

[Secretary]

MOTION

That the Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to Copyright be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 Members; 15 Members from this House, namely :—Shri Mohamed Valiulla, Prof. R. D. Sinha Dinkar, Shri G. Ranga, Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan, Dr. Raghuvira, Shri Banarasi Das Chaturvedi, Shrimati Lilavati Munshi, Shri Raghavendrarao, Dr. Raghubir Singh, Shri Shyam Dhar Misra, Kakasahab Kalelkar, Shri Abdur Rezzak Khan, Shri N. B. Deshmukh, Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha, Dr. K. L. Shirmali, and 30 Members from the Lok Sabha;

That in other respects, the Rules meeting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of Members of the Joint Committee;

That in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Select Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Chairman may make;

That this House recommends to the Lok Sabha that the Lok Sabha do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of Members to be appointed by the Lok Sabha to the Joint Committee; and that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 25th May, 1956."

(ii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Multi-Unit Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Bill, 1956, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 16th February, 1956."

MULTI-UNIT CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Secretary : Sir, I lay the Multi-Unit Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by Rajya Sabha, on the Table of the House.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE NINETEENTH REPORT

श्री बी० जी० मेहता (गोहिलवाड) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं रेलवे मंत्रालय सम्बंधी एस्टीमेट कमेटी की उन्नीसवीं रिपोर्ट लोकसभा की टेबल पर रखता हूँ।

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor) : May I seek one information from you? Notice was given of a breach of privilege motion about four days back. But we have not heard anything about it so far. When are we likely to hear about it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Branch of privilege regarding what?

Shri U. M. Trivedi : Breach of privilege arising out of Babu Ramnarayan Singh's arrest.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I shall make enquiries immediately.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad) : I had also given notice of a breach of privilege motion about the prevention of Members of Parliament from attending the sitting of the Lok Sabha in time on the 16th instant, when the Shah of Iran came.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I shall make enquiries and send word to the hon. Member.

ALL-INDIA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES BILL

Clause 9—(Office of President etc.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The Lok Sabha will now resume clause by clause consideration of the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences Bill, 1955. Clauses 2 to 8, and 10 to 30 have already been disposed of. Clause 9 of the Bill is under consideration, along with clause 1, the Title, the Enacting Formula etc.

After this Bill is passed, the Lok Sabha will resume discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the Address by the President.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, who was in possession of the House, may now continue his speech.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (गुडगांव) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मैं लोक सभा की खिदमत में दफा ६ के बारे में प्रश्न कर रहा था। कल मैंने दफा ६ को पढ़ कर सुना था जिस की रू से आल इंडिया इंस्टीट्यूट के जो मेम्बर्स होंगे या प्रेसीडेंट होंगे, उनके बारे में जो आफिस आफ प्राफिट (लाभप्रद) का रिस्ट्रिक्शन (प्रतिबन्ध) है, उस से बरी किये जायेंगे यानी हर एक मेम्बर और उस के प्रेसीडेंट अगर वह इस हैसियत में होंगे तो उस के साथ में वह हाउस की मेम्बरी भी कर सकेंगे और आइदर हाउस की मेम्बरी भी वह कर सकेंगे और आइदर हाउस की मेम्बरी के वास्ते वह खड़े हो सकेंगे।

लोक सभा को याद होगा कि कल चन्द एक मेम्बर साहबान ने बड़ा सख्त ऐतराज किया था कि आल इंडिया इंस्टीट्यूट की गर्वानिंग बाडी का जो कम्पोजीशन (रचना) है उस में बहुत सारे आफिशियल्स हैं, नानआफिशियल एलिमेंट (लोग) बहुत कम हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन का ऐसा ऐतराज करना बिल्कुल दुस्त है और दरअसल इस इंस्टीट्यूट के अधिकतर मेम्बर्स नान-आफिशियल्स होने चाहियें। जहां तक हाउस के उन मेम्बरान का सवाल है जिन का हाउस इन्तखाब करेगा, यह बिल्कुल ठीक बात है कि हाउस के उन मेम्बरों के साथ किसी किस्म की डिसक्वालिफिकेशन नहीं आ सकती क्योंकि वे हाउस के एलेक्टेड मेम्बर्स होंगे, लेकिन ऐसे दूसरे असहाब के साथ जो इस बाडी के मेम्बर होंगे, उन के साथ इस डिसक्वालिफिकेशन को हटाना वाजिब नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मिनिसट्री को अभी तक शायद यह इल्म ही नहीं है कि स्पीकर साहब ने एक कमेटी बनाई थी, उस कमेटी ने काफी छानबीन के बाद एक रिपोर्ट पेश कर दी है और कुछ उसूल कायम किये हैं और उस की रिपोर्ट की कापी हर एक मेम्बर साहब को मुहैया की जा चुकी है। इस रिपोर्ट की रू से जितने भी वाइस चांसलर्स हैं उन सब को कमेटी की राय में ऐसा शल्स करार दिया गया है जिन के बारे में डिसक्वालिफिकेशन नहीं हटाई जायगी। इस के कम्पोजीशन में मैं देखता हूँ कि एक वाइस चांसलर का जिक्र है, देहली यूनिवर्सिटी का वाइस चांसलर इस इंस्टीट्यूट का मेम्बर होगा और जाहिर है कि अगर कमेटी की राय मानी गई तो वह वाइस चांसलर डिसक्वालिफिकेशन के मातहत आ जायेंगे। इस के कम्पोजीशन में वाइस चांसलर को सब से पहले गह दी गई है और वह वाइस चांसलर डिस-

क्वालिफिकेशन से मुबर्कर दिये गये हैं। चाहिये तो यह था कि जब तक उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट लोक सभा में बिल नहीं बन जाती उस वकत तक इस किस्म का कोई प्राबिजन (उपबन्ध) नहीं रखा जाता और उस रिपोर्ट से कान-फिलक्ट (संघर्ष) की सूरत पैदा न होती और बेहतर होता कि इस के अन्दर यह जो एग्जैम्शन (छूट) का सेक्शन (धारा) है वह न आता। अभी तक उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट न तो लोकसभा में कंसिडर हुई है और न ही उस पर कोई डिस्-जिन (विनिश्चय) लिया है। हम ने यहां पर एक कानून पास किया था कि सन् १९५७ तक जो भी किसी कमेटी के मेम्बर हैं, उन को डिसक्वालिफाई होने से रोका गया है क्योंकि ऐक्ट जल्दी पास नहीं हो सकता था। ऐक्ट उस रिपोर्ट के बाद जल्दी ही आने वाला है और मेरी समझ में उस को पहले ही एंटिसिपेट (पूर्वा-वधारण) कर के ऐसे असहाब को इस में से मुबर्कर कर देना जो फिलवाक्या बहुत सारे आफिशियल्स होंगे, यह वाजिब और दुस्त नहीं है। मालूम ऐसा होता है कि इस मिनिसट्री को अब तक इस रिपोर्ट का पता नहीं है और देखने में आया है कि इस मिनिसट्री को दूसरी और बहुत सी बातों का भी इल्म नहीं है। इस लोकसभा में बहुत से एश्योरेसेज (आश्वासन) रिफ्यूजीज के मुफादात के बारे में दिये गये, उन की बाबत भी जब यहां पर मिनिसटर साहब के महकम से पूछा गया कि आप ने उन पर क्या प्रमल किया तो उन्होंने फरमाया कि हम को इन एश्योरेसेज का पता नहीं है

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur) : I refuse that statement. It is an untrue statement.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : I did not hear what the hon. Minister has said but I am not giving way. When I wanted to put a question to the Minister, she did not give way. So I want to retaliate as a matter of fact. I do not want to give way to any Minister who is not considerate enough to give way to Members.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur) : This is a non-violent way of retaliation?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : This is absolutely non-violent. There is a precedent for this also. If the Minister behaves like this, then we as Members of the Lok Sabha are certainly entitled.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : To give way or not to give way is entirely in the discretion of the hon. Member. There need not be any precedent for this. He need not quote any precedent for this. It is open to him to give way or not.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : I am too frank to say out my mind, so that the Ministers may improve their conduct towards us.

मैं जनाब की खिदमत में यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि एक ऐसे मामले में जिस में लोकसभा की रिपोर्ट हो चुकी है और जिस के अन्दर नया कानून आने वाला है और प्रान्सेबुल ला मिनिस्टर कोई एक ऐसा कानून लायेंगे और उस रिपोर्ट को बिल्कुल नजरअंदाज कर देंगे ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Am I to understand that the hon. Member is opposing clause 9?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I suppose the hon. Member wants that this sort of provision exempting Members of Parliament from incurring disqualification ought not be here in this Bill, but it should be in the general Act?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : My submission is this that members of such a body should be disqualified from sitting with us. Let us remember that they will all be the satellites of this Ministry. They will all be persons who will certainly be Government servants to start with.

If you would kindly see the composition, you will find that most of them will be the servants of Government. Even if they are not servants of Government, I am very anxious that the nominees of this Ministry should not be allowed to sit with us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Does it mean that the hon. Member is opposed to any Member of Parliament being on the institute?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : No. On the contrary, I submit that so far as Members of Parliament are concerned, their representation may be increased, because the Members of Parliament are the proper persons who are to sit on this

body. They are elected representatives and moreover will be re-elected by the Houses.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The hon. Member is opposing only the inclusion of the word 'President'?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : No, President and any member of the governing body. Now, the members of the governing body will be the nominees of Government. I am not expecting them to be independent. They will vote with Government in every matter.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara) : Have six Members of Parliament there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : If we see the composition of the institute as given in clause 4, we find that there are to be three Members of Parliament.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : So far as they are concerned, they are exempted. So far as they are concerned, the report of our committee is that if any Members of Parliament are elected by Parliament, then no disqualification can attach to them. We cannot stultify our own judgment and say that we shall disqualify them. Therefore, these persons will not come within the purview of the disqualification at all.

We are concerned with those other than the elected Members of Parliament. In so far as they are concerned, I humbly beg to submit that they ought not to be qualified. The disqualification should attach to them as attaches to all nominees specially servants of Government. So far as the other House is concerned, if they are elected Members, then the thing would be different. If they are elected then no question of disqualification shall apply. But there can be persons in the other House who may also be nominated by Government. I want that if any such person is there he ought to be disqualified. That is my humble submission. This clause ought not to have been there. I request Government not to include such clauses in any other Bill so long as the House has not taken any decision on the report of the Committee which has been appointed by the Speaker himself. It is rather anticipating the report and this should not have been included. This shows that in this Ministry there are people who do not know

anything of what is going about. I am very sorry to make this remark but it is unfortunately too true. Therefore, I oppose this clause.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur) : If I may point out, Sir, for such Members to continue in Parliament clause 9 is unnecessary. The provisions in the clause relating to Constitutions will do. This will not disqualify people. The mischief of clause 9 will come in only in this way that there is somebody who is not elected to either House of Parliament but who is there by virtue of his nomination by Government. He might come to Rajya Sabha by nomination. By clause 9, it is open to the Government to nominate a member of this Governing Body to Parliament. I hope that is not the intention of Government at all. The Government wants only to ensure by clause 9 that people who are elected by Parliament might continue to sit in Parliament and it should not be declared to be an office of profit. But the real point is whether clause 9 is necessary to give effect to that. To my mind, clause 9 is unnecessary. Clause 9 does not say, people elected under 4(g). It says—

“It is hereby declared that the office of President or member shall not disqualify its holder for being chosen as, or for being, a member of either House of Parliament.”

It is open to the Government to say that the office of the President is such an onerous thing that they would like to make full payment for that member. That will mean that a paid officer of the Government of India will be entitled to be nominated or to stand for election to both Houses of Parliament. I think that is not the intention of Government, in introducing clause 9. I think it is meant for the purpose of safety. It will have a different effect than what is intended. That is, any member, whether fully paid by a salaried post or given only allowances can stand for election to Parliament or can be nominated to the Rajya Sabha. As far as I see, that is not the intention of Government.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : May I know how does the hon. Member know the intention of Government? The intention is clear from clause 9. The intention does not matter; the clause matters.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar : I understand that; that is why I say that clause 9 is unnecessary.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur : We had really intended to put this clause in order to protect the Members of Parliament from being disqualified or from becoming President or members of the Institute But, in view of the Prevention of Disqualification Act, clause 4, it is not necessary to retain clause 9. I am perfectly willing to eliminate it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I am asking hon. Members whether if some fee is given to members of this Institute would that disqualify them?

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar : No, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The hon. Member says, No, Sir, I say yes. It may be by way of abundant caution that this has been put in. I leave it to the House.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar : If that is so, the clause should say : President and members of the Institute who are elected by Parliament. If we want to make that clear we should say so. The effect of this clause would be that people who are not elected from the Houses of Parliament but who are nominated to the Governing Body can be nominated to the Rajya Sabha.

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

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur : I am prepared to withdraw that clause. Am I permitted to withdraw?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : You are putting it all right.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : There is some small difference of opinion that unless I put this clause to the House, the Bill will continue without that clause. I am not going to take risks because the whole Bill has been taken into consideration and clause by clause have been put. There is no question of withdrawal of

any particular clause. No hon. Minister or hon. Member can now withdraw. I will put it to the House and it may negative it. That is the safest method.

The question is :

“That clause 9 stands part of the Bill.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 9 was omitted from the Bill.

Clause I—Short Title and Commencement

*Amendment made : Page 1, line 4.—
for "1955" substitute "1956".*

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

"That clause 1, as amended stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Enacting Formula

*Amendment made : Page 1, line 1.—
for "Sixth Year" substitute "Seventh year".*

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

"That the Enacting Formula, as amended, and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, and the Title were added to the Bill.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur : Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is

Shri Mohanlal Saksena (Lucknow Distt. *cum* Bara Banki Distt.) : *rose—*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : We have already exceeded the time limit.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha) : A second extension has been given.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : All right, two minutes for Shri Mohanlal Saksena and two minutes for Pandit Bhargava.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena : The other day you were pleased to ask about the

institution that has been established at Jamnager. I may inform the House that the expenditure has been very low. How much money has been spent? It is only about Rs. 10 lakhs. Though much has been provided in the whole plan only Rs. 10 lakhs has been spent. The hon. Minister is complaining that there are no funds. But there is money lying idle and she has not been able to spend because she has appointed a committee and it will take some time to report. Here we have got the Ayurvedic and Tibbia College founded by the late Hakim Ajmal Khan out of his own endeavours and there it is suffering for want of funds.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Why should one be linked with the other as if the Consolidated Fund of India is too poor to pay even the Tibbia College?

Shri Mohanlal Saksena : I am only saying what sort of sympathy the Government has got. It is adding insult to injury. On the one hand you do not grant sufficient funds for this purpose. The Princely States were financing Ayurveda and Unani to the extent of crores of rupees. Now, I ask how much money is being spent by the Government of India and all the States for this purpose. I say it is adding insult to injury, because you do not treat Ayurveda as Medical Science. It would have been much better if you had called this Bill by the name of All-India Institute of Allopathic Medical Sciences or something like that but not Medical Sciences. As I said yesterday, it is like enacting *Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark. You are having such a costly Institute like this and still you do not make provision for Ayurveda and other indigenous systems of medicine being studied there. As a matter of fact, in my original speech I had referred to the fact that the Planning Commission in their First Plan had made a definite recommendation that the possibility of making provision for the study of physical systems of treatment should be considered and facilities provided for education therein. I had asked the hon. Minister to tell me what steps were taken by the Health Ministry in this respect, but she kept mum. Very often she had been going to the official gallery for information, but on this point she had no information.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The hon. Member is saying what he had already said.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena : I looked into the First Five Year Plan, but there is nothing in it about the expenditure. But in a progress report issued in September 1954, it is stated that the provision for Rs. 1,64,00,000 had been made for expenditure to be incurred on the Institute and it was expected that it would be ready and completed within the Plan period. I want to know definitely what will be the expenditure involved in the running of this Institute. There is no definite figure given. It is very well to say that this recurring expenditure covers six or seven years, but I want to know how much every year. Even this year we find that there is a provision for about Rs. 46,00,000 and it may go in subsequent years to the tune of a crore of rupees and even more. So I would like the hon. Minister to give me this information. Why is she fighting shy to do so? After all she should have presented to the Lok Sabha a complete picture. She has taken four years for bringing this measure, as I said yesterday, and yet wanted the Lok Sabha to pass this measure in an hour's time. I would also request the Business Advisory Committee to take greater care in deciding the question of allotment of time for the different measures.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : So far as that is concerned, I will arrange for a notice to be put up hereafter regarding the meetings of the Business Advisory Committee; the agenda will be indicated on the notice board. Any hon. Member who wishes to make any special representation saying that a particular measure requires so much more time, etc., is always welcome. If we cannot accommodate all the Members in the Speaker's Chamber, I will hold the meeting in the Central Hall.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena : Of course, the Members are there. But after all, it is the duty of the Business Advisory Committee also to find out which measures involve too much expenditure,—expenditure amounting to crores of rupees—so that they may not be allotted just one hour's time. They are there to discharge a certain responsibility and they are supposed to work on behalf of the Lok Sabha and so the Members of that Committee must take care to study this more carefully.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Everyone studies, but not in the manner in which the hon. Member has studied.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena : No, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The hon. Member says that Members have not studied it. Two persons may study a thing but each one may address himself to some aspect of it.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena : So far as this Bill is concerned, I beg to submit not even one Member seems to have studied it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I am sorry I am not able to reply from the floor of the Lok Sabha.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena : Otherwise how could one hour have been allotted to this important measure?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I am sorry I cannot allow any more time to the hon. Member. I would now call upon Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं आप की खिदमत में छोटे से दो पायंट्स रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं बिजिनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी (कार्यमंत्रणा समिति) का एक मेम्बर था। मैं इस बहस में नहीं पड़ना चाहता हूँ कि हम ने ठीक किया या गलत किया। कमेटी ने इस सिलसिले में एक घंटा दिया या दो घंटे दिये, लेकिन इस वक़्त मुझे उस बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना है। इस बिल में साफ कहा गया है कि मेडिकल साइंसिज़ का एक ग़ाल-इंडिया इंस्टीट्यूट कायम किया जायगा। हम सब इस का मतलब यही समझे थे कि जितनी माइनों साइंसिज़ हैं, उन का यह इंस्टीट्यूट बनेगा। लेकिन दोराने-बहस में ग़ानरेबल मिनिस्टर साहिबा ने फरमाया कि माइनों साइंसिज़ से मेरा मतलब सिर्फ़ एलौपैथिक सिस्टम है। मैं यह अर्ज़ करना चाहता हूँ कि किस मेम्बर के दिमाग में यह बात आ सकती थी कि ग़ानरेबल मिनिस्टर साहिबा ऐसा डिस्कलोज़र कर देंगी (बतायेंगी) कि माइनों साइंसिज़ मीन्ज़ (का अर्थ) ओल्डी (केवल) एलौपैथिक सिस्टम है। जनाबे वाला ने भी कल फरमाया था—और वह बिल्कुल बजा था—कि माइनों साइंसिज़ के मानी होमियोपैथी भी हैं, यूनानी भी है और प्रायुर्वेदिक भी है। डा० सुरेश चन्द्र, जो कि इस बिल के हक में बोले थे, ने भी यही समझा और हर एक मेम्बर ने भी यही समझा। किसी को इस बात का ख्याल तक न था कि ग़ानरेबल मिनिस्टर साहिबा जो कि नेशनल काँग्रेस को बिलांग करती हैं, माइनों साइंसिज़ में से यूनानी और प्रायुर्वेदिक सिस्टम को हटा देंगी। जनाबे वाला, मैं अर्ज़

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

करना चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल का नाम—दि प्राल-इंडिया इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ़ मेडिकल साइंसिज बिल—मिसनामर (गलत नाम) है। जनाबे वाला का इन्टरप्रेटेशन (व्याख्या) दुस्त है कि इस में सब साइंसिज शामिल होंगी। अगर कभी यह मामला कोर्ट में गया तो आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहिबा की इन्टरप्रेटेशन होल्ड वाटर नहीं करेगी (कसौटी पर खरी नहीं उतरेगी) और अगर कोई दूसरा आनरेबल मिनिस्टर इस रकम को प्रायुर्वेदिक और यूनानी सिस्टम पर भी खर्च करेगा, तो वह बिल्कुल जस्टिफाइड (न्यायोचित) होगा और वह कार्यवाही ग्रन-कांस्टीट्यूशनल (असंवैधानिक) नहीं होगी।

जनाबे वाला ने निहायत खूबसूरती से फरमाया था कि सारे इंडिया के फाइनेन्सिज (वित्त) खरम नहीं हो गये हैं और मैं उन की इस बात की कद्र करता हूँ, लेकिन मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आज आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहिबा ने एलोपैथी के लिये पांच-छः करोड़ रखे हैं, तो मुझे अभी देखना है कि कब वह प्रायुर्वेदिक और यूनानी सिस्टम के लिये कोई बड़ी रकम रखती हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि वह हरगिज कोई रकम नहीं देगी। इस की वजह यह है कि उन के दिमाग में यह बात नहीं है कि प्रायुर्वेद को बढ़ाना है। जनाबे वाला ने प्लीड (तर्क) किया था कि उस के लिये और रुपया मिल जायगा। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर मुझे उस की भाशा होती और अगर मुझे और फाइनेन्सिज दिखाई देते तो मैं उन को कानग्रैचुलेट करता (बधाई देता)। जो रुपया और साइंसिज के लिए खर्च होना चाहिये था, वह उन के लिये खर्च न कर के और देश को यूनानी और प्रायुर्वेदिक सिस्टम के बैनिफिट (लाभ) से डिप्राइव (वंचित) कर के यहां दिया जा रहा है, इसलिये मैं इस को अपोज (विरोध) करता हूँ। क्या आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहिबा इतनी रकम किसी और सिस्टम के लिये भी देंगी? मैं जानता हूँ कि वह नहीं देंगी। जनाब ने भावनगर का जिक्र किया था। मैं जानता हूँ कि वहां के लिये कितनी रकम दी गई है। जब स्वराज्य नहीं था, तो सब स्टेट्स में यूनानी और प्रायुर्वेदिक सिस्टम के लिए बड़ी बड़ी रकमें खर्च की जाती थीं। अगर नेशनल गवर्नमेंट के कायम होने के बाद उन को उन का हक न दिया जाय, उन को इस तरह इग्नोर (उपेक्षा) किया जाय और रिवाइव (फिर कायम) न किया जाय, तो मैं नहीं समझता कि वह कोई ठीक काम होगा।

इस बिल को छोड़ कर जहां तक दूसरे मामला का सवाल है, मैं देखता हूँ कि इस मिनिस्ट्री में न विज्ञान (दृष्टि) है और न ही मैं उस में कोई काम करने की शक्ति पाता हूँ। अभी थोड़ा ही अर्सा हुआ कि हाउसिंग फैक्टरी की स्कीम हमारे जिस्म पर एक बड़ा ज़रम लगा गई है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May I submit to the hon. Member that all that will constitute a general discussion of the Budget and I am sure the hon. Member will have an opportunity to speak on it at that time, but not on this occasion? The housing factory does not come under this Bill.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव: बहरसूरत उन को यह देख लेना चाहिये था कि प्राया इस से देश को कोई फायदा भी होगा या नहीं। मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन में विज्ञान (दृष्टि) नहीं है—वह देख नहीं सकते कि देश का फायदा किस बात में है। कहा गया है कि इस से रूरल (ग्रामीण) लोगों को फायदा होगा, लेकिन मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमारे देश के लोगों को कोई फायदा होगा, उन को कोई मेडिकल फैसिलिटीज (सुविधायें) मिलेंगी और उन की हेल्थ अच्छी होगी, तो इस सिस्टम से नहीं, जो कि बहुत महंगा है, बल्कि इस देश के अपने सिस्टम से। जहां तक मैं देख सकता हूँ, दरअसल सारे सिस्टम को डिप्राइव किया जायगा और सारे देश को नुकसान पहुंचाया जायगा।

अगर महज साइंस का मामला होता तो आप करोड़ों रुपये खर्च कर देते मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं होता। इधर आप कहते हैं कि हमारे यहां रुपया नहीं है और दूसरी तरफ आप ऐसी चीजों पर जो कि महज सपने हैं रुपया खर्च करते हैं, जैसे कि हाउसिंग फैक्टरी है। शरणार्थियों के साथ क्या सलूक किया गया। इस मिनिस्ट्री को पता नहीं है कि उस की ड्यूटी क्या है। यह मिनिस्ट्री दिल्ली में ऐसा इन्स्टीट्यूट (Institute) बना कर रूरल एरियाज को फायदा नहीं पहुंचा सकती। इस सारे बिल का कन्सेप्शन (कल्पना) ऐसा है कि इस से देश को कोई फायदा पहुंचने वाला नहीं है। इस सिस्टम से देश को कैसे फायदा पहुंच सकता है कि जिसकी एक पेटेंट मेडीसिन की एक बोज (खुराक) का दाम ४२ रुपया हो। सैकड़ों रुपया इलाज शुरू होने से पहले कौन खर्च कर सकता है? हो सकता है कि इस सिस्टम

से दिल्ली के कुछ बड़े प्रफसरान को, मिनिस्टरान को और हम मेम्बरान को फायदा पहुँचे। लेकिन इस बिल के वास्ते यह कहना कि इस से रूरल एरियाज को फायदा पहुँचेगा गलत है और घोखे की बात है। मैं कहूँगा कि यह ऐसा बिल है कि इस को पास नहीं किया जाना चाहिये।

Shri Joachim Alva : May I put only two questions? So much has been said about Ayurveda. I want to know whether Government propose to put sufficient funds in the Jamnagar Institute started by the Maharani of Jamnagar. It is a big institution of sufficient importance. There are five persons to be nominated by the Central Government. Is one of these five men going to hold the post of Director—the person whose age is between 60 and 70? I want to get a straight answer to this question. This sort of manipulation of appointments should not take place. This appointment should go to a youngster, not more than 55.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Hon. Member should only put questions.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur : I have not got to say very much because I have already spoken in detail about this Bill. As far as Ayurveda is concerned, I may say that the Centre had allotted a sum of Rs. 37.5 lakhs in the first Plan for Ayurveda and Unani. This is in addition to what the States have provided. A Central Institute has been formed in Jamnagar and arrangements have been made already this year to introduce post-graduate studies there. A sum of one crore has been set apart for Ayurveda and Unani systems in the Second Plan. So, Government is not ignoring these systems. The tragedy is that the *vaids* are not able to put forth schemes by which they can absorb this money. That is my problem very much more than the ability or otherwise to provide funds.

As far as homoeopathy is concerned, the college at Calcutta is being upgraded in collaboration with the West Bengal Government and post-graduate studies are being arranged in collaboration with the Bombay Government in Bombay. None of these sciences are being ignored. But I claim that the majority of the people of our country want modern medicine.

Some Hon. Members : No.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur : Modern medicine has been described on the floor of this Lok Sabha again and again by me and I do not wish to go into it again. As for the expenditure on this Institute, figures have been given more than once and I am not going to give them again. I wish to say no more except that I am convinced that through this Institute a very great deal of benefit will accrue to modern medicine and to the propagation of that science and also it will serve the people of this country in a better way than it has been able to serve them before.

Shri Joachim Alva : My question remains unanswered. Would the Director, among the five men, be a man between 60 and 70 years of age, completely out of touch with the latest methods of research, operation, etc. ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Order, order.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur : I am not prepared to say today who the Director will be.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I shall put the motion, now.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava : We were told that some amount would be contributed by the Government of India for Ayurveda. The hon. Minister said that it would be one crore. May I, through you, ask the hon. Minister to increase the amount to at least 4.75 crores as you were pleased to suggest during the course of discussion that more money can be appropriated for sciences other than those specified by the Minister in this Bill ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Hon. Members have heard what the hon. Minister has said. It does not require any particular explanation. There must be schemes. The *vaids* have not been able to bring forward schemes. If schemes come up, say for Rs. 10 crores, then it is legitimate to say and fifty per cent will be given this year and the rest next year. Hon. Members will work up that way along with the *vaids*. For me to interest myself in this matter, I have no competence.

So, the question is :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.