh want an efficient Centre. That does not mean overburdening the Centre. I would say that let the resources be given to the States. Let them have more resources, but let the Centre keep a decisive and strategic control to themselves to advance the perpetual endurance of our sacred Union, our Bharatavarsha. But the Finance Minister when he looks into this problem seems to feel that he is carrying the whole burden on his shoulders, and he is, if I could use a jargon of modern political science, suffering from what I would call inflammation and communication overload. He

thinks the whole burden is on his shoulders.

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Member leave something for others also to say. He is taking so much time.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: I shall conclude in a minute.

When he was meditating on the Gajendragadkar Commission's report, some of us thought that he was like a pearl-diver who had gone deep into the sea to bring out some valuable pearl which we could then show to all the Government employees. I am disappointed and my final feeling is that let him not follow the example of that rather ill-fated European character Don Quixote who used to tilt at windmills. It is not Government employees who should be squeezed. The chances of getting what he wants for this country, real economic progress, are bright provided enough judgment and a certain honesty of purpose are brought to bear in public life.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Dearness Allowance Commission on the question of the grant of Dearness Allowance to Central Government employees in future, laid on the Table of the House on the 6th June, 1967."

One hour we have got. I would request friends on both sides.....

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): How do you reach the conclusion of one hour?

16 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Forty minutes you wasted, I do not know.

Some hon. Members: No.

Shri Nath Pal: Full two hours and more.

Mr. Speaker: I will call the Minister at 5 O' Clock, and then each one of them I will allow five or six minutes.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): We know the views of the Finance Minister. We have been discussing with him for the last few days.

Mr. Speaker: Then, why do you waste the time?

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay Central South): A continuous debate on this question has been going on. The political-party leaders had an interview with the Finance Minister, and yesterday, speaking on another resolution, the Minister of State also had some arguments against our demand for cash payment of dearness allowance. Therefore, nothing much new remains to be added, no doubt, but then some points have got to be restated, so that the viewpoint of the workers may not go unrepresented or misrepresented.

16.02 hrs.

[SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK in the Chair]

During our talk with the Finance Minister, i.e. the Deputy Prime Minister, the whole question was pivoted on a single point, that, as he claims, if Rs. 175 crores equivalent to 20 points rise in the dearness allowance in the cost of living were paid to the Government employees, pumping Rs. 175 crores into the system would start a rise in prices, and then that rise would again demand a rise in dearness allowance and therefore the cycle cannot be checked.

Therefore, he starts with wages. We started with prices. He said: you give me one year, do not ask for this, and I will try to hold the price line. He is not confident about it. He said: if I fail, then you start the demand again, or I will go away. What is the satisfaction to Government employees after having been starved for one year of Rs. 175 crores, if the Finance Minister walks away saying he is a failure. So, that is not the pleasure that we want.

He starts with wages; we, in theory, start with prices, and this is a perpetual quarrel going on in the world of theory, in the world of economists, in this country.

[Shri S. A. Dange]

and every where. All the economists of the bourgeois or capitalist class, trace the rise in prices to a rise in wages, and all the economists and theoreticians of the democratic movement, the workers and the people say that the prices are not made by wages. And in this I am not alone as a sort of communist party speaker only. The leader of the British TUC denounced the freezing of wages by denying the correctness of the theory that a wage freeze would freeze prices. Mr. Reuther, the American leader of trade unions, who is very well-known and who supports all the American efforts at killings in Viet Nam, even he rejected the theory of wage freeze.

Therefore, this theory, which is discredited everywhere, which has nowhere proved correct, is now being taken up by the Finance Minister in this country because he chooses to follow outmoded theories of capitalism and does not see that in this country, in order to build a democratic India, a socialist India, this theory should not be held invalid.

So, our appeal to him was this. For the last six months the Government employees have not got their dearness allowance increase. Then, why were prices rising? Who was then making the rise in prices? Those who control the wage goods are responsible for the rise in prices. Who are controlling the wage goods? Open the report of the monopoly commission. The whole pharmaceutical industry in certain essential medicines is controlled by two firms and they dictated the prices. The prices in textiles are controlled by a single federation. It may have 400 mills but they dictate the prices and the government who gives them price increases as they did last time who have got bank advances to hoard food are the people who are responsible for rise in the price of foodgrains. Therefore, these are the people who are to be taken possession of first and cured of their habit of mobilising profit, if they could be cured at all. If they could not be cured, they should be "frozen" completely, either under the Preventive Detention Act or any other Act and then he can ask us whether we want a wage rise or not. That is the way to

control prices, instead of starving wage-earners. This argument has not impressed him and he says: believe in me and allow me not to pump Rs. 175 crores into the economy. What does it mean? It means that the prices will continue to rise and with the existing demands, an additional Rs. 175 crores is put into the pockets of the traders and the manufacturers and they are given super profits of Rs. 175 crores for the next one year until the Finance Minister is convinced that we were right and he was wrong. That is one method of giving Rs. 175 crores of super profits. When he does that all the manufacturers in the country are going to do the same thing; he wants them also to have a wage freeze or a wage cut to be carried out. That means again that this government is not only doing this to save governmental treasuries but is doing this in order to give extra profits to the already profiteering interests in this country. That is another effect it will have.

The third point is this. Let me quote for your reference the study of prices made by the Reserve Bank of India, economic division. In this country the cost-push theory of price is not valid; prices have risen primarily because of the demand for food and the food prices have gone up. Therefore wage demand arises out of this rise in prices. It say: "Thus there has been a price induced wage spiral in India in recent years." It is not the view of a communist; it is the economic division of the Reserve Bank.

If he wants to avoid pumping into the economy more money, why has he given Rs. 268 crores deficit financing to be absorbed in the monetary system of the country from April to July as had been exposed by the Economic Times? He has tried to answer it but it has been a hopeless attempt and nothing has been answered. On the one side in order to enable manufacturers to earn profits, Rs. 268 crores of deficit financing is permitted. Not only that. If this rise is not given and if there is action on the part of workers and if there is a general strike, already the Bill is coming in order to put more security force into the

system in order to keep down the workers in the public sector. The charge of this force is going to be Rs. 11 crores as stated here. This security force in three instalments of seven battalions each is going to cost every year about Rs. 4 crores. To stop the public sector workers from demanding Rs. 11 crores the government is prepared to spend Rs. 4 crores on the security force, in order to beat them down. But they are not going to save the Balance of Rs. 7 crores; they are going to lose more crores. That only shows the way in which the policy is being carried out on behalf of the government.

The last point is this. Shri K. C. Pant advanced some arguments yesterday.

He said that the majority of the Ministers coming from the non-Congress States have agreed to it. And he read out the names of the parties who were in the Government, one party being my party. Yes. The majority of non-Congress Chief Ministers are not necessarily Ministers who do not subscribe to the Congress Minister's theory of finance. We are not responsible for that theory. If those Chief Ministers oppose a wage increase, we will oppose the Chief Ministers where we have the power; and we will throw them out. On this question there will be no compromise.

Secondly, there are now seven Congress Ministries and to make them a majority—three or four of those States like some of those where we are not in a majority, where we are not in force,—there, you can have the majority, of the Chief Ministers to support your line. The Kerala Ministry has not supported it. The Cabinet in West Bengal is not supporting it. The Bihar Cabinet is not supporting it. The hon. Minister here quoted that the Bihar Cabinet gave a deferred payment. Bihar is in famine. Declare famine throughout the country, and then come forward and say, "Please have deferred payment." (Interruption). If you are so bankrupt or famine-stricken, you can declare it.

Mr. Chairman : The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri S. A. Dange : Therefore, the point is this. Merely scoring a debating point,

as he was doing yesterday, is no use. Because this is a problem of six million workers; their problem of livelihood. Government has money; it has already increased the taxation. It is already pumping deficit financing. If he frightens me with the prospect of deficit financing, well, deficit financing by itself is not responsible for price rise. That also is a wrong economic theory. I would say, "all right: put in Rs. 175 crores as additional deficit financing to the Rs. 268 crores which has already been done and give me my DA increase." Even in spite of it, the prices can be held, because the prices are made by the bank advances to feed your monopoly houses who get the advance and it is these 75 monopoly companies who are controlling the price and are dictating things to this country. Therefore, freeze the prices first and take over the banks. He will say, "I have heard you saying that so many times." Well, he will hear the same thing again and again because you are also saying the same thing again and again. (Interruption). Therefore, take over the banks and you will be able to solve the problem of prices. Smash in some of those monopolists who are controlling the basic goods. You will be able to hold the prices.

I can understand and I can accept the statement that you want to hold the price line. Please then take the correct measures and not hit the wage-earner and the wages of the workers. So, in the end, I will appeal to him again: if this appeal falls on deaf ears, then, the Government employees' organisations are taking the decision, and we in the central organisation have taken the decision that we are going to carry out a general strike on 11th September or on any date that is accepted by all, in order to register our protest against the policy of the Government which is hitting the working class in this country.

श्री जार्ज फरनेग्डीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : दो दिन वित्त मंत्री से सदन के कई सदस्यों ने और सरकारी कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों ने महंगाई भत्ते के बारे में बातचीत चलाई है। लेकिन कोई भी ठोस उत्तर वित्त मंत्री जी से नहीं मिल पाया है। सिर्फ इतना ही उन्होंने कहा है कि महंगाई भत्ता इस वक्त वह नहीं

[श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज]

सकते हैं। एक बड़ी झूठ बात भी फैलाने का प्रयास इस वक्त मुल्क में हो रहा है। यह कहा जा रहा है कि अगर सरकार ने महंगाई भत्ता दे दिया तो 175 करोड़ रुपया सरकार को तत्काल देना पड़ेगा। मैं सब से पहले इस बात की सफाई कर देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन द्वारा रिपोर्ट किया गया महंगाई भत्ता, जोकि असल में हमें श्री सरकारी कर्मचारियों को मंजूर नहीं है क्योंकि दास कमिशन ने जो महंगाई भत्ता देने की बात कही थी उसमें कुछ कटौती करने का काम गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन ने किया है, देने की बात मान ली जाये तो केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों को जिनकी सीधे जिम्मेदारी वित्त मंत्री पर है सिर्फ साठ करोड़ रुपया उन्हें देना पड़ेगा, 175 करोड़ नहीं। राज्य सरकारों के कर्मचारियों के बारे में वित्त मंत्री को नहीं बोलना चाहिये, न ही स्थानीय स्वराज्य संस्थाओं के कर्मचारियों के बारे में अथवा पब्लिक सैक्टर अंटरटेकिंग के कर्मचारियों के बारे में। इस बात को मैं मानता हूँ कि उन्हें भी महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ाना पड़ेगा इस रिपोर्ट के अनुसार अगर केन्द्रीय सरकार इसको मान लेती है। लेकिन मेरा निवेदन है वित्त मंत्री से कि कोई भी ऐसी बात वह न फैलाये जिससे मुल्क के लोगों में गलतफहमी पैदा हो और लोग ऐसा समझें कि करीब दो सौ करोड़ के नये टैक्स इस साल हमारे अर्थ मंत्री ने लगाने का फैसला किया है और इतनी राशि वह भारत के लोगों की जेबों में से निकालने वाले हैं और निकास कर सरकारी कर्मचारियों को देने वाले हैं।

एक दूसरा झूठ भी फैलाया जाता है। यह कहा जाता है कि महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ने से चीजों के दाम बढ़ जायेंगे। मैं इस पर अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। एक ही बात उनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के कई सूबों में और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने रेलवे बंगाल के साथ मिल कर हिन्दुस्तान के

लोगों की जेबों से नये करों के द्वारा जो पैसा लेने का फैसला किया है उसकी कुल रकम कम से कम दो सौ करोड़ हो जाती है। नये टैक्स लगा कर दो सौ करोड़ लेने की बात जब चलती है तो इसका एक ही मतलब होता है कि चीजों के दाम भी उसी परिमाण में बढ़ जायें और वे बढ़ जाते हैं।

जो आपका बजट आया है और जो रेलवे का बजट आया है इस साल उनकी वजह से हिन्दुस्तान में हर एक चीज के दाम, जीवनोपयोगी वस्तुओं के दाम, जीवन के लिए आवश्यक वस्तुओं के दाम दस से पंद्रह प्रतिशत बढ़ गये हैं। आज आप खड़े हो कर साठ करोड़ रुपये वाली बात कहने हैं। लेकिन आप यह देखें कि यह कमिशन हमारा बनाया हुआ नहीं है, आपका ही बनाया हुआ है। मैं आपका याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आप शायद तब वित्त मंत्री नहीं थे जब यह कमिशन बना था। इसलिए मैं आपको खास तौर पर यह बात याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन की रिपोर्ट के 73 नम्बर पन्ने पर जो लिखा हुआ है, उसको आप देखें। उसमें लिखा हुआ है :

"Government had announced its intention that if the employees are dissatisfied with the extent of neutralisation of the rise in the price index effected by the grant of DA, the Government would refer the matter for impartial settlement."

यह सरकार का प्रस्ताव है। आगे जा कर गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन के हाथ में जो जिम्मेदारी देने में आई है, वहाँ यह बात लिखी हुई है :

"...to recommend at what rates and from what date the revised DA should be granted to the said employees."

आपने उस कमिशन से कहा था कि दामों को रोकने में आप असफल हुए हैं आपकी सरकार असफल हुई है और इस

आपकी असफलता के कारण गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन को बनाने का आपने फैसला किया, आपको यह फैसला लेना पड़ा और उस कमिशन से आपने कहा था कि बताओ कि कितना महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ना चाहिये और कौन सी तारीख से बढ़ना चाहिये। उन्होंने अपनी सिफारिशों स्पष्ट और साफ तौर पर दी हैं और इसमें कोई वाद-विवाद की गुंजाइश नहीं है।

16.18 hrs.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair.]

परसों जब हम वित्त मंत्री से मिले थे तब बातचीत के दौरान मैंने उनसे कहा था कि गजेन्द्रगडकर की जो रिपोर्टें डेशन है यह कोई नैगोशिएबल प्रस्ताव नहीं है, इस पर बहस नहीं हो सकती है। यह जो रिपोर्ट है इसको आप मान लीजिये। अगर सरकार की जवान की कोई कीमत है तो फिर आपका यह फर्ज है कि रिपोर्ट को पूरे तौर पर आप तत्काल मानें और इसको अमल में लायें। मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि कर्मचारियों में कई लोग हैं जिनको यह जो रिपोर्टें डेशन है यह पसन्द नहीं है। लेकिन अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस कमिशन की सिफारिशों को न मानते हुए मुल्क में जो वातावरण है उसकी बात कर दी जाती है और हमें समझाया बुझाया जाने लगता है। लेकिन आप देखें कि आज होयहां एक विधेयक के बारे में अभी काफ़ी शोरगुल हुआ है। सेंट्रल इंडस्ट्रियल सिन्डिकेट रिटो फोर्स बिल जो आया है, जो एक नई पुलिस फोर्स आप बनाने जा रहे हैं और जिस पर आप सालाना दो करोड़ खर्चा पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग की मदद करने के लिए खर्च करने जा रहे हैं, वहां पर पैसा बरबाद करने के लिए तो आपके पास है लेकिन यहां पर आप जो करने के लिए बचनबद्ध हैं, वह करने को तैयार नहीं हैं। अभी रोड रोलज का मसला आया था। यहां पर आपके रिश्तेदार लोग थे, कोई सम्बन्ध उन लोगों से

था इसलिए आप ने एक करोड़ 85 लाख खर्चा बरबाद करने का फैसला कर लिया लेकिन जब महंगाई भत्ते का सवाल आता है तो आकर आप बताते हैं कि पैसे की तकलीफ है। अगर पैसे की तकलीफ भी हो, तो गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन की रपट में मंत्रियों और सरकारी प्रशासन के खर्च में आस्टैरिटी के सम्बन्ध में सलाह दी गई है। वह सलाह ठीक हो या गलत, लेकिन उसमें कहा गया है कि आस्टैरिटी के बारे में हमारे सामने कई सुझाव आये हैं कि मंत्रियों और प्रशासन के खर्च में कैसे बचत की जाये।

"It has been urged before us that the Government of India and the State Governments must set a pattern of austerity in the conduct of the Ministers and in the general manner of administration."

अगर कहीं से आस्टैरिटी की शुरुआत करनी है, तो मंत्रि-मंडल और सरकार से शुरुआत करनी चाहिए, मंत्रियों आदि के व्यक्तिगत जीवन से करनी चाहिए। जिस मुल्क की म्यूनिसिपल कर्मचारी, रास्ते पर झाड़ू मारने वाली औरत, साल में एक साड़ी भी खरीबने की ताकत नहीं रखती है, उस मुल्क के मंत्रि-मंडल में दिन में तीन बार साड़ियां बदलने का तरीका चलता है। और फिर हमें कहा जाता है, देश को कहा जाता है कि आस्टैरिटी होना चाहिए। जिन लोगों में अपने व्यक्तिगत जीवन में आस्टैरिटी लागू करने की—सिर्फ दिखावे के लिए नहीं, बल्कि अमल में—न तो कुम्बत है और न ईमानदारी, उनको आस्टैरिटी के बारे में बात करने का कोई नैतिक या कानूनी अधिकार नहीं है।

मैं नम्रता के साथ वित्त मंत्री से कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेहरबानी कर के वह इस झगड़े को न बढ़ायें। 11 सितम्बर की तारीख केन्द्रीय सरकारी कर्मचारियों की अस्ट्राइक के लिये तय हुई है। जब परसों हमारे एक साथी

[श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज]

ने वित्त मंत्री से कहा कि अगर वह बेज फीज की बात करते हैं—श्रीर जो कुछ वह कर रहे हैं, वह बेज फीज ही है—तो बर्क फीज भी हो सकता है, तो उन्होंने कहा कि हम डीफीज भी कर सकते हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि उनके पास शक्ति है, क्योंकि उनकी बगल में गृह मंत्री बैठे हैं।

इस सम्बन्ध में बांड्ज की बात कही जाती है, डेफ्रैंट पेमेंट की बात कही जाती है—कहा जाता है कि साल के बाद पैसा ले लो और तब तक उस पैसे को हमारे पास रखो। मैं मांग करना चाहता हूँ, जिस को श्री मधु लिमये ने गजेन्द्रगडकर कमीशन की रपट धाने परपेश किया था, कि सरकार ने फ़रवरी से वह पैसा देना है और ग़रीब सरकारी कर्मचारियों का वह पैसा फ़रवरी से सरकार के पास पड़ा है, इसलिए वह पैसा ब्याज के साथ सरकारी कर्मचारियों को देना चाहिए।

मैं साफ़ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर धाने वाले तीस दिन के अन्दर इस रपट को सौ फ़ीसदी मान कर महंगाई भत्ते का यह पैसा न देकर, सरकारी कर्मचारियों के इस आन्दोलन को ठुकराने और मिटाने का प्रयास किया गया, तो सरकार और मंत्री महोदय यह याद रखें कि वे सरकारी कर्मचारियों को नहीं पीट सकेंगे। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि 11 सितम्बर के आन्दोलन से इस सरकार को मिट्टी में मिलाने का काम हो जाये। वह हम लोगों को इस परेशानी में नडालें।

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, let us try to see what exactly the issue is, what is the Government's attitude to it is and where we are disagreeing with it. It will help the debate if we try to clarify the issue.

In the beginning, Sir, I should like to say that when we met Shri Morarji Desai we had a delightful satisfaction. I think a little exile from office has done some good. There was unusual warmth and cordiality in his talks; the old habit of

obstinacy dying hard. He often mistakes obstinacy for tenacity of reasoning. Barring this, there was some very cordial and frank discussion between us. He was very lavish in offering sympathy but very stingy and miserly when coming to implement that sympathy in cash. He was offering a plateful of sympathy, a dishful of sympathy. Unfortunately for us who were invited to that repast there was a little difficulty in partaking in that plateful of sympathy because that plate was covered with an iron cast napkin which he kept on reciting.

Briefly, the issue is like this. The Gajendragadkar Commission states the issue like this:

"We have thought it necessary to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that we have been oppressed by the apprehension that the problem of rising prices may pose a very serious danger to the whole of our national economy, unless it is tackled effectively, comprehensively and without delay."

Then the Commission says:

"We have already mentioned that the living cost index has been registering rapid rise almost from month to month. In fact, whereas it took 8 months for the 12 months average to rise by 10 points, the next rise of the same magnitude was witnessed in six months."

Now the Commission says:

"We, therefore, recommend that automatic adjustment in future in the manner indicated by us in the Table in Paragraph B...."

Here comes a point of dispute between the Finance Minister and the representatives of the Government employees.

"After examining all the considerations involved, we are unable to recommend any alternative form of assistance....."

I am sure Shri Morarji Desai has read this part of the recommendation but for

the benefit of the other members, who might not have had the time to read it, I am emphasising and reiterating this para:

"...any alternative form of assistance which might be given to ensure real benefit to Government employees without necessarily increasing inflationary pressures on the economy."

Shri Gajendragadkar is very clear in his mind as to his recommendations. He has categorically rejected the possibility of what is due to the government employees being imposed on them in some form of deferred payment, as the Finance Minister obdurately and tenaciously has been trying to hold.

What is the malaise that has given cause to this kind of attempt? May I invite your attention to some recent studies done in this matter. Shri Morarji Desai and some of his colleagues in the Congress Government are never tired of telling this House, though he used sometimes to champion the cause of the underdog years ago, that inflation is inevitable since we are committed to development and growth. This is a fallacious theory which the experience of other countries has now blown to pieces. May I read from *Inflation and Growth*, in which it has been pointed out:

"The available statistical evidence suggests that rising prices discourage economic development and rapid inflation seriously inhibits growth."

Here, may I remind Shri Morarji Desai of what he has himself stated earlier? Perhaps he has forgotten that.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I have never forgotten what I said.

Shri Nath Pai: May I point out that in 1958 you said, you defended the position in these words in this House? Sir, this time should not be included in the time allotted to me; this is grace time—Sir, you must be fair to me.

Two points were made by him when he was the custodian of the finance portfolio. One was that price rise in India is negligible compared with other countries and,

secondly, that a certain price rise is inevitable.

Shri Morarji Desai: That is all right. It is not inflation.

Shri Nath Pai: There is a semantic difference. What he calls continuous rise in prices is technologically and technically called inflation; of course, there is semantic difference. I am glad that he is agreeing that he has made this statement.

I am just showing the fallaciousness of this argument. During these two years the annual average weekly index of wholesale prices rose by only 2.4 per cent per week. In the fourth page, emphasising the last three years of the Third Plan, the rise in prices was of the order of 29 per cent. The rate of price rise has continued till 1966-67.

If there is continued inflation in this country, who is responsible for it? Certainly, you will agree with me if I suggest, that it is not the government employees, that it is not the fixed wage income group, it is not the agricultural labour, it is not the school teacher, it is not those who come in the lowest income bracket, it is not these people who are responsible for continued inflation in this country. The responsibility for this has to be borne by those who are occupying the Treasury Benches. The mistake is theirs, but the penalty is to be paid by somebody else; that seems to be the sense of justice of Shri Morarji Desai!

Shri Desai, during his reply to the Finance Ministry's demands in this year's budget discussion, made a tall claim when it was brought to his notice that during the past years the real income of the lowest income brackets had declined; he, with his usual tenacity, rejected it. I wish he had brought to bear a little more of logic, facts and data, rather than cling tenaciously to his prejudices and pretend that they are arguments. I am reading from a recent study of Mr. R. K. Amin. Who are the people whom Mr. Morarji Desai is going to penalise? This is very simple. He says, "There is inflation. I know something is due to you accord-

[Shri Nath Pai]

ing to Justice Gajendragadkar. I am prepared to give it to you. But I am not prepared to give it to you in the form in which you are entitled as per the Commission's Report. I am going to give it to you by way of deferred payment." Why? The reply is, "If I give you in cash, the inflationary pressures will be increased and accelerated."

I am asking a very simple question: Who is responsible for this inflation? Is it the Government employee? Is it the man with fixed income? Why are you trying to penalise him for the sins committed by the Government? The whole trouble arises because of the failure of this Government on the economic front. For this failure of the Congress Government, who is to pay the penalty, who is to bear the burden? It is those who are less qualified to bear the burden. It is precisely the victim of this who is made to pay the penalty. If Mr. Morarjibhai Desai and the Congress Government come forward with proposal so that those who have benefited from the inflationary economic policies of the Government were made to pay the penalty, we can understand that and we can cooperate with the Government. It is precisely those who have paid through their nose due to the inflationary policies of the Government that are being called upon to pay the penalty by being asked to take what is due to them, not in terms of cash, in terms of bonds and defence certificates.

There are patent inequities about the suggestion of the Finance Minister. He will make much about it and, I think—he is really more eloquent these days—he will tell us, "I sympathise. I understand, my heart goes as much as that of anybody else to the poor employee. But what shall I do?"

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may try to conclude now.

Shri Nath Pai: May I quote this?

"The First and Second Agricultural Labour Enquiries conducted in 1950-51 and 1956-57 respectively indicate that in 1956-57 as compared to 1950-51 agricultural labourers had fewer days of work, lower real wages per day, heavier burden on debt per

household, larger number of households in debt and bigger deficit in the household budget."

This is the lowest income group in this country. I will ask Mr. Morarji Desai only one thing. Who is paying the penalty for inflationary economic policies followed not only by him but by the Government as a whole. Actually, when he was made to resign under the so-called Kamaraj Plan, he was about to make a new departure and, with his characteristic courage, he was about to accept mistakes and was to make a new departure. He was given a chance. I do not hold him entirely responsible for all this. But it is his lion's share in this. Then, this what I quote:

"It is certain that the poor were worse off in 1966-67 compared to 1961. Per capita income in 1961 and in 1966 was almost the same Rs. 325 at 1960-61 prices. During this period, conditions in agriculture deteriorated considerably....."

The per capita output in agriculture in 1965-66 and 1966-67 was the same. That is the lowest for that period.

I want to conclude by pointing out one or two things to Mr. Morarji Desai. He has indulged in a very strange play with some figures. What he owes to the Central Government employees is Rs. 60 crores. In order to frighten us, he says, "If I give you this much, I must think of what State Governments are going to pay. What about the public sector undertakings employees? What about the State Government employees?" And he has given a huge figure. Certainly, he has become the Christmas Father of all the employees in the country. He has taken the burden on his shoulders. I concede to him as the Finance Minister of the Union Government that he should think of the economy as a whole.

There, he does not answer our question. If you want to check inflationary pressures. In any way, where do you want to make a beginning? Is it with those who are less qualified to bear the burden, who are most oppressed by the burden, who are most vulnerable or those who have taken the benefit out of the inflationary policies of

the Government? I think, he is making a beginning in the wrong way. I must tell him that we are not at all convinced by what we heard from him. In the first place, I must tell him, this is not something that the Central Government employees demand. It is the Government of India which appointed the Gajendra-gadkar Commission to look into it. He has not given to them what they were entitled to and what they asked for. He is giving only 90 per cent neutralisation and Mr. Morarji Desai is even denying that. I know his anxiety for the economy as a whole. I think he is making a beginning in the wrong way. Exactly seven years ago, when there was a similar occasion, when this was discussed, you, Sir, participated in that and you told us as to who was responsible for the step taken by the Government employees.

History has a very bad way of repeating itself, but we wise try to learn some lessons from history. Mr. Morarji Desai was the Finance Minister in that year when the Government of India employees, for the first time in the history of a free country, resorted to a strike. That strike was crushed with an iron hand and that was the only victory that the Government of India had won since Independence, that is, it had beaten down the half-starving employees who had been kept on a subsistence level by the Government. Mr. Pant admitted that 21,000 employees were arrested, 45,000 were suspended, and he came here to this House gloating over the spurious victory of theirs.

I have to quote something from a confidential letter of the then Prime Minister. This will be my appeal to Mr. Morarji Desai, the so-called steel man: let no strength be displayed before the half-clad and half-starving government employees. That steel, if at all it is there, has to be displayed in some other sphere.

Then let us not forget this: it will not be helpful to hold the irresponsibility of the trade union leaders as the cause of the strike. Nobody wants a strike; the government employees want it least. But you drive them, you force them, you do not give them any other alternative: you close every door and when they resort to

the only weapon they have, then you hold them responsible as the people who are jeopardising the security and the economy of the country. The nation will not accept this plea; the fallacy of the plea has already been exploded.

Before I sit down, I should read what in a confidential letter, the then Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had to warn his colleagues:

"We have thus far not evolved any adequate machinery for the rapid settlement of disputes of this type. The Government's way of dealing with such matters is a leisurely way, and months and even years pass sometimes before we come to grips with the problem; a problem which perhaps could have been solved with greater ease, becomes more difficult. Frustration takes place and passions are aroused, and these lead to a conflict which is ultimately good for no one".

I want to plead with the Minister: let us not strike a false posture, let us see who is bearing the burden and let us try to relieve the burden, at least from the shoulders which have carried it too long and too patiently. It is the last straw that breaks the burden of the camel and he know who is the camel and how patient they were in this case. I hope that Mr. Morarji Desai will discard the false posture of strength and will come out in a real conciliatory manner. The real strength—it is no weakness—in a really good man of strength is to see the truth, even though it is a little late to see the truth sometimes.

श्री कृष्णी नाथ पांडे (पदरीवा) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्राज्ञ की जो परिस्थिति है वैसे मैं बहुत इसके लिए उत्साहित नहीं था कि इस विषय पर बोलूँ पर दोलना भी बहुत आवश्यक है इसलिए कि एक बहुत सिद्धांत का प्रश्न भी इस में प्राया है और मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी के ध्यान में यह चीज जानना चाहता हूँ। इस गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के दो भाग हैं। एक वह भाग है जिसमें उन्होंने एक रिपोर्ट की है कि इतना

[श्री काशी नाथ पांडे]

गवर्नमेंट के कर्मचारियों के लिए देना चाहिए। अब यह जरूर है कि जो भी उन की सिफारिश है उस से एक धनराशि का प्रश्न सामने आता है। गवर्नमेंट को तरकीब निकालनी है कि कैसे वह रुपया लाये और उन को दे? यह दूसरी चीज है जिस का इंतजाम वित्त मंत्री जी को करना है। पर एक चीज मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ जो सिद्धांत का प्रश्न इस में है वह यह है कि जब गवर्नमेंट को कोई कठिनाई होती है या दो पार्टियों में झगड़े होते हैं और भ्रक्सर यह झगड़े होते हैं क्योंकि गवर्नमेंट सब से बड़ी एम्प्लायर है चाहे वह गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लायी डाइरेक्ट हों जिन की तनख्वाह टैक्स से आती है या स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की फ़ैक्टरीज में काम करते हों, जब कभी भी इस तरह की बातों को लेकर झगड़ा होता है तो आप उसे जज के सुपुर्द करते हैं और जब जज का कोई फैसला हो, जैसे इस चीज को आप ने गजेन्द्र गडकर जैसे जज के सुपुर्द किया जिन का हिन्दुस्तान में एक स्थान है और मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि उन जैसे जज ने इस विषय पर अपना मस्तिष्क न लगाया होगा, यह बात दूसरी है कि आज वह बाहर हैं लेकिन एक दिन वह सुप्रीम कोर्ट के चीफ जस्टिस रहे हैं, जो उन्होंने रिपोर्ट दी है, अगर गवर्नमेंट ने उस में कोई तरमिष करने की कोशिश की तो दूसरी बार अगर आप ने किसी जज के सुपुर्द यह बाल की तो आप की इस बात का विश्वास किसी को नहीं होगा। मैं मन्त्र शब्दों में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब आप ने एक चीज पहले से सिद्धांतरूप में स्वीकार कर ली है और एक जज के सुपुर्द आप ने जिस चीज को किया है, तो उन्होंने जो सिफारिश की है उस सिद्धांत को मान लीजिए।

मैं आप की कठिनाई को समझता हूँ, लेकिन यह जो साइकिल है उस को आप को एक दिन तो फेंस ही करना पड़ेगा क्योंकि हम कह सकते हैं आप रुपया दे दीजिये। लेकिन रुपया देना आप को है। हम तो केवल बतला

सकते हैं कि रुपया आप को देना चाहिये। मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ, जैसा कि मैं समझता हूँ, कि जितनी धनराशि बढ़ती है, सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लायीज को जितना पैसा मिलता है, निश्चय ही उस का प्रभाव स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के एम्प्लायीज पर पड़ता है। वह पड़े बिना रह नहीं सकता। जब भी पे कमीशन की सिफारिश हुई है तब पब्लिक ग्रन्डरटेकिंग्स में, जहाँ बेज बोर्ड नहीं बने हैं, इस चीज का फायदा लोगों को मिला है। हम ऐसा नहीं कह सकते कि पब्लिक ग्रन्डरटेकिंग्स में जो कर्मचारी काम करते हैं, वह इस का फायदा नहीं उठावेंगे। जैसा कहा जा रहा है, हो सकता है कि 60 करोड़ की धनराशि की ही जरूरत हो। लेकिन इसके लिये 60 करोड़ की धन राशि कहां से आयेगी। इस को ढूँढना आप को है। हो सकता है कि आप टैक्स लगा कर यह रुपया दे दें। लेकिन आज देश और टैक्स के लिये तैयार नहीं है। तब यह रुपया कहां से आयेगा ?

जो एक लम्बी चीज आप प्राविडेंट फंड में दे रहे हैं उस के संबंध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्राविडेंट फंड एक ऐसी चीज है जिस से अगर रुपया उधार लिया जाये तो उस के लिये रूल्स बने हैं। उस से आदमी बिल्डिंग के लिये रुपया उधार ले सकता है, लेकिन अगर कोई और काम हो तो प्राविडेंट फंड से रुपया उधार नहीं लिया जा सकता। इसी लिये अगर आप डेफ़ड पेमेंट करना चाहते हैं, बाण्ड्स को शकल में मले हों उस को कोजिये, लेकिन कम से कम आधा पैसा जरूर दे दीजिये।

श्री नाथ पांडे : नहीं, नहीं। (ब्यवधान)

श्री काशी नाथ पांडे : मैं यह नहीं कहता कि बनर्जी साहब कहते हैं। यह तो काशी नाथ पांडे कह रहा है। उसको आप सुनिये। बनर्जी साहब अपनी जगह वहां पर बैठे हैं और मैं यहां बैठा हूँ। मैं अपना विचार

रख रहा हूँ। मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ : (व्यवधान) आप को समझना ही नहीं है, इस लिये जो चाहे कह डालिये। सब ठीक है। मैं एक चीज कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कर्मचारियों को बांड की ही शक्ल में देना है तो वह चीज ऐसी होनी चाहिये कि वह दो या चार साल में जब भी लेना चाहें उस को ले सकें किसी भी काम के लिये। बच्चों की शिक्षा के लिये प्राविडेंट फंड से रुपया नहीं मिल सकता। उस में बहुत सी ग़ौर भी रुकावटें हैं। इस लिये इस का दूसरा कोई फंड बनाइये और कम से कम आधा पैंसा कर्मचारियों को जरूर दे दिया जाये। यह मेरा सुझाव है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, Shri S. M. Banerjee. He should take just five minutes and be very brief.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi (Cuddalore): How can you neglect our party? We must also be given some time.

16.44 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जितनी बहस हम वित्त मंत्री जो से कर चुके हैं उस का एक ही निष्कर्ष निकलता है कि वह कहते हैं कि उन्हें 175 करोड़ रुपये की जरूरत है और हिन्दुस्तान के पास वह पैसा है नहीं। मैं एक चीज कहना चाहता हूँ कि पहले से ही यह इरादा था हमारी सरकार का या हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी का कि यह पैसा देना नहीं चाहिये, क्योंकि रेलवे मंत्रालय ने अपने बजट में डो० ए० के लिये, महंगाई के लिये पैसा दिया, लेकिन आप ने.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should be very short. Shri S. A. Dange has already spoken on behalf of his party.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have been pleading with you to give me some time. Today is the last day of this session.

Mr. Speaker: If two or three Members are going to speak from every party, then we shall not be able to complete the debate.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Even if you are harsh to me, I would submit that you may remember that.....

Mr. Speaker: I am not harsh at all.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I know, Sir, that you have been very kind to us. You are like a coconut, hard on the surface but very soft inside.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): What is this? The Speaker is being compared with a coconut?

Mr. Speaker: Now, let Shri S. M. Banerjee continue his speech. Let him not waste any more time.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would not take more than six to seven minutes.

मैं कह रहा था कि आज हमारे सामने जो मसला है वह 175 करोड़ ६० का नहीं है। जब वित्त मंत्री जी ने साफ तरीके से मुख्य मंत्रियों को कह दिया है कि सूबे की सरकार के कर्मचारियों के लिये कोई पैसा वह देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है, दूसरी म्यूनिसिपैलिटीज और लोकल बाडीज के जो एम्प्लायीज हैं उन के लिये भी उन्होंने कहा है कि नहीं है, तब हमारे सामने सबाल सिर्फ 60 करोड़ रुपये का रह जाता है।

अगर आप हमारे 22 लाख सरकारी कर्मचारियों की बेजेज को देखें तो वह 1947 से भी नीचे गिर चुकी है। सरकार ने जब 1952 में यह सोचा कि महंगाई तो कम होनी नहीं है, जैसा कि पहले पे कमीशन का कयास था और वह सोचता था कि 165 से ले कर 175 या 200 के ऊपर वह सीमित हो जायेगी, तब उन्होंने समझा कि यह महंगाई भत्ता महंगाई भत्ता नहीं है, बल्कि तनख्वाह का एक हिस्सा है। उन्होंने 1952 में एक

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

कमेटी का निर्माण किया जिस का नाम गाडगिल कमेटी था।

गाडगिल कमेटी ने कहा कि :

"This question of treating as part of pay a portion of the dearness allowance now granted to the Central Government employees has been engaging the attention of the Government of India for some time. The Government of India have now decided to set up a committee consisting of non-officials and officials to conduct an investigation into these matters and make recommendations to Government on this subject."

1952 में जो हमारे वित्त मंत्री थे उन्होंने समझा कि उस को तन्ववाह में जोड़ देना चाहिये। मैं कहता हूँ कि आप आज गाडगिल कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को भूल जाइये। गजेन्द्र गडकर कमिशन ने भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में केवल 90 परसेंट न्युट्रलाइजेशन दिया है, और वह भी 70 रु० से ले कर 109 रु० तक है। हम लोग चाहते थे कि 600 रु० या कम से कम 450 रु० तक सेंट पर सेंट न्युट्रलाइजेशन हो। जिन लोगों को 600-700 रु० मिलता है वह भी मध्यम श्रेणी के घ्रादमी हैं। यह सही है कि उन को भी मिलना चाहिये। लेकिन आप इस को भूल जाइये, हमारी जो बेसिक डिमांड है कि सेंट पर सेंट न्युट्रलाइजेशन होना चाहिये, वह भी अगर आप नहीं कर सकते, तो गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन को रिपोर्ट के अनुसार 185 और 195 के आधार पर जो महंगाई भत्ता हम को मिलता है, वह तो मिलना चाहिये।

आज मेरे लायक दोस्त जार्ज फर्रेंडीज ने, श्री डांगे ने और दूसरे लोगों ने कहा है कि 11 सितम्बर को हड़ताल होने वाली है। यह हड़ताल इस लिये नहीं है कि हम सरकार को उलट दें। यह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट तो खुद ही बिजाय करती जा रही है धीरे धीरे और मैं समझता हूँ कि वह अपने आप बिजाय

हो जायेगी क्योंकि चारों तरफ से इस के ह्यूम पर रह चुके हैं। इसलिये आज इसका मतला नहीं है। लेकिन आज सरकारी कर्मचारियों की हालत क्या है? 22 लाख कर्मचारियों में से 14 लाख कर्मचारी ऐसे हैं जिन की तनख्वाह 100 रु० से कम आज भी है। ऐसे वक्त में अगर वह चाहते हैं कि उन का पैसा रोका जाय, उन को नकद पैसा न मिले, तो घटना होगा। हमारी लड़ाई भाई भाई को लड़ाई है। हमारे वित्त मंत्री जो हैं उन से हमारा महाभारत की लड़ाई है। हमको पांच गांव चाहिये। हमें चाहिये रोटी, रोजी, कपड़ा, मकान और अस्पताल। यह पांच गांव अगर कर्मचारियों को नहीं मिले तो मैं बतला दूँ कि महाभारत कुश्नेत्र के मैदान में न हो कर दिल्ली, बम्बई, कानपुर के मैदानों में आज के दुर्योधन से जरूर होगी, कौरव राज्य से लड़ाई जरूर होगी।

इसलिये मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि वह मेहरबानी कर के दुबारा सोचें। हमारे दरवाजे खुले हुए हैं। अगर पैसे की बात है तो हम सोचेंगे कि पैसा कहां से मिले। उन्होंने कहा कि 31 मार्च, 1968 तक हम को मौका दीजिये। बी.आर. प्रामिजग उस के बाद हम आप के पास नहीं आयेंगे। लेकिन जहां तक गवर्नमेंट की प्रामिज की बात है, उसके लिये कुछ लोगों ने कहना शुरू कर दिया है कि :

"Government of promises, government by promises and government for promises."

प्रामिज के सिवा उस के पास और कुछ नहीं है। मैं श्री भारारजी देसाई की स्टेटफार्बडनेस और प्राम्नेस को ऐडमायर करता हूँ। मैं उन से एन्वी करता हूँ। कभी कभी मुझ में भी उन की एरोगेन्स होती है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस मामले को हल करें, उन की पूरी कॅबिनेट हल करे। अगर आज उन को रुपया नहीं मिलता है तो 11 सितम्बर की हड़ताल इसलिये नहीं

होगी कि वह सरकार को उलटना चाहते हैं। वह इस लिये होगी कि वह जीना चाहते हैं, फाकेकशी से बचना चाहते हैं, अपने बच्चों को सुस्कराहट को कायम रखना चाहते हैं। इस लिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बहुत बहस हम कर चुके हैं। आज वह डिक्लेयर करें कि वह कौश देने के लिये राजी हैं ताकि हम छापी से जा कर सरकारी कर्म-चारियों से कह सकें कि उन की मांग मंजूर हुई है।

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Even Mr. Dandekar has not spoken?

Shri Namblar: I am a co-signatory to the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I know, that is exactly where we get into trouble. One party gets two spokesmen.

श्री तुलसि चन्द कछवाड़ा (उज्जैन):
पांच मिनट मुझे भा क्या आप देंगे ?

Mr. Speaker: If I give a chance even to one from each party, it will go on for another two hours. I will call one or two speakers.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta (Delhi Sadar):
One or two minutes for questions.

Shri N. Dandekar (Jamnagar): I think this is one of those situation where, almost there seems to be 'right' on both sides.

The case for increase in dearness allowances has been carefully studied and ably reported in the Commission's report. I would not like to add anything to it. It is perfectly obvious that there has been a steady rise in the cost of living, and that the employees affected, whether you stop at Rs. 350 or Rs. 500 or whatever figure, are of a category who can least bear the burden of rising prices. And it is not as if the Commission has made any very generous recommendations, except at the very lowest rung, where also there is only

90 per cent neutralisation. I do not think one can characterise the report of the Commission as over-generous. So the case, as far as the Central Government employees are concerned, is pretty clear and beyond doubt.

On the other hand, one cannot ignore the impact of this upon public finances regardless of whether the money is going to come from the Central Government, State Government, public sector enterprises or whatever else. But it is not merely a question of a bill that aggregates Rs. 170 crores. It is also a question of the impact of this Rs. 170 crores additional expenditure by the persons to whom the additional Dearness Allowance would be given, upon the economy in general, and in particular upon the economy. And here I am very much in sympathy with the point of view which the cost of living part of the Finance Minister has on this, that if this goes on, it would start a spiral, a new spiral would be set in motion, which is going to make increasingly difficult any question of price control.

Nevertheless, I almost feel like saying at this point: the Government have made their bed, let them sleep in it, let them stew in their own juice, because this is the direct consequence of 15 or 20 years of reckless planning that has been going on. We on our side, and many, I know, on the Congress side, though they have not given expression to it publicly, have over and over again emphasized the extravagant character of planning, the extravagant expenditure of Government involved in terms of so much investment expenditure as well as consumption expenditure, the extraordinary degree of deficit financing and so on. All of which is well known.

Shri Ranga: Even now it is going on.

Shri N. Dandekar: We warned them over and over again. I certainly have done so in the last three years when I have had the honour of being in the House; and my colleagues have done so over a longer period. Over and over again

[Shri N. Dandeker]

we have said this to the Government that they were heading for disaster in terms of inflation, in terms of a general rise in prices in terms of rise in the cost of living, and that there will come a time when inflation will overtake all your plans and policies like the plans and policies of mice and men. And it has happened.

As I said, I almost feel like saying let the Government stew in their juice. But to be one sided in this issue would not be proper. However, I do ask myself this what have the Government done in this very year to restrain the rise in prices? The Railway Minister added to costs by increasing railway fares and freights, and the Finance Minister countered by increasing the petrol taxes and diesel taxes, so that the cost of transport all over, whether by road or rail, would increase. Then, he added a lot of indirect and direct taxes, the total impact of which in terms of general level of prices and cost of living is already known.

So, has this Government done anything in terms of its taxation policy that would arrest the rise in prices? Has this Government done anything in terms of restraining extravagant expenditure,—consumption expenditure as well as the so-called but phoney investment expenditure—that would restrain prices? If not, are they entitled to come over and say to their employees: you are the only people who must suffer the consequences of all this, and therefore please do not ask for this dearness allowance, because additional dearness allowances at this juncture will admittedly add to the rising cost spiral?

I do not think that in this sort of a situation it is possible justly and legitimately to deny the relief that is asked for. But the question does arise, from the point of view of the national economy which it is the business of the Finance Minister to consider: in what form should this dearness allowance for neutralisation of rise in the cost of living to the extent recommended by the commission be given? Here I support very much what Mr. Kashinath Pandey said a little while ago. I think a certain amount of it should undoubtedly be frozen by way of provident fund or some other form of saving

of that kind so that although they get a recompense for the rising cost of living, they put in a certain amount of the increase in dearness allowance into savings of that kind. But I also agree that it is not enough to do that. I am clearly of the opinion that a part of the allowances should also be given in cash.

Finally, Sir, I would say a few words about the threatened strike. I think that there are hardly any circumstances whatever in which a strike by public servants can ever be justified.

An hon. Member: It is the old I.C.S. which is speaking.

Shri N. Dandeker: I would put it at that extreme level. A strike by public servants is a strike against the community and against the entire economic structure; it is a strike against all that everybody wants in terms of further development of the country, in terms of further production, in terms of anything that one would care to mention in the present circumstances of recession... (Interruptions). I have therefore no hesitation whatever in saying that, on the one hand, the case for dearness allowance cannot be denied and, on the other, the government has a case about the consequences of giving this dearness allowance wholly in cash and their case too cannot be denied. There is necessity therefore to pay the dearness allowance partly in the form in which it cannot be spent and partly in a form in which it can be spent. But, finally, I cannot justify on any ground any strike, and the heavy "padding", that the all-India strike in all kinds of public activity is not intended for this or that but merely as some kind of a token demonstration of their resentment, cannot be accepted. No, Sir, a strike by public servants can under no circumstances be regarded as just and legitimate.

Mr. Speaker: I find some hon. members rising. I said I would call the Minister at 5 O'Clock and I can extend the time by 5 or 10 minutes. Even then, some parties have not spoken; the D.M.K. has not spoken. Some congressmen also want to speak.

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : घ्रापने कहा था कि पांच बजे दूसरी चीज लेंगे। पांच बज गए हैं, इसको अब घ्राप खत्म करें और उसको लें।

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, he cannot raise the point of quorum now. Therefore, I would suggest a via media. Instead of making speeches, you may put questions before the Finance Minister replies, not afterwards.

Shri Namblar: Five minutes each.

Mr. Speaker: Instead of making speeches about poverty and all that which is all very well known, they may put questions. They may each take two minutes. The question type of thing is what I suggest instead of making speeches about the cost of living and all that which had been said already. The other alternative is to allow one or two speeches and then I will call the Finance Minister.

Shri Namblar: Five minutes each.

Mr. Speaker: Even five minutes each, it will take another two hours. There are parties which have not spoken.

श्री कंडर लाल गुप्त : डी० एम० के० और लैफ्ट कम्प्युनिस्ट पार्टीज ही बची है।

Mr. Speaker: There are not only two parties, the D.M.K. and the CPI-Marxists. Gani Dhar is here.

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): Four or five from the Congress side also.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Radhir Singh's name is not here from the Congress side.

Every day, Mr. Randhir Singh's name is there. He sends slips for everything.

17 hrs.

Shri Randhir Singh: Sir, I am not speaking on this.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, the Railway Minister is to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker: After this, that will be made. (Interruption).

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I am calling Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji. I want to be fair to every party and everybody. It is not a question of calling only one or two from that side and avoiding the other party on this side. Yes, Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji (Howrah): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a subject which is really of great importance. (Interruption) I hope I will get at least five minutes, Sir. While I fully sympathise with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Members on the other side, I want to say that the Members on this side also yield to none in their sympathy for the Government employees either at the Centre or in the States. I was surprised that the hon. Member on the other side, while speaking in this air-conditioned chamber, forgot to mention the State Government employees—millions of them. The State Government employees are also equally suffering; they are just like the Central Government employees; similar is the case of the servants of the local bodies, and also the servants under the various public undertakings. I was surprised that Shri Nath Pai forgot them altogether and requested our Deputy Prime Minister also to forget them altogether. It is not possible.

I will just read out to you from the Gajendragadkar Commission's report, to show you how they themselves pointed out and pleaded also for those serving in the States and in the public undertakings; they could not find any way out of it although they have commended a certain dearness allowance. I crave your indulgence to read out just one sentence from that report. They have said:

"That is why we wish to emphasise the fact that even while we are making our recommendations in regard to the payment of dearness allowance in future we are quite clear that unless the menace of rising prices is effectively controlled, within a reasonably short time, our recommendations would become obsolete."

[Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji]

I am one of those who plead for a dearness allowance, and not only for the dearness allowance but for a need-based salary in a socialist State. It would be a travesty of truth if anybody comes here and says that our Deputy Prime Minister is trying to shirk the responsibility in respect of implementing the Gajendragadkar Commission's report. That is not so. What he has been saying before is that the price rise should be checked first and then the question of dearness allowance could be taken up. I had a talk with some of the Central Government employees only the other day. I told them point-blank, "Do you believe that an increase of Rs. 10 or Rs. 15 in their present dearness allowance, and thus, in their total emoluments, will solve your problems?" They replied, "No. It cannot solve the problems." (*Interruption*). I am with them; I plead for them and I say that they should get relief and they should get something, the money, as the Gajendragadkar Commission has reported. But then, what our Deputy Prime Minister has been asking the people was, he was asking for some more time to see that the price rise is checked first, which is also the essential provision in the Gajendragadkar Commission's report. Is there anything wrong in it; if the Deputy Prime Minister says that he only wants time? Shri Nath Pai said that the Central Government employees are entitled to get the enhanced dearness allowance from February last. Well, from February to August, during these three six odd months, they have carried on; they have been living; not dead. (*Interruption*). They continue to be very patriotic people, and they can suffer. I know them I feel for them, and I am one with them. (*Interruption*) Therefore, I only appeal to their sense of patriotism and their sense of responsibility for this country. It is an appeal to them. Therefore, it would be wrong if some political leaders would put it into their heads that this is the time to press for their demands. It would be wrong from a patriotic point of view. We were only appealing to them to give us two or three months' time so that the Deputy Prime Minister may make attempts to see that the price rise is held. He is not averse to giving a rise in the dearness allowance; he is quite prepared for it. He is only

calculating the effects it will produce, the chain of effects it will produce on the economy. Therefore, he is only pleading for time. The approach is quite clear: that he does not want to deprive the Central Government employees or any other employees of anything whatsoever. That is the point. He is thinking not only of the Central Government employees but also the employees of the State Governments; he is thinking of the employees in the public undertakings and he is thinking of the employees of the local bodies. He is more alive to this question than anybody else. The hon. Members on the other side have said that he is not thinking of them: it is not so. Our Deputy Prime Minister is quite alive to this question and he yields to none in his feelings on this question that concerns the employees, and the thoughts entertained by them. I would appeal to the hon. Members of this House not to approach this question with a political motive, but to see that a patriotic motive is generated even amongst the employees, so that in these difficult times, to tide over the crisis, all of us may unite and make a little bit of sacrifice, so that in the long run we can pay them more and bring about socio-economic justice.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi (Cuddalore): Sir, even though the Gajendragadkar Commission's report has been placed before the House two months back, Government has not taken any decision to award the increase in DA in the form of cash. The hon. Finance Minister says, it will give rise to price inflation. Who is to blame? It is the Government of India to blame and not the workers. Now he says, we will give in the form of certificates. The commission was appointed for helping the workers to have a better life. Can certificates be eaten? Can it satisfy the workers?

The rise in prices is a phenomenon of the Congress Governments. They are responsible for all these things. When the Government of India raises the DA, it has to compensate the State Governments also in the form of money. Now the Finance Minister says, where can I find the money? If he cannot find the money, let him at least listen to the opposition's suggestions. We suggest demonetisation of the currency and unearthing of black

money. He does not do that. At least he can nationalise the entire banking system. It is the private banking system that is responsible for the inflationary tendencies. This capitalistic Government is supporting the capitalistic business and allowing the private banks to raise the prices. If the Deputy Prime Minister is unable to hold the price-line and to find money to compensate the workers, let him quit office; let his party quit. He has no business to continue in office after 15th of this month.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): Sir, I would only say that the Finance Minister has partly succeeded in his attempt to make the Central Government employees to agree to the Gajendragadkar Commission's award. Prior to the coming into being of that commission, the employees were opposed to the commission. They said, we do not want it. Now Mr. Morarji Desai has succeeded in pinning down the employees and making them accept the commission's award. Now he wants to go a step further and say, even that I am not going to give you. This is the simple logic of what he is attempting to do. He must clearly understand that the next step he is going to take is a false step, by which he will bring doom not only to himself and to his ministry, but to the people also by a general strike and by the very stout resistance of the entire working class of the country.

There is no logic in his argument that there is no money. There is money to pay for other things, but not to the poor Government employees, to whom the money is rightly due. Sir, 75 directors of 40 companies draw a salary of more than Rs. 10,000 a month, under the company law, to which his ministry is agreeing. I have taken this figure from the report of the company law board for 1964. He can allow such things, but when it comes to the question of employees, he says, there is no money.

I will give another instance.

Sir, the Railway Minister allotted Rs. 13 crores towards payment of increase in dearness allowance to the railway employees and because of that he asked this House to approve his proposal to increase fares and freights. His speech is on re-

cord and we have answered it. After getting the approval of this House to increase fares and freights, after keeping apart Rs. 13 crores towards payment of increase in dearness allowance to the railway employees, now the Finance Minister comes and says that no more money is to be paid in the name of dearness allowance, we can only give the increase in paper, the paper which only donkeys eat. Where did that sum of Rs. 13 crores go? Do you want to hoodwink the people. When you wanted to increase the fares and freights you came before this House and said that because you wanted to pay increased dearness allowance to the extent of Rs. 13 crores you wanted more money. When you got that money, you say that you would not pay anything. Sir, this will not do.

Their argument is that if more money is paid by way of increased dearness allowance there will be more inflation. In the last eight months, right from January up to this day, no increase has been given to the government employees in their dearness allowance. But the prices have gone up sky high. How did it happen? Therefore, it is clear from realities that it is not the increase in dearness allowance that is going to help the spiralling of rise in prices of commodities. It is a false theory. Many of my colleagues have already spoken about it and therefore I am leaving it at that.

Sir, the private sector has given hundred per cent neutralisation. Many many industries have done that. They do it by agreement. No body knows what they give and the prices do not increase. If crores and crores are paid by the private sector and there is hundred per cent neutralisation due to which there is no increase in the prices, is this increase that we are asking for twenty lakh people out of which twelve lakh people belong to the Railways going to increase the prices? It is only a drop in the ocean. It is only a theory. It is only to hoodwink the people that the Finance Minister has come forward with such a false theory.

If the Central Government employees are forced to go on strike,—they do not want to go on strike—if the Government

[Shri Nambiar]

creates a situation where they are forced to go on strike, then the entire responsibility must be borne by the Government, the Finance Minister in particular, and not the Opposition. We do not want to see an all-India strike. Do not think that we want to incite people to go on strike. We warn you. Do not create a situation where a strike will be made inevitable. Do not force the employees. Let them have wisdom at least at the last minute. Let the zero hour be an hour when they will understand, they will appreciate the difficulties of the employees. Let them understand the difficulties of the poor millions of workers on whose toil and service this Government is alive and existing today. Let them not forget that.

श्री श्री० बॅंकरावराव (मिहीपेट) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रीमती बहुत सारे मेम्बरों ने सेंट्रल पे कमीशन के बारे में अपने अपने विचार प्रकट किए हैं। मैं अपनी तरफ से इस सिलसिले में थोड़े से सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। बहुत सारे अपोजीशन के मेम्बर यह समझते हैं कि सिर्फ वही सारे कर्ता धर्ता पूरे हिन्दुस्तान के सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लायीज के हैं। मैं कांग्रेस की तरफ से और आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० की तरफ से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे अन्दर वही दुख दर्द है जो आप जाहिर करते हैं। लेकिन हम जो हैं खामोश रह कर काम कर के बताना चाहते हैं और यह भी मैं कह सकता हूँ यह सही है कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लायीज के बारे में हमारा यह बजट सेशन शुरू होते वक़्त, जनरल एलेक्शन खत्म होते ही जब डा० राधाकृष्णन दोनो हाउसेज को ऐजेंड कर रहे थे तब उन्होंने यह आश्वासन दिया था कि हम ने गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन अप्वाइंट किया है, भविष्य में वह हमारे सारे फैसले करेगा। बड़ी चिन्ता के साथ और बड़े अफसोस के साथ मुझे कहना पड़ता है कि गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के अन्दर हन्ड्रेड परसेंट न्यूट्रलाइजेशन को नहीं लिया गया है। लेकिन जो कुछ भी प्राया है, उस के बारे में मैं साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि

सारे देश के सेंट्रल एम्प्लायीज और न सिर्फ सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के एम्प्लायीज बल्कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के एम्प्लायीज भी इस तरह से मुंह खोल कर बैठे हुए थे कि जब कभी भी गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट प्रायेगी गवर्नमेंट उसे इम्प्लीमेंट करेगी और जो भी मुझ पर मुसीबतें हैं, मुश्किलें हैं वह दूर होंगी। इसी विश्वास के साथ सारे 20 लाख एम्प्लायीज इन्तजार कर रहे थे। मगर मुझे आज चिन्ता के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज सारे एम्प्लायीज के अन्दर असन्तोष पैदा हो रहा है। आखिर कितना ही रुपया हम योजनाओं पर खर्च करते हैं, हजारों करोड़ रुपये की पंच वर्षीय योजनाएं हम ने बनायी हैं लेकिन हमारे एम्प्लायीज के लिए गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक कुल 60-62 करोड़ रुपया होता है। हमारे मोरार जी भाई, डिप्टी प्राइम मिनिस्टर, जैसा नाथ पं साहब ने कहा सचमुच वैसे ही बड़े मजबूत आदमी हैं, गोल्ड कन्ट्रोल को भी बड़े ही मजबूत तरीके से आप ने इम्प्लीमेंट किया, तो उन से यही आशा है कि जैसी भी रिपोर्ट आई है, कुछ भी हो जाय, उस पर एडामेंट रह कर उस को वह इम्प्लीमेंट करेंगे। मैं एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस को जल्दी इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया तो प्राइवेट सेक्टर की तरफ से और भी बहुत सारी गड़बड़ होने वाली है। प्राइवेट सेक्टर के अन्दर, बेज बोर्ड के अन्दर बहुत सी गड़बड़ होने वाली है। तो जो भी गवर्नमेंट इन्तजाम सोच रही है, विचार कर रही है उस को किसी न किसी तरह से जल्दी उस पर अमल करना चाहिए। मैं आखीरी एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि देर मत कीजिए, जल्दी से जल्दी अमल कीजिए। चाहे जो कुछ भी हो, दो तीन महीने के अन्दर जो भी गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है फौरन उस पर अमल कीजिए। सारे मुल्क के अन्दर यह हवा फैलने न दीजिए और अपोजीशन को यह चांस मत देने दीजिए।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai:

Shri Nath Pai: Thank you very much. Shall I begin again? I cannot disobey you.

An. hon. Member: He has already spoken.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. Shri Kripalani.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Guna): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have only a few words to say. I am sorry that our government lives from hand to mouth. When a difficulty arises, it tries to postpone it by appointing committees, and those committees are appointed of their own choice. But, when the committee gives a report I think the government is in honour bound to carry out the terms of that report. It is no use cavilling at what the committee has said. And what it has said is really reasonable. Therefore, not to prolong the discussions I would say it would be advisable for the government to carry out what has been decided by a committee appointed by themselves, resided over by the retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. That is the way of wisdom, if they do not want to create any trouble and discontent among Government employees.

श्री अश्विन शर्मा द्वार (गुडगांव): मिस्टर स्पीकर साहब, इस पर कोई दो राय नहीं कि जो गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है उस पर अमल होना चाहिए। लेकिन इस मौके पर मैं अपने आप से गद्दारी कर्हना अगर मैं अपने दोस्तों को जो अपोजीशन लीडर्स हैं उन से यह अपील न करूं कि एक तरफ वह कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान का खतरा है, चीन का खतरा है तो मोरार जी भाई गलती करे या इन्दिरा सरकार की गलती से उस पर अमल न हो पाये तो क्या उस पर मोरार जी को सजा देने के बजाय या इन्दिरा सरकार को सजा देने के बजाय सारे देश को सजा देने के लिए तैयार हो जायें? आखिर जितने श्री सैट्रल गवर्नमेंट के मुलाजिम हैं वह सब देश के प्रति बफादार हैं, देश से प्यार करते

हैं, देश से मुहब्बत करते हैं या तो यह लोग कहते कि चाइना और पाकिस्तान शरारत करने पर तुले हुए हैं। लेकिन जार्ज फरनेन्डीज साहब यह धमकी देते हैं कि यह सरकार बिल्कुल खत्म हो जायेगी 11 सितम्बर को। अगर सरकार खत्म हो जायेगी तो याद रखिये जार्ज फरनेन्डीज साहब कि डिमोक्रेसी भी खत्म हो जायेगी। यह बिल्कुल सही है कि अगर एस० एस० पी० के लॉग और कम्प्यूनिस्ट मिल कर राज्य चलाने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं ... (व्यवधान) ... आप देश में ऐसा वातावरण पैदा करें और जो मुलाजिम सरकार की बफादारी करते हैं उन का आप इस तरह से इस्तेमाल करें इस सरकार को खत्म करने के लिये और देश को हानि पहुंचाने के लिये, तो याद रखिये कि न आप मुल्क की सेवा करेंगे और न अपोजीशन की सेवा करेंगे। मैं हुकूमत से अपील करता हूँ कि वह इस बात को याद रखें कि बच्चे ने कहा कि पीर जी, मेरी मां ने खसम किया, उस ने जवाब दिया कि खसम किया तो बुरा किया, बच्चे ने कहा कि कर के छांड़ दिया, उस ने कहा कि यह और बुरा किया। या तो वह गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन न बिठलाती, और अगर बिठलाया है तो उस की सिफारिशों को वह पूरा करे।

[شری عبدالغنی ڈار (گوانوں)۔]

مسٹر سہیگر صاحب - اس پر کوئی دو رائے نہیں کہ جو کچھ لیدرز کہہ رہے ہیں ان کی رپورٹ ہے اس پر عمل کرنا چاہئے۔ لیکن اس موقع پر میں اپنے آپ سے غداروں کو اس کا اگر میں اپنے دوستوں کو جو اپوزیشن لیڈرز ہیں ان سے یہ اپیل نہ کروں کہ ایک طرف وہ کہتے ہیں کہ پاکستان کا خطرہ ہے چھن کا

[شہزادہ عبدالغنی قر]]

خطرہ ہے تو سرکاری ہوائی فلاحی کریں
یا اندرا سرکار کی غلطی سے اس پر
عمل نہ ہو پائے تو کیا اس پر
سرکاری کو سزا دینے کے بجائے یا
اندرا سرکار کو سزا دینے کے بجائے
سارے دیہے کو سزا دینے کے لئے تیار
ہو جائیں گے - آخر جنگی بھی سہیل
گورنمنٹ کے ملازمین ہوں وہ سب
دیہے کے پرتی وفادار ہوں دیہے
سے پیار کرتے ہوں دیہے سے محبت
کرتے ہوں - یا تو یہ لوگ کہتے کہ
چائلا اور پاکستان شہادت کرنے پر
لے ہوئے ہوں - لیکن جارج فرنیڈز
صاحب یہ دھمکی دیتے ہوں کہ یہ
سرکار بالکل ختم ہو جائے گی -
ساتھ ہی تو - اگر سرکار ختم ہو جائے گی
تو یاد رکھئے جارج فرنیڈز صاحب
کہ تیموودوسی بھی ختم ہو جائے گی -
یہ بالکل صحیح ہے کہ اگر ایس -
ایس - ہی کے لوگ اور گورنمنٹ مل
کو راج چلانے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہوں
(وہوہان) - آپ دیہے میں ایسا
واتارون بھدا کریں اور جرج فرنیڈز
کی وفاداری کرتے ہوں ان کا آپ اس
طرح سے استعمال کریں اس سرکار کو
ختم کرنے کے لئے اور دیہے کو
پہنچانے کے لئے تو یاد رکھئے کہ نہ
آپ ملک کی سزا کریں اور نہ
لہوہیشن کی سزا کریں گے - میں

حکومت سے اپیل کرتا ہوں کہ وہ
اس بات کو یاد رکھوں کہ ہجے نے
کہا کہ جی مہری ماں نے خصم کہا
اس نے جواب دیا کہ خصم کیا تو
برا کہا - ہجے نے کہا کہ کر کے
چھوڑ دیا - اس نے کہا کہ یہ اور
برا کہا - یا تو وہ گھوندر گذر
کھشن نہ بٹھاتی اور اگر بٹھایا
تو اسکی سفارشوں کو وہ پورا کرے -

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard with the greatest attention the views expressed so forcefully by several hon. Members of this House on the question of Dearness Allowance which is pending at present. This is one of the most unpleasant duties one has to perform at this juncture and it is only with the consciousness of the unpleasantness of it that I am speaking on this occasion. I have been compared with Dhuryodhna, Don Quixote and what not. But that is not what worries me or brings unpleasantness to me. After all, Dhuryodhna was also very great in his own way.....(Interruption).

An hon. Member: And a very good ruler too. (Interruption).

Shri Morarji Desai: That is not my ideal. My ideal is not that of Dhuryodhna. That is perhaps the ideal of the person who compares....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My ideal is Arjuna

Shri Morarji Desai: I would only say, poor Arjuna. I was even taunted by my hon. young friend, Pro. Sondhi, whom I know well. But I did not know that he was capable of also abusing in such a manner. He said that I am carrying the burden of the whole country on me. Well, that is an unfortunate position in

which I am that the finances of the country have been entrusted to me I may be inadequate for it; I may not be capable of it. But that is the fact.

An hon. Member: Very unfortunate.

Shri Morarji Desai: Well, make it more fortunate. I will have no regrets. I will be very happy. Therefore, that need not worry my hon. friend. If I do not consider this from the point of view of the finances of the whole country, not merely of the Central Government but also of the States, I would have failed in my duty in this office. I have no quarrel with my hon. friends who argue in favour of giving or in favour of implementing fully the Report or the recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Commission. They are, certainly, entitled to argue and press about it. Am I also not entitled to appeal to them which I have done during the last two days to see the conditions of the country and what will be the effect of doing this? If they do not agree with me, I do not quarrel with them. I do not give them any adjective. But if they disagree with me, then I must accept whatever they say! This is a very cruel logic. That is all that I can say.

After all, ultimately it will be for the Government to take a decision considering all the aspects of the case. The decision may be difficult, may be full of difficult consequences, and yet, it has to be taken. If I feel and consider, after hearing everything, after considering everything, that injecting Rs. 175 crores immediately into the hands of a large number of people will create such conditions in this country at present when we are not able to improve the supplies of food-grains—whatever we may do, we cannot do it—and still if I do that, then the consequences can be far more serious than the consequences which my hon. friends have threatened me with. If I come to that conclusion, what choice am I left with? That is what I have got to consider. If I am wrong, I am prepared to discuss, to argue, to consider further, whatever is asked, I am prepared to do. But I do not want to sway my hon. friends with any oratory which my hon. friend, Mr. Nath Pal, now attributes to me. I cannot compare myself with him

in oratory or in flourishes because I have not been able to acquire that; I wish I had acquired it and in that case I would perhaps have silenced him more effectively. That oratory does not silence anybody is also known to everybody because ultimately facts have to prevail and to say today that if this amount is given the prices will not shoot up, I can only say that it is only those who do not want to see the facts who would say that. I do not see how it requires any technical or economic knowledge to see this factor. Every time dearness allowance has been given during the last few years, prices have shot up.

Shri Nath Pal: They have shot up even when dearness allowance was not paid.

Shri Morarji Desai: Then it is all the greater a danger that more fuel would be added to the fire....

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalinhandi): Who started the fire?

Shri Morarji Desai: That is what one has to consider. I am prepared to grant for the sake of argument, even though I do not accept it, that this Government is responsible for it; granted.... (Interruptions).

Shri Piloo Mody: Honesty has to be rewarded.... (Interruptions.)

Shri Morarji Desai: I have not granted it. Do not be too loud about it.

Shri Piloo Mody: I am sorry. I withdraw it.

Shri Morarji Desai: I am glad you withdraw it.

I have always admitted that Government has a share in it; I would not say that the Government has no share in it. My hon. friends have also an equal share in it; that, they are forgetting. (Interruptions.)

एक माननीय सदस्य: गलत है।

श्री मो. र. रबी बे. ई: हर चीज को माननीय सदस्य गलत या झूठ कहे देते हैं। हर चीज उन के लिये झूठ हो जाती है। झूठ के धमझा उन

[श्री मोरारजी देसाई]

को कोई शब्द मिलता ही नहीं है। बार बार झूठ शब्द सुनाते हैं। लेकिन हम से मुझ को कोई तकलीफ नहीं है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
आप चिकने घड़े हैं, आप पर कोई असर नहीं होगा।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई: जरूर नहीं होगा। यही तो आप को तकलीफ है। इस के लिये मैं क्या करूँ ?

I have got to see that the duties performed are loyal to the nation. That is what this Government has to consider.

In this view, if my hon. friends say that this Government should consider only the granting of Rs. 60 crores to the Central Government employees and that is the only task before this Government to consider. I would say that my hon. friends opposite are not saying what they were saying in the past few days to me. They have been asking me all the while to help the State Governments and all the while asking me to take up that responsibility in various things.

श्री V. Krishnamoorthi: Even now we are asking.

श्री Morarji Desai: Therefore, if I am not able to give them money, should I not consider not putting more burdens on them? That is what I have got to consider. I cannot say that the Central Government are acting in a vacuum or that the Central Government should not bother if the State Governments come into difficulties. The Central Government have to bother, not only bother but to consider and see how these difficulties can be removed. After all, the State Governments and the Central Government do not work in isolation or do not work opposite each other. They work together and they have to work together and they have to consider the difficulties of each other. That is how the Central and State Governments have to work.

श्री S. M. Banerjee: Does he propose to pay them?

श्री Morarji Desai: I do not propose to pay them.

श्री S. M. Banerjee: Then, why talk of it?

श्री Morarji Desai: Therefore, I have got to consider how best I can help them.

श्री Nambar: By not giving to anybody? That is the solution?

श्री Morarji Desai: I am not denying; it is not refusal; I am not refusing to implement the Gajendragadkar Commission's recommendations. That is not what I have said. I made it very clear to my hon. friends when I discussed with them.

श्री Kanwar Lal Gupta: He is committed to it.

श्री Morarji Desai: There is no question of committal to anything. I cannot say and nobody can say that this is an award.

At least I do not accept it even if people say it.

श्री S. M. Banerjee: It is tantamount to an award.

श्री Morarji Desai: I would not say that I would not respect it. I have got to respect it. Government had appointed the commission and they have made recommendations after careful consideration. Therefore, one has to accept the major recommendations, but I cannot accept everything that they have said. If I differ on some things, well, I shall have respectfully to differ from them. When they say that a Pay Commission should be appointed after two years, whatever may be the condition, whether the price rise goes up to 235 or 245 or whatever it is or does not go up within two years, well, I do not accept that position. They also say that the capacity of Government or the employer cannot be taken into account in considering this. On this also, with all due respect....

श्री J. B. Kripalani: With due respect to the Finance Minister, may I ask him to let the House know what he proposes to accept? Moreover, all his arguments

will be valid if in other respects he effects some economies in the administration of the country.

Shri Morarji Desai: My hon..

An hon. Member: Leader.

Shri Morarji Desai: I cannot call him my leader. He has ceased to be my leader, but he is my elder. I certainly accept that, I shall always accept it and accept it with affection and not merely accept it ordinarily in language. And he knows that that is my attitude towards him. I may differ as he can differ from me and he can tell me, and he has a right to do so.

But as I had said before, I am not accepting these two things. As regards the other things, I have not said that I am not accepting the other things. What I do not accept is that it should be paid only in cash; I am not accepting it. But I would say that it is not merely that I am looking at it from this point of view that this can be done and nothing else can be done.

Here also, I have taken a lesson from the Gajendragadkar Commission's report. They say:

"We may, in this connection, incidentally point out that during the course of our discussions with some of the representatives of employees, we gathered the impression that if the Government took comprehensive action, unpopular though it might be, and involved the whole community in an endeavour to assist in the process of controlling prices, even a proposal to defer the payment of a part of dearness allowance which will be admissible to the employees on further rise in prices would be considered by them favourably".

By the employees' representatives.

"In fact, in one State, such a measure (which involves the payment of additional contribution to the provident fund or insurance schemes, thereby reducing the actual cash payment of additional dearness allowance) has already been adopted and,

we understand, accepted by the State employees. We were, however, told that we should not suggest any such measure in our report because if such a measure has to be adopted at all, it must be a part of an integrated effort, involving the whole community, and not an isolated measure by itself. The employees added that if profits, incomes and wages are sought to be controlled, both in the public and private sectors, an integrated and comprehensive scheme will have to be evolved, and in the context of such a scheme, a proposal to defer the payment of a part of the dearness allowance or any other similar proposal could be considered".

Therefore, they have also recommended...

Shri Nath Pal: No. Please see page 54.

"After examining all the considerations involved, we are unable to recommend any 'alternative forms of assistance..."

This is their final conclusion.

Shri Morarji Desai: A little further, they say:

"We are conscious that it is beyond our terms of reference to suggest any remedial measures to meet the present serious situation. We wish to make it clear that we do not purport to do so. Even so, we think it would be permissible to refer to some of the suggestions which have been made by several parties who discussed the problems with us".

This is how they have suggested it. I do not say they have made a recommendation. But they have suggested it and the suggestion is also a recommendation. That is how I look at it. I cannot look at it otherwise. I do not think language has any other meaning, if this is not the meaning.

Shri Nambiar: So the recommendation to give monetary payment is not acceptable and is not a recommendation. But a suggestion is a recommendation. Recommendation is not recommendation! What a logic it is?

Shri Morarji Desai: A recommendation is a recommendation. I have not denied it. Where have I denied it? But if I am considering this suggestion seriously, could I not request my hon. friends to co-operate with Government in this matter? This is a national problem. Yes, I may go a little further, I may go a little less. This is a matter in which if my hon. friends are prepared to discuss with us seriously, Government are prepared to discuss with them as to what should be done in the matter.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: First you decide that you will pay in cash. We will find out the money for you.

Shri Morarji Desai: Therefore, that is not the discussion they want. So Government have got to decide themselves. Government will have to decide. If my hon. friends do not want to co-operate, I do not say they must. How am I to do that? But I hope they will think twice before they contemplate launching a general strike of government employees in this country....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Token strike.

Shri Morarji Desai: at a time when we are in a very difficult situation, as is admitted by all. Even if they blame us, they admit this. This is a fact. Do you want to increase it, to increase the travail of everybody? If this is what they want to do, I can only say that I feel sorry—I would not use any other language which they would provoke me to do. I do not want to be provoked. It is not right for me to be provoked. My hon. friends can be provoked. I will have no quarrel with it. But I cannot be provoked about it. It is not right for me to be provoked, specially in a matter where even my sympathies would be with them, considering the situation in a different manner. It is a question of what I have got to do in the circumstances in which I am. I do not want to speak more in this vein because then my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, will again say that I have all sympathies but it has no meaning. Therefore, I do not want to labour that point very much.

Shri Nambiar: Only lip sympathy.

Shri Morarji Desai: Why do you deny me even the right of having sympathy? I cannot understand it.

Then, my hon. friend also said I have become reasonable, but I am still tenacious. Does he want me to be less tenacious than he is? I am taking a lesson from him. He is more tenacious than me because he even refuses to argue, I do not refuse to argue. What can tenacity do more than that? That is reasonable tenacity. Mine is firmness, it is not tenacity.

What have we to consider in this matter? It is not merely looking after the interests of the employees, which is certainly the business of Government, of any employer to do, but the business of Government is not merely to look after its employees, the business of the Government is to look after the whole population. There are four times the number of Government employees who are getting far less than what the Government employees are getting, and their conditions are becoming worse and worse in the rise of prices, and if there is a further rise in prices, in trying to help my friends here I will make their conditions far more worse. They are a larger number of people. Because they do not or cannot create trouble, does it mean they should not be heard, and they should be put in the dust bin, and those who can promise trouble only should be heard? Therefore, that will not be a right thing. If my hon. friends want me to do well for them, then they must leave to me the finances to look after that, but if that is not done, and if the money which is available with Government is to be utilised only for Government employees, does the theory mean that the Government should run only to pay the Government employees?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We never said.

Shri Morarji Desai: It is not a theory on which the Government can work.

Therefore, this has got to be considered in all its aspects.

My friends do not want me to repeat all the arguments that we discussed. I will not burden them with all that.

श्री स० मो० ब०जी : वित्त मंत्री तो दिल्ली के लड्डू बांटते हैं—जो उन को खाता है, वह भी पछताता है और जो नहीं खाता है, वह भी पछताता है ।

Shri Morarji Desai: There is no question of giving any excuse. Why have I to give any excuse? I am not labouring under any mis-conception of my duties. I have got to perform my duties, and I am trying to do so. You may say I am doing it wrongly, to that also I have no objection, because that depends upon each one's view of what I do. I do not know whether I will succeed or not. It is not a matter for me to speak. If my hon. friends are so sure of their success, why do they want to threaten me? It is only the weak who threaten. The strongest people never threaten, and it is not the policy of the Government to threaten anybody. Why should we?

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : सरकारी कर्मचारी मानते हैं कि वे कमजोर हैं ।

Shri Morarji Desai: It is not my business to do so. My hon. friend who spoke just now has the largest share in upsetting every thing, because he always believes in this kind of stoppage of work, Bombay bandh, Hindustan bandh, this bandh, that bandh.

श्री रा० सेवक यादव : अभी कांग्रेस को बन्द करना है ।

Shri Morarji Desai: That is how also the economy gets upset. If the economy gets upset in that manner, how can you merely blame the Government? It is therefore that this question has got to be considered very calmly and objectively and in the interests of the people.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj (Wardha): They receive their orders from Peking and Moscow.

Shri Morarji Desai: That is all I would request my hon. friends to consider.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: The discussion brought forth valuable points of view, and I may assure you that dialogue and

discussion and a sense of co-operation motivated us in bringing this matter here, and therefore no personal invectives were intended, but we would be failing in our duty if we do not convey to this House the sense of bitter resentment, the sense of hopelessness, and I would even say, and I use this word advisedly, the sense of betrayal that is felt by the Government employees on this question.

We are concerned with wider public interests, and the debate showed that members of the opposition, and I dare say members from the other side also, were concerned with public interests. But should principles and assurances be given up merely because an emergency looks before us? Emergency is the time to assert principles, and even sometimes to reaffirm assurances. The loyalty of government employees is not doubted. Their patriotism was borne out by their exemplary behaviour whenever this country was faced with external aggression. My friend here was rather, I would say, frivolous in his attitude about Pakistan and China. We are serious about the question of Pakistan and China. We do not want war with them. But deterrence is the way of politics and we must deter Pakistan and China by our solid will and our solid strength. Dearness allowance for the government employees is, I submit in all seriousness, an effort to make them live above the subsistence level and give them solid strength and faith in that strength. . . . (Interruptions). I, therefore, suggest that the idea of cash payment urged by members on this side had been given with a sense of seriousness. . . . (Interruptions) The hon. members here assured the Finance Minister when they called on him the other day and I think he should not have any reason to doubt their assurance about their interest and concern. There is a party here which rules in Madras; it is concerned with the state of affairs there. We are all interested in helping the hon. Finance Minister in finding ways and means of getting resources. But the decision taken to upset the recommendations of Gajendragadkar Commission, a commission of such high standing, means justice delayed, that is, justice denied. That will create frustration which we must avoid. The strike is not intended to be a kind of some ominous warning. What

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

other way is there in a democracy to provide evidence of a unified will on the part of the employees. The right to strike is a sacred right in the annals of mankind and we will not be brow-beaten by suggestions that we are not patriotic. We are fully patriotic and we believe that the strike is an index of our will to have a bright future in this country.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Dearness Allowance Commission on the question of the grant of Dearness Allowance to Central Government Employees in future, laid on the Table of the House on the 6th June, 1967."

The motion was negatived.

Shri Nath Pal: Sir, what is it that you put to the vote? It only says that the House takes note. The procedure is quite wrong. I think that Dr. Ram Subhag Singh knows that such a motion is never objected to. It is the first time that the House has voted down such a motion.

Mr. Speaker: We go to the next item ..(Interruptions.) I had put the motion to the vote and I had declared that the Noes have it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, the Railway Minister is making a statement now, I believe?

श्री रघु निन्दे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, नियम 342 के मातहत मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। नियम 342 इस प्रकार है:

"A motion that the policy or situation or statement or any other matter be taken into consideration shall not be put to the vote of the House,...."

An hon. Member: it has been agreed.
Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: When too many Members get up, when he wants to make his point, it does help anyone. Allow him two minutes; I will give my opinion. You are not really helping me by standing like this. The hon. Member has referred to

rule 342. Meanwhile, the others can look into the rules. It is not this rule which applies, but there is another rule.

श्री मधु लिम्बे : यही तो मैं कह रहा था तो इन्होंने विरोध काहे के लिए किया ?

Mr. Speaker: This would not apply. I have already put it to the vote.

श्री मधु लिम्बे : लेकिन यह गलत है, उसी वक्त मैंने कहा था लेकिन आप ने हां और नां उस पर लिया।

Mr. Speaker: It is all right. I have put to the vote.

You cannot raise it now, after it has been put to the vote.

Some hon. Members rose—

श्री मधु लिम्बे : प्रोसीडिन्स से इस बोट को खत्म किया जाय फिर मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं होगा। अध्यक्ष महोदय, कार्यवाही से मतदान को खत्म किया जाय।

Shri N. Dandekar: The motion is to take note of the thing. But they have taken a vote on it; it is a mistake. There is some error in the procedure.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri C. M. Poonacha.

17.52 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. SECURITY OF PASSENGERS IN HOWRAH-KHARAGPUR SECTION OF S. E. RAILWAY

The Minister of Railways (Shri C. M. Poonacha): There have been sporadic cases of looting of passengers between Bauria and Deulati stations on Howrah-Kharagpur section, and since June 1967 this Section has been badly affected by the hold-up of trains for various reasons. In view of the incidents of rowdiness in the Howrah-Kharagpur suburban areas, escorting of most of the passenger trains has been started by three Companies of the Railway Protection Special Force

which were drafted to assist the West Bengal State Police.

On 31-7-67, when there was a mass demonstration at Deulati and Bauria in connection with the Howrah Bundh agitation, the Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah arranged for escorting of more trains with Government Railway Police.

On 31-7-67 and 2-8-67, 318 Down Puri-Howrah Passenger was affected due to attacks by miscreants on passengers, and some of them were robbed of their belongings. The Government Railway Police escorts took prompt action and made recoveries of the stolen property, arrested three persons red-handed and effected subsequent arrest of 12 others.

There was another incident on 4-8-67 on Puri-Howrah passenger in which the Manager of a daily newspaper "Jana-shakti" was assaulted while assisting the officers of the Civil Supply Department in recovering smuggled rice. The Government Railway Police took prompt action and arrested six persons.

In all, there were 4 incidents of this nature on the Howrah-Khargpur Section between Bauria and Deulati, a distance of 27 Kilometres, and according to the West Bengal Police authorities, these incidents were not engineered by anti-Oriya hooligans or goondas. From the very nature of the incidents which are of brief duration and did not result in any serious hold up of trains, it is difficult to state that any organised gang is behind these happenings. The West Bengal Police authorities consider these incidents to be of a purely sporadic nature.

Pickets have been posted at various stations and all mail, express and passenger trains on Khargpur-Howrah section are being escorted by Government Railway Police assisted by Railway Protection Special Force escorts. There has been no incident on this Section after 4-8-67.

A number of students assembled at Cuttack Station on 9-8-67 and demonstrated against alleged interference with life and property of people of Oriya during hold-up of trains in West Bengal. At

10-20 hours on 10-8-67, Deputy Chief Minister of Orissa arrived at Cuttack and read a message from the Chief Minister of West Bengal and an appeal from the Chief Minister of Orissa to the crowd collected at Cuttack Station. The Chief Minister of West Bengal in his message had condemned these attacks on passengers and assured that the West Bengal Government would take all necessary precautions to prevent recurrence of such incidents.

As a result of the student demonstrations in Cuttack and other places in Orissa, trains could not pass through Cuttack and a number of them had to be cancelled and some trains have had to be diverted to Howrah and Madras by longer routes.

Since 11-8-67 (Friday) 5-40 A.M., the normal train services through Cuttack have been resumed.

Mr. Speaker: Both the Orissa Government and West Bengal Government are making efforts to bring some peace. Any question irritating either Bengal or Orissa will only bring about a deterioration. Normally after a minister's statement, I do not allow questions. But today being the last day, I do not mind allowing two or three questions. But I would request members to be careful in putting their questions. The Minister has said that both the Chief Ministers of West Bengal and Orissa are doing something. If any further information is necessary, you may put a question.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Bhubaneswar): We are grateful to you, Sir, for allowing this statement to be made. We do not want any bad feeling to be created. We want the situation to improve. But the facts stated by the minister are not correct. Sarees were removed from the body of the women. It was not a general kind of thing; only the Oriya travelling public were selected for that treatment. So far as looted property is concerned, this has not been given back to the passengers concerned. The looted property should be given back and compensation should be paid; and, The Minister should assure that such things are not repeated.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Sir, we are getting frantic telegrams and letters with the signatures of the persons who have been affected. The most unfortunate part of it is that the victims of hooliganism are the people from Orissa travelling in passenger trains. They do not affect the express or mail trains. It is very clear from these letters that there is a reign of terror and the local police has been most inactive. The railway protection force has completely failed to give them protection and as a reaction to it, the people in Orissa are very much agitated. We do not want that they should behave like this, because in spite of three years of consecutive drought, 80,000 tons of paddy have been supplied to Bengal. Under these circumstances, when we hear that those who are attacking the passenger shout. *Under Marco, Chal ante dichena*, all these are very very provocative.

I request you to convey our feelings to the Government and the linguistic Minority Commission in Allahabad should be immediately contacted. He should proceed there, look into the matter and ensure that the minority community there is not persecuted. Secondly, adequate protection should be given to all the passengers travelling in that section of the SE Railway.

18 hrs.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, I am glad that both the Governments of West Bengal and Orissa have taken steps immediately. We do not want this disturbance to develop into a racial conflict or a communal conflict. All that I want to impress upon the Railway Minister is this. There is no doubt that the elements who are responsible for such activities are smugglers, who were carrying out smuggling of rice from Orissa. Now, because—the Government of Orissa has been vigilant on that point, they are indulging in this activity. It has been stated in a petition to the Chief Minister of Bengal that there is a gang called "Babu" which is working behind it. They create all this mischief particularly in the railway trains Nos. 3 and 18—Puri Passenger. There they do all these things. I want the Railway Minister to give protection to the passengers. He must impress

upon the Government of West Bengal or take it upon his own Ministry to enquire about this gang, have them arrested and punished. Only then protection can be afforded to the passengers. We want safety to the railway passengers travelling from Howrah to Orissa.

Shri S. Kundu (Balasore): Sir, these things have happened just near my constituency. The Railway Minister has made a statement. All of us condemn such hooliganism. We wholeheartedly condemn these things. These things should not occur. There is no question of any State or party in this. The Railway Protection Force is not doing anything. This thing has been there much earlier. The Railway Protection Force has sat silent all along.

Secondly, Shri Panigrahi made a triumphant walk-out yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: You do not do it.

Shri S. Kundu: These things originated from the smugglers, people who were smuggling rice and illicit liquor. These smugglers were those who kept the former government in power. Since the Government is trying to strictly enforce the law these people are not getting a free scope for smuggling. They are now generating this sort of trouble. I am not going to say that the Congress Party are the representatives of smugglers, but the fact remains that it is these smugglers bordering those areas who are creating this trouble. Now he is making a triumphant walk-out because the Opposition overnment is there.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): He is partly responsible.

Shri A. Dipa (Phulbani): Sir, I have here a copy of a representation where it is said:

"In recent days miscreants in groups of 30's and 40's are attacking with daggers, iron rods and soda bottles and snatching away all belongings or Oriya passengers especially to the extent of daily used dresses. They have also the audacity to outrage the modesty of helpless ladies to the extent of taking away their sarees worn and ornaments

over their bodies. Besides, that they inflict serious injuries to passengers and shouting slogans such as—*Ude-der Maro* and *Kengo chal ante dichenā*”

Shri Srinibas Misra (Cuttack): While we are gratified to hear about the efforts of the government to arrive at a compromise for solving the situation, there are some points which require clarification. The persons who were harassed and looted got down at the station and went to the GRP to lodge complaints. It is reported that they refused to receive any information or complaints and these poor people were instructed to go from station to station back to Howrah in order to lodge their complaints. The Minister has not said anything on this point.

Shri Sradhakar Supakar (Sambalpur): We are told that the Chief Minister has stated that he would verify the facts. But it is a fact that those persons who were affected by the looting went to the police station to record their statements; their complaints were not at all recorded. Then, how is it that the Chief Minister is going to verify the facts? Would the hon. Minister do something to verify the facts?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: It is really unfortunate that some of these unsocial elements who resort to unlawful activities often times create situations which bring in other extraneous problems also into the picture. As my hon. friends have mentioned, this is entirely due to the operation of unsocial elements who resort to lawlessness, rowdiness and smuggling. In the course of that, some poor passengers have become the victims of their rowdiness and acts of lawlessness. It is true that some valuable properties were stolen and the travelling passengers were harassed. It is also a fact that a few of them were Oriyas. But this does not mean that it is a sort of organised attack against a particular class. It is not so. Incidentally, the travellers who were travelling in this particular train were subjected to rowdiness and acts of lawlessness.

The Government Railway Police, which is charged with the responsibility of

maintaining law and order, has immediately acted, promptly taken action and registered cases, apprehended some culprits red-handed and about 21 persons have been arrested already and full further action is proceeding against these people. Cases have been registered and criminal proceedings are going on against these people. Further investigations are also being made. This had some reaction in Orissa. With the kind and prompt intervention of the Chief Minister of Orissa and the assurance given by the Chief Minister of Bengal, conditions have returned to normalcy, train services have been resumed and we hope that further recurrence of such incidents will be prevented.

18.08 hrs.

CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL SECURITY FORCE BILL—contd.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Shukla.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): The object of this Bill is.....

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore): On what subject is he speaking?

श्री मधु लिमये: (मुंबेर) यह क्या है? यह घाटेर पेपर पर हे या नहीं?

Mr. Speaker: Will you all kindly sit down? When I occupied the Chair at 3-30 p.m. it was clearly stated that since hon. Members were particular and anxious that the Report of the Dearness Allowance Commission should be discussed, it can be taken up first but, after that, the Central Industrial Security Force Bill will be taken up. It is there in the records. There is no question of giving precedence to anything. In that case, that would have got precedence over the Dearness Allowance Commission Report. But I gave preference to that Report.

श्री मधु लिमये: कौचे प्रिफरेंस मिल सकता है? मैं इस के ऊपर प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर उठा रहा हूँ।

Shri Indrajit Gupta rose—

Mr. Speaker: What is your point of order?

Shri Indrajit Gupta : My point of order is on this Bill, not on the Order Paper. When this Bill was brought up earlier in the afternoon, the Deputy-Speaker was in the Chair, certain points of order were raised by certain Members who were opposed to the consideration of this Bill on the ground that this House is not competent to take up this Bill. Then, the hon. Minister was allowed to make his observations on those points of order but no ruling was given after that.

I want to raise an entirely different point of order on a different ground because I feel...

Mr. Speaker : What is the Rule ?

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak) : Read the Rule first.

Shri Indrajit Gupta : I am quoting the Rules; don't worry.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur) : Rule 376(2)...

(*Interruption*).

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli) : There are the Rule experts; they will give you the Number.

Shri Indrajit Gupta : This Bill violates Article 117 of the Constitution of India. The Constitution is above Rules.

This Bill cannot be brought here in this way. I submit that the Bill is a money Bill. Kindly look at the Financial Memorandum attached to the Bill. The Financial Memorandum quite clearly says that an expenditure amounting to Rs. 155.90 lakhs will be incurred for raising 7 battalions of the Central Industrial Security Force. Who is to bear this amount ?

Mr. Speaker : Don't go into the details now. What is the constitutional point ?

Shri Indrajit Gupta : I am going to prove that it is a money Bill. The Financial Memorandum provides that only after these battalions have been trained and raised and posted to the various industrial undertakings, then those industrial undertakings will bear the expenditure of these battalions. Until that stage is arrived at, while the battalions are in the process of being raised and trained, the expenditure is to be borne out of the Consolidated Fund of India or the

Central Government. Nobody else is going to bear the expenditure.

Mr. Speaker : Your point is that it is a money Bill...

Shri Indrajit Gupta : ...and this Bill could not have been introduced in the other House. Article 117(1) says :

"A Bill or amendment making provision for any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) to (f) of clause (1) of article 110 shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the President and a Bill making such provision shall not be introduced in the Council of States."

This Bill has been introduced in the Council of States. What are the matters specified in sub-clause (a) to (f) of Article 110 ? I need not read out all the sub-clauses (a) to (f). I would read out only the relevant one for the purpose, that is :

"(c) the custody of the Consolidated Fund or the Contingency Fund of India, the payment of moneys into or the withdrawal of moneys from any such Fund;

(d) the appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India;

(e) the declaring of any expenditure to be expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of India or the increasing of the amount of any such expenditure;"

If any of these matters is included in the Bill, according to Article 117, such a Bill cannot be introduced in the Council of States. Therefore, the President's recommendation to this Bill has been wrongly taken. This Bill cannot be introduced in the Council of States. It is invalid in terms of the Constitution and no question of its consideration can arise in this House.

Mr. Speaker : Mr. Limaye.

Shri S. Kundu (Balasore) : Before Mr. Limaye speaks, can I point out this ? The entire discussion started with my point of order that it is legally hit because it is not within its legislative competence

and, therefore, cannot be introduced. So, I suggest, I may be called after Mr. Limaye has spoken.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Mr. Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये : लैजिस्लेटिव कम्पिटेंस के बारे में चर्चा चल रही है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि पहले आप हमें यह बताइये कि क्या एक एक मुद्दे के ऊपर आप भ्रमल फँसला देंगे ? इसका कारण यह है कि कई भ्रमल हो सकते हैं। मैं पहले लैजिस्लेटिव कम्पिटेंस को लेता हूँ, उसके बाद नियमों के भ्रमल मेरे कुछ भ्रमल हैं। श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने पहले सवाल को ले कर भ्रमल उठाया था कि राज्यों के भ्रमलकारों पर यह विधेयक भ्रमलक्रमण करता है। अब चूँकि यह मुद्दा चल पड़ा है इसलिए मैं अपने जो भ्रमल हैं उनको एक साथ ही रख देता हूँ। उन्होंने संविधान की 117 दफा और 110 दफा का उल्लेख किया है। लेकिन आप जरा 109 (1) को देखिये उस में यह लिखा हुआ है :

"A Money Bill shall not be introduced in the Council of States."

यह बिल इस सदन में पेश नहीं किया गया है। अब जो इस वक्त प्रस्ताव है उसके शब्दों को आप भ्रमल तरीके से देख लीजिये। मैं सारा नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ। पहला हिस्सा ही पढ़ रहा हूँ जिस के बारे में मुझे व्यवस्था का भ्रमल उठाना है।

"Shri Y. B. Chavan to move that this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the constitution and regulation of a Force called the Central Industrial Security Force for the better protection and security of certain industrial undertakings and for certain other matters, made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 6th June, 1967" ... etc.

यह बिल यहाँ पेश नहीं हुआ है, राज्य सभा में पेश हुआ है और जैसा कि इस में कहा है यह भ्रमल फार कनकरेंस है। इसके ऊपर

संविधानिक भ्रमल यह है कि संविधान की धारा 109 के मातहत और 110 और 117 के मातहत जिस का उल्लेख श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने किया है यह प्रस्ताव इस सदन में नहीं आ सकता है।

नियम को ले कर मैं दूसरा भ्रमल उठाना चाहता हूँ। मैं भ्रमलका ध्यान नियम संख्या 74 की और दिलाना चाहता हूँ। नियम 72 इसलिए यहाँ लागू नहीं होता है क्योंकि यह इंट्रोडक्शन के लिए प्रस्ताव नहीं है, यह भ्रमल फार कनकरेंस है, उसको जो राज्य सभा ने पास किया है उस पर भ्रमल सहमति देने के लिए है। भ्रमल देखिये :

"When a Bill is introduced or on some subsequent occasion...."

बिल तो वहाँ पेश हुआ है इसको भ्रमल देखें। तो यह प्रस्ताव नहीं है।

"...the member in charge may make one of the following motions in regard to his Bill, namely,

(i) that it be taken into consideration...."

यह प्रस्ताव नहीं है।

"... (ii) that it be referred to a Select Committee of the House...."

इस सदन के भ्रमल समिति को सुपई करने का भी यह प्रस्ताव नहीं है। इस नियम के भ्रमल-सार तीसरा प्रस्ताव यह किया जा सकता है:—

"that it be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses with the concurrence of the Council."

भ्रमलत् कौंसिल की भ्रमलमति से जायंट पालिया-मेंटरी कमेटी..... (व्यवधान) इस तरह हल्का करने से क्या फायदा है ? यह तो बुद्धि की लड़ाई है न। भ्रमल बुद्धि है, तो ये लोग हमारी दलीलों को काटें।

Mr. Speaker: Let him conclude now.

श्री मधु सिन्घे : इतनी जल्दी कैसे हो सकता है। मुझे सब पढ़ना पड़ेगा। जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा है, इस नियम के अनुसार तीसरा प्रस्ताव यह किया जा सकता है कि कौंसिल की अनुमति से वह बिल जायंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी के पास भेज दिया जाये। लेकिन माननीय मंत्री का प्रस्ताव यह भी नहीं है, क्योंकि उन के प्रस्ताव में लोक सभा की अनुमति मांगी गई है, कौंसिल की नहीं। चौथा प्रस्ताव यह किया जा सकता है...

Mr. Speaker : He need not read out the whole thing.

श्री मधु सिन्घे : सिर्फ एक यहो प्रस्ताव और किया जा सकता है, इस लिए इस को पढ़ना जरूरी है। इस नियम के अनुसार चौथा प्रस्ताव यह किया जा सकता है :

"that it be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion therein."

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस का मतलब क्या हुआ ?— यह कि इन चार प्रस्तावों में से मंत्री महोदय एक प्रस्ताव कर सकते हैं। इन लोगों में कौन ऐसा विद्वान है, जो यह बतायेगा कि (शब्दबान) मैं तो इन लोगों को काम्प्लि-मेंट दे रहा हूँ। वे क्यों खबराते हैं। अगर ये लोग "विद्वान" से संतुष्ट नहीं है, तो मैं "विद्वान शिरोमणि" कहता हूँ।

Mr. Speaker : I know that there are some vidwans on the Congress side also. They will also be called later.

श्री मधु सिन्घे : इस में से कौन विद्वान शिरोमणि है, जो मुझे आप को और इस सदन को बतायेगा कि श्री चम्हाण का प्रस्ताव इन चार प्रस्तावों में से एक है ?

Shrinati Lakshminandanamma (Khammam) : *Atmastuti and paraninda is bad.*

श्री मधु सिन्घे : इस वक्त इन प्रस्तावों के अलावा और कोई प्रस्ताव नहीं हो सकता है। (शब्दबान) यह मामला इतना आसान नहीं है, यह बहुत गम्भीर मामला है। आप बाद

रखिए कि संविधान के अनुच्छेद 109 के अनुसार कोई भी बिल राज्य सभा में इंट्रोड्यूड नहीं किया जा सकता है।

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla : It is not a money bill.

श्री मधु सिन्घे : नियम 74 में जो चार प्रस्ताव दिये गये हैं, यह प्रस्ताव उन में से एक नहीं है। इस लिए यह प्रस्ताव गैर-कानूनी, अवैध, बेमूल्य और सदन का समय बर्बाद करने वाला है और इस को ठुकरा देना चाहिए।

Shri Nambiar : We are all getting tired. Till what hour are we sitting today? Is it not time to adjourn the House now? We are at the fag end of the session and the fag end of the day.

Shri Shri Chand Goel (Chandigarh) : Kindly hear me. You were not here earlier; the Deputy-Speaker was occupying the Chair and we had all raised our objections regarding the legislative competence of Parliament in regard to this Bill; I was promised that I would be given some time also.

Mr. Speaker : I have given time.

Shri Shri Chand Goel : You have given time only to one or two Members. I have not been given any chance.

Shri S. Kundu : Under rule 72, there has to be a full discussion on it.

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Member has already had his say.

Shri S. Kundu : Full discussion means discussion for one or two days, because it is a very important matter.

Mr. Speaker : Does Shri Shri Chand Goel also want to say the same thing?

Shri Shri Chand Goel : No. I do not want to say the same thing.

Shri Shoo Narain (Basti) : Those gentlemen sitting opposite are not behaving like gentlemen. They are creating difficulties. It was said that we would dispose of this Bill by 5 p.m., but now they are going back on it. This is not gentlemanship.

Shri Nambiar: Shri Sheo Narain is the Leader of the House on the other side?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let not hon. Members talk across the tables.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: The point that I am raising is regarding the competence of Parliament to legislate on this subject. Up till now it has been argued that it is either a question of public order or of police, both of which subjects appear only in the State list. But I would like to consider it from another angle.

By this measure the Government have tried to circumvent the Constitution by the substitution of the word 'Security Force' for the word 'police'. I have studied the definition of the word 'police' which has appeared in the Encyclopaedia Britannica and other dictionaries. What do those definitions say? The Encyclopaedia Britannica says:

'As now generally employed, the term 'police' means the maintenance of public order and the protection of persons and property from the hazards of public accidents and commission of unlawful acts'.

Shri Himatsingka (Godda): It has been defined in the Bill.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: A perusal of the aims and objects of this Bill clearly indicates that this security force is being created only with the objective which is given in the definition. Hence it is covered by the above two entries, either entry 1 or entry 2, of List II. In the other House, the Law Minister took up the position that this was covered by entry 32 of List I, which is the list on which Parliament can legislate. That entry is regarding the properties of the Union. But I want to submit that the definition which has been given of 'public undertakings' in this Bill itself has to be seen. Under cl. 2(1)(a) 'Force' means the Central Industrial Security Force; (b) 'Industrial undertaking' means any undertaking pertaining to a scheduled industry and includes an undertaking engaged in any other industry or in any trade, business or service which may be regulated by Parliament by law; (c)(ii) a corporation established by or under

a Central, Provincial or State Act, which is controlled or managed by the Government.

This clearly indicates that the public undertakings which are owned by various States and which are not owned by the Central Government directly, even they are covered by this definition. So the Union List does not cover the definition of public undertakings as given in the Bill. Labour is on the Concurrent List. In respect of legislation in pursuance of this, they have not consulted any of the States so far. In respect of Concurrent list subjects, laws can be passed by the State legislatures and the Central legislature and conflict can arise. So it is advisable to consult the States beforehand. This Bill will not be able to stand the test or scrutiny of the Supreme Court and a reflection will be cast on this House that it did not examine the legal complications that would arise in this case.

Therefore, I want to emphasise that if this Bill is passed, it will not be able to stand the scrutiny of the Supreme Court (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: When a constitutional point is raised, I cannot overrule the objection. I have to hear the objection.

Shri Nambiar: Next session will be in winter. It will be cool weather. We can discuss this calmly then.

Mr. Speaker: That is why the hon. Minister wants to refer it to a Joint Committee so that in winter both Houses can pass it in a calm atmosphere.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: Let me have one minute more. Over two-third of population in the country now, there are Governments run by parties other than the Congress, and this Bill is a serious reflection on the working of the State Governments. They have not reported to the Centre that they are unable to maintain law and order in their respective States. So, this will mean a serious reflection, unless the State Governments are contacted and unless their consent is obtained.

Mr. Speaker: You cannot go on. I have given you so much time.

Shri S. Kundu rose—

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla : He has already spoken.

Shri S. Kundu : I am on a point of order. I just want to make an appeal. Mr. Speaker, you are equal to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. So, nothing should be done hurriedly so that we will be blamed later on.

Shri Randhir Singh rose—

Mr. Speaker : After the Law Minister, the senior lawyer Mr. Randhir Singh will be called later on.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी)

साढ़ छः बज गए श्रीमन् आप ने ध्यान आकर्षण एडमिट किया है, उस को कब लेंगे ?

The Minister of Law (Shri Govinda Menon) : Mr. Madhu Limaye raised three points, and the points raised by him have covered all the points raised by the other members. I am surprised that he should refer to rule 74.

Mr. Speaker : First of all, you kindly enlighten me about the Finance Bill.

Shri Namblar : Ivor Jennings of Kerala is now speaking.

Shri Govinda Menon : It is good that Ivor Jennings sometimes comes. Rule 74 which was referred to and read by Mr. Madhu Limaye comes in the chapter in the rules entitled "Bills originating in the House". This is not a Bill originating in this House. Please refer to rule 114 onwards. They refer to Bills originating in the Council and transmitted to the House. This belongs to that description.

श्री मधु लिमये : मोशन देखिए न, कहां किस रूल के मातहत है ?

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur) : Let him have patience.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझको काफी पेशेंस है। मैं केवल पूछ रहा हूँ कि आप रूल बताइए कि जिस के मातहत यह प्रस्ताव आया है ? मुझे काफी पेशेंस है।

Shri Govinda Menon : Rule 74 is not applicable because that applies to Bills originating in the House. Bills originating

in the Council and transmitted to the House are covered by rule 114 onwards, and there there is the question of reference to the Joint Committee etc.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरे प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं दिया। किस नियम के अनुसार ?

Mr. Speaker : The Law Minister is enlightening me so that I may give my ruling. You cannot get up. It is not the Question Hour where you can say that your question has not been answered. The Law Minister is trying to help me to understand the problem. He is not trying to satisfy the hon. members.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह और बोलें, दो घंट बोलें लेकिन नियम तो बताएं। चैंटर कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा। किस नियम के मातहत ?

Mr. Speaker : 114.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप पढ़िए न, 114 क्या है ? यह मेज़ पर रखने के बारे में है।

आप को गुमराह कर रहे हैं वह।
114 पढ़ें।

Shri Govinda Menon : A money bill is defined in article 110.

श्री मधु लिमये : धन 114 से 110 पर आये।

Shri Govinda Menon : Article 110 of the Constitution defines money bills. Now, a Bill which may result in expenditure for the state is not a money bill because even if the Bill ultimately results in expenditure to the state that expenditure is met subsequently by appropriation from the Consolidated Fund of India. In those cases article 117(3) will come into play; that article says that in these cases the recommendation of the President is necessary; it says: A Bill which if enacted and brought into operation would involve expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of India shall not be passed by either House of Parliament unless the President has recommended to that House the consideration of the Bill. That recommendation is here. Article 110(1)(a) provides

for the imposition, abolition, remission, alteration or regulation of any tax, the regulation of the borrowing of money, etc., the custody of the Consolidated Fund and the appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund. Only in these circumstances this article comes in. Therefore, this is a case where if the Bill is enacted ultimately, it will be necessary to spend money and in this case the recommendation of the President is necessary. That is provided for in article 117(3).

The most important point raised by many Members here is regarding legislative competence. On that matter, it was argued that this was a subject left for the States under List II. The Home Minister has answered this point. This is a matter, Sir, on which no ruling can be given even by you. This is not a matter which the House can decide by a majority vote, whether a Bill as the one brought here falls within the legislative competence or not is for the courts alone to decide. That is why, there is this rule 72... (*Interruptions*). In a matter where the House is interested to know the legal position it is much better that I am listened to. You may accept or not accept what I say. In rule 72, it has been provided that if legislative competence is raised, an opportunity should be given to the members to discuss it. Please note that the rule does not say that it should be voted in the House or a ruling should be given. Ruling cannot be given because the Speaker cannot be expected to arrogate to himself the right to decide whether constitutional competence is there or not. Suppose you in your wisdom say that there is legislative competence, it does not prevent anybody to take the matter to the Supreme Court later. The Supreme Court is not governed by the ruling given by the Speaker. Therefore, no Speaker either of Parliament or of any State legislature will proceed to give a ruling as to whether there is legislative competence or not. Whenever Government brings forward a Bill, it looks into the question whether there is legislative competence or not and takes a risk. Suppose this Bill is passed and the contention of my hon. friends here is correct that Parliament has no competence—what will happen? It will be struck down by the courts. The matter has been examined

and we are satisfied; the sponsors of the Bill, the Government, are satisfied....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Did you consult the Attorney-General?

Shri Govinda Menon: ... that this is a Bill for which Parliament is competent. (*Interruption*) Now, it may happen—often we may consult the Attorney-General—that even after all these examinations, the Bill is struck down. It is finally for the Supreme Court or the High Court to decide. Mr. Poonacha had been referring to the Railway Protection Force, and it was mentioned that the railway is the property of the Central Government. Therefore, this House, in 1957, passed a law called the Railway Protection Force Act. There is provision in regard to police in the Constitution: entry 2 in List II of the Seventh Schedule says, "Police, including railway and village police". Therefore, although there is a specific entry for the railway police in the State List, that is, List II—in 1957, the Parliament enacted a law for the railway protection force. That was possible because in List I, there is an entry, entry 32, providing for the property of the Union. An entry in one or the other of these legislative lists means that this is a matter on which the Parliament or the Legislative Assembly has got the power to legislate.

If the entry is in the first list, Union List, then Parliament can legislate because the union property is mentioned against entry 32, and Parliament has got the power to legislate for it. That is the *prima facie* view of the matter. We have looked into the matter, and it has been anxiously looked into and any amount of discussion here on that question will not lead to any result, because there is nobody to decide that question. The only authority to decide that question will be the court, and that is why rule 72 has been enacted in the manner it is done. In these circumstances, I would request that we may be allowed to proceed with the discussion of the Bill.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Before your ruling is given, what I would request is that because this issue is so delicate and complicated, the House may be adjourned to think over it and then he can take it up. (*Interruption*).

Shri Nambiar : Have it for the next session.

Mr. Speaker : Order, order. There need not be any complication created. After all, the other House has considered this Bill. Every Bill, passed by this House and that House will entail some expenditure; any law which we may make will demand some expenditure. There is absolutely no doubt about it.

An hon. Member : Question.

Mr. Speaker : Apart from that, the Speaker's competence to give a ruling is a matter which is not relevant here. I will have to say something about the points raised by them. I will have to say if I agree with them or not, and that will become a ruling. Hon. Members in the Opposition, Mr. Madhu Limaye and Mr. Banerjee for instance, have raised some points, and therefore I will have to say something. That will be a ruling, naturally, even if I say, "Yes". Shri Indrajit Gupta has raised a certain constitutional point about finance and about its pertinence or not. Naturally, I will have to say something, and then it becomes a ruling. Even presuming I agree with them or I agree with the Law Minister, I will have to say something, and that becomes a ruling. Even presuming I give a ruling—right, wrong or indifferent whatever it is, the courts have a right, not only in this case but otherwise also, to say that the Speaker has no right to give such a ruling. So, I do not think I can accept that argument of the Law Minister. **The courts may strike it down.** Even in cases where the Speaker is competent to give a ruling, the court may strike it down.

Now, I am convinced that this is a financial Bill. The President has given consent. (*Interruption*).

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker : Order, order. The moment it is not favourable to you, you cannot get up like that, when I am on my legs. Please sit down. There can be no further discussion on this point. For 3 months, we have had a brilliant time. For the last 1 or 2 hours, I would request my friends to show the same patience and indulgence to the Speaker and to the House. No

more discussion on the constitutional point. The President has given his assent. Mr. Madhu Limaye raised another point. I have studied that also. The Bill can be taken up here and I would like it to be completed now. The Minister may continue his speech.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सदन को छोड़ कर जा रहा हूँ। आप एक मिनट मेरी बात सुनिये। यह संविधान के तहत आ सकता है या नहीं, इसके विषय में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है। इसके मताधिक शाब्द आ सकता है, लेकिन नियम 75 के मातहत केवल चार प्रस्ताव हो सकते हैं और यह प्रस्ताव उन चारों में से नहीं है। फिर भी अगर आप इस की इजाजत देते हैं तो फिर मैं आप को नमस्कार कर के यहाँ से चला जाता हूँ।

(*Shri Madhu Limaye and some other hon. members then left the House.*)

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla) : The watch and ward staff are not properly trained. That is why we want to have an integrated force, a well-trained watch and ward force, which will not only guard the entrance of the public sector industries. . . (*Interruptions*).

18.48 hrs.

[*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair*]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Let us have a quiet debate and finish it soon.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla : I was saying that the new industrial security force that we are creating under the Act is entrusted with the work not only of guarding the entrance and perimeter of the factories, but also of looking after the installations and valuable machinery of the public sector industries. Hitherto the various public sector industries have recruited the watch and ward staff in a rather unplanned manner and supervision also has not been very good. When this force is created, it will have the advantage of unified training, standardised equipment, etc. We also propose to integrate the fire-fighting services of the various public sector undertakings.

Certain powers have been given under this Act to take care of the problems of public sector undertakings. I would invite the attention of the House to clauses 3, 10 and 14.

Sir, the provisions of this Bill are generally on the lines of the Railway Protection Force Act which was passed by this hon. House some ten years back and the hon. Members already know about the various provisions of that Act. So I would not take more time of the House and I would request the House to concur in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha and join in the Joint Committee.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the constitution and regulation of a Force called the Central Industrial Security Force for the better protection and security of certain industrial undertakings made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 6th June, 1967 and communicated to this House on the 8th June, 1967 and resolves that the following thirty members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely:—

Shri Vidya Dhar Bajpai, Shri D. Balarama Raju, Shri Rajendra-nath Barua, Shri Anil K. Chanda, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri J. K. Choudhury, Shri Ram Dhani Das, Shri George Fernandez, Shri Indrajit Gupta, Shri Narayan Swaroop Sharma, Shri S. Kandappan, Shri Kinder Lal, Shri Srinibas Misra, Shri J. B. Singh, Shri Vikram Chand Mahajan, Shri A. Nesamony, Shri Dahyabhai Parmar, Shri Manibhai J. Patel, Shri Manubhai Patel, Chaudhuri Randhir Singh; Shri S. K. Sambandhan, Shri P. G. Sen, Shri Shashi Ranjan, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, Shri S. M. Siddayya, Shri N. K. Somani, Shri Tayappa Hari Sonavane, Shri R. Umanath, Shri Tenneti Viswanatham and Shri Y. B. Chavan.

This House recommends to Rajya Sabha that the Joint Committee be instructed to report by the first day of the next session of Rajya Sabha."

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : इस पर मैं इसलिये बोलना चाहता हूँ कि विरोधी दल वाले नए चले गए हैं और वे यह न समझें कि कांग्रेस में ऐसे लोग नहीं हैं जो सही बात सरकार को नहीं कहते हैं। कांग्रेस में ऐसे लोगों की कमी नहीं है जो सरकार को सही बात कहते हों।

इस बिल को इसलिए होम मिनिस्टर की तरफ से लाया गया है कि लाखों करोड़ों रुपया लगा करके जो फैक्ट्रियां बनी हैं, मिलें बनी हैं उनकी प्रोटेक्शन के लिए पुलिस रखी जाए। आप जानते ही हैं कि आज देश में गुंडागर्दी हो रही है। जो साम्यवादी हैं, जो विरोधी दलों में कुछ लॉग हैं ये बाहर के मुल्कों से इशारा पा कर इस मुल्क को तबाह कर देना चाहते हैं, मिलों और कारखानों को कई स्थानों पर ये फूंकने की कोशिश करते हैं। इस बिल को इसलिए लाया गया है ताकि हमारे जो होम मिनिस्टर हैं उनके हाथ मजबूत हों और वे इस अंडरटॉकिंग की सुरक्षा का प्रबन्ध कर सकें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट इसको जल्दी से सिलेक्ट कमेटी को भेज कर पास कराये ताकि देश की रक्षा हो सके।

श्री श्रीरंग गोयल (चण्डीगढ़) : मुझे इस बात का संतोष है कि यह दिल आज पास होने के बजाय प्रवर समिति को भेजा जा रहा है। इस बिल को पढ़ने पर मालूम होता है कि इस में कई कमियां हैं, कई दोष हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी इन सब पर विचार करेगी।

इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि जो पब्लिक अंडरटॉकिंग हैं वे आज संतोषजनक तरीके से काम नहीं कर रहे हैं, उन में घाटा हो रहा है। उनके जो मुख्याधिकारी हैं वे पुरानी किस्म की नौकरशाही के, ब्यूरोक्रेसी

[श्री श्रीचन्द गोंयल]

के नुमाइंदे हैं। आज जब वे श्रमिकों के अन्दर अनुशासनहीनता की बातें करते हैं, आज जब वे श्रमिक वर्ग के खिलाफ शिकायतें करते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उनको अग्रने किरदार की तरफ भी ध्यान देना होगा। ये पब्लिक अंडरटैकिंग प्राइवेट सैक्टर के मुकाबले में या तो बहुत ज्यादा घाटे में चल रहे हैं या बहुत ही कम नफा कमा रही हैं। इस वास्ते आज हमें इस बात की तरफ ध्यान देना होगा कि उनका वर्किंग दुस्त हो, उनके वर्किंग को सुधारा जाए और जिस प्रकार के व्यरोकेट्स, जिस प्रकार के नौकरशाही आज उनके इंचार्ज हैं उन के स्थान पर, अगर वे अयोग्य हैं, तो योग्य लोगों को रखा जाए।

जहां तक श्रमिकों का सम्बन्ध है मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारी सरकार उनकी समस्याओं की तरफ पूरा ध्यान नहीं दे रही है। आज उनको न मकान मिले हुए हैं, न उनको मुनाफा के अन्दर हिस्सा मिलता है, और न ही उनको मैनेजमेंट के अन्दर हिस्सेदार बनाया गया है और न ही उनकी दूसरी समस्याओं की तरफ ध्यान दिया गया है। आज जो यह सिक्पोरिटी फोर्स तैयार की जा रही है कहीं ऐसा न हो कि इसका उपयोग उनकी जायज मांगों को दबाने के लिए, उनके जायज हककों पर छापा मारने के लिए किया जाए। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल में इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था की जाए कि सिक्पोरिटी फोर्स का उनकी जायज मांगों दबाने के लिए या उनके जो जायज अधिकार हैं, हड़ताल करने इत्यादि का है, उनके अन्दर एकावट डालने के लिए इस्तेमाल न किया जाए।

जहां तक श्रमिक वर्ग के अन्दर अनुशासन की भावना पैदा करने का ताल्लुक है मैं ने पहले निवेदन किया है कि उच्च अधिकारियों को उनके सामने एक आदर्श उपस्थित करना चाहिए। यह दलील दी जा रही है

कि जो तोड़फोड़ करते हैं, जो बेईमानी करते हैं उनकी इन कार्रवाइयों पर अंकुश लगाने के लिए, उनके विरुद्ध कार्रवाई करने के लिए इस सिक्पोरिटी फोर्स का निर्माण किया जा रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो इंचार्ज हैं अगर वे ऐसे हों कि जो श्रमकों के मनोविज्ञान को समझते हों, लेबर की समस्याओं के साथ हमदर्दी रखते हों, उनकी मांगों और उनकी जरूरतों को महसूस करते हों तो यह जो समस्या है इसका बड़ी आसानी से हल निकाला जा सकता है। जब श्रमिक देखते हैं कि जो मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर है या जो उच्च अधिकारी हैं उनके बच्चों को स्कूल पहुंचाने और वापिस लाने के लिए कार जाती है, उसकी धर्म पत्नी सिनेमा देखने जाना चाहती है तो वह कार ले जाती है, जब वे देखते हैं कि इन उच्चाधिकारियों की आंखों के सामने लाखों रुपये का सामान इधर उधर किया जाता है, और इन बड़े-बड़े अधिकारियों के संकेत पर यह सब होती है तो उनके अन्दर भी इस प्रकार की दिली जलन पैदा होती है। इस वास्ते आपको चाहिए कि आप उच्च वर्ग की इस मनोवृत्ति की तरफ भी ध्यान दें और देखें कि वे कोई इर्रगुलर काम न करें और श्रमिकों के प्रति सहानुभूति का बरताव करें।

अब मैं सिक्पोरिटी फोर्स की सर्विस कंडीशन के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। इस फोर्स के कर्मचारियों को अपने बिल्कुल इनसिक्चोर बना दिया है। यह व्यवस्था उन के ऊपर लेबर लाज लागू नहीं होगी जो कानूनी सुरक्षा लेबर को मिली हुई है, मजदूरों को मिली हुई है या दूरे जो कर्मचारी हैं उनको मिली हुई है। वह सुरक्षा आपने सिक्पोरिटी फोर्स के लोगों को नहीं दी गई है। बल्कि उनको आपने बड़े अधिकारियों के रहम पर छोड़ दिया है। इस का नाम ही सिक्पोरिटी फोर्स है उस में काम करने

वाले जो कर्मचारी हैं उनकी सर्विस कंडिशन इन्सिफ्योर क्यों हो इस पर मैं चाहता हूँ कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी को विचार करना चाहिये। जहाँ तक उनकी नौकरी का सम्बन्ध है या दूसरी सुविधाओं का सम्बन्ध है, मैं नहीं चाहता हूँ कि उनको किसी एक व्यक्ति के रहम पर छोड़ दिया जाए। मैं चाहता हूँ कि श्रमिकों के बारे में जो सुरक्षा कानून हैं, जो बाकी सब लोगों पर लागू होते हैं, वे इन पर भी लागू होने चाहियें, उन से इनको बंचित न किया जाए।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि कमेटी इन सब बातों पर भी विचार करे।

Shri D. N. Patodia (Jalore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, since the Bill will be referred to a Joint Committee, I would restrict myself to a few observations relating to the policy. We are, at the moment, passing through a very difficult time and in various parts of the country the condition of lawlessness is prevailing. We have seen that in these conditions when people are guided by wrong elements, unsocial elements, even the right-thinking people, the loyal workers, will be tempted to take wrong actions and, if not guided properly, they resort to unsocial methods. We have seen in Bengal, in Durgapur, the industrial belts and other parts of the country how the workers, misguided by certain elements in the society, resort to certain unsocial and undesirable activities.

So far as the present situation in the country is concerned, so far as the general lawlessness is concerned, I believe it is desirable that some sort of legislation is brought in by the government. For the sake of illustration I would like to say that apart from the public enterprises, in certain private sector establishments also such incidents have happened. For instance, in the Rayon Factory at Veraval the workers, led by certain undesirable elements, completely destroyed very valuable machinery of the project. Another incident occurred in Union Carbide where the workers prevented the working of the unit and the unit had to be closed down. Therefore, under such circumstances, if

there is some legislation where there is some provision by which such undesirable acts of the workers or other unsocial elements can be prevented, it is desirable.

But, if the force which this particular legislation is creating, the Industrial Security Force, is going to behave in the same manner as the Railway Security Force is behaving, I would be the first man to oppose this legislation. The Railway Security Force, which is an additional burden on the exchequer, has not been able to stop any sabotage, has not been able to stop any theft, has not been able to render any service for which it was constituted. Therefore, whenever any such Force is created, whenever it becomes the additional burden on the exchequer, we have to see that the Force functions properly and that the objective for which the Force is being constituted is properly fulfilled.

19 hrs.

I would like to add one more point here. I believe this particular Bill is directed with a motive of providing protection to the industrial sector owned by the Central and State Governments. I also believe that the hon. Minister will agree with me that if the public sector undertakings like Bhilai and Durgapur are of national importance, in the same manner the factories like TISCO and the companies like Burn & Co. are also equally important. If the factories like Hindustan Machine Tools and Chittaranjan Locomotive Works are important from national point of view, in the same manner factories like Ashok Leylands, Hindustan Motors and TELCO are also equally important from national point of view. I, therefore, do not see how, when the Government considers that under the present situation of lawlessness the protection of public sector industries is necessary, it is not necessary to give similar protection to the private sector industries. I would, therefore, like to know in what respect, either through this legislation or through some other legislation, and in what manner the Government proposes to provide protection to those other industries which are equally important from the national point of view. I would like to ask one question: Will the Government

[Shri D. N. Patodia]

be prepared to permit private sector to form their own force with similar powers as they are doing for the sake of public sector.

With these observations, I support the Bill to be referred to the Joint Committee where it will be discussed threadbare with all the importance of it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister.

Shri Tulsidas Jadhav rose —

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have already called the Minister.

श्री तुलसीदास जाधव (बारामती) :
आप ने मुझे देखा ही नहीं। मुझे केवल दो मिनट चाहिए। यह कैसी बात है ! आप मुझे दो मिनट भी नहीं देते हैं। जब कोई बिरोधी सदस्य नहीं है तो आप हमें क्यों नहीं बोलने देते हैं ? हर वक्त इस तरह गड़बड़ क्यों की जाती है ?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: The hon. Member, Shri Goel, has made very useful suggestions and I am quite sure, when the Bill goes before the Joint Committee, all these will be very carefully considered.

The hon. Member, Shri Patodia, has also given his support to this Bill for which I am very grateful to him and I am quite sure that the points raised by him will be very carefully considered by the Joint Committee.

I commend the motion to the House that this Bill be referred to the Joint Committee.

श्रीमती जयबेन शर्मा (भरमरेली) :
मैं निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि हम कई सालों से पंडित जी के जमाने से देखते आए हैं कि हर एक सिलेक्ट कमेटी में एक या दो लेडी मेम्बरें जरूर रखी जाती हैं। लेकिन इस सिलेक्ट कमेटी में एक भी लेडी मेम्बर को

नहीं रखा गया है। यह उचित नहीं है। मैं समझती हूँ कि भविष्य में इस बात का ध्यान रखा जायेगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Next time you take into account the protest that has been reported. Now I put the motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the House on the Bill to provide for the constitution and regulation of a Force called the Central Industrial Security Force for the better protection and security of certain industrial undertakings, made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 6th June, 1967, and communicated to this House on the 8th June, 1967, and resolves that the following thirty members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely:—

Shri Vidya Dhar Bajpai, Shri D. Balarama Raju, Shri Rajendranath Barua, Shri Anil K. Chanda, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri J. K. Choudhury, Sri Ram Dhani Das, Shri George Fernandes, Shri Indrajit Gupta, Shri Narayan Swaroop Sharma, Shri S. Kandapan, Shri Kinder Lal, Shri Srinibas Misra, Shri J. B. Singh, Shri Vikram Chand Mahajan, Shri A. Nesamony, Shri Dabhyabhai Parmar, Shri Manibhai J. Patel, Shri Manubhai

Patel, Chaudhuri Randhir Singh, Shri S. K. Sambandhan, Shri P. G. Sen, Shri Saahi Ranjan, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, Shri S. M. Siddayya, Shri N. K. Somani, Shri Tayappa Hari Sonavane, Shri R. Umanath, Shri Tenneti Viswanatham and Shri Y. B. Chavan.

"This House recommends to Rajya Sabha that the Joint Committee be instructed to report by the first day of the next session of Rajya Sabha."

The motion was adopted.

18.05 hrs.

INDIAN OFFICIAL SECRETS
(AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Indian Official Secrets (Amendment) Bill.

Mr. Vidya Charan Shukla.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): I move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Official Secrets Act, 1923, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This is an amending Bill, amending a long-standing Official Secrets Act, which was passed in 1923. This is a Bill with very simple provisions and I shall, in a minute, describe the provisions of this Bill.

The main point in this Bill is to make the offences punishable with greater sentences of imprisonment and make most of the offences under this Bill cognizable offences. This is the main purpose of this amending Bill.

1926 (A1) LSD—7.

As the House knows, under this Official Secrets Act, we will prosecute... (*Interruptions*) such of those people who may indulge in anti-Indian, anti-national, activities and work for the foreign powers. They are the people who have to be punished under this Act.

This Bill has been passed unanimously by Rajya Sabha and practically all the sections of the House least us support in this. I am sure, the hon. members must have studied the provisions of this Bill. I, therefore, move that this Bill be given full support by this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the further Bill to amend the Indian Official Secrets Act, 1923, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Randhir Singh.

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : बिपुटी स्पीकर साहब, मैं इस बिल की पुरजोर हिमायत करता हूँ। यह बिल बहुत पुराना है और आज तक इस में कोई एमेंडमेंट नहीं हुई है। इस बिल के जरिये प्रिंसिपल एक्ट के सेक्शन 3 और 5 में जो एमेंडमेंट की गई है उस से देश को बड़ी ताकत मिलेगी।

हमारे देश में आफ्रिकन सर्कल में और दूसरी जगह भी ऐसे बहुत से एन्टी-सोशल और एन्टी-नेशनल लोग हैं जिन्होंने यह बिजनेस बना रखा है कि वे दूसरे देशों से ख़या ले कर उन को हमारे ग्रहम आफ्रिकन सीक्रेट्स दे देते हैं। इस तरह की बहुत सी मिसालें हैं। आईन्दा जो लोग इस तरह की हरकतें करेंगे इस बिल के जरिये उन को डेटेरेन्ट पनिशमेंट दी जायेगी।

इस के अलावा एक एमेंडमेंट के जरिये इस किस्म के आफ्रिकन के लिए कोड आफ्रिकनिस प्रोसीजर के सेक्शन 337 की ओरिजिन को भी एक्टिव किया गया है।

[श्री रणधीर सिंह]

भारत प्राप्ति के लिए सफ़्टवेयर, मैटीरियल में मिले तो एक्यूज्ड में से किसी को पार्डन दे कर एपेल्ड एक्टिविटी के बेसिस पर कनविक्शन हो सकेगा। हालांकि ला में एपेल्ड एक्टिविटी को धाम तौर पर इन्ट्रेस्टिड एक्टिविटी माना जाता है लेकिन इस बिल में यह प्राविजन एड कर देने से यह कानून और ज्यादा इफ़ेक्टिव हों जायेगा।

श्री श्रीचंद गोत (बंटीगढ़) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। हमारे देश में काफ़ी धरसे से इस प्रकार के पंचमांगी तत्व कार्य करते रहे हैं, जिन की तरफ़ से देश के लिए हानिकारक गतिविधियां होती रही हैं। उन से देश की सुरक्षा और स्वतंत्रता को आघात पहुँचा है। इस से ज्यादा दुर्भाग्य की बात और क्या हो सकती है कि दिल्ली में कांग्रेस के प्रखिल भारतीय कार्यालय में, श्री कामराज की नाक के नीचे उन के अपने दफ़्तर में, इस प्रकार के तत्व काम करते रहे, जो दूसरे देशों को हमारे देश के सम्बन्ध में महत्वपूर्ण रहस्य देते रहे। आज जबकि पाकिस्तान और चीन हमारे देश की सुरक्षा और स्वतंत्रता के लिए खतरा बने हुए हैं, अनेक प्रकार के देश-विरोधी और समाज-शत्रु तत्व हमारे देश में सक्रिय हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक उन के लिए और बड़ी सजाएं, कड़े दण्ड निश्चित नहीं होंगे, अख़्तिय के साथ जब तक उन को नहीं कुचलो जायगा देश की स्वतंत्रता और सुरक्षा के लिए, यह खतरा बनते रहेंगे। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि आज इस बिल के द्वारा सरकार इस बात के ऊपर विचार कर रही है जिस की आज तक प्रवृत्तियों की थी, आज तक जिस बात की ओर दुर्लक्ष्य किया था। भाषा है कि आगे से सरकार, सरकार के कर्मचारी, सरकार के सब मंत्री और कांग्रेस के भी अधिकारी सावधान रहेंगे और इस प्रकार की गतिविधियां उन के

अपने कार्यालयों के अन्दर, अपने मन्त्रालयों के अन्दर नहीं होंगी। उन के ऊपर अच्छी तरह से रोक लगाएंगे तभी यह गतिविधियां रुकेंगी।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I rise to oppose this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He had taken leave of the House already.

Let him be brief.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to oppose this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him be very brief.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I hope you will allow me to speak at least.

I did not take leave of the House for the whole proceedings. But I was only opposed to that particular Bill and the Law Minister's clarification which made it very difficult for us to sit here. I have come back now to oppose this Bill called the Indian Official Secrets (Amdtment) Bill.

Under the Official Secrets Act, we know that a certain amount of secrecy has to be maintained at all costs in the larger interests of the country. (Interruptions) I hope Shri Vidya Charan Shukla would gain in maturity and would not interrupt me.

श्रीमती जयबेन शर्मा (अमरेली) :
भाप-उन-को-यही-सिखा-रहे-हैं।

श्री. ए. ओ. बेनर्जी : देखिए, कोई भई मुझ से लड़े तो मैं जवाब भी दूँ। मैं लेडीज की तो बड़ी रेस्पेक्ट करता हूँ।

May I request you, Sir, to allot a definite seat and fix Shri Sbeo Narain to a particular seat? He is a moving shuttle-cock. Let him be fixed somewhere.

श्री शिवनारायण (बस्ती) : गरियाघो घरेलू में तुम, मैं हिन्दी में गरियाऊंगा। छोड़ूंगा नहीं। इन के बाद मैं बोल्गा।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Even if they are all together and I am alone, I am an Abhimanyu and I shall face them.

Shri Namblar (Tiruchirappalli): I am also here. Let him not worry.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What secrecy has been maintained in this country? Is it not a fact that in this very House I had referred to the case where certain very important and secret information concerning our very big project namely the Farakka barrage had been passed on to Pakistan? When this question was asked, the hon. Prime Minister replied only that the papers were not kept in the All India Congress Committee office at Jantar Mantar Road. But she admitted the fact when there was the case of Sunil Das or Mohit Choudhury that they had extracted some information from officials and wanted to give it to Pakistan. There also, kindly allow me to say that one of the ex-Members of the House, Shri Atulya Ghosh was involved. So, naturally, no action could be taken against them. I must congratulate Shri Y. B. Chavan for it. The cases against those people were withdrawn, or dismissed. The magistrate had said that the prosecution witness, namely the Deputy Superintendent of Police or the SP or the the CBI was not present and because they were not present he thought that Government wanted to drop the case, and accordingly that case was finished. But, again, a case has been lodged.

Even today, when we are discussing this Bill and talking of secrecy, it is only Government employees, especially the junior Government employees and the middle class employees for whom dearness allowance has been denied who would be governed by this Act and they are asked to maintain proper secrecy.

I would take this opportunity and request Shri Y. B. Chavan to kindly tell the House

what he is going to do with that Air Force Officer who was caught and who was found passing on certain information to Pakistan.

Then, our maps which were published by the Director of Map Publications, Dehra Dun, were found in the Chinese custody. They used those maps against us when they invaded Bomdila and forced our Army to come back.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardha): Supplied by the Communist Party.

Shri Namblar: Which party? Question.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Patriotism is not the monopoly of Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj. Money cannot purchase patriotism. Let him understand that.

These maps were supplied; they were in the possession of the Chinese. They knew the position better than us because these maps were supplied to them. How were they supplied to them? Brig. Wilson, who was the Surveyor General at that time had a brother, another Wilson, working in Pakistan. In 1948, when I was representing the Survey of India Karmachari Class IV Union, I pointed it out, and it was supported by the then Regional Labour Commissioner, Shri Hari Singh. I said that this officer should not be kept there. But what happened? He was in employment till this mischief was done and those very important maps were passed on to the Chinese.

So I say that secrecy is necessary, but that can only be had if we really maintain secrecy. But what is happening. Take the Report on the Vivian Bose Report. The original copy was with the Attorney General—I am referring to the Report of the Solicitor General and Shri Viswanatha Shastrri in regard to the Vivian Bose Report. The only duplicate. One copy was with somebody else and that was got cyclostyled and placed on the Table of the House. That is the secrecy that you maintain!

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

With these words, I say that the case of Sunil Das and Mohit Chaudhuri where we have definitely proved that Government have not been able to protect the secrecy of documents, should be pursued. Shri Atulya Ghosh who was a Member of this House, who was defeated by Shri J. M. Biswas, a member of my group, was involved in this. His conduct should also be scrutinised properly. Without such steps, secrecy cannot be maintained.

श्री शशि भूषण वाजपेयी (खारगोन) :

घाप तो इंडिपेंडेंट है।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This is the last day of this session. Shri Shashi Bushan Vajpayee should not interrupt me. I come from Kanpur where even stones do not debar us from speaking. I am used to such interruptions.

I was saying that Shri Atulya Ghosh, against whom an inquiry should be conducted, should have been behind the bars. But he is moving about in Calcutta. We say the officials are doing this. What can officials do if there is pressure from the AICC and when the staff of the AICC go there and collect information?

With these words, I say that secrecy should be maintained rigidly and proper steps should be taken towards that end. I hope the hon. Minister will take the necessary steps in this direction.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) :

उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं तो केवल दो म्युझाव ही देना चाहता हूँ। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि भारतीय रहस्यों को प्रगट करने के लिए जितनी अधिक से अधिक और कड़ी से कड़ी सजा दी जाय वह ही जानी चाहिये क्योंकि सडका राष्ट्र की अखण्डता से संबंध है। और देश के भविष्य से संबंध है। परन्तु साथ ही साथ जो बात मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि अभी पीछे इस प्रकार की भी बार बार सूचनाएँ मिलती

रहीं हैं स्वयं मंत्रिपरिषद् की बैठकों के निर्णय भी प्रगट हो जाते हैं। आप सरकारी अधिकारियों द्वारा रहस्य प्रगट किए जाने के संबंध में जहां कानून बनाने जा रहे हैं वहां कुछ इस प्रकार की भी अपनी परम्पराएं तो प्रारम्भ कीजिए कि आप की जो कैबिनेट की मीटिंगें होती हैं, वहां जो निर्णय लिए जाते हैं, वह रहस्य प्रगट हो जाते हैं, उस पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाने का क्या प्रयास कर रहे हैं? आप को थोड़ा अपने घर में भी सोचना होगा। सरकारी कर्मचारियों पर आप प्रतिबन्ध लगाए कि वह सरकारी रहस्यों को प्रगट न करें इस में दो राय नहीं हो सकती। लेकिन इस का अभिप्राय यह नहीं कि आप को स्वतन्त्रता है। आप के अन्दर बैठ हुए व्यक्ति इस प्रकार के रहस्यों को प्रगट करें कि जिन के प्रगट होने से देश को भी खतरा हो सकता है और आप की स्वयं की नीतियों पर भी उस का प्रभाव पड़ता है। मैं इस प्रकार के भी उदाहरण जानता हूँ और गृह-मंत्रालय की एकाध बैठकों में मैं ने इस बात की चर्चा भी की कि दिल्ली में कुछ इस प्रकार के क्लब हैं जहां सांयकाल सरकारी कार्यालयों के बन्द होने के बाद बड़े बड़े आफिसर खेलने के लिए जाते हैं और कुछ बड़ी बड़ी कम्पनियां या विदेशों से संबंध रखने वाले व्यक्ति इस प्रकार के हैं कि जो खेलने आते हैं और जो जानबूझकर उन अधिकारियों के साथ हार बैठते हैं। इस तरह उन के साथ संपर्क स्थापित करते हैं और फिर रहस्य लेते हैं और अपना कार्य उन से कराते हैं। इस का परिणाम यह होता है कि आप की नीतियों पर भी उग का प्रभाव पड़ता है और देश की सुरक्षा पर भी उस का प्रभाव पड़ता है। तो जहां आप सरकारी कर्मचारियों के संबंध में इस प्रकार का नियंत्रण करें कि उन से कोई रहस्य प्रगट न हो और उस के लिए कड़ी सजा दी जाय वहां अपने घर में भी ध्यान रखें आप के द्वारा कोई रहस्य बाहर न जाय। इस की सुरक्षा की भी आप को बड़ी कड़ाई के साथ व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए।

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): I am at one with the Government in regard to the spirit of the Bill that any spying whatever form it may be, must be curbed and with an iron hand, but this is not the only purpose with which this has been brought in. The Statement of Objects and Reasons reads like this:

"In certain cases of spying, however, where the offence is punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to fourteen years, it has been provided that it would not be necessary to prove that the accused was guilty of any particular act tending to show such a purpose, if from the circumstances of the case or the conduct of the accused or his known character as proved, it appears that his purpose was a purpose prejudicial to the safety or interests of the State."

That is, in extreme cases the punishment may go up to 14 years, but other lighter issues are also there. You went to extend the whole of this to the lighter issues also.

It continues:

"It is considered that this special rule of evidence should be made applicable to all offences of spying punishable under this section and it is proposed to amend the section suitable for this purpose."

That means, this is going to be a blanket clause which will cover all sorts of things which can be termed as spying. Spying is such thing that any person who has indulged in it will have to be punished severely, and I may say to the extent that he may be shot, but under the cover of spying you cannot bring in all and sundry and say that now here it is necessary on the part of the Government to prove that he has spied. You cannot have that blanket extension of the limited scope of the original Act. By opening the floodgates it may lead to all sorts of malpractices and innocent people may be . . . Why are you in a hurry? Moreover, you got the other thing passed just like lightning.

So, what I would request you is that this must be done with sufficient caution, and you cannot open it up like that.

Again, in the last line of the paragraph it is said:

"It is, therefore, proposed to enhance the punishments for the offences suitably while ensuring at the same time, that all offences under the Act become cognizable and non-bailable."

All offences under the Act become cognizable and non-bailable. So, anybody who is arrested or suspected of spying will be booked, shunted into jail, and he cannot get a bail, and it is cognizable automatically, and the burden of proof is on him to show that he has not spied, and the Government will have no obligation to prove the offence. All these things show that there is something more serious than what it looks. That is my fear. In the name of spying, you cannot do everything.

Further, the amendment of the clause which is sought also gives me suspicion. Clause 4 says:

"In section 3 of the principal Act,—

(a) in clause (c) of sub-section (1), after the words 'useful to an enemy', the following shall be inserted, namely:—

"of which relates to matter the disclosure of which is likely to affect the sovereignty and integrity of India, the security of the State or friendly relations with foreign States";

This is very loosely worded. It is likely. Anything can be interpreted like that. In many Bills that they are bringing forward they are using this sort of loose words and phrases like "which relates to a matter the disclosure of which is likely to affect the sovereignty and integrity of India" etc. who is to decide that?

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji (Howrah): Should a traitor go scot-free?

Shri Namblar: Why do you immediately jump to that. Then you can say, "if anybody is suspected of being a traitor, he must be immediately shot". You finish the Bill like that. After all, this is legislation, and legislation must have safeguards. As it is, a wrong thing is done against the citizen. The hon. Minister is not going to execute this Act. He is not going to arrest or apprehend a person. It is the machinery. There is a big machinery throughout the country, and if it misbehaves, what is the safeguard? We must also see that the innocent citizen is not unnecessarily put into so many difficulties. My hon. friend Mr. Banerjee stated about the erstwhile colleague from Bengal. He was implicated in a spy case; as he was a Congressman, he was not proceeded against. Suppose a person from the Opposition was there, he would have been behind the bars. Political opponents can be ill-treated. The law should not give room for that. You should not create a law like this. The next subsection has the following words "With imprisonment for a term which may extend to 14 years". That means any offence for which formerly the punishment was fourteen years. Now, that is removed and every offence is brought in. This Bill does not go to the Select Committee.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Rajya Sabha has already passed it.

Shri Namblar: The Rajya Sabha passes many things. Unfortunately, most of our members are not here; this should be studied carefully. Everybody agrees that safeguards must be there. The hon. Minister should assure us that this will not be misused or abused. We know how people who differ from the government are accused of everything. We say we differ from government and immediately a seal is put on us; a seal is put before an animal is taken to the slaughter house; a seal is put on us to put us behind the bars: traitors. A seal was put on us by his predecessor. But we are still here; he is not to be seen here. While I was a member of

the Madras Assembly I was prosecuted in 1948. I gave notice of a motion; I sent a letter to the Secretary of the legislative assembly enclosing a letter which I received by post. That letter was subsequently termed as a confidential document. I do not know who sent it or whether it was confidential. I was undergoing a sentence already in another connection for a term of three years. This prosecution came while I was in jail and I told the court the position. It was to be decided by a Sessions Court, Not a magistrat's court. I was brought from the jail and then I pleaded my case with all my ability. I was convicted and given one year's sentence. The learned judge was good to write that both the sentences should run concurrently. I was already in the jail and thereby avoided an additional imprisonment. So, I say that this can be against any individual, particularly political opponent. I explained what happened to me in 1948 and I am afraid that worse things can be done under this Bill. Therefore, I would request him not to do it.

श्री कमल नयन बजाज (वर्धा) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बिल के पक्ष में बोलने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। लेकिन इस तरह का बिल यदि हम को यहां लाने की जरूरत न होती तो मुझ को ज्यादा खुशी होती। हमें इस बिल के लाने से कोई खुशी नहीं है। लेकिन जिस वक्त भ्रान्तरिक स्थिति इतनी भ्रशान्त हो रही है, भ्रराजकता के तत्व फैलते जा रहे हैं, जान धौर माल की सुरक्षा भी बराबर नहीं हो पा रही है, कहीं कहीं पर देशद्रोही तत्व भी दिखलाई दे रहे हैं, ऐसे वक्त में देश को सुरक्षित रखने के लिये, देश में शांति और भ्रमन चमन कायम रखने के लिये यह बीज अत्यन्त आवश्यक हो गई है। इसको लाने में हमें किसी प्रकार का गर्व नहीं है, गुमान नहीं है, जउटे हमारे मन में सब है कि जितने इस तरह के विरोधी तत्व हैं, ऐसे तत्व हैं जो देश के खिलाफ भी काम कर सकते हैं और जो भ्राज भी देश में मौजूद हैं और इस तरह की बुरी कारंवाई भी कर रहे हैं, उनको रोकने के वास्ते अनिवार्य रूप से

हम को इस तरह का प्रबन्ध करना पड़ रहा है ताकि उन पर रोक लग सके।

मैं प्रसन्न नहीं बोलना चाहता हूँ। मैं इतनी ही भावना करता हूँ कि कानून तो हम बनायें लेकिन कानून के जरिये हम इस तरह का वातावरण भी बनायें कि लोगों में विश्वास पैदा हो कि आज उनकी जान और माल को खतरा नहीं है, वह सुरक्षित रहेगी। हम ऐसा वातावरण भी बनायें ताकि देश में शान्ति कायम रहे।

Shri M. L. Soodhi (New Delhi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I endorse the objectives of this Bill inasmuch as the needs of Government today require that we take into account the strategies of other countries towards us, which may be friendly today but hostile tomorrow.

With regard to the question of official secrets, I speak with some experience, and it is my feeling that administrative reform is long over due, because if everything is marked "secret", then the very notions of secrecy are devalued. Nevertheless, to apply the powers which Government will possess as a result of this Bill, what would be required would be both imagination and firmness and, above all, speedy action. We have known in New Delhi itself how lightly some of our official attitudes with regard to defence and foreign affairs have been taken by people representing other countries. An impression was created that we have certain groups of countries around us; sometimes these friendly countries say, "We are spying on your soil; we are not spying against you; we are merely counter-spying on other powers."

I submit that difficult times are ahead. I do not feel very apprehensive about the internal situation, I feel confident about the internal situation, but I think the external situation, the world crisis, confronts

us, and that will lead the other powers to attempt spying on the Indian territory on a large scale, and anything that Government does with honest purpose, with the honest purpose of maintaining the national interests shall win unstinted co-operation from every honest citizen in this country. I therefore would appeal to the Government to realise that the powers that they are getting should be used well so that it may be said that the pledge that we took here as Members of Parliament, and when we come to Parliament, is upheld and the territorial integrity of the country is upheld.

Shri Srinibas Misra (Cuttack): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there can be no two opinions that spying would be severely condemned. Regarding the principles for which this Bill has been brought forward, there can be no difference of opinion, but it appears that our Government are not satisfied with the power they have. They want to have more and more powers.

Here, only two hypothetical questions have been raised which will show you how this Bill has been intended to be used for purposes which are not mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It is said that by a new substitute section for section 15 of the Parent Act; they want to bring to book the directors of the company if their servants disclose something which relate to defence or to the sovereignty or integrity or any such thing. It is provided that if due to the negligence of the directors, certain information leaks out, even then the directors would be responsible. We have heard of vital information from our Defence Ministry leaking outside. Have the Ministers been made responsible for it? If persons due to whose negligence such vital information leaks out can go scot-free, why bring in here the poor directors who are 50 or 60 or just 15 in number, and only due to their negligence, because they could not check the officials, some information leaked out. If you apply that principle to the directors, you must apply it to the ministers as well. But they are not going to do that.

[Shri Srinibas Misra]

Clause 4 seeks to add the following.

"or which relates to a matter the disclosure of which is likely to affect the sovereignty and integrity of India."

I hope the minister will have no objection to add "territorial integrity" because only "integrity" carries no meaning.

Then it says,

"the security of the State or friendly relations with foreign States".

Section 3 is sought to be amended by adding these things. What is the enemy interested in it? The enemy is interested in our production, in what we are doing by way of defence. So far as relations with foreign countries are concerned, may be sometimes here we criticise, say, the misappropriation of foreign aid. As soon as we say that so many millions of dollars have been misused, that may strain the relations between the aid-giving country and our country. It is not clear whether such things will come under this or not. This aspect should be examined. Then, disclosure of our annual production or deficit in production, blackmarketing, etc. may be of interest to our enemy. That will also relate to the security of the State. So, there is a likelihood of this provision being used to stifle the press and expression of public opinion. Then, we have found that in the reports of the PAC and other committees, there is mention of misutilisation of foreign aid. Even that may be brought within the definition of prejudicial activity under this Act.

Then, there are agitations for recovery of occupied areas. Even that may come under the provisions of this Act. Of course, the intention of the Government is all right. But the power they have taken is so all-embracing that it can be used to stifle the press or public opinion. Sometimes during discussions in this House, if a person says that 10 square miles of our territory is in the occupation of Pakistan, it can be said that it relates to the sovereignty and the security of the country, because you are acknowledging Pakistan's occupation of 10 square miles.

The words used are "the disclosure of which is likely to affect....". It is a very thin end and it can be misused. Then, what is "friendly relations"? Supposing we say something against China, our known enemy. What is the friendly relation that will postulate, this Government declaring who are our friends and who are our enemies? Sometimes countries which are friendly may become inimical. Are not the public entitled to disclose, give out to the Press, declare from platforms that a country has got such and such a thing? Can the Government, if it chooses, haul him up for disclosing certain information because that will strain the relations with foreign countries? I will give only one example. It relates to our relationship with West Germany. Very recently some protest was voiced in the Press and public that they were helping Pakistan by sending arms to Pakistan. If the Government chooses, it can, as the Government always does take action. They are not willing to disclose anything. They are willing to suppress everything, suppress corruption. They are not very much careful about other things leaking out. They are very much careful about corruption leaking out. If corruption leaks out, somehow it is linked with the security of the State (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. This is not fair. We must have adequate debate. We should not hustle through anything.

Shri Srinibas Misra: When corruption leaks out the officials of Government can somehow or other link in with the security of the State, relationship with foreign countries and all that and somehow haul up the person concerned for legal action. Therefore, my contention is that this can be used to such an extent that even innocent activities, which are otherwise legal and lawful, can be prohibited under this. I hope that they will use the powers under the present Official Secrets Act, under the Defence of India Act and the Rules thereunder and not press for this Bill to be passed.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to the hon. Members who have taken part in the de-

bate. Shri S. M. Banerjee made a reference to the famous case of Mohit Choudhuri. I was very surprised that while making a reference to this case he opposed this amendment. This Bill has been brought forward to help in such cases only so that the persons concerned in such very cases can be prosecuted and convicted properly.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You have not prosecuted Atulya Ghosh.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: It is not understood by us as to why any hon. Member of this House should oppose this amending Bill because this amending Bill has been brought here only to effectively prosecute and get deterrent conviction for those people who tamper with official secrets and cause injury to the cause of the nation. That is the main purpose of this Bill and hon. Members who mentioned various cases should realise that this amending Bill has been brought in only to help proper prosecution and conviction in such cases. There is no reason why any hon. Member should oppose this.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri also mentioned certain cases. Shri Nambiar also mentioned certain cases. He also asked why we were making offences under this Act Cognisable and non-bailable. I will only remind him of the case of Amir Hussain who was prosecuted under this Act in 1963 for passing on some information—he was a Pak national—to Pakistan. When he was prosecuted under this Act, since under the provisions of this Act it was bailable, he was released on bail. He jumped the bail, crossed over to Pakistan and we lost that case completely; because he was not traceable after that. I give this case only to illustrate the necessity why the provisions of this clause must be made non-bailable so that we do not take the risk in the matter of agents of foreign countries or enemies of India and allow them to escape the clutches of law like this.

Shri Nambiar asked for an assurance that the provisions of this Act will not be used against political opponents. I say that we have never done so and this assurance

will be absolutely superficial. Even then, if it pleases him, I am prepared to give this assurance.

Shri Nambiar: Among the 500 Members of this House I am the solitary member who was convicted under the Official Secrets Act. That is why I am particular about it.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: The other members who have spoken on the Bill have generally supported the Bill. I will recommend this Bill for the approval of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Official Secrets Act, 1923, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will now take up clause by clause consideration. For clause 2 there is an amendment by Shri P. K. Deo. I find he is absent. I will now put clause 2 to the vote of the house.

श्री तुलसीदास जाधव (बारमती) : मैं क्लॉज 2 पर बोलना चाहता हूँ। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहाँ पर जो सदस्य शोर करते हैं, घ्राप उन्हीं की सुनते हैं, लेकिन हम लोगों को धक्कर नहीं देने हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Do you want to speak on clause 2? I do not understand this. If he wants to make any general observations, he can do so during the third reading. Now I am on clause 2.

श्री तुलसीदास जाधव : धगर कृपा करके घ्राप मुझे न हों, तो मैं कहूँ कि हाउस में जो लोग शोर करते हैं गड़बड़ करते हैं, घ्राप उन को सब सहूलियत देते हैं, लेकिन जो धनुशासन में रह कर नियम के अनुसार

[श्री तुलशी दास जाधव]

बोलना चाहते हैं, आप उन को दो मिनट भी नहीं देते हैं। यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would inform Shri Yadhav that this is not the way to address the Chair. I must warn him. What he has said is absolutely irrelevant. Now has he got anything to say on clause 2? For the benefit of the House, I will read clause 2.

"(2) It extends to the whole of India and applies also to servants of the government and to citizens of India outside India."

Shri Shri Chand Goel: Kindly permit him to speak at the third reading stage.

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव: मैं चौदह बरस तक बम्बई प्रेसम्बली का सदस्य रहा हूँ। बिल में जो एमेंडमेंट हुई हो या कोई क्लॉज निकाली गई हो, तो थर्ड रीडिंग में केवल उसी के बारे में कहा जाता है। थर्ड रीडिंग में जनरल बातें नहीं कही जाती हैं। इस लिए जब आप कहते हैं कि थर्ड रीडिंग में चाहे जो कुछ कहा जाये, तो आप की इजाजत होने पर भी मुझे वह जंचता नहीं है। क्लॉज-वार्ड-क्लॉज डिस्कशन में ही क्लॉजिज पर बोला जाता है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He need not speak anything on procedure or what he had learnt in Bombay. Clause 2 is before the House.

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव : क्लॉज 2 के मैं कहा गया है:

"It extends to the whole of India and applies also to servants of the Government and to citizens of India outside India."

मुझे इस के ऊपर कुछ बोलना है। हालत यह है कि हमारी बात सुनी नहीं जाती है, जिस से गम्बड़ होली है। मेरा कहना

यह था कि यही क्लॉज इस बिल की जान है। हिन्दुस्तान की जो भ्रवस्था है वह बड़ी गंभीर है और कठिन है। यह क्लॉज डालने से ठीक है इस का इम्प्लीमेंट न होना चाहिए। हमारे जो प्रपोजिशन वाले भाई हैं उन से मुझे कहना है, देश में सरकार किसी की भी हो पर सरकार की जो सीक्रेसी है वह बाहर नहीं जानी चाहिए। चाहे वह किसी भी पार्टी का प्रादमी हो या फारेनर हो, बाहर का प्रादमी हो, उस की निष्ठा, उस की लायल्टी देश की सरकार के प्रति होनी चाहिए और सरकार की किसी भी सीक्रेसी को फोड़ने में अगर उस का हाथ पाया जाय तो उस को भाफ करना ठीक नहीं है। जैसे मेरे भाई बैनर्जी ने कहा, उसी तरह से मैं भी उन के लिए थोड़ी बातें कहना चाहता हूँ। सी० वी० आई० की रिपोर्ट जो थी वह गवर्नमेंट का एक एक सीक्रेट डायग्राम था। यह ठीक है कि प्रपोजिशन वाले गवर्नमेंट को एक्सपोज करना चाहते हैं; लेकिन वह एक सीक्रेट चीज थी, उस की सीक्रेसी का क्याल न करते हुए उसे यहां लाये। इतनी बड़ी पार्लियामेंट जो एक आगस्ट बाड़ी है देश की, देश का एक मन्दिर है, उस में रहने वाले पुजारी जब कागज चुराकर लाएं और टेबल पर रखें तो वह फिर किस मुह से हम से बात करते हैं और लोगों को वह क्या प्रादर्श बताएंगे? मेरी कोई उन के प्रति शक्यता की दृष्टि नहीं है। लेकिन एक जिस दृष्टि से यह बिल प्राया है उस के लिए मैं कहता हूँ। दूसरी बात आप की जगह बैठने वाले, पांच वर्ष तक जो हमारे स्पीकर थे उन का भी प्राइवेट लेटर था, वह यहां लाकर रखा गया। जो बेयर है, मन्दिर की मूर्ति है उस के भी खिलाफ तौहीन देश में करते रहेंगे तो किस की तरफ देश के लोग देखेंगे कि हमारा प्रादर्श कौन सा है? तीसरी बात ब्रिटिश राज के जो

पेपर बे' वह गए। बीस साल तक राज करने वाली कांग्रेस पार्टी ने एक भी कागज कभी बाहर नहीं लायी लेकिन अभी चार दिन हुए मध्य प्रदेश में दूसरी सरकार बने और वहाँ का कागज फ़ाइनेंस सेक्रेटरी का कान्फ़िडेंशियल नोट वाजपेयी जी ने यहाँ ला कर बताया तो यह कैसी सीक्रेसी है ? इस रीति कैस नीक्रेसी रहेगी ? हमारे लिए भी कहा जाता है, जैसे कि एक भाई ने कहा कि वकिंग कमेटी का भी और कैबिनेट का भी बाहर आता है तो मैं नम्रना से कहूंगा कि जो पार्टी इन पावर है, और जो लायल्टी पर सिगनेचर करते है, वहाँ भी जब एक खानगी चर्चा होती है, और वह भी बाहर आ जाती है तो हमारा भी कोई अधिकार नहीं है दूसरों को कुछ कहने का। इसलिए मैं यह कहूंगा कि हम सब लोग इस देश के अन्दर भाई भाई हैं। देश को हमें संभालना है। देश के प्रति जो लायल्टी और निष्ठा होनी चाहिए उस की सीक्रेसी जिस तरह से मेन्टेन होनी चाहिए, वह हावी नहीं है, इसीलिए यह ऐसे बिल लाने पड़ते हैं। यह बिल और इंडस्ट्रियल सर्वोरेट्री फ़ोस बिल जो लाने पड़े उनका उद्देश्य यही है कि हम संभले और हमारी सीक्रेसी और लायल्टी रहे।

Shri Nambiar: I also want to speak on clause 2.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why do you want to speak now? What the hon. Member spoke was not relevant at all to this clause.

Shri Nambiar: I want to say something.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I had asked Mr. Tulshidas Jadhav to sit down, but he did not obey. Now does the hon. Member also want to participate in this? He may please sit down.

Shri Nambiar: All right: If you say, I will sit down.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is: "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill

Clause 4.— (Amendment of section 3)

Shri Srinibas Mishra: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 14,—

for "relates to" substitute—

"is". (2)

Page 2, line 15, .

after "and" insert—

"territorial". (3)

Page 2, lines 16 and 17—

omit "or friendly relations with foreign States" (4).

Page 2,—

Omit lines 19 and 20. (6)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put the amendments to the vote of the House.

Shri Srinibas Mishra: I want to say something. What I want is that on page 2, line 14, 'relates to' should be substituted by 'is'. Then on the same page, line 15, after 'and', 'territorial' be inserted. That is, it will read as, "or which is a matter the disclosure of which is likely to affect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of India...."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already made those points.

Shri Srinibas Mishra: Then, on page 2, lines 16 and 17, the words, "or friendly relations with foreign States" should be omitted. These are the three amendments. I hope there will be no objection to accepting these amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I now put his amendments, 2, 3 and 4 to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 2 to 4 were put and negatived

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is also another amendment of Shri Srinibas Mishra, No. 6. Is he proposing it?

Shri Srinibas Misra: I am not pressing it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has he leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

Hon. Members: Yes.

Amendment No. 6 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill

Clause 5.——(Amendment of section 5)

Shri Srinibas Misra: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 29,—

for "relates to" substitute—
 "is". (8).

Page 2, line 30,—

after "and" insert—
 "territorial" (10)

Page 2, lines 31 and 32,—

omit "or friendly relations with foreign States" (11)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I now put the amendments to the vote of the House.

Amendments No. 8, 10 and 11 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 6 to 11 were added to the

Clause 12.— (Substitution of new section for section 15)

Shri Srinibas Misra: I beg to move:

Page 4, lines 13 and 14,—

omit, "or is attributable to any negligence or the part of". (12).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I now put the amendment to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 12 was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 12 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 12 was added to the Bill.

Clause 13 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri Vjdy Charan Shukla: I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

20 hrs.

MOTION RE SITUATION ARISING OUT OF WORKING OF SUGAR INDUSTRY FOR SHORTER PERIOD DURING THE CRUSHING SEASON.

श्री काशी नरथ पाण्डेय (पदरत्ना) :
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज मुझे इस विषय में ज्यादा नहीं कहना है। चीनी के सम्बन्ध में जो एक गम्भीर समस्या हमारे देश में पैदा हो गई है उसकी जानकारी सभी लोगों को है। पहली बात यह है

20.0 1/4 hr.

[**SHRI G. S. DEHLON** in the Chair].

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) :
 सभापति महोदय, पूर्व इसके कि श्री पाण्डेय अपना वक्तव्य प्रारम्भ करें, मैं आपके द्वारा यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज कोठारी कमिशन की रिपोर्ट और संसदीय शिक्षा समिति की रिपोर्ट पर कुछ चर्चा होने वाली थी वह नहीं हो सकी। लेकिन शिक्षा मंत्री इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ वक्तव्य देने वाले थे कि भारत की शिक्षा सम्बन्धी नीति क्या होगी

होगे, विश्वविद्यालयों के स्तर तक माध्यम का रूप क्या होगा। यहाँ पर शिक्षा मंत्रालय के राज्य मंत्री उपस्थित हैं। प्राप अनुमति दें कि इस सम्बन्ध में वे कुछ कहें। उसके बाद श्री पाण्डेय प्रारम्भ करें। प्राइर पेपर पर यह चीज आई हुई है।

संसद-कार्य सभा संचार मंत्री (डा० राम सुभग सिंह) : इस के बारे में कह सकना असम्भव है।

श्री काशी नाथ पांडे : चीनी की समस्या से सारा देश भिन्न है। मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कहना है, क्योंकि चीनी की कमी से सारे देश में जो हाहाकार मचा हुआ है उसे हम ही नहीं बल्कि बच्चा बच्चा महसूस कर रहा है कि चीनी की क्या अहमियत है। जल्द ही इस बात को है कि हम देखें कि चीनी की कमी देश में क्यों हुई। जब तक इस बीमारी की तरफ हम नहीं जायेंगे तब तक इस को दवा भी नहीं हो सकती।

दूसरी बात यह भी है कि अभी तो यह हालत है कि जो चीनी पिछले साल पैदा हुई उस के ऊपर हम ने इस साल देखा है। अब यह विचार करना है कि क्या इस साल हालात ऐसे हैं कि यह अगले साल और सुधर सकते हैं। कुछ और भी बातें ऐसी हैं जिनके सम्बन्ध में प्राप का ध्यान आकर्षित करूँ तो प्राप समझेंगे कि स्थिति कितनी गम्भीर है। चीनी की कमी से, क्योंकि चीनी मिलों में बनती है। हमारे देश में 200 शूगर फैक्ट्रियाँ हैं, जिन में करीब 2 लाख आदमी काम करते हैं, और इन मजदूरों को मिला कर उन की संख्या 10 लाख हो जाती है। उन का सम्पर्क जिन किसानों से है वह करोड़ों की संख्या में है जो बीज बँह पैदा करते हैं फैक्ट्रियों में उस से करोड़ों का सम्बन्ध है और प्राप इस की कमी के कारण जो तकलीफें सारे समाज को भोगनी पड़ रही हैं उस का एहसास सब को है।

पिछले वर्ष पहली बात यह हुई कि हमारे देश में एक पानिसी गवर्नमेंट की यह हुई कि ज्यों ज्यों हमारे देश में चीनी की जरूरत बढ़ती गई, वह जो हमारी फैक्ट्रियाँ हैं उन की क्षमता को कर्पेटिटी बढ़ाती गई। दूसरी तरफ उस ने यह ध्यान नहीं दिया कि यह जो फैक्ट्रियाँ लगी हैं उन की क्षमता बढ़ी तो उन को गन्ना भी मिल सकेगा या नहीं। गन्ना किसानों के घर में पैदा होता है और गन्ने के लिये जरूरत इस बात है कि किसानों को उन के गन्ने का उचित मूल्य मिले। प्राज हालत यह है कि हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने राज्य सभा में स्टेटमेंट दिया है, मैं प्राप को बतलाऊँ कि अगले साल क्या भयावह स्थिति पैदा होने वाली है, वह उन के बयान में अच्छी तरह सिद्ध हो जाता है। वह यह कि इस देश में 1965-66 में 67 लाख एकड़ में गन्ने की खेती होती था, लेकिन 1967 में वह खेती घटाकर 59 लाख एकड़ में रह गई। 60 लाख एकड़ के करीब। 59 और 60 लाख एकड़ के बीच में। इस का मतलब यह है कि करीब 9 लाख एकड़ जमीन में गन्ने की खेती नहीं हो सकी इस के दो कारण हैं। एक तो यह कि देश में वर्षा की कमी से, दूसरी बात यह कि जिस जमीन में गन्ने की पैदावार होती थी उस में भी कमी होती गई। यह किसी भय का संकेत करता है। वह क्या है ? एक जमाना था कि शूगर फैक्ट्रियों में अन्तर यह होता था कि जब कभी भी चीनी की कमी होती थी तो देश में गन्ने का दाम बढ़ा दिया जाता था, चीनी बढ़ जाती थी और जब चीनी ज्यादा होती थी तो गन्ने का दाम घटा दिया जाता था और चीनी ज्यादा पैदा हो जाती थी। लेकिन प्राज गवर्नमेंट की इस मशीनरी से चीनी की समस्या की हल नहीं कर सकती, क्योंकि प्राज देश के अन्तर जो अच्छे बीज प्रा गये हैं कई तरह के, जैसे महाराष्ट्र में बाबरा और दूसरी चीजें, यू० पी० और पंजाब में गेहूँ

[श्री काशी नाथ पांडे]

घान और मक्का तथा दूसरी चीजें, उन से किसान को पैसा ज्यादा मिल रहा है बनिस्बत गन्ने के।

पिछले वर्ष ही यह खतरा भ्रामा शूगर फैक्ट्रियों में। गन्ने के दाम बढ़ी मुश्किल से उन्होंने 2 रुपया मन रखा था। बहुत हल्का मचा तो उस के बाद 211 रु० मन तक गन्ने के दाम हुए बैस्ट में। लेकिन 211 रु० मन के बाबजूद भी जो फैक्ट्रियां चली हैं उन का समय आप देख सकते हैं। आप यह देखिये कि बैस्ट बंगाल में तो खैर दो ही फैक्ट्रियां हैं लेकिन 107 दिन का सीजन रखा गया था लेकिन फैक्ट्रियां चलीं 73 दिन, नार्थ बिहार का सीजन था 151 दिन का, फैक्ट्रियां चलीं 82 दिन, साउथ बिहार में सीजन था 91 दिन, फैक्ट्रियां चलीं 33 दिन, इसी तरह से ईस्ट उत्तर प्रदेश में सीजन था 149 दिन फैक्ट्रियां चलीं 90 दिन, पंजाब में सीजन था 184 दिन और फैक्ट्रियां चलीं 89 दिन, मध्य प्रदेश में सीजन था 111 दिन और फैक्ट्रियां चलीं 31 दिन, नतीजा यह हुआ कि जिस देश में 1965-66 में 35 लाख टन चीनी बनी वो उस देश में 22 लाख टन चीनी बनी और इस तरह से गन्ने का एरुजेज भी घटा। इस के साथ-साथ प्रकृति का भी प्रकोप हुआ। गन्ने को खेतों पर। इस लिए अगर गन्ने के दाम इतने न बढ़ाये गये जिस से कि किसान के पास जो कुछ भी गन्ना है वह फैक्ट्रियों में आ सके तो इस देश में चीनी का उत्पादन और भी घट कर 12 या 15 लाख टन से ज्यादा नहीं रह जायेगा।

मैं अभी मम्बई में गया था तो मैंने देखा कि पुना में इस वक्त जब कि गन्ने को कोई गुड़ या चीनी निकाल नहीं सकती, लोग गन्ना काट कर गुड़ नहीं बना रहे हैं और 3 रु० किलो गुड़ बिक रहा है। इस लिये चीनी और गुड़ वहां नहीं मिलता। आज सभी जगहों की हालत यह है। मैं नहीं समझता कि

गवर्नमेंट इस चीज को हल करने के लिये कैसे तैयार है। मैं इन चीजों की फ्लटकलवाजी प्रखबार में भी देखता हूँ। अभी मैंने देखा 60 परसेंट कंट्रोल और 40 परसेंट डिक्ट्रोल की बात होती है। पहले तो मैं इस के मतलब ही नहीं समझता। मैं आप को बतलाऊं कि या तो आप कम्प्लीट कंट्रोल रखिये या कम्प्लीट डिक्ट्रोल रखिये। दोनों चीजें एक साथ चलने वाली नहीं हैं जो लोग डिक्ट्रोल की बात कहते हैं वह इस के लिये आज बैस्ट पंजाब में और दूसरी जगहों में जहां पर चीनी बल्कि पैदा होती है वहां 5 रु० मन भी गन्ना शूगर फैक्ट्रियों को नहीं मिल रहा है। अगर आप समझते हैं कि आप पांच रुपये मन गन्ने के दाम तय कर सकते हैं और उसके बाद आप पर कोई प्रेशर नहीं पड़ेगा और आपको दूसरी जो चीजें हैं उनको दाम नहीं बढ़ाने पड़ेंगे तो जरूर आप पांच रुपये मन गन्ने का भाव तय करें। नहीं तो आप फैक्ट्रिज पर छोड़ दें कि वे अपना काम ठीक तरह से चलायें। आज देश में ज्यादा चीनी पैदा करने की जरूरत है। यह जरूर है कि अगर चीनी का डिक्ट्रोल होगा उसके बाद चीनी के दाम बढ़ेंगे। लेकिन जब चीनी ज्यादा पैदा होगी और गुड़ और खण्डसारी भी पैदा होगी तो कम्प्लीटीशन में इसके दाम घटेंगे। यह इकोनॉमिक थ्योरी है, इकोनॉमिक्स का यह सिद्धांत है।

एक दूसरी तरकीब भी हो सकती है। अगर आप गन्ने की ऊंची कीमत नहीं रखते हैं तो आप देखें कि शूगर फैक्ट्री और शूगर पर तो आप कंट्रोल रखते हैं लेकिन गुड़ और खण्डसारी पर बिल्कुल कंट्रोल नहीं रखते हैं। अगर कंट्रोल ही रखना है तो गुड़ और खण्डसारी पर भी रखें और कम्प्लीट कंट्रोल करें

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Let there be factories all around the sugarcane producing areas.

श्री काशी नाथ पांडे : मैंने देखा कि अब तक गवर्नमेंट ने इस बात की कोशिश की है

कि वह गुड पर कंट्रोल न करे। इस में न केवल व्यावहारिक कठिनाइयां हैं बल्कि राजनीतिक भी कठिनाइयां हैं.

Shri Sonavane: Only the interested people are asking for control of gur and khandasari.

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : गवर्नमेंट कहती है कि प्रमुक्त रिजन में इतना सीजन होना चाहिये। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसका आधाधार क्या होता है? क्यों आप सीजन फिक्स करते हैं और किस आधार पर करते हैं? मेरा ख्याल है कि आप इस अनुमान पर ऐसा करते हैं कि यहाँ की फॅक्ट्रीज को इतना गन्ना मिल सकता है और उसके बाध आप कंट्रोल करते हैं, प्राइसिफ फिक्स करते हैं। जब आप यह सब कुछ करते हैं तो यह आपकी मोरल और लीगल ड्यूटी हो जाती है कि उन फॅक्ट्रियों को आप गन्ना सप्लाय करें। मैं मजदूरों के हित की दृष्टि से यह बात कह रहा हूँ। मजदूरों के हित की लड़ाई मैं कर रहा हूँ। देश में चीनी की ज्यों ज्यों खपत बढ़ी है त्यों त्यों चीनी मिननों की क्षमता पिराई की भी बढ़ती गई है। आज पिराई की 33 लाख और कुछ टन की क्षमता है। इसका नतीजा क्या हुआ है? गन्ने की पैदावार घट गई है और चीनी की पिराई की क्षमता बढ़ गई है और जो कुछ भी सप्लाय उनको मिलती है, फॅक्ट्री वालों को मिलती है उसको जल्दी से बे खत्म कर देते हैं और जो फॅक्ट्री चर महीने चलनी थी वह दो महीने में ही बन्द हो गई है। आप सोचिये मजदूर का क्या हाल होता होगा उसको बारह महीने बच्चों को खिलाना होता है और काम उसको केवल दो महीने ही मिला है। उनको सामने आज यह बहुत बड़ी समस्या है।

शूगर का मसला एक ऐसा मसला है कि आप अगर व्यावहारिक चीज को सामने रख कर काम नहीं करेंगे तो एक खतरा घागे चल कर आएगा। भगले सीजन के बाद से जो स्थिति पैदा होगी वह आपके कंट्रोल में नहीं रहेगी वह आपके कंट्रोल से बाहर हो जाएगी।

बहुत से लोग कहते हैं कि चीनी के दाम बहुत बढ़ जायेंगे। मैं बता रहा हूँ . . .

Shri Shri Chand Goel (Chandigarh): The hon. Member has got about a dozen pages, and he has covered only two. Is there any time limit, because it is already 20 past 8?

सभापति महोदय : कितनी देर और लेना चाहते हैं।

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : तीन चार मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा।

इस वक्त गवर्नमेंट में जो चीनी को कंट्रोल कर रखा है इससे कंज्यूमर को बहुत तकल्लिफ है, यह मैं मानता हूँ। गवर्नमेंट ने जो भाव तय किये हैं वह शायद 1 रुपया 34 पैसे या 1 रुपया 45 पैसे किलो है। लेकिन आप देखें कि ग्लाइड शूगर, शफेद चीनी आज बाजार में चार रुपये किलो पर बिक रही है। फिर आप यह भी देखें कि आप कितनी शूगर रिजिज कर रहे हैं। पहले आप कहते थे 2 लाख 50 हजार टन पर मंथ और अब उसको घटा कर आपने 1 लाख 57 हजार टन कर दिया है। अब आप देखें कि लॉग कहां से अपनी आवश्यकता की पूर्ति कर रहे हैं? ब्लैक मार्केट से ही तो कर रहे हैं। आपने चीनी पर कंट्रोल तो किया हुआ है लेकिन आप का यह फर्ज भी हो जाता है कि आप लोगों को कंट्रोल रेट पर चीनी दिलायें भी। लेकिन आप दिला नहीं सकते हैं। प्राइस पर इसका मतलब यह होता है कि आपका कंट्रोल है भी और नहीं भी है। ये दानों चीजें साथ साथ नहीं चल सकती हैं, यह समय में भाने वाली बात नहीं है

एक माननीय सदस्य : होर्डर्ज को सजा दिलाइये।

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : होर्डर्ज बाद में में आयेंगे। फिलहास तो चीनी ज्यादा कैसे पैदा हो, इसको देखना होगा।

[श्री काशीनाथ पांडे]

जो गुड़ पहले एक रुपये या बारह आने किलो बिकता था वह आज तीन रुपये बिक रहा है, ढाई रुपये किलो बिक रहा है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : जागसरेपुर में साढ़े तीन रुपये किलो है।

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : हमारे मंत्री महोदय बहुत अनुभवों भ्रामदो हैं। वह शूगर की पोजीशन को भ्रष्टों तरह से जानते हैं। वह व्यावहारिक भी हैं मैं उनको कहना चाहता हूँ कि डरने से काम नहीं चलेगा। वह हिम्मत से काम लें। अगर आप समझते हैं कि कंट्रोल से या किसी तरीके से आप देश को मुनाफिब वामों पर चीनी बिला सकते हैं तो जरूर कंट्रोल रखिये, स्ट्रिक्ट कंट्रोल रखिये, मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है। लेकिन आप नहीं बिला सकते हैं। आज आपको चीनी को व्यवस्था करनी है। ईश्वर के नाम पर आप अपना हाथ खींच लें। अगर आपने ऐसा किया कम से कम गाली खाने से तो आप बच जायेंगे

श्री स० ध० बनर्जी : (कानपुर) : छः रुपये किलो बिकेगी।

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : अभी बिक रही है आप रोक नहीं सकते हैं।

आप देखें कि शूगर फैक्ट्रीज के जो मजदूर हैं उनको दशा दयनीय है। जिस तरह से केन शूगर फैक्ट्रीज से डाइवर्ट हो रहा है अगर ऐसे हो होता रहा तो थोड़े दिन के बाद आप देखेंगे कि शूगर फैक्ट्री में गन्ना नहीं आएगा।

श्री शशि भूषण बाजपेयी (खार गांव) : मालिकों की हालत बहुत खराब है।

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : फैक्ट्रियां नहीं चलेंगी तो मालिकों की हालत तो खराब होगी ही।

बहुत से हमारे भाई हैं जोकि भाबुकता में वह कर बात करते हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना

चाहता हूँ कि यह भ्रम शास्त्र की बात है। यह हिसाब किताब की बात है। इस में भाबुकता का सवाल नहीं चलेगा। अगर गलत में कहता हूँ तो मुझे गलत बता दीजिये। अगर कोई और गलत और बेहतर आल्टरनेटिव हो सकता है तो उसको बता दीजिये। मजदूर, कंज्यूमर, किसान आदि सब भर रहे हैं। अगर यही तरीका आपने चलाया तो न केवल शूगर फैक्ट्रियां बरबाद हो जायेंगी बल्कि कंज्यूमर और मजदूर के साथ साथ सब बरबाद हो जायेंगे।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : सभापति महोदय, मैं प्रस्तावों करता कि मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर यह रखा जाए, अर्थात् :

“गन्ना पेरने के पिछले मौसम में चीनी उद्योग के अपेक्षाकृत कम समय कार्य करने के परिणामस्वरूप उत्पन्न स्थिति पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह सभा सिफारिश करती है कि—

(1) गन्ने की कीमत चीनी के भाव को ध्यान में रख कर निश्चित की जाए, तथा
(2) गन्ने का भाव उसकी बुवाई से पूर्व ही घोषित किया जाए ताकि किसान को यह निश्चय करने में सुविधा हो कि भूमि के कितने भाग में गन्ना बोना है” (1)

सभापति महोदय, मैंने अपना स्थानापन्न प्रस्ताव पेश कर दिया है और इस पर धावण श्री रघुवीर सिंह शास्त्री जी करेंगे।

Shri D. N. Patodia (Lahore): Sir, Shri Kashinath Pandey has explained in detail the difficulties that arose on account of the shortage of sugarcane and also the diversion of land.

श्री सु० ध० खाँ (कासगंज) : सभापति महोदय कोरम नहीं है।

सभापति महोदय : कोरम बिलेज किया गया है। बंटी बजाई जाए। (Interruptions.)

19315 Short Working of BRAVANA 21, 1889 (SAKA) Sugar Industries. 19316
(M)

Shri D. N. Patodia: Shri Pandey has also explained,—

Mr. Chairman: The quorum bell is ringing. Let us wait.

Now, I am sorry there is no quorum. Objection was raised owing to lack of

quorum. There is no other alternative except to adjourn the House *sine die*.

20.25 hrs.

(The Lok Sabha then adjourned *sine die*.)