

Mr. Speaker : I will put the amendments to the vote of the House.

Shri Kamath : They may be put separately, Sir.

Mr. Speaker : The question is :

That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"subject to the modification that—

'3 hours' instead of '2 hours' be allotted to the consideration and passing of the Travancore-Cochin State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill ;"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker : I come now to the next amendment, regarding the rules for the emergency recruitment to I.A.S. This seems to be practically out of order. The Business Advisory Committee is expected to allocate time. If it says 'not more than 1 hour', does it mean I can give 15 hours? It is not so. After all, we have no advice as to what ought not to be the time which should be allowed :

The question is :

That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"subject to the modification that—

'not less than 1 hour' instead of 'not more than 1 hour' be allotted to the Rules regarding emergency recruitment to I.A.S."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker : I shall now put the original motion to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 23rd May, 1956".

The motion was adopted.

RULING RE: BRINGING EMPLOYER—EMPLOYEE DISPUTES BEFORE HOUSE

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly) : Before the discussion on the second Five Year Plan is resumed, may I make a short statement on an important matter? On the 23rd May last, Shri A. K. Gopalan tabled an adjournment motion with regard to the railway workers'

strike in the Secunderabad division and at Kharagpur. The Railway Minister made a fairly long statement and he expressed the view that so long as the present railway workers' strike was not withdrawn completely and unconditionally, he was not prepared to consider any grievances of the workers or their request to refer the matter to adjudication.

You were good enough to rule out Shri Gopalan's adjournment motion. In giving your ruling you made certain observations which have deeply exercised the minds of some Members of this House and especially those of the Opposition. They may be mere *obiter dicta*. But we apprehend that coming from so exalted a person as the Speaker of the House they might be used as precedents for future occasions and that unless an immediate clarification is made, this may make our position difficult. We feel that the Members will not be in a position to discharge their duties and responsibilities as the elective representatives of the people unless the position is made clear. We have no intention to question your ruling. With due deference we were distressed by some observations made by you. You said that the dispute between the employer and the employees when the employer in this particular case was the Government—"Ought not to be brought up before the House for discussion and settlement". You also said that this House should not be used as "the forum for the purpose of settling such differences" and that the "public cannot be held at ransom by a section of the employees".

In view of the steady expansion of the public sector and in view of the further contemplated extension thereof under the next Five Year Plan, the State is going to be a very big employer of labour. We submit that it is the right and duty of the Members of the House to bring before Parliament matters of urgent public importance involving disputes or differences between the employer and the employees. The fact that technically a strike might not be legal or that the State is the employer should not be considered as grounds for negating discussions or for preventing interrogation of the Ministry concerned. We trust that you had no intention to say anything in curtailment of the rights and privileges of the Members of this House. But in the interests of all concerned, we submit that the position should be made clear.

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

Mr. Speaker : I did not mean that no difference between the employees and the railway administration should be brought up before the House however important and urgent it might be. I only meant that every small difference ought not to be taken advantage of by a few of the workers for settling the issues on the floor of this House and bringing it before the House. I grant that the Government is the employer in this case. Every matter of urgent public importance requiring the attention of Parliament can always be brought up and the same will be disposed of on its merits.

RESOLUTION RE. SECOND FIVE YEAR PLAN.—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker : The House will now resume further discussion of the following resolution moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the 23rd May, 1956 :

"This House records its general approval of the principles, objectives and programmes of development contained in the Second Five Year Plan as prepared by the Planning Commission".

Shri Ramachandra Reddi will resume his speech.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore) : Yesterday, I was referring to the important and valuable statement made by the hon. Prime Minister during the course of his speech moving the resolution on this subject, namely, that there can be no stable industrial economy in this country without a stable agricultural basis. Developing on that subject, I was referring to the need and the urgent necessity of improving the irrigational facilities in India, especially when we have large resources for the same. I suggested that for the development of irrigation facilities and for making larger provisions therefor, the allotments made in certain directions might be cut short and they may be diverted to irrigation. One of those subjects that I was referring to was the National Extension Service for which nearly Rs. 227 crores seems to have been allotted. I would suggest that we could easily cut off a hundred crores from that and divert it for irrigation so that with the betterment

of irrigation sources and facilities there will be a greater happiness and satisfaction in the rural areas which are the needs of the hour.

I would also suggest that in addition to this Rs. 100 crores, the salt excise duty can be revived which will probably come to about Rs. 100 crores, if there are no sentiments about its revival. I should think that in the matter of development of our economy, sentiments should not have a predominant place.

The third item that I would suggest is the withdrawal of prohibition in certain States where it is already adopted. This might give the State Governments about Rs. 100 crores within the course of the next five years. So, these items would make nearly Rs. 300 crores and if these amounts are added on to the irrigation projects, that will go a great way for developing the irrigation projects. As it is there is a great deal of dissatisfaction visible in certain States arising out of the fact that their irrigation sources have not been adequately developed and that the Central Government have not made adequate provision for the development thereof. Flood control projects have been provided for about Rs. 105 crores. Probably the hon. Finance Minister would say that flood control projects are also purely irrigation projects. If that is so, I would only mention that this amount should be equitably distributed between region and region. I find that the southern region of India is not adequately provided in this connection. If irrigation is also a part of the flood control measures that are now going to be adopted, then an equitable distribution of this money must be made between region and region.

I would also urge, for the development of the projects, a greater co-ordination between Ministry and Ministry of the Government of India. We have been hearing a good lot about the Ambar Charkha and the introduction thereof for the alleviation of distress in the rural areas. We have also been hearing that another Ministry has been opposing it and whether a compromise has been arrived at or not, things are going on fast. My suggestion is that there must be a greater co-ordination between the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and the Ministry of Planning so that the extent to which the Ambar Charkha can be introduced or not might be decided fairly and speedily. In fact, I am told that the Ministry of Commerce and