

{Shri A. P. Jain}

that is, we are licensing the wholesale dealers.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I have allowed a number of questions.

Shri K. N. Pandey: Sir, my question has not been replied to

Mr. Speaker: There is another hon. Member who also says that his question has not been answered

I would urge upon the hon. Minister this thing. Whenever they themselves come to know of such things, without waiting for questions of this kind they must make statements. The Members here are not only Members of Parliament but they represent lots of people outside who would also like to be satisfied as to why there is a spurt in the prices and what steps Government are taking in the matter

With great difficulty I allowed the adjournment motions in another form. But for that the hon. Minister would not have made a statement. I have insisted upon hon. Ministers who are in charge of certain things such as Defence, Air Services, Railways and so on to come to Parliament themselves and explain what has happened in cases where there is an accident or something of that sort. It is not only about accidents taking away life. These are matters of life and death when prices go up. Whenever there is an abnormal rise in prices, I expect the hon. Minister of Food to come before Parliament, without waiting for questions to be put, and explain what has happened, when the House is in session. But when the House is not in session he should issue statements as to why this has occurred and what steps Government are taking. Notwithstanding everything done by Government, it will remove a lot of misunderstanding about the actions of Government.

Shri A. P. Jain: What you have suggested is perfectly all right. But sometimes the difficulty arises because,

when we are contemplating certain action, if the line of action is made public, then, instead of producing the correct effect, it may produce the reverse effect.

We are also thinking upon certain lines; we are discussing with the State Governments and we may take action. But it is not always possible to make public the lines on which we propose to take action.

Mr. Speaker: Normally, the hon. Minister must have issued a notification. There is plenty of rice and plenty of sugar in the market. This is all artificially done by certain people.

Shri A. P. Jain: It has been done; that has appeared in the papers, not only in today's papers, but in the papers of a few days back also.

11.23 hrs.

#### STATEMENT RE EXTENSION OF EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND ACT

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): Sir, yesterday, when a copy of the notification, regarding the number of workers in the motor transport industry covered by the Provident Fund scheme, was placed here, one hon. Member said that it covered only 5,000 workers while another hon. friend said that it covered 23,000 workers. The fact is that about 215 establishments in the private sector employing approximately 21,000 workers and about 83 establishments in the public sector, employing approximately 82,000 workers are likely to get the benefit of provident fund scheme.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): The first notification was issued in February 1959 just on the eve of the meeting of the Budget session and the hon. Minister took about 3 months—just on the last day of the Budget session—to place that notification on the Table.

Shri Abid Ali: That was not particularly concerning this. It was of a miscellaneous nature. Our practice is that miscellaneous notifications are accumulated and placed when others are also placed. If hon. Members desire that these miscellaneous notifications should also be placed early I will do it.

Mr. Speaker: I will suggest to the hon. Minister that in all cases where notifications have to be placed on the Table of the House, they may be placed on the Table a week after their issue if the House is in session so that hon. Members may have an opportunity of seeing them.

11.25 hrs.

MOTION RE. EIGHTH REPORT OF  
U.P.S.C.—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Datar on the 7th May, 1959, namely.

"That this House takes note of the Eighth Report of the Union Public Service Commission, laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha on the 24th November, 1958"

The time allowed is 4 hours and the time taken already is 8 minutes and the balance of time left is 3 hours and 52 minutes. Shri Datar

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): Sir, yesterday I made a reference to certain points. I would rather leave the other points to hon. Members to consider and debate upon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister will please resume his seat.

11.26 hrs.

MOTION RE. BREACH OF PRIVILEGE  
—contd.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members may be aware that the other day Shri Anthony came to me post-haste inside the Chamber and wanted an opportunity to raise a privilege motion. He said that Shri Joachim Alva is reported to have said—in the *Times of India*—that Shri Anthony's motion for the inclusion of English was inspired by some foreigners and so on. Shri Joachim Alva immediately got up and said that it was not what he said and that he spoke something else. After that I thought there was nothing more to be done and that it need not be pursued.

Some hon. Members suggested that there was a report in the Press and as against it the hon. Member has now made a statement in the House. I always prefer the statement of hon. Members of this House to what appears in the newspaper. Therefore, I thought it was not necessary to pursue the matter at all.

But Shri Anthony came to me and said that I must ask the *Times of India* as to why they have reported like that and so on. I thought of asking them independently of this. In the case of such statements the veracity of any hon. Member who has made a statement should not depend upon the veracity or otherwise of the Press correspondent. Hon. Members must themselves give respect to one another and to Parliament as a whole. There is no meaning in trying to pursue this matter. However, I will get the explanation from the *Times of India* correspondent. But I do not want to make this question dependent upon that and so I refuse to give any consent to moving this motion.

All the same I will ask the *Times of India* correspondent for an explanation as to why he did report like that, but I would certainly accept the statements of hon. Members of this House in preference to anything appearing