

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): Sir, on a point of order. If you will kindly read the language of rule 110, the same rule: under which the other Bill has just now been withdrawn, and the new Bill is being introduced on the same subject, you will find that sub-rule (b) reads as follows:

“(b) the Bill is to be replaced subsequently by a new Bill....”

Though my knowledge of the English language is very meagre, yet, to my mind, the word “subsequently” is used in a different sense from the word “immediately”. This Bill has been introduced immediately after one Bill has been withdrawn on the same subject. When once a Bill has been withdrawn, he should take at least 24 hours before introducing a new Bill. “Subsequently” does not mean “immediately”. I would request you to let us know whether “subsequently” is the same thing as “immediately”. Let us have a reply.

**Mr. Speaker:** If it is immediately after the first, then it is subsequent to that. I will put the question again. The question is:

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1952.”

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Hathi:** I introduce the Bill.

13.32 hrs.

**JAYANTI SHIPPING COMPANY  
(TAKING OVER OF MANAGEMENT)  
BILL.\***

**The Minister of Transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism (Shri Sanjiva Reddy):** I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the taking over of the management of the undertaking of the Jayanti Shipping

Company Limited, for a limited period in order to secure the proper management of the same.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee** (Kanpur): The Bill clearly says that it is meant for taking over the management of the undertaking of the Jayanti Shipping Company for a limited period. I would like to know whether we are not seriously thinking of amending the Constitution, in cases where such concerns are taken over for better management, especially after the mismanagement, by the people, and especially when some concerns have been taken over and then handed back to the capitalists—

**Mr. Speaker:** We cannot go into the merits of the matter now.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I want to know whether this Bill makes this point clear or not.

**Mr. Speaker:** If he objects to it at the introduction stage, I can allow him.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** This is exactly the time when the Bill is sought to be introduced. I oppose its introduction.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then he can oppose it. I will have to give the Minister an opportunity to explain it then.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Yes, Sir. After that, I will have my say.

**Mr. Speaker:** The introduction of the Bill is being opposed.

**Shri Sanjiva Reddy:** We are taking it up for five years to begin with. There is provision to extend it up to 10 years, and if necessary Parliament has power to take it over permanently also. Nothing prevents it from doing so.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** While I welcome the Government's decision to take over this company, because this has become a scandal and the Gov-

\*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 2, dated 8-8-66.

ernment, naturally, has been helping it out of way by giving loans of Rs. 2 crores, 10 crores and so on. Now the Government have realised that their liability is more than the assets, Rs. 47 crores or something like that. Now, having realised this, they want to take it over and manage it for a limited period. Then hon. Minister now tells me that it is taken over for a limited period, while the Constitution itself empowers the Government to extend the period.

We have many undertakings, many textile mills and many sugar mills which have been taken over, where controllers have been appointed and receivers have been appointed, and after the mills or the concerns started making profits, and the Government have spent crores of rupees on them, the mills or the undertakings were given back to the previous management, the capitalists. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to take it over permanently, or why not nationalise this concern once it is taken over?

**Mr. Speaker:** These are not the matters which could be discussed now.

**Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):** I want to say something.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have heard the Member who opposed the introduction of the Bill.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** I am not opposing it.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the taking over of the management of the undertaking of the Jayanti Shipping Company Limited, for a limited period in order to secure the proper management of the same."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Sanjiva Reddy:** I introduce the Bill.

13.34 hrs.

### STATUTORY RESOLUTION LEVYING OF EXPORT DUTY ON CERTAIN ITEMS

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Commerce (Shri Shaif Qureshi):** I beg to move the following resolution on behalf of Shri Manubhai Shah:

"In pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 4A of the Indian Tariff Act, 1934 (32 of 1934), this House approves of the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 1696 dated the 6th June, 1966, as amended *vide* Notification Nos. 43(3)-Tariff dated the 6th June, 1966, S.O. 1841 dated the 15th June, 1966, S.O. 1940 dated the 27th June, 1966 and S.O. 2133 dated the 15th July, 1966, levying export duty on sacking (cloth, bages, twist, yarn, rope and twine), jute manufactures of certain description, cotton waste (all sorts), tea, all oil cake other than copra, groundnut oil cakes, tobacco, unmanufactured mica, all sorts, hides, skins and leather, tanned and untanned, all sorts, but not including manufactures of leather, and coir and coir manufactures from the date of such Notifications."

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad):** Sir, on a point of order. I invite your attention to rule 76, and also would like to state that you have ruled twice or thrice before that when a motion or a Bill is put in the name of a Minister, Shri Manubhai Shah in the present case, and if the Minister concerned is not present in the House, the reasons for his absence should be given. They have been consistently violating this. I think this is the third or the fourth time. They have not given us the reasons for his absence.

**Mr. Speaker:** I must explain that when the Minister concerned is not here to move the motion, some reasons should be given: