

against the request of the Government of Karnataka and similar requests from other State Governments as the entire estimated production of EC grade aluminium metal for 1974-75 had already been allocated to the various units for the manufacture and supply of cables/conductors etc against the orders placed by the State Electricity Boards

**CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO UN-STARRED QUESTION NO 3326 DATED 5TH DECEMBER, 1974 REGARDING ACCUMULATE OF MANGANESE ORE**

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI SUKHDEV PRASAD) While answering the question in Lok Sabha on 5th December 1974 an error had occurred in mentioning the name of the Steel Plant which takes its supply of manganese ore from Manganese Ore (India) Limited. The name of the Plant should be read as Bhilai Steel Plant instead of Bokaro Steel Limited in penultimate sentence of the Answer to Parts A and C of the Question.

After the Unstarred Question No 3326 had been answered on 5th December 1974 in the Lok Sabha it was noticed that an error had occurred in mentioning the name of the Steel Plant which takes its supply of manganese ore from Manganese Ore (India) Limited. It was proposed to issue a corrigendum but it came to the notice of the Department of Steel that the printed version of the Question had already been released. As there was little time left before the closure of the Session for a statement to be laid on the table of the House correcting the reply this could not be done during that Session.  
12 00 hrs

**RE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

श्री नरु सिन्घे • अध्यक्ष महोदय  
कार्य-सूची की प्रत्येक घण्टी के विषय में  
ऐसे में केवल व्यवस्था का सवाल है। लेकिन

अगर आप सबमिशन के रूप में सुनना चाहते हैं, तो उस तरह सुन लीजिये।

SHRI S M BANERJEE (Kanpur)  
In the order Paper it is shown that a call attention notice had been admitted regarding jute workers' strike. You must have read in today's newspapers that efforts had been made by certain agencies under the influence of the Indian Jute Mill Owners Association (IJMA) to see that the workers resume work without any settlement. That is why we tabled yesterday and the day before also an adjournment motion. We wanted the adjournment should be admitted. The call attention notice does not give opportunities to all to express their opinion.

I would only request you in all humility that this Calling Attention may be kindly converted into a discussion for three or four hours today.

MR SPEAKER We did it yesterday. How long will it continue?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore)  
We may have a discussion after the Railway Budget has been presented.

MR SPEAKER I will ask the Minister. As you know this has been coming up for the last days. The proposal is that the Calling Attention may not be taken up but after the Railway Budget is presented we can give them some time for discussion today.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI B SHANKARANAND) Let it be discussed in the Business Advisory Committee. We are meeting at 3 O'Clock.

MR SPEAKER Yes. No objection.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA If the Government says that they are not agreeable to a discussion and we lose the Calling Attention?

MR SPEAKER I shall try to see that time is made available.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour):** I have a submission for your kind consideration.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Please do not interrupt me. Please first listen to me. Do not develop this bad habit.

When we meet in the Business Advisory Committee the time for which is fixed 3 O'Clock, we can adjust the time.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** There are two things.

**SHRI S. M. BUSINESS:** They have started opening the mills with the help of the goondas.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We are not going to follow it in future. Since the very first day, the Opposition was very much exercised over this subject, so I do not have any objection to take up the discussion after the Railway Budget is presented. But this precedent ends today.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Because the Bangladesh News Weekly, a Bengali weekly published at Calcutta, was critical of the Chief Minister and the Congress Government in West Bengal, Congress goondas and anti-social elements have attacked, ransacked and smashed its printing press and although they sought protection from the local Government and I have written to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister, nothing has been done. Press freedom in this country is in great jeopardy and this is glaring example.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा मवाल अरेजमेन्ट आफ बिजिनेस के बारे में है। मैंने 28 जनवरी के लिये एक तारकित प्रश्न का नोटिस दिया था। वह प्रश्न इस प्रकार है :

"Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state:

(a) What are the details of allegations made against the Steel and Mines Ministry, Shri Chandrajit Yadav, in the letter dated the 29th January 1975 sent by an M.P. to the Commerce Minister;

(b) what is the wording of the notings alleged to have been made by the officer of the Import Control Authority, Kanpur in the Paramount Engineering Works case;

(c) the total value of the licences.. " etc.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am not allowing it. You can discuss it with me in my chamber.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माफ कीजिएगा, मेरे ए प्रोर बी को काट दिया गया है और मुझे बताया गया है . . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** You cannot raise such matters in the House.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** This is relating to the business of the House. You cannot disallow it.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** In the last session on this issue, a lot of heat was generated in the House. It is not a pleasant thing for a man like me to say anything about this Secretariat because I am here since 1967 and I know most of them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** This is not a very healthy practice. You can talk to me in my chamber.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** You are over-worked. Why don't you kindly ask the hon. Deputy Speaker to look after the Questions so that there is division of work? The Government is there constantly pressurising the Secretariat, which is most deplorable.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai):** This is point which ought to be considered very coolly by all of us—whether a question can be mutilated by the Lok Sabha Secretariat. This is an important right of an hon. member to table a question and to get it answered. Here the question of member's right is involved. There should not be any annoyance on the part of anybody if we table any question. Particularly, the Chair should be more jealous of our rights in the

matter. I quite agree with the Secretariat that the second part of the question could not have been permitted. But so far as part (a) is concerned, I cannot see any justification whatsoever for it is not being admitted. If a letter had been written by an M.P. enumerating certain charges against a minister, all those charges must be made known on the floor of the House. What is the difficulty about it?

MR. SPEAKER: In case of questions, we have followed this practice that if the member is not satisfied, he can meet me or address a letter to me. This is not to be explained in the whole House. I am not bound to do it. You are welcome to bring it to my notice and I will be most happy to sit with you and discuss it with you. The House is not the proper forum for it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: So far as meeting you in your chamber is concerned, you should be less generous about it, because we do not want the Chair to be influenced in the chamber to allow a question.

MR. SPEAKER In these matters it has always been the practice.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Secondly, for the benefit of the entire House and for the information of the other Members, it is necessary to be told in what respect the questions are being distorted or mutilated by the Secretariat. It must not be a private affair between one hon. Member and the Chair. It is the right of the entire House to know it.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: My question about Maruti was also mutilated. The Secretariat had no right to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: In the past, not only during my time but since the time of the first Speaker, this is the practice. Questions come, not in hundreds but in thousands and the office times, to be more helpful instead of rejecting a question partially, try to make it have an acceptable form.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: May I know what rule my question violates?

MR. SPEAKER: You can ask me in my chamber. Further, you cannot ask a question as to what was the noting on the file by an officer.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह पब्लिक इंटररेस्ट में नहीं है आप ऐसा कह दें ।

MR. SPEAKER You are putting it in a very bad shape.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): No chamber business. I have brought this to the notice of the Speaker in the House when questions asked by me have been mutilated. The matter has been settled here in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: It can be settled at the Secretariat level. Where a member is dissatisfied, he can bring it to the notice of the Secretary-General or myself.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I have raised it in the House. It has happened innumerable times. It has nothing to do with your agreement; it is a matter of fact which can be checked up from records.

MR. SPEAKER Browbeating the Secretariat is not a desirable thing.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर). महोदय, जो प्रश्न दे दिये जाते हैं, उन्हें सचिवालय देखता है, यदि प्रश्न में कोई बात आपत्तिजनक हो तो मेम्बर के ध्यान में वह बात लायी जा सकती है, उसकी सलाह से उसमें संशोधन भी किया जा सकता है । लेकिन मैं देख रहा हूँ कि श्री मधु लिमये जिस पत्र का हवाला दे रहे हैं, उसमें आपके सचिवालय की तरफ से यह लिखा गया है कि आपको कोई आपत्ति है तो 17 फरवरी तक लिख दें । अर्घ्यक्ष महोदय, अच्छा होता, यह बात सदन में लाये बिना ठीक ठंग तय हो जाती । मुझे एक शिकायत है, आप नोटिंग की बात कह रहे हैं, नोटिंग की बात में भी समझता हूँ कि नोटिंग के बारे में नहीं पूछना चाहिये, लेकिन आप इसका पहला हिस्सा देखिये . . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आपकी जानकारी के लिये कह रहा हूँ—नोटिंग का रॉले ही ट्रिस्ट दे दिया है। वह सही है या नहीं इतना ही मैं जानना चाहता था।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप इसका पहला हिस्सा देखिये —

“What are the allegations made against the Steel and Mines Minister in the letter dated 29th January 1974 by an M.P. to the Commerce Minister?”

इसको बतलाने की जरूरत नहीं थी—नोटिंग के बारे में हम भी पूछना नहीं चाहेंगे और मधु लिमये जी को भी जोर नहीं देना चाहिये, लेकिन सचिवालय ने उसको भी निकाल दिया। इसलिये शक पैदा होती है कि कहीं यह भ्रष्टाचार छिपाने के लिये तो नहीं किया जा रहा है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप एक दम ठीक कहते हैं, आप मेरे साथ चेम्बर में बैठ जाइये, सेक्रेटरी जनरल भी बैठेंगे, फाइल को भी मंगा लेंगे।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप आपांजीशन लीडर्स के सामने इस बात को रखिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले एक मेम्बर मिनिस्टर का भी लिख देता है।

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: The Commerce Minister is a master of evasion.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस पर चेम्बर में गौर कर लें।

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: You place it before the opposition leaders; I am prepared to accept it.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur): Why opposition leaders?

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Because it is a question of our rights. You do not want any rights.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Sir, I submit that the right of Members to ask questions is governed by the Rules that are laid down. It is always to be understood that when questions are disallowed, it is not done by the Secretariat but by the Speaker. The rules lay down what a question should not be; for example, it should not contain any insinuation. Questions are asked only to elicit information. It is under these rules that ultimately you decide. Whatever mutilation is sought is governed by the conditions laid down in the rule. There are about twenty clauses which say what should not be there in the question. If those conditions are not satisfied, the question can be rejected outright. We ask many more questions, much more, than all these Members ask. Not only the question of Shri Madhu Limaye but questions of Members from our side also are changed. Why? They are changed only to make them acceptable to you.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Under the rules

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Now if every hon Member comes to this House and says that his question has been mutilated, as they say—I will say it is amended—it will be difficult. They speak of the House but we also constitute the House. The rights of Members are governed under the rules and I think, when it is specifically mentioned, you are perfectly right and within the rules prescribed by this House to amend a question so as to make it acceptable or to reject the entire question. That should be absolutely clear to the House.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Meet the Opposition leaders... (Interruptions)

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अगर हमारे कांग्रेस के मेम्बर अपना चाहते हैं तो उनको भी बुला लिया जाय। और उनको क्लायर है तो उनको भी बुलाया जाय, हम अपने सामने बैठ कर इसको तय करेंगे, इसमें हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है।

**SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul):** If it is the question of right of Members, we are all with Madhuji and we will not compromise on that. But, on the one side, there is the question of right of Members and, on the other, there is a tendency to come out with untrammelled and wild allegations. If a balance has to be struck, I draw your attention to rule 41(2)(x) which governs the restrictions placed on questions to be asked. Rule 41(2)(x), *inter alia*, says:

"It shall not make or imply"—  
even by implication—

"a charge of a personal character;"

श्री भव लिमये : कोई व्यक्तिगत जीवन सम्बन्धी आरोप नहीं है, सार्वजनिक मामला है ।

**SHRI N. K. P. SALVE:** That is the *sine quo non*, the indispensable condition. It has to be satisfied before a question can be admitted. In terms of rule 43 it is incumbent upon you to admit only such questions as fall within the postulates of the rules.

Now, whatever may be the right, a whole lot of statements are being made and it is said that it is the right of the Member and that you are not above the rules. It is blowing hot and cold in the same breath. If you are not above the rules for any other matter which suits them, you cannot be above the rules in this matter when a question is asked.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** That is what I am saying. That is precisely my point... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Was it not the duty of your office to inform the hon. Member that a particular portion of his question was being disallowed under a particular rule? Why was it not the pleasure of your office to do so? Why is it not necessary to cite the rule?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I shall make it very clear. Many questions come, not hundreds but thousands. If you try to bring it up in the House as to what part was deleted, what part mutilated and what part changed, there will be no end to it. After all, all this examination and scrutiny is all in the name of the Speaker. As you know, if a Member is not satisfied, he can write to the Speaker. The Speaker can call for the file and satisfy the Member. But this is not the proper practice to come every time to the House. A Member writes a letter to the Minister and the Minister replies to that Member. Then, the Member asks what was the letter written by the Member to the Minister, what was the reply he sent, what was the noting and all that. The Minister has already replied to the Member.

After all, three parts, rather four parts, of the Question were admitted.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Why did you not cite the rule ?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Don't be so touchy over these matters.

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD** Under rule 43(1), you can disallow any question or a part thereof. The practice is that your Secretariat informs the Member that his question is disallowed. If the Member wants further details, he can meet the Speaker and ask him as to why his question has been disallowed. There are hundred questions disallowed every day and also amended and mutilated. If you, every day, bring it in the House as to why they have been disallowed, this will be the only job of the House, nothing else.

श्री सच्चु लिमये : मैंने सुझाव दिया था, आपने माना था कि विरोधी बलों के साथ आप विचार विमर्श करेंगे ।

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Let there be a meeting, let have a full discussion on it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** No more discussion on it. Such matters should not be brought in the House. You can discuss it with me. I will call the Secretary-General and we can sit together and discuss it. I am not allowing any further discussion on it. Papers to be laid.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Sir, three labour leaders have been shot dead in Dhanbad....

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** I have given an adjournment motion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** No adjournment motion; I did not allow it.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE** I have already given notice under rule 377. I have also given a Call Attention Notice. Three labour leaders have been shot dead in Dhanbad and two of them belong to the Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. I ask the Labour Minister to make a statement. It is a Central subject; it is a public undertaking.. *(Interruptions)*

**MR. SPEAKER:** Papers to be laid.

12.24 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

MERCHANT SHIPPING (CREW ACCOMMODATION) AMENDMENT RULES, 1974, REVIEW & ANNUAL REPORT OF COCHIN SHIPYARD LTD. FOR 1973-74 AND ANNUAL ACCOUNTS OF KANDLA PORT TRUST FOR 1972-73

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): I beg to lay on the Table

(1) A copy of the Merchant Shipping (Crew Accommodation) Amendment Rules, 1974 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1390 in Gazette of India dated the 28th December, 1974, under sub-section (3) of section 458 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 [Placed in Library. See No. LT-8926/75].

(2) A copy each of the following papers (Hindi and English versions)

under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956:—

- (i) Review by the Government on the working of the Cochin Shipyards Limited, Cochin, for the year 1973-74.
- (ii) Annual Report of the Cochin Shipyards Limited, Cochin, for the year 1973-74 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-8927/75].

(3) A copy of the Annual Accounts (Hindi and English versions) of the Kandla Port Trust for the year 1972-73 and the Audit Report thereon, under sub-section (2) of section 103 of the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-8927/75].

#### NOTIFICATIONS UNDER MINES AND MINERALS (REGULATION AND DEVELOPMENT) ACT, 1957

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI SUKHDEV PRASAD): ( I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (1) of section 28 of the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957.—

- (i) The Mineral Concession (Fourth Amendment) Rules, 1974, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1331 in Gazette of India dated the 14th December, 1974.
- (ii) The Mineral Concession (Third Amendment) Rules, 1974 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1332 in Gazette of India dated the 14th December, 1974.
- (iii) The Mineral Concession (Second Amendment) Rules, 1974, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1333 in