

Third Series, Vol. LVI, No.61

Monday, May 16, 1966
Vaisakha 26, 1888(Saka)

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(THIRD SERIES)

Vol. LVI, 1966/1888 (Saka)

[May 16 to 18, 1966/Vaisakha 26 to 28, 1888 (Saka)]



Fourteenth Session, 1966/1887-88 (Saka)

(Vol. LVI contains Nos. 61 to 63)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

CONTENTS

No. 61—Monday, May 16, 1966 Vaisakha 26, 1888 (Saka)

COLUMNS

Oral Answers to Questions—

*Starred Questions Nos. 1691 to 1695	16969—98
Short Notice Questions Nos. 35 to 37	16998—17042

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1696 to 1720	17042—59
Unstarred Questions Nos. 5657 to 5697, 5697-A and 5697-B.	17059—88

Calling Attention to Matter of Urgent Public Importance—

Establishment of a Fertiliser Plant at Madras	17088—93
---	----------

Papers Laid of the Table	17093—95, 17100—07
--------------------------	--------------------

Re. Motion for Adjournment—

(Query)	17098—17100
---------	-------------

Rules Committee—

Minutes	17107
---------	-------

Estimates Committee—

Minutes of Evidence	17107
---------------------	-------

Committee on Absence of Members from sittings of the House—

Minutes	17107—08
Message from Rajya-Sabha	17108
Leave of absence from sittings of House	17108—11

Committee of Privileges—

Seventh Report	17111—12
----------------	----------

Re. Business of the House

17112—13

Correcting Answer to S.Q. No. 94 Re. Nagas Infiltration into Burma

17113—14

Statement Re. Explosion in Bhusawal Down Goods Yard —

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh	17114
----------------------	-------

*The sign + marked above the name of a member indicates that the question was actually asked on the floor of the House by him.

Statement <i>Re.</i> Delay in placing the Kerala Moneylenders Rules, 1964 on the Table	17115—17
Shri B. R. Bhagat	17115—17
Constitution (Nineteenth Amendment) Bill Negatived	
Motion to Consider	17117—23
Shri Hathi	17117—23
Delhi Administration Bill—	
Motion to Consider, as reported by Joint Committee 17123—39, 17153—92	
Shri Hathi	17123—28
Shrimati Renu Chakravartty	17130—35
Shri Brahm Prakash	17135—39, 17153—58
Shri Bade	17159—64
Shrimati Subhadra Joshi	17164—70
Shri Nambiar	17170—74
Shri Shiv Charan Gupta	17174—80
Shri Naval Prabhakar	17180—86
Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath	17186—92
Shri Madhu Limaye	17192
Statement <i>re.</i> Prime Minister's Visit to Orissa	17139—53
Shrimati Indira Gandhi	17139—44, 17148—52
Half-an-hour Discussion <i>re.</i> status of High Court Judges	17192—93
Dr. L. M. Singhvi	17192—93
Shri Nanda	17193
Business of the House	17194—17206
Half-an-hour Discussion <i>re.</i> Capacity of Ports to handle Cargo	17206—12
Shri Linga Reddy	17206—08
Shri C. M. Poonacha	17208—12

LOK SABHA

*Monday, May 16, 1966/Vaisakha 26,
1888 (Saka)*

*The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Explosion of Hydrogen Bomb by China

+

*1691. Dr. L. M. Singhvi :

Shri P. C. Borooah :

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath :

Shri Nath Pal :

Shri D. C. Sharma :

Shri Ram Harkh Yadav :

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government are aware that China is shortly to explode a hydrogen bomb;

(b) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a statement by Edward Teller, father of hydrogen bomb, regarding the prospects and the implications of the Chinese nuclear advances; and

(c) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The People's Republic of China is reported to have conducted a nuclear explosion on the 9th May. A press communique issued by the Chinese Government stated that the device exploded contained thermonuclear material.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Government's reaction to China's development of its nuclear capability was stated by me in the House on the 10th May.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I realise that the position of the Government has not changed since the 10th May, when the hon. Minister replied, but the country is still anxious to know, because it has only been confused by his replies, and so, may I know whether the Government's policy, in terms of nuclear weapons, will continue to be signified by an attitude of resignation or what may be called an attitude of nuclear fatalism, or, whether the Government have sought to be realistic, namely, that a positive policy has to be followed if its efforts for non-proliferation meet with nothing but failure; particularly whether the Government have got in touch with Soviet Union, America and Britain?

Shri Swaran Singh: Government's policy is positive and realistic—both.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I asked a specific question; whether the Government have got in touch with the British, American and Soviet Governments, and if the Government's efforts at non-proliferation meet with nothing but failure, whether the Government would seek to develop its own nuclear capability, both for peaceful uses and wartime uses. If so, what is the response of those Governments?

Shri Swaran Singh: I thought I also clarified the position when I was replying to the Call Attention Notice, that efforts are still being made that in the context of non-proliferation, there should be willingness on the part of the main nuclear powers to go through certain sacrifices and also reassure the non-nuclear powers.

Shri P. C. Borooah: The hon. Minister of External Affairs has just said that Government believes that the best guarantee against proliferation of atomic weapons was the guarantee by the United States of America and Russia, the main nuclear powers, that the interests of the non-nuclear powers would not suffer because of the adherence of the principle of non-proliferation. May I know if and when such a guarantee is expected to be given by the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. and even if such a guarantee is given, to what extent we can rely on it because the national interests of India will not be tallying with the national interests of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. in the event of a nuclear attack?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is difficult for me to say as to how long will it take before the nuclear powers can re-assure the non-nuclear powers. In the national interests of India, as was categorically stated by the Prime Minister, our own defence is the paramount consideration in this respect as in any other respect.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: He wanted to know the form of re-assurance desired by Government; the answer must come.

Mr. Speaker: He says that the policy remains the same.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Considering that the Chinese Foreign Minister recently challenged to use his own words—"American imperialists, Russian modern revisionists, and Indian reactionaries"—"come one, come all"—and subsequently, the Chinese thermo-nuclear explosion took place, do the Government, in the light of the statement made by the External Affairs Minister on the 10th May, propose to write to the United States and the Soviet Union, the major nuclear powers, and also the non-nuclear nations of Asia and Africa, as to what is to be done against Chinese nuclear blackmail, and if they are not writing, what are the reasons therefor?

Shri Swaran Singh: If I had understood the hon. Member correctly, he asked whether the Government is prepared to write to the main nuclear powers and also to the main non-nuclear powers. Writing is

not difficult, but one has to be clear about the contents of that writing. We have already taken the position in the United Nations and also in the committee which is discussing these matters in Geneva that the main nuclear powers should work out suitable assurances and guarantees to the non-nuclear powers if they are interested in non-proliferation. Unless basically there is some agreement by the main nuclear powers about this, there is not much point in just spelling out these things in writing.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is there no agreement so far?

Shri Swaran Singh: There is no agreement so far.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The 17-nation disarmament commission which was seized of the problem of nuclear proliferation and the problem of not adding to the nuclear stockpiles in different countries has adjourned without arriving at any results. In view of the fact that even the nuclear nations and non-nuclear nations had not arrived at any formula for disarmament, especially in regard to nuclear non-proliferation, will it not be advisable for the Government to have a fresh look at its nuclear policy in the light of our defences which are being challenged not only by China but by Pakistan also, because I read in the papers that Pakistan is going to explode a bomb very soon?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have already said that the Government is constantly reviewing these international aspects, some of which have been referred to by the hon. member, and the paramount necessity of providing adequate defence for the country. All these matters—nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and the necessity to safeguard our integrity—are not mutually contradictory.

श्री राम हरक्ष दास : सरकार का यह कहना है कि हम बल्ले-बल्लूत अपने मुल्क में एटम बम तैयार कर लेंगे। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि मीजूवा साधनों की बिना पर एक विनाशकारी एटम बम के तैयार करने में कितना बलत लवेगा और उस पर कितना खर्च होगा।

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह: इसके मुताबिक मैं कुछ इतिहास नहीं दे सकता।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The non-aligned conference at Cairo had asked for a world conference on disarmament and China herself had made suggestions about a meeting of the Heads of States in order to secure a complete destruction of all nuclear weapons. In view of these happenings for whatever they are worth, may I know what the Government is doing to see that some tangible steps are taken and at least as an interim arrangement, an atom-free zone in this part of world is sought to be established, because such a kind of agreement for an atom-free zone in South Asia would mean something?

Shri Swaran Singh: The hon. member is correct that in the Cairo non-aligned conference, there was a declaration that a world conference on disarmament should be convened and to bring the information up-to-date, a similar proposal was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly sometime back. The important thing in this which has to be kept in mind is that not only the Chinese suggestion of complete destruction of all nuclear weapons, but also disarmament in regard to conventional weapons has to be tackled, because of the huge size of the Chinese arms and the conventional weapons they have got. We have always supported the convening of a world conference on disarmament. On the nuclear free zone we are in agreement. We support this in principle. But let us not forget that a nuclear free zone in which China continues to have and develops nuclear weapons really becomes somewhat unreal, unless, of course, China is prepared, for which there is no sign at the moment, of cooperating in any such venture. There was a proposal of establishing a nuclear free zone in Africa where none of the African countries at the moment is in possession of any nuclear device. We supported it and a large number of African countries also supported it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: May I know what force the hon. Minister sees in the Chinese attitude that they as also France are governed by the attitude of the United States of America and U.S.S.R., in

perpetuating monopolistic control of the nuclear weapons and that there should be no question of proliferation rather than that of destruction of the nuclear weapons which these powers have, and until and unless that attitude is taken there is no likelihood of any further improvement and success in getting non-proliferation ahead?

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, at the present moment, unfortunately, the two main nuclear powers, namely, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are not prepared even to undertake to stop the manufacture of fresh bombs, what to talk of destruction of the entire stock-pile, and we were hoping that in the Geneva Conference, at any rate, the main nuclear powers would undertake not to manufacture new atom bombs and new nuclear bombs. That was one of the suggestions which we had made, as a first step to ultimate destruction of all nuclear weapons, that they should not only continue not to undertake any new tests but should undertake that they will not also manufacture any new bombs. But there is very little response at the present moment from the main nuclear powers on that. Therefore, these are the difficulties which the world is experiencing in the matter of disarmament, particularly in this nuclear field.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Sir, my question was, what force do you see in this Chinese attitude, that it is useless to talk of non-proliferation if the nuclear powers take this attitude? What is the sense in talking to them when they want to keep the monopoly? Do we subscribe to that view? Are we not one with China particularly in this matter?

Shri Swaran Singh: We should not take the Chinese claim at its face value, when they say that there should be complete destruction, obviously because they have got two or three and the other party has got hundreds of them, and they put forward this idea in the hope that.....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Chinese are not the only people who say that, about the continuance of monopoly and that these nations who talk of non-proliferation and do not try for destruction of these weapons

want that they should keep the monopoly with them.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is for the non-nuclear powers also to take their own positions; it is not for me, for the main nuclear powers, to give an adequate reply. whatever reply they have got to this Chinese claim. But we should not be taken in by this assertion on the side of the Chinese, because it is not what it appears to be on the face of it. (Interruption).

Shri Ranga: May I know what steps are being taken by Government to assure themselves of nuclear protection from any of these great nuclear powers, whether they are two or four? Are they assured that they would come to our rescue in any such contingency in which these irresponsible Chinese Government thinks of using this nuclear weapon, as they did last time when China invaded India.

Shri Swaran Singh: In this respect, I have already ventured to state that our approach to this problem of safeguards being afforded to the non-nuclear powers has been in the context of international and multi-lateral basis rather than of bilateral basis. That is the essential difference between Prof. Ranga's approach and the attitude that we had taken. We had felt that the best protection that could be afforded to the non-nuclear powers was multi-lateral guarantee in the international sphere rather than bilateral arrangements which are another name for defence pacts.

Srimati Renuka Ray: The Minister has replied that we believe in a multi-lateral stand. I would like to know, for security of the non-nuclear powers, what steps are being taken towards this end now and, if not, why not?

Shri Swaran Singh: Steps are being taken in the United Nations and in the 17-Nations Committee and also in the course of exchange of views between various countries.

हैदराबाद छावनी बोर्ड

+

* 1692 डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :

श्री किशन पटनायक :

श्री राजसेवक यादव :

क्या प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) क्या यह सच है कि हैदराबाद छावनी बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष ने, जो एक मनोनीत प्रफसर हैं, बोर्डके एक निर्वाचित सदस्य को 1963 में पीटा था;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस प्रकार की कितनी घटनाओं के बारे में सरकार को जानकारी है; और

(ग) क्या सरकार कोई ऐसी योजना बना रही है, जिसमें छावनी क्षेत्रों को सचमुच स्वायत्त शासन प्राप्त हो और सदस्यों का मनोनीत करने की व्यवस्था समाप्त हो?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Government are not aware of any mishandling of an elected member in any Cantonment.

(c) Meanwhile question of providing autonomy to the Cantonment areas is under consideration but the total elimination of nominated members cannot be visualised at this stage.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरे पास एक जज का फंसला है, पांचवें शहर मजिस्टर सिकन्दराबाद का 11 मई, 1964 का श्री धनंजया के सिलसिले का, जो कि धर्म शास्त्र में एम० ए० हैं और किसी कालेज में लेक्चरर हैं। इस क्रमले में लिखा हुआ है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह डिलीटा प्राप दे दीजिये, मैं उनसे कहूंगा

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्राप सिर्फ एक जुमला मुन लीजिये, अपराधी का आरोप कि इस बारदात के बाद उनके साथ मिलटरी यानी पलटन के अफसरों ने और दूसरे जो उम सभा में थे, उन्होंने हाथापाई की, भारपीट की, मालूम होता है कि सच है, क्योंकि पुलिस ने बाद में उनको दवाई के

सिधे गांधी घसताल में भेजा। यह मजिस्ट्रेट का फैसला है और साथ ही साथ इस फैसले में यह भी कहा गया है कि जहां उनके मुहल्ले में पानी का चाप कम था, जब ब्रिगेडियर साहब तहकीकात करने गये, तो उस सदस्य को, जो कि उसका मेम्बर था, साथ लेकर नहीं गये। ऐसी हालत में क्या मंत्री महोदय यह कहने को प्रबन्ध भी रीयार हैं कि छावनी के इलाके में पलटन के लोग ऐसी कार्यवाही नहीं करते ?

Shri A. M. Thomas: As far as our information is concerned, there was no question of manhandling by the Commander against any elected Member. But our information is that on the 29th November, 1963, one elected Member assaulted the Commander. That is our information. In fact, what happened was that there was a meeting of the Cantonment Boards on 29th November, 1963 and Shri Anjappa wanted that whether three roads in his own ward should be metalled should be taken first before any other business was taken up. That could not be done. So, there was an uproar in the meeting and the Chairman had, as a last resort, to adjourn the meeting. After that, Shri Anjappa adopted an attitude which was not at all becoming on his part. He threw some rotten tomatoes against the Brigadier. That is what happened.

As regards the second question as to what the Government is going to do with regard to the revision of the Cantonment Boards Act, this is the position. In fact, that Act is more than 40 years old. We are ourselves, thinking of revising the Act. Several sections of the Act were examined, and but for the emergency, we would have perhaps completed that examination.

In the main answer, I have indicated that the question of giving autonomy to the cantonment areas is under examination. Meanwhile, under executive instructions, we have given certain autonomous powers to these boards. Besides, further democratisation has been done by introducing the elective element and by introducing parity

between elected members and the nominated members.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अभी भी माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने गलत बयानी की कि उस सभा में... (ध्वजबान) घायल जरा सुन तो लीजिये। जब साहब का फैसला था कि उस सभा में ब्रिगेडियर साहब ने सबक बनाने की इजाजत दी। वह पास हो गया था। फिर कुछ जरा मा

अध्यक्ष महोदय: इतने मारे की तहकीकात नहीं कर सकते हैं। घायल दूसरा सवाल करें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : दूसरा सवाल पूछू इसके पहले मैं घायल का ध्यान इस पर खींचना चाहता हूँ कि प्राप्ति मान लीजिये किसी ने टिमाटर फेंका तो क्या उसके माने यह हो जाते हैं कि उसकी हड्डी तोड़ देंगे ? यह क्या कोई तरीका है ? जबाब जिस ढंग से दिया जाता है उस पर मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : व्यवस्था नहीं, घायल दूसरा सवाल पूछें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मान लीजिये टिमाटर फेंका तो क्या हड्डी तोड़ने का अधिकार मिल जाता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं फैसला क्या करूँ ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : घायल अध्यक्ष महोदय हैं, घायल प्रश्न फैसला इन मामलों में नहीं देंगे तो।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कोई कोर्ट नहीं हूँ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कोर्ट घायल इस तरह से है कि मेरे सवाल का जबाब तो घायल जिला ही सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब घायल दूसरा सवाल करें।

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया : क्या मंत्री महोदय को मालूम है कि छावनियों में एक करोड़ जनता रहती है ? बाकी 47 करोड़ जनता को स्वायत्त शासन के अधिकार हैं लेकिन इस एक करोड़ जनता के स्वायत्त शासन के अधिकारों पर जबर्दस्त हमला हो रहा है क्योंकि उनके बोर्डों में, उनकी कमेटियों में आधे सदस्य पलटनों की तरफ से नामजद किये जाते हैं और ये सदस्य भारत के जनतंत्र के शासन को खत्म कर दिया करते हैं और यहां तक होता है कि बीस-तीस लाख रुपये का बजट दो-दो मिनट में पास करवा दिया जाता है। ऐसी स्थिति को देखते हुए क्या मंत्री महोदय भारत की पलटन का ऐसे गैरजनतांत्रिक कर्म से बिल्कुल भ्रम कर लेंगे और छावनियों की जनता को बाकी जनता के मुताबिक अपनी हुकूमत चलाने देंगे ?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): The hon. Member has certainly raised some very important points, and as we have said in our main reply, we are ourselves examining this question.

As a matter of fact, I have myself made a request to the chairman of the Reforms Commission that he should also constitute a team which should study this question specially, and if they make any recommendations, certainly we shall consider them also.

I quite agree that there is certainly some scope for democratisation. But I would like to inform the House that we ourselves have taken certain steps for democratisation, by allowing parity between the elected members and the nominated members.

As regards the problems of the civil areas, a civil committee is formed in which the elected members form a majority, and they themselves are delegated all the powers to decide about those problems. But I quite concur in this position that this is not enough, and something more will have to be done.

श्री किशन पटनायक : मंत्री महोदय ने घंटीया पर यह इल्जाम लगाया है कि उन्होंने मैनहैंडल किया। मैं पहले तो यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या टिमाटर फेंकना मैनहैंडलिंग है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह कोई सवाल नहीं है। मिनिस्टर साहब की स्पेशल इनफार्मेशन में यह नहीं आता है कि टिमाटर फेंकना .

श्री किशन पटनायक : मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जवाब देने के पहले क्या मिनिस्टर साहब ने मैजिस्ट्रेट की जजमेंट देखी है जिसमें उन्होंने लिखा है :

'The accused's complaint that after the incident he was roughly handled by the military officers and others present at the meeting appears to be true, for the police sent him to the Gandhi Hospital the next day for treatment'

क्या इसकी जानकारी उनको है ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: This particular judgment has not been brought to our notice. We shall certainly examine this judgment also.

Verification of Circulation Claims of Calcutta Newspaper

+

*1693. **Shri Basappa:**

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:

Shri D. C. Sharma:

Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Registrar of Newspapers reported to the Diwakar Committee that the publisher of some Calcutta Newspaper was consistently refusing to show the account books regarding circulation;

(b) if so, whether the Diwakar Committee recommended legal proceedings against the newspaper and its publisher;

(c) the names of the concerned newspaper, its publisher and editor;

(d) the newsprint quota allotted to it; and

(c) the total amount of advertisements given by the Directorate of Audio-Visual Publicity for this publication after the Registrar of Newspapers had given his evidence before the Diwakar Committee?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) There is a mention in the Enquiry Committee Report that the Press Registrar had mentioned to the Committee that he was experiencing some difficulty in assessing the circulation of a Calcutta daily as the publishers had failed to submit for scrutiny the necessary accounts books.

(b) The Committee has observed that in such cases the advice of the Ministry of Law should be sought for putting legal process in the motion.

(c) There is no mention in the Report of the Committee of the name of the newspaper referred to in part (a) of the question. The record of evidence before the Committee also does not contain the name of any particular paper in this context.

(d) and (e). Do not arise.

Shri Basappa: What efforts have been made to ascertain the name of this paper and whether this is a paper which is a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulation? If so, what is their estimate of its circulation?

Shri Raj Bahadur: There is on the part of the Registrar an experience and feeling that many of the papers do not produce their account books and other relevant documents in time for the purpose of checking of circulation. The number in 1965 was as much as 149. It is in that context that the whole position has to be examined.

Shri Ranga: The question has not been answered. What efforts have been made to ascertain the name of the paper? Why did they not find it out from their own Registrar? Who made this complaint?

Shri Raj Bahadur: If I make an indelible distinction between one paper and another where there are as many as 149 such papers, it would not be fair to any one of those papers, if I name it.

Shri Ranga: On a matter of procedure....

Mr. Speaker: When the name of one particular paper has been mentioned,—there might be many others also—does the Minister not think that its name should be given?

Shri Raj Bahadur: I can give its name and also the names of the others who have been so reported.

Mr. Speaker: That statement might be laid on the Table.

Shri Raj Bahadur: If you like, I will do so.

Shri Basappa: While giving the name of the paper, will he also say what is the quantity of newsprint given and also the amount of advertisement given to this papers?

Mr. Speaker: We cannot ask for all those things now.

Shri Basappa: Of only that one paper.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He might not agree to give the name of the paper. But he must have information about how much quota has been given and how much advertisement has been given to that particular paper?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You permitted this question to be formulated in this form. That being so, I do not see how it is not proper to give the name of the paper and other details in connection therewith.

Mr. Speaker: I have said it is not improper.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Therefore, it stands to reason, as Shri Ranga said and you agreed, that since the Registrar of Newspapers is an employee of his Ministry and since he gave evidence before the Committee, of which I happened to have been a member, it is easy enough to find out the name and give it to the House.

Shri Raj Bahadur: The complaint was of a general nature. I have not the least

inclination to conceal the name from the House. But the question is whether I should make an invidious distinction. As you have advised, I will place it on the Table.

Shri Tyagi: One name only.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Is Shri Atulya Ghosh connected with that paper?

Shri Raj Bahadur: Since this is being insisted upon, I may say that against the demand based on entitlement already certified, the demand was for 1009.50 metric tonnes in respect of these two years, 1964-65 and 1965-66, and the quantity given was 462.91 metric tonnes, which is much less than even 50 per cent of the entitlement.

Shri Ranga: What is the name of the sacred paper?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to seek your guidance.....

Mr. Speaker: On what ground should I refuse the question of Members about the name?

Shri Raj Bahadur: I do not mind giving the name. The name of this paper is *Jan Sevak*. I have got as many 23 now—28. If I give the name of one and do not give the names of the others, it will be making an invidious distinction as between paper and paper.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Before the Diwakar Committee, the Registrar deposed that the paper is not giving the circulation figures. Is it not a fact that the same Committee had said in its recommendations that the quota given to a paper against which there are certain allegations shall not be reduced unless it is given a show-cause notice? Is it a fact that this paper has since then supplied all the information wanted and yet without giving any show-cause notice, why has the Minister chosen to reduce the quota?

Shri Raj Bahadur: The fact of the matter is that in the first two years the necessary account books were not forthcoming. Later all the papers have been received.

Based on that, against a claim of 22,318 circulation, the paper has been adjudged to have a circulation of 11,000 and on that basis the decision has been taken.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: How did you do that? After giving an opportunity?

Shri Raj Bahadur: After giving them proper notice. Also, they have every right to appeal at any time they like.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: This Registrar is the most prejudiced fellow.

Mr. Speaker: I did not follow what he said.

Shri Raj Bahadur: Since this took place, this is the second Registrar. So, none of them is prejudiced.

Shri D. C. Sharma: May I know if the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting has any legal powers, or has given any legal powers to the Registrar of Newspapers, so that he can bring the erring newspapers to account, and if not, what steps the Government is going to take so that those newspapers which do not comply with the regulations of the Indian Newspaper Act are brought to book?

Shri Raj Bahadur: The Registrar of Newspapers has got the power to check the circulation and to demand evidence, account books etc., in support of the circulation claimed by any individual newspaper. In case that is not done, the Registrar is entitled to reduce, after giving proper notice, the newsprint to be allotted to the particular paper. That is the sanction that he has got.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would like to know whether, despite the report of the Diwakar Committee, Government has not initiated any legal proceedings against this *Jan Sevak* run by Atulya Ghosh, and whether it is a fact that after the reduction of the quota, the Chief Minister of Rajasthan, Mr. Sukhadia, intervened and requested the Information Minister to release the newsprint quota of this organ of the ruling party? May I know why Government has not taken action against this paper?

Shri Raj Bahadur: The latter part of the question and the insinuation made

therein is totally repudiated. It is not at all a fact. The Rajasthan Chief Minister never approached me.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What about the first part of the question? The first part of my question is . . .

Mr. Speaker: The first part also is going to be answered, but hon. Members should show greater responsibility. They should first satisfy themselves that there is reason for making any imputations.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What is the insinuation?

Mr. Speaker: It is left to the Minister to deny or repudiate, but the mischief is done.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: On a point of personal explanation

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know what ground he had to say like this (*Interruptions*).

Shri P. Venkatasubbalah: He had made an allegation. What are the facts in his possession for making such an allegation?

Shri Tyagi rose—

Mr. Speaker: Only when I call any Member, he should speak. I will call him. Not in this manner.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My question was whether despite the recommendation of the Diwakar Committee, Government has not initiated any action against the paper *Jan Sevak* because it is under the administration of Atulya Ghosh, whether it is a fact that when the quota was reduced the Chief Minister, Mr. Sukhadia, requested the Information Minister to restore the quota. What is the insinuation. If it is not so let him say so. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: It is not enough that a question is thrown just in this manner—is it not a fact that such and such a man was treated like that is it not a fact that such and such a man told a lie—and then it comes from the Minister it is not a fact. That is not enough. Members should

satisfy themselves that there is at least some reasonable ground for believing that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Let there be an enquiry against the newspaper. Black-marketing is going on. Only because Atulya Ghosh is there, no enquiry is being made.

Mr. Speaker: I will ask him to give the information to me.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to know whether it is correct or not.

Mr. Speaker: That should be decided first. If it is asked, "I want to know whether such and such a man has committed rape", the mischief is done, and if the Minister says it is not a fact, would that be enough?

Mr. Speaker: First the Member should satisfy himself that there are reasons to believe.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: If I am satisfied, I would have put a more definite question. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Similarly, can one ask whether Mr. Banerjee has taken some money for putting this question?

Shri Tyagi: In all fairness when one of the papers of a similar category had been named, it would be better if ten or 12 names, whatever they are, they are also read. I would, therefore, suggest five or six other names may also be read. Which are the names?

Shri Raj Bahadur: From Andhra Pradesh: Vahini, Pragathi, Sahakari, Timber Samachar; from Bihar: Awaz, Navarashtra, Sathi, Viman, Atma, Himalaya, Naqeeb, Navashakti, Nepal Sandesh, Paigham-E-Nehru, Roshni, Uttar Bihar, Vishwa Bandhu, Chatra Bandhu, Gram Sewak, Sevanjali; from Delhi: Namdhari Samachar, Navan Hindustan, Wattan, Daur-I-Jadid, India, Hajjan, Jasooi Phanda; from Gujarat: Agahai, Prakash, Spatnik . . . (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: How many are there?

Shri Raj Bahadur: I have got 149 cases for 1965.

Mr. Speaker: They may be placed on the Table of the House.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It has been admitted by the Minister that this particular paper was showing an inflated figure of circulation and was taking more newspaper quota than was due to it. Has the Government made enquiries of reports about blackmarketing of the extra paper that they got?

Shri Raj Bahadur: No such thing came to our notice. On the contrary, as far back as 1962, the State Government did support the claim of the paper and thereupon there were some questioning and the Registrar promised an enquiry which was done and because of certain facts and figures a tentative decision was reached for about 11,000 circulation, and even this was however protested by the paper concerned.

Shri Ranga: What does he say? What is the reply? Is it the reply to Mr. Dwivedy's question?

Mr. Speaker: He says that the Minister has stated that the paper had given inflated circulation and on enquiry it was found that the real circulation was less.

Shri Raj Bahadur: I have said that the State Government by its circulation officer supported the claim of the paper and there were some questions raised and there were enquiries and on the basis of those enquiries, tentatively we have reduced it to a figure of 11,000 in circulation.....(*Interruption*). So far as we are concerned, we have taken a tentative decision that they should not get on 22,000 circulation, they should get on 11,000 only. They are protesting and therefore, we cannot say this is the final position.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Is it the reply to my question? When I put that supplementary, he admits that it has been so....

Mr. Speaker: The answer has come that the paper is protesting that their circulation is what they have been claiming.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: No, Sir,

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Has not the government enquired about the blackmarketing of paper?.....(*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Government came to the conclusion that the circulation was not as much as was declared by the paper. But the paper is still fighting out that case.

Shri Nambiar: Every paper fights.

Mr. Speaker: The position is this.

Shri Raj Bahadur: May I make one thing clear? About the whole of 149 papers, the only difficulty which was reported by the Registrar was that they could not or did not produce the account books. If the account books were produced they are verified from time to time; there is nothing unusual in that. The 149 papers cannot all be condemned; nor can this be.

Shri Ranga: For two years thereafter, they did not submit their accounts to you.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: The hon. Minister told the House that there are more than 100 papers which have failed to supply the required circulation figures. Has he made any enquiry as to why the Press Registrar has chosen this particular paper for his attack before the Diwakar Committee when there are more than 100 papers in the list of defaulters?

Shri Raj Bahadur: The reason was that some complaints were made against this paper by those who were opposed to this paper. Therefore an enquiry had to be made in the normal course.

Shri Nambiar: May I know who is the editor of this paper?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Next question.

Sino-Pak Collusion

*1694. **Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the latest assessment made by Government regarding Sino-

Pak. collusion against India arising out of the recent Sino-Pakistan manoeuvres both in the West and East Pakistan; and

(b) if so, the steps taken to counteract evil effect of it?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The recent visit of Chairman Liu Shao-Chi to Pakistan and the statements made during the visit by the Chinese and Pakistani leaders clearly confirm Sino-Pak. collusion against India. The supply of military equipment to Pakistan by China has added a new dimension to this Sino-Pak collusion.

(b) The Government are taking necessary steps to meet the situation.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know whether the Government of India have studied the question in the context of the fact that Pakistan invaded India and since then, Pakistan has followed a policy which is bringing Pakistan nearer to China as well as nearer to the USA, the United Kingdom and the USSR even, and so, may I know what is the result of the study and what is the reaction of the Government in this regard?

Shri Swaran Singh: The result of the study is that the presumption that the hon. Member is giving expression to is not correct.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know whether it is a fact that recently some of the important outposts beyond the cease-fire line are being strengthened with the help of the Chinese experts and Chinese arms and, if so, what is the Government doing with regard to meeting the situation that may be created in the near future?

Shri Swaran Singh: This matter was referred to some days ago on the floor of the House. On our side, we have to strengthen our defences and any steps that Pakistan takes which are in contravention of the agreement, are a clear violation of the Tashkent declaration and spirit.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: May I know whether it is a fact that some part of the Gilgit area has been handed over

by Pakistan to China and whether China is preparing on a large scale to train the Pakistan army?

Shri Swaran Singh: We have information that the Chinese did supply arms and armaments to the Pakistanis, but we have not got any firm information about the training of Pakistani army by the Chinese.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: I mentioned about the surrender of the Gilgit area by Pakistan to China.

Mr. Speaker: Surrender of some parts of the Gilgit area by Pakistan to China.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is true that the northern part of Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir was given by the Pakistanis to the Chinese, on what they described as a border agreement. Besides that, I have no other information.

श्री बड़े : श्री मंत्री जी ने कहा कि ताशकंद समझौते की स्पिरिट के विरुद्ध यह काम हो रहे हैं। तो क्या प्रापकी गदनमेंट ने रक्षा को इस बारे में कुछ लिखा है या उनकी नजर में यह बात लाई गई है कि चाइना और पाकिस्तान इन दोनों का प्रापस में मिलन यह ताशकंद समझौते के विरुद्ध हो रहा है? यदि हां, तो रक्षा का इस बारे में क्या रिएक्शन है?

Shri Swaran Singh: China is not a party to the Tashkent declaration. I know they have been opposing the Tashkent declaration from the very beginning, and their action is really consistent with their original stand, to take steps to torpedo the Tashkent declaration. (Interruption). The hon. Member does not come here very often, and that is why he is repeating the question. This has been answered before: that we have been keeping the Soviet Union informed about the violation of the Tashkent declaration by Pakistan. I have already informed the House: probably the hon. member was not present.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam : The surrender of land by Pakistan to China and the regular training of Pakistani people in the Chinese army have proved very clearly the unholy alliance of Pakistan and China. What are the countries which disapprove of this unholy alliance and what steps are we going to take to safeguard our position *vis-a-vis* the position of these two allied countries?

Shri Swaran Singh : We have to continue to take steps to strengthen our unity and defence potential. What other countries disapprove of the Sino-Pak alliance or collusion is for those other countries to decide. There is not much point in going round the world and asking other countries to disapprove of the collusion between Pakistan and China. We have to defend ourselves pointing out our assessment of this relationship to other countries and it is for the other countries to decide. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker : We cannot give our opinion about other countries.

Shri Swell : Has the Government's attention been drawn to the recent statement of President Ayub Khan of Pakistan that Pakistan's relation with the USA is coming to normalcy, i.e., going back to the relationship that obtained between them before the Indo-Pak conflict? Has the Government assessed the truth of that statement and if there is truth in it, how do they square it up with this, this growing Sino-Pak collusion to which the Minister referred?

Shri Swaran Singh : I have seen the report. About the truth of the content of the report, it is either for China or for United States to say something. How can I say whether Pakistan's relationship with USA has returned to normal or not?

श्री प्रकाशवीर शाल्मी : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष के पूर्वी भाग में विशेषकर असम, मणिपुर, त्रिपुरा और नागालैंड में क्या यह सत्य है कि चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों ने मिलकर कुछ इस प्रकार से अपनी साठ-गांठ की है कि लाखों की संख्या में पहले अपने व्यक्ति वहाँ भेजकर आन्तरिक

विद्रोह कराया जाय और फिर अनुकूल स्थिति देखकर भारत के पूर्वी भाग पर अधिकार जमाया जाय ? यदि हाँ, तो इस सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार की प्रतिक्रिया क्या है ?

Shri Swaran Singh : There was subdued noise in the House and I could not fully comprehend the question. It is a fact that Pakistan has been encouraging the Nagas in the eastern part of our country and they have also been encouraging the Mizos. To what extent is the Chinese hand in this is not clear. If there is any Chinese hand, it will be *via* Pakistan and that also will be Pakistani help. We are aware of the situation and we have to take the necessary corrective steps.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : अध्यक्ष जी, मंत्री जी ने अभी कबूल किया कि पाकिस्तान और चीन की कुछ साठ गांठ है, अभी सेसन बन्द हो रहा है, हम लोग जायेंगे तो लोग पूछेंगे कि हमारी फौजी तैयारी क्या है और हमको बाहर से क्या मदद मिलेगी क्योंकि सुरक्षा मंत्री ने एक दिन पहले कबूल किया है कि डेढ़ लाख फौजी चीनी हमारी सरहद पर हैं, तो लोग झुलाबे में नहीं घायेंगे, वह डेफिनिट हमसे जानना चाहेंगे कि हमारी सरकार क्या कर रही है फौज के मामले में और विदेश से हमें क्या-क्या सहायता मिल रही है ?

Shri Swaran Singh : The Defence Minister has noted this point. It is not usual to give figures about the disposition of our defence forces.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : अध्यक्ष जी, प्लांट आफ आर्बर है। यह हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के द्वारा हम लोग चुनकर धाये हैं। वह इस तरह से झुलाबे से नहीं मानते हैं। वह डेफिनिट चाहते हैं कि हम क्या कर रहे हैं हिन्दुस्तान की

सुरक्षा के लिए, इसलिए मंत्री जी ठीक से बतावें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब वह हमें तो नहीं बतलाते । आप पार्टी में उनसे झगलाहिदा पूछ लें ।

Shri Tyagi : Are not the Chinese helping Pakistan in constructing a road which would connect Haji Pir bulge with China, so that they can easily bring their armoured vehicles to our front? If it is a fact, will the Government assure this House that they are taking immediate defensive action in this regard?

Shri Swaran Singh : Sir, I am unable to say if any road is being constructed between....

Shri Sham Lal Saraf : The two cannot meet.

Shri Tyagi : I was saying about the road connecting Chinese territory to the Haji Pir bulge on the other side where Pakistan is having heavy defence installations. Are not the Chinese helping them to build this road so that they can bring their vehicles to the front?

Shri Swaran Singh : Chinese vehicles, if they want to bring, can be brought into Pakistan territory and from there they can go to any part of Pakistan-occupied Kashmir. On this road between Haji Pir and Chinese territory, I am afraid I am unable to throw any further light.

Rev. Michael Scott

+

1695. **Shri Hem Barua :**

Shri Yashpal Singh :

Shri S. M. Banerjee :

Shri Kishen Pattinayak :

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state :

(a) whether in relation to what he said in the House about the steps to be taken against the Rev. Michael Scott, member of the Nagaland Peace Mission immediately after the second round of talks between the Prime Minister and the Naga underground leaders at Delhi are over, any

steps have been or proposed to be taken against the gentleman concerned; and

(b) if so, the nature of the action taken or proposed to be taken?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh) :

(a) and (b) The Government of India have asked Rev. Scott to leave India and he has already left the country.

Shri Hem Barua : Now that the main villain of the Nagaland drama is off the stage, may I know if the Government are aware of the fact that the Baptist Church in Nagaland has constituted another peace body—we call it 'Peace Mission'—if so, in that connection, if Government are in a position to tell us that: (a) religious institutions like the Baptist Church must not dabble in political matters, for that complicates political issues, and; (b) whether Government are prepared to tell us that there is no necessity for a second peace body for our experience about the peace body in Nagaland is that peace bodies create 'dispeace' and at the same time the underground Naga leaders are having their discussions with the Prime Minister?

Shri Dinesh Singh : We have seen reports to that effect, that Church leaders have nominated some more people to the Peace Mission. We have not received any communication.

Shri Hem Barua : You have received. The communication from the Baptist Mission has reached the office of the Foreign Minister on 12th May and it is there.

Mr. Speaker : Order, order, answers should be heard.

Shri Dinesh Singh : I am afraid the hon. Member move more information. But I checked it up even this morning. We have not received any proposal so far from the Church leaders. We shall bear in mind the suggestions made by the hon. Member when we receive the proposals.

Shri Hem Barua : Now that Shri Chaliha, a member of the now defunct Nagaland Peace Mission, has issued a

statement saying that it is the armed wing of the so-called Nagaland Federal Government who are responsible for the sabotages committed in Assam and that the civil wing of the so-called Nagaland Federal Government was persuaded by Shri Chaliha to issue a statement condemning these acts of sabotage in Assam, may I know, in that context, whether Government are going to have a second round or a third round or a further round of talks with these Naga underground leaders since they are people who cannot deliver the goods, people who do not have any authority on the armed wing who are creating all this havoc? It is for the Prime Minister to say.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Sir, I think we should not precipitate the breaking of these talks. But, however, nothing has yet been decided about the third round.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, my question was specific. Shri Chaliha, a member of the now defunct Nagaland Peace Mission, has said openly that it is the armed wing of the Nagaland hostiles who are responsible for committing these acts of sabotage and, at the same time, the civil wing of the Nagaland underground leaders have condemned these acts of sabotage. That shows the Naga civil wing does not have any hold on the armed wing. Therefore, what is the purpose in having any discussion with these people who cannot deliver the goods? (*Interruption*).

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: He is repeating the same question.

Mr. Speaker: That answer has come. The Government does not propose to precipitate breaking off these talks. Shri Yashpal Singh.

Shri Hem Barua: Because I thought the answer to my question had not come.

Mr. Speaker: He should resume his seat now.

Shri Hem Barua: Why should not I repeat the same question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hem Barua: I will do it. Nobody can stop me. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : सरकार ने यह नहीं बतलाया कि पादरी स्काट के हाथों से जो देश की डिस्सर्विस हुई है और नागालैंड में जो उन की गढ़ाराना हकतें हैं उस के मुतालिक सरकार ने उन्हें क्या पनिशमेंट दी है ? यह तो कोई बात नहीं हुई कि वह अपना काम करके चले गये, जो उन के हाथों डिस्सर्विस हुई है उस के लिए उन्हें क्या सजा दी गई है ?

श्री विनेश सिंह : सजा देने का कोई सवाल इस में नहीं उठता । उन्होंने कुछ बातों की जो कि उन के लिए करना मुनासिब नहीं था खास कर जिस जगह पर वे थे वहां उन को नही करना चाहिए था इसलिये हम ने उन से कहा कि पीस मिशन में वह कोई और फायदे-मंद काम नहीं कर सकते हैं लिहाजा बेहतर है कि वह चले जायें और वे चले गये यहां से ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Rev. Michael Scott, has left the country—well and good—but I would like to know whether he is still in correspondence or in league with some of those Naga hostiles who were responsible for creating this trouble.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Proceedings cannot be followed. There is so much of noise.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would like to know whether, after leaving India, Rev. Michael Scott has left some of his followers or his political progeny, if I may say so, in Nagaland to create more trouble and if so, the steps taken by the Government to break this chain.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I am sure there are some sympathisers of Rev. Michael Scott there. He has been voicing a con-

tain opinion which has been supported by some people. We have already made our position quite clear and we continue to hold the same.

श्री किशन पटनायक : जैसा कि मैंने घाप से कहा सरकार ने यह सदन में माना है कि बिद्रोही नागाओं के उत्पात के पीछे ब्रिटिश कूटनीतिक हाथ भी है ता मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार ने इसका पता लगाया है कि माइकेल स्काट ब्रिटिश कूटनीति के एक गैर-सरकारी कार्यकर्ता हैं ?

श्री बिनेश सिंह : मैं इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कह सकता . . . (व्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्यों नहीं कह सकते ?

श्री बागड़ी : पता लगाया है या नहीं सवाल यह पूछा गया है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : व्यवस्था इसमें कहाँ उठती है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं बतलाता हूँ कि वह क्या व्यवस्था है एक सैकेंड में मैं बतलाता हूँ ।

श्री बिनेश सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इसके बारे में मैंने प्रश्न किया कि वह ब्रिटिश सरकार के किसी कूटनीतिक के यहां पर नुमायन्दे हैं या नहीं है यह कहना बड़ा मुश्किल है इस के बारे में पता लगाना कि दूसरी सरकार का कोई जामूस है या नहीं है लेकिन हम उनके काम को यहां पर देखें तो उससे मालूम होता है कि उनका काम कोई मुनासिब नहीं रहा है और उसको देखते हुए हम ने उनको यहां से वापिस भेज दिया ।

Shri Nath Pal : Has the Government's attention been drawn to a report that Rev. Machael Scott has had a special interview with the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Arthur Bottomley and, if the

Government knows it, may we know whether Mr. Bottomley was being prevailed upon by Mr. Scott to take interest in this matter and whether the Government has taken up this matter and made a representation to the British Government that this is purely an internal affair and that the British Government is not called upon to interfere in this way ?

Shri Dinesh Singh : I entirely agree with the hon. Member that this is an internal matter in which the British Government has nothing to do at all. We have also seen the reports of Rev. Machael Scott meeting the Commonwealth Secretary. But he is a British national and, as such, he meets his Ministers.

12.00 hrs.

Paradip Port

*S.N.Q. 35. **Shri Surendranath Dwivedy :** Will the Minister of Transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism be pleased to state:

(a) whether any charter of demands has been received from the Paradip Port Workers' Union;

(b) whether it is a fact that the President of the Union met personally the Minister concerned and top officials of the Ministry in January, 1966 and urged for urgent intervention to check illegal activities of the Chief Engineer of Paradip Port;

(c) whether even the conciliation proceedings have failed on account of the uncooperative attitude of the Chief Engineer; and

(d) if so, the action taken to avert the strike?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Shri C. M. Poonacha): (a) Yes Sir. A list of demands was received from the Union on 30-4-1966.

(b) The President of the Union had discussions with senior officers of the Ministry regarding port labour problems in Paradip last January. He explained the Union's point of view and he was informed that action would be taken strictly

in accordance with the labour laws. Government do not agree that the Chief Engineer and Administrator of the Port of Paradip had been engaging in illegal activities.

(c) Government do not agree that the conciliation proceedings have failed because of the attitude of the Chief Engineer and Administrator.

(d) Further necessary action has been initiated by the Labour Relations machinery with regard to the points of difference between the Project authorities and the Union. Government see no justification for the Union launching a strike from the 23rd instant.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What is the answer to parts (c) and (d) of the question?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: The notice of strike is there, but the authorities concerned at Paradip port have been given instructions to deal with the situation in respect of the various demands, strictly in accordance with the labour laws, and the matter is dealt with accordingly.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The hon. Minister has said that the Chief Engineer had not violated any labour laws. May I draw his attention to the fact that on 19th October, 1965, the Chief Engineer himself had committed in writing that he had retrenched about 300 workers and that had been done illegally, and he had agreed with the Assistant Labour Commissioner at Jharsaguda that those workers would be taken back and they would be considered as if they had been there on the rolls, and back wages would be paid to them. But he has not done that for the last six months. May I know what action has been taken against the Chief Engineer?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: Some of the workmen belonging to some of the coastal vessels working at Paradip port were retrenched. I want to know whether the hon. Member is referring to those cases of retrenchment.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Those are different. These cases refer to 300

workers who had been illegally retrenched, and the Chief Engineer himself had admitted ultimately that he had done that illegally, and he promised that he would take them back. As regards the workers belonging to the coastal vessels, I shall come to that question presently.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: If the question is with regard to the other shore-labour, instructions have already been issued to the port authorities to pay compensation where retrenchment is inevitable, because after the completion of the project, a large number of labourers working in the port area are found surplus to our requirements. Therefore, they have got to be retrenched, and such retrenchment would be on the basis of 'last-come-first-go', and whatever is permissible under the labour laws by way of compensation and such other things would be paid to them. Those instructions have been issued, and the port authorities are taking action accordingly.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It seems that he has not read the charter of demands at all. I have put a specific question about 300 workers who had been retrenched, and in regard to whom the Chief Engineer had admitted in writing before the conciliation officer that it had been done wrongly and he would take them back....

Mr. Speaker: That information is probably not with the hon. Minister.....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: And he goes on saying that the authorities have been instructed to proceed according to the labour laws. What purpose does this answer serve?

Mr. Speaker: He says that these 300 construction workers.....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: This has nothing to do with them. These 300 workers had been retrenched, illegally....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is referring to some 300 labourers belonging to a different category. He says that these workers had been retrenched, and the Chief Engineer himself had said that they

had been retrenched illegally. That is the allegation.

Shri C. M. Poonacha : That matter is under conciliation proceedings with the local labour officer. That officer is seized of the question. He is taking necessary action to see that nothing illegal is done so far as the labour employed there are concerned.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : Let him straightway say 'I do not have the facts; I will find out and tell the House tomorrow'. This conciliation has failed. It has been reported to the Ministry. There are three other matters, victimisation of trade union officials, and vessel workers, about which he mentioned. All these conciliation proceedings have failed and the matter has been referred to here. They are not referring it to the tribunal.

Mr. Speaker : He might put his second question. I will ask him to get the information on this question and lay it on the Table.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : Tomorrow he can give it. These are all with them.

Mr. Speaker : If he can, he might give it tomorrow; if he cannot, later.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : Not only about this. Is it not a fact that conciliation has failed regarding the victimisation of officials for trade union activities and also victimisation of the water works staff numbering 35, illegal retrenchment of vessel staff, about which he was mentioning, numbering 40 or so? All these reports of failure of conciliation have been referred to the Ministry. Why have these cases not been referred to the tribunal?

One of the demands of the Union was for recognition, that being the only Union functioning there since 1964. Why this delay in according recognition to this trade Union?

Shri C. M. Poonacha : There are different batches of labour employed in various categories of work. As for labour who are working in the water works, the new water works installations have been completed. Earlier 250 tube-wells were being operated

employing a large number of labour. Consequently on the new water supply scheme having been finalised, those labourers who have been found surplus are being retrenched.... (*Interruptions*). Why don't you listen to me? If you do not want to listen, what can I do? I am giving information.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : The question is specific. You are not giving the answer to that.

Shri C. M. Poonacha : I am giving a clear answer.

Mr. Speaker : Order order. The Minister might go on.

Shri C. M. Poonacha : As for the crew that were employed in the vessels working there the vessels were taken on hire from the Government of Orissa and they were being used by the port authorities on the basis of payment of special hire charges. After the work was finished, the vessels have gone back to the Orissa Government. The part of the crew is not the concern of the port authorities.

As regards recognition of the Union, there are three Unions registered. The matter is under consideration as to how recognition should be accorded and necessary verifications are going on.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : He should give specific replies to my specific questions. I referred to the vessels workers, then recognition of the particular union which should have been given. As regards conciliation proceedings regarding victimisation, retrenchment etc. the failure report was submitted to the Ministry.

Mr. Speaker : That he has not got. He will find out.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : Let him say so. It was sent in December. I have written letters to them. They are not doing anything in the matter.

Shri C. M. Poonacha : The matter was discussed here in January. The President of the particular Union was here and the whole matter has been gone into in detail and very many of the demands have not been pressed since. Only one of the demands, about recognition of the Union, is

now being pressed. The matter is now being examined, because there are three Unions. It has to be verified and decided as to which of these Unions should be given recognition. This particular Union's headquarters are in Cuttack. As to what amount of representation it enjoys with regard to Port labour has to be verified. It cannot be done straightway.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Again, recognition apart, he has not replied to the question whether report of failure of conciliation has been received or not.

Mr. Speaker: Whether conciliation report has been received by the Government.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He is evading the question altogether.

Mr. Speaker: Whether conciliation has failed, and the report has reached the Government about that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That should be referred to the tribunal. That is the next course.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: On that point, this is not a recognised union, and the matter is being discussed, and we are trying to do our best so far as retrenchment of labour is concerned.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: We should get some reply. It may not be a recognised union, but if conciliation proceedings were held by the Labour Ministry, the next course, according to law is to refer it to the Employment Ministry, to refer it to the tribunal. He does not reply to that. It is not a recognised union, that is only one part.

Mr. Speaker: Twice I have repeated. What can I do?

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Mr. Poonacha always does this. He has not replied. He must answer the question.

Shri Bade: Why should he avoid the question?

Mr. Speaker: The Member is insisting that if conciliation has failed, the matter ought to have been referred to the

tribunal. According to the Minister, from what I could follow, his plea was that the union was not a recognised one. Probably he means to say that in that case, because the union is not a recognised one, therefore, even if conciliation.....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That is wrong.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: That would be going against the law.

Mr. Speaker: I may be mistaken. I do not know the labour laws.

Am I correct in inferring or concluding from what the Minister has said that his stand is, that because the union was not a recognised one, therefore when the conciliation failed with that union, it was not necessary to go to the tribunal? Am I right?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: The position is that the union is not a recognised one.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That is a different matter altogether.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: It is merely a registered union, and the headquarters of this union is in Cuttack, it is not in Paradip. The Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation Ministry is now verifying the fact as to what extent the members of this union represent dock labour. This is the most crucial point which is being now verified by the Labour Ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Whether the reference to the tribunal would depend upon the decision of this issue?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: Yes, Sir.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The headquarters is not at Cuttack, you are wrong.

Shri A. P. Sharma: Strike is the last resort for settling the disputes of workers when there is no alternative left. The Minister has said it is not a recognised union. May I know from him whether the union has taken a strike ballot to obtain the views of the workers before giving strike notice, or a few handful of people having registered a union have given this strike notice?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: I do not have any information.

Shri A. P. Sharma: This is a very important point that I have raised.

Mr. Speaker: I am not disputing its importance.

Shri A. P. Sharma: Will this information be made available?

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister says that he has not got the information at this moment, what should I do?

Shri A. P. Sharma: Will it be made available later on? Let the Minister say. He wants to say something.

Mr. Speaker: I have asked the question. He has answered it.

Shri A. P. Sharma: I wanted to say that the strike is not legal.

Mr. Speaker: This insistence of Members I cannot understand. The Minister says he has not got the information.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: He can lay it on the Table of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot compel him to come out with that information. What should I do?

Shri A. P. Sharma: I have raised a legal point. No strike can be valid unless and until the view of at least 75 per cent of the workers are in favour of the strike. Therefore, I have made this point. I wanted to know whether this union has obtained the views of the workers before giving the strike notice. That is a very important point. If the information is not available with the Minister, let the information be made available later.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Ranga: In view of the fact that the Minister has said that this question has been pending for the past five months, may be more, because in December they had their talks with the conciliation officer, may I know if when the conciliation officer was carrying on his proceedings or his talks there was only one union which he had to deal with so far as labour was concerned and thereafter two more have

come into existence and Government is waiting to see which one of this new unions which had been helped by somebody or the other to come into existence should be recognised apart from the original one?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: As far as the information that I have, we have three registered unions. As to which came into existence first, and which next, I do not have any information. I will try to collect this information and place it before the House.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: There are three short notice questions which I had admitted. That was a mistake. Fifteen minutes have been taken by this one.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There are several others who want to put supplementary questions.

Explosion of Mines in Border Areas of Punjab

+

S.N.Q. 36. **Shri R. Barua:**

Shri Gulshan:

Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:

Shri Kishen Pattanayak:

Shrimati Basant Kunwar:

Shri Madhu Limaye:

Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavalya:

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:

Shri Maurya:

Shri Bagri:

Shri Hem Barua:

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:

Shri D. C. Sharma:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether a number of civilians have been killed as a result of explosion of mines laid by Pakistanis in the border areas of Punjab since the withdrawal of Pakistani troops from those areas;

(b) if so, the total number of civilians as well as military personnel thus killed;

(c) whether all the mines laid by the Pakistani forces in those areas have since been cleared; and

(d) whether Government has taken up this matter with the Government of Pakistan?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (d). Government are aware of some recent deaths as a result of explosions of mines near Amritsar border. Since withdrawal of forces, three persons have died due to explosions of mines near Amritsar.

(c) All mines have since been cleared.

(d) No, Sir.

Shri R. Barua: May I know whether these mines were laid after the cease-fire and at the time of discussion of the withdrawal this matter was taken up?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: No mines were laid after the cease-fire but this matter of laying of the mines was discussed before the agreement for the actual withdrawal started. Pakistani forces certainly had removed some of the mines but till the last minute they could not remove some and about these they had given full information and sketches of these mines also. We find that even besides the sketches they gave us, a few more mines were found ultimately. There is no case of any fresh laying of the mines.

श्री गुलशन : क्या यह सच नहीं है कि सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों से जो भारतीय उखड़े थे, उनके शिविरों में रखने के लिये सरकार असफल हुई, उसके कारण ही वे लोग वापस सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों में सैनिकों द्वारा बारूदी सुरंगों के उठाये बगैर ही भेज दिये गये और इस गल्ती के फलस्वरूप सैकड़ों भारतीय नागरिक खेमकरण क्षेत्र में मारे गये? क्या अब सीमावर्ती क्षेत्र बारूदी सुरंगों से मुक्त किया जा चुका है?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: We had taken all precautions about warning the people concerned. As a matter of fact for a few weeks we did not allow anybody to go and reside in those areas. But sometimes some people make mistakes and suffer consequences as a result of that.

श्री गुलशन : अभी हाल में पंजाब फ़िर-बसाऊ मंत्री सरदार गुरुदास सिंह

दिल्लों ने कहा है कि 70 आदमी अकेले खेमकरण क्षेत्र में मारे गये, यहाँ मिनिस्टर साहब ने तीन बताया है, किसमें सच्चाई है।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I would certainly like to clarify that point. I know that figure of 70 is being mentioned. This number of 70 odd really speaking refers to the number of persons who were injured or killed since May, 1965. Because, as you know, as the House is aware, after May, we had our own forces advanced around the border; sometimes, mines were laid there also. The present question refers to the mines explosions, and it really involves the events after the withdrawal of the Pakistani forces. That is the point.

श्री मधु लिमये : अभी मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि युद्धबन्दी के बाद 25 फरवरी तक जबकि फीजें वापिस बनाई गई पाकिस्तान ने नई सुरंगें या नये बम वगैरा वहाँ पर नहीं छोड़े थे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस जानकारी का आधार क्या है? क्या इसका आधार वह है जो पाकिस्तान कहता है? मेरे प्रश्न का (ख) भाग यह है कि फाजिल्का, खेमकरण आदि इलाकों में, क्या यह बात सही है कि 25 फरवरी के बाद बारह से अधिक लोगों की मृत्यु इन विस्फोटों के कारण हुई है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि पूरा आंकड़ा, राजस्थान, खेमकरण आदि के बारे में जहाँ जहाँ पाकिस्तानी सेना घाई थी, मंत्री महोदय, मृत्यु का देने की कृपा करें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह मबल तो बोर्डर एरिया आफ पंजाब का था। राजस्थान इसमें कैसे . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : साथ साथ कह देंगे तो क्या बुरा है। नहीं तो फाजिल्का का तो कम से कम कहें।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I will give the information that is available with me. Before the withdrawal, in Amritsar area,

there were 20 deaths owing to mines and 25 injured. After withdrawal, in the Ferozepur area, deaths were two; injured 6. In the Amritsar area there were three deaths; two injured. In the Gurdaspur area, there was one injured. So, as a matter of fact, before withdrawal and after withdrawal, the total is as follows: Punjab:

श्री मधु लिथिये : राजस्थान के बारे में भी कुछ कहिये ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: About Rajasthan, I have no information. Ferozepur: two deaths; Amritsar 23 deaths; all combined—before withdrawal and after withdrawal, in the case of injured, Ferozepur, 6. Amritsar, 27 and Gurdaspur, one.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मंत्री महोदय ने पाकिस्तान के नक्शों का जिक्र किया । क्या उन नक्शों में जहाँ जहाँ सुरंगें और बिस्फोटक पदार्थ थे सब इलाके शामिल थे ? अगर नहीं थे तो क्या ताशकंद समझौते के मुताबिक और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून में गोलीबंदी की संधियों और नियमों के मुताबिक पाकिस्तान को ये पूरे नक्शे देने नहीं चाहिये थे ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I gave all the information that is available with me. They gave sketches of a number of mines in the area from where they had withdrawn. But as I mentioned, some, or rather, two mines were discovered even after withdrawal, and whose sketches were not given; it may be possibly by mistake; I cannot say, I cannot interpret any motive for that.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं आप से निवेदन करता हूँ कि मवाल बिस्कुल साफ था । तीन इलाके हैं जहाँ पर हमारे घादमी मरे हैं । वहाँ पर सुरंगें और बिस्फोटक थे । पाकिस्तान ने हटते वक़्त वे सब नक्शे दिये थे या नहीं दिये थे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उन्होंने बताया था कि कहाँ कहाँ माईज हैं । लेकिन उनके कहने के

अनुसार भी कई माईज लिखी जो उन्होंने नहीं बताई ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जहाँ पर मीनें हुईं ये पाकिस्तान ने नहीं बताई थी ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो आपका सवाल था उसका जवाब तो आ गया है । दूसरा सवाल आप करना चाहते हैं . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : दूसरा नहीं ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I will answer that question. I will try to meet the point as much as I have got information with me. These deaths were not connected with the mines which were found and which were not mentioned by Pakistan.

I will answer, if the hon. Member listens to me for a minute. As I have said, even about this information and about the sketches that we had, we had informed the people and warned them about these places. But sometimes, people make mistakes; sometimes they attempt, or they are tempted to go in and then this kind of action does take place.

श्री बागड़ी : सुरंगों को न हटाने का कारण जिनकी मृत्यु हुई उनमें सरकारी घादमी कितने थे और जनता के घादमी कितने थे ? जब फौज को पता था कि यहाँ यहाँ सुरंगें हैं तो वहाँ जनता को जाने से रोका क्यों नहीं गया ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: This is exactly what I said. People were warned about the location. But then sometimes people are tempted to go into those areas, because of agricultural operations, etc. Sometimes, they are tempted to go and collect brass, etc.

Shri Ham Banna: Pakistan has violated the Tashkent declaration with impunity and she has left behind here even mines in the areas of occupied Punjab from where she had to withdraw under the Tashkent declaration. Here, on a previous occasion, the Prime Minister told us that Soviet

Russia had decided to send an emissary to Pakistan to bring to the notice of the Pakistan authorities the violation of the Tashkent agreement, which the Soviet Union could not do because of Pakistan's objection. In that connection, may I know what steps the Government have taken to normalise the situation and to see that the Tashkent declaration is not violated by Pakistan, through the good offices of Soviet Russia?

Mr. Speaker: That question is too wide for a short notice question.

Shri Hem Barua: It is very specific, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The whole Tashkent agreement cannot be brought in. The question is about the mines that have been placed. The question about the Tashkent agreement is to be answered by another Ministry.

Shri Hem Barua: After the withdrawal, they have left behind these mines.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has answered that point.

Shri Hem Barua: My objection is, I do not think, as the Minister thinks, that they have left behind these mines through mistake. I think it is a deliberate action on the part of Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker: May be. But all that does not arise here.

Shri Hem Barua: Therefore, I want to know whether the Government have brought this thing to the notice of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I would like to know from the hon. Minister one thing. He said that the people were warned against these mines. May I know if they were warned against these mines, of which Pakistan had given notice, or against those mines which had been discovered after Pakistan had left and, if so, if they had given notice and they knew fully well that these mines were dangerous for the public, why did they not cordon off that area so

that the people could not for any reason enter that area?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: For weeks this area was cordoned off. The information about the mines which were located there was conveyed to us by Pakistan. We had warned the people about these mines, but unfortunately, the accidents took place in the case of some of these mines. In regard to some of them, two mines, of which we had no notice from Pakistan, there, no incident took place. The army officers in their own operations discovered them.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मंत्री महोदय के सारे जवाब परस्पर विरोधी हैं। मैंने पूछा था कि अगर नक्शे ये तो उन नक्शों के अनुसार आपने सुरंगों को क्यों नहीं हटाया ? श्री डी० सी० शर्मा के सवाल के उत्तर में मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि उस एरिया को उन्होंने काईन आफ्र किया था मतलब जनता को जाने नहीं देते थे। उस समय में इन्होंने सुरंगों को क्यों नहीं हटाया ? इसका कोई जवाब नहीं आ रहा है।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I submit, Sir, that short notice questions tend to accumulate now-a-days because most Ministers have developed the bad habit of not even intimating to the House about them. Though two or three days' notice is given to them, they do not let us know whether they accept or whether they refuse to accept the short notice questions. Normally, they are given two or three days' notice, and we are informed in time. But now-a-days, for days on end we are not informed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall see to it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is becoming worse and worse; it is becoming curi-
ous and curi-
ous. What is the Government coming to?

श्री मधु लिमये : हमें भी दस दस दिन तक जवाब नहीं मिलता है। हम भी अल्प-सूचना प्रश्न देते हैं लेकिन दस दस दिन तक

जवाब नहीं मिलता है। मैं आपको भी लिख चुका हूँ।

इंडियन स्कूल आफ इण्टरनेशनल स्टडीज

+

S.N.Q. 37. श्री भागवत झा आजाद :

श्रीमती रामकुमारी सिन्हा :

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :

श्री किशन पटनायक :

श्री मधु लिमये :

क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि सप्रू हाउस के इण्डियन स्कूल आफ इण्टरनेशनल स्टडीज के संचालक ने एक शोध-छात्र श्री वेद प्रताप "वैदिक" का छात्रवृत्ति तथा छुट्टी के लिये हिन्दी में लिखा हुआ प्रार्थना पत्र यह कह कर लौटा दिया था कि वह अंग्रेजी में लिखा होना चाहिए;

(ख) क्या संचालक की यह कार्यवाही संविधान के अनुरूप है; और

(ग) क्या उक्त शोध-छात्र के प्रति न्याय कराने के लिये सरकार तुरन्त कदम उठायेगी ?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) The certificate of attendance for payment of scholarship and application for leave submitted by Shri Ved Pratap Vedic have not been returned to him by the Director, but have been passed on to the Registrar whom Shri Vedic has been asked to see. Shri Vedic has not seen the Registrar although a written communication has been sent to him in this connection. Earlier, Shri Vedic had been advised by the Director that in accordance with the normal practice in the School, he may fill up the forms in English and get them endorsed by the Head of the Department.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Does not arise.

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह बात सत्य नहीं है कि 29 अप्रैल से लेकर 7 मई तक इस शोध छात्र वैदिक ने इन स्टडीज के निदेशक से बार बार मिलने की प्रार्थनायें की और उनकी वह प्रार्थनायें स्वीकार नहीं की गईं। क्या इस जवाब के अनुसार मैं यह समझूँ कि उनको रजिस्ट्रार से इसलिये मिलने को कहा गया कि उनका हिन्दी में लिखा हुआ आবেदन पत्र स्वीकृत हुआ और उसे वहाँ स्कालरशिप मिल जायेगा।

Shri M. C. Chagla: The certificate has got to be duly endorsed by the Head of the Department. When Shri Vaidik went to the Director's Office, he was advised to go to the Head of the Department and get both the attendance certificate and the leave application endorsed by the Head of the Department for further action, after writing then out in English. Instead of acting on this advice, Shri Vaidik chose to address a letter to the Director in Hindi, enclosing the certificate of attendance and the leave application written in Hindi without any endorsement from the Head of the Department. The Director passed on these documents to the Registrar and simultaneously Shri Vaidik was asked by the Director office to see the Registrar. Although the Registrar asked Shri Vaidik to see him, Shri Vaidik did not choose to see him.

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : मेरा प्रश्न यही तो था कि रजिस्ट्रार से मिलने के लिये इसलिये कहा गया कि उनका हिन्दी में प्रार्थना पत्र स्वीकार कर लिया गया, या कि डाइरेक्टर ने सिर्फ यह कहने के लिये बुलाया था कि आवेदन पत्र हिन्दी में लिखा हुआ है इसको अंग्रेजी में लिख कर लाओ। मैं सिर्फ यह जानना चाहता हूँ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: First he was asked to submit his application in English, because under the rules of this School, the application has to be in English. But when he insisted that his application in Hindi

should be considered, the Director asked him to see the Registrar.

श्री भागवत झा आजाद: मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इंटरनैशनल स्टडीज़ के नियम विधान के ऊपर हैं या विधान के अन्तर्गत। इस तरह से इस बात की आवाज़ उठाई जाती है कि किसी पर हिन्दी लादी न जाये। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यदि इंटरनैशनल स्टडीज़ का यह नियम है कि कोई व्यक्ति हिन्दी में दख्खान न लिखे यह उन पर अंग्रेजी लादना है या नहीं, और क्या यह विधान के अन्तर्गत है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I clarify the position? I deprecate any controversy over Hindi. We are all anxious to propagate and support Hindi and to see that non-Hindi areas.... (Interruptions).

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: He again tries to rouse the sentiments of the House. My question is simple, whether under the Constitution.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let him complete the answer and then I will judge whether the answer has come.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्या यह जवाब है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: The position under the Constitution is that Hindi is the official language of the country. Under a directive of the Constitution, English is associate language. May I point out that the Constitution only talks of Hindi being used for official purposes? The Constitution does not impose any language upon a private institution or an academic institution. We are here dealing with the School of International Studies, which is autonomous. The medium of instruction settled by this institution is English. The business is done in English. The correspondence is carried on in English.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Who pays the money?

श्री भागवती : यह गलत बात है। मंत्री महोदय का जवाब गलत है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am explaining the Constitutional position. This gentleman knows English; he carries on correspondence in English. He has written an essay in English. I request the House to judge it dispassionately. He enters an institution and he knows under the rules, the business of that institution is carried on in English. I could understand if he did not know English. The Constitution does not impose any language upon a university..

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सलाम करो उस विद्यार्थी को।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Does he mean to say that those who do not know English and who have graduated in Hindi medium cannot enter this School of International Studies? (Interruptions).

Shri M. C. Chagla: My hon. friend is getting unnecessarily excited. We are dealing with a gentleman who knows English, who has corresponded in English and who has written an essay in English. He enters an institution. He knows under the rules the business of the institution is carried on in English. This is not the case of a student who does not know English. He knows English and yet he does not follow the rules of business and writes in Hindi. The Director does not know Hindi; he comes from the south. This is an all-India institution, a national institution, where the admission is from all over the country. As I said, rightly or wrongly this autonomous organisation has decided that the medium of instruction should be English. My hon. friend talks of the Constitution. If you kindly look at the relevant article, the Constitution deals with official business between State and State, Government and Government and not with private institutions. Surely the Constitution is much too liberal to impose upon any institution a particular language. Is it suggested that an institution cannot have Tamil or Telugu or Bengali? (Interruptions).

श्रीमती रामबुलारी सिन्हा : मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहती हूँ कि इस विद्यालय में भारत के अतिरिक्त दुनिया के किन-किन मुल्कों के विभिन्न भाषा-भाषी विद्यार्थी शिक्षा प्राप्त करते हैं और इस विद्यालय की शिक्षा का माध्यम क्या है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो बतलाया उन्होंने ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have many foreign students and students from all over India. I have already said the medium is English.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री: अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपकी लोक सभा की दक्षता का परिचय देते हुए कि 13 तारीख को लोक सभा सचिवालय ने मुझे लिखा कि अध्यक्ष महोदय इस प्रश्न को स्वीकार करने में असमर्थ हैं, लेकिन अब यह प्रश्न स्वीकार हो गया, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस स्कूल को सरकार की ओर से कितना अनुदान दिया जाता है वार्षिक और क्या जिस प्रकार से इस प्रतिभा-शाली विद्यार्थी को इन कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ा, किसी और को ऐसी कठिनाइयों का सामना न करना पड़े । इसके लिये शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने क्या नये निर्देश जारी किये हैं स्कूल के अधिकारियों को ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: As soon as I realised that several Members felt agitated I immediately wrote to your department that I accept short notice, because I thought it was but right for me to come and mention it before the House.

In 1965-66, we paid Rs. 6 lakhs to this institution.

श्री श्रीरंज : प्राची शिक्षा मंत्री ने जो शब्द इस्तेमाल किया उसके बारे में मैं एक स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ । उन्होंने कहा कि जब बार बार बहुत से सबस्य जानकारी मांगने लगे तब मैंने उसे स्वीकार कर लिया । तो क्या कोई गलत बात बहुत से लोग कहें तो

वह उससे सही हो जाती है और क्या कोई सही बात एक ही भावमी कहे तो वह गलत हो जाती है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सही या गलत का सवाल नहीं है । शार्ट नोटिस स्वेशन को एक्सेप्ट करना न करना उनके ऊपर है । उन्होंने खुद कहा कि पहले उन्होंने कहा कि वह शार्ट नोटिस स्वेशन पर जवाब नहीं दे सकेंगे, लेकिन बाद में जब उन्होंने देखा कि बहुत से मेम्बर हैं जो सवाल पूछना चाहते हैं तब उन्होंने कहा कि वह जवाब दे देंगे ।

श्री किशन पटनायक : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस विद्यार्थी के सम्बन्ध में यह सवाल है इस ने अपना बी० ए० (प्रानस) और एम० ए० तक हिन्दी के माध्यम से पास किया है और 80 प्रतिशत या 70 प्रतिशत नम्बर रखे थे, इसका जानते हुए इसे ऐडमिशन मिला है इस संस्था में जिसको कि एक राष्ट्रीय संस्था कहते हैं और यह सीधा सवाल है कि इस विद्यार्थी को जिनने बी० ए० प्रानस और एम० ए० देशी भाषा के माध्यम से किया है उसका अपना शोध पत्र, थोसिस हिन्दी में लिखने दिया जायगा या नहीं और जो कुछ दरखास्त वगैरह वह हिन्दी में देगा उसको ग्रहण किया जायगा या नहीं ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I explain the position? As I have already told the House, Shri Vaidik who applied for admission to the school, carried on correspondence in English.

श्री किशन पटनायक : वह सवाल नहीं है । मेरा सवाल यह है कि उसने एम० ए० तक हिन्दी के माध्यम से किया है । प्रपोजी उस पर लायी जा रही है । उसने देशी भाषा में एम० ए० पास किया है ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: He wrote an essay in English. Later on, he expressed a desire to the Head of his Department as well as to the Director to write his doctoral thesis in Hindi. Both of them pointed out to him the difficulty of finding adequate research materials on Central Asia

in Hindi, as well as appointing Hindi-knowing experts on the subject for examining his thesis. After talking to the Director, Mr. Vaidik gave the Director the impression that he had accepted the position as stated by the Director. When Mr. Vaidik expressed his difference in writing in English, the Director advised him to make special efforts to improve his knowledge of English and he agreed to do so.

Mr. Speaker: The only thing that the hon. Member wants to know is whether such institutions as are being aided by the Government would be entitled to refuse such applications if they are submitted to them in Hindi?

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have many autonomous institutions. Take the case of a university. If a university decides tomorrow that the medium of instruction in that university will be Tamil and that it will do its work in Tamil, we cannot interfere. I agree that we pay the money. But, after all, we have to respect the autonomy of the institution.

श्री किसान पटनायक : अनुदान देने हो,
अनुदान बन्द करो ।

Shri Khadlikar: As the hon. Minister said, it is a university and an autonomous body. It gets grants as any other university gets from the University Grants Commission. The composition of the students is such that the majority come from Bengal, Kerala, Madras, Maharashtra and other States. There are students from other countries as well. In such an autonomous institution, when it has been laid down that the teaching medium will be English, because the question is that, ultimately, the examiners will have to be appointed at the international level. . . . (*Interruptions*). In such a situation. I would like to know this. This student who was getting scholarship from the school—not from the University Grants Commission—submitted a essay in English and later on. . .

Shri Bhagwat Jia Azad: He had not submitted any thesis in English. It is a wrong statement (*Interruption*).

Shri Khadlikar: I am connected with the university (*Interruption*).

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Sir, this kind of interruptions when non-Hindi-speaking Members are going into the facts of the case, should be stopped. When they asked questions we never interrupted. Why is Shri Azad interrupting like this? This should be stopped (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. All shall sit down. Hon. Members should have patience to hear each other (*Interruption*).

Shri Khadlikar: Sir, when the question of his application for the monthly scholarship came later on, he insisted on writing it in Hindi. In the mean time he wrote letters to the Hindi Press. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he is prepared to respect the autonomy of the university or not? Secondly, would he like to introduce—I have full sympathy for Hindi and I feel that slowly Hindi should be introduced even at the international level—Hindi in this way so as to encourage discipline in a body well-known all over the world by raising this issue here. Otherwise, the Academic Council is there. Instead of representing the matter to the Academic Council, to the body of Governors and to the administration, he goes to the Press and then some people take up the matter. I would like to know what is the procedure?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I want to respect the autonomy of this institution fully. As a matter of fact, a meeting of the Academic Council has been convened and this question will be considered. I beg of the House, of the hon. Members, to await the decision of the Academic Council. As my hon. friend pointed out, this is an institution which has acquired international stature. We have students from all over India. We have students coming from abroad. And, the institution, rightly or wrongly, has decided that the medium of instruction shall be English. Who are we to interfere with the autonomy of this institution and say that they should not have this medium, they should have some other medium? We should leave it to the

Academic Council. After all, we must respect their academic independence and freedom.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले साल इस संस्था में एक परिसंवाद हुआ था “केरल में राष्ट्रपति शासन” के विषय पर और मुझे उसमें बुलाया गया था। खेद की बात है कि कुछ लड़कों को उकसाया गया कि मैं वहाँ पर हिन्दी में न बोलूँ और अंग्रेजी में ही बोलूँ। मैं ने लड़कों को समझाया और वह फिर सहमत भी हुए। यह वही संस्था है जिसका मसला अब आया है।

अभी मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि संविधान के अनुसार राज्यों के बीच पत्र-व्यवहार की भाषा या केन्द्र की शासकीय भाषा केवल हिन्दी है और यह स्वायत्त संस्था है लेकिन शायद मंत्री महोदय भूल गए कि इस संविधान में 351 धारा भी है जिसमें लिखा है :

“It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop.....”

Shri Rajaram: Sir, I want to say one thing.....(Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He may kindly sit down. I can call hon. Members one after the other. Then he can have his say. In this manner we cannot proceed. Now I have called Shri Madhu Limaye. Let him put his supplementary. Then I can call another hon. Member. Then he might put his supplementary in his turn. Otherwise, in this manner we cannot transact any business.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उसी वक्त मैं व्यवस्था के प्रश्न पर उठने वाला था लेकिन समय बचाने के लिए मैं नहीं उठा। 351 धारा में साफ लिखा है :

“It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India”.....

अब मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के खजाने से यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन की सिफारिश पर हो, चाहे शिक्षा मंत्रालय की सिफारिश पर हो, आपने 25 संख्या की प्रस्थापना के बाद, उसके विकास के लिए और उसके सालाना खर्च के लिए काफी रकम दिया है, आपने एक साल का केवल बताया, आप पूरा बता दें कितना दिया है और उसके बाद मैं सवाल पूछता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के खजाने से जब कभी पैसा दिया जाता है अनुदान की शक्ल में हो या और किसी शक्ल में हो तो क्या यह धारा बीच में नहीं आती है? मैंने अध्यक्ष महोदय, हिन्दी लादने का सवाल नहीं उठाया। सवाल अंग्रेजी लादने का है। मैं तमिल और तेलगू भाषी सदस्यों से कहता हूँ कि हिन्दी लादने की बात नहीं है, अंग्रेजी लादने की बात है। तमिल भाषी, तेलगू भाषी, बंगला भाषी, उसमें हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है लेकिन अंग्रेजी लादने की बात नहीं होनी चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तो आपने सवाल पूरा कर लिया।

श्री मधु लिमये : स्वायत्त संस्था की बात आयी। * *

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह रेकार्ड में नहीं जायगा।

श्री मधु लिमये : इसमें काटने लायक बात क्या है?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जब मैं मना कर रहा हूँ तब भी वह बोलते चले जा रहे हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : **

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am fully conscious of article 351. As I started by saying, it is the duty of everyone.....

श्री मधु लिमये : आप ने केवल राज्यों की बात कही

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राइमरी, सेकेंडरी। आप उन को जवाब भी देने देंगे या नहीं ?

श्री बागड़ी: अंग्रेजी लादी क्यों जाय ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय: मंत्री जी का जवाब सुनिये ।

श्री अशु लिमये: मेरे प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं आया । क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार के पैसे का इस्तेमाल अंग्रेजी लादने के लिए किया जा सकता है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय: अब आप चलने भी बीजियेगा ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: He should not interrupt me like this. He has made a long speech and he is not prepared to listen to me.

I am fully conscious of article 351. As I started by saying, it is the duty of every one to promote Hindi. But in my humble view, the way to promote Hindi is not to interfere with the autonomous institutions. If the institution wants to carry on in English for the time being, well, let it do so. I hope, the time will come when all our institutions will be run in Indian languages.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

Mr. Speaker: Call Attention Notice. Shri P. C. Borooah.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I may be allowed to put a question on this.

Shri Ranga: You have allowed that gentleman to make a speech. This is an important matter.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I know whether the Central Government, if it gives any grant to any institution, specially in non-Hindi areas, when anybody starts submitting thesis in Hindi—my University does accept it—will immediately be forced to either give up the grant or allow thesis to be written in Hindi? He must make that clear.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । मैं संविधान के नियमों के अन्तर्गत व्यवस्था का सवाल उठाना चाहता हूँ ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have made it quite clear that the Central Government does not give grant to autonomous institutions on the basis of language. It is left to the autonomous institution to decide which language it wants. I am a great believer in academic freedom. I think, it will be wrong for the State to impose any language.

Mr. Speaker: Call Attention Notice; Shri P. C. Borooah.

श्री अशु लिमये: आप अंग्रेजी इम्पोज कर रहे हैं, आप अंग्रेजी लाद रहे हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: माननीय सदस्य मान नहीं रहे, हैं बीच में हम तरह से देखल दिये जा रहे हैं ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: मैं संविधान के नियमों के अन्तर्गत व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा रहा हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: व्यवस्था किस पर उठा रहे हैं जो सवाल था वह तो खत्म हो गया ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं इस संविधान के अनुसार व्यवस्था का सवाल उठा रहा हूँ । मंत्री महोदय ने जाने कितनी रूलत बातें यहां पर कही हैं । शिक्षा का काम है कि विद्यार्थियों के अन्दर जो कुछ योग्यता है वह प्रकाश में आये । इसलिए विद्यार्थियों की योग्यता को बढ़ायेगे और उसे ऊपर लायेगे या उसे दबा देंगे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय: व्यवस्था का सवाल कौन से रूल के अन्दर माननीय सदस्य उठा रहे हैं ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : नियम 343 और 120 हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: चलिए कहिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : संविधान की धारा 343 की उपधारा 3 में बिलकुल साफ कहा गया है कि 1965 के बाद से अंग्रेजी भाषा खाली खास खास कामों के लिए रहेगी, संघ के सभी कामों के लिए नहीं रहेगी यह संविधान में बिलकुल साफ लिखा हुआ है, खाली खास खास कामों के लिये रहेगी। अब कहिये तो मैं उस को पढ़ कर सुनाऊँ ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने देख लिया है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अभी तक कोई कानून नहीं है इस देश में जिसमें इस खास काम के लिए कानून बनाया गया हो। इस संविधान की धारा के मुताबिक शिक्षा के मामले से अंग्रेजी खत्म हो चुकी है। अब खाली हिन्दी हो, बंगला हो, तामिल हो और चाहे कोई भी भाषा रखना चाहें वह हो। संविधान की धारा इस मामले में बिलकुल साफ है।

इस के अलावा अगर आप चाहें तो खुद इस लोक सभा की भाषा के बारे में धारा 120 को देखिये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : पढ़ कर बताइये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह दूसरी धारा में पढ़ कर नहीं सुनाऊंगा क्योंकि वक्त लगेगा। एक माननीय सदस्य कह रहे हैं कि मैं यह धारा भी संविधान की पढ़ कर सुना दूँ तो मैं उसे पढ़े देता हूँ :—

"Notwithstanding anything in this article, Parliament may by law provide for the use, after the said period of fifteen years, of—

(a) the English language, or

(b) the Devanagari form of numerals,

for such purposes as may be specified in the law."

यह उद्देश्य विश्वविद्यालय का, स्कूल का, कालिज का किसी भी कानून में खास तौर से नहीं लिखा गया है इसलिए बिलकुल गैर-

कानूनी बात शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय ने कही है। रह गई धारा 201 अब धारा 120 के मुताबिक इस लोक सभा की भाषा मेरी राय में अंग्रेजी तो हो ही नहीं सकती लेकिन बंगला हो सकती है, तामिल हो सकती है, तेलगू हो सकती है। मुझे यह सुन कर बड़ा आश्चर्य और बड़ा दुःख होता है जब श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती जैसी सदस्य यहां पर आकर अंग्रेजी की भावभगत और अंग्रेजी की तारीफ करने लगती हैं जब कि उन के ही इलाक़ में सब से पहले कोई 20-30 वर्ष पहले श्री रवीन्द्राय टैगोर ने विश्वविद्यालय में बंगला में भाषण दिया था। उनको यहां पर कहना चाहिए कि अंग्रेजी के बजाय बंगला साइये, तामिल लाइये। यह संविधान की धारा है....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : धाराएं तो कितनी बतलाई हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब उम मे नतीजा निकाल रहा हूँ कि यह दिल्ली में जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति का क्षेत्र है अगर वहां पर तमिल विद्यार्थी तेलगू विद्यार्थी अंग्रेजी पढ़ना चाहे, अंग्रेजी में अपने लेख भी लिख, अपना शोध कार्य भी करें, मास्टर के लिए भी मैं कहता हूँ हालांकि यह गलत है कि वह अंग्रेजी में पढ़ाये लेकिन वह प्रकेला विद्यार्थी बेचारा कहता है कि मैं अपना शोध कार्य अपनी मातृ-भाषा में करूंगा तो जबरदस्ती उम के ऊपर एक ऐसी भाषा लाद देते हैं। जिससे कि उम की प्रतिभा और योग्यता खत्म हो जाती है तो यह संविधान के बिलकुल खिलाफ जाता है। इसलिए मैं साफ़ तौर से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कोई तामिल विद्यार्थी अंग्रेजी में काम करना चाहता है तो वह बुरा करेगा और फिर भी मैं कहूंगा और मैं चाहूंगा कि वह तामिल में ही अपना काम करे। अब अगर श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती बंगला में काम न कर अंग्रेजी में करना चाहती हैं तो मुझे बड़ा दुःख लगेगा लेकिन मैं उन के लिए कुछ नहीं कहूंगा। लेकिन अगर कोई विद्यार्थी बिलकुल साफ़ तौर से कहता है कि मैं अपनी प्रतिभा अंग्रेजी में नहीं दिखाना सकता।

हूँ तो उस को उसकी मातृभाषा में काम करने की इजाजत देनी चाहिए। अब गणित के मामले में (व्यवधान) मेरी मातृभाषा तो तामिल भी हो सकती है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: अब आप बैठ जाइये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वस एक वाक्य कह कर खरम किये देता हूँ। मुझे खाली शिक्षा मंत्री से यह कहना है कि आज भारत में विज्ञान गणित और इतिहास बिलकुल खत्म हो चुके हैं। उस का एक मात्र कारण है कि अंग्रेजी के द्वारा उन में शोध कार्य होता है। हम बिलकुल गरीब हो चुके हैं यह मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ...

Shri S. Kandappan: He has gained his sharp intellect through English. Why should he deprive the younger generation the privilege?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह बिलकुल गलत बात है। मैं वह बिलकुल नहीं हूँ। मुझे आठ वर्ष की उम्र तक अंग्रेजी का कुछ भी पता नहीं चला था। मैं अपनी मातृभाषा में बोल रहा हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठिये।

एक नई चीज है जो कि आज इंडियन डेमोक्रेसी में डेवलप कर रही है। बाकी जगहों में यह क़ायदा होता है कि अगर स्पीकर खड़ा हो तो दूसरे बैठ जाया करते हैं जब कि यहां स्पीकर खड़ा होता है तो दूसरे बोलने वाले मेम्बर कहते हैं कि बैठ जाइये और लाचार होकर स्पीकर को बैठना पड़ता है, जब कि होना यह चाहिए कि स्पीकर जब खड़ा हो तो सारे मेम्बरस बैठे रहें। जब मैं देखता हूँ कि मेरे खड़े हुए भी दो मेम्बरस खड़े होकर बोलते चले जा रहे हैं तो यह तो अच्छा नहीं लगता कि मैं भी उन के साथ बोलता चला जाऊँ।

अब सवाल सिर्फ इतना था जिसको बहुत बसीय तौर पर कहा गया कि जो इंटरप्रेशन चागला साहब ने 343 और 120 का किया है वह डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया के खयाल में बिलकुल गलत है और वह समझते हैं कि वह जो इनका इंटरप्रेशन लेते हैं वह दुरुस्त है

और चागला साहब का सही नहीं है। अब मेरा यह काम नहीं है कि मैं इस पर फैसला दूँ कि कौन सा इंटरप्रेशन सही है और कौन सा गलत है? अगर संविधान की धाराओं के इंटरप्रेशन को लेकर कोई झगड़ा हो तो उसका फैसला भ्रदालतें कर सकती हैं। अब अगर चागला साहब और गवर्नमेंट इस पर अपना एक इंटरप्रेशन बतलाते हैं तो उसका उनको हक है। अगर वैसा वह गलत कर रहे हैं तो उसका दुरुस्त भ्रदालत ही कर सकती है। भ्रदालन ही इस बारे में कोई फैसला दे सकती है कि वह कांस्टीट्यूशन के बरखिलाफ है या नहीं मुझे उस बारे में रुकना देने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। Shri Borooah.

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मेरा एक निवेदन सुन लीजिए। हम इस देश के अस्ती फीसदी गरीब भ्रदमी हैं, जिन से इस गवर्नमेंट के पास पैसा आता है। इंग्लैण्ड और अमेरिका में...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें। मैं ने सुन लिया है।

श्री शिव नारायण : सुन क्या लिया है? आप हमें कुछ कहने की नहीं देते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें।

Shri Frank Anthony: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to make a submission, because I want to put the record straight....

श्री शिव नारायण : गरीबों की कमाई का पैसा मिसयूज हो रहा है। कम से कम आप मुझे एक सवाल पूछ लेने दीजिए। क्या शार्ट नोटिस बवैस्चन दूसरी तरफ के सदस्यों का ही है?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जायें।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You have held not only now but several times here that as regards the interpretation of the

Constitution you are not the authority, and that the matter will have to be decided in the court. If that be your stand, how do you permit points of order based on the articles of the Constitution? If it is stopped in the very beginning, then the time of the House would not have been wasted in this manner.

My hon. friend had raised a point of order on the basis of the articles of the Constitution. So far as the interpretation of the Constitution is concerned, you have held not only now but several times that you are not the authority to interpret the Constitution, and if anybody is aggrieved, he has to go to the court. If that be your stand, how then do you permit points of order being raised on the basis of the articles of the Constitution. If it had been stopped in the very beginning itself, then the time of the House would not have been taken up in this manner.

Mr. Speaker: If the point was so patent that it had been decided earlier, then after hearing it. I can refer to that decision and say that it has already been decided.

Shri Frank Anthony: That was what I wanted to say. I only wanted to put the record straight. I would not have intervened but for this that Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia has presumed to interpret the Constitution. I do not expect him to know much about the Constitution, anyhow. He has referred to article 343 of the Constitution.....

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : हां, हां, आजादी के लिये तो यह ही लड़े थे न। इस लिये संविधान का पता इन्हीं को होगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दूसरे मेम्बरों को भी कुछ कहने दिया जाये। दूसरे मेम्बरों को भी कहने का हक है।

Shri Frank Anthony: These matters have already been placed beyond all doubt. I want to come to the assistance of the Education Minister. Since he has left the Bench he has not kept up with the decisions of the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has placed this matter beyond

all doubt. It was one of the counsels in the Gujarat University case. What did the Supreme Court strike down in the Gujarat University case? When the Gujarat University sought to make what is popularly but wrongly known as an Indian language as the sole medium, the Supreme Court said that they could not do it, because English is the only link language or medium....

श्री मधु लिमये : इस्टीमेट में अंग्रेजी ही मीडियम है, हिन्दी नहीं है। यह कैसी बात कर रहे हैं। वह जो कुछ कह रहे हैं, वह गैर-लागू है, इर्रिलिवेंट है।

Shri Kishan Pattanayak: What was he before 1947? He is only a nominated Member. (Interruptions).

Shri Kishan Pattanayak**

Mr. Speaker: These observations would not go on record.

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य किस विषय पर और किस हल के मातहत बोल रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने उनको बुलाया है। आप बीच में क्यों दखल दे रहे हैं ?

श्री कृष्ण पटनायक : यह 1947 से पहले क्या ये ?

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जनता के चुने हुए सदस्यों को तो मौका नहीं देते हैं और नामजद मेम्बर को बोलने का मौका दे रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्यों आप दूसरे मेम्बरों को अपनी बात नहीं कहने देंगे ?

Shri Frank Anthony: As regards the medium of instruction, so far as the university is concerned, the Supreme Court struck down the attempt of the Gujarat University to prescribe a single medium.....

श्री कृष्ण पटनायक : * *

**Not recorded.

अध्यक्ष महोदय: यह नहीं लिखा जायेगा।

श्री किशन पटनायक: हम इस सदन में राष्ट्र-विरोधी बातें नहीं सुनना चाहते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: जो नहीं सुनना चाहते हैं, वे बाहर चले जायें। यह फैसला करना उन का काम नहीं है कि यह राष्ट्र-विरोधी बात है या नहीं। जिस को नहीं भाता है, वह बाहर चला जाये।

श्री किशन पटनायक: श्री एन्थनी को बाह्र जाना पड़ेगा। वह नामजद मेम्बर हैं।

Shri Frank Anthony:.....on the basis *de facto* that English is a link language for the purposes of higher education; and that is why no university could outlaw English. That was the basis so far as that was concerned. (Interruptions).

Shri Sinhasan Singh: A point of order had been raised by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, and that had been disposed of by you. Now, Shri Frank Anthony is speaking on the same thing....(Interruptions).

Shri Frank Anthony: In 1954, when Shri M. C. Chagla was the Chief Justice of Bombay, I was one of the counsels. Interpreting article 30 of the Constitution, he said that it was the infeasible right of institutions run by the Anglo-Indian community whose mother-tongue is English to run them through the medium of English.....

श्री बागड़ी: अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपनी जानकारी के लिए पूछना चाहता हूँ कि—

Shri Frank Anthony: I am just giving you aid to show that this point has already been decided....

श्री बागड़ी: अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य किस विषय पर बोल रहे हैं? वह किस स्तर के मातहत बोल रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: माननीय सदस्य बार-बार दखल दे रहे हैं और कार्यवाही को रोक रहे हैं।

Shri Frank Anthony: Those who do not want English need not go there.

श्री बागड़ी: अध्यक्ष महोदय....

अध्यक्ष महोदय: अगर माननीय सदस्य इस तरह बीच में रुकावट डालेंगे, तो मुझे एक्शन लेना पड़ेगा। मैं ने कई दफा उन को मना किया है, लेकिन वह बाज नहीं आते हैं। आखिर सब की कोई हद होती है।

Shri Frank Anthony: What I want to say is this. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, on the 9th August, 1959, replying to my resolution gave an assurance that English would be.....

श्री किशन पटनायक: अगर हम इस तरह से भाषण देते, तो आप हम को बाहर निकाल देते।

Mr. Speaker: The decision is there. That is enough. He need not go into the details.

Shri Frank Anthony: I shall finish in a minute.

श्री मधु लिमये: माननीय सदस्य जो कुछ कह रहे हैं, वह नियम के विपरीत है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: नियम के विपरीत नहीं है। आप मुझे सुनने क्यों नहीं देते हैं? मैंने उनको इजाजत दी है।

श्री मधु लिमये: यहां पर गलत और इर्रिजेंट बात कहने की इजाजत नहीं दी जा सकती है। नियम 356 के मातहत मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: पहले मुझे इन को सुन लेने दें।

श्री मधु लिमये : माननीय सदस्य गैर-लागू बाल कर रहे हैं, वे इरैलिबेंट बातें कह रहे हैं। आप नियम को पढ़िये।

Shri Frank Anthony: On the 9th August, 1949, replying to my resolution, the Nehru formula mark was made that English shall be the associate language.....

Dr. M. S. Aney: Associate language.

Shri Frank Anthony: that English shall be the associate language, and Government have purported to translate that into the Official Languages Act. The people in the south are not satisfied with that translation, but it is there, and English is an associate language. In any case, in terms of the Supreme Court decision, no Government can say to any college or indeed any university that they shall not have English as the medium. Nobody is compelled to go.....

श्री मधु लिमये अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न सुन लीजिए। माननीय सदस्य गैर-लागू बातें कह रहे हैं :

Shri Frank Anthony: When English is the medium. I say....

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने जो व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाया है, आप उस को तो सुन लीजिए। माननीय सदस्य गैर-लागू बातें कह रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य कार्य-वाही में रुकावट डाल रहे हैं। मैं उन को कहूंगा कि वह बाहर चले जायें।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने उन को कहा है कि वह बाहर चले जायें।

श्री बागड़ी : श्री एन्वनी नामजद मੈम्बर हैं, इन का कोई हल्का नहीं है। इन को बाहर

निकाष्क जा सकता है। हम तो जनता के बोट ने कर यहां आए हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : **

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य जो शब्द कह रहे हैं, वे न लिखे जायें। मैं उन को कहूंगा कि वह बाहर चले जायें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप इस तरह किसी सदस्य को सदन से बाहर जाने के लिए न कहें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं जरूर कहूंगा। मैंने बहुत सब्र किया है। माननीय सदस्य बाहर चले जायें।

(Shri Madhu Limaye left the House)

Shri Frank Anthony: The only question is this. Why then the Supreme Court...

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर कोई सदस्य पायेंट आफ् धाईर उठाता है, तो आप उस को तो इजाजत नहीं देते हैं और इन को बोसने का मौका दे रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें और रुकावट न डालें।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: You are allowing a long time to Shri Frank Anthony to argue about his case. But when a Member wants to raise a point of order, you are not allowing him.

Shri Ranga: There was a point of order earlier by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. On that, how can there be a point of order again?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : रंगा माहव इतने जोर से न बोलें। उन की संम फट जायेंगे। हम भी जोर से बोल सकते हैं। हम कांसिस वाले उन को बहुत टास्केट करने हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने श्री एन्थनी को बुलाया है। दूसरे माननीय सदस्य क्यों बोल रहे हैं ?

मैं श्री एन्थनी से कहूंगा कि वह सिर्फ जजमेंट का हवाला दे दें। वह इस वक्त सब प्रार्गुमेंट्स न दें।

We do not need any arguments. We want only the decision.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When a Member wanted to raise a point of order, you had asked him to sit down. But you are allowing Shri Frank Anthony to have his say now.... (Interruptions.)

Shri Frank Anthony: They have given the constitutional.....

Shri Brij Raj Singh: Has he been nominated to speak by you?

Mr. Speaker: Shri Frank Anthony may refer only to the judgement. He need not enter into the arguments.

Shri Frank Anthony: I have referred to the Official Languages Act. I have also referred to the decision of Shri M. C. Chagla, affirmed by the Supreme Court. I want to know why when Shri M. C. Chagla concedes that they have the right, the constitutional right, that this international body or whatever it is, this university or school, has the constitutional right, affirmed by the Supreme Court....

Shri Bagri: On a point of order.

मैं व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ।

श्री शिव नारायण : आपने मुझे बोलने नहीं दिया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप उनको खतम कर देंगे या नहीं ?

Shri Maurya (Aligarh): Mr. Anthony should be asked to sit down.

श्री शिव नारायण : आपने मुझे को रोक दिया और इन को बोलने दिया। प्वाइन्ट ऑफ ऑर्डर रोज करने का हर मेम्बर को अधिकार है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं एक को वक्त दे सकता हूँ। दो को एक साथ नहीं दे सकता।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: We are illiterate Members. We want to understand what point of order you are hearing and what is this discussion about.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Anthony might sit down for the present.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am finishing my question.

Mr. Speaker: He might resume his seat.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: What is the point that Mr. Anthony is raising?

Shri Sinhasan Singh: A point of order was raised by Dr. Lohia. You have given your ruling on that and that matter is closed now. But on the very same thing Mr. Anthony is raising a matter and explaining. He goes on to speak on the language issue which is not here for the time being.

Shri Frank Anthony: On the constitutional issue.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: He is discussing the High Court and Supreme Court judgements. But when Shri Madhu Limaya rose on a point of order on that, you asked him to go out. At the same time, Mr. Anthony goes on arguing his own theme of English vs. Hindi. We are not discussing the question of English vs. Hindi now. After your ruling disposing of Dr. Lohia's point of order, the matter should have been closed. Nobody should have been asked to raise any point on it further. This is making a mockery of things. (Interruptions).

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I only wanted to know from you two things. This matter started on a short notice question. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty asked a question. After that, you asked Shri P. C. Borooah to take up the next call attention

notice. Then Shri Sheo Narain stood up. You asked him to sit down because you had already called Shri P. C. Borooah to read the call attention motion. So Shri Sheo Narain sat down. After that, Mr. Frank Anthony stands up and goes on speaking.

Shri Frank Anthony: No. no.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: All right, somebody else.

I want to know from you only two things. When Mr. Anthony started interpreting the Constitution, Mr. Madhu Limaye wanted to raise a point of order. I want to know most humbly from you: if a Member wants to raise a point of order, can you ask him to go out? Number two—as an illiterate Member, I want to know what are the points being discussed before the House? What are we discussing now? Also, why should Mr. Madhu Limaye be asked to go out. When he wanted to raise a point of order? Because it does not suit somebody? (*Inter-ruptions*).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I was here when actually Mr. Frank Anthony was speaking and at that time Mr. Madhu Limaye was searching the rules of procedure. He wanted to raise a point of order on the basis of the particular rule which says that discussion of irrelevant matters not concerning the House or the business of the House at the moment is not permitted or allowed. In all fairness, you should have asked Mr. Madhu Limaye to sit down and await his next chance. Instead of that something else had been done. He was probably angry with Mr. Anthony. In return, you asked him to go out.

श्री बागड़ी : मुझे भी सुन लो, मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने का हर मेम्बर को अधिकार है। मधु लिमये को उस प्रश्न पर आपत्ति हुई, जो कि गैर-संसदीय था और उन्होंने 356 के अन्तर्गत आपके सामने व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाया, तो जो बोलने वाले मेम्बर थे, उनको बैठ जाना चाहिये था और आपको उसके गलत

या सही होने के बारे में निर्णय देना चाहिये था। लेकिन आपको यह अधिकार नहीं है कि आप व्यवस्था का प्रश्न सुने बगैर पैमला देना तो दरकिनार, उनको निकाल दें, आप एक नामजद मेम्बर को भाषण देने की इजाजत दें और भाषण के प्रश्न पर प्वाइन्ट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर वाले को मौका न दें, यह आपकी अधिकार नहीं था।

Shri Kapur Singh: I am not questioning your right to have given that direction which you have to Mr. Madhu Limaye, nor am I saying that the direction itself was intrinsically wrong. I only submit that in view of the circumstances which have now been revealed to the House and now that your direction has been obeyed, he should be permitted to come back.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Yes.

श्री शिव नारायण : मुझे भी कुछ कहने का मौका दिया जाय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने कह दिया है, अब बैठ जाइये।

There ought to be some end.

श्री शिव नारायण : मैंने जब सवाल रखा कि गरीब आदिमियों से पैसा घाता है। इंग्लैण्ड और अमेरिका में जितनी प्राइवेट और आटोमोमस बाड़ीज वर्क करती हैं, डेवलपमेंट आफ एजुकेशन के लिये, उस में गवर्नमेंट कोई पैसा नहीं देती है। तब आपने उसको मना कर दिया। झगड़ा किस बात का है कि उस लड़के ने दरखास्त हिन्दी में लिखी, यह चार्ज है, न कान्स्टिट्यूशन का झगड़ा है, न कुछ, हुजूर ने मुझको रोक दिया। उसके बाद त्रिवेदी जी और एन्वनी साहब को एलाउ कर दिया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार जो रुज है, उसके मुताबिक मधु लिमये ने कोट किया, प्रोसीजर के मुताबिक कोट किया, लेकिन उसको निकाल दिया और मुझ को रोक दिया। केवल एन्वनी साहब ही इस हाउस की अथारिटी

नहीं हैं, हर मेम्बर को अधिकार है, कोरम उठाने का, प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर रोज़ करने का—प्रापकी इजाजत से।

श्री सुरेशनाथ द्विवेदी : उनका कहना है कि मधु लिमये को निकाला, उनको क्यों नहीं निकाला।

Mr. Speaker: My regret is that because the subject being discussed is a delicate one and opinions differ sharply on that, the real perspective is being ignored altogether.

I have been asked why I did ask Mr. Madhu Limaye to go out and why I did allow Mr. Anthony to speak on that subject. The sequence might just be appreciated. Dr. Lohia had raised that point of order. I told him that I would not interpret the Constitution, and then I called Mr. P. C. Borooah to take up the call attention notice. Mr. Dwivedy then raised this point of order that when I always have said that I would not interpret the Constitution, how could I allow points of order based on the articles of Constitution saying that the Constitution is transgressed or flouted. My answer was that sometimes it so happens that on those articles some decisions have been given by judicial courts, and if I or someone else was aware of them, probably we might benefit by that; then the point of order might be decided. That was my reply. Mr. Anthony stood up to say that decisions had been given. Because that was my position, therefore, he wanted to explain that already the Supreme Court had decided and he wanted to give me that assistance. That is being mixed up and it is said that I allowed Mr. Anthony to speak, I did not allow Mr. Sheo Narain to speak and so on.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : उन्होंने शुरू ही यहां से किया कि वह जिन्ना मंत्री को मदद देना चाहते हैं।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : उन्होंने कहा कि जिन्ना मंत्री को सहायता करना चाहते हैं।

अध्यक्ष श्रीधर : उन्होंने यह कहा था, शास्त्री साहब, क्योंकि जिन्ना मंत्री साहब ने वे डिस्ऑनर नहीं बतलाये हैं कि जब से वे जजी से आये हैं, उनके पीछे जो फैमले हुए हैं

Shri Nambar: You started giving your ruling in English, but now you have switched on to Hindi. Please continue in English.

Mr. Speaker: That was because that question had been put in Hindi.

अध्यक्ष श्रीधर : यह सवाल चूंकि शास्त्री जी ने किया था इसलिये इसका जबाब हिन्दी में देना था, यही भगड़ा तो एप्लीकेशन का चल रहा है।

अब दूसरा सवाल यह आया, जिसमें मुझ पर नुक्ताचीनी की गई है कि जब एक मेम्बर खड़ा हो कर कहता है कि प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर उठाना चाहता हूं, मैं उसको कहता हूं कि आप बाहर चले जाइये, यह सवाल नहीं है। उन्होंने प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर उठाया, प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर मैंने सुना, प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर का फैमला किया, जो कि उन्होंने कोट किया था

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Not this time.

Mr. Speaker: This time I have not allowed because the whole conduct throughout has been to put obstructions. I was asking again and again that he should allow me to hear Mr. Frank Anthony whom I had called, and after that I would hear him, but he interrupted in between.

श्री किशन पटनायक : आपने गलती की है।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : प्रश्न यह है कि जब एक विषय समाप्त हो गया तो समाप्त होने के बाद फ्रैंक एन्थनी साहब को बोलने को क्यों दिया गया? यह सदन का प्रपमान है जो किया गया है। जब एक विषय सदन में आ गया तो दूसरा विषय उठाने की अनुमति फ्रैंक एन्थनी साहब को क्यों दी गई?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं सीक्रेट्स बता चुका हूँ ।

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: You have given the sequence. I was under the impression that Mr. Madhu Limaye had raised a point of order on a point of order. If the sequence is what you have described, then Mr. Limaye has every right to raise a point of order, and I think we have to listen to it, and you have to listen to it, and I think if that is correct, then you should ask him to come back, if this is the sequence.

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया : मैं आपके सामने एक प्रश्न कर रहा हूँ । मैं कायदे कानून में नहीं जा रहा हूँ । मैं प्रश्न यह कर रहा हूँ कि आप मधु लिमये साहब को वापस बुला लीजिये । फ्रैंक एन्थनी साहब ने जो कुछ फ्रैंसले वहां पर कहे हैं उनका वर्तमान विषय से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है । उन फ्रैंसलों से यह साबित नहीं होता है कि किसी विद्यार्थी को मजबूर किया जा सकता है एक भाषा चुनने के लिये । उन फ्रैंसलों का खाली मतलब यह है कि वहां पर पढ़ाई प्रंग्रेजी में होगी । इसलिए बिल्कुल गलत तरीके से उन्होंने वक्त इस्तेमाल किया है । मैं आपसे निवेदन करता हूँ कि मधु लिमये साहब को आप वापस बुला लें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दो बातों को आपस में कनफ्यूज न किया जाए । धरर तो यह सवाल हो कि मैं ने गलती की है उनको निकाल कर धरर मैं उसका पश्चाताप करके उनको वापस बुलाऊँ तो वह मैं करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ ।

Whatever the consequences. I am prepared to suffer.

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया : यह मैं नहीं कह रहा हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर ऐसा कोई सवाल नहीं है और दूसरा सवाल है कि हाउस की राय है कि उनको इजाजत दी जाए तो मुझे उसमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं है ।

Shri P. C. Borooah.

Shri Frank Anthony: May I conclude?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब रहने दीजिये ।

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

मंत्रालयों का पुनर्गठन

* 1696. श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या मंत्रालयों/विभागों का मुख्यस्थित आधार पर स्थायी रूप से पुनर्गठन करने के प्रश्न पर उन्होंने विचार किया है ;

(ख) क्या उनका ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिलाया गया है कि मंत्रालयों/विभागों के प्रशासनिक ढांचे में बार-बार परिवर्तन से सुचारु रूप से कार्य-संचालन में बाधा पड़ती है

(ग) क्या यह सच है कि कुछ मंत्रालय काफी बड़े हैं किन्तु अन्य मंत्रालय छोटे-छोटे हैं ; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो क्या सरकार का विचार विभिन्न मंत्रालयों/विभागों को मुख्यस्थित आधार पर कब तक पुनर्गठित करने का है ?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा अनु शक्ति मंत्री (श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी) : (क) से (ग) . नीति तथा प्रशासनिक कार्य-क्षमता की आवश्यकताओं के अनुरूप मंत्रालयों एवं विभागों का समय-समय पर पुनर्गठन किया जाता है । ऐसी स्थिति में यह निश्चित करना संभव नहीं है कि सभी मंत्रालयों एवं विभागों का कार्य-भार समान ही हो । हाल में ही कई एक मंत्रालयों एवं विभागों को उनके द्वारा किये जाने वाले कार्यों के अनुसार पुनर्गठित किया गया । मंत्रालयों की संरचना, संगठन तथा कार्यविधि से सम्बद्ध मामलों की समीक्षा भी की गई और वैज्ञानिक आधार पर एक मंत्रालय में पुनर्गठन की एक नवीन योजना लागू की गई है । इस प्रकार के परिवर्तक

प्रशासनिक कार्य-क्षमता, मितव्ययिता तथा कार्य की गतिशीलता को ध्यान में रख कर किये गये हैं। सरकार को इस बात की जानकारी नहीं है कि उन परिवर्तनों के कारण सुचारु रूप से कार्य-संचालन में किसी प्रकार की बाधा पड़ी है।

(घ) हाल में ही गठित प्रशासनिक सुधार आयोग अन्य बातों के साथ-साथ मंत्रालयों तथा विभागों में विषयों के वर्गीकरण, कर्मचारी वर्ग के गठन तथा कार्य-विधि में सम्बद्ध मामलों की जांच करेगा। इस विषय में आयोग द्वारा की गई सिफारिशों पर सरकार विचार करेगी।

Memorial for Jawans in Delhi

*1697. **Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:**
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 657 on the 21st March, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the scheme to raise a memorial in Delhi in the memory of the Jawans of the Armed Forces who laid down their lives for the defence of the country has since been considered by Government; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). The scheme is still under consideration.

Foreign Exchange Allotted to Delegation of Communist Party visiting U.S.S.R.

*1698. **Shri Kappen:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have allowed the visit of a number of delegations of the Communist Party of India to Moscow for holding ideological discussions with the Soviet Communist Party leaders; and

(b) how many Indian Communists were given permission to visit the Soviet Union during the last one year for medical treatment or for other purposes?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) On an invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a 6-member delegation of the Communist Party of India visited the Soviet Union in March-April, 1966 to attend the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. On another invitation from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 9-member delegation of the Communist Party of India went to Moscow in April, 1966 for bilateral talks with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Necessary facilities were extended to the members of the delegations for their visit.

(b) During the last one year 70 members of the Communist Party of India were permitted to visit the Soviet Union including 27 persons for medical treatment.

Netaji Jayanti Celebrations

*1699. **Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to refer to reply given to Starred Question No. 817 on the 28th March, 1966 regarding Netaji Jayanti celebrations and state:

(a) whether the advice of the Central Programme Advisory Committee was sought in April;

(b) if so, what advice was tendered; and

(c) the decision of Government in the matter?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). The Central Programme Advisory Committee generally approved the pattern followed by All India Radio in the matter of observance of anniversaries of various national leaders. However, in view of the special importance of the matter, the Government have also had the benefit of the views of some Hon'ble Members of Parliament belonging to different political parties at an informal meeting on the 11th May, 1966. As a result of discussions which took place

at that meeting, it has been decided to modify the list in respect of anniversaries to be observed on an annual basis. A revised list of anniversaries to be observed by A.I.R. annually on an all-India basis is given below. The list includes the name of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose.

Revised List of Anniversaries of National Leaders to be Observed by AIR Annually on an All-India Basis

1. Mahatma Gandhi;
2. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru;
3. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri;
4. Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose;
5. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel;
6. Dr. Rajendra Prasad;
7. Lokmanya Tilak;
8. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

भारतीय समाचार बुलेटिन

- * 1700 श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :
 श्री हुकम चंद कच्छवाय :
 श्री बिशन चन्द्र सेठ :
 श्री स० मो० बनर्जी :
 श्री नाथ पाई :
 श्री प्रिय गुप्त :
 श्री मोर्य :
 श्री यशपाल सिंह :
 श्री राजी :

क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सब है कि पिछले कुछ समय से भारतीय समाचार बुलेटिनों में विदेशी अधिक खबरें प्रकाशित की जा रही हैं ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या इसके लिए कोई नई नीति बनाई गई है ; और

(ए) यदि नहीं, तो समाचार बुलेटिनों में मुख्य भारतीय खबरों की उपेक्षा करके विदेशी खबरें अधिक प्रसारित करने के क्या कारण हैं ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) जी, नहीं ।

(ख) और (ग). प्रश्न नहीं उठते ।

Purchase of Arms by Pakistan

- * 1701. Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:
 Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
 Dr. Kohor:
 Shri Hukam Chand Kachhawaia:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Indian Envoys abroad have reported the purchase of arms by Pakistan wherever they are available and without regard to price; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). Indian Missions report to Government whatever information becomes available to them on Pakistan's arms purchases abroad, and we take diplomatic action, as appropriate, in such matters.

Properties of Gurdwaras in Pakistan

* 1702. Shri Daljit Singh: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the value of the properties of Gurdwaras left in Pakistan comes to about Rs. 25 crores with Rs. 50,00,000 income annually against which neither any evacuee property of Muslims religious shrines of Punjab was allotted to S.G.P.C., Amritsar nor any settlement has been made with Pakistan Government so far;

(b) whether it is also a fact that previously, some such land was allotted to S.G.P.C., Amritsar temporarily and was cancelled afterwards and taken over by the Wakf Board of India; and

(c) if so, whether Government have any proposal to allot the same land of Punjab permanently to S.G.P.C., Amritsar in lieu of the same?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) It has been reported by the S.G.P.C., Amritsar, that the value of the properties attached to the Gurdwaras in Pakistan in 1947 totalled a little over Rs. 16 crores 18 lakhs and that the annual income from those properties was 48½ lakhs. According to the information with Government no evacuee property of Muslim religious shrines has been allotted to S.G.P.C. No settlement has yet been possible with the Pakistan Government in regard to the properties of the S.G.P.C. left in Pakistan.

(b) According to available information no land was allotted to the S.G.P.C., Amritsar from Muslim religious shrines, and there is no Wakf Board of India as such.

(c) Government have no such proposal under consideration.

Hostile Nagas

*1703. Shri R. S. Pandey :
Shri R. Barua:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have taken certain concrete steps against the hostile Nagas who have been carrying on anti-national activities during the recent past; and

(b) if so, the details of the measures taken and the results achieved, to normalise the situation in the State?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) and (b). Instructions have been issued by the State Governments of Assam, Manipur and Nagaland to intensify security arrangements and vigilance in the affected areas and suitable steps have been taken to protect the commission of unlawful acts by the underground Nagas and also to prevent danger to the life and property of the citizens. The State Governments have also issued instruction to their Adminis-

trative Officers to seek the help of the Army whenever necessity arises.

R.T.C. with Industrialists

*1704. Shri R. Barua:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Linga Reddy:
Shri Daji:
Shri P. C. Borooah:
Shri Prakash Vlr Shastri:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether a programme has been finalised by Government to hold a number of round-table conferences between Government and groups of industrialists and experts in different fields of industry and commerce with the object to harness to better purpose the expertise and dynamism in the country; and

(b) if so, the details of the programme of holding such discussions and the major issues which will be taken up at series of such conferences?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) and (b). It is intended to arrange meetings from time to time with those interested in industry, agriculture and other important aspects of our economy. The object of the meetings is not to arrive at any decisions on specific issues, but to provide for a free and frank exchange of views in order to bring about a better understanding of the problems and difficulties which are faced by Government and the people engaged in these lines of economic activity.

The first meeting of this kind was held on April 29 and 30 with some industrialists, managers, technologists and economists to discuss the problems hampering industrial production and development.

The next meeting is likely to be held early in June to discuss problems relating to Public Sector Enterprises and their production.

The dates for further meetings are yet to be finalised.

Ceylonese Government Claim on the Island of Kicha Thivu

*1705. **Shri Madhu Limaye :**

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:

Shri S. M. Banerjee:

Shri P. C. Borooah:

Shri S. Kandappan:

Shri D. C. Sharma:

Shri Warior:

Shri Daji:

Shri Rajdeo Singh:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the claim made by the Ceylonese Government on the island of Kicha Thivu;

(b) whether any representation has been made by the said Government to the Government of India;

(c) whether any reply has been sent to this communication; and

(d) the contents of the reply?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh :

(a) Government of India have seen press reports regarding this.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) and (d). Do not arise.

Alloys Steel Plant at Kanpur

*1706. **Shri S. M. Banerjee:**

Shri Klaben Pattanayak:

Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:

Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a final decision has since been taken to establish a special Alloy Steel Plant at Kanpur; and

(b) if not, the reasons for the delay in taking a final decision?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). There is a proposal under consideration for modernising the facilities available for Alloy Steel Production at Kan-

pur. The scope and pattern of facilities to be set up have to be determined with reference to the capabilities that may be developed in other steel plants in the public and private sectors. This is under examination of the Government of India.

Marine Diesel Engine Factory at Ennore (Madras)

*1707. **Shri S. Kandappan:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether the proposal to set up a Marine Diesel Engine Factory at Ennore near Madras has been dropped; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) On the invitation of the Government, a Team of M/s. MAN Engineers visited India during June, July and August 1965 to prepare a basic manufacturing plan for this Project. They were also requested to advise on the best location out of the sites at Cochin, Madras and Visakhapatnam or any other site which they may recommend. After taking into consideration various factors, e.g. geographical situation, communications, availability of labour, investment and factory costs, etc., and carrying out a relative assessment of the different sites, they have recommended in the following order for the location of the factory—Ranchi, Vishakhapatnam, Madras and Cochin.

डोगरा बटालियन

*1768. **श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा :**

श्री यु० ब० सिंह :

श्री रामेश्वरामन्व :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या यह सच है कि जम्मू तथा काश्मीर के मुख्य मंत्री ने डोगरा बटालियन की प्राप्ति की है

(ख) यदि हां, तो इसके क्या कारण हैं ;

(ग) क्या यह भी सच है कि इस आलोचना में डोगरा बटालियन में भारी रोष है ; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो क्या इसके सम्बन्ध में सरकार ने उनसे कोई पूछ-ताछ की है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण)
(क) से (घ). सरकार ने इस विषय की प्रेस रिपोर्ट देखी है, परन्तु उसे अधिकृत कोई सूचना नहीं है। जम्मू तथा काश्मीर सरकार से पूछताछ की गई है, और प्राप्य सूचना, प्राप्त होने पर सभा के पटल पर रख दी जाएगी।

Visit of an Official of E.A. Ministry to Vietnam

*1709. **Shri P. C. Borooah:**
Shri P. Venkatasubbalah:
Shri K. C. Pant:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a senior officer of his Ministry was recently sent to Vietnam to study the possibilities of economy in expenditure on the International Control Commission on Vietnam and to have a general idea about the position there;

(b) if so, what was his report to Government; and

(c) the action taken by Government in the light of his report?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). The report or Government's decision thereon cannot be divulged at this stage without embarrassment to India's position as Chairman of the Commission.

Film on Netaji

*1710. **Shri Nath Pai:** Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that a film called "Netaji" is being shown in several cinemas in the country;

(b) that the film does no justice to the greatness of Netaji; and

(c) whether there is a demand that the film be withdrawn from circulation ?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The film was passed at Bombay and the opinion of the Examining Committee of the Board was that the film has been made with due reverence and respect to Netaji.

(c) Government has received no complaint or representation that the film should be withdrawn from circulation. However, a petition was filed by Shri Dwijendra Nath Bose, in the Court of the Additional Chief Presidency Magistrate, Calcutta, for restraining the exhibition of the film under Section 144 Cr. P.C. and was dropped by the court. The film is now in circulation in the country.

Negotiating Machinery for Civil Defence Employees

*1711. **Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:**
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 807 on the 28th March, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the question regarding the setting up an interim negotiating machinery for the civil defence employees has since been considered by Government; and

(b) if so, the details thereon.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The proposal to set up an interim Negotiating Machinery for civilian defence employees

has since been considered and dropped, in view of the fact that the Joint Consultation and Compulsory Arbitration Scheme of the Ministry of Home Affairs in which the Defence Ministry will participate, is likely to come into force very soon.

Naga Hostile Activities

*1712. **Shri P. C. Borooah:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to refer to the replies given to supplementary question to Starred Question No. 1309 on the 25th April, 1966 and state:

(a) whether investigations as to the question of existence of foreign hand behind the Naga hostiles activities have been completed; and

(b) if so, with what result?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) and (b). We have definite information about the help given by the Pakistan Government to the Naga hostiles.

Coverage of P.M.'s Visit to U.S.A.

*1713. **Shri D. C. Sharma:**
Shri Yashpal Singh:
Shri Kapur Singh:

Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether the use of Voice of America voicecast for the coverage of Prime Minister's recent visit to the United States of America by the All India Radio has been enquired into; and

(b) if so, the result thereof?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) All India Radio did not use the Voice of America's voicecasts in covering the Prime Minister's recent visit to the United States. It, however, used excerpts from the Prime Minister's speeches recorded by the Voice of America. Such facilities are commonly availed of by broadcasting organisations all over the world on a reciprocal basis. The introductory remarks pertaining to the excerpts were written by A.I.R.'s own correspondent covering the Prime Minister's visit and were read by an Indian locally available.

Statement by British Defence Secretary

*1714. **Shri Hem Barua:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the statement made by the British Defence Secretary, Mr. Denis Healey in the House of Commons which says: 'India and Pakistan are still more concerned with the struggle with each other than with other troubles';

(b) if so, whether Government think that Britain has not been able to overcome her inhibition of equating India with Pakistan; and

(c) if so, whether Government have taken up this matter with U.K. Government?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Mr. Denis Healey's statement was not made in context of Britain's relation with India and Pakistan but arose out of a reference to the possibility of an "Asian coalition" made by Sir Alex Douglas Home.

(c) Does not arise.

इस्लामी गुट

*1715. **श्री मधु लिमये:**

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया:

क्या बंबेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार का ध्यान इस्लामी गुट के बनाने के लिये किये जा रहे प्रयास की ओर दिलाया गया है ;

(ख) इस में कौन-कौन से देश शामिल हो रहे हैं ;

(ग) भारत की सुरक्षा पर इसका क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा ; और

(घ) इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है ?

बेवैशिक-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विनेश सिंह) : (क) से (ब). इस्लामी गुट या संश्रय का विचार नया नहीं है। दिसम्बर, 1965 में जब शाह फैजल ईरान गए थे, तब यह प्रस्ताव फिर रखा गया था। पहले कदम के रूप में, दोनों शाह इस पर सहमत हुए कि सब इस्लामी देशों के राज्याध्यक्षों का एक शिखर सम्मेलन बुलाया जाए। इसके अनुरूप शाह फैजल ने पाकिस्तान समेत कई देशों की यात्रा की।

अभी यह नहीं कहा जा सकता कि शिखर सम्मेलन होगा और उसमें किन-किन देशों का प्रतिनिधित्व होगा। भारत सरकार अपनी धर्म-निरपेक्षता और गुटों से भ्रम रहने की नीति के अनुसार, इस प्रस्ताव के विरुद्ध है और उसे यह जानकर सन्तोष हुआ है कि प्रगतिशील और मुस्लिम तथा अन्य देशों में धर्म के आधार पर ऐसे गुट बनाने के खिलाफ जबरदस्त प्रतिक्रिया हुई है।

Accidents to Naval Aircraft

* 1716. **Shri Hari Vihnu Kamath:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that recently several naval aircraft have been involved in accidents;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) whether an inquiry has been or is being held in the matter?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) Only two aircraft of the Navy were involved in minor accidents while landing at Santa Cruz in the 1st May 1966.

(b) One of the aircraft was diverted from the Carrier INS VIKRANT to Santa Cruz after minor damage to the nosewheel whilst practising deck landing. The nosewheel collapsed on landing at Santa Cruz. The second aircraft which was escorting the first aircraft also landed at Santa Cruz. A minor fire developed in the second aircraft engine bay after the engine had been switched off. The fire

was promptly brought under control. Both the pilots are safe.

(c) Yes, Sir, a Board of Enquiry is being held to investigate the cause of fire which occurred after the engine of the second aircraft had been switched off. No enquiry is intended in the first accident as it was a case of material failure

Conflict in Vietnam

* 717. **Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the international Commission for supervision and control in Vietnam or any of its member Governments has taken initiative in the matter of seeking ways in ending conflict in Vietnam;

(b) if so, the precise nature of steps taken; and

(c) whether any and if so which other Governments have expressed their desire to help in this matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) and (c). The Government of Canada have been considering the utilisation of the services of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam towards a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam question. The Government of Canada have also informed the Government of India of their thinking in this regard. The proposal was only exploratory to find out how the International Commission could help in this and no specific details have been worked out. The proposal is not being pressed.

सेना के अफसरों द्वारा त्यागपत्र

* 1718. **डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :**
श्री बागड़ी :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) क्या यह सच है कि सेना के कुछ अफसरों ने दिसम्बर, 1960 के बाद इस आधार पर त्यागपत्र दिये हैं कि इस प्रकार

के कार्य के लिये उनकी आत्मा तैयार नहीं है ;

(ख) क्या यह सच है कि ऐसे घफसरो के त्यागपत्र स्वीकार नहीं हुए और उन्होंने इस सम्बन्ध में उच्चतम न्यायालय में अपील की है ;

(ग) क्या यह भी सच है कि बड़े घफसरो ने इनके सम्बन्ध में यह कहा है कि ऐसे दिमाग के लोग सेना में घच्छ साबित नहीं होंगे ; और

(घ) इनके बावजूद भी उनके त्यागपत्र स्वीकार न करने के कारण क्या हैं ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण) :

(क) 4 सैनिक घफसरो ने प्रायः इन कारणों से इस्तीफा दिया है कि उन्हें सेना में रहने में कोई रुचि नहीं है, सैनिक डग के जीवन के स्वाभाविक तौर पर वह अनुपयुक्त हैं, अपने आपको उसके लिए ढालने में असमर्थ हैं ।

(ख) केवल एक घफसर ने जिसका इस्तीफा निरीक्षणधीन है उच्चतम न्यायालय में रिट प्रार्थनापत्र दिया है ।

(ग) प्रार्थनापत्र भेजते समय हर एक अधिकारी सेना में घफसर की उपयोगिता अथवा अन्यथा के सम्बन्ध में अपने टिप्पण देता है जिन पर मामले का निर्णय करते समय विचार किया जाता है ।

(घ) सेवा के हित समेत सभी बातों का ध्यान रखते हुए प्रत्येक मामले पर सरकार द्वारा उसके गुणों के अनुसार विचार किया जाता है । दो मामलों में इस्तीफे स्वीकार कर लिए गए हैं । एक मामला विचाराधीन है, और चौथे में, कोर में कि जिसमें घफसर सेवा कर रहा था, घफसरो सम्बन्धी स्थिति के कारण इस्तीफा स्वीकार नहीं किया गया है ।

Closure of American Monitoring Stations by Pakistan

*1719. **Shri P. C. Borooah:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the reported closure of the American Monitoring stations by Pakistan in order to pressurize the United States to resume full-scale military assistance to Pakistan;

(b) if so, whether Government's attention has also been drawn to the psychological frenzy in the U.S. Government on resumption of arms aid to Pakistan in the context of this pressure and the display of the Chinese arms by Pakistan on Pak. day; and

(c) if so, Government's reaction to prevent U.S. Government from lifting the embargo on arms aid to Pakistan under such pressure?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Government are not aware of any 'psychological frenzy' in the U.S. Government to resume arms aid to Pakistan, in the context of the threat of closure of U.S. Monitoring stations in Pakistan. We presume that the U.S. Government have drawn its own conclusions from the display of Chinese arms by Pakistan on Pakistan Day.

(c) Government have expressed to the U.S. Government their deep concern at the reports about the possibility of lifting embargo on arms aid to Pakistan.

Diplomatic Relations between Rhodesia and United Kingdom

*1720. **Shri Madhu Limaye:**

Shri Sidheshwar Prasad:

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta:

Shri Indrajit Gupta:

Shri Vasudevan Nair:

Shri Nath Pal:

Shri Kishan Pathnayak:

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the move for the restora-

tion of diplomatic ties between the rebel white minority Rhodesian Government and the Government of United Kingdom;

(b) the likely repercussions of this on the Afro-Asian world;

(c) its impact on the Commonwealth and inter-Commonwealth relations; and

(d) the reaction of Government to this development?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) Southern Rhodesia is not a sovereign, independent country. Therefore, it could not have diplomatic relations with the U.K. However, Britain did have a representative (called the High Commissioner) and his staff functioning in Salisbury. The Rhodesians similarly had an office in London. With the declaration of UDI the British representative was withdrawn and a small residual staff was left in Rhodesia for the performance of consular functions. Even this residual staff was asked to leave the country by the Smith regime but when the British Government agreed to start exploratory talks with the illegal regime in Salisbury and it was decided not to withdraw the residual staffs in London and Salisbury.

(b) The U.K. decision to institute even exploratory talks with the illegal regime in Salisbury has come as a surprise to Afro-Asian countries including those in the Commonwealth and reactions to this development are critical of Britain's action.

(c) It is too early yet to assess what impact this will have on the Commonwealth and on relationships as between its members.

(d) The Government of India share the uneasiness felt by other Asian and African countries in this matter and are watching the situation.

Indo-Kuwait Joint Venture

**5657. Shri Basumatari:
Shri Kandar Lal:**

**Shri Vahwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Firodia:**

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Kuwait Government is prepared to help the Indian Government in respect of industrial development; and

(b) if so, the details of the agreement, if any, in this regard?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). In recent contacts between the Governments of India and Kuwait it has been agreed that possibilities of industrial and financial co-operation between the two countries for mutual benefit should be closely examined. A Joint Indo-Kuwait Committee has been formed and the first meeting of this Committee is likely to take place shortly.

Cheap Radios

**5658. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Ramachandra Ualka:**

Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2482 on the 21st March, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the question of supplying cheap radio sets to the villages has since been considered by Government; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) and (b). The entire question of augmenting the production/supply of radio receivers in the country is being pursued vigorously in consultation with the Ministry of Industry. Action is being taken to obtain foreign exchange resources to step up production of cheap sets and spare parts.

New Medals for Army Personnel

**5659. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Ramachandra Ualka:**

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 3197 on the 4th April, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the proposal for the institution of new medals for the Armed

Forces personnel has since been considered; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). The proposal is still under consideration.

Oriya News Reels and Documentaries

5660. Dr. Kohor : Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Oriya news reels and documentaries released so far;

(b) their names;

(c) whether any Oriya documentary films or news reels are under production or likely to be produced during 1966; and

(d) if so, their names and time of their release?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) to (d). All the documentaries produced and released by the Films Division in public cinemas on all-India circuits and all films released through mobile vans since May 1958 have been dubbed and released in Oriya. Since January 1960 all weekly newsreels released in public cinemas on all India circuits are also dubbed in Oriya. The exact number and names of documentaries and news reels so far dubbed in Oriya and released, are being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Paktoonishan

5661. Shri Madhu Limaye: Will the Minister of external Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the present policy of Government regarding the help to the Paktoonistan liberation movement led by Khan Abdul

Ghaffar Khan, as announced by the Minister of External Affairs in Lok Sabha on the 17th November, 1965

(b) whether Badshah Khan is to visit India in the near future; and

(c) if so, the date of his visit?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Government's attitude on this question has repeatedly been made clear in the House. Government has every sympathy for the just demands of the Pakhtoons and will do whatever is constitutionally possible to help them.

(b) and (c). Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan who was invited in January, 1965 has not indicated when he will visit India.

आकाशवाणी का विविध भारती कार्यक्रम

5662. श्री हुकम चंद कछवाय :

श्री बड़े :

क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि आकाशवाणी के "विविध भारती" कार्यक्रम के अन्तर्गत पोजी भाइयों के लिए अश्लील साहित्य एवं फिल्मों गीत प्रसारित किये जाते हैं ;

(ख) क्या ऐसे गीतों से जवानों के आचरण पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ता है ; और

(ग) क्या हमसे हमारी सुरक्षा व्यवस्था किसी प्रकार में खतरे में पड़ सकती है जिसका उत्तरदायित्व हमारे जवानों पर है ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) जी, नहीं । सैनिकों की प्रार्थना पर विविध भारती में प्रसारित होने वाले फिल्मी गानों में शृंगार की पुट तो होती है परन्तु हम बात का ध्यान रखा जाता है कि उनकी विषय वस्तु, मूर्खों के सामान्य मानदण्डों से गिरी न हो ।

(ख) तथा (ग). प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

बौन (पश्चिमी जर्मनी) में गांधी स्ट्रीट

5663. श्री ओंकार लाल बोरवा :
क्या बंदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि जर्मनी की राजधानी बौन की नगरपालिका ने हाल में बनाई गई सड़क का नाम "गांधी स्ट्रीट" रखा है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या इस सड़क को यह नाम देने से पूर्व भारत सरकार की स्वीकृति ले ली गई थी ?

बंदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) :

(क) जी हां ।

(ख) ऐसे मामलों में भारत सरकार की महमति लेने की आवश्यकता नहीं होती है । लेकिन बौन की म्युनिसिपैलिटी ने बॉन्ट-स्थित हमारे राजदूतावास के जरिये अपने निर्णय की सूचना भारत सरकार को दे दी है । बौन में एक सड़क का नाम महात्मा गांधी के नाम पर रखने के भाव की हम सराहना करते हैं ।

प्रधान मंत्री तथा कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष की चेको-स्लोवाकिया की यात्रा

5664. श्री ओंकार लाल बोरवा :
क्या बंदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि प्रधान मंत्री तथा कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष श्री कामराज शीघ्र ही चेकोस्लोवाकिया की यात्रा पर जायेंगे ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस पर होने वाला व्यय कौन वहन करेगा ; और

(ग) इस पर कितना व्यय होने का अनुमान है तथा कितनी विदेशी मुद्रा खर्च होगी ?

बंदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) :

(क) जी हां । चेकोस्लोवाकिया के विदेश उप-मंत्री डा० एल० सीमोविक ने उसे 15 अप्रैल, 1966 तक अपनी भारत यात्रा के दौरान अपने प्रधान मंत्री की ओर से हमारी प्रधान मंत्री को चेकोस्लोवाकिया की यात्रा करने का निमंत्रण दिया । हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ने यह निमंत्रण स्वीकार कर लिया है । यात्रा की अभी तक तारीख निश्चित नहीं की गई है । हमें यह सूचना है कि चेकोस्लोवाकिया नेशनल डेमोक्रेटिक फ्रण्ट के अध्यक्ष की ओर से चेकोस्लोवाकिया के विदेश उप-मंत्री ने कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष श्री के० कामराज को भी निमंत्रण दिया है । कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष ने अभी कोई तारीख निश्चित नहीं की है ।

(ख) सामान्य व्यवहार के अनुसार प्रधान मंत्री के स्थानीय आदर-मत्कार का खर्च आतिथ्य सरकार उठाती है और यात्रा-खर्च भारत सरकार ।

कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष की यात्रा का कोई खर्च भारत सरकार नहीं उठाएगी ।

(ग) चूंकि प्रधान मंत्री की चेको-स्लोवाकिया की यात्रा की तारीख और समय अभी अन्तिम रूप से निश्चित नहीं किया गया है, इसलिए अभी अनुमानित व्यय का प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

उपर भाग (ख) में जो उत्तर दिया गया है, उसे देखते हुए भारत सरकार कोई व्योरा देने की स्थिति में नहीं है ।

Furniture at M.E.S., Ambala

5665. Shri S. M. Banerjee: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that during the years 1963-64, 1964-65 and 1965-66, a lot of furniture in Military Engineering Services at Ambala Cantonment has been found missing or written off;

(b) if so, how much amount was involved and when that furniture was manufactured or purchased;

(c) whether action was taken or an inquiry held to find out the exact loss of the public money; and

(d) the steps taken to avoid such losses and misappropriation of Government stores and property?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan : (a) to (d). All the information necessary to answer this question is not available. It is being collected and a statement will be laid on the table of the House as soon as the relevant information is received.

सैनिक अधिकारियों के साथ करार

5666. डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :

श्री किशन पटनायक :

श्री मधु लिमबे :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार सैनिक अधिकारियों से उनकी सेवाओं के सम्बन्ध में लिखित रूप में कोई करार कराती है ;

(ख) यदि हा, तो क्या उसके आधार पर वे सैनिक अधिकारी राज्यादिष्ट होने (कमीशन प्राप्त करने) के बाद किसी निश्चित अवधि तक सेवा करने के लिए बाध्य होते हैं ; और

(ग) यदि नहीं, तो क्या कोई और कानूनी उपबन्ध हैं जिनके अनुसार सरकार सैनिक अधिकारियों की सेवा की शर्तों को विनियमन करती है और वह उन्हें कितनी निश्चित अवधि तक सेवा करने के लिये बाध्य कर सकती है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री ०० बामस) : (क), (ख) तथा (ग). जी नहीं, सिवाय वायु सेना की गैर-तकनीकी शाखाओं में, जहाँ कमीशन के लिए चुने गये उम्मीदवार को एक प्रतिज्ञापत्र पर हस्ताक्षर

करने होते हैं जिसके अन्तर्गत उसे छात्रता की अवधि पूरित कम से कम छह वर्षों के लिये सेवा करनी पड़ती है। सैनिक अधिकारियों को अनिवार्य सेवा निवृत्ति की प्राप्ति तक, अवकाश नियमित कमीशन प्राप्त होने पर वायु सेना में नियमों के अनुसार निर्धारित अवधि की तिथि तक, या अनियमित कमीशन प्राप्त होने की दशा में एक विशेष अवधि के लिए सेवा करनी पड़ती है। अपनी सेवा के दौरान वह अपनी अपनी सेवा सम्बन्धी अधिनियमों के अधीन होते हैं।

रेडियो बाल्व के मूल्य

5667. श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
क्या रक्षा मंत्री 26 नवम्बर, 1965 के प्रतारंगित प्रश्न संख्या 1388 के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि भारत इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स लिमिटेड, बंगलूरु द्वारा निर्मित रेडियो बाल्व दिल्ली में अब भी निर्धारित मूल्य पर नहीं मिल रहे हैं ;

(ख) क्या वे बाल्व काले बाजार में निगुनी और चौगुनी कीमतों पर उपलब्ध हैं, जिनके फलस्वरूप धाम जनता को ही नहीं अपितु सरकारी तकनीकी विभागों को भी कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ रहा है ;

(ग) क्या भारत इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स, लिमिटेड, द्वारा नियुक्त वितरक, मैसर्स यूनिवर्सल रेडियो, चांदनी चौक, दिल्ली भी इन बाल्वों को नहीं बेच रहे हैं ; और

(घ) इन बाल्वों को निर्धारित मूल्यों पर खुले बाजार में उपलब्ध कराने के लिए सरकार क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री ०० बामस) : (क) तथा (ख). जी नहीं। भारत इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स लिमिटेड द्वारा निर्मित विभिन्न प्रकार के रेडियो बाल्व दिल्ली में प्रकाशित दर पर नियुक्त किये गये वितरकों अथवा उनके परचून विक्रेताओं में प्राप्य है।

तदपि, बी० ई० एल० द्वारा प्रकाशित से अधिक दरों पर इन बाल्वों के बेचे जाने सम्बन्धी शिकायतें प्राप्त हुई हैं ।

(ग) चांदनी चौक दिल्ली के सर्वश्री यूनिवर्सल रेडियो नियुक्त किये गये वितरकों में से एक है । किसी विशेष समय में किसी विशेष किस्म का या किस्मों के बाल्वों की अप्राप्यता के कारण कभी कभार भ्रष्टमता के अतिरिक्त, वह नियमित सप्लाई कर रहे हैं ।

(घ) बी० ई० एल० द्वारा वर्तमान वितरण व्यवस्था प्रायः पर्याप्त है ।

N.D.F. Collection in Bahraich

5668. Shri Ram Singh :

Shri P. H. Bheel :

Shri P. K. Deo :

Will the Prime Minister be pleased state :

(a) the total amount collected from Sirsia and Prayagpur Blocks of Bahraich District in U.P. for the National Defence Fund during the recent Indo-Pakistan conflict;

(b) whether the entire amount has been deposited by the local authorities in the National Defence Fund; and

(c) if not, why?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi) : (a) In connection with the recent Indo-Pakistan Conflict Rs. 11,631.22 and Rs. 20,421.31 were collected from Sirsia and Prayagpur blocks respectively of Bahraich District in U.P. for the National Defence Fund.

(b) The entire amount has been deposited in the State Bank of India, for credit to the National Defence Fund.

(c) The question does not arise.

नौसेना के कर्मचारियों के परिवारों को
सुविधायें

5669. श्री रा० स० तिवारी : क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार ने नौसेना के उन कर्मचारियों के परिवारों को, जिन्होंने भारत-पाकिस्तान संघर्ष के परिणामस्वरूप अपने जीवन का बलिदान किया था, सुविधायें देने की कोई घोषणा की है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो कितने कर्मचारियों के परिवारों को सुविधायें दी गई हैं ; और

(ग) यदि नहीं, तो उनके क्या कारण हैं ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण) : (क) तीनों सेवाओं के, और इस लिए नौसेना के सेविगर्ग समेत, सभी सैनिक सेविगर्ग के लिए उद्धारतापूर्वक विशेष कुटुम्ब पेन्शन भ्रवाडों, और नियोग्यता पेन्शन के लिए आदेश जारी कर दिए गए हैं ।

(ख) तथा (ग). प्रश्न नहीं उठते क्योंकि हाल के भारत पाकिस्तान युद्ध के दौरान नौसेना के कोई सेविगर्ग नहीं मारे गए थे ।

मेरठ जिले में स्थानीय समाचारपत्रों के लिए
अखबारी कागज का अर्थ्यश

5670. श्री विधायक प्रसाद :

श्री हुकूम चन्द कछवाय :

डा० लक्ष्मी मल्ल सिधवी :

श्री राजी :

क्या सूचना और प्रसार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि उत्तर प्रदेश के मेरठ जिले के स्थानीय समाचारपत्रों को अखबारी कागज का कोटा दिया जाता है ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि ये समाचारपत्र 1000 से अधिक प्रतियां नहीं छापते हैं ;

(ग) क्या यह भी सच है कि "दैनिक मायराष्ट्र" की केवल 800 के लगभग प्रतियां छपती हैं ;

(घ) क्या यह भी सच है कि उक्त समाचारपत्र के पास जो मशीन है उससे एक दिन में 800 से अधिक प्रतियां नहीं निकाली जा सकती है ;

(ङ) क्या यह भी सच है कि उक्त समाचारपत्र की रिपोर्ट भी सच नहीं होती है ; और

(च) यदि हां, तो ऐसे समाचारपत्रों को प्रखबारी कागज का कोटा तथा सरकारी विज्ञापन देने के क्या कारण हैं जब कि अधिक परिचालन वाले अन्य समाचारपत्रों को न तो प्रखबारी कागज का कोटा दिया जाता है और न ही सरकारी विज्ञापन ।

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) जी, हां ।

(ख) जी, नहीं । सरकार के पास उपलब्ध जानकारी के अनुसार, मेरठ से प्रकाशित होने वाले प्रखबारों में कई प्रखबारों की प्रचार संख्या 1000 से ऊपर है ।

(ग) मेरठ के दैनिक मायराष्ट्र की प्रचार संख्या की जांच की जा रही है ।

(घ) ऐसा पता लगा है कि इस पत्र की छपाई मशीन एक दिन में 2000 प्रतियां छाप सकती है ।

(ङ) सरकार के पास कोई जानकारी नहीं है ।

(च) प्रखबारी कागज का बटवारा करते समय, प्रखबार की नीति या उसकी विषय वस्तु पर ध्यान नहीं रखा जाता । प्रखबारी कागज प्रखबारों को, प्रावेदन करने पर सार्वजनिक सूचना संख्या 54-आई० टी० सी० (पी० एन०) तारीख 26-4-1966 में निहित नीति के अनुसार घटाट किया जाता है । इस सूचना की एक प्रति लोक सभा की मेज पर रखी जा चुकी है ।

विज्ञापन देने के लिए पत्र-पत्रिकाओं को चुनने में यह ध्यान रखा जाता है कि उनकी प्रचार संख्या कितनी है, प्रकाशन में

वे कितने नियमित हैं उन्हें कौन लोग पढ़ते हैं उनका स्तर कैसा है विज्ञापन किस भाषा और क्षेत्र के लिए है और वे पत्रकारिता के स्वीकृत नैतिक आचार का कितना पालन करते हैं ।

Wage Board for Cantonment Board Employees

5671. **Shri Rama chandra Ulaka :**
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena :

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 831 on the 28th March, 1966 and State:

(a) whether the proposal to appoint a Wage Board for Cantonment Board employees has since been considered; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan) : (a) and (b). The proposal to appoint a Wage Board for Cantonment Board employees is still under consideration of Government.

Indian Contingent in Gaza

5672. **Shri Vashwa Nath Pandey :**
Shri Brij Basu Lal :
Shri Brij Behari Mehrotra :

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the officers and other ranks of Indian contingent of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Gaza were presented U.N. service medals at Dierel Ballah (Gaza) recently; and

(b) if so, the number of the Officers and other ranks who have got such medals?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas) : (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

L. N. A. Memorial in Singapore

5673. **Shri Hari Vashnu Kamath :** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 573 on the 15th November, 1965 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the then Prime Minister of Singapore had stated that "I would give the most courteous consideration to any request from the Government of India for the reconstruction of the I. N. A. Memorial in Singapore" and thus the Prime Minister Nehru had therefore answered: "In view of the statement of the Prime Minister of Singapore, we are giving further consideration to the matter";

(b) the reasons for now interposing the "people of Indian origin in Singapore" between the Government of India and of Singapore;

(c) whether Government have resiled from the stand taken by Shri Nehru as adumbrated in (a);

(d) if so, the reasons therefore; and

(e) if not, the upshot of consideration of the matter by Government?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) to (c) Shri Nehru stated in the Lok Sabha on 25-3-1960 in answer to question No. 1465 that the reconstruction of the I. N. A. Memorial in Singapore was a matter between the persons of 'Indian origin in Singapore and the Government of Singapore. The Government of India will, however, be glad to offer its co-operation and help.

Since Singapore is now an independent country it is best that the people in Singapore give thought to this matter. They already have the assurance of co-operation of Government of India.

कीनिया में एक भारतीय चल-चित्र का चित्रण (शूटिंग) करने की अनुमति देने से इन्कार

5674. **श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरबा :** क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मन्त्री यह बनाने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि हाल में एक भारतीय दल को कीनिया में एक चल-चित्र का चित्रण (शूटिंग) करने की अनुमति नहीं दी गई थी;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उसके क्या कारण हैं; और

(ग) क्या सरकार ने इस मामले के

बारे में कीनिया की सरकार से पत्र-व्यवहार किया है ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मन्त्री (श्री राज बहादुर): (क) और (ख). : सरकार को यह सूचित किया गया है कि कीनिया सरकार द्वारा भारतीय फिल्म यूनिट का कीनिया में कुछ दृश्यों का फिल्माने (शूटिंग) के निवेदन दी गई पहली याज्ञा कुछ गलतफहमी के कारण रोक ली गई और बाद में एक और प्रार्थनापत्र मांगा गया । इस बीच, फिल्म यूनिट ने, जिनकी कीनिया में रहने की स्वीकृत अवधि समाप्त हो गई थी, उन दृश्यों को अफ्रीका के एक अन्य देश में फिल्माने (शूटिंग) का फैसला किया ।

(ग) जी, हां ।

Use of Atomic Energy

5675. **Shri Linga Reddy :** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the steps taken to use atomic energy as a substitute for electric and thermal energy where there is scarcity of water in the country;

(b) the schemes proposed to be taken up in the Fourth Five Year Plan in this regard?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi):

(a) Atomic Energy can be used as a substitute for coal or hydro energy for production of electricity. Atomic power stations, like coal-fired stations, however, require water, as atomic power reactors, like boilers in thermal stations, convert water into steam, which drives the turbo-generators. In areas in which fresh water is scarce, but sea water is available, fresh water can be produced as a by-product by desalination in atomic power stations.

The Department of Atomic Energy is setting up two nuclear power stations, in locations remote from cheap coal supplies and where hydro power is not available, namely, one at Tarapur in Maharashtra, with a capacity of 380 MW(e) and another at Rana Pratap Sagar in Rajasthan with a capacity of 200 MW(e). Studies are in progress in the Atomic Energy Establishment, Trombay, on the economics

of the production of fresh water by desalination in atomic power stations.

(b) During the Fourth Plan period, it is tentatively proposed to double the capacity of the station in Rajasthan and to set up an atomic power station of 400 MW(e) at Kalpakkam in Madras. Schemes for the further expansion of the nuclear power programme are under consideration.

Meeting between under-ground Nagas and Chinese Foreign Minister

5676. Shri P. C. Borooah
Shri Hem Barua:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether inquiries about the meeting of an Underground Nagas delegation with the Chinese foreign Minister in Dacca have been completed; and

(b) if so, with what results?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). There is no confirmation available that the Naga rebels met the Chinese Foreign Minister at Dacca.

T.V. Studios

5677. Shri P. C. Borooah: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) the names of the countries which have offered assistance to build television studios in India; and

(b) the nature and details of assistance offered by each country?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Only the Federal Republic of Germany offered assistance to build one television studio in India. A few more countries have also made preliminary enquiries which are exploratory or and commercial in nature.

(b) The Federal Republic of Germany have supplied equipment for one T.V. studio in New Delhi, loaned services of

German technicians and agreed to train Indian Engineers in West Germany.

राजगीर में आकाशवाणी का केन्द्र

5678. श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या राजगीर में आकाशवाणी का एक प्रसारण केन्द्र स्थापित करने की मांग की गई है; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कार्यवाही की गई है ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) जी हां ।

(ख) आकाशवाणी के पटना केन्द्र से जो कार्यक्रम होते हैं वे राजगीर में, जो वहां से केवल 70 किलो मीटर दूर हैं, अच्छी तरह सुने जा सकते हैं । अतः राजगीर में एक प्रलग रेडियो स्टेशन स्थापित करना आवश्यक नहीं है ।

Portuguese Colonies

5679. Shri Madhu Limaye: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the ferment in the Portuguese colonies of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea; and

(b) if so, the assistance which Government is rendering to the freedom movements in these territories?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government of India have always vigorously opposed the colonial policies of Portugal and have constantly pleaded the cause of the people of Portuguese Colonies in the United Nations and in other international forums.

India is a member of the U.N. Special Committee of 24 on Colonialism, which

has done commendable work in bringing to the notice of the world, the atrocities committed by the Portuguese Colonialists on the inhabitants of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea, in contravention of the U.N. Charter and Human Rights. As a result of the efforts of this Committee in which India has played a notable part, the U.N. General Assembly has passed a number of resolutions aimed at securing independence for the Portuguese territories in Africa.

Some scholarships for higher studies in India are being offered each year, to students from Portuguese Colonies and we have also supplied some medicines, first-aid equipment and books etc. for use by the nationalists of these colonies, in exile.

Land Belonging to Muslim Shrines

5680. Shri Daljit Singh: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2507 on the 21st March, 1966 and state:

(a) whether all the land belonging to the Muslim Shrines in Punjab has been taken over by the Wakf Board of India;

(b) whether it is also a fact that neither Wakf Board of Pakistan nor Wakf Board of India pays any amount to S.G.P.C., Amritsar who spends about a lakh of rupees for the management of Gurdwara Nankana Sahib alone; and

(c) if so, whether Government have any proposal under consideration to pay some amount to S.G.P.C., Amritsar out of the income of Wakf Board?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) There is no Wakf Board of India as such but there are State Wakf Boards including one in Punjab established under the Central Wakf Act, 1954. Whether any lands belonging to Muslim Shrines in Punjab have been taken over by the Punjab Wakf Board will be known after the survey of wakf properties, which is now in progress, is completed.

(b) and (c). The Wakf Board of Pakistan has not paid any amount to the

S.G.P.C. in compensation for its properties in West Pakistan.

There is no proposal under consideration of Government to pay any amount to the S.G.P.C.

Reported discourtesy to resident of Israel

5681. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 4338 on the 25th April, 1966 regarding reported discourtesy to President of Israel and state:

(a) whether the case was heard in the last week of April, 1966, as scheduled; and

(b) if so, what stage it has reached?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The case came up for hearing on 10th May, 1966.

(b) The prosecution against the students has been withdrawn and they have been released.

Plant at Katni

5682. Shri Firodia: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a non-ferrous plant is likely to be set up at Katni;

(b) if so, the capacity of the plant and its estimated cost; and

(c) whether any foreign assistance will be utilised?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). A Project involving an estimated outlay of Rs. 340.57 lakhs is being implemented at the Ordnance Factory, Katni. Part of this Project viz. a Plant for Melting and Rolling of brass has already been commissioned. It is not in public interest to disclose the capacity of the Plant.

(c) There is no foreign assistance for this Project.

जवानों के लिये जूतों की खरीद

5683. श्री हुकुम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री श्रीकार लाल बरवा :

क्या प्रतिरक्षा मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि कानपुर के केन्द्रीय आयुध डिपो (सी० प्रो० डी०) के कमांडेंट ने जवानों के लिये 13 हजार जोड़ी जूते किसी भी कीमत पर बाजार से खरीदने के आदेश दिये हैं ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इसके क्या कारण हैं ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री प्र० म० चामस) : (क) तथा (ख) रक्षा सेवाओं के लिए बूटों की आवश्यकताएं डी० जी० एस० ए० डी० द्वारा ठेकों के विरुद्ध व्यापार में सप्लाई और कानपुर की हार्नेस तथा सेडलरी फैक्टरी में निर्माण द्वारा पूर्ण की जाती है। चूंकि साधारण संसाधन से बूट एकलों की समय पर सप्लाई न हो सकी, केन्द्रीय आर्म्मेन्स डिपो कानपुर के कमांडेंट ने 9 और 10 साइज के बूट एकलों के लिए 19.25 रुपये से 19.95 रुपये की विभिन्न दरों पर और 12 और 13 साइज के बूटों के लिए 24.00 रुपये की दर पर 12558 जोड़ों के लिए स्थानीय निविदाएं आमन्त्रित करने के पश्चात् स्थानीय क्रय के लिए फरवरी 1966 में आर्डर दिए थे, कि सेना की संक्रिया के कारण फोरी आवश्यकताएं पूरी की जा सकें। सामूहिक सप्लाई के डी० जी० एस० एण्ड डी० द्वारा तय किए गए ठेकों के तुलनात्मक दर हैं, 9, 10 और 12 साइज के लिए 19.00 रुपये से 20.10 रुपये तक और साइज 13 के लिए 19.10 रुपये। तदपि, सार्ज 12 के 35 जोड़े और साइज 13 के 12 जोड़े स्थानीय निविदाओं द्वारा खरीदे गए थे, और 12511 बूटों की मक्ची शेष राशि साइज 9 और 10 की थी।

~~Deaths~~ due to Explosion of Mines in Khem Karan Area

5684. Shri Gulshan:
Shri P. H. Bheel:
Shri Daljit Singh:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state the number of persons and animals died as a result of explosion of mines laid by the Armed forces on the Indo-Pakistan border after the withdrawal of forces according to Tashkent declaration upto now, especially in Khem Karan area?

The Minister of Defence Production (Shri A. M. Thomas): Five persons have died and 9 were injured in Punjab including 3 and 2 respectively in Amritsar district after the withdrawal of forces due to explosion of mines laid by Pakistanis. A few animals have died similarly; the exact number is not known.

Agreements with Foreign Advertising Agencies

5685. Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have entered into any collaboration agreements with foreign advertising agencies, contrary to its declared policy; and

(b) if so, the names of the foreign agencies and the terms of agreements entered into with them?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Stenographers in Directorate General of Ordnance Factories, Calcutta

5686. Shri R. Barua:
Shri Rishang Keishing:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any representation/complaint from any Member of Parliament during the last four months regarding the service condi-

tions of stenographers working in the Directorate General of Ordnance Factories, Calcutta;

(b) if so, the nature of representation/complaint received; and

(c) the steps taken in this regard?

The Minister of Defence Production (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes.

(b) The letter from a Member of Parliament deals with the promotion of Grade II stenographers of the Directorate General of Ordnance Factories, Calcutta, as Superintendents. It has been stated in the letter that the service conditions of stenographers of D.G.O.F. Headquarters do not compare favourably with those of their compatriots in the Armed Forces Headquarters, that there is a variation in the answer given in Parliament to two Questions on this subject, and that stenographers recommended by two Departmental Promotion Committees for promotion as Superintendents have not actually been so promoted so far.

(c) A reply is being sent to the Members of Parliament, explaining the correct position.

Promotion of Stenographers in Directorate General of Ordnance Factories, Calcutta

5687. Shri R. Barua: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have any proposal to promote Grade II stenographers redesignated as Assistants before the 10th May, 1965 to the posts of Superintendents in the Office of the Directorate General of Ordnance Factories, Calcutta; and

(b) if the reply to part (a) above be in affirmative, the period stipulated for these Stenographers to work as Assistants before they are promoted to the posts of Superintendents?

The Minister of Defence Production (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). 10 Stenographers have been given an opportunity to work as Assistants from December 1964 for a period of two years prior to being considered for promotion as Superintendents in available vacancies.

T.V. Gifts from Germany

5688. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether West Germany has made a gift of tele-cine equipment comprising two 35 mm. projectors, two 16 mm. projectors and two T.V. cameras; and

(b) The tele-cine equipment is being made use of?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The tele-cine equipment is being used for putting out filmed programmes over the TV Station at Delhi.

भारतीय राज्यक्षेत्र का क्षेत्रफल

5689. श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) 15 अगस्त 1947 को भारत का क्षेत्रफल कितना था ;

(ख) अब कितना क्षेत्र भारत सरकार के वास्तविक अधिकार में है; और

(ग) क्या इस सम्बन्ध में शीघ्र ही कोई श्वेतपत्र प्रकाशित करने का विचार है ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) :
(क) से (ग). सूचना इकट्ठी की जा रही है और सदन की मेज पर रख दी जायेगी ।

Handing over of Nagaland to Army

5690. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have been urged upon to hand over Nagaland to the Army; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs
(Shri Swaran Singh): (a) No, Sir

(b) Does not arise.

हिन्दी का प्रयोग

5691. श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री : क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि उनके मन्त्रालय के अधिकारी से, जिसने हिन्दी में एक पुस्तक प्रकाशित करने की अनुमति मांगी थी, उसका अंग्रेजी अनुवाद प्रस्तुत करने के लिये कहा गया था;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि कुछ अधिकारियों को लेखक सहकारी संस्था के सदस्य बनने की अनुमति नहीं दी गई थी क्योंकि वे उस संस्था के नियम आदि अंग्रेजी में नहीं दे सके थे; और

(ग) अधिकारियों के हिन्दी विरोधी रवैये को बदलने के लिये क्या कार्यवाही की जा रही है ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) जी, केवल एक मामले में ।

(ख) सूचना एकत्रित की जा रही है ।

(ग) यह कहना ठीक न होगा कि मन्त्रालय में हिन्दी विरोधी रवैया है ।

प्रकाशवाणी के कर्मचारी

5692. श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री : क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) प्रकाशवाणी समाचार विभाग में सम्पादकीय कार्य करने वाले कुल कितने

व्यक्ति नियमित सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं और प्रतिवर्ष ऐसे कितने कर्मचारियों का नियुक्ति की जाती है ;

(ख) प्रकाशवाणी में दफ्तरों का काम करने वाले कुल कितने व्यक्ति हैं और उन पर प्रति वर्ष कितनी राशि खर्च की जाती है ;

(ग) प्रकाशवाणी में कुल कितने इंजीनियर हैं और उन पर प्रति वर्ष कितनी राशि खर्च की जाती है ;

(घ) प्रकाशवाणी में कुल कितने स्टाफ आर्टिस्ट हैं और उन पर प्रति वर्ष कितना रुपया खर्च हो रहा है ;

(ङ) लम्बी अवधि के अनुबन्ध पर कुल कितने कैंजुअल आर्टिस्ट प्रकाशवाणी में काम कर रहे हैं और उन पर प्रति वर्ष कितना रुपया खर्च हो रहा है ;

(च) क्या स्टाफ आर्टिस्ट और कैंजुअल आर्टिस्ट वर्ग में दफ्तर का काम करने वाले टाइपिस्ट, क्लर्क आदि भी हैं; और

(छ) यदि हां, तो इसके क्या कारण हैं ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) में (छ). सूचना एकत्रित की जा रही है और यथाशीघ्र मदन की मेज पर रख दी जाएगी ।

सैनिक को पेंशन का दिया जाना

5693. श्री हुकूम खन्ड कछवाय : क्या प्रतिरक्षा मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार का ध्यान दिल्ली से प्रकाशित हिन्दी साप्ताहिक "गण्डू हिन" के 25 अप्रैल, 1966 के अंक में छपे इस समाचार की ओर दिया गया है कि दम्बन्दनहर जिले के एक जीवन सैनिक को "विधवा पत्नी" को पेंशन दी जा रही है ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि उक्त सैनिक भ्रपना नाम बदल कर सेना में भर्ती हुआ था; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्त राव चव्हाण) : (क) से (ग). सरकार के सामने ऐसा कोई समाचार नहीं आया, लगाए गए भारों की जांच की जा रही है ।

Assam Train Explosions

5694. **Shri D. C. Sharma:**

Dr. Mahadeva Prasad:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the hostile Nagas has dis-owned responsibility for the Assam Train Explosions and have sent telegrams to the Home Minister and the Prime Minister in this regard; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government of India feel that the Underground leaders should help the Government in bringing the culprits to book in case the inquiries reveal that the acts of sabotage were committed by the Naga hostiles.

The Government have not relaxed in their efforts to trace the culprits and to take other precautionary measures to ensure security and safety in the area.

Canadian Objection to Remarks in Annual Report of External Affairs Ministry

5695. **Shri Sidheshwar Prasad:**

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Canada has strongly objected to some remarks in the recent Annual Report of his Ministry;

(b) if so, what are those remarks; and

(c) the reaction of Government to Canada's objection?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Does not arise.

टेलीविजन उपकरणों की खरीद

5696. **श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :** क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि सरकार का विचार कुछ देशों से टेलीविजन उपकरण खरीदने का है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस प्रयोजन के लिये अनुमानतः कितनी विदेशी मुद्रा की आवश्यकता होगी ;

(ग) क्या इन टेलीविजन उपकरणों का निर्माण भारत में किया जा सकता है ; और

(घ) यदि भाग (ग) का उत्तर नाकारात्मक हो, तो इसके क्या कारण हैं ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) जी, हां । हम बाहर से टेलीविजन के उन यन्त्रों को, जिनकी हमें तुरन्त ही जरूरत है, प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं ।

(ख) से (घ). भारत इलाक्ट्रानिक लिमिटेड ने विदेशी फर्मों/संस्थाओं से टेलीविजन के सप्रेषण (ट्रांसमिट करने वाले) यन्त्रों की सप्लाई तथा उत्तरोत्तर देश में ही इनके तैयार करने के लिए सहयोग करने के प्रस्ताव भ्रामन्त्रित किए हैं । सप्रेषण के यन्त्रों में ये भी शामिल हैं : सप्रेषण यन्त्र (ट्रांसमीटर), स्टूडियो साज-सज्जा, कैमरे तथा इधर-उधर घासानी से लामे ले जाए जाने वाले यन्त्र । कुछ प्रस्ताव मिले हैं और इनका अध्ययन किया जा रहा ।

Shri Mohan Ranade

5697. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:
 Shri Madhu Limaye:
 Shri Bade:
 Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavalya:
 Shri Y. D. Singh:
 Shri Kishen Pattnayak:
 Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
 Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:
 Shri Daji:
 Dr. Ranen Sen:
 Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:
 Shri Hem Barua:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the plight of the Indian national Shri Mohan Ranade arrested in connection with the Goa liberation struggle and who is at present undergoing his life sentence in Portuguese captivity:

(b) whether there are other Indians in Portuguese imprisonment; and

(c) the efforts made by Government to secure their release?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir. The Government of India are fully alive to the difficult situation of Shri Mohan Laxman Ranade who is undergoing imprisonment in Portugal.

(b) Yes, Sir. Besides Shri Ranade, Dr. Talo Mascarenhas, a resident of Goa, is also undergoing imprisonment in Portugal.

(c) Notwithstanding the fact that Dr. Talo Mascarenhas has declared himself as an Indian national, the Portuguese Government have questioned our right to intervene on his behalf, as they continue to regard him as a Portuguese citizen. Efforts are being made to secure his release through the International Red Cross. In the case of Shri Ranade, we engaged a Portuguese lawyer through our Embassy in Mexico to plead his case. However, efforts to secure his release did not succeed and we are, now, trying to obtain his release through a third country and the International Red Cross. So far, our efforts have not borne fruit.

संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को क्षेत्रफल के संबंध में भेजे गये आंकड़े

5697-A. डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :

श्री किशन पटनायक :

श्री मधु लिमये :

क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार कभी-कभी संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को देश के क्षेत्रफल सम्बन्धी आंकड़े भेजा करती है ;

(ख) क्या ये आंकड़े वर्ष 1947 से अब तक कई बार बदल चुके हैं ;

(ग) यदि हां, तो उनका व्योरा क्या है ; और

(घ) इन परिवर्तनों के क्या कारण हैं ?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा धनु शक्ति मंत्री (श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी) : (क) जी हां, केन्द्रीय सांख्यिकीय संगठन 1961 से लेकर अब तक संयुक्त राष्ट्र जनसांख्यिकीय वर्ष बोध हे के लिए संयुक्त राष्ट्र सांख्यिकीय कार्यालय को क्षेत्रफल सम्बन्धी आंकड़े भेजता रहा है ।

(ख) जी हां, इन आंकड़ों में कुछ घन्तर होता रहा है ।

(ग) और (घ). एक विवरण संलग्न है ।

संयुक्त राष्ट्र जनसांख्यिकीय वर्ष बोध के विभिन्न प्रकाशनों के लिए संयुक्त राष्ट्र सांख्यिकीय कार्यालय को केन्द्रीय सांख्यिकीय संगठन द्वारा भेजे गये भारत के क्षेत्रफल सम्बन्धी आंकड़े

वर्ष	क्षेत्रफल (वर्ग किलो मीटर)
1961	2949275
1962	3276395
1963	3276140
1964	3276140
1965	3276443

टिप्पणियां :—

1. 1961 के आंकड़ों में उन क्षेत्रों के आंकड़े सम्मिलित नहीं हैं जिन के बारे में रिपोर्ट भेजते समय 1961 की जनगणना के जनसंख्या सम्बन्धी आंकड़े उपलब्ध नहीं थे।
2. 1962 तथा उसके बाद के वर्षों के आंकड़े पूर्ण क्षेत्रफल के आधार पर दिये गये थे। इन आंकड़ों में जो साधारण अन्तर है उसकी व्याख्या करते हुए महासर्वेक्षक ने बताया है कि यह अन्तर प्रतिवर्ष अधिक बढ़े पैमाने पर संकलित किये गये मानचित्रों के कारण है।

Kidnapping of Two Nurses in Delhi

16971-B. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a military staff car was used on the 2nd May, 1966 or thereabout to kidnap two nurses in Delhi;

(b) if so, the details of the incident; and

(c) the action taken against the culprit or culprits?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) On the night of 2nd May 1966, two military nursing officers who were walking on Maude Road, were offered a lift by a staff car driver. The MNS Officers asked him to drop them in Gopinath Bazar in Delhi Cantt. The driver, however, drove at great speed towards Dhaula Kuan. One of the lady officers jumped out of the car near Railway Colony. She was removed to military hospital by a civilian taxi driver. The other lady officer jumped near President's Body Guard Ranges. She was removed to Willingdon Hospital by some one in an unconscious state.

(c) The Staff Car driver has been immediately put under close arrest by the military authorities and a summary of evidence is being taken with a view to trying him by Court Martial.

13.25 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FERTILISER PLANT AT MADRAS

Shri P. C. Borooah (Sibsagar): I call the attention of the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"Establishment of a Fertiliser Plant at Madras".

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): Let that statement be laid on the Table of the House.

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Alagesan): I place it on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6345/66].

Mr. Speaker: Is it a long one?

Shri Alagesan: Four and a half pages.

Mr. Speaker: Members must have got the copies of this. He might put the question.

Shri P. C. Borooah: The statement makes no mention about the percentage of profits stipulated to be repatriated by the American company. May I know the estimated amount of foreign exchange to be repatriated thus and how it will compare with the saving of foreign exchange because of consequent elimination of imports of fertilisers?

Shri Alagesan: The capital cost of the project is estimated at Rs. 28.75 crores. The products that will be produced here will be urea, 850 tons per day.

Shri P. C. Borooah: That is not my question. It is about the profits to be repatriated by the American company.

Shri Alagesan: Even if 20 per cent of the profit is repatriated, it will not come to more than a crore of rupees.

Shri P. C. Borooah: How will it compare with the foreign exchange that will be saved by elimination of imports? That is the second part of my question.

Mr. Speaker: No second question.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना): क्या यह सही है कि हमारे योजना मन्त्री इसकी शरायत से सहमत नहीं हैं और वह यह कह रहे हैं कि शरायत दुबारा लिखी जायें ?

Shri Alagesan: No. Sir.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I refer to page 2 of the statement where it says:

"The main features of the Agreement are: The Government of India will hold 51 per cent of equity and Amoco the remaining 40 per cent."

On the other hand, page 3 says:

"The Managing Director, who will function under the control of the Board, would be a nominee of the American Company."

Not talking of our Indian economy, even the commercial practice is that the party which is having a minority share does not have a managing director. So, I want to know the circumstances under which the managing director's post has been given to this American company and not to an Indian.

Shri Alagesan: This is not the first time. In industries where we have to acquire the knowhow and where sufficient amount of foreign loans are raised and where foreign participation has been taken, in order to see that the plant is constructed efficiently in record time and also started up properly and goes into production we have made this arrangement that the managing director will be a nominee of the foreign participant.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalpuzha): Where is the precedent? You said this is not the first time.

Shri Alagesan: I may inform the House that in the case of Cochin Refinery, the managing director will be appointed for ten years by the American partner, whose equity shareholding is much less than the shareholding of the American company in this case.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My question was.....

Mr. Speaker: He has answered it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He says there are precedents. I want to know, before this is there any precedent in this country where a foreign collaborator has been given the post of managing director.

Shri Alagesan: I quoted the case of Cochin Refinery.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर): प्राप्ते मुझे वापिस प्राप्ते की इजाजत दी, इसके लिए मैं प्राप्ते को धन्यवाद देता...

अध्यक्ष महोदय: हाउस ने दी है, मैंने नहीं दी।

श्री मधु लिमये: मेरा मतलब यह है कि यह जो समझौता हुआ है यह बहुत अच्छा है और सारे तथ्यों को इन्होंने प्राप्ते निवेदन में नहीं लाया है। हमल में हममें व्यवस्था है कि एक निदेशक मण्डल रहेगा, बोर्ड प्राफ डायरेक्टर्स और कार्य समिति रहेगी, एग्जिक्यूटिव कमेटी। अगर प्राप्ते देखेंगे तो प्राप्ते को मानस होगा कि सारे अधिकार हम कार्य समिति को, एग्जिक्यूटिव कमेटी को दिये गये हैं और उनके जो अध्यक्ष हैं यह हमारी कम्पनी के द्वारा नियुक्त किये जायेंगे, मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर उनके प्रमुख हैं, वेयरमेन हैं। मैं जानता चाहता हूँ कि क्या इसका विवरण सभा के सामने रखा जाएगा और हम बात की प्राप्ते सफाई देंगे।

कि क्यों मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर हिंदुस्तान की सरकार की ओर से नियुक्त नहीं किया जाएगा और चयरमैन आफ दी बोर्ड आफ डायरेक्टर्स अमरीकी कम्पनी के जरिये ? इस तरह उलटा क्यों नहीं किया उन्होंने ?

Shri Alagesan: I have placed copies of the agreement in the Library for reference by hon. Members of the House.

श्री मधु लिमये : आपने बयान में तो यह नहीं दिया है ।

Shri Alagesan: The Chairman will be a nominee of the Government. Only the Managing Director will be a nominee of the American partners. Now there is an Executive Committee, and that Executive Committee is expected to take decisions almost unanimously. Wherever decisions are taken by the exercise of the casting vote of the Managing Director, all these decisions can be reserved for review by the Board.

श्री मधु लिमये : व्यवहार में सारे अधिकार अमरीकी मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर के हाथ में रहेंगे ।

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrack-pore): If one reads this statement very carefully one will find that almost all the most important technical and operational activities of this complex will have to be decided, in the case of any differences, by a three fourth majority. I shall point out to you, for instance, that the sales policy, fixation of prices, recommendation with regard to the declaration of dividends, etc. will have to be decided by a three-fourths majority, in other words, by the unanimous vote of the board. This is on page 2. Again on page 3, you see "What ever decisions are taken by the managing director by exercising his casting vote in this committee can be reviewed by the board and altered by a three-fourths majority." The Board further has powers to modify or withdraw the power or the authority of the managing director by a three-fourths majority. The Government of India has not got the three-fourths majority at all in the Board; it is 50:50.

with the one casting vote of the chairman to be nominated by the Government of India. I could have pointed many other things, technical as well as operational, over which the managing director has full power. In all these matters it is necessary to have three-fourths majority which we cannot get in case there is a deadlock. Then there is by a simple majority the right to refer it to a summit body, comprised of one member of the American company and the Chairman of the board. In that case, it will be 50:50 division. If there is a deadlock one does not know what will happen. I would like to know whether the Government considers these wide concession right or not. What has been stated by Mr. George B Hargens, Vice president of the American company is that the US firm has every right to block all decisions. In view of this, does he think that the country is to benefit by this agreement. I would like to know whether when he assures us that in future agreements he will try to improve upon this, will he keep this as a base? I would like to know if the Madras fertiliser agreement is going to be the pattern.

Shri Alagesan: The hon. Member has read out certain portions only. I take it that she has read the other portions as well. Two parties do not come together to have a deadlock and to be always quarelling. I have stated in the same statement:—

"Apart from the safeguards and provisions made in the interest of both parties in the Agreement. I believe that as practical men who are more interested in seeing the job through than insisting on their respective rights, both the representatives of Government and AMOCO will bring to bear upon the job on hand the fullest measure of mutual understanding, co-operation and spirit of give-and-take so that the plant is established in record time and produces the much needed half-a-million tonnes or so of fertilizers for the benefit of increased food production."

That is part of my statement.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: May I ask one more question?

Mr. Speaker: I would not allow that would be a departure from the normal procedure. But her question: Is that going to be a pattern, that question has not been answered.

Shri Alagesan: In fact, I shall draw the attention of the hon. Members to the last sentence of my statement.

"I may also assure the House that in future we will even try to improve upon this and secure even larger benefits for the country."

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What improvements?

Shri Alagesan: I had in mind the Haldia project where we propose to set up a refinery as well as a fertiliser plant and there we certainly propose to make improvements over this.

Mr. Speaker: Papers to be laid.....
(Interruptions).

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: The crucial question is whether this will be the basis, whether this will be the basic pattern on which he thinks he can improve.

Mr. Speaker: He will improve on it. That is what he says.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: The point is whether he thinks that this itself is a very good thing. I want to know this.

Mr. Speaker: Papers to be laid.....
(Interruptions).

13.35 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HEAVY ENGINEERING CORPORATION LIMITED, RANCHI, FOR 1964-65

The Minister of Industry (Shri D. Sanjivayya): I beg to lay on the Table—

(i) A copy of the Annual Report of the Heavy Engineering Corporation Limited, Ranchi, for the year 1964-65 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956.

707 (aj) LS—5

(ii) Review by the Government on the working of the above Company.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6346/66].

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BROADCASTING AND INFORMATION MEDIA ON RADIO AND TELEVISION

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): I beg to lay on the Table, a copy of the Report of the Committee on Broadcasting and Information Media on Radio and Television.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6347/66].

STATEMENT SHOWING ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON ASSURANCES ETC.

The Minister of State in the Department of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Jaganatha Rao): I beg to on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given by the Ministers during the various sessions of Third Lok Sabha:—

(i) Supplementary Statement No. II
Fourteenth Session, 1966.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6348/66].

(ii) Supplementary Statement No. IV
Thirteenth Session, 1965.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6349/66].

(iii) Supplementary Statement No. VII
Twelfth Session, 1965.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6350/66].

(iv) Supplementary Statement No. XI
Eleventh Session, 1965.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6351/66].

(v) Supplementary Statement No. XIV
Tenth Session, 1964.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6252/66].

(vi) Supplementary Statement No. XIX
Sixth Session, 1963.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-
6348/66].

Mr. Speaker: Shri Kamath.....
(Interruptions).

13.36 hrs.

RE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT
QUERY

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा भारत के सम्बन्ध में एक
कामरोको प्रस्ताव है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपका जो कामरोको
प्रस्ताव था उसे मैंने नामंजूर कर दिया है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं उस पर
व्यवस्था उठाना चाहता हूँ और आपका ध्यान
संविधान की धारा 1 के ऊपर दिलाता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने एक कामरोको
प्रस्ताव दिया। उस पर मैंने फैसला दिया।
अब आप उस पर व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना
चाहते हैं। यह कैसे हो सकता है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इसलिये कि
भारत ही खत्म हो रहा है। उसका क्षेत्रफल
कम हो रहा है। शायद आपने देखा नहीं है
मेरे कामरोको प्रस्ताव को। भारत क्या है।
घाज बही खत्म हो रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मुझे लिख
दीजिये जो आप को कहना है। मैं उसको
देख लूंगा।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब सिर्फ
कल का दिन रह गया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं उसे घाज देख लूंगा।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष
महोदय, आप जरा यह सोच लीजिये...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप मुझे घाजे चलने
दीजिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं चलने
देता हूँ, लेकिन आप देख लीजिये। शायद
आपके ध्यान में यह होगा कि परसों श्री गुल-
जारी लाल नन्दा ने यहां तक कह दिया कि
भारत का क्षेत्रफल संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की
किताबों के अनुसार क्या है इससे उनको
मतलब नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह कब हुआ है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह परसों
हुआ है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : परसों क्या हुआ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : परसों मैंने
संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की किताबों से कुछ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की
किताबों को आपने अब देखा। यह किताबें कब
छपीं थीं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं क्या
करूँ जब मुझे परसों पता चला।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इतने दिन बाद आप
उठाना चाहते हैं...

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरे इल्म
में जब बात घाई है तभी तो उठा सकता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यहां पर आप के इल्म
में घाने का सवाल नहीं है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं आप से
अनुमति करता हूँ कि आप बिल्कुल ठंडे दिमाग
से मेरी बात सुनें। यह भारत के क्षेत्रफल का
सवाल है...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कहता हूँ कि भारत के
क्षेत्रफल का सवाल हो या कुछ और हो, जो
नियम हैं मैं उनसे बाहर नहीं जा सकता।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : नियम यह है
कि जब मुझे कोई चीज मालूम हो...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं यह बात नहीं है । किताब छपी 1964 में । 1964 के जो नक्शे हैं उन में इस किताब में दिखाया गया है कि भारत का क्षेत्रफल कम है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जब मुझे मालूम हुआ . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जब आप को मालूम हो इसका सवाल नहीं है . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरी बात मान लीजिये । भारत खत्म होता जा रहा है है और यह परसों का मामला है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डाक्टर साहब आप मेरी बात मानिये । इस को हम इस तरह से नहीं ले सकते । मैंने आप से कह दिया ।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने विशेषाधिकार के बारे में जो दफे लिखा है । हमारे योजना मन्त्री ने यहां जो कहा . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह से नहीं ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं एक मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं ।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : भारत के क्षेत्रफल के बारे में मेरा श्री कामरोको प्रस्ताव था । मुझे उसके बारे में कहना है । न तो मुझे इत्तला दी गई, न मुझे उसके बारे में कुछ मालूम हुआ । पहले तो मुझे इस बात पर आपत्ति है कि मुझे मेरे कामरोको प्रस्ताव के ऊपर इत्तला नहीं दी गई, दूसरे इस पर कि मेरा जो कामरोको प्रस्ताव भारत के क्षेत्रफल के बारे में है वह मैं समझता हूँ कि नियम के अनुसार है । वह ठीक है और उसे लिया जाना चाहिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या हर एक मेम्बर ठीक होने के बारे में समझेंगे, चाहे मैं ठीक न समझूँ ।

श्री बागड़ी : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कायदे के मुताबिक . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कायदे के मुताबिक वह ठीक नहीं है ।

श्री बागड़ी : आप पहले मेरी बात सुन लीजिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, मैं इस तरह से नहीं सुन सकता ।

श्री बागड़ी : फिर कैसे सुन सकेंगे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बोलते बोलते जायेंगे तो क्या मेरे लिये यह लाजिम हो जाता है कि आप की बात को सुनूँ ।

श्री बागड़ी : लाजिम तो नहीं है लेकिन यह घर की छेती नहीं है, बाहर यह लोक-सभा है किस वास्ते । अगर भारत की सीमाओं . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य काम नहीं करने दे रहे हैं । अभी हाउस मूस से कह रहा था कि मैंने तेजी में फैमला किया । मैं इतनी दफे कह चुका हूँ लेकिन कोई सुनता नहीं है । ऐसी हालत में मेरे लिये चारा क्या रह जाता है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप इस कामरोको प्रस्ताव पर पुनर्विचार कर सकते हैं । मैं एक ही बात के ऊपर ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ । बेल्वाड़ी केस में सुप्रीम कोर्ट का फैसला है, आप उसे देखिये . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब क्या मेम्बर साहबान कोई काम नहीं होने देंगे । मैं पसला जानता हूँ ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं प्रदब हो, धर्ज करना चाहता हूँ . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सिर्फ इतना कह देने से कि मैं भ्रम से भ्रज करना चाहता हूँ क्यों भ्रान्त्वकान पदा नहीं होता, हाउस के काम में रुकावट नहीं आती।

श्री बागड़ी : अगर हम यहां भारतीय सीमाओं की बात नहीं कर सकते तो क्या यह लोक सभा रह जायेगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह से नहीं कर सकते।

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप को सूचित करना चाहता हूँ कि होम मिनिस्टर ने वादा किया था कि जो सीमा का प्रश्न है उस पर एक अलाहदा जवाब देंगे विचार कर के। मेरा यह कहना है कि पहले उनका जवाब सुन लिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह स्टेटमेंट तो वह कर रहे हैं। इस वक्त सवाल यह है कि आया यह ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन या सकता है या नहीं। स्टेटमेंट तो वह आ रहा है।

श्री त्यागी : इसीलिये मैं कह रहा हूँ कि पहले उसे सुन लिया जाये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सिर्फ एक दिन रह गया है इस सत्र के लिये। क्या भारत के संविधान की पहली धारा को खत्म करने के लिये कार्रवाई करनी पड़ेगी जिसमें साफ लिखा है कि भारत है क्या। भारत है राज्य, भारत है दिल्ली के मातहत जो इलाके बंधे हुए हैं...

श्री त्यागी : पहले मिनिस्टर का जवाब तो सुन लो।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जवाब आया नहीं। आज आ जाता तो कामरोको प्रस्ताव भी आ सकता था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या तीन चार मेम्बर इस तरह से एक बारगी खड़े हो जायेंगे और

मुझे कोई कार्रवाई नहीं करने देंगे और यहां का काम नहीं चलने देंगे।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब आप हमारे पर अपनी कोप दृष्टि इतनी न रखिए।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब देखिए, एक बैठे, दूसरे खड़े हो गए। वह बैठे तो दूसरे खड़े हो जायेंगे। यही चलता रहेगा और फिर जब मैं कोई कार्यवाही करूंगा तो कहेंगे... (अवधान)

13.14 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE—contd.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, permit me to invite your attention and the attention of the House to the very useful and interesting report that has been presented to the House on the 3rd May by the Committee on Government Assurances. This is the last instalment of statements laid by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on the Table with regard to this matter during this session. It is a very disturbing document that has been laid—

Mr. Speaker: He cannot discuss it now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It has relation to what has been laid today.

Mr. Speaker: It has been laid today, but now it cannot be discussed.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am not discussing what has been laid on the Table today, but I want to invite your attention to what has been laid on the Table on the 3rd May, more than a week ago and it has relevance to what has been laid today.

Now, while I do not go into the detailed figures, I wish to point out that very disturbing statements have been made

by the Committee on Government Assurances, and I am afraid that a major crisis is brewing—redolent, though in another context, of the constitutional conflict that has arisen between the two Houses of Parliament with regard to an other matter—a crisis which, unless you and the House effectively intervene, will result in an erosion of powers of Parliament and the Minister will, I am afraid, get away with, shall I say, a feather in his cap, and cocking a snook at the House.

May I invite your attention to the report of the Committee presided over by Shri Siddananjappa? I am glad that the Committee has re-inforced what has been said in this House during the last so many occasions....

Mr. Speaker: Briefly.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Very briefly, but you have been permitting very long statements to be made. This is a very relevant issue relating to the relation between Government and Parliament, a very major issue, at stake, and we must see to it that it is resolved in the interests of the supremacy of Parliament.

The Committee says:

"A statement showing the statistics regarding the implementation of the assurances pertaining to the Second and the Third Lok Sabha as on the 10th December, 1965 and also showing the up-to-date position is appended to the Report.....".

Then, it points out as follows:

"...It would be observed that 24.8 per cent assurances were implemented within two months, 43.9 per cent in two to six months, 20.3 per cent in six months to one year, 6.6 per cent in one year to one and a half years and the remaining 4.4 per cent in more than one and a half years."

The Committee is rather kind to have said only "more than one and a half years". It did not say whether it is two years or three years and so on.

But the more serious matter comes next; it will take away the rights of Parliament unless this tendency on the part of the Government is nipped in the bud. Here is what the Committee says. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is there, a senior Minister. The Committee says that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has "raised an objection to the Committee addressing the various Ministries and the departments of the Government of India direct for eliciting further information about the progress made in the implementation of the pending assurances under the directions given by the Speaker on the floor of the House or the Committee themselves." The Committee, commenting on this, rightly says:

"The Committee at their sitting held on the 11th March, 1966, felt that the action taken by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs in addressing the Ministries not to furnish information....

Look at the extent to which the executive, the Government, has gone; the executive is becoming very audacious and supercilious, to say the least—

"...direct to the Lok Sabha Secretariat contravened the provisions of Rules 270 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha....".

Now, what does rule 270 say? Rule 270 says:

"A Committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records:"

But the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs takes it into his head to write to the Ministries and the departments of the Government of India asking them not to furnish information direct to the Lok Sabha Secretariat. The Committee goes on to say:

"...inasmuch as the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs had asked the Ministries not to furnish any information to the Committee direct but to channelise it through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs."

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

The crowning disgrace is to come yet. The Committee says:

"The Committee also called for the letter addressed by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to the various Ministries referred to above...."

They would like to have this letter, because, under rule 270.... :

Mr. Speaker: Yes; I follow him.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Committee concludes:—Look at the pathetic, rather the bathetic statement by the Committee and the impotence the Parliamentary Committee has been reduced to, under your aegis—

"The Committee regret that it has not been furnished to them till the time they approved this Report."

This was on the 3rd May. They asked the Minister to furnish the letter on the 11th March, and nothing has happened till the 3rd May!

Now, I ask you, in all seriousness, is it the intension of the executive, of the Government....

An hon. Member: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Yes; but he represents the Government—to make the Parliamentary Committee set up under your aegis almost defunct? Is it not in the interests of parliamentary democracy to see to it that a Committee of Parliament retains the supreme powers of Parliament in the set-up that we are functioning? It is up to you, Sir, ensconced in that high Chair, to ensure that the powers, the rights, of this House are kept intact and are not eroded and that the Parliamentary Committee on Government Assurances functions as it ought to, and as you have directed it to function—and the rules permit it—as a full-fledged Parliamentary Committee. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs ought to be brought to book on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: I have had a discussion with the Minister.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What will he say to this? These are categorical statements made in the report.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha**): Shri Kamath has gone so eloquent and has been quoting....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I was only quoting from that document, the report of the Committee.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: That is one side of the thing. I request that the correspondence which has passed between you and me and my department and this Committee should be placed on the Table of the House, and let the House judge, and after that, we are prepared to discuss this matter. One should hear the other side of the picture also, and then let us see. We will agree to what you say, but let us first hear the other side also. The entire correspondence will be placed on the Table of the House for the information of hon. Members.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Sir, if the Minister chooses to place the papers on the Table of the House, one can certainly go into them, but it is a pity and a trifle humiliating also, if, when repeatedly we have seen this matter of Government assurances being made on the floor of the House and they are meant to be implemented, for some reason or other, it cannot be implemented within a reasonable period of time, then, it is for the Government to come and tell the House that it could not be implemented. We have got a Committee so that this matter might be proceeded with, with economy as regards the time of the House. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: It was no disrespect. No disrespect was meant to the Committee or to anybody. Probably, the Minister from the words that have been read, only meant that he was carrying on the correspondence with them, and therefore, he has said that he only meant that that might be done, so that he might get himself posted with what is being done.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: If Shri Kamath goes to your Chamber, I will also be there, and we shall all discuss it. (Interruptions).

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): If the Committee is not given full information and co-operation from the department, then how could the Committee function? This House appoints a Committee to look into the matters.

NOTIFICATION UNDER EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND ACT, 1952 AND COAL MINES PROVIDENT FUND AND BONUS SCHEMES ACT, 1948.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) A copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (2) of section 7 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952:

- (i) The Employees' Provident Funds (Second Amendment) Scheme, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 349 in Gazette of India dated the 12th March, 1966.
- (ii) The Employees' Provident Funds (Third Amendment) Scheme, 1966, published in Notification No. G. S. R. 349 in Gazette of India dated the 12th March, 1966.
- (iii) The Employees' Provident Funds (Fourth Amendment) Scheme, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 350 in Gazette of India dated the 12th March, 1966.
- (iv) The Employees' Provident Funds (Fifth Amendment) Scheme, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 351 in Gazette of India dated the 12th March, 1966.
- (v) The Employees' Provident Funds (Sixth Amendment) Scheme, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 352 in Gazette of India dated the 12th March, 1966.

(vi) The Employees' Provident Funds (Seventh Amendment) Scheme, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 412 in Gazette of India dated the 19th March, 1966.

(vii) The Employees' Provident Funds (Eight Amendment) Scheme, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 413 in Gazette of India dated the 19th March, 1966.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6354/66]

(2) A copy each of the following Notifications under Section 7A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Bonus Schemes Act, 1948.

- (i) The Andhra Pradesh Coal Mines Provident Fund (First Amendment) Scheme, 1966 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 490 in Gazette of India dated the 1st April, 1966.
- (ii) The Rajasthan Coal Mines Provident Fund (First Amendment) Scheme, 1966 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 491 in Gazette of India dated the 1st April, 1966.
- (iii) The Coal Mines Provident Fund (First Amendment) Scheme, 1966 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 492 in Gazette of India dated the 1st April, 1966.
- (iv) The Coal Mines Bonus (First Amendment) Scheme, 1966 published in Notification No. G. S. R. 517 in Gazette of India dated the 9th April, 1966.
- (v) The Andhra Pradesh Coal Mines Bonus (First Amendment) Scheme, 1966 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 518 in Gazette of India dated the 9th April, 1966.
- (vi) The Rajasthan Coal Mines Bonus (First Amendment) Scheme, 1966 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 519 in Gazette of India dated the 9th April, 1966.
- (vii) The Assam Coal Mines Bonus (First Amendment) Scheme, 1966 published in Notification

[Shri Shah Nawaz Khan]

No. G.S.R. 520 in Gazette of India dated the 9th April, 1966.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6355/66].

13.49 hrs.

RULES COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga): I beg to lay on the Table the Minutes of the sittings of the Rules Committee held on the 26th April and 11th May, 1966.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Will this be circulated, because of the discussion shortly coming up on the Rules Committee?

Will it be circulated tonight?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

13.49½ hrs.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

Shri D. D. Mantri (Bihar): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Minutes of evidence given before the Sub-Committee on Defence of the Estimates Committee and Minutes of the sittings of the Estimates Committee relating to Ninety-fourth and Ninety-fifth Reports on Ministry of Defence (Defence Research and Development Organisation)—Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory, Electronics and Radar Development Establishment and Defence Electronics Research Laboratory.

13.50 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF MEMBERS FROM THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

MINUTES

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): I beg to lay on the Table the Minutes of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Sittings of the Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House held during the current session.

13.50 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Kerala Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1966, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th May, 1966, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

13.51 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF MEMBERS

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: The Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House in their Seventeenth Report have recommended that leave of absence be granted to the following members for the periods indicated against each:

- (1) Shri Kolla Venkaiah—14th April to 28th April, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (2) Shri A. K. Gopalan—26th March to 27th April, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (3) Shri Dasaratha Deb—7th March to 4th May, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (4) Shri Ghyasuddin Ahmed—7th March to 4th May, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (5) Shri Biren Dutta—7th March to 31st March, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (6) Shri Laxmi Dass—7th March to 29th March, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).

- (7) Shri Ananda Nambiar—7th March to 30th April, 1966 (Fourteenth Session)
- (8) Syed Baddrudduja—16th February to 4th March, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (9) Shri Madala Narayana Swamy—14th April to 28th April, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (10) Dr. B. N. Singh—16th April to 17th May, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (11) Shri R. Umanath—14th April to 2nd May, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (12) Shri A. Jayaraman—14th February to 13th April, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (13) H. H. Maharani Vijaya Raje Scindia of Gwalior—1st April to 28th April, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (14) Raja P. C. Deo Bhanj—8th March to 5th April, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (15) Shri T. Abdul Wahid—12th March to 22nd April, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).
- (16) Shri Vijya Bhushan Singh Deo—28th February to 27th April, 1966 (Fourteenth Session).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Can it be held over till tomorrow till we have got the paper mentioned in item 9? We have not seen it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): I have seen it. I find that our two colleagues, Shri Dasaratha Deb and Shri Biren Dutta, Members from Tripura, have

been given 59 days leave. In the other House, the Home Minister made a categorical statement that all of the detainees are going to be released, who have been detained under the DIR. I would urge that it is very important that this House also exerts its influence in seeing that the Home Minister releases Shri Dasaratha Deb and Shri Biren Dutta also. I would request this House to look into this matter before agreeing to this.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): Only this morning I had occasion to meet you and the Leader of the House in your chamber. I requested the Leader of the House to see that these 2 Members are released. This practice of granting leave for 59 days has been going on for the last 16 months. I was also one of those who got leave like this. It is now too late in the day to continue it any longer. I request that the House should exert its influence to see that these two Members are released, so that they may be made available to the House as early as possible.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): When you read out that telegram the other day, Sir, we wanted to raise the issue about Shri Dasaratha Deb and Shri Biren Dutta. You said it can be raised on some other occasion. I submit that firstly this leave of absence is a compulsory one. He is not taking leave willingly; he is not sick or anything like that. He is compelled to take leave. Tomorrow is the last day. No other hon. member of this House is under detention now. These are the two unfortunate or fortunate Members of Parliament who are still being detained. My information is, the Tripura Government has decided not to release them till the next general election. That is why I request the Home Minister to make a statement announcing their release tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The Committee has only to recommend whether leave is to be granted or not. It is for the House to grant or refuse it. This is the only thing at this moment. Extraneous matters are referred to now. Is this the occasion when it is to be decided whether they are to be released or not? They put in an applica-

[Mr. Speaker]

tion; that is considered by the committee and a recommendation is made. That is all that we have to see. There is nothing else that can be discussed at this moment.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I request you to hold it over till tomorrow after we have received the paper mentioned in item 9?

Mr. Speaker: No; I am not holding it over.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I hope those Members who are reported to be ill are receiving competent medical treatment. It is rather anomalous that when all the Members of Parliament have been released, only these two should continue under detention. The hon. member mentioned in No. 16 has sought long leave for domestic reasons. I hope there is nothing serious and he will be back in the House very soon.

Mr. Speaker: The time of the House should not be taken on these things. I would request the hon. member kindly to abstain from this. If somebody is anxious to enquire about the health of another Member, he can....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This is very unfair. You have ruled before in this House that it concerns the whole House.

Mr. Speaker: I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Several hon. Members: Yes.

The Members will be informed accordingly.

13.54 hrs.

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

SEVENTH REPORT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga): I beg to present the Seventh Report of the Committee of Privileges.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): I had given a notice under Rule 377....

Mr. Speaker: When it comes up for discussion, he will have an opportunity.

Shri Kapur Singh: On the previous occasion, you had allowed me briefly to make a statement. It is very germane that the statement should be made now. This report is not coming up for discussion tomorrow. It is the other report which is coming up for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: I did not say this is coming up for discussion tomorrow.

Shri Kapur Singh: Certain portions have been suppressed and I want the House to know under what circumstances they have been suppressed.

Mr. Speaker: This is not the opportunity.

Shri Kapur Singh: There is a precedent. On a previous occasion, you allowed me to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker: He would appreciate that even at that time objection was taken by many Members that that opportunity had been afforded to him.

Shri Kapur Singh: In defiance of our Rules of Procedure, a report is being presented to the House. It is not in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker: There are other methods and modes under which this can be attacked. He must give notice....

Shri Kapur Singh: I had given notice under Rule 377. I want to pass on very vital information to the House.

Mr. Speaker: This is not the opportunity.

13.56 hrs.

RE: BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister will be making a statement at 3 P.M. today on her visit to Orissa.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I have a suggestion to put before the House through you. The difficulty is every day because of some unforeseen things—you are helpless and we all are helpless—the schedule is not adhered to. Our difficulty is this. We had thought

that the Constitution (Amendment) Bill will be taken up today because a particular voting is required for that and hon. Members have all been requested to be here in the House so far as this side is concerned. That side also they must have done so. A large number of Members have been informed that way. I suggest that we can take up the Constitution (Amendment) Bill first—it is only for two hours—and after finishing it, we can take up the Delhi Administration Bill.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad) : While I have no objection to the change suggested, I would only request that as a natural consequence, amendments to the Constitution (Amendment) Bill should be allowed to be moved straightway without notice, because we had not come prepared for that Bill today.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore) : I hope the discussion on Mr. Asoke Mehta's statement will not be pushed out.

Mr. Speaker: We are trying. . . .

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: If not today, it should be taken up tomorrow and it should not be pushed out.

श्री मधु लिखवे : (मुंगेर) : उनका जो सुझाव है कि पहले कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल को रक्खा जाय वह तो ठीक है लेकिन मैं इतना जानना चाहता हूँ कि नन्दा साहब का जो स्टेटमेंट होने वाला है और त्यागी जी ने जिसका जिक्र किया वह ग्राज होगा या कल होगा और अगर कल होगा तो कब होगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कन् करेंगे ।

13.59 hrs.

CORRECTING ANSWER TO S.Q.
NO. 94 RE. NAGAS INFILTRATION
INTO BURMA

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): I would like to make a statement....

Mr. Speaker: He can lay it on the Table.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad) : We have got copies.

Shri A. M. Thomas: It is only a few lines and I shall read it.

Sir, in the main Answer given to Starred Question No. 94 on the 21st February 1966, it was stated that a gang of Naga hostiles, estimated at 1000 to 1500 entered Burmese territory on the 29th December, 1965. The fact is that the date on which the gang of Naga hostiles entered Burmese territory was 29th November, 1965.

14 hrs.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kunpur): Sir, the original answer was that a gang of Naga hostiles, estimated at 1000 to 1500 entered Burmese territory on the 29th December, 1965. The fact is that the date on which the gang of Naga hostiles entered Burmese territory was 29th November, 1965. There is a difference of one month between the date given in the original answer and the date now given. I want to know whether the information given in the original answer was actually supplied wrongly or whether it has been corrected now, because there is a difference of one month in the date pertaining to such an important matter.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Sir, even when the original answer was given our information was that they entered on 29th November 1965. But this mistake took place due to a clerical error—it was typed wrongly.

14.01 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: EXPLOSION IN
BHUSAVAL DOWN GOODS YARD

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement clarifying certain points raised in the House on the 6th May, 1966, when the hon. Member, Shri A. P. Sharma stated that 11 days were taken by the Railways to go from Pathankot to Bhusaval, which was incorrect.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT.6358/66].

14:02 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: DELAY IN PLACING THE KERALA MONEYLENDERS' RULES 1964 ON THE TABLE

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Sir, the other day, the hon. Member, Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath, wanted to know the reasons for delay which has occurred in the Kerala Moneylenders' Rules, 1964 being placed on the Table of the House of the Lok Sabha. I tried to get the information. The Rules were notified on 31st March, 1964 and were required to be placed on the Table of the State Legislature. This was not done by the State Government while the Legislature was in session. The precise reasons for this are not known to the Central Government. A reference from the State Government was received in May 1965 more than one year after the date on which the notification was issued. In view of the time which had elapsed, by the time when the reference from the State Government was received and in view of the fact that other connected proposals for legislation relating to chit funds in Kerala were under consideration (while the question of making it clear that financial institutions should be excluded from the Acts and Rules relating to money-lending was also under consideration), the Rules had to be examined, so that modifications, if any, could be made, before they were placed on the Table of the House. Ultimately, however, it appears that no modifications were necessary or worthwhile and the Rules were laid on the Table of the House, as they were notified.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, it is good that I raised this point the other day because now we find that it throws a lurid light on the inefficient manner the Government is functioning or the State Government is functioning. Now, after the promulgation of the Emergency by the President, and President's rule in Kerala, the Centre is directly responsible for the good government of Kerala, for the administration in Kerala, and is it not Government's duty to find

out why it was that though it was notified on the 21st of March or so, till the end of September, 1964, when the Government resigned, it was not laid on the Table of the House? He says the reasons are not known, the reasons are obscure. Is the Government helpless in the matter and it cannot do anything at all?

May I also, Sir, in view of the accumulating business, invoke your powers under Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure and see that the business before the House is finished somehow. It says that the Speaker shall determine the time when a sitting of the House shall be adjourned *sine die*.

Mr. Speaker: The House has taken a decision on that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The House can revise its decision if it wants to finish the business.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): Sir, let me understand the order in which the business is going to be taken up today. I presume that we are going to take up the Constitution (Nineteenth Amendment) Bill first. This has been allotted two hours. That means, after we have proceeded with this Bill for one hour, the Prime Minister will intervene to make her statement at 3.00, and then after that we will again continue with this Bill. That means this Bill will go up to 4.00 and then we will take up the Delhi Administration Bill.

Mr. Speaker: That is right.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Then what about the Merchant Shipping Bill.

Mr. Speaker: That will come up tomorrow.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: That will mean that the Discussion under Rule 193 will go out. I would beg of you to specify as you have done on earlier occasions, that this discussion under Rule 193 will be taken up at 3.00 or 4.00 tomorrow.

Shri Namblar (Tiruchirapalli): Otherwise it will be elbowed out.

Mr. Speaker: We will see.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am sorry. Sir, the Minister has disappeared. It is very bad. I raised a point. I wanted to know whether the Government is helpless in the matter. Who is to answer that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member asked him to find out why this delay has occurred. Certainly he will find out.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He should have said so. It should go on record that he is going to find that out.

Mr. Speaker: He will find out.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Without your permission, Sir, he has decamped.

14.05 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (NINETEENTH AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathl): Sir, on behalf of Shri G. L. Nanda I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

Sir, this is a small Bill which purports to amend the Constitution of India. Article 3 of the Constitution reads as under:

"Parliament may by law—

- (a) form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States or by uniting any territory to a part of any State;
- (b) increase the area of any State;
- (c) diminish the area of any State;
- (d) alter the boundaries of any State;
- (e) alter the name of any State."

Now, Sir, under this article 3 which provides for the formation of new States, alteration of areas and boundaries and

alteration of names of existing States, before the constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act, 1956, was enacted, the expression "State" occurring in that article meant Part A States, Part B States and also Part C States. All the States were classified in three different categories A, B and C. I need not go into the details. Those which were originally provinces in the British period were mostly classified as A States, most of the States which were under the Indian rulers—there was a merger of States—like Rajasthan, Saurashtra and all that—with the Rajpramukhs were B States and others like Himachal Pradesh, Kutch, Delhi and such others were classified as C States. After that, instead of C States, the concept of Union Territories was introduced in our Constitution. But article 3 was not amended to include the term "Union Territories" and the word "State", remained as "State". The difficulty now is that if a part of a State has to be merged in the Union Territory, this provision of article 3 may perhaps not be applicable because the word is "State" in the provision and not "Union Territory". Therefore, while if you want to transfer a part of a State to another State this article 3 of the Constitution can be invoked, if a part of a State, for example, Punjab, is to be transferred to, say, Himachal Pradesh, this article cannot be operative, because the word used is "State" and not "Union Territory". Therefore, it is that under this article 3, two explanations are proposed.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Change of the name of a State is permissible under this article. Now the name is changed while the State remains. It is the same State, only the name is changed. From Part 'C' State, it has become a Union territory. So only the name will change. Otherwise, it remains as it is.

Shri Hathl: We can argue that Part 'C' State has become a Union territory. But suppose some objection is taken that this does not include Union territory? This is for making it absolutely clear. This is not amendment; this is Explanation. Therefore, we say:

"Explanation 1.—In this article, in clauses (a) to (e), "State" includes a Union territory...."

[Shri Hathi]

This is the Explanation added. What Mr. Tyagi says is right that it can mean so. But in order to make it abundantly clear, this Explanation is being added. Then, there is another Explanation:

"Explanation II.—The power conferred on Parliament by clause (a) includes the power to form a new State or Union territory by uniting a part of any State or Union territory to any other State or Union territory."

This is a simple Bill. I need not say anything more. I move.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): There are various amendments to the Bill. The Members are absent.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot just go and call them.

Does anybody want to speak? No.

Shri Pratap Singh (Sirmur): I want to move my amendments here.

Mr. Speaker: Not at this stage. They will be taken up later when we take up the clauses.

As there is nobody to speak. I will put it to the House.

Division No. 18]

Ram Singh, Shri

Achuthan, Shri
Akamma Devi, Shrimati
Anjanappa, Shri
Arunachalam, Shri
Agad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Bakliwal, Shri
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Balakrishnan, Shri
Banerji Dr. R.
Berman, Shri P.C.
Basappa, Shri
Bhanja Deo, Shri L.N.
Bhargava, Shri M.B.
Bhatkar, Shri

Rane, Shri

Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.
Boroosh, Shri P.C.
Brahm Prakash, Shri
Brij Basi Lal, Shri
Braj Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu
Chakravarti, Shri P.R.
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
Chandak, Shri
Chandrabhan Singh, Dr.
Chandriki, Shri
Chaudhry, Shri Chandramani Lal
Chaudhuri, Shri D.S.
Chaudhuri, Shrimati Kamla

AYE S

NOES

Chavan, Shri D.R.
Chavda, Shrimati Jotaben
Chuni Lal, Shri
Dafle, Shri
Daljit Singh, Shri
Deo Bhanl, Shri P.C.
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dixit, Shri G.N.
Dorai, Shri Kasinatha
Dwivedi, Shri M.L.
Elayaperumal, Shri
Gahmari, Shri
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

Shri Tyagi: At this stage, is the prescribed majority required?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Let the Lobbies be cleared.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): I just want out to get a copy of this Bill. I wanted to speak on this.

Shri Namblar (Tiruchirapalli): I too went out to get a copy of the Bill.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Even the Ministers are not here. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, the Leader of the House, is not here.

Shri Namblar: This is because of the sudden change in the agenda.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs himself proposed the change.

Shri Namblar: This is an important legislation. We should have been given due notice.

Mr. Speaker: Order. order. The Lobbies have been cleared. The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

The Lok Sabha divided.

[14.17hr^s

Ga spati Ram, Shri
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
 Hajarnavis, Shri
 Hansda, Shri Subodh
 Harvasi, Shri Anwar
 Heda, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri M.L.
 Jamunadevi, Shrimati
 Jena, Shri
 Jha, Shri Yogendra
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
 Kayal, Shri P.N.
 Khalikar, Shri
 Koulgi, Shri H.V.
 Krishna, Shri M.R.
 Kurvel, Shri B.N.
 Lakshminathamma, Shrimati
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Laskar, Shri N.R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Mahadeo Prasad, Shri
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
 Maimoona Sultan, Shrimati
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
 Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra
 Manan, Shri
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Mandal, Shri J.
 Maniyangadan, Shri
 Mantri, Shri D.D.
 Marandi, Shri
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Matcharaju, Shri
 Mehdi, Shri S.A.
 Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
 Mengi, Shri Gopal Datt
 Menon, Shri Krishna
 Miara, Shri Mahesh Dutta
 Mohammed Yusuf, Shri
 More, Shri K.L.

Mukane, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
 Murmu, Shri Sarkar
 Muthiah, Shri
 Naik, Shri D.J.
 Naik, Shri Maheswar
 Nair, Shri Vasudevan
 Nambiar, Shri
 Naskar, Shri P.S.
 Nayak, Shri Mohan
 Ora, Shri
 Pande, Shri K.N.
 Pandey, Shri R.S.
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Panna Lal, Shri
 Pant, Shri K.C.
 Parashar, Shri
 Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
 Patil, Shri Man Singh
 Patil, Shri T.A.
 Patnaik, Shri B.C.
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval
 Pratap Singh, Shri
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Rai, Shrimati Sahodra Bai
 Raidev Singh, Shri
 Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ramanathan Chettiar, Shri R.
 Rampure, Shri M.
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Shri Krishnamoorthy
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri Ramapathi
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Reddiar, Shri
 Reddy, Shri Linge
 Reddy, Shrimati Yashoda
 Roy, Dr. Saradith
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saha, Dr. S.K.
 Sabu, Shri Rameshwar

Saigal, Shri A.S.
 Samanta, Shri S.C.
 Sarma, Shri A.T.
 Sayabham Devi, Shrimati
 Sen, Shri P.G.
 Shankanta Devi, Shrimati
 Shankaraya, Shri
 Sharma, Shri A.P.
 Sharma, Shri D.C.
 Shree Narayan Das, Shri
 Shyam Kumari Devi, Shrimati
 Siddanajappa, Shri
 Siddhanil, Shri Jagdev Singh
 Siddish, Shri
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri D.N.
 Singh, Shri S.T.
 Sinha, Shrimati Ramdhari
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarakanwar
 Sivapraghasen, Shri K.
 Smeeth, Shri Narde
 Sonavare, Shri
 Subbaraman, Shri
 Subramanyam, Shri T.
 Sumat Prasad, Shri
 Swamy, Shri M. P.
 Tahir, Shri Mohammad
 Tiwary, Shri R.S.
 Tripathi, Shri Krishna Dev
 Tyagi, Shri
 Ulkey, Shri
 Uluka, Shri Ramachandra
 Verma, Shri M.L.
 Veerabassappa, Shri
 Verma, Shri S.L.
 Vidyalkar, Shri A.N.
 Virbhada Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Radhelal
 Wadiwa, Shri
 Wamlik, Shri Balkrishna
 Yadav, Shri N.P.
 Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is:

Ayes 2; Noes 170.

The motion is not carried by a majority of not less than two thirds of the total membership of the House, present and voting.

The motion was negatived.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Does it mean that in this session, nothing can be

done, there can be no Punjabi Suba or anything of the sort?

Shri Nambiar: May I make a submission?

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nambiar to continue his speech on the Delhi Administration Bill.

Shri Nambiar: Before we go to another item, may I make a submission on what has happened just now? My submission is, because of the change in the agenda, the

[Shri Nambiar]

whole thing has ended in a very serious chaos. The formation of the Punjabi Suba which was expected and which is bound to come has been delayed because of the deliberate change brought about by the Government. This is my accusation. The whole country will feel disappointed at the way this thing has been done. I want to make a strong protest and I want to record my objection to this way of doing things. Such a serious issue has not been properly dovetailed. As a consequence of this, we shall be made a laughing stock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What can I do? I cannot do anything.

DELHI ADMINISTRATION BILL— contd.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathl): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on Saturday last, when the House rose, I had just begun my speech on the Delhi Administration Bill as reported by the Joint Committee. This Bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha on 18th November, 1965 and thereafter it was referred to the Joint Committee of both the Houses of Parliament.

The Report of the Joint Committee was presented to Parliament on the 9th May, 1966. As stated in that report, the committee invited memoranda from public bodies and individuals and also took evidence from the representatives of the public bodies, political parties and individuals. The scope of the Bill was thoroughly discussed, and a number of improvements have been effected. I would not like to take the time of the House in explaining the previous history of the administrative set-up of Delhi.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister may kindly stop for a minute. There is so much of noise in the House.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): Members are excited.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): The whole House is excited.

Mr. Speaker: I do understand that the Members are excited. But what can I do now?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): It is not your fault.

It has happened once before also. This is the second or third time when Government have blundered. They are in blunderland.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Members have to give their attention to the proceedings that are going on. They should not go on talking among themselves.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): This was a snap arrangement which we did not anticipate.

Mr. Speaker: What can I do in that case?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Government should explain why all this has happened.

Shri D. C. Sharma: It is a big blow to us.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This is a emisson or blundering on the part of Government.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the hon. Minister might continue his speech.

Shri Hathl: I do not like to take the time of the House in explaining the previous history of the administrative set-up of Delhi.

The Home Minister, while moving the motion for referring the Bill to the Joint Committee had explained in full the reasons for bringing forward this measure for the administrative set-up of Delhi. He had explained in detail the special position which Delhi occupied and the position of the other federal capitals in the world also.

14.23 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

A balance is kept between the requirements of democratic association of the people with the administration and the need for effective control of the national Government over the Government of the capital, to avoid conflict which may detract from the efficient working of the metropolis.

It was also explained that keeping in view the fact that a large number of foreign Legations, Embassies etc., were housed in Delhi it was not expedient or advisable to have two sets of Government or a dual Government in the capital.

I would restrict myself to the Bill as it has emerged after the deliberations of the Joint Committee. The House will notice that there were in the original Bill 37 clauses. As the Bill has emerged from the Joint Committee, as the report of the committee shows, there have been two new clauses added, namely clause 15 and clause 36. One clause, namely original clause 24 has been deleted. 11 clauses have been amended, and two clauses have been amended because there are consequential amendments. In all 16 clauses have undergone changes out of 37 clauses. The new Bill has 38 clauses.

I shall now deal with the important changes which have been brought about. The first is the amendment of clause 3. The number of elected members of the proposed metropolitan council has been raised from 42 to 49. That is one important change. The second change which the committee has brought about is that instead of associating three members of the interim metropolitan council nominated by the Government with the Election Commission for the purpose of delimiting the constituencies of the council, provision has been made for associating the Members of the Lok Sabha representing Delhi with the Election Commission for this work. It was found by the committee that it should not be left to the Central Government to nominate any of the members for this purpose.

Then, clause 12 has been amended to make a provision for the Deputy Chairman of the council. There was only a chairman to be elected, but a deputy chairman has also been provided for by amending clause 12.

Clause 13 is only a consequential amendment. All those provisions which applied to the chairman have also to be made applicable to an extent to the Deputy Chairman. Therefore, amendment of clause 13 is a consequential one.

The new clause 15 specifically provides that every member of the executive council shall have a right to speak or otherwise take part in the proceedings of the metropolitan council or any committee thereof.

The next clause amended is clause 20 (old clause 19), where a provision has been made regarding the powers and privileges of persons who have the right to speak in and otherwise take part in the proceedings of the metropolitan council and any committee thereof, as they apply in relation to members.

Then, clause 24 which dealt with the language or languages to be used in transacting the business of the metropolitan council has been deleted. It was thought that it should be left to the metropolitan council itself to decide what language or languages it should use.

Clause 24 (original clause 23) has been amended to provide that the administrator shall make the rules after consulting the chairman of the metropolitan council. That has been added.

Then, there were demands from various members that one of the members of the executive council should be designated as chief executive councillor and the other members as executive councillors. This change has been made in clause 27.

Then, it was also thought that in order to avoid bye-elections to the Delhi Municipal Corporation, clause 32 might be amended so that the membership of the corporation should not preclude the persons from being members of the interim

[Shri Hathi]

metropolitan council. This provision removes the bar on being simultaneous membership of the interim metropolitan council and the Delhi Municipal Corporation.

Then the other clause 35 is of a consequential nature, which provides that the electoral college for the Union Territory of Delhi shall consist of the elected members of the Metropolitan Council constituted for the Territory under the Delhi Administration Act 1966, and until that Council is constituted, the electoral college shall consist of the elected members of the interim Metropolitan Council constituted under the Act.

Then a new clause—as I said, there are two new clauses, one is cl. 15 and the other cl. 36—has been added to provide for the representation of the Metropolitan Council on the Delhi Development Authority in view of the representation of the Delhi Advisory Committee on the DDA. With the coming into force of this Act, the Advisory Committee will not be there. Therefore, the representation which the Delhi Advisory Committee has on the DDA will be given to the members of the Metropolitan Council.

Clause 38 empowers the President to take necessary steps to remove any difficulty whatsoever for giving effect to the provisions of the proposed law, particularly in relation to the constitution of the Metropolitan Council. The Committee, specially Shri Kamath, wanted that orders made by the President shall be laid on the Table of each House and would be subject to such modifications as may be made by both Houses. That also has been incorporated.

These are the main amendments to the old Bill as was introduced. It may be that at the time of the motion for reference of the Bill to the Joint Committee and during the Committee stage, suggestions were made that the Metropolitan Council should be given financial powers, that is, power to approve the budget of the Territory and a provision that the Executive Council should be collectively

responsible to the Metropolitan Council. In substance, this suggestion amounted to placing the Metropolitan Council in the position of a legislative Assembly so far as the budget was concerned and making the Executive Council answerable to that body in the same way as the Council of Ministers is answerable to a State legislature. It was made clear that the theme as was envisaged and under which this Bill has been drafted and introduced is that it was not contemplated that there should be a Legislative Assembly for Delhi—art. 239 stands in the way—and so if there is no Legislative Assembly, it is not possible also to give financial powers. Even then, we have given as much thought as could be bestowed to this question, we have consulted experts, and the Committee came to this conclusion that it was not possible to give financial powers to this body....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Without amending the Constitution.

Shri Hathi: without amending the Constitution. Therefore, the Bill which gives the maximum association to the people of Delhi in the administration of the territory has been the result of the deliberation of the Joint Committee as it has emerged out of the Joint Committee.

I would not like to deal with other suggestions which are likely to come just now because I would be glad to hear the arguments and constructive and helpful suggestions. After that, if we think it feasible to accommodate, we may consider them. But so far as the main theme is concerned, giving financial powers and making the Executive Council responsible to the Metropolitan Council seem not to be possible.

I move.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the administration of the Union territory of Delhi and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration".

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What is the time allotted?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Three hours.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In view of the importance of the subject and the controversial nature of the Bill, I suggest that the time must be extended—I am sure members on both sides will agree—by at least one hour.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrack pore): No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The programme is very tight. There are other items of business also.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There are amendments also. How much for general consideration and how much for clause-by-clause discussion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We can have two hours and one hour.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: So many amendments are there. They cannot be disposed of in one hour.

Shri Bade (Khargone): The other business collapsed. We have saved some time on that. That may be given to this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall see: any way.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर (दिल्ली करोल बाग): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। संविधान में हरिजनों के लिये धारक्षण दिया गया है। संविधान की धारा 332 में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि :

“Seats shall be reserved for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. . .

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो दिल्ली प्रशासन विधेयक है उस की जो 32 धारा है जिस को धारा प्रस्थापी तौर पर रखने की व्यवस्था करने जा रहे हैं उस में कहीं पर भी अनुसूचित जातियों के लिये कोई धारक्षण नहीं रक्खा गया है। उन के लिये सीट्स सुरक्षित नहीं रखी गई हैं इसलिये यह विधेयक संविधान की भावना

के अनुरूप नहीं है और इस पर कोई विचार नहीं किया जाना चाहिये। इस में अंतरिम काल के लिये कहीं पर भी शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के लोगों के लिये कोई रिजर्वेशन नहीं है जब कि कांस्टिट्यूशन में स्पष्ट रूप से लिखा हुआ है कि शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के लोगों के लिये सीट्स रिजर्व्ड होनी चाहियें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This House has never taken up the question of deciding constitutional matters. That is for the courts to determine. Perhaps the provision for representation of scheduled castes will be made in the election rules by the Election Commission. There is no point of order.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर: संविधान में बिल्कुल स्पष्ट लिखा हुआ है, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have ruled it out of order. We do not decide constitutional questions.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर: उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have ruled it out of order.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, after hanging fire for a very long time, this Delhi Administration Bill has come before the Lok Sabha. Before coming to Lok Sabha, we have seen it passing through many phases as far as the ruling party is concerned. At one stage one heard that it was being opposed by the Delhi Congress; later we heard that a section of them were supporting it and a section were opposing it. Then we were in the Joint Committee, we witnessed the spectacle of several Members of the Committee, resigning.

Now, what ever may be the reasons for such behaviour, at least we on this side of the House—I can say this at least for my party—have not been able to understand till today why the Home Ministry and the Minister, Shri Nanda, and in his place, Shri Hathi, are consistently denying the people of Delhi a democratically elected

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

and fully representative government, when Delhi actually is the biggest Union Territory from the point of view of population and also from the point of view of its importance. If Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura, can have more or less elected legislatures—and the people there have agitated and got it—I do not see any reason why the Delhi State cannot also have a democratically elected and fully representative legislature.

As a matter of fact, I have not been able to understand why a section of the Delhi M.Ps. and why my hon. friend Shrimati Subhadra Joshi is so opposed to it. It has really puzzled me. Maybe personalities have got mixed up in the whole matter, but I have not understood the principle of it.

We have been told that in USA, Washington does not have such a thing. For everything that we have to do here, must we find a parallel in the United States? If it is a good thing, take it. But I was told that even in a place like Washington, there is much to be desired as far as civic administration goes. As a matter of fact, I heard just recently, and then I thought about the discussions we had in our Select Committee, that recently when Washington had a very big snow-fall, the civic administration was such that for days the Indian Embassy was completely surrounded by snow, and they had no means by which to clear it, and for days they could not come down to carry out their normal avocations. I have not been to Washington, I do not know what it was all about, but our Government is always telling us, this is what happens in Washington, this is what happens in New York. I have not been able to understand, if Manipur, Tripura and Himachal Pradesh can have elected legislatures, why the seat of the Central Government being in Delhi presupposes that they should not have an elected legislature.

It appears to me that all the arguments that Shri Hathi has put forward have been totally unconvincing, especially when I find that really in Delhi we have a multiplicity of organisations dealing with

matters which are essentially civic, and which makes the normal life of a State so difficult. For example, they have the Delhi Development Authority, they have the Delhi Milk Scheme, they have a plethora of bodies, all set up one on top of the other. We have the Delhi Corporation, and now we are going to have another Metropolitan Council which is neither fish nor flesh. So, I see absolutely no reason why Mr. Nanda, the Home Minister, the Home Ministry and the Government of India could not see their way to give a legislature to the people of Delhi.

Shri Hathi: Constitution.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The Constitution has been brought up as an excuse, but I am attacking the very basis, the very principle of the Bill. I am not in the Select Committee, I have the right to say that this Bill should be scrapped entirely and a full legislature with full rights to the people given just as are given to all other citizens of India and should be given to the people of Delhi too.

What is the set-up envisaged under the proposed Metropolitan Council? The fact is that even with the new amendments, the Metropolitan Council and its members are nothing but an advisory body. I know my hon. friend Mr. Khanna is very enamoured of this advisory body. So is my hon. friend Shrimati Subhadra Joshi. They would like to advise, but Members of Parliament know what the real status of these advisory bodies is. We have so many consultative committees, and we have seen that they are an absolute farce, a complete farce, with the result that after four or ten years, whatever the number of years, you have been elected to the House, Members have stopped going to them, because it is an utter waste of time, utter waste of breath. Nobody listens to you. You may try, as far as you possibly can, to attend these meetings, but as far as the executive is concerned, it goes merrily on. Therefore, this Metropolitan Council, which is nothing more than an advisory council, is, I would say, nothing more than a debating society.

Actually, all executive authority is going to vest in the Executive Council, and this Executive Council, again, is made a nominated body. Firstly they make the Metropolitan Council such that the Elected Members have an advisory capacity, and the Executive Committee, where they have some executive authority, it is made a nominated body. It is a peculiar concept that if you have elections, you make it advisory, and if you do not have elections and have nominations, you give them executive authority. This shows the undemocratic nature of the entire concept of this Metropolitan Council and the Executive Council set up under the Clauses of this Bill.

Not only that. In many cases it is the Administrator who will be ruling. If the Administrator thinks that questions should not be asked, he will make the rules, he will just take the advice and consult the Metropolitan Council Chairman, but beyond asking the Metropolitan Council Chairman, there is absolutely nothing to prevent him from making the rules as he thinks fit. If there is a deadlock, he will refer the matter to the President, and the President will give his verdict, but prior to getting the President's verdict it will be decided by the Administrator whether a particular matter is important enough for him to utilise the veto and refer the matter to the President or not. So, I say a bureaucrat, an Administrator, will have the whip hand over both the Executive Council and the Metropolitan Council. This is what I have understood from the Clauses of this Bill.

Therefore, after having opposed the very principle underlying the Bill, that the people of Delhi should be deprived of a legislature with full legislative powers given to other citizens in India. I have now tried to make an amendment which I put before the House, within the limitations which this Bill puts before us. As an Opposition Member, I cannot do anything further at this stage.

I propose that in the Clauses of this Bill, if we really are sincere to give the

Metropolitan Council some democratic rights, there should be a provision that after the Metropolitan Council's advice has to be taken, that advice should be referred to the Executive Council or to the Central Government or to the President as the case may be, and that the people to whom it is referred should regard the advice and the recommendation of the Metropolitan Council as mandatory. This at least should be done. If this also is not done, I would say that this is nothing but a farce. The people of Delhi rightly are agitated over this matter, however much my hon. friend Mr. Khanna may say that there is a large number of people in Delhi who do want such rights.

I have also tried, within the limitations of this Bill, to make the Executive Council responsible to the Metropolitan Council. I have not heard any worthwhile arguments made by Mr. Hathi when he introduced this Bill, as to why this also was not possible, why the Executive Council should not be responsible to those who are the elected representatives of Delhi. I believe that there is far too much of a personal element in this quarrel. We are people who come from outside Delhi, we are not at all concerned whether it will be Mr. Khanna who will be Chief Minister or X or Y or Z. What we are concerned with is the principle underlying the Bill. Therefore, I would say that at least the Executive Council and the Administrator should be responsible to the Metropolitan Council for their actions. Therefore, I have proposed and will propose and will press that at least this much should be accepted by Government that any member of the Executive Council against whom the Metropolitan Council has passed a vote of no confidence by a two-third majority should be removed. At least this minimum thing should be there. That is what should be there in spite of all the other arguments which have been put forward before us. If that is not done immediately, I say that this whole thing is useless. We are handing over the entire administration of Delhi to a bureaucratic set up, which is not the real idea behind a Bill of this

[Shrimati Renu Chakravarty]

typo. Sir, I would also urge that the number of elected members of the council should be increased to 56. Here I find myself very lucky; I find that Mrs. Subhadra Joshi has given a similar amendment and so I have a sneaking feeling that it is going to be accepted by the Government. Once in my life, I find I am in good company. But if this point had been accepted earlier it would have been better. Why did we go in for the other 49 which would have overlapping of constituencies. inevitable. It is also a question of deciding the number on the basis of population and other matters which I had explained. 56 is normal; I to 8 constituencies for the Lok Sabha seat. On the basis of the existing population and the constitution of the Delhi municipal authorities this is the most reasonable principle that should have been accepted. I have also proposed that we want this Metropolitan council should be an active body and in every clause we should give such authority and such powers to enable it to actively intervene in the life and well-being of the city. That is why regarding the question of whether the metropolitan council should be called at an interval of not less than six months, I have said not less than three months. Also have said not less than three months. Also whenever a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship of the council, it shall not be left vacant for any unspecified period; election to the chairmanship must not be later than a month from the date on which the vacancy takes place. I would recommend to this House that we should look at this Bill in all its minute details at the second reading stage but even at this stage we should give our verdict that the underlying principle in this Bill is something which we cannot accept. We cannot accept the decision of the Union Government to take away from the people of Delhi their right to have an elected legislature as every other citizen in the rest of India.

श्री बहादुर प्रकाश (बाह्य दिल्ली) : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर, इस बदकिस्मत दिल्ली वालों के लिए जो यह बिल बनाया गया है मैं उस सम्बन्ध में अपने कुछ सुने हुए विचार

घाप के सामने पेश करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यह राय खाली मेरी नहीं है, यह खाली दिल्ली कांग्रेस की नहीं है, यह दिल्ली कांग्रेस की भी है, दिल्ली जनसंघ की भी है, दिल्ली कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की भी है और दूसरी पोलिटिकल पार्टियों की भी है। जितनी यहाँ की ग्रागो-नाइज्ड पब्लिक ओपीनियन है चाहे वह ट्रेड यूनियन हो, चाहे वह बिजनेस ग्रागो-नाइजेशन हों, चाहे इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रागो-नाइजेशन हों, कलचरल, सोशल सभी ग्रागो-नाइजेशन की वह ओपीनियन है और वह राय है कि सब से पहले यह बिल जो इस वक्त दिल्ली ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बिल के नाम से दिल्ली के लिए आया है यह बेकार है यह ऐडवाइजरी है। कोई ताकत दिल्ली वालों को नहीं दी है यह एक तरीके से दिल्ली वालों को बहलाने का खिलौना दे दिया गया है और यही वजह थी कि दिल्ली के घाठ 8 मेम्बरस में से 5 मेम्बरस ने इस से सम्बन्धित सेलेक्ट कमेटी से इस्तीफा दे दिया था। उन की राय साफ थी कि इस बिल में जान नहीं है यह ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी है इस में कोई ताकत नहीं मिलती और चूँकि गवर्नमेंट कोई ताकत उस में देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है लिहाजा इस कमेटी के साथ इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में ताल्लुक रखना बोटरो के साथ बेइसाफ़ी करनी होगी। यह ठीक है कि हमारे 3 मेम्बरस उस में रहे बल्कि हमारे इस्तीफा देने के बाद वह ज्यादा जोर से गये और उस में हिस्सा लिया। दो वजह हैं। जाहिर है कि वजह बहुत नहीं होते अपनी राय में और उन्हें गवर्नमेंट के कहने के मुताबिक चलना पड़ता है। एक और साहब हैं एक हमारे मेम्बर हैं जिनका कि ताल्लुक सिर्फ नई दिल्ली से है, नई दिल्ली के लिए हो सकता है कुछ जानते भी हों लेकिन दिल्ली वालों के लिए बहुत ज्यादा नहीं जानते हैं। जो बुनियादी अधिकार हैं फंडामेंटल राइट्स हैं लोगों के उन के बारे में हमें बहुत स्पष्ट होने की जरूरत है। गांधी जी ने एक दफ़े कहा था:—

To be loyal to our organisation must not mean subordinating of one's settled convictions. Parties may fall and Parties may rise but our deep convictions must remain unaffected by such passing changes.

इसी कनविबेशन के साथ मैं आप के सामने अपने विचार प्रज करना चाहता हूँ। इस बिल के द्वारा भी और इससे पहले भी दिल्ली के 30 लाख लोगों के साथ बेइसाफी की गई है और यह बेइसाफी अंग्रेजी जमाने से लगा कर सन् 1912 से जब से यहां राजधानी आई वह बेइसाफी आज तक जारी है उन के साथ। मुझे नहीं पता कि कब तक यह बेइसाफी जा रही होगी? वही जवाब जो सन् 1914 में ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट ने नई दिल्ली के लोगों को दिया था वही जवाब सन् 1947 में दिया गया और वही जवाब आज भी दिया जा रहा है कि दिल्ली के लोगों को राजनैतिक अधिकार, दिल्ली के लोगों को डेमोक्रेटिक अधिकार प्रोसेम्बली आदि नहीं दी जा सकती है। मैं प्रदब के साथ प्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि तमाम दुनिया में वाशिंगटन और कैनबरा को छोड़ कर जिसकी कि राजधानी जंगल का टुकड़ा काट कर बसाई गई थी जो किसी आबादी का हिस्सा नहीं था और जो कि हिस्टारिकल शहर नहीं था बल्कि कांस्टीट्यूशन में एक जालग काट कर बनाई गयी थी उन के लिए तो कहना ठीक है कि उन का तो कोई डेमोक्रेटिक राइट नहीं है हालांकि वह अपने लिए लड़ रहे हैं। लेकिन इसके अलावा किसी और मुल्क में यहां तक कि फेडरल मुल्कों में जहां किसी सूबे की राजधानी है वहाँ उस की भी राजधानी है। ऐसे कई कंटिल दुनिया के अन्दर मौजूद हैं खासतौर से कनाडा में यही हालत है। जर्मनी में यही हालत है, साउथ अफ्रीका में यही हालत है यह फेडरल कंट्रीज की बात मैं आप से कहता हूँ। इस के अलावा कम्युनिस्ट मुल्क हैं उन का जो ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है सेंट्रल और स्टेट का उस में कोई फर्क नहीं है उन का कैपिटल वही मौजूद है। इसलिए यह कहना कि दिल्ली में दो राजधानी नहीं

हो सकती यह बात बिल्कुल सही नहीं है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कह कर दिल्ली वालों के साथ बेइसाफी की जा रही है। मैंने फिर भी कहा कि आज अगर आप कैपिटल प्रसंग चाहते हैं और नई दिल्ली वाले, खास तौर से नई दिल्ली के छात्रा साहब नुमाइंदे हैं वह खास तौर से चाहते हैं तो बेशक नई दिल्ली को प्रलग रख लें, अगर नई दिल्ली वाले भी यही पसन्द करें। नई दिल्ली को वह कोई अधिकार न दे यहां तक कि मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट को चुनने का अधिकार न दें यह बात भी मेरी समझ में आ सकती है। मैंने पहले भी कहा है कि आप नई दिल्ली को बेशक प्रलग रख सकते हैं। लेकिन जहां तक हम दिल्ली वालों का तात्सुक है मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा दिल्ली के वोटों के सामने बायदा है। मैं ने उन से बायदा किया था पिछले एलेक्शन में कि हम आप के लिए कोई डेमोक्रेटिक सैट अप लायेंगे क्योंकि हम समझते थे कि उस के बगैर उन की तकलीफों और उन की परेशानियों का कोई हल नहीं हो सकता है और यह मैं आप के सामने पढ़े देता हूँ :-

As has been said earlier, the problems of Delhi are problems of growing city and they need to be tackled with courage and imaginations. The Pradesh Congress is firmly of the opinion that the problems can be tackled properly only through a democratic set-up and a bureaucratic set-up is ill fitted and ill equipped to deal with the multifarious problems which Delhi of today poses.

यह बायदा दिल्ली के वोटों के सामने किया गया था। मैं ने और हमारे और काम करने वालों ने जा कर यह कैम्पेन किया था कि हम आप के लिये एक जिम्मेदार हकूमत लायेंगे। हम ने यहां तक कहा कि चलिए, एसेम्बली न सही, आप एसेम्बली के अलावा अगर कोई और डेमोक्रेटिक सेट-अप, कोई और ढांचा दे सकते हैं, तो दीजिये। हम उस पर ईमानदारी के साथ प्रमल करने

[श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश]

के लिए तैयार है। अगर वह भ्रष्टा होगा तो हम एसेम्बली की बात को छोड़ देंगे। शास्त्री जी अगर पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने हमारे सामने यह वायदा किया था कि आप बेक्रिफ्ट रहें, हम आपको एक भ्रष्टा ठाँचा, एक भ्रष्टा निजाम देने की कोशिश करेंगे, जिस से आप की तसल्ली होगी, आप एसेम्बली पर खिद न करें।

15 hrs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may continue afterwards. The Prime Minister may now make her statement.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद)
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। अभी अभी मैं ने सुना कि यह सरकार एक संवैधानिक संशोधन पर गिर चुकी है

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह कानून खत्म हो गया है। इस लिए क्या अब सरकार रह गई है ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They do not arise now. The Prime Minister.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सरकार अब है क्या ? भ्रष्टा सरकार बोल रही हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order, The Prime Minister.

15.01 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT TO ORISSA

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Sir, I returned yesterday afternoon from a two-day tour of the areas acutely affected by drought and scarcity in Orissa. On the eve of my departure, I extended my stay in the State as originally proposed, by an extra day so as to have a fuller idea of the prevailing situation. I had occasion

to visit ten villages in the three worst affected districts of Kalahandi, Sambalpur and Bolangir, including some which were not on schedule and which were selected on the spot, for surprise visits. At my request, my colleagues Shri Jaganatha Rao and Shrimati Nandini Satpathy, who accompanied me, went to another three villages for which I could not myself find time; Shrimati Satpathy went to two villages to which I was to go, while I went to two others which were not on schedule.

Apart from addressing large gatherings at Senapalli, Khariar and Padampur, I had the opportunity to meet and talk to a large number of villagers, wherever I went specially Adivasis and Harijans—and to visit their homes and see their families and children. I visited many gratuitous relief and free feeding centres, school centres for feeding children, sites where relief works were in progress and centres for the distribution of loans and seed. I also had occasion to meet the Honourable Member of this House from this area, and some Members of the State Legislature including those of the Opposition Party, local officials, Panchayat leaders, representatives of voluntary agencies working in the area, students and youth representatives, as well as others.

I was naturally distressed to see conditions in these affected areas. It was obvious that the people had suffered considerable hardships. There is unprecedented drought and scarcity, and an acute lack of purchasing power. At the same time I was somewhat relieved to find that the situation is under control as a result of the energetic measures taken by the State Government. But there is no room whatsoever for complacency. On the contrary, there is great need for administering the relief programme with the utmost possible efficiency and despatch and for a very vigilant eye on the situation.

My colleague, the Food Minister, apprised the House the other day of various measures taken to provide relief in the affected areas. The State Govern-

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

ment have already strengthened the relief machinery at various levels and appointed a senior officer as Special Relief Commissioner to co-ordinate and direct relief work; he accompanied us during the tour. The relief programme has now been revised upwards to provide for an outlay of nearly 9 crores. A sum of Rs. 1.35 crores was made available to the Orissa Government some time ago for expenditure on relief, and a further sum of Rs. 2 crores is being released to-day to provide ways and means support for further expenditure. I have emphasised that neither rigidity of procedure or formality, nor lack of resources should be allowed to come in the way of the programme, and such further needs as arise and are agreed upon will be similarly met.

As the Food Minister announced the other day, the number of people covered under gratuitous relief which is meant for the old, the disabled and the infirm is being increased by the State Government to 2,00,000. The number of free feeding centres has also been increased. Some road-works are being undertaken to provide widespread employment to people; 10,000 wells are included in the programme out of which 3,000 are to be made *pucca* immediately, and the remaining after the rains. Other similar works are being undertaken, including those which can continue during the monsoon. Some medical teams are already at work; more will be sent.

One of the most important and urgent needs of the affected people is the adequate and timely supply of seed requirements for the next Kharif crop. A programme for the procurement and supply of 4 lakh maunds of seed by the middle of June has been drawn up and is under execution. Side by side, Rs. 3.5 crores of taqavi has been arranged. The original limits for the grant of taqavi have been liberalised to provide loans at the rate of about Rs. 100 per acre, upto the limit of Rs. 800 to the same party. I have impressed upon the State Government and the officials concerned, the importance of timely implementation of this programme and they have assured me that they will

keep the target date so that difficulties of movement in the rainy season do not come in the way.

One of the questions raised concerned the actual wages earned by people volunteering themselves for relief works. The State Government have agreed firstly, that as far as possible panchayat and other agencies will be utilised to organise these works, with a view to minimising reliance on middlemen; and secondly, that in the pattern of wages paid, a minimum earning of the value of one rupee per head per day is ensured for subsistence, irrespective of output, with more for anyone who is entitled to it on the basis of his actual work.

There has been a demand in some quarters for the supply of paddy instead of milled rice. It appears that the bulk of the supplies have already been converted into rice, and the stocks of paddy available are now relatively limited; also, I was told that the actual demand for paddy might not be much. However, the State Government have agreed to arrange for some stocks of paddy to be sent to the affected areas where there might be demand.

The problem of the high price at which rice was being sold was also brought up and it has now been decided firstly, to subsidise rice in selected areas of specially acute distress; and secondly, to supply partly wheat and partly rice in areas where this combination will be appropriate, thereby bringing down the overall purchase price.

I was particularly concerned, as I am sure the House will also be, about the health and welfare of children in the scarcity-affected areas. I have advised the State Government to consider extending the scope of the children's midday feeding programme to non-school going children, at least in the pockets which are specially hard hit. At one such feeding centre I saw that this had, already been started in a small way. I have also suggested that a suitable person might be attached to the Special Relief Commis-

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

sioner to help him coordinate the Health and Child Welfare programmes.

For the next agricultural season, apart from loans and seed to which I have referred earlier, the State Government are arranging to press into service all available power-tillers and some tractors to help cultivators plough their lands, subsidising the service in the case of the more needy.

My anxiety is as much about the long-term needs of this very backward area as about its immediate needs. It is obvious that this area has not yet received the impact of development programmes in any appreciable manner. This state of affairs cannot be permitted to continue and we must devise an accelerated programme for its long-term development on the basis of priority. I am asking my colleague, the Planning Minister, to go into this matter at an early date in consultation with the Planning Commission so that we can undertake this task as early as may be practicable.

I was deeply touched by the affection and kindness with which people received me everywhere, in large numbers, in spite of the gruelling heat. I was also heartened to see their spirit and high morale, regardless of the present difficulties.

Thank you, Sir.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): I am glad that unlike the food Minister, it was possible for the Prime Minister to visit some of the villages and she also decided to go to some unscheduled villages. I want to know whether she or any of her colleagues who visited some of the villages were able to go to village Deodhar where 9 persons have died, according to the admission of the State Government. They did not admit that the deaths were due to starvation; they say it is due to continued mal-nutrition and super-imposed illness. Was it possible for her to verify any of these cases?

I am really sorry even she was not able to persuade the State Government to seize all the paddy that is available with the mill-owners and others and to supply it to the people. She says that she was told there was not much demand for paddy. I do not know who told her so. Was it possible for her to ask any of the villagers there and they said, "No; we would prefer rice to paddy"? When I raised it the other day, the Food Minister said, the Prime Minister will discuss it with the State Government. The mill-owners are charging high prices and they have procured the paddy. Some paddy is available in other places too. The point is if paddy is supplied, the husk will be available for the cattle also. I think even now they should take some steps in this regard.

She has told us about the other measures that have been taken. I want to know if she had any discussion with the State Government because this area has been long neglected to take up any major irrigation project like Indravati and other projects in that area, so that these things do not recur in future.

श्री श्री (अलीगढ़) : श्रीमत्, सब से पहले तो मैं माननीय प्रधान मन्त्री जी को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि वे इस मौके पर उस क्षेत्र में गई और जांच की जहां कि भूकाल पड़ रहा था, लोग मर रहे थे। लेकिन उन्होंने जो बयान दिया है, वह सदन में लाने से पहले पूरी दुनिया में और देश में जा चुका है, इस लिये उसका कोई महत्व नहीं रह गया है। फिर भी उनके बयान से ऐसा जाहिर होता है और वह सत्य भी है कि जितने लोग भूकाल से मरे हैं, मर रहे हैं और मरेंगे उन में बहुमत खेतीहर मजदूर, शेडयूल्ड कास्ट और शेडयूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लोगों का है। इस तथ्य को सामने रखते हुए क्या भविष्य में सरकार ऐसा कोई प्रोग्राम बनायेगी जिससे कि पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के आधार पर सीधे सीधे लाभ खेतीहर मजदूरों, शेडयूल्ड कास्ट्स और शेडयूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लोगों को हो।

दूसरे उड़ीसा में भ्रमाल के बारे में इस सदन में भ्राज से दो ढाई महीने पहले संयुक्त सोसलिस्ट पार्टी के भाई पटनायक जी ने यह सवाल रखा था और उस समय खाद्य मंत्री जी ने सदन को ऐसा बताया था कि कोई ऐसा संकट होने वाला नहीं है, हम ने पूरी व्यवस्था कर दी है, जिससे भ्रमाल वहाँ न होने पाये इस तरह से मिनिस्टर लोग बेमौत लोगों को मार देते हैं, क्या इस के लिये कोई व्यवस्था की जायगी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : भ्राज सवाल कीजिये।

श्री मौर्य : मुझे कहने दीजिये, किसान बेमौत मर रहे हैं, आखिर यह लोक सभा है किस लिये ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : समय नहीं है।

Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah): On a point of order. Sir, Shri Maurya is acting against Rule 372 which says:

"A statement may be made by minister on a matter of public importance with the consent of the Speaker but no questions shall be asked at the time the statement is made."

The rule is categorical and it should not be allowed to be violated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The practice in this House has been to allow a few questions in an explanatory way. I request members that the questions should be short.

श्री मौर्य : मध्य प्रदेश, राजस्थान, उत्तर प्रदेश के भी कुछ जिलों में कहते पड़ रहा है। वहाँ लोग बेमौत मरेगें इन समाज परिस्थितियों को सामने रखते हुए सरकार ने क्या क्या व्यवस्था की है। उड़ीसा में करीब 10 लाख लोग कहते मर रहे हैं, कहते के शिकार हैं उनमें ढाई-तीन लाख बच्चें हैं, उनके लिये भी कितनी व्यवस्था सरकार ने की है और क्या कराना चाहते हैं ?

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): The Prime Minister said she would not like to go into the past, but would only think of the future. But has she found out how in a surplus State like Orissa it was possible that there was such a tremendous lack of food even though it was a backward area how the administration failed to rush food there even after there was such a severe drought? In future, how does she propose to see that such a thing never occurs again because droughts will be there even in future ?

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): Only the other day Shri H. K. Mahtab, former Chief Minister of Orissa, compared this famine to the Bengal famine. So, may I know whether the Prime Minister and the Government have taken a serious note of the situation and are taking steps similar to those taken during the Bengal famine and subsequent famines elsewhere or have they taken it only as a scarcity area, as reported earlier?

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Although the Government so long in their own obdurate way have denied the fact that famine conditions, exist in these three districts of Orissa, viz., Balangir, Sambalpur and Kalahandi, I must congratulate the Prime Minister on having come out with a very out-spoken statement that is characteristic of her. In this connection, may I know whether after touring these areas, she was convinced of the fact that famine is there and if famine is there, whether she is going to declare these areas as famine-affected areas and take necessary steps to meet the situation? When a particular area is declared as famine-affected, work on a war-footing is taken up. Is she going to introduce that in these areas?

Shri Krishnapal Singh (Jalesar): According to the statement of the Prime Minister, the immediate problem seems to be to provide purchasing power to the population affected by the drought. My suggestion is that Government should start relief and development works. When we were discussing the Railway Budget the other day, some Member proposed here that new railway lines should be constructed there.

[Shri Krishnapal Singh]

I think this is the time when these works should be taken up. People who are capable of working should be provided with employment and those who are incapable of working should be given for relief and assistance.

श्री बड़े (खारगोन) : सबसे पहले मैं प्राईम मिनिस्टर जी को धनवाद देता हूँ कि वे वहाँ उस एरिये में गईं, और साथ-साथ वहाँ का अवलोकन करके ग्राई और स्टेटमेंट बहुत प्रच्छा दिया है। लेकिन मध्य प्रदेश का बस्तर जिला, जो कि उड़ीसा प्रान्त के पास ही लगता है, वहाँ पर सरकार ईमिडियेट रिलीफ देने के लिये फौरेन कैम्पस खोलने वाली है लेकिन जब तक उन लोगों को फ्री भोजन नहीं बाटा जाता है, तब तक कोई रिलीफ नहीं आता है। फौरेन रिलीफ में सरकार आदमीयों को 91 पैसे स्त्रियों को 51 देती है, उसको रिवाइज कर के ज्यादा राहत मिले इस के लिये सरकार क्या मदद करनेवाली है ?

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : उड़ीसा में दस लाख अकाल प्रसित लोग हैं जिन में से ढाई लाख के करीब बच्चे हैं। क्या प्रधान मंत्री बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि इस वक़्त कुल कितने बच्चे मुफ्त भोजनालयों में भोजन करते हैं।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, why do you leave me out?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You are an independent Member.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, you are independent when you are in the Chair and you are "unattached" when you come back. I want to come back unattached.

Sir, from the statement of the hon. Prime Minister it appears that the situation is really very grave and serious.

Though after her visit to these areas she has mentioned in some places, as reported in the newspapers, that famine conditions prevail, probably such a declaration by her in this House will definitely offend her colleague, Shri Subramaniam, who denied that there are famine conditions. I would like to know whether it is a fact that some long-term measures and also short-term measures, both, are in view, to see that Orissa does not remain a drought-affected area or a famine-stricken area; if so, may I know what are those measures?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Sir, the first question is whether this is a famine or not. As, I think, the Food Minister has mentioned in this House on an earlier occasion, the States have their own famine codes. According to the conditions for declaring famine under the State code, it is not a famine. Nevertheless, the State Government has adopted a number of relief measures which are generally more liberal than what the famine code would provide. I do not think it makes much difference what word is used, provided all that is necessary to be done is being done.

Shri Hem Barua: It must be done on a war-footing.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I do not know exactly what Shri Hem Barua means by war-footing.

Shri Hem Barua: You did that when the Pakistanis agressed on us, and you did that when the Chinese agressed on us.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I would certainly like to have it done on as much war-footing as possible. I think that can be done when everybody joins in that. Fortunately, the public is being very helpful, and even students who are now having their holidays are wanting to help. There is just one problem where students want help. They want to be fed. This causes a little difficulty because people who go from the city also want to be fed. There, perhaps, we can make some arrangements by which their own organisations can undertake to feed them.

In Sambalpur—I am afraid I did not have much time to go to the other areas—I did go into the reports about deaths which were supposed to have taken place on account of starvation. I looked in great detail into the enquiry reports, and I think the number which is now being quoted in this House is far from anywhere near reality and it is absolutely ridiculous.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I was speaking about a particular village.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I did not go to that. I looked into some of the reports which the Commissioner had got from different places. My general impression was that there have been some cases in which deaths have occurred. But generally these cases had a background of age, of ill-health and disease. It is also true that this is an area which has been very very poor where the people have been living on a very low diet for—I do not know, for how many years—I must say, about a hundred years. It was the hon. Member, Shri Dwivedy, who showed us some *mahuwa* and other things. As I was going from village to village, I noticed some people, almost like in small meetings under a tree. I stopped the car and went to them. The ladies among them came and showed me what they were eating. In the course of the conversation I asked them: "Is it the first year that you are eating this, or have you been eating this before?" They replied: "We always eat this".

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Peepal leaves?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : (फस्फा-
बाद) : हमेशा खाते रहते हैं।

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: They denied eating it. But it was in their baskets. When I asked them: "Do you also eat this", one of the ladies said "No". Obviously, I have not been to other places and I could not have seen those particular places which are the worst affected.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : हमेशा
मरते रहते हैं।

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Whenever we wanted to go to a place as originally fixed, somebody, for instance, from the Opposition, some local people, used to come and say that we should not go to that place but instead we should go to some other villages. So we dropped the original one and went to the other village. I did not see any persons who looked as if they were going to die or who looked specially thin and so on.

श्री मीर्य : **यह गलत बयानी है।

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): Sir, the hon. Member has used the word** which is unparliamentary. It should be expunged.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is unparliamentary. The hon. Member should either withdraw it or else it will be expunged (*Interruptions*)—It will be expunged.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I was told that the police were there and within a distance of two miles nobody was permitted to come and meet you.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: It is not correct. As I said, the police did not even know where I would be going. When I wanted to go to a village, some people used to say that instead of that village I should go to some other village. Immediately I sent Shrimati Satpati in the direction in which I was to have gone and I went in the other direction. So there was no question of the police being near me, the police were all in Bhuvaneswar, not in these areas.

I must confess that the people who really seemed to be suffering were the very old people and weak children. I saw a number of children with distended stomachs. But those who were part of the food programme were looking well. That is why I lay stress that apart from the distribution of seeds, which of course is of first importance to farmers, the children's programme should get top priority. I think we will be able to do that. The difficulty is now of personnel and collecting those who do not go to school. But

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

through the panchayats and with the help of voluntary workers I think this may be manageable.

श्री मौर्य : कितने बच्चों को खाना दे रहे हैं ?

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : जितने भी स्कूल जाते हैं उन सब को मिल रहा है एक खाना दिन का ।

श्री मौर्य : मैंने गिनती पूछी है कि कितने बच्चों को खाना दे रहे हैं ।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : संध्या तो मेरे पास नहीं है ।

Shri Sruendranath Dwivedi made a mention about giving paddy. I myself did ask the people in the villages, mostly women and none of the women I asked showed a preference for paddy. They felt that it would involve extra work and that it would be much easier to have rice. In spite of this, I told the Chief Minister who was with me that because people had made this demand paddy may be made available in some villages. If the Government felt that the people wanted it they might make efforts to give more.

Regarding the Indravati project, the hon. Member, Shri P. K. Deo, gave me a memorandum on it. As I mentioned in my statement also, we shall certainly look into this.

So far as the long-term and short-term measures are concerned, I have already spoken about the short-term measures. Regarding long-term measures, most of the adivasis live in areas where there is very bad communication. This is a great difficulty. Therefore, it is very important now to build up communication now. Also, most of the roads are such that during the rains the rivers and nullahs overflow and it is not easy to go. If something can be done to make that small bit pucca, I think that would be of help. There are many such things.

Shri Tyagi (Dehradun): Is there any plan to provide irrigation facilities to villages wherever it is possible?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Wells are being dug. The existing tanks are cleaned. In some places the people have dug canals of their own. They wanted to be reimbursed for that, and we are looking into it. But the major thing, of course, is irrigation, communication and, as far as the Adivasis and Harijans are concerned, some kind of multi-purpose food. I think, if we put forward these programmes, this would go a long way towards helping them. But the problem is such an old one, such a vast one. I must say it is not only in Orissa. You will find such people in every part of India and certainly in eastern U.P. So, this is something which is not easy to do and it cannot be done very quickly. But certainly it can be taken in hand as soon as possible.

Somebody mentioned whether this was like the Bengal Famine. This is nothing like that at all. There, it was a question of people dropping dead.

Shri Nambar: The Chief Minister of Orissa stated on the floor of the Assembly that it can be compared with the Bengal Famine.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: From what I have read of the Bengal Famine—because I was not out then—and heard from those who worked there is that the stories were quite different.

श्री बागड़ी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मेरा एक प्रश्न था कि कितने बच्चों को सरकार से बिना पैसे के खाना मिलता था । प्रधान मंत्री ... (अवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order; Shri Brahm Prakash to continue his speech.

श्री बागड़ी : क्या आप मेरे सवाल को सुनना भी नहीं चाहते ... अवधान सरकार के खजाने से ... (अवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please sit down.

श्री ब्राह्मणी : शर्म नहीं छाती है। यह बच्चों का सवाल है (ध्यक्षान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Member is defying the Chair. I will have to ask him to go out.

श्री ब्राह्मणी : प्रधान मंत्री . . (ध्यक्षान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he behaves like this, I will have to take action against him. Shri Brahm Prakash.

15.32 hrs

DELHI ADMINISTRATION BILL —
contd.

श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से निवेदन कर रहा था कि हम ने प्रसेम्बली की बात पर जिद्द न कर के यह तजवीज की कि अगर ऐसा ठांचा हम को दिया जाये जो कि डिमोक्रेटिक हो, जो एक यूनिफाइड एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन दे सके, तो हम उस पर प्रमल करने के लिये और तजुर्बा करने के लिये तैयार हो सकते हैं और प्रसेम्बली की मांग को इस्तबा में डाल सकते हैं। बहुत बात चीत के बाद एक बात तय हुई कि एक मेट्रोपोलिटन काउंसिल चुनी हुई बनाई जाये। लेकिन जब प्राये बात चली तो यह तो निश्चित हो गया कि उस के एग्जिक्यूटिव काउंसिलर चुने हुए बनाये जाय लेकिन वह मेट्रोपोलिटन काउंसिल के सामने जवाब देह हों यह तय नहीं हुआ। इस मेट्रोपोलिटन काउंसिल को बजट या फाइनेन्शियल पार्षस हासिल हों यह बात तय नहीं हुई। यह बातचीत यह कह कर मुत्तबी हो गई कि यह तफसील की बात है और हम इस पर बातचीत करेंगे।

उस के बाद हम लोग लगातार कोशिशें करते रहे कि होम मिनिस्टर से बातचीत करें लेकिन दुबारा बातचीत करने का मौका नहीं आया। प्रचानक मैं ने प्रखबार में पढ़ा कि इधर उधर मैं ने कुछ मान लिया था, कोई कमिटमेंट मैं ने दे दिया था। मुझे यह चुन कर बहुत दुःख और हेरानी हुई। मैं तो

तीन चार साल से बातचीत में सामने रहा हूँ और तफसीली बातचीत में मैं ने प्रगुष्ठा हो कर काम किया है। मैं लगातार कहता रहा हूँ कि कोई कमिटमेंट नहीं हुआ। कमिटमेंट सिर्फ इतना ही था कि हम प्रसेम्बली के प्रलावा कोई दूसरी सेग्रेन्ड बेस्ट चीज या सेट अप मानने के लिये तैयार हूँ। लेकिन वह बातचीत प्राधी शुरू हुई और बाद में टूट गई। मेरे पास तमाम खत मौजूद हैं। सबसे पहले जो होम मिनिस्टर की एडवाइजरी कमेटी थी उस में प्रगस्त सन् 1965 में सबाल उठा। दिल्ली के दूसरे मेम्बर्स ने उठाया कि उसमें फाइनेन्शियल पार्षस दी जाये। एक चीफ एग्जिक्यूटिव काउंसिलर मुकर्रर होना चाहिये और उस की हाउस के सामने जवाब देही हो। लेकिन बाद में इस का कोई जवाब नहीं दिया गया। वे एडवाइजरी कमेटी के मिनिट्स मंगा कर दे सकते हैं।

यह बिल इस हाउस में 18 नवम्बर को प्राया। मैं ने 21 अक्टूबर को एक खत लिखा होम मिनिस्टर को। मैं उस खत के जरूरी भाग का पढ़ कर सुना देता हूँ :

"The other matter which is very important and concerns the various schemes is that a clearer picture of the proposed Metropolitan Council needs to be indicated. The position is still confusing. We made certain observations in the last meeting of the Advisory Committee but no satisfactory answer was given at that time. The minutes of that meeting are not yet before me so that I could judge as to what decisions were recorded. However, I would like to make mention of a few points to avoid any embarrassments afterwards.

"The leader of the majority party in the Metropolitan Council should act as the Leader of the House and should be appointed as the Chief Executive Councillor, who will be the *ex-officio* Vice-Chairman of the Council. He will preside over the meetings in the absence of the L.A.

[श्री बहा प्रकाश]

Governor. The other Councillors should be appointed on his advice

The second important point pertains to financial powers. The Metropolitan Council should have its own Consolidated Fund and should have the power to pass its budget."

यह खत मैंने 21 अक्टूबर को लिखा था। अगर कोई कमिटमेंट था तो वह कहाँ था या किस की तरफ से हुआ था। इसके बाद मैंने लगातार होम मिनिस्टर साहब को टेलीफोन किया कि मैं उन से इस मामले में आकर बातचीत करना हूँ लेकिन मुझे उन्होंने एक दिन भी वक़्त नहीं दिया। मेरे खत तक को एकनालेज़ नहीं किया। उसके बाद मैं ने विल पेश होने से दो दिन पहले 16 नवम्बर को उन को लिखा कि अगर बिल आया तो डिफिकल्टी होगी, इस लिये मेहरबानी कर के उसे पेश न किया जाये। उस के बारे में बातचीत की गई लेकिन कोई फैसला नहीं हो सका। मेरे पास डाकुमन्ट्स हैं, जो इस को साबित करते हैं।

यह इल्जाम लगाना मेरे पर था कि किसी के ऊपर, या प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी के ऊपर कि हम ने कमिटमेंट किया था, यह सरासर ज़्यादती है और होम मिनिस्टर के स्टेटस के आदमी से हम यह उम्मीद नहीं करते थे कि वह इस तरह से कहेंगे। मैं मानता हूँ कि उन की अवाज़ बड़ी है, मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि उन की अवाज़ अखबारों में पहुँच सकती है, मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि अगर वह कुछ कहे तो बहुत से लोग उनके साथ मिल कर उन की अवाज़ में होंगे। हाँ हाँ मिल सकते हैं। अगर कोई कमिटमेंट किया गया है तो वह प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी दिल्ली की बैंक पर किया गया है। मैं तो यहाँ तक कहूँगा कि अगर किसी ने धूलग धूलग जा कर कमिटमेंट किया है ख़ाम लालच से किया है। दिल्ली को तरफ से कोई कमिटमेंट करने का उनको अधिकार नहीं था और बाद में उन्होंने हज़र पर यह इल्जाम लगा दिया कि हम ने कमिटमेंट किया है। हम तो कहते हैं कि इस बिल को मुस्तज़ी किया जाय और इसमें फाइ-

नैन्शल पावर रखने की बात की जाय। अगर ज़रूरत पड़े तो आप इसके लिए कांस्टिट्यूशन को प्रमेड कर सकते हैं। होम मिनिस्टर फाइनेन्शियल पावर देने के खिलाफ नहीं हैं और कहते हैं कि मैं दिल्ली को एक डिमाण्ड-टिक सेट अप देना चाहता हूँ। अगर हमको इसका यह जवाब दिया जाता है कि आप ने कमिटमेंट किया है। यह ऐसा इल्जाम है जिस को हम कभी भी वर्दाशत नहीं करेंगे हम दिल्ली के बूने हुए नुमाइन्दों में से कुछ को लालच दे कर लीम दे कर मिला लिया गया और पहला दिया गया कि हम ने कमिटमेंट किया है। हमें इस बात पर बड़ा अफ़सोस है।

जो लोग कहते हैं कि हम ने कमिटमेंट किया, उन में से चार पाँच आदमी वह हैं जो उन मीटिंगों में होम मिनिस्टर साहब के सामने हाज़िर भी नहीं होते थे। सुभद्रा जोशी तो एक मीटिंग में हाज़िर थी दूसरे दो मेम्बर किसी मीटिंग में हाज़िर होते थे किसी में नहीं होते थे। इस मामले को किसी ने भी स्टेडी नहीं किया है। होम मिनिस्टर श्री नन्दा ने भी शायद स्टेडी नहीं किया। अगर किया है तो मैं ने और सेक्रेटरी साहब ने किया है। मैं जिम्मेदारी से कह सकता हूँ कि इस बिल के बारे में हमारे साथ सरासर धोखा किया गया है। जब भी कमिटमेंट की बात कही जाती है पब्लिक के अन्दर तो उस की सख्त प्रोटस्ट होती है। और इस को मैं सख्ती से रीजैन्ट करता हूँ।

दूसरी बात कही जाती है फाइनेन्शियल पावर्स को होम मिनिस्टर कहते हैं कि मैं फाइनेन्शियल पावर देने के लिये तैयार हूँ अगर यह कहा जाता है कि कांस्टिट्यूशन आगे आता है और हम नहीं दे सकते हैं तो 245 आर्टिकल के मातहत हम यह फाइनेन्शियल पावर्स दे सकते हैं। आर्टिकल 245 और 246 (4) के अन्तर फाइनेन्शियल पावर्स दी जा सकती हैं। इस के लिये आप स्टडी कर के देख से और मालूम कर लें। अगर नहीं दी जा सकती है तो आप को क्या विस्कल

है। प्राप इतनी बार कांस्टिट्यूशन भ्रमंड कर चुके हैं, क्या इस बिल के लिये हम ऐसा नहीं कर सकते हैं। दिल्ली की जो पब्लिक प्रोपियन है, दिल्ली के जो लोग हैं, वह इस बात को चाहते हैं कि हमारे लिये कोई डिमाक्रेटिक सेंट प्राप मिले। वह प्रसेम्बली के लिये जिद्द नहीं करना चाहते, लेकिन कोई डिमाक्रेटिक सेंट प्राप चाहते हैं, वह कोई दिल्ली के लोगों के लिये रिस्पांसिबल बाडी चाहते हैं। वह ऐड-वाइजरी बाडी नहीं चाहते, कोई ग्लोरिफाइड क्लक नहीं चाहते हैं। अगर इन चालिस प्रादमियों को हम सिर्फ ऐडवाइजरी शक्ल में रखते हैं तो कौन जिम्मेदार प्रादमो ऐडवाइजर बन कर जायेगा। 245 और 246 (4) में कहा है कि :

Article 245 (1) reads thus:

"Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, Parliament may make laws for the whole or any part of the territory of India, and the Legislature of a State may make laws for the whole or any part of the State."

Then, article 246 (4) says:

"Parliament has power to make laws with respect to any matter for any part of the territory of India not included in a State notwithstanding that such matter is a matter enumerated in the State List."

Financial power means any power, Financial power is part of it.

Shri Hathi: The phrase is 'Parliament may by law make'.

Shri Brahm Prakash: In this very Bill those powers can be given. The hon. Minister can accept the amendments tabled by my hon. friend Shri Shiv Charan Gupta to that effect. Those amendments can be accepted, and financial powers can be given to that body.

The Bude: We also agree with the hon. Member that the powers can be given.

श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश : जब वह कहते हैं कि एनी पावर दे सकते हैं तो फार्मैलियम पावर इज एपार्ट फ्राफ दैट। तो जनाब प्राना,

707 (ai) LS.—7.

यह मैं बेलीस्टीट्यूशन के बारे में प्रार्ज किया। मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन्टरिम कौमिल प्राप इसमें लाये हैं। चन्द महीनों के लिए प्राप इन्टरिम कौमिल लाना चाहता है और 40 प्रादमी एक्सेट कराना चाहते हैं 90 लोगों से और वह भी चन्द महीनों के लिए दिल्ली के सेंट-प्राप के दो हिस्से हैं, एक मेट्रोपोलिटन कौमिल और एक कारपोरेशन मेयर-इन-कौमिल। मेयर-इन-कौमिल का बिल प्राज तक हाउस के सामने नहीं प्राया। एक प्रजीब बात है कि इतनी प्रनइय हेस्ट है इसके प्रन्दर कि कांस्टीट्यूशन का जो रीप्रागैनाइजेशन का था वह बिल भी थपले में चला गया लेकिन डेलही का मेट्रो-पोलिटन बिल डेलही के लोगों की बेइज्जती करने के लिए जरूर लाया जायगा चाहे कुछ भी क्यों न हो। यह गवर्नमेंट की जिद है। सेकेंड्री एजुकेशन बिल पड़ा है। वह ह उम में नहीं प्राया। डेलही हाईकोर्ट बिल को प्रायगिटी नहीं मिली, लेकिन डेलही मेट्रोपोलिटन बिल जरूर प्रा गया चूंकि जिद है, चूंकि सजा देनी है, चूंकि पंजाबी रीप्रागैनाइजेशन की मदद हमने की थी, इसलिए हमें सजा देनी है—कि यह बिल हम पर लागू किया जाय, जनाब प्राना मैं यहां यह कहना चाहता हूँ, मुझे पता नहीं, ... मैं इस हाउस में फिर प्राऊंगा या नहीं, इसका तो मुझे अभी बाद में तय करना है लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ गवर्नमेंट प्राफ इण्डिया, होम मिनिस्ट्री, खास तौर से, प्राज डिवाइड एण्ड रूल की कोशिश कर रही है। प्राज डेलही की पब्लिक के प्रन्दर, डेलही की काप्रेय के प्रन्दर और डेलही के लोगों के प्रन्दर डिवाइड करके रूल करना चाहती है जो कि एक फारेन गवर्नमेंट किया करती थी। अपनी गवर्नमेंट कभी ऐसा करती है। मुझे दुख है इस बात का और मैं कहता हूँ कि जो होम मिनिस्ट्री का रबैया दिल्ली वालों के साथ और खास तौर से दो एक और मिनिस्ट्रों का वह निहायत बेइज्जती का है। मैं समझता हूँ दिल्ली वाले इस रबैये को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे और मैं एक

[श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश]

बात और कह देना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक दिल्ली को डेमोक्रेटिक राइट्स नहीं मिलेंगे, दिल्ली के लोगों को खुद अपने फैसले करने का हक नहीं होगा दिल्ली के लोगों को खुद अपनी किस्मत बनाने का हक नहीं होगा वह अपने हक के लिए लगातार जद्दोजहद करते रहेंगे।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, Shri Bade. He may take not more than 10 minutes

An Hon. Member: Time may be extended.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You should extend the time for this Bill. The time saved on the Constitution (Ninth) Amendment Bill may be appropriated for this Bill.

श्री बड़े : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, डेलही एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बिल की सेलेक्ट कमेटी का मैं मेम्बर था और मैंने अपना डिसेंटिंग नोट दिया है। लेकिन मुझे एक कथा याद आती है कि एक दफा एक बच्चा बहुत रो रहा था और कह रहा था कि मैं चांद लूंगा। चांद कोई उसको दे नहीं रहा था और न दे सकता था। तो उस गांव में एक बड़े होशियार आदमी थे। वह आये और उन्होंने उस बच्चे के हाथ में एक आइना दे दिया और कहा कि लो, यह चांद तुम्हारे हाथ में आ गया। इसी प्रकार से हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने किया है। यहां के जितने कांग्रेसी सदस्य जैसे चौधरी ब्रह्म प्रकाश जी और बाकी सब जो हैं वह रो रहे थे कि हमें कुछ अधिकार चाहिये तो उन्होंने कहा कि ठीक है, यह लो डेलही एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बिल। इस प्रकार आइना देकर चांद उनके हाथ में दे दिया कि यह लो, यह चांद तुम्हारे हाथ में आ गया। और फिर यह कांग्रेस व ले कैसे मुर्गा को दाने डालकर लड़ाते हैं यह दृश्य आपके सामने आया। जो कांग्रेस के बड़े कट्टर सदस्य थे, जो कि चीफ मिनिस्टर थे भूतपूर्व, और बड़े कमेन्थ सदस्य हैं, आज वह किस तरह से हमला कर रहे हैं कांग्रेस पर और होम मिनिस्टर पर कि वह बोलते

बोलते टेबिल पर भी जोर जोर से हाथ से धावाज करने लग गए जब उनको जोश आ गया। शायद वह समझ गये होंगे कि अपोजीशन के अधिकारों पर भी जब कुठाराघात होता है तो उनको किस प्रकार से जोश और गुस्सा आता होगा। नाउ दि शू इज पिचिंग हिम।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कि यह डेलही ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल बिल बिलकुल यूजलेस बिल है। डेमोक्रेसी की ध्वजियां इसमें उड़ाई गई हैं। इसमें क्या कह रहे हैं, आप देखें, सेक्शन 22 में यह लिखा है :

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Metropolitan Council shall have the right to discuss and make recommendations with respect to the following matters in so far as they relate to Delhi".

वह अपनी राय दे सकती है, लेकिन डिमिशन नहीं ले सकती हैं। एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल उनकी राय को मानेगी या नहीं यह एक समस्या की बात रहेगी। यानी मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल को अपना समय हममें व्यतीत करना है। समय देने के बाद डिस्कस करना है और अपने सुझाव एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल को भेजना है और एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल माने नौकरशाही। पहले प्रीलियाशाही, नादिरशाही निजामशाही और क्या क्या थे, अब नौकरशाही एक और आ गई। यह नौकर शाही ऐसी है, जिनमें इसका कटु कटु अनुभव कभी किया है, वह जानता है कि जो इसके पचड़े में पड़ गया उसका भला कभी होता नहीं। यह जो एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल है इसमें तीन मेम्बर होंगे जिनको प्रेसीडेंट नामिनेट करेंगे और उसके हाथ में ही, एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल को ही ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव एगारिटी है। एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल में एक भी मेम्बर ऐसा नहीं रखा है जो मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल के प्रति रेस्पॉन्सिबल हो। एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल के ऊपर मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल का कुछ कन्ट्रोल, रखते तो भी मैं समझता कि दिल्ली वालों को खिलोना नहीं कुछ और दिया

है। आज इतने साल से दिल्ली के लोग और दिल्ली की जनता चिल्ला रही है कि हमको कुछ मिलना चाहिये, डेमोक्रेटिक राइट्स हमको मिलने चाहिए। लेकिन आपने दिया क्या है कि चुनकर घाना, एक जगह इकट्ठा होना और केवल वहाँ जो एक बजट धारणा उस पर डिस्कस करना और रेज्यूशन करना ! बट दे थार नाट फाइनल। उनके हाथ में कुछ भी नहीं है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : राज्य सभा में क्या है ? यही तो राज्य सभा में है।

श्री बड़े : राज्य सभा को अपर हाउस और परलोक कहते हैं। तो परलोक भोजना है तो भोजिए। यह है लोक सभा और वह है परलोक सभा : परलोक भोजना है तो भले ही भोजिए। पर यह मैं कहता हूँ कि यह प्रजातन्त्र की हंसी है, यह रिडिकिलिंग दि डेमोक्रेसी है। डेमोक्रेटिक राइट्स में माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने प्रस्ताव रखा था कि फाइनैशियल राइट्स होने चाहिए, बजट पर कंट्रोल होना चाहिए। आप कहते हैं कि उसके लिए कांस्टीट्यूशन को अमेंड करना पड़ेगा। कांस्टीट्यूशन में 18 अमेंडमेंट्स आप कर चुके हैं और उन्नीसवाँ अमेंडमेंट आज लाये थे। तो कांस्टीट्यूशन तो आपके हाथ का मेल है। आप उसको जब चाहे बदल सकते हो। लेकिन जब मन में नहीं होगा तो कहेंगे कि कांस्टीट्यूशन को अमेंड करना पड़ेगा, जब तक कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंड नहीं होगा तब तक फाइनैशियल राइट्स कैसे दिये जा सकते हैं। जब म्युनिसिपल कारपोरेशन को बजटरी पावर्स हैं और वह बजट डिस्कस कर सकते हैं, उन को पूरा अधिकार है अपने बजट पर तो क्यों नहीं मेट्रोपोलीटन कौंसिल को अधिकार होने चाहिए ? आप सेलेक्ट कमेटी में इस शंका का कोई निरासन कर नहीं सके। मैं अभी तक यही समझता हूँ कि फाइनैशियल पावर्स अगर नहीं दिये तो कुछ भी नहीं दिया है और रेज्यूशन फाइनल नहीं होने तो उनका भी कोई धर्म नहीं है। साथ में जब कांस्टीट्यूशनल

एक्सपर्ट लाये थे तो एक्सपर्ट ने यह कहा था कि कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंड करना पड़ेगा और हम और कांसेस के सदस्य यह मांग कर रहे थे कि कम से कम फाइनैशियल पावर उन को दें। फाइनैशियल पावर्स देंगे, और बजटरी राइट्स देंगे तो हमारा काम हो जायगा, लेकिन वह बात हुई नहीं।

उसके साथ साथ मैं मस्टीप्लीसिटी आफ एक्जिटरी होती है। म्युनिसिपल कमेटी है, कारपोरेशन है, वह भी रहेगा और साथ साथ में मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल और घा गई। यानी दो मियां के बीच में मूर्छा हलाल होती है। तो कारपोरेशन और मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल के बीच में दिल्ली हलाल हो जायगी क्योंकि इनका कोई समन्वय नहीं हुआ। इसके साथ साथ में डेसही मिस्क स्कीम है, डेवलपमेंट आफ डेलही की एक संस्था है उन पर इसका कोई कंट्रोल नहीं है। ब्रह्म प्रकाश जी कहते हैं कि यहाँ लेजिस्लेटिव प्रसेम्बली होनी चाहिए। मैं कहता हूँ कि दुनिया में जहाँ जहाँ कैपिटल है वहाँ लेजिस्लेटिव प्रसेम्बली नहीं है। हमारे मित्र ब्रह्म प्रकाश जी बैठे हैं, वह दुनिया में एक भी जगह बना दें कि जहाँ कैपिटल है वहाँ लेजिस्लेटिव प्रसेम्बली है। ऐसा कहीं नहीं है। लेकिन अपने यहाँ इस प्रकार की संस्था होनी चाहिए कि लेजिस्लेटिव प्रसेम्बली तो नहीं लेकिन लेजिस्लेटिव प्रसेम्बली के बराबर कोई चीज होनी चाहिए जिसमें फाइनैशियल पावर्स हों और उन पर पूरा कंट्रोल उसका होना चाहिए।

श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश : कैनाडा में, वेस्ट जर्मनी में और माउथ अफ्रीका में तीनों जगह मौजूद है।

श्री बड़े : मैं यह इसलिए कहता हूँ कि वाशिंगटन में नहीं है, और इंग्लैंड में काउंटी कौंसिल्स हैं, वहाँ भी नहीं है और आस्ट्रेलिया में नहीं है। कैनाडा का मुझे मान्य नहीं है। लेकिन उसके अनुसार आपकी* इसमें फिर अमेंडमेंट देना था कि कैनाडा में इस तरह से है और यहाँ भी ऐसे होना चाहिए।

[श्री बड़े]

इसके अलावा कमेटी ने भाषा के बारे में जो उसका 24वां सेक्शन होता था उसे ही गायब कर दिया है और मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल पर अपनी भाषा निर्धारित करने का काम छोड़ दिया है। मेरा खयाल है कि धारा सम्बन्धी क्लॉज 24 को सैलैक्ट कमेटी ने गायब करके उचित काम नहीं किया है क्योंकि वहां पर फिर इस चीज को लेकर दादविवाद खड़े होंगे और झगड़ेबाजी होगी। जब हमारे संविधान में साफ लिखा हुआ है कि भारतीय संघ की राष्ट्रभाषा और राजभाषा हिन्दी होगी तो बिना किसी संकोच के उसे रख देना चाहिए था और इस तरह से इस मामले को अनिश्चित और विवाद का विषय बना कर नहीं छोड़ना चाहिए था।

मेरा यह भी निवेदन है कि अगर यहां दिल्ली की विशेष स्थिति में आप दिल्लीवासियों को एक लेजिस्लेटिव असेंबली नहीं देना चाहते हैं तो इस का पावर्स देनी चाहिए और फाइनैशियल पावर्स से वेस्ट करना चाहिए। इस मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल को एक जिम्मेदार संस्था होना चाहिए। अगर लेजिस्लेटिव असेम्बली आप दिल्ली वालों को नहीं देते हैं तो इस कौंसिल को तो ताकत दीजिये ताकि वह जिम्मेदारी के साथ अपने कर्तव्यों को निभा सके।

श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती ने एक संशोधन दिया है कि अगर दो तिहाई वोट्स मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल में किसी एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिलर के खिलाफ हो जाएं तो उसको हट जाना चाहिए मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूं। एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिलर शूड बी रिसर्चिबिल टु बी मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल।

जहां तक सीट्स का सवाल है मेरे खयाल में उसकी तादाद 56 होनी चाहिए। जब मेट्रोपोलिटन कारपोरेशन के 100 मेम्बर हो जायेंगे तो उसके अनुसार 50 सीट्स कारपोरेशन की हो जायेगी, 6 सीट्स बाकी रहेंगी तो 6 सीटों का एलैक्शन हो जायेगा। उसमें ऐसा लिखा हुआ है :—

"In my view, it should be 56. If the number of elected members is kept at 49, then out of these 49 members, 43 would be from the Corporation area. If the Corporation and Metropolitan Council elections are going to be held simultaneously, then the number of the Corporation Wards would have to be either 86 or 129. But according to the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, a Ward for the purpose of Corporation election, shall be of not more than 20,000 population....".

इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि बजट 49 के उनकी तादाद 56 होनी चाहिये।

मेरा विचार है कि जिन 4.5 मेम्बरों ने अपने त्यागपत्र दिये हैं अगर वह त्याग पत्र देने के बजाय डिसेंटिंग नोट देते तो सब को मालूम पड़ना और देश की जनता के सामने आता कि उनके इस बारे में क्या विचार हैं। इस्तीफा देने से शासन के ऊपर कोई अमर पड़ने वाला नहीं है क्योंकि हम मिनिसटर और गवर्नमेंट के मन में एक ऐसी बात थी कि इसे करना है इसलिए उसे उन्होंने रख दिया। उस में जो दो मिनिसटर्स थे वह इटरेस्टेड थे क्योंकि अब दिल्ली के लिए पालियामेंट में बजट 5 सांटी के 7 सांटी हो गया है और इसलिए वह खुश होते होंगे कि सम्भवतः 7 कांवेसी उन पर चुन कर आयेंगे इफनिये उन्होंने इस मेजर को सपोर्ट किया। खन्ना साहब किस प्रकार से उनका सपोर्ट करने हैं जब कि इस मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल को फाइनैशियल पावर्स नहीं हैं? मैं इस बिना पर इस बिल को सपोर्ट करता हूं।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (बलरामपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज दिल्ली ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बिल के ऊपर जोकि सदन के सामने पेश है बातचीत हो रही है। मुझे को यह सुन कर ताज्जुब हुआ जब आनरेबुल मेम्बर श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती ने कहा कि वह नहीं समझती कि मैं दिल्ली में असेम्बली के खिलाफ क्यों हूं। वह यह भी नहीं समझती कि इस बिल में क्या चीज है जिससे मैं एक इन्समंड फील

करती हूँ। मैं इस बारे में सिर्फ यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि यह उनका उनका ही भ्रम है जैसी कि गसती उन को लगी कि दिल्ली के पालियामेंट के सदस्यों में मैं भी हूँ पर मैं दिल्ली से पालियामेंट की सदस्य नहीं हूँ पर दुर्भाग्य मेरा यही है कि उन की तरह कुछ और लोग भी जब अपना मतलब समझते हैं तो मुझको दिल्ली का सदस्य समझ लेते हैं और जब मतलब नहीं रहता तो मुझको बाहर का सदस्य समझ लेते हैं। इसके लिए मैंने उनको हमेशा धन्यवाद दिया और मैं सफाई से कहना चाहती हूँ कि मैं दिल्ली में प्रेसम्बल के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ। हमेशा मैंने इस स्टैंड को सपोर्ट किया है आज भी करता हूँ और हमेशा करती रहूँगी, कौन नहीं चाहता कि जनता को अधिकार मिलें? अब क्या श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी मुझ को सिखायेंगे कि उमूलों के लिए हम को लड़ना चाहिए? आज मैं श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती की पार्टी का जिक्र नहीं करना चाहती लेकिन वाक्या यह है कि ज्यों ज्यों चुनाव नजदीक आते जा रहे हैं त्यों त्यों उनकी पार्टी उमूलों को ताक में रख कर दूसरे दलों में चुनाव के लिये समझौते कर रही है उनकी पार्टी बिना उमूलों के समझौते हिन्दुस्तान के एक कोने में दूसरे कोने तक कर रही है।

Shri Namblar : What has that to do with this ?

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : उनकी पार्टी का बिहार में समझौता जनता पार्टी से हो रहा है। उत्तर प्रदेश में उन का समझौता जनसंघ से हो रहा है, आंध्र में उन का समझौता स्वतंत्र पार्टी से हो रहा है और पंजाब में जहाँ उनका समझौता पहले भी अकाली पार्टी से हुआ था फिर भी अकाली पार्टी से हो रहा है फिर उन से मैं क्या उमूल की बात सुनूँ ?

इतना ही नहीं मैं दिल्ली की बात करती हूँ। बड़े मास मूवमेंट का उन्होंने जिक्र किया। जनता कितनी उनके पीछे है उस का जिक्र किया? किस तरह से दिल्ली की जनता के लिए उन के दिल में प्रेम है और किस तरह

से वह उनकी जिमांड के साथ है इस की दुहाई उन्होंने दी? मैं उन से आदर के साथ पूछना चाहती हूँ कि जिस दिन दिल्ली का सेंस टैक्स बढ़ा तो व्यापारियों के साथ उन्होंने मिल कर और उन की पार्टी ने मिल कर हड़ताल का नाग दिया लेकिन जिस दिन दिल्ली में झालडा गायब हो गया, महंगाई अत्यधिक बढ़ गई, कीमतें बढ़ गईं और जिस दिन दिल्ली में लोग घाटे के घेले लेकर घर-घर धूसा किए तो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने दिल्ली बन्द का नारा क्यों नहीं दिया? आखिर यह कहाँ का उमूल है? वर भी जलूस मुझको देखने का सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ जब ग्रेटर हरियाना के उमूल पर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी एक प्रदर्शन लेकर हमारे सामने आई? वह रिपब्लिकन पार्टी के जलूस के साथ भी यहाँ पर आई जिसमें मांग की गई कि लोगों को मकान चाहिए, सगरी शोपइडिया चाहिए। जहाँ तक मांगों का सवाल है वह सही है। लेकिन मैं बतला रही थी कि क्या उनका उमूल है जिनकी वह दुहाई दे रही हैं? उस जलूस में 25 एक पार्टी के और 25 दूसरी पार्टी के लोग शामिल थे। ग्रेटर दिल्ली की जिमांड का लेकर संसद् के सामने प्रदर्शन हुआ। मैं नहीं कहती कि दिल्ली की प्रेसम्बल की मांग गलत है लेकिन मैं यह कहती हूँ कि आज जब दिल्ली की जनता के नाम पर यहाँ मांग पेश कर रहे हैं उन के पीछे दिल्ली की जनता कितनी है यह अपने दिल को टटोल कर पूछें।

अब उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, पावर किस को नहीं चाहिए? शक्ति कौन नहीं चाहता? जनता के हाथ पावर आये इस को मंजूर करके पंचों द्वारा पावर्स दे दी गई हैं। वहाँ भाग चुनाव हुआ करे। आज होम मिनिस्टर के ऊपर बड़ा चार्ज लगाया गया। मैं न तो एकस मिनिस्टर हूँ, न बुड बी मिनिस्टर हूँ और न ही प्रजेंट मिनिस्टर हूँ लेकिन मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि अगर आज यहाँ ऐसी बाब न होती तो अच्छा था। मुझ को बड़े दिन याद है जब इस देश के सबसे बड़े नेता ने अपने स्वभाव के खिलाफ आकर, अपनी आदत के

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

खिलाफ़ जाकर जैसे कि कोई एक परसनल दिलचस्पी लेकर दिल्ली में प्रसेम्बली कायम की थी लेकिन वह हमारी करतूतों से कायम नहीं रह सकी। मैं उस वक़्त भी दिल्ली में थी और काम करती थी, आज भी दिल्ली में रहती हूँ और हमेशा रही हूँ कभी भ्रष्टाचार जगह रही कभी छोटी जगह रही और कभी बड़ी जगह रही लेकिन जैसा मैंने कहा कि यह हमारा दुर्भाग्य रहा कि हम अपने कारनामों से और करतूतों से जिस उमूल की बिना पर हम को दिल्ली की जनता को एक चीज़ मिली थी उसको हमने तोड़ दिया। जब चुनाव आये तो दिल्ली की जनता ने कहा कि प्रसेम्बली कहाँ गई? हमने वायदा किया कि हम तुम को फिर लाकर देंगे। हम आज फिर अपने हाँम मिनिस्टर साहब से प्रसेम्बली मांगते हैं। आज जो बिल हमारे सामने आया है मैं प्रदब के साथ कहता चाहती हूँ कि वैसे उसका दिल्ली की प्रसेम्बली के बिल के साथ मुकाबला नहीं है पर मैं उसका स्वागत इसलिए करती हूँ कि वह एक कदम और आगे है...

Shri Nambiar: What is that one step? One more confusion, not more step.

Shri Hathli: I will clear it.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मैं अभी बताऊंगी कि उसमें क्या क्या खूबियाँ हैं लेकिन मैं यह अवश्य कहूँगी वह एक कदम आगे की ओर है। मैं मानती हूँ कि बहुत सारी बातें हैं जो कि हमारे हाथ में वहाँ नहीं हैं। उसे समझने के लिये कोई कांस्टीट्यूशनल ऐक्सपर्ट होने की जरूरत नहीं है। हमारे नेता यह समझते हैं और मैं समझती हूँ कि किसी हद तक सही समझते हैं कि हम लोगों को दिल्ली के कार्य-कर्ताओं को दिल्ली के नेताओं को अभी बहुत कुछ सीखने की जरूरत है, बहुत कुछ ट्रेनिंग चाहिए जो हम दो उनके सुपरविजन में लेकर हासिल करनी चाहिए।

15-59 hrs.

[SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH in the Chair]

माफ़ करेंगे हमारे हाउसिंग मिनिस्टर, अभी डी० डी० ए० उनके पास आया है न मालूम उसको क्या शकल बनने वाली है और किस तरीके से चलने वाला है, मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकती। वह तो देख कर पता चलेगा। लेकिन मैं भ्रष्टा करना चाहती हूँ कि डी० डी० ए० में जनता के बहुत से नुमायन्दे रहते हैं। इस सिलसिले में मैं उन भ्रष्टासरो का जिक्र नहीं करना चाहती हूँ, जो दिल्ली के क्लबों और होटलों में बैठ कर फ़ैमले करना चाहते हैं और करते हैं। मैं तो सिर्फ़ जनता के नुमायन्दों का जिक्र करना चाहती हूँ, जो समाजवाद का नारा लगाते हैं। दिल्ली में जो ग्रीन बेल्ट बनी, डी० डी० ए० में जनता के नुमायन्दे होते हुए भी कानूनों को तोड़ कर, कानूनों से बच कर, उस ग्रीन बेल्ट में सिनेमा हाउसिज़ बने, शराब की दुकानें बनीं और बड़ी-बड़ी मोटरों की मरम्मत की दुकानें बनीं।

16 hrs.

इस हाउस के माननीय सदस्यों ने दिल्ली में पच्चीस पैसे में काफ़ी का कप बेचने वाले उस काफ़ी हाउस को देखा होगा, जिसने पहली दफ़ा यहाँ के ट्रेडर्स और बिजनेसमैन को चैलेंज किया कि आप दो रुपये में काफ़ी बेचते हो, लेकिन हम पच्चीस पैसे में काफ़ी बेच कर भी कमा सकते हैं। उस काफ़ी हाउस के लिए डी० डी० ए० में जनता के किसी नुमायन्दे की तरफ़ से आवाज़ नहीं उठाई गई।

श्री मौर्य (अलीगढ़) : भ्रष्टाचार से तो शायद ही कांग्रेस के कोई मिनिस्टर बचे हों। तो फिर उनको क्यों नहीं हटाते?

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : अगर नन्दा जी और हाउसिंग मिनिस्टर, जिन पर दुनिया भर के चार्जिज़ लगाए जा रहे हैं, इस बारे में मदद न करते, तो उस काफ़ी हाउस को तोड़ कर गिरा दिया जाता, जो दिल्ली के दस हजार, लोगों को केटर कर रहा है और पच्चीस पैसे

में काफ़ी बेच कर भी जिस की पांच हजार रुपये रोज की सेल है, और उन सब लोगों को फिर काफ़ी के लिए दो रुपये खर्च करने पर मजबूर होना पड़ता ।

श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश : मैं सफ़ाई देना चाहता हूँ कि इस बारे में डी० डी० ए० में प्रकेला मैं उसके हक में था और सारे मेम्बर उसके खिलाफ थे ।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मैं उन भ्रष्टारों का खिन्न नहीं कर रही हूँ, क्योंकि वे जनता के नुमायन्दे नहीं हैं । यहाँ के सबसे भाला भ्रष्टार भी उसका विरोध कर रहे थे, लेकिन मैं उनका खिन्न नहीं करना चाहती हूँ । इस सदन के सदस्य यह न समझे कि मैं यह चाहती हूँ कि जनता के प्रतिनिधियों को पावर न मिले और वह पावर भ्रष्टारों के पास रहे । मैं यहाँ पर भ्रष्टारों का काज प्लीड करने के लिए नहीं आई हूँ । मैं तो उसूल की बात कर रही हूँ । जो पावर ली जाती है, वह अच्छे काम करने के लिए ली जाती है ।

मुझे वह बात भी याद है कि काश्मीरी गेट के जो चमार और मोची दो-दो पैसे कमाने के लिए सारे शहर का टूर लगाते हैं, उनको शहर से सात मील दूर भेजा जा रहा था, लेकिन जो बड़े-बड़े कबाड़ी शहर के बीच में बैठे हुए हैं, जब उनको हटाने का सवाल आया, तो जनता के नुमायन्दों ने कहा कि अगर उनको हटाया जायेगा, तो हम सत्याग्रह करेंगे । चूँकि मेरा नाम बहुत दफ़ा लिया गया है, इसलिए मैं इस दर्दनाक इतिहास में गई हूँ । इसका मुझे बड़ा भ्रष्टास है और मैं इसके लिए आपसे माफ़ी चाहती हूँ ।

जहाँ तक इस बिल का तात्सुक है, मैं भी चाहती हूँ कि मेट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल में इलैक्टिव मेम्बरज की तादाद 49 के बजाये 56 कर दी जाये । इस बिल में जो भ्रष्टाचार बार्ते रखी गई है, डिप्टी होम मिनिस्टर साहब उनको बतायेंगे । एक भ्रष्टाचार बात यह रखी

गई है कि बैंक तक तो एन० डी० एम० सो० और दूसरी लोकल बाडीज के बजट डिस्कस नहीं हुआ करते थे, वे सारे बजट अब मेट्रो-पालिटन कौंसिल में डिस्कस होंगे । यह मैं मानती हूँ कि शायद वह कौंसिल कैसला नहीं करेगी । यह भी मैं मानती हूँ कि शायद वह सिर्फ़ एक डिबैटिंग सोसायटी हो । लेकिन मैं भ्रष्टा करना चाहती हूँ कि कुछ पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर चाहे बहुत कुछ पावर रखने हों, लेकिन हमारी पावर बोलने की ही होती है । हम यह भी जानते हैं कि अपोजीशन के एक सवाल पूछने से हिन्दुस्तान हिल जाता है, सरकार हिल जाती है । इसलिए उस मेट्रो-पालिटन कौंसिल में हम कुछ नहीं कर सकेंगे, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है ।

आखिर मैं मेरी दरकवास्त यह है कि सरकार इस बात को मान ले कि डी० डी० ए० और दूसरी बाडीज के बजट मेट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल में डिस्कस हुआ करें । जितनी ज्यादा से ज्यादा पावर हो सकती है, वह इस मेट्रो-पालिटन कौंसिल को देने की कोशिश की जाये ।

आज दिल्ली में सर्विसिड का बुरा हाल है । दिल्ली में बाहर से—पंजाब से, यू० पी० से—लोग काम करने के लिए आते हैं और जो दिल्ली के नौकरी करने वाले हैं, वे पच्चीसों बरस तक नौकरी करने के बाद भी तरक्की नहीं कर पाते हैं । मेरी तजवीज है कि दिल्ली का एक असलग पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन बने और दिल्ली वालों को भी नौकरी पाने, तरक्की करने और ऊपर जाना का ज्यादा से ज्यादा मौका दिया जाये । बैंक यू ।

Shri Nambiar : I am strongly opposed to this Bill. We have just now seen two hon. Members from Delhi speaking—Mr. Brahm Parkash who was Chief Minister of Delhi State when I came here in 1952, and Shrimati Subhadra Joshi, whom also I have known from 1952.

[Shri Nambiar]

These two hon. Members representing Delhi are speaking in two different tones and opposing each other.

Mr. Brahm Prakash stated categorically here in the very presence of the Minister of State of Home Affairs that Mr. Nanda had a sort of deal with some section of the Congress here and with some section of his own henchmen to decide upon this issue, and that the majority of Congress Members of Delhi are opposed to this move. The same sort of division is bound to happen inside that Council.

Wherefrom have they coined this word Metropolitan Council? So far we have known of States and Union Territories, but this Metropolitan Council is a very imaginary word which they have concocted or found out from the dictionary. They say because it is a metropolitan city, there must be a Metropolitan Council. Bombay is a metropolitan city as also Madras and Calcutta. Why this Metropolitan Council particularly for Delhi? Is it because the Home Minister's rule has to be perpetuated in Delhi, over the heads of the people of Delhi? Therefore, it is a shame that we introduce a newly coined word or a new addition to the so-called statehood. Therefore, this Metropolitan Council is a move to fool the people of Delhi and the people of India.

Today they may talk of a Metropolitan Council for Delhi, tomorrow they may say it must be there for Bombay and Madras, and finally they will say that the State of Kerala, the State of Andhra Pradesh, the State of Bengal, may be a Metropolitan State, and they may say that the President must rule the roost through an Administrator or the Governor, without the people's consent. Therefore, this is the thin end of the wedge of a new era, a new step that they are taking here to undo the democratic tradition that has been built during all these years.

We have seen what happened in Kerala during the last election and immediately after that. Before the Assembly was summoned, when all the hon. Members elected were in jail, it was dissolved. There was no Assembly available, how can they dissolve a thing which is not there? This

is the type of democracy that they want to bring in India, and in its footsteps comes the Metropolitan business now. Again, this will go. Therefore, in the larger interests of freedom and democratic tradition that we have built, and in the larger interests of the desire of the people who live in democracy, this abnoxious method and this most derogatory and reactionary step of Metropolitan business must be ended here and now.

Shrimati Subhadra Joshi said just now that when a green belt was coming round Delhi, moneyed people have built this thing and that thing. Moneyed people can build anything anywhere. They did in Bombay, they did in Calcutta. Could you stop it? And here alone in Delhi they want to stop it through the agency of the President and the Administrator, a thing which is happening all over. This is impossible. I would ask Shrimati Subhadra Joshi: Cannot the Administrator and the so-called Executive Council which is going to be nominated by the President be purchased or persuaded to do more harm to the people? Where is the method of stopping it? At least if there is an elected assembly, if there is a council of ministers responsible to the assembly and people, if they misbehave, there is a method of voting them down or correcting them through public opinion. There is no way to correct the executive Council and so the called administrator except by dismissal by the President. But unless and until you create public opinion throughout India and bring pressure through this House and persuade this House to take action against these officers, they cannot be removed. Shrimati Subhadra Joshi says that the bad cases that happened during the previous regime should not be repeated; therefore, they should not be any elected assembly. I do not know whether any bad things happened in 1952 when Mr. Brahm Prakash was Chief Minister: that is none of my business to go into that. It is not only in Delhi that there were mistakes and failures: it is there everywhere under the Congress regime. That cannot be the reason to say that people should not be allowed their democratic set up. If this logic of

Shrimati Joshi is correct, President's rule in Kerala is correct. President's rule everywhere will be correct because there may be misbehaviour by the Assembly and council of ministers. If there is misbehaviour, book them. But that is where they do not do anything. Then all will join together. When we point out to them at such and such things happened under the Congress regime, how the ministers misbehaved, etc., they will pounce on us and say: He is a communist, pro-Peking communist, who is to be put in Cuddalore Central jail for ten months, he should not open his mouth. There, it is a question of dividing the spoils. Democracy means democracy and even if my brother, father or mother has misbehaved, under the democratic system he or she should be punished. Unless that spirit is inculcated here, you cannot have better regime in this country. I want this House. Slowly, bit by bit we are following the path that was followed by many of the Asian-African countries. If we do not stand up for democratic traditions and principles, we would become just like the other States in Asia and Africa where ministers will not be there. They will be suddenly put behind the bars; their heads will be rolling in the corners here and there; in the ditch you can find the bodies of ministers. Such things may happen in this country as well. Let us take a vow, whether it is communist or congress, we must follow the tradition of democratic principles. The metropolitan council should not be there; it is to be nominated by the President. There must be an election, an elected assembly, a council of ministers answerable to the people. If the Centre feels that such an assembly in Delhi will interfere in their day-to-day functions of this Parliament or the minister's head offices, you can create proper safeguards against any intervention. Here I beg to differ from hon. Mr. Kamath. I read his dissent note; he said that the metropolitan council was necessary because we want to keep a safe position for Delhi so that the Centre's control, etc. may be there. I ask him to reconsider his position.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I say so with reference to the scope of the Bill.

Shri Naubiar: So, this Bill from that point of view is wrong. Therefore, we must have a democrat set up immediately created in Delhi which will show the path to the whole country. Democracy could thrive only by the leadership of headquarters here. Therefore, I oppose this Bill.

Shri Shiv Charan Gupta (Delhi Sadar): Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to speak on account of two remarks by the hon. Home Minister in his speech while introducing the subject for discussion. He said that article 239(A) comes in the way of giving a legislative assembly. Secondly, he said financial powers cannot be given without amending the Constitution. There is a lot of confusion about the constitutional position on this matter. I would humbly suggest to the hon. Minister that he may kindly not stand on prestige and consider this matter in its correct perspective. Article 239(A) provides for administrative arrangement for some of the Union Territories and lays down "Parliament may by law create for any of the Union Territories of Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Goa, Daman and Diu and Pondicherry etc." The Name of Delhi and a few other Union territories is not mentioned. Similarly, article 239(1) says: "save as otherwise provided by Parliament by law, every Union Territory shall be administered by the President acting, to such extent as he thinks fit, through an administrator to be appointed by him with such designation as he may specify". Then there is another clause. I shall deal with these two Articles jointly. Previously, article 239(1) began with the words "subject to the other provisions of this part." Now the Article has been amended these words have been substituted by "save as otherwise provided by Parliament by law." Because of this substitution at the beginning of article 239 (1) Parliament was given unfettered powers to create a legislature and specific provision in article 239(A) for Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Goa, Daman and Diu and Pondicherry does not restrict Parliament to make law for providing a legislature for the Union Territory of Delhi. Even though it may be contended that the power to make laws under article 245(1) and 246(4) does not confer the power to

[Shri Shiv Charan Gupta]

set up a legislature for the union territory in respect to which power to make laws has been conferred, that argument would not be available in the construction of the words "save as otherwise provided by Parliament by "law" in article 239(1). It is not making laws for the union territory, but it is providing for administration of the union territory. Part VIII is the exclusive part laying down the Constitution of union territories just as we have got part VI to deal with the constitution of the States. In this state of affairs, it will not be illegitimate to argue that though articles 239 to 241 lay down the executive, legislative and judicial structure of the union territory, the above provisions are subject to the overall power of Parliament to make alterations in the provisions contained in part VIII. In this sense, the power conferred upon Parliament by the opening words of article 239(1) need not be unnecessarily restricted to making administrative changes. In short, by virtue of the power conferred by the opening words of article 239(1) also, it is now possible for Parliament to set up a legislature for the union territory of Delhi by an ordinary legislation. It is suggested that article 239(A) indicates a particular arrangement for Union Territories. It is suggested that the provision restricts the power of Parliament. Now, this is a very serious matter, because Parliament draws this power under article 245(1) and 246 and then under article 248 also. Under article 245(1), Parliament has, subject to the provisions of the Constitution, the power to make laws for the whole or any part of the territory of India. Article 245 distributes legislative powers under certain heads exclusively to Parliament and certain other heads exclusively to the State legislatures and certain further heads concurrently to Parliament and the State legislatures. Clause 4 of article 246 provides that Parliament has power to make laws with respect to all matters for any part of the territory of India not included in a State notwithstanding that such matter is a matter enumerated in the State List.

..

Thus, in respect of Union territories, which are a part of the territory of India,

not included in any State, Parliament has power to make laws with respect to all matters whatsoever. Apart from the above, all residuary powers of legislation are vested in Parliament under article 248 and entry 97 in List I of the Seventh Schedule. The powers of Parliament for legislation in respect of the Union territories are thus absolute and plenary, as plenary as the power of Parliament to legislate in respect of matters mentioned in List I to the Seventh Schedule or items falling under its residuary powers of legislation under article 248.

Now, when we discuss the arguments put forward by the hon. Home Minister, let us examine the position of the Australian Constitution or the Constitution of the United States of America or the Constitution of the British Parliament. Take the British constitution from which we have drawn certain analogies and certain usages and certain practices. Now, if we look at this question, this may be illustrated by a precedent from the Commonwealth of Australia. It has been provided by section 122 of the Commonwealth of Australia Act that the Parliament may make laws for the government of any territory surrendered by any State to and accepted by the Commonwealth or otherwise acquired by the Constitution. The Australian Parliament by section 35 of the Papua and New Guinea Act, 1950, has established a Legislative Council and the legislature itself makes laws under section 48 for peace, order and good government of the territory. The laws are of course subject to disallowance by an administrator or the Governor-General. This would, therefore, show that in any event in Australia the term "to make laws" has been understood to mean a power to erect a subordinate legislature in the territory.

Let us next take the position in the United States of America. Clause 2 of the US Constitution says:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and

nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By virtue of these undoubted powers, Congress had created local legislatures for Alaska and Hawaii when they were territories but which have not become full-fledged States and have become part of the United States, but Puerto Rico presumably is still a territory.

Chapter 145 passed by the 64th Congress during the second session provided for a civil government for Puerto Rico, where under section 25 all local legislative powers are conferred on a legislature. By section 37, the Legislative authority provided shall extend to all matters of legislative character, not locally inapplicable, including power to create, consolidate and reorganise the municipalities so far as may be necessary and to provide and repeal laws and ordinances therefor, also the power to alter amend, modify or repeal any or all laws. This power, of course, is subject to the power of disallowance by the President. They are also subject to the annulment by the Congress: because it has been stated that all laws enacted by the legislature or Puerto Rico shall be reported to the Congress of the United States. But in 1952, the United States Congress went very much further.

In India also, under article 245 of the Constitution, Parliament may make laws for the whole or any part of the territory of India which includes Union territories. Under Article 246(1) and (2), Parliament has power to make laws with respect to matters enumerated in List I and List II, and under clause (4) of article 246, Parliament has power to make laws for any part of the territory of India not included in a State notwithstanding that such a matter is enumerated in the State List. Under article 248, Parliament has exclusive power to make any law with respect to any matter not enumerated in the Concurrent List or State List. In the words of the American decision, the Indian Parliament has all the dominion and sovereignty—national,

federal, municipal and State—so long as it remains a Union territory.

Let us go further. In deciding this question, our Parliament must be assumed to have at least as large power as the United States Congress with respect to Union Territories. This is important—the US Congress has power to make rules and regulations whereas under our Constitution, Parliament has power to make laws and if the US Congress by virtue of its power to make rules and regulations establishes almost a full legislature subject to disallowance by the President or repeal by the Congress, there is no reason why under similar conditions, the Indian Parliament cannot create similar institution in the Union Territory of Delhi.

So, there is no Constitutional bar. I can understand a policy decision of the Government that a legislature should not be provided. I may not agree with it, but to take shelter behind the Constitution is perhaps not correct. I think it is time that this matter should be gone into, because according to the Home Ministry's appraisal of the situation, they limit the power of Parliament to make laws for the whole of the country, including the Union Territories.

I would like to say something about the financial powers. What is the provision in our Constitution in this regard? The procedure in financial matters is dealt with under articles 112 to 117 for the receipts and expenditure of the Government of India and 202 to 207 for the States. Under article 245 and 246(4) Parliament has enacted several laws where financial powers have been given. It may be argued that these powers have been given to the local authorities. May it be so, but there is no provision in the Constitution limiting the power of the Parliament to vest financial powers in a body like the Metropolitan Council as envisaged in the Delhi Administration Bill. No doubt the powers of appropriation can be given only when the legislative powers are given to the Metropolitan Council. I do not see any difficulty in giving such limited powers to this body, but however, if it creates any difficulties in the present scheme of things, there is no difficulty in creating a Fund for the Union Territory of Delhi, transferring the money

[Shri Shiv Charan Gupta]

from the Consolidated Fund of India after appropriation by Parliament and giving powers to the Metropolitan Council to grant estimates of expenditure. In this connection, I have moved certain amendments. Previously also I gave some amendments. But these are modified amendments. They should not be treated in the light manner in which the previous amendments were treated when the Bill came up for discussion earlier. When we insist on these powers, it is not for the pleasure of it, but it is in order to make the Metropolitan Council an effective body to create close relation between the Metropolitan Council and the Executive Council. This relation will create a sense of responsibility in the mind of the Executive Councillors as they will have to look to the Metropolitan Council for sanctioning expenditure. This would not achieve the object of having a responsible Government, but it would partially create a sense of responsibility both among the Executive Council and the Metropolitan Council.

This is important: It would not be out of place to mention here that wherever people have enjoyed democratic form of Government, even if the powers have been misused here and there, the people have always been clamouring for it, because they feel that they can talk on a point of self-respect and prestige with their elected representatives and this feeling is not there when they have to deal with the officials. This is the reason why the people did not feel satisfied with the working of Corporation in Delhi or elsewhere except in Bombay and Calcutta, because the arrangement before the Corporation was more democratic as the Executive was elected, but later on, when the Executive and Deliberative wings became separate, and the Executive was not elected, the sense of frustration crept into the minds of the people. Even in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras there is a growing feeling that the Executive should be elected, and it should not be surprising when the people have tasted the fruit of democratic functioning in the last sixteen years.

In conclusion, I would urge upon the hon. Home Minister, because Delhi is his

direct responsibility and because he wants that some good arrangement should be made for Delhi where there should be no trouble, even at this late hour, to kindly consider this matter in its correct perspective and grant us financial powers. That can even be made at this late stage, so that the Metropolitan Council and the Executive Council can work in cohesion and the people of Delhi can look to the Metropolitan Council for removal of their various difficulties and problems.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : सभापति महोदय, श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश ने इस का इतिहास बतलाया और कहा कि दिल्ली के जो सदस्य थे उन्होंने कहीं भी किसी अवस्था में इसे स्वीकार नहीं किया। श्री शिवचरण गुप्त ने इसकी संवैधानिक स्थिति बतलाई। किन्तु मैं एक दूसरा रूप प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ। और वह यह कि आज की स्थिति क्या है ?

आज जो लोक सभा के सदस्य बैठे हुए हैं या जो राज्य सभा के सदस्य बैठे हुए हैं उन को पूर्ण अधिकार है कि दिल्ली के बारे में वह यहां पर कोई प्रश्न कर सकें या कोई समस्या उठा सकें। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि यह कार्य मंत्रालय और गृह मंत्री इससे बहुत परेशान हैं। वह समझते हैं कि 500 सदस्य इधर हैं, और 250 उधर हैं, 750 सदस्यों की परेशानी में बचने के लिये कोई रास्ता निकाला जाये। उन्होंने दिल्ली वायों की परेशानी का कोई रास्ता नहीं निकाला है, उन्होंने अपना बचाव देखा है, और अपना बचाव देखने के लिये जो इस सभा के सदस्य के अधिकार हैं उनको हटा कर एक ऐंड बाइजरी नेचर की, सलाहकार परिषद् दी जा रही है। आज तो यह है कि अगर दिल्ली में कोई भी परेशानी होती है तो हम यहां पर सरकार को परेशान करते हैं। हम यहां पर उस मामले पर विचार करते हैं, बहस करते हैं, सब कुछ करते हैं। लेकिन कल क्या होगा ?

कल यह होगा कि जिसको मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल कहा जाता है उस को यह मामला सौंप दिया गया है। उसके बारे में कहा जाता है कि वह छः महीनों में एक बार मिल लिया करेगी और उस पर विचार कर लिया करेगी, और विचार कर के सलाह दिया करेगी। अर्थात् वह सलाहकार परिषद् है। भले ही उसकी सलाह मानी जाय या न मानी जाये। मेरा यह कहना है कि गृह-कार्य मंत्री इस सभा की परेशानी से बचने के लिये यह बिल लाये हैं। अपने बचाव के लिये इसे लाये हैं। यह उन के लिये ठीक है, किन्तु उन्होंने यह कभी नहीं सोचा कि इसमें दिल्ली का कितना लाभ होगा। आप ने देखा कि जितने भी सदस्य बोले हैं, और उन में मैं श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी को भी लेता हूँ, उन्होंने कहा है कि इस में कोई अधिकार नहीं है, लेकिन प्रगति का एक कदम है। परन्तु एक कदम चलने से तो कोई बात बननी नहीं है। दिल्ली वाले तो यह चाहते हैं कि जिस प्रकार से इस देश के दूसरे नागरिक हैं और जितने अधिकार दूसरे नागरिकों को हैं, दिल्ली वालों के उनसे कम न रहें। आखिर यहां के लोगों ने क्या अपराध किया है। मैं आपसे यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब हर प्रदेश वाले लोगों के पास अपने हक हैं, अपने अधिकार हैं तो हम लोग उन अधिकारों से बंचित क्यों रहे। आज उनके लिये यह कहा जाता है कि वह सलाह दिया करेंगे जिसका अर्थ यह होता है कि वह शासन न करें।

मैं इस सन्दर्भ में आप को बतलाऊँ कि दिल्ली में 55 सलाहकार समितियाँ हैं। उन 55 सलाहकार समितियों में यह अवस्था है। उनमें से कई एक में मैं भी सदस्य हूँ। जब जब उन सलाहकार समितियों में नुक्ता चीनी को जाती हैं, वह सलाहकार समितियाँ ठप्प कर दी जाती हैं। मैं आप को एक मिसाल देकर भी बतलाऊँगा कि उन की मीटिंग नहीं बुलाई जाती। गृह-कार्य मंत्री उसके चेयरमैन

हैं। दिल्ली की एक सलाहकार समिति है। उसकी ओर दिल्ली में जो सलाहकार समितियाँ बनी हुई हैं उन की मीटिंगें नहीं बुलाई जाती। इस का लेखा जोखा जब लिया गया तो मानम हुआ कि मीटिंगें होती ही नहीं हैं। फिर गृह-कार्य मंत्री जो से यह कहना पड़ा कि मीटिंग तो बुलवाइये। मैं आपको बतलाऊँ, मैं लोक सभा से बुन कर के दिल्ली मिल्क स्कीम में गया हुआ हूँ। वह भी एक सलाहकार समिति है। डेढ़ साल हो गये हैं, अगर उसकी मीटिंग नहीं हुई तो क्यों नहीं हुई। एक मीटिंग में जरा कुछ न दे हुई, कुछ मवान पूछे गये, कुछ जोर दिया गया तो उस के बाद मीटिंग हॉली बन्द हो गई। एक दफे उस के फैमले पर नुक्ता चीनी की गई तो उस में मे एक अधिकारी ने कहा कि आप का अधिकार नहीं है, और यह टर्म एंड कर्नडिशन में नहीं आता है। यह वन्मुष्फि है।

अब मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह सलाहकार समिति किस तरह की बनने जा रही है जिस को मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल कहते हैं। यह इस तरह की होगी जैसी कि आज भी एक कमेटी है जिस को जनमार्क समिति या पब्लिक रिलेशनस कमेटी कहते हैं। एक नान आफिशियल उसके चेयरमैन है। उस में बहुत से सदस्य हैं। अन्तर इतना है कि जो मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल होगी उस के सदस्यों को भत्ता दिया जायेगा, कुछ तम्बाह दी जायेगी और जिस तरह ने आज भी दो ऐड-बाइजर वहाँ पर हैं जिन को हजार हजार रुपया दिया जाता है, उन की संख्या बढ़ा कर चार कर दी जायेगी। अब भी गृह-कार्य मंत्री जो उन को नामिनेट करने हैं और जो आने वाली मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल होगी उस के भी चार सदस्य होंगे जिन को एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिलर कहते हैं। उन के लिये गृह-कार्य मंत्री राष्ट्रपति को मिफारिश देंगे, और राष्ट्रपति के नाम से वह नामिनेट हुआ करेंगे। इस में दिल्ली के लोगों को क्या अधिकार मिल रहे हैं। यह देखने की

[श्री नवल प्रभाकर]

बात है। आज अवस्था यह है कि जो लोग हमारे यहां बैठे हुए हैं वह बोल तो सकते हैं, कह तो सकते हैं कि आज यह हमारे अधिकारों को छीनने की बात हो रही है।

मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि दिल्ली के पिछले चीफ कमिशनर जो थे जब वह उप-राज्यपाल होकर हिमाचल जाने लगे तो मैं उन से मिला और कहा कि आप बड़ी जगह पर जा रहे हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं बहुत ही खुश हूँ कि मैं दिल्ली से जा रहा हूँ। उन्होंने कहा कि दिल्ली की अवस्था निराली है। एक जमाना था कि मैं गृह मंत्रालय के अन्दर सचिव था, सेक्रेटरी था और मेरा आदेश सारे मंत्रालय पर चलता था, और आज अवस्था यह है कि गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय का अन्दर सेक्रेटरी मुझे चिट्ठी लिखता है, मुझे आदेश देता है। वही बात इस मेट्रोपॉलिटन कौंसिल में होने वाली है। वहां पर गृह-कार्य मंत्री की ओर से नहीं उन के अंडर सेक्रेटरी की ओर से चिट्ठी जाया करेगी चीफ कमिशनर को, और चीफ कमिशनर उस को ध्यान में रख कर काम करेंगे। इस मेट्रोपॉलिटन कौंसिल में जो चार सदस्य होंगे वह भी नामिनेटड होंगे। अगर वह ठीक से नहीं चलेंगे तो उन्हें नामिनेट कीन करेगा? वह वही काम करेंगे जो उन को कहा जायेगा। इसलिये दिल्ली के लोगों की जो वस्तुस्थिति है उस के अनुसार यह मेट्रोपॉलिटन कौंसिल काम नहीं करेगी। इस लिये इसको हम सदस्यों को भी देखना चाहिये और देख कर के उस पर विचार करना चाहिये।

मैं एक बात और बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले दिनों इसी सदन में एक बिल प्रवर समिति से आया था जिस का नाम काशी विश्वविद्यालय बिल था। उस के ऊपर जब सदस्यों की राय जानी गई और यह मासूम हुआ कि सदस्यों की राय उस के विपरीत है तो वह बिल आज तक कोल्ड स्टोरेज में पड़ा हुआ है। मैं एक नेक सलाह देना चाहता

हूँ। हम दिल्ली के प्राठ सदस्य हैं। दो तो मंत्री हैं। वह तो सरकार की ही कुर्सी पर बैठे हैं।

निर्माण, आवास तथा नगरीय विकास मंत्री (श्री मेहर खन्ड खन्ना) : वह चुन कर के नहीं आये हैं।

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : नहीं, चुनकर के तो आप भी आये हैं। लेकिन आप जिस कुर्सी पर बैठे हुए हैं, आप तो उसी रूप में बोलेंगे जिस रूप में गृह-कार्य मंत्री बोलेंगे और जिस दिन उस कुर्सी के बिनाफ बोलेंगे तो शायद आप वहां बैठ नहीं सकेंगे यह एक वस्तुस्थिति है जो हर सदस्य जानता है।

दिल्ली के लोक सभा के पांच में मेरी न सदस्य बोले हैं और तीनों की गाय है कि यह बिल दिल्ली के लोगों के लिए उन तो भावनाओं की पूर्ति नहीं करता है। तो कृपा करके जिस तरह से काशी विश्वविद्यालय का बिल वापस ले लिया था इसको भी वापस ले लीजिए, उसी में अच्छा है और वही ठीक है।

मैं अन्त में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 1962 के अन्दर दिल्ली नगर निगम ने कुछ सुझाव दिये थे कि दिल्ली कारपोरेशन का जो अधिनियम है उस में कुछ अमेंडमेंट होना है और सरकार ने वादा किया कि हां, वह होंगे, लेकिन वह जो मांग थी वह पीछे पड़ गई और मेट्रोपॉलिटन कौंसिल आगे आकर खड़ी हो गई। अब जो यह कहा जाता है कि हां, वह ड्राफ्ट हो तो चुका है, लाने वाले हैं। तो मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि उसी को पहले ले आइये। उस का हम देख लेंगे और उसकी छाया में फिर हम बाद में इस पर भी विचार कर लेंगे। तो आप इन बातों को देखिये, सोचिए, समझिये और सोच समझ कर के उस पर आप विचार कीजिए। मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो बिल है किसी भी मूरत में दिल्ली के लोगों की भावनाओं की पूर्ति नहीं करता। आपने देखा होगा कि

प्रवर समिति के प्रन्दर जो लोग ध्राये और वहां उन्होंने ध्रपने विचार व्यक्त किये, बिटनेस में 15 पार्टीज ध्रायीं और पन्द्रह में से "जहां तक मुझे याद है एक को छोड़कर के और वह भी ध्रकेला एक व्यक्तित था, बाकी किसी ने भी इस बिल का कोई समर्थन नहीं किया। सब ने यह कहा कि यह बिल जा है यह ध्रधूरा है और यह हमारी भावनाओं की पूर्ति नहीं करता है, लोगों की आकांक्षों की पूर्ति नहीं करता। इसको वापस ले लीजिए या इसमें कुछ ऐसी शक्ति डालिए कि उस के कारण इसमें कुछ जान ध्राये।

ध्रन्त में मैं श्रीमन्, यह बताना चाहता हूं कि मैंने प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर भी रोज किया था और वह मैं फिर दोहराता हूं और यह मैं ध्रापको बिलकुल साफ करना चाहता हूं कि ध्रगर ध्रापने मेरी बात को नहीं माना तो यह ध्राप का जो बिल है, जब यह कानून बनेगा तो यह कोर्ट के प्रन्दर चैलेंज होगा कि ध्रापने संविधान की ध्रवहेलना की है और संविधान की ध्रवहेलना करके ध्रगर इस बिल को ध्राप लायेंगे कि इंटरिम पीरिअड के प्रन्दर ध्राप ध्रनुसूचित जाति के लोगों के लिए सुरक्षित स्थान नहीं रखेंगे तो यह बिल चलने वाला नहीं है और न चलेगा। यह ध्राप निश्चित रूप से समझ लीजिए। कांस्टिट्यूशन की धारा 332 में बिलकुल यह स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि ध्रनुसूचित जाति के लोगों के लिए सीटें रिजर्व होनी चाहिएं। एक तरफ ध्राप इसी बिल में मानते हैं कि हरिजनों के लिए, ध्रनुसूचित जातियों के लिए कुछ सीटें रिजर्व होनी चाहियें लेकिन वह जो इंटरिम पीरिअड है उस में ध्राप ध्रपनी उमी बात से मुकर जाते हैं। तो यह एक संविधान की ध्रवहेलना है और या तो ध्राप उतना पोशन निकालिए और नहीं तो कोई न कोई प्रदालन में जायगा और ध्रनुसूचित जाति के जो भी अधिकार हैं उन अधिकारों का चैलेंज करेगा और वहां ध्राप सफाई नहीं दे सकेंगे। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं फिर ध्रापको मलाह देता हूं कि ध्राप इस बिल का वापस ले लीजिए।

और ध्रगर नहीं वापस लेते हैं, ध्राप बखिद हैं तो मैं यही बताता हूं कि यह दिल्ली के लोगों की भावनाओं की पूर्ति नहीं करता है।

Mr. Chairman: Now, Shri Kamath.

I would request hon. Members to be very brief, because there are a large number of Members who want to speak on this Bill.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You can extend the time for this Bill. You cannot reduce the time for others; the same time as was given to the previous speakers will have to be given to all speakers.

Au hon. Member: The Prime Minister had taken about half an hour in between.

Mr. Chairman: 10 minutes is the time allotted to each Member.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: 10 to 15 minutes is the usual time.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Kamath may please try to finish in 10 minutes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mr. Chairman, the Bill before the House is the end-product of the Haphazard agitation carried on by the discontented, if not frustrated, and faction-ridden Congress party politicians of the former Delhi State, Part 'C' State, during the last ten years since the still dissolution of the Part 'C' set-up, and of the confused cogitation among the members of the Union Council of Ministers. That being so, I am not surprised that the product that has resulted from this blend of haphazard agitation and confused cogitation is a strange constitutional animal.

Here I am reminded of what the poet said in Sanskrit:

विनायकं प्रवर्णाणां गन्धर्वाणां वानरं

Shri Nambiar: Well said.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: A potter set out to make an image of Vinayaka, Ganesh. He did it so clumsily because of various factors intervening that ultimately he produced a vanara, a monkey. That is what has happened with regard to this Bill for Delhi (Interruption).

I wonder in what category I should place the measure that the Government has devised for the Union Territory of

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

Delhi. Time was when we had diarchy under the British regime after the Montford reforms. This is not even diarchy. Here we have what I may call a triarchy, that is, from the Corporation to the Metropolitan Council, then the Executive Council and then our Ministers here, the Home Minister and the entire Council of Ministers. This is nothing less than triarchy for the Union Territory of Delhi.

I have no hesitation in saying that the Government has deliberately devised this measure as a sop to the politicians of Delhi, the Congress politicians, who could not achieve unity among themselves so far as the demand for a Delhi State was concerned, and the Government has succeeded in throwing this sop to the Delhi Congress politicians who are themselves to blame—if anybody were to blame—for this Bill that has been inflicted upon them and on the people of Delhi.

The Bill suffers from or is afflicted by various obnoxious provisions. When an amendment was incorporated in art. 239 of the Constitution by a Bill amending the Constitution that Parliament may by law create the Union Territories of Himachal, Manipur, Tripur, Goa, Daman and Diu and Pondicherry, Delhi was left out of the ambit of this provision. I wish that my hon. friends, representing the Delhi Union Territory, Shri Brahm Prakash and his colleagues had moved an amendment to this. I do not know whether they did so at that time. Perhaps they overlooked it at that time.

Shri Brahm Prakash: We moved it, but it was not accepted.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Perhaps because there was no pressure behind the amendment to be incorporated in that Bill. If there had been sufficient pressure on Government, they might have incorporated that amendment in the Bill. I believe if they had worked among the Members of Parliament for this, they would have had more success than was actually achieved at that time.

Article 239 as it stands, unfortunately debars the Delhi Union Territory from having some kind of an Assembly and a Council of Ministers as the other Union Territories have. If Delhi had been in-

cluded in that amendment, the story would have been different today. But even as it is, the Attorney-General also gave evidence before the Joint Committee, and he gave it as his expert opinion that unless the Constitution was amended, even budgetary and financial powers could not be conferred on the Delhi Metropolitan Council that is proposed in this Bill. I do not know, I wish it could be done, managed.

Shri Shiv Charan Gupta: He has given a different opinion at a different place.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The former Attorney-General or the present?

Shri Shiv Charan Gupta: Mr. Setalvad.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I too referred to the former Attorney-General, Mr. Setalvad.

Shri Hathi: Does the hon. Member mean to say that the opinion given before the Committee deliberately was not the correct opinion?

Shri Shiv Charan Gupta: That I am not saying. Whenever a particular case is presented in a particular manner, the opinion is sought. That is why I suggested and made out that this point should be now thoroughly gone into, because, while taking recourse to article 239A, the powers of Parliament which are given under Articles 245, 246 etc., are being limited.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If this be a fact that he has given a different opinion elsewhere, it is a serious reflection upon the integrity of the former Attorney-General. If he has spoken in two different voices on the same matter, it is very unfortunate to say the least, and we would like to have some light thrown upon this by the Minister when he replies to the debate.

May I suggest that the Minister has made matters worse now, bad as it was, he has made it worse, by suggesting a last minute amendment—we have just got a copy—which will be moved later on I know, but that shows the pernicious manner in which the Government's mind is working.

There is a clause which seeks to empower the Government to nominate the

Members of the Metropolitan Council, and there is at least a useful proviso there that they should not be in the service of Government, and I have proposed my own amendment which will be moved at the appropriate stage when the Clauses are taken up. Now Government has proposed this amendment. I do not know whose brain-wave it is.

Shri Hathhi: Yours.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You have made it a Vanara instead of a Vinayaka. They want to delete this proviso also. That means they can nominate even Government servants on the Metropolitan Council, that is what it comes to. If Government wants to press that amendment at the appropriate stage, I would like to suggest that the principle of nomination by the executive to a legislative or a quasi-legislative body is a thoroughly obnoxious principle in a democratic set-up and I would be very happy if that clause, that sub-clause, is completely deleted, which empowers Government to nominate members on the Metropolitan Council and reduces it to zero. If it is not reduced from 5 to zero, at least it should be reduced from 5 to 2, it should be not more than 2. Even then, they should be neither Government servants nor holders of permits or licences granted by the Government. I hope the House, in the interests of the integrity and of democracy will accept that amendment and throw out this wholly pernicious amendment given notices of by the Minister today.

Then there is another provision which makes the proposed Executive Council completely irremovable except at the pleasure or the displeasure of the President, which is absolutely unthinkable in a democratic set-up. I am aware that the Bill does not confer a full-fledged State legislature and a council of ministers on Delhi, but certainly we must ensure that democratic principles are not completely thrown to the winds, set at naught. But that is what the Bill seeks to do, and I have therefore suggested in one of my amendments an alternative. The Bill provides that the members of the Executive Council can sit in the Metropolitan Council, can take part in the proceedings but they have no right to vote. The President

himself can be impeached, he is not completely irremovable, the Judges under the Bill that is coming can be brought to book and removed from office by the President, but are these members of the Executive Council higher than the President, higher than the High Court and Supreme Court Judges? Certainly there should be a provision which stipulates, provides, that if a special majority, say two-thirds, of the members of the Metropolitan Council, passes a vote of no confidence, or presents a petition to the President seeking his removal from office, the President should remove that member forthwith from office. I hope the House will accept that very desirable, wholesome and necessary amendment.

One last word and I have done. Much has been said about Delhi being the federal capital. It is difficult to have a full-fledged democratic apparatus, paraphernalia for the union territory of Delhi. There have been experiments in various parts of the world. Some federal capitals have a democratic set-up, full-fledged; others do not have it. Shri Brahm Prakash pointed out some instances and gave some illustrations of some federal capitals having a democratic set-up or quasi-democratic set-up. I do not know; I have not studied. So I have to rely on the word of Shri Brahm Prakash. But you are well aware that in the district of Columbia—I am quoting at the risk of being dubbed as a sort of emulator of the American pattern; my friend Prof. Mukerjee is sitting next to me. But that is one of the democratic countries in the modern world, the United States, though of course it may not be liked by all of us; the pattern of democracy they have set up is perhaps hated by my friend Prof. Mukerjee; he may refer to the democracy of Moscow rather than the democracy of Washington. I do not know what he thinks, but even so—as I said in the district of Columbia till the last amendment of the Constitution of the United States, the people of Columbia district—Dr. Singhvi may correct me if need be—were not enfranchised at all; they were disenfranchised so far as American presidential elections were concerned. Be that as it may, even if there is no of democratic set-up in other federal capitals, certainly Mr. Brahm

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

Prakash can argue we can argue : let us have a new precedent and make a new start. Certainly. Why not? But the experiment that was tried during 1952-56, when it finally came to an end may I say with all humility and in all earnestness, was not too happy. Delhi as a Part (c) State had a full-fledged democratic apparatus and my hon. friend Shri Brahm Prakash himself was the Chief Minister of Delhi State. We recollect that here, in this very House, endless and unseemly quarrels used to go on in this Parliament, and carried on outside also in the city of Delhi, Delhi State Assembly. Of course it may be argued that such quarrels are a sort of ordinary every day feature of the Congress regime, the tussle between the Centre and the states. But here Delhi being the federal capital, Delhi being one of the international cities of the world, if it becomes the seat of two government authorities, the Central and State Governments, carrying on day to day struggle for power, and what not, it will not be a happy spectacle to watch. Therefore perhaps it was decided by an amendment in 1962 that Delhi should be excluded from the purview of Article 239(a).

One last word and I have done. I will finish in two minutes. If Delhi cannot have a democratic apparatus, certainly we must safeguard the people of Delhi against this dangerous situation resulting and flowing from the undemocratic set-up, and therefore I propose that there should be at the Centre a separate minister for Delhi affairs. And no measure affecting Delhi, no Bill, no resolution or any other measure affecting Delhi, should be introduced in Parliament without the prior approval of an advisory committee—not a consultative committee, but an advisory committee—which will include within its fold all the Members belonging to Delhi Union territory. If that is accepted it will go, I suppose, some way, not all the way, towards making the provisions of the Bill which are otherwise unacceptable, a little less unacceptable.

Therefore, while I give partial support to some of the provisions in the Bill before the House, I hope that the amendments proposed by me will be accepted. Otherwise, it will be wholly unacceptable. and

I will not then be able to give even my partial support to the measure.

श्री मन्त्रि लिम्बे (मुंगेर) : सभापति जी, आज लोकतंत्र के लिए बड़े शर्म का दिवस है, क्योंकि लोकतंत्र की हत्या करने वाला कानून आज इस सभा के मामले मंत्री महोदय लाए हैं। लोकतंत्र की जितनी कसौटियां हैं, उन में से कोई भी कसौटी आप ले लीजिए। आप को मानना पड़ेगा कि यह कानून लोकतंत्र की किसी भी कसौटी पर निखरता नहीं है, पूरा उतरता नहीं है। लोकतंत्र की चार बड़ी बड़ी कसौटियां हैं। एक कसौटी है कानून बनाने के लिए श्री आमदनी-खर्च पर नियंत्रण रखने के लिए जनता के द्वारा चुनी हुई सभा का गठन। हम लोग यहां देख रहे हैं कि दिल्ली के लिए ...

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may continue tomorrow. Now we take up the half-hour discussion.

श्री प्रकाशश्रीर शा श्री (बिजनौर) : इस बिल के लिए कितना समय और रह गया है ?

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : इस के लिए समय बढ़ाया जायगा। कम से कम एक घंटा—या दो घंटा—बढ़ाना पड़ेगा।

श्री मोर्य : इस के लिए समय बढ़ाया जायेगा।

*STATUS OF HIGH COURT JUDGES

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: (Jodhpur): I have already intimated that certain developments which are very heartening and gratifying have taken place and that the question of the status and conditions of service of the High Court Judges and the Supreme Court Judges appears to have been reopened. I am informed that the hon. Home Minister is himself holding consultations with the Chief Justice of India with a view to arriving at a mutually agreed basis of revision of these conditions of service, and the question of upgrading the status. At this stage, as I submitted in my letter this afternoon, I would not like to voice

a discordant note. I would only like to express the hope that these consultations would be fruitful and that the judges' conditions of service and their status would be upgraded after mature consideration and in an adequate measure.

17.02 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I would like the hon. Minister or the Deputy Minister, only to give this assurance to the House, that at the appropriate time when these mutual consultations are concluded a statement would be laid on the Table of the House, informing the House of the steps that are or have been taken or proposed to be taken by the Government with a view to improving the conditions of service including pension and leave of High Court Judges and Supreme Court Judges, and with a view to seeing that their exalted position in our constitutional system is protected, preserved and maintained. That is all that I would like to say at this stage because, as I said, I would not like at this stage of mutual consultation between the hon. Home Minister and the Chief Justice of India to voice a discordant note. That is all I have to say.

Shri D. D. Puri (Kaithal): I do not think that the hon. Member was going to strike a discordant note. I think if the matter is before the consideration of the Government, it is all the more appropriate that they should be armed with the views and the various suggestions in this House, and therefore, this half-hour would be extremely well-utilised if we proceed as we originally proposed to proceed.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I think Dr. L. M. Singhvi has acted very wisely in not speaking about the subject at this stage. He has acted very wisely because the question is already being discussed somewhere else.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Unless the hon. Member has given notice, he cannot go on like this.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: He should say that when that stage is reached, we would be informed about it.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): As has been said, we are already moving in this matter. I have had some talks with the former Chief Justice of India, Shri Gajendragadkar. Since we could not complete those discussions, I am having talks with the Chief Justice of India now. I hope that as a result of that, the best that is possible in connection with the question that has been raised will be done. In due course, we shall place a statement on the Table of the House in this connection.

17.05 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is another half-hour discussion.

Shri Linga Reddy (Chikballapur): Sir,.....

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I would like to make a statement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, Mr. Linga Reddy may kindly resume his seat.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, you and the House are aware of the circumstances under which the Motion for consideration under which the Motion for consent Bill, could not be carried for want of the requisite number of votes. As you and the House are aware, Sir, the intention of a very large number of Members of Parliament has already been expressed in favour of the steps initiated by the Government in connection with the re-organisation of the State of Punjab which necessitated the bringing up of the 19th Constitution Amendment Bill.

As the vote taken today does not represent the overwhelming wish of the House, the Government propose to re-introduce the Bill in the Current Session of Parliament and to put it up for consideration by the House. Therefore, a notice for leave to introduce the Bill is being given by Government and a request is

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

being made to you to waive direction No. 19B of the Directions by the Speaker. It is also proposed to move for waiver of Rules 338 and Second Proviso to Rule 74 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Lok Sabha to facilitate the introduction and consideration of the Bill tomorrow by the House. I hope, Sir, you and the House will agree to the proposed action.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is not moving a formal motion now. He is just making a statement. Tomorrow he will move the motion.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): Sir, we ourselves were very upset when the whole thing was changed and the Bill fell through. We accept the principle of the Bill and we are in favour of Punjabi Suba. But if we allow this precedent whereby because of their big majority they can waive the rules even for constitutional amendment, what bar is there to the Government bringing forward any Constitutional amendment that it desires which we may think is very undemocratic and which we may have to oppose? In such a situation, let us not treat it as lightly as is being done.

17.08 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I am glad you have come, Sir, without meaning any disrespect to the Deputy-Speaker. I want to urge upon the Government not to try to waive the rules for a constitutional amendment. I and many of us would not want to come back for another session in between. But unfortunately, because of the sins and omissions of the Government, we will have to do it. We want this to be passed. At the same time, we do not want to open the floodgates to permit constitutional amendments to be passed in a light manner by waiving the Rules and Directions by the Speaker. I would beg of the Government, through you, not to bring forward this Bill so lightly. We fully support the objectives of the Bill and we want it to

go through quickly, but we cannot allow it to be done by waiving the rules.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are strongly opposed to this move. We had a similar occasion before. Then what we did was not to suspend the rules but to have another session to pass that Bill. Now, if we agree to open the floodgates for suspension of the rule as and when they require for their own failure, that will be quoted as a precedent for further action of a similar nature. Again, as I have already pointed out, the shifting of the agenda or the order of items on the agenda this morning was done without any imagination or preparation. The Leader of the House or the Whip should have got his own men to vote, this being a Constitution (Amendment) Bill. They neglected the whole thing. Even in my case, I was ready with the Delhi Administration Bill. When it was decided to take up the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, I had no copy of the Bill and I had to go to the Table Office to get one. By the time I could go and get it, within a minute or two, the whole thing collapsed, there was need to take the vote and you, Sir, had no other go but to take the vote. Therefore, it is none of our fault, nor the fault of the House. As such, if there is a fault, it must be squarely placed at the proper place. We should not give room for any of these easy methods to come in and float the traditions that we have built up so far.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni): Of course, Sir, this cannot be taken as a precedent. These are circumstances that have come up suddenly. The unanimous opinion of the House, from all the sections of the House, and the wish of all hon. Members is that there should be an early creation of Punjabi Suba. For that reason the amendment has to be passed. The Boundary Commission has been set and it is doing its work. As it has been promised by the Government and as it is the unanimous wish of the people, this amendment has to be passed. I would only request you, Sir, though it is not a good precedent, because of the circumstances

prevailing, because of the temper of the country, because we have also to watch the expeditious manner in which the thing has to be brought, to waive this rule.

Shri L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Sir, what has come to transpire is truly distressing. It is true that those who do not agree with the request for waiver of Direction No. 19B are not trying to obstruct whatever is the desire of the Government. It is not with a view to delay or to obstruct, it is with a view to secure compliance with certain conventions which have been observed invariably in the House, that this is being opposed. You would recall, Sir, this is not the first occasion when the plea of circumstance is being advanced. It is true the circumstances are such that we would all like that we do not have to come again. We would all like that we do not have to meet again for the purpose of considering this Constitution (Amendment) Bill. But, Sir, I think even more compelling than the circumstances is the compulsion of our precedents or conventions and what underlies those precedents and conventions. I think it is a salutary convention that we would like this Direction should not be waived in this particular case. There should be no need, no opportunity for letting any objections or aspersion be cast in a matter such as this. I think following the precedent set by the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, under similar circumstances, the Government should readily agree to have another session if that is necessary, or postpone it until the next session if that can be done, but in no case resort to a waiver or suspension of the direction.

Shri Rajaram (Krishnagiri): Sir, somehow the Government side lost their amending Bill today at 2.30 and the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs comes up to make a statement at 5.5, that too after the Deputy-Speaker had called another hon. Member to raise the Half-hour-discussion standing in his name. We never expected such things to happen. I do not want to use Dr. Lohia's words. He said that the Government has gone away, he asked where is the Prime Minister, where is the Cabinet and so on.

I do not want to use such words. Anyhow, there has been the precedent created by our late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and he had not accepted such kind of things going on inside the House. He had called another session for such a Bill and it had been carried through like that. So, I say, this amendment must come either in the next session or in another special session before that but not tomorrow or the day after in such a haphazard manner.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): What has happened today reminds me, rather poignantly, of the remissness that was displayed by the Congress Benches and the Congress Members of this House some two years ago when the then Prime Minister took very serious notice of it and he even—and the papers carried that—sent severe castigatory letters to the Members of his Party. But the Party does not seem to have learnt anything. It is very unfortunate that for the second time in two years the Constitution Amendment Bill has fallen through because they were nowhere to be seen and they could not assemble in sufficient numbers. May I, therefore, say that this proposal made by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs or the Leader of the House would have us not merely waive your direction but also Rule 338 and another rule too, which makes it incumbent on us to give two days notice for a motion. Now, this motion is made today at 5 O' Clock and it is to be taken up tomorrow. It should be taken up two days later, that is, on Thursday, not even Wednesday.

Sir, this triple result flows from the one egregious blunder they have committed today which does not exonerate them from the responsibility of calling another session. I, therefore, seriously suggest that the Congress Parliamentary Party must be made to learn a lesson which they will not forget all their lives and that can only be done by ensuring, by providing, by making the House agree to the proposal that the expenditure incurred in connection with the next session that may be called will be debited to the Congress Party funds and that they will have to pay for the next session.

Shri Khadlikar (Khed): Sir, the procedure that is being laid down is a sort of self-imposed discipline of this House with the sanction of the House. I admit it has a certain amount of sanctity. But on occasions like this....

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What is the occasion?

Shri Khadlikar:because of certain procedural accident, this may be allowed. *(Interruption)* Let me have my say. It can be called a little bad management. After all, in managing the affairs of this House, sometimes there are some slips. Keeping all these things in view—I agree that there is some sanctity to the procedure but, at the same time, we are the masters of the procedure, the House is the master of the procedure, in the final analysis—I plead that this waiver as has been asked by the Leader of the House should be accepted. At the same time, this should not be cited as a precedent and I would urge that, as far as possible, care should be taken by the Leader of the House or the Whip to avoid such situations where waiver is called for.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The Leader of the House went for his lunch. What is the great urgency?

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): There are forms and procedures as against the substance and rights. Forms and procedures can be changed to the exigencies of the situation if the need so demands. It is very difficult to change the substance and rights recognised by law. In this case, it is a matter of form and procedure and the situation demands a change. So, it may be accepted as it is.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): The provisions regarding the amendment of the Constitution laid down there are mandatory and they are not optional in any way and, therefore, those other provisions re. suspension of rules etc. cannot be light-heartedly applied in cases of this kind. I request you, in the interest of showing our respect for the Constitution, that we must put up with that thing.

The provision should not be suspended for the day so that the whole thing could

be revived for tomorrow. That would be ridiculous.

Some hon. Members: *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Is it necessary for all Members to speak?

Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda): I would take just half a minute. In spite of all precautions, sometimes accidents do take place.

Shri Namblar: This was not an accident.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: Whatever has happened has happened. When the Opposition Members were speaking, I did not disturb them at all. I am not yielding. Let hon. Members please allow me to have my say.

In spite of all the precautions this thing has happened, but it does not involve any question of legality. It is a simple matter of procedure. I would beg of you that you may kindly accept the proposition put forward by the hon. Leader of the House so that that would save us, and save the country from all the difficulty and the trouble of holding another session.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Why was the order of the Bills changed?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Let me say with what best of intentions that was done. Let her not prejudge me before hearing me completely.

An hon. Member: We do not doubt his good intentions.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: In the first place, I tender my sincere apologies for the inconvenience which has been caused to the House.

Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar (Fatehpur): On a point of order. May I know whether it is a regular motion under discussion or only a statement? We were

given to understand that there was no motion.

Mr. Speaker: It is only a statement, not a regular motion.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I did not want to take the House by surprise tomorrow. Therefore, I wanted to tell you what we proposed to do tomorrow, of course, with your approval and with the approval of the House. The hon. lady Member has asked me why the order of the Bills was changed. All that I can say is, as the hon. lady Member Shrimati Savitri Nigam has said, that in spite of our best precautions accidents do happen. But in this case it is not only a question of accident. As I was telling my friends outside, there is a proverb in Hindi that *Chauhe* wanted to become *Chabbe* but he became *Dubbe*. Really, that is the position here also, correctly speaking.

This Bill was to have come up on the 14th instant, and three-line whips were issued, and the Members were all here on the 14th. But as I had explained to you, because of certain circumstances, two hours or two and a half hours or three hours every day are spent after the Question Hour on other items. The result is that as I have said no schedule could be adhered to. The result was that we had again to issue three-line whips to all the Members to be here on the 16th instead of on the 14th. Then, what happened was this. We thought that according to the schedule, this Bill would have been taken up yesterday, and perhaps the voting would have taken place today. This morning I was informed, and I saw the agenda also and I found that there was no chance of this Bill being taken up even towards the end of the day if we had allowed the Delhi Administration Bill to go on. The difficulty then would be that the message would have been sent tomorrow to the Rajya Sabha. The Rajya Sabha Members were very anxious that they should rise on the 18th; they said that they would not wait on the 19th; they said that there would be very thin attendance on the 19th, and it may not be possible for many of them to be pre-

sent, because they had been informed to be present only on the 18th.

In those circumstances, with the best of intentions, we were rather anxious that this Bill should be put through. Therefore, I sounded you first and I also consulted other friends. Some friends sitting on this side of the House said 'What is this? You had asked us to be here on the 14th; again, you had asked us to be present on the 16th; but now you say that this Bill would not be taken up today and it would be taken up only tomorrow.' Therefore, in that anxiety we thought that precedence should be given to this Bill so that we would be able to finish this Bill today, and all those people who had been asked to be here on the 16th would have been here. Therefore, it was done with the best of intentions. And yet this kind of thing has happened. How has this happened? In the first place, after the consideration, motion, nobody had thought that the whole thing would collapse. As I always say, the House is quite so unpredictable sometimes, and, therefore, this has happened. My hon. friend Shri Kamath would not allow even a small thing to go through unchallenged and would deliver speeches for half an hour. Why did he not make any speech?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Who is he to question that? Why should I be forced to speak?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I am not questioning him.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why should he bring in irrelevancy? He should speak relevantly here.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I was saying that there are hon. Members like him also, but nobody took part on this Bill.

The whole thing collapsed....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is for the House to decide. You cannot decide that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: On the Delhi Administration Bill, for example,

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

from our Group, Prof. Hiren Mukerjee was to speak. But the order was upset suddenly and because of the change we had to go out to call them in.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I was saying that the whole thing collapsed.....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Tactics of warfare, parliamentary warfare.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Generally this does not happen. There were no Members to speak. These difficulties were there. The fact remains that this thing happened. But because this Bill is absolutely non-controversial, everybody is anxious that it should be pushed through as soon as possible, I think there should be no difficulty. I think the House should believe our *bona fides* that we tried to change the order only because we were anxious that this Bill should be pushed through today. Under the circumstances, it is for you and the House to judge and decide anything you like.

I may also say this. It is not going to be a precedent. But every rule has an exception. If any rule does not have it, it is not worth having.

Mr. Speaker: Normally, I am not in favour of suspending rules and directions. Last time also, it was done on my advice; I was of that opinion—that a special session might be called and that the rule might not be suspended. That is correct.

But today I find that there are circumstances which are distinct from those. I will put it to the House. All of us are desirous that this reorganisation takes place. It should take place now in time in order to avoid further complications. Relations are being strained between the communities as time passes. There are further complications arising. All sections of the House desire—we are all united in that—that complications should not arise.

Shri Kamath may say that we must chastise Government. But that would be out of the affair. In doing that, whether we

do harm to the cause that is dear to all sections should also be seen. All of us desire that this must be pushed through.

Then there were two or three unexpected things that happened. This was the first time on such a Bill when I found nobody prepared to speak when I looked around.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Circumstances were such. They changed it in such a way that nobody knew what was happening.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Part of his tactics, to take us by surprise.

Mr. Speaker: Then this is not only a matter of our choice. Other State legislatures have also to be convened and their consent has to be obtained. There are so many circumstances intervening.

I will make this appeal to Members. As they are all of the same opinion and they are also surprised that this has happened, in this particular case, we might make a departure and just agree to it being considered.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let the party pay the extra expenditure.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: They want to have their lunch, sleep and everything. Are we to tolerate this kind of thing for that?

Mr. Speaker: As I have said, other interests are also involved. They would also be affected.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): We agree with your statement.

Shri K. C. Sharma: We welcome it.

Mr. Speaker: Other complications would come in. I am afraid of those things.

Shri Nambiar: Within a week, we can assemble. What is the difficulty?

Mr. Speaker: There are so many interests.

Shri Namblar: We sympathise with the cause; we are for the Suba.

Mr. Speaker: That is why I have appealed to all to agree. All sections are agreed on the main thing.

Shrimad Renu Chakravarty: May I make one point very clear? If you are going to give your ruling to the effect that this might be permitted to be done, I would request you, before you put this to vote, to make it very clear to the House and to the country that this waiving of rules will never be resorted to any more. This may be made very clear.

Mr. Speaker: It is not possible to say that never again it will be resorted to, but at least I will give this guarantee that normally or ordinarily it will not be taken advantage of in future. If such a thing happens on account of the failure of Government, then certainly they would not come up for this.

Shri Namblar: But it will be a very bad precedent.

Mr. Speaker: There are different circumstances that come up, different considerations.

Shri Namblar: We sympathise with the cause very much more than they.

Mr. Speaker: That is why I am appealing to him.

Shri Namblar: But we are really afraid, frightened, that they will repeat these things.

Mr. Speaker: We will see. We are here.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I withdraw my objection.

Mr. Speaker: I hope all others will fall in line.

Shri Namblar: No, not in this case.

Mr. Speaker: I am appealing to him, because the cause is dear to him as to anybody else.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): When is it to be taken up?

Mr. Speaker: A new motion has to be made. It cannot be done today.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Why should we not move the motion just now? All the hon. Members are sitting in the Central Hall. They can all come. We can have the motion now.

Mr. Speaker: We have to suspend many rules. The Bill has to be introduced afresh. All things have to be done. It cannot be done in this manner. Tomorrow it may be done, but we will have to take care that tomorrow we finish all the work that we have.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Has the rule been suspended?

Mr. Speaker: That motion will have to be moved.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Ask the leader to make the motion

17.32 hours

*CAPACITY OF PORTS TO HANDLE CARGO

Shri Linga Reddy (Chikballapur): I am raising this discussion on points arising out of the answer given on the 1st March, 1966 to Starred Question No. 275. A discussion on this will be very useful and very purposeful.

The other day, the Food Minister was pleased to say that arrangements are being made for importing 9 million tons of foodgrains. Out of this, 5 million tons have been imported so far.

When we are faced with unprecedented drought in several parts of the country, it is very necessary that our ports should be in a position to handle the cargo of foodgrains in addition to handling other materials such as fertilisers etc., that come from other countries. It is very necessary that the Transport Ministry, the Food and Agriculture Ministry and the port authorities co-ordinate their

[Shri Linga Reddy]

activities to import foodgrains through the ports and send them as early as possible to the places where there is necessary. Time is the essence of the matter.
17.34 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

We have a number of major ports, but all of them are not fully developed. Sometime ago an expert committee from America came and inspected some of the ports, and I believe they have submitted a report. A summary of it, no doubt, has been given, but I wish the full report had been made available to the hon. Members. Now I understand that it is intended to import 1.5 million tons of foodgrains every month through these ports and send them to the other parts. Unfortunately foodgrains are not imported in ports situated near the drought affected areas. It is because the handling of the foodgrain and other cargo in the several ports are not properly planned for some reason or the other. I understand that some officers here in the food department are interested in getting the bulk of the imports through Bombay port only though there are other ports which can very easily and conveniently handle the grains and send them to the needy parts. For example, according to the answer given, Bombay received during 1964-65 a total tonnage of 17.5 million in foodgrain and other cargoes. Other ports like Calcutta, Kandla, etc. have very few shipments of grains. I understand that some officers in the food department are interested in getting foodgrains only through Bombay, the result being that the foodgrains received at the Bombay port are not being handled quickly and results in payment of demurrage. The hon. minister may find out the demurrage that had been paid. I understand that this demurrage is being shared by some interested officers and others. This may kindly be enquired into. An instance may be given. *Manhattan*, a supertanker carrying 72,000 tonnes of PL 480 grains was not in a position to be received in the Bombay port. Arrangements were made to receive it at Madras by stopping it mid-sea for a long time and unload

them into smaller ships. The same thing could be sent to Kandla port or Pradip port. Of course, it could not be landed there. But by smaller ships foodgrains could have been easily sent to Calcutta and other ports. It is necessary that the handling capacity of foodgrains and other materials should be geared up so that foodgrains could be sent to the needy places early. That is not being done at present. Out of 9.1 million tonnes that are to be imported from several parts, five million tonnes have been received. We have to receive about seven million tons from other countries such as America. At least in future it may be properly planned and grains should be sent to the other parts. If wheat is needed in an area, the wheat ship should be sent there. But it is sent to Madras and from there sent to wheat needing areas. The transport charges thus become heavy. Mangalore port can easily handle some grains but they are not at all sent there. Similarly, the Cochin port, the Vizagapatnam port and Marmagao port—all three ports—depend upon the supply of foodgrains that are received from several countries, whether it is imported wheat or rice, and to send them to the places where they are needed. But that is not being done. It is because of the unplanning, that is there in the Food Department. The whole thing may kindly be reviewed, and the ships should be overhauled, and the things be properly planned.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Shri C. M. Poonsach): As regards the handling of imported foodgrains, of the imported cargoes and the export of goods from this country, the capacity of the ports has got to be developed. It is with this object in view that the capacity of our various ports, major and minor, and the coastal ports, is being developed year after year. For the benefit of the hon. Members of this House, I may be permitted to quote that in the year 1964-65, the total handling capacity of our ports, major ports, was of the order of 48.4 million tons. In 1965-66, this capacity was stepped up to 49.5 million tons and in 1966-67, this capacity is now further stepped up to a new

level of 57 million to 58 million tons. That is to say, the capacity that we have developed to handle cargo, both import and export, at the various ports of India is being steadily developed and improved.

Apart from this, even the capacity of the minor ports all along our coastline is being systematically developed and that capacity is today somewhere at 8.5 million tons. With this development, now we are organising our machinery to handle the unprecedented import of foodgrains to this country. Up till recent years an average of five to six million tons of foodgrains we used to import. Due to abnormal conditions in the country this year, the proposal is to import about 12 million to 15 million tons of foodgrains, an all-time high record. We have to make extraordinary arrangements to handle this heavy import that we have before us. With this programme in view, the ports have been geared up to handle the increased volume of import. The imports of food grains could be arranged; ships could be chartered and the purchase of mechanical equipments for handling also could be agreed upon or arranged, but the capacity to deliver the goods at the ports depends upon several factors. Firstly, it is a question of berthing facilities; secondly, storage facilities and the transhipment facilities at the ports; thirdly, capacity to move unloaded grains to the hinterland either by rail, or by road and fourthly, which is a very important one, the labour that could be mustered at all these big ports to handle this big import programme. It is not a one-sided development. It is not merely the question of development of port capacity. It is all these things which go to the success of our handling the import of this heavy stocks of foodgrains. In that, we had to mechanise some of the handling programmes at the various ports, particularly at Bombay, Kandla, and now, in Madras, where we are now mechanising the unloading of foodgrains. We are having special mechanised installations at the various berths and by that we are trying to step up the discharge of foodgrains at every port. Besides this, railway movement also has to be organised. It is an all-round attempt to handle this big programme of imports which is being done continuously.

Till the end of April, we had been able to handle the imports fairly successfully. But in May, it is going to be a bit difficult because there has been a bunching of vessels at various ports, particularly Bombay. That is due to various reasons. The vessels that were chartered to bring grains from America used their maximum lay time of 15 days and they did not reach the ports sufficiently early. These were some slow-moving vessels which could not reach the ports according to the time programme. So, they slipped into May. Otherwise, we should have had them in April. Consequently there is bunching of vessels.

We have also made arrangements to import food by bulk carriers, with the result at the moment we have heavy bunching of vessels and consequently we are running into some difficulties this month. Our programme is that during the non-monsoon months we should be able to handle 1.5 million tons of grains in all our major ports and 1 to 1.2 million tons during the monsoon months. However, on accounts of bunching of vessels we are now finding it rather difficult to handle cargo in the way we have programmed for. However, this month as against 1.2 million tons, we may have to even handle much more than that, for which we are making every effort for the successful handling of the vessels that come.

The hon. member made a passing remark that that has been a tendency to accept vessels only at Bombay and other ports are not given due consideration. This is not a fact. Bombay, of course, is handling the bulk, because we have about five berths there and one berth is going to be added exclusively for foodgrains. So, six berths would be working only for food ships in Bombay. In addition, we have port installations to handle mechanically the discharge of grains from the vessels. For these reasons, Bombay is more suited to handle a larger import of foodgrains. Even though we have all these facilities we had to divert two vessels from Bombay to Madras, because there has been heavy bunching. We could not divert more vessels to Kandla, because Kandla also at the moment is somewhat congested.

[Shri C. M. Poonacha]

However, we are making every possible effort.

The other arrangement we are making is that we would be discharging these big tankers into Liberty coasters and ships at mid-stream and taking them to various ports, so that demand on berth facilities may be minimised. With all these arrangements, it is our hope that the programme which has been drawn up for import of foodgrains during the year will be successfully handled in spite of the difficulties we have to encounter. I can give the assurance that with regard to port handling, we will try to do our utmost. Much depends upon the rail and road movement and the facilities available at the various port areas.

Mention was made that Manhattan, the big tanker which is about to reach our port, has been arranged to be brought to Bombay and it has not been taken to Kandla or Paradip. It is not so. Because this bulk carrier has to be taken to a port from where the grain so discharged could be moved quickly by railways, we had to take it to Madras. We could take it to Paradip. But Paradip port by itself cannot handle the discharge. We do not have a rail connection to Paradip. We cannot go and unload it at Paradip and then move it by trucks. 70,000 tons of grain is coming in one load. So it has to be taken to a port which could handle it.

Shri Linga Reddy: What I said was that it could be taken to Paradip and....

Shri C. M. Poonacha: The idea is that it is not going to be unloaded at Paradip but it will be taken to Paradip from where it will be unloaded into "liberty" ships and moved to Calcutta. But the difficulty is, Paradip is a newly constructed port and we are not still fully organised at that port. So the owners of the vessel

themselves insisted that it has to be discharged at a port which is acceptable to them. This is one of the conditions of the charter party. Therefore, we had to accept their decision to unload this cargo at Madras. Then, Madras has all the other facilities of movement of foodgrains which, when it is discharged in Madras, could be organised to the best possible advantage.

Mention was made that we are not using the facilities available in other ports such as Vishakhapatnam, Mangalore and others. It is not correct. We have this year handled about 53,000 tons of foodgrains import through Vishakhapatnam, through Cochin about 48,000 tons, through Mangalore about 12,000 tons. The hon. Member would be knowing that Mangalore is a seasonal port. After 15th May we cannot handle any vessels there. Only for about 6 to 8 months in a year or, at the most, 9 months we can work vessels, and that too mid-stream which is very expensive. Even then we have made use of Mangalore port and discharged about 12,000 tons of foodgrains.

Shri Linga Reddy: I said that Mangalore port has to be developed quickly and made an all-weather port.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: When the major port comes into being, no doubt, we will take big tankers there. At the moment it is mid-stream unloading. Even with these difficulties and handicaps we have made arrangements to unload vessels wherever possible, so that our port capacities are used to the maximum and this heavy programme of foodgrain import is successfully handled.

17.53 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, May 17, 1966/ Vaisakha 27, 1888 (Saka)