

(iii) REPORTED CUT IN RICE QUOTA FOR CALCUTTA, DURGAPUR, ETC.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : Sir, I have given two notices. I am grateful to you for having allowed one. You have sent the other to the Minister. That is concerning...

MR. SPEAKER : Do not mention the name. I have allowed that.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I did not allow it. Don't do it. You can speak only on the matter which I have allowed.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : The other one is this. According to newspaper reports (*Times of India*, New Delhi, dt. 13-5-73, page 5), the rice quota for Calcutta, Durgapur-Asansol belt, Darjeeling and other statutory rationing area, will be reduced by 150 grammes per adult per week from the third week of this month.

The cut, it has been alleged, has been necessitated by the Centre's failure to supply more than 25000 tonnes of rice a month, against the requirement of 35000 tonnes to meet the commitment in respect of statutory rationing areas. May I request your goodness to ask the hon. Minister to make a statement in regard to this?

MR. SPEAKER : Now I go over to the next business.

12.14 hrs.

RE. DISCUSSION ON PAY COMMISSION'S REPORT

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, about to-day's order paper, I have one submission to make. In to-day's order paper, the last item is half-an-hour discussion on the Pay Commission's Report.

We were told that the Finance Minister was unable to discuss that. He is not prepared to give any commitment in this regard. We request that the motion in my name as also in the names of others be extended to two hours. Let the Minister not commit himself this way or that way. Will the hon. Minister reply to this half-an-hour discussion? He may only say 'yes' or 'no' to the House.

I would only request you to make this half-an-hour discussion a two-hour discussion. We are even prepared to sit upto 8 O' clock. I would beg of you to allow two hours for the discussion so that both the motions might be discussed simultaneously.

MR. SPEAKER : I have no objection if they are prepared for the debate. But they are not prepared for it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : If they are prepared for half-an-hour-discussion why are they not prepared for a full discussion? What is the logic in that?

MR. SPEAKER : He is repeating the same argument today. I have discussed this with him. As I said, I have no objection, even if it is for the whole night; if the Government agree to it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am speaking purely logically. If the Finance Minister can reply to the half-an-hour discussion, he can reply to a full discussion.

श्री हुकम चन्द्र कच्छबाय (मुरेना) : ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार जानबूझ कर इस चर्चा को टालना चाहती है। पे कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के बारे में सारे देश में सरकारी कर्मचारियों में असंतोष है।

MR. SPEAKER : I want to know from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs the position of the Government. Shri Banerjee is asking for a full debate instead of a half-an-hour discussion.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH) : I had a talk with the Finance Minister on this point. As Shri Banerjee himself stated the other day, this half-an-hour discussion is on a different aspect. It is only incidental.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Sir, on a point of order... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : On that day I gave a lot of latitude. Now all of them are standing up again.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Sir, on a point of order... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : If he wants to make a submission, why should he say that it is a point of order? Let him say that it is a submission... (Interruptions)

[Mr. Speaker]

मैं तो हैरान हूँ कि हाउस में सात-सात, दस-दस मेम्बर शोर करते रहें और बाकी मेम्बर मुँह देखते रहें। यह कम कब तक चलेगा ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : The last item of today's order paper is half-an-hour discussion regarding request by Confederation of Central Government Officers' Association to the Prime Minister for a fair scrutiny of the Pay Commission's Report. This is exactly what we want. When the Finance Minister replies to the half-an-hour discussion he will have to say either "yes" or "no". So, why should he restrict it to half-an hour ?

MR. SPEAKER : Then why do you restrict it to two hours ? Why not ask for a full debate ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : That is what he has been asking all these days.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH : As soon as this matter arose in the BAC, I consulted the Finance Minister and I put before him the views expressed by some of the hon' Members in the Committee. The Finance Minister was of the view, as I mentioned the other day, that since Government are examining the report, it is premature to have any discussion here.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Then how was the half-an-hour discussion allowed ?

MR. SPEAKER : It is no use insisting on it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : If the Minister can reply to the half-an-hour discussion, he can as well reply to a two-hour debate. I do not understand what is the principle involved here.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : You can extend it to tomorrow by 1· hours. It is in your hands. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Don't connect it with the Half-an-hour discussion.

श्री हुकम चंद कछवायः सरकार जानबूझ कर इस चर्चा को टालना चाहती है। सारे देश के कर्मचारियों में उत्तेजना फैल रही है। यह रिपोर्ट बिलकुल निराधार है। इस में कोई दम नहीं है . . . (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please. You believe, by shouting everything is settled. That is wrong.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : You direct the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to convey the feelings of the House to the Finance Minister once again and to tell him that he must accept a discussion on the Pay Commission's Report.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH : I shall certainly convey.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I wanted to raise a point of order.

Just now, the hon. Minister said that this Half-an-hour Discussion is not directly on the Pay Commission's Report but it is incidental to the Report. Look at the wording of it. It says :—

"regarding request by Confederation of Central Government Officers' Association to the Prime Minister for fair scrutiny of Pay Commission's Report."

This is exactly our demand also . . .

MR. SPEAKER : This is not a point of order.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I have raised a very valid point

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Don't you feel that before the Government takes a final decision on the Report, the House should be allowed to express its views.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : The Government should hear our views. That will help the Government to reach proper conclusions. Therefore, in what we demand and what the Half-an-hour Discussion is about, there is no contradiction . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I am not going to allow anybody. There is no point of order. If you think by interrupting the proceedings of the House any useful purpose is served, that is wrong. You raised it last time and you are doing it again.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I again humbly submit to you . . .

MR. SPEAKER : You said, it was a point of order. It is not at all a point of order. Don't misuse the right to raise a point of order. You can make a submission.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : You have not heard me. Just now, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs said that the Half-an-Hour Discussion is not directly on the Report but it is only incidental to it. He said that the Government is examining the Report. But the wording of the Half-an-Hour Discussion is :

"... for fair scrutiny of Pay Commission's Report."

Is it incidental to the Report? Is it not directly on the Report itself? They do not permit us to have a discussion on it because it is under examination. But here is the Half-an-Hour Discussion on the "scrutiny of Pay Commission's Report". Is there any difference between "examination" and "scrutiny"? Is not what the minister says contradictory and self-defeating?

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola) : What is the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER : I have not been able to follow.

12 24 hrs
**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE:
 PROCLAMATION IN RELATION TO
 THE STATE OF MANIPUR
 AND
 MANIPUR STATE LEGISLATURAE
 (DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL—**
Contd.

MR. SPEAKER : We now take up further discussion on the Statutory Resolution and the Manipur State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill.

SHRI MOHANRAJ KALINGARAYAR (pollachi) : MR. SPEAKER, Sir, the approval of this House is being sought through this Resolution for the proclamation of the President's Rule in Manipur.

I rise to express my views on the Resolution. If the Central Government takes effective and energetic steps to improve the tourist potential of Manipur, I believe that Manipur, a beautiful place, would become a second Kashmir. This is not only going to attract thousands of tourists but it

is also going to earn us a large amount of foreign exchange.

Manipur is strategically located—in the extreme corner of the eastern part of our country. And unless the Central Government makes the people of Manipur happy and contented, the people there will not have faith in the Government, and being a border State, we need the support of the people there to safeguard and defend our borders.

I would like to know the real situation obtaining in Manipur. The Manipurians are the pawns in the political game of chess in the hands of the ruling Congress party. Instead of performing the duties of a referee, the Central Government has been partisan towards the ruling Congress party. The interests of the ruling party are always kept in the forefront. The Governor, Mr. B. K. Nehru, recommended suspension of Manipur Assembly. But this recommendation was not accepted by the President. As the Orissa Assembly was dissolved a couple of days before, they never wanted the Manipur Assembly also to be dissolved. The Government was a bit scared that the public opinion would go against them; the Central Government was scared of the scathing criticism that might come from all sides of public opinion if they were to suspend the Manipur Assembly while they had dissolved the Orissa Assembly. The Home Minister has already stated in this House that the Government did so against the advice of the Manipur Governor, to put an end to all kinds of political horse trading. I would like the Minister to tell this House whether the Governor was not aware of this while recommending suspension of the Assembly. If he were to perpetuate political horse-trading by recommending suspension, he would have to be removed from the Governorship without delay. Was the Governor of Manipur ignorant of the political precedents which took place in other States like Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh and Mysore? Either he should have been ignorant of these revolting political defections or he should have been influenced by the Centre when he recommended the suspension. On both the counts his action deserves severe condemnation.