

[Shri Channa Reddy]

(i) A copy of the Annual Report of the Bokaro Steel Ltd., for the year 1966-67, along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon (Hindi and English versions). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-793]68].

(3) (i) Review by the Government on the working of the Hindustan Steel works Construction Limited, Calcutta, for the year 1966-67 under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956 (Hindi and English versions).

(ii) A copy of the Annual Report of the Hindustan Steel works Construction Limited, Calcutta, for the year 1966-67, along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General (Hindi and English versions).

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-794]68].

REVIEW ON WORKING OF MINERALS & METALS TRADING CORPORATION, ETC.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI): Sir, on behalf of SHRI DINESH SINGH, I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) (i) Review by the Government on the working of the Minerals and Metals Trading Corporation of India Limited, New Delhi for the year 1966-67 under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956.

(ii) A copy of the Annual Report of the Minerals and Metals Trading Corporation of India Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1966-67 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-795]68].

(2) (i) Review by the Government on the working of the State Trading Corporation of India Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1966-67, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956.

(ii) A copy of the Annual Report of the State Trading Corporation of India Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1966-67 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-796]68].

12.35 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT

SHRI KHADILKAR (Khed): I present the Twenty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

FORTY-SECOND REPORT

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI (Berhampore): I present the Forty-second Report of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Agriculture)—Indo-Norwegian Project, Ernakulam.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

TENTH REPORT

SHRI D. N. TIWARY (Gopalganj): I present the Tenth Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings on National Coal Development Corporation Limited—Audit paras in Section III of Audit Report (Commercial) 1967.

MR. SPEAKER: We will now take up....

श्री मोनू प्रसाद (बांसगांव) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक ब्याख्या का प्रश्न है ...

MR. SPEAKER: On what subject is it?

श्री मोनू प्रसाद : नियम 197 को माप देखिये ।

MR. SPEAKER: Under what rule is he raising it? The point of order must be on a subject. Will he tell me on which part of the agenda he is referring to?

श्री मंगलू प्रसाद : 197 के अन्तर्गत । चार दिन हुए मैंने एक ध्यान दिलाने वाली सूचना का नोटिस दिया था । प्रधान मंत्री जी इसी 20 तारीख को गोरखपुर में फटिलाजरी फैंक्ट्री का उद्घाटन करने जा रही हैं । वहां पर एक सिनेमा अभिनेत्री का नाच होगा । उस अवसर पर तीन लाख रुपया खर्च किया जाने वाला है । वह बड़ा गरीब इलाका है । तीन लाख उस आयोजन पर खर्च होने जा रहा है । प्रधान मंत्री वहां जा रही हैं । प्रबन्धक लोग नचनिया वहां बुला रहे हैं ।

MR. SPEAKER: He has said whatever he wanted to say. Now, let him resume his seat.

12.37 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1968-69—
Contd.

MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION—contd.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation. Day before yesterday the discussion had just started. Since the time allotted is 10 hours and tomorrow being non-official day, it will continue next Monday also. Shri Shivappa was speaking. He has taken 16 minutes. His party's time is there.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA (Hassan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday I was just touching on the question of taxation on certain inputs like implements, fertilizer etc. and I had suggested that all these articles should be exempt from taxation for the benefit of the agriculturists.

12.38 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair].

Now I come to a very salient point

which has been lost sight of by the Central Government. I do not know how the Central Government have allowed the State Governments to introduce the levy system by which a portion of the agricultural produce is compulsorily acquired by the State at the price fixed by the State.

Suppose an industrialist, an official or a labourer asks for increased returns by making a hue and cry, that request is immediate granted by allowing a rise either in price or dearness allowance. But, what is the position of the poor agriculturists? I would like to know what is the constitutional power under which the State Governments are authorised to ask the agriculturists to pay to the State some quota of the produce grown in their lands. It is a question of natural justice which is at stake. What is the justification for the levy? How can you allow that? Does it not effect the fundamental right of the citizen? I will give you an analogy. Suppose you ask an industrialist that he should give to the State 25 per cent of his production at a rate fixed by the Government, will the industrialist keep quiet? Can such a scheme be successful? No. Then, why is it that the Centre is allowing the States to confiscate a percentage of the production by the agriculturists? What is the constitutional provision which justifies it, I want to know. I want a categorical answer in this respect. This is as good as robbing Peter to pay Paul; it is nothing else than that. How can they rob the peasant?

My learned friends, coming from the leftist organisations and even the so-called extreme section of the Communists, are arguing only on behalf of a certain class, the labour class. They are exploiting them. 66 per cent of the peasants have not been cared for by them also. They have not advanced any arguments for them. My hon. friends are arguing at length about socialism. But what is their socialism? Is it socialism to confiscate everything of Peter to pay Paul? Can