

11-19 hrs.

**RAILWAY PASSENGER FARES
(AMENDMENT) BILL***

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Dr. B. Gopala Reddi): On behalf of Shri Morarji Desai, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Railway Passenger Fares Act, 1957.

Some Hon. Members: The Finance Minister himself is here.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Ministers can distribute the work among themselves. Under the rules, hon. Members will see that if a notice has been tabled in the name of one Minister, any other Minister may rise in his seat and move it. For the purpose of debate here and for noting the proceedings properly, I wanted them to say "On behalf of so and so, and so and so." The rules do not require that any Minister who is in charge of the same portfolio should get up and say, "On behalf of so and so, I move." It is not necessary, unless another Minister who is in charge of another portfolio presents the Bill or moves the motion. If perchance, the concerned Minister—the Finance Minister or the Revenue Minister—is not here, and another Minister moves the same thing, the record will show that notwithstanding the fact that he is not here, he continues to be here! It is only to avoid that, that I have said that they may add, "On behalf of so and so." Otherwise, the rules do not require it. (*Interruptions*). Hon. Members must wait until they become Ministers.

The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Railway Passenger Fares Act, 1957."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. B. Gopala Reddi: I introduce the Bill.

**INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT
(STANDING ORDERS) AMEND-
MENT BILL***

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Nanda: I introduce the Bill.

11:22 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FIFTY-SEVENTH REPORT

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 21st November, 1960."

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 21st November, 1960."

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): I beg to move:

That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

"Subject to the modification that the time allotted for the Preventive Detention (Continuance) Bill, 1960 be increased from '5 hours' to '15 hours'.

*Published in the Gazettee of India Extraordinary Part II—Section 2, dated 22-11-60.

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Braj Raj Singh]

When this Bill was originally debated in 1950, I am told that there was no time-limit on the speeches. The Bill is a very important one and the feelings which are prevalent in the country against the Bill have to be given expression to here in the House. For that, I feel 5 hours which are allotted will not be enough. I also plead that when this Bill is discussed in the House, you may be pleased to remove the time-limit on the speeches. At least the various spokesmen of the parties who are interested in this may be allowed to speak without any time-limit. It is not possible to finish this Bill within 5 hours.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I have also tabled the same amendment.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): It is a joint amendment. We are also a party to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: One person has spoken.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Why we have suggested 15 hours is, under the Preventive Detention Act, a man can be detained not for a day, a week or a month, but for years. So, why should there be restriction on the speeches?

Shri Vajpayee: When Government want power to detain citizens, they should not grudge more time for the Members for debating the Bill.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: So far as my memory goes, not more than 5 hours were taken by this House. We have taken all this into consideration. You were presiding there and all the parties were represented and we have come to that conclusion unanimously. There is no reason why we should extend the time now.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members are aware that the representatives of the various groups attend the Business Advisory Committee meeting. It is not by majority vote that matters are decided there, but as far as possible

unanimity is sought to be achieved. I shall do this. Under the rules, the Speaker or whoever is the Presiding Officer can extend the time by one hour.

Regarding Shri Braj Raj Singh's suggestions, he may not be called first. There are other leaders of bigger groups. If they take away all the 5 hours, I do not know if his suggestion will be worth considering; I must spare some time for him also. Therefore, the usual time-limit of half an hour to leaders of major groups, 20 minutes to the leaders of other groups and 15 minutes to the other Members will be allowed. I shall not avoid any discussion when any hon. Member is making good points. I think it is unnecessary to pursue this matter. If he wants me to put this amendment to the vote of the House, I shall do so.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: That is not the intention.

Mr. Speaker: I have agreed to giving one hour more. Originally the Minister suggested only 3 hours. We raised it from 3 to 5 hours. I now say I will increase it by one hour if necessary. I think hon. Members must be satisfied. (*Interruptions*). Shall I put the amendment to the House?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: We do not want that . . . (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: All right; the amendment is not pressed.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: That provision of extending the time by 1 hour is already there. I wanted to clarify that the representative of my party who was on the Business Advisory Committee is still detained in Manipur at Imphal. He is not represented there.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 21st November, 1960."

The motion was adopted.

12-36 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the international situation, with particular reference to the matters that have come up before the United Nations General Assembly in its current session, be taken into consideration."

At the beginning of this session of Parliament, a very large number of questions were sent to me relating to my visit to New York for the purpose of attending this current session of the U.N. General Assembly. I thought that it would be more convenient to the House and more profitable to me if we could have rather a debate on this subject instead of my making just a statement on my visit there, on what I saw and did there. Therefore, in this particular debate, although there is no limit to any subject which might be mentioned—that is in your discretion—it is particularly intended, I take it, and it is so mentioned in this motion, that we should deal with the important matters that have come up in the current session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

When the question of my going to New York for this purpose arose, I was at first rather reluctant to do so, partly because it was not very easy for me to leave India because of the stress of work here and I was not

quite convinced at the time that my going would serve any useful purpose. But in the balance, I decided to go and I am glad that I did so. Indeed, soon after I got there, I realised that it was very much worth while, my visit to this session. Now looking back, I feel still more convinced that it was a right step to take for a variety of reasons.

Among those reasons are, it was helpful to have a more intimate knowledge for me of the inner working of the United Nations, something which it is difficult to get from reading reports, however full they might be, to see the various pressures and pulls at work there and the way people's minds work. Secondly, there were a large number of eminent personalities from the newly independent States of Africa and it was a privilege to meet them, to get to know them and to discuss matters with them. Thirdly, this session of the General Assembly was rather unique, because it attracted a very considerable number of heads of Governments, heads of Nations and heads of States. Naturally, when so many of these eminent persons were present there, in a sense it gave a special look to the Assembly and a special authority to the Assembly and it was a chance for meeting them and discussing matters with them.

Now, much has appeared in the public press about the proceedings and hon. Members must have noticed how often the tempers and temperatures rose rather high and from that, perhaps, to some extent, they may have even overlooked the basic issues at stake, because the public mind looks at incidents more because they stand out than the exact issues at stake. I am sure, hon. Members of this House are well acquainted with these major issues; I am referring to the general public. There were the unfortunate incidents and there was the language used which, I am glad to say, we are not used to in this House. But the fact is that this