

[Shri D. P. Yadav]

- (i) The Uttar Pradesh State Universities (Removal of Difficulties) (First) Order, 1973 published in Notification No. Shiksha (10)/6334-XV-60 (61)-73 in Uttar Pradesh Gazette dated the 24th July, 1973.
- (ii) The Uttar Pradesh State Universities (Removal of Difficulties) (Second) Order, 1973 published in Notification No. Shiksha (10) 6335-XV-60 (61)-73 in Uttar Pradesh Gazette dated the 24th July, 1973.
- (iii) The Uttar Pradesh State Universities (Removal of Difficulties) (Third) Order, 1973 published in Notification No. Shiksha (10)/6336-XV-60 (61)-73 in Uttar Pradesh Gazette dated the 24th July, 1973.  
[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5603/73].

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICES  
OF PROFIT**

**SIXTH REPORT**

**SHRI D. BASUMATARI** (Kokrajhar): Sir, I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit.

11.32 hrs.

**CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO S.Q.  
NO. 368 RE. DEMARCATION OF  
MILK SHED AREA OF DELHI MILK  
SCHEME**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prof. Sher Singh.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE  
(PROF. SHER SINGH):** Mr. Speaker,  
Sir...

**MR. SPEAKER:** You may lay it on the Table.

**PROF. SHER SINGH:** Yes, Sir. I lay on the Table of the House a statement correcting the answer given on the 20th August, 1973 to Starred Question No. 368 by Shri Inder J. Malhotra regarding demarcation of milk shed area of Delhi Milk Scheme.

**Statement**

In reply to part (b) of Lok Sabha Starred Question No. 368 answered on 20th August, 1973 regarding Demarcation of Milk Shed Areas of Delhi Milk Scheme, it was stated that the areas for milk collection by Delhi Milk Scheme in Rajasthan under the Operation Flood Programme were the district of Alwar and Bikaner. The district of 'Bharatpur' in Rajasthan is also included in the D.M.S. milk shed areas under the Operation Flood. The word 'Bharatpur' was omitted in the reply to part (b) of the Question inadvertently. Part (b) (iv) of the answer given to the Question may accordingly be read as (iv) Alwar, Bharatpur and Bikaner in Rajasthan'.

I would also like to correct the reply given to parts (c) & (d) of the above question as under:—

"(c)&(d)" The Government of Uttar Pradesh are not in favour of Moradabad being included in the D.M.S. milk shed area under the Operation Flood Programme. It has been proposed that the district of Mathura may be included in place of Moradabad. This is under consideration.

**STATEMENT RE. STOPPAGE ON  
SOUTH CENTRAL RAILWAYS  
TRUNK TRAFFIC**

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS  
(SHRI L. N. MISHRA):** Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement regarding stoppage on South Central Railway's Trunk Traffic.

*Statement*

Sir, Indian Railways were regrouped into six major integrated zones in 1952. In course of time, South Eastern Railway was formed out of Eastern Railway in 1955. Thereafter, in 1958 the Notheast Frontier Railway was formed out of the North Eastern Railway. Thus to meet the growing needs of transport, some of the larger or outstretched Zones had to be subdivided to make the zonal units organisationally more manageable. Any regrouping or reorganisation inevitably entails adjustments and accommodation of all components and constituents in the interest of operational, administrative and economic compatibility and effectiveness.

The South Central Railway was formed mainly by combination of two divisions of Southern Railway and two divisions of Central Railway in 1966. From time to time, demands were pressed for the merger of Sholapur Division with Central Railway. This became more vociferous towards the middle of 1972 as local interests took an active part leading not only to relay fasts for about a week from 21st June, 1972 but also to occasional interference with train operations. Any reorganisation gives rise to problems of adjustment but the Government has been constantly reviewing the problems posed before them with a view to mitigate them to the extent possible. It was decided in 1972 that recruitment for Sholapur Division of South Central Railway would be made by the Railway Service Commission at Bombay and not the Commission at Madras. An assurance was given in December, 1972 on the Floor of the House that a committee of Members of Parliament of the area covered by this Division would be constituted to go into the administrative and economic aspects of the functioning of Sholapur Division and to make recommendations on adminis-

trative, economic and operational grounds. In fulfilment of the above assurance, it was decided to constitute a committee consisting of Shri Mohd. Shafi Qureshi, Deputy Minister for Railways and three Members of Parliament. The first meeting of the Committee was fixed for 1st September, 1973.

The recent agitations in Sholapur Division started from the 15th August, 1973 with hunger strike by outsiders and some railwaymen in support of the demand for outright merger in background of the appointment of the Committee. From the 29th August, the hunger strike was escalated to the stoppage of train running when railwaymen abstained from work.

Interchange of traffic at Daund Junction in Sholapur Division is vital for movement of goods between Northern, Western and Southern India. With the agitations over 10,000 wagons have been immobilised and nearly 70 trains have been stabled *enroute* on South Central and the adjoining Railways. Movement of essential commodities like foodgrains, petroleum products and fertilisers to deficit areas in Maharashtra, Mysore, Kerala and other Southern States has been adversely affected. Supply of liquid petroleum gas for industrial and domestic consumption in Hyderabad area has also been cut off. Apart from the effect on the goods services, passenger services have also been seriously affected. In three days between 29th and 31st August, 20 Broad Gauge trains, 14 Metre Gauge trains and 40 Narrow Gauge trains had to be fully cancelled and 21 Broad Gauge trains, 14 Metre Gauge and 3 Narrow Gauge trains had to be partially cancelled.

The first meeting of the Committee under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Minister for Railways with three Members of Parliament has already been held on Saturday, the 1st of September, 1973. An appeal has been issued by the three Members of

[Shri L. N. Mishra]

Parliament in the Committee that the agitation be withdrawn assuring that in their deliberations they will give the highest consideration to the demand and would try to get all the legitimate grievances of the railway workers redressed I join in this appeal to all the people of the area and the staff of the Sholapur Division to withdraw the agitation immediately because to continue it further will seriously affect the economy of the country

11-33 hrs.

STATEMENT BY MEMBER RE  
MONOPOLY OF EMI/HMV IN  
GRAMOPHONE RECORDS

अध्यक्ष महोदय श्री मधु लिमये ।

श्री मधु लिमये (बाका) मझे प्राप्त  
इसको पढ़ने का मौका दीजिये । नियमों के  
अध्यक्ष महोदय हाउस के सामने  
सब आ जायगा ।

श्री मधु लिमये : एक प्रार्थना गृनिये ।  
नियमों के अनुसार डायरेक्शन 115 के  
अन्दर इसको पढ़ने का आदेश है । मैं आपकी  
बात मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ लेकिन, मरी  
एक प्रार्थना है कि इसको आप प्रिमीडेट न  
बनाइयेगा । अगर प्रिमीडेट बनाना चाहते  
हैं तो मुझे पढ़ना पड़ेगा क्योंकि लिखा हुआ  
है नियमों में कि पढ़ा जायगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पढ़ना चाहते हैं तो  
पढ़िये । लेकिन मैं तो कनवीनियम के ख्याल  
में बहता हूँ ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आपकी इच्छा का  
प्रारंभ करता हूँ । लेकिन इसको आप प्रिमीडेट  
न बनाइयेगा ।

“मैं ग्रामोफोन रिकार्डों में ई०एम०आई०/  
एच० एम० बी० के एकाधिकार के तार में  
अन्ताराकित प्रश्न संख्या 1580 के । प्रश्न  
1973 को दिए गए उत्तर में औद्योगिक  
विकास मंत्रालय में उपमन्त्री द्वारा दो गई  
कतिपय जानकारी के बारे में अपना वक्तव्य  
समाप्त पत्र पर रख रहा हूँ ।”

Statement

In Unstarred Question No. 1586 on  
the monopolistic practices of EMI/  
HMV (Gramophone Records Company)  
answered on 1st August, 1973, I asked:

“(c) Whether the Company is  
using its monopoly position to exploit  
the artistes and dealers.” The Minis-  
ter's answer was

“(c) Government have no in-  
formation”

When I drew your attention to  
this misleading and incorrect reply,  
the Minister instead of owing his  
mistake offered an elaborate ex-  
planation which really made matters  
worse and proved to the hilt my  
charge that he is misleading the  
House

It was as far back as 28th November,  
1970 that on the receipt of a com-  
plaint by HMV dealers I had written  
a long letter to the then Minister of  
Industrial Development drawing his  
attention to clauses in the HMV's  
contracts with their dealers which  
were violative of the Monopolies and  
Restrictive Trade Practices Act;

The letter, after asking the Govern-  
ment to accept the principle of sup-  
porting Swadehi, said:

“(1) the Gramophone Company  
of India, company known as HMV,  
is a dominant undertaking controll-  
ing production, supply and distri-  
bution of more than 90 per cent  
gramophone records manufactured  
in India ;

(2) This Company has a net work  
of 1,000 distributors and dealers.  
This is an exclusive channel of  
distribution of which no use can be  
made by any new company. These  
dealers are required to give an  
undertaking in the following form:

“We shall not, unless with the  
written consent of the Company  
offer for sale, sell or assist in sell-  
ing or otherwise dealing in either