

(iii) RESTRICTIONS ON INTER-STATE TRADE.

श्री रामजी लाल सुमन (फिरोजाबाद): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं नियम 377 के तहत आपातकालीन अध्यादेश द्वारा बेकार बनाये गये लोगों की तरफ़ इस सम्मानित सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। यह अध्यादेश 5 फरवरी, 1977 को व्यवहार में आया। इस के द्वारा बम्बई, अहमदाबाद, ग्वालियर और कानपुर में कैसटर-सीड, अलसी और सिल्वर का जो व्यापार सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट के तेहत फार्वर्ड-मार्केट-कमीशन के सेन्टर पर चलता था, उस को समाप्त कर दिया गया था। उस समय केन्द्रीय सरकार के तेहत लीगल व्यापार चार जगहों पर चलता था, लेकिन अब इस अध्यादेश के अमल में आने की वजह से सैकड़ों जगह अवैध व्यापार चल रहा है और सरकार को राजस्व की हानि हो रही है। सैकड़ों परिवार इस अध्यादेश से प्रभावित हैं, साथ ही साथ अवैध व्यापार को जिस प्रकार से प्रोत्साहन मिल रहा है, वह एक विचारणीय सवाल है। महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात, मध्य प्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकारों ने दिल्ली की सरकार को बराबर इस बारे में लिखा है और उन के अधिकृत प्रतिनिधियों ने संसद सदस्यों के माध्यम से तथा अपनी प्रतिनिधि संस्थाओं के माध्यम से सरकार को इस बारे में जानकारी दी है। दांतवाला कमीशन की रिपोर्ट भी सरकार के समक्ष है। लेकिन अफसोस की बात यह है कि अभी भी सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई जोरदार प्रयास नहीं किया है। इस सम्मानित सदन के 34 लोकसभा सदस्यों ने भी इस अध्यादेश की समाप्ति के लिये सरकार को लिखा है और बताया है कि इस अध्यादेश के चलते, तमाम लोग बेकार हो रहे हैं और अवैध व्यापार को प्रोत्साहन मिल रहा है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, 13 महीनों में जो कुछ हुआ, वह बड़े दुख की बात है। काले दिनों में जो काला कानून बनाया गया, यह आवश्यक है कि सरकार तुरन्त उस कानून

को वापस ले और जो अवैध व्यापार चल रहा है और जो सैकड़ों रुपये का नुकसान हो रहा है, शायद मंत्री महोदय इसके बारे में नहीं जानते हैं, मंत्री महोदय को इस की जानकारी प्राप्त करनी चाहिये और निश्चित रूप से ऐसा कानून बनाना चाहिये, जिस के द्वारा वैध व्यापार शुरू हो और अवैध व्यापार रुक सके।

(iv) REPORTED TAKING OFF OF AN AIRBUS FROM BOMBAY AIRPORT IN VIOLATION OF SECURITY REGULATIONS.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): I rise to call the attention of this House to what I consider to be a very shocking incident which took place yesterday. It has been reported in the press—today's *Statesman* carries the news—that an airbus took off from Bombay yesterday in complete violation of security regulations.

The security regulations with which the airlines are absolutely strict stipulate that unaccompanied baggage should not be carried in the aircraft. The reason is so clear. An unaccompanied baggage can possibly contain a time-bomb or a grenade, some explosive something like that. Somebody can push it in and go away. If it is put in the aircraft, the aircraft may explode. It so happened that the baggage belonging to four passengers was in the aircraft and the aircraft took off without those four passengers. The pilot knew that the aircraft was without those passengers and still took off.

The anti-hijack staff and the security staff took objection. It is reported that they informed the airlines and contacted the control tower. It has got to be explained how it is that the pilot took off. I have experience and some other members will also be having experience of an Airbus being delayed for one or two hours. When an attempt was made to take off, the passengers protested that they would not travel by that air-

craft and they got all the baggage unloaded and the un-accompanied baggage taken away.

How is it that the pilot took off? Did the pilot inform the control tower and the airlines? Did the control tower instruct the pilot to come back and get grounded? If such an instruction was given, did the pilot disobey the instruction and still continue to fly the aircraft? These are important matters on which an inquiry is necessary and the House must be informed about it.

There is another thing also. The aircraft carried two cabinet Ministers. The lives of the Cabinet Ministers are important and one of them was Mr. Raj Narain who, according to me, is too precious for this nation to spare. He also travelled by that aircraft. The preserver of the health of the nation, the symbol of our great tradition and too precious a jewel for this nation was going to be risked by the pilot. We want to know how he dared to risk the life of Mr. Raj Narain. Did he consider in a moment of discovery that punctuality of aircraft was more necessary than the safety of the aircraft and, therefore, he took off the aircraft like that?

These are matters on which an inquiry must be held. I appeal to the Minister of Civil Aviation to make an inquiry and inform the House as to how the whole thing happened. It is too serious a matter to be overlooked.

14.18 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENTS ADDRESS

MR. SPEAKER: We now take up the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Shri Gauri Shankar Rai.

SHRI C.M. STEPHEN (Idukkā): Sir, I rise on a point of order.

The Motion of Thanks is with respect to an Address delivered by the President. Under the rules or as per the precedent, a copy of the Address was laid on the Table on the House. The Address that is laid on the Table of the House is not, according to me, the complete Address delivered by the President. I was there, all of us were present there. Before reading out the English part of the speech, I heard the President for about two or three minutes reading out something from a Hindi text. I do not know Hindi. Therefore, I do not know what he really spoke. Under the Constitution, when he rises and speaks, every part of what he speaks, is a part of the Address he delivers to the members of both the Houses assembled together. It is a joint session. Nobody has got any business to withhold any part of it. The Address now before the House does not contain that part of the speech of the President. Therefore, the Address before the House is not the complete Address.

My point of order is that the entire Address has got to be placed before the House. I would like to have your ruling on that. There is a constitutional provision. Nobody has got a right to bypass that. This is an important question. Is it that the President spoke that part of it without the sanction of the Cabinet? Is it that the Cabinet permitted him to speak that and, if so, does it reflect the language policy of the Government? The whole thing comes there. Therefore, that part of the speech cannot be withheld. That part also must be placed on the Table of the House.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): I am a point of order with regard to his point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: There cannot be a point of order on the point of order.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: I want to say something. My point of order is that whatever my friend Mr. Stephen has said just now, I am