

Shri Karmarkar: It is about nurses working in hospitals. All the time nurses work in hospitals and not outside.... (Interruptions). I think my hon. friend knows better and I cannot afford to spend more time to meet his argument. If I say more surely you would rule me irrelevant. (Interruptions.)

Coming back to the point of Shri Mathur, the information that he has given this House is precious vague. He has not mentioned—he may do it later—the name of the hospital in which he has seen this type of thing. This could not happen in all hospitals or more than one hospital. Nor has he given the name of the State. Perhaps it is Rajasthan. If he gives those particulars, I promise to convey the facts of the case to the State concerned and give our own views. But a vague complaint like that is bound to meet with a vague answer that the Government are always prepared to do the best in the circumstances but that is neither here nor there. I hope he will—not on the floor of the House—give me the details. I shall have it forwarded to the State concerned and if there is any legitimate ground for such grievances, certainly the State will do the needful. I have no more points to reply to.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I did not say anything about hospitals. Under the Constitution the Central Government is empowered to do certain things such as laying down the conditions of service.... (Interruptions.)

Shri Karmarkar: I shall say a word about it, Sir.

... Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. That might be a matter of interpretation. Let it remain where it is.

The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Opium Act, 1878 and the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1930 be taken into consideration."

This is not a very controversial Bill. Rather it is a simple Bill. It seeks to define the word 'opium' and also wants to take some more powers in order to enforce and prevent smuggling bringing in a number of officers in the work of stopping smuggling. A little background is needed on this question.

The cultivation of poppy for the collection of crude opium is controlled by the Central Government under licenses issued by the Narcotics Commissioner. Such licensed cultivation takes place only in certain approved districts in the States of Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. Moreover in the State of Punjab, cultivation of poppy seeds and poppy heads is permitted under licences issued by the State Government. The raw opium produced by lancing the capsules is collected by licensed cultivators but has to be surrendered at pre-determined price, to the Narcotics Commissioner. The seeds and the capsules remain the cultivators' property and any surpluses over their own requirements are disposed of by them in the market. The control over sales of manufactured opium produced by the Ghazipur Opium Factory out of the crude opium thus purchased, is exercised through the State Excise Departments. Certain States, however, also control the import and export, and the sale of poppy capsules because these too contain a small percentage of morphine, have addiction producing properties and are often used by opium addicts for preparation of a decoction thereof. This practice generally prevails in the Punjab, and also to some extent in the State of Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal which import these poppy capsules from the other producing areas.

Sir, following the unanimous decision arrived at in consultation with the States, in a Narcotics Conference held in 1949, and as part of our general policy of prohibition, the Central Government have given a declaration to the United Nations to completely prohibit the oral consumption of opium except by registered addicts on medical grounds by 1959—that is the target date. With a view to implementing this decision, supplies of excise opium to State Governments are being progressively reduced by 10 per cent every year, and this supply will cease with effect from the 31st March, 1959. With this gradual reduction in the supply of opium the consumption of its substitute, which is popularly known in Punjab—hon. Members from Punjab will bear with me—as 'Bhuki', by the opium addicts is likely to increase. Similarly, the Government of India have undertaken other international obligations, such as the Geneva Convention of 1925, the 1931 Convention to combat illicit traffic in narcotics and the 1936 Convention on the same subject, to take stringent legislative as well as administrative action to enforce prohibition of consumption and prevent smuggling of all narcotic drugs including opium and its products. It is in this background that the present proposals, both to prevent increased consumption of 'Bikuki' or the dried capsules in Punjab or its export to other States also, and to prevent smuggling of opium, have been framed in the Bill that is now before the House.

Now, coming to the provisions of the Bill, the definition of opium as given in Section 3(i) of the Opium Act, 1878 and Section 2(e) of the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1930 includes the capsules of the poppy—the Latin or botanical name of which is *Papaver somniferum*. Until recently the view was held that the crushed capsules of the poppy were also covered by this definition in the two Acts. This was also the view expressed by the Nagpur High Court in a criminal case which came before them. But in December, 1955, a Division Bench of the Punjab High

Court held in three criminal appeals, that the crushed capsules of the poppy, commonly known as poppy husk or 'Bhuki' do not come within the scope of the definition of 'opium' as given in these two Acts. As a result of this decision, the Punjab Government are no longer able to exercise any control over the import into and sale in the State of poppy husk which according to reports is now being imported and sold freely in the streets. The Punjab Government is very much worried about it. They have represented to the Government of India that the definition might be changed or something should be done to prevent this state of affairs. If this state of affairs were allowed to continue, it would undermine the policy of prohibition of opium consumption which has been adopted by the Central as well as the State Governments. In the crushed state the lanced capsules cannot be distinguished from the unlanced capsules. The danger is thus increased. The Punjab Government have, therefore, urged strongly that the definition of opium in the two Acts should be amended suitably. There is also considerable public opinion, as you are aware, Sir, in the Punjab against the uncontrolled sale and consumption of 'Bhuki', and prominent persons and leaders of public opinion have repeatedly urged that early steps should be taken to enable the Punjab Government to exercise the necessary control over 'Bhuki'. It is, therefore, proposed to amend the definition of opium given in these two Acts so as to put the position of such capsules (whether extracted or not), cut, crushed or powdered, beyond doubt.

As regards the other provisions of the Bill, for example, the enhancement of punishment contained in clauses 3, 6 and 7 of the Bill, as mentioned already, with the gradual reduction in the supply of opium for oral consumption, the tendency to smuggle both from the growing areas as well as from outside is likely to increase. Up to 1956, there was very little of smuggling of opium from

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

Pakistan across the land frontier, but recently several cases of such smuggling have come to notice. It has, therefore, become necessary to tighten up control over smuggling. The 1878 Act was chiefly intended to enforce the State monopoly in opium and was mainly conceived as a measure for the protection of excise revenue from opium. The scale of punishments provided in this Act was conceived as punishments for revenue offences. Even when the Dangerous Drugs Act was enacted in 1930, following the Geneva Convention of 1925, India had not subscribed to a policy of total prohibition. The position has considerably changed now, and instead of their being revenue offences they have entered into the field of criminal offences. Therefore, the powers of punishment sought to be taken need to be greater.

Apart from the effects on the implementation of the policy of total internal prohibition, the Government of India are thus liable to be exposed to international criticism. In view of our international obligations, if we are not prepared to check smuggling or export of opium through smuggling, we will be held responsible, and it will be said that India is not honouring its international commitment. The position or the reputation that we have in honouring our international commitments is a further reason that we should be armed with legal powers to be in a position to completely stop all, smuggling both inside and outside. Therefore, it is necessary that these provisions should be inserted.

Also, the All India Narcotics Conference which was held in Simla last year and which was attended by representatives from almost all the States in India, unanimously recommended that steps may be taken to enhance the punishments provided for the various narcotics offences. The Commission on Narcotics Drugs at its 12th Session held in April—May, 1957, also urged the Governments to increase their efforts to detect and

suppress the illicit production and illicit manufacture of drugs, and strengthen the measures for apprehending traffickers and to impose on persons convicted of narcotic offences very severe penalties in every country. India is a party to this obligation and we have to honour our obligation.

In view of these circumstances, it is proposed to enhance the punishments provided in the two Acts to imprisonment for a period of three years where only one or two years have been at present provided, so that the offences may become cognizable. It is also further proposed to make the award of imprisonment on conviction mandatory.

Another purpose of the Bill is, as I said earlier, to authorise certain officers of the Central Government to exercise the powers under the Act. At present only the State Governments can authorise officers of the departments of State Excise, Police, Customs, Salt, Opium or Revenue, to exercise the power of entry, search, seizure, or arrest in connection with the narcotic offences.

14 hrs.

Now, both the area as well as the size of smuggling have increased, and it is necessary for us to take measures. The area of operation is no longer restricted to one State but it is all round the border and it moves from one State to another. I think that, with our experience of other smuggling cases as in gold etc., it is necessary that we must have a common intelligence and centralised operation for guidance, so that we may be able to root out the social evil. So, it is necessary that the Central Government officers should also have powers to effect seizure and thus to strengthen the anti-smuggling measures.

These are some of the main provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Opium Act, 1878 and the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1930 be taken into consideration."

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah): I am constrained to take part in the discussion of this Bill for two main reasons. One is that this is the first time I believe in this Parliament as well as in the last one that an opportunity has been given to this House to discuss the opium laws. Secondly, my constituency is one which has a large opium growing area and therefore, I welcome this opportunity to say a few things on the administration of opium laws.

As far as this Bill is concerned, I agree with the hon. Deputy Minister about the remarks that he has made. I welcome the enhancement of punishment so far as the smuggling is concerned. I could regale this House with many stories of smuggling and of the failure of the anti-smuggling squads in capturing those fellows who are engaged in smuggling. But I do not propose to do so. I could say many other things about the way and the methods with regard to smuggling which takes place. But, while I welcome the enhancement of punishment and while I also welcome that certain other officers are also being given powers with regard to smuggling, arrest, so on and so forth, I wish the hon. Minister has said certain things about the tightening of the methods of anti-smuggling. This question of smuggling is a major question in areas which grow opium. As I was saying, my constituency is one of those which has a large opium-growing area.

I am quite unable to say what other methods could have been employed, but certainly there could have been certain tightening of controls in this. There could have been some more police personnel to look after these things so that smuggling does not go on as it has been going on. There could have been more publicity among the people themselves so that they could co-operate with the police

authorities in matters of anti-smuggling. I say all that has not been done.

Then, among other things that I would like to say is that although the hon. Minister has said that it is the policy of the Government to have a progressive reduction in the oral consumption of opium, I wish he had told us what exactly is the policy of the Government with regard to the cultivation of opium. Is it the policy of the Government continue to decrease opium cultivation or to increase the opium-cultivated areas? We have been told here many times, at Question Hour in this House and previously also, that it depends on the amount of demand that we receive from foreign countries. I do not know how far that is right. Presumably, it is correct, and that is why I wanted very much to draw the pointed attention of the hon. Minister to this fact, namely, what exactly is the policy of the Government with regard to opium cultivation.

We were told at one time that there was a proposal that Government should stop opium cultivation by private peasants altogether, and Government proposed to have opium cultivated on their own account. I do not know whether that was just a rumour in the air or what it was. But there is no doubt that there was something in the air. But presumably I believe that Government have decided that opium cultivation will still be continued in certain areas of the country by private parties. I know that in Himachal Pradesh opium cultivation has been stopped for various reasons.

I am very glad that in those areas where there has been large-scale smuggling, where cultivators have given very small quantities per *bigha* or per acre, those areas must be stopped, and I am very happy that so far as that policy of the Government is concerned, I welcome it. I know that in certain other smaller areas, for example, in Rajasthan,—and I have seen in Jammu also—they have stopped it. But while saying all these

[Shri Kasliwal]

things, I would very much like to know, every year when Government say that they propose to allocate opium-growing areas for the cultivation of opium, what exactly is the policy of the Government for that year or for the next two or three years. It is easy to say that "this year there is a great international demand and so we are increasing the area, and to say next year that "the demand for opium has decreased and so we are decreasing the area". What is the position of those cultivators who have been given areas for opium cultivation in one year and if, in the next year, they are told that "this year, we do not propose to give you any such area"? The poor cultivator is put in a very difficult position and one of the reasons what is obvious is that opium cultivation is a very paying proposition is that the Government purchase the entire opium which is grown on their own account.

So, it is the peasant who suffers. I want to appeal to the hon. Minister that before he decides the policy for a year, he should make it clear to the cultivators at least three, four or six months before, saying that "this year, your cultivable area for opium will be, say, 40,000 acres", as we were told on the floor of the House some years back that "we propose to reduce the area of 50,000 acres to 30,000 acres", so that those cultivators who have been depending upon the cultivation of opium may be forewarned and they may take up some other cultivation of some other crops like potatoes, wheat or maize and so on. That is one point on which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister.

There is one other matter which I would like to mention in this connection, and it is this. I have seen with my own eyes that when thousands of cultivators are sitting around the District Opium Officer, when he is allocating opium areas, there is a great deal of scope for corruption. I am not blaming the District Opium Officers for that. I am pained at the

way in which the areas are being distributed. I wish the Government organises the machinery in a better way. I wish they give the areas in a better way in the sense that they do not have 4,000 cultivators sitting round the officers. One never knows what happens there. Some person comes to a particular peasant and says, "pay me Rs. 50, and I will get you an area of five bighas" or something like that. He manages to catch hold of the peasant and extract some money. That is a very pernicious practice. I have tried myself to see that such a practice should be avoided in these areas.

I would like to draw the attention of the Deputy Minister to the fact that he should devise some machinery or some method by which this corruption will be removed. I recall that five years back I had occasion to complain to the then hon. Minister, Shri Tyagi, in charge of opium. I have seen myself the kind of corruption that was prevailing at that time in the entire opium machinery of that district. I am very glad that the hon. Minister took some steps and today I can say that so far as the higher officers are concerned, I have no cause of complaint of corruption. But I want to say that with regard to the machinery as such, something has got to be done, so that the peasants do not unnecessarily suffer at the hands of those people who want to get money from them on one pretext or other.

There is another matter to which I would like to refer and that is with regard to the facilities which should be given to the cultivators. I know that from the department certain instructions had been issued to the district opium officers with regard to the weighing of opium and payment of money to the cultivators. I believe that those instructions are that as far as possible weighing of opium should be done at the Tehsil headquarters and not at the district headquarters. This is a very great cause

of complaint. I do not see why the thousands of peasants should be called to the district headquarters for weighing of opium and payment of money for the opium which is being purchased. Why should not district opium officer go to the tehsil headquarters and make payments there? This is a matter which the hon. Minister must look into, because it is a cause of complaint both from the peasants and from the people and so many other quarters.

Not only that; there is good reason to believe that in between a good amount of opium is lost. For example, the peasant comes on foot from 30 miles away and one does not know what happens to that opium in between. He says he is going to bring about 7 or 8 seers of opium. But then actually there are only 4 seers. What has happened to the 3 or 4 seers of opium? Probably that is smuggled away and given to the agents. And, what is the price of smuggled opium in that area? It is about Rs. 100 per seer and I am told that by the time it reaches the port like Madras, Calcutta, or Bombay, it acquires a price of Rs. 400. By the time it reaches foreign ports, it acquires a very high price. Such is the high profit which they gain by smuggling opium. So, I would like the hon. Minister to tighten up things so far as this matter is concerned, not only to tighten up things, but also to give certain facilities to cultivators in this respect.

I am very glad that so as the question of punishment is concerned, that has received the attention of the hon. Minister. In fact, I myself thought of bringing forward a Private Member's Bill to provide for a very severe punishment with regard to smuggling of opium or possession or cultivation of opium. But I am glad that it has received the attention of the Member.

Shri Kodiyar (Quilon—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I would like to say only a few words about this. After, all, as the hon. Deputy Minister has pointed out, this is not a controversial subject. As my previous speaker has pointed out them, Government implement their policy of decreasing

progressively the consumption of opium, Government have to take into consideration the interests of the opium cultivators. They are not to be left in an uncertain condition, whether next year they would be allowed to cultivate the land they are now cultivating. That is an important thing to be borne in mind.

I support this Bill. According to this Bill, the definition of opium capsule has been made very clear so as to include what is known as the opium husk. I am also happy to know that the consumption of opium, except for medicinal and research purposes, is going to be eliminated by 31st March, 1959. But I have to point out one thing here, and that is with regard to the effective control and implementation of what is provided in this Bill. The hon. Deputy Minister has pointed out that recently a number of cases of smuggling of opium have come to the notice of the Government. In spite of the various enactments dealing with spurious and dangerous drugs, we are not in a position to implement the provisions of those measures effectively.

When we taken the question of drugs control, we find that in spite of the various enactments, dangerous and spurious drugs are being manufactured in the country. In my opinion, it is not merely a question of legislation; the more important question is that of evolving an effective machinery to implement the provisions of these measures. Recently in my State a Drugs Inspector, while inspecting a drug house, was stabbed to death by the owner of the drug house. According to this Bill, some new officers are being given the power to search and arrest and so on. But with regard to the Drugs Inspectors, as far as my knowledge goes, they are not given sufficient number of staff so as to carry out their task. In my State, the Drugs Inspector with some of his colleagues went to a drug house, but there was physical resistance from the owner. As there was no police available in that spot, he had to face the dangerous consequences that followed. Therefore, an effective machi-

[Shri Kodiyar]

nery to check and prevent not only smuggling, but also the manufacture of dangerous drugs should be evolved. Otherwise, this will not be an effective remedy for the situation.

Another thing I wish to point out is this. There are other narcotics also apart from opium such as *charas* or *ganja*. Such narcotics also should be brought within the scope of the present legislation. That is all I have to say.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I am very grateful to the hon. Member, who has now come by my side, for his full-throated support to the measure. He has raised a few points about the administration of the Opium Act, the policy regarding opium cultivation and also the corruption involved in these matters. All these things principally come under the purview of the State administration.

In the field of opium, so far as production is concerned, the policy is laid down by the Centre. So far as sale and smuggling are concerned, they are mainly within the State sector. So, there is not only duplicity but multiplicity of administration and organisation. So, I agree that there might become lacuna or weakness in certain sectors of the administration.

I think the powers that we have taken to enhance punishment and associating the Central Government officers within the administration would mean some centralised guidance and operation and it would result in efficiency. I agree with him that tightening the methods of administration and tightening the methods against smuggling are called for. I assure him that whatever personnel is needed will be appointed and this matter will be paid greater attention. And any suggestion from the hon. Members, particularly from the areas where poppy is cultivated, will be welcomed. If there are any suggestions, either for increasing the efficiency or stopping smuggling, that would be looked into. There is no difference in the objective or in the

emphasis which the hon. Member has made.

So far as the question of policy on opium cultivation is concerned, I think the policy is well-defined. As I said while making the motion, by March 1959 all internal consumption of opium, except by the registered addicts, will be stopped. So, the cultivation will be only to meet the needs of the supply of alkaloids like morphine or codeine which are used for medical purposes. As the hon. Members know, we have an export market also. We are exporting these alkaloids outside India. The cultivation in future will only be to meet the demands of these medicinal uses of opium.

Even today, I am told, the area of cultivation has decreased. It was about 7 to 9 lakhs *bighas*. Today it is in the neighbourhood of one lakh *bighas*. In future, as I said, the cultivation will be only to meet the requirements of alkaloids both inside the country as well as for exports. This prescribes the limit or four corners of the policy as regards cultivation.

Regarding licensing, I agree that it might create some trouble and difficulties for the cultivator because the element of uncertainty is there. But it should be possible for the administration to smoothen it out. We should see that there is as little corruption as possible. About the objectives we agree. What is required is constant vigilance and critical appreciation.

I would welcome greater vigilance by the hon. Members, particularly members from constituencies where poppy is cultivated. I think that is the only way to root out corruption.

I could not follow the point made by the last hon. Member. I think there is no other point on which I have to say anything.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Opium Act, 1878 and the Dan-

gerous Drugs Act, 1930 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find that there are no amendments up to clause 9.

Shri B. K. Bhagat: There is an amendment to clause 1.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Clause 1 will be taken up later. Now, the question is:

"That clauses 2 to 9 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 9 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1— (Short title)

Shri Naldurgker (Osmanabad): I beg to move:

Page 1—

for lines 3 and 4, substitute.

"1 This Act may be called the Opium and Dangerous Drugs (Amendment) Act, 1957."

I really welcome the introduction of this Bill. But I have moved this amendment because I entertain a reasonable doubt that when clause 1 will be subjected to judicial scrutiny in future, there is the probability of an anomalous interpretation, or such interpretation will be put in that clause which is not intended by this Bill. It is a fundamental principle of the interpretation of Statutes that every sentence should be interpreted in its etymological and phraseological meaning. No new sense is to be imported. Taking this principle of the interpretation of law, it is my *bona fide* belief, when clause 1 is taken into consideration in conjunction with other clauses, if it is subjected to judicial scrutiny, it means that the amending Bill is only applicable, as far as opium laws are concerned, and not in respect to other laws. That is the real meaning.

The clause says: "This Act may be called the Opium Laws (Amendment) Act, 1957". I find from clause 5 that some of the provisions of the Dangerous Drugs Act are also being amend-

ed by this Bill. I will first refer to the Dangerous Drugs Act, its intention etc.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is admitted that amendments are made there also. The title of the Bill says "further to amend the Opium Act, 1878 and the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1930".

Shri Naldurgker: But in clause 1 nothing is mentioned. I find in the main Act it is stated:

"And whereas the contracting parties to the said Geneva Convention resolve to take further measures to suppress the contraband traffic in and abuse of dangerous drugs, especially those derived from opium, Indian hemp and cocoa leaf, such measures being more particularly set forth in the articles of the said Geneva Convention....."

and whereas it is also expedient that the penalties for certain offences relating to dangerous drugs should be increased, and that all penalties relating to certain operations should be rendered uniform....."

So, the Dangerous Drugs Act is applicable, not only to opium but to other matters. The Amending Bill, according to clause 1, relates to only opium law and not other laws. Supposing some offences are committed under section 10 or section of the provisions of the Act. Then, what will be the interpretation of the law? At that time a certain advocate will argue that this Bill, the amending Bill, is only applicable, so far as opium laws are concerned and that this Bill is not applicable to cocaine or Indian herb. They will say that this amending Bill specially lays down that it is applicable only to the opium laws and not to other narcotic derivatives. Then there will be one imprisonment according to the old law and another imprisonment according to the new law. That will be an anomalous interpretation. Some of the sections of the Opium Act and some of the sections of the Dangerous Drugs Act are incorporated here. But, clause 1 will be interpreted in

[Shri Naldurgker]

connection with all these provisions. It means that this amending law is applicable to these provisions as far as Opium is concerned, but not to any other things. In order to avoid future anomalous interpretation, I request the hon. Minister to see that as far as the title of this law is concerned, it should be amended, in view of the main intention with which the Dangerous Drugs Act was enacted. Therefore, I have suggested that this Act may be called the Opium and Dangerous Drugs (Amendment) Act, 1957. There is no other intention. I think it carries out the main intention with which this law is introduced.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I very much appreciate the learned exposition of law by the hon. Member. This point of view was also considered by the Government. Particularly, the Law Ministry went into this question. In the present case, the Bill seeks to amend identical provisions in two separate Acts. The words are the same. The provisions are the same, actually identical. We have been advised by the Ministry of Law, who have gone into all legal aspects of the case including that which has been pointed out by the hon. Member, that the present Title is the more proper one than the one suggested by the Mover of the amendment. Therefore, I am unable to accept the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the amendment to the House.

The question is:

Page 1—

for lines 3 and 4, substitute:

"1. This Act may be called the Opium and Dangerous Drugs (Amendment) Act, 1957."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1—was added to the Bill.

The Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall now take up Non-official Business.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

TENTH REPORT

Shri S. C. Godsora (Singhbhum-Reserved-Sch. Tribes): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House agree with the Tenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 27th November, 1957."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put this motion to the House.

The question is:

"That this House agree with the Tenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 27th November, 1957."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE: STATUTORY BODY FOR CONTROLLING THE QUALIFYING EXAMINATION RE: CERTIFYING COSTING RESULTS
—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion of the Resolution moved by Shri C. R. Narasimhan on the 15th November, 1957, regarding Statutory Body for controlling the qualifying examination re: certifying costing results. Out of the one hour allotted for the discussion of the Resolution, twenty