

Mr. Speaker: So far as these matters are concerned, the hon. Minister has stated before the House that he would make a statement. I requested him to make the statement before the discussion on the President's Address starts, so that if any point about the food situation has to be raised, it may be raised during the course of the discussion on the President's Address.

I have also sent to him all the questions which I have admitted in respect of this subject so that he may answer all those points referred to in those questions wherever necessary. He will also take notice of the adjournment motion that is tabled and find out how far the facts mentioned by the hon. Members agree with the facts as they are. The hon. Minister will refer to the statements made by other Ministers on this subject, wherever necessary, and he will naturally make as full a statement as possible with the facts available to him.

I see no need to grant permission to this adjournment motion. I come to the next one.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: There is another adjournment motion on this subject.

Mr. Speaker: I shall treat it likewise.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I want to know whether my point has been taken into account.

Mr. Speaker: I will come to it.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN STATUES

Mr. Speaker: About the adjournment motion regarding the removal of certain statues, I can say immediately that I do not give my consent to the motion. It has been said that a satyagraha is going on in Uttar Pradesh regarding the removal of statues, that so many people are doing a patriotic task, and that as the Education Ministry is in charge of this subject, it should pro-

vide accommodation for housing those statues here.

So far as this adjournment motion is concerned, it is purely a matter of law and order in respect of the State concerned. Further, this statue business has come in here several times. The hon. Prime Minister wants to say something.

Shri Vijayram Raju (Visakhapatnam): The Chair has not read the adjournment motion. How can the Prime Minister make a statement then?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is new to this House. Of the three copies, one is given to the Notice Office. Another is given to me and the third is with the Minister in charge. He has already got it.

The Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The Chair has ruled out this motion, as I understand it. I need not say anything about it, because, if I may say so with all respect, it has no relevancy here in this context. I would venture to point out to the hon. Member that, apart from the context of the adjournment motion, he makes a very large assumption in this House, on behalf of the people of Uttar Pradesh, that of all the hon. Members here who represent Uttar Pradesh, he alone is the representative! But, as far as this subject is concerned not the adjournment motion but the larger question must necessarily interest him and all the hon. Members of this House and others. If you, Sir, would permit me to say a few words as to what our policy is, I shall proceed. Our policy is—

Shri Surendra Mahanty (Dhenkanal): On a point of order. When you have ruled out the adjournment motion, what is the point of the Prime Minister in explaining it?

Mr. Speaker: All that I say is, the hon. Minister is willing to give some information to the House, so as to satisfy the House. Though this matter may not be taken up by way of an ad-

jourment motion in the House, it is a matter with respect to which any person in the country would like to have the views of the Government, and the hon. Prime Minister is the fittest person to explain to the House. There is no point of order.

Shri Surendra Mahanty: But you have ruled it out.

Mr. Speaker: I am allowing the hon. Prime Minister to speak. There is no point of order.

Shri Vijayram Raju: The Prime Minister is making a statement without the House knowing what is the adjournment motion which I have tabled. I would like the adjournment motion to be read clearly and then the Prime Minister may make the point.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has made out a huge memorandum regarding this particular matter, and so, is it necessary that I should go on reading it to the House and take away the time of the House? I have explained to the House the gist of this adjournment motion. The adjournment motion says that all the people in Uttar Pradesh are very much agitated about this statute business and so on. I need not read all the details. The hon. Member says that satyagraha is going on regarding the removal of statutes and that the Uttar Pradesh Government says "We have no accommodation here". An adjournment motion must relate to the failure of the Government here to take action. The failure of the Government does not lie in not providing accommodation for the statutes!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I was venturing, Sir, to place before the House what the general policy of Government is in regard to this question of statutes put up during the period of the British rule in various parts of India. There are various kinds of statutes; some may be considered historical, some may be considered artistic and some may be considered, well, rather offensive in themselves, and of various types. Our general attitude has been, first of all, to remove such

as might be considered offensive, and that too, gradually without making too much fuss and without doing anything to raise ill will between countries. We have removed some of those statues and we propose to continue doing that. There are those which have been historically significant without causing offence; we shall also remove them and put them in historic museums. There are those that are not important historically or artistically. I do not know what we will do with them; if somebody else wants them, we will make a present of them. In particular, regarding such statutes as may be considered in a sense offensive to our national sentiment, we have taken them up and we do propose to take them up; but, we wish to do all this in a manner so as not to create international ill will and raise up old questions which are dead and gone.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City Central): On a point of clarification. Will the Government take a census of statutes in the three categories, those which are offensive, those which are historical and those which are artistic, and make a statement to this House at a later stage?

Mr. Speaker: They want to avoid satyagraha.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I may mention to this House that these are not all statutes. There are numerous paintings, some of high artistic value. Sometimes we have exchanged them for valuable articles of Indian art. So, we proceed in this way to benefit ourselves as far as possible and not to be burdened by them.

Shri S. C. C. Anthony Pillal (Madras North): My colleague, Shri Vijayram Raju, requested that this adjournment motion may be read out. On the other hand, only a paraphrase of it has been given by you, Sir, and it has been suggested by you...

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has not tabled the adjournment motion. I gave a gist of it. I need not have brought it before this House at all; I might have rejected it, but I only

[Mr. Speaker]

wanted that the House should know the Government's view. The hon. Member who has tabled the motion has no objection, but another hon. Member wants to come back on my paraphrase.

Shri Vijayram Raju: I asked you to read it out; when you refused, I accepted it.

FOOD SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY

Mr. Speaker: There is another adjournment motion relating to the alarming food situation in the country and the prevailing famine conditions in many parts as revealed by press reports, etc. I have already said that the hon. Minister will take this matter also into consideration when he makes the statement tomorrow. As he himself has said, if his statement does not cover all the points raised here either by way of adjournment motions, questions or calling attention, those matters may be referred to in the debate. Even then if hon. Members are not satisfied, we shall consider it later.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): In addition to the famine conditions and scarcity, the very sharp rise in the price of rice has also to be dealt with in the statement by the hon. Minister, because that is also important.

Mr. Speaker: That is the subject-matter of a series of questions, which I have admitted; I am sending them on to the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister will kindly take note of that also.

There is another adjournment motion by Shri Ramji Verma again on the food situation. Then, there is an adjournment motion by Shri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.

STRIKE BY BURMAH-SHELL EMPLOYEES

Shri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai (Madras North): I have given notice

of an adjournment motion and I should like it to be read out.

Mr. Speaker: I am reading it.

"The grave and imminent threat of a general strike in the oil-distributing industry which will paralyse the economic life of the country consequent on notices being served on the striking employees of Burmah-Shell that if they fail to resume work by tomorrow, they will all be dismissed."

What is the suggestion of the hon. Member? Does he suggest that they may go on striking and the employers should go on keeping quiet? What is the adjournment motion? How is this Government responsible for this?

Shri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai: Under the Industrial Disputes Act, the Government of India can appoint a national tribunal to settle this dispute.

Mr. Speaker: Has that been the demand?

Shri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai: The point is this. Certainly, no one has declared this particular strike as illegal. It is true that the workers have a right to strike; but, as to whether the strike is justified or not, no one has declared anything. The workers have felt that they are being dealt with arbitrarily. All that the workers have requested is that this particular question should be referred to a tribunal or a labour court for settlement. In April, 1956,...

Mr. Speaker: Let us not have a general survey of this matter. What is the failure of the Government. They were asked to refer this matter to a tribunal and they failed to do it. Is that the failure of the Government?

Shri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai: They have been told on the 11th of this month that the interpretation of a Settlement that was reached under the Industrial