

(c) A loan of Rs. 10 lakhs, repayable at the end of six years and bearing interest at 4 per cent has been sanctioned to the State Government. The question of granting a subsidy to the State Government, towards the rate of interest payable on that portion of the loan which is utilised for incurring outright expenditure or for granting advances to cooperative societies, will be considered, if necessary, when further details are available.

Smuggling of Foreign Exchange

1863. { Shri D. C. Sharma:
Shri Indrajit Gupta:
Shri Yashpal Singh:

Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether 11 persons of two branches of banks in Calcutta were held on the 30th August, 1963 in connection with alleged smuggling of foreign exchange out of the country;

(b) if so, whether any enquiry has been instituted into the case; and

(c) the findings thereof?

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be placed on the table of the Sabha.

12 hrs.

RE: COMPULSORY DEPOSIT SCHEME

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): Sir, may I submit that thousands of railwaymen have come to this Parliament to represent their grievances against the Compulsory Deposit Scheme and other grievances for your consideration and for the consideration of this august House....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I can hardly control Members in this House. How can I control outsiders?

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav (Barabanki): He is not asking for control.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Dr. Singhvi.

12.01 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

GOLD CONTROL ORDER

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The grievances against the Gold Control Order voiced by goldsmiths in Delhi and other places and the remedial action, if any, proposed to be taken by the Government."

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Gold Control Rules were promulgated eight months ago. This matter has figured in Questions and discussions in the House since then. There was a discussion at some length in the House on this subject in march of this year.

2. In view of the fact that a full picture of the working of this scheme is not before me, I am having this matter gone into and hope to have all the relevant information by the end of the week. It was my intention to make a statement in the House on the position of the working of this scheme after I had collected all the details.

3. My distinguished predecessor had written to the State Governments more than once about the provision of assistance to Goldsmiths who have been affected as a result of this scheme. The Union Government have so far placed a sum of Rs. 1.75 crores at the disposal of the State Governments for this purpose. It is per-

fectly obvious that the scheme cannot be put into operation without the co-operation of the affected section of the community.

The Delhi Administration is seized of the problem of providing relief to displaced goldsmiths in the union territory and has been in touch with the Delhi Swarnakar Mandal, the Delhi Prant Sonar Sabha and the Bhartiya Swarnakar Sangh regarding the schemes or measures which are under consideration.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to a point of order. The new Finance Minister has done well in taking the House into confidence. When we tried to raise this matter last time the previous Finance Minister, his distinguished predecessor, gave a categorical reply that the Government is not contemplating having a second look at this thing. It is perfectly his right to do what he has done. The point of order arises like this that when this, perhaps, appropriate step is being taken the House is the last to be informed. Shri T. T. Krishnamachari the Finance Minister is right in his anxiety to consult his party first. But yesterday we read in the papers that the Parliamentary Party,—and the All India Radio gave more importance to that report of the private party than the proceedings in Parliament—the Congress Parliamentary Party was told by him that the matter was receiving consideration. (*Interruption*). Mr. Speaker, let me conclude. I think it is a question of right of this House. When major policies we have been told are not under consideration, if Government reconsiders its opinion and its stand in regard to them, they have been told that the first announcement should be made before Parliament and not before a party. We say this is very important. Repeatedly you have told the Government also.

Some hon. Members rose—

Shri Tyagi: (Dehra Dun): Since he has referred to the Congress Party...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There ought to be one Member standing at one time.

Shri Tyagi: Since my hon. friend has referred to the meeting of the Congress Party, may I make it quite clear that it is a privilege of all parties to meet whenever they feel like meeting and discuss about important problems of the country. Recommendations, if at all made, are by way of recommendations to the Government which they might consider, reject or accept. But our freedom to talk cannot be curtailed.

An Hon. Member: Nobody objects to that.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, very often in this House such questions are raised that a Minister of the Government has announced a certain policy outside before he took the Parliament into confidence. I am not talking of this particular instance. But I seek a ruling from you on this whether we as members of our party are not entitled to raise certain topics for discussion in our party. What Shri Nath Pai pointed out was that the members of the Congress Party raised that question in their general body meeting. We will henceforth also discuss many topics which are of interest to us and to the country. Are we not entitled to do that?

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): I only want to draw the attention of the House and you, Sir, to this patent fact that we are entirely side-tracking the issue. The point that has been raised by Shri Nath Pai is very pertinent. The question is only this, whether a policy statement to be made by a Minister can be made to his party first before he makes it known to the House. That is the only pertinent point. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members should have patience.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We do not challenge the right of the Congress Party to meet and discuss things as best as they like. What we want to stress is that a Minister is responsible to this House. He may be responsible to the Congress Party also, but he is legally responsible to the House—morally he may be responsible to the party. Can he make a policy statement to the party before he comes to this House? That is the only point to be considered. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order order. Unless a Member is identified and recognised by me he should not begin to speak. Only one hon. Member should stand at a time. When I identify one the others must sit down.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): Sir, I wish to stress, if I may, the significance of the point raised by Shri Nath Pai. There is no question of denying the Congress Parliamentary Party or any other group in this House their own right of discussing whatever is agitating the mind of the country and offering suggestions in regard thereto. But there is a difference between discussions in a particular party in its own confabulations and the communications by Government through an authoritative spokesman of a decision, however tentative it might be, in regard to something which Parliament has a right to be seized first of all. At a time when Parliament is sitting, we find intimations in the press of the Congress Parliamentary Party having held meetings—it has every right to hold those meetings; it is very good that they do so—but we find intimations in the press—and the Minister having informed the Congress Parliamentary Party in regard to his intentions of reviewing a particular order. Now, that may be a good thing or a bad thing; in this case, a very good thing. But technically

speaking, as a matter of principle, the Minister should have come, first of all, to this House with his provocation, thus making a public pronouncement in regard to it. But he chose to go to his own party, to his own confabulation, to his own conclave, rather than to Parliament. This is happening over and over again, it is very wrong and I hope you will look into it.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse the point which Shri Nath Pai has made in its entirety, and I wish to add that an impression has been there in the whole country that the Congress Party is acting as an exclusive substitute for the Parliament. That has been the impression in the country for a long time. Now another impression is gaining ground, which is that the Congress Party is arrogating to itself the status of an equation with the State itself. These impressions are strengthened when the Congress Party acts, as it has done in this matter and has acted in such manner in the past.

Shri Haunmanthaiya (Bangalore City): Mr. Speaker, the point that has been raised by Shri Nath Pai is a very relevant point. The only request that I make to him is to look at it in its proper perspective. According to parliamentary conventions, parliamentary proceedings are not confined to the four walls of this House. Under the parliamentary system of Government, party governments are established and they function. Therefore, if any party, or its executive, whether it is the Congress Party or other party, considers parliamentary measures in its party meetings, that is also covered in a sense by parliamentary privilege. Of course, that is a matter for examination by you and I am not offering any opinion in this matter. It is a matter entirely for you to consider. After all, the Congress Parliamentary Party, whenever it meets, does only parliamentary work, and those meetings are always held in the Central Hall, with-

in your jurisdiction. Further, even the Minister has not committed himself to any definite policy. All that he said was that he will review the position. There fore, no breach of privilege is involved. Shri Nath Pai is becoming too technical. He has to look at it in the spirit in which party system of government and parliamentary system of government function.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order I cannot allow so much time and give opportunity to so many hon. Members. There must be an end to it.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I entirely agree with what fell from the lips of the hon. Member from the side of the opposition. Nobody can take any objection to the Congress Parliamentary Party holding its meetings. When such meetings are held, the Ministers show courtesy to their friends, the Members by taking part in the discussions and giving their opinions on various subjects that are being considered by Government. I myself have had experience of his, being the Secretary of the Congress Party for many years.

Shri Tyagi: Then come back to us.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): We are ready to welcome you.

Shri Ranga: After we became free, just before I left Congress in order to found this new party, I had experience of this kind. Even at that time, when I was asked by the press to give a resume of what transpired in the party meeting, I used to avoid giving them any information, because the party confabulations are supposed to be secret. But, unfortunately, our friends have developed the habit of giving inspired messages or reports, more or less authentic, to the press as well as to the radio, with the result that the press naturally jump at that kind of information and give it wide publicity. All that I can say is, in the interests of parliamentary traditions and parliamentary democracy,

it would be best for our friends not to try to hasten to go to the press and give all information to the press as to what the Prime Minister has stated, what various members have stated and what the Ministers have stated. I think that would be wrong.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): Could I say a word?

Mr. Speaker: I think, we cannot continue like this. I suppose, I have followed the point of order and the opinion on both sides. Therefore I do not think there is any need to carry further the discussion. That is so far as participation in this is concerned.

There is no doubt that we work on party system and every party has got the right to sit; rather, it will be essential for the parties to discuss matters and to take up those items that are coming up before Parliament. Every party does it, be it a minority party or a majority party, the ruling party or an opposition party.

Shri Ranga: But we do not get any publicity.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Why are you sorry for that?

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, there I cannot help Professor Ranga. That might be the situation today but some time afterwards it might alter and he should hope for that.

Some Hon. Members: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the point is whether parties have a right to discuss matters that are coming up before Parliament, to take decisions and then to give publicity to those decisions. These are the three things. So far as parties are concerned, if we were to have a fair assessment and, I should say, an approach that might be equitable, I can say that every party meets, discusses, takes decisions and sometimes we do find in the press that such-and-such party has taken this attitude towards a particular item or issue that is going to arise in Parliament. So, they cannot complain about that. But there is a fact that

[Mr. Speaker]

has been worrying me sometimes. The difference comes because whatever decision is taken by the Congress Party which is the ruling party and the majority party, is afterwards likely to be adopted by the House though there might be some opposition to it. Therefore there might be some objection at certain levels at that moment as to how far publicity should be given to the decision which has been taken inside the party meeting. That is the only question.

Shri Ranga: Publicity to what Ministers say.

Shri Nath Pai: You have very cogently summed up the situation so far. I am feeling very very constrained to interrupt you, but you will bear with me for half a second. The situation summed up so far by you is very succinctly put by you. The question that I have submitted for you to decide is not that they have no right to take decisions. They can take any decision under the sun possible. It is the conveying of Government's decision to them first before this is brought before the House that I raised. I have no objection to the Congress Party deciding anything. My charge is that both the hon. Prime Minister—now he is here; I did not refer to him earlier because he was absent—and the hon. Finance Minister who are showing such consideration for Parliamentary propriety and niceties, I think, were guilty of telling the party first what the decision of Government was. It is on this point that we ask for your ruling.

Shri Kapur Singh: That is the point.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I beg to submit that my hon. friend opposite is not factually correct. For one thing we never discussed these Gold Control Rules at all at our party meeting. So, that is completely beside the point. No discussion was had about this matter and I made no statement.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): CDS.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As regards the other matter, what I and the hon. Prime Minister said was that we were watching the position and we would make such adjustments as are necessary from time to time. No policy decision was mentioned to the party. In fact, as I have said in my statement, it was my intention before the House rose to take it into my confidence, or at any rate, to present the factual position of these issues which agitate the House and my Party. If hon. Members had waited until I made that statement the position would have been clear. But factually Gold Control Rules were not mentioned at our Party meeting. I will again repeat that neither the hon. Prime Minister nor I did announce any policy decision. But we are certainly bound to tell the Party that we are considering this matter. If that is a policy decision, I am afraid that cannot be helped as we function as creatures of our Party and are expected to tell them what we are doing about issues as these..... (Interruption).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I rise on a point of order.

The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Hon. Members are perhaps misled often enough by what appears in the press. Normally that is thoroughly unauthorised and guess work and sometimes such things which have not been said in the Party are mentioned. Far from a decision they were not even mentioned. My hon. colleague has said that there was no mention even indirectly, if I remember, of the Gold Control Rules in the Party. There was some discussion about the C.D.S. Of course, some Members expressed their opinions. There was no statement of policy at all except to say that he will consider it. In what form the newspapers gave it out, I do not know. But normally they have a habit of giving it out in an utterly wrong form. (Interruption.)

Mr. Hon. Member: It was given on the radio.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: On a point of order, Sir. My point of order is this. It is not the Gold Control Order, but other things which have been clarified by the Prime Minister, that is, the C.D.S. It means they have discussed C.D.S. outside this House. When in this House myself and many Members tabled short notice Questions and Calling Attention notice, every time it had been disallowed probably on the ground that the Minister does not want to make any statement. I would seek your protection and guidance—in those matters which are apparently coming in the newspapers about the C.D.S., that the modification is coming and the Congress Party was informed about it—whether the Minister can refuse to make a statement on the same subject on which he makes a statement outside in the Congress Party.

Mr. Speaker: I am not concerned with what happens inside the parties. Every party has got perfect discretion, perfect freedom, to discuss anything they like. I can go even further than what the Minister for Finance has said. Even policy decisions they shall have to take with the consultation of their Party. They can do that. But the question only is how far they should release those decisions to the press. That is the only question. *(Interruption).*

Shri Nath Pai rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What is it that he wants to say?

Shri Nath Pai: Government decision; not of the Party decision.

Mr. Speaker: Government takes decision on the basis of what the Party decides first and then the Government is to be led, to be

influenced by the decisions of the Party. That is how the parties work.

Shri Ranga: According to you and him, if a Party takes a particular decision, that becomes a decision of the Government. Then, all the discussions in this Parliament will be farcical. *(Interruption).*

Shri Tyagi: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Ranga: They should be open to conviction; they should be open to persuasion, herefore, they cannot take a decision like this.

Mr. Speaker: I can't comprehend how else the parties can work if they do not discuss it.

Shri Ranga: It is only provisional.

Mr. Speaker: Then also that comes to the same question.

Shri Ranga: It does not come.

Shri Tyagi: We must take their permission. *(Interruption).*

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. That comes again only to the question, whether what information is to be released to the press so far as those discussions and decisions are concerned. Of course, I agree with the Opposition in that respect that they should not go out as if a decision on such and such a matter has been given and finally taken. It ought to be only that such matters were discussed and some decisions taken by the Party. That would be better. The opinion that I have got otherwise is, they can freely discuss, come to decisions, formulate their policies and do whatever they like so far as their party meetings are concerned. Really, we cannot interfere with their liberty and their freedom to discuss all matters. The only thing is, and probably the Opposition also wants to take exception to that, that it should not be given out to the coun-

[Mr. Speaker]

try that Government has taken some decision in a particular matter.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): The Party can take any decision.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav rose—

Shri A. P. Jain: Sir, I rose several times, but you did not allow me an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ajit Prasad Jain.

Shri A. P. Jain: I want to say just a few words. There are various stages in taking a policy decision. There are consultations. Of course, whatever Party decides has a great value with the Government and ordinarily the Government is expected to follow the policies laid down by the Party. None-the-less, the Government can make a different policy. It is quite a different thing as to what consequence would follow. During these various stages we discuss things, we take tentative decisions and, I think, the Party has full right to take tentative decisions. But they go as recommendations to the Government and unless the Government takes a final decision on that, it does not become a decision of the Government. It is a decision of the Party. I do not see that there is anything wrong in giving publicity to the tentative decisions of the Party. What is objectionable is that Government should not give publicity to their decision unless the matter has been considered at the highest level. It may be that the decision may have been taken by the party, but unless the matter has been considered by the Cabinet or by the Government at the highest level and a decision taken, it should not be given out. But there is nothing to debar the party from giving publicity to its tentative decision.

Mr. Speaker: Probably I was not understood properly or I could not explain myself in adequate language. Shri A. P. Jain has given me that guidance. This was what I was saying that the release that is given to the press should not appear as if it was a decision of Government.

An Hon. Member: That never happens.

Mr. Speaker: That was what I was saying. Otherwise, I conceded that the party had every liberty to discuss and to take decisions.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): There is a subtle difference in the point that you have made. The party may take a decision, but the point is whether a Minister can say that Government are going to review or revise their decision or that they have come to this conclusion; he may say that privately in the party, but the point is whether that could be given publication to. That is the point which has been made, because when a Minister makes an announcement, it becomes a Government decision, and that should be made first in the House.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We should not continue indefinitely with this.

Shri Tyagi: I want to submit only one point. If any of the representatives of the Opposition parties lead a deputation and wait on the hon. Minister, then should the hon. Minister not give them any indication as to what is going to happen?

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): My point is this. A policy decision is taken by the Cabinet, or by the Cabinet Minister either individually or in consultation with the Prime Minister. Before that, it does not become a

Government decision or a policy decision of Government at all.

Now, the point is this. If there is a discussion like that in the Cabinet, then the hon. Ministers are under an oath not to disclose anything of what took place in the Cabinet. But, here we find that in the course of the party discussion, the hon. Minister discloses that this is the policy of Government or this is their decision, and if that is going to be published, it means that it is disclosed to the people even before the Cabinet has taken a decision. Thereby, the party is placing the entire House and the entire Parliament itself in a very difficult situation. Therefore, Parliament has a right to insist that no decision on any policy shall be taken by Government at a party meeting and that there should be no disclosure of any policy decision by any Minister, even if he be the Prime Minister at the party meeting. They may discuss among themselves in the party, but once the policy decision is taken by Government it should first be disclosed in the Parliament and not at the party meeting if Parliament is in session.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There are many Members who want to make their submissions. Therefore, there ought to be some limit now.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): I only want to point out one thing. Apart from the fact that this thing was discussed in the Congress Party or something may have leaked to the press, and apart from the decision of the Congress Party, the news has appeared about four days ago that an officers' committee has been appointed, and the names of the members of that committee have also appeared in the press, and news has also appeared in today's papers that the Gold Control Board is going to be abolished. If all these things continually come out in the press, do you expect the House to sit silent over what decision would be

taken by the party and the Government?

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: The spokesman of the hon. Member's party has already spoken.

Shri Hem Barua: I have to make one submission about your ruling.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने यह कहा है कि पार्टी के अन्दर इस तरह के विषयों पर चर्चा हो सकती है, बहस चल सकती है, मंत्री भी उस बहस में हिस्सा ले सकते हैं, पार्टी फैसला भी ले सकती है और मंत्री उस में कोई बात कहें, वह भी हो सकता है लेकिन वह चीज अखबारों में न जाए। अखबारों में वह चीज नहीं जाती है तो कोई झगड़े की बात नहीं है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह भी नहीं कहा है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : फर्क जो है, वह मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। पार्टी में कुछ फैसला हो, अच्छी तरह से बहस करें, नीतियां तय करें और फैसला ले लें कि सरकार यह काम करेगी, तो कोई एतराज की बात नहीं है। एतराज की बात तो तब आती है जब मंत्री मंडल के फैसले के बिना वहां पर कोई आश्वासन मंत्री दे देते हैं। और यह आश्वासन अखबार में निकलता है, जब कि सदन बठ रहा हो। तो इसी विषय पर नहीं, आन्दोलन के लिये भी आप का निर्णय और मार्ग दर्शन मैं चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी मैंने आप से कह दिया कि पार्टी आजाद है कि वह फैसले ले और सब कुछ करे।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : उस के बारे में . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय । आर्डर, आर्डर । अब आप खामोशी से सुनें । उस के बाद यह बात है गवर्नमेंट पर कि वह अपनी पार्टी के फैसले को मढ़े नजर रखते हुए फिर अपने फैसले । गवर्नमेंट के फैसले बाद में आते हैं । गवर्नमेंट का फैसला जो हो, श्रेय का जिक्र आयेगा तो उसी से आयेगा कि वह डिस्कलोज होता है या नहीं, पालिसी का डिक्लैरेशन होता है तो वह भी उस से आयेगा कि वह होता है या नहीं जो पहले डिक्लैरेशन हो पार्टी के, उन का उन को पूरा हक है । यह मैं ने उन से कहा है कि जो फैसले वहां हों उन को ऐसे न बाहर दिया जाय कि जैसे वह गवर्नमेंट के फैसले हों । वह पार्टी के फैसले होते हैं ।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There was no dispute on that. Parties can take decisions.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of clarification of your ruling.

May I submit that in the last session, the budget session, you yourself upheld a point raised by me about the 6-monthly statement on import-export policy? In raising that point I said that the House was sitting, the Government was about to release that statement to the press and it should not do so. You upheld the point, and the statement was withheld by the Commerce Ministry for two days, and was first made here, laid on the Table.

Mr. Speaker: I am still of the same opinion and my ruling does not conflict with that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The crux of the matter is this. On the last occasion when the Prime Minister announced to the House the resignations of 6 Ministers, we raised the point and he himself said that the resignations did not involve any change of policy at all. He gave an absolutely categorical assurance then about that. Now Government has disclosed to the party changes in policy before they were announced to the House when the House is in session.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think there is any conflict between what I have said and what he wants to say. If the Government wants to change any policy and the Minister has something in his mind or there are pressures from the party, they can discuss among themselves whatever they like.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardha): I would like to submit one thing....

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj: It is about your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Singhvi.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I would like to know who are the persons who have been entrusted with the task of reassessing the Gold Control Order what their terms of reference are and whether one of the terms of reference is the possibility of annulling the Gold Control Order and the abolition of the Gold Control Board. I would also like to know whether Government have come to the realisation that the problem of unemployed goldsmiths....

Mr. Speaker: A question cannot be so long.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: It is only a matter of construction.

Mr. Speaker: Advancing arguments, giving information and then deliberating over it—these may be avoided.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I would like to know who are examining this matter, what are the terms of reference, and whether they include the abolition of the Gold Control Board and the annulment or modification of the Gold Control Order.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is not a formal committee. It is a committee of my own officers, and I have asked the Cabinet Secretary to help them. Therefore, there are no formal terms of reference. It is an examination by the officials.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Is the hon. Minister aware that an all-India agitation under the leadership of the Akhil Bharatiya Swarnakar Sang is going on in the country, and they have come from Calcutta to Delhi? Has any assurance been given to their representatives that this matter is being considered with the utmost sympathy, and they should withdraw their agitation?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I understand that the President of this organisation has been in touch with the Chairman of the Gold Control Board and also with the Ministry, and that on every occasion he saw them, he was told that Government would do their best in the matter. I cannot recall that there has been any recent conversation with this gentleman.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शस्त्री (बिजनौर) :
क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि भारत सरकार को भिन्न भिन्न राज्यों से यह आंकड़े प्राप्त हो चुके हैं कि गोल्ड कंट्रोल आर्डर लागू होने के बाद मुनार और सोने के काम से संबंधित कितने व्यक्ति कुल मिलाकर बेकार हुए हैं? यदि हाँ, तो सरकार जो निर्णय लेने जा रही है क्या उस में एक यह प्वाइंट भी है कि १४ कैरेट के सोने के कानून को हटाकर २२ कैरेट का रहने दिया जाय?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The number of States that have accepted schemes for relief to displaced goldsmiths is about ten, barring the Union Territories. For other matters that he has asked, I would either ask for notice or ask him to wait until I make a further statement.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to know whether it is under consideration or it is being proposed that 14 carat might be allowed to go to 22 carat.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Even that is a matter about which I am not in a position to say anything now. As I have promised, I shall make a statement in both the Houses.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): What is the amount allotted to Kerala State for the rehabilitation of goldsmiths? There is a complaint that the amount has not been used.

Mr. Speaker: We cannot go to individual States.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): In view of the fact that there is a very large number of goldsmiths running into lakhs who have been rendered unemployed, is it within the purview of Government to consider putting a ceiling on the amount of gold to be held by a person and permitting the jewellers to utilise and work with 22 carat gold?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I shall certainly consider the suggestion made by the hon. Member.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): A few days ago the ex-Finance Minister stated in the House in answer to a question that the Central Government had absolutely no idea exactly as to how many people were thrown out of employment, and how many people had got employment afterwards. May I know whether the Ministry is now collecting information, or have they already some information as to the number of people who have been re-employed in the various schemes proposed by Government?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As I said, I would request the hon. Member to wait for my statement, because I expect to have this information, or some part of the information, when I make the statement.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhury (Barhampur): May I know if the officers entrusted by him with the work of reviewing the Gold Control Order are taking into account the results of its working in the perspective of the three objectives that were set forth by Shri Morarji Desai when he promulgated these orders, namely bringing down gold prices to international prices, stopping of smuggling;

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhury]

and conserving of foreign exchange? May I know whether facts and statistics have been obtained with regard to all these three things, and whether the question is being considered in the light of those facts and statistics?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As I said, we have not given them any formal terms of reference, but I believe, four of the officers being officers of the Finance Ministry, they must be cognizant of the ideas behind the scheme laid before the House by my distinguished predecessor, and they will certainly consider the matter on those lines.

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Government says it is being considered still. What further do the Members want?

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta.

श्री काशी राम गुप्त (अलवर) : क्या मंत्री महोदय यह जानकारी देने की कृपा करेंगे कि १४ करंट के जेवर बनाने में कितने प्रतिशत मुनाफा काम पर लग हुए हैं और कितने प्रतिशत बेकार हो गये हैं, और जो जेवर वे बनाते हैं उसके लिये उन्हें मोना कहां से मिलता है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह सवाल पहले पूछा जा चुका है और उसका जवाब दिया जा चुका है ।

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : कितने लोग इस समय १४ करंट के जेवर बनाने में लग हुए हैं ?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid over four lakhs of people are supposed to be goldsmiths. For me to hazard even a guess would be difficult.

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad): In view of the serious discontent expressed by almost all the Opposition Parties against this order and its working, would the Finance Minister deem it advisable to have a panel of Members

of Parliament including Members of the Opposition to advise him and make recommendations in the matter?

Mr. Speaker: It is a suggestion.

श्री यज्ञगाल सिंह (कैराना) : क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि गोल्ड कंट्रोल आर्डर की सख्ती की वजह से और इस मजबूरी की वजह से जिन स्वर्णकारों को आत्म हत्या करके मरना पड़ा है उनके परिवारों को और आश्रितों को सरकार क्या सहायता दे रही है ?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have to ask for notice.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): In regard to procedure, may I make a request? When some of us table a calling attention notice and others, short notice question on the same subject, and one of them has been admitted—either the calling attention notice or the short notice question. I suggest that the names of Members who have tabled notice of either may be clubbed in respect of the admitted notice or question. For instance, I had given a short notice question on this subject of gold control.

Mr. Speaker: I shall consider that.

श्री सरजू पांडेय : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा भी नाम है, आगे मुझे सवाल करने की इजाजत नहीं दी ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपका नाम है तो आप भी सवाल कर लीजिए ।

श्री सरजू पांडेय : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो दिल्ली में मुनारों का सत्याग्रह चल रहा है उस सिलसिल में कितने आदमी गिरफ्तार हुए हैं ?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Really, it is the province of my hon. colleague on my right. But I have the information. Two hundred and twenty-six

people were arrested till 3 P.M. yesterday; the trial is yet to take place.

tion No. G.S.R. 1417 dated the 31st August, 1963.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1703/63].

श्री राम सेवक यादव : श्रीमन्, मैंने एक विशेषाधिकार अवहेलना का प्रश्न दिया है। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ने भी यहाँ इसी विशेषाधिकार अवहेलना का प्रश्न यहाँ उठाया था—

(iii) a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 1422 dated the 31st August, 1963 making certain further amendment to the Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) Rules, 1960, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 and section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1704/63].

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मेरे पास आकर बात कोजिए। मैं देख लूंगा कि उसमें क्या किया जा सकता है।

12.42 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER CUSTOMS ACT, ETC.

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER GOVERNMENT SAVING CERTIFICATE ACT, ETC.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari (Sinha): Sir, on behalf of Shri B. R. Bhagat: I beg to lay on the Table—

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications:—

- (i) a copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962,—
 - (a) G.S.R. No. 1419 dated the 31st August, 1963.
 - (b) G.S.R. No. 1420 dated the 31st August, 1963.
 - (c) G.S.R. No. 1421 dated the 31st August, 1963.

(i) The Post Office Savings Certificates (Second Amendment) Rules, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1385 dated the 24th August, 1963, under sub-section (3) of section 12 of the Government Savings Certificates Act, 1959. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1705/63].

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1702/63].

- (ii) a copy each of the following Notifications under section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944,—

(ii) The Income Tax (Amendment) Rules, 1963 published in Notification No. S.O. 2508 dated the 30th August, 1963, under section 295 of the Income Tax Act, 1961. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1706/63].

- (a) The Central Excise (Nineteenth Amendment) Rules, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1412 dated the 31st August, 1963.

12.42 hrs.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

- (b) The Central Excise (Twentieth Amendment) Rules, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1417 dated the 31st August, 1963.

(i) In accordance with the provisions of rule 101 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya