

***THE JOURNAL OF  
PARLIAMENTARY  
INFORMATION***

**VOLUME XXIX, No. 3  
September, 1983**

**C O N T E N T S**

	<b>PAGES</b>
<b>EDITORIAL NOTE</b>	<b>287</b>
<b>CONFERENCE OF CHAIRMEN OF LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT AND STATE LEGISLATURES</b>	
Inaugural Address by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha. ...	288—89
Address by Shri G. Lakshmanan, Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha and Chairman of Library Committee of Parliament. ...	289—93
<b>CONFERENCE OF CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES ON THE WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES &amp; SCHEDULED TRIBES OF PARLIAMENT AND STATE LEGISLATURES</b>	
Inaugural Address by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha. ...	294—99
Address by Shri Anadi Charan Das, Chairman, Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes of Parliament. ...	299—302
<b>ADDRESSES AND ARTICLES</b>	
Address by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha at the Seminar on "The Budgetary Process" ...	303—306
Address by Shri P.C. Sethi, Union Minister of Home Affairs to the Indian Administrative Service Probationers. ...	307—11
<b>PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES</b>	
Homage to Sardar Hukam Singh ...	312—15
Conferences and Symposia ...	315—16
Indian Parliamentary Delegations Abroad. ...	316—17
Parliamentary Delegations from Abroad. ...	317—18
Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training ...	318—19

	PAGES
PRIVILEGE ISSUES	... 320—24
PROCEDURAL MATTERS	... 325—29
PARLIAMENTARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS	... 330—35
SESSIONAL REVIEW	
Lok Sabha	... 336—55
Rajya Sabha	... 355—84
State Legislatures	... 384—86
BOOK REVIEW	... 387—90
Daniel Nelson and Stephen White (ed) : <i>Communist Legislatures in comparative Perspective.</i>	
—INDRAJIT GUPTA	
RECENT LITERATURE OF PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST	... 391—94

## APPENDICES

I. Statement showing the sittings held by the Committees of the Seventh Lok Sabha during the period 1 April to 30 June, 1983.	... 395—96
II. Statement showing the work transacted during the Hundred and Twenty-Sixth Session of the Rajya Sabha.	... 397—400
III. Statement showing the activities of the State Legislatures during the period 1 April to 30 June, 1983.	... 401—406
IV. List of Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament and Assented to by the President during the period 1 April to 30 June, 1983.	... 407
V. List of Bills passed by the State Legislatures during the period 1 April to 30 June, 1983.	... 408—10
VI. Ordinances issued by the Central and the State Governments during the period 1 April to 30 June, 1983.	... 411—16
VII. Party Position in Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha and State Legislatures.	... 417—26

## EDITORIAL NOTE

The Second Conference of the Chairmen of Library Committees and the Third Conference of the Chairmen of Committees on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of Parliament and State Legislatures in India were held recently in New Delhi. The Conferences were inaugurated by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker of Lok Sabha. We open this issue with features on the two Conferences which include, besides the Inaugural Addresses by the Speaker, the speeches delivered by the Chairmen of the respective Committees of Parliament on the occasions.

We also reproduce in this issue the Inaugural Address by the Speaker of Lok Sabha delivered at the Seminar on "The Budgetary Process" held under the auspices of the Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training and the Indian Parliamentary Group in New Delhi on 22 April, 1983.

Also included in this issue is the Address delivered by Shri P. C. Sethi, Union Minister of Home Affairs at an Appreciation Course for the Indian Administrative Service Probationers held under the auspices of the Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training in New Delhi on 30 April, 1983.

We offer our felicitations to Shri Wali Mohammed Itoo on his election as Speaker of the Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly.

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

—AVTAR SINGH RIKHY

## CONFERENCE OF CHAIRMEN OF LIBRARY COMMITTEES

---

The Second Conference of the Chairmen of Library Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures in India was held on 19 and 20 March, 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 G. Lakshmanan, Deputy Speaker of Lok Sabha and Chairman of Library Committee of Parliament, on the occasion.

—*Editor*

---

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

I have great pleasure in being with you this morning to inaugurate the Second Conference of the Chairmen of Library Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures. Our common bond is the endeavour of Library Committees to see that Members of Parliament and State Legislatures are assisted in getting information, papers, documents etc. to facilitate the discharge of their Parliamentary/legislative duties and responsibilities.

In the world of today we have a surfeit of publications and it is, therefore, important that we should exercise judgment and discretion in the matter of selection of publications to be added to the Library. As you know, knowledge has got no boundaries, no limits. The more you learn, the more you acquire knowledge, the more you know how less you know. This increase in knowledge is unlimited. Hence our quest for knowledge goes on. All of us know how hard-pressed a Member of Parliament/Legislature is for time. It is, therefore, essential that the library and reference services should be so organised as to provide authentic and pertinent information without loss of time. It is in this context that the Library Committees which are headed by distinguished Presiding Officers/Chairmen play an important role.

We are fortunate that our Library Committee which comprises learned Members of both the Houses and is presided over by Hon'ble Shri G. Lakshmanan, Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha, has been playing this role with

great dedication and distinction. Thanks to them, we have over the years collected, without overstraining our limited resources and space most of the significant books and publications on subjects of interest to parliamentarians. A glance at the weekly bulletin which is issued by the Library Service would indicate the wide spectrum of interests covered ; these range from constitutional, economic, social, commercial, industrial, defence, external affairs to the cultural heritage of India and the latest advances made in the field of science and technology—the whole gamut of it.

We subscribe in the Library to over a thousand periodicals and over two hundred newspapers drawn from all over the country and the world.

We have built up a comprehensive Clippings Section and our effort is to increasingly incorporate annotated notes in the library catalogue as well as in the weekly bulletin to facilitate reference by Members.

We have recently increased the Budget allocation for the Parliament Library from the existing Rs. 3 lakhs to Rs. 5 lakhs partly to off-set the escalation in prices, but more important than that to enlarge our holdings of pertinent books and publications.

I am glad that special efforts are being made to enrich our stock of books and publications in regional languages with particular reference to those of parliamentary interest. We are grateful to the State Legislatures for their valuable assistance in this behalf.

For some time now we have been trying to finalise the plan for the new Parliament Library building, but are stuck up on the question of its location. To be really useful to the Members, it has to be located close to the Parliament House. We hope that it would be possible to make significant progress in this behalf in the not too distant a future.

I am glad that the services rendered by our Library and Reference, Research, Documentation and Information Service (LARRDIS), are being put to ever greater use by Members. Only six years ago the number of references serviced was about 1,100 in a year, but this has more than doubled now. More than the numbers, we have to constantly lay stress on quality. It has to be ensured that objective information is placed at the disposal of the Members and that it is free from any bias or undue emphasis creeping in ; it has to be truly factual and reliable which can stand up to any critical scrutiny.

The first formal Conference of Chairmen of Library Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures was held in 1976 and since then there have been two informal meetings. This Conference again is in pursuance of our standing practice of having such a Conference of Chairmen of Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures once in the life time of a Lok Sabha. I

am sure, it would provide a useful forum for exchange of ideas and experiences and help to strengthen the arrangements for rendering better information and Library service to the Members.

Before I conclude, may I take this opportunity of acknowledging the dedicated work put in by my distinguished colleague, Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Shri G. Lakshmanan, as Chairman of the Library Committee of Parliament, and if I may say so, as a Presiding Officer in the House. He is one of those rare individuals who give the best of themselves to any assignment which is entrusted to their care. He is blessed with a genial temperament and a sense of wit and humour which make for good and effective Committee work. You shall soon see these qualities of head and heart at work in the ensuing Conference and with this may I wish you all a purposeful and fruitful Conference.

**ADDRESS BY SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN, DEPUTY SPEAKER, LOK SABHA,  
AND CHAIRMAN OF LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT**

I am grateful to the Hon'ble Speaker for having readily agreed to inaugurate this Conference. His inspiring Address sets the Conference on its right course.

I have great pleasure in welcoming you, my fellow Presiding Officers, Chairmen, Hon'ble Members of Parliament and other friends to this Conference. If knowledge is power, the acquisition of that power depends on how we organise and run the Library and the service connected with it. The Libraries and the ancillary services, provided within the legislature set-up at the Centre and the States, play a crucial role in assisting the legislators. The information needs of a modern legislator have increased vastly. The Library Committees have, therefore, to be continuously on the job of building up the Libraries and improving their services to keep pace with the growing demands so that the Members are fully and properly equipped in the discharge of their responsibilities.

As the Hon'ble Speaker has mentioned, after the first Conference there were two informal meetings between us in 1980 and 1981. I was keen to widen the areas of coordination and cooperation between us and the Committees of State Legislatures. I am glad to say that Parliament Library's regional language collections have already gone up to over 20,000 books, thanks to the cooperation of a number of State Legislatures. We shall be grateful if the State Legislature Libraries could help us further in selecting useful books in regional languages not only on specific themes but also on politics, economics, history, law, sociology, etc., which are particularly relevant to the work of Members in Parliament.

We have planned to acquire more and more works on and by Mahatma

Gandhi so that our Gandhiana Section develops into a truly representative and authentic storehouse of knowledge on the life of Gandhiji. We have also embarked upon the ambitious project of building a similar Section on works by and on Jawaharlal Nehru. These great personalities belonged to the whole nation and they symbolised the unit in diversity of our great country. Therefore, our aim is to have a comprehensive collection in regional languages as well as in English and Hindi on these two great leaders. Similarly, we are on the look out for enlarging our collections on a subject of perennial interest to Members : "India's Freedom Struggle".

Our Parliament Library was not built up overnight. It was as the result of painstaking efforts of our predecessors on this Committee backed by the constant encouragement of the Speaker that we have now an integrated library, research, reference, information and documentation service to cater to the needs of Members of both Houses of Parliament. Today we have over 6 lakh holdings in our Library. We are also bringing out in the LARRDIS a number of publications like Journal of Parliamentary Information, Digest of Central Acts, Digest of Legislative & Constitutional Cases, Public Undertakings—Digest of News & Views, Abstracts of Books, Reports and Articles, Diary of Political Events and Documentation Fortnightly, which provide useful information contemporaneously to the Members and help to place at their disposal upto-date information.

We must not rest satisfied with what we have achieved so far. We have to constantly modernise our services with better equipment, storage and retrieval systems. I may mention in this connection that we are taking steps to instal a computer terminal for storage and retrieval of information with a view to meeting the information requirements of Members of Parliament more satisfactorily in terms of quality and promptness. Further, we are also making a beginning in the direction of setting up a microfilm unit with a view to conserve and properly utilise the space available to the Library and also to preserve better the documents.

The principle objective of a Conference like this is to learn and draw upon each other's experiences because we are engaged in a common endeavour. Our distinguished guests from the States are welcome to see our LARRDIS at work, the extent and variety of its functions, the Members, call on its services and our response thereto, the projection through periodicals, publications and compilations of the facts relevant to issues before Parliament and the country.

I need hardly say that the quality of the Library Service depends on the competence of the officers and staff attached to it. The Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training had organised a full-fledged training course for



the Librarians of State Legislature Secretariats in the year 1976. Training programmes for Library and Research and Reference personnel from the States are also arranged as and when a request is received.

The Hon'ble Speaker is not only a great lover of books but also a reputed author. He has been a source of inspiration and encouragement to our Library Committee. I have personally received advice and guidance from him from time to time. I thank him for so graciously accepting the invitation to be with us this morning to inaugurate the Conference.

I have received valuable suggestions from the learned Members of the Parliament Library Committee who have evinced keen interest in developing the Library and its services. I thank them for their cooperation and hard work.

The Conference Agenda covers a good ground and lays emphasis on coordination among the Parliament and State Legislature Library Committees in enriching the libraries and services provided by them. I may assure the Hon'ble Speaker that the deliberations in the Conference will prove to be valuable in strengthening these further.

I would on behalf of my fellow Chairmen of the State Legislature Library Committees once again thank the Hon'ble Speaker for sparing his valuable time for addressing us and inaugurating the Conference.

The words of encouragement which my Leader, Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, has been pleased to use in respect of me are bound to enthuse me to do better work for the nation at large and I am really thankful to my elder brother for this generous gesture. You all know his name is Ram and mine is Lakshman and there is a close understanding between us in the work of the House. What he has said about me is as a member of the family of Parliamentarians because here in our House we have a tradition of regarding all Members, whether belonging to the Opposition or the Ruling Party, as members of a large family where the Presiding Officers occupy the position of elder brothers among them. Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker of Lok Sabha embodies in himself these qualities of an elder brother. Whenever a demand is made to discuss a matter of wide public importance his response is to find a way of accommodating the Member's request. At the same time he insists that the rules, precedents and rulings of the Chair should be meticulously observed. We are building up sound traditions of purposeful functioning in our Parliament with the coopera-

tion of all sections of the House. If I am successful in conducting the proceedings of the House it is largely due to the encouragement that I receive from my elder brother, Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar. I am thankful to him for the confidence he has reposed in me and I will do everything to see that the proceedings of the House are conducted properly.

I thank you all.

---

**CONFÉRENCE OF CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES ON  
THE WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND  
SCHEDULED TRIBES**

---

The Third Conference of the Chairmen of Committees on the welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of Parliament and State Legislatures in India was held on 5, 6 and 7 August, 1983, in the Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi. The Conference was inaugurated by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker of Lok Sabha. We reproduce below the inaugural address as well as the address delivered by Shri Anadi Charan Das, Chairman of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of Parliament, on the occasion.

—*Editor*

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

I am happy to inaugurate this Third Conference of the Chairmen of the Committees on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. This Committee is very important because it acts as the guardian of the weaker sections of our society to ensure the fulfilment of the constitutional safeguards provided for them. These safeguards are necessary so that there is a real socio-economic development of our society as a whole.

Government has been initiating, from time to time, legislative measures with a view to improving the socio-economic conditions of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. However, mere statutory protection would not do. The enforcement agencies and the machinery for implementation of various programmes have to be made more effective. It is here that the Committees on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes play a vital role. The adequacy or otherwise of the measures for amelioration of the conditions of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes, and the progress of their implementation, particularly in regard to the facilities for education, employment and housing through which socio-economic progress of these communities could be achieved, should receive the constant attention of the Committees.

No man is born inferior. A human being is steadfast and is not swayed by considerations of money or position high or low. These considerations are illusion only and it is the duty of the society to remove this illusion. One who considers someone small and some other

big or someone high and some other low in the society, betrays his conscience first and does anything else thereafter. All should realise it and act accordingly. Any discrimination between one section of society and the other is, therefore, against the basic concept of equality of man. If a section of our society has lagged behind in the past because they were denied adequate opportunities for growth and progress, it is the duty of those who are better placed in life now to help and assist in bringing this section up. We must arouse the conscience of our people to remind them that they cannot persist in their old ways nor can the underprivileged remain so for ever. The obligations imposed by the Constitution, Statutes, Orders and Rules should be given effect to in letter and spirit. Democracy demands a more homogenous and egalitarian society when distributive justice is denied. It brooks no delay but we have to go a long way still.

The Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes at the Centre, I can say with a sense of genuine satisfaction and pride, has been doing a commendable job ever since its inception. It has so far presented as many as 159 Reports on a variety of problems affecting the socio-economic status of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Committee keeps a continuous watch on the implementation process through its Action Taken Reports. The Committee has thus evolved itself as an effective and vigilant instrument for safeguarding the interests and rights of this section of our society.

As you are aware, time and again, Parliament and the Parliamentary Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes have expressed their great concern at incidents of atrocities on Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and we discuss these things daily in the House. It is unfortunate that cruel people still live on this holy earth even after so many years of Independence. They do not realise that perpetrating cruelty on human beings is to kill one's own soul. We should fight this tendency and create a feeling in the society whereby such people find it difficult to exist and realise that it is they who are hateful and who are mean. But it is a painful reality that such incidents continue to occur in various parts of the country. We must, therefore, take effective measures for protecting these communities from violence and harassment.

I would like to refer two aspects which merit attention.

In several institutions, particularly those devoted to engineering, medicine and other professional vocations, a number of seats are reserved for students hailing from Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Since, however, entrance to these institutions is linked to passing of entrance examination/*viva voce* the quotas reserved for students of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are not

being fully availed of. As the Parliamentary Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes has rightly pointed out, it is imperative that the pre-examination training facilities are suitably augmented and provided liberally to students of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, so that they may improve their skills and manage to qualify in larger numbers and thus gain admission into these professional institutions. I need hardly add that mere admission to these institutions is not enough. The students belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes should be continuously helped not only with liberal scholarship money, but also given extra attention and coaching facilities on sustained basis so they can remain abreast with their studies and qualify with credit. In this connection, I would like to put before you an idea which often crops up in my mind and I do not know how far it is correct. What came to my mind and I am placing before you and you may consider whether it is right or wrong. History bears testimony to the fact that some wrong divisions took place resulting in the formation of classes of haves and have-nots. The haves want to keep and retain what they have got and do not want others to share it. With a view to doing justice to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, we have made a provision for reservation of posts in order to bring our backward brethren at par so as to eliminate the element of discrimination of high and low, and to establish an equitable order. The spirit behind it was and still is valid. But we must ensure that when we translate this into actual practice, we do not commit mistakes or implement it in a faulty manner. When a person occupies a high position, it is obligatory on his part to share it with others and not to enjoy all the benefits himself or distribute them among his family members, friends or near and dear ones. He should not retain the benefits and resources exclusively with himself. Otherwise it will lead to a new trend to effect further division of these communities between the haves who will try to corner key positions and the have-nots who are denied that opportunity. We have to ensure that the benefit of this provision reaches those for whom it was intended, lest new classes are created among them; some usurping the benefit at the cost of others. This requires careful thought. The Chairmen of S.C. & S.T. Committees present here may consider whether a person, who has become an I.A.S. or I.F.S. Officer or a Minister, is not in a position to pay for the education of his children. If he continues to avail of these facilities, how can the children of a farmer or a village worker get full benefit of the concessions given to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. You may consider whether we are not creating another class and bringing back in another form the old order which we intended to remove.

One of the distinguishing features of the current Plan is to provide for Special Component Plan for Scheduled Castes and Tribal-Sub-Plan for Schedu-

led Tribes. As you well know, the main objective of development programme under the Special Component Plan is to enable at least 50 per cent of the Scheduled Caste families to cross poverty line during the current plan period. The Tribal Sub-Plan envisages execution of 181 integrated tribal development projects in areas where tribals are in a majority with a view to alleviate their condition. The allotment of funds for these projects is really impressive; it is of the order of Rs. 4483 crores for the Special Component Plan and Rs. 3505 crores for the Tribal Sub-Plan. It is of the utmost importance that the benefits of the schemes executed under these projects flow to our brethren belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes; that the wastage is reduced, if not eliminated, and that the expenditure on overheads and other administrative machinery is kept to the minimum. With a view to achieve these objectives I would suggest that the Committees on Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, both at the Centre and the States, should pay continuous attention to the execution of these schemes and give meaningful recommendations which would make for efficient and economic execution of the development projects. I am glad that our Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes has already given in April this year a Report dealing with some aspects of Special Component Plan and that they have also covered earlier in another Report in some depth the execution of integrated tribal development projects in two of the States having a large proportion of tribals, namely, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh.

One of the important functions of the Committee is to consider the reports submitted by the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes under Article 338(2) of the Constitution. The Commissioner is a constitutional authority entrusted with the duty to investigate all matters relating to the safeguards provided for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes under the Constitution and to report on the working of these safeguards. He provides valuable assistance to our Committee at the Centre. I believe the State Committees also consider his reports in respect of matters within the purview of the respective State Governments.

I have often stressed the need for coordination between the Parliamentary Committees and the State Legislature Committees. In our federal polity, which we seek to develop through centralised planning, need for such a coordination cannot be over-emphasised. I am glad to find that this subject has been put down as the first item on the Agenda for discussion at this Conference.

I am happy to say that, like its predecessors, the present Committee, under the able and inspiring guidance of Shri A. C. Das has been functioning efficiently and effectively. Shri Das has to his credit a distinguished record of

selfless and dedicated service and rich experience. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him, the Conveners and other Members of the Committee for the excellent work they are doing.

It gives me great pleasure to inaugurate this Conference. I have no doubt that Conference of this nature would help in exchanging ideas and sharing experiences and in resolving problems faced by the Committees of Parliament and State Legislatures in the discharge of their onerous responsibilities, with these words, I thank you for coming here and wish you success in your deliberations.

**ADDRESS BY SHRI ANADI CHARAN DAS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON THE WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES OF PARLIAMENT**

We are grateful to the Hon'ble Speaker for having found time in the midst of his extreme pre-occupation during the Session of Parliament to inaugurate this Third Conference of Chairmen of Committees on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. His thought-provoking Address would be a source of great inspiration to all of us and give proper direction to our deliberations.

Friends, it is an honour to welcome you all to this Conference. Like the two Conferences which were held earlier in the years 1976 and 1979, this Conference affords a valuable opportunity to us to exchange views and share experiences in regard to the onerous task of looking after, on behalf of Parliament and State Assemblies, the welfare of a sizeable section of our people—the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

As per 1979 census, out of a working force of 29 million among the Scheduled Castes, 15 million (51.8%) were agricultural labourers and 8 million (27.9%) were cultivators, mostly small and marginal farmers, share-croppers and tenants. Occupations like scavenging and sweeping are almost entirely left to the Scheduled Castes. Recent studies indicate that two-thirds of all bonded labourers are from Scheduled Castes.

Our Five Year Plans pay particular attention to the well-being of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. However, majority of them who form about one-fourth of our population are still below the poverty line and face special problems peculiar to them. Their economic status is decided by their educational and employment levels. We have, therefore, to ensure that adequate special facilities are available to them for improving their educational and employment prospects to a level that would put them on par with the rest of the country. Once this is done, their social status also would automatically improve. Our aim all along has been to integrate them into the mainstream of

our national life, in every respect, as early as possible, so that belonging to Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes does not remain a stigma to them.

It was very thoughtful on the part of Parliament to have taken the initiative in constituting separate Committee to act as a watchdog of the interests of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. It has now become a standing Committee consequent on the incorporation of the rules regarding its constitution and functions in the Rules of Procedure of Lok Sabha in December 1973. As you know this Committee consists of Members of both Houses of Parliament. The main aim of the Committee is to see that justice is done to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

The responsibility for the welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes falls equally both on the Centre and the States. Therefore, as the Hon'ble Speaker stressed it is necessary to have a measure of coordination between the Committees at the Centre and the States. Our efforts should be complementary to each other. I may assure the Hon'ble Speaker on your behalf that our discussions in this Conference would explore the avenue of and establish effective coordination among us.

The Committee at the Centre has examined in depth a variety of subjects pertaining to the welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and reported to Parliament. Further, a number of Study Notes and Reports based on on-the-spot studies have also been presented to Parliament. Since the Second Conference held in 1979, 40 Reports have been presented. These Reports have made deep impact on all concerned.

I would like to mention here that the Committee's recommendations are given due consideration by the Government Departments and Public Sector Undertakings and about three-fourth of our recommendations have been accepted by them for implementation. We keep a continuous watch over the action taken on our Reports and assure ourselves that our labours have not been in vain.

Some of the important subjects on which the Committee has presented Reports of Parliament are the socio-economic conditions of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in some of the Union Territories; Working Integrated Tribal Development Projects; educational facilities for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Indian Institutes of Technology, Central Universities, and in Medical Colleges under the control of or aided by, Central Government; reservations for, and employment of them in public undertakings; bank credit facilities for them etc.

The problems faced by the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes due to



their economic and social backwardness are not only varied but complex. The Committee had therefore recommended the setting up of a separate department in the Ministry of Home Affairs for looking after the entire work relating to the development of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. In the opinion of the Committee the provision in the Special Component Plan for Scheduled Castes needed to be enhanced so that it was not less than the percentage of the population of these communities. As regards the Integrated Tribal Development Projects, we are of the view that these should be made more beneficiary-oriented as at present disproportionately large expenditure is incurred on infrastructural development. Some States and Union Territories have issued Identity Cards to the beneficiaries under the scheme of Integrated Rural Development Programmes. The Committee recommended that these Identity Cards should be made comprehensive containing full details of a Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe family and that such Identity Cards should be introduced in all States and Union Territories as this would go a long way in proper monitoring of assistance given to the beneficiaries and to know the impact of the various schemes on the economic development of the beneficiaries.

The Committee further recommended that a Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe person who wished to set up an industrial unit with a total cost of upto Rs. 3 lakhs should be provided financial assistance upto 95% of the cost of fixed assets, repayable within 6 to 10 years. A moratorium of 2 years should be allowed and a concessional interest rate should be charged from the applicant. There should also be a scheme for providing loans for purchasing agricultural land. As regards other credit facilities provided by the banks for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, we were of the view that at least 2% of the aggregate advances of banks as at the end of the previous year should be fixed for lending under Differential Rate of Interest Scheme and a minimum of 75% of the total advances under DRI should go to the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes. The Committee has also recommended that at least 10 per cent of total loans advanced by banks should be given to persons belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes to meet their medium and long term requirements.

With the assistance provided by the Government to the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes for professional courses like law and medicine, a large number of students belonging to these communities are coming out with law and medical degrees. Many of them do not have resources to set up their own legal or medical practice and consequently they look forward to paid jobs. If adequate amount of loan at concessional rate of interest and repayable in convenient instalments is provided to persons belonging to these communities, it can be expected that a large number of them would be able to start their own practice. The Committee has made a recommendation in this regard.

Since the commencement of the Fifth Five Year Plan, larger investments have been made for the social and economic development of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. However, proportionate benefits have not flown to them primarily due to lack of education among them as also weak administrative machinery for implementation of various schemes. The endeavour of our Committees should, therefore, be to ensure that these deficiencies are removed.

As regards reservation policy, although Government of India's orders on the subject have been extended to the public sector undertakings and the public sector banks, the Committee has come across several instances where reservation orders were not being actually implemented. I feel that if the organisation of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is adequately strengthened, it would be possible for the Commissioner to conduct detailed studies and more spot visits by his staff and to report on the actual implementation of the Government's instructions. At present there is no reservation for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in employment in the private sector establishments. This question has been considered by Government in the past on various occasions. Notwithstanding the legal and other difficulties, I am of the view that the private sector owes an obligation to the society to come forward and absorb a large number of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in their services. Government should, therefore, devise ways and means to bring the private sector establishments within the fold of reservation policy.

Since the last Conference, the Parliamentary Committee had also undertaken on-the-spot study to inquire into cases of atrocities or reports of forcible conversion of persons belonging to Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes which had come to its notice. The Committee presented its findings in the reports presented to Parliament.

I have given a brief narration of work of the Committee just to give you an idea of the hard and meaningful work done by the Members of the Committee. It is the thoroughness of examination done by Members and the dedicated work put in by the Conveners which enables the Committee to cover in depth all the subjects taken up for examination during its term. The Committee functions on non-party lines and its recommendations are unanimous which accounts for the regard and respect which its reports command.

The office of Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes renders valuable assistance to the Committee in its work. I must place on record our appreciation of the help given by the officers of the Commissioner's organisation.

The Committee has received constant encouragement, guidance and

support from the Hon'ble Speaker and his predecessors. Sir, we are conscious of your great concern for the welfare of the weaker sections of our society and particularly those belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. On behalf of the Chairmen of the State Legislature Committees and Members of the Parliamentary Committee as also on my own behalf, I extend to you Sir, a hearty vote of thanks for graciously inaugurating this Conference.

-----

**ADDRESS BY DR. BAL RAM JAKHAR, SPEAKER, LOK SABHA  
AT THE SEMINAR ON "THE BUDGETARY PROCESS"  
HELD IN NEW DELHI ON 22 APRIL, 1983**

Let me, first of all, thank you for inviting me to inaugurate this Second Seminar on "The Budgetary Process" organised under the joint auspices of the Bureau of Parliamentary Studies & Training and the Indian Parliamentary Group. The first Seminar on this subject was organised in December, 1978. During the last five years a number of seminars have been conducted by the Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training on a variety of subjects relevant to the responsibilities of legislators. It is but appropriate that not only Members of Parliament and Associate Members of the Indian Parliamentary Group but also Members from various State Legislatures are participating in this seminar on "The Budgetary Process". I am glad to see the number of delegates as also the Ex-Members of Parliament present here today; it shows the keen interest that they take in this important subject. It gives me great pleasure to extend a warm and hearty welcome to all the participants.

Control over provision of finance for Government is central to the parliamentary system. It is the 'power of the purse' that gives the legislature its supremacy. And, it should be so. The manner in which this power is exercised is, therefore, very important. Budget is not an end in itself but means to an end. Budget is an instrument of socio-economic development of the country. It is, therefore, necessary to ensure that the Budget estimates are well laid out and the programmes and policies underlying them are implemented properly. The financial oversight by a legislature is thus carried out in two stages, initially while approving the revenue raising and expenditure proposals embedded in the Budget and later on while scrutinising the accounts rendered.

Since we embarked upon planned development of our country, there has been a vast growth in governmental activities entailing manifold increase in revenue raised and expenditure incurred. It is of great importance that our scarce resources are employed in such a way as to produce optimum results. The enforcement of the right of the legislators to keep themselves informed as to how the activities of Government are carried on and the discharge of

their responsibility to see that public funds are put to the best use, depend on the nature and quality of information given to them.

In a seminar at Patna last year I stressed the point that the information system for effective monitoring and review of governmental activities is an area that should engage the constant attention of the legislatures and their Committees with a view to refining the system for meaningful and informed control over the Executive. I particularly referred to the quality and coverage of the documents circulated with the Budget papers. Apart from the inadequacy of information, one finds that the information has traditionally been presented in a technical manner, comprehensible only to financial experts which all are not.

The Annual Reports of the Ministries/Departments and the Public Undertakings as well as the Performance Budgets should bring out not only the achievements but also the shortcomings in a manner that is easily comprehensible even to a lay-person. These should compare the performance *vis-a-vis* plan targets and objectives. These should be comprehensive and critical appraisals of implementation of plan in different sectors and these should be laid before the legislature. All new schemes/projects or significant expansion of the existing ones require prior approval of the legislature. You would agree that this would be reduced to a mere ritual without comprehensive data and information on such proposals and critical scrutiny thereof. It is, therefore, necessary that the entire background including the relevant technical, economic and financial data should become available to the legislature.

The Budgets of the Centre and the States are interlinked, and naturally so, in our federal polity. We have a centralised planning in our country. There is Central Plan assistance to the States and there are centrally sponsored plan schemes in the State Sector and Central schemes executed by the States, which are financed from the Central Budget. I have made this suggestion on several occasions and it bears repetition here, that a national perspective in financial accountability in the context of the national plans should emerge. This has been taken note of in the recent Conferences of Chairmen of Financial Committees in an attempt to bring about some coordination in their efforts.

Legislative control over expenditure will not be complete until the need for *ex-post-facto* approval to excesses over voted grants and charged appropriations is minimised if not eliminated. 'Exchequer Control' was contemplated at the time of adoption of the constitution but this still eludes us. I do not know whether this control over drawal of funds could be introduced under the new system of departmentalisation of accounts and disbursement of money through banks at the Centre to regulate expenditure within the voted

grants and charges appropriations. I have no doubt that this Seminar will give thought to this.

Legislatures have obvious limitations in regard to scrutiny of the Budget. The time available is short and often Demands for Grants relating to a number of Ministries/departments are not discussed at all. Further the accounts rendered by the Executive in the form of finance Accounts and Appropriation Accounts duly audited by the Comptroller & Auditor General of India are not discussed. It is here that the Financial Committees service the legislature by undertaking detailed scrutiny of the Budgets and the Accounts as well as Audit Reports.

After critically examining the position recently, the Business Advisory Committee was of the opinion that the Demands for Grants of as many Ministries/Departments as possible should be discussed in the House. But as you know what we decided cannot be carried out unless we have the cooperation of the whole House. The time actually taken far exceeds the time allocated for each Demand. Then, how can we discuss all the Demands? The time at our disposal is limited and cannot be over-extended. You cannot have the cake and eat it as well. So, that is the problem we are facing today in Parliament. I think there should be some *via media* whereby all parties and groups in the House agree to abide by the time limit for discussion as recommended by the Business Advisory Committee and as agreed to by the House. Time taken for discussion on each Demand has to be strictly adhered to; otherwise so many demands relating to various Departments/Ministries will continue to be guillotined every year and there would be no effective parliamentary check on them.

The three standing Committees *viz.* Public Accounts Committee, Estimates Committee and the Committee on Public Undertakings together keep a continuous vigil over the governmental activities. It is, however, not possible for these Committees to cover the whole range of the Budget or the accounts and Audit Reports. I, therefore, feel and this view is shared by others, that the time at the disposal of the legislature or its Committees will have been well spent if a broad efficiency-cum-performance appraisal of investments in economic and social development is attempted rather than going deep into individual transactions. The efficacy of the systems of control internal to Government and of the built-in safeguards against waste and inefficiency are to be gone into. In short it is necessary to reorient our methods of ensuring financial accountability of the Executive in the changed context.

The Conference of the Chairmen of Public Accounts Committees last month discussed a variety of problems. Shri Satish Agarwal, the Chairman of

the Conference, is here. The Conference took note of the fact that when there was delay or ineptitude in implementing a scheme it had far reaching adverse effects. This is how discussions bring out the lacunae or shortcomings to the forefront and should help us to overcome them.

Friends, I am sure the discussion in the Seminar ably guided by eminent persons who have intimate knowledge and vast experience in the process of Budget making and financial management, will throw up many useful ideas and suggestions for further improvement in our system designed to ensure financial accountability of the Executive to the legislature. With these words, I have great pleasure in inaugurating this Seminar and thank you once again for taking such a keen interest as you have shown today.

**ADDRESS BY SHRI P.C. SETHI, UNION MINISTER OF HOME  
AFFAIRS TO THE INDIAN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE  
PROBATIONERS.\***

---

**Friends,**

I welcome you as members of India's most important All-India Service. In the Premier's Conference held in October, 1946, under the chairmanship of late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, it was decided to create two All-India Services, namely, the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service. They were to replace the former Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police. The system of All India Services, as you are aware, is unique to the administration of our country.

Our Constitution has laid down certain Directive Principles of State Policy. These Principles enjoin upon us to promote the welfare of the people securing to them social, economic and political justice. These Principles also direct the State to minimise the inequalities in income and to eliminate inequalities in status, facilities and opportunities, not only among individuals but also among groups of people, residing in different areas or engaged in different vocations.

Maintenance of law and order continues to be our first priority. You will appreciate that no development can take place without law and order, peace and tranquillity. We therefore, keep in touch with the States to have an overall assessment of the situation and give such assistance and advice to them as may be necessary from time to time.

---

\*Delivered at an Appreciation Course in Parliamentary Processes and Procedures for the Indian Administrative Service Probationers under the auspices of Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training, Lok Sabha Secretariat on 30 April, 1983.



Certain developments in the country, particularly in Assam and Punjab, keep causing deep concern to us. Stray acts of violence in some parts of Assam have recurred. Efforts are being made by us to restore normalcy and give relief to the affected victims. Such violence gives a set back to the delicate process of normalising the situation. A climate of goodwill and harmony is essential so that people can live in peace and harmony. Violence has no place in a democracy. We have always believed that in a democratic set up like ours, all issues can be resolved through discussions. We are determined to continue efforts for finding a satisfactory solution to the problem. Similarly, we have been making earnest efforts to resolve the various issues in Punjab through negotiations.

The Constitution describes your Service as common to the Union and the States. As you are aware, the relations between the Centre and the States are governed by the provisions of the Constitution. The States have their own defined spheres of legislative and executive authority. While providing enough power to the States to discharge their functions, the Constitution places in the hands of the Central Government also, necessary powers to ensure unity and integrity of the country. We have been periodically looking into these arrangements which govern Centre-State relations. We have revitalised the Zonal Councils. They have met more frequently during the last three years. The Government have recently appointed a Commission under the chairmanship of Shri R. S. Sarkaria to examine in some depth the working arrangements between the Centre and the States keeping in view the experience of over three decades. The terms of the Commission will be so spelt as would enable a comprehensive examination of all the aspects involved.

The State is also required to promote the educational and economic interests of weaker sections of the people. We stand committed to the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. There are two sides of our approach in this regard. One side is the positive strategy for expediting their development. This has been highlighted in Point 7 of the new 20-Point Programme. The other side is their protection against exploitation. A massive outlay of Rs. 4500 crores has been earmarked during the Sixth Plan for development of the Scheduled Castes. A substantial allocation of Rs. 600 crores has also been made for this as Special Central Assistance to the States. Similarly the Sixth plan outlay for the development of the Scheduled Tribes is also Rs. 4500 crores with a special Central Assistance of Rs. 470 crores during the Sixth Plan.

You have a crucial role to play in all the development programmes. Only recently our Prime Minister has spelt out certain measures to improve

the efficiency and increase the responsiveness of the Civil Services. On another occasion she has called upon them to give their best in the service of the country. She has made it very clear to them that they need make no commitment to any particular individual or any particular ideology of any political party but their commitment to the national goals and objectives should be total, as people have come to repose a great deal of confidence in them.

The competitive examination, through which you have been selected, has been designed to attract the best available talent to the Service. The Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, where you are undergoing training, attempts to impart to you training of practical use in the early part of your career. Attempts have also been made to bring about greater uniformity in the field of training in the States although local conditions and special features in the States do require certain variations. Through your two year training period, endeavours are made to equip you professionally with the necessary skills and the techniques to enable you to discharge your duties efficiently and with confidence. This is essential due to the complexities of the problems which you will be required to face.

On entry, you are allocated to any of the State Cadres according to set principles. We visualise the All-India Services as one of the important means to ensure administrative unity. After putting in a few years of service you will be posted to responsible positions in the districts. The success of our development programmes to a large extent depends on their implementation at the district level. This calls for coordinated efforts of the various development departments. It is necessary for successful implementation that the schemes are imaginatively drawn up and faithfully implemented. Monitoring the implementation and evaluation of the results are important. They ensure that lasting benefits reach the people and do not remain only claims on paper. This has been recently brought to the notice of the State Governments. The district administration should be toned up. It should be more agile and dynamic. The officers should have a reasonable spell of continuous posting and they should be made accountable and protected against outside interference. This has been impressed on the State Governments from time to time.

In your administrative career when you are called upon to advise on policy matters, let your advice be fair and objective, uncoloured by any narrow or parochial considerations. One of the values which your Service cherishes is to take responsibility. Failure or success is not so important

as the will to do duty and to stand firm. In regard to your service matters, the advice, I believe, is: don't ask and you will not be disappointed. Passing on the fault to one's subordinates is treated as a moral degradation. The rule is: take the blame and distribute the reward. Another rule is: that work should be attended to first which does not come in the lime-light. Your Service also, I understand, advises you never to build yourself up at the expense of your predecessor, and never to solve your problems at the expense of your successor. All these are very valuable pieces of advice and everyone should try to live up to these for a satisfying career in the Service. You will imbibe many standards, some times without even being told. Protection of the weak from the strong is treated as the duty. The value of inspection hardly needs any emphasis. It is said that nothing is done which is not inspected.

One aspect which has come to my notice is your relationship with the media. Occasionally, cases come up where the members of the Service have succumbed to the temptation of quick and cheap publicity. This has been more noticeable among the younger members of the Service. While I admit the important role the media has to play, particularly in the context of our developmental efforts, it is not known, as to why should there be any such temptation for personal publicity or airing of personal grievances for a member of the premier Civil Service like yours. No doubt, you have your conduct rules in this regard. In your working, occasions may arise when you feel aggrieved; at times, perhaps for good reasons. Since you have prescribed channels for redressal of your grievances, you should take recourse to them and not rush to the media, whose function is to address to the more serious problems facing the country rather than your service matters. You may say that I have given you a long list of our expectations from you, and ask what is the Government doing for you? I can assure you, that, we, in the Government, are aware of your problems and the difficult nature of your work. We are also aware of the problems of cadre management. We have designed a number of in-service training programmes for you at different stages of your service career for promoting your efficiency and effectiveness. These programmes equip you with necessary skills and expertise. In selection for training, particularly foreign training, we are giving due weightage to those who have worked in difficult areas like the North-East. We have also introduced, from 1 January, 1982, a scheme of compulsory group insurance for members of your Service. In considering your placement in the Central Government, we also give due weightage to your field experience. Those who do well in their sub-divisional and district assignments normally get credit for higher appointments in the Secretariat.

Friends, it was not my intention to give you a sermon of do's and don'ts, but I wished to share with you, some thoughts and emphasise that being members of the important All-India Service, you should always have an all-India perspective. In fact, it is this all-India perspective that underlies the significance and importance of your Service, reiterating the basic unity of administration of our country and ensuring uniformity of the standards.

I wish you a successful career in the public service.

## PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

---

### HOMAGE TO SARDAR HUKAM SINGH

On 25 July, 1983 the Speaker, Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, informed the Lok Sabha of the passing away of Sardar Hukam Singh, former Speaker of Lok Sabha, on 27 May, 1983, at New Delhi at the age of 88. After the Speaker, the Prime Minister and leaders of various parties and groups had paid tributes to Sardar Hukam Singh, the Members stood in silence for a short-while as a mark of respect to his memory and the House was adjourned for the day.

The Speaker, Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, said that with the passing away of Sardar Hukam Singh the country had lost a dedicated son who devoted himself to the service of people and the democratic institutions.

Giving a brief life-sketch of Sardar Hukam Singh, the Speaker said that he was a noted Parliamentarian. He was a Member of the Constituent Assembly, the Provisional Parliament and the first three Lok Sabhas during the years, 1948—67.

In March, 1956 Sardar Hukam Singh, at that time a Member of the Opposition and a Member of the Panel of Chairmen, was elected to the office of the Deputy Speaker of Lok Sabha. He was re-elected as Deputy Speaker of Second Lok Sabha. He was unanimously elected to the high office of the Speaker of Third Lok Sabha, in April, 1962 and continued in that office till March, 1967.

As a Deputy Speaker in the Second Lok Sabha, he was the Chairman of the Committee of Privileges, the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions and the Committee on Subordinate Legislation. In his capacity as the Speaker of Lok Sabha, he was elected as the first President of the Institute of Constitutional and Parliamentary Studies. During his tenure as Speaker, he led Indian Parliamentary Delegations to USSR and Mango-

lian People's Republic, United States of America, West Germany, United Kingdom and Philippines. He also led Indian Delegations to Commonwealth Parliamentary Conferences held at Lagos in Nigeria and Kuala Lumpur in Malaysia. He served as a Member of the General Council of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference for two years.

Sardar Hukam Singh had an amiable personality. He was deeply devoted to Parliamentary institutions and made a very distinguished contribution as a Presiding Officer in the form of decisions and rulings from the Chair.

He was appointed as Governor of Rajasthan in April, 1967 and served there till 1972.

A deeply religious man, Sardar Hukam Singh was an intellectual, social reformer and an able administrator. He won wide respect for his qualities of head and heart, unflinching sense of courtesy and dignified behaviour.

Expressing her sorrow at the death of Sardar Hukam Singh, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi said that he presided over the proceedings of the august House with dignity, impartiality and earnestness and earned the respect of all sections of the House. Sardar Hukam Singh came to this high office after many decades of public service in Punjab. Later, he rendered further distinguished service as Governor of Rajasthan.

Associating himself with the sentiments expressed by the Speaker and the Prime Minister, Shri Samar Mukherjee [CPI (M)] said that a loss of such an outstanding parliamentarian was really a loss to our parliamentary democracy and to the people.

Prof. Madhu Dandavate (Janata) said that Sardar Hukam Singh contributed through his rulings to a free and fair debate and discussion on various matters, including the privileges and the rights of the House. To preserve these values and to inculcate them in the life of this Lok Sabha was a real tribute to Sardar Hukam Singh.

Paying his tributes, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee (BJP) said that a leading personality had been lost and a void had been created in public life due to the demise of Sardar Hukam Singh.

Shri C.T. Dhandapani (DMK) said that he was one of the noted parliamentarians of our time and his death was a great loss to our country.

Shri A. Neelalohithadasan Nadar (DSP) said that as Speaker and Governor, the name of Sardar Hukam Singh would always remain imprinted in the history of our Parliamentary democracy.

Expressing his condolences, Shri Rasheed Masood (Lok Dal) said that he was one of those persons who had left an imprint on history.

Shri Ramavatar Shastri (CPI) said that all that the former Speaker, Sardar Hukam Singh, did for strengthening democracy or for the betterment of the society was before all of us. What was required was that we followed in his footprints.

Joining his friends in paying tributes to Sardar Hukam Singh, Shri Dharam Bir Sinha [Congress (S)] said that he created many precedents in the House.

Shri Tridib Chaudhuri (RSP) recalled the fine way in which the former speaker blended sweet reasonableness with firmness and strict adherence to democratic and parliamentary principles.

Shri G.M. Banatwalla (Muslim League) said that Sardar Hukam Singh had, for the benefit of the entire nation, left behind him an indelible contribution to parliamentary democracy in our country.

Shri Chitta Basu (Forward Bloc) said that as a Speaker of this august House, he had been a jealous defender of the dignity and decorum of the House.

Associating himself with the sentiments expressed by the Speaker, the Prime Minister and the Leaders of the opposition, Shri Abdul Rashid Kabuli (National Conference) hoped that democratic institutions would be strengthened further in the country in the light of the healthy traditions laid down by Sardar Hukam Singh.

Shri C. Chinnaswamy (AIADMK) said that a great administrator and a great parliamentarian had been lost.

Paying his tribute, Shri Chandrajit Yadav (Janvadi) said that his death was a great loss to the country particularly at a time when the country

needed such people who could give a new direction to the society through their selfless services.

Expressing his condolences, Shri Jagjivan Ram [Congress (J)] said that he never forgot human values whatever office he held inside and outside this House.

The Members requested the Speaker to convey their condolences to the members of the bereaved family.

#### CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA

*Spring meetings of the Inter-Parliamentary Union:* The Spring Meetings of the Inter-Parliamentary Union were held in Helsinki (Finland) from 24 to 29 April, 1983. The Indian Delegation to the meetings was led by Shri Jagannath Kaushal, Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs and consisted of Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, M.P., Shri T. Chandrasekhara Reddy, M.P. and Shrimati K.K. Chopra, Additional Secretary, Rajya Sabha Secretariat and Secretary to the Delegation. The Indian Delegates also attended the meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Council held there.

The following subjects were discussed at the Study Committee Meetings in Helsinki:—

- (1) Ways and means of strengthening the United Nations so that this world institution could play a more effective role in resolving conflicts and present and future world problems, especially in the field of arms control and disarmament.
- (2) The contribution of Parliaments to the adoption of concrete measures by UNCTAD VI and to their implementation, particularly with regard to trade, commodities, financial and monetary issues and technological transfers, with a view to making progress towards an equitable international economic system.
- (3) Youth employment, particularly in the developing countries, including the role of education and training.
- (4) The role of Parliaments in promoting the process of decolonization and in promoting the political, economic, social and cultural



rights of ethnic groups within multi-ethnic States, particularly with a view to encouraging inter-ethnic co-operation and justice.

*Meetings of the Association of Secretaries-General of Parliaments:* The meetings of the Association of Secretaries-General of Parliaments were also held in Helsinki from 24 to 29 April, 1983. From India, Shrimati K.K. Chopra, Additional Secretary Rajya Sabha Secretariat, attended the meetings.

*Conference of Chairmen of Committees on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes:* The Third conference of Chairmen of Committees on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of Parliament and State Legislatures in India was held at New Delhi on 5, 6 and 7 August, 1983. Besides the Chairman of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of Parliament, 20 chairmen of the said Committees from State 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 Shri A.C. Das, M.P., Chairman of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled castes and Scheduled Tribes of Parliament and Chairman of the Conference.

The Conference discussed matters pertaining to the following aspects of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes :

1. Coordination;
2. Special Component Plan;
3. Upliftment of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes;
4. Educational Facilities;
5. Separate Ministry/Department for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes;
6. Atrocities on Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes;
7. Reservation in Services;
8. Representations; and
9. Implementation of Recommendations.

#### INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS ABROAD

*Indian Parliamentary Delegation to Republic of Korea:* On the invitation of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea, an Indian Parliamentary Delegation led by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha visited the Republic of Korea from 15 to 23 May, 1983. Besides the leader, the Delegation consisted of Shri G.Lakshaman, Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha,

Shri Bishnu Prasad, M.P., Shri D.M. Putte Gowda, M.P., Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav, M.P., Shri Ram Pyare Panika, M.P. and Shri Era Sezhiyan, M.P., Shri Avtar Singh Rikhy, Secretary, Lok Sabha, was Secretary to the Delegation.

*Indian Parliamentary Delegation to European Parliament:* On the invitation of European Parliament, an Indian Parliamentary Delegation led by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha visited European Parliament from 4 to 14 June, 1983. Besides the leader, the Delegation consisted of Shri Bansi Lal, M.P., Shri Hari Shankar Bhabhra, M.P., Shri Mahendra Prasad, M.P. and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P. Shri Avtar Singh Rikhy, Secretary, Lok Sabha, was Secretary to the Delegation.

*Indian Parliamentary Delegation to German Democratic Republic:* On the invitation of the People's Chamber (Parliament) of the German Democratic Republic, an Indian Parliamentary Delegation led by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha visited the German Democratic Republic from 24 to 30 June, 1983. Besides the leader, the Delegation consisted of Shrimati Vidya Chennupati, M.P., Shri G.L. Dogra, M.P., Shri G.Y. Krishnan, M.P., Shrimati Usha Malhotra, M.P., Dr. (Shrimati) Sathiavani Muthu, M.P. and Shri Ramavatar Shastri, M.P. Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Secretary-General, Rajya Sabha, was Secretary to the Delegation.

*Indian Parliamentary Delegation to Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia:* On the invitation of the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia, an Indian Parliamentary Delegation led by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha visited Czechoslovakia from 1 July, 1983 to 5 July, 1983. Besides the leader, the Delegation consisted of Shri Shyam Lal Yadav, Deputy Chairman, Rajya Sabha and Deputy Leader of the Delegation, Shri M.M.A Khan, M.P., Shri Sunil Maitra, M.P., Shri Lakshman Mallick, M.P., Shri Anantha Ramulu Mallu, M.P., Shri Narendra Singh, M.P. and Shri Abdul Rehman Sheikh, M.P. Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Secretary-General, Rajya Sabha, was Secretary to the Delegation.

#### PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS FROM ABROAD

*Cyprus Parliamentary Delegation:* In response to an invitation from India, a Cyprus Parliamentary Delegation led by his Excellency Mr. George Ladas, President of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus visited India in March, 1983.

The Delegation called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha on 21 March, 1983. A meeting between the visiting Delegation and Members of our Parliament

was held on 22 March, 1983. The Speaker, Lok Sabha hosted a banquet in their honour on the same day.

Besides Delhi, the delegates visited some places of historical, cultural and industrial interest, viz. Agra, Bangalore, Mysore and Bombay.

*Zambian Parliamentary Delegation:* In response to an invitation from India, a Zambian Parliamentary Delegation led by Hon'ble Mr. R.M. Nabulyato, OGCF, M.P., Speaker of the National Assembly of the Republic of Zambia, visited India in April, 1983.

The Delegation called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha on 17 April, 1983. The Speaker, Lok Sabha hosted a banquet in their honour on 18 April, 1983. A meeting between the visiting Delegation and Members of our Parliament was held on 19 April, 1983.

Besides Delhi, the delegates visited some places of cultural and industrial interest, viz. Agra, Faridabad, Hyderabad, Bombay and Pune.

*Algerian Parliamentary Delegation:* In response to an invitation from India, an Algerian Parliamentary Delegation led by Hon'ble Mr. A. Belayat, M.P., Member of the Central Committee and Vice-President of the Popular National Assembly of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria visited India in May, 1983.

The Delegation called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha on 4 May, 1983. The Speaker, Lok Sabha hosted a banquet in their honour on the same day. A meeting between the visiting Delegation and Members of our Parliament was held on 5 May, 1983.

Besides Delhi, the delegates visited some places of cultural and industrial interest, viz. Faridabad, Bangalore, Mysore and Agra.

#### BUREAU OF PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES AND TRAINING

During the period 7 April to 30 June, 1983, the following Programmes/Courses were organised by the Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training, Lok Sabha Secretariat.

*Seminar on "The Budgetary Process":* A Seminar on "The Budgetary Process" was held under the joint auspices of the Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training and the Indian Parliamentary Group on 22, 23 and 24 April, 1983 in Committee Room (Main), Parliament House Annexe.

The Seminar, inaugurated by Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker, Lok Sabha on 22 April, 1983, was attended by 47 Members of Parliament, 16 Members of the Indian Parliamentary Group (IPG) and 50 Members from the State Legislatures, including Shri E.K. Mawlong, Speaker, Meghalaya Legislative Assembly, Shri W. Angou Singh, Deputy Speaker, Manipur Legislative Assembly and Shri T. Dihingia, Minister of State for Law, Assam. The following were the Panel Speakers:

1. Shri Satish Agarwal, M.P.
2. Shri B.R. Bhagat, M.P.
3. Shri Eduardo Faleiro, M.P.
4. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi, M.P.
5. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy, M.P.

Besides the above-mentioned 5 Panel Speakers, in all 3 Members of Parliament, 5 members of IPG and 30 Members from the State Legislatures took part in the discussion.

*Appreciation Courses for Probationers of Civil Services:* Two Appreciation courses in Parliamentary processes and procedures viz. the Thirteenth Appreciation Course for I.A.S. Probationers and the Seventh Appreciation Course for IFS Probationers, were organised from 26 April to 30 April, 1983 and 3 May to 7 May, 1983 respectively.

*Course for Officers of the Lok Sabha and State Legislature Secretariats:* Training Course for Middle Level Officers of Lok Sabha and State Legislature Secretariats in the Working of Financial Committees was organised from 16 May to 10 June, 1983.

*Attachment Programmes:* From 26 April to 30 April, 1983, the Bureau organised an Attachment Programme for two Officers from the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha Secretariat to enable them to familiarise with the work relating to Editorial and Translation Service. Another Attachment Programme was organised from 9 May to 10 June, 1983 for three Officers from the Madhya Pradesh Vidhan Sabha Secretariat to provide them necessary information about the working of Parliament Library and Reference, Research, Documentation and Information Service. An Officer from the Himachal Pradesh Vidhan Sabha Secretariat was attached to Parliamentary Committees from 2 June to 4 June, 1983 for enabling him to study their working.

## PRIVILEGE ISSUES

---

### LOK SABHA

*Manhandling of a Member and use of abusive language in respect of Members of Parliament by police personnel :* On 6 April, 1983, a Member (Shri Bhogendra Jha) made a statement in the House under rule 377 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, regarding his alleged manhandling and use of abusive language in respect of Members of Parliament by the police personnel at Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, on 3 April, 1981. In his statement the Member alleged as under :

“Having come to know that Police in Ghaziabad had beaten up AITUC workers after entering its district office on the 1st of April, it was decided, in consultation with CPI Group Leader in this House, Comrade Shri Indrajit Gupta, that I should go to Ghaziabad to ascertain the actual facts. I reached Ghaziabad at about 5.15 p.m. on the 3rd April. Comrade Jitendra Sharma, Ghaziabad District Secretary of C.P.I. and another Comrade accompanied me from Delhi on a taxi. We reached Ghaziabad after 5.15 p.m. About 5 to 6 persons were present in the District AITUC Office situated at the site of what is known as Meerut road.

While we took our tea in the office, some more workers gathered and narrated the story of the police repression on them. After hearing them, I began talking to them, about the need to defend their hard-won trade-union and other legal rights without getting provoked or cowed down. Just I had begun, one police Inspector named R.R. Pal appeared and asked me whether I was Bhogendra Jha, Member of Parliament. Confirming this query, I asked him to wait a bit as I would like to talk to him. Just at this point, scores of PAC men and constables came running and began unwarrantedly assaulting the sitting workers with lathis etc. Indiscriminately, brandishing lathis, rifle butts, they pulled out the workers

from the AITUC office room and pushed them out giving blows after blows. District AITUC President, Ghanshyam Sinha, General Secretary, Sukhbir Tyagi, District CPI Secretary Jitendra Sharma and two to three other local leaders surrounded me from all sides apparently to save me from blows. While I was standing in their midst, several PAC men rushed towards me, pulling out and pushing out those surrounding me while giving them barrel push and bayonet blows. One of the PAC men hit me with barrel in my chest exclaiming: "Saale Assembly aur Parliament wale kya karne aate hain." Immediately after PAC men gave me push with barrel behind my back, then three of them began giving me full blows with rifle butts while hurling filthy abuses as to why Members of Parliament poke their nose everywhere. When I was fainting, on the orders of the City Magistrate, some Trivedi, they huddled me into a jeep standing by in which the above named Mazdoor leaders had also been huddled in. The City Magistrate, Trivedi, and the Police Inspector Pal were also sitting in the same jeep on the front benches. I asked the Magistrate to find me back my spectacles taken away by some PAC men. Exclaiming 'Nothing doing', he ordered the driver to proceed. After going about one to two furlongs, both the officers got down from the jeep at a place which I was told was the office of the Sri Ram Piston and Rings Mills, where workers are on strike since 17th March. Both of them had some confabulation with one official of the mill, who I was told was General Manager of the mill, some Agarwal. After talking to him, the Magistrate ordered me out of the jeep and asked me to go wherever we wanted to. Fortunately, the taxi from Delhi had been following us and we got into it. Having received severe blows and feeling acute pain all around the body, we rushed to the emergency ward of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital and got ourselves treated.

Sir, I do not know and hence cannot impute any personal motivation against any of the officers and their men, because they had no personal acquaintance with me, excepting that they could not tolerate any 'investigation' by any Member of Parliament nor could I make out any understandable reason for their wanton and brutal display and use of force, including several rounds of firing."

The Speaker (Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar), gave his consent to the raising of a question of privilege given notices of by two Members (Sarvashri Indrajit Gupta and Ramavatar Shastri) on the matter,

Shri Indrajit Gupta then moved the following motion which was adopted by the House :

“That the matter relating to the statement made here on the floor of the House by Shri Bhogendra Jha concerning assault on him by the PAC at Ghaziabad on the 3rd of this month be referred to the Committee of Privileges.”

The Committee of Privileges, after examining in person the Member (Shri Bhogendra Jha), Shri S.K. Trivedi, the then City Magistrate, Ghaziabad, Shri R.R. Pal, the then Inspector of Police, Ghaziabad, Shri Om Pathak, the then District Magistrate, Ghaziabad and Shri A.B. Shukla, the then Superintendent of Police, Ghaziabad, in their Fourth Report presented to the House on 5 May, 1983, reported *inter alia* that the facts stated in their oral evidence before the Committee by Sarvashri R.R. Pal and S.K. Trivedi, who were present on the scene of incident on 3 April, 1981, were totally contradictory to the facts stated by Shri Bhogendra Jha, in his statement in the House and later during his evidence before the Committee. The Committee also found that there were certain material contradictions between the evidence given by Sarvashri R.R. Pal, S.K. Trivedi, A.B. Shukla, and Shri Om Pathak.

After careful consideration of the evidence and other documents made available to the Committee, the Committee felt that there was no reason to disbelieve the facts stated by the Member (Shri Bhogendra Jha) that he was abused in filthy language and assaulted by the police personnel who were acting under the supervision of Sarvashri R. R. Pal and S.K. Trivedi. The Committee were not convinced that Sarvashri S.K. Trivedi and R.R. Pal were not aware of the presence of the Member (Shri Bhogendra Jha) at the scene of incident on 3 April, 1981, at Ghaziabad. The Committee found that both Sarvashri S.K. Trivedi and R.R. Pal, who were present at the scene of incident, failed in their duty to provide protection to Shri Bhogendra Jha, from being abused and assaulted by the police personnel under their charge.

The Committee, after taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances of the case, came to the conclusion that “the police personnel used abusive language in respect of Members of Parliament in general and Shri Bhogendra Jha, MP, in particular, and assaulted him at Ghaziabad, on 3 April, 1981”

In view of their finding, the Committee decided that Sarvashri S.K. Trivedi and R.R. Pal, be called again before the Committee to give them another opportunity to have their say in the matter. When both of them appeared again before the Committee on 7 April, 1983, they were apprised of the findings of the Committee. Thereupon, Sarvashri S.K. Trivedi and R.R. Pal tendered their unqualified regrets and unconditional apologies to the Committee and the Member.

In view of the unconditional and unqualified apologies tendered by the concerned officers, the Committee recommended no further action in the matter.

The Committee were, however, distressed to find that there had been several cases referred to them by the House regarding ill-treatment and assault by the police on the Members. The Committee urged that "the Ministry of Home Affairs should issue instructions\* to all the authorities concerned to ensure that the Members are not exposed to such ill-treatment and violence at the hands of the police authorities."

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

*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:* On 10 May, 1983, the Deputy Speaker (Shri G. Lakshmanan) informed the House that at about 14.50 hours that day, a visitor calling himself Ram Sarup shouted slogans and threw a piece of cloth containing some printed matter thereon from the Visitors' Gallery on the floor of the House. The Watch and Ward Officer took him into custody immediately and interrogated him. The visitor had made a statement but had not expressed any regret for his action. The Deputy speaker added that he had brought the matter to the "notice of the House for such action as it may deem fit."

---

\*The Ministry of Home Affairs while inviting the attention of all the State Governments and Union Territories Administration to these observations of the Committee of Privileges, issued the following instructions to them on 24 June, 1983 [*vide* their letter No. I/13014/25/83-IS (D. III), dt. 24.6.83] :

"It is needless to say that the law enforcing authorities should bear in mind that while discharging their duties, all due respect and consideration is shown to Members of Parliament as representatives of the people and entrusted with discharge of important functions and responsibilities under the Constitution. It is requested that the observations of the Committee of Privileges may be brought to the notice of District Magistrates/District SPs and other authorities in charge of law and order for due compliance."



Thereupon, the Deputy Minister in the Department of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Mallikarjun) moved the following motion which was adopted by the House :—

“This House resolves that the person calling himself Ram Sarup, son of Shri Gainda Lal, who shouted slogans at about 14.50 hours today and threw a piece of cloth containing some printed matter thereon from the Visitors’ Gallery on the floor of the House, and whom the Watch and Ward Officer took into custody immediately, has committed a grave offence and is guilty of the contempt of this House.

This House further resolves that he be let off with a stern warning on the rising of the House today.”

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

---

LOK SABHA

*New Direction 118A relating to authentication of papers to be laid by private Members*: Under existing procedure, when Members laid some paper or document on the Table of the House, they were required to record a certificate authenticating the said document. However, the exact text of the certificate to be recorded had not been prescribed either in Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha or in the "Directions by the Speaker." With a view to bring about uniformity in certificates that may be recorded by Members, the Speaker of Lok Sabha, has issued a new Direction 118A providing for authentication of papers to be laid by private Members.

The Direction, which came into force w.e.f. 9 May, 1983, reads as under :—

- “(1) When a Member seeks permission of the Speaker to lay a paper or document on the Table of the House under direction 118, he shall record thereon a certificate in one of the following forms, as the case may be :—
- (a) ‘I certify from my personal knowledge that this is the original document which is authentic’.
  - (b) ‘I certify from my personal knowledge that this document is a true copy of the original which is authentic’.
  - (c) ‘I certify that the contents of this document are correct and based on authentic information.’
- (2) If the paper or document consists of more than one page, the Member shall put his signature with date on every page thereof.”

*Collapse of Question Hour before time*: Under Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, unless the Speaker

otherwise directs, the first hour of every sitting of the House is available for the asking and answering of Questions. On very rare occasions, the Question Hour may collapse before time.

On 3 May, 1983, out of the usual number of twenty Questions in the List of Questions for Oral Answers for that day, only seven Questions were orally answered as other Members, in whose names Questions stood, were not present in House. Consequently, the Question Hour was over at about 11.51 hrs. *i.e.* nine minutes before the scheduled time. Answers to the remaining Questions were treated as having been laid on the Table of the House.

*Conversion of Calling Attention included in the List of Business into Discussion allowed :* In the List of Business for 27 July, 1983, a Calling Attention regarding the reported attacks on the Tamil speaking people in Sri Lanka was included. Before the item was reached, several Members submitted that instead of a Calling Attention a Short Duration Discussion might be allowed to enable other Members to participate in the discussion. Thereupon, the Speaker (Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar) in consultation with the Leaders of Party/Groups agreed to convert the Calling Attention into a Discussion on the same day. Later on, the Minister of External Affairs (Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao) made a *suo motu* statement on the subject. Thereafter, the Members in whose names the Calling Attention item had appeared in the List of Business were called to speak before other Members were called by the Chair to participate in the discussion.

Similarly, another Calling Attention regarding the reported investment in Indian Industries and takeover bids of Indian companies by certain non-resident Indians included in the List of Business for 12 August, 1983, was converted into a Short Duration Discussion on request in the House by Leaders of Groups/party on a date to be decided later. Subsequently, the Speaker, in consultation with the Business Advisory Committee decided to take up Short Duration Discussion on 24 August, 1983. Accordingly, the item was included in the List of Business for 24 August, 1983. The Members in whose names the Calling Attention item had appeared in the List of Business were called to speak first and other Members were called after them, which had been taken up for discussion on 24 August, 1983.

*Discussion on a Calling Attention not to be prolonged by bringing in extraneous matters :* On 28 July, 1983, while asking clarificatory questions on the statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri H.K.L. Bhagat) in response to a Calling Attention regarding the

reported refusal to the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh (Shri N.T. Rama Rao) to broadcast from All India Radio Station, Hyderabad, on 18 July, 1983, the Members in whose names the item appeared in the List of Business, brought in many extraneous matters which resulted in an abnormally long-drawn discussion. Thereupon, the Speaker (Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar) observed that a discussion on a Calling Attention should not be prolonged by bringing in extraneous matters.

*Opposing of a statement being made by a Minister not permissible :* On 1 August, 1983, before the Minister of State for Home Affairs (Shri N.R. Laskar) was called to make a statement regarding extension of time for completion of inquiry and submission of report by Kudal Commission of Inquiry on Gandhi Peace Foundation and other organisations included in the List of Business, the Deputy Speaker (Shri G. Lakshmanan) informed the House that some Members wanted to oppose the statement being made by the Minister. While pointing out that there was no provision in the Rules of Procedure of Lok Sabha to oppose a statement to be made by a Minister, the Deputy Speaker observed that Members were, however, entitled to table appropriate notices for a debate on the statement.

*Making of allegations by the Members against a person in high authority disallowed :* On 16 August, 1983, immediately after the Question Hour, a Member (Prof. Madhu Dandavate) sought Speaker's permission to refer to a motion given notice of by him under Rule 184\* of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha regarding certain allegations against the functioning of the Governor of Sikkim. The Speaker disallowed remarks sought to be made by the Member as no allegations could be made against a person in high authority whose conduct could only be discussed on a substantive motion.

STATE LEGISLATURES  
RAJASTHAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\*\*

*Written authorisation by the Chairman required to enable a Member to present the Report of a Committee :* Rule 204 (1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly provides that the report of a Committee shall be presented to the House by

---

\*Rule 184 reads as under :

“Save in so far as is otherwise provided in the Constitution or in these rules, no discussion of a matter of general public interest shall take place except on a motion made with the consent of the Speaker.”

\*\*Contributed by the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly Secretariat.

the Chairman or in his absence by any Member of the Committee. When, in the absence of the Chairman, a Member of the Committee on Public Undertakings rose to present a report of that Committee to the House during its Budget Session, held in February-March, 1983, the Leader of the Opposition objected to its presentation. He contended that the Member, who was presenting the report of the Committee, must have an authority to do so from the Chairman in as much as in the absence of such authority, any other Member of the Committee may legitimately object to his doing so. The Speaker thereupon ruled that in future whenever a Chairman was unable to present the report himself, he should authorise in writing another Member of the committee who may present such report in his absence.

#### UTTAR PRADESH VIDHAN SABHA\*

*Objection regarding the reading of part of Governor's Address by the Speaker rejected:* On 1 February, 1983, while raising a point of order, a Member (Shri Rajendra Kumar Gupta) referred to Article 176(1) of the Constitution and Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha and said that when the Governor came to address the Members of both the Houses on that day, he did not read his Address himself but gave it to someone else to read it out. Since the Governor did not address the House in accordance with the Constitution and Rules of Procedure, the Member wanted to know as to how the Motion of Thanks could be presented.

Another Member (Shri Mohan Singh) also raised objection and said that the Address, which was read out by the Speaker, should not be treated as Governor's Address. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, the Minister of Food and Supply and several other Members also expressed their views on the subject.

Dealing with the objections raised by the Members, the Speaker in his ruling observed that the Governor after his arrival had read the first paragraph of his Address and authorised the Speaker to read out the rest of the Address on his behalf. In the end the Governor read out the last paragraph himself. Therefore, the question of any objection did not arise. Referring to the previous rulings on the subject, the Speaker rejected the objections raised in the matter and held that the action of the Governor was constitutional.

---

\*Contributed by the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha Secretariat (Original in Hindi).

*Point of order regarding a resolution seeking increase in certain expenditure included in the List of Business of the Legislative Council rejected:* On 18 February, 1983, raising a point of order under Rule 300 of the Rules of Procedure, a Member (Shri Mohan Singh) said that in the List of Business of Legislative Council dated 17 February, 1983, a resolution seeking increase in the expenditure on the administration of justice to the tune of 5% of the total expenditure had been included. He said that by bringing such a resolution, the Legislative Council had attempted to give direction to make some additional financial provisions in the Budget under a particular head and by discussing this resolution it had encroached upon the jurisdiction of the Legislative Assembly.

Referring to the provisions of Articles 198 and 199 of the Constitution and Rule 147 of the Rules of Procedure of the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Council, Shri Mohan Singh demanded a ruling on certain points *viz.:* whether permission was sought from the Speaker before starting discussion on this point by the Chairman of the Legislative Council; whether the Legislative Council was authorised to have a discussion on that point without the permission of the Speaker; and whether the entire proceedings could not be expunged by the order of the Speaker in view of the fact that discussion had violated the jurisdiction of the Legislative Assembly.

Referring to a previous ruling delivered on 22 April, 1965, by the then Speaker in the Legislative Assembly, the Speaker said that Legislative Council was an independent body, had its own Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, and had got full authority to take decisions in its own matters, except in those cases which, as per Rules, were allotted to the Legislative Assembly. Since he was not aware of what had been done in the Legislative Council, the Speaker rejected the point of order.

*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:* On 17 March, 1983, while inviting the attention of the Speaker to the reply given to an Unstarred Question, a Member (Shri Ram Asre Verma) raised a point of order and wanted to know whether a reply, that the question was comprehensive and the expenditure and time involved in collecting the information would not be commensurate to the benefits accruing from it, could be given. The Speaker held that in practice such replies could be given but the Government should get permission from the Speaker for making such replies. It should be noted for compliance in future, he added.

PARLIAMENTARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS  
(1 April to 30 June, 1983)

INDIA

DEVELOPMENTS AT THE CENTRE

---

*Resignation by a Minister* : Shri Virbhadra Singh, Minister of State for Industries, resigned from the Council of Ministers on 8 April.<sup>1</sup>

*By-elections to Lok Sabha* : On 17 May, Shri Maldevji Bharatkumar Odedra of Congress (I) was declared elected from Porbandar Parliamentary constituency.<sup>2</sup>

On 20 June, Shri Gotte Bhoopathy of Telugu Desam and Shri Abdul Rashid Kabuli of the National Conference were declared elected from the Peddapalli and Srinagar Parliamentary constituencies respectively.<sup>3</sup>

*Death of the former Speaker* : Sardar Hukam Singh, former Speaker of Lok Sabha and Governor of Rajasthan, passed away on 27 May.<sup>4</sup>

*By-elections to Rajya Sabha* : On 2 June, Sarvashri Baharul Islam and Dharanidhar Basumatari of the Congress (I) were declared elected unopposed for the two Rajya Sabha seats from the State of Assam.<sup>5</sup>

AROUND THE STATES

ASSAM

*Expansion of the Ministry* : On 2 April, 16 Ministers were inducted into the Council of Ministers while three more Ministers were inducted into the Ministry on 17 May, raising its strength to 32.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>*Hindustan Times*, 9 April, 1983.

<sup>2</sup>*Hindu*, 18 May, 1983.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid*, 21 June, 1983 and *Indian Express*, 21 June, 1983.

<sup>4</sup>*Hindu*, 28 May, 1983.

<sup>5</sup>*Hindustan Times*, 3 June, 1983.

<sup>6</sup>*Times of India*, 3 April and 18 May 1983.

## HARYANA

*Changes in the Cabinet* : On 27 June, two Ministers were dropped from the Council of Ministers by the State Governor, Shri G.D. Tapase, on the recommendation of the Chief Minister, Shri Bhajan Lal. On 28 June six Ministers resigned from the Ministry.<sup>7</sup>

## HIMACHAL PRADESH

*New Ministry* : Shri Virbhadra Singh was sworn in, on 8 April, by the State Governor, Shri A.N. Banerji, as the Chief Minister of the State following the resignation of the then Chief Minister Shri Ram Lal. Six more Ministers were sworn in on 14 April, raising the strength of the Ministry to seven. The allocation of the portfolios was as follows :

*Cabinet Ministers* : Shri Virbhadra Singh, Chief Minister: *Finance, Industry, Education, Health and Public Relations*; Shri Sukh Ram: *PWD (Building and Roadways), Housing, Excise and Taxation*; Shri Sant Ram: *Irrigation, Public Health, Rural Integrated Development and Election*; Shri Ghuman Singh: *Agriculture, Horticulture and Fisheries*; Shri Shiv Kumar: *Revenue, 20-point Economic Programme and Planning*; Shri Sat Mahajan: *Transport, Tourism and Civil Supplies*; Shri Devi Singh: *Soil Conservation and Tribal Development*.<sup>8</sup>

*New Governor* : Shri Hokishe Sema was sworn in as the Governor of the State by the Chief Justice of the Himachal Pradesh High Court on 16 April.<sup>9</sup>

## JAMMU AND KASHMIR

*Dissolution of Legislative Assembly*: The Legislative Assembly of the State was dissolved on 18 April by the State Governor, Shri B.K. Nehru, to pave the way for holding of elections in the State.<sup>10</sup>

*General elections*: Elections were held on 5 June for 76 Assembly seats in the State. The National Conference party got an absolute majority by winning 47 seats. The Congress (I) party won 25 seats while one seat each was won by Panthers Party, Peoples Conference and Independent. The result in one constituency was withheld.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid*, 28 and 29 June, 1983.

<sup>8</sup>*Times of India*, 9 April, 1983 and *Patriot*, 15 April, 1983.

<sup>9</sup>*Statesman*, 17 April, 1983.

<sup>10</sup>*Times of India*, 19 April, 1983.

<sup>11</sup>*Times of India*, 11 June, 1983 and *Hindustan Times*, 13 June, 1983.



**New Government :** An eight-member Council of Ministers, headed by Dr. Farooq Abdullah, was sworn in by the State Governor, Shri B.K. Nehru, on 12 June. One more Minister was added into the Ministry on 14 June. The allocation of portfolios was as follows :

**Cabinet Ministers :**

Dr. Farooq Abdullah: Chief Minister: *General Administration, Home, tourism, Planning and Development, Industry, Environment and Ecology and Medical Education*; Shri Ghulam Shah: *Works, Housing and Power*; Shri P.L. Handoo: *Law and Revenue*; Shri A.R. Rather: *Finance*; Shri Bodh Raj Bali: *Food and Supplies, Transport and Health*; Shri Hakim Habibullah: *Agriculture and Forests*; Shri Mohammad Shaffi: *Information, Education and Social Welfare*; Shri Rafiq Hussain Khan: *Industry and Labour*.

**Minister of State.**

Shri Jagjivan Lal: *Food and Supplies*.<sup>12</sup>

**New Speaker :** Shri Wali Mohammed Itoo of the National Conference was elected Speaker of the State Assembly on 7 July.<sup>13</sup>

### KARNATAKA

**New Governor:** Shri Ashok Nath Banerjee was sworn in as the Governor of the State on 16 April by the acting Chief Justice of the Karnataka High Court, Justice V.S. Malimath.<sup>14</sup>

**By-election:** Shri Ramakrishna Hegde of Janata Party and the Chief Minister of the State was declared elected on 16 May from the Kanakapura Assembly seat.<sup>15</sup>

### MADHYA PARDESH

**Changes in the Ministry:** Major changes were made in the Council of Ministers on 30 June when two Ministers and three Parliamentary Secretaries were dropped and one Cabinet Minister, eight ministers of State and two Deputy Ministers were inducted into the Ministry. The total strength of the Ministry was increased to 41.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup>*The Tribune*, 14 June, 1983 and *Indian Express*, 15 June, 1983.

<sup>13</sup>*Indian Express*, 8 July, 1983.

<sup>14</sup>*Statesman*, 17 April, 1983.

<sup>15</sup>*Indian Express*, 17 May, 1983.

<sup>16</sup>*National Herald*, 1 July, 1983.

*Resignation by the Speaker:* Shri Yagya Dutt Sharma tendered his resignation on 19 July from the office of the Speaker of the Vidhan Sabha to the Deputy Speaker, Shri Ramkishore Shukla.<sup>17</sup>

MANIPUR

*Changes in the Ministry:* Five new Ministers were sworn in on 4 May by the Governor, Shri S.M.H. Burney, while four had resigned on 3 May following minor changes in the Council of Ministers.<sup>18</sup>

MEGHALAYA

*New Ministry:* A new 14-member Ministry, headed by Captain Williamson Sangma, was sworn in on 2 April by the State Governor, Shri Prakash Mehrotra. The strength of the Ministry was raised to 18 by inducing four new Ministers on 20 April.<sup>19</sup>

SIKKIM

*Additions in the Ministry:* Two new Ministers were sworn in by the Governor Shri Homi J.H. Talyarkhan, on 9 May, raising the strength of the Ministry to ten.<sup>20</sup>

UNION TERRITORY

PONDICHERRY

*Proclamation of President's rule:* On 22 June, the Congress (I), a coalition partner of the Ministry headed by Shri D. Ramachandran of the DMK, announced the withdrawal of support to the Government, thereby reducing it to a minority. On 24 June, the President, Giani Zail Singh, on the advice of the Lt. Governor, Shri K.M. Chandy, dissolved the Legislative Assembly and proclaimed President's rule in the Union Territory.<sup>21</sup>

DEVELOPMENTS ABROAD

AUSTRIA

*New Chancellor:* Mr. Fred Sinowatz was sworn in as head of the first left-liberal coalition Government in the State on 24 May following the resignation of Mr. Briano Kreisky.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>*Times of India*, 20 July, 1983.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid* 4 May, 1983 and *Indian Express*, 5 May, 1983.

<sup>19</sup>*Times of India*, 3 and 21 April, 1983.

<sup>20</sup>*Indian Express*, 10 May, 1983.

<sup>21</sup>*Hindustan Times*, 23 and 25 June, 1983.

<sup>22</sup>*Stateman*, 25 May, 1983.

## CHINA

*New President:* Mr. Li Xiannion, Vice-Chairman of the Communist Party, was appointed new President of the State by the National People's Congress on 18 June.<sup>23</sup>

## FINLAND

*Resignation by the Prime Minister:* Mr. Kalevi Sorso, Prime Minister of the country resigned from the office on 11 April.<sup>24</sup>

## GREAT BRITAIN

*General elections:* Elections were held for the 650 seats of the House of Commons on 9 June. The ruling Conservative Party won an absolute majority by winning 397 seats. The seats won by other parties were: Labour Party-209; the Alliance-23 and other parties-21.<sup>25</sup>

*New Government:* After winning the elections, Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher formed her new Council of Ministers on 11 June by making some changes in her old Ministry.<sup>26</sup>

*New Speaker:* Mr. Bernard Weatherill was elected Speaker of the House of Commons on 16 June.<sup>27</sup>

## ISRAEL

*New President:* Mr. Chaim Herzog was sworn in as President of the country on 5 May.<sup>28</sup>

## ITALY

*Resignation by the Government:* Mr. Amintore Fanfani, Prime Minister of the country resigned from the office on 22 April.<sup>29</sup>

## NORTH YEMEN

*Election of the President:* Mr. Ali Abdullah was unanimously re-elected President of the country on 22 May.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>23</sup>*Times of India*, 19 June, 1983.

<sup>24</sup>*Hindustan Times*, 12 April, 1983.

<sup>25</sup>*The Times*, 11 June, 1983.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid*, 12 June, 1983.

<sup>27</sup>*Patriot*, 17 June, 1983.

<sup>28</sup>*Statesman*, 7 May, 1983.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid*, 24 April, 1983.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid*, 24 May, 1983.

## PERU

*Declaration of emergency:* A state of emergency was declared in the country on 5 June by President Fernando Belaunde Terry to wipe out a guerilla insurgency.<sup>31</sup>

## PORTUGAL

*New Government:* A new centre-left Government headed by Mr. Mario Soares, was sworn in on 9 June.<sup>32</sup>

## SRI LANKA

*Declaration of emergency:* The Government declared a state of emergency in the country on 18 May following the large scale violence there.<sup>33</sup>

## SUDAN

*Election of the President:* Mr. Jaafar Nimeiri was re-elected President of the country on 2 May. He was sworn in on 24 May.<sup>34</sup>

## THAILAND

*Appointment of Prime Minister:* Gen. Prem Tinsulanonda was appointed Prime Minister of the country on 30 April by the King Bhumibol Adulyadej.<sup>35</sup>

## U.S.S.R.

*Election of the President:* Mr. Yuri Andropov, Soviet Communist Party Chief, was elected head of the State by the Supreme Soviet on 16 June.<sup>36</sup>

## YUGOSLAVIA

*New President:* Mr. Mika Spiljak took office of the President of the country on 9 May, succeeding Mr. Peter Stambolic who completed his term.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>*Hindustan Times*, 6 June, 1983.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid*, 10 June, 1983.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid*, 19 May, 1983.

<sup>34</sup>*Times of India*, 3 May, 1983 and *Statesman*, 25 May, 1983.

<sup>35</sup>*Hindustan Times*, 1 May, 1983.

<sup>36</sup>*Times of India*, 17 June, 1983.

<sup>37</sup>*National Herald*, 14 May, 1983.

## SESSIONAL REVIEW

---

### SEVENTH LOK SABHA

#### TWELFTH SESSION

The Twelfth Session (Monsoon Session) of the Seventh Lok Sabha commenced on 25 July, 1983 and adjourned *sine die* on 26 August, 1983. A brief resume of the important discussions held and other business transacted during the Session is given below :

#### A. DISCUSSIONS

**Situation in Punjab :** On 26 July, 1983, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah, laid on the Table of the House, a statement on Punjab together with copies of correspondence exchanged between his Ministry and the President of Akali Dal since 30 May, 1983. It was stated therein that in their endeavour to find a peaceful solution to the problem in Punjab, the Government had put forth proposals to resolve serious issues as also to preserve the sanctity of holy shrines and maintain amity among all sections of society. Detailing the various steps taken in this behalf, it was stated that in pursuance of views expressed by Members during the last session, the Government had invited the Akali Dal leaders to resume negotiations in respect of sharing of waters of Ravi-Beas and the territorial disputes between Punjab and Haryana, but to no avail. Despite Government's clear offer to refer the two pending issues to tribunals, the Shiromani Akali Dal leaders had not reacted in a positive manner so far.

In regard to the use of places of worship as sanctuaries for criminals and anti-national elements, the Government had expected the Shiromani Akali Dal to assure the nation that it would not permit the holy shrines to be used for the storage of arms or for harbouring wanted persons. The Government had also suggested setting up of a five-member committee of Sikhs, jointly by the State Government and Shiromani Akali Dal, to screen the persons living within the premises of holy shrines. The leadership of Shiromani Akali Dal was not

prepared to discuss the question of misuse of holy shrines, the Minister added.

The subject came up for discussion in the House later on an Adjournment Motion moved by Shri B. D. Singh regarding "Serious deteriorating situation in Punjab arising out of extremists' activities and failure of Government to settle issues".

Initiating the discussion, Shri Charan Singh said that no legal or administrative step had been taken by the Government to implement the resolution passed by the Constituent Assembly on 30 May, 1948, demanding ban on participation of communal organisations in the political activities. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, taking part in the discussion, appealed to the Akali Dal to suspend the agitation indefinitely and make serious effort for bringing about Hindu-Sikh unity. Shri Indrajit Gupta expressed the view that the extremists could be isolated only through the early settlement of the issue. He also advocated giving Chandigarh to Punjab and said that Haryana should be given adequate financial assistance and resources to build a separate capital. Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan felt that acceptance of demand for relay of devotional music from the Golden Temple through A.I.R. Jullundur, would lead to certain consequences. He asked the Government to issue a White Paper on the activities of the extremists, Dal Khalsa and others who were advocating 'Khalistan'.

Replying to the discussion, lasting for about 9 hours, in which 18 other Members\* participated, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P. C. Sethi observed that the territorial dispute and the water dispute had never been raised by Akali Dal, when they were in power in Punjab many a time from 1962 and from 1977 to 1980 when they were in the coalition in the Centre. But when Shrimati Gandhi came to power and the Akalies lost power in Punjab, then all the problems started. Shrimati Gandhi, he added, had, however, held talks with them. But before the talks could be finalised, the Akali Dal had boycotted them and the talks broke down.

Referring to the papers circulated to the Members by Sant Longowal raising a separate nation theory, a multi-nation theory for India, Shri Sethi

---

\* The Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri R.L. Bhatia, Satyasadhan Chakraborty, Chiranji Lal Sharma, George Fernandes, Chandulal Chandrakar, C.M. Stephen, K. Mayathevar, G.S. Nihalsinghwal, H.N. Bahuguna, Krishan Dutt Sultanpuri, Chitta Basu, N. Soundarajan, Ram Nagina Misra, Chandrajit Yadav, Saifuddin Soz, K.K. Tewari and Shrimati Gurbrinder Kaur Brar and Shrimati Krishna Sahi.

affirmed that India might be multi-lingual, multi-racial, multi-cultural, but "India is one nation and the Indian people have sacrificed for keeping India as one nation and they continue to make all sacrifices to keep India as one nation".

As far as the river water dispute was concerned, the Minister said that Akali Dal had gone back on their earlier stand and brought in the idea of riparian rights in the context of water dispute. He contended that it might not be correct to invoke the principles of riparian rights in a dispute between two or more States. Such a dispute, if it was a river water dispute within the meaning of section 2 (C) of the Inter-State Water Dispute Act, 1956, had to be referred to a Tribunal and Supreme Court as demanded by the Akalis.

Referring to their religious demands, Shri Sethi said that the Prime Minister had already announced their acceptance and, in principle, even the Gurudwara Act had been accepted. But the Government could not accept the demand for Gurudwara Act without the consent of the respective Gurudwaras and the respective States. In keeping with their original demand, the Government had agreed to the relaying of *Kirtan* for one hour in the morning and half an hour in the evening. The Prime Minister had also acceded to their demand for the relay without any payment. But they had now sought the relay for three hours, he added.

As far as the Amritsar question was concerned, Shri Sethi indicated that Government and the Akalis had agreed that the precincts round about the Golden Temple and the Durgiana Temple would be treated as holy places and sale of liquor, meat, tobacco etc. would not be permitted there.

Regarding the question of Centre-State relations, Shri Sethi said that Government had announced the appointment of Sarkaria Commission and the terms of reference had been finalised. The Commission would start its work in right earnest and the concerned States were free to raise constitutional and other issues before it.

Concluding, Shri Sethi detailed various measures taken in Punjab for strengthening law and order arrangements, besides activating the peace and communal harmony committees in all districts.

In another statement, made on Punjab on 25 August, 1983, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P. C. Sethi said that the Government had been deeply distressed over incidents of attacks on innocent people in Punjab. As the endeavour of the Government had been to resolve issues through negotiations, the Shiromani Akali Dal leadership should not permit such elements, who made rabid and provocative statements and even indulged in violent activities,

to join them. Many of those statements also tended to violate the climate for communal amity. It was unfortunate that some leaders were misusing the premises associated with holy shrines which were regarded as a symbol of love and brotherhood. The Government had exercised restraint and had refrained from taking action which might precipitate the situation. However, the Government of Punjab had been alerted and advised to review and strengthen Police arrangements.

Shri Sethi reiterated that the Government had repeatedly appealed to the leadership of Shiromani Akali Dal to unequivocally condemn violent activities and not to say or do anything which might aggravate the situation. He urged that the Members should also appeal to the Shiromani Akali Dal to prevail upon their associates for desisting themselves from doing anything which was not conducive to peace and harmony in the State.

In response to Members, persistent requests in the House, the Speaker (Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar) made an appeal on 10 August, on behalf of the House, to the Nirankaris not to send their proposed 'Shaheedi Jatha' to Amritsar to avoid any possible untoward situation. It was also suggested by some Members in the House that efforts should be made to bring about reconciliation between Nirankaris and Akalis. Later, on 26 August, the Speaker made an announcement regarding formation of a Committee, consisting of nine Members\* of Parliament, to bring about reconciliation between Nirankaris and Akalis.

*Third Year's Programme (1983-84) of India's Extended Arrangement with the International Monetary Fund:* Making a statement on 26 July, 1983, the Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, informed the House that negotiations with the International Monetary Fund for the third year's programme of India's Extended Arrangement had been successfully concluded and the Fund had approved, on 22 July, 1983 the third year's programme which would enable drawals of another SDR 1200 million between the period July 1983 and June 1984. The programme for 1983-84, as outlined in a Statement of Policies furnished to the Fund, reflected the strategies and programmes that had been approved by the House from time to time and formed an integral part of the Sixth Plan.

Shri Mukherjee expressed confidence that the Programme for 1983-84, under the extended Arrangement, would help to achieve further economic progress in line with the original medium term balance of payments adjustment programme. Agricultural policies during the year had also been designed to

---

\* The Members are : Sarvashri R.S. Sparrow, Indrajit Gupta, Chandrajit Yadav, G.L. Dogra, Ratansinh Rajda, Satish Agarwal, Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait, S.P. Mittal and Shrimati Margret Alva.



give a boost to agricultural production. In line with the targets of the Sixth Plan, large investments would be made in key sectors such as petroleum and petroleum products, fertilisers, coal and edible oils to increase productive capacity. The programme would also aim at promoting the expansion of exports.

Concluding, the Minister assured the House that the Government was fully committed to the successful implementation of the programme and would continue to ensure that India's basic policies were not compromised during the course of implementation of Extended Arrangement.

*Attacks on the Tamil-speaking people in Sri Lanka :* Making a statement on 27 July, 1983, the Minister of External Affairs, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao, informed the House that ethnic violence had sharply increased in Sri Lanka after the elections there in May, 1983. There had been incidents of clashes between the Tamil minority community and the Sinhala majority, resulting in loss of life and property and disruption of essential services, communications, etc. The Government of Sri Lanka first declared an Emergency and, then on 4 June, promulgated the Public Security Ordinance, which was to be confined to the Northern province. A provision of the Ordinance authorised the Armed Forces to dispose of dead bodies without any inquest or post-mortem. This measure, Shri Rao indicated, was viewed with apprehension both in Sri Lanka and abroad.

Shri Rao affirmed that developments, affecting the Tamil population in Sri Lanka, gave rise to feelings on the Indian side and could create situations of strain. The Government of India conveyed their views to the Government of Sri Lanka in a constructive spirit, having regard to the way that such developments could impinge on the relations between the two countries. The attention of the Government of Sri Lanka had also been drawn to the possible repercussions of recent events, especially the Ordinance provisions. While conveying his concern, Shri Rao added that it had been made clear to the Government of Sri Lanka through diplomatic channels both in New Delhi and Colombo that it was an internal matter of that country and it was entirely for them to safeguard unity and deal with the situation.

Shri Rao said that the fresh outburst of violence and terrorism in the Northern-Province had spread to other parts of the island including the capital. It had, most regrettably, involved some members of Indian Mission in Colombo causing, however, no loss of life. The Sri Lankan authorities, he said, had assured that they would safeguard Indian officers, staff and their property. The international media, on the other hand, had reported a large number of deaths, including prisoners in jail, burning down of the India

Overseas Bank and State Bank of India building, having offices of Indian High Commission. The cycle of violence in Sri Lanka affecting Indian nationals and their property was naturally a matter of anxiety for India.

Despite such unfortunate turn of events, the need of the hour, Shri Rao said, was to restore normalcy and India's relations continued to be based on amity and mutual respect. Accordingly, the Government of India sought the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka for ensuring the safety of Indian nationals and had also stressed the importance of working in friendship and cooperation and were naturally keeping in close touch with the Sri Lankan authorities and Indian Mission there.

Concluding, Shri Rao said that the Prime Minister, during her reply to a Press question on 23 July, 1983, had also shared the concern of the people of Tamil Nadu and other parts of India in this regard. She had, however, observed that it was an internal problem of Sri Lanka and India did not wish to interfere in the domestic affairs of another country.

Later, the statement of the Minister was the subject matter of discussion in the House, raised by Shri Ram Vilas Paswan. Initiating the discussion, he said that in view of the gravity of the situation, Indian Government should remain in constant touch with Sri Lanka Government to explore all avenues for the safety of people of Indian origin.

Participating in the discussion, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said that while India could not allow anything to come in the way of good neighbourly relations between India and Sri Lanka, it could also not remain a silent spectator if human rights were denied there. He wanted the Government to ensure that each newspaper, published from New Delhi, had a correspondent in Colombo so that they could get correct version of the happenings in Sri Lanka. Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan held that while it was very important to exercise certain restraint on the issue, Government should not hesitate to speak up for those who were oppressed. Shri C. T. Dhandapani maintained that it was the moral duty of the Central Government to protect Tamilians in Sri Lanka. He suggested that the matter be taken up to the United Nations Organisation. Shri A. Neelalohithadasan Nadar wanted the Government to use its good offices and discuss the problem of people of Indian origin with the Government of Sri Lanka and come to a settlement at the earliest.

Replying to the discussion, which lasted for more than 4 hours and in which 17 other Members\* participated, Shri Rao observed that they had to look to

---

\*Members who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Subramaniam Swamy, K. Ramamurthy, M.M. Lawrence, K.K. Tewari, Mani Ram Bagri, Era Anbarasu, Brajamohan Mohanty, Kusuma Krishna Murthy, K.A. Rajan, K. Lakkappa, K.T. Kosalram, Chitta Basu, Manoranjan Bhakta, G.M. Banatwalla, C. Chinnaswamy, Chandrajit Yadav and Era Mohan.

the permanent relations between the two countries and at the same time could not lose sight of the happenings in Sri Lanka. While confirming the incidents which had occurred within the jail and that of damaging of Bank building, Shri Rao said that every effort was being made to bring the situation to normal. To make any further comment, he said, would neither be proper nor in the interest of relations between the two countries. He, however, assured that the Government were in constant touch with the Government of Sri Lanka and would inform the House of further developments as soon as possible. He also added that the Foreign Minister of Sri Lanka was expected here on 30 July, 1983, and Government would certainly have some occasion to discuss the matter in detail.

In a statement made in the House on 28 July, 1983, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, said that during her talk on telephone with the President of Sri Lanka on 27 July, 1983, she had apprised him of the grave concern expressed by the Members of Parliament and the people generally all over India and especially the people of Tamil Nadu and the South. She informed the House that her suggestion to the President about Indian Foreign Minister meeting him, had been accepted by the President and, accordingly, the Foreign Minister would be leaving the country on that evening.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, visited Sri Lanka on 29 July, 1983. Giving details about his visit to Sri Lanka, Shri Rao said, in a statement on 2 August, 1983, that Sri Lankan leaders welcomed his visit and told him that they understood India's position and assured him that Indian nationals would be given all protection and assistance. However, India's concern, he pointed out, had been not only about the safety of Indian nationals and their properties but also on the sensitivity of the Indian people as a whole at reports of large scale killings and destruction of property of people of Indian origin, some of them of stateless category, with whom Indian people were bound by strong ties of culture and kinship.

Referring to the conditions of Camps in Colombo and Kandy, Shri Rao said that Sri Lankan authorities had told him that they were doing whatever they could to improve conditions and were examining what help would be needed. This, he pointed out, was a human problem and India could not remain impervious to the suffering of large number of people in her immediate neighbourhood, though separated by boundaries of nationality and citizenship.

Recalling his discussion in Colombo, Shri Rao said that the President gave him a full account of his long standing effort to redress Tamil grievances and also acknowledged failures of implementation and deplored the shift to violence. The outrages that had both contributed to and resulted from the explosion of communal frenzy had, however, led not only to an enormous gulf of hatred between the Tamils and Sinhalis but also to a fear among the latter

of a partition of the country. The Government was determined to prevent this and that was its first duty. The Sri Lankan Government, he added, believed that its task had been complicated by the efforts of a political group which was trying to take advantage of the communal animosities to bring down the Government. They said that they had only lately realised it, but were now seized of the whole situation. Shri Rao said that obviously it was not for India to comment on the perceptions of the Sri Lankan Government about the main causes of the present troubles. What was of concern to India was that life and property of Indian nationals were in danger and that there had been large scale killings and destruction of property of people of Indian origin and that communal frenzy was still the main threat to those people.

Shri Rao said that he, on his part, had impressed upon the President and his colleagues the intensity of the concern felt in India and the anxiety that the clashes as well as the sufferings might persist or even grow. He pointed out the urgent need for reassuring the minority as essential to the process not only of restoring harmony but even of restoring law and order. He also conveyed to them that India was willing to do whatever she could to help.

The latest position, Shri Rao said, was not fully clear. The Sri Lankan Foreign Minister who was in Delhi for a Conference informed that the Sri Lankan law enforcement agencies were re-establishing their control and hoped to be able to assure the safety of all segments of the population. It was earnestly hoped that calm would return, but it was prudent to realise that one would have to wait and see for some more time.

On 4 August, 1983, the House held a discussion on the statement made by the Foreign Minister. Initiating the discussion, Shri Ram Jethmalani suggested that keynote of India's foreign policy in the situation must be not to intervene itself or to allow anyone to do so in Sri Lanka and to resist all super-power machinations in that area. Shri Indrajit Gupta strongly opposed the suggestion of sending of Indian troops or deployment of Navy along the coasts of Sri Lanka. The Government, he added, should make it abundantly clear that it would take extremely serious view if anything said or done in Sri Lanka led to the intervention or induction of foreign powers or a super power.

Participating in the resumed discussion on 5 August, 1983, Shri C. T. Dhandapani demanded that as Chairman of NAM, the Prime Minister should use her good offices, with some other non-aligned countries, to influence Sri Lanka to stop killings and to come forward to help the refugees. He also wanted the Government to consider snapping ties with Sri Lanka and making an appeal to the U.N.O. for assistance. Shri A. Neehalohithadasan Nadar was of the view that the statement of the Minister was not based on his

experience there and was far away from the truth. Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan saw a movement of global significance in the bogey of Indian invasion raised by President Jayewardene and urged the Government to exercise restraint. Dr. Karan Singh felt that, in view of vital national interests involved, the situation should not be looked upon only as an internal matter of Sri Lanka. He asked the Government to rush massive aid to the victims through the Government and non-official authorities.

Replying to a two-day discussion, in which 17 other Members\* participated, the Minister of External Affairs, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao, said that nobody was claiming that situation in Sri Lanka was back to normal. It had been said that the worse was over and if effective control was exercised there was a likelihood of situation tapering off.

About the food supplies, Shri Rao informed the House that a consignment of nine tonnes of wheat flour, bread, sugar, milk-powder, some clothing and medicines, had been sent.

In a brief statement made at the end of the debate, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, informed the House that attacks in Colombo had not been on the Tamil population alone but other people of Indian origin had also suffered. India's 'immediate interest', she said, was two-fold, to see that the killing, the destruction, the looting and the harassment was stopped and secondly to provide as much help as they could to those who were in need. She had personally conveyed India's concern to the President of Sri Lanka on the phone, who in turn, told her that the situation was coming under control and the people affected would soon be returning to their homes.

Shrimati Gandhi affirmed that it had been made clear in every forum and in every possible way that India did not pose any threat to Sri Lanka, nor did she want to interfere in their internal affairs. India, she added, also wanted unity and the national integrity of Sri Lanka to be preserved. At the same time, she had pointed out to President that developments in Sri Lanka affected India as well and any extraneous involvement would complicate matters for both the countries. The forces of destabilisation were at work in the region and efforts should be made "to minimise any opportunity for foreign elements to weaken us".

Referring to the reports that Sri Lanka had approached other Govern-

---

\*Those who participated in the discussion were : Sarvashri Madhavrao Scindia, R.S. Sparrow, Satyasadhan Chakraborty, Era Anbarasu, Chandrajit Yadav, Xavier Arakal, N. Soundarajan, Chitta Basu, K. Brahmanand Reddy, Rasheed Masood, Narain Chand Parashar, Ratansinh Rajda, K.T. Kosalram, B.K. Nair, Tridib Chaudhuri, G.M. Banatwalla and Abdul Rashid Kabuli,

ments for assistance, Shrimati Gandhi said that the Sri Lanka President had told her that America had promised some wheat and U.K. some money.

Concluding, Shrimati Gandhi told the House that according to the President of Sri Lanka, the rehabilitation work had started and about 80,000 displaced persons would return home within a week. On her part she had suggested to the President that everything possible should be done to start a process of reconciliation at the earliest.

Making a statement on 12 August, 1983 on her talks with Mr. W. H. Jayewardene, special emissary of Sri Lankan President, Shrimati Gandhi informed the House that according to the emissary, the situation in Sri Lanka was fast returning to normal and the number of people in refugee camps had come down from 80,000 to 30,000. The Sri Lankan authorities had set up a special agency for making arrangements for relief and rehabilitation of people rendered homeless. She had conveyed to Mr. Jayewardene that while measures were being taken to meet the immediate situation, the process to find a permanent solution to satisfy the legitimate aspirations and ensure the security of the Tamil minority be urgently initiated. Shrimati Gandhi said that Mr. Jayewardene told her that the Sri Lankan President had intended to place before a Round Table Conference with the Tamil leaders a five point agenda for discussion which included full implementation of the laws relating to District Development Councils ; use of Tamil as provided for in the Constitution as a national language, a dialogue for amnesty on condition that violence would be given up ; discontinuance of the active role of armed forces in Jaffna on the cessation of terrorist violence ; and repeal of Prevention of Terrorism Act. In addition, if the idea of a separate state was abandoned, the President was willing to discuss the release of those detained in prison, who were not already convicted or were awaiting trial.

On her expressing the view that such proposals might not meet the aspirations of the Tamil community, Mr. Jayewardene told her that the Sri Lankan Government were willing to consider any other proposals which would give the Tamil minority their due share in the affairs of their country within the framework of united Sri Lanka.

Shrimati Gandhi said that rendering relief to the affected persons was a big task which the Government could not accomplish alone. She had, therefore, decided to constitute a "Sri Lanka Relief Fund" and "Sri Lanka Relief Fund Committee" under her Chairmanship with an initial contribution of Indian Rs. 1 crore from the Prime Minister's National Relief Fund.

Concluding, Shrimati Gandhi pointed out that the situation,

arising out of the events in Sri Lanka, was serious and highly complex and needed careful handling. The Government were dealing with it appropriately and would continue to remain in close touch with the Government of Sri Lanka and others concerned. She appealed to the House and all sections of people not to take any step which could result in aggravating the problems and hardships of the Tamils in Sri Lanka and at the same time making it more difficult for the Government to help in the immediate task of relief and rehabilitation as well as of finding a lasting solution.

The statement made by the Prime Minister was the subject matter of discussion in the House on 18 August, 1983 on a motion moved by Prof. Madhu Dandavate. Initiating the discussion, he said that slogan of separatism raised by the Tamil United Liberation Front in Sri Lanka was a reaction to violence and discrimination. He urged upon the Government to seek solution of the problem without intervention of foreign countries.

Intervening in the discussion, Shrimati Gandhi said that the "basic need of the hour" was to bring a sense of security among the people of Sri Lanka which, in turn, could restore confidence in their living together and in working out permanent solutions to the satisfaction of Tamil minority and Sinhala majority. To facilitate the process of dialogue and to give effect to "our good offices", she had offered to send a special envoy to meet President Jayewardene and others and the Sri Lankan President had agreed to this offer. Accordingly a distinguished and experienced diplomat, Shri G. Parthasarthy, had been asked to undertake "this delicate and important task". He would visit Colombo next week. The Government, she added, wished to assist in bringing about an atmosphere which was free of Communal tension and conducive to the efforts of all communities to achieve a lasting political settlement.

Referring to her talks with the Opposition Leader of Sri Lanka, Mr. G. Amrithalingam, the Prime Minister said that he had welcomed "our offer of good offices", which, he said, had introduced a basic change in regard to negotiations between his party and the Government of Sri Lanka. He also felt that as a result of India's efforts, the picture had changed and although differences between the two sides remained deep, there might now be some possibility of a solution. In the circumstances, Shrimati Gandhi said that restraint with firmness would continue to determine India's policy.

Participating in the discussion, Shri C. T. Dhandapani sought to know if there was any pre-condition for the reconciliation process to take off the ground. Shri Indrajit Gupta said that every one was interested in negotiated political solution in which the minority, the Tamils in Sri Lanka, had equal rights and were not treated as second class citizens.

Replying to the discussion in which 19 other Members\* took part, Shri Narasimha Rao, at the outset, observed that their caution in relation to events in Sri Lanka had not ended in inaction. The Government viewed the acceptance of offer of "good offices" by Sri Lanka as a breakthrough. At the moment, he added, it was important to follow up the breakthrough and they needed not to be discouraged by the fact that neither side had really come down from their original stand. He assured the House that they were in contact and would do whatever was possible in the task of rehabilitation and provision of immediate relief.

*Annual Floods and Drought* : On 11 August, 1983, Shri Rajnath Sonkar Shastri moved the following Motion :

"That this House do take note of the situation arising out of the annual floods and drought in various parts of the country resulting in heavy loss of life, property and crops seriously affecting the economy of the country and the imperative need for the implementation of the short-term and long-term measures to meet the situation."

Initiating the discussion, Shri Shastri said that floods, droughts or cyclone occurred in some parts of the country every causing large scale devastation. He suggested the digging of ponds for storing the flood water and proper utilization of funds provided by the centre for relief and rehabilitation.

Participating in the discussion, Prof. Madhu Dandavate said that on account of large scale jungle cutting in Konkan region there was the greatest soil erosion causing greater degree of landslides. Besides landslides, the floods had caused a tremendous damage. He called for stern measures against those indulging in cutting of trees. Shri A. Neelalohithadasan Nadar sought adequate financial assistance to Kerala for the rehabilitation of all persons affected by drought in the State and implementation of Ganga-Kaveri-Brahmaputra Link Project.

Intervening in the discussion, which lasted for more than five hours and in which 22 other members\*\* took part, the Minister of Agriculture, Shri Rao

\* Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Eduardo Faleiro, Satyashan Chakraborty, R.S. Sparrow, Rasheed Masood, Era Anbarasu, K. Mayathevar, Zainul Basher, K.P. Unnikrishnan, Brajamohan Mohanty, Subramaniam Swamy, H.N. Bahuguna, N. Dennis, Satish Agarwal, Pasala Penchalaiah, Chitta Basu, G. Narasimha Reddy, Chandra Pal Shailani, S.T.K. Jakkayan, and Chandrajit Yadav.

\*\* Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Chintamani Panigrahi, E. Balanandan, S.B. Sidnal, Virdhi Chander Jain, R.L.P. Verma, Mohanlal Patel, M. Kandaswamy, Uma Kant Mishra, P.K. Kodiyan, Tarun Gogoi, Narain Chand Parashar, P. Namgyal, Chitta Basu, Ajitsinh Dabhi, Girdhari Lal Vyas, Ram Pyare Panika, S.T.K. Jakkayan, Ram Singh Yadav, Uttam Rathod, Brajamohan Mohanty, Abdul Rashid Kabuli and Prof. Satya Dev Sinha.



Birendra Singh informed the House that the Government had been paying great attention to the problem of floods and drought from two sides. The main relief came from preventive measures that had been adopted and large sums of money had been provided in the past plans for prevention of floods and, secondly, assistance had been provided against drought whenever it had been occurring in a very serious proportion.

The Minister said that more money was released to States after due processing, if the assistance was found insufficient by them. For floods, cyclone and such disasters, the Central Government provided 75 per cent of the money needed or proposed to be spent or adjusted. In the case of drought, upto 5 per cent of the development plan of a State, was generally sanctioned by the Central Government as additional plan assistance. If the expenditure was more than 5 per cent of the annual development plan, the Central Government shared 50 per cent of the expenditure. Whatever was given as advance plan assistance was adjusted against the State plan over a period of five years. Where there was a very severe drought, free assistance or grant was given by the Central Government. He added that there was a tendency on the part of some States to use this avenue for providing relief against natural calamities to augment their States' resources.

In order to ensure that drought did not occur in the country, the Minister said that the Government were contemplating to store more water for irrigation. Fourteen million hectares of additional land was proposed to be brought under irrigation in the Sixth Five-Year Plan.

Shri Rajnath Sonkar Shastri replied to the debate. Three amendments moved by Sarvashri Madhu Dandavate, Chitta Basu and Abdul Rashid Kabuli were negatived. The Motion was negatived.

*Price situation in the country* : Making a statement on 18 August, 1983, the Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, said that the rate of increase in prices during the current year had been more moderate than in any of the previous four years. Taking the financial year as a whole, the increase in prices upto 30 July, 1983, had been 6.5 per cent as against 5.8 per cent last year, 6.7 per cent. in 1981-82, 12.2 per cent in 1980-81. However, the prices of certain specific items, particularly rice, pulses, edible oils, khandsari, gur, fruits and vegetables and tea had increased rather sharply, which was a matter of concern. The increase, he added, reflected the after-effects of the severe drought experienced in the previous kharif. He hoped that with improved crop prospects in the current kharif, there would be a downward movement in the prices.

Shri Mukherjee said that the Government had also been keeping a close

watch on price movements from week to week and had been taking timely corrective measures to contain the general price rise as well as prices of specific commodities. In addition to measures to augment availability and production, the Government had been closely monitoring trends in money supply, aggregate demand and liquidity in the economy. In order to absorb excess liquidity with the banking system, the Minister announced an increase in the cash reserve ratio from 8 per cent to 8.5 per cent with effect from 27 August, 1983.

The above statement was discussed in the House on 25 August, 1983. Initiating the debate, Shrimati Pramila Dandavate said that the price escalation had been very fast during the last 3 years and was causing great hardships to the middle class families. She attributed price rise to factors like generation of black money, increasing deficit financing, rise in unproductive expenditure, mal-practices adopted by traders and total collapse of Public Distribution System. She asked the Government to set up Price Fixation Committee and a separate Ministry for the protection of consumers.

Replying to the discussion, in which 15 other Members\* took part, Shri Mukherjee said that the situation was no doubt serious, but there was no need to be panicky. The price rise, he added, was within the manageable limit and with the cooperation of all sections, including workers and farmers, it would be possible to maintain it. In justification of his contention, the Minister said that the rate of inflation which was 21 per cent in the wholesale price index in January, 1980, came down to 16.7 per cent in 1980-81, and 2.4 in 1981-82. It, however, increased to 6.2 per cent in 1982-83.

Denying the allegation that the Public Distribution System was collapsing in the country, Shri Mukherjee said that in the first five months of current calendar year, 7.93 million tonnes of stock had been distributed through this net work as against 5.93 million tonnes in the same period in 1982. He, however, admitted that the Government had not been able to cover the entire country through Public Distribution System and its strength and effectiveness also varied from State to State.

As regards effecting reduction in the non-development expenditure, Shri Mukherjee said that 72 per cent of it was accounted for by Defence, by subsidies and interest payments. The Government were making serious efforts to reduce expenditure on the Defence, Economic, General and other services.

---

\* Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Sunil Maitra, Harish Rawat, Rasheed Masood, Ram Pyare Panika, Ravindra Varma, Narain Chand Parashar, J.S. Patil, Chandra Pal Shailani, K. Mayathevar, Girdhari Lal Vyas, P.K. Kodiyan, Chitta Basu, Harikesh Bahadur, Abdul Rashid Kabuli and Shrimati Krishna Sahi.

Welcoming the suggestion, made by Members for building up a strong consumer movement, the Minister observed that such a movement would contribute to check the price and insulate the weaker sections from the impact of rising prices.

*Large scale infiltration by Pakistani nationals into the border district of Kutch in North Gujarat and in various parts of the country :* Making a statement on 18 August, 1983, in response to a calling Attention Notice by Shri Jaipal Singh Kashyap, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P. C. Sethi, said that the Government had no information about any recent large scale infiltration by Pakistani nationals into any part of the country along the Indo-Pakistan border including the border district of Kutch (Gujarat). However, constant vigilance all along the international border was being maintained. In order to strengthen vigilance on the Gujarat-Pakistan border covering a length of 512 kms., it was proposed to establish a few more outposts of B.S.F. in addition to 21 already existing.

Answering questions, Shri Sethi ruled out erection of any fencing on the Western Border, in view of a small number of infiltration on that side. He, however, told the Members that it had been decided to erect a fencing in Assam with Bangladesh border.

*Non-implementation of the recommendations of the Mandal Commission :* Raising a discussion on the subject, on 19 August, 1983, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan asserted that the section of society, which had been oppressed and suppressed for centuries, needed special assistance of the Government to come at par with the rest of the society. He wanted the Government to implement the recommendations of the Mandal Commission for establishing harmony in the country.

The debate lasted for more than four hours in which 19 other Members\* took part. Replying to the discussion, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi, said that the Government stood for creation of a society based on social justice and had always kept in view the feelings, hopes, fears and aspirations of the various groups in "our pluralistic society". He, however, conceded that in spite of tremendous strides made in almost all fields since independence, they had not been able to achieve an egalitarian society based on social justice. The Government, he added, were firmly committed to safeguard the socio-economic interests of all people and specially the backward sections.

---

\* Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Uttam Rathod, Rupchand Pal, Rajesh Pilot, Jaipal Singh Kashyap, D.P. Yadav, Chaturbhuji, Ram Pyare Panika, T. Nagarathnam, A. C. Dass, Bhogendra Jha, B. R. Bhagat, Saif-ud-Din Soz, Sunder Singh, R.N. Rakesh, D.K. Naikar, R.P. Yadav, Jai Ram Varma, Chandrajit Yadav and G.M. Banatwalla.

It was also committed to emancipate them from the discriminatory treatment in the society.

In regard to the implementation of Mandal Commission Report, Shri Sethi informed the House that some of its recommendations needed to be studied in depth in view of their wide implications. A Committee of Secretaries had been appointed to look into it and give its report within three months. Besides, the Prime Minister had appointed a Cabinet Committee to look into the problem. The criteria for declaring a group of people as backward had to be gone into to ensure that the communities included among backward classes stood the test of social and educational backwardness. He assured the House that the Government would not take much time to reconcile the inconsistencies.

*Investment in Indian industries and take-over bids of Indian companies by certain non-resident Indians :* Raising a discussion on 24 August, 1983 under Rule 193, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan wanted to know whether 13 companies of Swaraj Paul had remitted money through Punjab National Bank to share brokers for purchasing shares in India in violation of Foreign Exchange Regulations.

Participating in the discussion, Prof. Madhu Dandavate was of the view that unaccounted money sent out of the country had come back in the form of investment. He termed such take-over bids as attempt by commercial capital to swallow the industrial capital.

Replying to the discussion, in which 13 Members\* took part, the Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, recalled that, in order to attract foreign exchange, a scheme for investment by non-residents was announced in the 1982 Budget speech. Government had been encouraging them to invest in the new areas or new technology, new companies, new series of existing companies and in the existing equity shares. Since the prospective investor was to be guided by profit motive, the Government had to earmark the areas where they could invest without any risk and their interest were protected.

Refuting the allegation that the scheme had been formulated to facilitate one or two individuals to invest in one or two companies and to create destabilisation, Shri Mukherjee said that besides receipt of 114 applications up to 30 June, 1983, there was also an increase in the flow of money owing to an increase in the interest rates and various tax exemptions announced by the

---

\* Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Brajamohan Mohan y, K. Lakkapa, Virdhi Chandra Jain, Kusuma Krishnamurthy, Somnath Chatterjee, Deen Bandhu Verma, Rejesh Kumar Singh. G.L. Dogra, Satish Agarwal, Girdhari Lal Vyas, Bhogendra Jha, Harish Kumar Gangwar and K.P. Unnikrishnan ,

**Government.** According to the latest figure, it had increased from Rs. 1886 crores in March, 1983, to Rs. 1960 crores in April, 1983.

Dealing with the suggestion of restricting the investment by non-residents to the new areas and new companies, Shri Mukherjee pointed out that after the approval of the proposal by Parliament, the Government could not restrict it to limited areas.

So far as the take-over bid was concerned, the Minister said that if the companies had the confidence of their share-holders, they would definitely have no problem. So far as the speculative bid was concerned, he assured the House that the institutions would not support such bids.

*Allegations made by Mr. Seymour Hersh in his recent book "The Price of Power" against former Prime Minister of India, Shri Morarji Desai :* Making a statement on 26 August, 1983, the Minister of External Affairs, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao, informed the House that in June 1983 a book was published in the United State by an American author Seymour Hersh entitled "The Price of Power : Kissinger in the Nixon White House". The book dealt primarily with the years during which Dr. Henry Kissinger was the National Security Adviser to the US Government. The book contained one chapter dealing with the period immediately preceding the birth of Bangladesh, Indo-Pakistan relations, and the attitude of President Nixon and Dr. Henry Kissinger towards India.

The chapter, the Minister said, also contained allegations against "a former member of the Indian Cabinet" and subsequently indentified the person as Shri Morarji Desai. Shri Desai had already commented in public, calling the various allegations as a "sheer mad story". The Government had subsequently received information that a plaint had been filed in the US District Court in Illinois, on behalf of Shri Morarji Desai by an Attorney, Shri Mahendra Mehta. A plaint had also been filed in the Bombay High Court. The matter was thus before courts of law.

Answering questions, Shri Rao said that there was no occasion for the Government to institute an enquiry and he had no comment on the matter.

#### B. LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

*Statutory Resolution regarding disapproval of the Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1983 and the adoption of the Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1983\* :* On 9 August, 1983, moving that the Bill be taken into consideration, the Minister of State

---

\* The motion for leave to introduce the Bill, moved by Shri Nihar Ranjan Laskar on 2 August, 1983, was opposed by Sarvashri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo and N.K. Shejwalkar. The motion was however adopted and the Bill was introduced.

in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Nihar Ranjan Laskar said that, of late, there had been increasing incidence of the use of both unlicensed and licensed fire arms in commission of crimes and other anti-social and anti-national activities. The trend of events in certain parts of the country, he added, was such that there was an imminent danger of extensive disturbance of public peace and tranquility. It, therefore, became urgently necessary to carry out amendment proposals through promulgation of ordinance by the President on 22 June, 1983. The present Bill sought to replace the Ordinance.

Earlier moving a Statutory Resolution, Shri N. K. Shejwalkar saw no point in restricting the grant of licence only upto three firearms. He suggested that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee and the Government should bring forward a consolidated legislation.

The House held a combined discussion on the Statutory Resolution and the Bill on two days viz. 9 and 10 August, 1983. Participating in resumed discussion, on 10 August, 1983, Dr. Karan Singh and Shri A. K. Roy also stressed that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Replying to a two day discussion in which 15 other Members\* took part, Shri Laskar said that the provisions of this Amending Bill should not be viewed in the light of individual or sectional interests but should be viewed in the overall context of activities of anti-social and anti-national elements and the law and order situation prevailing in the country. The need of the hour, he asserted, was to check the proliferation of arms in the country by making the conditions for acquisition and possession of arms more stringent and making the punishment for violation of the conditions more deterrent.

In regard to the logic behind the imposition of the ceiling of three firearms for individual licences, the Minister explained that after giving a serious thought and detailed consideration to the issue it was felt that the ceiling of three firearms per licence would meet the legitimate requirements of most type of licences.

Refuting the suggestion about referring the Bill to a Select Committee, Shri Laskar said that the proposed amendments took into account the recommendations of the National Police Commission and reference of the Bill to a Select Committee now would only delay things.

The Statutory Resolution was negatived, The motion for consideration of the Bill was adopted. The Bill as amended, was passed.

---

\* Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Bhim Singh, Sudhir Kumar Giri, Shiv Prasad Sahu, Era Mohan, Jaideep Singh, P.K. Kodiyan, Anand Singh, Jitendra Prasad, Ram Singh Yadav, Ram Swarup Ram, Mool Chand Daga, Abdul Rashid Kabuli, Sunder Singh, Chhotey Singh Yadav and C.P.N. Singh.

*Salary, Allowances and Pension of members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill 1983\** : On 26 August, 1983, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, Sports and Works and Housing, Shri Buta Singh moved a motion that the Bill be taken into consideration.

Replying to the brief discussion, in which 7 Members\*\* took part, Shri Buta Singh said that salary was given to members so that they could serve the people efficiently. As such they should have ideal facilities. He, however, admitted that it had not been possible to do much as recommended by the Joint Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament.

Dealing with the demand for providing transport facilities to MPs in the different States, the Minister stated that owing to complications involved, it was difficult to make such arrangements.

The Bill was passed.

### C. THE QUESTION HOUR

In all, 16,697 notices of Questions (12,302 Starred, 4,292 Unstarred and 103 Short Notice Questions) were received during the Session. Out of these Questions, 473 were listed as Starred and 5375 as Unstarred. One 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 3, 5, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 25 and 26 August, 1983, which contained 21 Questions each and that of 22 August, 1983, which contained 22 Questions and that of 10 August, 1983, which contained 23 Questions. On an average 5.5 Questions were orally answered daily on the floor of the House. The maximum number of Starred Questions orally answered was 7 on 5, 8, 12, 16, 25 and 26 August, 1983 and the minimum number of Questions orally answered was 3 on 26 July, 1983.

*Half-an-Hour Discussions* : In all, 116 notices of Half-an-Hour Discussions were received during the Session. Out of these, 52 notices were admitted and eight were discussed on the floor of the House.

---

\* Earlier the motion for leave to introduce the Bill by Shri Buta Singh, was opposed by Shri A.K. Roy. The House was divided on the Motion with Ayes 132; Noes 12. The Motion was accordingly adopted and the Bill was introduced. The Bill seeks to raise the salaries of Members from Rs. 500 to 750 per month and daily allowance from Rs. 51 to Rs. 75 each day.

\*\*Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Sudhir Kumar Giri, Subramaniam Swamy, Ramavatar Shastri, Harish Kumar Gangwar, A.K. Roy, Bhogendra Jha and Abdul Rashid Kabuli,

## D. OBITUARY REFERENCES

During the Session, obituary references were made to the passing away of Sardar Hukam Singh, former Speaker of Lok Sabha, and Sarvashri Karnesh Marak, Panna Lal Barupal, Satis Chandra Samanta, C.K. Chinnaraje Gounder, Ghanshyam Das Birla, Trilokshah Lal, Priyendra Shah, Munishwar Datt Upadhyay, Lakshman Singh Charak, N. Sreekantan Nair, Satya Narayan Sinha, Sunkam Achalu, Sham Lal Saraf and Niranjana Jena, all ex-Members. The Members stood in silence for a short while as a mark of respect to the deceased.

## RAJYA SABHA

HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH AND HUNDRED AND  
TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSIONS\*

The Rajya Sabha met for its Hundred and Twenty-Sixth Session on 26 April, 1983, and adjourned *sine die* on 10 May, 1983. The Rajya Sabha met again for its Hundred and Twenty-Seventh Session on 25 July, 1983, and adjourned *sine die* on 26 August, 1983.

Resume of some important discussions and other business transacted during these two Sessions is given below.

## HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

## A. DISCUSSIONS

*Working of the Ministry of Home Affairs* : Initiating the discussion, on 26 April, 1983, on the working of the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Era Sezhiyan appreciated and welcomed the appointment of a Commission to go into the Centre-State affairs. He said that for the first time during the functioning of the Indian Constitution, an opportunity had been given to make a review and to find out solutions to the very vexed problems that were facing the country and the frictions that were disturbing the Centre-State relations. During the past three decades many extra-constitutional forces had developed which eroded and distorted the basic structure and the assumptions on which the co-operative federal system was founded in the Constitution.

He stated that the Mandal Commission had given its report on the last day of 1980. This report had not been rejected by the Government, but it had been allowed to gather dust. There was an obligation on the part of the Central Government to cause a copy of the report so presented together with a memorandum explaining the action taken thereon to be laid before each

---

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



House of Parliament. He felt that it was high time the Minister made this House aware of the action that had been taken.

Stating that the National Police Commission reports had been summarily rejected, the Member said that the House was entitled to know as to what aspects of the recommendations were not acceptable to the Government.

The Member referred to the 1982-83 report of the Ministry, in which it had been stated that "several rounds of discussion with the representatives of the agitating groups in Assam had been held with a view to finding a satisfactory solution to the problem of the foreign nationals in Assam. Unfortunately, it had not been possible to find an agreed solution. Since the Constitution did not permit President's rule to be extended for a period beyond one year, it was necessary to hold elections in Assam." The Member said that it was true that there was no unanimity on the subject, but the Government had sufficient strength of their own, and support was offered by the Opposition parties and with the strength and support of the Members, a limited Constitution Amendment Bill applicable only to Assam, could have been passed. The Opposition parties had said: "We should wait till the negotiations took place. If there was a breakdown, then we would go forward with the constitutional amendment." The Government at that time had not indicated their mind. Later on, they had given the specious plea that there was no unanimity among the Opposition.

Referring further to a statement contained in the Report that an elected Government had assumed office in Assam, the Member stated that persons who had got 200, 300 or 400 votes were declared, elected, whereas in many places these would have been invalid votes. A person who would have got 10,000 votes would have lost his deposit if a normal election had been conducted. So that was a mockery of the elections.

The Member pointed out that the implementation of many of the recommendations made by the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes had been very slow. He said that Indian democracy was in peril because social integration had not taken place and inequalities based on birth, religion and ethnic factors existed and these were the corroding factors.

The Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi, replying to the debate,\*

---

\* Other Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Maqsood Ali Khan, Dipen Ghosh, Sultan Singh, Ashwani Kumar, Ram Bhagat Paswan and A.P. Janardhanam, Shrimati Saroj Khaparde, Sarvashri Ram Naresh Kushawaha, Bhagatram Manhar, Gulam Mohi-ud-Din Shawl, (Molana) Asrarul Haq., V. Gopalsamy, M.M. Jacob, Yogendra Sharma and Amarprosad Chakraborty.

said that the Members were exercised about the situation in Punjab and this was quite understandable. It was unfortunate that Shiromani Akali Dal had persisted in its attitude of confrontation which provided encouragement to the extremist elements and led to senseless violence. The Minister appealed to all to shun violence and ensure that places of worship were not used to provide shelter to criminals. He informed the House that earnest efforts had been made to resolve the various issues through negotiations. Since the Akalis had not continued their discussions after 25 February, 1983, the Government had accepted the religious demands of the Sikh Community. He further stated that the issue of the Centre-State relations was not only raised by Punjab but by many other States and now Justice Sarkaria Commission had been constituted. The names of the other members of this Commission were under consideration of the Government. The terms of reference were in the process of finalisation and they would be announced soon.

The Minister stated that the two major questions that remained to be solved with regard to Punjab were territorial issues and sharing of river waters. Regarding the river waters dispute, Government had almost come to a point of settlement, but, unfortunately at the last moment, the stand had been changed by the Akali Dal.

He informed the House that the Police Commission's reports had been released. Most of them related to policy matters in the States' sphere. It was for the State Governments to consider them and take appropriate action. Matters that related to the Centre were under consideration of the Central Government.

Referring to the Assam situation, he said that recurrence of sporadic acts of violence in some parts of the State after the elections was a matter of deep concern. The State Government had taken immediate steps to bring the situation under control. In all, 82 police-stations had been declared as disturbed areas. The Chief Minister was periodically reviewing the situation. It was entirely wrong to give a communal colour to these incidents. The Government would do all that was possible to bring normal in Assam, the Minister assured the House.

*Working of the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour)* : Initiating the discussion on the working of the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour) on 27 April, 1983, Shri P. Ramamurti said that the policies of the Government of India towards labour arose from its general economic policies.

The policies pursued by the Government had fattened the monopolists in the country. It was also a fact that unemployment and poverty had been

increasing. Therefore, it was obvious that the State policy subserved the interest of the big business houses in the country. The Member felt that the policies of Indian Government were not in the interest of the labour.

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation, Shri Veerendra Patil, replying to the debate,\* said that the prosperity of the nation was possible only when there was a perfect understanding and harmonious relationship between the employer and the employee.

He said that it was unfair to say that the policy of the Labour Ministry was anti-labour and procapitalist. The Government was anxious about the welfare of the working class whose bargaining position was very weak. The role of the Labour Ministry was that of a mediator. At the Central level it had the Central Industrial Relations Machinery. At the State level, it had got the State Industrial Relations Machinery. And it had a monitoring Cell also whose task was to meet the workers' representatives and employers' representatives, and to try its best to avoid strikes. He remarked that the industrial relations situation in the country was fairly satisfactory.

In order to improve the service conditions of those who were working in the building and construction industry, a suitable legislation would be introduced as early as possible, the Minister assured.

Referring to the impression that in most of the cases the labour was responsible for making the industrial units sick, he said that it was not true. In 1982 the units which went sick because of labour trouble accounted for 2 per cent of total sick units. But the number of sick units, which went sick because of mismanagement, was 56 per cent. In the case of lock-out, the worker was not responsible.

*Threat to national integrity caused by separatist and terrorist activities in the State of Punjab* : On 28 April, 1983, Shri Lal K. Advani called the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the grave threat to national integrity posed by unabated separatist and terrorist activities of the extremist elements in the State of Punjab, the latest manifestation of these activities being the cold blooded murder of a D.I.G. of Police at Amritsar and the reported statement of the extremist leader Shri Balbir Singh Sandhu that 'War of Independence' for the creation of a separate Sikh State was 'inevitable'.

---

\* Other Members who took part in the discussion were Sarvashri P.N. Sukul, Surendra Mohan, H. Hanumanthappa, Jagdish Parsad Mathur, N.P. Chengalraya Naidu, U.R. Krishnan, Vishvajit Prithvijit Singh and Rameshwar Singh, Shrimati Usha Malhotra, Sarvashri Indradeen Sinha, G.C. Bhattacharya, P.W. Dhabe, Ram Bhagat Paswan and Ghulam Rasool Matte, Dr. Malcolm S. Adisehiah and Shri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav.

Making a statement on the subject, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi said that the House was aware of the activities of certain secessionist elements which had resulted in the banning of Dal Khalsa and National Council of Khalistan and declaring them as unlawful associations on 1 May, 1982. The State Government had been keeping a close watch on the activities of separatist and extremist elements and appropriate action had also been taken against them from time to time. The Government had taken note of the press statement of Shri Balbir Singh Sandhu. Shri Sandhu, the self-styled Secretary General of National Council of Khalistan who was wanted in 5 criminal cases had taken shelter in Guru Nanak Niwas, He had not been handed over to the police by Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee (SGPC) authorities despite requests made to them in this regard by appropriate authorities, the Minister informed the House.

The Government's endeavour had always been to arrive at a peaceful solution of various problems and not to do anything which might precipitate the situation. The Minister was confident that Shiromani Akali Dal and SGPC leadership would respond to the appeal that criminals, anti-national elements and extremists were not given shelter in places of worship and they were surrendered without any delay to the authorities. If activities of persons taking shelter in places of worship posed a threat to national security and integrity the Government would have to take action as might be warranted by the circumstances, he stated.

He remarked that the demand for a separate State did not enjoy the support of the vast majority of Sikhs. The Government would oppose this demand whatever the cost might be.

As regards the question of protection of Members of Parliament, the Minister informed that whenever the Government received a letter from any Member apprehending danger to his life, it certainly provided him with a security man.

In the end, the Minister thanked Shri P. Ramamurti and Shri Harkishan Singh Surjeet who had taken great pains to keep a link between the Akali leaders and the Government.

*Industrial sickness* : On 4 May, 1983, Shri Kalyan Roy, raising an half-an-hour discussion on points arising out of the answer to Unstarred Question No. 2272 regarding industrial sickness, given in the House on 4 November, 1982, said that the Government had expressed great concern at the phenomenon of industries getting sick everyday and had assured Parliament and the people that something would be done. However, nothing was done to tackle the problem of sickness at h steource. Information in regard to

sick industries was not readily available, the Member added. He further stated that sickness in units was because of the failure of the management, inefficiency, diversion of funds, misappropriation, and super profits. The Government had intended to establish standing Committees for major industries to monitor sickness. But the proposal for setting up of standing committees was revised. Later on, the Government did not consider that there was need for setting up Standing Committees. Where there was corruption and mismanagement in a unit, the only way was to take-over and take stern action against those who were responsible for the mismanagement, the Member concluded.

Making a statement on the subject, the Minister of Industry, Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari, said that the phenomenon of industrial sickness was not confined to India alone but it was an international phenomenon. Referring to the suggestion that if revival of a unit was not possible, it should either be taken over or sold or liquidated, the Minister stated that impression should not be given that each and every unit was bound to be nationalised if it went sick for it would encourage sickness.

In the guidelines announced in October 1981, it was said that the Administrative Ministries might "consider" setting up of industry-wise and unit-wise committees. The question of setting up of standing committees had been considered and they had been set up in the jute and textile industries, which accounted for a large part of all the sick units. These standing committees would consider the question of sickness unit-wise. It was mainly for commercial banks and financial institutions and the State Government to do the job, the Minister stated. The Government would do whatever was possible under the circumstances to rehabilitate the sick units, and to see that this poison of sickness did not spread, the Minister assured the House.

#### B. LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

*The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1983\**: On 28 April, 1983, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance, Shri Pattabhi Rama Rao, moving the motion for consideration of the Bill, said that the Bill provided for withdrawal out of the Consolidated Fund of India of the amounts required to meet the expenditure for the year 1983-84 charged on the Fund as well as the Grants voted by the Lok Sabha. The net provisions aggregated to Rs. 34,836 crores. Of this, Rs. 19,994 crores or 57 per cent was for developmental expenditure. The provision for defence expenditure constituted about 17 per cent.

---

\* The Bill, as passed by the Lok Sabha, was laid on the Table of the House on 26 April, 1983.

Interest payments accounted for 14 per cent, statutory and other transfers to State and Union Territory Governments 4 per cent and the balance 8 per cent was for normal administrative and other expenditure. The amount provided in the Bill was inclusive of the amount already authorised in the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Act, 1983, the Minister concluded.

On 2 May, 1983, the Minister, while replying to the debate,\* said that the Government had started a concerted drive for uplift of villages. The Budget had provided Rs. 480 crores for Integrated Rural Development Programme and the National Rural Employment Programme. This would enable about 30 million families in rural areas to cross the poverty-line.

The Government was taking all steps to implement the 20-Point Programme most sincerely. Recently all Chief Ministers had met in Delhi to preview and expedite the programme. Various programmes of employment generation like National Rural Development Programme were being vigorously followed. The Government was also regulating the industry so as to prevent the growth of monopolies. As regards Central assistance to the States for their plans, allocations were made on the basis of the formula approved by the National Development Council. The per capita Central assistance to Jammu and Kashmir was Rs. 508.81 as against all States' average of Rs. 64.82. The Plan outlay of Jammu and Kashmir had also been going up year after year, the Minister informed the House.

The Motion for consideration of the Bill was adopted, the clauses were adopted and the Bill was returned.

*The Finance Bill, 1983\*\** : On 5 May, 1983, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance, Shri Pattabhi Rama Rao, moving the motion for consideration of the Bill, said that the Bill contained a provision for the disallowance in the computation of taxable profits of an amount equal to 20 per cent of the aggregate expenditure incurred by tax-payers, including companies, under the specified heads. Under the Bill as passed by the Lok Sabha, expenditure on travel by rail, motor-car, ship, powered craft or aircraft had been excluded from the ambit of the proposed disallowance. This modi-

---

\*Other Members who took part in the discussion were : Shri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav, Dr. Rudra Pratap Singh, Sarvashri R. Ramakrishnan, Mirza Irshadbaig Aiyubbaig, Era Sezhiyan, Vithalbhai Motiram Patel, K. Mohanan, Bijoy Krishna Handique, Kalraj Mishra, Ghulam Rasool Matto and Ram Neresch Kushawaha, Dr. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah, Sarvashri Shankar Prasad Mitra. Ajit Kumar Sharma, B. Satyanarayan Reddy and Shiva Chandra Jha.

\*\*The Bill, as passed by the Lok Sabha, was laid on the Table of the House on 3, May, 1983.

fication would be of particular benefit to the consultancy firms, certain professions and industry, where travel was a significant portion of essential business expenditure. In the case of small business, the relevant provisions had been modified to provide that the disallowance of 20 per cent would be made only in respect of aggregate expenditure under specified heads in excess of Rs. 1 lakh.

The Bill now provided that in addition to the deduction of an amount equal to five per cent of the incremental export turnover admissible under the Bill as introduced, Indian exporters would also be entitled to a further deduction equal to one per cent of the export turnover of the relevant year, the Minister informed the House.

On 9 May, 1983, the Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, replying to the debate\* said that there could not be any artificial barrier between the agriculture sector and non-agriculture sector. The economy was a compact and integrated one. Allocations would not lead to the correct perception. The investment in power generation, oil sector, pesticides and engineering industries had to be accounted for. The strategy pursued in the agriculture sector had been reaping dividend. There had been a tremendous improvement.

The motive behind taxation proposals was not to see whether the States would get more or the Centre would get more. From the very nature of taxation, one could not have uniformity. The health of the economy was the main consideration, the Minister stated.

The recommendations of the Jha Committee in regard to simplification of the tax laws would be made available. Some of the recommendations had been implemented, the Minister said. After getting the recommendations examined in details he would try to see to what extent they could be implemented. The Jha Committee had been asked to dispose of their work by 30 September, 1983.

The motion for consideration of the Bill was adopted, the clauses were adopted and the Bill was returned.

---

\* Other Members who took part in the discussion were : Dr. Mahabir Prasad, Sarvashri Krishna Mohan Bhamidipati, and Nirmal Chatterjee. Dr. Rudra Partap Singh, Dr. Bhai Mahavir, Sarvashri B. Ibrahim. R. Mohanarangam and Dayanand Sahaya. Dr. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah, Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, Sarvashri Remeshwar Singh, and Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee, Kumari Saroj Khaparde, Sarvashri Kalyan Roy, M.S. Ramachandran, A.G. Kulkarni. Santosh Kumar Sehu, Biswa Goswami and N.P. Chengalraya Naidu, Shrimati Noorjehan Razack, Sarashri Vishvajit, Prithvijit Singh, Syed Shahabuddin, Ghulam Rasool Matto, and B.Satyanarayan Reddy, Prof. (Shrimati) Asima Chatterjee and Shri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav,

### C. THE QUESTION HOUR

During the Session, 3192 notices of Questions (2984 Starred and 208 Unstarred) and 3 Short Notice Questions were received. Out of these, 218 were admitted as Starred Questions and 1665 as Unstarred Questions. No Short Notice Question was admitted.

*Daily Average of Questions*: Each of the lists of Starred Questions contained 19 to 20 Questions. On an average 5 Questions were orally answered on the floor of the House, per sitting. The maximum number of Questions answered orally was 8 on 9 and 10 May, 1983 and the minimum number of Questions answered orally was 3 on 26 and 29 April and 2 May, 1983.

The maximum and the minimum number of Questions included in the Unstarred list were 218 on 9 May, 1983 and 100 on 29 April, 1983 respectively and the average number of Questions in the Unstarred list per sitting came to 151.

*Half-an-Hour Discussion*: In all 24 notices of Half-an-Hour discussion were received during the Session. Out of these, only 5 were admitted and discussed in the house.

## HUNDERED AND TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

### A. DISCUSSIONS

Discussions of issues through Calling Attention, Short Duration Discussions, Half-an-Hour Discussions and Ministerial Statements dominated the Session. Through these devices the House discussed various issues and topics—leakage at the Tarapur Atomic Power Plant and of correspondence between the former President Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy and former Prime Minister Shri Morarji Desai; deterioration in the law and order situation and in the telephone services; atrocities on women and on Scheduled Castes and Tribes; drought situation and dropsy epidemic; repatriation of Indian doctors in the UK and investment in India by non-resident Indians. Such were the wide ranging subjects which occupied the time of the House. The House also approved the National Health Policy on a Government Resolution. Besides these, there were over a dozen Ministerial statements which provided further opportunities to Members to express their views on the subjects of the statements. However, the following discussions may be highlighted.

*Radiation leaks at Tarapur Atomic Power Station*: On 25 July, 1983, Dr. Bhai Mahavir called the attention of the Prime Minister to the



reported radiation leaks at the Tarapur Atomic Power Station and the poor performance of the Rajasthan Atomic Power Plant and the steps taken by the Government in this regard.

Making a statement on the subject the Minister of State in the Departments of Science and Technology, Atomic Energy, Space, Electronics and Ocean Development, Shri Shivraj V. Patil said that the Tarapur Atomic Power Station comprising of two units of 210 MW each, had been commissioned in 1969. The station had been supplying electric power over the last 13 years in a safe, reliable and economic manner. All atomic power stations were required to control the radiation exposures of personnel and also release of the radioactivity to the environment.

Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection were used as the basis for providing radiation protection to plant personnel and the public from exposures arising out of operation of nuclear power stations and other major facilities of the nuclear industry, the Minister stated.

Insofar as radiation protection for plant personnel was concerned, the practices used, were consistent with the practices used internationally, under the recommendations of the International Commission of Radiological Protection, the Minister declared.

Department of Atomic Energy's prevailing radiation protection manual had come into effect as on 1 January, 1983. All the Manuals were generally adopted from ICRP recommendations, the Minister informed the House.

Replying to the points raised by Members, the Minister said that there were certain international norms beyond which a worker was not to be allowed to be exposed to radiation. According to the international rules, the life time exposure limit was 100 rems. We had been following these rules up to 1st January, 1983. After 1st January, 1983. We had our own manual made and we were following that.

The situation in Tarapur plant or around Tarapur plant was was not hazardous to the personnel or the flora or fauna in that place, the Minister asserted.

*Situation in Punjab* : On 25 July, 1983 the Minister of Home Affairs Shri P.C. Sathi made a statement on the subject and placed on the Table of the House copies of the correspondence exchanged between him and the President of the Shiromani Akali Dal since 30 May, 1983. The Home Minister *inter alia* stated that that he had informed the House during the last Session that it

was the Government's endeavour to find a peaceful solution to the problems in Punjab. The Members had also expressed the view that negotiations with the Shiromani Akali Dal leadership should be resumed in respect of the sharing of waters of Ravi-Beas and the territorial disputes between Punjab and Haryana. In pursuance of that, the Home Minister had invited the Akali Dal leaders to resume discussions, but unfortunately they had not responded favourably to his invitation.

Government's appeal to reconsider the call for 'Rail Rako' programme on 17 June, 1983, had not been heeded. Keeping in view the need for safety and security of the passengers and public property and the large scale violence by Akali workers during the 'Rasta-Roka' agitation, the Government decided to suspend rail traffic and State transport in Punjab. Despite the fact that Shiromani Akali Dal leadership called off the 'Rail Roko' agitation, agitators indulged in disruptive activities that caused loss of public property and inconvenience to the travelling public, the Minister stated.

It was suggested that a five member committee of Sikhs might be set up jointly by the State Government and Shiromani Akali Dal to screen the persons now living within the premises of holy shrines. It was unfortunate that the Shiromani Akali Dal leadership was not prepared to discuss the question of misuse of holy shrines, the Minister added.

The Government had repeatedly appealed to the leadership of Shiromani Akali Dal to unequivocally condemn violent activities and not to say or do anything which might aggravate the situation. But unfortunately there had still been provocative and threatening speeches by some of the leaders, the Minister declared.

The Minister reiterated his appeal to the Shiromani Akali Dal and the S.G.P.C. leadership to respond to the proposals put forth by the Government.

Replying to the points raised by Members,\* the Minister, said that there was no question of any drift in Government's stand. The Minister had reiterated that as far as religious demands were concerned, they had been accepted.

---

\* Members who sought clarifications on the statement were: Sarvashri Surendra Mohan, Sat Paul Mittal, Harkishan Singh Surjeet, P. N. Sukul, Jagdish Prasad Mathur, Hansraj Bhardwaj, Satya Pal Malik, Sultan Singh, Indradeep Sinha, Shrimati Amarjit Kaur, Sarvashri Khushwant Singh, Madan Bhatia, V. N. Tiwari, Sushil Chand Mohunta, Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee, Sarvashri Ghulam Rasool Matto and V. Gopalsamy.

Government had offered that there should be two tribunals—one for the river water dispute between Ravi and Beas and the other for territorial matters. As far as the river water was concerned, the Minister made it very clear that in the river water dispute, the Government wanted to limit the dispute only between Haryana and Punjab. Rajasthan had to be completely kept out. The Government still stood by that position, the Minister declared.

So far as the question of powers to States was concerned, the Sarkaria Commission had been appointed and it had been made clear that all these questions, even with regard to the change in the Constitution, could be referred to this Commission which would give its verdict on that, the Minister further added.

In the last few days, the Government of Punjab had taken some steps to improve the situation. The law and order arrangements have been strengthened. We did not want any confrontation. The Minister had not accused anybody of that; he had only appealed to them that they should not take up the path of confrontation. They should come to the negotiating table, and whatever demands had remained could be sorted out by negotiations, the Minister concluded.

*Reported refusal to Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh to broadcast his speech from the Hyderabad station of the All India Radio :* On 26 July, 1983, Shri Satya Pal Malik called the attention of the Minister of Information and Broadcasting to the reported refusal to the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh to broadcast his speech from the Hyderabad station of the All India Radio on 18 July, 1983, and wanted to know about the action taken by Government in this regard.

Making a statement on the subject, the Minister of State the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Shri H.K.L. Bhagat said that there had been no change in the AIR policy to provide broadcast facilities to the Chief Ministers and other Ministers (subject to the AIR Code which was applicable to all such broadcasts). The same practice had been followed in Andhra Pradesh. The Chief Minister, Shri N.T. Rama Rao, used this facility on the AIR on four occasions, *i.e.* 9 January, 6 April, 14 April and 15 July, 1983. Similarly some of the Ministers of Andhra Pradesh Cabinet had been utilising the AIR from time to time.

The Chief Minister's appeal on the threatened strike of NGOs was broadcast on the evening of 15 July, 1983 at 7.45 P.M. On 18 July, 1983, Chief Minister's office sent a requisition to Assistant Station Director of AIR

for making arrangements for the Chief Minister to broadcast again on the subject of NGOs strike, on the same evening.

The Station Directors were not required to get any clearance from the AIR Headquarters for such broadcasts. The Assistant Station Director, Hyderabad Station, however, was not clear whether a broadcast on the same subject could be made again so soon after two days. Moreover, he was being pressed by the representatives of the NGOs and some opposition leaders in Andhra to provide similar broadcast facilities to them on the issue. He, therefore, approached AIR Headquarters for clarification through a telephonic message on 18 July, 1983. In view of the difficulties expressed by him, he was asked to await further instructions before proceeding with the proposed broadcast.

On the same day, *i.e.* 18 July, 1983, he was asked by the AIR authorities to proceed with the broadcast. Due to communication difficulties the message could be given to him only in the evening and he informed the Chief Minister's staff and some others concerned with the State Information Department accordingly the same evening. He was informed that the Chief Minister would decide only on the next day, *i.e.* 19 July, 1983. Again on 19 July, 1983, Chief Ministers's office was informed that the broadcast arrangement could be made. The AIR was informed that that the Chief Minister would decide as to when he would make the broadcast.

The Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh sent a telex message to the Prime Minister on the subject and she immediately made enquiries and was informed that the instructions to proceed with the broadcast had already been given. From this it was clear that AIR had no intention whatsoever to deny the broadcast facilities to the Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister and that there was no question of discrimination against him.

Replying to the clarifications sought by some Members, the Minister gave the break-up in regard to the number of occasions on which the Chief Ministers of various States were provided broadcast facilities during January—July, 1983, as under : Haryana—1; Punjab—2; Pondicherry—1; Kerala—2; Rajasthan—1; Andhra Pradesh—5; Madhya Pradesh—8; Maharashtra—4; and Gujarat—4. This showed that Andhra Pradesh stood second in this regard. Hence the charge that the Chief Ministers of congress (I) ruled States were being given more opportunities for broadcast than the Chief Ministers of non-Congress (I) ruled States was utterly baseless.

The government of India had all respect for the non-Congress Chief

Ministers. But there was a code for broadcasts and everybody who wished to make broadcast was subject to this code irrespective of the fact to which political party he belonged. In fact, some persons were making a deliberate attempt to use this incident to incite people, the minister concluded.

*Take-over of Indian Companies by non-residents of Indian Origin :* On 2 August, 1983, Shri Jagdish Prasad Mathur called the attention of the Minister of Finance to the situation arising out of the recent take-over bids of Indian companies and investment in Indian industries by certain non-residents of Indian origin causing instability and uncertainty in the capital market and hampering industrial growth and the steps taken by Government in this regard.

Making a statement on the subject, the Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, said that following repeated representations from various quarters including industrial houses, Chambers of Commerce and representative organisations of non-resident Indians, he had in his 1982-83 Budget announced some relaxation in respect of investments in new issues of companies as also portfolio investment in shares and debentures quoted on Stock Exchanges by non-residents of Indian nationality/origin as also by overseas companies, partnership firms, trusts, societies and other corporate bodies owned to the extent of at least 60 per cent by such non-resident Indians. In order to give a fillip to the above facilities, certain fiscal concessions were announced by him in his 1983-84 Budget in respect of investments made by non-resident Indians in certain specified assets, which included shares in Indian companies and debentures issued by a public limited company. The fiscal concessions proposed applied to only non-resident Indian individuals and not to companies controlled by them.

The House in replies to several questions had already received information about the overseas companies that had bought shares during the period 1 March, 1982 to 2 May, 1983, in M/s. Escorts Limited and the Delhi Cloth & General Mills Limited. The Board of Directors of Escorts, at their meeting held on 9 June, 1983, decided to refuse transfer of these shares. The Board of Directors of Delhi Cloth & General Mills Company Ltd. also, at their meeting held on 15 July, 1983, decided to reject transfer of these shares. While, no doubt, the parties concerned could have recourse to law in respect of refusal of transfer of shares, it was hoped that a solution to this problem would be found very soon, the Minister informed.

The Minister reiterated that the intention of the Government was not to permit speculative takeover of established Indian companies by non-resident Indian investors.

In order, however, to allay fears in the minds of Indian industrialists, the Minister had announced in the Lok Sabha on 2 May, 1983, that under the liberalised scheme of portfolio investment there would be an overall ceiling of 5 per cent of paid-up capital of a company and a similar ceiling on the existing convertible debentures of each series of the company in respect of investment by non-resident Indian investors, the Minister said,

Replying to the points raised by Members, the Minister said that the policy regarding investment was announced not in the Budget of 1983-84, the policy had actually been announced in the Budget of 1982-83. A circular was issued by the Reserve Bank of India, under which these investments took place. That circular was issued on 14 April, 1982. Therefore, it was only a presumption to say as to how Shri Swaraj Paul had come to know or how Caparo Group had come to know. This policy was known to all the Members. It was known to the prospective investors that these were the areas where they could invest.

The Government was not only interested in having non-resident investment in the existing companies. It was equally interested in non-resident investment in new companies and facilities had been provided for investment in new companies, with new technology. Facilities had been provided for investment in new issues also, the Minister declared.

It was important that financial institutions should have more effective role in the units to which they were providing assistance. It was true that at present in a large number of units we had holdings from 20 per cent to much more and sometimes our nominee directors did not take active interest to look into this aspect. A Committee would go into this aspect and come forward with its recommendation in this regard, the Minister concluded.

*Resolution on National Health Policy* : On 2 August, 1983, the Minister of Health and Family Welfare Shri B. Shankaranand moved a Resolution seeking the approval of the House of the National Health Policy contained in the statement laid on the Table of the House on 2 November, 1982. Speaking on the Resolution, the Minister said that we were committed to attain the goal of 'Health-for-All' by the year 2000 A.D. The National Health Policy would provide the necessary direction for reorienting and restructuring the health services with long-term perspective. The policy laid stress on the preventive, promotive, public health and rehabilitative aspects of health care and point out the need for establishing comprehensive primary health care services to reach the population in the remotest areas. The policy emphasised the need for ensuring adequate nutrition, safe drinking water supply and improved sanitation. Steps

had already been taken during the Sixth Five Year Plan the 20-Point Programme of the Prime Minister for implementing the policy.

It was now proposed to have one Primary Health Centre for every 30,000 rural population, for every 20,000 in hilly and tribble areas. Four hundred and seventy-one new Primary Health Centres had been opened since April, 1983.

A programme had been evolved to train Health Guides selected by the community for every village for every 1,000 rural population. About 2.42 lakh Health Guides had already been trained, the Minister informed.

The Leprosy Control Programme had now been renamed as Leprosy Eradication Programme. To start with, it was converted into a 100 per cent Centrally-funded programme. The incidence of Malaria had been showing steady decline. The policy laid emphasis on adequate utilisation and propagation of the Indigenous Systems of Medicine and Homoeopathy as also the integration of these systems within the overall health care delivery services. The policy further suggested that there should be a separate National Population Policy and a separate National Medical and Health Education Policy. The Government was working on the preparation of these policies, the Minister further informed.

The Minister of Health and Family Welfare, Shri B. Shankaranand, replying to the discussion\*, said that for the first time after independence, the Parliament was discussing the National Health Policy. and for the first time, we had come before Parliament for its seal of approval with a definite change in the emphasis on the curative aspect of the health to the preventive and promotive aspect of the health. Not only this, we had taken into consideration that poor man about whom everyone had expressed sympathy. We had given Ayurveda its due importance of late, even foreign countries had been showing their interest in Ayurvedic medicines. 'Grow your own medicines in your back-yards had been the Minister's slogan. After independence, small-pox had been completely eradicated. Of coures, there had been some cases of

---

\* Members who took part in the discussion were : Dr. M.M.S. Siddhu, Shrimati Margaret Alva, Shrimati Ila Bhattacharya, Sarvashri T. Basheer, Jagdambi Prasad Yadav, Shrimati Saroj Khaparde. Sarvashri Bijoy Krishna Händique, Dinesh Goswami, Dr. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah, Dr. Rudra Pratap Singh, Sarvashri S. W. Dhabe, P. N. Sukul, Mirza Irshadbaig Aiyubbaig, B. Satyanarayan Reddy, Chand Ram, prof. B. Ram Chandra Rao, Sarvashri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav, Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee, Shjiva Chandra Jha and Dr. Bhai Mahavir,

chicken-pox. We had been able to bring down the incidence of malaria to a considerable extent. The mortality rate per thousand of population had been reduced from 27.4 to 14.8 and the life expectancy of birth had increased from 32.7 to over 52. A fairly extensive network of dispensaries, hospitals and institutions had become available, the Minister informed.

Family planning had been given its due importance. In the field of family planning, the people had, by and large, accepted the concept of small family now. The number of beneficiaries under the mother-child care programme was really encouraging, the Minister further informed.

The Health Policy document envisaged that there should be a separate medical education and health education policy. The Government had appointed a Medical Education Review Committee constituting very eminent medical persons and others to look into the basic problems of medical education. The Committee had submitted its report and the Government were going to take a decision on these matters, the Minister stated.

The Health Policy document had also envisaged another new idea about health insurance. And the Government would definitely try to have the co-operation of the States and the Union territories in evolving a definite scheme. The health policy gave definite guidelines and gave the direction in which efforts in regard to medical care and health care activities should take place in the country. So the Implementation part of the policy was contained in the document itself, the Minister concluded.

The Resolution was approved.

*Distribution of surplus land during Sixth Five-year Plan period:* On 8 August, 1983, Shri Harkishan Singh Surjeet, raising a discussion on points arising out of the answer given in the Rajya Sabha on 29 July, 1983, to Starred Question No, 82, regarding distribution of surplus land during Sixth Five-Year Plan period said that it had been stated in para 1.51 of the 6th Plan document that land reforms involved elements like tenancy reforms, protection of share copper land ceiling and land consolidation. The pace of implementation of these measures, particularly of ceiling legislation, had been so slow and full of loopholes that their impact on the structure of land holding had been minimal.

Certain legislations which had been adopted by certain States had not got the sanction of the Central Government. There was a legislation from Nerala and another from Tamil Nadu, which were still pending sanction of the Central Government. This clearly showed the pre-land lord bias of the



Central Government. This thoroughly exposed the claim of the Government that it stood for land reforms, the Member stated.

Making a statement on the subject, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Rural Development, Shri Hari Nath Mishra, said that Kerala Land Reforms Bill sought to delete section 6 (c) of the Kerala Land Reforms Act, 1963. Under this section, tenants who had made permanent improvement of a significant nature on the land help by them as tenants were recognised under the law. The 1980 Bill proposed to nullify their status. This was taken exception to by the Ministry. The State Government had since withdrawn the Bill.

Coming to the Tamil Nadu Bill, in 1960 the Tamil Nadu Legislature had passed a Bill seeking to put the date back to April, 1958, that is, two years before. The Government of India felt that retrospective legislation should not be undertaken too many times. The Bill was, therefore, refused President's assent. So the matter was not pending with the Centre, the Minister pointed out.

Coming to West Bengal, the Minister stated that the Bill was received by his Ministry in July, 1981. It was examined and found that certain provisions of it were not in accordance with the accepted policy. It was proposed to hold a discussion at a high level within this month and some amicable solution would be found to this problem during the current month, the Minister averred.

About Minister's statement, it might be that no that day, so far as the written reply was concerned, there might have been some error. But what the Minister meant to say was that, by and large, the loopholes had been plugged or were being plugged with the enforcement of the national guidelines issued in 1972 and subsequently reinforced in 1976 and the various other measures. Up-to-date, the position was that at least more than 80 such legislations had been included in the Ninth Schedule. It was proposed to include 14 other legislations in the Ninth Schedule, by introducing another Constitution (Amendment) Bill, the Minister informed the House.

Replying\* to the points raised by Members, the Minister said that he would go through the various suggestions that had been put forward by the Members.

*Situation in Sri Lanka\*\** : On 16 August, 1983, Shri R. Ramakrishnan, raising a discussion (under Rule 176), said that the people of India should be commended and applauded for they had risen as one man on this occasion. The issue today before India was a national one; it was even an international

\* Other Members who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Sushil Chand Mohunta, Shiva Chandra Jha, B. Satyanarayan Reddy, Ram Bhagat Paswan, Suraj Prasad, Harekrushna Mallick, and Shanti Tyagi.

\*\* A calling Attention discussion on the subject were also held on 28 July, 1983.

issue. The stand taken by the Prime Minister was bold and firm. In a difficult and sensitive matter she had acted with considerable restraint, and had also displayed mature statesmanship when she had talked with President Jayewardene. While both talking on the phone and, with the emissary of President Jayewardene, she had expressed her distress and India's displeasure in no uncertain and unclear terms. The All India Anna D.M.K. Party at its General Council meeting had unanimously passed a Resolution placing on record the appreciation of the Prime Minister for her statement in Parliament on this issue.

Tamil Nadu, Chief Minister, Shri M.G. Ramachandran, had shown considerable restraint, and he had been in close contact and touch with the Central Government. In fact, he had set up the Chief Minister's Relief Fund for which donations were coming forward in a big way. The Prime Minister herself had taken the lead in not only appointing a committee but also setting up Sri Lanka Relief Fund at the Centre itself.

The Special emissary himself had talks with Shrimati Gandhi and according to all the reports, though crucial issues were discussed, the entire talks were not exactly of a satisfactory nature. The member wanted to know whether the Government had received any feed back on this which was likely to improve the situation. The Member also wanted to know whether the Government of India would appoint some person as Prime Minister's special emissary to look into the matter, who would be in close touch with the leaders there and also with our State Government and other Opposition leaders.

The Government had acted wisely, but a time-bound programme should be there to settle this matter, the member suggested.

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, intervening in the debate, said that the day after her statement in Parliament Shri A. Amrithalingam, who was the leader of the Opposition in the Sri Lankan Parliament and was also the Secretary-General of the main party representing Sri Lankan Tamils, left Jaffna to come to Delhi. He had met her, the Minister of External Affairs, other Ministers and several Members of Parliament representing different parties.

Shri Amrithalingam gave harrowing account of the brutalities to which Sri Lankan minority had been subjected. The Prime Minister, her Government and her party were just as deeply distressed as others who had spoken in the House. A solution to this problem had to be sought at the conference table and it was for the Sri Lankan Government to decide how and when a conference with the Tamil leaders was to be brought about. If a settlement was to be reached, both sides had to talk to each other. The Prime Minister

said she was prepared to send an emissary to Sri Lanka to facilitate this process.

The Prime Minister hoped that with the continued support of Parliament and the Indian people India would be able to bring about an atmosphere more conducive to negotiation which would be the first step to eliminate communal tension.

The Minister of External Affairs, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, Replying to the discussion\*, said that Shri Amrithalingam came here and had met the Prime Minister and the Minister twice. They had an extremely useful discussion and at the end of the discussion at least the Minister felt satisfied that Shri Amrithalingam was satisfied with the discussions and his satisfaction was important to India. Now a situation had been brought about wherein Shri Amrithalingam felt that there was a qualitative change. Therefore, there was the possibility of parleys re-starting. The Government of India did not know how parleys were going to re-start. But their good offices would be available for re-starting the parleys. They were not going to guarantee results, they were going only to try their best.

In regard to the recent law vesting damaged and abandoned properties in the Government, there was also a provision for divesting. Therefore, both provisions were there. But much would depend on how they were implemented. It was not proper for the Minister to pass a judgement in advance in this regard.

The number of persons living in camps had come down from 80,000 to a comparatively small figure of 13,000 or 14,000. The Government of India was prepared to send more assistance and more food to Sri Lanka, if necessary.

*Price situation* : On 18 August, 1983, the Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee making a statement on price situation in the country said that the position was constantly under review. The weekly index of wholesale prices was available upto 30 July, 1983. An analysis of recent trends in the behaviour of this index showed that, since the middle of May, 1983, there had been a noticeable moderation in the rate of increase in prices. In the 11 week period from 14 May to 30 July, 1983, wholesale prices increased by 2.5 per cent which was significantly lower than the increase of 5.4 per cent during the same period in 1982-83, 3.7 per cent in 1981-82, 8.2 per cent in 1980-81 and 7.9 per

---

\* Other members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Buddha Priya Maurya, Era Sezhiyan, Shyam Sunder Mohapatra, Harkishan Singh Surjeet, P.N. Sukul, Dr. Bhai Mahavir, Sarvashri R. Mohanarangam, M. S. Ramachandran, Madam Bhatia, Rameshwar Singh, M. Kalyanasundaram, G.C. Bhattacharya, Murasoil Maran, Smt. Maimoona Sultan, Dr. (Shrimati) Sathiavani Muthu, Sarvashri Syed Ahmad Hashmi, V.N. Tewari, V. Gopalsamy, L. Ganesan.

cent in 1979-80. Because of seasonal factors, during this period wholesale prices, particularly of primary products, tended to show an increase. Fortunately, the rate of increase during the current year had been much more moderate than in any of the previous four years. The moderation in the rate of price increase since mid-May was to be welcomed as the price increase in the first 7 weeks of the current financial year was nearly 3.9 per cent which was causing concern.

However, the prices of certain specified items, particularly rice, pulses, edible oils, khandasari, gur, fruits and vegetables and tea during this period had increased rather sharply, which was a matter of concern. The Government had responded by making arrangements to import some rice and to step up releases of foodgrains and edible oils from the public distribution system. It was to be hoped that with improved crop prospects in the current Kharif, there would be a downward movement in these prices. Sugar releases had been stepped up in the recent months, which should exercise a moderating influence on prices of sweetening agents as a group, the Minister added.

The Government had been keeping a close watch on price movement from week to week and, as was the case last year, during the current year also timely corrective measures had been taken to contain the general price rise as well as prices of specific commodities, the Minister declared.

The need for vigilance on the price front was as great as ever. We had been able to moderate the increase in prices through timely action, but the continuation of this trend could not be taken for granted. The Minister sought the cooperation of this House in the continued efforts of the Government to contain inflation.

The Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, replying to the discussion,\* said that every year from mid-May onwards, there was a seasonal factor and prices started increasing. And from September-October prices started declining because certain seasonal factors were there. In most of the commodities the prices had increased upto 23 July, 1983, over which one could not have much control by monetary policy or by fiscal policy. None of these commodities were subjected to any taxation. And the simple law of demand and supply availability controlled the situation.

The public distribution system was an effective instrument to check inflation. Therefore, there was no question of giving up the idea. Rather,

---

\*Members who sought clarifications on the statement were: Sarvashri Ladli Mohan Nigam, Sukomal Sen, Dr. Bhai Mahavir, Dr. Malcolm, S. Adiseshiah, Sarvashri Rameshwar Singh, P. N. Sukul, R. Ramakrishnan, M. Kalyanasundram, Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare A.G. Kulkarni, Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav, Ghulam Rasool Matto and B. Satyanarayan Reddy.

efforts were being made to strengthen the public distribution system, and from January to June, 1983, we had added to the distribution system a number of outlets, the Minister further stated.

There was no denying the fact that black money was helping speculative trade to a considerable extent because this sort of trade was not permitted from bank finance. We were intensifying raids, searches, and seizures. To prevent smuggling, we were intensifying detentions under COFEPOSA, and various other enforcement measures were being taken, the Minister declared.

*Reported disclosure of confidential correspondence between former President Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy and former Prime Minister Shri Morarji R. Desai :* On August 25, 1983, Shri V. N. Tiwari called the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the reported disclosure of certain confidential correspondence exchanged between the former President, Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy and the former Prime Minister, Shri Morarji R. Desai and the action taken by the Government in the matter.

Making a statement on the subject, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P. C. Sethi said that Government's attention had been drawn to reports appearing in the August, 1983 issue of the 'Imprint' magazine and in some newspapers purporting to be the correspondence exchanged between the former President Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy and the former Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai in January/February, 1979. It had not been possible so far for the Government to locate the original papers pertaining to this correspondence either in the President's Secretariat or in the Prime Minister's Office. Government was not, therefore, in a position to say categorically anything about the authenticity of the correspondence as had appeared in the Press. However, according to the press both the persons concerned had acknowledged that the letters were theirs. If so, the leakage of these papers, from whatever source might be, was a breach of the Official Secrets Act and the conventions and traditions which were normally followed in a Parliamentary system.

According to the press reports, the former President was reported to have referred to the correspondence as having been classified as 'top secret'. Again, according to press reports, Shri Morarji Desai's reply letter dated 10 February 1979, which was reportedly marked 'secret/personal', seemed to suggest that the President's letter dated 14, January 1979, was not given any security classification. It was a matter of concern that letters purporting to be correspondence between the President and the Prime Minister on matters which had to do with public affairs should have been made public in the manner it had been done.

The Government was trying to ascertain the position as regards the authenticity of the said correspondence and circumstances of its release to the press.

Replying to the points raised by the Members, the Minister said that the relationship between the President and the Prime Minister was governed by the provisions of Article 74 of the Constitution. The Government had neither concealed the facts nor had it any motive in hiding the facts. The correspondence could neither be located in the Archives of the President nor in the Prime Minister's Secretariat. Anything marked as 'top secret' and which pertained to the State could not be taken away by the President or the Prime Minister at the time of relinquishing office, the Minister clarified.

*Re-starting of negotiations with Assam Agitation Leaders* : On 25 August, 1983, Shri Ajit Kumar Sharma raised a discussion on points arising out of the answer given in Rajya Sabha on 28 July, 1983, to Unstarred Question No.536, regarding restarting of negotiations with the Assam Agitation leaders, and said that the Home Minister should inform the House of the real intention of the Union Government about the solution of the foreigner's problem. The External Affairs Ministry should supply a copy of the booklet "The Assam Events in Perspective" to every Member of Parliament so that he could know how the Indian Government was functioning and how it was maligning Indian citizens in the foreign lands, the member suggested.

The Government had decided that they would start detection with effect from 31 March. In spite of this decision, why did they hold the elections in Assam on the basis of the 1979 electoral rolls which, according to the Election Commission itself, had a very large-scale inclusion of foreigners' names, the Member wanted to know.

The Members sought the following information from the Home Minister :—

(1) What were the specific points of disagreement between the Government and the Assam movement leaders which had stood in the way of a satisfactory settlement up till now ? (2) When would the Government invite the movement leaders to resume negotiations ? (3) What were the purposes with which the Home Ministry had circulated the booklet on Assam to foreign countries through the External Affairs Ministry ? (4) Why was the Home Ministry carrying on the savage repression on the people and when was it going to end the same ? Had the Home Ministry taken any steps to control this extensive police repression in the State of Assam ? (5) When were Government going to institute a judicial inquiry into all the cases of repression and killings in Assam ? Lastly, when were Government going to publish a White Paper on Assam as had been demanded from both sides of the House for a very long time ?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Nihar Ranjan Laskar, replying to the discussion, said that the members had passed a unanimous Resolution in this very House in which the Government had

appealed to the people of Assam to restore peace and normalcy. In accordance with the letter and spirit of that resolution, the Government had taken steps to restore peace and normalcy and to render relief and rehabilitation to those who had suffered in the disturbances.

The Home Minister made it clear that there was some understanding on the pre-1961 and post-1971 period. Now the real problem was in between 1961 and 1971. Talks were likely to be held as soon as the situation became normal in Assam. At the moment, it was very difficult to give any target date for the talks, the Minister said.

Replying to the points raised by Hon. Members\*, the Minister said that the Government being committed to the detection of post-1971 people, were taking necessary steps for setting up the tribunals which would be 20 in number, and were also in the process of selection of Judges and other matters related to the setting up of these tribunals. There was no question of erecting walls on the entire border, but barbed-wire fencing was proposed to be provided along the Indo-Bangladesh border. Fencing would be not only in Assam but also on West Bengal and Tripura borders, the Minister informed the House.

*Non-implemenation of Mandal Commission Report* : On 26 August, 1983. Shri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav, initiating the discussion (under Rule 176) said that the subject which was under discussion today related to the economic, social, political, educational, spiritual and moral questions of the 52 per cent people of India.

Manusmriti had ruled Indian minds for centuries. Had the Manusmriti been followed, the Member would not have been in Rajya Sabha today. When Rama invaded Lanka, it were the poor who had supported him. It were those people who made him God and who made temples for him. But a time came when those very sections of the people were not allowed to enter his temples. Even dogs and cats were given preference over those people. It was not Mandal Commission which raised the question of reservation. It was Manusmriti, because it was Manusmriti that certain privileges were reserved for the Brahmins, the member stated.

The Government should put a stop to the disparities both on the basis of birth and on the basis of economic condition. Mandal Commission had recommended 27 per cent reservation for 52 per cent population of the country. If the Government were not ready to accede to this demand, Members would take 52 per cent through revolution, the Member concluded.

---

\* Other Members who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Shiva Chandra Jha, Dinesh Goswami, Biswa Goswami, Harkishan Singh Surjeet, Ladli Mohan Nigam, Kalraj Mishra, Baharul Islam and Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee, Shri G.C. Bhattacharya and Shri Satya Pal Malik,

The Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P.C. Sethi, replying to the discussion,\* said that the Government fully shared the concern about the socio-economic standing of backward classes and the planning policy had been conditioned by the different kinds of innovations made from time to time in this respect.

The policies pursued by the Government all these years had been guided by the concept of equal opportunity and social justice, consistent with the concept of a welfare State. The Government were committed to this concept and would continue to act in a manner that would emancipate these classes from discriminatory social treatment. Government of India had, from time to time, persuaded the State Governments to appoint commissions to prepare a list of socially and educationally backward classes to provide them weightage in the educational and employment spheres and the same had borne considerable fruits. The Commission had made several useful and meaningful recommendations. However, there were some recommendations which deserved to be studied in depth, the Minister said.

There was no uniformity among the States in their views on the Mandal Commission's Report. A large number of States had not been able to send their comments so far. Some of the States had suggested that economic criteria should be adopted for determining the status of Backward Classes. All these factors would have to be considered and the States would be persuaded to fall in line with the Constitutional concepts and it would be only appropriate if there was a uniformity of approach as between the Centre and the States, the Minister concluded.

#### B. LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

*The Copyright (Amendment) Bill, 1982* : On 4 August, 1983, the Minister of State in the Ministries of Education and Culture and Social Welfare, Shrimati Sheila Kaul, moving the motion for the consideration of the Bill, said that our copyright law was governed by the Copyright Act which was passed in 1957. The Act conformed to the provisions of the two International Conventions on Copyright of which India was a member, namely, the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (1948 Brussels text) and the Universal Copyright Convention (1952). Both these conventions were revised at Paris in 1971. The revised text provided for certain additional facilities to the developing countries to enable them to have easier access to

---

\* Other Members who took part in discussion were : Dr. Rudra Partap Singh, Sarvashri Harkishan Singh Surjeet, Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav, Jagdambi Prasad Yadav, Chand Ram, Dr. (Shrimati) Sathiavani Muthu, Sarvashri Ramanand Yadav, Ram Naresh Kushawaha, Ram Pujan Patel, Suraj Prasad, Narendra Singh, G.C. Bhattacharya, Alexander Warjri, Hayat Ulla Ansari and Dr. Mahabir Prasad.



works of foreign origin required for educational purposes. This was proposed to be done through the grant of compulsory licences for translation and reproduction of such works if these rights could not be obtained on freely negotiated terms enabling their publication or ensuring their availability at prices reasonable in the national context. In fact, India was the chief spokesman in bringing about these amendments before the international forum, but India had not been able to take advantage of these provisions in the revised conventions because this was possible only after we had suitably amended the Copyright Act, 1957, to conform to the provisions of the revised conventions and thereafter accede to the revised text.

The present Act did not provide adequate protection of authors' rights. It was accordingly proposed to make certain additional provisions pertaining to authors' rights such as providing for the manner of assignment of copyright, and to empower the Copyright Board to decide disputes arising out of such assignments. The working of the Act had also revealed certain lacunae and administrative drawbacks. There was no provision in the Act at present for the publication of unpublished works of an Indian author who was either dead or unknown or whose whereabouts were not traceable or where the owner of the copyright could not be located, to give effect to the above proposals certain amendments to the Act had been provided, the Minister added.

The Minister of State in the Ministries of Education and Culture and Social Welfare, Shrimati Sheila Kaul, replying to the debate\*, said that the main purpose of this Bill was that, wherever piracy took place, if the country concerned was a member of the convention the aggrieved party could approach the Copyright Board of the country. But what happened was that we ourselves did not know that things like this existed. The question of payment of minimum royalty was a question of a contract between the author and the publisher. The general question of hardship of the author *vis-a-vis* publisher was being taken care of in this Bill. The books to be brought out under compulsory licensing system would be only those books which were not available in India at reasonable price. The limits of three years and one year for compulsory licensing were in line with the Paris Text and thus we had no option to this, the Minister further stated.

The Copyright Office was being set up under the proposed amendment and its functions included taking care of international aspects of copyright.

---

\* Members who took part in the debate were : Sarvashri Shiva Chandra Jha, R. Ramakrishnan, Bijya Krishna Handique, Sukomal Sen, Ram Lakhan Prasad Gupta, Sankar Prasad Mitra, Dr. Rudra Pratap Singh, Sarvashri V.N. Tiwari, Ramchandra Bharadwaj, Khushwant Singh, Ladli Mohan Nigam, B. Satyanarayan Reddy, Hayat Ulla Ansari.

The drafting and phraseology of the Bill were based on the Berne and Paris texts.

The Minister concluded that they would look into the question of making piracy a cognizable offence.

The motion for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee of House was negatived.

The motion for consideration of Bill was adopted, the clauses etc. as amended, were adopted and the Bill, as amended, was passed.

*The Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1983* : On 17 August, 1983, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Nihar Ranjan Laskar, moved the motion for consideration of the Bill to replace the Arms (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983. Shri Jagdish Prasad Mathur also moved a statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Ordinance. Both the Bill and the Resolution were discussed together.

Moving the motion for consideration of the Bill, the Minister said that the Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1981, was passed by the Rajya Sabha on 8 September, 1981, and was sent to the Lok Sabha. In the mean time a number of suggestions for further amendment of the Bill were received which had to be examined in depth before incorporating them into the Bill. However, the trend of events in certain parts of the country was such that there was an imminent danger of extensive disturbance of public peace and tranquility and it, therefore, became necessary to carry out the amendment proposals through promulgation of an Ordinance.

The Bill provided for all the amendments contained in the earlier Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1981, as passed by Rajya Sabha, subject to some changes aimed at making the punishment for certain offences more stringent and some changes of verbal and consequential nature. Some new provisions had also been added to prohibit possession and carrying of arms in disturbed areas, the Minister added.

To deal effectively with the menace of illicit firearms, a provision had been made for significant enhancement in punishment for offences involving illicit firearms. It was also proposed to introduce a ceiling of three firearms per person, with certain exceptions. We had come across instances of large scale use of arms in group clashes and in mass agitations. To deal with such extraordinary situations we had proposed two new provisions in the Bill, the Minister declared.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Nihar Ranjan Laskar, replying to the debate\*, said that under this Act, the Government would frame rules. At that time we would take into consideration the suggestions made by the Members and try to implement them, whatever was possible. This Bill should be viewed in the context of the overall situation prevailing in our country. Anti-social and anti-national elements were active. It was the duty of the Government to see that these anti-national activities were curbed as early as possible. Therefore, the prime need was to check proliferation of the arms in the country, make acquisition and possession of arms more stringent, and punishment more deterrent.

About the demand for referring it to the Select Committee, the Government was not in a position to accept it. The Bill was passed in 1981, after detailed discussion. The Government had taken all precautions to consult the various people who were legitimately connected with this. Also we had consulted a very wide range of public opinion and taken into consideration the views of experts. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by referring this Bill again to the Select Committee, the Minister declared.

The Resolution was negatived.

The motions moved by Shri Shiva Chandra Jha and Shri Bhola Prasad for reference of the Bill to Select Committee of the House were negatived.

The motion for consideration of the Bill was adopted, the Clauses, etc. were adopted and the Bill was passed.

*The Emigration Bill, 1983* : On 25 August, 1983, the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation, Shri Veerendra Patil, moving the motion for consideration of the Bill, said that the Emigration Bill, 1983, had been passed unanimously by the Lok Sabha on the 12 August, 1983, and the Bill was now before this August House. India had a long history of emigration moving from the era of maritime adventure to the era of colonisation of the early twentieth century. The Emigration Act of 1922 legislated by the British, which the present Bill sought to replace, was an offshoot of the British policy of economic colonisation and it catered to the needs of a very different era. With the passage of time and virtual end of colonisation new ideals and fresh needs had arisen.

The main approach of the present Bill had been to protect the emigrant worker from exploitation both in India and abroad and, at the same time, not

---

\* Other Members who took part in the debate were : Sarvashri Ghanshyambhai Oza, Dinesh Goswami, Dr. Rudra Pratap Singh, Sarvashri K. Mohanan, Ram Naresh Kushawaha, Narendra Singh, Suraj Prasad, Shanti Tyagi, B. Satyanarayana Reddy, Natha Singh, Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav, S.W. Dhabe, Ajit Kumar Sharma and Shiva Chandra Jha.

to have too cumbersome or complicated a procedure which would reduce or adversely affect the competitiveness of Indian labour in the overseas market. The recruitment agents would be required to have a registration certificate which could be cancelled on the grounds of inefficiency, dishonesty, moral turpitude, etc., the Minister said,

The Government of India had no intention of participating in the field or recruitment for the present. Some State Governments were already in the field and were competing with the private operators in the open market. Keeping the crucial concept of protection of emigrants in view, the Central Emigration Authority had been designated as the Protector General of Emigrants, the Minister informed.

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation, Shri Veerendra Patel, replying to the debate,\* said that the emigration clearance was being given now in accordance with the guidelines that had been fixed by the Supreme Court. There was no Act to regulate the migration. Therefore there was an urgency that this Bill should be adopted as early as possible and it should become an Act. Sufficient care had been taken in drafting the Bill and it was scrutinised at different levels and there was no need to refer it to a Select Committee.

It was true that the recruiting agents were exploiting the emigrants. So far as the migration clearance work was concerned, it was strictly in accordance with the guidelines fixed by the Supreme Court. If any recruiting agent charged ten thousand or fifteen thousand rupees then today it did not constitute any offence at all and if he cheated him, he could be prosecuted under the IPC. Sufficient care had been taken and so far as cheating was concerned, and so far as violation of the provisions of the Emigration Act was concerned deterrent punishment had been provided for in the Bill. Minimum punishment was six months imprisonment, the Minister declared.

Sometimes we received complaints that when our emigrants were taken to those countries to work then services conditions were changed and they were not properly paid. We proposed to have Labour Attaches to safeguard the interests of workers in the countries where we had a concentration of labour. If there was any violation of the labour laws in these countries, there were sufficient labour laws in these countries and any worker, any emigrant, could approach the labour court, the Minister informed.

The motion for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee of the House was negatived. The motion for the consideration of the Bill was adopted and the Clauses etc. were also adopted and the Bill was passed.

---

\* Members who took part in the debate were : Sarvashri Sushil Chand Mohunta, B. Ibrahim, O. J. Joseph, C. Haridas, Ram Laxhan Prasad Gupta, Shrimati Maimoona Sultan, Sarvashri R. Ramakrishnan, Santosh Kumar Sahu, Remeshwar Singh, Ramanand Yadav, B. V. Abdulla Koya and Maqsood AliKahn.

### C. THE QUESTION HOUR

During the Session, 7103 notices of questions (6536 starred and 567 unstarred) and 12 Short Notice Questions were received. Out of these, 452 Starred Questions and 3346 Unstarred Questions were admitted. No Short Notice Question was admitted.

*Daily Average of Questions* : Each of the lists of Starred Questions contained 18 to 21 Questions. On an average 4 Questions were orally answered on the floor of the House, per sitting. The maximum number of Questions orally answered was 6 on 16 August, 1983, and the minimum number of Questions orally answered was 2 on 11 August, 1983.

The minimum number of Questions admitted in the Unstarred Questions list was 96 on 10 August and their maximum number was 244 on 22 August, 1983. Their average come to 145.48 per sitting.

*Half-an-Hour Discussions* : In all 31 notices of Half-an-Hour Discussions were received during the Session and 5 of them were admitted and discussed in the House.

### D. OBITUARY REFERENCES

During the Session, the Chairman made references to the passing away of Sarvashri Sikander Ali Wajid, M.R. Venkataraman, Bhanu Pratap Singh, Lakshmana Mahapatro, all ex-Members and Sardar Hukam Singh, former Speaker Lok Sabha. The Members stood in silence for a short-while as a mark of respect to the deceased.

### STATE LEGISLATURES

#### GUJARAT LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\*

The Eighth Session of the Sixth Gujarat Legislative Assembly commenced on 17 February, 1983. The Assembly was prorogued on 2 April, 1983.

*Governor's Address* : On 17 February, 1983, opening the Budget Session, the Governor of the State addressed Members of the Legislature.

*Financial Business* : On 18 February, 1983, the Minister for Finance presented Supplementary Demands for the year 1982-83 amounting to Rs. 353.03 crores. The Minister also presented Budget Estimates for the year 1983-84 amounting to Rs. 2142.85 crores on 24 February, 1983.

*Appointment of a Parliamentary Committee to inquire into the alleged police atrocities at Vijaynagar* : On 18 February, 1983, while discussing a Calling Attention notice the Opposition demanded an inquiry into the alleged

\* Contributed by the Gujarat Legislature Secretariat.

police atrocities at Vijaynagar in Sabarkantha District by a Parliamentary Committee. After some discussion, the Home Minister accepted the demand and agreed to appoint an all-party Committee to inquire into the matter and requested the Speaker to nominate the Committee. The Speaker nominated a 15-Member Committee on 22 February, 1983, having a Chairman from the Opposition.

*Obituary References* : On 3 March, 1983, obituary reference was made on the passing away of Shri Raghavji Leuva, a former Speaker of the Assembly and rich tributes were paid to him in the House. Thereafter, as a mark of respect to his memory, the House was adjourned for the day.

#### MADHYA PRADESH VIDHAN SABHA\*

The Eighth Session of the Seventh Vidhan Sabha commenced on 21 February, 1983, and ended on 8 April, 1983.

*Financial Business* : On 2 March, 1983, the Deputy Chief Minister and Finance Minister, Shri Shiv Bhanu Solanki, presented the Budget Estimates for the year 1983-84. Beginning on 4 March, 1983, the general discussion on the Budget Estimates lasted for four days. Individual Demands for Grants were discussed and voted in full by the House, on 4 April, 1983. The relative Appropriation Bill was discussed and passed by the House on 5 April, 1983. Shri Solanki also presented Supplementary Estimates for the year 1983-84, which had been voted earlier on 4 March, 1983 and passed on the same day. The Demands for Vote on Account for a month for the Financial year 1983-84 were also moved by Shri Solanki and voted by the House on 4 March, 1983, and the relative Appropriation Bill was passed on the same day.

#### RAJASTHAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\*\*

The Budget Session of the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly commenced on 17 February, 1983, and concluded on 26 March, 1983.

*Governor's Address* : The Governor of the State addressed the Members of the Legislative Assembly on 17 February, 1983. A motion of Thanks to the Address was discussed for four days and adopted by the House.

*Question Hour* : During the Session, 819 Starred Questions, 1067 Unstarred Questions and one Short Notice Question were listed for answer.

*Resolution regarding legislation on a State subject by Parliament* : A Resolution empowering the Parliament, under clause (1) of Article 252 of the Constitution, to legislate on a State subject, viz. training and practice in veterinary science, was adopted by the Legislative Assembly.

\* Contributed by the Madhya Pradesh Vidhan Sabha Secretariat.

\*\* Contributed by the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly Secretariat.

**UTTAR PRADESH VIDHAN SABHA\***

The Budget Session of the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha commenced on 1 February, 1983, and concluded on 7 April, 1983.

*Governor's Address* : On 1 February, 1983, the Governor of the State addressed Members of both Houses of the Uttar Pradesh Legislature assembled together. Subsequently, on 7 February, 1983, Shri Rajendra Tripathi moved a Motion of Thanks to the Address. The House discussed the Governor's Address for four days *i. e.* on 7, 8, 9 and 10 February, 1983, and adopted the Motion of Thanks.

*Question Hour* : During the Session, 8,196 notices of Questions were received and admitted. Out of these, 5,990 Questions were answered.

*Obituary References* : During the Session, obituary references were made to the passing away of Mr. Leonid Brezhnev, the President of U.S.S.R., Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Sarvodaya Leader, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Shri Godey Murahari, former Deputy Chairman of Rajya Sabha, Shri Pilo Mody, Member of Parliament, Shri Yadvendra Singh, Deputy Speaker of the Assembly, four sitting Members and thirteen former Members of the Assembly. The House paid rich tributes to them.

---

\* Contributed by the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha Seçtt,

## BOOK REVIEW

## COMMUNIST LEGISLATURES IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Edited by Daniel Nelson and Stephen White (Ed.). Published by the Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1982, 201 pages.

For the serious student of Communist societies and their political structures, this publication can certainly claim to have a higher standard of objectivity and keener perception of dialectical processes than many others dealing with the subject. The editors and contributors all belong to the West and obviously have no pro-communist leanings or sympathies. One or two of them—notably Otto Ulc, Professor of Political Science at the State University of New York—can, in fact, barely conceal their anti-Communist bias. This is not surprising since it appears that Prof. Ulc is a Czechoslovak emigre settled in the USA. But he is the exception rather than the stereotype in this volume.

The other contributors include professors, assistant professors and lecturers from the Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Canada; City University, London; University of Kentucky; University of North Carolina; and University of Glasgow. They have contributed studies on the composition, functions, powers and background of the Parliaments of six countries, *viz* ; Yugoslavia, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, USSR and China.

What is notable about the book as a whole is the candid admission by the editors set out, for example, in the very opening sentences of their Preface:

“Communist Legislatures have not normally been taken seriously by scholars or by the mass public in the West. Passive instruments for the unanimous endorsement of whatever the party might propose, it is believed, they play little part in the political life of their countries and can safely be dismissed as ‘rubber stamps’. The contributors to this volume, a group of students of communist politics drawn from both sides of the Atlantic, take issue with this view. Communist Legislatures, admittedly, do not directly challenge the dominance of the ruling party. But they represent and help to integrate the diverse



populations that elect them; they provide a forum for the discussion and sometimes the modification of major measures of public policy; and, above all, in their developing committee structure they provide a mechanism for the examination of draft legislation, for the discussion of plan and budget allocations and for the supervision of government and state bodies which in some cases may rival that of Western Parliaments in its scope and effectiveness." (Emphasis reviewer's).

This general and positive assessment emerges from the detailed studies contained here of a variety of Communist legislatures and based on a number of sources—published proceedings, interviews, specialist journals and the daily press of the countries concerned. There is much here of immense relevance for Indian legislatures, provided they bear in mind the basic points of difference and similarity between the historical evolutions and the economic, social and political structures of communist and non-communist societies.

In the reviewer's opinion, the contributors of this volume have failed to emphasise adequately certain decisive components of their "comparative perspective".

Firstly, none of the Communist countries selected for study (with the exception of Czechoslovakia and that, too, for a brief period) had any parliamentary institutions or democratic traditions worth the name, prior to the advent of socialist power. The Communist legislatures are, historically speaking, products of the post-World War II period, again with the exception of the USSR.

Secondly, the economic and social foundations of the state having been fundamentally transformed from capitalism (and even pre-capitalist structures) to socialism, why should the newly established legislatures be judged from the standpoint of their "opposition" or "challenge" to the ruling party and the government? Failure—deliberate or unintended—to grasp this point inevitably leads to the theory of "rubber stamp" Parliaments—a theory which has been thoroughly debunked in the book under review without going into the fundamentals of social evolution.

Thirdly, the invaluable role of Parliaments as symbols and instruments of genuine national integration can better be appreciated and judged in the light of the multi-national societies comprising at least four out of the six countries studied—Yugoslavia with its Serb, Croat and Slovene peoples, Czechoslovakia with its Czechs and Slovaks; the People's Republic of China with its dominant Han nationality and numerous other minorities; and the USSR—a federation of fourteen Republics (at widely divergent levels of deve-

development prior to 1917) and numerous autonomous regions, stretching across Europe and Asia.

Fourthly, in the Communist societies and legislatures, politics as an avocation is bound to dwindle to the point of extinction. The "professional" politician, the "wholetime" party functionary, the legislator without any other occupation, is here replaced by the deputy or M.P. who is, at the same time, actively engaged in a particular profession. He, or she, comes to the sittings of Parliament direct from the factory bench or office, from the farm, educational and scientific institute, and even from the armed forces. They do not give up their jobs when elected but, through their work, keep in live contact with the people, their needs and opinions. Naturally, unlike the practice of Parliaments in many other countries, the communist legislatures cannot indulge in lengthy sessions.

Further interesting sidelights and commentaries are to be found in the detailed analysis of individual legislatures. These may come as an eye-opener to those who subscribe to the "rubber stamp" theory.

For example, writing on Poland, David M. Olson and Maurice D. Simon observe :

"While the parliaments of Western democratic systems are assumed to be more independent and active than those of communist systems, this general observation may not apply consistently to both of the suggested dimensions along which parliamentary activity may be compared. This judgement may very well be accurate in respect of the policy-making function, but not necessarily in respect of the review and supervision of administrative agencies. It may be, in fact, that the Polish Sejm is more active in this respect than at least some Western parliaments..... The institutional development of the Polish Sejm presents an example of the evolving capacity of a formally democratic institution in a communist political system."

Again, describing the functioning of the Chinese National People's Congress, Donald Gasper notes that "China possesses a surprisingly elaborate and flexible structure in its highest state organ..... Apart from the educative and informative role of Congress sessions, the system of people's congresses also has the function of bringing up new cadres from the localities and drawing them into the discussion of state affairs, both for the sake of their own development and in order to improve links between the centre and the periphery."

Professor Stephen White has dealt at length with the evolving and developing functioning of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR—the doyen of the communist Parliaments. He appears to be somewhat mystified by the equal

representation given to all the Republics, irrespective of population, in the Soviet of Nationalities, and it is a pity he has not bothered to study the impact of this "equality" factor in the remarkable transformation of the former Tsarist "prison-house of the peoples" into the great Socialist family of equal nationalities which is a marvel of historical integration.

But Professor White is unsparing in his commendation of the system of standing commissions of the Supreme Soviet; their exhaustive and in-depth scrutiny, frequently resulting in amendments of the State Plans and budgetary proposals; their initiation of legislation and proposals for amendments to draft legislation submitted to them on behalf of the Council of Ministers—a process in which voluminous public correspondence and debate play an important part; their supervision or monitoring of Government, "a function summed up by the Russian word 'kontrol'," and checking up on the performance of ministries; and their investigation into the implementation of legislation by ministries and other bodies.

Most Western scholars have held that communist legislatures are "subordinate and passive bodies, called simply for the purpose of legitimising what the party has already decided and making no contribution of their own to the work of government or the formation of public policy." It is to the credit of objective scholarship that the editors of this volume brand this as "a mistaken and misconceived conclusion. Not only does it underestimate the part that communist legislatures play in matters of this kind; it also makes the fallacious assumption that a dominant single party must preclude the existence of an active and influential legislature."

Some would like to think that as communist societies are increasingly confronted by more "complex" political issues, by "nationalist pressures" or instability of one kind or another, their legislatures will suffer devaluation. Some, on the other hand, would prefer to attribute the admitted institutional evolution of these legislatures, and the expansion of their authority, to the growing stability and inner-unity of the societies they represent and the deliberately relaxed policies of their ruling parties.

As the editors say in conclusion: "Comparative communist politics is notoriously a graveyard of predictions. On the evidence presented in this volume, however, it would seem reasonable to conclude that communist legislatures are not, as their Western counterparts are reputed to be, 'in decline', and that the next ten years or so will see a further expansion, not a regression, in their authority."

Anyone, looking for food for thought, will find solid sustenance in this volume.

—INDRAJIT GUPTA, M. P.

## RECENT LITERATURE OF PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST

## I. BOOKS

Beyme, Klaus Vou : *The Political System of the Federal Republic of Germany*. Harts, Gower, 1983.

Bhattacharjee, Arun : *Indian Constitution and Administration*. New Delhi, Metropolitan Book Co., 1983.

Blondel, Jean : *The Organisation of Government; a Comparative Analysis of Governmental Structures*. London, Sage Publications, 1983.

Crittenden, John A. : *Parties and Elections in the United States*. New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1982.

Jewell, Malcolm E. : *Representation in State Legislatures*. Lexington, The University Press of Kentucky, 1982. (Deals with State Legislatures in United States of America).

Jois, P.V. : *Delegated Legislation and Exercise of Delegated Powers in India with Special Reference to Custom and Central Excise Laws—Some Aspects*. Bombay, Somaiya Publications, 1982.

Kohn, Walter S.G. : *Women in National Legislatures; a Comparative Study of Six Countries*. New York, Praeger, 1980.

Martin, Lawrence : *The Presidents and the Prime Ministers; Washington and Ottawa Face to Face; the Myth of Bilateral Bliss 1867-1982*. Toronto, Doubleday Canada Ltd., 1982.

Mukherji, A.R. : *Parliamentary Procedure in India*. Calcutta, Oxford University Press, 1983.

Murti, A.S. : *Assam the Difficult Years ; a Study of Political Developments in 1979-83*. New Delhi, Himalayan Books, 1983.

Naik, J.A. : *The Opposition in India and the Future of Democracy*. New Delhi, S. Chand & Company Ltd., 1983.

Perry, Michael J. : *The Constitution, the Courts and Human Rights; an*

*inquiry into the Legitimacy of Constitutional Policy making by the Judiciary.* New Haven, Yale, University Press, 1982.

Smith, Gordon : *Democracy in Western Germany; Parties and Policies in Federal Republic.* London, Heinemann, 1982.

## II. ARTICLES

Barnet, Richard J. : Future of Democracy. *Otherside*, June, 1983. (Discusses the future of democracy in the world).

Chopra, V.D. : Reviewing Centre-State Ties. *Patriot*, 4 April, 1983. (Highlights the appointment of Sarkaria panel to go into the Centre-State relations)

Das, Sitanshu : Electoral Reforms Empire Building by the CEC? *Hindustan Times*, 8 April, 1983.

Dhar, Niranjana : Sociology of Partyless Democracy. *Radical Humanist*, May, 1983.

Gandhi, Rajmohan : Culture of Sportsmanship. *Hindustan Times*, 9 April 1983. (Emphasises the need to develop a culture of sportsmanship for the functioning of Parliamentary Democracy in India).

Gandhi, Rajmohan : Nominations to the Rajya Sabha. *Indian Express*, 27 April, 1983. (Comments on the process involved in the nomination of Members to Rajya Sabha and suggests some reforms in the system).

Gopalji Ram : Electoral Reforms ; Utility and Futility. *M.P. Chronicle*, 4 April, 1983.

Gopalji Ram : Purity of Poll-process and Politicians. *M.P. Chronicle*, 12 April, 1983. (Emphasises the need for electoral reforms in India).

Haksar, Nandite : Justice for the common man. *Hindustan Times*, 22 May, 1983.

Inderjit : Growth doesn't stop at 30. *Tribune*, 10 May, 1983. (Reviews the working of Parliament in India during the last 30 years).

Inderjit : Parliament requires Reforms. *Assam Tribune*, 15 May, 1983.

Inderjit : Poll Panel and Speaker's Ruling. *Tribune*, 5 April, 1983. (Comments on the decision of Election Commission to conduct elections in Assam and the ruling of Speaker of Lok Sabha thereon).

Katyai, K.K. : Too many Parties the Bane. *Hindu*, 7 April, 1983. (Discusses the issues to be covered in the electoral reforms as suggested by the Chief Election Commissioner).

Khanna, K.C. : Dynastic Rule is a Myth. *Illustrated Weekly of India*, 17 April, 1983.

Khanna, K.C. : Opposition in a Bind. *Illustrated Weekly of India*, 8 May, 1983. (Comments on the working of Opposition Parties in India).

Kidwai, Anser : Communal Amity and Social Cohesion. *National Herald*, 11 June, 1983.

Madhava Menon, N.R. : Legal Aid and Social Justice. *Hindustan Times*, 2 May, 1983.

Nayar, Kuldip : Art of Parliamentary Silence. *Tribune*, 21 April, 1983. (Analyses the role of Parliament in India and comments on the tendency to curtail the period of a session of Assembly or Parliament).

Nayar, Kuldip : Basic Issues come to Fore in Kashmir Poll. *Free Press Journal*, 2 June, 1983.

Pandit, C.S. : Parliament ; Time to change it with the Times. *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 21 April, 1983. (Reviews the working of the present Parliament and suggests some modifications in its functioning).

Patil, R.K. : Worst Enemy of Unity. *M.P. Chronicle*, 24 May, 1983. (Deals with the problem of unity and integrity in India under the present circumstances).

Rajagopaul, G.R. : Protecting Judicial Independence. *Indian Express*, 11 May, 1983.

Sathe, Vasant : People's Choice will prevail. *Illustrated Weekly of India*; 17 April, 1983. (Comments on the prospects of a dynastic rule in India).

Sethi, J.D. : Regionalism or Decentralisation? *Indian Express*, 1 April 1983 (Assesses the implication of the recent meeting of the non-Congress (I) Chief Ministers of Southern States on Indian politics and the appointment of Sarkaria Commission to deal with Centre-States relations).

Sham Lal : National Scene ; Enemies of Promise. *Times of India*, 14 May, 1983. (Comments on the present political scene in the country).

Soni, S.R. : Why are MPs playing Truant? *Pioneer*, 19 May, 1983. (Deals with the present rate of salary and allowances and other amenities of MPs).

Sundar Rajan, K.R. : Permanent Election Syndrome. *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 20 April, 1983. (Examines the need to reduce frequency of elections by injecting an element of stability into legislative system in India).

Vishwanathan, Savitri : East-Asia Analysis ; Debate on Japan's Constitution. *Indian Express*, 25 May, 1983.

## APPENDIX I

### STATEMENT SHOWING THE SITTINGS HELD BY THE COMMITTEES OF THE SEVENTH LOK SABHA DURING THE PERIOD 1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE, 1983

Sl. No.	Name of the Committee	No. of sittings held
1	2	3
(i)	Business Advisory Committee	2
(ii)	Committee on Absence of Members	2
(iii)	Committee on Public Undertakings	13
(iv)	Committee on Papers laid on the Table	3
(v)	Committee on Petitions	3
(vi)	Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions	4
(vii)	Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes	8
(viii)	Committee of Privileges	5
(ix)	Committee on Government Assurances	1
(x)	Committee on Subordinate Legislation	3
(xi)	Estimates Committee	30
(xii)	General Purposes Committee	1
(xiii)	House Committee	4*
(xiv)	Ad-hoc Sub-Committee of House Committee	...
(xv)	Public Accounts Committee	11
(xvi)	Railway Convention Committee	6
(xvii)	Rules Committee	1

\* Includes one sitting of the Accommodation Sub-Committee of the House Committee.



1	2	3
<b>JOINT/SELECT COMMITTEES</b>		
(i)	Joint Committee on Offices of Profit	8**
(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.	5
(vi)	Joint Committee of Chairmen, House Committees of both the Houses of Parliament.	...

\*\*Includes four sittings of Sub-Committee of the Joint Committee on the Offices of Profit.

## APPENDIX II

### STATEMENT SHOWING THE WORK TRANSACTED DURING THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY SIXTH SESSION OF RAJYA SABHA

---

1. PERIOD OF THE SESSION	26 April to 10 May, 1983
2. NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD	11
3. TOTAL NUMBER OF SITTING HOURS	74 hours and 11 minutes (excluding lunch break)
4. NUMBER OF DIVISIONS HELD	... 2
5. GOVERNMENT BILLS	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	... 10
(ii) Introduced	... Nil
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by Lok Sabha	... 5
(iv) Returned by Lok Sabha with any amendment	... Nil
(v) Referred to Select Committee by Rajya Sabha	... Nil
(vi) Referred to Joint Committee by Rajya Sabha	... Nil
(vii) Reported by Select Committee	... Nil
(viii) Reported by Joint Committee	... Nil
(ix) Discussed	... 5
(x) Passed	... 3
(xi) Withdrawn	... Nil
(xii) Negatived	... Nil
(xiii) Part-discussed	... Nil
(xiv) Returned by Rajya Sabha without any recommendation	... 2
(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	... 77
(ii) Introduced	... 2
(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	... 2

(vii) Withdrawn	...	Nil
(viii) Passed	...	Nil
(ix) Negatived	...	1
(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	...	78
<b>7. NUMBER OF DISCUSSIONS HELD UNDER RULE 176</b>		
<b>( MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE)</b>		
(i) Notices received	...	2
(ii) Admitted	...	Nil
(iii) Discussion held	...	Nil
<b>8. NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE UNDER RULE 180</b>		
<b>(CALLING-ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE)</b>		
<b>STATEMENTS MADE BY MINISTERS</b>	...	7
<b>9. HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSIONS HELD</b>	...	5
<b>10. STATUTORY RESOLUTIONS</b>		
(i) Notices received	...	Nil
(ii) Admitted	...	Nil
(iii) Moved	...	Nil
(iv) Adopted	...	Nil
(v) Negatived	...	Nil
(vi) Withdrawn	...	Nil
<b>11. GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS</b>		
(i) Notices received	...	Nil
(ii) Admitted	...	Nil
(iii) Moved	...	Nil
(iv) Adopted	...	Nil
<b>12. PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS</b>		
(i) Received	...	5
(ii) Admitted	...	5
(iii) Discussed	...	1
(iv) Withdrawn	...	1
(v) Negatived	...	Nil
(vi) Adopted	...	Nil

(vii) Part-discussed	...	Nil
(viii) Discussion postponed	...	Nil
<b>13. GOVERNMENT MOTIONS:</b>		
(i) Notices received	...	Nil
(ii) Admitted	...	Nil
(iii) Moved	...	Nil
(iv) Adopted	...	Nil
(v) Part-discussed	...	Nil
<b>14. PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS:</b>		
(i) Received	...	31
(ii) Admitted	...	31
(iii) Moved	...	Nil
(iv) Adopted	...	Nil
(v) Part-discussed	...	Nil
(vi) Negatived	...	Nil
(vii) Withdrawn	...	Nil
<b>15. MOTIONS REGARDING MODIFICATION OF STATUTORY RULE:</b>		
(i) Received	...	Nil
(ii) Admitted	...	Nil
(iii) Moved	...	Nil
(iv) Adopted	...	Nil
(v) Negatived	...	Nil
(vi) Withdrawn	...	Nil
(vii) Part-discussed	...	Nil
<b>16. NUMBER OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES CREATED, IF ANY, DURING THE SESSION</b>	...	Nil
<b>17. TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED</b>	...	1268
<b>18. TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITORS</b>	...	1563
<b>19. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED ON ANY SINGLE DAY, AND DATE ON WHICH ISSUED</b>	...	203 on 5-5-83
<b>20. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF VISITORS ON ANY SINGLE DAY AND DATE ON WHICH VISITED</b>	...	226 on 10-5-83
<b>21. TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ADMITTED:</b>		
(i) Starred	...	218
(ii) Unstarred	...	1665
(iii) Short-Notice Questions	...	Nil

**22. DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRIES :**

1. Ministry of Home Affairs.
2. Ministry of Labour & Rehabilitation (Deptt. of Labour)
3. Ministry of Rural Development (Discussion not concluded)

**23. WORKING OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES :**

Name of Committee	No. of meetings held during the period 1 April to 30 June, 1983	No. of Reports presented to the House during the Session
(i) Public Accounts Committee	*	*
(ii) Committee on Public Undertakings	*	*
(iii) Business Advisory Committee	1	...
(iv) Committee on Subordinate Legislation	9	1
(v) Committee on Petitions	9	...
(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	10	1
(xi) Joint Committee of the Houses on the Viswa-Bharati (Amendment) Bill, 1978.	4	...
(xii) Committee on Papers Laid on the Table of the House	1	...
(xiii) Joint Committee on the Indian Veterinary Council Bill, 1981	3	...
(xiv) Joint Committee on Mental Health Bill, 1981	2	...

\*See Supra Appendix 1.

**24. NUMBER OF MEMBERS GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE 2**

**25. PETITIONS PRESENTED 3**

**26. NAMES OF NEW MEMBERS SWORN WITH DATES :**

S. No.	Name of Member sworn	Date on which sworn
1.	Shri Chandan K. Baghi	26-4-83

APPENDIX III

STATEMENT SHOWING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE LEGISLATURES OF STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES  
DURING THE PERIOD 1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE, 1983

Legislature	Duration	Sittings	Govt. Bills	Private Bills	Starred Questions	Unstarred Questions	Short Notice Questions
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>States :</b>							
Andhra Pradesh L.C.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Andhra Pradesh L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Assam L.A.	30.5.83 to 6.6.83	6	7(7)	...	120(107)	3(2)	15(9)
Bihar L.C.	20.12.82 to 12.1.83 & 10.3.83 to 23.3.83	4 and 10	(8)	...	741(731)	103(a)	479(419)
Bihar L.A.	17.6.83 (date of Commencement)	...	...	...	943(900)	45(113)(a)	623(478)
Gujarat L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Haryana L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Himachal Pradesh L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Jammu & Kashmir L.C.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Jammu & Kashmir L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Karnataka L.C.	10.3.83 to 2.4.83	...	...	...	...	...	...
Karnataka L.A.	10.3.83 to 2.4.83	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kerala L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Madhya Pradesh L.A.	21.2.83 to 8.4.83	30	16(15)	4(1)	3523(2319)	1833(1454)	2(1)
Maharashtra L.C.	7.3.83 to 22.4.83	26	1(1)	6	2471(622)	7(288)(b)	131(40)
Maharashtra L.A.	7.3.83 to 22.4.83	31	10(9)	11	4152(995)	78(35)	193(45)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Manipur L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Meghalaya L.A.	10.6.83 to 5.7.83	15	5(5)	...	9(9)	509(499)	...
Nagaland L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Orissa L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Punjab L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rajasthan L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sikkim L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tamil Nadu L.C.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tamil Nadu L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tripura L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Uttar Pradesh L.C.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Uttar Pradesh L.A.	1.2.83 to 7.4.83	40	9(12)	3	1404(607)(c)	2805(3375)(d)	1221(223)
West Bengal L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<b>Union Territories :</b>							
Arunachal Pradesh L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Delhi Metropolitan Council	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Goa, Daman and Diu L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mizoram L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pondicherry L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

**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 figures in bracket include the Notices received as Starred and Short Notice Questions.

(b) The figure 288 includes 284 Notices received as Starred Questions.

(c) The figure 607 includes 375 Notices received as Short Notice Questions.

(d) The figure 3375 includes 825 Notices received as Starred Questions and 320 Notices received as Short Notice Questions.

**APPENDIX—III (Contd.)**

**COMMITTEES AT WORK/NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD AND NUMBER OF REPORTS PRESENTED**

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Business Advisory Committee	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Committee on Govt. Assurances	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
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.

Andhra Pradesh L.A.

Assam L.A.

Bihar L.C.

Bihar L.A.

Gujarat L.A.

Haryana L.A.

Himachal Pradesh L.A.

Jammu & Kashmir L.C.



	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Jammu & Kashmir L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Karnataka L.C.	...	5	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Karnataka L.A.	...	2	...	...	1	8	...	4	3	...	...	1	5	...	...	2(e)
Kerala L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Madhya Pradesh L.A.	5(4)	3(1)	1	5(5)	6(2)	6(2)	4	2	3	2	3	2	4(f)	1	...	7(g)
Maharashtra L.C.	3(2)	12(1)	1(1)	5(5)	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2(3)(h)
Maharashtra L.A.	6(3)	10(1)	3	7(7)	...	23(4)	11(1)	42(3)(i)	16(7)...	...	1	...	16	...	...	27(7)(j)
Manipur L.A.	...	2	2	...	...	3	...	...	4	...	...	...	3	8	...	...
Meghalaya L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...
Nagaland L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	1	...	...	...
Orissa L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Punjab L.A.	...	24	4	...	7	18	3	12	17	...	5	1	17	...	...	11(k)
Rajasthan L.A.	...	27	31	...	20	14	23	55(l)	53(m)	...	19	23	28	23	...	...
Sikkim L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...
Tamil Nadu L.C.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tamil Nadu L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tripura L.A.	...	2	1	...	1	2	...	3	3	...	1	1	1	1	...	3(n)
Uttar Pradesh L.C.	...	30	38	...	17	31	...	...	...	...	20	...	...	5	7(o)	76(p)
Uttar Pradesh L.A.*	10(10)	11(3)	3	...	2	6(1)	4	20(4)	7	...	...	1	12(1)	1(1)	1(1)(q)	4(1)(r)
	...	11	8	...	1	22	12	32	18	...	...	...	2	6	...	4(s)
West Bengal L.A.	3(3)	2	2	...	2	4	5	3	1	...	3	...	3	...	...	...
<b>Union Territories :</b>																
Arunachal Pradesh L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...
Delhi Metropolitan Council	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Goa, Daman & Diu L.A.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mizoram L.A.	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	8	...	...	...	3	...	...	...

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Pondicherry L.A.	...	1	3	...	...	...	2	...	15	...	...	2	13	...	...	2(t)

**Notes :** Figures in the brackets indicate the number of reports presented to the House.

\*Pertain to the periods 1 January to 31 March, 83 and 1 April to 30 June 83 respectively.

- (a) E.R.C. (Ad hoc Committee)—3 sittings.
- (b) Members' Facilities Committee—81 sittings and Question and Calling Attention Committee—79 sittings.
- (c) Members' Allowances and Rules Committee—2 sittings; Committee on the Welfare of Socially and Educationally Backward Classes, Nomadic Tribes and Denotified Tribes—3 sittings, and Special Committee of the House Appointed to inquire into the Incidents of Police Firing and Atrocities by Police at Vijaynagar in Sabarkantha District on 8 February, 1983—2 sittings.
- (d) Committee on Papers Laid on the Table of the House—2 sittings.
- (e) Committee on Welfare of Backward Classes—2 sittings.
- (f) Includes Sub-Committee of Public Accounts Committee—1 sitting.
- (g) Committee to inquire into the conditions Precedent to Death of Shri Abdul Rehaman Farouqi—7 sittings.
- (h) Committee on Leave of Absence from the Sittings of the House—2(3).
- (i) Committee on Welfare of Scheduled Castes—17(1); Committee on Welfare of Scheduled Tribes—13(1) and Committee on Welfare of Vimukta Jatis and Nomadic Tribes—12(1).
- (j) Committee on Leave of Absence from the Sittings of the House—2(3); Panchayati Raj Committee—11(2); Employment Guarantee Scheme Committee—8(2); and Catering Committee—6 sittings.
- (k) Committee on Papers Laid/to be Laid on the Table of the House—11 sittings.
- (l) Committee on Welfare of Scheduled Castes—27 sittings, and Committee on Welfare of Scheduled Tribes—28 sittings.
- (m) Estimates Committee (A)—31 sittings and Estimates Committee (B)—22 sittings.
- (n) Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of House—1 sitting and Committee on Delegated Legislation—2 sittings.
- (o) Select Committee on Police (U.P. Amendment) Bill, 1982—1 sitting; Select Committee on U.P. Goondas Control (Amendment) Bill, 1982—5 sittings and Select Committee on U.P. Krishi Evam Prodyogik Vishwavidyalaya (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1981—1 sitting.

- 406
- (p) **Parliamentary and Social Goodwill Committee—20 sittings ; Compilation of Rulings Committee —12 sittings ; Financial and Administrative Committee—20 sittings ; Parliamentary Studies Committee—14 sittings ; and Shramik Basti Committee—10 sittings.**
  - (q) **Select Committee on the U.P. Revenue Code Bill, 1980—1(1).**
  - (r) **Accommodation Advisory and Kitchen Committee—2 sittings, and Committee on Parliamentary Research, Reference and Studies—2(1).**
  - (s) **Committee on Parliamentary Research, Reference and Studies—4 sittings.**
  - (t) **Committee on Papers Laid on the Table of the House—2 sittings.**

## **APPENDIX IV**

### **LIST OF BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT AND ASSENTED TO BY THE PRESIDENT DURING THE PERIOD 1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE, 1983**

---

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Title of the Bill</b>	<b>Date of assent by the President</b>
1.	<b>The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1983</b>	6.5.83
2.	<b>The Finance Bill, 1983</b>	13.5.83
3.	<b>The Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill, 1983</b>	18.5.83
4.	<b>The African Development Bank Bill, 1983</b>	26.5.83
5.	<b>The Central Industrial Security Force (Amendment) Bill, 1983</b>	26.5.83

---

## APPENDIX V

### LIST OF BILLS PASSED BY THE STATE LEGISLATURES DURING THE PERIOD

1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE, 1983

#### ASSAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Assam Panchayati Raj (Seventh Amendment) Bill, 1983.
2. The Assam (Temporarily Settled Areas) Tenancy Bill, 1983.
3. The Assam Agriculture Produce Market (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Assam Contingency Fund (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
5. The Assam Speaker's Salaries & Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
6. The Assam Deputy Speaker's Salaries & Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
7. The Assam Legislative Assembly Members' Salaries & Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

#### BIHAR LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

1. Bihar Chini Upkram (Arjan) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
2. Bihar Rajya Kamjor Varg Vidhik Sahayata Vidheyak, 1982.
3. Bihar Abhidhari Holding (Abhilekhon Ka Anurakshan) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
4. Bihar Kaamgar Suraksha (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
5. Bihar Viniyog (Sankhya—2) Vidheyak, 1982.
6. Bihar Viniyog (Lekhanudan) Vidheyak, 1983.
7. Bihar Viniyog Vidheyak, 1983.
8. Bihar Vitt Vidheyak, 1983.

#### MADHYA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. Madhya Pradesh Auodyogik Sambandh (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
2. Madhya Pradesh Sthan Niyantaran (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
3. Madhya Pradesh Lok Ayukt Evam Up-Lok Ayukt (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
4. Madhya Pradesh Grah Nirman Mandal (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
5. Madhya Pradesh Karadhan (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
6. Madhya Pradesh Van Upaj (Vyapar Viniyaman) Sanshodhan Vidheyak, 1983.
7. The Indian Forest (Madhya Pradesh Amendment) Vidheyak, 1983.
8. Madhya Pradesh Municipal Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
9. The Madhya Pradesh Appropriation (No. 1) Vidheyak, 1983.
10. Madhya Pradesh Rajya Bhumi Vikas Nigam (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.

11. **The Madhya Pradesh Appropriation (Vote on Account) Vidheyak, 1983.**
12. **Madhya Pradesh Bhu-Rajswa Sanhita (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.**
13. **Madhya Pradesh Krishi Jote Uchhtam Sima (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.**
14. **Madhya Pradesh Samanya Vikraya (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.**
15. **Madhya Pradesh Viniyog (No. 2) Vidheyak, 1983.**
16. **Madhya Pradesh Vishwavidyalaya (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.**
17. **Madhya Pradesh Madhyastham Adhikaran Vidheyak, 1983.**
18. **Madhya Pradesh Speaker and Deputy Speaker, Ministers and Leader of Opposition, Tatha Members of Legislative Assembly (Salaries and Allowances) Laws Amendment Vidheyak, 1983.**

**MAHARASHTRA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

1. **The Bombay University (Amendment) Bill, 1983.**
2. **The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) (Maharashtra Amendment) Bill, 1983.**
3. **The Maharashtra Zila Parishads and Panchayat Samitis (Amendment and Continuance) Bill, 1983.**
4. **The Maharashtra Forest Development (Tax on Sale of Forest Produce by Government or Forest Development Corporation) (Continuance) Bill, 1983.**
5. **The Maharashtra Drinking Water Supply Requisition Bill, 1983.**
6. **The Maharashtra Vacant Lands (Further Interim Protection to Occupiers from Eviction and Recovery of Arrears of Rent) (Extension of Duration) Bill, 1983.**
7. **The Maharashtra (Supplementary) Appropriation Bill, 1983.**
8. **The Maharashtra Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.**
9. **The Maharashtra Appropriation Bill, 1983.**

**MAHARASHTRA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. **The Bombay University (Amendment) Bill, 1983.**
2. **The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) (Maharashtra Amendment) Bill, 1983.**
3. **The Maharashtra Zila Parishads and Panchayat Samitis (Amendment and Continuance) Bill, 1983.**
4. **The Maharashtra Forest Development (Tax on Sale of Forest Produce by Government or Forest Development Corporation) (Continuance) Bill, 1983.**
5. **The Maharashtra Drinking Water Supply Requisition Bill, 1983.**

6. The Maharashtra Vacant Lands (Further Interim Protection to Occupiers from Eviction and Recovery of Arrears of Rent) (Extension of Duration) Bill, 1983.
7. The Maharashtra (Supplementary) Appropriation Bill, 1983.
8. The Maharashtra Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1983.
9. The Maharashtra Appropriation Bill, 1983.
10. The Maharashtra Zila Parishads and Panchayat Samitis (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

#### MEGHALAYA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Meghalaya Societies Registration Bill, 1983.
2. The Bengal, Agra, Assam and Shillong Civil Courts (Meghalaya Amendment) Bill, 1983.
3. The Meghalaya Homoeopathic Medicines (Amendment) Bill, 1983.
4. The Meghalaya Appropriation (No. II) Bill, 1983.
5. The National Sports Club of Assam (Taking-over of Management) (Amendment) Bill, 1983.

#### UTTAR PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. Uttar Pradesh Sahkari Samiti Sanshodhan Vidheyak, 1983.
2. Uttar Pradesh Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samiti (Alpkalik Vyavstha) Sanshodhan, Vidheyak, 1983.
3. Uttar Pradesh Viniyog (Lekhanudan) Vidheyak, 1983.
4. Uttar Pradesh Zila Parishad (Alpkalik Vyavstha) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
5. Vidyut Vidhi (Uttar Pradesh Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
6. Uttar Pradesh Nagar Mahapalika (Dwitiya Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
7. Uttar Pradesh Rajya Vishwavidyalaya (Dwitiya Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
8. Uttar Pradesh Rajya Vishwavidyalaya (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1983.
9. Uttar Pradesh Viniyog (1982-83 ka Dwitiya Anupurak) Vidheyak, 1983.
10. Uttar Pradesh Viniyog Vidheyak, 1983.
11. Uttar Pradesh Khadi Tatha Gram Udyog Board (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 1982.
- \*12. King George Medical College Aur Gandhi Memorial and Associated Hospital (Grahan Karana) Vidheyak, 1981.

---

\*The Bill was passed by the Legislative Assembly on 21 September, 1981. It was referred to a Select Committee by the Legislative Council. The Bill, as amended by the Legislative Council, was laid on the Table of the House on 17 March, 1983. The Bill was further amended by the Assembly on 5 April, 1983 and returned to the Council. The Council, on 6 April, 1983 agreed to the amendments made by the Assembly.

**APPENDIX VI**

**ORDINANCES ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS DURING THE PERIOD 1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE, 1983**

S. No.	Subject	Date of promulgation	Date on which laid before the House	Date of cessation	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>CENTRAL GOVERNMENT</b>					
1.	The Societies Registration (Delhi Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 (No. 3 of 1983)	22.6.83	25.7.83	5.9.83	—
2.	The Arms (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983 (No. 4 of 1983)	22.6.83	—do—	—do—	—
<b>STATE GOVERNMENTS</b>					
<b>ASSAM</b>					
1.	The Assam Panchayati Raj (Seventh Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	7.4.83	30.5.83	—	—
2.	The Assam Contingency Fund (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	2.5.83	—do—	—	—
<b>BIHAR</b>					
1.	Bihar Khanan Bandobast (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	31.3.83	17-6-83	—	—
2.	Bihar Nagarpalika (Sanshodhan) Dwitiya Adhyadesh, 1983.	13.4.83	—do—	—	—
3.	Bihar Vinirdishat Bhrashta Aacharan Nivaran Dwitiya Adhyadesh, 1983.	—do—	—do—	—	—



1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Bihar Adhivakta Kalyan-Nidhi Adhyadesh, 1983.	--do--	--do--	--	--
5.	Bihar Intermediate Shiksha Parishad Dwitiya Adhyadesh, 1983.	--do--	--do--	--	--
6.	Bihar Van Upaj (Vyapar Viniyaman) Dwitiya Adhyadesh, 1983.	20.4.83	--do--	--	--
7.	Bihar Eint Aapurti (Niyantaran) Dwitiya Adhyadesh, 1983.	--do--	--do--	--	--
8.	Shrimati Radhika Sinha Institute Evam Sachchidanand Sinha Library (Adhigrahan Aur Prabandh) Adhyadesh, 1983.	21.5.83	--do--	--	--
9.	Jhariya Jalpurti (Sanshodan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	27.5.83	--do--	--	--
10.	Bihar Aaksmikta Nidhi (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	14.6.83	--do--	--	--
<b>GUJARAT</b>					
1.	The Gujarat Contingency Fund (Temporary increase) Ordinance, 1983.	30.4.83	--	--	--
2.	The Indian Forest (Gujarat Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	23.5.83	--	--	--
3.	The Bombay Essential Commodities and Cattle Control (Gujarat Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	15.6.83	--	--	--

HIMACHAL PRADESH

1. The Himachal Pradesh Lokayukta Ordinance, 1983. — — —

MADHYA PRADESH

1. The Madhya Pradesh Griha Nirman Mandal (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983. 1.2.83 22.2.83 — — —  
 2. The Madhya Pradesh Lokayukt Evam Up-Lokayukt (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983. 4.2.83 —do— — — — —  
 3. The Madhya Pradesh Karadhan (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983. 5.2.83 —do— — — — —

MAHARASHTRA

1. The Bombay University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983. 14.1.83 7.3.83 7.4.83 Replaced by Legislation  
 2. The Maharashtra Zila Parishads and Panchayat Samitis (Amendment and Continuance) Ordinance, 1983. 17.1.83 —do— —do— —do—  
 3. The Maharashtra Forest Development (Tax on Sale of Forest-Produce by Government or Forest Development Corporation) (Continuance) Ordinance, 1983. —do— 15.4.83 —do— —do—  
 4. The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) (Maharashtra Amendment) Ordinance, 1983. 18.1.83 —do— 16.4.83 —do— —do—

1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	The Maharashtra Drinking Water Supply Requisition Ordinance, 1983.	26.2.83	—do—	15.4.83	—do—
6.	The Maharashtra Vacant Lands (Further Interim Protection to Occupiers from Eviction and Recovery of Arrears of Rent) (Extension of Duration) Ordinance, 1983.	5.3.83	—do—	—do—	—do—
<b>MANIPUR</b>					
1.	The Manipur Professions, Trades, Callings and Employment Taxation (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	21.5.83	—	—	—
<b>MEGHALAYA</b>					
1.	The National Sports Club of Assam (Taking-over of Management) (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	2.6.83	13.6.83	28.6.83	Replaced by Legislation
<b>RAJASTHAN</b>					
1.	Rajasthan Imposition of Ceilings on Agricultural Holdings (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	16.6.83	—	—	—
2.	Rajasthan Homoeopathic Medicine (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	23.6.83	—	—	—
<b>UTTAR PRADESH</b>					
1.	U.P. Kshetra Samitis and Zila Parishads (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	12.4.83	—	—	—

2. U.P. Sales Tax (Amendment and Validation) (Second) Ordinance, 1983.	—	—	23.4.83	—
3. U.P. Krishi Evam Prodyogik Vishwavidyalaya (Sanshodhan) (Dwitiya) Adhyadesh, 1983.	—	—	—do—	—
4. U.P. Sri Kashi Vishwanath Temple (Third) Ordinance, 1983.	—	—	24.4.83	—
5. U.P. Urban Local Self-Government Laws (Amendment) (Second) Ordinance, 1983.	—	—	27.4.83	—
6. U.P. Bikri-Kar (Dwitiya Sanshodhan) Aur Vidhikaran (Dwitiya) Adhyadesh, 1983.	—	—	27.4.83	—
7. U.P. Urban Planning and Development (Amendment) (Second) Ordinance, 1983.	—	—	—do—	—
8. U.P. Official Language (Amendment) (Second) Ordinance, 1983.	—	—	28.4.83	—
9. The Sanjay Gandhi Post-Graduate Institute of Medical Sciences (Second) Ordinance, 1983.	—	—	—do—	—
10. U.P. Kesari Gram (Prohibition) (Second) Ordinance, 1983.	—	—	—do—	—
11. U.P. Dacoity Affected Areas (Second) Ordinance, 1983.	—	—	—do—	—
12. U.P. Urban Buildings, (Regulation of Letting, Rent and Eviction) (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	—	—	18.5.83	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	The Intermediate Education (Amendment) Ordinance, 1983.	23.5.83	—	—	—
14.	U.P. Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samitis (Alpakalik Vyawastha) (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	—do—	—	—	—
15.	U.P. Kshetra Samitis and Zila Parishads (Dwitiya Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	23.6.83	—	—	—
16.	Roorkee Vishwavidyalaya (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 1983.	—do—	—	—	—

APPENDIX VII

A. PARTY POSITION IN LOK SABHA (AS ON 5 AUGUST, 1983)

Sl. No.	Name of States/ Union Territories	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		Seats	Cong. (I)	CPI(M)	Lok Dal	Janata	BJP	Other Parties	Unatta-ched	Total Vacancies	
1	2										
<b>(i) States</b>											
1.	Andhra Pradesh	42	39	...	...	...	...	3(a)	...	42	...
2.	Assam	14	7	...	...	...	...	...	...	7	7
3.	Bihar	54	33	...	...	7	2	8(b)	3	53	1
4.	Gujarat	26	23	...	...	1	...	...	2	26	...
5.	Haryana	10	5	...	2	1	1	...	...	9	1
6.	Himachal Pradesh	4	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	...
7.	Jammu and Kashmir	6	2	...	...	...	...	3(c)	1	6	...
8.	Karnataka	28	27	...	...	1	...	...	...	28	...
9.	Kerala	20	6	6	...	...	...	6(d)	2	20	...
10.	Madhya Pradesh	40	33	...	...	...	6	...	1	40	...
11.	Maharashtra	48	39	...	...	6	2	...	...	47	1
12.	Manipur	2	1	...	...	...	...	1(e)	...	2	...
13.	Meghalaya	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	2	...
14.	Nagaland	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
15.	Orissa	21	20	...	...	1	...	...	...	21	...
16.	Punjab	13	10	...	...	...	...	...	1	11*	1
17.	Rajasthan	25	18	...	1	2	3	1(f)	...	25	...
18.	Sikkim	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
19.	Tamil Nadu	39	20	...	...	...	...	18(g)	1	39	...

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
20. Tripura	2	...	2	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	2	...
21. Uttar Pradesh	85	46	85	46	...	22	2	1	12(h)	1	84	1
22. West Bengal	42	4	42	4	28	...	...	...	10(i)	...	42	...
<b>(ii) Union Territories</b>												
23. Andaman and Nicobar	1	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
24. Arunachal Pradesh	2	2	2	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...
25. Chandigarh	1	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
26. Dadra and Nagar Haveli	1	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
27. Delhi	7	6	7	6	...	...	...	1	...	...	7	...
28. Goa, Daman and Diu	2	2	2	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...
29. Lakshadweep	1	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
30. Mizoram	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...
31. Pondicherry	1	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
32. Nominated (Anglo-Indian)	2	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	2	...
	544	355	544	355	36	25	21	16	62	16	531*	12

\*Excluding the Speaker.

(a) Congress (S)—1 ; Telugu Desam—2.

(b) Congress (S)—2 ; CPI—5 ; Congress (J)—1.

(c) National Conference—3.

(d) Congress (S)—1 ; CPI—2 ; Muslim League—2 ; DSP—1.

(e) CPI—1.

(f) Congress (S)—1.

(g) AIADMK—3 ; Muslim League—1 ; D.M.K.—14.

(h) CPI—1 ; DSP—8 ; Janavadi—2 ; Congress (J)—1.

(i) RSP—4 ; Forward Bloc—3 ; CPI—3.

B. PARTY POSITION IN RAJYA SABHA (AS ON 1 JULY, 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.												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	MK (M) vadi (S)												
<b>States.</b>													
Andhra Pradesh	18	16	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Assam	7	3	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bihar	22	12	...	3	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gujarat	11	8	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Haryana	5	3	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Himachal Pradesh	3	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Jammu and Kashmir	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Karnataka	12	11	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
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	...	...	...	...	...





Kerala	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Madhya Pradesh	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Maharashtra	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Manipur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Meghalaya	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nagaland	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Orissa	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Punjab	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rajasthan	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sikkim	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tamil Nadu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tripura	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Uttar Pradesh	5	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	1
West Bengal	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<b>Union Territories</b>																	
Arunachal Pradesh	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Delhi	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
Mizoram	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pondicherry	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nominated	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	8	...	...
<b>Total</b>	6	3	1	1	1	3	7	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	8	4

## C. PARTY POSITION IN LEGISLATURES OF STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES

State/Union Territory	Seats	Cong. (I)	Janata	Lok Dal	BJP	Cong. (S)	CPI(M)	CPI	Other Parties	Ind.	Total	Vacancies
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Andhra Pradesh L.C. (As on 1.4.83)	90	55	1	...	6	...	1	2	10(a)	9	84	6
Andhra Pradesh L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	295	59	1	...	4	...	5	5	218(b)	1	293	2
Assam L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	126	91	...	...	...	2	2	1	3(c)	10	109	17
Bihar L.C. (As on 1.4.83)	96	32	5	7	2	1	...	5	3(d)	2	57	39
Bihar L.A. (As on 30.6.83)	325	193	40	12	23	5	6	22	17(e)	6	324*	...
Gujarat L.A. (As on 30.6.83)	182	141	16	...	12	...	...	...	7(f)	6	182	...
Haryana L.A. (As on 31.3.83)	90	57	9	15	6	...	...	...	1(g)	...	88*	1
Himachal Pradesh L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	68	35	2	...	28	...	...	...	...	1	66*	1
Jammu & Kashmir L.C. (As on 1.4.83)	36	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	34(h)	1	36	...
Jammu & Kashmir L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	78	11	10	...	1	...	...	...	51(i)	...	73	5
Karnataka L.C. (As on 1.7.83)	63	24	7	...	5	...	...	...	...	5	41*	21

Karnataka L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	225	81	88	...	18	...	3	3	2(j)	29	224*	...
Kerala L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	141	34	4	...	...	6	30	13	46(k)	7	140*	...
Madhya Pradesh L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	321	245	1	1	62	...	...	2	2(l)	6	319*	1
Maharashtra L.C. (As on 31.3.83)	78	40	4	...	7	3	...	...	8(m)	9	71	7
Maharashtra L.A. (As on 31.3.83)	289	236	14	...	14	8	2	2	10(n)	3	289	...
Manipur L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	60	44	1	...	...	...	1	5	8(o)	1	60	...
Meghalaya L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	60	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	59(p)	...	59*	...
Nagaland L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	60	36	...	...	...	...	...	...	24(q)	...	60	...
Punjab L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	117	66	...	...	1	...	4	8	36(r)	1	116	1
Rajasthan L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	200	148	9	5	32	3	1	1	...	1	200	...
Sikkim L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	32	26	...	...	...	...	...	...	4(s)	2	32	...
Tamil Nadu L.C. (As on 1.1.83)	63	3	...	...	...	...	1	1	27(t)	9	41*	21

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Tamil Nadu L.A. (As on 1.1.83)	235	31	2	...	...	...	11	10	176(u)	4	234*	...
Tripura L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	60	11	...	...	...	...	37	...	8(v)	3	59	1
Uttar Pradesh L.C. (As on 1.7.83)	108	32	3	10	4	...	...	2	11(w)	1	63	45
Uttar Pradesh L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	426	321	11	53	8	2	1	6	10(x)	10	422	4
West Bengal L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	295	53	...	...	...	...	174	7	60(y)	1	295	...
<b>Union Territories</b>												
Arunachal Pradesh L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	33	27	...	...	...	...	...	...	3(z)	3	33	...
Delhi Metropolitan Council (As on 1.4.83)	61	38	1	2	19	...	...	...	...	...	60*	...
Goa, Daman & Diu L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	30	28	...	...	...	...	...	...	2(aa)	...	30	...
Mizoram L.A. (As on 1.7.83)	33	8	...	...	...	...	...	...	25(bb)	...	33	...
Pondicherry L.A. (As on 1.4.83)	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 Front—11; Majlis-Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen—5 and Sanjay Vichar Manch—4.
  - (c) Plains Tribals Council of Assam—3.
  - (d) Congress (J)—1; Bihar Janata Party—1 and Jharkhand Mukti Morcha—1.
  - (e) Forward Bloc—1; Jharkhand Mukti Morcha—14; 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's Conference—1; Inqalabi N.C.—1 and Jamait-i-Islami—1.
  - (j) All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (A.I.A.D.M.K.)—1 and Nominated—1.
  - (k) Indian Union Muslim League—14; Kerala Congress (J)—8; Kerala Congress—6; Janata (S)—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 (Gavai Group)—1; Republican Party of India (Kamble Group)—1 and Shiv Sena—3.
  - (n) Peasants and Workers Party—8; Nominated—1 and Republican Party of India (Khobragade Group)—1.
  - (o) M.P.P.—4 and P.L.P.—4.
  - (p) Meghalaya Democratic Front—37 and Meghalaya United Parliamentary Party—22.
  - (q) Nagaland National Democratic Party—23 and Nagaland People's Party—1.
  - (r) Shiromani Akali Dal (L)—33; Shiromani Akali Dal (T)—2, and All India Communist Party—1.
  - (s) Sikkim Congress (R)—3, and Sikkim Prajatantra Congress—1.
  - (t) A.I.A.D.M.K.—15; Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (D.M.K.)—5; Teachers-Graduates Progressive Front—4; Indian Union Muslim League—1; United Party—1 and Gandhi Kamraj National Congress—1.
  - (u) A.I.A.D.M.K.—130; D.M.K.—35; Gandhi-Kamraj National Congress 4; All India Forward Bloc—3; Tamil Nadu Congress (K)—3 and Nominated—1.

- (v) **R.S.P.—2 and Tripura Upajati Juba Samity—6.**
- (w) **Lok Tantrik Samjvadi Dal—3 ; Shikshak Dal—4 and Nirdaliya Vidhayak Paksha—4.**
- (x) **Democratic Socialist Party—6 ; Congress (J)—3 and Soshit Samaj Dal—1.**
- (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 Party—24 and Mizo Union—1.**
- (cc) **D.M.K.—14 ; Indian Union Muslim League—1 and A.I.A.D.M.K.—1.**

THE JOURNAL OF PARLIAMENTARY INFORMATION

Index to Vol. XXIX (1983)

	Page		Page
<b>ADDRESSES AND SPEECHES</b>		men of Estimates Committees.	8
<b>AGARWAL, SATISH</b>		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
<b>BANSI LAL</b>		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
<b>DAS, ANADI CHARAN</b>		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
<b>JAKHAR, BAL RAM</b>		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
<b>JHA, RADHA NANDAN</b>		<b>ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS</b>	
at the Conference of Presiding Officers.	109	New Lt. Governor	29
<b>JOSHI, VIJAY KUMAR</b>		<b>ANDHRA PRADESH</b>	
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
<b>LAKSHMANAN, G.</b>		<b>APPENDICES</b>	39, 239, 395, 503
at the Conference of Chairmen of Library Committees.	290	<b>AROUND THE STATES</b>	26, 165, 330, 474
<b>NEGI, THAKUR SEN.</b>		<b>ARTICLE</b>	
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
<b>PARTHASARATHI, G.</b>		<b>ARUNACHAL PRADESH</b>	
on the occasion of 94th Birth Anniversary of Jawaharlal Nehru.	431	New Lt. Governor	477
<b>SETHI, P.C.</b>		<b>ASSAM</b>	
to the Indian Administrative Service Probationers.	307	Election of the Speaker	167
		Expansion of the Ministry	330
		General elections	166
		New Ministry	166
<b>SHIV SHANKAR, P.</b>		<b>ASSAM SITUATION</b>	
on the occasion of 19th Death Anniversary of Jawaharlal Nehru.	73	Discussion on	186, 218
<b>VAIRALE, MADHUSUDAN</b>		<b>AUSTRALIA</b>	
at the Valedictory Meeting of the Parliamentary Financial Committees.	92	New Prime Minister	172
<b>ALBANIA</b>		<b>AUSTRIA</b>	
New President	30	New Chancellor	333
		<b>BANSI LAL</b>	
		See under Addresses and Speeches.	

	Page		Page
<b>BHAGAT, B.R.</b>			
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
<b>BIHAR</b>		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		
<b>BILLS</b>		<b>BUDGET</b>	
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	<b>BUREAU OF PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES AND TRAINING</b>	
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	<b>BY-ELECTIONS</b>	
The Finance Bill, 1983.	208, 361	Bihar	26
The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 1983.	352	Karnataka	332
<b>BOLIVIA</b>		Maharashtra	476
End of Military Rule	30	Uttar Pradesh	29
Resignation by Ministers	477	West Bengal	29
<b>BOOK REVIEWS</b>		<b>CAMEROON</b>	
Gupta, R.C. : Indian Free-		Dismissal of the Prime Minister	478
		<b>CHAD</b>	
		New President	30
		<b>CHAIRMAN</b>	
		New appointments in Delhi Metropolitan Council	172

	Page		Page
Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Parishad	171	Meetings of the Association of Secretaries-General of Parliaments	316
<b>CHILE</b>			
Revocation and reimposition of emergency	478	Public Accounts Committees—Conference (6th) of Chairmen (New Delhi, 19 February, 1983).	99, 125
<b>CHINA</b>			
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
<b>COMMITTEES ON THE WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES</b>			
Conference of Chairmen	294, 316	Spring meetings of Inter-Parliamentary Union (Helsinki, 24 April, 1983)	315
<b>CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA</b>			
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	<b>CYPRUS</b>	
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	<b>DAILY AVERAGE OF QUESTIONS</b>	
Library Committees—Conference (2nd) of Chairmen (New Delhi, 19 March, 1983)	125, 288	Lok Sabha	211, 354
		Rajya Sabha	222, 363
			384
		<b>DAS, ANADI CHARAN</b>	
		See under Addresses and Speeches.	
		<b>DELHI</b>	
		General elections	172
		New Chairman, Metropolitan Council	172
		New Chief Executive Councillor	172

	Page		Page
<b>DEPUTY CHAIRMAN,</b>		<b>FRANCE</b>	
New appointment in An-		Formation of a new Minis-	
dhra Pradesh Legislative		try	172
Council	475	<b>GAMBIA</b>	
<b>DEVELOPMENTS</b>		Extension of Emergency	31
<b>ABROAD</b>	30, 172	<b>GANDHI, MAHATMA</b>	
	333, 477	Portrait, Unveiling of	445
<b>DEVELOPMENTS AT THE</b>		<b>GENERAL ELECTIONS IN</b>	
<b>CENTRE</b>	25, 163	<i>India</i>	
	330, 474	Andhra Pradesh	165
<b>DOCUMENTS OF CONSTI-</b>		Assam	166
<b>TUTIONAL AND PAR-</b>		Delhi	172
<b>LIAMENTARY INTE-</b>		Jammu and Kashmir	331
<b>REST</b>	175, 480	Karnataka	167
<b>ECUADOR</b>		Meghalaya	170
Declaration of emergency	30	Nagaland	28
<b>EDITORIAL NOTE</b>	1, (V)	Tripura	171
	287, 427	<i>Other Countries</i>	
<b>ESTIMATES COMMITTEES</b>		Great Britain	334
Conference of Chairman	8, 16	Mauritius	478
<b>FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF</b>		<b>GHANA</b>	
<b>GERMANY</b>		Suspension of the Constitu-	
New Chancellor	30	tion	173
<b>FINANCIAL COMMITTEES</b>		<b>GOA, DAMAN AND DIU</b>	
Valedictory Meeting of	86	Resignation by a Minister	477
<b>FINLAND</b>		<b>GORDON, CHARLES</b>	
New Government	31	Article on 'The Media and	
Resignation by the Govern-		Parliament in U.K.'	118
ment	31	<b>GOVERNOR</b>	
Resignation by the Prime		New appointments in—	
Minister	334	Andhra Pradesh	474
<b>FLOOD SITUATION</b>		Gujarat	476
Discussion on	347	Himachal Pradesh	167, 331
		Karnataka	16, 332

	Page		Page
Kerala	26	<b>INDIA</b>	
Orissa	476	By-elections to Lok Sabha	25, 163
Punjab	171		164, 330
<b>GREAT BRITAIN</b>		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
<b>GUJARAT</b>		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
<b>GUPTA, INDRAJIT</b>		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
<b>HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSIONS</b>		<b>INDONESIA</b>	
Lok Sabha	211, 354	Dissolution of Parliament	31
Rajya Sabha	222, 363, 384	Election of the President	173
<b>HARYANA</b>		<b>INDUSTRIAL SICKNESS</b>	
Changes in the Cabinet	331	Discussion on	359
MLA's election set aside by the High Court	167	<b>ISRAEL</b>	
<b>HIMACHAL PRADESH</b>		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	<b>ITALY</b>	
New Governor	167, 331	New Government	31, 478
New Ministry	331		
<b>IMPORT AND EXPORT POLICY</b>			
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	
<b>MANDAL COMMISSION</b>		<b>NEHRU, JAWAHARLAL</b>	
Discussion on non-imple-		94th Birth Anniversary-	
mentation of recommen-		Meeting of	428
dations of	350, 378	Parliamentarians Homage	
		to	71
<b>MANIPUR</b>		Portrait, Unveiling of	445
Changes in the Ministry	333	<b>NEPAL</b>	
Expansion of Ministry	28	New Ministry	479
<b>MAURITIUS</b>		<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	
General elections	478	New Constitution	173
New Ministry	479	<b>NORTH YEMEN</b>	
<b>MEDIA AND PARLIAMENT</b>		Election of the President	334
<b>IN U.K.</b>		<b>OBITUARY REFERENCES</b>	
Article on	118	Lok Sabha	211, 355
<b>MEGHALAYA</b>		Rajya Sabha	222, 384
Expansion of the Ministry	476	<b>ORISSA</b>	
General elections	170	New Governor	476
New Ministry	170, 333	<b>PARAGUAY</b>	
New Speaker	171	Election of the President	173
<b>MEXICO</b>		<b>PARLIAMENT</b>	
New President	32	Bills passed by	52, 257, 407
<b>MIZORAM</b>		<b>PARLIAMENTARY AND CONS-</b>	
New Lt. Governor	477	<b>TITUTIONAL DEVELOP-</b>	
<b>NAGALAND</b>		<b>MENTS</b>	
Expansion of Ministry	171	<i>India</i>	25, 163
General elections	28		330, 474
New Ministry	28	Andaman and Nicobar	
<b>NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY</b>		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	<b>PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS</b>	
<b>PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES</b>	16, 125 312, 449	Motion of Thanks on	182, 212
<b>PARTHASARATHI, G.</b>		<b>PRICE SITUATION</b>	
See under Addresses and Speeches		Discussion on	348, 374
<b>PARTY POSITION IN</b>		<b>PRIME MINISTER</b>	
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
<b>PATEL, VITHAL BHAI</b>		Japan	31
Portrait, Unveiling of	445	Lebanon	31
<b>PERU</b>		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
<b>PONDICHERRY</b>		<b>PRIVILEGE ISSUES</b>	
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
<b>PORTUGAL</b>		<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
<b>PRESIDENT</b>		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
<b>PROCEDURAL MATTERS</b>		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
<b>PUBLIC ACCOUNTS</b>		<b>Statement showing the</b>	
<b>COMMITTEES</b>		<b>work transacted during</b>	
Conference of Chairman	99, 125	<b>the Hundred and Twenty-</b>	
		<b>Sixth Session</b>	397
<b>PUNJAB</b>		<b>Statement showing the work</b>	
New Governor	171	<b>transacted during the</b>	
		<b>Hundred and Twenty-</b>	
<b>PUNJAB SITUATION</b>		<b>Seventh Session</b>	509
Discussion on	196, 219, 336	<b>RECENT LITERATURE OF</b>	
	358, 364	<b>PARLIAMENTARY 36, 234, 391,</b>	
		<b>INTEREST</b>	498,
<b>QUESTION HOUR</b>		<b>SADAR HUKAM SINGH</b>	
Lok Sabha	211, 354	<b>Homage to</b>	
Rajya Sabha	222, 363		312
	384	<b>SATELLITE LAUNCH</b>	
<b>RAJASTHAN</b>		<b>VEHICLE SLV-3-D-2</b>	
Changes in the Cabinet	476	<b>Launching of</b>	206
Expansion of the Ministry	29	<b>SESSIONAL REVIEW</b>	
<b>RAJYA SABHA</b>		<i>Lok Sabha</i>	
Party Position in	62, 279,	<b>Allegations made by Mr.</b>	
	419, 547	<b>Seymour Hersh in his</b>	
Sessional Review of Hund-		<b>recent book 'The Price</b>	
red and Twenty-Fifth		<b>of Power' against former</b>	
Session	212	<b>Prime Minister of India,</b>	
Sessional Review of Hund-		<b>Shri Morarji Desai</b>	352
red and Twenty-Sixth		<b>Annual Floods and Drought</b>	347
Session	355	<b>Assam situation</b>	186
Sessional Review of Hund-		<b>Attacks on the Tamil-</b>	
red and Twenty-Seventh		<b>Speaking People in Sri</b>	
Session	363	<b>Lanka</b>	340
Statement showing the		<b>Daily Average of Questions</b>	211, 354
work transacted during		<b>General Budget, 1983-84</b>	193
the Hundred and Twenty-		<b>Half-an-Hour Discussions</b>	211, 354
Fourth Session	41	<b>Import and export policy</b>	
Statement showing the work		<b>for 1983-84</b>	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>		<b>SETHI, P.C.</b>	
Financial Business	492	See under Addresses and speeches	
Governor's Address	386		
Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Minis- ters	491	<b>SHARMA, SHANKAR DAYAL</b>	
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	<b>SHIV SHANKAR, P.</b>	
<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	<b>SHORT NOTE</b>	
<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	<b>SIKKIM</b>	
Administrator's Address	227	Cabinet Reshuffle	29, 333
Financial Business	227, 494	<b>SPAIN</b>	
Obituary References	35, 228, 494	New Prime Minister	32

	Page		Page
<b>SPEAKER</b>		Sessional Review of	34, 223, 384, 488
New appointments in			
<i>India</i>		<b>ST. CHRISTOPHER AND NEVIS</b>	
Andhra Pradesh	166	Independence to	479
Assam	167	<b>SUDAN</b>	
Jammu and Kashmir	332	Election of the President	335
Meghalaya	171	<b>SWITZERLAND</b>	
Tripura	171	New President	32
<i>Other Countries</i>		<b>TAMIL NADU</b>	
Great Britain	334	Appointment of New Ministers	477
Sri Lanka	479	<b>TANZANIA</b>	
<b>SRI LANKA</b>		New Prime Minister	174
Amendment of the Consti- tution	174	<b>THAILAND</b>	
Declaration of emergency	335	Appointment of Prime Minister	335
Election of the President	32	<b>TRIPURA</b>	
Imposition of emergency	32	General elections	171
New Speaker	479	New Ministry	171
Referendum for extending the life of the Parliament	32	New Speaker	171
Revocation of emergency	174	<b>UNION TERRITORIES</b>	
<b>STATE LEGISLATURES</b>		Developments in	29, 172, 333, 477
Activities of	46, 248, 401, 515	<b>U.S.S.R.</b>	
Bills passed by	54, 257 408, 525	Appointment of Deputy Prime Minister	33
Ordinances issued by	56, 267, 411, 535	Death of the President	33
Party Position in	66, 28, 422, 550		
Privilege Issues in	19, 131, 460		
Procedural Matters in	23, 327, 470		

	Page		Page
Election of the President	335	<b>WEST BENGAL</b>	
New Party Chief	33	By-election	29
<b>UTTAR PRADESH</b>		<b>WORKING OF THE MINIS- TRIES</b>	
By-elections	29	Home Affairs	355
Death of the Deputy Speaker	29	Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour)	357
Election of the Chairman	171	<b>YUGOSLAVIA</b>	
<b>VAIRALE, MADHUSUDAN</b>		New President	335
See under Addresses and speeches			