

## LOK SABHA DEBATES

### LOK SABHA

Thursday, April 10, 1975/Chaitra 20,  
1897 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the  
Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

#### WELCOME TO THE SOVIET PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, at the outset I have to make an announcement.

On my own behalf and on behalf of the hon. Members of House, I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Mr. S. B. Niyazbekov, Vice-Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the hon. Members of the Soviet Parliamentary Delegation who are on a visit to India as our honoured guests. The other members of the delegation are:

1. Mr. S. F. Antonov, M.P.
  2. Mr. A. M. Bagirov, M.P.
  3. Mrs. E. P. Moskalenko, M.P.
  4. Mr. G. T. Stenko, M.P.
- ◀Official
5. Mr. V. V. Surotsev
  6. Mrs. V. V. Shumarina
  7. Mr. A. K. Kapkaev
  8. Mr. V. V. Nazarov

The delegation arrives this morning and will be in India till the 17th

April. They are now seated in the Special Box. We wish them a happy fruitful stay in our country. Through them we convey our greetings and best wishes to the Parliament, Government and the friendly people of the USSR.

#### ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTION

Admission to Aircraft Factories at  
Kanpur and Bangalore

+  
\*587. SHRI SHANKARRAO  
SAVANT:

SHRI VASANT SATHE:

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that Shri Pande, Minister of State for Education in Maharashtra, has stated in the Legislative Council of Maharashtra on the 27th February, 1975 that Maharashtrians are refused admission for training to the aeroplane manufacturing Defence factories at Kanpur and Bangalore on the ground of secrecy; and

(b) if so, what are the facts about it and what steps are taken to do away with this invidious discrimination?

THE MINISTER OF STATE (DEFENCE PRODUCTION) IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No instructions have been issued by Government or HAL debarring the entry of students from either Maharashtra or from any other State for employment in HAL factories.

The Maharashtra Government have informed that it has been found that the reply of the Minister of State

was based on incorrect information supplied to him and that steps were being taken to clear the wrong impression created.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** This is a bogus question. This has never happened in Kanpur.

**SHRI SHANKERRAO SAVANT:** The prevailing impression in Maharashtra is that this individual discrimination is the actual state of affairs, but this disclosure by the Maharashtra Minister is considered unauthorised and inconvenient. I should, therefore, like to know how many students were actually admitted to the H.A.L. factories at Kanpur and Bangalore during the last three years and how many of them were Maharashtrians.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** This is the Shiv Sena business.

**SHRI SHANKERRAO SAVANT:** It is a fact.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** It is not only in Maharashtra that there are such undertakings; there are so many other States which have them.

**SHRI SHANKERRAO SAVANT:** Let him say it.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** This Shiv Sena business won't do.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** U.P. is the only State where there is no parochialism. I am an example of it.

**SHRI SHANKERRAO SAVANT:** I am not accusing U.P. It is a question of HAL.

**SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA:** As I said in my answer, the Maharashtra Government have admitted that what their Minister had said in the Council is based on wrong premises and wrong information and it is not correct, and they are taking the first opportunity to set the whole thing right—which means their information and their premises were wrong. I would request the hon. member not

to go on these premises which they themselves admit do not exist.

**SHRI SHANKERRAO SAVANT:** Give us statistics.

**THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH):** I would appeal to the hon. member not to suggest this because this means that in all public sector undertakings in all States including Maharashtra, we will be called upon to give figures State-wise. For this, we should have an all-India perspective. There are already enough of divisions. So let this not be raked up. I would appeal to the hon. member not to pursue this.

**SHRI SHANKERRAO SAVANT:** I would like to know what action has been taken against the persons who gave wrong information and whether they are from the State or Central service.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** The best action is to forget about it.

**SHRI SHANKERRAO SAVANT:** That means you are hiding something.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I want to thank heartily the hon. Minister and the Minister of State for clarifying this cloud which was caused on account of the wrong information given in the Maharashtra Legislative Council. I am sure there will be no discrimination in any part of the country on this ground.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I will pass on to the next question. After the Minister's statement, there should be no further question.

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN:** It is a very important question. I will ask only one question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Only one is permissible.

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN:** Let me quote two sentences only from a statement of the Chief Minister of

**Maharashtra.**

"The Maharashtra Chief Minister, Mr. S. B. Chavan, said here today that the State's policy towards the 'sons of the soil' demand was that in all new establishments, both in the public and private sectors, a minimum of 80 per cent of the non-managerial and 50 per cent of the managerial posts should be to the locals. In the existing establishments, locals should get a minimum of 90 per cent of non-managerial and 80 per cent of the managerial posts for new recruitment so as to give the locals their due within a reasonable time".

I would like to know from the Government of India whether they approve of this policy of the 'sons of the soil', this new theory, which is disintegrating this country, and I want to know from the Minister what is the reaction of the Government.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** If I may say so, if the Chief Minister has said any such thing, he cannot lay down a policy for Central Government undertakings. If it is a State....

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN:** He has included the public sector also.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** Public sector of Maharashtra, not ours.

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN:** Can they do it?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** This is really a matter for which I cannot answer. For one thing I have not studied that statement carefully. I cannot in good conscience answer as to what is in his mind.

**Construction of Bridge over River  
Mansai**

**SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY:** Will the Minister of SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Ministry has sanctioned any amount for construction of a bridge over the river Mansai (the bridge to be named as 'Panchanan Setu') in the District of Cooch-Behar, West Bengal; and

(b) if so, the total amount required for the scheme and the amount sanctioned now and when the proposed construction will be completed?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND  
TRANSPORT (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI):**

(a) No Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

**SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY:** Let me find out whether I can find out anything from the 'No'. While he has very emphatically said 'No', is it a fact that the Government of West Bengal had already requested the Centre to sanction some amount of money for the project mentioned in the question? Is it also a fact that the Government of West Bengal has already projected this particular project in the Fifth Plan?

**SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI:** As I have already indicated, no amount has been sanctioned for this bridge. That is the answer. But it is true that the West Bengal Government, amongst several schemes which they have proposed to the Central Government, on the ground of their inter-State and economic importance, have proposed the Mansai bridge in Mathabhanga in the district of Cooch-Behar.

**SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY:** What about the other part of the question whether any amount has been sanctioned for all the projects with particular reference to this? If not, what is the reason for not giving certain plan allocations even for construction in view of the economic backwardness of that particular district?