

[Shri K. C. Reddy]

The German Combine will be appointed the technical consultants and will receive a fixed fee of about Rs. 2.10 crores, which works out to about 3 per cent. on the estimated cost. No royalties are payable and no bonus shares will be issued.

The management of the company will be vested in a board, in which the Government and the Combine will have representation proportionate to their respective investments. The Chairman and the Managing Director will be the nominees of Government, thereby reserving to Government the control and overall management of this vital industry. The German Combine will recommend a team of technical experts for the efficient working of the plant. The number of Germans to be employed will be kept down to the minimum commensurate with the requirements of efficiency. Indians will receive, meanwhile, specialised training for the progressive replacement of German nationals.

The German collaborators expect that the plant could be commissioned within a period of four years after the preliminary details have been settled. A representative team is expected in India in September to discuss and settle the constitution of a Company and to make specific recommendations on the location of the plant etc. The over-riding consideration for location will be the economics of production and of distribution and the site will be selected with these in view.

After a careful assessment of the requirements for steel with the growing industrialisation of the country, Government have come to the conclusion that there still exists the need for the establishment of another unit after providing for the expansion of the present project. To this end, necessary planning and other action will be initiated.

ANDHRA STATE BILL

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I beg to present the report of the Committee on Petitions on the Andhra State Bill, 1953.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

PATIALA AND EAST PUNJAB STATES UNION POLICE (INCITEMENT TO DISAFFECTION) ACT, 1953.

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Patiala and East Punjab States Union Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Act, 1953 (President's Act No. 1 of 1953), under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Patiala and East Punjab States Union Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Act, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S-105/53.]

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

FLOODS IN GODAVARI

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Sir, I had given notice of an adjournment motion. The Secretary asked me not to raise it until Mr. Reddy had made his statement. I want to know whether it has been disallowed, and the reasons thereof. I have a right to know the reasons.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member gave me a notice of an adjournment motion regarding floods in Godavari and the adequacy of relief measures taken by the Railway administration. I immediately told him that I am withholding consent, as this is not a matter which need be raised by way of an adjournment motion. All are interested in it. A number of such adjournment motions have been brought to me during the past sever-

or eight days. But I have not allowed the adjournment motions. Those hon. Members who are equally interested, who came from those areas, accepted the ruling and did not raise it on the floor of the House. They tabled Short Notice Questions. I have admitted them and one Short Notice Question relating to this very matter is coming up for answer tomorrow.

Notwithstanding this, this hon. Member wants to interrupt the proceedings. I do not want any hon. Member to have an advantage over another hon. Member. I have told him repeatedly that this is not the practice. Hon. Members must be aware of the use to which adjournment motions should be put on the floor of the House. The hon. Speaker on a prior occasion, having regard to all the circumstances, taking into consideration all the rulings that were given before, the practice in the House of Commons and the changed circumstances here has said that adjournment motion is an extraordinary remedy. What can be got by way of information on a Short Notice Question ought not to be made the subject matter of an adjournment motion to interrupt the proceedings of the House. Now, I would invite hon. Members' attention to a few lines in the hon. Speaker's ruling:

"They can put short notice question and get information...."

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): What is the reference and what is the page?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The reference is *Decisions from the Chair—First and Second Sessions, 1950.*

Shri S. S. More: They have not distributed it to us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are all available in the Notice Office. Whoever wants it, can always take it. They are in the debates too.

I cannot dispel ignorance overnight. The papers are always available. I shall make the *Decisions*

from the Chair available to any hon. Member who wants it. The hon. Speaker in the course of his ruling said:

"Since the 15th August 1947, the entire constitutional and political set up has changed. The Ministry is fully responsible to this House and Members have now ample opportunities of discussing various matters. They can discuss matters on Demands for Grants and again during discussions on the Appropriation Bill and Finance Bill. The Government being responsive, time can be had by a pressing request made to Government. I may cite as an illustration the desire of the Government to allot time for discussion on the question of security to East Bengal Refugees. They can put short notice questions and get information.

* * * *

It appears we have not yet got out of the old moorings and continue to labour under a wrong impression that an adjournment motion continues to be a normal device for raising discussion on any important matter, as in the past. I have already stated how the conditions have entirely changed and, therefore, in the new set-up, with the various opportunities and the responsive and responsible character of the Government, we cannot look upon an adjournment motion as a normal device for raising discussion on any important matter."

Since this ruling was given, hon. Members may be aware that a number of other opportunities are given—Half-an-Hour Discussion, One Hour Discussion, One-and-half hour discussion and on every Friday a half-day discussion, and any other discussion also at the discretion of the Chair.

In spite of that the hon. Member wants to interrupt. I never said I would call the hon. Member after Mr. K. C. Reddy. I was not prepared. On a previous occasion he said that he

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

had a right to raise a point of order however bad it might be. The present one is a wrong point of order and he ought not to have raised it. I discountenance this kind of interruption. I may state it again and again that no hon. Member ought to interrupt the proceedings of the House. If the hon. Member was not satisfied, a number of other hon. Members are satisfied. I have put down expressly that subjects which hon. Members wish to raise by adjournment motions can be raised by Short Notice Questions, and hon. Ministers try to give information in their possession. After all they are not gods. They may be on the Treasury Benches, but they must also get information to place it before the House. In these circumstances, if any hon. Member claims a right to interrupt the proceedings of the House the Chair has an equal right to take any kind of action.

Shri Frank Anthony: I wish to raise a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No point of order; I do not find any point of order in this matter.

Shri Frank Anthony: I want to make a submission, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will immediately say that I am not going to allow such raising of point of order easily.

Shri Frank Anthony: While I raise this, Sir, I must protest against.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is this protest against me?

Shri Frank Anthony: I always defer to the Chair but not when this loud howling to a Member is unleashed. I do not wish to interrupt the proceedings of the House. My point of order is this. We have a distinct rule for moving for the adjournment of the business of the House. Now, we are asked to accept in fact that the rule has been superseded because in 1947 something else happened and that if we put down short-notice questions,

we should not move for an adjournment of the business of the House. What I want to know is this. Is it your ruling that this rule is nugatory or illusory, and although it is a definite matter of public importance, simply because some one chooses to forestall me and gives notice of a short-notice question, Government is absolved of its responsibility?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not allowing the hon. Member to go on. It is starting a discussion on this. It is definitely my ruling. I am only following a ruling that has already been given by the hon. Speaker. In the changed circumstances, the general rule that an urgent matter of public importance can be brought up has got its own limitations. It has always been considered in the House of Commons and elsewhere that it is a censure motion against the Government for having committed a default in carrying out its duties and responsibilities to the House. It is for the Chair to find out whether such a thing has happened or not. The rule is no doubt wide but it is subject to the limitations that I have already indicated. I do not find anything in this point of order. I am not giving a new ruling now.

So far as the word 'protest' is concerned, I would urge upon the hon. Member to withdraw it. It is not a question of homily. I have already said several times on the floor of the House that immediately after question hour there is such a confusion in the House that if we embark upon a new thing there is no end to this. That is going on still and the hon. Member persists. I have seen this for some time. It is not a question of homily. Even now I would urge upon the hon. Member to withdraw the word 'protest'. He ought not to protest against the ruling of the Chair.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am quite prepared to withdraw it, Sir. But in withdrawing, I beg to submit that we have certain rights....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I know the rights. I have...

Shri Frank Anthony: We are not here to be shouted down or shouted out.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not a question of shouting out or shouting down.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE
NOTIFICATION UNDER REQUISITIONING
AND ACQUISITION OF IMMOVABLE
PROPERTY ACT

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply Notification No. 4304-EII/53, dated the 7th August, 1953, under sub-section (2) of section 17 of the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952. [Placed in Library See No. S-106/53.]

STATEMENTS SHOWING ACTION TAKEN
BY GOVERNMENT ON ASSURANCES ETC.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given during the various sessions shown against each:—

(1) Supplementary Third Session of the Statement No. III House of the People, 1953.

[See Appendix VII, annexure No. 8.]

(2) Supplementary Second Session of the Statement No. IV House of the People, 1952.

[See Appendix VII, annexure No. 9.]

(3) Supplementary First Session of the Statement No. V House of the People, 1952.

[See Appendix VII, annexure No. 10.]

(4) Supplementary Third Session (Second Part) of the Provisional Parliament, Statement No. VIII, 1951.

[See Appendix VII, annexure No. 11.]

(5) Supplementary Third Session (First Part) of the Provisional Parliament, Statement No. IV, 1950.

[See Appendix VII, annexure No. 12.]

ESTATE DUTY RATES BILL

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to fix the rates of estate duty for the purposes of the Estate Duty Act, 1953.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is.....

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): On a point of information, Sir. This Bill is being introduced now under clause 34 of the Estate Duty Bill. According to that clause, Government has got the power to fix the rates. But, we have not passed the original measure yet, under which the Government gets this power to fix the rates and the right of introducing this measure prescribing the rates. Is it not too premature on the part of Government to introduce this Bill before the other Bill has been passed into an Act?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Will the Finance Minister explain?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am carrying out an assurance that I gave to the House—it was at the express wish of the House that I would indicate the rates on the ground of which the Bill will be passed. It is now only the introduction, which is really for the information of the House and the House will be seized of the matter.

Shri S. S. More: Sir, I would like to have further clarification. Clause 34 of the Estate Duty Bill says that the Government can introduce a measure indicating the rates of duty. It is only after that Bill has been placed on the Statute Book that this Bill prescribing the rates can be introduced. As a matter of fact, the Finance Minister is anticipating the decision of the House. It is quite possible, Sir, theoretically that the House may reject the Bill.

Several Hon. Members: No, no

Shri S. S. More: So, I am raising this not as a point of order. But, I want some information from you which may