

**SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN :** I did not say the Law Ministry of the Government of India ; I said the Law Ministry of Madhya Pradesh.

**SHRI NATH PAI :** What did you do on the 19th ?

**SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN :** On the 19th I discussed the matter with the Law Minister.

**SHRI NATH PAI :** Since he said in Parliament the other day that a public document before the Supreme Court cannot be placed on the Table of the House since then I am worried about him. Now, coming back to my question, what about an answer to them. He can say "No". Can he give an assurance to all future contestants that in case they lose the election or a case and they want the services of the Attorney-General, will it be made available to them ? 'Are we not going to make an evil out of all this ? Should we not show some semblance of political decency ?

**SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN :** The rules about consulting the Attorney-General are obvious Any State Government or a layman can consult him provided it is not against the interests of the Central Government. Further, the Attorney-General is entitled to give his private opinion also ; nobody can come in the way. If the Government of India feel that it is a question which is likely to be raised in this House, or is likely to come up in the course of administration, it is certainly entitled to seek that opinion.

**SHRI NATH PAI :** How is D. P. Mishra or his election . . .

**MR. SPEAKER :** This is over. I am going to the next item . . . . (Interruption)

11.50 hrs.

**QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST EDITOR OF "ORGANISER"**

**MR. SPEAKER :** On the 18th March, 1969, Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah had sought to raise a question of privilege regarding certain comments published in the "Organiser" dated the 15th March, 1969. I had

then said that I would ask the Editor to state what he had to say in the matter.

I have now received a letter dated the 21st March, 1969 from the Editor of the "Organiser" in which he has stated *inter alia* as follows :

"I must say I am very sorry that that half-sentence crept into the piece.

We are sorry for that comment—more so because we know Shri Venkatasubbaiah to be a distinguished leader, an accomplished Parliamentarian and, above all, a Hindu proud of his Hinduism."

In view of this, I think the matter may be dropped. I take it that the House agrees.

11.5 hrs.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**MR. SPEAKER :** Before we take up the other business, I would like to say that today we are sitting because the BAC decided that the Budget Demands could not be postponed. We will have to take up to the Demands on Wednesday ; so, we had only two days—Monday and Tuesday—and there were the Ordinances, which we had to pass. In addition to the Ordinance, the Assam Reorganisation Bill is also there. It is supposed to be very important. Members came and said that it must be finished now so that the Rajya Sabha could take it into consideration before they adjourned. So, we decided in the BAC that these Ordinances, three and four of them are there like the wakfs Ordinance and the special powers to the military, could be finished very quickly because all the Members thought that they were not very controversial and on Monday afternoon we could take up the Assam Reorganisation Bill, devote the whole of Tuesday to it and finish it on that day so that on Wednesday we could take up the discussion on the Demands. I hope, hon. friends will help me in finishing these things.

Shri Goyal was very particular in helping us in the BAC saying that these were not very controversial and we could finish them if only we cut down one or two hours on each of them. But I would appeal to Shri Goyal also to forego some of his time. Of course, he has a constitutional right to move opposing all these Ordinances. He has moved it; he has made use of the constitutional rights that is there. There is nothing wrong in that. It is a matter of principle and you have a right to oppose the Ordinance. But whether it is opposing one Ordinance or two or three Ordinances, the principle is the same. So, I would appeal to him to oppose strongly one Ordinance and save the time on the rest so that others also could fight on merits and we could finish them by Monday evening.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : He will withdraw one and let them also withdraw one or two.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि मंगले सप्ताह में मध्य प्रदेश के बारे में हाउस में चर्चा करने के लिए कोई समय निश्चित किया जाय। राज्यपाल ने निर्णय कर दिया है कि मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा को भंग नहीं किया जायगा और उससे एक बड़ी प्रवांछनीय स्थिति बहाल हो गयी है। इसलिए थोड़ा समय इस पर आपको मंगले सप्ताह देना होगा।

SHRI S. M. BENERJEE (Kanpur) : My motion also.

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : एग््रीकलचरल प्राइसिज कमिशन के बारे में हाउस में चर्चा करने के लिए अवश्य कुछ समय निकाला जाय।

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH) : With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business in this House during the week commencing from Monday the 24th March, 1969, will consist of:-

(1) Consideration of any item of Govern-

ment Business carried over from today's Order Paper.

(2) Consideration of a motion for concurrence for referring the Indian Medicine and Homeopathy Bill, 1968, to a Joint Committee.

(3) Consideration and passing of the Constitution (Twenty-Second Amendment) Bill, 1969, as reported by the Joint Committee, on Tuesday, the 25th March.

From 26th March to 28th April, 1969, the House will take up the discussion and voting of the Demands for Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1969-70.

SHRI RANGA (Srikulam) : The needs of Madhya Pradesh have already been mentioned to you by Shri Atal Behari. I would like to appeal, through you, to the Government to find some time, if necessary by the House to sit a little longer, to discuss the question of prices for wheat which have been announced by the Agricultural Prices Commission. Already some daily papers begun to write editorials in support of cheaper wheat and subsidisation of the urban people and so on. Let them, therefore, make available some time for that.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : We can sit tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER : Before I allow Members to speak one by one, I may say that after all this cannot be decided here. There will be two days before we take up the Demands. If you cut into the time for the Demands, it is not the Government that loses. But it is the Opposition that loses the privilege of discussing the Demands. If you want to discuss Madhya Pradesh, Telengana, this and that--we have only 1½ days--perhaps, Governments will be happy because it will cut into the demands. I will have a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee and I appeal to leaders of the parties to come to that meeting and discuss what should be discussed and when to discuss. If you cut into demands, into Government time, actually, it is Opposition which stands to lose.

[Mr. Speaker]

because they can pinpoint something during the discussion or the demands. I will have no objection. Nothing should be raised here. I will call a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee and I appeal to the leaders of the parties to come. Normally, many of them are not coming. I would appeal to them to come and discuss all the aspects, what to discuss and when to discuss, I am sure, the Government will not oppose that. We need not take more time of the House in raising all these things here.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : May I make a submission ?

MR. SPEAKER : No please. Once I hear you, I will have to hear everybody else.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am not demanding any discussion.

MR. SPEAKER : No, no. I am appealing to you also to come to the meeting. I will hear you there.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I just want to remind you that Home Minister has not made a statement on taking back the temporary employees ..

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order; nothing more now.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : The Agricultural Commission's Report is very important and that should be discussed.

MR. SPEAKER : That also will be considered in the Business Advisory Committee. You can also come on behalf of the Congress Party. Now, we go to next item .....

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : Prof. Samar Guha has tabled a motion demanding discussion on the urban development of Greater Calcutta and you promised that that discussion will be allowed.

MR. SPEAKER : I am glad you have raised it. I allowed that when West Bengal

was under the President's rule. I allowed a number of motions about U. P., West Bengal, Bihar and Punjab also. Of course, it is an important subject. I admit; I do not belittle it. But now, naturally, let it go to the Government, to the Assembly and all that. If we take it up now, I will be in trouble. (Interruptions) I am not going to reply to anything. The supplementary questions to the Speaker are becoming too many now.

SHRI M. N. REDDY (Nizamabad) : What about sending a Parliamentary Delegation to Telangana to make an on-the-spot study ? What happened to that ?

MR. SPEAKER : Now, we go to next item.

11.58 hrs.

#### CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL— CLAUSE— 2 *Contd*

MR. SPEAKER : We now take up further clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. We are on clause 2.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P C. SETHI) : I have to reply to the amendments moved.

Sir, the hon. Member, Shri Lobo Prabhu, has moved an amendment to clause 2 and he wants that instead of "any" the word "identifiable" should be used. As for as this particular article is concerned, it is with regard to imported goods. It does not apply to any goods manufactured, in India. Therefore, there would be no harassment to anybody who is dealing in the Indian goods and he is not to make any declaration. But only such goods which are of foreign-make or imported will be covered under this. This position is amply clarified. Even where goods are notified, it has been said that imported articles of this variety would be subject to confiscation. Therefore I hope, the doubt expressed by my hon. friend, Shri Lobo Prabhu, will be clarified from this.