

What has happened is that those motions which were admitted by you as of public importance, and to which the Business Advisory Committee also allotted time are not taken up but new business enters in and some more time is allotted to it. If we permit this motion to be carried by this House, the direct result is that the motions which were admitted are ruled out or elbowed out. We want to invite your particular attention to the fact how useful results emerge out of these motions which are considered to be of public importance, as we have seen from the debate yesterday. Now, these motions are going to be kept out and motions which are given notice of later are given priority and are admitted. So, we find that there is no time to be allotted to these motions. So, the present allotment of time should not be accepted.

Sardar Hukam Singh: This motion of mine deals only with three allotments. It does not mention those other motions that have not been included. The real position was that you, Sir, had to come away for some urgent business here in this House, and the Business Advisory Committee had no time to give its attention to those other motions. It does not mean that they are not to be taken up or they have been rejected. The Business Advisory Committee might meet again and allot time, as desired by hon. Members.

But the only question at present is whether this allotment that has been made by the Business Advisory Committee should be approved by the House or not. If there is some objection so far as this allotment is concerned, that can be taken into account for the present. Otherwise, hon. Members should rest assured that the Business Advisory Committee might meet again and might allot time for the other motions that are still there.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: But there is no time....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member cannot take part more than once. He

has already made his statement or his observation here.

So far as the question of priority is concerned, priority is not fixed by the Business Advisory Committee. Let us understand the scope of the discussion in the Business Advisory Committee and its functions. The Business Advisory Committee fixes only the time. So far as priority is concerned, even if time is allotted for particular items now, it does not necessarily mean they must be taken up and the others should be elbowed out; they may come tomorrow or at the next Business Advisory Committee meeting, and time may be fixed there.

I shall call a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee tomorrow and fix time for these items. In the meanwhile, if priority has to be given, that will be settled by the Leader of the House.

I shall now put the motion to vote.

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Sixteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 16th December, 1957."

The motion was adopted.

INTERIM REPORT OF PAY COMMISSION

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Sir, I beg leave to make a statement.

Government have received from the Pay Commission an interim report in regard to relief to Central Government employees to be given as an interim measure pending their final recommendations. A copy of the report is placed on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-447/57]

They consider a further increase of Rs. 5 per month in the dearness allowance of all Central Government

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

employees drawing a basic pay not exceeding Rs. 250 per month is called for, and recommend that such an increase should be granted. They have also recommended that the increase should take effect from 1st July, 1957.

Government accept the recommendations of the Commission.

CONVICTION OF A MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that I have received the following wireless message dated the 15th December, 1957, from the District Magistrate, Kanpur:

"Shri Jagdish Awasthi, Member, Lok Sabha, who was arrested on the 21st September, 1956, under section 188 IPC for contravening the order under section 144 Cr. P.C. promulgated by the City Magistrate of Kanpur in connection with the agitation on the publication of the book Religious Leaders has been convicted by Judicial Magistrate, Kanpur, under section 188 IPC and sentenced to pay a fine of rupees hundred or in default one month's rigorous imprisonment. He has been granted three weeks' time to pay the fine."

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): May I submit one thing? Under rule 229,

"...the committing judge, magistrate or executive authority, as the case may be, shall immediately intimate such fact to the Speaker...."

That is, the magistrate should inform you immediately after the conviction is made. He was convicted on 14th of this month, but we have received this news only today.

Mr. Speaker: The message was sent on the 15th. It was received yesterday.

Shri Jagdish Awasthi (Bilhour): I am in the House today. How is it that the wireless message has come only today? It is very strange.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I draw your attention to this? The rule says that the magistrate shall intimate immediately after conviction is made....

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing in this. The conviction was made on 14th. He sent the message on the 15th. It was received on the 16th, and I have read it out here on the 17th.

PREVENTION OF DISQUALIFICATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Prevention of Disqualification Act, 1953, be taken into consideration".

The House will recall that when the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill was introduced, the Business Advisory Committee unanimously recommended that the Bill should be referred to a Joint Select Committee. It was then understood that since the Act of 1954 was going to expire on the 31st December, 1957, it would be better to introduce a Bill extending the life of that Act, pending our deliberations on the new Bill.

Yesterday, the House agreed to reference of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill, 1957, to a Joint Select Committee. We have now introduced this Bill to extend the life of Act of 1954 upto 31st December, 1958. So it is really for the purpose of allowing a full discussion on the Bill which we had introduced earlier and which has now been referred to a Joint Committee, that we have agreed to bring forward this Bill so that many of our Members may not suffer from disqualification, unless the life of the parent Act is extended.

I hope the House will accept this motion.