

***THE JOURNAL OF
PARLIAMENTARY
INFORMATION***

VOLUME XXIX, No. 2
JUNE, 1983

C O N T E N T S

	PAGES
EDITORIAL NOTE	(v)
PARLIAMENTARIANS' HOMAGE TO PANDIT JAWAHARLAL NEHRU	71—73
Speech by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha.	
Speech by Shri P. Shiv Shankar, Union Minister of Energy. 	73—85
VALEDICTORY MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENTARY FINANCIAL COMMITTEES	
Speech by Shri Satish Agarwal, Chairman, Public Accounts Committee. 	86—90
Speech by Shri Bansi Lal, Chairman, Estimates Committee. 	90—92
Speech by Shri Madhusudan Vairale, Chairman, Committee on Public Undertakings. 	92—95
Valedictory Speech by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha. 	95—98
CONFERENCE OF CHAIRMEN OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEES OF PARLIAMENT AND STATE LEGISLATURES	
Inaugural Address by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha. 	99—103
Address by Shri Satish Agarwal, Chairman of Public Accounts Committee of Parliament. 	104—108
ADDRESSES AND ARTICLES	
Address by Shri Radha Nandan Jha, Speaker, Bihar Vidhan Sabha, at the Conference of Presiding Officers. 	109—117
The Media and Parliament in U.K. — Sir Charles Gordon, KCB. 	118—124

	PAGES
PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES	
Conferences and Symposia.	125—126
Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training. ...	126—127
PRIVILEGE ISSUES	128—158
PROCEDURAL MATTERS	159—62
PARLIAMENTARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS ...	163—74
DOCUMENTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST	175—81
SESSIONAL REVIEW	
Lok Sabha	182—211
Rajya Sabha	212—22
Legislatures of States and Union Territories	223 - 28
BOOK REVIEW	
J.A.A. Stockwin : <i>Japan : Divided Politics in a Growth Economy.</i> —B.R. Bhagat	229—33
RECENT LITERATURE OF PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST ...	234—38

APPENDICES

I. Statement showing the work transacted during the Eleventh Session of the Seventh Lok Sabha. ...	239—43
II. Statement showing the work transacted during the Hundred and Twenty-Fifth Session of the Rajya Sabha.	244—47
III. Statement showing the activities of the Legislatures of States and Union Territories during the period 1 January to 31 March, 1983.	248—55
IV. List of Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament and assented to by the President during the period 1 January to 31 March, 1983.	256
V. List of Bills passed by the State Legislatures during the period 1 January to 31 March, 1983....	257—66
VI. Ordinances issued by the Central and the State Governments during the period 1 January to 31 March, 1983.	267—76
VII. Party Position in Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha and Legislatures of States and Union Territories. ...	277 - 86

EDITORIAL NOTE

On the occasion of the 9th Death Anniversary of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, a meeting to pay homage to the great leader was held under the auspices of the Indian Parliamentary Group in Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi on 27 May, 1983. We open this issue with a feature on the meeting which includes the tributes by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker of Lok Sabha and President of the Indian Parliamentary Group and a talk delivered by Shri P. Shiv Shankar, Minister of Energy on the occasion.

We include in this issue a feature on the Valedictory Meeting of the Parliamentary Financial Committees, 1982-83 which includes, besides the Address by the Speaker of Lok Sabha, the speeches delivered on the occasion by the Chairmen of the Public Accounts Committee and the Committee on Public Undertakings.

The Sixth Conference of the Chairmen of Public Accounts Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures in India was held in February 1983 in New Delhi. The Conference was inaugurated by the Speaker of Lok Sabha. We also publish in this issue a feature on the Conference which includes, besides the Inaugural Address by the Speaker, the speech delivered by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee of Parliament on the occasion.

Also included in the issue is an article entitled "The Media and Parliament" by Sir Charles Gordon, KCB, Clerk of the House of Commons (U.K.) which deals exhaustively with the manner in which the media covers the proceedings of the House of Commons (U.K.).

The Address delivered by Shri Radha Nandan Jha, Speaker of Bihar Vidhan Sabha, at the Conference of Presiding Officers of Parliament and State Legislatures held at Patna in November 1982 is also being published.

We offer our felicitations to Sarvashri T. Satyanarayana, Sheikh Chand Mohammed, B. Chandre Gowda, E.K. Mawlong and Amarendra Sarma on their election as Speakers of the Legislative Assemblies of the States of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Karnataka, Meghalaya and Tripura respectively and Sarvashri Virendra Bahadur Singh and Purushottam Goyal on their election as Chairmen of the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Parishad and Delhi Metropolitan Council respectively.

The issue also carries the other regular features like notes on Procedural Matters, Parliamentary Privileges, Parliamentary Events and Activities, Constitutional and Parliamentary Developments in India and abroad, and brief resumé of the Sessions of the two Houses of Parliament and State Legislatures.

— AVTAR SINGH RIKHY

**PARLIAMENTARIANS' HOMAGE TO PANDIT
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU**

On the occasion of the 19th Death Anniversary of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, a meeting to pay homage to the great leader was held under the auspices of the Indian Parliamentary Group on 27 May, 1983, in the Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi. Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker of Lok Sabha and President of the Indian Parliamentary Group and Shri P. Shiv Shankar, Union Minister of Energy addressed the meeting. We reproduce below [the two speeches delivered on the occasion.

—Editor

SPEECH BY DR. BAL RAM JAKHAR, SPEAKER OF LOK SABHA

Since 1981 we have started the practice of having an eminent personality address Members of Parliament on the death anniversary of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, a great and noble son of India, who made such a signal contribution to the freedom struggle, to the framing of our Constitution, to the establishment of a parliamentary democratic system and for laying sound foundations of a modern forward looking India.

We are thankful to Shri Shiv Shankarji, Hon. Minister of Energy, a man of deep scholarship and creative thinking for kindly agreeing to participate in the series. Before I invite him to address us, may I pay my personal tribute to Panditji, who to my mind combined unique qualities of a visionary and practising democrat, a secular thinker and a leader of national and international standing.

Panditji made significant original contribution in all spheres of activities. I would like to recall on the present occasion his contribution in the fields of democracy, secularism and socialism.

Pandit Nehru was an outstanding man of his times with a commanding personality who enjoyed allegiance of common people. He chose to put his weight and authority behind democratic institutions which placed trust and power in the hands of people and their representatives rather than any authoritarian form of government.

Panditji was a true democrat to whom the parliamentary form of Government came natural. He himself promoted discussions on subjects of importance in Parliament and thus laid the healthy tradition that the Members of Parliament would get adequate opportunities to discuss and influence matters of national policy. His respectful and dignified bow to the Chair while taking his seat in the House epitomised the highest esteem in which he held the institution.

Pandit Nehru enjoyed a nation-wide popularity and his presence radiated a message of affection and concern for the welfare of common man. It would be true to say that he loved people and they in turn adored him. He was clear in his mind that the parliamentary institutions were meant to serve the cause of people and as he put it :

“All our institutions, including parliamentary institutions, are ultimately the projections of the people’s character, thinking and aims. They are strong and lasting in the measure that they are in accordance with the People’s character and thinking.”

His concept of democratic institutions was a modern and on going one where people’s needs and aspirations would receive foremost consideration.

That brings us to the second aspect of his significant contribution, namely, economic content of policies. He wanted to lay the foundations of a modern and developing India which would harness science and technology to alleviate the sufferings of common man in India and put him above want. He wanted everyone in the country to enjoy dignity as a human being and feel free. He dreamt of having industrial units, scientific research institutions, multi-purpose irrigation-cum-power projects as a means of sustained development. What we need today is a determination to see that the heavy engineering infra-structure that he so carefully nurtured and developed is put to the best use in national interest.

Pandit Nehru was a true Indian. His spirit of secularism, humanism and love for mankind, embraced people from all parts of the country. To him unity in diversity was the most striking characteristic of our heritage.

He regarded the whole world as one family. He advocated and practised the principles of peaceful co-existence. He consistently stood for peace and development and opposed vehemently the senseless race for armaments, particularly for nuclear weapons, amongst the super powers. It was his conviction that in a world torn asunder by strife and conflict, it was freedom not fear, faith not doubt, confidence not suspicion, that would lead to true and abiding friendship amongst nations. He regarded universal peace as a prerequisite for the economic, social and cultural progress of all countries, particularly those which were less developed. Throughout his life he stood for a positive approach to peace, for widening areas of understanding and agreement and for fighting and overcoming the demon of war in the hearts of men.

Pandit Nehru was a man of destiny, a man of extraordinary vision and determination. He carved out a unique place for himself not only in the history of India but of the entire world. Truly, his was a historic and legendary contribution which would be remembered for all times.

This is a befitting occasion to remind ourselves of our duties and responsibilities as representatives of people in the supreme forum of our country. We must turn inward and ask ourselves the question whether we have honoured that commitment and whether we have fulfilled the dreams of new India that Jawaharlal Nehru had envisioned. We should free the body politic from all fissiparous and divisive tendencies which pose a serious threat to integrity and solidarity of our country.

Let us on this day once again resolve to be vigilant and face all the challenges unitedly so that our people and country continue to move forward.

We are greatly indebted to Shri Shiv Shankar, our able Minister for Energy for having kindly agreed to speak on Panditji's concept of development, secularism and social justice as well as his contribution to the growth of parliamentary democracy in our country. I would request him to share his thought with us.

SPEECH BY SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR, UNION MINISTER OF ENERGY

On the midnight of 14 and 15 August, 1947, when the world slept, India awoke to freedom. On that occasion, the mantle of steering the ship of Indian nation fell to the lot of the great soul, in Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. His words on that midnight "long ago we had tryst with destiny and the

time has come to redeem the pledges that we made to the nation" still echo in the ears of the Indian politician, reminding him his duties and responsibilities to the nation which remain still unfulfilled. The 'pledges' referred to by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru were those that the Indian National Congress had made to the people of India from time to time in the form of its resolutions which were engrafted later in the diverse articles of the Constitution and its Preamble. Nehru, with his farsighted astuteness, guided the Constituent Assembly to conceive and adopt these concepts in order to see the dawn of an egalitarian society and a welfare state. To put it succinctly, the constitutional concepts sum up the personality in Nehru which was at once democratic, secular and socialist.

Jawaharlal Nehru was the combination of a many-faceted personality, a patriot, a statesman, a thinker, a man of letters and specially a humanist. He would undoubtedly enjoy always a pre-eminent position amongst the great men of this country. As the first Prime Minister of independent India, he would be remembered for the way in which he steered the ship of the State and faced myriads of mighty problems.

There were many intensely human qualities in Jawaharlal Nehru which captivated the masses and made him their idol. He was a far-sighted statesman, thinking in most matters ahead of his colleagues in the Cabinet.

In the whole history of parliamentary government in any democratic country during the last hundred years, Jawaharlal Nehru held the record for the rare combination of the unchallenged and unrivalled leadership of his party and the Government as Prime Minister. He had always been a disciplined soldier of the Congress, ever obeying its behests, ever loyal to its resolutions, ever fulfilling its objectives. In his opinion, discipline was the very bedrock of democracy. "You may define democracy in a hundred ways", he says, "but surely one of its definitions is self-discipline of the community". Again and again he called upon his followers to channel their energies and enthusiasm in proper directions in the interest of the community without a resort to wild talk or behaviour, impelled by the proud consciousness of their superior numbers. "Democracy means tolerance, not merely of those who agree with us, but of those who do not agree with us. With the coming of freedom our patterns of behaviour must change so as to fit in with this freedom."

Born in affluent circumstances and brought up and educated in accordance with the best contemporary aristocratic traditions, when Nehru

joined the Allahabad Bar, it seemed that his future career was set on the pattern which convention usually prescribed for brilliant young intellectuals belonging to his class. Providence, however, had willed otherwise, and so the young, impressionable and impetuous Nehru came into close contact with Gandhiji, the Sage of Sabarmati, who had meanwhile appeared on the political horizon of India and had begun to preach his revolutionary doctrine of truth, non-violence, non-attachment and non-cooperation. Thus began the relationship of the teacher and the disciple between Gandhiji and Nehru, which was destined to have such a significant and far-reaching impact on the history of India.

When Motilal Nehru died, the entire responsibility of the Nehru family naturally fell on his son Jawaharlal who had led a life almost free from anxieties and domestic worries. Motilal Nehru had left no will, and Jawaharlal was afraid lest the family should think that now after his father's death everyone was dependent upon him for everything. He did not want anyone to have this impression. He wrote a letter to sister Krishna in which he said that after father's death she and mother should consider themselves "the real owners of Anand Bhawan and all that father had left". Vijaya Lakshmi had already been married and, therefore, Nehru did not include her in his generous offer.

In this money-mad world, it is difficult to come across men who have genuine contempt for wealth. Nehru was one such rare individual and the specie who was utterly indifferent to money. Nehru believed with A.P. Herbert that "money was the bane of bliss and source of woe".

Speaking in Parliament on 11 April, 1955, he said, "I have no respect for property at all, except for some personal belongings The House will forgive me if I say I have no property-sense. It is a burden to me to carry property about. In life's journey one should be lightly laden. One cannot be tied down to a patch of land, or building, or something else. So I cannot appreciate this tremendous attachment to property".

Nehru strongly pleaded for a parliamentary system as opposed to other systems. According to K.M. Munshi, "as a middle-of-the-way socialist, impatient to transform India's life, Nehru favoured parliamentary supremacy". The system of parliamentary democracy was finally adopted by deliberate choice, in Nehru's words, "not only because, to some extent we had always thought on those lines previously, but because we thought it was in keeping with our own old traditions also." Conscious of the problems

faced by parliaments everywhere, he recommended parliamentary reforms as early as February 1956 and in that connection referred to the paucity of time with the Legislatures and the suggestions for the appointment of large committees to deal with legislation in depth. Parliamentary democracy, he felt, was inevitably going in the direction of economic democracy and whatever forms it might take, "only in the measure that it solves the economic problems does it succeed even in the political field". Nehru believed that the parliamentary form of Government was "more likely to do so than the other forms which lead to some measure of authoritarianism". The parliamentary system with all its failings, had "the virtue that it can fit in with the changing pattern of life".

India's Parliament owes a great deal to Nehru. It has developed from its beginning as the Constituent Assembly, inaugurated on 9 December, 1946, and has progressed through seven general elections as a sovereign institution representative of the people. In its constitution, composition and functioning Nehru has left an indelible impression. Under his guidance, it has laid solid foundations for our country's political and economic growth. He took good care to safeguard the rights and privileges of Members and to uphold the dignity and prestige of the House. He was responsive not only to the members of his own party, but also to those of the opposition. This was amply illustrated when he agreed in 1956 to amend the States Re-organisation Bill to constitute Bombay into a large bilingual State in accordance with the overwhelming wishes of Members belonging to all parties.

It was through Nehru's conscious efforts as well as through his very association with it in the formative years after Independence, that the Parliament of India soon became a true and effective institution of people's representatives and secured a pre-eminent position in the country's democratic polity. His respect for the parliamentary institution was as deep-rooted as his faith in the democratic process. Parliament symbolised for him the ultimate sovereignty of the people and he was ever zealous of guarding its dignity.

I would like to mention one or two instances about Nehru's forthrightness and frank expression. When he stood up in Parliament as early as in 1949, he said about food imports: "I think the very ease [with which we have been able to get foodstuff from abroad has rather prevented us from facing the problem properly. I think we should think in terms of not

getting any food at all from abroad after a certain period—let us put it at two years, I should not add a day more—and just make up our minds that we shall live on the food that we produce after two years or die in the attempt”. A few years later, when a Member of Parliament reminded him of his earlier resolve to put an end to all imports of food by April 1952, he answered frankly : “I regret that my words have been falsified and I feel thoroughly ashamed that what was almost a pledge to the country has been broken”.

Again, on another occasion in the early days of Parliament (15 November, 1950) referring to the stupendous refugee problem and the enormities that had followed in the wake of partition, he said : “In fact, I have often wondered why the people of India put up with people like me who are connected with the governing of India after all that has happened during the last few months. I am not quite sure that if I had not been in the government I would put up with my government”.

The born democrat that he was, the democratic form of government had a powerful appeal to him on the ground that it provided a peaceful method of achieving all ends—resolving all differences, religious, regional, lingual, social and economic, in our national context. Expounding his view on the subject, he once said :

“Democracy means to me an attempt at the solution of problems by peaceful methods. If it is not peaceful, then to my mind, it is not democracy. In a proper democracy, discipline is self-imposed. There is no democracy if there is no discipline”. Never was the need greater than today to remind ourselves of these noble ideas when fissiparous tendencies and divisive forces are raising their ugly heads in some parts of the country.

There was nobody as punctilious as Jawaharlal in regard to the courtesies of parliamentary life, the very manner of his entry into the House, the deep bow to the Chair as he took his seat, his observance of parliamentary etiquette in the best sense of the term particularly as regards respect to the whole House and his constant readiness to answer even irritating interruptions were exemplary. He was no expert when questions relating to privilege and such things cropped up, but he was full of sound sense in his suggestions regarding procedure and was always keen on upholding the prestige of the House as a whole.

In the earlier years, he would sometimes flare up and show something of his celebrated temper, but he would calm down quickly, and if necessary

would make ample amends for his own outburst. It was a delight to watch him in such moods, for it showed him as a straight and generous man who stood sharply for certain principles but respected also the other man's right to his point of view. In later years, he seemed to have developed a kind of quietude ; he would be seldom angry, and if more than ordinarily provoked, would recover himself very quickly. This was felt by many to be a loss, for even when he flared up, there used to be a sudden shine of his spirit which itself was worth a great deal.

Unlike most Prime Ministers he spoke extempore almost entirely without notes, and while as a result he sometimes rambled, the artist in him came out regularly in some beautiful flashes and the thinker in him always gave a certain compactness to his ideas. It was as if a very sensitive man was thinking aloud, and to hear him thus, though occasionally he was repetitive, was a genuine pleasure. One could see that here was a politician very different from the usual breed and here was a coin minted very differently.

One of the ideas which endeared Nehru to the populace of the world was his passion for social justice. He knew that legal justice was not social justice because law is framed and applied to maintain a certain social structure. It has no eternal validity because that which is legal at a certain stage of the development of society may become illegal at another stage of its development. Many things which were legal in India during the British rule have become illegal after independence.

Social justice, therefore, meant for Nehru, the removal of economic injustice which the individual in a capitalist society was compelled to suffer. In the Indian context, as Nehru says in his autobiography, the greatest sufferer was "the agricultural proletariat," the large number of landless labourers in rural areas who, Nehru says, were drawn to the national movement of liberations because of the "growing pauperisation of both the petty landholders and tenants." He came, therefore, to the conclusion that "only a solution of the basic problem of land (not to mention other vital national issues) could resolve the conflict" which was increasingly assuming, according to him, the form of a class conflict.

Nehru's success in winning admiration for himself wherever he went was actually a gain for India herself because, by admiring Nehru, people everywhere in the world admired also our country. And people admired him because they saw in him the embodiment of an ideal human being who

fought, and they verily believed he also died fighting, for "social justice" not only for the people of his own country but also for the people everywhere in the world. His fight for obtaining social justice was all the more unique because never and nowhere in the world had any statesman laid so much emphasis on the purity of means by which one fights "injustices" in order to bring into this world a just order based on social, political and economic justice. This purity of means, which Nehru had adopted and for which Mahatma Gandhi also stood unflinchingly, had come into sharp conflict with law and the legal system which existed at the time. That is to say, what was known as legal justice was, in the eyes of Nehru, not social justice and, therefore, he had no hesitation in breaking those laws which tried to give the society an unjust system based on certain principles of law. Maintenance of law and order, which is the main function of legal justice, was not, however, considered to be enough because it came into conflict with the notion of social justice, notion of political justice and also the notion of economic justice. If the laws of a state fail to give political liberty, freedom of expression to the individual and the right of every man to earn his bread and to live the life he chooses, then this legal system condemns itself completely. Thus, the more one reads of Nehru's approach to the society-not only the society of the period in which he lived but the society as a whole or the human society also in future-then one realises that his main aspiration was that eventually our society should evolve a system where the greatest degree of justice would be meted out to the people at large and that justice would not be merely a legal term but a term which would have its significance in the everyday life of the citizen of every country

Thus Nehru believed the goal of national endeavour to be a new social order under which the basic needs of the common man will be fulfilled ; all shall enjoy fundamental human freedoms and have equality of opportunity. The Constituent Assembly and the Constitution framed by it were to be mere parts of the larger national endeavour.

Nehru had told the Assembly that its first task was "to free India through a new Constitution, to feed the starving people, and to cloth the naked masses, and to give to every Indian the fullest opportunity to develop himself according to his capacity." In other words, the Constitution was relevant to him only as an instrument of social change. "I trust", Nehru said, "the Constitution itself will lead us to the real freedom that we have clamoured for and that real freedom in turn will bring food to our starving people, clothing for them, housing for them and all manner of

opportunities of progress.” And, what Nehru said in the Constituent Assembly remains as relevant today as it was then :

“At present the greatest and most important question in India is how to solve the problem of the poor and the starving. Wherever we turn, we are confronted with this problem. If we cannot solve this problem soon, all our paper Constitution will become useless and purposeless.”

Nehru gave persons coming from any part of the country a feeling that he belonged to the country as a whole and that barriers of caste, creed, religion etc. were artificial and constricting in their effect. He understood clearly that socio-economic problems were at the root of such divisive tendencies, and, therefore, it was his ceaseless endeavour to see that no part of India lagged behind in development and no section of the society felt neglected. His concept of planning was comprehensive and wide-ranging and its central inspiration was more equitable distribution of opportunities for people from all regions and strata of society. He was particularly concerned about the hardships suffered by the weaker sections of society and, therefore, special emphasis was laid in all development programmes to provide a helping hand to them.

Jawaharlal Nehru never in his life demonstrated any inclination towards religious feelings. Religion had no practical meaning for him, as it was not capable of solving India's vital problems on a scientific basis, and also because it demanded a completely different approach to life on Earth than one that could secure the social and economic advance of the Indian people. “Religion, as I saw it practised, and accepted even by thinking minds, whether it was Hinduism or Islam or Buddhism or Christianity, did not attract me,” writes Nehru in *The Discovery of India*. “It seemed to be closely associated with superstitious practices and dogmatic beliefs, and behind it lay a method of approach to life's problems which was certainly not that of science.”

Nehru more than once pointed out that religion could not exist in some pure form, but was often mis-applied by its representatives for the exploitation of others, thus becoming a tool of oppression. He did not therefore conceal his criticism of the application of religion in political life. In his *Autobiography*, for instance, he contemplated the reactionary role of religion : “The spectacle of what is called religion, or at any rate organized religion, in India and elsewhere has filled me with horror, and I have frequently condemned it and wished to make a clean sweep of it. Almost always it seems to stand for blind belief and reaction, dogma and bigotry, superstition and exploitation, and the preservation of vested

interests.” And further : “religion” has lost all precise significance (if it ever had it) and only causes confusion and gives rise to interminable and argument, when often enough entirely different meaning are attached to it ...”. And yet further : “...organized religion, whatever its past may have been, today is very largely an empty form devoid of real context.” Whenever representatives of religious systems tried to avail themselves of the situation for their own profit and started to actively encroach upon political life, Nehru never hesitated to stand up with sharp criticism of such communal tendencies. In free India, Nehru naturally passed from anti-communalism to secularism. He was firmly convinced that political life, the ideology of the new state and state administration must be completely rid of all religious influence.

Nehru's secular spirit provided the inspiration for establishing a secular society based on justice and equity. But in a country like ours, with its many religions, creeds and castes, secularism could endure only by strengthening national integration. All his life Nehru worked devotedly for bringing the diverse groups in our society closer to each other emotionally and bound by a higher loyalty to the nation. He could not but regard communalism and parochialism as dangerous and inimical to the unity of India and to the democratic set up which he had helped to establish.

A universal man, Jawaharlal Nehru could never tolerate bigotry dogmatism of any sort-of religion, caste or language. His faith in man was self-warming and communicated itself instantly to anyone who came in contact with him. Under his leadership, people from all parts of India were proud to call themselves Indians. He fully appreciated and voiced the right to freedom of religion and the right to one's culture, but he was clear in his mind that it did not entitle anyone to be bigoted and biased against others who preferred a different religion or creed. Notwithstanding Nehru's abstinence to religious and dogmatic susceptibilities, his rational mind developed the ethos and values, which were imbued in the culture and civilization, that is only Indian.

In no other aspect of the short history of India as a sovereign state is Nehru's impact as great as on foreign policy. He was the sole architect of the foreign policy of independent India. As Michael Brecher has pointed out in his penetrating political biography, he was 'the philosopher, the architect, the engineer and the voice of his country's policy towards the outside world.' He has further stated : “In no other state does one man dominate foreign policy as does Nehru in India.”

By the end of 1956, Nehru was recognized as one of the few living men who made an impression on the word—‘the man who’, in the words of Harper’s Magazine, ‘since the end of the Churchill-Stalin-Roosevelt era, is the most arresting figure on the world political stage.’ A writer in the *New York Post* described him as ‘one of the most incandescent figures of contemporary history’, and the *Chicago Daily Tribune* warned its readers that ‘he will lead India as long as he wishes-for better or for worse-and his voice will be heard as long as he lives, in world councils-again for better or for worse. *The New York Times* recognized in him one of the world’s most important politicians, and of the unchallenged rulers of the world, perhaps the only one who ruled by love and not fear. This acceptance of the position of Nehru was, of course, primarily because of the impact of the strength and the sanity that his foreign policy had achieved. He had, on assuming office, made clear that India would participate actively in the world, not merely because of his understanding of the role which India had assumed and could not shirk but because this policy was also to him a way of safeguarding India’s newly won freedom.

Nehru’s thinking and the ideas he expressed on foreign policy and international relations have become a part of India’s political culture and no Government in India could function beyond that culture at least for quite some time to come.

There was a distinct idealist image in many of Nehru’s utterances on international politics. He often spoke as a keen student of history and as a visionary.

Nehru’s greatest achievement was that he could make an economically poor and militarily weak India a factor in international politics. Many features of the International situation facilitated India playing this role and Nehru had the intellectual ability to comprehend the complexities of the international situation and displayed remarkable diplomatic skill to take advantage of them and to promote India’s national interest and increase its moral and ethical influence.

While formulating the basic aims of India’s foreign policy and in giving a shape to it in its formative phase one of Nehru’s main concerns was to have a national consensus. He fully realized that in the context of the national and international politics of 1946-47, a government of a newly independent country like India could not separate domestic and foreign policies into watertight compartments. Apparently, the Indian public opinion followed rather than led the government in regard to foreign policy.

But from the very beginning, Nehru was cautious not to go against the sentiments of the people. As early as March, 1949 while explaining that India could not be tied up to any group of states. Nehru said: 'Any attempt on our part i.e., the government of the day here, to go too far in one direction could create difficulties in our country. It would be resented and would not be of any help to us or to any other country'.

When India became free, the majority of the politically conscious people of India looked upon the Western Powers with suspicions because their outlook was influenced by their struggle for independence and by their impressions about the attitude of these Powers towards it.

India's decision not to align with the West was thus connected with the desire of the people of India to defend their freedom and to champion the cause of other countries which were struggling to be free.

The experience of many Asian and African countries confirmed the wisdom of Nehru. Whenever any government tried to move too much in one direction, it created instability partly because a determined and well-organized group of people inside the country challenged its legitimacy and partly because it depended upon a foreign power which tried to penetrate inside the country and convert the government into a clique.

Nehru was the first Asian statesman who comprehended the interrelation between domestic politics and foreign policy of an under-developed and newly independent country.

After the freedom struggle, Jawaharlal was invited to direct the Nation towards development as the first Prime Minister of the largest democratic republic, bent upon moving towards socialism. In his personal as well as in public life, Jawaharlal built bridges of understanding and tolerance between tradition and modernity in the development process, and amity and friendship between the contending forces in the east and the west. His Panch Sheel (non-alignment) was an significant a contribution to international relations as Panchayati Raj (Democratic Decentralisation) to people's participation in public administration (Government-in-action). His main contribution to administration was by way of constitution fram-

ing, steering the ship of State through turbulent times after partition, and the dynamic adventure of development through planning.

Thus in 1946 when Nehru and his colleagues assumed the reins of power they inherited an administrative system and structure which was devised entirely for a different purpose. Here was a herculean task of transforming an autocratic administrative structure and into that of a democratic apparatus suited to the needs and genius of Indians and conforming to their hopes and aspirations. According to Nehru, verily the focus had now to change from law and order problems to that of socio-economic problems and programmes.

The outstanding problem faced by Nehru was the administrative framework and the services left over from the British regime. His charismatic personality and national stature easily enabled him in winning over the loyalty of the administrative personnel and, without breaking the structure, he tried to mould and adapt it to the changed needs and circumstances.

The cornerstone of his concept of administration was human approach to problems. He yearned to bring administration as near to the common man as possible and was very much concerned with the administration at the grassroot levels. That is why he laid great emphasis on administration of Community Development Programme and Panchayati Raj.

Nehru laid great emphasis on the devotion of the civil servants to the general welfare and cause of the masses they were expected to serve. In his view "an administrator has to work with some objectives in view, more especially in a dynamic society".

Nehru was a great writer. His autobiography is a remarkable book. Whatever he wrote that had the stamp and impact of his personality. Nehru as a writer is, however, certainly submerged in Nehru as a political leader of unbounded popularity and public esteem. In fact, some keen observers of Nehru's life and work are of the opinion that the stress and turmoil of his political career provided the sure base on which he could set up the edifice of his literary workmanship. His four main books, *An Autobiography*, *The Glimpses of World History*, *The Unity of India*, *The Discovery of India* have been applauded as remarkable pieces of writings in English.

Nehru was a superb draftsman. He drafted many historical resolutions for the Congress. Independence Pledge was one of them. He wrote it in his study in Anand Bhawan. When he had finished it, he asked his daughter to read it aloud because he wanted to know how it sounded. She read it. Nehru remarked, "You read it well, Indu. But do you realize that by reading it aloud, you too are now pledged?"

Such was the mind, heart and the spirit of THE MAN who strode like a colossus for decades on the Indian political firmament and left an indelible impression on the socio-politico-economic institutions of independent India that he conceived in many a cases and nurtured undoubtedly in the case of all. His 19th death anniversary falls today and we gratefully recall him and seek strength to follow his footsteps.

Jai Hind.

**VALEDICTORY MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENTARY
FINANCIAL COMMITTEES**

The Valedictory Meeting of the Parliamentary Financial Committees, 1982-83, was held on 28 April, 1983, in the Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi. The valedictory speech was delivered by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker of Lok Sabha. We reproduce below the valedictory speech as well as the speeches delivered by Shri Satish Agarwal, Chairman of Public Accounts Committee ; Shri Bansi Lal, Chairman of Estimates Committee ; and Shri Madhusudan Vairale, Chairman of Committee on Public Undertakings on the occasion.

—Editor

**SPEECH BY SHRI SATISH AGARWAL, CHAIRMAN OF
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE**

On behalf of the Public Accounts Committee and on my own behalf, it is my proud privilege to welcome you, Mr. Speaker, at today's Valedictory Meeting of the three Financial Committees. Sir, I have had the proud privilege to have worked in the Public Accounts Committee for the last three years, first as a Member and then as Chairman. This has been a period of great fulfilment for me and I will ever cherish this experience.

Sir, the Public Accounts Committee is the oldest of our Financial Committees. Over the years, it has built up a unique place for itself in our Parliamentary System. The keen interest taken and hard work put in by this committee has enabled it to exercise a very effective role in keeping surveillance over the Executive on behalf of the Parliament and in enforcing accountability. On this occasion, I would like to congratulate my distinguished predecessor, Shri Chandrajit Yadav, who is being honoured appropriately today.

The Committee have presented 50 Reports this year of which 28 are Original Reports. As you are aware, Sir, one of the most important subjects taken up by the Committee for detailed examination this year is that of Planning Process and Monitoring Mechanism in relation to Irrigation projects.

In this context, May I recall, Sir, that in your Inaugural Address at the Conference of Chairmen of Public Accounts Committees held in February this year, you had referred to the role of irrigation in our predominantly agricultural economy. You had drawn attention to the delays and cost escalation in the implementation of various irrigation projects and had expressed your serious concern over this situation. The Committee's 141st Report on the subject was presented to Lok Sabha before the House took up the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Irrigation and I am glad to say it was very well received not only by the Members but by the treasury benches also. The Report has exposed the various areas of weaknesses in the planning process in this vital sector. It has brought to light the colossal loss that the country has suffered on account of the inordinate delays and huge cost overruns in the execution of irrigation projects. In order to bridge the huge gap of over 20.59 million hectares in the realisation of the Plan targets over the last 31 years, the country would be required to muster resources to the tune of Rs. 14,000 crores at 1970-71 prices. This is the price the poor taxpayer has to pay for the failure to realize the Plan targets. Out of a total of 205 major irrigation projects taken up since Independence, only 29 had been completed till the end of 1979-80. 8 major projects have been lingering on for the last 15 to 20 years. The spill over cost to complete these projects would be of the order of over Rs. 923 crores in addition to an expenditure of Rs. 1,221.45 crores already incurred on them. The cost of development of irrigation potential has increased manifold since the commencement of the First Plan. The idle capital attributable to unutilized irrigation potential which was nearly 4 million hectares, works out to a staggering figure of about Rs. 2,800 crores at constant prices.

The Committee's Report also highlights the high rate of siltation observed in the reservoirs of major dams and if unchecked, this is bound to reduce their life very considerably. The transmission losses are also much more than anticipated. All this underscores the need for laying down a well-defined national water policy so as to provide for a balanced development of the scarce water resources and their utilization in the larger national interest. I am sure, Sir, the Committee's labours would not have been in vain if the Planning Commission, the Central Ministries concerned and the State

Governments, could develop an interdisciplinary approach in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, both at macro and micro levels, as suggested by the Committee.

It is a matter of deep gratification that this Report has received extensive publicity through the Press and other media. It has also been very favourably commented upon in the editorial columns of some of our leading dailies. I owe a special word of thanks to the PAC Secretariat for bringing out such a well-documented Report in such a short time.

Parliament has seldom grudged voting in full the Demands of Grants of the Ministry of Defence nor has it ever failed to pay tribute to the high morale and valour of our defence forces in guarding the Nation's frontiers. Yet it is sad to find that in the matter of equipping them with better armour and in providing the essential facilities, many a failure have come to the notice of the Committee. Sir, you will recall that in their Reports presented last year, the Committee had drawn attention to the inordinate delays and cost escalation in the execution of the projects for replacement of a basic trainer aircraft and in the development of a helicopter. This year's reports bring out *inter alia* a case of unproductive expenditure of over Rs. 7 crores on procurement of a large number of 10-ton vehicles which do not have the requisite cross country mobility to operate in forward areas and have therefore become surplus to requirements. The Committee have urged that such cases should be brought to the notice of the highest decision making authorities so that the nation's precious resources are not frittered away on such ill-conceived schemes in the guise of meeting urgent/operational requirements of the armed forces.

The Committee's examination of the Comptroller and Auditor General's Reports on Revenue Receipts has been yet another area of fruitful work. A large number of exemption notifications issued by the Government involve huge sacrifice of revenue. There is no assessment available as to what extent such exemptions have subserved the objectives in view *vis-a-vis* the revenue foregone.

The Committee's examination has shown that the percentage of contribution by the corporate sector to the total tax collections under various direct taxes has been going down steadily from 55% in 1977-78 to 51% in 1978-79 and 1979-80 and has further dropped to 48% in 1980-81, despite the fact that the number of companies and the company assessments completed have been generally going up and the rates of tax have remained

stationary. The profits before tax of big industrial houses have, however, been going up. According to the Committee, the steady decline in collections of Corporation Tax is attributable either to liberal allowance of tax incentives, evasion or avoidance of tax by more and more companies or both. The number of top companies with zero tax liability has increased from 35 in 1979-80 to 49 in 1980-81. The Committee have rightly pointed out the need for making a comprehensive study so as to ascertain the impact of various incentives which are being given from year to year.

In the 144th Report, the Committee has drawn attention to the various techniques of tax avoidance by big industrial houses through the medium of trusts. Government have been granting exemptions liberally and for indefinite periods to a large number of trusts, thus, clearly outstepping the limits of delegated legislation. The Committee have urged the need for bringing all trusts under the discipline of Sections 11 and 13 of the Income Tax Act.

Sir, the Committee's decision to enforce the accountability of the Executive in respect of all paragraphs contained in the various reports of the C & AG is another landmark of their work. I am glad to report that Government have responded very well to the Committee's directive to furnish remedial notes on all the paragraphs. The Committee have finalised two Reports—one on Customs Receipts and the other on Excise Duties, based on Government's replies showing remedial action taken in these cases. I am sure this innovation would be followed in years to come.

Considering the manifold increase in the revenue as well as expenditure of the Government of India since Independence, the Committee have come to realize that some structural changes are necessary so as to make for better financial control. The setting up of two separate Public Accounts Committee—one for examining the Revenue Receipts and the other, the Expenditure side of the Government of India—seems to be the need of the hour, I am sure, Sir, that this matter would receive your kind consideration.

Sir, I am greatly beholden to you for the unfailing courtesy, guidance and encouragement that I have received from you during my term as Chairman of this august Committee. May I express once more my deep sense of gratitude to you, Sir, on this occasion.

Sir, I owe a word of thanks to the Conveners of the Working Groups—Sarvashri Sunil Maitra, Bhiku Ram Jain, G.L. Dogra, Kalyan Roy and

K. Lakkappa and the other Members of the Committee for the courtesy and cooperation so willingly extended by them to me in the day-to-day working of the committee and for the deep interest that they took in the examination of various subjects. May I add a word here that we not only worked in a team spirit but also worked as family members. That is the beauty of this Committee.

May I also take this opportunity, Sir, to place on record my deep sense of appreciation for the valuable assistance rendered to the Committee by Shri Gian Prakash, the Comptroller and Auditor General of India and his officers, particularly Sarvashri B. Maithreyan, R.K. Chandrasekharan, R.S. Gupta and N. Sivasubramanian. They have taken tremendous pains in assisting the deliberations of the Committee through various stages. I am sure, without their assistance and active cooperation it would not have been possible for the Committee to make their examination as incisive and deep as it has been.

Sir, I would be failing in my duty if I do not bring to your notice the tremendous support that has been extended to the Committee by the staff and officers of the PAC Secretariat under the able stewardship of Shri Avtar Singh Rikhy, Secretary, Lok Sabha. The team of highly devoted staff and officers provided by him to the Committee has left no stone unturned in making a success of the work assigned to them. On behalf of my colleagues and on my own behalf, I would like to convey our deep sense of appreciation to Sarvashri T.R. Krishnamachari, K.C. Rastogi, K.K. Sharma, Ram Kishore, M.G. Agarwal and other officers and staff for the labours that they have put in and for the quality work that they have produced in assisting the Committee. I will like to add here that in order to make it possible for the Committee to present a Report on Monday before the Demands of the Irrigation Ministry were taken up, the whole Secretariat worked on Saturday and Sunday, which were otherwise holidays.

May I once again thank the Hon'ble Speaker for having consented to grace this function and address us ?

SPEECH BY SHRI BANSI LAL, CHAIRMAN OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

On behalf of the Members of the Estimates Committee and on my own behalf I welcome the Hon'ble Speaker, at this Valedictory Meeting of the three Financial Committees of Parliament. We are grateful to you, Sir, for having graciously agreed to be with us on this occasion. Your presence in our midst is indeed greatly inspiring for all of us.

With the rapid growth of governmental activities consequent on our embarking on planned development of the country, the responsibilities of Financial Committees in ensuring the accountability of the Executive have increased vastly. We in the Estimates Committee have endeavoured to improve the coverage of our examination. During this year we have examined as many as 10 subjects covering a number of Departments either as a whole or significant activities thereof. The year 1982 being the Year of the Productivity, we gave particular importance to productivity. Further, the decated 1981-90 being the 'International Decade of Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation' we examined the Ministry of Works and Housing in relation to their responsibilities in this regard. Our selection of subjects was marked by the topicality and relevance to the socio-economic development. And Defence was not neglected. Thus we took up Productivity in Industry. Production Units of Railways, Ordnance Factories, Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Programmes, Medical Relief, Education Training and Research, Department of Petroleum, Textile Commissioner's Organisation, Central Public Works Department, Police and Military Contonments. We have been able to hold as many as 84 sittings, including 11 sittings of the Sub-Committee on Defence. We have finalised 19 Reports — 10 Original and 9 Action Taken.

I would like to briefly touch upon some of the significant points made by the Committee in a few Reports. In the Report on 'Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation' the Committee has focussed attention on the general inadequacy of drinking water and sanitation particularly in rural areas and the serious regional imbalances in the availability of the facilities. Dealing with 'Productivity in Industry' in all its aspects we have stressed that the wages of industrial employees should be linked to productivity which would be in their interest as well as in the interest of the economy. We have received an impression that the resources and powers of the Textile Commissioner's Organisation are employed in a manner that development of the industry could at best be regarded as an incidental gain and there is no deliberate and sustained effort in that direction. We have, therefore, recommended that the developmental role of the Textile Commissioner would be clearly spelt out and given a statutory basis so as to make him accountable for the development of the textile industry. In our Report on 'Department of Petroleum' we have suggested effective demand management, reduction of imports, conservation in the use of petroleum products by pricing and other devices, developing alternate sources of energy etc. and streamlining the distribution arrangement. We have stressed the need for intensifying the exploration of oil resources and attaining self-sufficiency at

least in refining of crude. As regards Railways' Production Units we have felt that the balance of advantage lies in granting them autonomy on the lines of public undertakings so that they may function efficiently on business lines.

Hon'ble Speaker has always found time, despite his heavy preoccupations to keep in touch with me and the Committee's work. I have also received ideas and suggestions from him on various occasions. I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to him.

Sir, it is but appropriate that you have chosen to honour the ex-Chairmen of the Financial Committees on this occasion. I congratulate my distinguished predecessor, Shri Pattabhi Rama Rao, who has made a valuable contribution to the Estimates Committee.

I would like to thank the Conveners, Sarvashri M. Satyanarayana Rao, Tridib Chaudhuri, Madhu Dandavate and Girdhari Lal Vyas and other Members of the Committee who took a great deal of interest in the work of the Committee and extended their whole-hearted cooperation to me. There were always frank discussions during deliberations and the conclusions were arrived at with complete unanimity.

I wish to express my appreciation of the valuable advice received from the Secretary, Lok Sabha, Shri Avtar Singh Rikhy, who despite continuous pressure of work on him has always found time to look after the work of the Committees.

I take this opportunity to place on record my appreciation of the sustained hard work put in by Sarvashri T.R. Krishnamachari. Bipin Behari, S.P. Chanana, D.M. Chanan and other officers and staff connected with the work of our Committee.

In the end I once again thank you very much Sir, for finding time to be with us and address us. This is a measure of your deep and abiding interest in the work of the Financial Committees.

**SPEECH BY SHRI MADHUSUDAN VAIRALE, CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS**

It is my privilege on behalf of the Members of the Committee on Public Undertakings and on my own behalf to welcome you at this Valedictory Meeting of the three Financial Committees. We are grateful to the Hon'ble Speaker for having kindly agreed to be with us on this occasion.

The character and functions of government underwent a radical change in our country after independence. With the increasing participation of the State in industry and trade, a large number of public enterprises have come into being. The Committee on Public Undertakings set up in 1964 is the youngest of the Financial Committees. I am proud to say that the Committee in its brief existence of less than two decades has significant achievements to its credit. I take this opportunity to congratulate Shri Bansi Lal ji under whose chairmanship the Committee presented 50 useful Reports during 1980—82. We have endeavoured to maintain the tradition of objective examination to effectively ensure the accountability of the public undertakings and their administrative Ministries. I shall briefly describe the work of the Committee during the year 1982-83.

Our examination during the year covered mining and manufacturing, production, shipbuilding, trading and financing activities of 10 undertakings in a variety of sectors. The Committee had also undertaken on-the-spot study of these undertakings besides taking evidence, oral and written, from the undertakings and their administrative Ministries. Most of us on the Committee are new to the Committee. We quickly oriented ourselves to the demands on us and we could finalise as many as 27 Reports, 10 original and 17 Action Taken. We have also initiated a detailed horizontal study of productivity in public undertakings realising the importance of the subject. The number of Reports which we have presented is not less than those presented during the previous two years—perhaps we have exceeded and thus we have kept up the tradition.

Our Reports have all been unanimous. The exposures of weaknesses and shortcomings have been made in a constructive spirit. We had also appreciated the difficulties faced by the public undertakings and suggested remedial measures to Government. To illustrate, our Report on Bharat Aluminium would show how its working has been greatly inhibited by power constraint. We have suggested that Government should take up the issue at the highest level with the concerned. States and make them fully aware of their obligations to supply adequate and regular power to the Central public undertakings set up in their States. A serious problem that we have highlighted in our Report on Hindustan Petroleum is the exodus of skilled personnel. During the last 7-8 years the company has lost more than 400 experienced officers. Something has to be done early to arrest this trend. We noticed time overruns and cost escalation in regard to several fertilizer projects. Under the retention price formula for fertilizers there was no incentive for the project authorities to economise on cost of the projects,

but Government have recently rectified this anomaly. We have suggested that there should be a similar approach to the retention price of aluminium so that neither the Exchequer bears high subsidy burden nor the consumer pays higher price. In our Report on Hindustan Antibiotics we have taken note of the need to diversify its product range so as to generate adequate surplus for self-reliance and growth. We have, however, cautioned that the company should ensure that drugs are made available to the consumer at reasonable prices in a manner that would regulate the prices of drugs in the market in larger public interest. The Cotton Corporation of India has an unenviable task of protecting the interests of the growers of cotton as well as those of cotton textile industry. Sir, we had in mind the keen interest your honour was taking always in the agricultural community of this country. We have suggested that its procurement of cotton should be stepped up to a level that would give it a decisive say in the cotton market. We have recommended that the questions of support price for all varieties of cotton should cover the actual cost of production and assure a reasonable return to the grower. In our view the support price fixed by the Agricultural Price Commission should be a remunerative price and should have linkage with cloth prices.

Mr. Speaker, it is inspiring to have you in our midst today. We value greatly your matured advice. I take this opportunity to express my gratitude for all the advice and guidance that you gave me from time to time in my new assignment as Chairman of the Committee. It has always been my endeavour to rise up to your expectation and be worthy of the trust that you reposed in me in appointing me the Chairman.

On this occasion I would like to thank the Conveners, Sarvashri Kamaluddin Ahmed, Lakshman Mallick, D.K. Naikar and Satyendra Narain Sinha. They have borne the brunt of the work by going deep into the respective subjects and taking the lead in examination of witnesses, I would also like to thank the Members all of whom took keen interest and actively participated in our examination and deliberations. It is the hard work of the Conveners and Members that has enriched our Reports. As Chairman I have always received their unflinching cooperation. Moreover, I may add we always had a very informal atmosphere and we functioned as one family in the Committee.

In our work during the year we received valuable support and assistance from the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, Chairman, Audit

Board and other Audit officers. I would like to place on record our deep appreciation of the high quality of the Commercial Audit Reports and the guidance and support received from the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. Shri Gian Prakash, who has had rich and varied experience in Government.

I need hardly stress that Committee's work depends on the quality of Secretariat assistance. I am happy to say that we received an excellent support from the P.U. Branch of the Lok Sabha Secretariat. It is no wonder that the Secretariat functions so well under the able leadership of Shri Avtar Singh Rikhy. Shri Rikhy, conscientious and well informed, was always available to me for consultation on any matter relating to the Committee. I would thank him. I would also like to place on record our appreciation of the assistance rendered by Sarvashri Krishnamachari, Gadhok, Gupta, Bhasin and other officers and staff connected with our work.

May I once again thank you, Mr. Speaker, for finding time to be with us and agreeing to address us.

VALEDICTORY SPEECH BY DR. BAL RAM JAKHAR, SPEAKER, LOK SABHA

I deem it a privilege to be invited to participate in the Valedictory Meeting of the three Financial Committees. This is an occasion to take stock of the achievements of the Committees and to look ahead. I thought it appropriate to honour on this happy occasion Shri Pattabhi Rama Rao, ex-Chairman, Estimates Committee, Shri Bansi Lal, ex-Chairman, Committee on Public Undertakings, Shri Chandrajit Yadav, ex-Chairman, Public Accounts Committee and Shri Satish Agarwal, who will be laying down office as Chairman, Public Accounts Committee shortly. They are all distinguished and dedicated Members of Parliament who have rich experience not only in the Committees but also in Government.

Financial Committees of Parliament play a crucial role in ensuring the accountability of the Executive to Parliament. Together they cover the entire range of governmental and para-governmental activities. Over the years since independence, these activities have increased manifold and the task of the Financial Committees in scrutinising the performance has changed in scope and nature. I must say that the Committees have gradually adapted themselves to the changing context and devised methods to have a meaningful evaluation of schemes and projects as well as systems and procedures. I am sure in the coming years they will refine these further,

The Committees do not and cannot work in isolation. I am glad the selection of subjects of the Committees during this year reflects a measure of co-ordination. I would refer to the accent on Productivity given both by the Estimates Committee and the Committee on Public Undertakings. Another striking feature is the topicality and social as well as economic relevance of the subjects examined. I am particularly impressed by the detailed evaluation of Medical Relief, Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation, Planning Process and monitoring mechanism in relation to irrigation, procurement and distribution of cotton, tax avoidance by big industrial houses taking advantage of tax incentives and by forming innumerable trusts, etc.

As I stressed on several occasions, in view of the link between the Central and State Budgets in our federal polity and the centralised planning, there has also to be a measure of co-ordination between the Financial Committees of Parliament and the States. I am happy to say that this suggestion found an echo in the Conference of Chairmen of all the three Committees held during the last one year, in an attempt to bring about some coordination in their efforts. I would watch with considerable interest the follow up action in this regard and the results that flow out of it.

Friends, we have heard the account of work done during the year by the Financial Committees of Parliament from the respective Chairmen. Their report bears evidence of the excellent teamspirit that permeated their work. It is indeed a demonstration of the unity in diversity. One cannot but be impressed by the quality of the Reports brought out by the Committees under the able guidance of Shri Satish Agarwal, Shri Bansi Lal and Shri Madhusudan Vairale. I would like to congratulate them on this occasion. I also owe a word of praise to the Conveners and Members of these Committees. The Members have devoted themselves wholeheartedly to the work and the Conveners of the Working Groups/Sub-Committees have put in hard work in studying in depth the assigned subjects and taking the lead in the examination.

The Public Accounts Committee under the dynamic leadership of its Chairman, Shri Satish Agarwal has indeed done a commendable job in bringing out in time a Report on irrigation planning. This is the first exercise of its kind. The Report is an eye-opener to many who are complacent about the planning and implementation of plans in our country. The serious delays ranging upto 20 years in completion of projects, manifold cost

escalation. the short-falls in achievement of targets of irrigation potential and the considerable lag in the utilisation of potential tell their own story. We have to make the persons incharge of such projects and schemes accountable, as the taxpayer is being made to bear a heavy price for their inefficiency and the economy is being deprived of timely benefit. This state of affairs cannot continue. I trust the Committee will pursue its Report to its logical end.

The Estimates Committee under the mature and farsighted stewardship of its Chairman, Shri Bansi Lal has widened its coverage of estimates and comprehensively examined several important sectors of socio-economic activity. I appreciate the emphasis on rural development. The Committee's Report on Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation has brought out how the rural areas have been neglected in this regard. You might have heard the story of the kingdom of a very good king *i.e.* *Ramrajya* where lion and goat used to take water at one place. But now the supply of drinking water is so bad that I have seen people drinking water along with animals and unfortunately it still exists in some parts of the country. This curse has to be wiped out and this essential requirement of the people should be fulfilled. The Committee has also rightly called attention to the need for balanced development of medical and public health facilities, where again the rural areas are lagging behind. In this nation of ours, people get medical education at the cost of the Exchequer. But they are very much reluctant to serve in rural areas. What right have they got to study at such cost to the nation and refuse to work for the very people with whose money they study? In my view minimum needs programmes will have to be put through vigorously to cover the entire country within the shortest possible time.

The Public Undertakings Committee under the able and dedicated Chairmanship of Shri Mandhusudan Vairale has also brought out significant Reports. I would make a mention of the Report on the Cotton Corporation of India. This set-up should truly help the farmers. It should be ensured that the benefit of higher price of cotton in the market goes to the farmers and that they do not suffer. We must keep a watch on this. I am glad the Committee has made a forthright recommendation that the support price of primary commodities fixed by the Agricultural Price Commission should be a remunerative price. When the price of wheat was raised by Rs. 9/—per quintal, the Press made a hue and cry. The Press should be free. Does the Press give free expression to the problems of 70 to 80 per cent of the people particularly those living in rural areas? Why is it in the hands of a few people? The Press should be in the hands of people. I do not

see any reason why this should not be so. We must have a look into that also. Why should there be a continuous transfer of surplus from agriculture to industry and from rural to urban areas ? It is time that we did justice to the toiling masses in the rural areas.

Two of these Committees, *viz.*, Public Accounts Committee and Committee on Public Undertakings have received excellent support from the distinguished Comptroller and Auditor General of India, Shri Gian Prakash and his dedicated team of officers. Unfortunately it has not been possible for Shri Gian Prakash to be present here on this occasion. I would, however, place on record my deep appreciation of the role played by him in our system of ensuring the financial accountability of the Executive to the Legislature.

I am very happy to hear the sentiments expressed by the Chairmen about the secretariat support given by the Lok Sabha Secretariat. I am proud of my secretariat and I am prouder when I hear others say how happy they were with the assistance rendered by their Secretariat.

I once again thank the Chairmen and Members of the Committees for providing me this opportunity.

Thank you all.

— — —

CONFERENCE OF CHAIRMEN OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEES

The Sixth Conference of the Chairmen of Public Accounts Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures in India was held on 19 and 20 February, 1983, at New Delhi in the Parliament House Annexe. The Conference was inaugurated by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker of Lok Sabha. We reproduce below the inaugural address as well as the speech delivered by Shri Satish Agarwal, Chairman of Public Accounts Committee of Parliament, on the occasion.

—*Editor*

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY DR. BAL RAM JAKHAR, SPEAKER, LOK SABHA

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you all today to the Sixth Conference of the Chairmen of Public Accounts Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures. I consider it an honour to be invited to inaugurate this Conference.

The institution of Public Accounts Committee as an instrument of enforcing financial accountability of the Executive to the Legislature in our country is more than six decades old. There has been vast change in nature, scope and functions of the Committee since it was set up at the Centre in 1921. There, however, runs a thread of continuity, for the essence lies in the enforcement of the right of the Legislature that votes supplies to ensure that the money is spent in the manner intended. After independence, the country has witnessed a tremendous spurt in developmental and welfare activities of Government. The work of ensuring economy and efficiency in administration has assumed a dimension and character that call for greater vigilance. The Conferences of Chairmen, therefore, serve the important purpose of sharing experiences for mutual benefit.

The Public Accounts Committee is an effective means to enforce the authority of the Legislature in the matter of oversight of administration. With the growth and complexity of modern administration there is naturally a shift in emphasis from the legislative activities to the oversight of administration. The Public Accounts Committee is a Legislature in miniature and yet it functions on non-party lines. Herein lies its effectiveness in toning up the administration in the interest of common man. The Committee does not work in isolation. The three Financial Committees, *viz.*, the Public Accounts Committee, the Estimates Committee, and the Committee on Public Undertakings, work in unison supplementing and complementing their efforts in subjecting to close scrutiny the entire gamut of governmental and para-governmental activities.

The need for coordinated effort is not confined to the Financial Committees of any one Legislature. In the context of the planned development of the country as a whole, there is need for coordination among the Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures. The Centre and the States are integral and inseparable parts of the body politic. The body as a whole functions properly if all its parts are healthy and work in unison. If one part is recalcitrant or does not function properly, the body goes sick. It is, therefore, imperative that there should be close coordination between the States and the Centre which should promote understanding and integration. The very fact of your presence here as Chairmen of the Public Accounts Committees of States is evidence of our mutual desire to exchange experience and strengthen the unity and integrity of our country.

We have a centralised planning and there are large areas of mutual interest between the Centre and the States. It would, therefore, be in overall interest of the country if a national perspective in financial accountability gradually emerges. I am glad that this point, that I made in December, 1981 while inaugurating a Seminar on 'Financial Accountability of the Executive to the Legislature' has been taken note of in the Conferences of Chairmen of Committees on Public Undertakings and Estimates Committees which were held in April and December last year and has been put down in your Conference as the first item of the agenda for discussion. The successful implementation of our national plans would be facilitated by the coordinated vigil that your Committees at the Centre and the States keep.

The Public Accounts Committee at the Centre has always been very active. It has presented over 700 Reports during the past thirty years.

Realising the complementarity of the functions of the Executive and Parliament, the Committee has adopted a critical but constructive approach to avoid waste, to cut down delay and to channelise the efforts of the Executive in fulfilling through Five-Year Plans and annual Budgets the aims and aspirations of the people as enshrined in the Constitution. I am particularly impressed by the attempt to examine the Planning Process in relation to irrigation which is being currently undertaken by the Committee. Ours is still predominantly an agricultural economy. Irrigation is crucial to the success of agricultural sector; yet the delays and cost escalation in implementation of irrigation projects are a common phenomenon that causes serious concern to all of us. Hopefully, the Committee's examination will improve matters and contribute to development of the agricultural sector. It is very important that the agricultural sector, to which 75 per cent of our people belong, is looked after properly. We should be able to inspire in them a feeling that their genuine needs and requirements are understood and that no effort would be spared to meet their basic needs like potable water, educational and civic facilities, roads, communications, hospitals, electrification etc.

As for irrigation projects, I feel greatly concerned to note that some of them have been languishing for years. I see no reason why we do not have accountability in the matter of execution of such projects. Why can not the Chief Engineer or the Project Manager be made answerable for such gross delays in completion. We must come out with a concrete solution to this basic problem of timely execution of planned projects to obviate the over-run in terms of time and financial outlay.

The powers, privileges and obligations of the Committee are derived from the Constitution, Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the House and conventions developed over time. These enable the Committee to function effectively in a non-partisan manner. However, the extent to which the Committee succeeds is also determined by the extent to which it gets the confidence and cooperation of the Executive first in furnishing information to the Committee, oral or written, and then in carrying out the directions of the Committee faithfully. I must say here that at the Centre mutual trust prevails and the Committee is shown healthy respect by all concerned. This is a tribute to the Committee as well as to the Executive.

It is not enough that the Committee reaches conclusions objectively and report them. It is equally necessary that the Committee pursues its

recommendations for effective implementation. The Committee at the Centre has evolved an elaborate system to ensure this. It presents follow-up Reports and further ascertains the response of Government to such follow-up Reports for reporting to the House. Thus, a close watch is kept. However, I may caution here that mere formal acceptance of recommendations will not do. It has to be ensured that these are actually implemented and the same types of deficiencies do not persist. It is in this connection that the innovation of the Central Committee in reviewing the implementation of its recommendations on important subjects like Direct and Indirect Taxes. Administration, over a period of time deserves commendation and is worthy, of emulation by other Committees.

I was shocked to learn from the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee the loopholes that exist in our tax structure and how companies and individuals who earn substantial amounts manage to pay nominal or nil tax. I am given to understand that houses, cars and all other facilities are being enjoyed by some individuals in the name of trusts. How can a small fraction of people be allowed to appropriate such unjustified benefits? All this should be brought pointedly to the notice of Parliament and the Government with a view to thrash out the issues and take effective remedial measures so that such large scale evasion in payment of taxes is not allowed to take place.

In the last analysis, the strength of the Committee depends on the dedication of its Members and the leadership of the Chairman. I am very happy to say that Members of our Public Accounts Committee have generally been experienced legislators, some of them having held important offices. They bring to bear on the work a constructive perspective which makes for purposeful dialogue and presentation of Reports which further the public interest. I am very happy to acknowledge the debt that we all owe to the Members of the Committee, their knowledgeable Conveners and the Chairman of the Committee, Shri Satish Agarwal, who has been dedicating himself wholeheartedly and unsparingly to the work of the Committee and has carried his Members as a happy and well-knit team together. He has brought to bear on the work his rich experience of financial management as a Minister of State for Finance, and his extensive knowledge of administration as a legislator of long experience and standing. He has introduced several innovations thereby adding new dimensions to the role and functions of the Committee. He has inspired the Committee to examine all matters objectively and it is this which, more than anything else, determines the

effectiveness of the Reports given by the Committee ; for if the Reports contain solid facts and objective recommendations they naturally make for willing acceptance and implementation by the Executive.

The work of the Public Accounts Committee is greatly facilitated and made effective through the contribution of meaningful Audit Reports by the learned Comptroller and Auditor General of India. Our Constitution has assigned him the onerous responsibility of auditing and reporting. His reports bear eloquent testimony to his detached and painstaking efforts. I am glad that the Comptroller and Auditor General has endeavoured to highlight the areas of common interest in his reports which are placed about the same time before Parliament and the State Legislatures concerned. I am referring to the reports on irrigation, road construction etc. His Department has been continuously breaking new grounds. A comprehensive revenue audit has been attempted since sixties and the Audit Reports on revenue and expenditure contain more and more reviews of schemes and systems rather than individual irregularities. These are welcome developments that provide the basis for meaningful scrutiny by the Public Accounts Committees and I am glad to pay this public tribute to the distinguished services rendered as a guide, philosopher and friend by the present Comptroller and Auditor General, Shri Gian Prakash. Mr. Auditor-General, please help us in finding a way out and sort out the problems mentioned by me.

May I now turn to the Secretariat support to be provided to the Committees. I need hardly stress that the Financial Committees should get adequate, able and trustworthy Secretariat support. I am glad that our Secretariat staff and officers attached to the Committees continue to render devoted and diligent service to the Committee. I am always proud of my people who work in this Secretariat. They are so good.

I find that you have a fairly long list of subjects for discussion. The subjects cover a wide ground and indicate the anxiety of the sponsors to improve further the working of the Committee. I am sure that your deliberations in the Conference, ably guided by my friend, Shri Satish Agarwal, will help to enrich the institution of the Public Accounts Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures. It is with great pleasure that I inaugurate this Conference.

Thank you.

ADDRESS BY SHRI SATISH AGARWAL, CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT

We are grateful to you, Hon'ble Speaker, for inaugurating the Conference with your thought provoking Address. Your summing up of the significance and role of the Public Accounts Committee in the context of ensuring the accountability of the Executive to the Legislature with the right stress on the complementarity of the functions of the Committees of Parliament and the State Legislatures in the context of planned development of the country as a whole, brings out in sharp focus the need for the Conference.

One of the important functions of a legislature is to oversee the administration and in this process it is necessary to subject the activities of Government to detailed scrutiny. Though the initiative in legislative and financial proposals vests with the Executive, the Legislature has unlimited powers to call for information and to verify whether the administration is carried on efficiently and economically. The financial procedures of the House are not adequate to exercise detailed scrutiny to ensure that money is effectively spent though annual estimates are to be voted and Finance and Appropriation Bills are to be passed. The Public Accounts Committee plays a pivotal role in ensuring the accountability of the Executive on the basis of its detailed examination of accounts and Audit Reports.

It will not be out of place to mention here that the first Budget in this country was introduced in the Central Legislative Assembly on 1st March, 1921, with a meagre sum of nearly Rs. 18 crores and revenue expenditure of Rs. 128 crores. It was in 1921 with the introduction of the Budget in the Central Legislative Assembly for the first time that the first Public Accounts Committee was established in 1921. So, from 1921 onwards for the last 62 years this institution has been working in this country.

The responsibilities of the Committee have increased vastly with the rapid expansion of governmental activities in diverse fields. The Central Finance Accounts show that Revenue and Capital expenditure which was only about Rs. 260 crores in 1921-22 has gone up to Rs. 65,292 crores in 1980-81. The tax burden and the level of public sector borrowing have correspondingly increased. The terms of reference of the Public Accounts Committee are very wide in that it can examine all the accounts of the Government and autonomous bodies other than public undertakings. To

quote J.S. Mill, "the proper office of a representative assembly is to watch and control the government, to throw the light of publicity on its acts, to compel a full exposition and justification of all of them which anyone considers questionable to censure them if found condemnable." This is precisely what the Public Accounts Committee attempts to do on behalf of the Legislature.

A fear has been expressed that the complexity of governmental activities has heavily weighted the balance of powers in favour of the Executive and made genuine public accountability much more difficult to achieve. This feeling is not without basis. I would like in this context to refer to some aspects of our financial set up.

Control over provision of finance for Government is central to the parliamentary system. In terms of Article 265 of our Constitution no tax shall be levied or collected except by the authority of law. However, borrowing which has become a major source of financing is not controlled by Parliament. Although the Public Accounts Committee has stressed many a time that statutory limit should be fixed to the borrowing powers of the Government under Article 292 of the Constitution, no such limit has been fixed so far. There is, therefore, greater need for the Public Accounts Committee to go into the details of borrowing and repayment of loans. Now, near about Rs. 60,000 crores is the internal as well as external debt. It is high time that we give thought to it.

If the expenditure of Government is charged upon the Consolidated Fund it is not votable by the Legislature. The Union Government Appropriation Accounts (Civil) for the year 1980-81 show that out of the total grant/appropriation of Rs. 67,889 crores the voted grant was only Rs. 15,812 crores. The rest is charged expenditure and we cannot do anything about it. It is, therefore, necessary to systematically examine the charged items of expenditure to ensure that at least the classification is satisfactory.

With the phenomenal increase in the raising of resources and spending by Government, there is clearly need to reorient our methods of scrutiny. The time of the Public Accounts Committee will have been well spent if it goes into the systems and procedures of Government, efficacy of its enforcement agencies etc. ; in short it should get increasingly into efficiency evaluation. We have to pay adequate attention to problem areas rather than get lost in details. There should be no occasion for real conflict or confrontation between the Executive and the Committee as both have

to work in public interest. It has to be appreciated that the role of the Committee is not only critical but also corrective. I must say that our Committee has always enjoyed the active cooperation of the Executive which has made our task easier. I am talking about the Centre. We have never found them wanting in responsiveness to our requirements and in taking urgent action, wherever needed. We have been shown courtesy uniformly by all concerned.

Though the Committee is primarily concerned with the Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, it is neither possible nor necessary to go into every issue dealt with in his reports. However, there should be a built-in arrangement to see that action is initiated promptly by the Executive on all the pertinent issues. At the Centre we have now evolved a system whereby the Ministries/Departments are required to intimate to us through the Ministry of Finance the remedial action taken on all the Audit paragraphs within three months of the presentation of Audit Reports. This has ensured the accountability of the Executive in respect of all the issues dealt with in the Audit Reports. Further this provides the basis for the Committee for selection of important issues for detailed examination. What I have referred to here is that for all the Audit paras contained in the Audit Report which we do not select for comprehensive examination written replies are sent. Out of 400 paras, suppose we have selected 50 paras and all the 350 paras go unattended to. With this system that we have introduced we ask the Ministries concerned to communicate to the Committee within three months what action has been taken by them with regard to all these 350 paras. If the Committee thinks that the answers are not satisfactory then some paras out of these paras are also selected. So, this way we are enforcing accountability of the Executive to Parliament on all Audit paras which are reported to Parliament.

As Hon'ble Speaker has mentioned we have recently broken new grounds in that we have taken up for the first time examination of the Planning Commission in regard to planning process and monitoring mechanism. Our examination covers the crucial sector of our economy—Agriculture. We have gone into the implementation of such community welfare schemes as National Malaria Eradication Programme, Food for Work Programme, Drought Prone Areas Programme etc. Thus greater emphasis is given to efficiency evaluation of important developmental and welfare activities. The labours of the Committee will have been in vain without effective follow-up of the Reports of the Committee. Our Committee has evolved an elaborate system to follow-up our Reports to ensure concrete and prompt action by the Executive.

Sir, you have rightly appreciated the examination by our PAC of the planning process in relation to irrigation about which you were much concerned. Sir, 70 per cent of our population is dependent upon agriculture. It is an irony of fate that during the last 30 years we have spent Rs. 140 thousand crores on public sector plans in this country and there is not even a single major project which has been completed within time-schedule and within the original estimates. There is huge cost escalation and time run-over. For more than 20 years some irrigation projects are pending for completion. The initial cost of irrigation in this country was Rs. 120 crores per million hectares which has gone to Rs. 1500 crores per million hectares. To make good the shortfall in creation of irrigation potential of about 10 million hectares under major and medium irrigation we have to spend now Rs. 15000 crores. Some body has to be made accountable for the delays which have resulted in huge cost escalation. Sir, I have brought certain facts to your notice and you kindly appreciated and you have always encouraged.

And, similarly, in regard to the Direct Tax system, the Comptroller and Auditor-General's Reports have brought out such interesting facts that there are thousands and thousands of Trusts who are not paying any tax. No Industrial House is paying any Wealth Tax. Now there are companies earning crores of rupees. There is one Company, earning Rs. 66 crores with a 'Zero-tax' liability. And there are a large number of companies in this country who are earning crores and crores of rupees but are in this 'zero-tax' liability legally under the law. It is not evasion. It is avoidance—lawful avoidance—of the tax under the law, because the law permits them. This has to be looked into. So, this is the position today.

Apart from the direct control over the Executive on the floor of the House and through Parliamentary Committees there is an indirect influence exercised by the Press. The Press establishes a two-way traffic of informing the Legislatures of what is happening outside and informing the outside public of what is happening in the Legislatures. The Press coverage of the Reports makes the recommendations better and more extensively known to public. I suggest that the link between the Press and Parliament has to be strengthened. We have at the Centre a system of briefing the Press by the Chairman about the Public Accounts Committee's Reports immediately after presentation to the House and a formal Press Release is also issued. May I commend this to my colleagues of the State Committees ?

Despite heavy preoccupations, the Hon'ble Speaker has taken keen interest in our Committee's work and has been readily available to me for advice on matters however intricate they may be. Sir, I take this opport-

unity to express my gratitude and thanks to you for the guidance and encouragement received from you from time to time in the discharge of my responsibilities.

I have always received unstinted cooperation from the Members and Conveners of the Committee. The Conveners of the Working Groups of the Committee have borne the brunt of the work by taking the lead in examination. The Members have evinced keen interest in our work and effectively participated. I would like to compliment the Conveners and Members and thank them for their cooperation.

As the Hon'ble Speaker said the Public Accounts Committee's effectiveness largely depends on the support that it receives from the distinguished Comptroller and Auditor General and his able officers. The Comptroller and Auditor General links the Public Accounts Committees of the Centre and the States. I would like to place on record my deep appreciation of the quality of the Audit Reports and the unfailing personal support and guidance made available to us by Shri Gian Prakash, the present Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

As stressed by the Hon'ble Speaker, the Committees should also get adequate and able Secretariat support as is the case at the Centre, I may add here that the Chairman also should get appropriate facilities including personal staff support to discharge his onerous responsibilities. This is not the case in many States.

We shall be discussing in the Conference a variety of subjects touching upon the important facets of our work. I can assure the Hon'ble Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Deputy Chairmen and other colleagues that our deliberations will prove to be valuable in the context of strengthening the institution of the Public Accounts Committee as an instrument of ensuring financial accountability.

I wish to thank and compliment all those who have helped us in organising this Conference.

I would on my behalf and on behalf of my fellow Chairmen once again thank the Hon'ble Speaker for sparing time to be with us this morning to inaugurate the Conference and address us.

I thank you very much.

**ADDRESS BY SHRI RADHA NANDAN JHA, SPEAKER,
BIHAR VIDHAN SABHA, AT THE CONFERENCE OF
PRESIDING OFFICERS HELD AT PATNA ON
7 NOVEMBER, 1982.**

Hon'ble Chairman and friends,

It is my proud privilege to accord a hearty and cordial welcome to the distinguished Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India who have gathered for this conference in the ancient and historic city of Patna. This is the second time that Bihar has had the honour of hosting this Conference; the earlier one was in 1964. Having the generous support of our Chief Minister, Dr. Jagannath Mishra, we requested the Hon'ble Speaker of the Lok Sabha, Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar to give us an opportunity of being hosts of this Conference a second time. Dr. Jakhar very kindly acceded to our request, for which we are extremely grateful to him.

It is a happy coincidence that we are meeting on this memorable and auspicious occasion at Patna (Pataliputra), the capital of Modern Bihar which has always enjoyed a special reputation as one of the most ancient cities of the world whose known history goes back to 6th Century B. C. Ajatsatru, with a view to containing the growing might of the Lichchivies of Vaishali, constructed a fort, around which grew the city which, later, became the capital of Magadha. The Nandas ruled here and their mighty army deterred Alexander and his legions from venturing eastward in the Gangetic plain. It remained the imperial Capital of the Nandas, the Mauryas and the Guptas. It received the Greek ambassador, Megathenes at the court of Chandragupta Maurya. The cultural conquest of the contemporary world by Ashoka through the tenets of Buddhism is of universal significance.

Bihar is the birth place of Lord Buddha. Lord Mahavira and Guru Govind Singh, the apostles of Ahimsa, Karma, sacrifice and patriotism. They had enriched and influenced the thought and life of millions of people not

only in this country but outside too. This is the land of saints, philosophers and linguists. It gave birth to Rajas like Janaka Emperors like Ashoka, invincible conquerers like Samudra Gupta, powerful administrators like Chandra Gupta, warriors like Babu Kunwar Singh, wise statesmen like Kautilya, linguists like Panini and Patanjali, versatile scholars like Yagyavalkya, philosophers like Gautam, Kapil, Mandan Mishra and poets like Vidyapati. The very name King Janaka immediately recalls to us Mithilas' primeval swamps which was made firm by sacrificial fires; that paradisaal earth from which Sita grew like a plant; that royal where *Yogi* 'Suka' engaged in metaphysical interpellation with the *durban* of Mithilesh; that age when the butcher taught the essence of action and sacrifice to the anger-corrupted ascetic; and that cottage where parrots were perpetually crowing of truth, self-evident and truth by inference. No age has produce such a philosopher king with this harmony of spirituality and kingliness. These noble sons of Bihar made a great impact on the Indian history and civilisation.

The name of Shershah cannot be forgotten as he made Bihar the nerve centre of Indian Politics and in 1541 transferred the capital of Bihar from Bihar Sharif (Nalanda) to Patna where he built an exceptionally strong fort standing on the bank of the Ganga.

Bihar also remained a seat of learning, religion and art. The scholars from abroad used to visit its Universities like Nalanda, Vikramshila and Odantpuri and Sanskrit institutes of Mithila and gained knowledge in Science, Philosophy, linguistics, Literature, Ayurveda, Tantra and other subjects. The learned Pandits and Buddhist Bhikkhus of this place crossed the rivers, mountains and went abroad to preach what was the best in Indian civilization and culture. Thus, Bihar laid an impact on history, administration, politics and social living of the people of India for several centuries.

The great scholar, Aryabhatta, belonged to this place. He was the first in the World to announce the "the earth is round". He had also proved, what later came to be known as the "Law of Gravitation". He declared with conviction that the earth is moving round the sun. Even today, Bihar is marching forward with the background of its glorious past.

The Buddhist literature reveals that after the Great War, 'Mahabharata', the Vaji Sangha of Vaishali had been the most powerful Republic of India. It has been described in the "Jatakas" that Lichchhavigana had 7,707 kings who ruled as democarts. Even the head of each division was elected by the Rajya Parishad. The election of each head—Kulpati—was conducted democratically. The elected heads had administrative power. Even in

criminal cases, a person was awarded punishment after he was found guilty by Seven Councils appointed for that purpose. The voting system was by ballot (Salaka). Even women enjoyed the right of franchise and participated in public activities like men. At that time there was no country in the world which gave these rights to women. Thus the Republic of Vaishali was one of the oldest Republics in the world.

Bihar has some other achievements to its credit. If in the ancient times, it integrated Indian people and propounded the doctrine of *Panchasheel* in the middle ages, it advocated peace and morality through the *sofis* and saints and in the beginning of the 20th century it was the good fortune of Bihar that the Father of the Nation—Mahatma Gandhi—Selected Champaran to make his experiments with truth. It was here that Mahatma Gandhi, after his return from Africa, made for the first time on Indian soil, a bold and successful experiment of the new weapon of Satyagraha against the British Rule in India. It was a unique method in social dynamics, based on what he loved to call the “soul force” developed through service and sacrifice, with truth and non-violence as the sheet anchors. In other words, it would not be an exaggeration to say that Bihar was the Starting Point of an experiment in truth and non-violence, which ultimately spread to the whole country and won us our independence.

In India's epic struggle for freedom during the great revolution, Bihar played a very important part with unflinching determination and unbending spirit. As stated above, we feel proud of the fact that the first experiment in the technique of Satyagraha was conducted by Mahatma Gandhi in Bihar. To all the subsequent movements and agitations, Bihar made its appropriate contribution. But there was one movement with which Bihar completely identified itself: and that was the campaign of August, 1942. In our whole history of the freedom struggle, it would be difficult to find a parallel to the sacrifices made and hardships suffered by the people of Bihar during the 1942 movement. At the eastern gate of the Bihar Legislative Assembly you will find martyr's memorial. On 11 August, 1942, people, in thousands with bands of youngmen, students from schools and colleges among them, marched, in a huge procession, firm in their resolve to hoist the national flag on the building of the Patna Secretariat. The police opened fire and as a result, seven youngmen were killed. These seven youths set a shining example of heroic self-sacrifice by facing bullets to resist tyranny. All these martyrs laid down their lives for the sake of Indian Independence. All that happened in Bihar during those months is a matter of pride not only for state but for the whole country and these brave youngmen were the true sons of India. Honouring their memory can admit of no geographical bounds. It

pervades the whole land of India. These patriots ended their wordly existence so that a new chapter in India's history may begin; they offered their lives so that the generations to come may breath, unfettered, the air of freedom in this country.

Bihar is one of the major states in the Indian Union. The area is more than 67,000 square miles and the population is 6,98,25,154. The State consists of two distinct physical units—the Ganga plain and the Chotanagpur Plateau. The Ganga divides the plain into two—the north Gangetic plain and the south Gangetic plain. Thus Bihar is clearly divided into three natural regions : (1) North Bihar, (2) South Bihar and (3) Chotanagpur Plateau which abounds in hills, mountains and forests.

Bihar is an agricultural State, where nearly 80 per cent of the people are dependent on agriculture. This State is richly endowed by nature with important mineral deposits which are so favourably grouped together as to induce the development of a number of industries including heavy industries. This tract contains about 54 per cent of the known deposits of coal, in the country, including large deposits of cooking coal, and vast deposit of high-grade iron-ore. In addition, there exist large quantities of limestone, manganese, bauxite, mica, copper-ore, china clay, kyanite and beryl etc. However, Bihar's economy gets severely disturbed on account of natural calamities like flood and drought which come almost every year and cause immense suffering to the people.

Historical records reveal that some national leaders and intellectuals of Bihar had launched a movement for the separation of Bihar from the province of Bengal. It was our good luck that at Delhi *Durbar* held on 12 December, 1911. The King Emperor made an announcement accepting this demand. The people of Bihar received the momentous and historic announcement with great acclamations and joy. In accordance with the announcement, Bihar and Orissa was constituted as a province by a proclamation dated 22 March, 1912. Thus the long-cherished desire and long-felt want of the people was fulfilled. Bihar and Orissa became a separate province and Patna became, once again, the capital of the provincial Government. This also necessitated the formation of a Legislative Council for the new province. As a result, Legislative Authority in Bihar was established in 1913. Uptill 1912, the Legislative Authority of Bihar and Orissa was vested in the Council of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. Under the provisions of Indian Council Acts, 1861—1909, as amended by the Government of India Act, 1912, the Bihar and Orissa Legislative

Council was constituted consisting of 43 Members of whom 24 were elected and 19 nominated.

In addition the Lieutenant-Governor with the sanction of the Governor-General was empowered to nominate one person, official or non-official, having expert knowledge connected with the proposed or pending legislation, to be an additional Member of the Council. The term of office of the additional Member was fixed as three years. Provision was made that where such additional Members were officials or person nominated as having expert knowledge, the term was three years or such shorter period as the Lieutenant-Governor might determine. The first meeting of the Council of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bihar and Orissa was held in the Council Chamber at Bankipur on 20 January, 1913, under the presidentship of Sir Charles Stuart Bailey Lieutenant-Governor of Bihar and Orissa.

In 1917, the British Government declared that increasing association of the people of India with the work of Government and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible Government in British India as an integral part of the Empire was its aim. The principals enunciated in this declaration were given effect to in the Government of India Act, 1919, which, together with the Act 1915, was subsequently consolidated into a new Government of India Act. Under section 46 of this Act, Bihar and Orissa was declared to be a Governor's province from 29 December, 1920, and the new scheme of reforms as provided in the Act was inaugurated from that date. The composition of Bihar and Orissa Legislative Council was also amended to provide for a Council consisting of 103 members, of whom seventy-six were to be elected members, and twenty-seven nominated by the Governor.

Under section 72 of the Act, the Members of the Executive Council were *ex-officio* Members of the Bihar and Orissa Legislative Council but, with this exception, the composition of the rest of the Council was laid down in the rules framed under the Act. Of the twenty-seven nominated Members, including the *ex-officio* Members, not more than eighteen were to be officials and nine were to be persons nominated to represent different classes or interests.

For the election of the seventy-six elected Members, the province was divided into 76 constituencies of which, 66 were General Constituencies and 10 Special Constituencies. The General Constituencies covered the whole of the geographical area of the province with each district forming one or more constituencies according to its size and population. These General Constituencies comprised 48 Non-Mohammedan Constituencies 42 rural

and 6 urban and 18 Mohammedan Constituencies—15 rural and 3 urban. The Special Constituencies covered 5 Landholders' Constituencies corresponding to 5 Commissioner's divisions and 5 other Constituencies. In addition to the seventy-six elected and twenty-seven nominated members, the Governor could nominate two other members and experts for the purpose of any Bill introduced, or proposed to be introduced, in the Legislative Council.

After the constitution of the Governor's Province, need was felt for an independent council building. By the order of the Government, the construction work of the new council chamber was started in March, 1920, and the building was completed in the same year. The first meeting of the Bihar and Orissa Legislative Council was inaugurated on 7 February, 1921. The Hon'ble Sir Francis Mudie presided over the deliberations.

The people of Orissa had for many years been pressing for a separate province of their own. They claimed that the whole of the Oriya-speaking tract should be formed into a separate administration. Accordingly when the Government of India Act was passed in 1935, Orissa was given the status of a separate province. In January, 1936, an Order in Council was promulgated by His Majesty's Government creating a separate province of Orissa. At the end of March, 1936, the Bihar Legislative Council bade farewell to the Orissa Members, and the Hon'ble President voiced the general feeling of Bihar in wishing the new province a happy future. On 1 April, 1936, the separation took effect.

1st April, 1937, witnessed the inauguration of Provincial Autonomy as envisaged in Government of India Act, 1935. The unicameral legislature of the old Government of India Act, 1919, was replaced by a bicameral legislature, consisting of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council. Under the new Constitution, the Legislative Assembly had a strength of 152 members chosen directly by the people voting in territorial and special constituencies in accordance with the extended franchise qualifications embodied in the fifth and sixth schedules of the Government of India Act, 1935.

The new Legislative Council, as constituted, was a permanent body not subject to dissolution as was the old unicameral Bihar and Orissa Legislative Council. It consisted of 30 Members including the President. Of these, nine represented the general seats, four Muhammedan seats, one European seat. 12 were elected by the Bihar Legislative Assembly and four were chosen by the Governor, in his discretion. The new Bihar Legislative

Council building was constructed in 1935. According to the provisions of Government of India Act, 1935, election was held in Bihar in 1937.

On 3 July, 1937, a notification was issued by the Governor of Bihar summoning the Legislative Assembly on 22 July, 1937. Dr. Sachchidananda Sinha was appointed as Protem-Speaker and he took his oath before the Governor at Government House on the morning of the 22 July. The Members spent the whole of the day in taking the oath prescribed under section 67 of the Government of India Act, 1935. On the following day, i.e. 23 July, the Assembly proceeded to elect a Speaker and a Deputy Speaker. Shri Ramdayalu Sinha and Professor Abdul Bari were elected without any contest as the first Speaker and Deputy Speaker of the Assembly respectively. Before vacating the chair the Protem Speaker Dr. Sinha delivered a long speech rapidly surveying the political changes since 1893 and dilating on the altered constitutional circumstances due to the introduction of Provincial Autonomy and the new powers and responsibilities under it.

Then in 1939 came the Second World War and Britain sought to involve India in it without its consent. In this background the Congress Parliamentary Board, with the approval of the Congress Committee, issued the following instructions for the guidance of the Ministries and Congress Party in the Congress Provinces :—

“The resolution of the Working Committee calls upon Congress Provincial Governments to tender their resignations. These resignations should be given after the Assembly meetings which have been convened for the purpose of discussing such urgent business as may be pending but it is expected that resignations will be tendered by October 31, 1939.”

The Congress Government of Bihar headed by Dr. Shri Krishna Sinha resigned on 3 October, 1939 and the Bihar Legislative Assembly was dissolved. Thus from November, 1939 to 1945 Bihar Legislative Assembly was not in existence.

According to the provisions of Government of India Act, 1935, elections were again held in Bihar in the year 1946. i.e., after a gap of more than six years. Then came Independence; and according to the provisions of the Constitution of India, the first general election was held in 1952 and in order to accommodate 331 elected Members and one nominated Member the present Assembly Chamber was remodelled.

Bihar's boundry underwent a modification in the light of the recommendations of the State Reorganisation Commission. In pursuance of the enactment of the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Act, 1956, a total area of 3,166 square miles with a total population of 14,46,385 was transferred to West Bengal on November, 1956. Thereby the total number of elected Members of Bihar Legislative Assembly was reduced from 331 to 318. In 1977, the total number of elected Members of the Bihar Legislative Assembly was raised from 318 to 324 in proportion to the increase in population. This position continues unchanged till now.

Adult franchise has created amongst the people, a new awareness of the power which they hold. The battle of the ballot has, in course of time become more decisive than any other kind of battle that could have been fought. Man, specially, the common man, has once again, become the centre of attention. Members drawn from local areas are everwilling to espouse his cause, and bring his problems to the notice of the House. Events, which, otherwise, would have gone un-noticed find their echo in the House. Ripples become waves and this keeps the administration always on its toes.

However, while this has made the legislature truly representative of the people, it has created a problem, namely, the problem of orderly conduct of the proceedings of a House, which has grown in size and maturity. Our democratic system requires the fullest opportunity to be given for the expression of views of all segments of society represented by the Members; and yet a degree of restraint is required to be exercised for the smooth flow of business of the House and for the resolution of conflicting opinions. Over the years, a set of systems procedures and conventions have grown and these have been codified; but the system requires constant review and modifications, in the light of the experience gained. Conferences like this have always been very fruitful as these provide a window, through which one can look out and see what is happening elsewhere, in India and abroad. Plenty of difficult and, at times, very tricky, situations are arising in the legislature all over the country and outside. Through exchange of views and information, in the light of the experience gained, it should be possible for us to weave into the rules of procedure of our House, a set of view acceptables and wholesome precedents and conventions. Parliamentary democracy works through consensus. Man being man, opinions would necessarily differ on any issue, and in a democracy, it is necessary that his freedom of speech and expression should not be curtailed; hence these opinions should also be aired; but it is necessary that, in the end, these conflicts should be resolved; and a consensus found. The business of the House must go on.

We cannot afford to get bogged down on every single issue that might be raised. For this rules of procedure are very necessary. Let us hope that this Conference of Presiding Officers, will enable us to learn from each other's rich experience; and that this will be helpful in developing some sort of understanding of the right procedure to be adopted. It will ultimately forge new wholesome precedents and coventions for the successful working of the democrataic administration. Last but not the least, this Conference will provide an opportunity for valuable personal contacts and development of a spirit of comradeship in the service of our country and inspire each of us to work for the creation of a parliamentary office with ideals and traditions that are noble and in conformity with our constitution. Problems, such as, political, social, economic, communal, linguistic or regional have to be got over in the interest of our society and country. Our role is very difficult. We have to profess strict impartiality in all matters and give our decision whenever the circumstances require it. We should therefore try to achieve uniformity in our rules and regulation and control the situation even if it becomes very provocative. The recommendations or decisions of the Conference do help in focusing attention on important issues and in developing healthy conventions to maintain and strengthen our cherished democratic institutions and values. So far as purely procedural matters are concerned the decisions of the Conference carry great weight with Presiding Officers who take requisite action in the light of circumstances and requirements of their respective Houses.

We are beholden to Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha, who very kindly gave his consent for convening this Conference at Patna. We are sure that under his able guidance, this Conference will chisel out many important problems with which we are faced in our legislature. With these words, I once again welcome you all.

Thank you.

THE MEDIA AND PARLIAMENT IN U.K.

SIR CHARLES GORDON, KCB

As I am writing this article, coverage of Parliament is approaching one of its regular high points—I refer, of course, to the General Election which is to take place on 9 June. It is perhaps ironic that coverage of Parliament should reach its maximum when there is in fact no Parliament in existence. However, this apparent contradiction only intensifies an ever-present problem in this context, and one about which Members of Parliament are constantly exercised. That problem is the disparity between what those Members (and especially back-benchers) consider to be the important activities of the House, and what the media consider the most newsworthy elements of the Parliament's proceedings. There is, of course, inevitably an element of personal esteem in this, and no individual back-bencher is likely to feel that full justice has been done to the arguments he has raised in debate. But it is also certain that reporting of proceedings tends to dwell on the sensational or personal elements rather than the significant processes of legislation. This conflict of interests between Parliament and the media has been further sharpened by the introduction of sound broadcasting of the proceedings of the House, and I intend to return to these problems later in the article.

This general conflict, and balance of interests, between the desire of Parliament to control coverage of its proceedings and the freedom of the press to report what it wishes in whatever manner (within the constraints of law) it chooses, has been the principal factor in modelling the historical developments of coverage of Parliament. It would seem extraordinary to a modern Member of Parliament that the House in the past should have so vigorously opposed the making of records of speeches delivered in the Chamber, but it was only late in the last century that Hansard was established on an official footing as the "Official Report". As such, Hansard has come under the full control of the House, and has ceased to be part of the "media" in the usual sense of that term. It remains, of course, the most important,

objective and efficient organ for disseminating widely the proceedings of the House, and perhaps by these same tokens, the one that reaches the smallest audience. It provides a verbatim record of everything that is said in the House or in Standing Committees within twenty-four hours of its being said, and is published and made available to the general public. It is often asked to what extent Members are permitted by the Editor of the official report to adjust the record of what they say after it is first printed and before the permanent bound volumes are published. The answer is : not at all in substance, and only in a strictly limited way in detail. Very few Members, however, express dissatisfaction with the way in which their words are reported, and the very, fullness of the record is taken to be guarantee of its fairness.

The shorthand reporters who compile the Official Report sit in the Press Gallery of the Chamber, which is sited opposite the Public Gallery directly above the Speaker's Chair. There are other "members" of this Gallery, which is kind of self-governing organisation within the House, with its own catering facilities, offices and services in the area outside the Chamber immediately off the gallery. These are the journalists who work for the national daily papers, the local provincial papers, the press agencies, the BBC and independent broadcasting organisations, and the foreign press. Membership of the Press Gallery is strictly limited and divided by quota among the various papers and organisation (it is again a sign of the changing relationship between Parliament and the press that this specially reserved area was first provided only with the opening of the new Chamber in the 1850's, but was doubled in size when the Chamber was rebuilt in 1945 after being destroyed by enemy action in the war). Apart from the Official Report, the members of the Gallery can be divided into three principal categories.

The oldest, but now probably the smallest, are the shorthand reporters retained by the daily newspapers and the Press Association. Only two newspapers, "The Times" and "The Daily Telegraph", now provide any real coverage of the speeches delivered in the Chamber, although the Press Association continues to produce a full verbatim record for use by its members. Generally there is about a page each day of summarised accounts of the speeches, and their function for most of the audience has been largely superseded by sound broadcasting and Hansard.

The next group are the "sketch writers", and all the major "quality" daily newspapers employ these. Their job is to provide a more partisan and dramatic account of the day's business in the House, and they often adopt a

sharply satirical tone in their reports. It is these brief accounts which probably provide the most widely read account of Parliamentary business. The house has chosen to turn a blind eye to the occasional excesses of these writers and has never attempted to control their reports or exclude them from the gallery.

The third major group in the Press Gallery are the so-called "lobby correspondents". Each major news organisation maintains a team of two or three such correspondents. Their title derives from the special privilege they enjoy of access to the Members' Lobby and surrounding corridors at all times when the House is working (except, it should be noted, during divisions). This Privilege is in the gift of Mr. Speaker, although he delegates the day-to-day control of the list of lobby members to the Serjeant-at-Arms; the latter in turn usually fills the quota allocated to each organisation with their own nominees without challenge. The privileged status of lobby correspondents enables them to have frequent and regular contacts with all Members of Parliament, including Ministers, and encourages the establishment of confidential relationships. It is now generally accepted that the "Lobby" is regularly briefed "en masse" by spokesmen for 10 Downing Street, Ministers and civil servants, and the official opposition. But in return for this privileged and confidential status the Lobby binds itself by an unwritten code of conduct which forbids them to use material gained through their special position in a way to embarrass the government or individual Members, or to expose to the public any information which has been divulged in confidence. By tradition the sources of information to the lobby are never named without their express permission.

The system has, with one or two unfortunate exceptions, served both sides to this unwritten contract very well. It enables the journalists and reporters to have access to all kinds of information which is not generally available, but which gives them a breadth of knowledge and an insight into the workings of politics which can inform and give authority to their writings. And for the politicians, it gives them a means of disseminating information in a way that may be less complicated and hedged-about than formal press releases. As the lobby correspondents have access to all Members, they may often be the best informed about what is happening in all the parties and the government, and will thus be a very useful source of information to Members themselves. The Lobby system might be held up as the most effective solution yet found to the problem of balancing Members of Parliament's natural desire for publicity with their anxiety to exercise some form of control over the way in which that publicity is finally achieved. The strenuous insistence on parliamentary privilege as the method

controlling the activities of the press, which often characterised Parliament in earlier centuries (most particularly during the Protectorship in the seventeenth century) has now been largely abandoned as too blunt an instrument to be effectively wielded in the modern state.

I must now turn to what is currently the most vexed question in Parliament's relations with the media; the introduction of sound broadcasting of proceedings. On 24 February, 1975 the Houses authorised an experiment in public sound broadcasting by 354 votes to 182 (a similar motion relating to television was defeated by 275 to 263). In the following June and July experimental broadcasts took place and were favourably reported on by the Services Committee, and on 16 March, 1976 permanent sound broadcasting was approved in principle by 299 to 124. Regular sound broadcasting began on 3 April, 1978. A Sound Broadcasting Select Committee was set up to oversee the general arrangements, and to report on developments to the House when it saw fit.

It should be noted that the Resolution bringing sound broadcasting into effect clearly gave full editorial control to the broadcasters themselves as to what material to use and in what manner, subject to certain provisions of a fairly minor kind connected with privilege. It required that only *proceedings* of the House could be broadcast (*i.e.* it excluded interruptions from the public gallery, or anything taking place in the Chamber during a suspension). The only way in which the House can stop recording or broadcasting of its proceedings is to vote to exclude strangers. Only the BBC and the IBA have permission to make recordings and transmit them, but the IBA acts in effect as an umbrella organisation for all legitimate independent broadcasting organisations. In the first months of sound broadcasting the BBC broadcast Prime Minister's Questions live (every Tuesday and Thursday afternoon); many Members, including those on the Sound Broadcasting Committee, felt that this was an unfortunate decision which gave rise, among the listening public, to an entirely misleading impression of the work of the House. Prime Minister's Question Time has always been, and increasingly so in recent years, the occasion when the House engages in its most robust demonstrations of adversarial, and sometimes personal, debate. It has proved to be one of the insuperable technical problems of recording in the Chamber that background noise is far more intrusive in the broadcasts than it would be to someone watching from the Public Gallery. Letters to the BBC and newspapers from the general public expressed some dismay at what they heard. Some argued that television broadcasting would overcome some of these

difficulties, but the House, having been given several opportunities, to vote on this question, has always rejected it. Eventually, following encouragement from the Sound Broadcasting Committee, the live transmission of Prime Minister's Questions on the BBC was stopped, although some independent companies continue to broadcast live transmissions of certain question times. Since then, live transmission has been mostly confined to major occasions—the annual Budget Statement by the Chancellor, the Prime Minister's statement on the Blunt case, and most recently and significantly the first three-hour emergency debate on the Falklands Crisis on Saturday 3 April, 1982. A local independent London radio station continues to broadcast a recording of the whole of daily Question Time each evening.

Since the virtual cessation of live broadcasting, the principal air-time given to proceedings of both Houses of Parliament is on the BBC's two daily programmes, "Today in Parliament" and "Yesterday in Parliament". The former of these is broadcast late at night and has a relatively small audience of about 250,000. The latter is broadcast at 8.30 in the morning and has a regular audience of over one million. Until recently the programme was designed primarily as a sound equivalent of the newspaper summaries described earlier. It has now been changed to something more equivalent to a sound version of the parliamentary sketch, a development which has upset many Members as being an unfair use of the recorded proceedings. Under the terms of the BBC's licence agreement with the Home Office, the Corporation is required to broadcast a daily objective summary of the proceedings of both Houses of Parliament. This obligation, the BBC say, is discharged by the broadcast of "Today in Parliament". It is, however, some indication of the sensitivity of Members to sound broadcasting that there have been many objections to this new development, which, it is felt by some, fails to achieve sufficient standards of objectivity. In fact, in the last days of the recent Parliament, a Bill was passed by the House of Commons to set up an annual review of the arrangements for broadcasting of Parliament. The Member who presented the Bill specifically referred to the disquiet over the changed form of "Yesterday in Parliament" as the main stimulus to its introduction. Owing the unexpectedly early dissolution, however, there was no time for its consideration by the Lords.

The current controversy once again highlights the age-old conflict of interests. Some Members have proposed that all the proceedings of Parliament should be broadcast live on a radio or television channel

specifically set aside for this unique purpose. Such a development seems unlikely to take shape in the foreseeable future, but the idea embodies the principle that any form of editorial selection is likely to be unfair to some sections of Parliament, however unwittingly. The ideal solution may well be some form of "Hansard of the air", but since a solution is far away, the debate over the form of sound broadcasting is bound to continue for many years.

It took centuries for the House of Commons to come to terms with the newspapers. It took only about half a century from the establishment of the BBC to the introduction of sound broadcasting. That move has undoubtedly brought Parliament before a vastly increased audience. Indeed, our recently retired Speaker, Mr. George Thomas, became a nationally known figure in a way quite unprecedented among previous Speakers by being heard so often on the radio, leading the House through some difficult moments of intense conflict, and delivering some historic communications to the Chamber. But the impression made on that wider audience has not, unfortunately, always been a good one. Nevertheless, I believe that most Members feel on balance that the greater awareness of the activities of Parliament that has been brought about through the introduction of sound broadcasting more than compensates for the ensuing disadvantages. One side-effect of sound broadcasting has been the creation of the Sound Archives of the proceedings of Parliament, which will be of inestimable value and interest to future historians.

However, the role of the written word has not been superseded. The Departmental Select Committees which were introduced for the first time in the 1979-83 Parliament have added a new dimension to media coverage of Parliament. It might almost be said that the periodical Reports of these Committees receive at least as much attention in the media as they do in government circles. They are especially of interest to the serious weeklies and Sunday papers. There is also an excellent forty-five minute programme on the BBC on Sundays, which uses recordings of evidence sessions in Committees, coupled with interviews with Members of the Committee and other interested parties. These Reports are a new development in Parliament, as they are in some ways directed as much to the world outside Westminster as to Parliament itself. The Committees have developed a fairly sophisticated relationship with the press, including all the paraphernalia of briefings and press conferences. They illustrate once again the symbiotic relationship between Parliament and the media, and if the Committees continue in the future, doubtless that relationship will need to become more sophisticated.

Looking yet further into the future, it is almost inevitable that television will eventually come to Parliament in some form or other, if only because that is the channel through which an even wider audience will be reached. It remains to be seen how the balance will be achieved between Parliament retaining its character and integrity as developed painstakingly over nearly a thousand years, and its coming to terms with the inevitable changes wrought by the introduction of the new technology, which will enable an even wider section of the population to become involved in the power-house of democratic government.

PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA

Conference of Chairmen of Public Accounts Committees : The Sixth Conference of Chairmen of Public Accounts Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures in India was held in New Delhi on 19-20 February, 1983. Besides the Chairman of Public Accounts Committee (P.A.C.) of Parliament, 16 Chairmen from State/Union Territory Legislatures attended the Conference. The Conference was inaugurated by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha. The inaugural address was followed by an address by the Chairman of the Conference, Shri Satish Agarwal, M.P.

The Conference discussed matters pertaining to the following aspects of Public Accounts Committee :

1. Coordination;
2. Scope and Working of the P.A.C.;
3. New Service and New Instruments of Service;
4. Audit of Cooperative Bodies;
5. Procedure for Evidence and Production of Documents;
6. Implementation of P.A.C.'s Recommendations;
7. Chairman of P.A.C.;
8. Staffing Pattern; and
9. Examination of Autonomous Bodies.

Conference of Chairmen of Library Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures : The Second Conference of Chairmen of Library Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures in India was held in New Delhi on 19 and 20 March, 1983. Besides the Chairman of Library Committee of Parliament

(i.e. Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha), Chairmen of Library Committees of State/ Union Territory Legislatures, including some Presiding Officers, attended the Conference. The Conference was inaugurated by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha. The Inaugural Address was followed by an Address by the Chairman of the Conference, Shri G. Lakshmanan, Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha.

The Conference discussed matters pertaining to the following aspects of Library Committee :

1. Coordination;
2. Library, Research & Reference Service;
3. Scope and Functions; and
4. Staffing.

BUREAU OF PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES AND TRAINING

During the period 15 January to 6 April 1983, the following Programmes/Courses were organised by the Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training, Lok Sabha Secretariat :

Appreciation Courses for Probationers/Officers of All India/Central Services : Three Appreciation Courses in Parliamentary processes and procedures viz. the Appreciation Course for officers of the rank of Under Secretary and Section/Desk Officer in the Ministry of Commerce, the Third Appreciation Course for Indian Audit and Accounts Service Probationers and the Fifth Appreciation Course for Probationers of (i) Indian Defence Accounts Service; (ii) Indian Civil Accounts Service; and (iii) Defence Lands and Cantonment Service, were organised from 15 January to 21 January, 1983, 5 March to 12 March, 1983, and 22 March to 26 March, 1983, respectively.

Study Visit : A Study Visit for three officials from the National Secretariat of Nigerian Legislatures and the Administrative Staff College of Nigeria was organised from 24 February to 1 March, 1983 to enable them to study the working of the Bureau in particular and the Lok Sabha Secretariat in general. The Nigerian officials had discussions with Secretary, Lok Sabha, Secretary-General, Rajya Sabha, and other senior Officers of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Secretariats for this purpose.

Attachment Programmes: From 24 January to 11 February, 1983, the Bureau organised an Attachment Programme for the Officers from Madhya Pradesh Vidhan Sabha Secretariat to enable them to familiarise themselves with the procedure regarding Legislative matters and then working of Parliament Library and Reference, Research, Documentation and Information Service.

Another Attachment Programme was organised on 17 and 18 March, 1983 for the participants in the International Training Programme on the Audit of Receipts, conducted by the office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. The Programme was attended by 21 participants from 18 countries (including India) of Asia and Africa. Besides being addressed on various aspects of Parliamentary processes and procedures, the participants were also enabled to watch the proceedings of Lok Sabha and Public Accounts Committee.

PRIVILEGE ISSUES

LOK SABHA

Increase in prices of certain petroleum products on the eve of the Budget Session : On 16 February, 1983, a Member (Prof. Madhu Dandavate) gave notice of a question of privilege against the Minister of Energy and Petroleum (Shri P. Shiv Shankar) for issuing notifications regarding increase in the prices of certain petroleum products just before the commencement of the Budget Session of Parliament.

On 22 February, 1983, when the Speaker (Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar) called upon the Minister of Energy and Petroleum to lay the aforesaid notifications on the Table of the House, several Members (Sarvashri Chitta Basu, Ram Vilas Paswan, Somnath Chatterjee and Sunil Maitra) raised objections to the laying of the notifications, on the ground that it amounted to impropriety and contempt of the House.

Thereupon, the Speaker *inter alia* observed that the "Government have issued the notifications increasing the prices of petroleum products under the powers conferred on them by the relevant Act and the rules framed thereunder. The Members, if they so wish, may write to the Committee on the Papers Laid on the Table". However, sharing the feelings of the Members in this regard, he added : "It would have been more appropriate to announce the increase in prices in the House as the Lok Sabha was scheduled to sit from 18 February, 1983".

On 23 February, 1983, when Prof. Madhu Dandavate sought to raise the matter again as a question of privilege, The Speaker stated that he had already observed in the House that it was an "impropriety".

The matter was thereafter closed.

Wrong and misleading statements allegedly made in the House by two Ministers in regard to a note stated to have been sent by the Chief Election Commissioner to Government after the first round of poll in Assam for postponing the elections : On 15 and 16 March, 1983, a Member (Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee) gave notices of breach of privilege, under rule 222 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, against the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs and by implication against the Chief Election Commissioner of India. On 16 March, 1983, Shri Vajpayee also forwarded to the Speaker a copy of the note which he claimed was sent to the Government of India by the Chief Election Commissioner after the first round of poll in Assam and sought Speaker's permission for laying a copy of the note on the Table of the House.

In his notice dated 15 March, 1983, Shri Vajpayee *inter alia* stated* that he had read in the newspapers that after the elections in Assam, on 14 February, 1983, the Chief Election Commissioner had advised the Government to postpone the next phase of elections. He had contacted the Chief Election Commissioner personally to enquire whether the report published in the newspapers was correct and the Chief Election Commissioner had replied in the affirmative.

Shri Vajpayee alleged that during the discussion on Assam situation held in the House on 14 March, 1983, first the Home Minister and later the Law Minister had denied that they had received any suggestion from the Chief Election Commissioner about Assam. The Ministers had also said that they had not received any letter from the Chief Election Commissioner.

Subsequently, on 16 March, 1983, another Member (Shri Harikesh Bahadur) also gave a notice, under rule 222, of breach of privilege against the Minister of Home Affairs and the Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs on the ground that the Ministers had given a wrong statement that they had not received any communication from the Election Commission regarding postponement of elections in Assam.

In continuation of his earlier notices, Shri Vajpayee sent on 18 March, 1983, another communication clarifying his point of view.

After going through the material contained in the notices and the material furnished by the Home Minister and the Law Minister, the Speaker (Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar) informed the House on 24 March, 1983, that a note

*Spoke in Hindi.

entitled 'The General Elections to the Legislative Assembly of Assam—1982' was prepared in the Election Commission and it was the same as the one for which Shri Vajpayee had sought permission for laying it on the Table of the House. He stated that the note in question was sent on 19 February, 1983, to the Legislative Department of the Ministry of Law by the Election Commission not on its own violation, but in compliance with a specific request made by that Department on 27 January, 1983, and a reminder sent by that Department on 14 February, 1983, for material for preparing a statement for the use of the Law Minister for dealing with Calling Attention notices in the Rajya Sabha. On 21 February, 1983, a copy of the same note was also sent to the Home Ministry by the Election Commission as an aid for the use of the Home Minister in connection with his proposed statement on Assam in Parliament.

As regards the contents of the note, the Speaker observed that a careful perusal of the note led one to the logical conclusion that "far from containing any suggestion for postponement of the poll in Assam after the first round of poll on 14 February, 1983, it contains passages which indicate that the Commission itself considered it improper to cancel in to elections on the basis of the views of one of the parties and without taking into account the views of certain parties which had representation in the dissolved Legislative Assembly of Assam and which were in favour of elections. The note also contains a passage indicating that the Commission was continuing with the process of election on account of the assurances given by the State Government at various stages that they were in a position to carry out the process of election. The note also contains a statement to the effect that Commission would be referring some of the important complex constitutional issues to the Attorney General of India for his considered advice, which would show that the references had not been made on or before 19 February 1983". The Speaker found that the Commission had sent the first communication for making reference to the Attorney General only on 21 February, 1983, *i.e.* after the third round of poll in Assam was over on 20 February, 1983.

Since there had been speculation about the contents and implications of the note, the Speaker accorded permission under Direction 117 (of the 'Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha') to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to lay it on the Table of the House. It was clear, the Speaker said, that "the note does not afford any factual basis for the inferences that the Election Commission made any suggestion that the poll in Assam be postponed after the first round on 14 February, 1980."

The Speaker was also unable to accept Shri Vajpayee's contention in his second letter of 18 March, 1983 that the central issue was not that the

note sent by the Election Commission on 19 February, 1983, contained any suggestion or hint for postponing the next round of poll in Assam, for this was the very point which he had raised in the House pointedly.

He referred to the established parliamentary practices, procedures and precedents and observed that a breach of privilege could arise only when a Minister/Member made a false statement or an incorrect statement wilfully, deliberately and knowingly.

The Speaker said that in the instant case, the statements of the Minister of Home Affairs and the Minister of Law, taken in the context of the specific queries by Shri Vajpayee in the House on 14 March, 1983, "were factually not incorrect and there is thus no question of breach of privilege or contempt of the House". He, therefore, did not accord consent to the matter being raised as a question of breach of privilege or contempt of the House.

He, however, wished that "greater care had been taken to ascertain the facts in their entirety before the issue was taken up on the Floor of the House." He also wished that "greater restraint was shown by the persons concerned, and the high office of the Chief Election Commissioner, who has his own statutory obligations and responsibilities under the Constitution, is not brought in unnecessarily. Truth should prevail."

STATE LEGISLATURES

GUJARAT LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Obtaining a group pass for the Visitors' Gallery by giving false names :

On 1 October, 1980, 25 students of Ayurved College, Ahmedabad, were issued a group pass for getting entry into the Visitors' Gallery on the recommendation of a Member (Shri Ashok Bhatt). After their entry into the Gallery some of the students demonstrated by shouting slogans and throwing pamphlets in the House. They were arrested and removed from the Visitors' Gallery by the staff of Sergeant-at-Arms. Thereafter, the House unanimously passed a motion that these 21 persons be sentenced to simple imprisonment until the prorogation of the Session and be sent to Sabarmati Central Jail, Ahmedabad.

Out of the aforesaid 21 demonstrators, the names of only 7 of them conformed to the entries appearing in the list of 25 persons. Thus, only 7

persons were having valid entry passes while remaining 14 did not have such passes. This meant that they had entered into the Visitors' Gallery unauthorisedly without valid entry passes and they had misled the officers of the House by giving false names to the Legislature Secretariat.

Since the group pass was obtained under the signature of Dr. Prafull Thaker, the entire responsibility in this matter rested on him. The Speaker, therefore, wrote a letter to him on 14 November, 1980, for explaining within 10 days why penal action should not be taken against him. Subsequently, two reminders were sent to him but Dr. Thaker ignored them and did not send his explanation.

While observing that Dr. Prafull Thaker and 14 other students had committed a contempt of the House by violating the Assembly Rules and by misleading the Officers of the House in giving them wrong information, the Speaker referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges for examination and report.

In his reply submitted to the Committee of Privileges, Dr. Prafull Thaker said that it was not at all their intention either to mislead the House or to commit its contempt and in any case they did not deliberately mislead the House. When Dr. Thaker appeared in person before the Committee, he was told that his letter did not contain a clear confession with regard to the contempt of the House as he had put forth his arguments and that the apology tendered was not unconditional as was the Parliamentary practice. Thereafter, Dr. Thaker tendered unconditional apology and owned up the entire responsibility.

The Committee of Privileges, after considering the written reply of Dr. Prafull Thaker and after hearing him in person, in their First Report, presented to the House on 11 February, 1982, agreed with the recommendation of the Speaker that these persons had misled the Officers of the House by giving false names to the Legislature Secretariat.

In view of the unconditional apology tendered by Dr. Prafull Thaker, the Committee recommended that it would be worthy of the House not to take any action against Dr. Thaker.

No further action was taken by the House in the matter.

JAMMU AND KASHMIR LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Alleged casting of reflections on Members and the House by a newspaper :

On 22, 24 and 25 September, 1981, several cartoons were published in the *Srinagar Times*, a local daily, in which Members of the Legislative Assembly were variously depicted in a way which tended to cast reflections on Members and the House.

On 29 September, 1981, the Speaker, observed* that Sardar Parduman Singh had, a few days ago, called the attention of the House about the publication of the cartoons. He called the Editor of the newspaper and drew his attention to the cartoons and sought clarification from him. The Editor told that the said Cartoonist was sticking to his position and was of the view that the way the proceedings were carried on in the House and the way in which the Members behaved, necessitated its exposition to the public.

After some discussion, the House decided to summon the Editor (Shri Sofi Ghulam Ahmed) and the Cartoonist (Shri Bashir Ahmed) of the *Srinagar Times* to the Bar of the House and on 30 September, 1981, they were brought to the Bar of the House. Thereupon, the Speaker informed them that they were charged for contempt of the House for the publication of the aforesaid cartoons and were, therefore, required to give statements in their defence.

In his statement the Editor assured the House that none of the aforesaid cartoons was published out of any malice or lack of respect for the august House as an institution. He honestly believed that those cartoons constituted a fair comment on the performance and the conduct of numerous Members.

The cartoonist also stated that he regarded the House as august and its Members as hon'ble. Nevertheless, none was infallible and people did commit follies here and there which provided cartoonists like him the material which enabled him and his readers to laugh at. It was all done with harmless humour and well intentioned and innocuous satire.

After some discussion, the leader of the House, Shri Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, moved the following motion which was adopted by the House :

“After considering the explanation given by the two viz, the Editor and the Cartoonist, the House decides to drop the matter,”

*Spoke in Urdu.

KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Alleged misleading of the House by a Minister, and giving advance publicity in the Press to a notice of question of privilege by a Member : A Member (Shri K. P. Prabhakaran) gave notice of a question of privilege against the Minister of Electricity (Shri R. Balakrishna Pillai) arising out of certain answers given by the Minister in reply to a starred question and supplementaries thereto on 5 July, 1982. In his notice the Member alleged that the statement made by the Minister in the House that the Kerala Electricity Workers' Federation, a union affiliated to the Member's political party, had yet to submit its demands for the long-term settlement, was incorrect, because the union had, in fact, submitted the same on 12 January, 1982. Shri Prabhakaran, therefore, contended that Minister had deliberately misled the House by concealing a fact already known to him and thereby committed a breach of privilege of the House.

On enquiry, the Minister informed the Speaker that the reply given by him in the House on 5 July, 1982, was based on the information made available to him at that time. Subsequently, however, it had come to his notice that the aforesaid Federation had sent a communication on 12 January, 1982, pertaining to the pay structure of the workers.

Withholding his consent for raising the question, the Speaker observed, in the House on 18 August 1982 that on a careful consideration of the matter, he was satisfied that no breach of privilege was involved in the case. However, he asked the Minister to make a statement clarifying the position.

The Speaker further informed the House that he had received another notice of question of privilege from a Member (Shri M. M. Hassan) against Shri K. P. Prabhakaran for allegedly giving publicity in the Press to the latter's aforesaid notice of question of privilege against the Minister for Electricity. He said that Shri Prabhakaran had denied that he had given any such publicity and had expressed regret that such a news item was published in the Press. In view of these circumstances, the Speaker observed : "I have decided to drop the matter. No question of breach of privilege arises."

UTTAR PRADESH VIDHAN SABHA

Alleged threatening of a Member by a Police Officer : On 16 July, 1980, a Member (Shri Badan Singh) gave notice of a question of privilege against the Circle Officer (C. O.) of Police, Khairagarh, District Agra (Shri Rayi

Shankar Tripathi) for allegedly threatening him. In his notice, the Member stated that while speaking under Rule 301 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the U. P. Legislative Assembly (relating to raising a matter which is not a point of order) on 10 July, 1980, and on the motion of thanks on the Governor's Address on 11 July, 1980, he had exposed the arbitrary and partial attitude of the C. O. On 12 July, 1980, when he reached Agra, the C. O. threatened, intimidated and warned him for future in the presence of another Member (Shri Vijay Singh Rana) and some other persons for raising the matter in the Assembly. That amounted to a contempt of the House and its Members.

At the request of the Speaker, the Chief Minister furnished a factual report in the matter, according to which the C. O. denied that he had met the Member on 12 July, 1980, and had a talk with him. In their reports, the District Magistrate and the Senior Superintendent of Police (S.S.P.), Agra, stated that during the Legislative Assembly elections, a case was registered at the Police Station, Malpura against Shri Badan Singh and others under the Indian Penal Code for obstructing the Harijan voters of village Nehchani under Fatehpur Sikri constituency from casting their votes and that case was under investigation. The S.S.P. stated that the above case was not hushed up as desired by Shri Badan Singh.

On 4 August, 1980, the Speaker referred the matter to the Committee of privileges for examination and report. The Committee of Privileges, after examining Shri Badan Singh, Shri Ravi Shankar Tripathi (C.O.), and several other Members, in their Second Report, presented to the House on 21 September, 1981, reported *inter alia* that the meeting of Shri Badan Singh with Shri Ravi Shankar Tripathi, outside Idgah Station, Agra, on 12 July, 1980, and the allegation of threatening the Member by the C.O. remained doubtful and uncertain. None of the witnesses before the Committee, except Shri Vijay Singh Rana, confirmed that Shri Tripathi got down at Idgah Station. Most of the witnesses stated that he got down at Agra Fort Station.

The Committee further observed that there was also contradiction in the evidence of Shri Badan Singh and Shri Vijay Singh Rana. Shri Singh had stated that only the constables with Shri Tripathi, were in Police uniform, while Shri Rana had stated that the constables with him were in civilian clothes. According to Shri Badan Singh, when Shri Tripathi threatened him, Shri Rana, who was with him at that time, did not speak anything while Shri Rana stated that it was not possible for him to remain silent after hearing those threats. The Committee, therefore, felt that the words which the C.O. was alleged to have used in threatening the Member were not corroborated by Shri Rana's evidence.

In view of the above, the Committee recommended that the matter be closed. No further action was taken by the House in the matter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (AUSTRALIA)

Alleged casting of reflections on Members in a newspaper article : On 8 September, 1981, a Member (Mr. P. M. Ruddock) sought to raise a question of privilege against the *Daily Mirror* and stated¹ *inter alia* as follows :

“I raise a matter of privilege based on an article published in the *Sydney Daily Mirror* of Wednesday, 2 September, under the page one heading ‘MPs bludgers, drunks’, and the page nine heading, ‘Bludgers on the back bench’. I produce a copy of the *Daily Mirror* printed and published by Mirror Newspapers Ltd. at the office of the company at 2-4 Holt Street, Surry Hills, New South Wales. I saw this article last week. I am not one, who is normally sensitive to reasonable criticism, nor proper and perspicacious comments by well-informed journalists. However, I felt quite incensed at the nature of this article which reflected, I believe, on all members of this Parliament...I can say without any fear at all that I believe this is the most sober working place anywhere in this country.

I must say that whilst the journalist who wrote this article endeavoured to divide members in some senses—he tried to suggest that some members in marginal seats might work harder than others—the fact of the matter is that the article is written in such a form as to reflect upon all members of Parliament. Even though in his judgment there are those members who warranted such criticism—I do not believe there are any—all members are lumbered with the tag he has used. I shall quote some of the comments which those members from inter-state might not be aware were included in this article. He started his article by saying :

‘Most members of Federal Parliament are not—repeat not—in imminent danger of dying of hard work’.

He went on to state :

‘The truth is that a majority of MHRs and senators do not have enough to do. At least not the kind of work that would challenge and interest them.’

¹, *House of Representatives Deb.*, 8 September 1981, p. 975.

I am not sure what he means by that. He went on to state :

‘For much of the rest of the time they loaf, become frustrated and often frequent the members’ bar at Parliament House’.

He went on to add :

‘They sit around the members’ bar boozing, complaining . and achieving very little.

‘There are quite a few members on the Government side who are little more than political time servers—bludging, in effect, on the taxpayers’.

I will stop there with that reference to the members of the Government because I do not wish to repeat the even more scathing comments he made about members of the Opposition, which I believe also were totally and absolutely unjustified. I do not believe any journalists who have observed this Parliament and the conduct of members in and around this Parliament would support the remarks of their colleague. I thought of writing a letter to the newspaper concerned in the hope that it might be published and that it would correct some of the tremendous harm that this has done to my colleagues and, in a sense, all members of the Parliament. I have not done that but I have raised this matter as a matter of privilege in the hope that you will give consideration to it, Mr. Speaker, and so that members of the Parliament can see for themselves the nature of the comments and perhaps can add their comments to mine.”

The Speaker (Sir Billy Snedden) then observed² as follows :

‘The paper produced by the honourable member for Dundas (Mr. Ruddock) is the same as a copy that I had earlier seen. I formed an opinion then that, without any doubt, under the rules of privilege, this was a contempt of the Parliament and therefore clearly was a *prima facie* breach of privilege. Under the Standing Orders it is the requirement that a member raising a matter of privilege, if the Speaker finds that there is a *prima facie* breach of privilege, ought then to be prepared to move a motion for the reference of the breach to the Privileges Committee. I do not on this occasion propose to call upon the honourable member to so move at the moment because it may be that he will give consideration to the form of the motion which may enable the matter to be disposed of on this day.

². *Idid.*, p., 976.

It has been the practice of the Parliament in the past not to deign to consider itself offended by those people we make allegations of a kind which they well know are a breach of privilege and may very well have been intended to acquire personal publicity, especially when they know that the allegations are not based on fact. Accordingly, I will exercise my discretion not to give this matter precedence at the moment. I will allow the honourable member for Dundas to consider, perhaps in consultation with other members of the House, a form of motion which may dispose of the matter today.”

Later in the day, Mr. Ruddock moved³ the following motion which was adopted by the House after some discussion :

“That the matter of the printed reference and the article by Mr. L. Oakes relating to Members of the Commonwealth Parliament appearing on pages 1 and 9, respectively, of the *Sydney Daily Mirror* of Wednesday, 2 September 1981, be referred to the Committee of Privileges”.

The Committee of Privileges, after hearing Mr. Peter Floyd Wylie, Editor of the *Daily Mirror* in their Report presented to the House on 27 October, 1981, reported *inter alia* as follows :

- (i) “In considering the matter referred to it, the Committee had recourse to the practice and precedents of the House of Commons and of the House of Representatives itself. Relevant cases and precedents are included in the Memorandum of the Clerk of the House of Representatives.”
- (ii) “Guided by these precedents the Committee first gave consideration to the wording of the article, to the heading on the article on page 9 and to the heading and printed references published on page 1 of the first edition of the *Daily Mirror* of Wednesday, 2 September 1981. It then decided to call the Editor, of the *Daily Mirror* Mr. P. F. Wylie, to appear before it and he was so requested.”
- (iii) When he appeared before the Committee, Mr. Wylie requested permission to have his legal advisers assist him with respect to any questions that may be put to him and to make submissions to the

³. *Ibid.*, p. 1025.

Committee on his behalf. The Committee deliberated on this request and agreed that counsel be permitted to address argument to the Committee on his right to appear generally for Mr. Wylie. The Hon. T. E. F. Hughes, Q. C. and Mr. N. R. Carson instructed by Mr. H. D. H. Keller of Dawson Waldron were nominated by Mr. Wylie as his legal presentatives. Mr. Hughes argued the case for representing Mr. Wylie before the Committee.”

- (iv) “Following consideration of the arguments the Committee resolved by a majority decision ‘that applying Section 49 of the Constitution and Standing Order 1 of the House of Representatives, this Committee determines that this application for counsel to appear generally on behalf of Mr. Wylie is not granted’. In making that decision the Committee was guided by the practice of the House of Commons where counsel have not been heard before its Committee of Privileges since the 1770s and the decision in the *Bankstown Observer* case of 1955 when the House of Representatives Committee of Privileges heard counsel on his right to appear generally for one of the witnesses, but declined to so allow.”
- (v) “Mr. Wylie was examined before the Committee and accepted responsibility for the publication. He informed the Committee that he had personally written the heading ‘MPs BLUDGERS, DRUNKS’: on page 1 of the first edition and that the printed reference on Page 1 of the first edition and the heading on the article on page 9 of all editions of the *Daily Mirror* had been written by the acting features editor. He confirmed that Mr. L. Oakes had written the article. He also advised the Committee that Mr. Oakes’ article ‘underwent normal sub-editorial treatment for grammar, paragraphs, cross-heads, commas and so forth. It was not taken out of context. It was normal sub-editorial treatment’.”
- (vi) “The Committees questioned Mr. Wylie in regard to his choice of words used in the heading and the wording of the ‘pointer’ on page 1 of the first edition of the paper and to the allegations made by Mr. Oakes in the article itself. Referring specifically to back bench members of the House (and the Senate) the article claimed that :

‘For much of the rest of the time they loaf, become frustrated and often frequent the members’ bar at Parliament House.’

It went on to say that :

‘There is a group of Opposition MPs known as the Labour Old Guard Socialists—LOGS for short. They sit around the members’ bar boozing, complaining...and achieving very little. There are quite a few members on the Government side who are little more than political time-servers-bludging, in effect, on the taxpayers.

Later it went to say :

‘People who are really working hard do not get time to hit the bottle, though. The Parliamentarians with reputations as drunks and those regarded as workers are two quite separate groups’.

Later the article stated that :

“The result is a small group of ministers weighed down by workloads that are well nigh inhuman and nearly a hundred other MPs with too little to do’.”

- (vii) “Mr. Wylie was asked if he had any personal knowledge to substantiate the allegations and informed the Committee that he did not. He had not checked the accuracy of the statements contained in the article and had not discussed the article with Mr. Oakes prior to publication. He stated that he had ‘Complete faith in Laurie Oakes’ and endorsed the article. He described Mr. Oakes as ‘a credible and reputable journalist’. He had relied on ‘Mr. Oakes’ reputation in satisfying himself on the accuracy of accusations contained in the article.”
- (viii) “In answer to a questions Mr. Wylie admitted that prior to publication he considered the article may have constituted a contempt of the Parliament. Although he did not want to commit a breach he had not sought legal or other advice in relation to it. Nevertheless, he allowed publication.”
- (ix) “Mr. Wylie maintained that an article published the following day which described the activities of a hard working Minister was a deliberate ‘balancing article’ quite apart from any other aspect, the Committee points out that the first publication singled out the non-ministerial members as ‘drunks and bludgers’—it specifically excluded Ministers from the description. Far from balancing the

first publication the second article can only be seen as reiterating and re-enforcing the allegations contained in the first.”

- (x) “The author of the article, Mr. L. Oakes, was requested and did make himself available to attend the hearing at which Mr. Wylie was heard. However, he was not called that day. Through his legal advisers he had previously made it know to the Committee that he would be making application to be legally represented if called before the Committee.”
- (xi) “Having ascertained the facts of the publishing and the authorship from Mr. Wylie, the Committee resolved that Mr. Oakes should be extended the opportunity to appear before the Committee if he so wished. This advice was conveyed to Mr. Oakes in writing and he declined. The Committee did not call Mr. Oakes and he did not give evidence to it.”
- (xii) “The Committee is satisfied that sections of the publication are inaccurate and offensive and had individual Members been named redress may have been sought through normal court action. The Committee believes that the clear impression that the headings (especially) and parts of the article would convey to the average reader of the *Daily Mirror* was that back benches were lazy drunks and bludgers. Such an inaccurate allegation could not fail to bring the institution into contempt. The Committee has concluded that parts of the publication come under the established rules of contempt.”
- (xiii) “The Committee has determined as follows :
 - (1) That the printed reference on page of the first edition and the article on page 9 of all editions of the *Sydney Daily Mirror* of 2 September, 1981 constitute a contempt of the House of Representatives by the author, editor and publisher;
 - (2) having considered the reference and the articles, the Committee is of the view that the article and its presentation are irresponsible and reflect no credit on its author, the editor or the publisher; and
 - (3) while finding a contempt of the House of Representatives has been committed, the Committee is of the opinion that the

matter is not worthy of occupying the further time of the House.”

- (xiv) “The Committee feels that it should comment on some additional matters related to this inquiry. The matters now referred to serve illustrate inconsistencies and anomalies that can arise in applying the law of Parliamentary privilege.”
- (xv) “The article by Mr. L. Oakes which was referred to the Committee of Privileges was published in the Sydney *Daily Mirror* of 2 September, 1981. In respect of that publication the Committee has found that the article and the headings constituted a contempt of the House of Representatives. The same article with different headings and slightly altered format also appeared in three other newspapers about the same time. Also about that time a fourth newspaper published an editorial which, in effect, repeated some of the extravagant and inaccurate aspects of the Oakes, article, challenged the whole basis of the law of Parliamentary privilege and strongly deplored the reference of the *Daily Mirror* article to the Committee of Privileges. Only the publication in the *Daily Mirror* was raised as a complaint of breach of privileges in the House and referred to the Committee of Privileges. Having found that the *Daily Mirror* publication was a contempt of the House, it would appear, *Prima facie* that the publications in the other newspapers were also a contempt. Yet it is not within the power of this Committee to inquire into and report on the other publications as they were not referred to it by the House.”
- (xvi) “Then 1978 report of the Committee of Privileges in relation to an editorial published in the *Sunday Observer* newspaper of 26 February, 1978 (Parliamentary Paper No. 120/1978) raised matters in relation to the law of Parliamentary privilege in general. The report of that Committee of Privileges strongly recommended that the whole question of Parliamentary privilege should be referred to it for investigation and report. This Committee has noted that despite the agreement in principle of the House on 13 April 1978 (V & P 1978-80/147-8) for the carrying out of such an inquiry by a joint select committee of the Parliament, the proposed inquiry has not eventuated. Accordingly, this Committee has resolved as follows :

“.....the Committee of Privileges—

- (1) notes that on 13 April, 1978 the House agreed in principle that

there should be an inquiry into the whole question of Parliamentary privilege, as proposed by the Committee of Privileges in its report presented on 7 April, 1978, but that such inquiry should be conducted by a joint committee of the Parliament;

- (2) notes that the proposed joint committee inquiry has not eventuated;
- (3) calls on the House to immediately initiate a resolution for the establishment of a joint committee as previously proposed; and
- (4) further calls on the House, in the event of the failure of the Senate to agree to the establishment of the proposed joint committee, to move for the establishment of a Select Committee of the House to conduct the inquiry.'

It is the Committee's unanimous view that it is essential that such a Committee should be established immediately and the inquiry commenced without delay."

(xvii) "Having recommended the establishment of a Committee of Inquiry this Committee feels that it should comment in this report on some of the areas of Parliamentary privilege which merit particular attention. In doing so it does not seek to pre-empt any consideration by that Committee of Inquiry but rather to invite attention to particular areas of continuing concern to the Committee of Privileges."

(xviii) "In 1979 the House of Representatives Standing Orders Committee recommended adopting procedures for raising privilege matters based on revised arrangements adopted by the House of Commons in 1978. The new procedures of the House of Commons stemmed from a major review of Parliamentary privilege conducted by a Select Committee of that House in 1966-67 which was reviewed by the Committee of Privileges in 1977. The proposals of the House of Representatives Standing Orders Committee were as follows :

'That standing orders 95, 96 and 97 be omitted and the following standing order substituted :

Privilege 95. Upon a matter of privilege arising :

- (a) a Member shall give written notice of privilege or contempt to the Speaker as soon as reasonably practicable after the matter has come to his attention;

- (b) if the matter arises from a statement published in a newspaper, book or other publication, the member shall provide the Speaker with a copy of the newspaper, book or publication;
- (c) the Speaker thereupon will determine as soon as practicable whether or not the matter merits precedence over other business;
- (d) if, in the opinion of the Speaker, the matter does not merit precedence, he will inform the Member, in writing, accordingly and may also inform the House of his decision; and
- (e) if, in the opinion of the Speaker, the matter merits precedence, he will inform the House of his decision, and the Member who raised the matter may move a motion without notice forth with to refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges.'

The House of Representatives did not debate the recommendation of the Standing Orders Committee and the new procedures were not adopted. The experience of the House of Commons as described by Speaker Thomas in *The Parliamentarian* of October 1980 provides ample evidence of the success of the new arrangements operating at Westminster. There is no reason to believe that such a procedure would be any less effective here in sieving matters referred to the Committee of Privileges."

(xix) "The 1966-67 House of Commons Select Committee on Parliamentary Privilege proposed the following set of rules for the guidance of the House in dealing with complaints of contemptuous conduct :

- (1) 'The House should exercise its penal jurisdiction
 - (a) in any event as sparingly as possible, and
 - (b) only when it is satisfied that to do so is essential in order to provide reasonable protection for the House, its Members or its Officers from such improper obstruction or attempt at or threat of obstruction as is causing, or is likely to cause substantial interference with the performance of their respective functions,

- (ii) It follows from sub-paragraph (i) of this paragraph that the penal jurisdiction should never be exercised in respect of complaints which appear to be of a trivial character or unworthy of the attention of the House; such complaints should be summarily dismissed without the benefit of investigation by the House or its Committee.
- (iii) In general, the power to commit for contempt should not be used as a deterrent against a person exercising a legal right, whether well-founded or not, to bring legal proceedings against a Member or an Officer.
- (iv) In general, where a Member's complaint is of such a nature that if justified it could give rise to an action in the courts, whether or not the defendant would be able to rely on any defence available in the courts, it ought not to be the subject of a request to the House to invoke its penal powers. In particular, those powers should not, in general, be invoked in respect of statements alleged to be defamatory whether or not a defence of justification, fair comment, etc., would lie.
- (v) The general rules stated in sub-sections (iii) and (iv) of this paragraph should remain subject to the ultimate right of the House to exercise its penal powers where it is essential for the reasonable protection of Parliament as set out in sub-section (i) of this paragraph. Accordingly, those powers could properly be exercised where remedies by way of action or defence at law are shown to be inadequate to give such reasonable protection, *e.g.* against improper obstruction or threat of improper obstruction of a Member in the performance of his Parliamentary functions.'

Subsequently in 1977 the House of Commons Committee of Privileges recommended that the intention of the Select Committee's recommendation should be given effect, not by means of a formal resolution attempting to define contempt a step which it considered might later prove to be too restrictive—but rather by proposing the adoption of a resolution that the Speaker be empowered to have regard to the reports of the Committee of Privileges in deciding whether to give a complaint precedence over the orders of day. The House of Commons agreed to such a resolution on 6 February 1978 and as a consequence of that resolution and the revised method

of raising complaints of breach of privilege, privilege, matters face a more severe test before being allowed precedence by Mr. Speaker. The result has been a substantial reduction in the number of matters referred to the Committee of Privileges.”

- (xx) “The Committee has already referred to the applications for legal representation which were made to it by a witness and a potential witness during the present inquiry. The decision the Committee reached to decline such applications was in accordance with long standing Parliamentary precedents in the United Kingdom and the experience of the Committee of Privilege of the house of Representatives itself. An alternative view put to the Committee was that this matter should be referred back to the house for direction.”
- (xxi) “As previously stated, since the 1770s the United Kingdom House of Commons Committee of Privileges has not heard counsel or solicitors on behalf of persons called before it. The view has consistently been taken that the justification of the practice is that the Committee of Privileges is not a court of law; it is a Committee of the House to which a complaint is referred for investigation and report.”
- (xxii) “The 1966-67 Select Committee of the House of Commons in considering the question of legal representation had this to say :
- ‘182. The practical situation is that a complaint is made which may lead the House eventually to impose the penalty of Committal to prison upon the person against whom the complaint is made. Moreover, the conduct of other persons, including the Member who has made the complaint, may be placed under serious scrutiny and their reputations may be subject to the severe criticism in effect of the Committee’s Report.
183. In Your Committee’s opinion the Committee of Privileges, whatever their technical character may be, are in practice in a position closely analogous to that of a tribunal set up under the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act, 1921. Such a Tribunal is empowered to authorise the representation before it by counsel or solicitor of any person appearing to the tribunal to be

interested, or it can refuse to allow such representation. Your Committee consider that similar rules ought to apply to a complaint of contempt which is being investigated by the Committee of Privileges,

×

×

×

190. Your Committee are of the opinion that provision should be made by legislation to enable the Committee of Privileges to authorise in appropriate cases payments out of public funds for legal aid and for the necessary resources to be made available for this purpose, The benefits of this assistance should, whenever the Committee think it desirable, be available to all persons (including Members) who have or to whom the Committee authorise the right of attendance, as explained in paragraphs 185 and 187.’

The recommendations were not adopted by the House of Commons and advice received by the Committee makes it clear that there has been no change in the practice of the Commons.”

- (xxiii) “The Committee has also sought advice of the position in other Commonwealth Countries. It has now been informed that in New Zealand alleged privilege offenders may be legally represented by counsel with the consent of the Committee of Privileges. In 19 0, in a case regarding alleged breach of privilege by a Minister, the Minister and another witness were each legally represented before the Committee.”

“In Canada the position is some what different. The Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections resolved in 1975 that any witness or member or group of members may have in attendance legal counsel but such counsel shall not participate in the proceedings of the Committee beyond rendering advice to his client or clients.”

- (xxiv) “The Australian Senate Committee of Privileges which in 1971 inquired into articles published in the *Sunday Australian* and the *Sunday Review* of 2 May, 1971 (Parliamentary Paper 163/1971) adopted a similar approach to that operating in the Canadian House of Commons. On that occasion the Senate Committee resolved :

- (1) that witnesses may be accompanied by their solicitor or counsel

and may, with leave, seek advice from their solicitor or counsel during the answering of questions put by the Committee;

- (2) that any submission or representations made by witnesses be heard by the Committee; and
- (3) that the right of the solicitor or counsel to make any submissions be considered by the Committee when application therefor be made."

The Minutes of Proceedings of the Committee reveal that in the event the legal adviser accompanying one of the witnesses also addressed the Committee."

- (xxv) "Having carefully considered the procedures adopted elsewhere and the undesirability of turning an inquiry by the Committee of Privileges into a court-type situation, the Committee feels that there are good grounds for review and reform. It sees this issue as requiring early resolution by the proposed joint select Committee inquiry."
- (xxvi) "It has been the practice of the House of Representatives Committee of Privileges since its first establishment on 7 March 1944 to conduct its examination of witnesses at in camera hearings. This practice was adopted from the Committee of Privileges of the United Kingdom House of Commons which, as expressed in May, page 675, 'does not sit in public'."
- (xxvii) "On one occasion (*The Daily Telegraph case of 1971*) the House of Representatives Committee of Privileges presented the evidence received by it with its report to the House. On another occasion (*The Sun case 1951*), the Committee laid parts of the evidence it had taken on the table in the Parliamentary Library, and in the *Banktown Observer case* parts of the evidence were quoted in the Committee's report. On all other occasion the evidence taken by the Committee has not been published."
- (xxviii) "In accordance with long standing practice, the Committee followed the procedure of examining a witness in the privacy of a committee room, *in Camera*. Nevertheless, the Committee believes that the evidence should be published in the instant case. There may, on occasions, be over-riding considerations of national or commercial

security or of a or of a sensitive nature *e.g.* involving unsubstantiated personal allegations; however, the Committee believes that generally the evidence should be presented. The Committee has accordingly supported this Report to the House by the Publication of the evidence taken.'

- (xxix) "The question of whether in *camera* hearings are the most appropriate method of proceeding, and in the best interests of the Parliament and the witnesses, are matters that should be the subject of consideration by the proposed joint Select Committee."
- (xxx) "Suggestions have been made from time to time that the House should hand over to the Courts investigation of complaints of breach of privilege or contempt and the imposition of any penalty. It is said that the House should not be 'both prosecutor and judge and that it is wrong in principle that 'Parliament should be judge in its own cause'. The 1908 report of the Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Privilege (H. of R. 4, S. 6 1907-08) under the chairmanship of Sir Johan Quick, M.P. for Bendigo, reported that :

'The ancient procedure for punishment of contempt of Parliament is generally admitted to be cumbersome, ineffective, and not consonant with modern ideas and requirements in the administration of justice. It is hardly consistent with the dignity and functions of a legislative body which has been assailed by newspapers or individuals to engage within the Chamber in conflict with the alleged offenders, and to perform the duties of prosecutor, judge, and gaoler.'

The Committee went on to make the following recommendations :

- (1) That all persons printing, publishing, or uttering any false, malicious, or defamatory statements calculated to bring the Senate or House of Representatives or Members or the Committee thereof into hatred, contempt, or ridicule, or attempting to improperly interfere with or unduly influence, or obstructing, or insulting or assaulting, or bribing or attempting to bribe Members of Parliament in the discharge of their duties, shall be deemed guilty of breach of privilege and contempt of Parliament, and shall be liable to be prosecuted for such contempts upon complaint instituted by the Commonwealth Attorney-General before a Justice of the High Court pursuant to a resolution authorising such prosecution to be passed by the House affected,

- (2) That such prosecutions shall be heard and determined by a Justice of the High Court in its original jurisdiction, and in summary way upon evidence upon oath presented in open court subject to the proviso that matters of form and not of substance can be proved by affidavit.
- (3) That upon the hearing of such complaints the persons accused shall have the right to give evidence upon oath.
- (4) That upon the hearing of complaint for libel and slander against Parliament the only defence available shall be justification or proof of the truth of the statements complained of.
- (5) That upon such Justice of the High Court finding such complaints proved he shall, according to his judicial discretion, have power to impose a fine not exceeding five hundred pounds or imprisonment not exceeding twelve months, and may in addition to such fine or imprisonment order the accused so found guilty to pay the costs of the prosecution.
- (6) That, in view of the fact that a new measure of punishment for breach of privilege and contempt of Parliament is hereby recommended, your Committee cannot advise that the proposed new law should be made retrospective.
- (7) That a law be passed defining the mode of proving by legal evidence what are the powers, privileges and immunities of the House of Commons.
- (8) That a law be passed making provision for the summoning, attendance, and examination on oath or affirmation of witnesses before Select Committees of either House; and in cases of contempt before the High Court.'

A Bill was drafted in 1934 at the request of the House of Representatives Standing Orders Committee to give effect to the recommendations of the Quick Committee.....which was never introduced into the Parliament."

(xxxi) "The question of the possible transfer of its penal jurisdiction to some other tribunal was considered in detail by the 1966-67 United Kingdom Select Committee which reported as follows :

'140. Your Committee have nonetheless considered the suggestion with open minds. Having done so, they have come to the very clear conclusion that no such change is desirable. In the following paragraphs your Committee Set out the principal reasons for their view.

141. Reference to paragraph 48 indicates that in deciding whether a contempt has been committed the tribunal concerned must decide a number of questions-which involve a delicate balance between the freedom of the individual and the essential protection of the House, its Members and Officers to enable them to perform their various functions and duties. Such functions and duties are in a constant state of alteration and development and Your Committee are firmly of the opinion that it must be the prerogative of the House, and of the House alone, to determine what at anytime are their limits.

142. This balance between the freedom of the individual and the essential protection of the House involves consideration of a political character which may vary according to the circumstances of the day. It is right that the House, which is responsible to the electorate, should make such decisions rather than that they should be made by an appointed tribunal, whether or not of a judicial character.

143. Once the decision has been made that a contempt has been committed, the question of the necessary penalty, if any, may again be governed by consideration of a political character. In practice, as pointed out by the Clerk of the House...the House has in recent years adopted a very much harsher approach to Contempts committed by its own Members than to those committed by strangers. If it has

been judge in its own cause, 'it has been a very lenient Judge in its own cause'. An outside tribunal—and in particular any branch of the Judiciary—would have very great difficulty in exercising a similar selective leniency and would undoubtedly be embarrassed by the need to take into account considerations of a political character.

144. If the jurisdiction were transferred to an outside tribunal, whether that tribunal dealt with both guilt and penalty or with only one of them, it would still be necessary for the House to decide in each case whether to refer the complaint to the tribunal. In order to make this decision the House would have to be satisfied that it would be proper to do so and accordingly in practice might have to give to the complainant the same consideration which would be given to it if the jurisdiction were retained by the House. There could, in Your Committee's opinion, arise embarrassment in the event of a conflict of view between the House and the ultimate tribunal.
145. Your Committee are not clear whether those who suggest such a change would impose any limit upon it. In Your Committee's opinion, quite apart from the consideration set out in the preceding paragraphs, it would be contrary to the normal practice of responsible bodies to remove from the House its penal jurisdiction over its own Members and Officers, involving respectively the possibility of expulsion and dismissal. It would also be inconvenient and undesirable to remove from the penal jurisdiction of the House misconduct committed within the precincts and in the sight or hearing of Mr. Speaker, whether committed by a Member, an Officer or a stranger.
146. Your Committee accordingly strongly recommend that the House should retain its penal jurisdiction. It has been suggested that there should be some appellate procedure, but Your Committee are satisfied that the present procedure whereby the Report of the Committee of Privileges is not effective until endorsed by a resolution of the House which

may be debated contains adequate protection of an appellate character. If the House is not satisfied that justice has been done, or that it is manifest that it has been done, it has the power to reject the recommendation of the Committee of privileges and, if need be, to refer the matter back to the Committee or to some other body.'

The Committee presents both views on this aspect of the method of dealing with privilege matters for consideration by the House and the proposed joint select committee of inquiry."

(xxxii) "Another aspect of privilege to which this Committee invites the attention of the proposed joint select committee of inquiry is in respect of the desirability of attempting to codify categories of contempt."

(xxxiii) "It has been said that the scope of Parliament's penal jurisdiction is too wide, too uncertain and too dependent upon precedent; the press and the public are wrongly inhibited from legitimate criticism of Parliamentary institutions and of Members' conduct by fear that the penal jurisdiction may be invoked against them.

This view was rejected by the Commons Select Committee. In doing so it referred to the possibility of new forms of obstruction, new functions and new duties all contributing to new forms of contempt. The Commons Committee was convinced that the House ought not to attempt by codification to inhibit its powers."

(xxxiv) "This Committee believes that the proposed joint select committee ought to give serious consideration to the possibility of drawing up some guidelines to assist those persons and organisations involved in the reporting of the Parliament and the functioning of its Members. Such guidelines if able to be drawn up would do much to clear up some of the misunderstandings which surround Parliamentary privilege, the lack of appreciation of what are in fact the very limited privileges available to the Parliament, and in particular, those matters which may amount to a contempt of the institution of Parliament or its Members."

(xxxv) "Standing Order 340 of the House of Representatives provides that :

'The evidence taken by any select committee of the House and

documents presented to and proceedings and reports of such committee, which have not been reported to the House, shall not, unless authorized by the House, be disclosed or published by any Member of such committee, or by any other person'.

The Standing order is in similar terms to the rule applied in the House of Commons."

- (xxxvi) "A strict interpretation of the standing order can present, and on this occasion has presented, the committee with some difficulty. Taken literally it is not possible for a witness to discuss any part of his evidence with his legal representative, or his employer, even on a strictly confidential basis, without putting him or self into contempt of the House. There are occasions when it is necessary that such discussions should occur and this committee seeks guidance from the proposed joint select committee inquiry on the latitude that should be permitted in applying the provisions of Standing Order 340 in the future."
- (xxxvii) "The circumstances surrounding this particular reference to the Committee and the large number of media reports and interviews in relation to it and Parliamentary privilege generally, combined with comments made in the House itself both at the time the matter was referred to the Committee and subsequently, have made this inquiry particularly difficult. The Committee has already referred to the anomalies created by referring only one of several publications of the Oakes article, namely that in the *Daily Mirror* to the Committee. Nevertheless the Committee was charged with the responsibility of conducting this particular inquiry on behalf of the House and it has so done."
- (xxxviii) "The Committee urges that its findings and recommendations in respect of the *Daily Mirror* publication and its earnest suggestion for the establishment of a proposed joint select committee of inquiry into all aspects of Parliamentary privilege are given serious and urgent consideration by the House and the Government. It is strongly of the view that the House should pass a resolution for the establishment of the proposed joint select committee without delay and that in the event of the Senate's concurrence in the establishment of the proposed joint select

committee not having been received within a reasonable period, say by 30 April, 1982, the House should proceed immediately to set up a select committee of Members of the House of Representatives to carry out the proposed inquiry as recommended by this Committee.”

On 29 October, 1981, the Leader of the House (Mr. Ian McCahon Sinclair) moved the following motion in the House :

“That the House take note of the report of the Committee of Privileges relating to a printed reference in an article in the Sydney Daily Mirror of 2 September”.

Speaking on his motion Mr. Sinclair *inter alia* stated¹ as follow :

“I have moved the motion in the form of only taking note of the report because, quite obviously, neither the joint parties nor the Labour Caucus have had an opportunity to consider the report of the Committee of privileges. There are matters which I think most members of this House would like to have considered and perhaps submitted to the Parliament for consideration. The whole question of privileges and their administration has been of considerable debate in this place. My sympathy is certainly towards having an examination of the matter of privilege in the manner that has been suggested by the Privilege Committee. Yet I feel reluctant to move a motion to that effect without the party rooms having had an opportunity to consider it.”

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and Manager of Opposition Business (Mr. Lionel Frost Bowen) then stated² *inter alia* as follows :—

“There is much business to be dealt with and I do not want to detain the House. Some of my colleagues are anxious to make a contribution in respect of the detailed matter contained in the report of the Privileges Committee. I will help the leader of the House (Mr. Sinclair) by saying that the opposition has formed a party view on one specific matter. We support the idea of a joint

¹. House of Representatives Deb., 29 October 1981, p. 2761.

². Ibid

committee or, if that cannot be arranged within a specified time—I think by April next year—certainly a committee of this House. I know that the honourable gentleman is not aware of that. He referred to it as being a reason why we might have a general debate. We can sharpen up the debate. We do not need to talk about our view on this matter. We have already come to a party decision. It is about time this House had a recommendation from the Committee as to what its privileges should be and how they should be identified and enforced. I indicate to the Government that our party has made a firm decision in that respect”.

The discussion on the motion was not, however, concluded.

On 23 March, 1982, the debate from 29 October, 1981, on the motion moved by Mr. Sinclair was resumed and after some discussion the motion was adopted¹ by the House.

The Leader of the House (Mr. Sinclair) then moved the following motion which was adopted² by the House :

(1) “That a joint select committee be appointed to review, and report whether any changes are desirable in respect of :

(a) the law and practice of parliamentary privilege as they affect the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the members and the committees of each House,

(b) the procedures by which cases of alleged breaches of parliamentary privilege may be raised, investigated and determined, and

(c) the penalties that may be imposed for breach of parliamentary privilege,”

(2) That the Committee consist of 10 members, 3 members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Prime Minister, the Leader of the House or the Government Whip, 2 members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Leader of the

¹. Ibid., 23 March, 1982, p. 1293.

². Ibid. p. 1295.

Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition or the Opposition Whip, 2 senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and 1 senator to be nominated by any minority group or groups or independent senator or independent senators.

- (3) That every nomination of a member of the committee be forthwith notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
- (4) That the members of the committee hold office as a joint committee until the House of Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time.
- (5) That the Committee elect as chairman of the committee one of the members nominated by either the Prime Minister, the Leader of the House or the Government Whip, or by the Leader of the Government in the Senate.
- (6) That the committee elect a deputy chairman who shall perform the duties of the chairman of the committee at any time when the chairman is not present at a meeting of the committee, and at any time when the chairman and deputy chairman are not present at a meeting of the committee, the members present shall elect another member to perform the duties of the chairman at that meeting.
- (7) That 5 members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee.
- (8) That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to move from place to place,
- (9) That the committee have power to authorise publication of any evidence given before it and any document presented to it.
- (10) That the committee be provided with necessary staff, facilities and resources.
- (11) That the committee have leave to report from time to time.
- (12) That the foregoing provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the Standing Orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the Standing Orders.

- (13) That a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.”

On 29 April, 1982, a message, received from the Senate acquainting the House that it had agreed to the following resolutions was read out in the House :

- “(1) That the Senate concurs in the Resolution transmitted to the Senate by Message No. 259 of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of a Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Privilege.
- (2) That the provisions of the Resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the Standing Orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in Standing Orders.”

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

LOK SABHA

Introduction of certain changes in ceremonies connected with President's Address: Under article 87 (1) of the Constitution, the President addresses both Houses of Parliament assembled together at the commencement of the first Session after each general election to Lok Sabha and at the commencement of the first Session of each year, and informs Parliament of the causes of its summons. President is conducted to the Central Hall in a procession when he arrives at the Parliament House to address both Houses.

On 18 February, 1983, certain changes were introduced in ceremonies connected with the President's Address. The President (Giani Zail Singh) arrived by State coach instead of by car. He was then received by Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Prime Minister, Speaker, Lok Sabha and Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and was conducted to Central Hall in a procession. The arrival of Presidential procession in Central Hall was first announced by Marshal and thereafter two trumpeters of Rashtrapati Bhavan, positioned in Gallery above dais facing entrance to Central Hall, also blew fanfare till President reached the dais. The National Anthem was then played. The President, while standing, addressed in Hindi. After he concluded, the Vice-President (Shri M. Hidayatullah) read out the English version of President's Address. On conclusion, National Anthem was played again. Thereafter, Presidential procession left Central Hall.

Objection regarding laying of papers at the Table to be referred to the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table and not to be raised in the House: On 22 February, 1983, some Members (Shri Ram Vilas Paswan and others) raised objection to the laying of notifications issued by the Ministry of

Energy regarding increase in prices of certain petroleum products on the eve of the Budget Session. In this connection, another Member (Shri Indrajit Gupta) submitted that while the right of the Government was not being questioned, it involved a question of propriety. Thereupon, the Speaker (Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar) drew the attention of Members to Rule 305C of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (relating to restriction on raising of matters in the House about laying of Papers) and observed that the "Government have issued the notifications increasing the prices of petroleum products under the powers conferred on them by the relevant Act and the rules framed thereunder. The Members, if they so wish, may write to the Committee on the Papers Laid on the Table." However, sharing the feelings of the Members in this regard, the Speaker added: "It would have been more appropriate to announce the increase in price in the House as the Lok Sabha was scheduled to sit from 18 February, 1983".

A Minister cannot be prevented from laying on the Table, rules framed or amended in pursuance of a statute; but it is open to Members either to accept, reject or modify the rules through a separate motion: On 24 February, 1983, after the Minister of Communications (Shri V.N. Gadgil) laid on the Table a notification containing Telegraph (Third Amendment) Rules, 1983, issued under sub-section (5) of section 7 of the Indian Telegraph and Postal Act, 1885, several Members (Shri Ram Vilas Paswan and others) submitted that it was not proper of the Government to raise postal tariffs by issuing notification while the House was in Session. The Minister explained that the notification did not relate to any Budget proposal and it was laid under the provisions of the Indian Telegraph and Postal Act, 1885, and thus there was no impropriety involved in the matter.

Thereupon, the Deputy Speaker (Shri G. Lakshmanan) observed *inter alia* as follows:

"Let us recall the provisions of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 as amended from time to time. Section 7 (2) thereof provides as under:

'7 (2) Rules under this Section may provide for all or any of the following among other matters, that is to say:

(a) the rates at which, and the other conditions and restrictions subject to which, messages shall be transmitted.....'

Government have issued the notification and the Minister has laid it on the Table to comply with the statutory requirement in terms of the

aforesaid provision. It is now open to the Members to exercise their right in terms of Section 7 (5) of the Act to table an appropriate motion for acceptance or rejection, or acceptance with modification of the rules as proposed to be enforced by Government with effect from 1st March, 1983. The important thing is that the House should have an opportunity to discuss this matter before these rules come into force...

If the House agrees, we can have a discussion on the subject on an appropriate motion later, though discussion on President's Address is normally not so interrupted. I hope the House agrees."

Discussion on a motion regarding annulment of the said notification moved by a Member (Shri G.M. Banatwalla) was taken up on 25 February, 1983, before the Motion on Thanks to the President's Address. The Motion was negatived.

When a motion appears in the List of Business in the name of more than one Member, only mover has a right to speak while moving the motion : In the List of Business for 25 February, 1983, a motion for annulment of Indian Telegraph (Third Amendment) Rules, 1983, appeared in the names of three Members (Sarvashri G.M. Banatwalla, Suraj Bhan and Ram Vilas Paswan). After Shri Banatwalla had moved the motion and spoken on it, Shri Bhan rose to speak. The Deputy Speaker (Shri G. Lakshmanan) observed that if he wanted to speak, he would call him later. Thereupon, a Member (Shri N.K. Shejwalkar) raised a point that when Shri Suraj Bhan's name was next on the motion in List of Business, how another Member could be called to speak before him.

The Deputy Speaker observed that under rules a motion appearing in Order Paper in the names of more than one Member, could be moved by the Member whose name appeared first against item, if present in House. In his absence, by the second or the the third Member etc. who might be present in House. Other Members were clubbed against the item could participate in discussion if they so desired like other Members with permission of Chair. Accordingly, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, who had intimated Chair earlier, was called to speak after the motion had been moved by Shri Banatwalla. Shri Suraj Bhan was called to speak later.

Display of a revolver in the House by a Member deprecated : On 28 February, 1983, immediately after the Question Hour, a Member (Prof. Madhu Dandvate) while seeking to raise a matter, displayed a revolver in

support of his contention in the House. Some Members took serious objection to the display of the revolver. The Speaker (Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar) deprecated the display of arms in the House. The Member expressed his unqualified regrets.

Permission to bring a walking strick by a Member in the Chamber on account of his physical disability granted: On 2 March, 1983, the Speaker (Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar) granted permission to a Member (Shri Krishna Chandra Haldar) to bring his walking stick in the Chamber on account of his physical disability.

PARLIAMENTARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT
(1 January to 31 March, 1983)

INDIA

DEVELOPMENT AT THE CENTRE

By-Election : Shri P. Penchaliah of the Telugu Desam, was declared elected on 8 January from the Nellore (SC) Lok Sabha constituency in Andhra Pradesh¹.

Cabinet Reshuffle : The Union Council of Ministers was reshuffled during the months of January and February. Two new Cabinet Minister and five Ministers of State inducted into the Cabinet while four Cabinet Ministers, five Ministers of State and three Deputy Ministers resigned from the Ministry. Changes were made in the portfolios of several Ministers while the rank of a few Ministers was raised. Consequently the total strength of the Ministry had come down from 61 to 56.

The Council of Ministers is at present as follows :

Cabinet Ministers :

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Prime Minister (All Ministries/Departments not specified below) ; Shri Pranab Kumar Mukerjee *Finance* ; Shri V.P. Narasimha Rao : *External Affairs* ; Shri P.C. Sethi : *Home Affairs* ; Shri Shive Shankar : *Energy* ; Shri R. Venkatarman : *Defence* ; Shri A.B.A. Ghani Khan Chaudhri : *Railways* ; Shri S.B. Chavan : *Planning* ; Shri Jagannath Kaushal : *Law, Justice and Company Affairs* ; Shri Veerendra Patil : *Labour and Rehabilitation* ; Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara Reddy : *Shipping and Transport* ; Shri Vasant Sathe : *Chemicals and Fertilizers* ; Shri B. Shankaranand : *Health and Family Welfare* ; Rao Birendra Singh : *Agriculture* ; Shri Buta Singh : *Parliamentary Affairs, Sports and Works and Housing* ; Shri Vishwa-

¹*Hindustan times*, 9 January, 1983.

nath Partap Singh ; *Commerce and Department of Supply* ; and Shri Naryan Datt Tiwari : *Industry*.

Ministers of State :

Shri Z.R. Ansari : *Shipping and Transport* ; Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : *Food and Civil Supplies* ; Shri H.K.L. Bhagat : *Information and Broadcasting and Department of Parliamentary Affairs* ; Shri K.P. Singh Deo : *Defence* ; Shri Dharamvir : *Labour and Rehabilitation* ; Shri V.N. Gadgil : *Communications* ; Shrimati Sheila Kaul : *Education and Culture and Social Welfare* ; Shri Arif Mohammad Khan : *Agriculture* ; Shri Khursheed Alam Khan : *Tourism and Civil Aviation* ; Shrimati Mohsina Kidwai : *Health and Family Welfare* ; Shri S.M. Krishna : *Industry* ; Shri Nihar Ranjan Laskar : *Home Affairs* ; Shri Yogendra Makwana : *Agriculture* ; Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha : *Irrigation* ; Shri Gargi Shankar Mishra : *Department of Petroleum in the Ministry of Energy* ; Shri Hari Nath Mishra : *Rural Development* ; Shri Shivraj V. Patil : *Science and Technology, Atomic Energy, Space Electronics and Ocean Development* ; Shri A.A. Rahim : *External Affairs* ; Shri Kalp Nath Rai : *Department of Parliamentary Affairs* ; Shri Pattabhi Rama Rao : *Finance* ; Shri R.C. Rath : *Chemicals and Fertilizers* ; Shri N.K.P. Salve : *Steel and Mines* ; Shri C.K. Jaffar Sharief : *Railways* ; Shri Chandra Shekhar Singh : *Energy* ; Shri Dalbir Singh ; *Department of Coal in the Ministry of Energy* ; Shri Virbhadra Singh : *Industry* ; Shrimati Ram Dulari Sinha : *Commerce* ; and Shri P. Venkatsubbaiah : *Home Affairs*.

Deputy Ministers :

Shri Mohammad Usman Arif: *Works and Housing*; Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad: *Law, Justice and Company Affairs* ; Shri Ashok Gehlot : *Tourism and Civil Aviation* ; Kumari Kumudbhen M. Joshi: *Health and Family Welfare* ; Shri Mallikarjun : *Information and Broadcasting and Department of Parliamentary Affairs* ; Shri Vijay N. Patil : *Communications* ; Shri Janardhna Poojary : *Finance* ; M.S. Sanjeevi Rao : *Department of Electronics* ; Shri P.A. Sangma : *Commerce* ; Shri Digvijay Singh : *Department of Environment* ; and Shri P.K. Thungon : *Education and Culture and Social Welfare*.²

By-election : The election Commission announced on 26 February that Congress (I) had won five out of 12 Lok Sabha seats in Assam for which elections were held in February. Repoll was ordered in the remaining seven constituencies.³

²*Statesman*, 26 January, 1983 ; *Hindu*, 30 January 1983 and *Cabinet Secretariat List of Council of Ministers* (As on 14 February, 1983).

³*Indian Express*, 27 February, 1983.

Formation of a new Group in Rajya Sabha : A new group, called United Association of Members with a strength of 22 Members, was formed in Rajya Sabha on 16 March for the purpose of effective functioning in the House. The group was recognised as a separate group by the Chairman, Rajya Sabha.⁴

AROUND THE STATES

ANDHRA PRADESH

General Elections : In the general elections, held on 5 January for the 294 Assembly seats, the newly formed Telugu Desam party won a two-third majority by winning 198 seats as against 59 won by Congress (I). The seats won by other parties were : Communist Party of India (Marxist) (CPI (M))-5 ; Communist Party of India (CPI)-4 ; Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP)-2 ; Janata Party-1 ; and Independents-17. Repoll was ordered in seven constituencies while in one constituency the poll was countermanded.⁵

New Ministry : A 15 members Council of Ministers headed by Shri N.T. Rama Rao, was sworn in by the State Governor Shri K.C. Abraham on 9 January. Earlier Shri Rama Rao was elected leader of the Legislature Party on 8 January.

The allocation of the portfolios among the Ministers was as follows:

Cabinet Ministers :

Shri N.T. Rama Rao, Chief Minister : *General Administration, Law and Order, Home, Information and Public Relations and Major Industries* ; Shri N. Bhaskara Rao : *Finance, Commercial Taxes and Energy* ; Shri P. Mahendranath : *Land Revenue and Food and Civil Supplies* ; Shri N. Srinivasulu Reddy : *Irrigation and Roads* ; Shri S. Satyanarayan : *Transport* ; Shri K. Ramachandra Rao : *Panchayati Raj and Rural Development* ; Shri P. Anada Gajapathi Raju : *Education* ; Shri K. Jana Reddy : *Agriculture and Forests* ; Shri Ramamuni Reddy : *Medical and Health* ; and Shri E. Anjaneyalu : *Endowments*.

Ministers of States :

Shrimati Pratibha Bharati : *Women and Child Welfare, welfare or Scheduled Castes and Tribes* Shri M. Ramachandran Rao : *Labour and Employment* ;

⁴*Hindustan Times*, 17 March, 1983.

⁵*Statesman*, 8 January, 1983.

Shri Y. Ramekrishnudu : *Municipal Administration and Law* : Shri T. Jeevan Reddy : *Excise and* Shri Mohammed Shakir : *Tourism and Wakfs*.⁶

New Speaker : Shri T. Satyanarayana of Telugu Desam was unanimously elected Speaker of the Assembly on 18 January.⁷

Death of Minister : Shri E. Anjaneyalu, Minister for Endowments, passed away at Hyderabad on 27 March.⁸

ASSAM

General Elections : Elections were held in the month of February for 126-Member Legislative Assembly. The Congress-I won a two-third majority by winning 90 seats. The seats won by other parties were : CPI (M)-3 ; Plains Tribal Council of Assam (PTCA)-3 ; CPI-1 ; Congress (S)-1 ; and Independents-10. The polling could not be completed due to disturbances in 17 constituencies while in one constituency it was countermanded.⁹

New Ministry : A new 13-Member Ministry headed by Shri Hiteswar Saikia, who was earlier elected leader of the Congress (I) Legislature party, was sworn in on 27 February by the State Governor Shri Prakash Mehrotra. The allocation of the portfolios was as follows :

Cabinet Ministers :

Shri Hiteswar Saikia, Chief Minister : *Home, Excise, General Administration, Tourism, Food and Civil Supplies* ; Shri Mohammed Idris : *Finance, Planning, and Development* ; Shri Keshab Chandra Gogoi : *Revenue and Industries* ; Shrimati Anwara Taimur : *PWD and Wakfs* ; Shri Ranendranath Basumatari : *Agriculture, Welfare of Plains Tribes and Backward Classes, Sericulture and weaving* ; Shri Upen Das : *Fisheries, Panchayat and Community Development* ; Shri Dhaniram Rongpi : *Forest Areas and Soil Conservation* ; Shri Zehirul Islam : *Irrigation* ; Shri Jagannath Sinha : *Transport and town and Country Planning* ; Shri Mukut Sarmah : *Education* ; Shri Jagdish Chandra Choudhury : *Animal Husbandry and Veterinary* ; Shri Rameshwar Dhanwar : *Labour*.

Minister of State

Shri Pandam Bahadur Chauhan : *Animal Husbandry and Veterinary, Panchayat and Community Development*.¹⁰

⁶*Times of India*, 9 January, 1983 and *Hindustan Times* 10, January, 1983.

⁷*Times of India*, 19 January, 1983.

⁸*Indian Express*, 29 March, 1983.

⁹*All India Radio New Bulletin*, 26 February, 1983.

¹⁰*Hindustan Times*, 28 February, 1983 ; and 2 March, 1983.

Election of the Speaker : Shri Sheikh Chand Mohammed was re-elected unopposed as the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly on 21 March.¹¹

BIHAR

MLA's election set aside by the High Court : The Patna High Court, on 18 January, set aside the election of Shri Arun Kumar Bose to the State Assembly and declared in his place Shri Kurken Ansari as elected to the Assembly. The Court ruled that 74 votes, polled in favour of Shri Ansari in a particular booth of the constituency had been illegally declared invalid by the Assistant Election Officer at the time of counting of votes.¹²

Changes in the Cabinet : The State Chief Minister, Dr. Jagannath Mishra dropped 11-members of his Council of Ministers on 15 February, thereby, reducing the strength of the Ministry from 36 to 25. The Ministers, who were dropped, were : Sarvashri L.P. Shahi, Shankar Dayal Singh, Y.P. Yogesh, Ghansyam Singh, Budhadeo Singh and Sami Hadvi, all Cabinet Ministers ; Sarvashri Rajo Singh, Raghunath Jha, Prabhunath Singh and Sadananad Singh, all Ministers of State and Shri Shyam Sunder Dhiraj, Deputy Minister.¹³

HARYANA

MLA's election set aside by the High Court : On 11 January, the High Court of Punjab and Haryana set aside the election of Shri Azmat Khan to the State Assembly and in his place declared Shri Khilan Singh as elected. In the recounting of votes, ordered by the Court, it was reported by the Counting Committee that Shri Singh had secured 53 votes more than Shri Khan.¹⁴

HIMACHAL PRADESH

New Governor : Shri Hokishe Sema was appointed Governor of the State on 15 February in place of Shri Ashok Nath Banerjee who was appointed Governor of Karnataka.¹⁵

KARNATAKA

General Elections : The general elections were held on 5 January for the 224 Legislative Assembly seats. The Janata-Kranti Ranga Combination

¹¹*Hindu*, 22 March, 1983.

¹²*Indian Express*, 19 January, 1983.

¹³*Ibid.*, 16 February, 1983.

¹⁴*Hindustan Times*, 12 January, 1983.

¹⁵*Indian Express*, 16 February, 1983.

won 95 seats ; Congress (I)-80 ; BJP-18 ; CPI-3 ; CPI (M)-3, and Independents and other Parties-23 seats. Repoll was ordered in one constituency while in another constituency the poll was countermanded.¹⁶

New Ministry : An eight-member Council of Ministers, headed by Shri Ramakrishna Hegde, was sworn in on 10 January by the State Governor, Shri Govind Narain. On 16 February, with the addition of 16 new Ministers ; the total strength of the Ministry was increased to 24. The allocation of the portfolios was as follow :

Cabinet Ministers :

Shri Ramakrishna Hegde, Chief Minister : *Home, Finance, Planning, Health and Family Welfare* ; Shri S.R. Bommai: *Industries and Commerce*; Shri Abdul Nazir Sab : *Rural Development and Panchyati Raj* : Shri H.D. Deve Gowda : *Public Works and Irrigation* : Shri V.L. Patil ; *Transport and Revenue* ; Shri B. Rachaiah : *Education* ; Shri A. Lakshmisagar : *Law and Parlimentary Affairs* ; Shrimati Chradraprabha Urs : *Social Welfare and Scriculture* ; Shri J.H. Patel : *Power and Excise* ; Shri B.L. Gowda : *Agriculture* ; Shri Azeez Sait : *Labour* ; Shri R.L. Jalappa : *Cooperation* ; Shri Viswanath Reddy : *Horticulture and Veterinary Services* ; Shri M. Chandra Shekhar : *Urban Development* ; Shri G. Basavanappa : *Food and Civil Supplies* ; and Shri M. Raghupathi : *Tourism and Information*.

Ministers of State

Shri B.A. Jivijaya ; *Forest* : Shri R.M.P. Prakash : *Transport* ; Shri Jeevaraj Alva : *Youth Service, and Sports* ; Shri S. Revana : *Agriculture* ; Shri P.G.R. Scindhia : *Health and Family Welfare* ; Shri Ramesh Jigajinni : *Home* ; Shri R.N. Lakshmipathi : *Minor Irrigation* ; and Shri Rajvardhan : *Social Welfare*.¹⁷

New Speaker : Shri B. Chandre Gowda of the Janata party was un-animously elected Speaker of the State Assembly on 24 January.¹⁸

New Governor : Shri Ashok Nath Banerjee, Governor of Himachal Pradesh, was appointed Governor of the State on 15 February, succeeding Shri Govind Narain who completed his tenure.¹⁹

¹⁶*Statesman*, 8 January, 1983.

¹⁷*Deccan Herald*, 11 January 1983 and *Hindustan Times*, 17 February, 1983.

¹⁸*Statesman*, 25 January, 1983.

¹⁹*Indian Express*, 16 February, 1983.

MADHYA PRADESH

Resignation by Ministers : On 31 January, Shri Satyavrat Chaturvedi, Deputy Minister for Irrigation, resigned from the Ministry following his conviction in a criminal case. Another Minister, Shri Chandra Prabhaskar, holding the charge of Housing and Environment, resigned from the State Ministry on 13 February.²⁰

MAHARASHTRA

New Chief Minister : Shri Vasantao Patil was sworn in as Chief Minister of the State on 2 February by the State Governor, Shri I.H. Latif following the resignation of Shri Babasaheb Bhosale.²¹

New Ministry : A new Ministry, headed by Shri Vasantao Patil was sworn in on 7 February by the State Governor Shri I.H. Latif. Two more Ministers were inducted into the Ministry on 11 February, raising the total strength of the Ministry to 36. The allocation of the portfolios was as follows :

Cabinet Ministers :

Shri Vasantao Patil, Chief Minister : *General Administration, Home Information and Public Relations, Employment Guarantee Scheme, Cooperation and any other subject not allotted to any Minister* ; Shri Ramarao Adik, Deputy Chief Minister : *Industries and Urban Development* ; Shri S.M.I. Aseer : *Labour, Wakf, Jails and Transport* ; Shri Prataprao Bhosale : *Rural Development* ; Shri Ramprasad Borade : *Public Works* ; Shri Shantaram Gholap : *Revenue, Rehabilitation, Legislative Affairs, Ports and Khar Lands* ; Shri Baliram Hiray—*Energy, Prohibition and Excise* ; Shri N.M. Kamble ; *Housing, Slum Improvement, House Repairs, Protocol and Special Assistance* ; Shri Sudhakar Naik—*Education, Technical Education, Dairy Development and Animal Husbandry* ; Shri Surupsingh Naik—*Forest, Social Forestry, Advasi Welfare* ; Shrimati Pratibha Patil ; *Food and Civil Supplies and Social Welfare* ; Shri Shivajrao Patil Nilangekar : *Irrigation and Command Area Development Authority* ; Shri Sushil Kumar Shinde : *Finance Planning, Culture Affairs and Tourism* ; Shrimati Lalita Rao : *Public Health, Family Welfare, Medical Education and Drugs* ; and Shri Nanabhu, Yambadwar : *Agriculture and Horticulture*.

Ministers of State :

Shri Abdul Azeem Abdul Hamid : *Housing, Prohibition, Excise and Special Assistance* ; Shri Kallappa Baburao Avade : *Industries and Energy* ; Shrimati

²⁰*Times of India*, 1 February, 1983 and *National Herald*, 14 February, 1983

²¹*National Herald*, 3 February, 1983.

Yashodhara Bajaj : *Public Works* ; Shri Vilasrao Deshmukh : *General Administration, Home, Information and Public Relations* ; Shri Arun Divekar : *Sports and Youth Welfare* ; Shri Ganesh Dudhagaonkar—*Employment Guarantee Scheme, Technical Education* ; Shri Raosaheb Jamkar *Agriculture and Horticulture* ; Shri Azhar Husain ; *Protocol and Public-Health* ; Shri Madhukar Kimmaatkar : *Finance, Law and Judiciary and Labour* ; Shrimati Parvati Malgonda : *Education* ; A. T. Pawar : *Adivasi Welfare and Social Welfare* ; Shri Vijaysingh Mohite Patil *Irrigation and CADA* ; Shri Satish Pendnekar : *Labour, Slum Improvement, House Repairs and Reconstruction* ; Shri Abhaysingh Raje-Bhosale : *Cooperation* ; Shri Bhalchandra Alias Bhai Sowant : *Revenue, Khar Lands, Fisheries and Ports* ; Shri Yashwant Sherekar *Tourism and Energy* ; Shri Bajirao Shinde : *Rural Development* ; Shri Anantrao Thopate : *Dairy Development, Animal Husbandry* ; Shri Chandrakant Tripathi : *Urban Development* ; Shri Surendra Bhuyar : *Food and Civil Supplies, Forests and Social Forestry* ; Shri Shivajirao Deshmukh : *General Administration, Home, Information and Public Relations.*²²

MEGHALAYA

General Elections : In the general elections held on 17 February for the 60-member Legislative Assembly, the Congress (I) emerged as the largest party by winning 25 seats as against 15 seats each won by the All party Hill Leaders Conference and Hill State People's Democratic party. Two seats were secured by the Public Demands Implementation Committee and three by Independents.²³

New Ministry : On 2 March, Shri B.B. Lyngdoh and Shri Hopingston Lyngdoh were sworn in by the State Governor Shri Prakash Mehrotra as Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister respectively. The Ministry was expanded on 8 March with the swearing in of 16 more Ministers. However, the Chief Minister Shri Lyngdoh resigned from the office on 31 March following the defeat of his United Parliamentary Party Coalition Government in the State Assembly.

A new 14-member Meghalaya Democratic Front Ministry led, by Capt. Williamson A Sangma, was sworn in on 2 April by the Governor. It included 12 Cabinet Ministers and two Ministers of State²⁴.

²²*Statesman*, 8 February, 1983 and 13 February, 1983 and *Indian Express*, 9 February, 1983.

²³*National Herald*, 23 February, 1983.

²⁴*Statesman*, 3 March, 1983; *Hindustan Times*, 9 March, 1983; and 3 April, 1983; and *Times of India*, 1 April, 1983.

New Speaker. Shri E.K. Mawlong of the Meghalaya United Parliamentary Party was elected Speaker of the Assembly on 9 March²⁵.

NAGALAND

Expansion of Ministry. The State Ministry was expanded on 2 February with the induction of nine new Ministers—three of the Cabinet rank and six Ministers of State, raising the strength of the Ministry from 14 to 23²⁶.

PUNJAB

New Governor. On 21 February, Shri A.P. Sharma was sworn in as the Governor of the State by the Acting Chief Justice of the Punjab and Haryana High Court, Shri P.C. Jain, in place of Dr. M. Chenna Reddy who resigned on 2 February. Earlier Shri Sharma resigned from the membership of Rajya Sabha on 21 February. The resignation was made effective from 19 February²⁷.

TRIPURA

General Elections : In the elections held for 60 Legislative Assembly seats on 5 January, the CPI(M) got an absolute majority by winning 37 seats, followed by 12 seats won by Congress (I). The Tripura Upajati Juba Samiti (TUJS) won 6 seats Revolutionary Socialist Party—2 and Independents—3 seats²⁸.

New Ministry. A 12-member Left-Front Ministry headed by Shri Nripen Chakraborti, was sworn in on 11 January by the Governor, Shri S.M.H. Burney²⁹.

New Speaker. Shri Amarendra Sarma was elected unopposed as Speaker of the Assembly on 9 February.³⁰

UTTAR PRADESH

Election of the Chairman. Shri Virendra Bahadur Singh Chandel was unanimously re-elected as the Chairman of the Vidhan Parishad on 3 March³¹.

²⁵*Indian Express*, 10 March, 1983.

²⁶*Statesman*, 3 February, 1983.

²⁷*National Herald*, 3 February, 1983 and *Statesman* 22 February, 1983.

²⁸*Statesman*, 8 January, 1983.

²⁹*Indian Express*, 12 January, 1983.

³⁰*Tripura Legislative Assembly Secretariat*.

³¹*Times of India*, 4 March, 1983.

UNION TERRITORY

DELHI

General Election : Elections were held on 5 February for the 56 seats of Metropolitan Council. The Congress (I) got an absolute majority by winning 34 seats as against 19 by BJP. The Lok Dal (C) won 2 seats and Janata 1³².

New Chief Executive Councillor : Shri Jag Parvesh Chandra was sworn in as Chief Executive Councillor on 8 February by Lt. Governor, Shri Jagmohan.

Subsequently, on 21 February, three Executive Councillors viz. Sarvashri Prem Singh, Kulanand Bharatiya and Bansilal Chauhan were sworn in by the Lt. Governor following their nominations by President, Giani Zail Singh³³.

New Chairman : Shri Purushottam Goyal of the Congress (I) was elected Chairman of the Delhi Metropolitan Council on 18 March³⁴.

DEVELOPMENTS ABROAD

AUSTRALIA

New Prime Minister : Mr. Bob Hawke took over as the new Prime Minister of the country on 11 March³⁵.

CYPRUS

Election of the President : Mr. Sypros Kyrianiou was re-elected President of the country on 14 February³⁶.

FRANCE

Formation of new Ministry : A new Ministry, headed by Mr. Pierre Mauroy was formed on 23 March. Earlier Mr. Mauroy tendered his Government's resignation to President Francois Mitterrand on 22 March with a view to reduce the strength of his Ministry³⁷.

³²*Indian Express*, 6 February, 1983; and *Times of India*, 8 February, 1983.

³³*Times of India*, 9 February, 1983 and *Indian Express*, 22 February, 1983.

³⁴*Times of India*, 19 March, 1983.

³⁵*Statesman*, 12 March, 1983.

³⁶*Hindustan Times*, 15 February, 1983.

³⁷*Hindu*, 23 March, 1983 and *Statesman*, 24 March, 1983.

GHANA

Suspension of the Constitution : On 6 February, the ruling Provisional National Defence Council suspended the country's Constitution which was adopted in 1979³⁸.

INDONESIA

Election on the President : President Suharto was re-elected unopposed as Head of the State on 10 March³⁹.

ISRAEL

New President : Mr. Halim Herzog was elected as the new President of the country on 22 March.⁴⁰

NETHERLANDS

New Constitution : A new Constitution came into force on 17 February after 20 Years of Parliamentary discussions. It gives voting rights to foreign residents in local elections and also allows them to stand as candidates in such elections. It lays down a series of basic social rights including the rights to public assistance and health care. Capital punishment is banned under any circumstances.

The new Constitution also provides that the first Chamber (Upper House) of Parliament will, in future, be elected every four years instead of every six years. Under an amendment to the Constitution, male children will no longer be first in line to the Dutch throne.⁴¹

PARAGUAY

Election of the President ; General Alfredo Stroessener was re-elected President of the country on 6 February.⁴²

PERU

New Prime Minister : Mr. Fernando Schwalb took charge as the country's Prime Minister on 3 January.⁴³

³⁸*Times of India*, 7 February, 1983.

³⁹*Indian Express*, 11 March, 1983.

⁴⁰*Times of India*, 23 March, 1983.

⁴¹*Statesman*, 19 February, 1983,

⁴²*Ibid*, 8 February, 1983.

⁴³*National Herald*, 5 January, 1983.

SRI LANKA

Revolution of emergency : On 21 January, Government revoked the state of emergency, in the country promulgated in October 1982⁴⁴.

Amendment of the Constitution : The country's constitution was amended by the Parliament on 24 February to provide for holding of by-elections to fill vacancies in the legislature. Until now, when a vacancy occurred as a result of death or resignation of a Member, his party was required to nominate a successor⁴⁵.

TANZANIA

New Prime Minister : Mr. Edward Moringe Sokoine was appointed as the Prime Minister of the country by the President Julius Nyerere on 23 February⁴⁶.

⁴⁴*Statesman*; 21 January, 1983.

⁴⁵*Hindustan Times*, 26 February, 1983.

⁴⁶*Ibid*, 26 February, 1983.

DOCUMENTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARLIAMENTARY
INTEREST

[The Andhra Pradesh Payment of Salaries and Pension and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1983 was passed by both the Houses of the State Legislature and assented to by the Governor.

The Punjab Legislative Assembly (Allowances of Members) Amendment Bill, 1983 was passed by the Legislative Assembly during the Budget Session and was published in the Punjab Government Gazette (Extraordinary) on 15 March, 1983.

The Rajasthan Legislative Assembly (Officers and Members Emoluments and Pension) (Amendment) Bill, 1983 was passed by the Legislative Assembly and assented to by the Governor.

The Goa, Daman and Diu Salaries and Allowances of Members of the Legislative Assembly (Amendment) Bill, 1983 was passed by the Legislative Assembly on 17 January, 1983, and assented to by the Governor.

We reproduce below the texts of the four Acts.

— Editor]

THE ANDHRA PRADESH PAYMENT OF SALARIES AND PENSION AND
REMOVAL OF DISQUALIFICATIONS ACT, 1983

An Act further to amend the Andhra Pradesh Payment of Salaries and Pension and removal of disqualifications Act, 1953.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Andhra Pradesh in the Thirty-fourth Year of the Republic of India as follows :—

1. *Short title* : This Act may be called the Andhra Pradesh Payment of Salaries and Pension and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Act, 1983.

2. *Amendment of long title and preamble Act II of 1954* : In the Andhra Pradesh Payment of Salaries and Pension and Removal of Disqualifications Act, 1953 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act)—

(a) in the long title, the words “and also to provide for the pension of persons served as members of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council”, shall be omitted :

(b) in the preamble, the words “and for the pension of persons served as members of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council”, shall be omitted.

3. *Amendment of Section I* : In section I of the principal Act, in sub-section (1), the words “and pension” shall be omitted.

4. *Omission of Section 11-D* : Section 11-D of the principal Act shall omitted.

THE PUNJAB LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS)
AMENDMENT ACT, 1983

An Act, to Amend the Punjab Legislative Assembly (Allowances of Members) Act, 1942.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Punjab in the Thirty - fourth Year of the Republic of India as follows :—

1. *Short title* : This Act may be called the Punjab Legislative Assembly (Allowances of Members) Amendment Act, 1983.

2. *Amendment of section 4 of Punjab Act 4 of 1942* : In the Punjab Legislative Assembly (Allowances of Members) Act, 1942 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), in section 4, in sub-section (1), in clause (h)—

(i) for clause (ii) excepting the provisos thereto, the following clause shall be substituted, namely :—

“(ii) **a halting allowance at the rate of forty-five rupees per day for each day of attendance at a meeting of the Assembly or the Committee and for each day of journey undertaken by him from the usual place of his residence for attending such a meeting and for return journey and for journeys undertaken to attend such meetings as per tour programme approved by the Speaker and for journeys undertaken under the orders of the Speaker for any other business connected with his duties as a member :**” ;

(ii) after the first proviso to sub-clause (ii), the following provisos shall be inserted, namely :—

“Provided further that in case of meetings attended or journeys undertaken outside the State of Punjab and the Union Territory of Chandigarh, the rate of halting allowance shall be increased by twenty-five per centum :

Provided further that where a member while on tour outside the State of Punjab and Union Territory of Chandigarh has to stay in a hotel or tourist bungalow run on commercial lines, he shall be reimbursed the actual hotel or tourist bungalow expenses at such rates as are admissible to Punjab Government Officers drawing pay exceeding two thousand rupees but not exceeding two thousand and five hundred rupees.”.

3. *Amendment of section 4-C of Punjab Act 4 of 1942* : In the principal Act, in section 4-C, after sub-section (3), the following sub-section shall be inserted, namely :—

“(3-A) Where a member having obtained an advance for building or purchasing a house dies during his term as such member, the amount of such advance or any part thereof which would have accrued after the date of his death in accordance with the terms and conditions of the grant of the advance along with interest thereon shall be written off with the sanction of the prescribed authority.”

THE RAJASTHAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (OFFICERS AND MEMBERS
EMOLUMENTS AND PENSION) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983.

An Act further to amend the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly (Officers and Members Emoluments and Pension) Act, 1956.

Be it enacted by the Rajasthan State Legislature in the Thirty-fourth Year of the Republic of India, as follows :—

1. *Short titles* : This Act may be called the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly (Officers and Members Emoluments and Pension) (Amendment) Act, 1983.

2. *Amendment of section 4A, Rajasthan Act 8 of 1957* :—In section 4A of the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly (Officers and Members Emoluments and Pension) Act, 1956 (Rajasthan Act 6 of 1957), hereinafter referred to as the principal Act, after Explanation III, the following explanation shall be and shall always be deemed to have been added, namely :—

“*Explanation IV.*—In computing the amount of pension payable to any person under this section, the amount of pension received by him under the Rajasthan Freedom Fighters Aid Rules, 1959 or under any other rules made on the same subject shall not be taken into account.”

3. *Amendment of section 8-B, Rajasthan Act 6 of 1957* :—In section 8-B of the principal Act, for the words “rupees four thousand” wherever occurring, the words “rupees six thousand” shall be substituted.

4. *Amendment of section 9, Rajasthan Act 6 of 1957* :—In the explanation to sub-section (1) of section 9 of the principal Act,—

(a) for clause (i), the following clause shall be substituted, namely:—

“(i) reimbursement of actual charges on account of consumption of electricity and water upto a maximum limit of rupees one hundred and fifty per month to members residing at Jaipur and occupying their own or hired accommodation or the Government accommodation on standard rent,” ;

(b) after proviso to clause (ii), the following clause shall be and shall always be deemed to have been inserted, namely:—

“(ii-a) allotment of Government residential accommodation on rent at Jaipur for such period as may be prescribed but not exceeding four months from the date the member ceases to be as such;”.

5. *Amendment of section 11, Rajasthan Act 6 of 1957.*—In section 11 of the principal Act, after sub-section (2), the following sub-section shall be added, namely:—

“(3) Any rule under this Act, may be made so as to have retrospective effect from such date, not earlier than the date of commencement of this Act, as the State Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint”

6. *Repeal and Savings* :—(1) The Rajasthan Legislative Assembly (Officers and Members Emoluments and Pension) (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982 (Ordinance No. 9 of 1982) is hereby repealed.

(2) Notwithstanding such repeal, anything done or any action taken under the principal Act, as amended by the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly (Officers and Members Emoluments and Pension) (Amendment), Ordinance, 1982, shall be deemed to have been done or taken under the principal Act as amended by this Act as if this Act had come into force on 26th day of November, 1982.

THE GOA, DAMAN AND DIU SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES
OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983

An Act, futher to amend the Goa, Daman and Diu Salaries and Allowances of Members of the Legislative Assembly Act, 1964.

Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of Goa, Daman and Diu in the Thirty-third Year of the Republic of India as follows :

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) This Act may be called the Goa, Daman and Diu Salaries and Allowances of Members of the Legislative Assembly (Amendment) Act, 1983.

(2) It shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of January, 1982, except section 6 which shall come into force at once.

2. In the Goa, Daman and Diu Salaries and Allowances of Members of the Legislative Assembly Act, 1964 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), in the long title, for the words “salaries and allowances”, the words “salary, allowances and pension” shall be substituted.

3. *Amendment of section 1.*—In section 1 of the principal Act, in subsection (1), for the words “Salaries and Allowances”, the words “Salary, Allowances and Pension” shall be substituted.

4. *Amendment of section 3.*—In section 3 of the principal Act, for the words “three hundred and fifty” and “twenty-five” the words “four hundred and fifty” and “thirty” shall respectively, be substituted.

5. *Insersion of new section 3B.*—After section 3A, of the principal Act, the following section shall be inserted, namely :

“3B. Pension.—(1) With effect from the first day of January, 1982, there shall be paid a pension of two hundred rupees per mensem to every person who has served as a Member of the Legislative Assembly for a period of five years, whether continuous or not :

Provided that where any person has served as aforesaid for a period exceeding five years, there shall be paid to him an additional pension of fifty rupees per mensem for every year in excess of five, so, however that, in no case, the pension payable to such person shall exceed four hundred rupees per mensem.

(2) Where any person entitled to pension under sub-section (1),—

- (i)** is elected to the office of the President or Vice-President or is appointed to the office of the Governor of and State or the Administrator of any Union territory, or
- (ii)** becomes a member of the Council of States or the House of the People or any Legislative Assembly of a State or Union territory or any Legislative Council of a State ; or
- (iii)** is employed on a salary under the Central Government or any State Government or any corporation owned or controlled by the Central Government or any State Government or any local authority or becomes otherwise entitled to any remuneration from such Government, corporation or local authority.

such person shall not be entitled to any pension under sub-section (1) for the period during which he continues to hold such office or as such member, or is so employed, or continues to be entitled to such remuneration :

Provided that where the salary payable to such person for holding such office or being such member or so employed or whom the remuneration, referred to in clause (iii) payable to such person, is, in either case, less than the pension payable to him under sub-section (1), such person shall be entitled only to receive the balance as pension under that sub-section.

(3) Where any person entitled to pension under sub-section (1) is also entitled to any pension from the Central Government or any State Government, or any corporation owned or controlled by

the Central Government or any State Government, or any local authority under any law or otherwise, then

- (a) where the amount of pension to which he is entitled under such law or otherwise, is equal to or in excess of that to which he is entitled under sub-section (1), such person shall not be entitled to any pension under that sub-section ; and
 - (b) where the amount of pension to which he is entitled under such law or otherwise, is less than that to which he is entitled under sub-section (1), such person shall be entitled to pension under that sub-section only of an amount which falls short of the amount of pension to which he is otherwise entitled under that sub-section.
- (4) In computing the number of years for the purpose of sub-section (1), the period during which a person has served as Minister as defined in the Goa, Daman and Diu Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1964 or as a Speaker or Deputy Speaker as defined in the Goa, Daman and Diu Salaries and Allowances of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker Act, 1964 shall also be taken into account”.

6. *Insertion of new section 7A.*—After section 7 of the principal Act, the following section shall be inserted, namely :—

“7A. *Telephone facilities.*—Where telephone facilities are available at the place declared by a Member to be his head-quarters, he shall be entitled to have a telephone at his residence, or at the place where he ordinarily conducts his work relating to the Assembly, subject to the conditions that he shall, meet the cost of installation of such telephone in full and that, in regard to the recurring charges, the liability of the Government shall be limited to the reimbursement of rental charges for that telephone and charges in respect of a maximum of seven hundred and fifty local calls made from that telephone per quarter including calls, if any, permitted free of charge.”

SESSIONAL REVIEW

SEVENTH LOK SABHA

ELEVENTH SESSION

The Eleventh Session (Budget Session) of the Seventh Lok Sabha commenced on 18 February, 1983, with an Address by the President to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together and adjourned *sine die* on 10 May, 1983. A brief resumé of the important discussions held and other business transacted during the Session is given below :

A. DISCUSSIONS

President's Address : In his address, the President said that the year ahead would be full of challenges and opportunities requiring concerted efforts of the Parliament, the Government and the People. The President emphasised the need to tone up the economy by enhancing production and productivity, eliminating non-productive expenditure and containing prices. He said that the economy had achieved a reasonable growth for a second successive year in spite of difficulties in balance of payments, unfavourable climatic conditions and the severe constraints on the resources. The performance in the infrastructure and industry had maintained improvement. The Revised Twenty-Point Programme, announced on 14 January, 1982, had shown heartening results.

The President said that the Government were vitally concerned with the welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and had evolved a three-pronged strategy which consisted of special component plans of State Governments and Central Ministries. Special Central assistance in addition to the States' special component plans and the Scheduled Castes Development Corporations. Besides social and economic advancement of the economically weaker sections and the backward classes of the society would also continue to be given priority in Government's development programmes.

was one of the very few countries which had managed to keep the annual rate of inflation at the low level of 2.8 per cent.

Allaying the apprehensions expressed by Members regarding inadequacy of stocks of grains, the Prime Minister assured the House that the current stocks were higher than the stocks held during the corresponding months in 1981 and 1982. The Government, she added, was aware of the difficulties faced by the State and had sent grains to the States of Tamil Nadu as well as to some other States which had asked for it.

As regards the current Budget, Shrimati Gandhi claimed that it was consistent with the national policy. It introduced new measures for reforming financial administration that would have a long term impact on the economy. The current Budget and some other earlier proposals would mobilise reasonably large amount of resources. It had given some more incentives for exports to enable the industries to rise to the challenge by increasing efficiency and production. The most important priorities within the Plan, she added, were the infrastructure, such as power, railways, coal, steel, transport and, above all, petroleum. In agriculture, the emphasis was on irrigation, fertilizers, etc.

The Prime Minister did not subscribe to the view that the work of five eminent economists appointed as advisers to the Government of India would in any way overlap with the functions of the Planning Commission. She hoped that they would come up with constructive suggestions for solving short-term as well as long-term problems.

Referring to the loose talk indulged in by some people about the breaking up of the country, Shrimati Gandhi declared that the country was not going to break up. She was confident that Parliament, the Ruling party and all the Opposition parties, would never let that to happen. She, however, felt that tension would be aggravated if any party, group or person concentrated too much on the problems of a particular region in isolation from the problems of the country as a whole.

So far as Assam was concerned, the Prime Minister said, there was a need for all sections of the society to curb their emotions and come together to find out the solution of the problem. Even if some young people these days were consumed by anger, she continued to regard them as her children and the children of the country. There was no problem which could not be solved amicably and through earnest discussions.

Referring to the need for revival of the spirit of brotherhood in Punjab, Shrimati Gandhi said that the basic tenet of Sikhism was love and brotherhood among all people. Unfortunately, some sections were whipping up communalism and a large number of communal incidents were basically the result of economic or other rivalries and fears, she observed.

Concluding, Shrimati Gandhi sought the cooperation of every Member to make the forthcoming Non-Aligned Meeting in New Delhi a success. Its effectiveness could do much towards the solutions of issues which were vital to the world *viz.* disarmament and peace, and cooperation and development.

The Motion of Thanks was thereafter adopted.

Assam Situation : On 21 February, 1983, the Speaker, Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, expressed grief on the loss of lives in the State of Assam. Thereafter, the Members stood in silence for a short while, as a mark of respect to the departed souls.

Later on the same day, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi made a statement expressing deep anguish of the Government on the happenings in Assam. He said that the brutality and the horror perpetrated on the innocent people resulting in the loss of a large number of lives and destruction of properties were difficult to describe. All possible assistance, added, had been rushed to the affected families for the purpose of relief and rehabilitation.

The prolonged agitation in Assam, the Minister said, generated an atmosphere of bitterness and distrust and disturbed the harmony amongst different sections of the society. The immediate provocation for the holocaust was reported to be the resentment of some people against those who wished to exercise their democratic right of franchise.

The Government, the Minister said, spared no effort to find a satisfactory solution to the vexed problem of foreigners in Assam. In the endeavour, apart from consultations with Opposition Leaders, from time to time, seven rounds of tripartite talks were held. When the last round of the talks failed to resolve the deadlock, Shri Sethi added that the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, on 5 January, 1983, met the Leaders of the Opposition and apprised them of the position. In the absence of unanimity amongst the Opposition parties regarding extension of Presidents' rule through an amendment of the Constitution, the only alternative, available with the Government was to take recourse to clause (5) of Article 356 of the Constitution. The Government, Shri Sethi said, was not in favour of such a step.

The successful holding of Asian Games and the creation of a Department of Sports in the Union Government were two significant events of the last year. The Games also provided the occasion for the extension of television to many new areas and the introduction of colour telecasting. As regards science and technology, the Government formulated and announced a Technology Policy statement and it would pursue the search for technological self-reliance. The second scientific expedition to Antarctica would set up a permanent manned station there. India's work in the survey of polymetallic nodules on the ocean floor had rewarded her the recognition, at the Conference of Law of the Sea, as a pioneer investor.

In a brief reference to the domestic political scene, the President cautioned that divisive and disruptive forces were at work fomenting violence and weakening the national fabric and they should be fought resolutely. The Government on its part had adopted a well coordinated drive to combat the activities of extremist organisations which were active in certain north-eastern States and territories and maintain peace and normalcy. The Government had also taken initiative to associate the Opposition in discussions on major issues relating to Assam and the Punjab and the President expressed the hope that the same trend would continue.

The international situation, the President pointed out, had deteriorated. The escalation of foreign military intrusion in the Indian ocean in disregard of the wishes of littoral States, the continuing war between Iran and Iraq, the increasing recklessness of Israel and the sufferings of the Palestinians, the aggressive acts of the racist regime of South Africa against its own people and its neighbours and the lack of progress in the Disarmament Talks and in North-South Dialogue were all matters of concern. Besides, certain developments in the neighbourhood had worsened India's security environment. The entire nation was concerned over the acquisition of sophisticated weaponry by Pakistan. It was hoped that the meetings that had taken place with the President of Pakistan, General Zia-ul-Haq and between officials of the two countries would eventually lead to the conclusion of an enduring relationship of peace, friendship and co-operation between the two countries.

The policy of non-alignment, the President said, had helped India to work unswervingly for the objectives of peace, friendship and stability throughout the world. India, at the unanimous request of Non-Aligned Community, would be playing host to the Seventh Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in New Delhi next month. The President hoped that the summit would make an important contribution for solving the problems

besetting the international community. Later in the year, he added, another major conference—the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting would be held in New Delhi.

Concluding, the President said that economic and political crisis in the world had led to sharpening of tensions which India could withstand only through vigilance, unity and optimal use of the productive capacity. The President further said that apart from fighting corruption and inefficiency, it must be ensured that differences were not aired in a manner which provoked violence or weakened the secular democratic fabric of the country.

The President's Address was discussed for six days *i.e.* on 22, 23, 24, 25, 28 February, and 1 March, 1983, on a Motion of Thanks moved by Shri K. Brahmananda Reddy. Initiating the discussion, he said that the solution of national problems required patience. In view of the helpful and conciliatory attitude of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and the Government, he solicited the cooperation of the Opposition for finding the solutions to the problems of the States of Assam and Punjab. Prof. K.K. Tewari, who seconded the motion, appealed to the Opposition to shed their narrow-mindedness and take up issues which were larger than individual political parties. Shri Samar Mukherjee suggested that conditionalities of the International Monetary Fund should be changed, as they were seriously affecting the economy. Dr. Karan Singh suggested that the Ruling party and the Opposition parties should cooperate for introducing some substantial electoral reforms so that dependence upon unaccounted money could be removed.

Replying to the discussion on 1 March, 1983, in which 35 other Members* took part, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi observed that the President's Address was objective and presented a balanced view of strength as well as that of the shortcomings. However, it certainly highlighted the nation's grit and achievements in the face of tremendous difficulties. Despite the decline in the overall growth rate owing to rapid deterioration in the international economic situation and the unprecedented drought of 1982 in the vast areas of the country, India, she contended,

*Those who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Chandrajit Yadav, R.S. Sparrow, Uma Kant Mishra, Subramaniam Swamy, M. Satyanarayana Rao, Ram Jethmalani, P. Namgyal, Anantha Ramulu Mallu, Bhogendra Jha, Ram Swarup Ram, M. Ramgopal Reddy, George Joseph Mundackal, Sunder Singh, Kunwar Ram, Chitta Basu, Virdhi Chander Jain, Krishna Prakash Tewari, T.S. Negi, Ram Pyare Panika, Girdhari Lal Vyas, P.V.G. Raju, Mahipatray M. Mehta, V. Kulandaivelu, Shankar Dayal Sharma, J.C. Barve, Rasheed Masood, Somanth Chatterjee, Dharam Bir Sinha, G.M. Banatwalla, C. Chinnaswamy, Vijay Kumar Yadav, Shrimati Vidya Chennupati, Prof. Nirmala Kumari Shaktawat, Shrimati Krishna Sahi and Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik.

within the frame-work of the Constitution and the laws and national commitments, international obligations and agreements and including the humanitarian considerations. The people, he added, could not be deported arbitrarily but only after following the due process of inquiry as per law.

After Prof. Madhu Dandavate replied to debate, the House adopted the following Resolution moved by the Speaker, Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar :

“This House, after discussing the situation in Assam, do condemn the brutal killings and riots that took place there and appeal to the people of Assam to strengthen the feelings of mutual cooperation and brotherhood and find a solution to the complicated problem amicably and help the administration in restoring peace.”

The Home Minister in a statement on Assam situation on 3 March, 1983, informed the House about the incidents of mob violence which took place in Hathikuli in Sibsagar District and Madhvapura in Nowgong District on 1 and 2 March, 1983. He said that the army was called in and intensive patrolling was continuing. Besides this, army had also been inducted into seven districts of Assam, declared as disturbed areas under the Assam Disturbed Areas Act. The Government, he added, were taking all possible steps for the restoration of peace and normalcy.

Shri Sethi visited Assam on 11 and 12 March, 1983, in order to make an on the spot assessment of the situation including the relief operations. Making another statement in the House on 14 March, 1983, he affirmed that there was no question of dismissal of the State Government and dissolution of the Legislative Assembly in Assam. Such an act, he added, would mean a submission to the reign of terror.

The Central Government, Shri Sethi reiterated, had been giving maximum support to the State Government in the task of restoring peace and law and order, and in the rehabilitation of the uprooted people. The Central Government had released Rs. 10 crores for the purpose of relief and rehabilitation.

Raising a discussion on the statement of the Minister made in the House on 3 March, 1983, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan demanded the setting up of a Commission to enquire into the whole episode in Assam.

Taking part in the discussion, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee alleged that 8 lakh new names had been inserted in the electoral rolls of 1979 without scrutiny. He held that if elections could be postponed in 14 constituencies on the ground of abnormal situation, there seemed to be no justification for

not postponing elections in other constituencies. Shri Indrajit Gupta said that the Government should show political sagacity and statesmanship in tackling the situation in Assam. Shri N.E. Horo suggested that the Government and all the political parties should join together in finding out a solution to the problem.

Replying to the discussion which lasted for more than 4 hours and in which 11 other Members* participated, Shri P.C. Sethi said that regarding the relief work and its coordination a special officer had been appointed in every district.

The Minister reaffirmed that the Government was committed to solve the problem of foreign nationals. As there was no armed rebellion there was no question of imposition of internal emergency in Assam. Army, he explained, had been deployed there only to assist the civil authorities.

Shri Sethi solicited the cooperation of every Member and every political party in order to restore peace in Assam.

Making yet another statement on 22 March, 1983, Shri P.C. Sethi informed the House that notwithstanding the sporadic incidents, there had been signs of improvement in law and order situation in the State. The relief and rehabilitation operations were in full swing. But the agitator's calls of non-cooperation was bound to aggravate the situation. While the State Government was taking all steps to control the situation, he appealed all sections of the society in Assam to cooperate with the Government to bring about normalcy. He assured the House that the Central Government would continue to give full support and necessary assistance to the State Government in the onerous task of restoration of normalcy and rehabilitation of the affected people.

Further on 4 May, 1983, making a statement regarding Massacre at Nellie in Assam reported in an issue of the New Delhi Journal, Shri P.C. Sethi recalled that the Government had taken the House into confidence at every stage and it had come forward on more than one occasion to discuss frankly the various aspects of the situation in the State of Assam including major incidents which took place there from time to time.

*Those who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Satyasadhan Chakraborty, Sontosh Mohan Dev, Jagpal Singh, Rajesh Pilot, Zainul Basher, H.N. Bahuguna, Tarun Gogoi, Dharam Bir Sinha, Pius Turkey, Chandrajit Yadav and Shrimati Raiendra Kumari Bajpai.

The Minister informed the House that after the announcement of elections by the Election Commission, a prolonged, intensified and militant programme of agitation was launched by All Assam Students Union and All Assam Gana Sangram Parishad. The miscreants disrupted communications and attacked police parties, outposts and polling booths with lethal weapons. He said that the Government, had strained every resource and made elaborate law and order arrangements to ensure free and fair conduct of poll in the State. The tragic and reprehensible incidents witnessed in Assam, Shri Sethi added, deserved to be condemned by all sections of the House, as violence had no place in a democracy.

Concluding, the Home Minister expressed the hope that after a representative Government had assumed office in Assam, the development of the State would be accelerated and the problems of the people would be satisfactorily solved. The Central Government, Shri Sethi assured the House, would continue efforts in finding an amicable solution to the problem of foreign nationals.

The House immediately took up the discussion on the statement of the Minister of Home Affairs on a motion moved by Prof. Madhu Dandavate. Initiating the discussion, he said that the spokesmen of Janata Party, Bhartiya Janata Party and Lok Dal had made it explicitly clear that they were not against a constitutional amendment for extension of the President's Rule for a limited period. He appealed to the Prime Minister to ponder over the problems of Assam in a calm and cool manner and started that nothing should be done to harm the unity and integrity of the country.

Participating in the discussion, Shri Samar Mukherjee contended that holding of elections in Assam was a constitutional obligation, and he urged upon the Government to guarantee sufficient protection to the people so that clashes did not take place there after the elections. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee attributed the current grave situation in Assam to Government's insistence for holding the elections on the basis of the electoral rolls of 1979. Shri Indrajit Gupta felt that the amendment of the Constitution for extending the President's Rule in the State beyond one year could have created a dangerous precedents for the future. Shri Gupta said that the development in the State was a challenged to the country's integrity and unity and needed collective thought. Shri Unnikrishnan was of the view that the problem could not be solved by elections alone and he called for the economic development of the State. Dr. Karan Singh suggested that Parliamentary Delegation consisting of Members of both the Houses of Parliament should proceed to Assam and help in the task of reconciliation.

In a brief intervention, on 22 February, 1983, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, stressed the need for creating an atmosphere conducive to peace and harmony in the State. The first consideration, the Prime Minister said, was the safety, relief and rehabilitation of all those who were menaced. She affirmed her deep commitment to each group in India maintaining its cultural and other identities.

Shrimati Gandhi denied that she had ever said that nobody would be sent out of Assam. She reiterated her consistent stand of making the year 1971 not the cut off point, but the starting off point. She had pointed out the difficulties in moving large population. She had also held that those who were born in the State after 1950 could not be sent out as they were the Indian citizens under the Constitution.

The Prime Minister informed the House that the linguistic and religious minorities were greatly frightened and the plain tribals had been requesting her to take them out of Assam and make a separate State or Union Territory for them.

Dealing with a reference regarding holding of elections in the State, Shrimati Gandhi asserted that it was a constitutional obligation. She denied that elections were held at gun-point. The guns, she added, were pointed at the people coming to vote by those who did not want them to vote. Violence had been growing in Assam even before the elections, she added. The Assamese people, the Prime Minister said, were greatly agitated. The Government, on her part, had offered tribunals and suggested many alternatives so that some way, least disruptive to Assam and least harmful to any of the others concerned, could be found. Even the question of foreigners could have been solved, if the people remained peaceful.

Intervening in the discussion, in which 14 other Members* participated, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi maintained that elections alone were not the cause of current wave of violence in Assam. There had been considerable escalation of violence since the start of agitation in the State in 1979. The Government, Shri Sethi said, had been making earnest and sustained efforts to find an amicable solution to the problem

*Those who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri C.M. Stephen, Ananda Gopal Mukhopadhyay, K.K. Tewari, Rasheed Masood, Beravadan K. Gadhavi, Chiranjilal Sharma, Harikesh Bahadur, Jamilur Rahman, Chitta Basu, Girdhari Lal Vyas, Chandrajit Yadav, G.M. Banatwalla, Sontosh Mohan Dev and Begum Abida Ahmed.

Referring to the article published in the Journal, regarding massacre at Nellie Shri Sethi said that it had quoted several wireless messages issued by the State police authorities. It would be seen from these messages that the State Government authorities had been very prompt in alerting local police about the dangers of communal violence including the issue of instructions regarding the need for prompt action. In the face of clear evidence in the messages quoted in the article it was ironical to make the allegation that there had been negligence and connivance on the part of the Government. The State Government had decided to institute a high level administrative inquiry into the disturbances and that inquiry was bound to cover all aspects. At this stage to form an opinion on the basis of reproductions of some wireless messages in a journal, would be prejudging the issue. The Minister assured the House that the Government had no intention to protect any administrative lapse that might have occurred despite the arrangements.

On 5 May, 1983, the House held a discussion on the above statement of the Home Minister. Initiating the debate, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy demanded that a Supreme Court Judge should be appointed to hold a judicial inquiry. Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait was also in favour of holding such an inquiry.

The discussion lasted for about five hours and 10 other Members* participated in it.

Replying to the discussion Shri Sethi dealt with the doubts expressed by Members over the administrative inquiry. The Minister stated that the inquiry would be of a very high level and the inquiry officer would be drawn from an other State. In his view, the judicial inquiry, was not likely to help solve the situation.

As regards the allegation relating to the deployment of outside police force in Assam for conducting elections, the Minister said that the force was not there for election alone, but for the maintenance of law and order. The Army was not deployed in the State during the elections in pursuance of instructions from Election Commission, he added.

Railway Budget 1983-84. Presenting the Railway Budget for the year 1983-84, on 24 February, 1983, the Minister of Railways, Shri A.B.A. Ghani Khan Chaudhuri, informed the House that administrative measures

*Those who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Sontosh Mohan Dev, Somnath Chatterjee, C.M. Stephen, H.N. Bahuguna, Tarun Gogoi, Jaipal Singh Kashyap, Rajesh Pilot, Ram Jethmalani, Nurul Islam, and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee.

taken by the Government coupled with new operational strategies and innovations enabled the railways to maintain an upward swing in freight operations. The railways, he said, would reach a figure of 166 billion tonne kilometres of revenue earning traffic and 226 billion passenger kilometres during the current year which would be a record. The railways were also determined to improve the quality of services rendered to the community with the new slogan of "Safety, Security and Punctuality." To ensure safety in rail travel, a Central Safety Committee had been constituted under his own supervision, the Minister added.

The Budget Estimates for the year 1983-84, placed the gross traffic receipts at Rs. 4,656.78 crores at the current fares and freight rates and the total expenditure, including contributions to the Depreciation Reserve Fund and Pension Fund, was estimated at Rs. 4,474.48 crores. The net revenue of Rs. 182.30 crores would not be sufficient for meeting the dividend liability of Rs. 465.47 crores. The anticipated additional revenue from the proposed upward revisions in the passenger fare and freight rates amounting to Rs. 488.90 crores would cover the gap between the traffic receipts and revenue expenditure and partially liquidate the indebtedness to General Revenues.

The Railway Budget was discussed in the House on 1, 2, 3 and 4 March, 1983. Initiating the discussion Prof. Madhu Dandavate urged upon the Government to relieve the Indian Railways of certain social burdens like carrying of commodities below the operating cost as it would help in providing more funds for developmental activities. The better safety in railways, he felt, would be brought about by effectively implementing the recommendations of the Railway Accidents Enquiry Committee relating to staff and equipment.

Participating in the resumed discussion on 3 March, 1983, Shri N.E. Horo suggested that casual labourers employed in railways be made regular. He also wanted the creation of a new zonal Railway by the amalgamation of Chakradharpur and Dhanbad divisions.

On 4 March, 1983 replying to a four-day discussion in which 38 other Members* participated, the Minister of Railways, Shri A.B.A. Ghani Khan

*Those who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Uttam Rathod, Basudeb Acharya, Narain Chand Parashar, Shiv Prasad Sahu, Jagpal Singh, Kamal Nath, Surya Narayan Singh, Krishna Chandra Pandey, T. Nagarathnam, Mahavir Prasad, Shantubhai Patel, R.P. Yadav, G.L. Dogra, Harikesh Bahadur, Chiranji Lal Sharma, N.K. Shejwalkar, Keyur Bhushan, Satya Dev Sjnha, Harihar Soren, Qazi Saleem, Dileep Singh Bhuria, Chhangur Ram, Ram Singh Yadav, Krishan Datt Sultanpuri, Ghulam Mohd. Khan, Mool Chand Daga, Pratap Bhanu Sharma, Oscar Fernandes, P.J. Kurien, Golam Yazdani, Ajit Kumar Saha, Jairam Varma, Keshorao Pardhi, Krishan Pratap Singh, A.T. Patil, Era Anbarasu, Shrimati Kesharbai Kshirsagar and Shrimati Usha Verma.

Chaudhuri, stated that the constraint of resources had been the basic reason for not agreeing to many of the proposals relating to conversion of railway tracks, electrification and construction of new lines. Similarly, regional imbalances could not be rectified without the positive availability of funds. In the Sixth Five-Year Plan, the railways got Rs. 5,100 crores, less than half of the minimum need based requirement of Rs. 11,000 crores. In pursuance of the concern expressed by the Members over the finances of railways, he promised to apprise the Minister of Planning and the Minister of Finance about the basic problems of the railways and thereby impress upon them for the allocation of more funds. In an expanding economy, he said, the need was not only to restore intensive health to the system, but also to expand the system. He had attempted to present a balanced Budget providing adequately for Depreciation Reserve Fund, Pension Fund, Development Fund and liquidation of heavy indebtedness to the General Revenues. In the matter of raising resources, the fundamentals laid down by the Railway Tariff Committee had been accepted, he told the House.

Defending the social burdens, the Minister said that the railways were not merely a commercial enterprise, but a public utility service which had to carry on certain social obligations.

Dealing with the suggestion of setting up of a new divisional railway headquarters, the Minister informed the House that the Railway Reforms Committee was already seized of the problem of the reorganisation of the railways and their report on the matter was awaited. As regards over-centralization of power with the Railway Board, the Minister said that it was his strong belief that in order to achieve better and speedier results, more powers be delegated to the General Managers and he had taken certain positive steps in this regard.

Referring to the question of enhancement in the amount of accidents' compensation payable to the victims, the Minister informed the House that, as recommended by the Railway Reforms Committee, the amount of compensation had been increased from Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 1,00,000.

In deference to the wishes of the Members, the Railway Minister announced concessions in fares and freight rates of certain essential commodities of common use amounting to Rs. 57.50 crores.

General Budget, 1983-84 : Presenting the General Budget for the Year 1983-84, on 28 February, 1983, the Finance Minister, Shri Pranab Mukherjee said that although the growth in gross domestic product during the current year would be lower than it had been in the two previous years, the country would achieve an average growth rate of nearly five per cent

over the three years which was close to the target envisaged in the Sixth Five-Year Plan. The impact of drought had not been allowed to affect the pace of development and at the same time tempo of investment was also maintained. The rate of inflation, he pointed out, had been brought down and a considerable success had also been achieved in the matter of restoring the viability of balance of payments.

In order to provide benefit to workers and small savers, Shri Mukherjee said that it had been decided to increase the interest on post office deposit schemes, special deposits of employees' provident fund and other non-Government provident, gratuity and superannuation funds. The Government, he added, had appointed a Fourth Central Pay Commission for revision of pay scales of the Government's employees.

The Finance Minister said that the total receipts for the year 1983-84 were estimated at Rs. 32,586 crores, which included the effect of the changes in fare and freight rates of the railways and in the posts and telegraphs tariffs as well as the continuance of Compulsory Deposit Scheme for income-tax payers, and the expenditure at Rs. 34,836 crores. Thus, the overall budgetary gap at the existing rates of taxation will be Rs. 2,250 crores. The various tax measures, together with the reliefs and concessions proposed in the Budget, would yield an additional revenue of Rs. 615.31 crores to the Centre and Rs. 100.74 crores to the States. After taking a net yield of Rs. 80 crores as receipts from the new Bonds, the Budget would leave an uncovered deficit of Rs. 1,555 crores, which, Shri Mukherjee claimed, would not put undue strain on the economy.

The general discussion on the Budget lasted for five-days. Initiating the discussion on 14 March, 1983, Shri Sunil Maitra contended that no basic economic problem of the country could be solved without drastic land reforms. He demanded the distribution of arable lands held by big landlords among the landless agricultural labourers and poor peasants. He wanted the Government to pay regulated and remunerative prices of food-grains to peasants.

Taking part in the discussion, Shri Maganbhai Barot said that only a meagre amount was provided for 20-Point Programme.

Intervening in the discussion on 16 March, 1983, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance, Shri Pattabhi Rama Rao, informed the House that the Income-Tax Department was making every effort to recover the old arrears of tax. The machinery for collection, collation and dissemination of information for discovering new assesseees and detection of concealment of taxes in the case of existing assesseees had been streamlined.

Vigorous steps, he added, had also been taken against evasion of excise duty.

Taking part in the discussion, Shri Indrajit Gupta said that the Budget proposals did not ensure any new direction towards the growth of economy.

Intervening in the resumed discussion on 17 March, 1983, the Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance, Shri Janardhana Poojary said that the number of rural branches of banks had now gone up to 20,900 from 1,833 in 1969. The banks had been giving preference to the poorer sections of the society, in providing loans. The Government, he said, had taken up providing of drinking water facilities in the villages on a crash basis in the Sixth Plan. All efforts for economic development and towards improving the lot of the people, he observed, would be in vain, if the increase in population was unchecked. The Government, therefore, had laid considerable emphasis on curbing population growth and provided Rs. 930 crores for various programmes of the Department of Family Welfare.

Participating in the discussion, Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan said that the Budget did not contain any direction and it was not in the interest of the people.

On 18 March, 1983, replying to the discussion in which 54 other Members* participated, the Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, contended that India was one of the very few developing countries which had built up public sector infrastructure with an investment of about Rs. 25,000 crores in which the share of foreign assistance was only two per cent. The performance of the Central public sector, he asserted, was improving and the Government wanted to have a vibrant economy which would depend on public sector.

*Those who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Y.S. Mahajan, G.L. Dogra, A. Kalanidhi, Girdhari Lal Vyas, Chintamani Panigrahi, Krishan Datt Sultanpuri S.R.A S. Appalanaidu, Thazhai M. Karunanidhi, D.P. Yadav, Zainul Basher, Bajubon R. Kharlukhi Manoranjan Bhakta, Mool Chand Daga, Sunder Singh, Bheravadan K. Gadhavi, Viridhi Chander Jain, Sontosh Mohan Dev, Satish Prasad Singh, Oscar Fernandes, Pius Tirkey, Ravindra Varma, Bhagwan Dev Acharya, Brajimohan Mohanty, Chitta Basu, R.R. Bhole, Ram Pyare Panikr, Chittubhai Gamit, Uttambhai H. Patel, Satish Agarwal, Balkrishna Wasnik, R.L. Bhatia, Jagannath Rao, Jagpal Singh, Chandulal Chandrakar, H.N. Bahuguna, Bishnu Prasad, K T. Kosalram, Mahavir Prasad, Shantubhai Patel, Puchalapalli Panchalaiah, Satya Dev Sinha, Chandra Pal Shailani, Chiranji Lal Sharma, Hiralal R. Parmar, S.B. Sidnal, S.T.K. Jakkayan, S.A. Dorai Sebastian, Era Anbarasu, Biren Singh Engti, Narain Chand Parashar, Shrimati Rajenda Kumari Bajpai, Shrimati Gurbrinder Kaur Brar, Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik and Shrimati Kesharbai Kshirsagar.

Shri Mukherjee informed the House that the Government were fully aware of the needs of the States and were going to give them more than Rs. 1,600 crores during the current year, which was more than anticipated at the time of planning, to augment the resources of the States.

Dealing with a reference that administrative expenditure in relation to total Budget had increased, the Minister stated that in terms of percentage it had been reduced from 3.8 in 1979-80 to 3.53 in 1981-82 and to 3.18 in 1982-83.

Shri Mukherjee maintained that the expenditure on the outlay of 20-point programme, stepped up to Rs. 10,000 crores, was not a small amount to those sectors which were directly concerned with the removal of poverty in the rural areas.

In regard to International Monetary Fund (IMF) conditionalities, Shri Mukherjee said that it had been made clear in the first meeting of the World Bank and IMF, and the Interim Committee, that the developing countries could not accept a straight-jacket formula for development. Every country had its own ethos, socio-economic compulsions, and dependence on more commercial borrowings could not be expected of the developing countries. Therefore, IMF conditionalities could not be there which would put the developing countries in a difficult situation.

The Finance Minister informed the House that the Government had decided, with immediate effect, to restore the single price system for kerosene oil with a small increase of 10 paise per litre.

All the Demands for Grants on Account (General) were voted in full.

Situation in Punjab : On 4 March, 1983, the House resumed discussion on the statement on Punjab Situation made by the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi, in the House on 4 November, 1982.* Participating in the discussion, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said that tripartite talks among the Congress Party, Akalis and other political parties had helped in removing mutual distrust and bringing the parties nearer to some agreement. He appealed to the Akali leaders to shun the path of confrontation and not to press the resignations of their legislators. They should come forward to settle their problems across the table.

Taking part in the discussion, Shri G.S. Nihalsinghwalu urged the Central Government to take a just and judicious decision acceptable to all the Sikhs.

*For the brief text of the statement see JPI, December, 1982, Vol. XXVIII, No 4, p. 533.

Replying to the discussion in which all other Members** participated, Shri P.C. Sethi told the House that negotiations on the situation in Punjab were going on and the Government had been making earnest efforts to consider the demand of the Shiromani Akali Dal. The solution to the grievances of Akalis, he added, had to be found keeping in mind the large national interests. He appealed to all concerned not to do anything which might precipitate the situation. The Government, he assured the House, would always keep its doors open for talks. But the solution of one problem should not give rise to another, he added.

Dealing with the demands of Akalis, Shri Sethi said that the Government had accepted the religious demands of the Sikh Community. The question of sharing of the waters of Ravi-Beas rivers and territorial adjustments had been discussed with the Chief Ministers and the leaders of the Opposition of the concerned States.

On 21 March, 1983, the Home Minister made a statement on "growing tendency to defile and desecrate the sanctity of the religious places" in response to a Calling Attention Notice by Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee. Shri Sethi recalled that in the meeting held with the leaders of Shiromani Akali Dal, a request was made to them that there should be unequivocal open condemnation of violence and under any circumstances Gurudwaras should not be made and used as sanctuary for criminals. He regretted that neither Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee (SGPC) nor Shiromani Akali Dal leadership had come out with any condemnation of such activities or had taken effective steps to put a stop to the use of Gurudwaras by the criminals as their rendezvous.

Gurudwaras, the Minister said, were sacred not only to the Sikh community but to other communities as well. Though entry of police in places of worship was not prohibited by law, in deference to the religious sentiments of the people, the Government had always exercised restraint in this matter. The State authorities, Shri Sethi added, had been approaching the SGPC from time to time for handing over to them the wanted criminals including Dal Khalsa activists taking shelter in the religious places. But the prior intimation needed by the Gurudwara authorities about the wanted persons and restriction of entry only to plain clothed policemen without arms to a Gurudwara had not been found workable in apprehending the criminals. The Government, he added, fervently hoped and trusted that

**Members who took part in the discussion were Sarvashri R.S. Sparrow, Satyasadhan Chakraborty, Swami Indervesh, Ratansinh Rajda, N.G. Ranga, Sunder Singh H. N. Bahuguna, Chiranjilal Sharma, Chitta Basu, Shrimati Gurbrinder Kaur Brar and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee.

SGPC and Akali Dal would take concrete steps to see that the sanctity of the Gurudwaras in Punjab was not violated.

Answering questions, the Home Minister said that pending matters in tripartite talks were under the consideration of the Government.

On 31 March, 1983, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi, made a statement on "increase in terrorist activities by extremists, reactionary elements and religious fanatics disturbing peace in Punjab", in response to a Calling Attention Notice by Shrimati Sukhbans Kaur. Expressing the deep distress and concern of the Government on the recent incidents in the State of Punjab and Union Territory of Chandigarh since 21 March, 1983, in which two persons had died and thirteen injured, Shri Sethi said that as per the reports received from the Government of Punjab cases had been registered and investigations were in progress.

The Government had time and again appealed to all concerned to eschew violence and not to do anything which might infringe the unity and integrity of the country. At the same time, the Government of Punjab had been requested to deal with the situation firmly.

Answering questions, the Minister said that the Chief Minister of Punjab had given instructions to unearth arms held by the extremists and their supporters. The Central Government, he asserted, would preserve the integrity of the country and any idea to bifurcate it would be resisted at all costs and with all force.

Making another statement on 5 April, 1983, on the situation in Punjab, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi, recalled that on 31 March, 1983, the House had appealed to the Akali leadership to call off their agitation and condemn violence. But their *Morcha* continued and pursuant to their decision on 12 March, 1983, senior Akali leaders addressed congregations throughout the State to mobilise support. Despite protestations of the Akali leaders that the agitation would be non-violent, the agitators resorted to unprovoked violence and arson at a number of places in the State and caused considerable damage to property. The police had exercised restraint and patience but, in order to control the situation, they had to use force including resort to firing, which resulted in the death of 15 persons and injuries to 30 persons in different places in the State. The situation in the State was reported to be normal.

The Government, Shri Sethi reiterated, had always held the view that issues should be resolved through negotiations and in the spirit of accommodating each other's point of view. He had appealed to the leaders

of Shiromani Akali Dal to give up the path of confrontation as it would give rise not only to violence and sufferings but also make the task of finding out the solution of the problem of Punjab more difficult.

On 19 April, 1983, making a statement on the reported “functioning of the Office of so-called Khalistan Council in Harminder Sahib, Amritsar”, in response to a Calling Attention Notice by Shri Mani Ram Bagri, the Home Minister informed the House that ‘National Council of Khalistan’ and ‘Dal Khalsa’ were declared as unlawful associations and banned under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, on 1 May, 1982, for indulging in secessionist activities. According to the Government of Punjab, Shri Balbir Singh Sandhu, self-styled Secretary-General of National Council of Khalistan and a proclaimed offender was reported to be living at Guru Nanak Niwas in the Golden Temple, Amritsar. It was alleged that the room occupied by him was also being used as temporary headquarter of the National Council of Khalistan. Verification of this fact, he added, had been rendered difficult as investigating agencies were not being permitted to enter Guru Nanak Niwas. Shri Sethi said that the Government hoped and trusted that SGPC and Shiromani Akali Dal would realise their national responsibility and extend their cooperation and take steps to ensure the surrendering of Shri Balbir Singh Sandhu to the police or court. He assured the House that the Government was keeping a close watch on Dal Khalsa activists and all steps were being taken to preserve the unity and integrity of the country.

In another statement made on 26 April, 1983, Shri P.C. Sethi informed the House with great anguish and sorrow the murder of Shri A.S. Atwal, Deputy Inspector General (DIG) of Police, Jullundur on April 25, 1983, while he was visiting Darbar Sahib, Amritsar, for offering prayers. According to information received from the Government of Punjab, he was shot dead just outside the main entrance of Darbar Sahib towards Chowk Ghan-ta Ghar. The assailant reportedly had come from inside the Darbar Sahib complex with rifle and reportedly ran back there after committing the crime.

The Home Minister said that the dastardly crime near the entrance of the Darbar Sahib, had confirmed that wanted criminals including Dal Khalsa activists were taking shelter in the place of worship. The request of State authorities to the SGPC to handover the accused person had not been heeded to so far. The Government had decided to entrust the investigation of the case to the C.B.I., he added.

On 27 April, 1983, the House held a discussion on an Adjournment Motion on “Government’s failure to ensure that religious places like Golden

Temple, Amritsar etc. are not used in a manner to aggravate law and order situation" moved by Shri B.D. Singh.

Participating in the discussion, Shri Charan Singh stressed that every effort should be made to redress the grievances of Akalis through negotiations. The demand for Khalistan, he added, was there for a very long time and its acceptance would give rise to such demands from other parts as well and the country would disintegrate.

Referring to the murder of a DIG at the entrance of the Golden Temple he pointed out that the problem would not be solved unless the laws were enforced vigorously and the police were allowed to enter the religious places like Gurudwaras to trace out the criminals.

Shri C.T. Dhandapani demanded that foreign elements behind the Akali agitation should be identified and the extremists isolated and dealt with firmly. Shri Indrajit Gupta pointed out that the situation in Punjab was not merely a law and order problem but a question of the State of Punjab as well as that of the country. The Government should, therefore, try to narrow down the differences and settle it as a political dispute. Shri A.K. Roy was of the view that no attempt had been made to rouse the consciousness among the Sikhs and other people against the violent activities of the extremist Akali volunteers.

The discussion lasted for 5 hours in which 12 other Members* took part.

Intervening in the discussion, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi, informed the House that the Punjab Government had sanctioned ex-gratia grant of Rs. 3 lakhs to the wife of late Shri A.S. Atwal, DIG. Besides, the State Government would also grant her the full salary that late Shri Atwal would have drawn during his full term of service and the pension thereafter.

The Government of Punjab, Shri Sethi said, had respected the religious sentiments of the Sikh community in not permitting the police to enter places of worship. But this gesture of the Government had not been reciprocated by the SGPC authorities so far.

Denying the allegation that the Government were in league with the extremists and had not taken steps to apprehend the culprits, the Minister

*Those who took part in discussion were : Sarvashri R.S. Sparrow, Satyasadhan Chakraborty, Era Anbarasu, Dhanik Lal Mandal F.H. Mohsin, Ram Jethmalani, R.L. Bhatia, Zainul Bashir, Ram Nagina Misra, Harikesh Bahadur, Chitra Basu and Chandrajit Yadav.

said that the Punjab Government had taken action against the extremist elements by arresting 833 persons relating to 323 cases registered upto 31 March, 1983. It had declared the Dal Khalsa and National Council of Khalistan as unlawful and was keeping close watch on the activities of the former. Drives regarding checking of arm smuggling and unearthing of unlicensed and illicit weapons had also been launched.

As regards finding a solution to the problem, the Minister said that despite various difficulties, the Government had all along made an honest and sincere effort in the matter. The Government had a number of rounds of discussions with the Shiromani Akali Dal. Unfortunately, the reluctance on the part of the Akali Dal to continue discussions, when differences had been narrowed down considerably, left the Government with no other choice but to take certain decisions on its own. The Prime Minister, he added, had already made certain announcements regarding the religious demands of the Akali Dal. The demands that remained to be sorted out related to the territorial issues, and the sharing of river waters. As regards territorial issue, there were differences of opinion among the leaders of the States of Haryana and Punjab. The Government, however, were trying to find some amicable solution to this problem. It had always been the Government's endeavour to arrive at a peaceful solution and not to take any step which might be misconstrued as an affront to the religious sentiments of the Sikh community. Shri Sethi expressed the confidence that their appeal to the Shiromani Akali Dal and SGPC to ensure that criminals were not given shelter in places of worship and that they were surrendered to the authorities would be acted upon without any delay. The Government, he added, would have to take some suitable action if the nation's security was in danger. He assured the House that unity and integrity of the country would be preserved at any cost.

The Motion was negatived after Shri B.D. Singh replied to the debate.

In a statement made on 4 May, 1983, regarding incidents at Patiala, Shri Sethi told the House that an altercation took place between two shopkeepers over the use of loudspeakers. Their supporters reached the spot and both the groups clashed and indulged in arson and brickbatting. It had been reported that about 28 shops were set on fire and some scooters were also damaged.

The above statement made by the Home Minister was discussed in the House on 9 May, 1983. Initiating the discussion, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy asked the Government to negotiate and not put their own personal prestige or party's interest above the nation.

Taking part in the discussion, Shri A.K. Roy stated that there was no question of compromising on the vital issue of communalism. The Government should diagnose the disease and fight it.

Replying to the discussion, which lasted for more than five hours, and in which 14 other Members* participated, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi subscribed to the view expressed by Members that communal harmony in Patiala and other parts of Punjab was in danger and assured the House that steps would be taken to restore it. The Punjab Government, he pointed out, had also banned the use of *bidi* and cigarette in the vicinity of Golden Temple.

The Minister told the House that the Sikh community or even the SGPC leadership or Sant Longowal were not in favour of Khalistan. But the demand of Khalistan was there in certain quarters and was supported by some persons who were outside the country.

As far as invitation for talks to Akali Dal leaders was concerned, the Minister informed the House that Government had taken a number of initiatives in the matter. Had the talks been continued, some solution would have been found. The Prime Minister and the Central Government, he reiterated, had always preferred a settlement by negotiations and were prepared to talk. The aim of the Government was that before any formal invitation was actually extended to Akalis for talks, the difference of opinion on the particular point, namely on water dispute and the territorial dispute, should be completely narrowed down so as to ultimately clinch the issue. Some doubts, the Minister added had been cleared and some formula had been communicated to the Akali leadership and their reaction was awaited.

Clarifying that he had not given any ultimatum, Shri Sethi renewed his appeal to the leadership of the SGPS and Sant Longowal to cooperate with the law and order authorities and hand over to them any real culprits that might be there in the Gurudwaras.

Seventh Conference of Non-Aligned Countries : On 22 March 1983, Shri Kamal Nath moved the following motion for the consideration of the House :

“This House notes with satisfaction and pride that the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries

*Members who took part in the discussion were Sarvashri Satyasadhan Chakraborty, Narain Chand Parashar, Krishan Kumar Goyal, R.L. Bhatia, Swami Indervesh, Chandrajit Yadav, Viridhi Chander Jain, R.S. Sparrow, Chitta Basu, Acharya Bhagwan Dev, Keyur Bhushan, Harikesh Bahadur and Shrimati Gurbrinder Kaur Brar and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee.

held in New Delhi has concluded its deliberations successfully. The New Delhi Summit has reinforced the unity and the international role of the non-aligned community.

This House requests the Government of India to convey its thanks and appreciation to the Heads of State and Government and leaders of various delegations who, through their presence and positive contribution, ensured the success of the Summit. It also places on record its appreciation of the work of the Indian delegation and the leadership provided by the Chairperson, Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

India has been given the responsibility of chairing the Movement. This House believes that our country will be able to discharge this responsibility in the best traditions of anti-imperialism and self-reliance of our national movement.

This House welcomes the Declaration adopted by the Summit and the "New Delhi Message", which has called for an end to the production and stockpiling of nuclear arms as also for more purposive efforts to launch a North-South dialogue, to enlarge South-South co-operation and to usher in a New International Economic Order, and believes that these have strengthened the hands of all those who stand for independence, peace, disarmament and development."

Initiating the discussion, Shri Kamal Nath said that the Summit was certain to leave its mark on contemporary history for the range and sweeps of its membership.

Participating in the discussion, Prof. Madhu Dandavate did not favour congratulating the Prime Minister and the host country in the motion. He added that he would like to congratulate all the developing countries for their participation and demonstration of their will to work for an international order based on freedom, peace and equality of nations.

Supporting the Motion, Shri C.T. Dhandapani said that the recent Non-Aligned Meet had done a commendable job. It reiterated its commitment to the establishment of a New Economic Order based on justice and equality. Shri Indrajit Gupta felt that it was the first Summit which had taken up so many issues for discussion, and everything would now depend on its follow up and implementation. Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan suggested that the motion should also include references to the roles of some other significant persons.

The discussion continued for more than five hours in which 11 other Members* took part. Intervening in the discussion, the Minister of External Affairs, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, clarified that there was no departure whatsoever from the previous Summit held in Havana in 1979 in regard to invitation extended to the Delegations either as observers or guests or as full Members.

Shri Rao reminded the House that it was not in New Delhi in 1981, but in the Havana Summit that the Diego Garcia was agreed to be kept out of declaration. The question of Indian Ocean, he added, was very complicated than what could really be described as rivalry between the two power blocks. India brought in Diego-Garcia not only as a base, which needed to be vacated, but also a part of territory belonging to some other country which required to be restituted to it. India, he said, had not abandoned the original argument that the establishment and strengthening of military bases at Diego Garcia had endangered the Sovereignty and integrity and peaceful development of Mauritius and other countries.

As regards the International Declaration, Shri Rao observed that its economic part was perhaps the most comprehensive document adopted so far in any international Conference; particularly the Non-aligned Conferences. It had received all round appreciation irrespective of the social or economic system a particular government stood for.

Referring to the question of the Centre of Science and Technology in India and the South-South dialogue, the Minister informed that this action programme had been accepted for the first time in the New Delhi Summit. It was an exercise in self-reliance. International co-operation for development, housing, education and culture, standardisation, measurement and quality control were the subjects, which had been gone into in great detail, he added.

After Shri Kamal Nath replied to the debate, the motion was adopted.

Setting up of a Commission on Centre-State Relations: Making a statement on 24 March, 1983, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi informed the House that the need for a review of the existing arrangements between the Centre and the States had been under consideration of the Government. Keeping in view the social and economic developments that had taken place over the years, such a review, she said, would take into account the importance of the unity and integrity of the country. The

*Those who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Satyasadhan Chakraborty, K.K. Tewari, B.D. Singh, R.L. Bhatia, Madhavrao Scindia, Ram Jethmalani, C.M. Stephen, Bheravadan K. Gadhavi, Abdul Samad, Ashfaq Husain and Chandrajit Yadav.

Government had accordingly decided to set up a Commission under the Chairmanship of Shri R.S. Sarkaria, retired Judge of Supreme Court. to go into these matters. The Commission, she added would examine the working of the arrangements between the Centre and the States and recommend such changes as might be appropriate within the present constitutional framework.

Price policy for foodgrains. Making a statement on 7 April, 1983, the Minister of Agriculture Rao Birendra Singh informed the House that the Government had fixed the procurement price for 1982-83 wheat crop at Rs. 151/- per quintal for fair average quality and it would be adopted by all the procurement agencies in all the States and Union Territories. Consequent on the increase in the procurement price, the Government had also decided to raise the issue price of wheat for the distribution system to Rs. 172/- per quintal, and for issues to the roller flour mills at Rs. 208/- per quintal, with effect from 15 April, 1983. The minimum support price of barley had also been fixed at Rs. 122/- per quintal for fair average quality.

Raising Half-an-Hour discussion on support price of wheat on 8 April 1983, Shri H.N. Bahugua claimed that the present support price of wheat at Rs. 151/- was inadequate. In open market, farmers were getting a much higher rate for their wheat.

Replying to the discussion, Rao Birendra Singh said that the support price was fixed at the harvesting time. It would not be profitable for the farmers if the support prices were fixed at the time of sowing, because in the meantime the prices of inputs could rise and it would not be proper for the Government to revise the price again and again. The Government, he added, had all along been trying to give better prices to the farmers.

So far as the problems of seepage, water-logging and salinity were concerned, the Minister said that steps were being taken to solve them. Farmers were also being educated in making proper use of fertilisers.

Answering questions, the minister made it clear that the government had to keep a balance between the price that was paid to the farmers and the price which the consumers had to pay. Procurement prices, he added were meant only to help primarily the small farmers who could not retain their stocks, All inputs which went into cost of production were taken into consideration by the Agricultural prices commission while recommending the prices,

Import and export policy for 1983-84 : making a statement on 15 April, 1983, the minister of commerce and of the Department of Supply, shri

Vishwanath pratap singh said that challenges of international trade as well as the essential needs of rapidly growing economy had been kept in view while formulating the Import and Export policy for 1983-84. The objectives of the policy, he added were to provide further impetus to exports; to effect all possible savings in imports; to provide support to the growth of indigenous industry; to maximize the utilisation of our major resource endowments in manpower and agriculture, the policy also made provisions for upgrading technology' particularly for export production and energy conservation

Import procedures, the Minister observed, had also been further simplified, especially to assist small-scale units and to encourage non-resident Indians for setting up industries in India. Besides, Open General Licence (OGL) for approved 100 per cent Export Oriented Units had been substantially enlarged. The ban on export of sugarcane and khandsari sugar, he added, had been lifted and those items had been placed on OGL. To harness the initiative of the private trade, export of castor oil to the general currency area had been permitted to private agencies as well.

The Minister said that import of specialised aids for physically handicapped persons would continue to be permitted liberally. Besides, applications for import of capital goods for setting up industries to rehabilitate disabled persons would be given special consideration. Import of specially designed components would be allowed for manufacture of vehicles fitted with disability controls and devices, for use by physically handicapped persons.

Concluding, the Minister expressed the hope that through the various measures proposed in the Import and Export Policy, further impetus would be given to exports, savings in imports would be effected, growth of indigenous industry assured, and the major endowments of man-power and agriculture would be fully exploited.

Launching of Satellite Launch Vehicle, SLV-3-D-2. Making a statement on 18 April, 1983, the Minister of State in the Departments of Science and Technology, Atomic Energy, Space, Electronics and Ocean Development Shri Shivraj V. Patil, informed the House that Satellite Launch Vehicle, SLV-3-D-2, with the new augmented fourth stage motor lifted off from Sriharikota Range on 17 April, 1983, and placed a 415 kg Rohini Satellite, RS-D-2, in a near-earth orbit. The performance of the launch vehicle and the injection of the satellite into the orbit was normal. The RS-D-2 Satellite, the Minister added, incorporated a 2-hand CCD Camera System with a "SMART" sensor for imaging of the land-marks and other ground features. The Satellite was expected to be in the orbit for over a year,

The successful launch of SLV-3-D-2, the Minister said, had established a firm base of Launch Vehicle Technology which would directly feed into the larger launchers currently under development. All these developments, the Minister added would help the scientists and technologists in putting in orbit satellites, which would ultimately help in studies of monsoon resources on the land and in the sea.

Conveying congratulations and good wishes to scientists, engineers, technicians, and workers, Shri Patil expressed the hope that they would keep up their endeavours in promoting scientific and technological excellence with self-reliance.

B. LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Statutory Resolution regarding disapproval of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 ; and the adoption of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Bill, and the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill.* On 21 March, 1983, moving that the Bill to amend the Delhi Administration Act, 1966, be taken into consideration, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah said that the Bill sought to replace the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983, promulgated earlier for holding elections to the Metropolitan Council of Delhi. In order to hold the elections as early as possible, the Constitution (Forty-second) Amendment Act, under which the number of the constituencies, both for the State Assemblies as well as for the Parliament had been frozen and the 1971 Census had been taken as the base till 2000 A.D., was extended to the Metropolitan Council of Delhi.

Moving that the Bill further to amend the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957, be taken for consideration, Shri Venkatasubbaiah said that it sought to replace the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983, promulgated earlier for holding the elections to the Municipal Corporation of Delhi. The Municipal Corporation, he added was superseded initially for a period of one year by the Central Government with effect from 11 April, 1980. The period of suspension was extended from time to time and the last such extension was due to expire on 10 April, 1983.

Earlier, expressing disapproval of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983, Shri N.K. Shejwalkar pointed out that the whole process of delimitation of the constituencies as per the present law could

*The Bills were introduced by the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah on 22 February, 1983,

take hardly one and a half month. He said that labourers had migrated and settled down in Delhi in large numbers during the last ten years and the Government, he added, had denied them their right to vote.

The House held a combined discussion on the Resolution and the Bills on two days viz. 21 and 22 March, 1983, in which 10 Members* participated.

Winding up the discussion, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah observed that the Government had been very consistent in holding elections at all places alike and adhered to the objectives of the Constitution. Referring to the point raised by Shri Shejwalkar, he said that the voters' list had been revised from time to time and there was no intention on the part of the Government to deny the right of franchise to any eligible voter in Delhi.

Dealing with the demand of some Members to provide statehood to the Union Territory of Delhi, the Minister informed the House that the Government was studying the matter in depth.

The Statutory Resolution regarding disapproval of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983, was negatived.

The Bills were passed.

Finance Bill, 1983 : Moving a motion for consideration of the Bill** on 27 April, 1983, the Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee stated that after taking into account the various representations received on the proposal for the disallowance in the computation of taxable profit of 2 per cent of the expenditure incurred on specified items, it was proposed to exclude expenditure on travel by rail, motor car, ship, powered craft or aircraft from the ambit of proposed disallowance. Further to avoid possible hardship to small businesses it was proposed to provide that the disallowance of 20 per cent would be made only in respect of aggregate expenditure under specified heads in excess of rupees one lakh. The Bill, he added, also sought to liberalise the provision to provide that Indian exporters would be entitled to a deduction equal to one per cent of the export turnover of the relevant year plus a further deduction in an amount

*Those who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Sudhir Kumar Giri, Chandra Pal Shailani, R.L.P. Verma, Girdhari Lal Vyas, Ramavatar Shastri, Acharya Bhagwan Dev, Harikesh Bahadur, Mool Chand Daga, Chander Pal Singh and Xavier Arakal.

**The Finance Bill, 1983 was introduced on 28 February, 1983.

equal to five per cent of the incremental export turnover the export turnover of the immediately preceding year.

To mitigate the hardship arising from the taxation of profits derived by institutions for the blind, handicapped, orphans, widows, etc. from the sale of articles made by their inmates, the Finance Minister announced that their profits would be exempted in cases where the work was mainly carried on by the beneficiaries of the institution.

As regards the trusts, Shri Mukherjee said that it was proposed to provide that assets, including equity shares, constituting the corpus of the trust, in contradistinction to the original corpus, as on 1 June, 1973, would be exempted from the proposed investment pattern, provided that such assets were donated to, and not purchased by, the trust. The relaxation would be allowed only if the trust or institution maintained separate books of account in respect of its business.

Detailing the concessions in the case of indirect taxes, the Finance Minister announced exemption of duty payable on metal containers used in specified food products, reduction of duty on aluminium strips used for welding process and liberalisation of the scheme of concessional rate of duty for small paper mills using uncoventional raw materials.

The discussion on the Bill was held on 27, 28, 29 April, and 2 May, 1983. Participating in the debate, Shri Charan Singh wanted to know the measures envisaged in the Budget for combating the increasing poverty, unemployment and disparities in income in the country. He demanded that special attention should be paid towards the victims of malnutrition. He suggested that the problem of unemployment could be solved, if the Government curbed the big industries and gave protection to the household industries.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee suggested that the non-resident Indians abroad should be given exemption and encouragement to invest their capital in India. However, their share could be limited to 2 to 3 per cent.

Shri C.T. Dhandapani was of the view that for tackling the prevailing financial and economic conditions, the Government should impose Financial Emergency in the country.

Winding up the discussion in which 31 other Members* took part, Shri Mukherjee did not agree with the contention of a Member that the

Government was deliberately making reduced allocation for agricultural sector in the plan allocations. A sizeable part of the investment in so called industrial sector, he said, was directly or indirectly linked with agricultural investment.

Defending the present taxation system, Shri Mukherjee said that with the process of industrialisation, indirect taxes were bound to increase and it was not possible to maintain parity between the indirect and direct taxes which was obtaining in the early 50s or early 60s.

Referring to the criticism of the public sector, Shri Mukherjee said that most of 85 to 87 units which were incurring losses were not established by the Government, but they were the sick units taken over by it in response to demands made by Members of Parliament.

Referring to the reports of the Economic Administrative Reforms Commission, Shri Mukherjee said that some of the reports had already been implemented through the various budgetary proposals. In regard to reforms, the Government would bring forward a comprehensive legislation incorporating the recommendations of the Commission.

As regards investment by non-resident Indians, Shri Mukherjee stated that it had been Government's policy to encourage these investments. In order to promote such investment flow, the regulation governing the terms of portfolio investment in existing companies as well as direct investment in new companies were liberalised. Referring to the apprehensions expressed by Members regarding the possibility of taking over of the established Indian companies with sound domestic managements, Shri Mukherjee clarified that it was certainly not the intention of the policy. The Financial institutions had been instructed to use their voting power to prevent any sudden take over of management of companies by those who did not reside in India.

*Those who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Somnath Chatterjee, Krishna Prakash Tewari, Dileep Singh Bhuria, Sontosh Mohan Dev, K. Ramamurthy, Narayan Choubey, Balasaheb Vikhe Patil, Chitta Basu, Tarun Gogoi, Xavier Arakal, V.S. Vijayaraghavan, Acharya Bhagwan Dev, Chandra Pal Shailani, D.P. Yadav, Satya Dev Sinha, Krishan Datt Sultanpuri, K. Lakkappa, Oscar Fernandes, Girdhari Lal Vyas, Harish Kumar Gangwar, Rajiv Gandhi, Chandrajit Yadav, P. Namgyal, N. Soundarajan, A.C. Das, Ajit Kumar Mehta, Bhiku Ram Jain, Satish Agarwal, G.M. Banatwalla, Ram Singh Yadav and Ratansinh Rajda.

The motion for consideration of the Bill was adopted by the House and the Bill, as amended, was passed.

C. THE QUESTION HOUR

In all, 36,635 notices of Questions (29, 648 Starred, 6,957 Unstarred and 30 Short Notice Questions) were received during the Session. Out of these Questions, 973 were listed as Starred and 10,975 as Unstarred. No Short Notice Question was admitted during the Session.

Daily Average of Questions : Each of the lists of Starred Questions contained 20 Questions, except those of 25 February, 1, 4, 15, 22, 23, 24, 28 and 31 March, 5, 6, 12, 18 and 20 April, 3, 5, 6 and 9 May, 1983, which contained 21 Questions each and those of 30 March, 7, 8, 22 and 28 April, 1983, 4 and 10 May, 1983 which contained 22 Questions each and those of 17 March, 13 and 15 April, 1983 which contained 23 Questions each. On an average, six Questions were orally answered daily on the floor of the House. The maximum number of Starred Questions orally answered was 9 on 6 May, 1983, and the minimum number of such Questions answered was 1 on 14 March, 1983.

Half-an-hour Discussion : In all, 127 notices, of Half-an-Hour Discussions were received during the Session. Out of these 29 notices were admitted and five were discussed on the floor of the House.

D. OBITUARY REFERENCES

During the period, obituary references were made to the passing away of Mr. Leonid Brezhnev, the President of U.S.S.R., Acharya Vinoba Bhave, father of the Sarvodaya and Bhoodan movements, Sarvashri Mahmood Hasan Khan, K. Rajamallu, and Kedar Pandey, all sitting Members and Sarvashri Dinkar Dattatraya Desai, Mohindra Kumar Ghosh, Kondaji Basappa, Chiman Lal Chakhubhai Shah, Shri Chand Goel, Bhogji Bhai, Anirudh Sinha, J.M. Imam, N.M.R. Subraman, Pilo Mody, C.D. Gautam, R. Kanakasabai, Arun Chandra Guha, V.N. Swami, A. Durairasu, R. Lakshminarasa Reddy, Jang Bahadur Singh Bisht, Babulal Tiwari, Narayan Sadoba Kajrolkar, Shrimati Yashoda Reddy, Sardar Ujjal Singh and Choudhri Suraj Mal, all ex-Members. The House paid homage to Karl Marx on the occasion of his 100th death anniversary and to the victims of unfortunate incidents in Assam. The Members stood in silence for a short while as a mark of respect to the deceased.

RAJYA SABHA

HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION*

The Rajya Sabha met for its Hundred and Twenty-Fifth Session on 18 February, 1983, and adjourned *sine die* on 25 March, 1983. Resume of some of the important discussions and other business transacted during the Session is briefly given below.

A. DISCUSSIONS

Motion of Thanks on the President's Address : On 22 February, 1983, Shri Buddha Priya Maurya, moved that an Address be presented to the President in the following terms : —

“That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 18th February, 1983”.

Speaking on the motion, the Member said that the people had inherited democracy from their great leaders but some of the political parties did not believe in democracy. They had boycotted the elections and the President's Address. He said that their action was against democracy and the Parliamentary system. It was disrespect towards the President and the Constitution.

The Member further said that it was wrong to say that the country had achieved nothing during the last 35 years. The 20-Point Programme launched by the Government had shown heartening results and it had gone a long way in the upliftment of the weaker sections of the society. While concluding, the Member said that since the attainment of independence, India had made remarkable progress in all the fields.

Intervening in the debate, the Minister of Finance and the leader of the House, Shri Pranab Mukherjee said that the Government had been able to maintain the tempo of development despite severe drought and this claim was not too much. As regards exports, the target reached till date was reasonably satisfactory. Referring to the Assam elections, the Minister said that people had accepted a system of government in which they had the right to choose their own representatives through the process of election.

*Contributed by the Research and Library Section, Rajya Sabha Secretariat.

Concluding, he urged people to create an atmosphere in which unity and integrity of the country would be strengthened.

On 1 March, 1983, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, replying to the debate* said that some Members of the Opposition were so wedded to certain concepts that they were unable to appreciate or understand any other. The first priority was, surely, the reduction in disparities leading to the ending of poverty and economic backwardness. The Address emphasised these aspects.

The Prime Minister said that some Members had commented that the average growth rate of 5 per cent of GNP in the last three years was hardly an achievement. She pointed out that index of agricultural production was 0.8 in 1977-80 and 5.9 in 1980-83 and that of industrial production was 3.1 in 1977-80 and 6.7 in 1980-83. The wholesale price index on point to point basis had been brought down from 22.2 per cent on 12 January, 1980 to 14.8 per cent on 10 January, 1981, 6.4 per cent on 16 January, 1982, and 2.8 per cent on 15 January, 1983. The rate of increase in the consumer price index was also declining. From 12.1 per cent in December 1981, it fell to 8 per cent in December, 1982. The present Government had been primarily concerned with lowering of the rate of increase in prices of essential commodities which touched all sections of the people.

Elaborate monitoring mechanism for the revised 20-Point programme had been set up. Targets for each point had been worked out at the national and also at the State and district level. The results between April 1982 and January 1983 had been quite impressive.

She further said that the rate of increase in imports was being brought down. In 1979-80 and 1980-81 the increase in imports was between 34 and 38 per cent. In 1981-82, it was brought down to 7.3 per cent. In

*Other Members who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Era Sezhiyan, Sudhakar Pandey, Jagdish Prasad Mathur, Hansraj Bhardwaj, R. Mohanarangam and Syed Rahmat Ali, Dr. Sarup Singh, Dr. Malcolm S. Adiseshian, Shrimati Saroj Khaparde, Sarvashri P. Ramamurti, Khushwant Singh, Shyam Sunder Mohapatra, Sankar Prasad Mitra, Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav, Dharam Chander Prashant, Ghulam Rasool Matto and Ram Bhagat Paswan, Dr. Rudra Pratap Singh, Sarvashri Ashwani Kumar, Shanti Tyagi, Rafique Alam, G. Swamy Naik, Ghanshyam Singh, A.G. Kulkarni, Sushil Chand Mohunta and R. Ramakrishnan, Prof. (Shrimati) Asima Chatterjee, Sarvashri Syed Shahabuddin, Ajit Kumar Sharma, Syed Ahmad Hashmi, Bhagat Ram Manhar, Madan Bhatia and B. Satyanarayan Reddy, Dr. Sankata Prasad, Sarvashri Gulam Mohi-ud-Din Shawl and Ram Pujan Patel.

1982-83 taking into account the net oil imports, the increase in total imports was likely to be around only 6 per cent. In fact, in the petroleum sector, after deducting exports, the value of net imports of crude oil and petroleum products was expected to come down by about Rs. 600 crores in 1982-83. The Government intended to reduce oil imports even further in 1983-84. It was not correct to say that domestic oil production had been neglected.

Referring to the loan from the International Monetary Fund. Shrimati Gandhi said that the borrowing from the IMF did not in any way affect the national economic policies which were laid down in Parliament. India made it very clear to the Fund authorities that it would not accept any condition which might conflict with these policies. IMF borrowing was necessary for additional foreign exchange to sustain the pace of development. The alternative was to borrow from international commercial banks which would have cost much more. The Government's aim was self-reliance and it was pursued with determination. It was not correct to imply that the debt service burden would become unmanageable, because the present Government were using these borrowings to increase the productive capacity which would expand the exports and also reduce imports.

Dealing with corruption, she said that all complaints regarding corruption were looked into and action had been taken against those—at whatever level—where it was necessary.

There was nothing wrong in loving or being proud of one's region. But if such feelings overrode concern for the Motherland, it would affect the country's unity and integrity, and it would also deprive the region itself of the many opportunities and advantages which came from belonging to a larger unit.

Referring to the Assam situation, she said that bloodshed, killings and sabotage had taken place on an unprecedented scale after the elections. All sections had been affected. Many people found it politically useful to attribute this entirely to the holding of elections. Deliberate attempts were made to paralyse the normal functioning of the State. It was unfortunate that polling was disrupted by attacking booths, snatching ballot boxes etc. The situation was too heart-rending and tense. This was the time for calm and collective thinking, for understanding and reconciliation. There was no problem on earth which could not be solved through discussions.

Communalism was a blot on India. It must be rooted out and this needed not only administrative steps but a concerted effort by all those who had the true interests of the country at heart.

Various legislative and administrative measures had been taken for the protection of women and for their advancement. Others were under consideration. The suggestions of the Joint Committee of Parliament were under Government's examination. But the problem of women was much more complex. Laws were not enough. It needed nothing short of a complete change in the thinking of men and of women themselves.

The Soviet Union had shown understanding and had stood by India in times of need. Non-alignment did not mean non-acknowledgment of friendship. India had never allowed friendship and cooperation or for that matter disagreement and hostility, to come in the way of her independence or assessment of international or national issues or of pursuing its own direction. India's policy was to protect and promote her national interests.

Concluding, the Prime Minister said that in less than a week New Delhi would host the largest ever gathering of Heads of States Governments of Non-aligned countries. This was a great honour for India. The Conference posted an enormous challenge which had been accepted because of India's firm commitment to the cause of non-alignment. The summit was especially significant in the current troubled international situation. It was hoped that its deliberations would make some contribution to the solution of the problems of peace, disarmament and development. Cooperation amongst the developing countries would enable them to work together for a more just, economic and social order.

All the amendments moved were negatived and the Motion of Thanks as originally moved, was adopted.

The Budget (Railways) 1983-84 : On 2 March, 1983, Shri Sadashiv Bagaitkar, initiating the discussion on Railway Budget, said that this Budget was going to lead to a further deterioration in the condition of railways in the country. The Railway Finance Commissioner had stated in the press conference after the presentation of the Budget that the increase in railway freight and fares was deflationary. One wondered as to how this increase was going to lead to deflection when the railways were on the verge of bankruptcy.

He observed that inefficiency, pilferage and mismanagement in railways was on the increase. The Member further added that the Railway Reforms Committee had also observed that there had been no remarkable improvement in the working of the railways during the last ten years.

On 15 March, 1983, the Minister of Railways, Shri A.B.A. Ghani Khan Chaudhuri replying to the debate* said that the railways had been complimented for the marvellous job they did on the freight front. Referring to the concern expressed by some Members about the deterioration in passenger traffic he stated that due to some financial constraints same obligation towards the passengers amenities could not be fulfilled. He added that Government did not subscribe to the concept of passenger oriented or goods oriented services which were like the two sides of the same coin. Government had implemented, by and large, the recommendations of the National Transport Policy Committee, the Rail Tariff Enquiry Committee, the Railway Reforms Committee with appropriate modifications in increasing passenger fares, freight rates and season ticket rates. The hike was essential to generate resources to arrange for renewal and replacement of assets by increasing the contribution to the Depreciation Reserve Fund.

Railways had not made any discrimination between different States. Higher allocation had to be given to the projects which were already in hand. If all the projects were to be completed, Rs. 870 crores would be required, but only Rs. 70 crores could be allotted for the purpose. If all the demands for conversion of tracks were to be met then Rs. 600 crores would be needed. But it had been possible to allocate only Rs. 50 crores for this purpose.

As regards the corruption in railways, he observed that the Minister and his Ministry alone could not control the corrupt practices. He sought cooperation from all Members in this respect.

The Budget (General) 1983-84. On 16 March, 1983, initiating the discussion on the General Budget for the year, 1983-84, Shri R.R. Morarka said that the Finance Minister had done some window dressing. Though 100 per cent of the Plan allocation had been spent, less than 50 per cent of the

*Other Members who took part in the discussion were ; Shri C.K. Jaffar Sharief, Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways, Sarvashri P.N. Sukul and Sukomal Sen, Shrimati Usha Malhotra, Shri Hari Shankar Bhabhra, Dr. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah, Sarvashri V.C. Kesava Rao, U.R. Krishnan, Ramchandra Bharadwaj, Harekrishna Malick and Ghulam Rasool Matto, Dr. Rafiq Zakario, Shri Ram Naresh Kushwaha, Prof. (Shrimati) Asima Chatterjee, Shri Ramanand Yadav, Prof. Surendra Bhattacharjee, Shrimati Ratan Kumari, Sarvashri K. Hanumanthappa, Surendra Mohan and Narendra Singh, Shrimati Saroj Khaparde, Sarvashri S.W. Dhabe, Syed Ahmed Hashmi, Sat Paul Mittal, Lakhan Singh, Santosh Kumar Sahu, R. Mohanarangam, Dhuleshwar meena, M.M. Jacob, V. Gopalsamy, Vishvajit Prithwijit Singh, Krishna Mohan Bhamidipati, B.C. Pattanayak, Jagadish Jani. Khushwant Singh, and Suraj Prasad, Shrimati Monika Das, Sarvasri Ghan Shyam Singh, B. Satyanarayan Reddy, B. Ibrahim, Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav, Ram Bhagat Paswan, Gulam Mohi-ud-Din Shawl, Ram Pujan Patel and Hashim Raza Abidi Allahabadi.

targets had been realised. He requested the Finance Minister to consider the whole gamut of the plan implementation more carefully. He said that he had written a letter requesting the Prime Minister to appoint a Parliamentary Committee analogous to the PAC or the PUC only for the purpose of supervising and monitoring the implementation of the Plan without any executive power. The Finance Minister had, after considering it, found it unacceptable at the moment. He requested him to reconsider the proposal. He further said that while there was very little scope for reducing the Non-Plan expenditure, there was ample scope for reducing the Plan Expenditure.

On 22 March, 1983, the Minister of Finance Shri Pranab Mukherjee replying to the discussion*, said that he had received more bouquets than brickbats from the initiator of the discussion. The Minister pointed out that the Budget was not directionless. The objective was to provide a direction through the Budget proposals ; and to provide incentive for saving, incentive for investment and to provide disincentive for spending and to create a situation where ostentatious expenditure was reduced.

The second objective of his proposals was to protect the plan size. Despite drought, the Government had been able to maintain a minimum level of growth which was positive. In 1982-83, the Government had increased the allocation in the Plan by 27 per cent. This year also, there was a step up in the Central Plan outlay to the extent of 26.1 per cent. The direction was to provide a sizeable allocation for planning.

The Minister justified a liberalised import policy with respect to technology, raw materials, spares and components on the ground that it could expand the production base and reduce the country's dependence on imports.

*Other Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri K.C. Pant, Harkishan Singh Surjeet, G.C. Bhattacharya and J.K. Jain Dr. Bhai Mahavir, Shrimati Usha Malhotra, Shri Rameshwar Singh, Shrimati Pratibha Singh, Dr. Rudra Pratap Singh. Dr. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah, Sarvashri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare and Ghanshyambhai Oza, Shrimati Saroj Khaparde, Sarvashri Nirmal Chatterjee, R. Ramakrishnan and Hayat Ulla Ansari, Dr. (Shrimati) Najma Heptulla, Sarvashri Sankar Prasad Mitra, Harvendra Singh Hanspal, Indradeep Singh, T. Aliba Imti, Shanti Tyagi and Dinkarrao Govindrao Patil, Dr. Shanti G. Patel, Sarvashri D. Heerachand, Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav, G. Swamy Naik, V.N. Tiwari, B. Ibrahim, S.W. Dhabe, Krishna Nand Joshi and L. Ganesan, Shrimati Vijaya Raje Scindia, Sarvashri Krishna Mohan Bhamidipati, Bijoy Krishna Handique, Syed Sibtey Razi and Alexander Warjri, Shrimati Monika Das, Sarvashri Suresh Kalmadi and K. Gopalan, Prof. Sourendra Bhattaeharjee and Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi.

A question had been raised about the propriety of resorting to extra-budgetary resource mobilisation. He admitted that the Government had done it, but it was not correct to say that these were not subject to the scrutiny of Parliament.

Situation in Assam. On 21 February, 1983, making a statement on the subject, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi, said that the recent happenings in Assam in the last few days had caused deep anguish.

The immediate task before the Government was to render all possible assistance in this hour of distress to the affected families. This was being attended to with utmost expedition. Medical relief and other supplies had been rushed. Government would do whatever was required for their relief and rehabilitation, the Minister stated.

Government had spared no effort to find a satisfactory solution of the vexed problem of foreigners in Assam. In this endeavour apart from consultation with the opposition from time to time, seven rounds of tripartite talks had been held. When the last round of tripartite talks held in January, 1983 had failed to resolve the deadlock, the Prime Minister met the leaders of the Opposition on 5 January, 1983 and apprised them of the position. In the absence of unanimity amongst the Opposition parties regarding extension of President's rule through an amendment of the Constitution, the only alternative for extending President's rule which was to end by 18 March, 1983 was by taking recourse to clause (5) of Article 356 of the Constitution. The Government was not in favour of such a step, the Minister told the House.

On 22 February, 1983, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi, replying to the discussion, said that a demand had been made by a Member that the parties who did not support the Constitution Amendment should be named. There was no need to name the parties as they were well known, he said.

As far as the deportation of foreign persons from Assam was concerned, the Government was committed to it and whether a settlement was arrived at or not, the Government on its own would appoint tribunals, for the purpose, he assured the House.

The Government wanted to solve the Assam tangle and would take the help of all the Opposition parties and leaders to resolve the situation in Assam. As for the sending of a delegation there, certainly some parties could go from the National Integration Council or some other such organisation for finding a solution to the problem, the Minister concluded.

Situation in Punjab. On 4 March, 1983, Shri Harkishan Singh Surjeet called the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the situation in Punjab.

Making a statement on the subject, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah, said that the Government had been making earnest efforts to consider and find a solution to the demands of the Shiromani Akali Dal. Extensive discussions had been held with representatives of the Shiromani Akali Dal. In the last few rounds of discussions, the leaders of Opposition Parties in Parliament as well as the Chief Ministers and Opposition leaders of Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan had been associated.

The Minister expressed his thanks to the leaders of the Opposition in Parliament for their participation and their valuable contribution to the tripartite talks.

He further stated that the Government had always been sympathetic to the sentiments and interests of all communities. It would be appreciated that solutions to any demands and grievances had to be found keeping in mind the larger national interests, he said. The Government had accepted the religious demands of the Sikh community.

Concluding, the Minister said that the Government believed in resolving problems through negotiations, but the solution of one problem should not give rise to other problems.

B. LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 and the Motion for consideration of The Delhi Administration (Amendment) Bill, 1983 and Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 and the Motion for consideration of The Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1983** : On 24 March, 1983, Shri Jagdish Prasad Mathur moved the following Resolutions :

“That this House disapproves the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 (No. 1 of 1983) promulgated by the President on the 2nd January, 1983.”

Speaking on the Resolution, the Member said that it had now become only an academic discussion because the Government had already done what it wanted to do. Elections for the Metropolitan Council in Delhi

*The Bills, as passed by Lok Sabha, were laid on the table of the House on 22nd March, 1983.

were conducted on the basis of old electoral lists. The Election Commission should have done the delimitation of constituencies and revised the voters' lists before conducting the elections. He wanted to know whether the Government was willing to accord Statehood to Delhi.

On the same day, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah, moving the motion for consideration of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Bill, 1983, said that through amendment made by the Constitution (Forty-second) Amendment Act, it was provided that elections to State Assemblies and the House of the People and the reservations of seats for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in those bodies would continue to be on the basis of population ascertained at the 1971 Census till the first census was taken after the year 2000 A.D. A similar amendment was not, however, made in the Delhi Administration Act, 1966. If the Metropolitan Council constituencies were to be delimited afresh and the number of seats to be reserved for the Scheduled Castes in the Council were to be redetermined on the basis of population ascertained at the 1981 census, it would not have been possible to hold elections to the Metropolitan Council for another five to seven months. It was, therefore, decided to amend the Delhi Administration Act, 1966 to bring it in line with the provisions of the Constitution and enable the holding of elections to the Metropolitan Council on the basis of population figures ascertained at the 1971 census or in other words on the basis of the constituencies delimited after the 1971 census. Accordingly, the necessary amendments were made by promulgating the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983. This Bill sought to replace the Ordinance, the Minister stated.

On the same day, Shri Jagannathrao Joshi moved the following Resolution :

“That this House disapproves the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 (No. 2 of 1983) promulgated by the President on the 2nd January, 1983.”

Speaking on the Resolution, the Member said that the Constitution amendment referred to by the Minister did not apply to Municipal Corporation of Delhi. Elections for Municipal Corporation of Delhi should have been conducted after delimitation of Constituencies and revision of electoral rolls, because many voters could not find their names in the voter lists.

On the same day, Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah, moving the motion for consideration of the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1983, said that the Delhi Municipal Corporation was superseded for a period of

one year by the Central Government under Section 490(1) of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 with effect from 11 April, 1980 because in the opinion of the Central Government the Corporation had persistently made default in the performance of its duties, had abused its powers and was not competent to perform the duties imposed on it. The period of supersession was extended from time to time and the last such extension was due to expire on 10 April, 1983. The reasons which prevailed with the Government in promulgating the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983, also applied to the promulgation of the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.

Shri Jagdish Prasad Mathur, replying to the debate on his Resolution, said that the Minister should give an assurance that if Delhi was given a status of a State, the Delhi Metropolitan Council would be dissolved and fresh elections would be ordered for Vidhan Sabha. The Metropolitan Council should not be transformed into State Assembly.

Shri Jagannath Rao Joshi, replying to the debate on his Resolution, said that the Minister should clarify as to why it became necessary to hold elections for the Delhi Municipal Corporation and the Delhi Metropolitan Council immediately.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah, replying to the debate* on the Bills, said that as regards the criticism that Government had no business to hold the elections by bringing an Ordinance, the Presidential Order superseding the Metropolitan Council would have ended by the 10 April, 1983 and Government did not want to extend the time further. Same was the case with the Municipal Corporation. In all the democracies it was the prerogative of the ruling party to time the elections. The Government could not wait till Opposition parties were ensured of their victory in the elections. The State Assemblies and the Parliament were being governed by the Forty-Second Amendment Act of the Constitution under which the delimitation had been made on the basis of 1971 Census and the population had been freezed till 2,000 A.D. Whatever principle had been applied to the State Assemblies and Parliament had been applied to the Metropolitan Council.

As regards the holding of elections to the Municipal Corporation alongwith the Metropolitan Council, the Minister said that the important consideration was that the Government did not want the people of Delhi to be subjected to the possibility of participating in two elections at different times. The Government had brought forward the Bills only to fulfil the Constitutional requirements, the Minister assured the House.

*Other Members who took part in the discussion were : Shrimati Kanak Mukherjee, Sarvashri Shiva Chandra Jha, Shridhar Wasudeo Dhabe and Ghulam Rasool Matto,

The Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 and the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 were negatived. The motion for consideration of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Bill, 1983 and the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1983 were adopted. The Bills were passed.

C. THE QUESTION HOUR

During the Session, 5866 notices of Questions (5407 Starred and 459 Unstarred) and 5 Short Notice Questions were received. Out of this total, 392 were admitted as Starred Questions and 2865 as Unstarred Questions. No. Short Notice Question was admitted.

Daily average of Questions : Each list of Starred Questions contained 18 to 20 Questions. On an average 4 Questions were orally answered on the floor of the House, per sitting. The maximum number of Questions answered orally was 6 on 14 and 25 March, 1983 and the minimum number of Questions orally answered was 3 on 21, 22 and 24 February, 1983, and 2, 3, 4, 17, 18 and 21 March, 1983.

The maximum and minimum number of Questions included in the Unstarred Question List was 200 on 14 March, 1983 and 98 on 23 February, 1983 respectively and the average number of Questions in the Unstarred list came to 143.

Half-an-Hour Discussion. In all 29 notices of Half-an-Hour Discussion were received during the Session. Out of these only 2 notices were admitted and discussed in the House.

D. OBITUARY REFERENCES

During the Session, the Chairman made references to the passing away of Mr. Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, President of U.S.S.R., Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Shri Pilo Mody, sitting Member, Shrimati Yashoda Reddy, Sarvashri Mahendra Mohan Chaudhury, C.K. Daphtary, and B.T. Kemparaj, all ex-Members and also paid homage to Karl Marx on the occasion of his 100th death anniversary and to the victims of unfortunate incidents in Assam. The Members stood in silence for a short while as a mark of respect to the deceased.

*The Bills, as passed by the Lok Sabha, were laid on the Table of the House on 22 March, 1983.

**LEGISLATURES OF STATES AND UNION
TERRITORIES STATES**

ANDHRA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY*

The Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly met from 17 to 21 January, 1983, for its First Session and from 9 to 24 March, 1983 for its Second Session.

Resolution on Prohibition of defections from political parties by the Members of the Legislature : On 23 March, 1983, the Assembly adopted the following Resolution moved by the Chief Minister, Shri N.T. Rama Rao :

“Whereas, it is the considered view of this Assembly that the matter relating to ‘prohibition of defections from political parties by the members of the State Legislature’ should be regulated by Parliament by law under sub-clause (e) of clause (1) of article 191 of the Constitution of India, in the interests of effective functioning of democracy on sound lines :

Now therefore, this Assembly resolves that a law providing for matters connected with the prohibition of defections from political parties by the members of the State Legislature be made by Parliament immediately.”

Resolution regarding the abolition of the Legislative Council : On 24 March, 1983, the Chief Minister also moved the following Resolution which was subsequently adopted by the Assembly :

“The Legislative Assembly of the State of Andhra Pradesh resolves that the Legislative Council of the State be abolished”.

BIHAR VIDHAN SABHA**

The Vidhan Sabha met from 16 December, 1982 to 11 January, 1983 for its Eighth Session and from 10 March, 1983 to 22 March, 1983, for its Ninth Session.

Governor’s Address : On 10 March, 1983, the Governor of the State addressed the Members of both the Houses of the Legislature. A Motion of Thanks to the Address was moved on 14 March, 1983. The House discussed the address for three days on 14, 15 and 16 March, 1983, and adopted the Motion of Thanks.

Ratification of the Constitution (Forty-Sixth) Amendment Bill, 1982 : On 10 January, 1983, the Assembly adopted the Resolution regarding the

*Contributed by the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly Secretariat,

**Contributed by the Bihar Vidhan Sabha Secretariat.

ratification of the amendments to the Constitution of India falling within the purview of the proviso to clause (2) of Article 368 thereof, proposed to be made by the Constitution (Forty-Sixth) Amendment Bill, 1982, as passed by the two Houses of Parliament.

Financial Business: The Chief Minister and the Finance Minister, Dr. Jagannath Mishra, presented the second Supplementary Budget for the year 1982-83 on 10 March, 1983. The relevant Demands for Grants and the relative Appropriation Bill were discussed and passed on 21 March, 1983.

Shri Mishra also presented the Budget for the year 1983-84 on 11 March, 1983, and thereafter, he introduced the Bihar Finance Bill, 1983. On 17 March, 1983, a copy of the Vote-on-Account authorising the Government to meet out the expenditure of various Department for a period of four months *i.e.* from 1 April to 31 July, 1983, was presented to the House and Motion for granting the amount was moved and passed. Thereafter, the related Appropriation Bill was introduced, considered and passed after discussion on the same day. The Bihar Finance Bill, 1983, was passed on 22 March 1983.

Question Hour: During the Ninth Session, 2,427 notices of Questions was received. Out of them 1,702 Questions—979 Starred, 663 Unstarred and 60 Short Notice Questions—were admitted.

HARYANA VIDHAN SABHA*

The Session of the Haryana Vidhan Sabha commenced on 7 March, 1983, and concluded (was adjourned *sine die*) on 25 March, 1983.

Resolution regarding Seventh Non-Aligned Meet: On 9 March, 1983, the Vidhan Sabha adopted the following Resolution moved by the Chief Minister, Shri Bhajan Lal :

“This House extends its heartiest welcome and most warm greetings to the galaxy of distinguished Heads of States and other esteemed delegates from 101 countries who are participating in the Seventh Non-aligned Meet at New Delhi.

It is a matter of great honour for the country that our Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi, has been unanimously chosen as the Chairman of the Non-aligned Meet. Every Indian has reason to feel proud at this great honour which has been bestowed on our country. This House conveys its heartiest congratulations to Smt. Indira Gandhi.

*Contributed by the Haryana Vidhan Sabha Secretariat.

Our ancient land has a great tradition of peace and amity. We have constantly followed a path of peace, prosperity and goodwill for all. In our own times, Mahatma Gandhi was one of the greatest apostles of peace. Independent India's first Prime Minister, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the founding fathers of the Non-aligned Movement. It is only befitting that this great assembly should take place in New Delhi.

It is the fervent hope of this House that the Non-aligned Meet will usher an era of peace and greater economic cooperation amongst the participating countries."

KARNATAKA LEGISLATURE*

The Karnataka Legislative Assembly met from 24 January to 25 January, 1983 and later for another Session from 10 March to 31 March, 1983. The Karnataka Legislative Council also met twice, first on 24 January, 1983 and later from 10 March to 2 April, 1983.

Resolution on the death centenary of Karl Marx : On 21 March, 1983, the Legislative Assembly adopted the following Resolution :

"This House places on record a deep sense of appreciation of the invaluable services rendered to humanity by Karl Marx, a great thinker and founder of scientific socialism, on the 100th anniversary".

On 23 March, 1983, a motion on the lines of the above Resolution was also adopted by the Legislative Council.

MADHYA PRADESH VIDHAN SABHA†

The Sixth Session of the Vidhan Sabha commenced on 20 September, 1982, and concluded on 6 October, 1982. The Vidhan Sabha also met for its Seventh Session from 13 to 22 December, 1982.

Financial Business : The Deputy Chief Minister and Finance Minister, Shri Shiv Bhanu Solanki, presented Supplementary Estimates for the year 1982-83, which were Voted on 27 September, 1982, and the relative Appropriation Bill was introduced and passed on the same day. Shri Solanki also presented the Second Supplementary Estimates for the year 1982-83 which were voted on 16 December, 1982, and the relative Appropriation Bill was passed on the same day.

NAGALAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY††

The First Session of the Fifth Legislative Assembly commenced on 29 November, 1982, and came to an end on the same day.

Governor's Address : The Governor of the State addressed the Members of the Legislative Assembly on 29 November, 1983. Subsequently,

*Contributed by the Karnataka Legislature Secretariat.

†Contributed by the Madhya Pradesh Vidhan Sabha Secretariat.

††Contributed by the Nagaland Legislative Assembly Secretariat.

a Motion of Thanks to the Address was moved, discussed and adopted by the House.

PUNJAB LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY*

The Session of the Assembly commenced on 7 March, 1983, and ended on 26 March, 1983.

Resolution regarding the Seventh Non-Aligned Summit : On 8 March, 1983, the Legislative Assembly adopted the following Resolution :

“This House expresses its warm greetings to the distinguished Heads of the States and other esteemed Delegates from 101 countries of four continents, who have assembled at New Delhi, to attend the Seventh Non-aligned Summit.

It is a matter of great pride that the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, has been unanimously elected as Chairman of the Summit, for which this House heartily congratulates her. This is a befitting honour to India, and a tribute to the policies of peace laid down by the first Prime Minister of India, late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, which have been ably continued by Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

This House hails the Non-aligned movement as the single largest force of world peace against imperialism, colonialism and Neo-Colonialism and wish the summit all success.”

SIKKIM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY†

The Budget Session of the Assembly commenced on 15 March, 1983 and concluded on 22 March, 1983.

Governor's Address : The Governor of the State addressed the Members of the Legislative Assembly on 15 March, 1983. On the same day, a Motion of Thanks to the Address was moved by the Chief Minister. On 17 March, 1983, the motion was discussed and adopted by the House.

Financial Business : On 16 March, 1983, the Chief Minister and the Finance Minister, Shri N.B. Bhandari, presented the Budget. The Budget was discussed for three days from 18 March, 1983, onwards and was passed by the House on 21 March, 1983. The relative Appropriation Bill was also passed by the House.

Obituary References : During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of Sarvashri Martam Topden and P.B. Khati, ex-Members of the erstwhile Sikkim Council. The Members observed silence for two minutes as a mark of respect to the departed souls.

*Contributed by the Punjab Legislative Assembly Secretariat.

†Contributed by the Sikkim Legislative Assembly Secretariat.

TRIPURA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY*

The Session of the Assembly commenced on 9 February, 1983 and concluded on 16 February, 1983.

Governor's Address: The Governor of the State addressed the Members of the Legislative Assembly on 9 February, 1983. A Motion of Thanks to the Address was moved, discussed, and adopted by the House on 11 February, 1983.

Financial Business: During the Session, the Assembly passed the Supplementary Budget for the year 1982-83 and the Vote-on-Account for meeting the expenditure for a period of six months. Necessary Appropriation Bills were also passed by the House.

Legislative Business: The House passed the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of the Legislative Assembly (Tripura) (Third Amendment) Bill, 1983. The Bill provides for payment of pension to the Members in addition to the political sufferer pension, being received by them from other sources separately. The Salary and Allowances of Ministers (Tripura) (Second Amendment) Bill, 1983, making provision for salary and allowances of Deputy Chief Minister, was also adopted by the House.

UNION TERRITORIES

MIZORAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY†

The 11th Session (Budget Session) of the Third Mizoram Legislative Assembly commenced on 16 March, 1983, and concluded on 28 March, 1983.

Administrator's Address: The Administrator of the Union Territory addressed the Members of the Legislative Assembly on 16 March, 1983. A Motion of Thanks to the Address was moved and discussed on 17 and 18 March, 1983, and it was adopted by the House.

Financial Business: The Minister of Finance, Shri Pu Lalhming-thanga, presented the Supplementary Demands for 1982-83 and Annual Budget for the year 1983-84 on 18 March, 1983. Discussion and voting on Supplementary Demands for the year 1982-83 were held on 21 March, 1983, and the relative Appropriation Bill was introduced, considered and passed on the same day. General discussion on the Budget for the year 1983-84 was held for two days on 21 and 22 March, 1983. The Demands for Grants

*Contributed by the Tripura Legislative Assembly Secretariat.

†Contributed by the Mizoram Legislative Assembly Secretariat.

were discussed for three days viz. 23, 24 and 28 March, 1983, and voted. The relative Appropriation Bill was introduced, considered, and passed on 28 March, 1983.

Obituary References : During the Session, obituary references were made to the passing away of Shri Pилоo Mody, Member of Parliament, and Shri Noke Konyak, Member of Nagaland Legislative Assembly. The Members stood in silence for a short while as a mark of respect to the departed souls.

BOOK REVIEW

JAPAN : DIVIDED POLITICS IN A GROWTH ECONOMY

By J.A.A. Stockwin. Published by Weidenfeld and

London, 1982, XIV, 333 pages.

The book under review encompassing a study of Japanese politics and government—fully revised and updated since its first appearance seven years ago—has not come a day too soon. With the focus once again on far-reaching political developments in Japan, the author's (a specialist on contemporary Japan) conclusions of Japan being "a seriously divided polity" but in which "consensus and conflict are not mutually incompatible" (p. 25), are as relevant as ever. These contradictions of the Japanese system and the paradoxical pressures arising therefrom were highlighted once again following the recently concluded local elections in the country. Despite the ruling Liberal Democratic Party's (LDP) overwhelmingly dominant successes in the local elections, its key losses of governorships (though it retained control of the Assemblies in these two prefectures) in the constituencies of Fukuoka and Hokkaido gave rise to the forebodings of "alarming" and "truly regrettable" developments. Even the *Asahi Shimbun* termed the election verdict as a "stinging blow" for Nakasone, the Prime Minister, and saw in it "the clear signals of the electorate's desire to see the political tide change." This was largely [because of the subjective world of Japanese politics ; the people, the Press and the politicians wanted to highlight what they had consistently stated, that Nakasone's defence posture and domestic alignment with former Premier Tanaka were highly unpopular. They also wanted to pressurize Nakasone not to follow entirely in what Tanaka desired—a quick general election before the conclusion of the Lockheed Scandal trial in which the latter is indicted, so as to cash in on the present massive successes of the party. Thus, despite the overwhelming statistical evidence in his favour (the LDP in winning 1,386 seats had many more local Assembly seats than all other political parties combined prior to this election), Nakasone could not but carefully interpret the subjective pressures of the Japanese people and the Press through their assertion describing these local elections as a "setback."

Coming back to the present work, one notes that the author has drawn an intelligent balance between institutional descriptions and the

political processes of government, both in historical perspective and their contemporary relevance, to highlight the concept of a divided polity in which conflict and divisions abound, "but consensus is laboriously reached or solutions imposed." (p. 5), Chapters 2, 3, and 4 discuss the historical and social backgrounds to contemporary politics and the problem-bound legacies of American Occupation.

Stockwin believes that this distinctive conflict and consensus feature of the Japanese political world that runs through the entire length of the period of the Meiji Restoration, beginning in 1868, through the 1930s when the Armed Forces played a commanding role in the affairs of state, the wartime period of the 1940s, the Occupation of the 1950s and 1960s, to the present, was founded in the perceptions of *status quo*. This was the outcome of peace in the Tokugawa period after centuries of recurrent civil war when the Japanese people were "by deliberate government policy virtually isolated from contact with the outside world, frozen socially into rigid social strata and governed, much like the feudal societies of Europe in the Middle Ages, by local *han* (clans) which were self-supporting and self-governing but owed allegiance to the Central Government." (p. 11) Then again in the Meiji period, even though they (Meijis) proclaimed "the necessity of bringing Japan into the modern world through a crash programme of westernizing reforms," their Constitution was an ambiguous document which "failed to guide the course of social and economic change along a path of either liberalism or political stability." The guiding principle of the 1947 Constitution, imposed on the defeated administration, was also continuity through a stable government and an economy consistent with the aim of economic growth. Thus, neither constitutional arrangement ushered in any massive shift in political outlook as was promised, concentrating on the underlying current of continuity. The result was that outside the central decision-making orbit there was a continued play of opposing political forces.

Contributing to the continuity of this special feature of Japanese politics and affecting the whole nature of decision-making were the social and cultural norms (recognisably Japanese) of group cohesiveness and local loyalties. "Neither the dynamism of the Japanese economy, nor the persistent fragmentation of political life into cliques and factions," Stockwin reiterates, "can be properly understood without an awareness of the social context (including an appreciation of the extent to which it is changing)." (p. 8)

Since the Meiji period, the Japanese Governments have been able to mobilize the group cohesiveness and dedication to the achievement of group

goals. In this way, they have succeeded in channelling the energies of a highly motivated society along constructive paths. At the same time the relative stability and effectiveness of political institutions was instrumental both in mobilizing the integrative and in minimizing the politically disruptive implications of group-centered social norms. (p. 40)

The second part of the book amplifies the concept of unresolved differences (Chapter 5 chronicles developments in post-war politics), the deep political divisions within the polity on fundamental political issues (Chapters 10-12 concentrate on foreign and defence policy issues, domestic developments and problems arising out of the Constitution), even as Japan emerged as a first rank economic power consequent to the continued success of the single conservative party (Chapters 6-8 analyze the working of the Parliament, parliamentary elections and the Ruling Liberal Democratic Party) to prevent political divisions from getting out of hand (Chapter 9 studies the politics of the Opposition).

Divisions in policies of defence and foreign affairs, according to Stockwin, were the most significant. In the sphere of defence, "the lines of division are not simply between a militarist government and a pacifist Opposition. Differences between both camps are substantial and involve rival interpretations of national interest as well as pacifism and anti-nuclear feeling versus realistic views on defence." (p. 472) Its division ridden foreign policy has resulted in Japan coming under attack in the United States Senate in the form of the so-called "reciprocity bills," the European Community calling for consultations under Article XXIII of the GATT, it being accused of unfair trade practices especially in terms of the accessibility of the Japanese market, the fact that it is not integrated into the international economy despite enjoying the benefits of the system and that it not only gives little in return but instead carries serious problems. Of course every nation is entitled to its foreign policy which undoubtedly is a reflection of its own circumstances, but no other country has the peculiarities as they are in Japan. Stockwin has highlighted these peculiarities—the deep political divisions beneath the surface.

At the domestic level of politics these contradictions have been highlighted, stressing the social and ideological tensions arising therefrom, by focussing on issues of local government and education. On both these issues continued LDP rule and the dominance of the government bureaucracy under it indicated that, "statist concepts of government have been pitted against ideas of democratic pluralism stemming from the Occupation," (p. 272)

In the field of local government, attempts to regain the centralizing control of Japanese governments since the Meiji Restoration (by reconstituting the Local Autonomy Ministry with total powers over education and the police) from the progressive local authorities which had arisen following radical decentralization introduced by American Occupation, led to continuing political clashes. However, their dependence on central government funds made it difficult for them to play any other than a subordinate role.

In education, the extent and nature of Government LDP Control (over the controversial issue of textbooks and administrative control of Universities) was a just cause of conflict; it was regarded as dangerous and undemocratic by its opponents. After initial problems in the 1960s and 1970s with the unions and the Universities, the revived attempts at textbook control in 1981 and 1982, so as to eliminate its biased contents, have once again revived conflicts.

Another important factor at the root of Japan's divided polity at the domestic level is the nation's basic law—the Constitution of 1947, since revision is extremely difficult and is hardly to be expected in the foreseeable future, lack of agreement about it, particularly within the LDP, is understandable.

In this way, Stockwin has demolished the prevailing Western image of a "consensus society," a homogeneous nation begetting a unique degree of harmony concomitant of the world's third fastest growing economy. In fact, these contradictions, as already indicated, are more marked than ever as the country is on the threshold of the eighties.

In the ultimate analysis one may conclude that Stockwin's study is indeed a well-researched and documented work of political institutions and governmental processes of a country which, because it believed that foreign influences of any kind were highly destabilizing and therefore should be kept to the minimum, until very recently had studies that presented distorted versions of the system. His specific focus on the tensions between stability and instability, cohesion and division between economic growth and stable conservative government on the one hand and fundamental political division on the other, is an indispensable guide not only to students and teachers of Japanese Government and politics, but to all those engaged in studying modern political systems. In highlighting the central paradoxes of the Japanese political system, with specific instances, which have enabled Japanese Governments since the American Occupation to preside over the

world's fastest growing economy with continuous conservative rule, Stockwin has enabled readers to understand the possible future lines of economic, defence and foreign policies.

Nevertheless there are a few shortcomings in the study which could have been attended to when bringing out this revised and updated version. In his analysis, Stockwin has throughout concentrated on the role of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party in Japanese politics ; it would have been well and would certainly have facilitated a better understanding if some attention had also been devoted to the politics of both the extreme left and the recently militant resurgence of the right. This would certainly have set into better focus the role of the Ruling Party and Government. However, this is not to detract from the worthiness of this study, which is a valuable addition to the library of Japanese literature as also to that of contemporary modern political institutions.

—B.R. BHAGAT

RECENT LITERATURE OF PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST

I. BOOKS

Balbir Singh : *State Politics in India ; Explorations in Political Processes in Jammu and Kashmir*. New Delhi, MacMillan, India, 1982.

Basu, Sajal : *Politics of Violence : A Case Study of West Bengal*. Calcutta, Minerva Associates, 1982.

Beer, Samuel H. : *Modern British Politics ; Parties and Pressure Groups in the Collectivist Age*. London, Faber and Faber, 1982.

Benn, Tony : *Parliament, People and Power ; Agenda for a Free Society*. London, Verso, 1982.

Bobbit, Philip : *Constitutional Fate ; Theory of the Constitution*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1982.

Burnhem, Walter Dean : *The Current Crises in American Politics*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1982.

Hari Ram : *Special Status in Indian Federation ; Jammu and Kashmir*. Delhi, Seema Publications, 1983.

Jha, Prabodh Kumar : *Federal Finance in Developing India*, Delhi, Capital Publishing House, 1983.

Kohli, A.B. : *Council of Ministers in India, 1947-1982*. New Delhi, Gitanjali Publishing, House 1983.

Mahajan, Sneh, : *Imperialist Strategy and Moderate Policies ; Indian Legislature at Work, 1909-1920*. Delhi, Chanakya Publications, 1983.

Pai Panandiker, V.A. and Sood, Arun : *Changing Political Representation in India*. New Delhi, Uppal Publishing House, 1983.

Powell, G. Bingham : *Contemporary Democracies Participation, Stability and Violence*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1982.

Sankhdher, M.M. : *Framework of Indian Politics*. New Delhi, Gitanjali Publishing House, 1983.

Satyamurti, T.V. : *Nationalism in the Contemporary World ; Political and Sociological Perspectives*, London, France Pinter (Publishers), 1983.

Satyanarayana, P, and Surya Narayana Rao, T. ; *Perspectives on National Integration*. Hyderabad, Prakasam Institute of Development Studies. 1982.

Shukla, J.D. : *Indianisation of All India Services and its Impact on Administration*, New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1982.

Stevens, I.N. : *Constitutional and Administrative Law*, Plymouth, Macdonald and Evans, 1982.

Suntharalingam, R. : *Indian Nationalism ; an Historical Analysis*, New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House, 1983.

Venkatasubbarao, G.C. : *Manual of Indian Constitutional Law*. Hyderabad, Law Academy, 1983.

II. ARTICLE

Abraham, A.S. : Reflection on Regionalism ; Natural Outgrowth of Mass Politics. *Times of India*, 29 January, 1983.

Basavarajan, K B. : Centre-States Financial Relationship Under Indian Constitution. *Parliamentary Affairs*, March, 1983.

Bhagwati, P.N. : Law as Instrument of Change. *Mainstream*, 8 January, 1983.

Bhargava, G.S. : Civil Servants and Fundamental Rights. *Indian Express*, 22 February, 1983. (Examines the constitutional right of freedom of Civil servants).

Bose, Pradip : Impact of Assembly Polls. *Assam Tribune*, 4 January, 1983.

Chandrasekhara Rao, R.V.R. : Legislative Council Abolition ; Analysis of Legal Implications. *Hindu*, 15 March, 1983. (Analyses the legal implications of the abolition of legislative council in Andhra Pradesh).

Chora, V.D. : 1983 ; Difficult Questions. *Patriot*, 3 January, 1983. (Comments on the Indian political scene).

Dang, Satyapal : Law and the Poor. *Mainstream*, 19 February, 1983 (Relates to the Schemes of free legal aid to the poor and types of problems which arise in the course of their implementation.)

Diwan, Paras : Three Decades of Constitutional Development. *Focus*, 1 and 15 December, 1982.

Dua, H.K. : Uncertainties Ahead. *Indian Express*, 26 January, 1983. (Comments on present political situation in India).

Dutta, Sukumar : Boycotting Assam Elections in Unprincipled, Opportunistic, *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 1 February, 1983.

Gandhi, Rajmohan : What keeps us Together. *Indian Express*, 13 January, 1983. (Emphasises the need for national integrity in India).

Gopalji Ram : Crusade for Electoral Reforms. *M.P. Chronicle*, 18 March, 1983.

Goswami, Arati : Human Rights and Freedom. *National Herald*, 7 January, 1983.

Gross, Donald R. : Bicameralism and the Theory of Voting. *Western Political Quarterly*, December, 1982.

Gupta, Ranjan : Rise of Regional Parties is Ominous, *National Herald*, 25 January, 1983.

Haragopal Reddy, Y.R. : Place of Preamble in the Constitution and its Relative Importance in Interpreting the Constitution. *Lawyer*, January, 1983.

Inderjit : Doubts Over Election Laws. *Deccan Herald*, 25 February, 1983. (Comments on the powers of the Chief Election Commissioner and the role of the Government and the Opposition. Parties in conducting elections in the country in the light of Assam elections).

Inderjit : Non-debate on Assam. *Tribune*, 1 March, 1983. (Highlights the discussion on Assam in Parliament).

Indrajit : Role of the Southern Council. *Tribune*, 30 March, 1983, (Analyses the role of the Council of four Southern States Chief Ministers in accelerating the review of Centre-State relations).

Inderjit : Silent Majority Must Assert. *Searchlight*, 4 January, 1983. (Assesses the present state of democracy in India).

Indejit Singh : Punjab Situation ; the Realities. *Mainstream*, 1 January, 1983.

INSAF : Ban on Communal Bodies. *M.P. Chronicle*, 31 January, 1983. (Highlights the Jammu and Kashmir Government's recent Ordinance providing for a ban on communal bodies).

Jain, Girilal : Change in Leadership Style ; Development not Abdication. *Times of India*, 2 February, 1983. (Deals with Shrimati Indira Gandhi's efforts to effect improvements in the working of her Government).

Jain, Girilal : Majority-Minority Concept; Product of Divide and Rule Policy. *Times of India*, 5 January, 1983.

Jha, Himanshu Shekhar ; Basic Structure of Indian Constitution. *Searchlight*, 26 January, 1983.

Jha, Sambhunath : Free Press-Democracy's Safety Valve. *Searchlight*, 26 January, 1983.

Kakati, Deva Kanta : Right to Vote. *Assam Tribune*, 7 February, 1983. (Emphasises the need to lower the qualifying age of a voter in India).

Khanna, H.R. : Devaluation of Fundamental Rights. *Janata*, 2 January, 1983.

Khanna, H.R. : Funds for the Party; Where Black is Beautiful. *Statesman*, 9 February, 1983. (Examines the role of money power in elections in India).

Mir Mushtaq Ahmed : National Integration and Communal Harmony. *National Herald*, 19 January, 1983.

Mohan, S. : Judicial Reforms. *Lawyer*, March, 1983.

Mrityunjay Prasad : I have never been a Candidate for any Post. *Indian Express*, 23 January, 1983. (Comments on the Presidential powers in India and role of Dr. Rajendra Prasad as first President of the country).

Mukerjee, Hiren ; What Now Mr. Politician ? *Statesman*, 16 January, 1983. (Comments on the election results in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka).

Nayar Kuldip : Who to Blame; Rulers of Officials. *Free Press Journal*, 20 January, 1983. (Discusses the relation between politicians and civil servants in India and its impact on administration).

Noorani, A.G. : Extra-judicial Activity of Judges. *Indian Express*, 15 February, 1983.

Panchajanyam, Thota : Need for Upper Chamber. *Deccan Chronicle*, 24 March, 1983.

Pandey, R.K. : MLAs Axe of Disqualification. *M.P. Chronicle*, 9 February, 1983. (Discusses the powers of the Government in removing the disqualifications of MLAs with retrospective effect).

Pasricha, K.L. : Trust of the People; Government in the Light of Day. *Statesman*, 3 January, 1983. (Discusses the merits of open government and the danger of excessive official secrecy).

Pradeep Kumar : Founding Fathers of Our Constitution. *Peoples Sector*, January, February, 1983. (Studies the role played by those who contributed to the framing of the Indian Constitution).

Pradeep Kumar ; Promoting National Integration. *People Sector*, December, 1982,

Puri, Balraj : Election in Jammu and Kashmir. *M.P. Chronicle*, 18 March, 1983.

Ram Chandran, C. P. : Ram Raj. *Hindustan Times*, 10 January, 1983. (Highlights the political situation in the country).

Sahgal, Nayantara : Secret Ways of Power; How the System Works in India, *Statesman*, 12 March, 1983. (Discusses the working of political parties in India).

Soni, S.R. : Is Mid-term Poll Inevitable ? *Pioneer*, 5 January, 1983. (Comments on the speculations about the mid-term poll in India).

Srikantiah, L. : Why not Abolish Upper House. *Deccan Herald*, 18 February, 1983.

Suresh Chandra : Time to Change Election System. *Searchlight*, 27 February, 1983.

Unna, Warren : Letter from America. *Statesman*, 29 March, 1983. (Deals with the constitutional amendments in United States).

Vajpayee, Upendra : Whither Opposition Unity. *Free Press Journal*, 5 January, 1983. (Analyses the efforts of the opposition parties to come together and field common candidates).

APPENDIX I

STATEMENT SHOWING THE WORK TRANSACTED DURING THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE SEVENTH LOK SABHA

1. PERIOD OF THE SESSION	18 February to 10 May, 1983
2. NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD	48
3. TOTAL NUMBER OF SITTING HOURS	361 hours and 55 minutes.
4. NUMBER OF DIVISIONS HELD	4
5. GOVERNMENT BILLS :	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	15
(ii) Introduced	21
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by Rajya Sabha	1
(iv) Return by Rajya Sabha with any amendment/ recommendation and laid on the Table	1
(v) Referred to Select Committee	Nil
(vi) Referred to Joint Committee	Nil
(vii) Reported by Select Committee	Nil
(viii) Reported by Joint Committee	Nil
(ix) Discussed	15
(x) Passed	15
(xi) Withdrawn	Nil
(xii) Negatived	Nil
(xiii) Part-discussed	Nil
(xiv) Discussion postponed	Nil
(xv) Returned by Rajya Sabha without any recommendation	8
(xvi) Motion for concurrence to refer the Bill to Joint Committee adopted	Nil
(xvii) Pending at the end of the Session	23
6. PRIVATE MEMBERS BILLS :	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	258
(ii) Introduced	45
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by Rajya Sabha	Nil
(iv) Returned by Rajya Sabha with any amendment and laid on the Table.	Nil
(v) Reported by Selected Committee	Nil
(vi) Discussed	4
(vii) Passed	Nil
(viii) Withdrawn	3

(ix)	Negatived	Nil
(x)	Circulated for eliciting opinion	Nil
(xi)	Part discussed	1
(xii)	Discussion postponed	Nil
(xiii)	Motion for circulation of Bill negatived	Nil
(xiv)	Referred to Select Committee	Nil
(xv)	Removed from the Register of Pending Bills	Nil
(xvi)	Pending at the end of the Session	300
7. NUMBER OF DISCUSSIONS HELD UNDER RULE 193 :			
(Matters of Urgent Public Importance)			
(i)	Notices received	209
(ii)	Admitted	4
(iii)	Discussion held	5
			(including one part discussed in Tenth Session)
8. NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE UNDER RULE 197 :			
(Calling-Attention to matters of Urgent Public Importance)			
Statements made by Ministers			27
9. MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN COUNCIL OF MINISTERS			
(i)	Notices received	Nil
(ii)	Admitted and discussed	Nil
(iii)	Barred	Nil
(iv)	Withdrawn	Nil
10. HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSIONS HELD			
			5
11. STATUTORY RESOLUTIONS :			
(i)	Notices received	5
(ii)	Admitted	2
(iii)	Moved	1
(iv)	Adopted	Nil
(v)	Negatived	1
(vi)	Withdrawn	—
12. GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS :			
(i)	Notices received	3
(ii)	Admitted	3
(iii)	Moved	2
(iv)	Adopted	2
13. PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS :			
(i)	Received	14
(ii)	Admitted	14
(iii)	Discussed	3

(iv) Withdrawn	1
(v) Negatived	1
(vi) Adopted	Nil
(vii) Part-discussed	1
(viii) Discussions postpond	Nil
14. GOVERNMENT MOTIONS :		
(i) Notices received	Nil
(ii) Admitted	Nil
(iii) Discussed	1 (Part-discussed in Tenth Session)
(v) Adopted	Nil
15. PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS :		
(i) Notices received	499
(ii) Admitted	203
(iii) Moved	2
(iv) Adopted	1
(v) Discussed	2
(vi) Negatived	Nil
(vii) Part-discussed	Nil
(viii) Withdrawn	Nil
16. MOTIONS RE : MODIFICATION OF STATUTORY RULE :		
(i) Received	3
(ii) Admitted	1
(iii) Moved	1
(iv) Adopted	Nil
(v) Negatived	1
(vi) Withdrawn	Nil
(vii) Part discussed	Nil
17. Number of Parliamentary Committees created, if any, during the Session	Nil
18. Total number of Visitors' passes issued during the Session—35,514		
19. Maximum number of Visitors' passes issued on any single day, and date on which issued.		1,283 on 6.4.83
20. NUMBER OF ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS :		
(i) Brought before the House	1
(ii) Admitted and discussed	1
(iii) Barred in view of adjournment motion admitted on the subject.		13
(iv) Consent withheld by the Speaker outside the House		540
(v) Consent given by Speaker but leave not granted by House.		Nil

21. TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ADMITTED :

(i) Starred	973
(ii) Unstarred (including Starred Questions converted as Unstarred Questions.)	11,075
(iii) Short Notice Questions	Nil

22. WORKING OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES :

Sl. No.	Name of the Committee	No. of sittings held during the period 1 January to 31 March, 1983	No. of Reports presented to the House during the Session
1	2	3	4
(i)	Business Advisory Committee	7	7
(ii)	Committee on Absence of Members	...	2
(iii)	Committee on Public Undertakings	21	23
(iv)	Committee on Papers Laid on the Table	4	2
(v)	Committee on Petitions	3	2
(vi)	Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions	3	7
(vii)	Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes	21	13
(viii)	Committee of Privileges	3	1
(ix)	Committee on Government Assurances	3	1
(x)	Committee on Subordinate Legislation	8	5
(xi)	Estimates Committee	...	19
(xii)	General Purposes Committee
(xiii)	House Committee	2	...
(xiv)	Ad-hoc Sub-Committee of House Committee
(xv)	Public Accounts Committee	23	38
(xvi)	Railway Convention Committee	5	...
(xvii)	Rules Committee	1	...
JOINT/SELECT COMMITTEES			
(i)	Joint Committee of Offices of Profit	2*	1

*Includes one sitting of Sub-Committee of the Joint Committee on the Offices of Profit.

1	2	3	4
(ii)	Joint Committee on Criminal Law Amendment Bill, 1980.
(iii)	Joint Committee of the Houses to Examine the question of working of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.
(iv)	Joint Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament.	2	...
(v)	Joint Committee on the Marriage Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1981.	14	...
(vi)	Joint Committee of Chairmen, House Committees of both the Houses of Parliament.	1	...
23.	NUMBER OF MEMBERS GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE ...		6
24.	PETITIONS PRESENTED	...	3
25.	NUMBER OF NEW MEMBERS SWORN WITH DATE		
	No. of Members Sworn		Dates on Which Sworn
	2		18.2.83
	4		2.3.83
	1		3.3.83

APPENDIX II

STATEMENT SHOWING THE WORK TRANSACTED DURING THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY FIFTH SESSION OF RAJYA SABHA.

1. PERIOD OF THE SESSION	18 February to 25 March, 1983.
2. NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD	21
3. TOTAL NUMBER OF SITTING HOURS	135 hours and 47 minutes (excluding lunch break).
4. NUMBER OF DIVISIONS HELD	Nil
5. GOVERNMENT BILLS :	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	11
(ii) Introduced	Nil
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by Lok Sabha	8
(iv) Returned by Lok Sabha with any amendment	Nil
(v) Referred to Select Committee	Nil
(vi) Referred to Joint Committee	Nil
(vii) Reported by Select Committee	Nil
(viii) Reported by Joint Committee	Nil
(ix) Discussed	9
(x) Passed	3
(xi) Withdrawn	Nil
(xii) Negatived	Nil
(xiii) Part-Discussed	Nil
(xiv) Returned by Rajya Sabha without any recommendation	6
(xv) Discussion postponed	Nil
(xvi) Pending at the end of the Session	10
6. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS :	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	72
(ii) Introduced	5
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by Lok Sabha	Nil
(iv) Returned by Lok Sabha with any amendment and laid on the Table	Nil
(v) Reported by Joint Committee	Nil

(vi)	Discussed	Nil
(vii)	Withdrawn	Nil
(viii)	Passed	Nil
(ix)	Negatived	Nil
(x)	Circulated for eliciting opinion	Nil
(xi)	Part-discussed	1
(xii)	Discussion postponed	Nil
(xiii)	Motion for circulation of Bill negatived	Nil
(xiv)	Referred to Select Committee	Nil
(xv)	Pending at the end of the Session	77
7.	NUMBER OF DISCUSSIONS HELD UNDER RULE 176 (MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE)							
(i)	Notices received	10
(ii)	Admitted	Nil
(iii)	Discussion held	Nil
8.	NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE UNDER RULE 180 (CALLING- ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE).							
	Statements made by Ministers	12
9.	HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION HELD							2
10.	STATUTORY RESOLUTIONS :							
(i)	Notices received	2
(ii)	Admitted	2
(iii)	Moved	2
(iv)	Adopted	Nil
(v)	Negatived	2
(vi)	Withdrawn	Nil
11.	GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS :							
(i)	Notices received	2
(ii)	Admitted	2
(iii)	Moved	1
(iv)	Adopted	1
12.	PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS :							
(i)	Received	10
(ii)	Admitted	10
(iii)	Discussed	2
(iv)	Withdrawn	2
(v)	Negatived	Nil
(vi)	Adopted	Nil
(vii)	Part-discussed	Nil
(viii)	Discussion postponed	Nil

13. GOVERNMENT MOTIONS :

(i) Notices received	Nil
(ii) Admitted	Nil
(iii) Moved	Nil
(iv) Adopted	Nil
(v) Part-discussed	Nil

14. PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS :

(i) Received	220
(ii) Admitted	220
(iii) Moved	1
(iv) Adopted	1
(v) Part-discussed	Nil
(vi) Negatived	Nil
(vii) Withdrawn	Nil

15. MOTIONS REGARDING MODIFICATION OF STATUTORY RULE :

(i) Received	1
(ii) Admitted	1
(iii) Moved	1
(iv) Adopted	Nil
(v) Negatived	1
(vi) Withdrawn	Nil
(vii) Part-discussed	Nil

16. Number of Parliamentary Committees created, if any, during the Session Nil

17. Total number of Visitors' Passes 2800

18. Total number of Visitors 2987

19. Maximum number of Visitors' Passes issued on any single day, and date on which issued. 215 on 24.3.83

20. Maximum number of Visitors on any single day, and date on which visited 284 on 25.3.83

21. TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ADMITTED :

(i) Starred	391
(ii) Unstarred	2853
(iii) Short-Notice Questions	Nil

22. Discussion on the working of the Ministries , . Nil

23. WORKING OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES :

Name of Committee	No. of meetings held during the period 1 January to 31 March, 1983.	No. of Reports presented to House during the Session.
(i) Public Accounts Committee	*	*
(ii) Committee on Public Undertakings	*	*
(iii) Business Advisory Committee	4	...
(iv) Committee on Subordinate Legislation	7	2
(v) Committee on Petitions	5	1
(vi) Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes	*	*
(vii) Committee of Privileges
(viii) Committee on Rules
(ix) Joint Committee on Offices of Profit	*	*
(x) Committee on Government Assurances	2	...
(xi) Joint Committee of the Houses on the Viswa-Bharati (Amendment) Bill, 1978.	2	...
(xii) Committee on Papers Laid on the Table of the House	4	...
(xiii) Joint Committee on the Indian Veterinary Council Bill, 1981.	5	...
(xiv) Rules Committee	1	...

24. Number of Members granted leave of absence 1

25. Petition presented 3

26. NAMES OF NEW MEMBERS SWORN WITH DATES :

S. No.	Name of Members sworn	Date on which sworn
1.	Shri R. Mohanarangam	21.2.83
2.	Shri Chand Ram	14.3.83
3.	Shri Mirza Irshadbaig Aiyubbaig	21.3.83

27. OBITUARY REFERENCES :

S. No.	Name	Sitting Member/ Ex-Member
1.	Mr. Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev	President of U.S.S.R.
2.	Acharya Vinoba Bhave	Father of the Sarvodaya and Bhoodan movements
3.	Shri Pilloo Mody	Sitting Member
4.	Shri Mahendra Mohan Chaudhury	Ex-Member
5.	Shri mati Yashoda Reddy	do
6.	Shri C.K. Daphtary	do
7.	Shri B.T. Kemparaj,	do

*See Supra. Appendix 1, Sl. No. 22.

APPENDIX III

STATEMENT SHOWING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE LEGISLATURES OF STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES
DURING THE PERIOD 1 JANUARY TO 31 MARCH, 1983

Legislature	Duration	Sittings	Govt. Bills	Private Bills	Starred Questions	Unstarred Questions	Short Notice Questions
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
States :							
Andhra Pradesh L.C.	18.1.83 to 21.1.83 and 9.3.83 to 24.3.83	152(62)(a)
Andhra Pradesh L.A.	17.1.83 to 21.1.83 and 9.3.83 to 24.3.83	3 and 11	(9)	...	420(130)(b)	...	134(22)(c)
Assam L.A.	21.3.83 to 28.3.83	5 and 11	14(11)	...	722(526)(d)	(144)(e)	272(24)
Bihar L.C.	...	7	2(2)	13(9)
Bihar L.A.	10.3.83 to 22.3.83
Gujarat L.A.	17.2.83 to 2.4.83	34	18(11)	12	3881(1883)(g) 125(80)	771(468)(h) 23(3)	51(6) ...
Haryana L.A.	7.3.83 to 25.3.83	15	9(9)	...	306(232)	56(41)	...
Himachal Pradesh L.A.	7.3.83 to 25.3.83	15	10(10)	...	1217(1082)	121(177)(i)	...
Jammu & Kashmir L.C.	26.2.83 to 12.3.83	11	356(301)	58(43)	...
Jammu & Kashmir L.A.	26.2.83 to 10.3.83	12	10(11)	...	645(527)	309(246)	...
Karnataka L.C.	24.1.83 and 10.3.83 to 2.4.83	1 and 18	17(14)	...	302(230)	50(50)	12(2)

Karnataka L.A.	24.1.83 to 25.1.83 and 10.3.83 to 31.3.83
	...	2 and 17	16(14)	...	499(248)	131(95)	27(2)
Kerala L.A.	25.2.83 to 30.3.83	18	8(8)	...	5367(1951)(j)	(2802)	8(1)
Madhya Pradesh L.A.	20.9.82 to 6.10.82* and 13.12.82 to 22.12.82	13 and 8	36(36)	1	954(568)	513(350)	2
Maharashtra L.C.	13.12.82 to 24.12.82*	10	1(1)	4	1566(429)	7(217)(k)	89(22)
Maharashtra L.A.	13.12.82 to 24.12.82*	10	10(10)	4	3297(399)	63(748)(1)	86(29)
Manipur L.A.	21.2.83 to 31.3.83	20	2(2)	...	190(170)	...	20(20)
Meghalaya L.A.	12.1.83 to 13.1.83 and 8.3.83 to 31.3.83	2 and 13	7(7)	24(24)
Nagaland L.A.	29.11.82* and 15.3.83 to 29.3.83	1
	(2)	(2)	100(83)	18(18)	3(3)
Orissa L.A.
Punjab L.A.	7.3.83 to 26.3.83	17	11(11)	...	759(293)	72(27)	1
Rajasthan L.A.	17.2.83 to 26.3.83	28	14(5)	...	3,165(819)	2,710(1,067)	25(1)
Sikkim L.A.	15.3.83 to 22.3.83	7	7(7)	...	115(115)	...	3(3)
Tamil Nadu L.C.
Tamil Nadu L.A.
Tripura L.A.	9.2.83 to 16.2.83	6	4(4)	...	193(123)(m)	2(13)(n)	6(2)

APPENDIX III (Contd.)

Legislature	Duration	Sittings	Govt. Bills	Private Bills	Starred Questions	Unstarred Questions	Short Notice Questions
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Uttar Pradesh L.C.	1.2.83 to 11.3.83 and 17.3.13 to 7.4.83	26 and 11	2(12)	...	411(389)	13(13)	369(341)
Uttar Pradesh L.A.	...* ...*	2057(1113)(o)	1813(2259)(p)	235 ...
West Bengal L.A.	21.2.83 to 23.4.83	28	13(14)	...	1826(1181)	548(311)	3(1)
Union Territories							
Arunachal Pradesh L.A.	21.3.83 to 26.3.83	6	8(8)	...	140(126)	29(29)	1(1)
Delhi Metropolitan Council	17.3.83 to 21.3.83	3
Goa, Daman and Diu L.A.	13.1.83 to 18.1.83 and 21.3.83 to 30.3.83	4 and 7	6(6)	1(1)	627(351)	310(252)	5(3)
Mizoram L.A.	16.3.83 to 28.3.83	9	2(2)	...	28(25)	...	12(7)
Pondicherry L.A.	18.3.83 to 22.4.83	24	5(5)	...	1,089(788)	207(207)	1

* This information pertains to the period from 1 October to 31 December, 1982.

- Notes :** (i) Figures in Cols. 4 and 5 indicate the number respectively of Government and Private Members Bills introduced with the number of Bills passed in brackets.
- (ii) Figures in Cols. 6, 7 and 8 indicate the number of Notices received followed by the number of Notices admitted in brackets.
- (a) The figure 62 includes 7 Notices received as Unstarred Questions.
- (b) Out of 130 admitted, 18 were treated as Unstarred Questions.
- (c) Out of 134 received, 44 were converted as Starred Questions and 2 Unstarred Questions.
- (d) The figure 526 includes 121 Notices received as Short Notice Questions.
- (e) The figure 144 includes 107 Notices received as Starred Questions and 37 received as Short Notice Questions.
- (f) The figure 2427 includes all Notices received as Starred, Unstarred and Short Notice Questions.
- (g) The figure 1883 includes 4 Notices received as Short Notice Questions.
- (h) The figure 468 includes 238 Notices received as Starred Questions.
- (i) The figure 177 also includes Notices received as Starred Questions.
- (j) The figure 5367 includes Notices received as Starred and Unstarred Questions.
- (k) The figure 217 includes 210 Notices received as Starred Questions.
- (l) The figure 748 includes 719 Notices received as Starred Questions.
- (m) The figure 123 includes 1 Notice received as Short Notice Question.
- (n) The figure 13 includes 11 Notices received as Starred Questions.
- (o) The figure 1,113 includes 91 Notices received as Short Notice Questions.
- (p) The figure 2,259 includes 647 Notices received as Starred Questions and 97 received as Short Notice Questions.

APPENDIX—III (Contd.)

COMMITTEE AT WORK/NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD AND NUMBER OF REPORTS PRESENTED

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
Business Advisory Committee	...	12	1	
Committee on Govt. Assurances	...	12	1	
Committee on Petitions	
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions	
Committee on Privileges	
Committee on Public Undertakings	
Committee on Subordinate Legislation	
Committee on the Welfare of SC and ST.	
Estimates Committee	
General Purposes Committee	
House/Accommodation Committee	
Library Committee	
Public Accounts Committee	
Rules Committee	
Joint/Select Committee	
Other Committees	
States :																									
Andhra Pradesh L.C.	...	2(2)	3	
Andhra Pradesh L.A.	...	3(3)	
Assam L.A.	1	
Bihar L.C.	
Bihar L.A.	4(1)	103(10)	63(5)	123(12)	24	41(2)	140	
Gujarat L.A.	4(4)	...	2	4(4)	1	14(4)	7(5)(e)	4(2)	7(2)	1	5(f)	9(4)(g)	

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Delhi Metropolitan Council
Goa, Daman & Diu L.A.	1(1)	(1)	1	3(1)	1(z)	15(3)(aa)	...
Mizoram L.A.	1(1)	2	...	1
Pondicherry L.A.	2(2)	6(4)	9(2)	3(1)	...	22(11)	20(5)...	1(1)(bb)

NOTE : Figures in the brackets indicate the number of reports presented to the House.

- (a) Committee on Papers Laid on the Table of the House—1 sitting.
 (b) Committee on Papers Laid on the Table of the House—1 sitting.
 (c) Members' Amenities Committee—5(5).
 (d) Members' Facilities Committee—86 sitting and Question and Calling Attention Committee—64(1).
 (e) Committee on Welfare of Scheduled Tribes—2(1) and Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Cast is —5(4).
 (f) Select Committee to Inquire into the Incidents of Violence and Police Atrocities Reported at Vijaynagar on 8 February, 1983—5 sittings.
 (g) Committee on the Welfare of Socially and Educationally Backward Classes, Nomadic Tribes and Denotified Tribes—2(2) and Panchayati Raj Committee—7(2).
 (h) Committee on Papers Laid on the Table of the House—4(1).
 (i) Joint Select Committee on Civil Laws—5(1) ; Joint Select Committee on Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Bill—4 sittings ; Joint Select Committee on Application of Muslim Personal Law Bill—4 sittings and Select Committee on Legal Practitioners—2(1).
 (j) Forest Committee—1 sitting.
 (k) Subject Committees Nos. 1 to 10, in all held 29 sittings.
 (l) Select Committees (for examination of legislation)—6(7).
 (m) Subject Committees Nos. 1 to 10, in all held 22 sittings and presented 5 reports.
 (n) Public Accounts Committee—3 sittings and Sub-Committee of Public Accounts Committee—3 sittings.
 (o) Sub-Committee of Rules Committee—2 sittings.
 (p) Committee on Welfare of Schedule Castes—18 sittings ; Committee on Welfare of Scheduled Tribes—10(2) and Committee on Welfare of Vimukta Jatis and Nomadic Tribes—7(1).
 (q) Committee on employment Guarantee Scheme—2 sittings ; Catering Committee—8 sittings, and Panchayati Raj Committee—7 sittings.

- (r) Committee on Papers Laid/To be Laid on the Table of the House—12(1).
- (s) Estimates Committee A—11(3) and Estimates Committee B—9(1).
- (t) Select Committee on U.P. Krishi Evam Prodyogik Vishwavidalaya (Sanshdhan) Vidhayak, 1981—2 sittings and Select Committee on Police (U.P. Sanshodhan) Vidhayak, 1982—2 sittings.
- (u) Bharat Bandh Committee—7 sittings ; Sansdiya Sadabhawa Committee—8 sittings ; Compilation of Rulings Committee—6(1) ; Parliamentary Studies Committee—4(1) ; Financial and Administrative Committee—2 sittings and Shramik Basti Committee—20 sittings.
- (v) Select Committee on the U.P. Revenue Code Bill, 1980—14 sittings.
- (w) Committee on Parliamentary Research, Reference and Studies—1 sitting.
- (x) Select Committee on the West Bengal Co-operative Societies Bill, 1982—5 sittings.
- (y) Select Committee on the West Bengal Co-operative Societies Bill, 1983—8(1).
- (z) Select Committee on Preservation of Trees Bill—1 sitting.
- (aa) Five *Ad-hoc* Committees in all held 15 sittings and presented 3 reports.
- (bb) Committee on Papers Laid on the Table of the House—1(1).

APPENDIX IV

LIST OF BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT AND ASSENTED TO BY THE PRESIDENT DURING THE PERIOD 1 JANUARY TO 31 MARCH, 1983.

S. No.	Title of the Bill	Date of assent by the President
1.	The Constitution (Forty-sixth Amendment) Bill, 1982.	2.2.83
2.	The Aircraft (Amendment) Bill, 1983	26.3.83
3.	The Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983	26.3.83
4.	The Appropriation Bill, 1983	26.3.83
5.	The Appropriation (No. 2) Bill 1983	26.3.83
6.	The Appropriation (Railways) Bill, 1983	26.3.83
7.	The Appropriation (Railways) No. 2 Bill, 1983	26.3.83
8.	The Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 1983	26.3.83
9.	The Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1983	31.3.83
10.	The Delhi Administration (Amendment) Bill, 1983	31.3.83

APPENDIX V

LIST OF BILLS PASSED BY THE STATE LEGISLATURES DURING THE PERIOD 1 JANUARY TO 31 MARCH, 1983.

ANDHRA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

1. The Andhra Pradesh Appropriation Bill, 1983.
2. The Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
3. The Andhra Pradesh Educational Institutions (Regulation of Admission and Prohibition of Capitation Fee) Bill, 1983.
4. Srikrishnapevaraya University (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
5. The Andhra Pradesh Housing Board (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
6. The Andhra Pradesh Payment of Salaries and Pension and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
7. The Hyderabad Municipal Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
8. The Andhra Pradesh Urban Areas (Development) (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *9. The Land Acquisition (Andhra Pradesh Amendment and Validation) Bill, 1983.

ANDHRA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
2. The Andhra Pradesh Appropriation Bill, 1983.
3. The Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Samithis and Zilla Parishads (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Andhra Pradesh Educational Institutions (Regulation of Admission and Prohibition of Capitation Fee) Bill, 1983.
5. The Andhra Pradesh Housing Board (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
6. The Andhra Pradesh Urban Areas (Development) (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
7. The Andhra Pradesh Payment of Salaries and Pension and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
8. The Andhra Pradesh Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
9. The Hyderabad Municipal Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
10. Srikrishna Devaraya University (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *11. The Land Acquisition (Andhra Pradesh Amendment and Validation) Bill, 1983.

*Awaiting assent.

BIHAR LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Bihar Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
2. The Bihar Finance Bill, 1983.
3. The Bihar Appropriation Bill, 1983.

GUJARAT LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Gujarat Panchayats (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
- *2. The Gujarat Higher Secondary Schools Services Tribunal Bill, 1983.
3. The Gujarat Secondary Education (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Gujarat Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
5. The Gujarat Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
6. The Gujarat Universities Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
7. The Gujarat (Supplementary) Appropriation Bill, 1983.
8. The Gujarat Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1983.
9. The Gujarat Entertainments Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
10. The Gujarat Panchayats (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
11. The Gujarat Appropriation Bill, 1983.

HARYANA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

- *1. The Punjab Ayurvedic and Unani Practitioners (Haryana Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *2. The Faridabad Complex (Regulation and Development) Amendment Bill, 1983.
- *3. The Maharshi Dayanand University (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *4. The Haryana General Sales Tax (Amendment and Validation) Bill, 1983.
- *5. The Haryana Forest Development Bill, 1983.
- *6. The Haryana Appropriation (No. 1) Bill, 1983.
- *7. The Haryana Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1983.
- *8. The Punjab Panchayat Samities (Haryana Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *9. The Haryana General Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1983.

HIMACHAL PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Himachal Pradesh Motor Spirit (Taxation of Sales) (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
2. The Himachal Pradesh War Awards (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
3. The Himachal Pradesh Public Premises and Land (Eviction and Rent Recovery) (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Himachal Pradesh Water Supply (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
5. The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation Bill, 1983.
6. The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1983.
7. The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1983.
8. The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1983.

9. The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1983.
10. The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 1983.

JAMMU AND KASHMIR LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

1. The Jammu and Kashmir Delegation of Powers Bill, 1983.
2. The Jammu and Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
3. The Jammu and Kashmir Taxation Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Jammu and Kashmir Appropriation Bill, 1983.
5. The Jammu and Kashmir Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
6. The Jammu and Kashmir Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
7. The Jammu and Kashmir Professions, Trades, Callings and Employments Tax (Repeal) Bill, 1983.
8. The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
9. The Jammu and Kashmir Public Men and Public Servants Declaration of Assets and other Provisions Bill, 1983.
10. The Jammu and Kashmir Prevention of Corruption Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
11. The Jammu and Kashmir Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

JAMMU AND KASHMIR LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Jammu and Kashmir Public Men and Public Servants Declaration of Assets and Other Provisions Bill, 1983.
2. The Jammu and Kashmir Prevention of Corruption Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
3. The Jammu and Kashmir Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Jammu and Kashmir Delegation of Powers Bill, 1983.
5. The Jammu and Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
6. The Jammu and Kashmir Taxation Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
7. The Jammu and Kashmir Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
8. The Jammu and Kashmir Professions Trades, Callings and Employments Tax (Repeal) Bill, 1983.
9. The Jammu and Kashmir Appropriation Bill, 1983.
10. The Jammu and Kashmir Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
11. The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

KARNATAKA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

1. The Karnataka Appropriation Bill, 1983.
2. The Karnataka Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
3. The Karnataka Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Karnataka Entertainments Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

5. The Karnataka Tax on Entry of Goods into Local Areas for Consumption, Use or Sale Therein (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
6. The Karnataka Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
7. The Karnataka Forest (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
8. The Karnataka Agricultural Income Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
9. The Karnataka Rent Control (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
10. The Karnataka Stamp (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
11. The Karnataka Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
12. The Karnataka Municipal Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
13. The Karnataka Village Panchayats and Local Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
14. The Karnataka Highways (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

KARNATAKA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Karnataka Rent Control (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
2. The Karnataka Village Panchayats and Local Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
3. The Karnataka Stamp (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Karnataka Municipal Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
5. The Karnataka Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
6. The Karnataka Agricultural Income Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
7. The Karnataka Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
8. The Karnataka Appropriation Bill, 1983.
9. The Karnataka Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
10. The Karnataka Entertainments Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
11. The Karnataka Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
12. The Karnataka Forest (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
13. The Karnataka Tax on Entry of Goods into Local Areas for Consumption, Use and Sale Therein (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
14. The Karnataka Highways (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Electricity (Supply) Kerala Amendment Bill, 1983.
2. The Kerala General Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
3. The Kerala Appropriation Bill, 1983.
4. The Agricultural Income Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
5. The Kerala Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
6. The Kerala Raw Cashewnuts (Procurement and Distribution) Amendment Bill, 1983.
7. The Kerala Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
- *8. The Kerala Co-operative Land Mortgage Banks (Amendment) Bill, 1982.

*Awaiting assent.

MADHYA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

- *1. Madhya Pradesh Shri Mahakaleshwar Mandir Vidheyak, 1981.
2. Sagaur, Jabalpur Aur Indore Vishwavidhyalaya (Naam Parivartan) Vidheyak, 1982.
3. Madhya Pradesh Nirasan Vidheyak, 1982.
4. Madhya Pradesh Grah Nirman Mandal (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
5. Samrat Ashok Technological Institute (Degree) Vidisha (Prabandh Grahan) Sanshodhan Vidheyak, 1982.
6. Madhya Pradesh Sihaniya Kshetra Me Mal Ke Pravesh Par Kar (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
7. Madhya Pradesh General Sales Tax (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
8. Madhya Pradesh Excise (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
- *9. Madhya Pradesh Shram Kalyan Nidhi Vidheyak, 1982.
10. Madhya Pradesh Vritti Vyapar Ajivika Aur Sevayojankar (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
11. Madhya Pradesh Bharat Bhawan Nyas Vidheyak, 1982.
12. Madhya Pradesh Rajya Pashudhan Evam Kukkut Vikas Nigam Vidheyak, 1982.
13. Madhya Pradesh Anugrahik Tatha Sevarth Nagad Anudan Samapatti Vidheyak, 1982.
14. Madhya Pradesh Dakaiti Aur Vyapharan Prabhavit Kshetra (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
15. Madhya Pradesh Vinirdishta Bharashta Acharan Nivaran Vidheyak, 1982.
16. Madhya Pradesh Money Lenders (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
17. Madhya Pradesh Cement Apmishran Nivaran (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
18. Madhya Pradesh Co-operative Societies (Second Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
19. Madhya Pradesh Municipalities (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
- *20. Mandsaur Slate Pencil Karmkar Kalyan Nidhi Vidheyak, 1982.
21. Madhya Pradesh Appropriation (No. 5) Vidheyak, 1982.
22. Madhya Pradesh Land Revenue Code (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
23. Madhya Pradesh Upkar (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
24. Madhya Pradesh Nagar Tatha Gram Nivesh (Sanshodhan Evam Nivesh Kshetron Ka Vidhimanyakaran) Vidheyak, 1982.
25. Madhya Pradesh Town Improvement Trusts (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
26. Madhya Pradesh Sahkari Bhumi Vikas Bank (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
27. Madhya Pradesh Krashik Jot Uchchatam Sima (Vidhimanyakaran) Vidheyak, 1982.

*Awaiting assent.

28. Madhya Pradesh Vidhan Mandal Sadasya Nirarhaya Nivaran (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
29. Madhya Pradesh Rajya Beej Farm Vikas Nigam (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
30. Madhya Pradesh Gramin Rin Vimukti Vidheyak, 1982.
31. Madhya Pradesh Vishwavidyalaya (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
32. Madhya Pradesh Uchcha Shiksha Anudan Ayoga (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
33. Madhya Pradesh Lok Adhikaron Ke Madhyam Se Bis Sutriya Karyakaram Ka Karyanvayan (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
34. Madhya Pradesh Viniyog (No. 6) Vidheyak, 1982.
35. Madhya Pradesh Nagar Tatha Gram Nivesh (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
36. Madhya Pradesh Mantri (Vetan Tatha Bhatta) Sanshodhan Vidheyak, 1982.

MAHARASHTRA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

- *1. The Maharashtra Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
2. The Maharashtra Supply of Forest Produce by Government (Revision of Agreements) Bill, 1982.
3. The Maharashtra Water Supply and Sewerage Board (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
4. The Marathwada Agricultural Universities (Krishi Vidyapeeths) (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
5. The Maharashtra Sales Tax (Third Amendment) Bill, 1982.
6. The Bombay Betting Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
7. The Maharashtra (Third Supplementary) Appropriation Bill, 1982.
8. The Maharashtra Appropriation (Excess Expenditure) Bill, 1982.
9. The Maharashtra Appropriation (Second Excess Expenditure) Bill, 1982.
10. The Maharashtra Appropriation (Third Excess Expenditure) Bill, 1982.
- *11. The Bombay Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
- *12. The Maharashtra Kidney Transplantation Bill, 1982.
- *13. The Administrators General and Official Trustee (Maharashtra Amendment) Bill, 1982.
14. The Maharashtra Secondary and Higher Secondary Education Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
- *15. The Maharashtra Ownership Flats (Regulation of Promotion of Construction, Sale, Management and Transfer) (Extension of Duration) Bill, 1982.

MAHARASHTRA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

- *1. The Maharashtra Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
2. The Maharashtra Supply of Forest Produce by Government (Revision of Agreements) Bill, 1982.

*Awaiting assent.

3. The Maharashtra Water Supply and Sewerage Board (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
4. The Marathwada Agricultural Universities (Krishi Vidyapeeths) (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
5. The Maharashtra Sales Tax (Third Amendment) Bill, 1982.
6. The Bombay Betting Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
7. The Maharashtra (Third Supplementary) Appropriation Bill, 1982.
8. The Maharashtra Appropriation (Excess Expenditure) Bill, 1982.
9. The Maharashtra Appropriation (Second Excess Expenditure) Bill, 1982.
10. The Maharashtra Appropriation (Third Excess Expenditure) Bill, 1982.
- *11. The Bombay Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
- *12. The Maharashtra Kidney Transplantation Bill, 1982.
- *13. The Administrators General and Official Trustee (Maharashtra Amendment) Bill, 1982.
14. The Maharashtra Secondary and Higher Secondary Education Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1982.
- *15. The Maharashtra Ownership Flats (Regulation of Promotion of Construction, Sale, Management and Transfer) (Extension of Duration) Bill, 1982.

MANIPUR LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Manipur Appropriation (No. 1) Bill, 1983.
- *2. The Manipur Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1983.

MEGHALAYA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Meghalaya Appropriation (No. 1) Bill, 1983.
2. The Indian Stamp (Meghalaya Amendment) Bill, 1983.
3. The Meghalaya Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
4. The Meghalaya Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
5. The Meghalaya Legislative Assembly (Leader of the Opposition) Salary and Allowances Bill, 1983.
6. The Legislative Assembly of Meghalaya (Members Pension) (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
7. The Prevention of Disqualification (Members of the Legislative Assembly of Meghalaya) (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

NAGALAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Nagaland Appropriation (No. 1) Bill, 1983.
2. The Nagaland Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1983.

PUNJAB LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Punjab Appropriation Bill, 1983.
2. The Punjab Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1983.

*Awaiting assent.

3. The Punjabi University (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Punjab Affiliated Colleges (Security of Service) Amendment Bill, 1983.
5. The East Punjab War Awards (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *6. The Northern India Ferries (Punjab Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *7. The Punjab Scheduled Castes Land Development and Finance Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
8. The Punjab Panchayat Samitis and Zila Parishads (Temporary Supersession) Amendment Bill, 1983.
9. The Punjab Agricultural Produce Markets (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *10. The Punjab Ex-Servicemen Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *11. The Punjab Legislative Assembly (Allowances of Members) Amendment Bill, 1983.

RAJASTHAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. Rajasthan Cinema (Viniyaman) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
2. Rajasthan Sahkari Society (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
3. Rajasthan Vidhan Sabha (Adhikariyon Tatha Sadasyon ki Parliabhdhiyan Aur Pension) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
4. Rajasthan Viniyog (Sankhya-1) Vidheyak, 1983.
5. Rajasthan Viniyog (Sankhya-2) Vidheyak, 1983.

SIKKIM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

- *1. The Sikkim Panchayat (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *2. The Sikkim Shops and Commercial Establishments Bill, 1983.
- *3. The Sikkim Court Fees (Exemption and Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill, 1983.
- *4. The Tashi Namgyal Academy Board Bill, 1983.
- *5. The Sikkim Appropriation Bill, 1983.
- *6. The Sikkim Sales Tax Bill, 1983.

TRIPURA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

- *1. The Tripura Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1983.
- *2. The Tripura Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
- *3. The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of the Legislative Assembly (Tripura) (Third Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *4. The Salaries and Allowances of the Ministers (Tripura) (Second Amendment) Bill, 1983.

UTTAR PRADESH LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

1. King George Medical College Aur Gandhi Memorial and Associated Hospital (Graham Karana) Vidheyak, 1981.
2. Uttar Pradesh Rajya Vishva-vidyalaya, (Dwitiya Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.

*Awaiting assent.

3. Uttar Pradesh Viniyog (Lekhanudan) Vidheyak, 1983.
4. Uttar Pradesh Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samiti (Alpakalik Vyavstha) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
5. Uttar Pradesh Sahkari Samiti (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
6. Uttar Pradesh Viniyog (1982-83 ka Dwitiya Anupurak) Vidheyak, 1983.
7. Uttar Pradesh Zilla Parishad (Alpakalik Vyavstha) Sanshodhan Vidheyak, 1983.
8. Uttar Pradesh Viniyog Vidheyak, 1983.
9. Vidhyut Vidhi (Uttar Pradesh Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
10. Dand Prakirya Sanhita (Uttar Pradesh Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
11. Uttar Pradesh Nagar Yojna Aur Vikas (Sansodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
12. Uttar Pradesh Rajya Vishav-vidyalaya (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.

WEST BENGAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The West Bengal Panchayat (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
2. The West Bengal Legislative (Removal of Disqualifications) (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
3. The Rabindra Bharati (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Calcutta Tramways (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
5. The Jadavpur University (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *6. The Bengal Agra and Assam Civil Courts (West Bengal Amendment) Bill, 1982.
7. The Bengal Electricity Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *8. The West Bengal Motor Vehicles Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
- *9. The West Bengal Co-operative Societies Bill, 1983.
10. The D.N.D.C. Homoeopathic Medical College and Hospital (Taking over of Management and Subsequent Acquisition) Bill, 1983.
11. The Calcutta Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital (Taking over of Management and Subsequent Acquisition) Bill, 1983.
- *12. The West Bengal Taxation Laws (Amendment) and Repealing Bill, 1983.
- *13. The West Bengal Appropriation Bill, 1983.
14. The West Bengal Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.

ARUNACHAL PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Arunachal Pradesh Appropriation Bill, 1983.
2. The Arunachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1983.
2. The Arunachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1983.
4. The Arunachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1983.
5. The Arunachal Pradesh Speaker and Deputy Speaker Salaries and Allowances Bill, 1983.
6. The Arunachal Pradesh Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Bill, 1983.

*Awaiting assent.

7. The Arunachal Pradesh Salaries, Allowances and Pension of Members of the Legislative Assembly Bill, 1983.
8. The Arunachal Pradesh Forest (Removal of Timber) Regulation Bill, 1983.

GOA, DAMAN AND DIU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Goa, Daman and Diu Salaries and Allowances of Ministers (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
2. The Goa, Daman and Diu Salaries and Allowances of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
3. The Goa, Daman and Diu Salaries and Allowances of the Members of the Legislative Assembly (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Goa, Daman and Diu Entertainment Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
5. The Goa, Daman and diu Supplementary Appropriation Bill, 1983.
6. The Goa, Daman and Diu Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
7. The Goa, Daman and Diu Legislative Diploma No. 645 dated 30-3-1933 (Second Amendment) Bill, 1983.

PONDICHERRY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
2. The Appropriation Bill, 1983.
- *3. The Pondicherry Money Lenders (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1983.
- *5. The Pondicherry Non-Agricultural Kudiyruppudars (Stay of Eviction Proceedings) (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

APPENDIX VI

ORDINANCES ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS DURING THE PERIOD 1 JANUARY TO 31 MARCH, 1983

S. No.	Subject	Date of promulgation	Date on which laid before the House	Date of cessation	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT					
1.	The Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 (No. 1 of 1983)	2.1.83	22.2.83	1.4.83	Replaced by Legislation
2.	The Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 (No. 2 of 1983)	--do--	--do--	--do--	--do--
STATE GOVERNMENTS					
ANDHRA PRADESH					
1.	The Andhra Pradesh Housing Board (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	29.1.83	11.3.83	20.4.83	Replaced by Legislation
2.	The Andhra Pradesh Urban Areas (Development) (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	--do--	--do--	--do--	--do--
3.	The Andhra Pradesh Educational Institutions (Regulation of Admission and Prohibition of Capitation Fee) Ordinance, 1983.	30.1.83	--do--	--do--	--do--
4.	The Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Samithis and Zilla Parishads (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	1.2.83	--do--	--do--	--do--

1	2	3	4	5	6
			BIHAR		
1.	The Bihar Intermediate Education Council Ordinance, 1983.	27.1.83	—	—	—
2.	The Bihar Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	—do—	—	—	—
3.	The Bihar Contingency Fund (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	28.1.83	—	—	—
4.	The Bihar Bricks Supply (Control) Ordinance, 1983.	29.1.83	—	—	—
5.	The Bihar Forest Produce (Trade Regulation) Ordinance, 1983.	28.1.83	—	—	—
6.	The Bihar Corruption Eredication Ordinance, 1983.	28.2.83	—	—	—
			GUJARAT		
1.	The Gujarat Municipalities (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	19.1.83	17.2.83	—	Replaced by Legislation
2.	The Gujarat Higher Secondary Schools Services Tribunal Ordinance, 1983	20.1.83	—do—	—	—do—
3.	The Gujarat Universities Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	25.1.83	—do—	—	—do—
4.	The Gujarat Secondary Education (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	27.1.83	—do—	—	—do—
5.	The Gujarat Sales Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	4.2.83	—do—	—	—do—

HARYANA

- | | | | | |
|----|---|----------|--------|-------------------------|
| 1. | The Haryana Forest Development Ordinance, 1982. | 21.11.82 | — | — |
| 2. | The Maharshi Dayanand University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982 | 17.11.82 | — | — |
| 3. | The Haryana General Sales Tax (Amendment and validation) Ordinance, 1983. | 13.1.83 | 7.3.83 | Replaced by Legislation |
| 4. | The Faridabad Complex (Regulation and Development) Amendment Ordinance, 1983. | —do— | —do— | —do— |
| 5. | The Haryana Forest Development Ordinance, 1982. | 2.11.83 | —do— | —do— |
| 6. | The Maharshi Dayanand University (Amendment) ordinance, 1982. | 17.3.82 | —do— | —do— |

HIMACHAL PRADESH

- | | | | | |
|----|--|---------|--------|-------------------------|
| 1. | The Himachal Excise (Himachal Pradesh Repeal and Validation) Ordinance, 1983. | 19.1.83 | 7.3.83 | 31.3.83 |
| 2. | The Himachal Pradesh Motor Spirit (Taxation of Sales) (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983. | 4.2.83 | —do— | Replaced by Legislation |

JAMMU AND KASHMIR

- | | | | | |
|----|---|---------|---------|-------------------------|
| 1. | The Jammu and Kashmir Public Men and Public Servants Declaration of Assets Ordinance, 1983. | 21.1.83 | 26.2.83 | Replaced by Legislation |
|----|---|---------|---------|-------------------------|

1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	The Jammu and Kashmir Prevention of Corruption Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	—do—	—do—	—	—do—
3.	The Jammu and Kashmir Criminal Law (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	—do—	—do—	—	—do—
4.	The Jammu and Kashmir Delegation of Powers Ordinance, 1982.	8.11.82	—do—	—	—do—
5.	The Jammu and Kashmir Taxation Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	3.12.82	—do—	—	—do—
6.	The Jammu and Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	2.12.82	—do—	—	—do—
KARNATAKA					
1.	The Karnataka Municipalities (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	24.2.83	10.3.83	—	Replaced by Legislation
2.	The Karnataka Municipal Corporations (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	—do—	—do—	—	—do—
3.	The Karnataka Agricultural Income-Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	26.2.83	11.3.83	—	—do—
4.	The Karnataka Rent Control (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	28.2.83	—do—	—	—do—
5.	The Karnataka Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	—do—	—do—	—	—do—
6.	The Karnataka Stamp (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	9.3.83	17.3.83	—	—do—

KERALA

1.	The Kerala Education (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	11.10.82	—	—	—
2.	The Agricultural Income-Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	12.10.82	—	—	—
3.	The Kerala General Sales-Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	—do—	—	—	—
4.	The University Law (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	17.11.82	—	—	—
5.	The Kerala Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	4.1.83	2.3.83	—	Replaced by Legislation
6.	The Kerala Labour Welfare Fund (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	—do—	—do—	—	—do—
7.	The Kerala Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Revival and Special Provisions Ordinance, 1983.	20.1.83	—do—	—	—
8.	The Kerala Public Buildings (Eviction of Unauthorized occupants) Amendment Ordinance, 1983.	4.2.83	—do—	—	—
9.	The Kerala Public Services (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	8.2.83	—do—	—	Replaced by Legislation
10.	The Electricity Supply (Kerala Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	21.2.83	—do—	—	—do—
11.	The Kerala Raw Cashewnuts (Procurement and Distribution) Amendment Ordinance, 1983.	—do—	—do—	—	—do—

3. The Maharashtra Sales Tax (Third Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	26.11.82	—do—	9.1.83	—do—
4. The Maharashtra Zilla Parishads and Panchayat Samitis (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	29.11.82	—do—	13.1.83	—do—
5. The Bombay Betting Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	3.12.82	—do—	16.1.83	—do—
6. The Maharashtra Forest Development (Tax on Sale of Forest-produce by Government or Forest Development Corporation) Ordinance, 1982.	4.12.82	16.12.82	17.1.83	—do—
PUNJAB				
1. The Punjab Panchayat Samitis and Zilla Parishads (Temporary Supersession) Second Amendment Ordinance, 1982.	9.10.82	7.3.83	—	Replaced by Legislation
2. (i) The Punjab Agricultural Produce Markets (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	16.11.82	8.3.83	—	—do—
(ii) The Punjab Agricultural Produce Markets (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983	5.1.83	—do—	—	—do—
3. The Punjab War Awards (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	17.12.82	7.3.83	—	—do—
4. The Punjabi University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1982.	29.12.82	—do—	—	—do—
5. The Punjab Affiliated Colleges (Security of Service) Amendment Ordinance, 1982.	28.12.82	—do—	—	—do—

					Replaced by Legislation
10.	U.P. Nagar Yojana Aur Vikts (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1982.	5-10-82	--Do--	--	
11.	U.P. Sales Tax (Sanshodhan and Validation, Adhyadesh, 1982.	6-10-82	--Do--	15-3-83	
12.	Sanjay Gandhi Snatakottar Ayurvigyan Sansthan Adhyadesh, 1982.	16-10-82	--Do--	--Do--	
13.	U.P. Bikri-Kar (Dwitiya Sanshodhan Aur Vaidhikaran) Adhyadesh, 1982.	19-10-82	--Do--	--Do--	
14.	U.P. Urban Local Self-Government Laws Tiritiya Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1982.	29-11-82	--Do--	--Do--	
15.	U.P. Urban Local Self-Government Laws (Fourth Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1982.	30-12-82	--Do--	--Do--	
16.	U.P. Raja Vishwavidyalaya (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	12-1-83	--Do--	--	Replaccd by Legislation
17.	U.P. Sri Kashi Vishwanath Temple Adhyadesh, 1983.	24-1-83	--Do--	15-3-83	
18.	U.P. Urban Local Self-Government Laws (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	14 3-83	17-3-83	28-4-83	
19.	U.P. Official Language (Amendment) Adhyadesh 1983.	--Do--	--Do--	--Do--	
20.	U.P. Krishi Evam Prodyogik Vishwavidyalaya (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	--Do--	--Do--	--Do--	
21.	U.P. Sal's-Tax (Amendment and Validation) Adhyadesh, 1983.	--Do--	--Do--	--Do--	
22.	King Georges Medical College and the Gandhi Memorial and Associated Hospitals (Taking Over) Adhyadesh, 1983.	--Do--	--Do--	--Do--	

1	2	3	4	5	6
23.	U.P. Dacoity Affected Areas Adhyadesh, 1983.	14-3-83	17-3-83	28-4-83	—
24.	U.P. Shri Kashi Vishwanath Temple (Second) Adhyadesh, 1983.	15-3-83	—Do—	—Do—	—
25.	U.P. Khadi and Village Industries Board (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	—Do—	—Do—	—Do—	—
26.	U.P. Urban Planning and Development (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	—Do—	—Do—	—	Replaced by Legislation
27.	U.P. Kesari Gram (Prohibition) Adhyadesh, 1913,	—Do—	—Do—	—Do—	—
28.	Sanjaya Gandhi Post Graduate Institute of Medical Sciences Adhyadesh, 1983.	—Do—	—Do—	—Do—	—
29.	U.P. Sales Tax (Second Amendment and Validation) Adhyadesh, 1983.	16-3-83	—Do—	—Do—	—
WEST BENGAL					
1.	The D.N.D. Homoeopathic Medical College and Hospital (Taking Over of Management) Ordinance, 1982.	27-12-82	—	—	—
2.	The Calcutta Homoeopathic Medical College and Hospital (Taking Over of Management) Ordinance, 1982.	—Do—	—	—	—
3.	The Bengal Electricity Duty (Amendment) Ordinance.	—Do—	—	—	—
4.	The West Bengal Panchayat (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	19-1-83	3-3-83	18-6-83	Replaced by Legislation
5.	The West Bengal Legislative (Removal of Disqualifications) (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	21-1-83	—Do—	20-6-83	—Do—
6.	The Rabindra Bharati (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	1-2-83	8-3-83	30-6-83	—Do—
7.	The Jadavpur University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	10-2-83	—Do—	9-7-83	—Do—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
19.	Tamil Nadu	39	20	15	4 (f)	...	39	...
20.	Tripura	2	...	2	2	...
21.	Uttar Pradesh	85	46	...	22	2	1	...	12 (g)	1	84	1
22.	West Bengal	42	4	28	10 (h)	...	42	...
UNION TERRITORIES												
23.	Andaman and Nicobar	1	1	1	...
24.	Arunachal Pradesh	2	2	2	...
25.	Chandigarh	1	1	1	...
26.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	1	1	1	...
27.	Delhi	7	6	1	7	...
28.	Goa, Daman and Diu	2	2	2	...
29.	Lakshadweep	1	1	1	...
30.	Mizoram	1	1	1	...
31.	Pondicherry	1	1	1	...
32.	Nominated (Anglo-Indian)	2	2	2	...
		544	355	36	25	21	16	15	43	17	528*	15

*Excluding the Speaker.

- (a) Congress (S)—1.
 (b) Congress (S)—2 ; CPI—5 ; Congress (J)—1.
 (c) Congress (S)—1 ; CPI—2 ; Muslim League—2 ; DSP—1.
 (d) CPI—1.
 (e) Congress (S)—1.
 (f) AIADMK—3 ; Muslim League—1.
 (g) CPI—1 ; DSP—8 ; Janavadi—2 ; Congress (J)—1.
 (h) RSP—4 ; Forward Block—3 ; CPI—3.

B. PARTY POSITION IN RAJYA SABHA (AS ON 1 APRIL, 1983)

States/Union Territories Seats Cong. (I) F.B. C.P.I. Janata R.S.P. AIAD C.P.I. K.C. M.L. D.M.K. Jan- Cong vadi (S)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
States													
Andhra Pradesh	18	16	1
Assam	7	1	2
Bihar	22	11	...	3	4
Gujarat	11	8	2
Haryana	5	3	1
Himachal Pradesh	3	2
Jammu and Kashmir	4
Karnataka	12	11	1
Kerala	9	3	3	1	1
Madhya Pradesh	16	10	2
Maharashtra	19	12	2	3
Manipur	1	1
Meghalaya	1
Nagaland	1
Orissa	10	8	2
Punjab	7	3	1
Rajasthan	10	7	1
Sikkim	1	1
Tamil Nadu	18	3	...	1	1	...	8	1	4
Tripura	1	1

C. PARTY POSITION IN LEGISLATURES OF STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES

State/Union Territory	Parties													Total Vacancies
	Seats	Cong. (I)	Janata	Lok Dal	BJP	Cong. (S)	CPI(M)	CPI	Other	Ind.	10	11	12	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	13	
States :														
Andhra Pradesh L.C. (As on 1.4.83)	90	55	1	...	6	...	1	2	10(a)	9	84	6	6	
Andhra Pradesh L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	295	59	1	...	4	...	5	5	218(b)	1	293	2	2	
Assam L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	126	91	2	2	1	3(c)	10	109	17	17	
Bihar L.C. (As on 1.10.83)	96	32	5	7	1	1	...	5	4(d)	2	57	39	39	
Bihar L.A. (As on 31.3.83)	325	194	40	11	23	5	6	22	17(e)	5	323*	1	1	
Gujarat L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	182	141	16	...	12	7(f)	6	182	
Haryana L.A. (As on 31.3.1983)	90	57	9	15	6	1(g)	...	88*	1	1	
Himachal Pradesh L.A. (As on 1.4.1983)	68	35	2	...	28	1	66*	1	1	
Jammu & Kashmir L.C. (As on 1.4.1983)	36	1	34(h)	1	36	
Jammu & Kashmir L.A. (As on 1.4.1983)	78	11	10	...	1	51(i)	...	73	5	5	
Karnataka L.C. (As on 1.4.1983)	63	24	7	...	5	5	41*	21	21	

Karnataka L.A. (As on 1.4.1983)	225	81	86	...	18	...	3	3	15(j)	16	222*	2
Kerala L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	141	34	4	6	30	13	46(k)	7	140*	...
Madhya Pradesh L.A. (As on 1.1.1983)	321	244	1	1	62	2	2(1)	6	318*	2
Maharashtra L.A. (As on 1.1.1983)	78	40	4	...	7	3	7(m)	9	70*	7
Maharashtra L.A. (As on 1.1.1983)	289	235	14	...	14	8	2	2	10(n)	3	288	1
Manipur L.A. (As on 1.4.1983)	60	44	1	1	5	8(o)	1	60	...
Meghalaya L.A. (As on 1.4.1983)	60	59(p)	...	59*	...
Nagaland L.A. (As on 1.4.1983)	60	36	24(q)	...	60	...
Punjab L.A. (As on 1.4.1983)	117	66	1	...	4	8	37(r)	1	117	...
Rajasthan L.A. (As on 1.4.1983)	200	147	10	5	30	3	1	1	...	1	198	2
Sikkim L.A. (As on 1.4.1983)	32	22	8(s)	2	32	...
Tamil Nadu L.C. (As on 1.1.1983)	63	3	1	1	27(t)	9	41*	21
Tamil Nadu L.A. (As on 1.1.1983)	235	31	2	11	10	176(u)	4	234*	...
Tripura L.A. (As on 1-4-1983)	60	12	37	...	8(v)	3	60	...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Uttar Pradesh L.C. (As on 1-4-1983)	108	32	3	10	4	2	11(w)	1	63	45
Uttar Pradesh L.A. (As on 1-1-1983)	426	321	7	54	8	5	...	6	15(x)	8	424	2
West Bengal L.A. (As on 1-4-1983)	295	52	172	8	60(y)	1	293	2
Union Territories												
Arunachal Pradesh L.A. (As on 1-4-1983)	33	27	3(z)	2	32	1
Delhi Metropolitan Council (As on 1-4-1983)	61	38	1	2	19	60(*)	...
Goa, Daman & Diu L.A. (As on 1-4-1983)	30	28	2(aa)	...	30	...
Mizoram L.A. (As on 1-4-1983)	33	7	25(bb)	...	32	1
Pondicherry L.A. (As on 1-4-1983)	30	10	3	1	...	16(cc)	...	30	...

Excluding the Speaker/Chairman who is not a Member of any Party.

- (a) Telugu Desam—6 and Progressive Democratic Front—4.
- (b) Telugu Desam—198 ; Progressive Democratic Found—11 ; Majlis-Ittehad-Ul-Muslimeen—5 and Sanjay Vichar Manch—4.
- (c) Pleins Tribals Coucil of Assam—3.
- (d) Congress (J)—1 ; BJP—2 and Jharkhand—1.
- (e) Jharkhand Mukti Morcha—14; Forward Block—1 ; S.U.C.I.—1 and Nominated—1.
- (f) Rashtriya Congress—7.
- (g) Indian National Congress (J)—1.
- (h) National Conference—33 and Others—1.
- (i) National Conference—48; J and K People Conference—1 ; Inqalabi N.C.—1 and Jamait-i-Islami—1.
- (j) Kranti Ranga—8; M.E.S.—5; A.I.A.D.M.K.—1 and Nominated—1.
- (k) Indian Union Muslim League—14; Kerala Congress (J)—8; Kerala Congress—6; Janata (G)—4; All India Muslim League—4; National Democratic Party—4; Revolutionary Socialist Party—4 and Socialist Republican Party—2.
- (l) Republican Party of India (Khobragade—1 and Nominated—1.
- (m) Peasants and Workers Party—3; Republican Party of India (Kamble Group)—1 and Shiv Sena—3.
- (n) Peasants and Workers Party—8; Republican Party of India (Khobragade Group)—1 and Nominated—1.
- (o) M.P.P.—4 and P.L.P.—4.
- (p) Meghalaya Democratic Front—32 and Meghalaya United Parliamentary Party —27.
- (q) Nagaland National Democratic Party—23 and Naga People's Party—1.
- (r) Shiromani Akali Dal (L)—33; Shiromani Akali Dal (T)—3 and All India Communist Party—1.
- (s) Sikkim Prajatantra Congress—1 and Sikkim Congress (R)—7.
- (t) All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam—15; Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam—5; Teachers-Graduates Progressive Front—4; Indian Union Muslim League—1; United Party—1 and Gandhi-Kamraj National Congress—1.

- (u) All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam—130; Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam—35; Gandhi-Kamraj National Congress—4; All India Forward Block—3; Tamil Nadu Congress (K)—3 and Nominated—1.
- (v) R.S.P.—2 and Tripura Upajati Juba Samity—6.
- (w) Loktantrik Samajvadi Dal—3; Shikshak Dal—4 and Nirdaliya Vidhayak Paksha—4.
- (x) Democratic Socialist Party—11; Soshit Samaj Dal—1 and Congress (J)—3.
- (y) Forward Bloc—28; Revolutionary Socialist Party—19; West Bengal Socialist Party—3; Democratic Socialist Party—3; Revolutionary Communist Party of India—2; Forward Bloc (Marxist)—2; Socialist Unity Centre of India—2 and Nominated—1.
- (z) People's Party of Arunachal Pradesh—3.
- (aa) Maharashtrawadi Gomantak Party—2.
- (bb) People's Conference (P.C.)—24 and Mizo Union—1.
- (cc) Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam—14; Indian Union Muslim League—1 and All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam—1.

THE JOURNAL OF PARLIAMENTARY INFORMATION

Index to Vol. XXIX (1983)

	Page		Page
ADDRESSES AND SPEECHES		men of Estimates Committees.	8
AGARWAL, SATISH		at the Conference of Chairmen of Library Committees.	288
at the Conference of Chairmen of Public Accounts Committee	104	at the Conference of Chairmen of Public Accounts Committees.	99
at the Valedictory Meeting of the Parliamentary Financial Committees.	86	at the Seminar on 'Parliamentary Questions.'	440
BANSI LAL		at the Seminar on 'The Budgetary Process'.	303
at the Conference of Chairmen of Estimates Committees.	13	at the Symposium on 'Time of the House'.	2
at the Valedictory Meeting of the Parliamentary Financial Committees.	90	at the Valedictory Meeting of the Parliamentary Financial Committees.	95
DAS, ANADI CHARAN		on the occasion of 19th Death Anniversary of Jawaharlal Nehru.	71
at the Conference of Chairmen of Committees on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.	298	on the occasion of 94th Birth Anniversary of Jawaharlal Nehru	428
JAKHAR, BAL RAM		on the occasion of unveiling of the Portraits of Mahatma Gandhi, Vithalbhai Patel and Jawaharlal Nehru.	446
at the Conference of Chairmen of Committees on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.	294		557
at the Conference of Chair-			

	Page		Page
JHA, RADHA NANDAN		ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS	
at the Conference of Presiding Officers.	109	New Lt. Governor	29
JOSHI, VIJAY KUMAR		ANDHRA PRADESH	
on the occasion of unveiling of the portraits of Mahatma Gandhi, Vithalbhai Patel and Jawaharlal Nehru.	448	Death of a Minister	166
		General Elections	165
		New Deputy Chairman	475
		New Governor	474
		New Ministry	165
		New Speaker	166
LAKSHMANAN, G.		APPENDICES	39, 239, 395, 503
at the Conference of Chairmen of Library Committees.	290	AROUND THE STATES	26, 165, 330, 474
NEGI, THAKUR SEN.		ARTICLE	
on the occasion of unveiling of Portraits of Mahatma Gandhi, Vithalbhai Patel and Jawaharlal Nehru.	445	The Media and Parliament in U.K. by Sir Charles Gordon.	118
PARTHASARATHI, G.		ARUNACHAL PRADESH	
on the occasion of 94th Birth Anniversary of Jawaharlal Nehru.	431	New Lt. Governor	477
SETHI, P.C.		ASSAM	
to the Indian Administrative Service Probationers.	307	Election of the Speaker	167
		Expansion of the Ministry	330
		General elections	166
		New Ministry	166
SHIV SHANKAR, P.		ASSAM SITUATION	
on the occasion of 19th Death Anniversary of Jawaharlal Nehru.	73	Discussion on	186, 218
VAIRALE, MADHUSUDAN		AUSTRALIA	
at the Valedictory Meeting of the Parliamentary Financial Committees.	92	New Prime Minister	172
ALBANIA		AUSTRIA	
New President	30	New Chancellor	333
		BANSI LAL	
		See under Addresses and Speeches.	

	Page		Page
BHAGAT, B.R.			
Review of the book 'Japan: Divided Politics in a Growth Economy' by J.A.A. Stockwin.	229	dom Movement and Thought : Nehru and the Politics of 'Right' versus 'Left' (1930-47) by Shankar Dayal Sharma.	495
BIHAR		Nelson, Daniel and White, Stephen : Communist Legislatures in Comparative Perspective by Indrajit Gupta.	387
By-election	26		
Changes in the Cabinet	167		
MLA's election set-aside by the High Court	167		
New Government	475	Stockwin, J.A.A : Japan : Divided Politics in a Growth Economy by B.R. Bhagat.	229
Resignation by the Minister	26		
BILLS		BUDGET	
The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1983.	360	General	193, 216
The Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1983.	352, 381	Railway	191, 215
The Copy Right (Amendment) Bill, 1982.	379	BUREAU OF PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES AND TRAINING	
The Delhi Administration (Amendment) Bill and the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1983.	207, 219	Courses conducted by	17, 126, 318, 451
The Emigration Bill, 1983.	382	BY-ELECTIONS	
The Finance Bill, 1983.	208, 361	Bihar	26
The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 1983.	352	Karnataka	332
BOLIVIA		Maharashtra	476
End of Military Rule	30	Uttar Pradesh	29
Resignation by Ministers	477	West Bengal	29
BOOK REVIEWS		CAMEROON	
Gupta, R.C. : Indian Free-		Dismissal of the Prime Minister	478
		CHAD	
		New President	30
		CHAIRMAN	
		New appointments in Delhi Metropolitan Council	172

	Page		Page
Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Parishad	171	Meetings of the Association of Secretaries-General of Parliaments	316
CHILE			
Revocation and reimposition of emergency	478	Public Accounts Committees—Conference (6th) of Chairmen (New Delhi, 19 February, 1983).	99, 125
CHINA			
New Constitution	30	Seminar on 'Parliamentary Questions' (New Delhi, 12 August, 1983)	440, 451
New President	334	Seminar on 'The Budgetary Process' (New Delhi, 22 April, 1983)	303, 318
COMMITTEES ON THE WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES			
Conference of Chairmen	294, 316	Spring meetings of Inter-Parliamentary Union (Helsinki, 24 April, 1983)	315
CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA			
Committees on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes—Conference (3rd) of Chairmen (New Delhi, 5 August, 1983).	294, 316	Symposium on 'Time of the House: Focus on Important Issues. (Patna, 9 November, 1982)	2
Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference (29th) (Kenya, 22 October, 1983)	450	CYPRUS	
Estimates Committees—Conference (5th) of Chairmen (New Delhi, 18 December, 1982)	8, 16	Election of President	172
Inter-Parliamentary Conference (70th) (Seoul, 4 October, 1983)	449	DAILY AVERAGE OF QUESTIONS	
Library Committees—Conference (2nd) of Chairmen (New Delhi, 19 March, 1983)	125, 288	Lok Sabha	211, 354
		Rajya Sabha	222, 363
			384
		DAS, ANADI CHARAN	
		See under Addresses and Speeches.	
		DELHI	
		General elections	172
		New Chairman, Metropolitan Council	172
		New Chief Executive Councillor	172

	Page		Page
DEPUTY CHAIRMAN,		FRANCE	
New appointment in An-		Formation of a new Minis-	
dhra Pradesh Legislative		try	172
Council	475	GAMBIA	
DEVELOPMENTS		Extension of Emergency	31
ABROAD	30, 172	GANDHI, MAHATMA	
	333, 477	Portrait, Unveiling of	445
DEVELOPMENTS AT THE		GENERAL ELECTIONS IN	
CENTRE	25, 163	<i>India</i>	
	330, 474	Andhra Pradesh	165
DOCUMENTS OF CONSTI-		Assam	166
TUTIONAL AND PAR-		Delhi	172
LIAMENTARY INTE-		Jammu and Kashmir	331
REST	175, 480	Karnataka	167
ECUADOR		Meghalaya	170
Declaration of emergency	30	Nagaland	28
EDITORIAL NOTE	1, (V)	Tripura	171
	287, 427	<i>Other Countries</i>	
ESTIMATES COMMITTEES		Great Britain	334
Conference of Chairman	8, 16	Mauritius	478
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF		GHANA	
GERMANY		Suspension of the Constitu-	
New Chancellor	30	tion	173
FINANCIAL COMMITTEES		GOA, DAMAN AND DIU	
Valedictory Meeting of	86	Resignation by a Minister	477
FINLAND		GORDON, CHARLES	
New Government	31	Article on 'The Media and	
Resignation by the Govern-		Parliament in U.K.'	118
ment	31	GOVERNOR	
Resignation by the Prime		New appointments in—	
Minister	334	Andhra Pradesh	474
FLOOD SITUATION		Gujarat	476
Discussion on	347	Himachal Pradesh	167, 331
		Karnataka	16, 332

	Page		Page
Kerala	26	INDIA	
Orissa	476	By-elections to Lok Sabha	25, 163
Punjab	171		164, 330
GREAT BRITAIN		By-elections to Rajya Sabha	330, 474
General elections	334	Cabinet Reshuffle	163
New Government	334	Death of the former Speaker	330
New Speaker	334	Formation of a new Group in Rajya Sabha	165
GUJARAT		Four new nominated Members sworn in	25
By-election	26	Recognition to Shri Charan Singh's group as Lok Dal	25
New Governor	476	Resignation by Ministers	330, 474
GUPTA, INDRAJIT		Resignation by Rajya Sabha Members	25, 474
Review of 'Communist Legislatures in Comparative Perspective by Daniel Nelson and Stephen White	387	Vice President sworn in as Acting President	25
HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSIONS		INDONESIA	
Lok Sabha	211, 354	Dissolution of Parliament	31
Rajya Sabha	222, 363, 384	Election of the President	173
HARYANA		INDUSTRIAL SICKNESS	
Changes in the Cabinet	331	Discussion on	359
MLA's election set aside by the High Court	167	ISRAEL	
HIMACHAL PRADESH		New President	173, 343
Cabinet Reshuffle	26	New Prime Minister	478
Death of a Minister	26	Resignation by the Prime Minister	478
Election of two MLAs set aside	26	ITALY	
New Governor	167, 331	New Government	31, 478
New Ministry	331		
IMPORT AND EXPORT POLICY			
Discussion on	205		

	Page		Page
Resignation by the Govern- ment	31, 334	LEBANON	
JAKHAR, BAL RAM		Appointment of Prime Minister	31
See Under Addresses and Speeches		LIBRARY COMMITTEES	
JAMMU AND KASHMIR		Conference of Chairmen	125, 288
Dissolution of Legislative Assembly	331	LOK SABHA (SEVENTH)	
General elections	331	Party Position in	60,277,417,545
New Government	332	Sessional Review of Ele- venth Session	182
New Speaker	332	Sessional Review of Twelfth Session	336
JAPAN		Statement showing the sit- tings held by the Com- mittees	39, 395
New Prime Minister	31	Statement showing the work transacted during the Eleventh Session	239
JHA, RADHA NANDAN		Statement showing the work transacted during the Twelfth Session	503
See Under Addresses and Speeches		LT. GOVERNOR	
JOSHI, VIJAY KUMAR		New appointments in—	
See Under Addresses and Speeches		Andaman and Nicobar Islands	29
KARNATAKA		Arunachal Pradesh	477
By-election	332	Mizoram	477
General elections	167	Pondicherry	477
New Governor	168, 332	MADHYA PRADESH	
New Ministry	168	Cabinet Reshuffle	27, 332
New Speaker	168	Resignation by Ministers	169
KERALA		Resignation by the Speaker	333
Changes in the Cabinet	476	MAHARASHTRA	
New Governor	26	By-election	476
LAKSHMANAN, G.		Death of a Minister	28
See Under Addresses and Speeches			

	Page		Page
Expansion of Ministry	28	NEGI, THAKUR SEN	
New Chief Minister	169	See Under Addresses and	
New Ministry	169	Speeches	
MANDAL COMMISSION		NEHRU, JAWAHARLAL	
Discussion on non-imple-		94th Birth Anniversary-	
mentation of recommen-		Meeting of	428
dations of	350, 378	Parliamentarians Homage	
		to	71
MANIPUR		Portrait, Unveiling of	445
Changes in the Ministry	333	NEPAL	
Expansion of Ministry	28	New Ministry	479
MAURITIUS		NETHERLANDS	
General elections	478	New Constitution	173
New Ministry	479	NORTH YEMEN	
MEDIA AND PARLIAMENT		Election of the President	334
IN U.K.		OBITUARY REFERENCES	
Article on	118	Lok Sabha	211, 355
MEGHALAYA		Rajya Sabha	222, 384
Expansion of the Ministry	476	ORISSA	
General elections	170	New Governor	476
New Ministry	170, 333	PARAGUAY	
New Speaker	171	Election of the President	173
MEXICO		PARLIAMENT	
New President	32	Bills passed by	52, 257, 407
MIZORAM		PARLIAMENTARY AND CONS-	
New Lt. Governor	477	TITUTIONAL DEVELOP-	
NAGALAND		MENTS	
Expansion of Ministry	171	<i>India</i>	25, 163
General elections	28		330, 474
New Ministry	28	Andaman and Nicobar	
NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY		Islands	29
Resolution on	369	Andhra Pradesh	165, 166
			474
		Arunachal Pradesh	477

	Page		Page
Assam	166, 167 330	Chad	30
Bihar	26, 167 475	Chile	478
Delhi	172	China	30, 334
Goa, Daman and Diu	477	Cyprus	172
Gujarat	26, 476	Ecuador	30
Haryana	167, 331	Federal Republic of Germany	30
Himachal Pradesh	26, 167 331	Finland	31, 334
Jammu and Kashmir	331, 332	France	172
Karnataka	167, 168 332	Gambia	31
Kerala	26, 476	Ghana	173
Madhya Pradesh	27, 169 332, 333	Great Britain	334
Maharashtra	28, 169 476	Indonesia	31, 173
Manipur	28, 333	Israel	173, 334 478
Meghalaya	170, 171 333, 476	Italy	31, 334 478
Mizoram	477	Japan	31
Nagaland	28, 171	Lebanon	31
Orissa	476	Mauritius	478
Pondicherry	333, 477	Mexico	32
Punjab	171	Nepal	479
Rajasthan	29, 476	Netherlands	173
Sikkim	29, 333	North Yemen	334
Tamil Nadu	477	Paraguay	173
Tripura	171	Peru	32, 173 335, 479
Uttar Pradesh	29, 171	Portugal	32, 335
West Bengal	29	Spain	32
<i>Other Countries</i>		Sri Lanka	32, 174 335, 479
Albania	30	St. Christopher and Nevis	479
Australia	172	Sudan	335
Austria	333	Switzerland	32
Bolivia	30, 477	Tanzania	174
Cameroon	478	Thailand	335
		U.S.S.R.	33, 335
		Yugoslavia	335
		PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS	
		Foreign	17, 317

	Page		Page
Indian	16, 316	PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS	
PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES	16, 125 312, 449	Motion of Thanks on	182, 212
PARTHASARATHI, G.		PRICE SITUATION	
See under Addresses and Speeches		Discussion on	348, 374
PARTY POSITION IN		PRIME MINISTER	
Lok Sabha	60, 277, 417, 545	New appointments in—	
Rajya Sabh	62, 279, 419, 547	Australia	172
State Legislatures	66, 282, 422, 550	Israel	478
PATEL, VITHAL BHAI		Japan	31
Portrait, Unveiling of	445	Lebanon	31
PERU		Peru	173
Declaration of emergency	335	Portugal	335
New Prime Minister	173	Spain	32
Resignation by Prime Minister	32	Tanzania	174
Revocation of emergency	479	Thailand	335
PONDICHERRY		PRIVILEGE ISSUES	
New Lt. Governor	477	<i>House of Representatives (Australia)</i>	
Proclamation of President's rule	333	Alleged casting of reflections on Members in a newspaper article	136
PORTUGAL		<i>Lok Sabha</i>	
New Government	335	Alleged misrepresentation of the proceedings of the House and casting of reflections on a Member by a newspaper	454
Resignation by Prime Minister	32	Increase in prices of certain petroleum products on the eve of the Budget Session	128
PRESIDENT		Manhandling of a Member and use of abusive language in respect of Members of Parliament,	320
New appointments in—			
Albania	30		
Chad	30		
Israel	173, 334		
North Yemen	334		
Switzerland	32		
U.S.S.R.	335		
Yugoslavia	335		

	Page		Page
Shouting of slogans and throwing of a piece of cloth containing some printed matter thereon from the Visitors' Gallery on the floor of the House.	323	<i>Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly</i>	
		Alleged casting of reflections on Members and the House by a newspaper	133
Wrong and misleading statements allegedly made in the House by two Ministers in regard to a note stated to have been sent by the Chief Election Commissioner to Government after the first round of poll in Assam for postponing the elections.	129	<i>Kerala Legislative Assembly</i>	
		Alleged misleading of the House by a Minister, and giving advance publicity in the press to a notice of question of privilege by a Member	134
<i>Rajya Sabha</i>		<i>Maharashtra Legislative Assembly</i>	
Alleged casting of reflections on Members and the House by a Member in a newspaper column.	458	Alleged casting of reflections on Members and the House in a newspaper article	19
Alleged casting of reflections on the Chair by a journalist.	457	Alleged casting of reflections on Members in a newspaper article.	20
Alleged exclusion of Members of Rajya Sabha from certain Committees of a State Government.	457	<i>Maharashtra Legislative Council</i>	
		Alleged casting of reflections on Members by the Chief Minister.	460
<i>State Legislatures</i>		<i>Nagaland Legislative Assembly</i>	
<i>Gujarat Legislative Assembly</i>		Alleged casting of reflections on Members by the Chief Minister in a press-statement.	461
Obtaining a group pass for the Visitors' Gallery by giving false names.	131	<i>Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly</i>	
		Issuing of a notice to the Chief Minister by the	

	Page		Page
Madras High Court in connection with a writ petition filed before that Court.	462	Conversion of Calling Attention included in the List of Business into Discussion allowed	326
<i>Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha</i>		Discussion on a Calling Attention not to be prolonged by bringing in extraneous matters	326
Alleged failure to give reply by a Minister to a notice given by Member.	467	Display of a revolver in the House by a member deprecated	161
Alleged threat by a Government Officer to stop construction work in the Constituency of a Member who had sought to raise a matter in the House relating to the Department under that officer.	21	Faulty functioning of Automatic Vote Recorder	23
Alleged threatening of a Member by a Police Officer	134	Introduction of certain changes in ceremonies connected with President's Address	159
Alleged use of derogatory words for Members by a Police Officer.	468	Making of allegations by the Members against a person in high authority disallowed	327
PROCEDURAL MATTERS		New Direction 118A relating to authentication of papers to be laid by private Members.	325
<i>Lok Sabha</i>		Objection regarding laying of papers at the Table to be referred to the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table and not to be raised in the House	159
A Minister cannot be prevented from laying on the Table, rules framed or amended in pursuance of a statute ; but it is open to Members either to accept, reject or modify the rules through a separate motion.	160	Opposing of a Statement being made by Minister not permissible	327
Collapse of Question Hour before time	325	Permission to bring a walking stick by a Member in the Chamber on account	

	Page		Page
of his physical disability granted.	162	by a Minister not allowed	472
When a motion appears in the List of Business in the name of more than one Member, only mover has a right to speak while moving the motion	161	Objection regarding the reading of part of Governor's Address by the Speaker rejected	328
<i>State Legislatures—</i>		Point of order raised on the basis of a Member's personal information regarding the recommendation of Lokayukta for taking action against Ministers, disallowed	470
<i>Bihar Vidhan Sabha</i>		Point of order regarding a resolution seeking increase in certain expenditure included in the List of Business of the Legislative Council rejected	329
Priority amongst the Starred Question to be decided by Ballot	470	Point of order regarding the attachment of financial memorandum with a Bill held valid	471
<i>Nagaland Legislative Assembly</i>		Reply to a question that it was comprehensive and the expenditure involved in collecting information was not commensurate to the benefits accruing from it held valid	329
Written submission for making an inquiry not necessary when sufficient information already given by the Member on the floor of the House	470	<i>Union Territory—</i>	
<i>Rajasthan Legislative Assembly</i>		<i>Goa, Daman and Diu Legislative Assembly</i>	
Special procedure adopted for the consideration of a Bill	23	Point of order regarding putting to the vote of the House a substantive motion seeking resignation/dismissal of a Minister held valid	472
Written authorisation by the Chairman required to enable a Member to present the Report of a Committee	327		
<i>Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha</i>			
Notices admitted under Rule 301 should be replied by the concerned Minister	471		
Objection regarding personal clarification given			

	Page		Page
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS		Statement showing the	
COMMITTEES		work transacted during	
Conference of Chairman	99, 125	the Hundred and Twenty-	
		Sixth Session	397
PUNJAB		Statement showing the work	
New Governor	171	transacted during the	
		Hundred and Twenty-	
PUNJAB SITUATION		Seventh Session	509
Discussion on	196, 219, 336	RECENT LITERATURE OF	
	358, 364	PARLIAMENTARY 36, 234, 391,	
		INTEREST	498,
QUESTION HOUR		SADAR HUKAM SINGH	
Lok Sabha	211, 354	Homage to	
Rajya Sabha	222, 363		312
	384	SATELLITE LAUNCH	
RAJASTHAN		VEHICLE SLV-3-D-2	
Changes in the Cabinet	476	Launching of	206
Expansion of the Ministry	29	SESSIONAL REVIEW	
RAJYA SABHA		<i>Lok Sabha</i>	
Party Position in	62, 279,	Allegations made by Mr.	
	419, 547	Seymour Hersh in his	
Sessional Review of Hund-		recent book 'The Price	
red and Twenty-Fifth		of Power' against former	
Session	212	Prime Minister of India,	
Sessional Review of Hund-		Shri Morarji Desai	352
red and Twenty-Sixth		Annual Floods and Drought	347
Session	355	Assam situation	186
Sessional Review of Hund-		Attacks on the Tamil-	
red and Twenty-Seventh		Speaking People in Sri	
Session	363	Lanka	340
Statement showing the		Daily Average of Questions 211, 354	
work transacted during		General Budget, 1983-84	193
the Hundred and Twenty-		Half-an-Hour Discussions 211, 354	
Fourth Session	41	Import and export policy	
Statement showing the work		for 1983-84	205
transacted during the			
Hundred and Twenty			
Fifth Session	244		

	Page		Page
Investment in Indian Industries and take-over bids of Indian Companies by certain Non-Resident Indians	351	1983, and the adoption of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Bill, and the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill	207
Large Scale Infiltration by Pakistani Nationals into the Border District of Kutch in North Gujarat and in various parts of the country	350	The Finance Bill, 1983	208
Launching of Satellite Launch Vehicle SLV-3-D-2	206	The Question Hour	211, 354
Non-Implementation of the Recommendations of the Mandal Commission	350	The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 1983	354
Obituary References	211, 355	Third Year's Programme (1983-84) of India's Extended Arrangement with the International Monetary Fund	339
President's Address	182		
Price policy for foodgrains	205	<i>Rajya Sabha</i>	
Price situation in the country	348	Daily Average of Questions	222, 363, 384
Railway Budget, 1983-84	191	Distribution of surplus land during Sixth Five-Year Period	371
Setting up of a Commission on Centre-State Relations	204	Half-an-Hour Discussions	222, 363, 384
Seventh-Conference of Non-Aligned Countries	202	Industrial sickness	359
Situation in Punjab	196, 336	Motion of Thanks on the President's Address	212
Statutory Resolution regarding disapproval of the Arms (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 and the adoption of the Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1983	352	Non-implementation of Mandal Commission Report	378
Statutory Resolution regarding dis-approval of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance,		Obituary References	222, 384
		Price situation	374
		Radiation leaks at Tarapur Atomic Power Station	363

	Page		Page
Reported disclosure of confidential correspondence between former President Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy and former Prime Minister Shri Morarji Desai	376	Take-over of Indian Companies by non-residents of Indian Origin	368
Reported refusal to Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh to broadcast his speech from the Hyderabad Station of the All India Radio	366	The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1983	360
Resolution on National Health Policy	369	The Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1983	381
Re-starting of negotiations with Assam Agitation Leaders	377	The Budget (General) 1983-84	216
Situation in Assam	218	The Budget (Railways) 1983-84	215
Situation in Punjab	219, 364	The Copyright (Amendment) Bill, 1982	379
Situation in Sri Lanka	372	The Emigration Bill, 1983	382
Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 and the Motion for consideration of the Delhi Administration (Amendment) Bill, 1983 and Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Delhi Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 and the Motion for consideration of the Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1983	219	The Finance Bill, 1983	361
		The Question Hour	222, 363 384
		Threat to National Integrity caused by separatist and terrorist activities in the state of Punjab	358
		Working of the Ministry of Home Affairs	355
		Working of the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour)	357
		<i>State Legislatures</i>	
		<i>Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly</i>	
		Resolution on Prohibition of defections from political parties by the Members of the Legislatures	223
		Resolution regarding the abolition of the Legislative Council	223

	Page		Page
<i>Bihar Vidhan Parishad</i>		<i>Karnataka Legislative</i>	
Financial Business	489	<i>Assembly</i>	
Obituary References	489	Ratification of the Consti- tution (Forty-Sixth Amendment) Bill, 1982	34
Resolution regarding with- drawal of the Press Bill	489	Resolution on the death centenary of Karl Marx	225
<i>Bihar Vidhan Sabha</i>		<i>Karnataka Legislative Council</i>	
Financial Business	224, 489	Ratification of the Consti- tution (Forty-Sixth Amendment) Bill, 1982	35
Governor's Address	223	Resolution on the death centenary of Karl Marx	225
No-Confidence Motion against the Council of Ministers	488	<i>Madhya Pradesh Vidhan Sabha</i>	
Question Hour	224, 489	Financial Business	225, 385
Ratification of the Consti- tution (Forty-Sixth) Amendment Bill 1982	223	<i>Nagaland Legislative Assembly</i>	
Resolution regarding ex- pulsion of Mr. Harry Barnes, U.S. Ambas- sador to India	488	Financial Business	490
Resolution regarding with- drawal of the Press Bill	488	Governor's Address	225
<i>Gujarat Legislative Assembly</i>		Obituary References	490
Appointment of a Parlia- mentary Committee to inquire into the alleged police atrocities at Vijay- nagar	384	<i>Punjab Legislative Assembly</i>	
Financial Business	384	Resolution regarding the Seventh Non-Aligned Summit	226
Governor's Address	384	<i>Rajasthan Legislative Assembly</i>	
Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Ministers	34	Governor's Address	385
Obituary References	385	Question Hour	385
<i>Haryana Vidhan Sabha</i>		Resolution regarding legis- lation on a State subject by Parliament	385
Resolution regarding Se- venth Non-Aligned Meet	224	<i>Sikkim Legislative Assembly</i>	
		Financial Business	226, 490
		Governor's Address	226
		Half-an-Hour Discussion	491

	Page		Page
Obituary References	226	Question Hour	35, 494
Question Hour	490	Resolution regarding detec- tion and deportation of the unauthorised foreign- ers from Mizoram	493
Resolution regarding reser- vation of seats in the As- sembly for different eth- nic groups	490	Resolution regarding the establishment of Circuit Bench of the Gauhati High Court at Aizawl	493
<i>Tripura Legislative Assembly</i>			
Financial Business	227		
Governor's Address	227		
<i>Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha</i>		SETHI, P.C.	
Financial Business	492	See under Addresses and speeches	
Governor's Address	386		
Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Minis- ters	491	SHARMA, SHANKAR DAYAL	
Obituary References	386, 492	Review of "Indian Freedom Movement and Thought : Nehru and the Politics of 'Right' Versus 'Left' (1930-47)" by R.C. Gupta	495
Question Hour	386		
Resolution regarding deve- lopment of the National Capital Region	491		
Resolution regarding Man- dal Commission Report	491	SHIV SHANKAR, P.	
<i>Union Territories</i>		See under Address and Speeches	
<i>Arunachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly</i>			
Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Minis- ters	493	SHORT NOTE	
<i>Mizoram Legislative Assembly</i>		Unveiling of the Portraits of Mahatma Gandhi, Vithalbhai Patel and Jawaharlal Nehru	445
Accommodation for MPs and M.L.As	35	SIKKIM	
Administrator's Address	227	Cabinet Reshuffle	29, 333
Financial Business	227, 494	SPAIN	
Obituary References	35, 228, 494	New Prime Minister	32

	Page		Page
SPEAKER		Sessional Review of	34, 223, 384, 488
New appointments in			
<i>India</i>		ST. CHRISTOPHER AND	
Andhra Pradesh	166	NEVIS	
Assam	167	Independence to	479
Jammu and Kashmir	332	SUDAN	
Meghalaya	171	Election of the President	335
Tripura	171	SWITZERLAND	
<i>Other Countries</i>		New President	32
Great Britain	334	TAMIL NADU	
Sri Lanka	479	Appointment of New	
SRI LANKA		Ministers	477
Amendment of the Consti- tution	174	TANZANIA	
Declaration of emergency	335	New Prime Minister	174
Election of the President	32	THAILAND	
Imposition of emergency	32	Appointment of Prime	
New Speaker	479	Minister	335
Referendum for extending the life of the Parliament	32	TRIPURA	
Revocation of emergency	174	General elections	171
STATE LEGISLATURES		New Ministry	171
Activities of	46, 248, 401, 515	New Speaker	171
Bills passed by	54, 257 408, 525	UNION TERRITORIES	
Ordinances issued by	56, 267, 411, 535	Developments in	29, 172, 333, 477
Party Position in	66, 28, 422, 550	U.S.S.R.	
Privilege Issues in	19, 131, 460	Appointment of Deputy	
Procedural Matters in	23, 327, 470	Prime Minister	33
		Death of the President	33

	Page		Page
Election of the President	335	WEST BENGAL	
New Party Chief	33	By-election	29
UTTAR PRADESH		WORKING OF THE MINIS- TRIES	
By-elections	29	Home Affairs	355
Death of the Deputy Speaker	29	Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour)	357
Election of the Chairman	171	YUGOSLAVIA	
VAIRALE, MADHUSUDAN		New President	335
See under Addresses and speeches			