

रियायतें प्रदान करती रही है। उदाहरणार्थ चालू अखबारी कागज आबंटन नीति के अन्तर्गत, छोटे और मझोले समाचारपत्र अखबारी कागज की अपनी आरम्भिक हकबारी में क्रमशः 15 प्रतिशत और 10 प्रतिशत की बढ़ोतरी प्राप्त करेंगे। सरकार विज्ञापन देने के मामले में भी उपर्युक्त श्रेणियों के समाचारपत्रों को उपलब्ध धन (वेटेज) देती रही है। उपर्युक्त के अतिरिक्त, हिन्दी के समाचारपत्रों को साप्ताहिक समाचार समीक्षा, ग्रामीण पत्र सेवा (साप्ताहिक), कृषि पत्रिका, विज्ञान पत्रिका और संचार पत्रिका जैसी अनेकौ सेवाएं पत्र सूचना कार्यालय द्वारा प्रदान की जा रही है। बेहतर सेवा प्रदान करने के लिए वर्ष 1981-84 के लिए संशोधित छठी "योजना" के प्रस्तावों के अंग के रूप में पत्र सूचना कार्यालय के कई कार्यालय हिन्दी भाषी राज्यों में खोलने का प्रस्ताव है। उपरि उल्लिखित रियायतें और योजनायें हिन्दी समाचार-पत्रों के विकास और कुछ हद तक उनकी परिचालन संख्या और पाठकों की संख्या में वृद्धि को प्रोत्साहित करेंगी।

Industrial Licences issued in violation of M.R.T.P. Act

4367. SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) during the years 1977-1979 how many industrial licences had been issued in violation of Monopoly and Restrictive Trade Practices Act and the details including names of the Industrial Houses, the amount of investment and reasons for violation and

(b) have Government made any assessment as to whether the said Act has curbed the monopoly trade and concentration of wealth?

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): (a) No case has come to the notice of the Department regarding the issuance of an industrial licence in violation of the provisions of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act during the period 1977-1979.

(b) The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission enquires into restrictive and monopolistic trade practices under Section 10 and 31 of

the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act. Since its inception in 1970, the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission has instituted 344 enquiries into restrictive trade practices upto 31-12-1979. 276 enquiries had been disposed of by the Commission by 31-12-1979 and in 129 cases "cease and desist" orders had been passed under Section 10(a) of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act. This is a matter which calls for continuing vigilance.

As far as economic concentration is concerned, approval of the Government is necessary in respect of new capacity creation or expansion of activities of, or amalgamation proposed by all undertakings registered or registrable under Section 26 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, and approval to the proposals is granted only where required in the public interest.

Statement correcting the Reply to Unstarred Question No. 197 dated 10-6-1980 re: The Area Irrigated and Area depending on Rain Water in the country

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION (SHRI KEDAR PANDEY): In reply to the above Unstarred Question No. 197 asked by Shri Bheekhabhai in the Lok Sabha on 10-6-1980, the following reply was given. —

"The total area in the country irrigated by river/canal projects (major, medium and minor) by the end of 1979-80 is expected to be 30.9 million ha. An additional area of 22.0 million ha. is expected to be irrigated from ground water sources.

The total culturable area of the country is about 140 million ha. Thus the area that depends on rain water is about 87 million ha."

It has now been noticed that the figure of the total culturable area in the country was net area. As

per provisional land utilisation statistics now available for the year 1978-79, the reply to the above Unstarred Question would be as under:—

“As per the provisional land utilisation statistics available (1978-79), the gross sown area and irrigated area from all sources are 173.80 and 48.48 million hectares respectively. The gross area irrigated from surface water sources only, was 29.30 million hectares. The gross area that depends on rain waters is thus 124.32 million hectares.”

12.00 hrs.

ARREST AND RELEASE OF MEMBERS

MR. SPEAKER: I have to make an announcement.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record without my permission.

*(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : I have to inform the House that I have received the following communication dated 14th July, 1980, from the Deputy Commissioner of Police, New Delhi District, New Delhi:—

“I have the honour to inform you that Sarvashri Jaipal Singh Kashyap and Chandrapal Shailani, Members of Parliament, regarding whose arrest your honour was informed were produced in the Court of Shri Prem Kumar, Metropolitan Magistrate, New Delhi, on 14-7-80. The Court admonished the said Members of Parliament and let them off at about 6.15 P.M. on 14-7-80 itself.”

12.01 hrs.

RE. TREATMENT METED OUT TO SHRI RASHEED MASOOD, M.P. WHILE UNDER ARREST

MR. SPEAKER: On 11 July, 1980, I had informed the House that a letter received by me from Shri George Fernandes enclosing a letter dated 9 July, 1980 from Shri Rashid Masood regarding the treatment meted out to him while under arrest, had been referred to the Ministry of Home Affairs for furnishing a factual note on the matter.

A reference was thereupon made in the House to the case of Shri N. K. Ramalingam who had brought to the notice of the House in May 1979 that he had been beaten by the Delhi Police and not given proper medical aid and asked the Speaker “to protect the rights and privileges of the Members and, at the same time, direct the Government to hold a judicial inquiry in this regard.”

This was followed up on the same day by a notice of question of privilege given by Shri Vasant Sathe, MP, under Rule 222. My distinguished predecessor Mr. Speaker Hegde had made the following observations on the matter:—

“There are two versions about the incident that took place on the 1st of May—one given by the Home Minister and another given by Shri Ramalingam. It is not the version of Shri Ramalingam that any harm was done to him when he was discharging any duty or function qua member of Parliament. In cases like these recourse should be had to Courts of Law. No question of privilege arises. This position is well settled. No consent.”

In the light of the above observations, there is no question of privilege arising in this matter or consent being given under Rule 222. Since, how-