

(iii) that when any new item of work is undertaken in the Ministry, an endeavour shall be made to entrust such work to existing personnel by suitable re-distribution of work rather than by creating new posts.

(iv) that short-term leave vacancies of less than two months duration will not generally be filled.

Late Duty Allowances to Government Employees

1002. Shri Ram Garib. Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to refer to the reply given to unstarred question No. 167 in the Lok Sabha on the 18th November, 1959 and state:

(a) whether necessary amendments to the Ministry of Finance Office Memorandum No. F.5(14)-E.II(B)/56, dated the 23rd April, 1957 have since been issued incorporating the Government's decision to allow the late duty allowance on the basis of duty hours;

(b) if so, whether a copy of the same will be laid on the Table; and

(c) if not, when do Government propose to do the same.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): (a) and (c). No amendments have been issued. The cases where hours of work are different from those mentioned in the Ministry of Finance Office Memorandum referred to in the question are very rare and there is no need to issue general orders to cover such cases. Whenever such cases are brought to the notice of the Ministry of Finance the late duty allowance for duty performed beyond 9 hours is granted at the rates prescribed in the Office Memorandum with the concurrence of Ministry of Finance.

(b) Does not arise.

Duty Hours in Government Offices

1003. Shri Ram Garib: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) what are the normal hours of work a Government servant is required to put in daily in civil offices of the Government of India in Delhi/New Delhi; and

(b) whether Government have issued any directives in this regard?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): (a) The working hours for Central Government offices are 36 hours per week (8½ hours daily on week days and 3½ hours on Saturdays);

(b) Yes.

Sixth Inter-University Youth Festival

1004. Shri P. C. Borooah: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that as many as seven Universities are not participating in the Sixth Inter-University Youth Festival scheduled to be held in Mysore from the 7th to 16th December 1959; and

(b) if so, whether these seven Universities have given any reasons for not participating in the festival?

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimall): (a) Eight Universities will not be participating.

(b) No. It is within the competence of the Universities whether they can or cannot participate in the Festival

12.10 hrs.

RE: MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, I just wrote a letter to you about the point at issue of the letter which the Prime Minister has received from

Chou En-Lai and which he referred to in the Press Conference yesterday. He did not say that in this House, although he was given an opportunity to say so through adjournment motion given notice of by me. I find that this is disrespect shown to you and to the House by the Prime Minister. I wrote a letter to you about it and I wanted to raise that issue here but your Secretariat has informed me like this:

"I am directed to say that the Speaker has declined to accord you the necessary permission."

This is a very important issue as the receipt of this letter was revealed in the Press Conference yesterday morning. Just an hour thereafter, it was raised in this House and the Prime Minister was provided with ample opportunity to make a statement. You, Sir, in your wisdom, on many occasions, have said that when the House is in session whenever any important statement is to be made it should be made on the floor of the House before it is made anywhere else outside.

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday the hon. Member gave an adjournment motion. Today he has given another adjournment motion.

Shri Hem Barua: I have not. I just wrote a letter to you seeking your guidance. I have become very polite after your admonition. I only seek a clarification.

Mr. Speaker: Even then, I say, it is not a matter for clarification. No occasion arose yesterday here for the hon. Prime Minister to state it in this House. I have said that whenever any statement of policy has to be made or is made by a Minister when the House is in session he must take the House into confidence first. If a letter has been received and no specific question has been put here to the hon. Prime Minister, you cannot take it as a breach of privilege of this House if he does not state it here. No doubt, the hon. Member tabled yesterday an adjournment motion on "the country-wide discontent

and discomfiture felt due to the reported rejection by the Chinese Government of our polite protest.... etc." I did not allow it because it arose out of a series of matters on which we had discussion for a couple of days. Therefore, every small incident—it may be important or otherwise—need not be brought up by way of an adjournment motion. I disallowed his adjournment motion. It is not as if I called upon the Prime Minister, he refused to disclose that information here and then went to the Press Conference and disclosed it there. In that case it would have been a different matter. I did not allow him; I did not give him an opportunity.

Shri Hem Barua: I did not press my adjournment motion. I wanted to know whether a letter from Mr. Chou En-Lai was received or not. It seems the Prime Minister has got greater confidence in the Press than in this House.

Mr. Speaker: It is not incumbent upon any Minister immediately to come and say that he has received a letter from Mr. Chou En-Lai. Surely he will choose a proper occasion for that.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Yesterday, Sir, you were pleased to observe that adjournment motions were utilised for eliciting information, that that was not a proper use of them and that there were other ways mentioned in the Rules of Procedure for seeking any information. In fact, Sir, as I understood, your direction to me was that I should not accept the adjournment motion for giving information if it was not a proper adjournment motion. Therefore, there was nothing to hide about it. It was not after I went from the House; it was long before that I went and spoke in the Press Conference in the early morning. In fact, I do not see any question of policy involved or any question in which the House or the country, as I said yesterday, is agitated. Here is a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

correspondence going on, I wrote a letter and I received a letter in reply to which I am going, no doubt, to reply in time, but just to inform the House that I have received a letter, rather a formal letter from there, seems to me of no specific or great importance. I would certainly have informed it always if a proper request or a suggestion for that was made, but trying to follow your direction, Sir, I do not propose in future to treat a motion for adjournment as a request to make a statement.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): Sir, I want to seek your guidance in this matter. We are not anxious to move adjournment motions on any and every subject, but when our short notice questions are not accepted and our calling attention notices are not paid any attention to, there is no other course left open to us except to move motions for adjournment. I have given notice of a short notice question on this very subject, but the hon. Prime Minister has not been pleased to accept, whereas he disclosed the fact that Government of India has received a letter from Mr. Chou En-Lai in the Press Conference. I think this House should be treated in a more respectful manner.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I fail to understand it, Sir. I get dozens of letters every day from various governments (*Interruption*). I regret I am unable to accept the hon. Member's argument. If any request is made at any time to make a statement of fact I shall make it if I know it is a fact and that it is not to be treated as confidential or secret. But the whole issue at present is whether a motion for adjournment should be treated otherwise than as a motion for adjournment. I submit it should not be.

Mr. Speaker: So far as motions for adjournment are concerned—I have already said so—I will again request hon. Members like Acharya Kripalani and other leaders of the various

groups to have a meeting with me and then decide on the question. As I said yesterday, if they have got any particular representations to make we shall consider all of them. Now, to elicit information by means of an adjournment motion is rather curious affair. Yesterday I said at length that the proceedings of this House need not be interrupted. Today, the hon. Member has again brought up the issue by way of seeking a clarification. Of course, the hon. Member, Shri Hem Barua might have thought that if I take exception to an adjournment motion he can come up with a question of clarification. I have to find out whether a clarification is permitted under the rules or not.

So far as short notice questions are concerned, it is up to the Ministers to accept or not to accept them. So far as calling attention notices are concerned, if I consider they are of urgent public importance I allow them; I do not leave them to the Ministers to accept or not to accept them. I only intimate to them (*Interruption*). So far as short notice questions are concerned it is left to them; they must gather some information. I find that hon. Ministers are willing to answer them wherever they are able to place matters before the House. But there is no justification for bringing an adjournment motion because we do not get the information from the Ministers through Short Notice Question. I shall try to get as much information as possible. If they are important matters I give top priority to such questions and fix up the very next day. Therefore, they need not embarrass the House or me by adjournment motions. If they think it is necessary that they must get the information, if I am satisfied I shall find out some method by which the information can be got.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai (Kheri): Sir, I would like to seek another clarification about the acceptance of short notice questions. A short notice

question was sent to the Minister. You said that it is for the Minister to accept it or not. If he does not accept it and gives the information outside this House, does it not amount to a breach of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: Very well, let me see. Hon. Member will bring the case to my notice.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I really cannot understand this argument. We are generally following, and refer to, I take it, the British Parliamentary procedure. Short notice questions and motions for adjournment are of the rarest occurrence there; Speakers do not permit them. Therefore, if we are to follow that, am I to accept every short notice question which according to me is neither of public importance nor of urgency? I have to judge all that. Any ordinary question can be put to me. As a matter of fact, apart from parliamentary activities here, if the hon. Member writes to me I can send him the information immediately. But I am not going to take the time of the House in answering a question which I consider neither urgent nor of public importance. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Generally, it is open to the hon. Minister to say whether he is willing to answer, whether it is of public importance or not. It is for him to decide. So far as calling attention notices are concerned I decide. On every small matter that they want information they need not come here and think that the Government is not there. They may write to the Minister and elicit the information. Every matter which is not placed before the House is not a matter of such great importance. It is not a breach of privilege. Each case will be decided on its merits.

Shri Goray (Poona): May I draw your attention to a concrete case, now that you are dealing with short notice questions? I should like to tell you that on the anniversary day..

Mr. Speaker: We are not disposing of all these cases here. If he writes to me I shall send it on to them. If there is any particular case which is very important and they hush it up in this House and then make a statement elsewhere—I do not know what the motives would have been—possibly it may be that they do not consider it important. In this cases he has answered casually at the Press Conference.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not make any statement there. A question was asked and I gave an answer that I have received a letter. Everybody knows that I have received a letter. I would have received a day here, but your direction to me was not to say anything here.

12.29 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT OF TARIFF COMMISSION

The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Sardar Swaran Singh): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under subsection (2) of Section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, a copy of each of the following papers:—

- (i) Report (1950) of the Tariff Commission on the Levy of interest on Special Advances to the Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited and the Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited.
- (ii) Government Resolution No. P6-45(112)/57 dated the 25th November, 1950.
- (iii) Statement explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid on the Table within the period prescribed in the said subsection. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-1736/59.]