

(b) if so, when it is likely to be met?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): (a) Yes.

(b) Introduction of an additional train between Manmad and Bombay is not feasible at present for want of spare line capacity. The question of providing an Express train which will also serve Bombay-Manmad section will be duly considered when the electrification of Igatpuri-Bhusawal section is completed, which is expected by 1967.

12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE

REPORTED DESCRIPTION OF REV. MICHAEL
SCOTT AT "FOREIGN OBSERVER" BY
NAGA HOSTILES

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion and Calling Attention notices about the reported Naga hostiles describing the Rev. Michael Scott to the 'Foreign Observer' at the Peace talks and Mr. Scott's own statement that the cease fire in Nagaland is an 'International Cease fire Agreement'.

I have not given my consent to the adjournment motion, but the Calling Attention notice I have admitted.

Is the Minister prepared to answer it just now?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): Sir, on one or two occasions it has happened earlier that the Rev. Michael Scott has said after a press statement....

Mr. Speaker: If he is prepared to reply, I will ask the Member to put it.

Shri Swaran Singh: No, Sir. I have received it just now. I only

wanted to say that we are getting the statement from the local Government there to find out....

Mr. Speaker: So he wants time.

Shri Swaran Singh: ...as to whether he has made any such statement. But I have no hesitation in contradicting straightway that we do not recognize him as a foreign observer. And there is no question of having an international cease fire agreement..

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. In that case he should allow the Member to read that notice and put it, and then the Minister might say anything he likes.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): He is partly answering.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the reported Naga hostiles describing the Rev. Michael Scott as the 'Foreign Observer' at the Peace talks and Mr. Scott's own statement that the cease fire in Nagaland is an 'International Cease fire Agreement' thereby drawing a distinction between the underground Nagas and the Indians as two different peoples, and activities of some Nagas to raise a liberation army.

May I submit, Sir, that the Prime Minister in Lucknow has already said that he does agree with the statement, and the hon. Minister says....

Shri Nambiar: Let him say.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Mr. Speaker, is this a question to be answered by the Foreign Minister? Because, this is our own territory. Either it is our territory or it is not our territory. (*Interruptions*):

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The Prime Minister would have answered it. But he is not here. Therefore the Minister of External Affairs.... (*Interruptions*). Does not matter if

any of them answers. Let him make the answer and then we can see.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, the point raised by Acharya Kripalani is absolutely right.

An Hon. Member: The Home Minister is there.

Shri Hem Barua: On a previous occasion when this matter was brought up before the House it was said that the Nagas have faith in our Prime Minister....

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: When a Member is just on his legs how can a point of order arise?

Shri Hem Barua: This is a very important thing that Acharya Kripalani has raised. On a previous occasion—in fact not once but on many occasions—this was raised on the floor of this House, and then it was said that the Nagas have implicit faith in Mr. Nehru as a person, and that that is why this was under him and he was Foreign Minister also. Now that Mr. Nehru is not there and we have a different Foreign Minister it is not proper to have a part of our territory administered by the Foreign Affairs Ministry. It must go to the Home Ministry.

Mr. Speaker: I have followed that.

Shri Hem Barua: Because, it produces a different impression abroad.

Mr. Speaker: At this stage we cannot enter into detailed arguments. A point has been made. I have also appreciated it. Now I will put it and ask the Minister. There is no need to go on with a detailed discussion of it.

Shri Narendar Singh Mahida: I rise on a point of order. The point of order is that Nagaland is a part of India.

Mr. Speaker: That point has been made.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: I support him in that point.

Mr. Speaker: No regular discussion now.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, गृह-मंत्री बँटे हुए हैं। उनसे
उत्तर दिलाया जाये ।

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): It will be recalled that during the last session, when the hon. Minister of External Affairs similarly rose to answer a question with regard to Nagaland, I had raised this point, and then....

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I do remember that the hon. Member had raised it. Now, Shri Narendra Singh Mahida wants to support that point. I have said that if not the whole House there is a large section at least of the House....

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): We are also with him. The whole House is with him. It is our internal affair. It is not a foreign affair. Therefore, let the Home Minister answer it.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): We want that the Home Minister should answer it.

Shri Raghunath Singh: It is our internal affair, and, therefore, the Home Minister should answer.

Shri Kapur Singh: On that occasion, I had said that when the hon. Minister of External Affairs rose to answer questions on this matter, all types of suspicions arose in our minds; then, you Sir, were pleased to observe that on that particular occasion, the hon. Minister of External Affairs was making a reply because the proper Minister was not present in the House. Now, the hon. Minister of Home Affairs is present in the House. Therefore, it is in the fitness of things that he should answer this question.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): The Home Minister should reply immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members have expressed their feelings showing what the view of the whole House is. Let Government say what they want to, and then we shall proceed....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: They should respect our feelings also. Let the Home Minister reply to this calling-attention notice.

Shri Raghunath Singh: This is a subject for the Home Minister, and not for the External Affairs Minister. Nagaland is not a foreign country. *(Interruptions).*

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members must resume their seats when I am standing. I have appreciated the extent and the intensity of the feelings of hon. Members, and Government also must have realised that. Now, let us hear the hon. Minister.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : हाउस की इच्छा है कि गृह मंत्री उत्तर दें ।

Shri Raghunath Singh: They have not realised it; they are not realising it.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I want to raise one more point to which I would like to draw your attention. In the absence of the Prime Minister, not only would we like the Home Minister to reply but we would like to have the reply from the No. 2 in the Cabinet on this matter. If Government respect the feelings of the House, they should immediately come forward and ask the hon. Home Minister who is also the No. 2 in the Cabinet, in the absence of the Prime Minister, to make a statement on this matter. If the Minister of External Affairs answers this question, then it makes our position intolerable in the international field. We do not want to hear from the Minister of External Affairs but only from the Home Minister.

Shri Swaran Singh: I fully appreciate....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Is that the respect shown by Government for the feelings of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Should he not be allowed to say what he wants? We should listen to him and see what he has got to say. At least this much courtesy should be shown to the Government and to the hon. Ministers.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: We also expect the same courtesy for us from the Government.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry that Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad would not allow me also to say anything.

Shri D. C. Sharma: 20 Ministers cannot overrule the whole House.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Courtesy should be both ways and not only one way.

Mr. Speaker: I am very sorry at this attitude of hon. Members that they would not hear anybody at all. *(Interruptions)* Order, order. Hon. Members have expressed themselves. Should we not listen to the hon. Minister now? Perhaps he might say that he had got the information and the Home Minister would answer it. At least, hon. Members should listen to the hon. Minister. I cannot understand this attitude of hon. Members at all that they would not allow the hon. Minister to say even a word. That is not proper.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Please do not put that kind of thing into our mouths. We only wanted that the Home Minister should answer it.

Mr. Speaker: We have yet to hear the hon. Minister of External Affairs. Perhaps, he might say that..

Shri D. C. Sharma: We have great respect for the hon. Minister of External Affairs, but we want that the Home Minister should answer this.

Shri Raghunath Singh: It is also a question of fundamental importance.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad's view represents only one view. Hitherto, the Ministry of External Affairs has been carrying on negotiations with these people on the question of Nagaland, and this House had silently acquiesced in that action or accepted that proposition. But, today, suddenly because somebody else makes a statement, hon. Members seem to get excited.

Some Hon. Members: Previously, it was the hon. Prime Minister who was answering such questions.

Shri Thirumala Rao: The Minister of External Affairs is as much responsible as the Home Minister. Therefore, let us not make any distinction between one Minister and another. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. How can we conduct any business in this manner?

Some Hon. Members: The hon. Home Minister wants to make the statement.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): Mr. Speaker, Sir... (*Cheers*) These cheers are premature

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West): Before the Home Minister makes his statement, I have a suggestion to make.

Mr. Speaker: Let the Home Minister make his statement, and then I shall hear the hon. Member.

Shri Jaipal Singh: With due respect, I would request you to allow

me, because I have a suggestion to make...

Mr. Speaker: I know that. Let the Home Minister say what he wants to say and I shall give an opportunity to the hon. Member afterwards. Now, he may kindly resume his seat.

Shri Nanda: I find that the feelings of hon. Member are roused. There may be a good cause for it. But the question here at the moment is a limited one.

There are two questions. Should this matter, the question of dealing with Nagaland, be in the Home Ministry or as things are? That is a question which certainly the Prime Minister when he comes will consider. But at the moment, the Ministry which has been dealing with this matter certainly is called upon to give information which hon. Members ask for. These two things should be dealt with separately. Therefore, I ask the indulgence of the House: let us deal with the other aspect now and get the information which they seek from the Minister who is concerned.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I think we are unnecessarily being agitated by this or that Minister answering a question. I hope we know not for the first time, that in this House there is such a thing as Cabinet responsibility; in other words, whatever one Minister says ties down the whole lot of them. This is rather an important point. It does not matter whether the Prime Minister or my hon. friend, who does not talk very much, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, or anybody else answers a question.

Mr. Speaker: I have followed him.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I think we are getting upset unnecessarily. Technically it is correct that if the Minister of External Affairs is the one and only person who has to reply to questions about Nagaland, it gives a wrong impression, a false impression.

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

It is not a right thing; it is not a foreign territory. But I hope hon. Members realise that he is a member of the Cabinet and every member of the Cabinet speaks on behalf of the Cabinet. Let us remember that and not get agitated over this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Whether the Minister of External Affairs should answer or the Home Minister should do it . . .

An Hon. Member: Home Minister.

Mr. Speaker: I have not put that question. Whether the External Affairs Minister should answer it or the Home Minister should answer it is quite a separate thing. That cannot be decided just at this moment. The House has expressed its feeling and its viewpoint.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): For the second time.

Mr. Speaker: For the second time, I agree. It is now for Government to decide. They will take some time. Just now the Home Minister has said that as soon as the Prime Minister comes, he will consider it. Then probably they will come to some conclusion. But now, as the Home Minister has said, when one Minister is in charge of this subject and he has been answering these questions—this notice had been sent to him—and he stands up to answer, to take up this attitude that we would not listen to him or would not allow him to proceed to answer is not fair. Hon. Members would realise it is their internal arrangement; it is Cabinet and joint responsibility also. But there is no doubt that when it has been given to the External Affairs Minister, it might also create some wrong impression . . .

Shri Raghunath Singh: Yes, yes. That is our apprehension.

Mr. Speaker: But the Home Minister has said that they will consider

it. Let us now hear the External Affairs Minister.

Shri S. C. Jamir (Nominated—Nagaland) rose—

Shri Swaran Singh: To begin with, I want to make it absolutely clear that there should not be any such feeling, that the mere fact that one Ministry, namely the External Affairs Ministry, is dealing with this denotes that it is Government's position that this is a matter which is not a matter of our own country. Merely because the External Affairs Ministry as such is dealing with it does not make it an international matter. That position I want to make absolutely clear.

Now, I can well appreciate the other thing, which you, Sir, yourself suggested, that the fact that it is being dealt with by the External Affairs Ministry might raise some doubts. Not that I am keen to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker: There may be no doubt in our minds, but somebody else might use it as an argument against us.

Shri Swaran Singh: Therefore, this categorical statement of mine on behalf of Government should not leave any doubt.

As to the actual allocation of business, it is for the Prime Minister to decide. If he thinks that it should be handled by some other Minister, it is for him to decide. But you will appreciate that so long as the responsibility of handling it is in a particular Ministry, that Ministry is the only Ministry which can deal with it in the House. In fact, it would be shirking the responsibility if it is not to be dealt with in that form. I do not suggest that I am keen, I am the last person to suggest that it should be with this or that Ministry. It is entirely for the Prime Minister to decide about the allocation of business.

I would like to add further that it is not unknown in the parliamentary system that Ministers dealing with external affairs in this country as well as other countries, are also dealing with several other matters which are purely internal. I know of many Foreign Ministers who are in charge of industry or other things. The fact that a particular department is under the Foreign Affairs Minister does not indicate that that particular responsibility has become an international affair. That is the constitutional position, and there should not be any feeling on that score.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक निवेदन

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब नहीं ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : प्रश्न सुन लेंगे, तभी तो जवाब देंगे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नोटिस दूसरे का है, आपका नहीं ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not give way.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : व्यवस्था का प्रश्न आ गया है, मैं क्या करूँ ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : इस सभा में सरदार जी के व्यक्तित्व के सम्बन्ध में नहीं, उनके द्वारा उत्तर देने के सम्बन्ध में सन्देह हो रहा है । नागालैंड का प्रश्न सरदार जी को सौंपा गया है, इससे जान पड़ता है कि इस प्रश्न को विदेशी समझ कर उनको सौंपा गया है और चूँकि यह विदेशी प्रश्न है, इस वास्ते गृह मंत्री जी को नहीं सौंपा जा रहा है । जब आप मानते हैं कि विदेशी नहीं, यह तो देशी प्रश्न है, तो गृह मंत्री को इसका उत्तर देना चाहिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो सभी बाकी माननीय सदस्यों ने भी कहा है । फर्क इतना हुआ है कि यह अब स्वामी जी की तरफ से आया है ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : हिन्दी में आया है ।

Shri Swaran Singh: I am grateful to Swamiji because I never took it as personal. So, I am thankful that he has come to our rescue once for a change, but I know that there is nothing personal in it, and it is the feeling in the House which I follow.

On the points that have been mentioned in this Calling Attention Notice, there are two things. The House would, no doubt, have seen the press reports of our Prime Minister's speech in Lucknow, where he has clearly said that this type of statements which have appeared on behalf of Rev. Michael Scott would come in the way of any settlement, and they are unfortunate or unhappy. That is the stand of the Government. Those who are in the peace mission should not act in any manner which might seem to be partisan or might indicate that they are taking sides in this controversy.

Shri Hem Barua: But that is the impression created by Rev. Scott's statement.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is incorrect that Rev. Scott has the position of a foreign observer as has been mentioned in certain press statements.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): Send him back to England. He is not fit to be here.

Shri Swaran Singh: Then, it is absolutely incorrect that there is any international cease-fire agreement. We have made the position quite clear on the floor of the House that it is a question of cessation of operations against the hostiles, pending, these talks. Therefore, this is an internal

[Shri Swaran Singh]

matter, and there is no question of this being an international cease-fire by any stretch of the imagination.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: May I suggest that the language that is being used is used in international affairs?

Shri Swaran Singh: I think the language I am using is not the language used in international relations.

An Hon. Member: Not yours.

Shri Swaran Singh: If a third party used such language, it is objectionable.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Send him out of India.

Shri Swaran Singh: We can state our position clearly, and that is . . .

Shri D. C. Sharma: Why was that man put in that position?

Shri Swaran Singh: There is another press statement which is attributed to Rev. Scott where he is reported to have said that the Nagas and Indians are two different people. That is absolutely an incorrect statement: Nagas are Indians and Nagaland is a part of India. Any such statement is absolutely incorrect and untenable and we do not accept it. I will not be surprised if Rev. Scott might explain later that he was wrongly reported. Therefore, we are having a second check and trying to ascertain as to what precisely he has said.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I invite the attention of the hon. Minister to what Mr. Shastri has said:

"He (Mr. Scott) is one of the members of the peace mission along with Mr. Jaiprakash Narain and the Chief Minister of Assam, Mr. Chaliha. He is not there in an individual capacity and hence he cannot make such a statement as in that case it would defeat the very purpose of the talks. I shall

ask Mr. Scott about it when he returned from the mission."

May I know whether it is not a fact that in this House many Members brought to his notice and also to the notice of the late lamented Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, that Mr. Scott was getting inspiration from Mr. Phizo and he was doing the same thing as Mr. Phizo wanted him to do in Nagaland? If this statement is proved to be correct after proper investigations, will he be sent out of this country or put under arrest? . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: We cannot proceed in this manner.

Shri Swaran Singh: We are checking up the authenticity of the statement. But I have made the Government's position quite clear as to the points reported as having been said by Rev. Scott or by the hostile Nagas. After verifying the authenticity of the statement, Government will further consider as to what further action is needed.

Shri Hem Barua: May I draw the attention of the Government to the fact that Rev. Michael Scott had been doing a series of propaganda work there in favour of the hostile Nagas? Firstly, he said that if the West did not provide arms and ammunition to the Naga hostiles, they will be forced to secure arms and ammunition from foreign sources. That is No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: How many numbers would be there? Would the fingers of the hand be enough?

Shri Hem Barua: Secondly, in spite of the protests in the House and in spite of the assurances given by the Foreign Minister that words 'cease fire' would not be used in this case because 'cease-fire' had a different legal implication. Rev. Scott had been deliberately using that term, times without number. Rev. Scott has openly stated in a statement signed and released by the PTI that the

Nagas and the Indians are two different people. Fourthly, Rev. Scott issued statements alleging atrocities committed by our Indian security forces on the hostile Nagas but he had never said a single word in condemnation of the atrocities committed by the Nagas. Fifthly, Rev. Scott is in collusion with Mr. Phizo. I can divulge that fact.

Mr. Speaker: He need not divulge the fact. He should come to the question.

Shri Hem Barua: In view of the fact that Rev. Michael Scott, a peace missionary in Nagaland, has been behaving as though he was an emissary of the Naga hostiles and not really as a peace missionary,—

An Hon. Member: A pseudo-missionary.

Shri Hem Barua: He might be a pseudo-missionary—why is it that Government by now have not asked the Peace Mission to withdraw from Nagaland for the good of the Peace Mission and for the good of the country as well?

Shri Swaran Singh: That is a suggestion. (*Interruption*).

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Swaran Singh: As I said on the last occasion, as to what precisely he said on this occasion—the correctness of that will be checked and further action in the light of the veracity of that statement will be taken.

Shri Hem Barua: What about the other points made by me?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have already made the position quite clear that members of the Peace Mission should not say anything which might create an impression that they are taking sides and any such thing that is said by Rev. Scott or any other member of the Peace Mission which might create a feeling or an impression that

they are partisans taking sides will not be a correct attitude. Therefore, as the Prime Minister said in Lucknow, it comes in the way of the successful fructification of these peace efforts.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of information. Please excuse me for saying this. He has not given the information—

Mr. Speaker: The information that is desired from the Minister has been given.

Shri Hem Barua: He has not given. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Then I am sorry. I cannot give any answer to that.

Shri Hem Barua: I want to have a reply to all the points of facts. I have catalogued so many. Even after these facts, is he not convinced that Rev. Michael Scott is behaving in an odd way in Nagaland? (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order order. Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad!

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: In view of the fact that the statement reported by a known and authoritative agency of India has not been contradicted by Rev. Michael Scott and since the Government have not been able to challenge the veracity of that statement even after 20 hours of the statement, may I know how long the Government will take time to respect the wishes and sentiments of this country and of this House to expel this man who has affronted the dignity and sovereignty of this country?

Shri Swaran Singh: So far as the wishes and sentiments of the House are concerned, the Government has always given the highest respect; this is a sovereign House and whatever it decides is binding upon the Government. There is no dispute or there is no doubt in anybody's mind about it; certainly not in the mind of the

[Shri Swaran Singh]

Government. But in all these matters action should be taken in a considered way after ascertaining the facts. That is what I have said. The facts have to be ascertained. (*Interruption*).

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: How long will they take to respect the sentiments?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Shri A. P. Jain.

Shri A. P. Jain: The question is about the status of Rev. Michael Scott. It has been said that he is a foreign observer and it has been denied. Admittedly he is a member of the Peace Mission and the Government owes it to the House to make it plain what is the position of the Peace Mission *vis a vis* the Government and how far it is being recognised because, upon that will depend how Rev. Michael Scott should be dealt with. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri D. C. Sharma rose on a point of order. ✓

Shri D. C. Sharma: I want to know—

Mr. Speaker: Not "I want to know." He may raise the point of order which he wanted to raise.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The point of order is this. Rev. Michael Scott is not the whole Peace Mission; there are others also in the Peace Mission. The point of order is, why it has been said that Rev. Michael Scott is saying this, and why does not the Minister tell us what the other members of the Peace Mission also say and whether Rev. Michael Scott is the spokesman of all the members of the Peace Mission and also whether another member of the Peace Mission, Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan, has not said anything.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a point of order.

Shri P. C. Borooah (Sibsagar): May I know, regarding this Peace Mission which is working so hectically in Nagaland to bring about a settlement between the hostile Nagas and the Government, who formed that Peace Mission—whether it was the Nagaland people or the hostiles—and whether Mr. Phizo had a hand in sending Rev. Michael Scott to Nagaland for the Peace Mission when it started its work and . . .

Mr. Speaker: There are so many 'ands'.

Shri P. C. Borooah: . . . and when Mr. Scott came to Nagaland, whether Government ascertained his views about Nagas and Indians being separate entities and if not, why not?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Minister follow that?

Shri Swaran Singh: I am sorry I have not followed it.

Mr. Speaker: There were so many questions that we could not follow it. Shrimati Barkataki.

Shrimati Renuka Barkataki (Barpeta): Has the Government considered the possibility that the international sympathisers of Naga hostiles like Rev. Scott may act as intermediaries of the hostiles to persuade some unfriendly Governments to take the so-called claims of the Naga hostiles, to the International Court, if so, what steps Government is going to take to forestall or deal with such a move?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have stated categorically yesterday that it is an internal matter and it is not an international matter. Therefore, any party taking it to any international forum will be doing something which will be invalid and which we cannot accept.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: There is a rule that we have been following that only

those Members are called to put questions in connection with call attention notices whose names appear there in the notice. I have never allowed any other Member to put any questions. So, I am sorry I cannot oblige other hon. Members. Papers to be laid.

Shri P. C. Borooah: I come from a constituency adjacent to Nagaland.

12.33 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER MINES AND MINERALS (REGULATION AND DEVELOPMENT) ACT AND COAL BEARING AREAS (ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT) SECOND AMENDMENT RULES

The Minister of Steel and Mines Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy: I beg to re-lay on the Table—

(1) a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (1) of section 28 of the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957:—

(i) The Minerals Conservation and Development (First Amendment) Rules, 1964, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 444 dated the 14th March, 1964. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-2677/64].

(ii) S.O. No. 841 dated the 14th March, 1964. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-2822/64].

(iii) G.S.R. No. 730 dated the 9th May, 1964, containing Corrigendum to Notification No. G.S.R. 1486 dated the 31st October, 1962. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-2938/64].

(iv) G.S.R. No. 1123 dated the 9th August, 1964. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-3072/64].

(v) G.S.R. No. 1144 dated the 15th August, 1964. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-3162/64].

(2) a copy of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Second Amendment Rules 1964, published in Notification No. S.O. 3051 dated the 5th September, 1964, under sub-section (3) of section 27 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-3163/64].

COTTON TEXTILES (CONTROL) THIRD AMENDMENT ORDER AND COTTON TEXTILES (CONTROL) FIFTH AMENDMENT ORDER

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Manubhai Shah): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Orders under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955:—

(i) The Cotton Textiles (Control) Third Amendment Order, 1964, published in Notification No. S.O. 3667 dated the 19th October, 1964.

(ii) The Cotton Textiles (Control) Fifth Amendment Order, 1964, published in Notification No. S.O. 3733 dated the 23rd October, 1964.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-3381/64].

ORDERS UNDER COPYRIGHT ACT

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Steel and Mines (Shri P. C. Sethi): On behalf of Shri Hajarnavis, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Orders under section 43 of the Copyright Act, 1957:—

(i) The International Copyright (Fifth Amendment) Order, 1964, published in Notification No. S.O. 3527 dated the 1st October, 1964.