

की बात है। मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि 5 करोड़ की जो राशि इसमें लगेगी क्या वह भारत सरकार देगी और क्या सीमेंट की आपूर्ति करेगी जिससे 1981 या 1982 तक यह पुल बनकर तैयार हो जाये ?

श्री बोरेन्द्र पाटिल : सवाल यह पूछा गया है कि जो 5 करोड़ रुपये और लगेगे क्या वह गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया देगी ? अब हुआ यह है कि बिहार गवर्नमेंट 23 करोड़ रुपये के बारे में हमसे पूछ रही है, एडीशनल लोन देने के लिए मांग कर रही है। 5 करोड़ तो टू-लेन कैरिज-वे के लिये लग जायेगा और उनका प्रयोजन यह है कि फोर-लेन कैरिज-वे होना चाहिये इसलिए फोर-लेन कैरिज-वे का सुपर स्ट्रक्चर होना है तो उसके लिये एडीशनल 18 करोड़ रुपया चाहिये। इस तरह से 18 करोड़ यह और 5 करोड़ रुपया पहले के एस्टीमेट का है, इस तरह से 23 करोड़ रुपया वह पूछ रहे हैं।

23 करोड़ रुपये मैं आज हो दे दूंगा, यह कहने की हालत में नहीं हूँ। यह 23 करोड़ रुपये का आउट साइड दी प्लान लोन देने का सवाल है। इसलिये मैंने कहा है कि प्लानिंग कमीशन और फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर से डिसकस करूंगा और जितना मेरे से हो सकता है, मैं पूरा प्रयत्न करूंगा लेकिन आज कोई भी आश्वासन देने की हालत में मैं नहीं हूँ। इसलिये मैं कोई आश्वासन नहीं दे सकता, लेकिन मैं प्रयत्न करूंगा, इतना कह सकता हूँ।

माननीया सदस्या ने यह सवाल पूछा कि सीमेंट सप्लाई न होने की वजह से यह काम धीमा हो रहा है, ठीक तरह से नहीं चल रहा है। मैं अभी चानना साहब से रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि इसके लिये स्पेशल सीमेंट की जरूरत है, पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट की जरूरत है, बिहार में जो सीमेंट मिलता है वह इस काम के लिये ठीक नहीं है,

यह सीमेंट तमिलनाडु से लाना पड़ेगा, अब चाहे तमिलनाडु से लाना पड़े या कहीं से भी लाना हो इस ब्रिज के लिये जो भी सीमेंट लगना है वह मैं अपने मित्र चानना साहब से रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि टाप-प्रायटी पर इस सीमेंट की सप्लाई करवाने की व्यवस्था करें। हम लोग भी पूरी तरह से प्रयत्न करेंगे कि जहां तक हो सके उनका जो टारगैट डेट है दिसम्बर, 1981 तक खत्म होने का उसके अन्दर ही यह ब्रिज पूरा करने के प्रयत्न हम करेंगे।

12.58 hrs.

PETITION RE: DELHI MUNICIPAL
LAWS (AMENDMENT AND VALI-
DATION) BILL, 1980

आचार्य भगवान देव (अजमेर) : श्रीमन्, मैं दिल्ली नगर पालिका विधि (संशोधन और वैधीकरण), विधेयक, 1980 के संबंध में श्री पी० एन० नारंग द्वारा हस्ताक्षरित याचिका प्रस्तुत करने की अनुमति चाहता हूँ।

12.59 hrs.

MOTION RE: JOINT COMMITTEE
ON OFFICES OF PROFIT

THE MINISTER OF LAW,
JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS
(SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR): I beg
to move:

"That a Joint Committee of the Houses to be called the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit be constituted consisting of fifteen members, ten from this House and five from the Rajya Sabha who shall be elected from amongst the members of each House in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote:

[Shri P. Shiv Shankar]

That the functions of the Joint Committee shall be—

(i) to examine the composition and character of all existing "committees" [other than those examined by the Joint Committee to which the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill, 1957 was referred] and all "committees" that may hereafter be constituted, membership of which may disqualify a person for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament under article 102 of the Constitution;

(ii) to recommend in relation to the "committees" examined by it what offices should disqualify and what offices should not disqualify;

(iii) scrutinise from time to time the Schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, and to recommend any amendments in the said Schedule, whether by way of addition, omission, or otherwise;

That the Joint Committee shall, from time to time, report to both Houses of Parliament in respect of all or any of the aforesaid matters;

That the members of the Joint Committee shall hold office for the duration of the present Lok Sabha:

That in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee, the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Committee;

That in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

That this House recommends to the Rajya Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the said Joint Committee and to communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by the Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

13.00 hrs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That a Joint Committee of the Houses to be called the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit be constituted consisting of fifteen members ten from this House and five from the Rajya Sabha who shall be elected from amongst the members of each House in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote;

That the functions of the Joint Committee shall be—

(i) to examine the composition and character of all existing 'committees' [other than those examined by the Joint Committee to which the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill, 1957 was referred] and all "committees" that may hereafter be constituted, membership of which may disqualify a person for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament under article 102 of the Constitution;

(ii) to recommend in relation to the "committees" examined by it what offices should disqualify and what offices should not disqualify;

(iii) scrutinise from time to time the schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, and to recommend any amendments in the said Schedule, whether by way of addition, omission or otherwise:

That the Joint Committee shall, from time to time, report to both House of Parliament in respect of all or any of the aforesaid matters.

That the members of the Joint Committee shall hold office for the duration of the present Lok Sabha;

That in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee, the quorum

shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Committee;

That in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

That this House recommends to the Rajya Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the said Joint Committee and to communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by the Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion was adopted.

13.03 hrs.

AUROVILLE (EMERGENCY PROVISIONS) BILL*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are two Bills for introduction; and I think we will take a few minutes and finish that business.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHR. S. B. CHAVAN): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the taking over in the public interest, of the management of Auroville for a limited period and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR (Ratnagiri): I object to the introduction of this Bill under rule 72. My objections are two fold. Firstly the notification came up before the Calcutta High Court with reference to the competence of the President to issue the notification and the object for which Auroville is being taken over by the Government. The Calcutta High Court granted a stay; that is to suggest that the High Court felt there was a *prima facie* case in the contention of the petitioners. Finally the Calcutta High Court rejected that petition and against that the objection has been filed in the Supreme Court. If I am right the matter

is right now being heard on this question before the Supreme Court, with reference to the competence of this legislation whether that violates the provisions of article 26 of the Constitution. The matter being thus *sub judice*, the Bill not be introduced because the very matter is right now under consideration before the Supreme Court.

My second objection is this. Article 26 mentions, "subject to public order, morality and health..." It is only with reference to these three things that under article 26 legislation can be made with reference to religious denominations—Hon. Minister would say that Auroville is not a religious denomination. That is the very point which is being discussed and considered by the Supreme Court. I therefore submit that it would be showing disrespect to the Supreme Court, and so, the Bill should not be introduced today. Inasmuch as the introduction is against the provisions of the Constitution, article 26 and inasmuch as the matter is *sub judice*, it would be contrary to the mandatory provisions of the Rules of Procedure, I object to its introduction.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Dr. Vasant Kumar Pandit what is your position?

DR. VASANT KUMAR PANDIT (Rajgarh): Apart from Rule 72 under which the introduction of this Bill is opposed as being *sub-judice* as my hon. colleague has said the question that arises is of procedure. There is so much haste in the matter. What haste has the Government to introduce this Bill when it is being heard by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court today? Why should it not be done on some other day? They could have waited for some time. This will be setting up a bad precedent. Last time we had objected to it, as it is a question of procedure and lead precedent. When a matter is being heard in the Supreme Court and High Court almost the same time, there

*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part-II Section 2 dated