

(b) It is a matter for the State Governments to consider.

**Coal Ash Produced by National Rayon Corporation**

5365. SHRI D. BASUMATARI : Will the Minister of COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) whether Coal Ash being produced at National Rayon Corporation was being disposed of free of cost for the past 8 years : and

(b) whether at the insistence of the new Directors of the Board tenders were invited and the said Corporation shall now fetch Rs. 5 lakhs per year from the sale of the same coal ash ?

**THE MINISTER OF COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY) :**

(a) In the Inspection Report under 209(4) of the Companies Act, 1956, there are references to disposal of coal ash, free of cost, during some of the years.

(b) According to the Inspection Report, the matter was considered by the Board in March, 1970, and necessary steps were taken to call for tenders. It is observed by the Inspector in this context that it is learnt that the company has awarded the contract for clearance of coal ash to Messrs National Transport Co. at Rs. 5.31 per ton.

**Ban on Planting and Cultivation of Hashish**

5366. SHRI CHENGALRAYA

NAIDU :

SHRI R. BARUA :

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether the Government propose to ban planting of the Hashish and its cultivation in the country ;

(b) whether State Governments have been consulted on this issue and if so, their views ; and

(c) whether any licensing system would be set for permitting cultivation and planting of Hashish in certain areas of the country ?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI VIDYA**

CHARAN SHUKLA) : (a) and (b). Cultivation of cannabis plant for production of Hashish (Charas) is banned since long in the country.

(c) Question does not arise.

12.01 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

SHRI SHRI CHAND GOYAL (Chandigarh) : I would like to raise a point. I had given notice of a calling attention motion regarding the agitation in Chandigarh and the discontent among the people there. The reply which was given by the Minister of Home Affairs, Mr. K. C. Pant, was absolutely unsatisfactory. He had said that there was a responsibility of the Central Government towards the people of Chandigarh. I want to know whether the Chandigarh Administration's recommendations contained something irresponsible which compelled the Minister to say that they also owe a responsibility towards the people of Chandigarh.

The position is that the rents in Chandigarh are increasing at a high rate, that a student to hire a room for Rs. 70 per month, and a Government employee who gets Rs 300 has to pay Rs. 150 for his accommodation.

Kindly hear me because you have not admitted my calling attention motion.

An agitation is going on. Hunger strikes and chain fasts are going on for eight days because the problem is so serious, it is affecting 59 to 60 thousand people. All Government employees, students and members of the trading community are very much hard hit, and this is why this has become a mass movement there. The agitation is of the common man there. Now they are resorting to hunger strikes and chain fasts, and the Minister must assure us as to when they will bring the necessary legislation or at least the regulation of rents. This is a very serious problem which is agitating the minds of the Chandigarh people for a long time.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : The Minister may be asked to make a statement regarding the atrocities committed in the Midnapore Central Jail. Yesterday it was raised specifically.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, रूल 377 के अन्तर्गत में एक मामला उठाना चाहता हूँ। यह मामला सारे सदन से सम्बन्धित है। समाचार-पत्रों में खबर लगी है कि मन्त्रि मंडल की किसी बैठक में पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को टेलिविजन के लिए कर्जा देने से मना कर दिया गया है। हम जानना चाहते हैं कौन ऐसे सदस्य हैं जो टेलिविजन के लिए कर्जा चाहते हैं? हमने कर्जा नहीं मांगा है लेकिन सारे सदस्यों को बदनाम किया जा रहा है। यह मामला किसने कैबिनेट में भेजा? वे कौन से सदस्य हैं जोकि सरकार के लोन के मोहताज हैं? पार्लमेंट के मेम्बरों के बारे में इस तरह की खबर देना जैसे सारे ही मेम्बर टेलिविजन चाहते हैं, वे सरकार के दरवाजे पर खड़े हैं कहां तक उचित है? आप सरकार से पूछें कि वे कौन मेम्बर हैं जो कर्जा चाहते हैं? इसमें सारे सदस्यों को बदनाम करने की जरूरत नहीं है।... (व्यवधान)... वे कौन लोग हैं कर्जा मांगने वाले ?

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister will clear the position in the course of the day.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : I am speaking subject to correction, but so far as I know, it was a general proposition. I do not know whether individual Members of Parliament had approached the government in this regard or whether it was a general proposal.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह मामला उलझ गया है। प्रधान मंत्री बताने की कृपा करें कि क्या मन्त्रि मण्डल ने यह तय किया है कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को टेलिविजन के लिए कर्जा नहीं दिया जायेगा और अगर यह तय किया है तो इसको तय करने की जरूरत क्यों पड़ी? वे कौन से मेम्बर हैं जो कर्जा चाहते हैं?.

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : जहां तक मेरा अनुमान है कोई खास मेम्बर नहीं थे, शायद सामान्य प्रस्ताव था। मेम्बरों ने शायद कभी कहा होगा।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : इसको वापिस लीजिए। इधर किसी मेम्बर ने नहीं मांगा है।... (व्यवधान)...

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जो फैसला प्रीवी पर्सनल के बारे में हुआ है उसको गवर्नमेंट ने ग्रब देख लिया होगा तो ग्रब सरकार का माइन्ड किधर जा रहा है? आया वह स्पेशल सेशन बुलाकर बिल ला रहे हैं या कोई बिल ला ही नहीं रहे हैं या फिर प्रिन्सेज के साथ बातचीत कर रहे हैं? आखिर सरकार क्या करना चाहती है?... (व्यवधान)...

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रधान मन्त्री ने अभी तक यह नहीं बताया कि कैबिनेट ने कर्जा न देने के बारे में फैसला किया या नहीं। वे कहती हैं कि उन्हें याद नहीं है। कैबिनेट की मीटिंग हुई होगी, उसकी अध्यक्षता उन्होंने की होगी तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कर्जा किसने मांगा है।... (व्यवधान)...

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : मैंने जो जवाब दिया उसमें निहित था कि एक प्रस्ताव था था...

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : किसकी तरफ से आया था ?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : प्रस्ताव मिनिस्टर की तरफ से आया था। मैं यह कह रही हूँ कि जहां तक मुझे मालूम है किसी खास मेम्बर ने नहीं मांग की थी बल्कि एक आम बात उठी होगी जो हमारे सामने रखी गई। लेकिन हमने जो निर्णय लिया है उससे आपको खुशी होगी।

[श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी]

सौधी साहब ने एक बात कही है उस पर हम जरूर विचार करेंगे।

He would like to appear on television and not just to view it.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मैंने जो बात पूछी थी उसके सम्बन्ध में प्रधान मंत्री बतायें कि उनका माइन्ड किधर जा रहा ? ... (व्यवधान)...

डा० राम सुमंग सिंह : मैंने मिदनापुर के बारे में कहा था ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मिदनापुर के बारे में स्टेटमेन्ट करेंगे। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मैंने यह पूछा था कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फैसले पर क्या सरकार ने लीगल ग्रास्पेक्ट की जांच कर ली है ? ... (व्यवधान)...

डा० राम सुमंग सिंह : कल वहां पर एक दर्जन आदमी मारे गए हैं तो कब दिया जायेगा जवाब ?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : इसका जवाब तो वह देने जा रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Eluru) : For the production of consumer goods, facilities are already being given from the co-operative banks, from the private banks, from the commercial banks, from the Government nationalised banks. So, there is no necessity from the Government side to give them any more special facilities particularly in these hard days when every one suffers. (Interruption)

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन्होंने कोई इन्टेरिम फैसला लिया है या नहीं ? इनके लीगल एक्सपर्ट्स ने क्या राय दी है ? क्या सरकार स्पेशल सेशन कराने जा रही है या नहीं ? इसमें तीन चार महीने के इन्टेरिम

पेमेन्ट की भी बात है, वह पेमेन्ट करेंगे या नहीं करेंगे ?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : जजमेंट बहुत पेचीदा और लम्बा है। उस पर पूरी तरह से विचार किया जा रहा है।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Yesterday, I raised two issues, and I was seriously thinking that the Minister of Foreign Trade or the Minister of Labour and Employment would kindly make a statement, because, today is the last day of this session. That is what I said. There is already a cry by the textile workers in Kanpur. This is concerning the Central Government, because the Central Government is concerned in two ways. It is the non-implementation of the Wage Board award by the J and K Industries, one of the biggest employers in Kanpur among the textile industry. Secondly, they are trying to implement the scheme of rationalisation. Thirdly, there is a shortage of cotton. They have taken this pretext, and have laid off workers, and have closed down the mills, throwing 10,000 textile workers on to the streets. I expect that the Minister of Foreign Trade will make a statement. I have sent a letter already to him, and you have passed on my letter to him. Let him kindly make a statement. I would urge upon you to ask him to make a statement. Today is the last day of this session. So, to avoid a general strike of all the textile workers in Kanpur, a statement should be made.

The Prime Minister should also make a statement about this : It was raised in the other House also. The Government said that Government have an open mind about the Supreme Court judgment. Open mind sometimes means vacant mind also. We want a special session to pass the Bill. We do not want the princes to get a copper from this Government. The Bill should be brought without providing for any compensation.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : There are certain specific problems about New Delhi. Sir, we have been seeing the skyline of New Delhi. So many multi-storied buildings are coming up and there is no law to regulate it. All sorts of

problems are arising out of it, including crimes, corruption, etc. I want an assurance that there will be a thorough enquiry by the CBI into it. I also want an assurance that special steps will be taken to provide for police arrangements, for which I would like a high level cell to be set up to handle the new problems. There should be a high level grievance redress cell for the police. There is a lot of discontent amongst the police and it has to be looked into. Then, crimes have doubled in Delhi since last year. About all these problems, somebody should make a statement, either the Prime Minister or the other ministers concerned. They should not ignore New Delhi.

beyond my intention that it should in any way erode the powers and privileges of members. I assure you about that. This House has laid down a certain procedure and I was asked in this House to give some ruling. I avoided giving a ruling; I did not want to, but the House insisted on it. I said, I cannot give a ruling offhand. So, I just went into the proceedings of the previous Rules Committees and also rule 353. I am told there is objection to the words "permission by the Speaker". Is there anything else?

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur):** Also, you said it shall not form part of the record.

-----

**RE : PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS AGAINST OUTSIDERS**

**SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore):** Sir, with all respect to you, I would like to say something. When I say this, I request you not to take it that I am commenting on your action. Yesterday I raised the matter about your ruling. It is my humble submission—not a comment on your ruling—that I felt yesterday that the ruling you gave, it will erode the powers and privileges given to Members under the Constitution. I pointed out to you at least two major departures. Earlier, if anybody wanted to make an allegation, he had only to intimate it to the Speaker. Now you have said that permission has to be sought. My personal opinion is, by this ruling the power given to us to make a statement in the House without fear or favour has been eroded considerably. I understand the Rules Committee which met yesterday could not discuss the matter because they were engrossed with a lot of other things. I would request you to take the House into confidence and tell us what exactly is the position. You said, the leaders of the parties and other members who are interested can talk to you. I would request you to talk to them over this matter or put the whole matter before the Rules Committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I will explain it to you. I have told the leaders who met me and sent suggestions that leave aside whether it is my ruling or not I have only referred to rule 353 and two quotations from the proceedings of the Rules Committee—I would be glad to refer it back to the Rules Committee. I relied on three things—rule 353 and two decisions of the Rules Committee. Rule 353 provides for "previous intimation" in which case I do not come into the picture.

**SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur):** If you are referring it to the Rules Committee may I humbly submit that we do not proceed with further discussion?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am very grateful to you for bringing it to my notice. There is a lot of misunderstanding about it. At the outset, I must assure you that it is much

**MR. SPEAKER:** Let me explain the position. Then you can decide what you want. Rule 353 refers to "previous intimation". But that is not adhered to sometimes. I was asked: if the member had not given previous intimation, how did I allow it? As you know; in the case of Shri Shashi Bhushan he did not give it and then there was apology. There was no necessity of going into this procedure—if he had not given previous intimation, then the member should be made to express regret in the House. I did not like it. When the previous intimation comes, the Speaker does not come in; it automatically goes; I do not come in. I do not sit as a judge and I do not scrutinise whether this has happened or this has not happened. If there is no previous intimation, then comes the question of my permission, because I did