

[Mr. Speaker]

Members for the period indicated against their names:

- (1) Shri Shankarrao Shantaram More—
14th September to 21st September, 1963 (Fifth Session).
18th November to 21st December, 1963 (Sixth Session).
- (2) Raja P. C. Deo Bhanj—
13th August to 21st September, 1963 (Fifth Session).
- (3) Shri Lal Shyamshah—
13th August to 21st September, 1963 (Fifth Session).
- (4) Shri Bholaram Paradhi—
13th August to 19th September, 1963 (Fifth Session).
- (5) Shri Jai Bahadur Singh—
18th November to 10th December, 1963 (Sixth Session).
- (6) Shri Dasaratha Deb—
18th November to 21st December, 1963 (Sixth Session).
- (7) Shri Ghyasuddin Ahmad—
18th November to 21st December, 1963 (Sixth Session).

I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Members will be informed accordingly.

12.27 hrs.

STATEMENT REGARDING ARREST OF MEMBER

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajarna-

vis): With your permission I would like to make a statement on behalf of Shri Nanda. When the Speaker announced to the House on 12th December, 1963, the arrest of Shri Mauriya, a member of the House, under sub-rule (5) of Rule 41 of the Defence of India Rules, some members had expressed concern and asked for full facts of the case which had led to the arrest of this Member. I have since ascertained from the Government of Uttar Pradesh the circumstances leading to his arrest.

2. According to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, for the last several years Shri Mauriya had been indulging in a campaign of hatred amongst the Scheduled Castes and the Muslims against the members of the other castes among the Hindus. In the past also action had to be taken by the Government of Uttar Pradesh when he tried to foment trouble. On 27th August, 1957 he was convicted under Section 107/117 Criminal Procedure Code by the City Magistrate, Aligarh and was bound down to maintain the peace through a personal bond of Rs. 1,000. In particular, the speeches delivered by him in April-May this year were considered highly offensive by the Government of Uttar Pradesh. In these speeches, he threatened subversion of Government and declared that there would be a mass rising in a couple of years and that there would be a rebellion any day to liberate the Scheduled Castes from centuries of slavery. The tone and contents of the speeches were alleged to be such as to excite disaffection towards Government established by law in India and to promote feelings of enmity and hatred between different communities. In the opinion of the Government of Uttar Pradesh they attract the definition of "prejudicial act" given in clauses (e) and (g) of sub-rule (6) of Rule 35 of the Defence of India Rules. The Government of Uttar Pradesh could have even detained him under clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of

Rule 30 of the Defence of India Rules, but in order that the member concerned could have a chance to explain his position and defend himself before a judicial forum, he was arrested for an offence under clause (c) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 41 of the Defence of India Rules. The State Government took this decision after a great deal of consideration in the light of the speeches and activities of Shri Mauriya over a fairly long period.

3. The offence for which he has been arrested being cognizable, no warrant from a Magistrate was necessary. Hence, a Police officer was deputed by the Superintendent of Police Allahabad, to effect his arrest in Delhi with the help of the Delhi Police.

4. As regards the lapse of time between the date of delivery of the speech by Shri Mauriya and the date of his arrest, it is understood that it took some time for the State Government to obtain verbatim reports of Shri Mauriya's speeches and to ascertain whether adequate evidence was available to prove before a Court of Law that these speeches were actually delivered. Legal advice had to be taken at every stage. So, the decision to prosecute could not be taken earlier than August. The State Government are finding out the reason why investigation took such a long time.

5. Enquiries have also been made by Government into the complaint about the misbehaviour of the Delhi Police towards Shri Mauriya. There is no substance in this allegation. Shri Mauriya did not also complain to the Delhi Magistrate before whom he was produced about any misbehaviour by the Delhi Police.

6. After his arrest in Delhi Shri Mauriya was produced before the court at Allahabad which remanded him to jail, where he has been given the Superior Class befitting his posi-

tion as a Member of Parliament. The District Magistrate, Allahabad has been instructed by the State Government to ensure that Shri Mauriya gets all facilities that are due to a prisoner lodged in the Superior Class. The charge-sheet has also been submitted to the Court. The case is now *subjudice*.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर यह बयान हिन्दुस्तानी में भी दे दिया जाये, तो हम भी उस को समझ जायें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सारा हिन्दुस्तानी में देना बड़ा मुश्किल है ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : यह बड़े महत्व की बात है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने कल भी देखा था कि स्वामी जी अंग्रेजी बहुत अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : इसका ग्रंथ क्या हुआ ? वास्तविक बातों को तो सुनाया नहीं जा रहा है । मैं अंग्रेजी समझता हूँ या नहीं समझता हूँ, इस को जाने दीजिये । मंत्री महोदय जैसे अंग्रेजी बोलते हैं, वैसे ही वह हिन्दी भी बोल सकते हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हमारा मकसद यह है कि जो कुछ यहां पर कहा जाये, उस को मेम्बर साहबान समझ सकें । अगर कोई मेम्बर साहब समझ जायें, लेकिन फिर भी इस बात पर जोर दें कि उन को हिन्दी में समझाया जाये, और यह भी कहें कि वह समझते हैं या नहीं, इस का कोई सम्बन्ध ही नहीं है, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है ।

मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है कि माननीय सदस्य, श्री मोर्य, पहले भी ऐसी तक्रारें करते रहे थे और उन को पहले एक दफा सजा ही चुकी थी । बाद में उन्होंने ऐसी तक्रारें कीं, जिन में उन्होंने हरिजनों को दूसरों के खिलाफ भड़काया । इसलिए यू० पी० सरकार ने यह

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

मुनासिब समझा कि उन को गिरफ्तार किया जाये और उन पर मुकदमा चलाया जाये। इस सिलसिले में तहकीकात करने और कानूनी राय लेने में बहुत अर्सा लग गया, इसलिए उन को गिरफ्तार करने और उन पर मुकदमा चलाने में देरी हो गई। लेकिन तहकीकात में इतनी देरी क्यों हो गई, राज्य सरकार इस की जांच-पड़ताल करेगी।

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Is it proper to mention what he had done in the past, long before he was elected to this House, for which he had already been convicted and he paid the penalty? Are we to understand that, as the previous Government used to have its own dossiers against so many of us, merely because the Government has got something against Shri Maurya, a Member of Parliament, it was justified in allowing his arrest to be made without any warrant at all? The Minister said, I think, that he was arrested here without warrant.

Mr. Speaker: If the offence is cognizable, then without warrant he may be arrested.

Shri Ranga: My earlier point has to be answered. Why should he mention all those facts?

Mr. Speaker: The Central Government was asked to give the report, and the Minister says that the Uttar Pradesh Government has given this report. He has only read out what the Uttar Pradesh Government has supplied to the Centre.

Shri Ranga: Are they going to quote it?

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): It is clear from the Statement that of the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs that the arrest of the hon. Member of this House was made while he was on his way to attend the sessions of this House,

and also that it was ill timed and it was considerably delayed. We would like to know whether he has made any efforts to satisfy himself whether he was not greatly delayed and also whether the speeches were actually made after he was elected to this House?

Mr. Speaker: It was never disputed that his arrest was made in his house and not when he was on his way to the Parliament House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): If I remember aright, the Government told the House earlier in the week that the hon. Member was arrested for an objectionable speech made as long back as April, about nine months ago, and now, we are told that it took nearly four months or more to study the speech and the order, whatever it was, was issued in August. Now, the implementation of the order has taken another four months. May I know, first of all, why the speech took such a long time for examination—four or five months—and another four or five months for implementing the order. The entire matter looks very fishy.

Mr. Speaker: Order order. when the matter is *sub judice*, he cannot say that it is fishy.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I would like you to give a ruling, whether it is *sub judice*, because, as far as we know from the statement of the hon. Minister, the case is not in court, not yet. He said that the case would be in court shortly. When the case is not yet filed in the court, when it is on its way to the court,—you, Sir, have been a judge—can you hold that at this stage even, the matter is *sub judice*, when it has not been filed in court?

Mr. Speaker: Once it is *sub judice*, pending before the judicial

court, then the same principle applies when investigation has been made by the police and the challan is being put up before the court.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is being put up; even then, is it *sub-judice*?

Mr. Speaker: I am only telling the House that the same principle applies because, if now, the police have challaned the man and they are to put up before the court, the next day, or two days afterwards, if we discuss the whole thing threadbare and give our opinions on the facts of the case, certainly that would also be *sub-judice*.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Is the court seized of the question?

Shri Hajarnavis: The charge-sheet has been submitted.

Shri Tyagi (Dera Dun): May I make a submission. Now, an arrest has been made of an MP while he was busy in Parliament, although not in the Parliament House itself. But when we are once here to attend the sessions of Parliament, we are under your guardianship, whether we are in the House or in our residences. We are on duty. I therefore want to make this submission. About the merits of the case, I do not know and I do not want to enter into the charges against my hon. friend. But I request you to look to this aspect and make a rule of privilege, that when Members are here on duty in Parliament, they may not be arrested unless there is a charge of a very urgent nature. Since this case was an old one, in such cases, you might make a rule that arrests, if at all they have to be made, should not be made in this manner and the Member concerned should not be taken away from Parliament in this manner.

Shri Bade (Khargone): May I make a submission? I quite agree

that when the FIR is prepared and sent to the magistrate, the case is *sub-judice*. There is no question about that. But the hon. Minister says that there was no necessity for a warrant because it is a cognizable case. In cognizable cases also the warrant of the police is given to the accused whenever he is to be arrested. Without showing him this warrant, he cannot be arrested by the police. The magistrate's warrant is not necessary but the police warrant is necessary. In the press it appeared that there was no warrant at all, and the Member was taken by surprise.

Mr. Speaker: It is admitted that there was no warrant. The police officer who is competent under the rules can arrest him.

Shri Bade: Under what section was it? It appeared in the press. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Nambiar.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): My question to the hon. Minister is this. He says that the police did not misbehave here. I say that an enquiry is necessary, because I have my personal instance. When I was arrested here, I was unnecessarily put behind the bars. I was locked up in the police lock-up in Delhi before I was taken to Madras during day-time immediately after my arrest. Therefore the Delhi police has got a notoriety for misbehaving towards Members. My submission is towards Shri Maurya the police might have misbehaved. Therefore, the protection of yours is required to see that Members of Parliament are not so treated by the police in this manner.

Mr. Speaker: Because Shri Nambiar was maltreated by the police in Delhi when he was arrested, it does not necessarily follow that Shri Maurya also might have been treated like that.

Shri Nambiar: That is the general procedure, which is persistent.

Shri Nath Pai: We had made two requests on that day, but we did not get any reply from him. I am still waiting for those replies. I want to put these questions to which the hon. Minister should give an answer. When the powers under section 124A of the IPC are so ample and their gamut so wide that they can cover any act of sedition, why has it been found necessary to take shelter under the Defence of India Act? We want an answer to this, because the main charge against him, it seems to me....

Mr. Speaker: Now, the second question.

Shri Nath Pai: The second question is this. We had also asked his senior colleague to look into the desirability whether a procedure cannot be evolved—of consulting the Chair and informing the House before the police are allowed to lay their hands on a Member of this House. I want a reply to both these questions.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Daji.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, let the Minister reply, because he will forget this question, if you go to another question. The questions will get piled up.

Mr. Speaker: I will answer both the questions.

Shri Nath Pai: I do not want to add to your burden, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I want to make one request. The other day also, so many hon. Members took part in this subject. Now, a statement has been made; the arrest is by the Uttar Pradesh police, that is, the State Government. After having completed the investigation, the charge sheet has been put up to the court. Now, there is nothing that we can discuss. So many Members are getting up one after the other, when there is no more to discuss here at this moment. There is nothing more that we can discuss.

Shri Nath Pai: Only a clarification.

Mr. Speaker: No clarification also is needed. I have been allowing so many questions, and the number of hon. Members who want to put questions is increasing. When I call one, there are many more that stand up. There is nothing that we can discuss here just at this moment. This should be realised. It is required of me that there ought to be a change of rules. I cannot change the rules. The hon. Member might give notice of the change of rules.

श्री रामसेवक दादा (बागबंकी) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय,

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप इस तरह से बोल नहीं सकते हैं ।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय गृह मंत्री जी की तरफ से जो जवाब मिला है उसके अन्दर आखिर में उन्होंने कहा है कि यह मुकदमा अदालत में है । लेकिन बयान के बीच में उन्होंने यह जरूर कहा है कि उन्होंने ऐसा भाषण दिया था जिस को बिना पर जातियात में भड़काव हो कर अमन खारे में पड़ सकता था । यह बात कम से कम आठ महीने की है । आखिरकार वह लोक-सभा के एक माननीय सदस्य हैं । अगर उन्होंने कोई तक्रार की और उस में कोई एक आधा ऐसा वकूआ होने वा अंदेशा था, जातियात का अगड़ा होने का डर था . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप राय जाहिर न करें । जो कुछ दरअसल में कहना चाहते हैं कहें ।

श्री बागड़ी : थोड़ा सा कहकर मैं आपकी खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि दरअसल में तथ्य यह है कि मौर्य साहब के ऊपर इलकशन पेटिशन चल रही थी और उसी के . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इसकी इजाजत नहीं दे सकता हूँ । तहकीकात चल रही है, अभी तक कोई फैसला नहीं हुआ है ।

श्री बागड़ी : वह बैकवर्ड क्लासिस से ताल्लुक रखते हैं। उन्होंने चिट्ठी लिखी है कि उनको साबुन नहीं दिया गया और रात भर वे सदी में पड़े रहे और उनको लिहाफ नहीं मिला। यह आनरेबल मेम्बर की खुद की लिखी हुई चिट्ठी है, दस्ती चिट्ठी आई है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह चिट्ठी मुझे भेज दीजिये। अब आप बैठ जायें।

श्री शिव नारायण (वांसी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं और किसी को इजाजत नहीं दे सकता।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : एक बहुत जरूरी बात है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : और नहीं।

Shri Daji (Indore): I want to draw your attention to a very serious matter. Your ruling is quite correct that when the matter is *sub judice* we cannot discuss the merits of it and I abide by it. At the same time, justice should be done to us and Mr. Maurya and to the case in-hand. Whereas we are prevented from expressing any opinion, the statement itself clearly expresses the opinion of a high authority like the Home Minister when the trial is pending. It is a very serious matter. There is nothing left to be said by the Minister, he has said

Mr. Speaker: He may kindly sit down; he is unnecessarily getting excited. This is a charge-sheet which the U.P. Government has made against Mr. Maurya and the Minister has read that out.

Shri Daji: The Minister further made a statement that the State Government observed for a very long time and so on. All these are never part of a charge-sheet.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever he has said against Mr. Maurya, that was the charge-sheet.

Shri Tyagi: It is not the charge-sheet; the House is interested in seeking your protection.

Mr. Speaker: I have not called the hon. Member. Shri Deshmukh.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati): Apart from the fact that a statement has been made, I submit that we should consider the contents of the statement and the treatment which maybe an offending Member of Parliament has received. The facts are he was here and therefore I presume he was here to attend the session of Parliament.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: (Kendrapara): He was attending the session.

Dr P. S. Deshmukh: He has been removed without a warrant not from any other place, but from Allahabad. He has also been kept in a lock-up there.

Mr. Speaker: Can he point out to me any violation of rules that we have got? Then alone we can discuss it. Otherwise, this general discussion does not help.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: The only point I want to make is whether, apart from other things, you would not feel concerned at the facts which have been disclosed by the statement, namely, a Member of Parliament who has come here to attend the session should be removed from Delhi. You can also consider the kind of offence, when it was perpetrated, how long it has taken, etc. In these circumstances, it is frightfully undesirable that any Member of Parliament should be removed from Delhi. In these circumstances we will be quite right in presuming that the Member of Parliament does not enjoy any consideration either under the rules and laws or at your hands. (*Interruptions*).

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरी बात मुन लीजिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जायें ।

Mr. Speaker: There are two things which we must consider. One is the present privileges that we enjoy. It should be pointed out to me that there has been some breach of privilege or some right has been infringed under the rules that are there. The other is that we should enlarge the scope of the rules, so that such a thing might not happen. If we want to enlarge them, it is only the House that can do it, not the Speaker. A regular notice shall have to be given for that and a regular procedure should be adopted. That is what I have been appealing to the hon. Members again and again that they are asking me to give protection, to do this thing or that thing. Am I competent to enlarge the scope of the rules?

Shri Nambiar: Through you, we are asking the House to do it.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Nambiar is an experienced parliamentarian.

Shri Nambiar: I have myself been a victim to that.

Mr. Speaker: Now he wants protection for the old things?

Shri Nambiar: At least for future.

Mr. Speaker: Then he ought to have taken care to give notice of changes in the rules. He has not done that.

Shri Nambiar: I will do that.

Mr. Speaker: When he does it, I will certainly consider it. I do not think there is any need for any further discussion on this matter. (*Interruptions*).

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी बात मुन लें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जायें । क्या बार-बार यही होगा कि आप जब चाहें मेरी इजाजत के बगैर बोलें ? (*Interruptions*)

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : मैं उत्तर प्रदेश से आया हूँ । अपनी रिसपांसिबिलिटी समझता हूँ ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अध्यक्ष महोदय. . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर इस तरह से सब ने बोलना शुरू कर देना है तो आप बोलते चले जा सकते हैं । मैं किसी को इजाजत नहीं दे सकता हूँ । किसी को भी आप रिप्रिजेंट करने हों, मैं इजाजत नहीं दे सकता हूँ ।

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन (मुरादाबाद) :
जनाब स्पीकर साहब. . .

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Karur):
On a point of order, Sir.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर पैदा नहीं होता है । बोलना खत्म कर चुके हैं और अब किसी को इजाजत नहीं दी जा सकती है ।

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : मेरी पार्टी का आदमी है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तां भी नहीं मिल सकती है । आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : वह मेरी पार्टी से ताल्लुक रखते हैं, मुझ आप बोलने की इजाजत जरूर दें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह पार्टी का ताल्लुक नहीं है । हाउस का ताल्लुक है इससे । आप बैठ जाइये ।

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: May I say a word?

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय. . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इजाजत नहीं दे सकता हूँ ।

श्री शिव नारायण : यह ज्यादाती है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दो बार इजाजत दे चुका हूँ। बाकियों को तो मैं बन्द कर रहा हूँ और आप कहते हैं कि आपको वक्त दे दूँ, आपको बोलने की इजाजत दे दूँ।

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : इस मिलसिले में मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मौर्य जी की गिरफ्तारी अगर ३० अप्रैल को हुई होती तो बात समझ में आ सकती थी। वह वक्त गुजर गया और आज आठ महीने के बाद उनको गिरफ्तार किया गया है। अगर उनकी तकरीर से हिन्दुस्तान की सरजमीन पर किसी किस्म की बदअमनी या आपस में दो कौमों के लड़ने का अंदेश था या हकूमत को उनकी तकरीर से किसी किस्म का कोई नुकसान पहुंचने का अंदेश था तो आठ महीने पहले उनको उगहें वन्द करना चाहिये था, पकड़ना चाहिये था। आठ महीने में अब तक वह चुप क्यों बठी रही ?

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी अर्ज कर दूँ कि जिस वक्त मौर्य साहब तकरीर कर रहे थे, उन वक्त मैं वहां पर मौजूद था। उनकी तकरीर में कोई ऐसा जुम्ला नहीं था कि जिस पर एतगज हो . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जायें। मैंने आपको सुन लिया है।

श्री प्र० कृ० खन्ना (कायमगंज) : आपको भी गिरफ्तार किया जाना चाहिये। आप भी बहुत आब्जकशनेबल . . .

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : सब से ज्यादा आब्जकशनेबल तकरीरें आप लोग करते हैं और आपको गिरफ्तार किया जाना चाहिये। आपको क्यों नहीं पकड़ा जाता है . . .

श्री प्र० कृ० खन्ना : आपके खिलाफ इस कानून . . .

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : मैं स्पीकर साहब से मुखातिब हूँ। आप बोलने वाले कौन हैं . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मेरी तरफ से मुखातिब रहते तो यह तकलीफ पैदा न होती। आपने उधर लड़ना शुरू कर दिया।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उनको गिरफ्तार किया जाना क्या उचित था ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस पर आप अपनी व्यवस्था दें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : आप मुझे जो हुकम चाहे दे सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ने जो कुछ कहा मैं ने सुन लिया, आप ने कोई नई चीज नहीं कही।

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : मेरा नई बात कहने का मकसद नहीं है। चूंकि मैं उस तकरीर के वक्त मौजूद था इसलिये अर्ज कर रहा हूँ कि श्री मौर्य के साथ ज्यादाती हो रही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह आप नहीं कह सकते। मैं आप को इस की इजाजत नहीं दूंगा। अगर आप उस वक्त मौजूद थे तो क्या आप की गवाही पर मैं गवर्नमेंट से कहूँ कि वह मुकदमा छोड़ दें ?

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : यह मैं बिल्फुल सही बात कह रहा हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या आप उन की बगुनाही का सबूत यहां देना चाहते हैं ?

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : मेरे कहने का मकसद यह है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये। मैं इस की इजाजत नहीं दे सकता।

श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन : उस वक्त तकरीरें मुस्तलिफ लोगों ने की है। उन को क्यों गिरफ्तार नहीं किया गया ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठेंगे भी या नहीं ? श्री मनुभाई शाह।

Adulteration (Amendment)
Bill

श्री राम सेवक यादव: अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भी ऐसा आदमी हूँ जिस के साथ अन्याय हुआ है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: नहीं साहब।

12.52 hrs.

COIR INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT)
BILL*

The Minister of International Trade (Shri Manubhai Shah): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Coir Industry Act, 1953.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Coir Industry Act, 1953."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Manubhai Shah: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

12.52½ hrs.

PREVENTION OF FOOD ADULTERATION (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Health (Dr. D. S. Raju): Sir, on behalf of Dr. Sushila Nayar, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954.

Mr. Speaker: The Question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. D. S. Raju: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

12.53 hrs.

BANKING LAWS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill further to amend the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, the Banking Companies Act, 1949 and the State Bank of India (Subsidiary Banks) Act, 1959. There is no amendment to clause 2. I shall put it to the House. The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 3 and 4 were added to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: There are some amendments to clause 5.

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): Sir, I beg to move:

Page 2, line 33,—

for 'any other assets' substitute—

"other marketable securities of a like nature" (52).

Page 2,—

for lines 37 and 38, substitute—

'(d) "firm" means a firm as defined in the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 of which the capital subscribed by its partners exceeds one lack of rupees.' (53).

Page 5,—

for line 30, substitute—

"or with fine or with both." (55).

My amendment No. 52 is of a clarificatory nature. The reason for this amendment is, if we have the expression "any other asset", then all the

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II—Section 2. dated 20-12-63.