

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): (a) and (b). A Control Room was established in the Parliament Street Police Station on the 27th November, 1959 and has started doing useful work.

(c) No extra expenditure has been incurred as the staff has been found by internal adjustment within the Delhi Police.

Surrender of Arms and Ammunition

1404. Shri L. Achaw Singh: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there has been a large surrender of arms and ammunition from Moreh in Manipur; and

(b) if so, the number and nature of such arms?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): (a) and (b). A statement showing the quantity and nature of arms and ammunition recently recovered from Moreh in Manipur is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 26.]

12 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

EXPLOSION IN HYDERABAD

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri S. M. Banerjee: Serious explosion caused by gun powder in the densely populated Begum Bazar, Hyderabad, on 13th of December, resulting in the death of seven persons and injury to 15 persons. That is the news that appeared in the papers. Hon. Members want to know what the responsibility of the Centre is and what that is due to. We had a similar explosion in Anasol also.

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Anil K.

Chanda): I regret to inform that yesterday there was a serious explosion in the city of Hyderabad costing several lives.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What several lives?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: I am reading the statement, Sir.

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Andhra Pradesh, the Chief Inspector of Explosives, Nagpur, and the Inspector of Explosives, Madras, as well as the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police, Hyderabad were contracted on phone today to obtain information regarding the explosion that took place in Begum Bazaar, Hyderabad city, on Sunday, the 13th December, 1959.

It was reported by the District Magistrate that an explosion took place about 8 A.M. in an old two-storeyed building as a result of which the building cracked and collapsed. The police rushed to the spot immediately along with the fire brigade and from the debris, 5 dead bodies were taken out. The five killed were two women, two men and one child. Seventeen persons were injured by the accident who were rushed to the hospital. The Commissioner of Police has informed the Chief Inspector of Explosives on phone that the injuries are not very serious. Parts of the building which were in a precarious condition and about to collapse were pulled down and the debris is being cleared under the direction of the District authorities. The preliminary enquiries made by the Commissioner of Police show that 9 families were residing in this building. The precise cause of the explosion has not yet been ascertained. This will be looked into by the Inspector of Explosives as soon as he reaches Hyderabad. A wireless message was received by the Inspector of Explosives, Madras, in the afternoon of 13th December. The Inspector of Explosives is leaving for Hyderabad by plane at 11 A.M. today and will be reaching Hyderabad this afternoon. The Chief Inspector of

Explosives is also leaving Nagpur by train this evening and will be reaching Hyderabad tomorrow morning.

According to the Commissioner of Police, a resident of the building was apparently trying to break open a fuse or detonator (usually used for exploding shells) in order to sell the metal (usually copper) in the bazaar. The fuse contains usually high explosives which can explode by mere friction alone. It is surmised at this stage that probably the explosion took place as a result of friction while the metal portion was being broken open. The person alleged to have been tampering with the fuse is reported to have been killed in the explosion.

A fuller report is expected to be received soon when it will be decided whether a more formal enquiry under Section 9A of the Explosives Act is required to be held. The information so far received indicates that the detonator was possessed by the person concerned unauthorisedly.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): I just want to know from the hon. Minister this. Are we strictly enforcing the elementary rules of the Explosives Act? These accidents are occurring in Calcutta and Hyderabad. Are the Inspectors going about doing their duty and enquiring into the causes why these lapses are not checked and why do they not check violations of the elementary rules?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri K. C. Reddy): In answer to that, I would like to say that the staff of the Chief Inspector of Explosives is doing its part of the duty. For much of the information in regard to these matters, we have to depend naturally on the police authorities of the States concerned. We seek help from them, we receive information from them and our Inspectors act on that basis. The organisation of the Chief Inspector of Explosives is a comparatively small one. In Hyderabad, I do not think we have got an Inspector. The person who is in Madras will have to attend to that

part of the work at Hyderabad. What I am trying to point out is, we have to depend to a large extent on the police also in regard to this matter.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berampore): May I know if there is any Central Government dump of explosives and how the responsibility of the Central Government comes in?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: Could he repeat the question?

Mr. Speaker: How is the Central Government responsible for this? What is the part played by the Central Government in the management and supervision of this?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: So far as the Explosives Act is concerned, it is under the control of the Works, Housing and Supply Ministry of the Government of India. We have not got the details at this moment. We do not know how far we come into the picture.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: According to the statement of the hon. Minister, some shells were purchased by somebody. If that is correct, they might have been purchased from some store. I want to know whether this will also be enquired into and whether the other shells which are kept in that place are properly examined. The others may also explode. The second point is this. Now that explosion are occurring more in the country, either an Assistant Inspector or Deputy Inspector should be there. Otherwise, every time, the Chief Inspector has to rush and it takes three days to enquire into the matter.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: I nowhere stated that it was purchased in the market or something like that. I said, apparently the person was trying to break it open in order to sell the metal in the bazaar.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Probably this was purchased in some store. Otherwise, why should he break open? He wanted to sell it in the form of scrap. The real thing is, it must have contained gun powder.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: At this stage, we have no information as to how he came into possession of this detonator.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): May I know why the Chief Inspector at Nagpur did not give top priority to this and proceed to Hyderabad? He has said that he will be proceeding this evening reaching there next morning. Why did he not give top priority to this?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: Hyderabad comes under the jurisdiction of the Inspector of Explosives, Madras. He is proceeding this morning and by now possibly, he is there.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the hon. Minister's statement, I am not giving my consent to the adjournment motion. Now, Papers to be laid on the Table: Shri Morarji Desai.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I seek a clarification from you, Sir. There was an adjournment motion given by me. Even the statement that you have made here, it is very difficult for me to understand. How you gauge the importance of an adjournment motion. I said that there was reference to this in the Assam Assembly by Shri K. P. Tripathi, Minister of Labour and Industries to the effect that there were attempts at derailing a train carrying army personnel in a place near Tezpur. There are fifth columnist activities going on in that frontier State. Air space violations have taken place not once, nor twice, but thrice after the occupation of Hongkai. Secondly, there is a very subtle propaganda going on to the effect that we do not have arms to defend our country and then to the effect that Assam is primarily a land of mongoloids and China is a land of Mongoloids. All sorts of propaganda are going on. There are attempts at derailment of trains. This was referred to by the Minister for Industries in the Assam Assembly on the 11th

of December. You say, it may be important otherwise, but it is not so urgent a matter to warrant interruption of the business of the House. I would ask you very humbly to tell us how you gauge the importance of a subject?

Mr. Speaker: I am not bound to answer all that. Hon. Member may feel it is important. I do not feel it important for an adjournment motion. There is attempt at derailment; no derailment has taken place; no casualty. Therefore, hon. Members may put a question or ask for a statement on the floor of the House. Did I say at any time that if the hon. Minister does not accept a short notice question, I will disallow it? Hon. Members know full well that even when short notice questions are not accepted, I never disallow those questions. I bring them as long notice questions. I am trying to help every hon. Member to elicit as much information as possible. The only difference is this. The hon. Member thinks, here and now this matter ought to be taken up. Cannot I have a different view that this could be taken up on the floor of the House by a question? That is all the difference. I am not minimising the thing at all. I do not want the hon. Member to wait till a derailment takes place.

Shri Hem Barua: You know, on most occasions, they are disallowed.

Mr. Speaker: I must tell hon. Members about short notice questions also, even on the day on which the House commences, short notice questions come in. We originally thought that if it is not possible to give 10 days' notice, at the close of a session, short notice questions are allowed, because you cannot give 10 days' notice and the session will close. At other times, short notice questions are allowed on urgent matters which could not wait for long notice. Now, short notice question is becoming a regular feature. Hon. Members may

have their own views. I can have my own view also. Therefore, if they insist upon asking how do I judge, on what ground, this is the ground. I can only say that the hon. Member could have waited and if he had put in a short notice question, I would have allowed a short notice answer as quickly as possible because there is not sufficient time and we close on the 22nd. I am alive to the seriousness of it.

Shri Hem Barua: This is an adjournment motion, and you have admitted yourself that this is an emergent thing.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Shri Hem Barua: If it had happened on the 16th November, possibly there could have been a short notice question, and the time-limit of ten days could have been adhered to.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Hon. Member may put down a question.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Regarding my adjournment motion about the violation of air space in NEFA and in the Kamrup District of Assam, you have been pleased to write to me that a calling attention notice on a similar subject has already been received. May I submit with regard to that that an adjournment motion must always get priority in such affairs? Because a calling attention notice has been received and perhaps admitted, my adjournment motion on the violation of air space in NEFA and in Kamrup District of Assam has not been allowed.

Mr. Speaker: True. The hon. Member knows full well that an adjournment motion will be admitted only if there is urgency. If some other person came two days earlier and tabled a short notice question or even a calling attention notice, the urgency of this disappears. He must have come at the earliest possible moment, before any other persons comes. If some other person had

already come a couple of days earlier, I would say there is no urgency.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The calling attention notice admitted by you is about the entire violation of the air space. This is something else.

Mr. Speaker: So far as these matters are concerned, I hold a different opinion. Hon. Members are under the impression that adjournment motions are the normal rule for bringing up matters before the House; I am not. Adjournment motions are of a serious nature. We are losing touch with respect to this matter. We do not realise the importance of adjournment motions. An adjournment motion should be tabled only in exceptional cases where the Government is at fault on a serious matter. If the adjournment motion is carried, the Government will have to quit and put the Opposition in its seat. Or, it may be raised in respect of other very serious matters with respect to which very important action has to be taken immediately. Otherwise, an adjournment motion seems to be an ordinary question itself, and when I disallow, every hon. Member thinks it is his right to get up and spend away the time of the House. I am really surprised. I have been saying again and again that this ought not to be the attitude of the hon. Members regarding adjournment motions. In regard to very serious matters I have no objection.

Shri Hem Barua: On this air space violation, I submitted a short notice question on Saturday, but you have allowed a calling attention motion, but a short notice question is always better than a calling attention motion. Scope for the short notice question was prevented.

Mr. Speaker: It is for me to decide. Short notice may or may not be accepted by the Minister. I have no control over short notice questions. Calling attention I can allow by myself. I must have disallowed the

[Mr. Speaker]

calling attention motion also. That is what the hon. Member wants me to do.

Shri P. C. Borooah (Sibsagar): I have already submitted a calling attention motions on the subjects I request that both may be admitted.

Mr. Speaker: I may not admit.

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री (गुड़गांव) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने इलाहाबाद और लखनऊ विश्वविद्यालयों के सम्बन्ध में एक स्थगन प्रस्ताव दिया है जहाँ पर कुछ ऐसी घटनाएँ हुई हैं जिनके कि कारण उत्तर प्रदेश के यह दो बहुत बड़े और पुराने विश्वविद्यालय इस समय बन्द हो गये हैं और इसका प्रभाव प्रान्त के और भी विश्वविद्यालयों पर पड़ने जा रहा है। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि यह विषय प्रान्त की सरकार का है परन्तु क्योंकि दूसरे विद्यालयों के जीवन पर और दूसरे विश्वविद्यालयों पर भी उसका प्रभाव पड़ेगा इसलिए यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि इस विषय पर यहाँ विचार किया जाय।

Mr. Speaker: I have disallowed the adjournment motion. This relates to the Allahabad University being closed sine die. An adjournment motion has been tabled. I have disallowed it on the ground that the University is being run under a statute of the State Government. This Government has absolute, y no control over that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The University Grants Commission is there.

Mr. Speaker: They may give money, but they seem to have no control over that, but all the same I would like to ask the hon. Minister independently of the adjournment motion a question. There seems to be an epidemic spreading to all these Universities. One after the other is being closed. There is a separate Ministry here. Though

under the Constitution, Education and Health are State subjects, we are spending much more than even an individual State does, but so far as the responsibility is concerned, we say we have nothing to do with it. I am also following it. Therefore, though I have disallowed the motion, I would like to know what exactly the position is? We have no control at all over it. This seems to be catching. Students after students are striking. Have we no control when we give them money? Or, let them manage it themselves. I wanted to put that question.

About six months ago I requested the various Ministers here to tell me, wherever they have something to do with a State subject, what their jurisdiction is and what the State's jurisdiction is. I have been sending reminders after reminders. Every day I have to decide whether a case should come up before the House or not. If I take one view, the hon. Ministers say I have taken that view wrongly. Hon. Members also say that I have not taken the view correctly. Therefore I would urge upon the Ministers to tell me, wherever they have something to do with State subjects, what their jurisdiction is, how far I can allow and admit an adjournment motion or a calling attention notice or anything, so that I may be clear in my own mind.

What is the attitude of the hon. Minister? Has he nothing to do with this at all?

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimall): I have not yet spoken.

As far as these two universities are concerned, Allahabad and Lucknow, as you are fully aware.....

An Hon. Member: And Mysore.....

Dr. K. L. Shrimall:.....the State Government is entirely responsible for their administration. They have

been created by an Act of the State Legislature, and the Central Government has no jurisdiction over these universities.

The question was raised with regard to giving grants by the University Grants Commission.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Of course.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: It is true that that the Commission does give grants to all the universities for certain specific purposes, but neither the University Grants Commission nor the Government of India have any control, direct or indirect, over the administration of the universities. Therefore, I should like to submit most respectfully that these subjects cannot be discussed in this House.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORTS OF GOVERNORS OF IMF, IBRD AND I. F. C.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Indian Delegation to the 14th Annual Meeting of the Boards of Governors of the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Finance Corporation. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1785/59.]

REPORT OF TARIFF COMMISSION

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Shri Gajendra Prasad Sinha): On behalf of Sardar Swaran Singh, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of Section 18 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, a copy of each of the following papers:—

- (i) Report (1958) of the Tariff Commission on the revision of fair retention prices, ex-

works, of Pig Iron produced by the Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited.

- (ii) Letter No. 63(8)-TR/58, dated the 18th July, 1958 from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry to the Tariff Commission regarding revision of price of Pig Iron produced by the Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited.
- (iii) Letter No. TC/ID/P-2, dated the 14th November, 1958 from the Tariff Commission to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry regarding revision of price of Pig Iron produced by the Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited.
- (iv) Government Resolution No. SC(A)-2(217)/57, dated the 5th November, 1959.
- (v) Statement explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents at (i) and (iv) above could not be laid on the Table within the period prescribed in the said subsection. [Placed in Library. See No. LT/1786/59.]

AMENDMENTS TO INDIAN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE (PAY) RULES

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the All India Services Act, 1951, a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 1291, dated the 28th November, 1959 making certain amendments to Schedule III to the Indian Administrative Service (Pay) Rules, 1954. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1787/59.]

NOTIFICATIONS ISSUED UNDER MADRAS CULTIVATING TENANTS (PAYMENT OF FAIR RENT) ACT

Shri Datar: I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of Section 17 of the Madras Cultivating Tenants (Payment of Fair Rent) Act, 1956