

I suppose this is where the planters get their sense of confidence from and perhaps it is natural that when....

Shri Kanungo: I shall be obliged if the hon. Member will give me the quotation, reference to the speech which she has made.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: This has come in the verbatim report that has appeared in the press and I am quite prepared to give him a copy of this quotation or the whole speech if it has not yet reached his office by now, though it should have. Because, the Minister of Commerce and Industry was supposed to be present at that conference. But, indisposition prevented him from reaching there and fortunately he was not placed in the embarrassing position of having to hear, as Chairman, these words in his physical presence though his spiritual presence was probably there guiding the deliberations of that conference.

Be that as it may, it is this sort of remarks that are made on the floor of the House by Members of the Government and the actions of the Government that follow these remarks that enable or give courage to these people to make derogatory remarks about our country, our heritage and our freedom. Today, when we are moving forward, in keeping with our best traditions, in keeping with the pledges that have been made to those martyrs in the national liberation movement, it is time that, step by step, we get back to India what is her own, whether it be cultural paintings or such other relics which were referred to in the previous Resolution or whether it be wealth that belongs to the people and not only to Shri T. T. Krishnamachari as Shri Feroze Gandhi tried to make out.

Therefore, what I would like to point out is that the reply of the hon. Minister has certainly not served to remove from the mind the apprehensions that remain there. When I spoke I said that we knew that the question of plantations was not decided on. I made an appeal that this question

should be decided on the basis of the recommendations made by the Plantation Enquiry Commission.

We are fully aware from the articles that have appeared in the press and from the statements made by plantation owners that that is the target of attack. The figures that have been given by the Plantation Enquiry Commission are now under fire from the plantation side, from the owners' side. I was really very regretful to hear an echo of that challenge of these figures coming also from the Treasury Benches.

I would, in concluding, like to appeal to the Minister and to the Government that once again they should take up the major recommendations—I stress the word major—that they should take up the major recommendations and reconsider those that have been rejected and give effect to the recommendations of a responsible Commission which was appointed by the Government and which, certainly, went about its work in a most responsible and very thorough manner.

REGULATION OF WORKING HOURS IN THE TRANSPORT INDUSTRY

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): May I know, Sir whether one of these Ministers will reply or the Labour Minister?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): I am here.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Sir, I am raising this discussion to point out the gross neglect to which the workers in the road transport industry are subjected by the Government of India.

Before I make my points, I would like to make a very humble request through you to the Minister that he might try at least to find some arguments for the points which we are raising. I have found, and just now, when the hon. Minister was replying I found it again that on important points which are raised from the opposition, Ministers have recently

[Shri V. P. Nayyar]

acquired a habit of giving very evasive replies, and in so doing, they seem to have developed something more entertaining than a fine art. I want, therefore, the hon. Minister who, unfortunately does not deal with the subject—even in subjects with which he deals, we have seen what it is—to give us a reply and if he does not know the details, let him kindly get the details on this very very important subject

The road transport industry, today, employs not less than 4 lakhs of workers. I was amazed the other day when in answer to a question, the hon. Minister Shri Abid Ali gave us the figure that the industry employed only about 80,000 workers. I have here figures which show that we have 110,000 trucks and about 26,500 buses in our country. I do not know whether the hon. Minister takes it that these trucks and buses can be operated by a single driver. In the case of two or three buses, probably, the Minister thinks that all of them can together be operated by a single driver. Otherwise, when there are 150,000 vehicles, there is no reason why there should be 80,000 workers only.

The workers in the road transport industry have many problems. Their organisations, especially the National Federation of Road Transport Workers has been agitating on the basis of several demands. Very often, we find hon. Ministers giving replies, such evasive replies as I said before, that we are inclined to think that there was not at all a case before the Government, pending consideration. I very well remember, when I asked whether he had received a copy of the memo submitted by the National Federation of Road Transport Workers, he said that he did not have a copy. I immediately said, probably search your waste paper basket. I hope he has found it out. I have it here with me.

What is the real issue? When we assess the difficulties of these workers, we must also assess the importance of this industry in this very peculiar

context. The British Government, in the old days, thought that the transport industry was confined only to the Railways. They never considered that the road transport industry was an industry at all. They did not try to develop the road transport industry. I want to ask the hon. Minister whether that situation has at all changed today. Today you know, Sir, that a well-developed transport industry is an essential pre-requisite of any planning worth the name. Here, we are having several bottlenecks. The railways are not adequately developed, and if you go to other countries where the railway system is very well developed, you find that there are far larger number of buses and trucks than what you have in India. I am not going to tire the House with figures, but I would say that in the case of the U.S.A., for example, with its very well developed railway system, there are about 9 million trucks U.K. which is very small in area compared to our country has ten times the number of buses and trucks that we have. That is the importance of the industry even in countries where the railway system is very well developed. Then we can understand what the importance of this industry will be in a country like India where the railway system is still very much under-developed.

Then, I would like to know from the hon. Minister how he can say that the policy in regard to the labour employed in this industry has changed. To me it does not at all appear to have changed, it has gone from bad to worse.

You will remember, Sir, that in 1939 the I.L.O. had a convention on the transport industry. India was a member. Very often the Ministers boast of being Members. It is certainly not a revolutionary organisation, being controlled through fractional committees of this party or that party. The I.L.O. had agreed as early as 1939 that in this industry which had its own hazards peculiar to it there should be a limitation on the working hours. I find that in 1939 the Government of

India sent a note on the questionnaire circulated by the I.L.O. And here in the report of the 25th session of the I.L.O. I find that the attitude of the then Government of India was also similar to what we find from the Government at present. This is what the report says.

"The reply from India says:

'Conditions of driving in India do not make the same demand on drivers as conditions in western countries, and the advantages of further regulations would require careful consideration in the light of further developments. In the circumstances, the Government of India feel that no useful purpose would be served by making a detailed reply to the questionnaire.'

What are the driving conditions in India? Are there any other countries with roads so unworthy of road traffic? In other countries we know that the roads have developed very well, and it is common knowledge that when the surface of the road is bad, there is a greater strain on the man at the wheel, as also on the conductor. In India we ply our buses through village roads. Our drivers and conductors have to work in tropical heat. Yet in 1939 the British Government chose to say for and on behalf of India that the working hours need not at all be reduced.

And what do we find now? Now, a year after the socialistic pattern of society was voted upon by this House, we find the Motor Vehicles Act being amended. In 1939 the Motor Vehicles Act had prescribed nine hours steering duty. You know, Sir, steering duty does not mean all the work that a driver has. The hon. Minister knows from his own experience that probably his driver reports to him at 9 o'clock or 8 o'clock in the morning. Maybe he has steering duty only for two, three or five hours, but he goes home not earlier than 10 o'clock in the night. Steering duty may be three hours only, but with this spread-over it might be many more hours.

In the case of transport workers, although the steering duty is fixed at nine hours, along with the spread-over it is very much more than nine hours. It is sometimes eleven or twelve hours, and in some cases it goes up to even 18 hours.

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): I drive my own car. The key is with me.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I meant the Minister, not the Deputy Minister. So, I correct myself as Deputy Minister. If he drives himself, then it is quite good. I must thank the pedestrian who is safe on the way.

I say that by working even one hour more than their counterparts in other countries, the additional contribution which the drivers and the conductors in India would make to the industry is not a very negligible one. It is nothing short of 250 million man-hours a year. Our transport workers are obliged to work under that legislation because the Government has not been sympathetic towards them.

The hon. Minister may say that our conditions do not require any change. I would just quote one or two figures to show what the duty hours as fixed in other countries are. Here are the figures which I have taken again from the I.L.O. labour statistics of 1955: Canada 45.1 hours; U.S.A. 43.2 hours; Japan 48.2 hours; Philippines 45 hours; France 47.6 hours; U.K. 50.1 hours; India 54 hours. These figures are all for the week. When I said that 250 million man-hours is the additional work which our transport workers put in, I was referring in particular to this.

And what are the present circumstances? In 1939 when the working hours per day had to be fixed at nine, and the weekly working hours at 54, you know very well that India did not have any truck heavier than a three tonner. India did not have any bus which was weighing more than three tons. We know that in those days the carrying capacity of a bus was only 23. What is the position now? Now we have got the Leyland which weighs

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

eight or nine tons, we have got the Tata-Mercedes-Benz which weighs eight or nine tons. We know in the case of Delhi transport especially at peak hours what the position is. There is a seating capacity for 40 or 50, there is a standing capacity for 15 or 20, then there is a hanging capacity for another 20, and ultimately there is a sandwiching capacity of what number God alone knows. Does it not increase the workload of the driver? Does it not increase the workload of the conductor who has to issue tickets to all these people? And remember what will be the position in Delhi's sweltering heat of summer when a man has to work in D.T.S for nine hours steering duty and another two hours spread-over. Is there anything wrong if they ask, when they know that our country is supposed to march forward to a goal of a socialistic pattern, that they must work only for a number of hours which are prescribed in other civilised countries? They are not asking for anything else. These are conditions which ought to have been attended to long, long ago.

We were told time and again when this issue was raised here that a comprehensive Bill would be brought forward. We had a Bill in 1956, but this was not changed. We are now promising that there will be another Bill.

Here again I want the hon. Minister to remember that in the recent deliberations of the tripartite committee, I am told, the workers made a united demand for a reduction of the working hours from nine to eight, but the brief of the Government at that conference even in the year of Grace 1957 seems to have been that there can be no reduction in the working hours per day nor in the working hours per week.

Mercies are being shown to other workers, very small mercies; particularly in the case of the transport workers, the mercies of Government seem to be rather strained. They do not drop as gentle rain at any rate, but they hit the worker as hailstones.

Why is this peculiar treatment meted out to the transport workers? We have got regulations to govern the working conditions in other industries, we have got regulations and codes in the tea industry or in the jute industry or the textile industry, even in the railways. Is there any such law or regulation which determines the number of working hours at a human level in respect of the transport industry?

It is easy for them to say that we are undergoing a process of development. We know the transport industry has a very vital role to play, and this is not the way to treat its workers. I found from the rates of payment for the various grades of workers also that they are not at all in a happy position. I am not taking up that matter now.

I also want the hon. Minister to remember that while it is easy for him to say that Government will come out with a very comprehensive piece of legislation and they are already attempting the draft of such a legislation, it is difficult for us to believe that there will be any material change from the conditions as we find now. I do not see any reason at all for Government having this attitude in the case of the workers of a very important industry.

Another point before I close is this. In such committees where labour is also represented, in such committees set up after consistent agitation, it is really understandable for us to find that Government come after a period of 18 years from the day when it was originally laid down and say that they shall, for the time being, have 9-hour day and 54-hour week. I want the hon. Minister to consider the special problems of this industry, and if he would care, I shall give him some suggestions as to how Government should proceed if the interests of the industry have to be maintained.

The Minister is not listening to me. I thought I was wasting my lungs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has to speak.

Shri V. P. Nayar: But am I not entitled, when I speak, to a little attention from him?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is taking notes for preparing his reply.

Shri Abid Ali: If he does not want a reply, I will not take notes. Either I write and reply or I do not write and do not reply.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I would give him some suggestions in the hope—may be I am not very much justified—that he will pay attention to them.

I want Government to ratify the I.L.O. Convention to which India was a party. We should not be told that it will be ratified after a long time or after due consideration. Government have been considering all these 18 years. We want, therefore, that the Convention should be ratified and working hours, as fixed by the Convention, namely 8 hours per day inclusive of steering, spread over to 48 hours a week, should be enforced. I would also request him to have the draft of the legislation for the motor transport workers, which is under discussion of the expert committee, to be brought before us at least in the next session.

The third suggestion is that the working hours for operating group should be made 8 hours per day including—not as we have done earlier—the steering duty, and spread over to 48 hours a week.

My fourth suggestion is that a tripartite inquiry commission should be appointed immediately to go into the service and living conditions of the motor transport workers in all their details. Such an inquiry is called for. Many other industries have had it and it is time that we had such an inquiry here also because we find that transport workers do not get most of the amenities—I do not say the workers in other industries get all the amenities; but they get a little bit of them—they do not get even that little bit; that has been consistently denied in the case of the transport workers.

Finally, I would request him to have another tripartite industrial committee to be constituted in order to discuss outstanding problems. I would again invite his kind attention to the memorandum submitted by the National Federation of Road Transport Workers, and urge upon him, while replying, to reply to the points which we have raised in regard to the labour conditions in the motor transport industry.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): At the outset, I must say that we on this side are glad that this question of transport workers and their conditions of service has been raised by my esteemed friend, Shri V. P. Nayar.

Road transport workers are really of the category of sweated labour. When I say sweated labour, I am basing myself on the recognition accorded to it by the Government. Yesterday, we were discussing certain amendments to the Minimum Wages Act. That Act was meant to cover only those workers who were not well organised, those workers from whom sweated labour was extracted. Of the 12 industries which are mentioned in the Schedule to the Minimum Wages Act, public motor transport is the 11th. For the sake of comparison, I would like to mention the other industries which are covered by this Act, namely, woollen, rice mill, tobacco and biri, plantation, oil mills, stone-breaking, lac, mica, tanneries etc. Admittedly, some of these are cottage industries where the workers are not well organised. So these workers, including transport workers, whose conditions are the subject matter of today's discussion, should deserve greater attention and sympathy at the hands of Government.

I have also got certain association with these transport workers because for the last ten years or so, I have been working for the transport workers in Madras State so that I can also speak from my experience of the past ten years. My hon. friend was referring to the ILO Convention No. 67 which was adopted in 1939. Even before this Convention was

[Sbri Tangmani]

taken up for consideration, it was admitted by the trade union movement in 1945 and 1946 and also by all shades of political opinion, that the 8-hour day must be introduced in all these industries. Probably the Deputy Minister is also fully aware of such a campaign which was going on during 1945 and 1946. 8-hour day was the demand of the working class of India. So on 1st August 1946, 8-hour day for all the organised industries was introduced. But we find in 1957 that the transport workers are not enjoying that privilege. Ever since 1946, whenever there was a question of hours of work for transport workers referred to a tribunal, the adjudicators were always prepared to give—they have always given—8-hour day as working day.

I shall illustrate this point. In 1946, there was a strike in the SRVS bus service in Madurai. They were plying about 100 buses and employing nearly 800 workers. One of the issues raised was the question of hours of work and it is on record that as early as September 1946, the hours of work fixed, including half an hour as rest for a particular trip, were 8 a day. But today the Central legislation which fixes the hours of work for the transport workers says that the weekly quantum of work to be done by transport workers is 54 hours.

We are really confronted with this difficulty. In government transport services also when the hours of work are to be fixed, they say, 'Unless you work for 54 hours a week, no overtime can be claimed.' I am asking in all seriousness whether Government today are going to insist on this 54-hour week. The hon. Deputy Minister also knows that in the conference of the World Federation of Trade Unions, two categories of workers were mentioned—workers in mines and workers in road transport—who need special attention and sympathy because of the nature of the work that they have to do. The work is more strenuous and responsibility is also greater in the case of these workers.

They have even suggested that a 6-hour day will meet the ends of justice. When trade unions in India have accepted that less than 8 hours will be the proper working hours for transport workers, we are confronted with the fact that the actual number of hours of work per day is 9 for these transport workers. I would like to say that the transport workers also number nearly half a million. I will mention only the figures which I have taken from 1955. In 1955, there were 108,000 trucks plying in this country and there were also 26,600 buses plying. In these two years, certainly, the number must have increased and not decreased. So, 5 lakhs would be a moderate estimate of the total transport employees in the transport services.

In this I am not including those who are in the automobile workshops, those who have to be engaged for repairs. I am only including those people who are known as drivers, conductors, checking inspectors and booking clerks. That category of workers alone would come to nearly 5 lakhs. That is half the number of workers engaged in the railway transport today.

The railwaymen have got their own legislation; the Post and dock workers have their own legislation; the coalmine workers have got their own separate legislation for protecting them. The time has come for a separate legislation dealing not only with the hours of work but with the conditions of work of the transport workers.

The hours of work for the transport workers was fixed in 1939 by the Motor Vehicles Act and the Hon. Minister knows the circumstances under which the Motor Vehicles Act was passed. That was there just coming and the Government wanted to equip themselves with more powers, take more police powers to restrict the movement of these bus drivers and conductors and in that way the Act was passed. They fixed 54 hours as the weekly duty hours and that continues to this day even after nearly 18 years.

One might ask whether this is a practical or a feasible proposition. In one of the States in the South, in Kerala they have now adopted this 8 hours, not only on the wheel, but also including the hours of rest and the spread-over. That is the period fixed by the State Government of Kerala for the transport workers.

I should also like to mention that these workers come under the Minimum Wages Act and they get very poor pay. When we were discussing the Minimum Wages (Amendment) Bill, hon. Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani pointed out how in particular industries there is so much of disparity in the wages. I will only mention the wages of conductors and cleaners. The conductors may be taken as skilled workers and the cleaners as unskilled workers. The wages which they get in the various States will show how there is so much of disparity.

In Madras, the conductor gets Rs. 1/14/- and the cleaner gets Rs. 1/2/- inclusive of dearness allowance. In Orissa, the conductor gets Rs. 1/12/- and the cleaner, Rs. 1/2/-; in the Punjab, the conductor gets Rs. 1/14/9 and the cleaner 0/12/5; West Bengal, the conductor gets Rs. 2/14/- and the cleaner Rs. 2/1/- and in Mysore the conductor gets Rs. 1/12/- and the cleaner gets 1/8/-. In Delhi the conductor gets Rs. 2/3/- and the cleaner Rs. 2/-. There is not only this disparity. In the cities where the corresponding skilled workers are very low paid, these will not compare favourably with them.

I do not want to score a debating point. I would request the hon. Minister to consider seriously about bringing in a comprehensive legislation which will give adequate protection to the transport workers. We are having a discussion about the explosions in the railways tomorrow. We will probably have to rely more on motor trucks. The road rail link has got to be developed also.

My hon. friend Shri Nayar was mentioning how in America they have

got something like 9 million trucks. Here the number of trucks in India is hardly one lakh. We have got a long way to go. More and more trucks and lorries are likely to come into the market and on the road also. More and more buses are also likely to come. More trucks and more buses mean more workers and workers with greater responsibility.

I will mention one important point which may also be taken into consideration by the hon. Minister. I have already mentioned that there are nearly 5 lakhs of transport workers in the country. What do they do? If the average is taken, every day nearly 5 million people are taken in these passenger transport. So, the lives of 5 million people are in the hands of these transport workers. So, they are doing such vital and responsible work. When we are talking of socialism or any other ism in this country, it is not fair to these people to extract 9 hours of work.

In Madras, we have got one of the biggest operators in the south, the TVS who have got nearly 500 buses. They are running it very efficiently. But they also rely upon the law which is to protect them. I can tell the hon. Minister that there it is not the Motor Vehicles Act that is applied; it the convention that is being applied—8 hour day. But then the question arises where the worker has done work for 50 hours, he is not able to claim overtime wages because the law comes to the rescue of the employer. He says: 'Unless you have done 54 hours of work, you cannot claim overtime'. In the Government Transport, there are about 3,000 workers employed. There the question of overtime does not arise; the question of 48 hours does not arise. They say, 'We have got the Motor Vehicles Act and we are going to stick to it'.

I would request the hon. Minister to refer to the awards that have been given. As early as 1947, there was an award by Shri Venkataramaiah which dealt not only with the working conditions of the workers but actually the condition of the industry itself.

[[Shri Tangamani]]

He pointed out how this motor transport is a flourishing industry. Any owner of motor transport will be able to make enormous profits; the margin of profit is also higher. That is an industry where the margin of profit is higher and the labour is sweated and the wages paid are very low and the maximum number of hours of work is extracted. I submit this position cannot continue.

The hon. Labour Minister during the last Parliament has also assured the House that a comprehensive legislation, bearing in mind the working conditions and the hours of work of the transport employees, will be brought in. I submit that such legislation is long overdue.

Shri Abid Ali: Sir, at the outset, I may inform my hon. good friends there who say that I have no sympathy for these workers, that I was connected with the transport workers for a good number of years, both in the BEST and again in the Bombay State Road Transport Corporation. I know their conditions very well. Having been in the trade union movement for nearly four decades and moving about the country from one corner to another, meeting and contacting the workers in various industries, I know their conditions and I do not want that the hon. Member opposite should take the trouble of making me aware of the condition of workers in this particular industry.

I could not appreciate the necessity of the discussion which he has attempted this afternoon. He knows that we are bringing in this Bill but he is simply trying to tell his constituents outside that it is because of the attempts that they have made and because of the discussion that they have raised here, Government has come forward with the Bill. This is a good attempt on their part. But, I assure them that people outside know us also very well and they appreciate all that we are doing and they know that we are their friends and they have full confidence in us. (An Hon. Member:

You have all credit). Then, this discussion was not necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let that credit be divided.

Shri Abid Ali: I was submitting that it becomes difficult to satisfy the hon. Members both ways. They want that everything should be discussed in a tripartite conference. Because of such a demand, a tripartite committee was appointed. That is the reason for the delay. That committee is considering this matter and so the legislation could not come here earlier. Now, because of this and the consequent delay, a complaint is made that we are delaying this matter.

In April 1956, the matter was discussed in the 15th session of the Standing Labour Committee and tentative proposals for draft legislation were formulated in June 1956 and sent to the State Government for comments. A small tripartite committee was set up in February 1957 as recommended by the Standing Labour Committee to examine the tentative proposals and comments thereon. These were sent to the labour representatives also. In May 1957 that Committee met for the first time and discussed the proposals. In September, 1957, there was a second meeting and a report is now expected. He said that I should promise to place the report before this House during the next session. How can I promise? Let it submit the report first. Unless the report is submitted, we cannot place it here for discussion or even draft a Bill.

So, I may request the hon. Members to decide once and for all whether these things should be considered on the basis of the present procedure or we should bring them here straight. The matter should come here straight, if hon. Members want to avoid delay. But, if they want the present procedure to be continued, then they should tolerate the delay. It is not of our making.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Will the hon. Minister abide by the advice given by them?

Shri Abid Ali: To a great extent, certainly. Because these things go into tripartite committees and the decisions there are mostly unanimous; their counterparts are present there. That is the demand they are making and we should be responsive to good suggestions, coming from that side also.

The complaint has been made as if no Act is applicable to workers in that industry. A majority of them have got awards. So far as the working conditions, hours of work, etc. and also wages are concerned, these awards are enforced. In some cases, I may inform the hon. Members that the provisions of the proposed Bill may not be so advanced as some of the awards already are. Of course, they will be protected but that is another thing.

Coal, plantation and so many other things are mentioned. They have got enactments because they were not organised and their service conditions were bad. Transport workers are in cities or go from one city to another or from towns to villages. They are well-organised industrial workers. They have got their terms and conditions, in most cases, fairly satisfactory. A very large number of them are employees of municipalities and State Governments. The Motor Vehicles Act of 1939, one hon. Member said, was brought forward because the war was coming. I do not know on what basis he has got those dates but I know the Act was there already. Under that Act, nine hours a day are fixed with half an hour rest during that period. What is the good of saying that they are on their jobs for twelve hours or longer?

I shall submit that the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Payment of Wages Act and, so far as their workshops are concerned, the Factories Act are applicable to these workers also

Shri Tangamani: But, the Provident Fund Act does not apply to them. The hon. Minister mentioned....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is not yielding.

Shri Abid Ali: The hon. Member has also said that conditions have become from bad to worse. Can he please tell us how conditions have become from bad to worse? If he were kind enough to mention some facts, then we would have been able to accept that but so far as I am concerned, the condition has certainly improved considerably. Then, he went on to say that even when the Bill came, it would not be satisfactory. Then, why press for it? If he is convinced that nothing is coming and also knows that it will not be to his satisfaction, why all this agitation? He cannot have it both ways. It is being demanded with the expectation that it will improve the position. Only then, there is some sense in it.

Nothing particular was said by the hon. Member excepting, as I have said earlier, the propaganda part of it. On the basis of the information he has got from his friends, I am sure he is also convinced about the things. The work of that Committee is fairly advanced and I assure the House that as soon as we receive the report, it will be examined. We will lose no time in placing the report itself before the House, if necessary, and place the Bill itself before the House if possible. I may once again reiterate that we ourselves are very anxious that all those who need our help must be helped. The transport workers are having a fair deal and will have a still better deal and that all they deserve will be done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The discussion is over.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Shall I have a chance to reply? Previously, there was the reply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No reply. That was a motion but this is not. The House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

17-50 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday the 11th September, 1957.