

[श्री विनेश सिंह]

और 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 और में 60 फ्रीसदी से 62 फ्रीसदी आयरन और है, उसकी ड्यूटी 10 रुपये से 9 रुपये कर दी गई और जिस आयरन और 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 और आयरन और फ़ाइन्च 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 अन्दाज़ा 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 विनेश सिंह : माननीय सदस्य ने तो इस अवसर से फ़ायदा उठा लिया। अब मैं भी इससे फ़ायदा उठाने की कोशिश में हूँ।

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

जहाँ तक एम० एम० टी० सी० और एस० 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 कहूँ कि प्रदेशों में उनके जो नये नये मिनिस्टर बने हैं, वे किस पार्टी के सदस्य हैं इस बारे में वह ज़रा 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 विनेश 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 सिन्हा (मुंगेर) : मैं एक गस्ता
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. Kandappen, Shri Kinder Lal, Shri Srinibas Misra, Shri J. B. Singh, Shri Vikram Chand Mahajan, Shri A. Nesamony, Shri Dharma-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 Nambiar: 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 only 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 काम्पिटेंस 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 काम्पिटेंस 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 पढ़ता 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 प्राप दिव्ये

"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: असल 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 मुम्बई 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 यूनिजन 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 धाराएँ 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 धाराएँ हैं, प्रोटेक्शन, एरेस्ट, मंचिज ये सारी लिस्ट दो आइटम एक और दो के मातहत आ जाती हैं। इसलिए यह आर्डर फॉर्स 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 अयु 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 Namblar: 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 निम्बे : 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 बंधु लिंगे : 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 बंधु लिंगे : 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 बंधु लिंगे : 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 गुप्ता (दिल्ली सदर)
सरकार को डी० एन० कमीशन को डिस्कस करने से भागना नहीं चाहिये । अगर इस तरह से एम्प्लोयेमेंट को फ्लाउट 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 रक्खा । 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 रक्खा है उस को उन्होंने गैर-कानूनी ढंग से, अनियमित ढंग से वापस लिया । यह वह नहीं कर सकते हैं ।

मेरा दूसरा प्वाइंट ऑफ 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.

अब मैं यह झगड़ा नहीं कर रहा हूँ कि यहां दिया या वहां दिया। मैं हलकी बात नहीं कहूंगा।

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, अमेंडमेंट 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 आपसे यह गुजारिश है कि इस सदन में कोई भी व्यक्ति ऐसा नहीं है, मैं तो यहां तक कहूंगा कि राष्ट्रपति भी नहीं, जो संविधान, कानून, नियम और निर्देश से भी ऊंचे उठ कर मनमानी कर सकें। मेरी आपसे 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 अब समय बरबाद न करते हुए श्री सोंधी 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. Khadlikar (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 सुकूम वरह कक्षबाय (उपजैन) ।
आप रिपोर्ट को रंगा कर देखिये कि श्री सोधी
ने अपना भाषण भी शुरू कर दिया था ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री कठाय को कम से कम आज तो पूरी तरह साइजेंट 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 Nambar: 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