

(c) whether the Officers making the survey would be instructed to consult the Chambers of Commerce on the route in order to properly assess the economic potentials of the lines ;

(d) whether in deciding the economic feasibility the Surveyors would be asked to consider the beginning of the line from either ends, Bombay and Mangalore ; and

(e) whether it is a fact that a survey from Mangalore upto Udipi has already been made and, if so, whether it would be utilised for what it is worth ?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI NANDA) : (a) Presumably reference is to the Study recently carried out in Iraq by an Indian Team of Railway Officers. The study was only in the nature of a techno-economic feasibility study for a duration of 4 months in fairly plain country. The Apta (near Bombay)—Mangalore new line survey is a detailed traffic survey together with an engineering reconnaissance survey for a length of over 800 kms. The working season is also limited on account of the heavy rainfall in this area. Hence the survey for the new line is of longer duration and cannot be completed within one year.

(b) The new line is being considered to serve the coastal areas. At the time of survey, the most economical alignment after taking into account various alternatives will be arrived at.

(c) A detailed assessment of the traffic prospects of the region is always made during the traffic survey, after consultations with the State Government and other important bodies. No specific instruction in this regard is necessary.

(d) The economic aspect of the line from either ends is taken into account while assessing the traffic projections of the various areas the proposed new line will serve.

(e) Surveys were carried out in 1927-28 for a new line from Mangalore to Udipi. Some of the data of these surveys will be utilised during the present survey.

12.01 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

NATIONALISATION OF SUGAR MILLS IN U. P.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I call the attention of the Minister of Food and Agriculture to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon :

"The reported clearance given by the Government of India to the Government of U. P. to nationalise sugar mills in the State."

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI F. A. AHMED) : As the House is aware there has been a demand for nationalisation of sugar industry in Uttar Pradesh. The Government of Uttar Pradesh have been of the view that the Central Government only can make laws for the nationalisation of sugar industry. The Central Government considered the matter and my predecessor, Shri Jagjivan Ram informed the House in its December 1969 session that according to the legal advice available to the Central Government, the State Legislature was also competent to make laws with respect to the acquisition of sugar mills. The Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh was advised about this position.

The Government of Uttar Pradesh have however, maintained, on the basis of the legal advice given to them, that the acquisition of sugar factories for the purpose of nationalisation of the sugar industry would not be within the competence of the State Legislature even though such a legislation may receive the assent of the President. The Central Government has, therefore, re-examined the matter and has been advised again that the Parliament as well as a State Legislature are competent to make laws providing for the acquisition of sugar undertakings and for the State running the business of such undertakings. If such a law is passed by the State Legislature, it has to be reserved for the consideration of the President and should receive his assent. However, even after such acquisition by a State Government

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

the industrial undertaking or undertakings will be governed by the provisions of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951. The Government of Uttar Pradesh is being informed accordingly.

I would like to stress that the Central Government is fully seized of the all-India aspect of the question, and as was stated by Shri Jagjivan Ram in this House, a Committee is being set up to undertake a thorough examination of the working of the sugar industry in the country in the context of the demand for its nationalisation and the manner in which its problems, including the problem of sick mills, should be tackled. This enquiry is proposed to be undertaken shortly.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The Chief Minister, Mr. Charan Singh, made a public statement four days after becoming Chief Minister that he would nationalise the sugar mills. Now after the clearance has been given by the Centre and the Attorney General's opinion is that the State Government is competent enough to take such a step without the Centre delegating to it special powers, even after this, instead of taking a final decision to nationalise the sugar mills, this question was again referred by the Chief Minister to the Advocate General of UP, Mr. K. L. Mishra, as if the UP Government and the Chief Minister did not rely on the wisdom and advice of the Attorney General. Now, taking advantage of the legal quibbling—it appeared in the newspapers also—a final decision is not being taken. As to what the Chief Minister has stated to the press after the Cabinet meeting, I would quote from *Patriot* of 3rd August 1970:

“He told the newsmen that the opinion of the Attorney General was considered inconclusively.”

“He further said ‘The take-over of the industry involved great financial implication. We tried to digest the content of the official note of the Attorney General which was brought here by the members of the delegation (consisting of Cabinet Ministers N. D. Tewari, Jai Ram Verma and Virendra Verma) from Delhi.’”

In addition to this, some of the BKD Ministers, specially the Agriculture Minister, Shri Shiv Raj Singh, wanted the Government to be cautious and desist from any hasty step that might involve it in prolonged litigation with the mill owners. If any government worth the salt is afraid of litigation by the vested interests, be it the Central or State Government no decision for nationalisation of any industry can be taken. If this House was afraid of litigation, we would not have taken a decision, or this government would not have taken a decision to promulgate an Ordinance to nationalise the fourteen banks. We did pass that legislation in this House knowing fully well that some of the reactionaries would go to the Supreme Court or High Court and will try to undo this. But when it was undone, again legislation was brought forward and it was passed by a thumping majority and it has become a law and all those fourteen banks which the reactionaries did not want to be nationalised stand nationalised today. The Chief Minister of UP has made a public commitment within four days of assumption of office that he would nationalise it. Now, most probably under the influence of the vested interests of the sugar magnates, he wants to reverse the decision or take shelter by bringing in legal quibbling before the Central Government. May I know from the Minister whether a clear directive has been issued, or will be issued, to the Chief Minister to rely on the advice of the highest law officer of the country, that is, the Attorney-General, and go ahead with nationalisation, not worrying about what will happen in the Supreme Court or High Court? Let him nationalise the sugar industry and end the miseries of the cane growers, who are being exploited by the mill-owners, and lakhs of workers who are serving the sugar factories. Since the Chief Minister of UP has made a public commitment, I would request him, through this House, that if he wants to wriggle out let him quit peacefully and gracefully.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE (Monghyr): Withdraw support.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: My party has already withdrawn support.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : उन्हें आपकी सपोर्ट की जरूरत ही नहीं है।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : One of the Ministers Shri Genda Singh has resigned and he said at the time of his resignation : I will become a Naxalite but I will see that the sugar industry is nationalised. He is a Congress Minister and not a CPI Minister. There are certain members in the committee, like Shri Prithvi Nath, who are being influenced by the sugar magnates and there is a sugar lobby in UP. I would, therefore, request....

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री (बागपत) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य कुछ व्यक्तियों का नाम ले रहे हैं जो यहां पर अपने को डिफेंड करने के लिये मौजूद नहीं हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : बोलने दीजिये।

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : कैसे बोलने दें, यह गलत बात है। (व्यवधान)

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : Sir, he should be allowed to ask his question.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : दूसरों की बात भी तो सुनिये।

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : Let Shri Banerjee first ask his question. Then....

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : मैं अध्यक्ष महोदय से कह रहा हूँ।

SHRI J. M. BISWAS (Bankura) : Sir, he is not allowing.... (Interruptions)

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : यह क्या तरीका है? अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप से सवाल पूछा जा रहा है तब भी माननीय सदस्य ऐतराज करने लगते हैं। यह कलकत्ता नहीं है, पार्लियामेंट हाउस है।

MR. SPEAKER : I would request Shri Biswas to resume his seat. He is unnecessarily

intervening.... (Interruptions) There should be no threatening.... (Interruptions).

Mr. Biswas, I disapprove of your conduct.... (Interruptions).

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : Sir, it is you who can correct me. Who is he to correct me? (Interruptions).

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : The point of order must be heard.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि श्री बनर्जी कुछ लोगों का नाम ले रहे हैं जो यहां डिफेंड करने के लिए नहीं हैं।

MR. SPEAKER : Who are they?

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : उन्होंने श्री पृथ्वी नाथ सेठ का नाम लिया है, श्री गेंदा सिंह का लिया है, श्री चरण सिंह का लिया है। वे अपने आपको डिफेंड नहीं कर सकते हैं यहां आकर। उन्होंने कुछ एलीगेशंस भी लगाए हैं। 353 के अन्दर...

MR. SPEAKER : They are also Ministers in the State. He is referring to the Ministers. Unfortunately, he mentioned them by name. But it is all right. He was just referring to the policy matter and, in that matter, he heppened to mention certain names. But those were not allegations.... (Interruptions).

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : एलीगेशंस लगा रहे हैं।

SHRI N. DANDEKAR (Jamnagar) : There were definite allegations that these two gentlemen mentioned by him by name were bought by sugar magnates.

MR. SPEAKER : If that was the allegation, I will not allow it. Mr. Banerjee, you are making allegations against certain persons.... (Interruptions).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I am not making allegations. I mentioned the name of the Chief Minister. The name of the Chief Minister of U. P. is Mr. Charan Singh. Am I correct or not? Then, I referred to Mr. Genda Singh who was the Food Minister there..... (Interruptions).

SHRI K. N. TIWARY (Bettiah): On a point of order, Sir.

स्टेट गवर्नमेंट क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है क्या वह यहां डिसकस होगा ?

MR. SPEAKER: This is a Call Attention notice regarding certain decision by the Government of India in relation to a Provincial Government.

श्री भोलू प्रसाद (बांसगांव) : यह राष्ट्रीयकरण का मामला है। प्रान्तीयकरण का मामला नहीं है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : हर बीमारी की दवा राष्ट्रीयकरण है।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Sir, I have great regard for him. But because he is not nationalising the sugar industry, I mentioned his name.... (Interruption) I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether a clear direction will be issued now because they have taken a decision in the party meeting called the AICC and they have also taken a decision in the Cabinet called the Union Cabinet and there also they have taken a decision in the Cabinet called the U. P. Cabinet. I want to know whether a clear direction will be issued to nationalise the sugar industry based on the advice given by the highest legal luminary, the Attorney-General. Let them not bother about what will happen in the High Court or the Supreme Court. This House is supreme and sovereign. That House is also supreme and sovereign. The U. P. Legislature can pass any law. If something is done by judiciary, we are the sovereign people and we know how to counteract that. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether clear instructions will be issued and when the sugar industry is

going to be nationalised and whether a decision to nationalise other mills also will be taken soon.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मेरा निवेदन एक है। आपने घ्राणाकर्षण प्रस्ताव स्वीकार किया इसमें हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। कृषि मंत्री ने अभी एक वक्तव्य दिया है। अब वह जो जबाब देने जा रहे हैं उसमें इस बात को अवश्य स्पष्ट करें कि ला सैन्टरी की क्या राय है, ला ज्वाइन्ट सैन्टरी की क्या राय है और एटार्नी जनरल ने क्या राय दी है? क्या एटार्नी जनरल ने अपनी राय में यह भी कहा है कि हो सकता है कि मेरी इस राय को सुप्रीम कोर्ट न माने? इसके अतिरिक्त सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि जो सेंटर का विषय है, उसको प्रान्तीय सरकार पर क्यों थोपा जा रहा है? अगर शूगर मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना है तो सारे देश में आप क्यों नहीं करते हैं। एक प्रान्त के लिये ही यह बात क्यों होती है?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह (बक्सर) : सारी शूगर इंडस्ट्री का जल्दी नेशनलाइजेशन कीजिये।

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The matter was clarified by my predecessor. So far as the decision of the Government is concerned, the decision of the Government was announced by him in the last session of Parliament i. e., that Government have decided to appoint a committee for the purpose of studying the working of the sugar factories in the context of nationalisation. We stand by that decision. The question involved is whether the State Government is also competent to nationalise the sugar industry. Now there is difference of opinion between the legal experts of the State Government and the Central Government. We have recently obtained the highest legal opinion of the Central Government and the opinion is being sent to the State Government for taking decision in the light of the opinion expressed by him.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): What is that opinion?

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI: Will it be laid on the Table of the House? (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : दोनों रायों को सदन के सामने रखा जाय ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : एटार्नी जनरल और एडवोकेट जनरल दोनों की रायें टेबल पर रख दीजिये ।

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I have already indicated that I have no objection to place all the legal opinion on the Table of the House.

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI: The letter of the Chief Minister also.

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore): What is the opinion?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The question was whether a clear directive has been issued apart from the legal opinion. They should not bother about the legal opinion.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh): The Central Government is trying to avoid paying compensation.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: So far as Government of India is concerned, it has to be done not for UP alone but for the entire country. For that purpose a Committee is being appointed and when the report of the Committee is available, we shall take necessary action.

Now, so far as the opinion of the legal experts is concerned, we are sending it to the UP Government. The question of direction can only arise when the question is determined definitely by the Supreme Court. May I say that so far as we are concerned, we shall take action after the report of the inquiry committee is available to us.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur): Sir, it is regrettable that the fate of an industry is to be decided not on economic grounds or merits but for building up the political image. The proposal is being bandied about between UP and the Centre. The Chief Minister of UP, it appears, wants to use nationalisation to bolster his dwindling election prospects. That

is the impression we gather. The move is politically motivated, it is politically immoral and reprehensible.

The hon. Minister said that the Central Government is going to set up an inquiry committee. Why are they delaying setting up the inquiry committee? By now it should have been constituted.

Secondly, instead of waiting for the report of the committee, they have suddenly rushed to give a clearance to the UP Government that they can go ahead with the nationalisation. What are the consequences of nationalisation? Are we to look into that also or are we just to blindly rush into this matter? Several crores of rupees—about Rs. 60 to 100 crores will be required for paying compensation. From where will the UP Government find this money? All that money can be better utilised for renovation and modernisation of the sugar mills in the national interest by giving loans to the mills as recommended by the Gundu Rao Committee and other expert bodies. The machinery of some of these mills is very old. These mills are in a shattered condition and they are incurring serious losses. If these mills are to be taken over by the U. P. Government I shudder to think what would be the result.

Bureaucratisation will be there and there is bound to be marked fall in efficiency all round. The Central Government cannot manage their own public enterprises properly, what to talk of State Governments? It is my view that this will only multiply losses and the real consequence of all this would be that these steps will, instead of benefiting the cane growers, put them in a quandary.

Therefore, Sir; my basic point is this. The Central Government should inform the U. P. Government very clearly and categorically that it is against that State tampering with the structure of any all-India industry, the nationalisation of any section of the industry, which happens to be in that particular State. It is a bad precedent, I submit, if an extremist Government takes charge, say, for instance in Kerala or in West Bengal, and follows this precedent what will happen? Nationalisation of industry should be considered only on a countrywide, national, basis. It is the Central

[Shri S. S. Kothari]

Government which should have the power to take over any industry on an all-India basis, and purely on economic grounds.

But, in this case, what has happened? Due to the scare of nationalisation, the sugar-mills are not making fresh investment for expansion, modernisation, major repairs etc. This will affect their productive capacity; and this would also impinge upon the interest of the cane-growers.

There is one important point which I wish to stress in this connection. We find, that the sanctity that should normally be attached to the legal opinion of the Attorney General is being steadily eroded. That is a very serious matter for us to ponder and consider. The Attorney General is the highest legal authority, but it appears, his opinion is moulded according to the dictates or wishes of the political masters. What then is the sanctity of the Attorney General's opinion, Sir?

This matter is governed by Entry No. 52 in the Union List. It says:

"52. Industries, the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest."

According to Basu's Commentary, the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 and Sugar (Regulation of Production) Act, 1961, have been passed by Parliament under which the control of sugar industry is vested in the hands of the Central Government. Entry 24 in the State list refers to Industries subject to the provisions of Entry 52 of the Union List. The opinion of the Attorney General is wrong. It is the Central Government which alone has the power to nationalise any industry, if at all, on an all-India basis, on economic grounds. The U. P. Government has no right to do so.

I wish to ask why has the Enquiry Committee—which was proposed to be set up to study problems of the sugar industry, in the context of the demand for nationalisation—not been set up so far? Would the Committee be asked to enquire whether nationalisation is at all

necessary in the public interest?

Secondly, Sir, will the Central Government tell the U. P. Government to give up its idea of nationalisation of the sugar industry in U. P. because it is not going to help the country, the industry, or the public? Besides, would the Central Government ask the U. P. Government from where it would find the money of Rs. 60 crores to Rs. 100 crores which would be needed? What are the steps which the Government propose to take to evolve a national sugar policy which would avoid periodical imbalances that would lead to an increase in cane and sugar production?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: As I have pointed out, there is difference between acquisition and 'control' and 'regulation'. We would like to acquire property when it is expedient to do so in the public interest. So far as the right to acquire property is concerned, there are high legal experts who have expressed their opinions that both the State legislatures and the Central Government are competent to legislate so far as acquisition of property is concerned.

Control and regulation certainly are matters that have to be done by the Government of India; but here I would like to say, it is not because of any political motivation that we are going to do anything in this regard. It is for that reason that Shri Jagjiwan Ram had announced about the appointment of a Committee which will study the working of the sugar industry in the context of the demand for Nationalisation. I wish to say that that Committee is going to be appointed very shortly. I hope, in a few days' time, I will be able to announce the appointment of that Committee. I hope, when the Report of that Committee is available, it will be possible to take action not only for one part of the country, but for the whole of the country.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: That committee has nothing to do with U P. The case of U P is already decided.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI: Will he provide Rs. 100 crores to the U. P. Government?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : That question does not arise at all.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : The tragedy of the whole situation in our country is that in complete disregard of the results of nationalisation in our country which has not done any good to any section of the society, we very often continue to raise the bogey of nationalisation in one State or another of one industry or another. Looking at the past results, we find that nationalisation has not benefited either the producers or the labour or the consumer or even the exchequer. The producer is getting less ; the labour is not being made comfortable ; the consumer has to pay high, and the exchequer is the biggest loser, because these industries do not make profit at all, and the result has been that the capital invested in these industries has been completely stagnated without producing anything and without adding to the capital.

Coming to the sugar factories in U P, there has been the experience of five or six units which are under State control and the experience of each one of them is unsatisfactory. They have not been able to produce any good result. They are also in great arrears as compared to the private sector.

This particular trend of the Central Government of permitting a State to take independent decisions with regard to nationalisation is an extremely dangerous trend. I want to warn them to look into the consequences of that, namely that the process of disintegration will further be accelerated and it would be impossible for them to control the flight of industry from one State to another. The type of opinion that they are giving is extremely dangerous. I would like to tell them that this type of opinion should be completely withdrawn.

In the present world, there are two items which are very scarce not only in India but in the world over ; one is capital and the other is management. India is equally scarce in both of them. If we have additional money to nationalise these industries, then why should we not invest this money in other and much better products which are beneficial to the

country ? Why should we disturb an industry which is running and which is already producing goods and wealth and contributing to the welfare of the country ? Therefore, in the context of all these considerations, I would expect to get two definite and positive assurances from Government. One is that they should assure this Parliament that in view of the shortage of capital in the country and in view of the past experience of the nationalised sector, no further private sector will be nationalised and that all the money that is available will be invested in that sector which is more needed. The next assurance is that the Central Government will come forward with an assurance and a decision that they will not permit any individual State to function unilaterally and arbitrarily and that all these decisions with regard to industries will be taken by the Centre at the Central level.

MR. SPEAKER : May I invite the hon. Member's attention to one of the rules of procedure, namely that he may ask a question but not ask an assurance on a calling-attention-notice ?

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : In that case, let me re-frame my question. My question is whether the Central Government are prepared to give an undertaking that any decisions in future will be taken at the Central level and that no individual States will be permitted to take independent decisions ? Further, are the Central Government prepared to give an undertaking that in view of the shortage of capital and in view of the past experience of the nationalised sector, no further private sector will be nationalised, and that any additional money that is available will be invested in much more important projects ?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : On a point of order. I want to know whether the hon. Member is entitled to ask a question which impinges upon the powers of a State Government. If a State Government has got the power to take over an industry, how can the hon. Member ask the Central Government to give an assurance that the Central Government will go against the Constitution and

force the State Government not to do a thing which is within its powers? I want to have your ruling on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER : This is a Calling Attention motion on the clearance given by the Government of India to the Government of U. P. Therefore, it comes within that.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I do not subscribe to the views expressed by my friend Mr. Patodia regarding the nationalisation of industries. He is entitled to his own opinion. I feel that nationalisation has done good and will do more good to the country in future. Therefore, I am not prepared to give any assurance or undertaking that no nationalisation will be undertaken by the Government. So far as the sugar industry is concerned, I have explained the position that we have obtained the opinion and conveyed it to the U. P. Government, and it is for them to take into consideration either this opinion or that opinion.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Does it mean that the Central Government will permit every State to function independently in the matter of nationalisation and bring about the disintegration of the country? He has not replied to my point.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) : केन्द्रीय सरकार आदेश दे बिहार सरकार को बिहार की चीनी मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के लिये ।

श्री शारदानन्द (सीतापुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हैं मैं उत्तर प्रदेश से आता हूँ। वह अभाग उत्तर प्रदेश जो देश के सब प्रदेशों से पिछड़ा हुआ है और चीनी का उत्पादन उत्तर प्रदेश से ही सबसे ज्यादा करता है। आज इस सरकार ने उस उत्तर प्रदेश को ही अखाड़ा बनाया हुआ है, राजनैतिक अखाड़ा बनाया हुआ है। आर्थिक दृष्टिकोण से सोचना इन्होंने छोड़ दिया है और राजनैतिक उठापटक वहाँ हो रही है। वहाँ के मुख्य मंत्री ने गुप्ता सरकार को हटाने के बाद जब वहाँ बैठे तो

एक स्टेटमेंट दे दिया कि हम चीनी मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करेंगे। अब अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि चांदी का तमाचा इतना बड़ा तमाचा होता है कि लोगों का दिमाग बदल देता है और अब उनका दिमाग बदल गया है...

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : देखिए अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं फिर आपत्ति करता हूँ। यह चांदी के तमाचे की बात करते हैं।..... (व्यवधान).....

श्री शारदानन्द : आज इस मामले को ले करके सारे उत्तर प्रदेश में एक अनिश्चितता का वातावरण पैदा हो गया है... (व्यवधान)... आज किसान को कितने पैसे का उससे लाभ होगा यह उसको कुछ पता नहीं है और जितनी भी चीनी मिलें हैं राष्ट्रीयकरण के डर से जो वह मशीनें नई लगाना चाहते थे या रिपेयर कराना चाहते थे वह उन्होंने करना छोड़ दिया है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस राजनैतिक उठापटक को आप बन्द करेंगे और आर्थिक दृष्टि से इसके ऊपर सोचेंगे? अभी इससे पहले जगजीवन राम ने आश्वासन दिया था कि हम एक कमेटी बना रहे हैं, वह कमेटी जो कुछ भी राय इस बारे में देगी उसके ऊपर हम निर्णय करेंगे। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता कि आज उत्तर प्रदेश को जो आपने राय दी है कि वह राष्ट्रीयकरण कर सकते हैं तो क्या उसके साथ मैं यह भी राय दी है कि उसका ढांचा क्या होगा? किस प्रकार से उसका संचालन होगा, अपने हाथ में लेने के बाद किस प्रकार से वह चलाई जायेंगे? अन्त में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ जो भी ढांचा आपने दिया हो उसमें क्या यह भी करने जा रहे हैं कि इन मिलों को अपने हाथ में ले करके उनका प्रबन्ध उन मिल मजदूरों को और गन्ना उत्पादकों को देने जा रहे हैं या नहीं? अगर नहीं तो फिर आप क्या करने जा रहे हैं?

श्री फलरुहीन अली अहमद : दो या तीन सवाल उठाये गये हैं। सबसे पहले तो यह कहा गया कि शुगर मिलों के नेशनलाइजेशन का सवाल लाकर हमने यू० पी० में एक अखाड़ा बना रखा है, यह बिलकुल गलत बात है...

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : बिलकुल सही बात है।

श्री शारदानन्द : बिलकुल यही बात है, अखाड़ा बना रखा है।

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, झगड़ा वहाँ यही है कि पैसा कांग्रेस को मिले या बी० के० डी० को मिले... (व्यवधान)...

एक माननीय सदस्य : सी० बी० गुप्ता को गिराने के लिये यह ईश्यू बनाया गया।..... (व्यवधान).....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय, अगर इस तरह से आप सारी कार्यवाही में रुकावट करेंगे तो फिर मुझे आप में से किसी न किसी को नेम करना पड़ेगा।

श्री शारदानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह स्पष्टीकरण चाहूँगा, मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि हम उत्तर प्रदेश में अखाड़ा नहीं बनाए हुए हैं तो यह कहने का उनका आधार क्या है ?

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : इनका कहना सिर्फ यह है कि बी० के० डी० भी चीनी मिलों के नेशनलाइजेशन के सवाल का पोलिटिकल ईश्यू बना रहा है और यह भी बना रहे हैं। वह अपना फायदा उठाना चाहता है, यह अपना फायदा उठाना चाहते हैं। तो यह कहाँ तक उचित है ? अगर राष्ट्रीयकरण करना है तो करो, यह पोलिटिकल ईश्यू क्यों बनाए हुए हैं ?

श्री फलरुहीन अली अहमद : अब आपको समझ में नहीं आ रहा है तो मैं क्या करूँ ?

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : समझ तो आपकी सब प्राइम मिनिस्टर ले गईं।

श्री फलरुहीन अली अहमद : दूसरी बात जो आनरेबल मेम्बर ने कही वह यह '.....' (व्यवधान) '.....' नेशनलाइजेशन के लिये उन्होंने हमारे पास रेफर किया था और उसी वक्त से उस पर छानबीन हो रही है। दूसरा सवाल यह है कि श्री जगजीवन राम जी ने कहा था कि हम एक कमेटी बनायेंगे और जब उसकी रिपोर्ट आएगी तब उसके बारे में सोचेंगे कि क्या करना है, वह कमेटी बनाने के बारे में मैंने बताया कि थोड़े दिनों में उसकी एनाउंसमेंट होगी..... (व्यवधान).....

एक माननीय सदस्य : सारे हिन्दुस्तान की चीनी मिलों का नेशनलाइजेशन क्यों नहीं करते ? (व्यवधान).....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री हुकम चंद कछवाय, मैं आपको यह बता देना चाहता हूँ कि और ज्यादा मैं आपको बर्दास्त नहीं करूँगा। मैं आपको फाइनल वार्निंग दे रहा हूँ। आपने काफी तंग किया है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : आप भी तो हमको तंग किया करते हैं, हमको मौका नहीं देते।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको मौका दें तो बाकी सभी घरों को चले जाएंगे।

श्री फलरुहीन अली अहमद : हमने कोई भी राय या हुकम यू० पी० गवर्नमेंट को नहीं दिया है। हमने एटार्नी जनरल को उनकी अधिनियम के लिये भेजा था। वह जो उनकी अधिनियम आई है वह हम यू० पी० गवर्नमेंट को भेज रहे हैं।

श्री शारदानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन्होंने कोई ढांचा इस प्रकार का बनाया है कि उसको लेने के बाद किम प्रकार से उसको चलायेंगे ? क्या उसका कोआपरेटिव आधार रहेगा ? हमने मांग की है कि मजदूरों को उसका प्रबन्ध सौंपा जाये, उसके सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कहा ।

श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद : इस सम्बन्ध में हमने कोई राय नहीं दी । लोगल काम्प्यूटिस का जो सवाल उठाया था, उसके बारे में हमने जो एटार्नी जनरल की राय ली वह उनको भेज रहे हैं ।

12-40 hrs.

RE: SITUATION IN DELHI UNIVERSITY

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी इजाजत से एक सवाल उठा रहा हूँ । दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय के तीन लड़के—श्री विकास देशपाण्डे, विजय स्नेही और नरेन्द्र शर्मा—सात दिनों से भूख हड़ताल पर हैं । इनके मुद्दे ये हैं—एक—विश्वविद्यालय में 21 लड़कों को सस्पेंड किया गया है, दूसरा—श्री राज-कुमार जैन ने, जो कि विश्वविद्यालय के विद्यार्थी हैं, अपने इतिहास के पर्चे का उत्तर हिन्दुस्तानी में लिखा है, इसलिये उनका नतीजा नहीं निकाला गया है, तीसरे—ला-फैकल्टी में में 200 स्थानों को घटाया गया है, जिसके कारण विद्यार्थियों को भरती होने के लिये स्थान नहीं मिल रहा है, इस तरह से उनके चार-पांच मुद्दे हैं । इन सब मुद्दों को लेकर विद्यार्थी वहाँ आन्दोलन कर रहे हैं, सात दिन से भूख हड़ताल चल रही है । मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा कि आप भक्त दर्शन जी और होम मिनिस्टर साहब को आदेश दें कि वे इसके बारे में शाम तक, हाउस उठने के पहले, बयान दें । यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है, मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार उनकी मांगों को मान ले ताकि ये

लड़के अपनी भूख हड़ताल वापस ले सकें ।

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : Sir, it is an important point. I support the hon. Member. I request that the Minister must make a statement on it.

श्री कंचर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भी इसका समर्थन करता हूँ । वहाँ पर ला-फैकल्टी बन्द हो गई है ।

श्री रवि राय : 200 स्थान घट गये हैं, विद्यार्थियों को भरती होने के लिये स्थान नहीं मिल रहा है ।

MR. SPEAKER : I am not going to allow any more thing. He has already spoken on it.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय केन्द्रीय विश्वविद्यालय है । हिन्दी माध्यम से परीक्षा में उत्तर देने से अगर किसी को फेल किया जाता है, तो शिक्षा मंत्रालय इस दायित्व को ले ।

12-41 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

LAW COMMISSION'S REPORT ON INDIAN POST OFFICE ACT

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI K. HANUMAN-THAIYA) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Thirty-eighth Report of the Law Commission on the Indian Post Office Act, 1898. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—3826/70].

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER FORWARD CONTRACTS (REGULATION) ACT

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNAL TRADE (SHRI DINESH SINGH) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. S. O. 1526 (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 25th April, 1970, issued under Section 6 of the Forward