

of Shri Bipinpal Das and do communicate to this House the name of the member so appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion was adopted.

13.44 hrs.

MATTER UNDER RULE 377

REPORTED DECISION TO RAISE LEVY PRICE OF SUGAR

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Jaipur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to draw the attention of the House to a very disturbing news in the Times of India dated December 1, 1974.

There is a news item that there is an increase in the levy price of sugar which would be announced within a fortnight. Mr. Pillai of the Indian Sugar Mills Limited said to-day at Madras that the Union Agriculture Minister Shri Jagjivan Ram gave him this assurance when he met him last Monday.

This is a very disturbing news. The consumers of the whole country had not been expecting that. Despite this serious failure to implement the previous assurances, this Government perhaps, apparently seems to be serious to hold the priceline—at least it claims that it is serious to hold the priceline—and, at this moment, if the price of levy sugar is increased, it will naturally have reaction and the market price of sugar is bound to go up. And the other commodities' prices will be affected. The most disturbing aspect of it, is that when this is to be announced, the Minister of the Central Government makes it known to the people of this country through the Chairman of the Indian Sugar Mills Federation when Parliament itself is in session. The Chairman, Shri Pillay, has said that he gave this assurance last Monday. I wanted the Minister of Agriculture to be present here to confirm or contradict this report. If

he contradicts it, the country will gain. But the statement is very categorical that last Monday Shri Pillay was assured by the Minister of Agriculture that the levy price of sugar would be raised.

Here the question of propriety and the question of privilege also comes. If the price has to be raised, the House must first be taken into confidence when it is in session. We do not want to hear this news from the mouth of the Chairman of the Indian Sugar Mills' Association.

So I would request you to ask the Minister to make a statement in the House clarifying whether the news is correct or not. If it is correct, then with regard to the increase in the price of levy sugar, the House must be given an opportunity to raise its voice against it because we are against any increase in the price of any item, particular with regard to the price of levy sugar. This is a question not only of the right but of the privilege of the House.

श्री छटल बिहारी बाजराय (ग्वालियर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या आप ने इस विषय के लिए रूल 377 के अन्तर्गत इजाजत दी है ? यह तो प्रिविलेज का मामला है। सदन बँटा हुआ है और मंत्री महोदय लेबी सुगर की प्राइस को बढ़ाने के बारे में फंडरेशन के प्रेजिडेंट से बातचीत कर रहे हैं और उस से ऐलान करवा रहे हैं।

श्री इयाचनन्दन मिश्र (बगलसराय) : माननीय सदस्य ने नोटिस दिया है और मिनिस्टर सदन में मौजूद नहीं हैं।

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: I would like the Minister to clarify the position. If he contradicts the reports, it is all right. But if he had given any such assurance, then the question of privilege comes in.

MR. SPEAKER: This will be conveyed to the Minister. Mr. Maurya.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): You have rejected my adjournment

motion on the question of DA to the employees. You may not admit the adjournment motion, but you can kindly ask the Finance Minister to make a statement. The DA due must be paid to the employees.

MR. SPEAKER: Everyday you raise it in one form or other.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): This is agitating the minds of all the employees.

SHRI THA KIRUTTANAN (Sivaganga): It is a very important issue that Shri Banerjee is raising.

MR. SPEAKER: I will see; I do not commit myself.

13.47 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE.
DISAPPROVAL OF SICK TEXTILE
UNDERTAKINGS (NATIONALISA-
TION) ORDINANCE
AND

SICK TEXTILE UNDERTAKINGS
(NATIONALISATION) BILL—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Madhu Limaye on the 25th November 1974, namely:

"This House disapproves of the Sick Textile Undertakings (Nationalisation) Ordinance 1974 (Ordinance No. 12 of 1974) promulgated by the President on the 21st September 1974" and

further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri B. P. Maurya on the 25th November 1974, namely:—

"That the Bill to provide for the acquisition and transfer of the right, title and interest of the owners in respect of the sick textile undertakings specified in the First Schedule with a view to re-

organising and rehabilitating such sick textile undertakings so as to subserve the interests of the general public by the augmentation of the production and distribution, at fair prices, of different varieties of cloth and yarn, and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be taken into consideration".

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI B. P. MAURYA): Let me express my gratitude to the hon. members who took great interest in the debate on the Sick Textile Undertakings (Nationalisation) Bill. Nearly 28 hon. members belonging to different political parties represented in this august House participated in the discussion. This very fact goes to show beyond doubt that this is a Bill which is appreciated by all of us. There may be difference of opinion on the approach and working, but so far as concerned, every hon. member who took part in the debate has, directly or indirectly, extended his support to it. There are two constituents of every piece of enactment or legislation: i.e., Aims and Objects of the Bill. I may be allowed to call it "Life" and clauses, sub-clauses and the Schedule, if any, of the Bill, I would call them "Body." I had been listening to the views of the hon. Members very attentively. I can say that so far as the Aims and Objects of this Bill are concerned, this House appears to be unanimous on this point and supports the Bill. But most of the hon. Members, irrespective of party affiliation, either belonging to this side or that side of the House, have expressed their great concern on the constitution of clauses 5, 14 and Schedule II of the Bill. According to their opinion, these clauses are framed in such a manner that the interest of the workers is not kept in vision. Some of the hon. Members even belonging to the ruling party went to the extent in mentioning that these provisions of the Bill are anti-