

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad] continuous touch with the State Government. I understand that the Adviser to the Governor of Bihar is expected to be in Jamshedpur today to continue the State Government's efforts towards a settlement. I hope that with understanding and cooperation from both sides, the strike would soon be called off and work resumed.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Forty-Third Report

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH): I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Forty-third Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 17th December, 1969."

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): I want to say that this is really very unusual. I am not at all in agreement with the recommendation of the Business Advisory Committee. Whether the House would adopt it or not, I do not know. As you know, knowing full well that we have lost some hours, we agreed to sit half an hour extra each day. We also agreed to sit on Saturday. Now the lunch hour is sought to be abandoned for this purpose, I do not think it is good.

MR. SPEAKER: We have had to adjourn for two days without transacting business.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: You have also hinted that if necessary, towards the end of the days, we should sit for further time.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: You said that in your preliminary remarks.

I would suggest that whenever the House is to meet the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs should sit with you and let us know what is the business and how long we have to sit. What happens is that on major Bills we are not permitted to speak 15 minutes and 3 minutes. The Deputy-Speaker will ring bell at al-

most every two minutes. It is very difficult for us.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur): I was not allowed even two minutes yesterday.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: For discussing important matters, we do not get time. Now for all odd things, they do like this. Let us consider this very seriously whether it is not time to consider afresh that the House should sit for longer time, more days, so that we can transact more business. Otherwise, this sort of thing puts everyone in difficulty. It is unfair to members that towards the end some such proposal comes.

श्री मोलू प्रसाद (बांसगांव) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

बिचौलियां को समाप्त करने, भूमिहीनों को भूमि देने और भूमि समस्या के सम्बन्ध में होने वाले मुख्य मंत्रियों के सम्मेलन विषयक ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव पर चर्चा के दौरान 2 दिसम्बर को आप ने और मंत्री महोदय ने यह स्वीकार किया था कि इस विषय पर इस सदन में चर्चा की जाये, इस बारे में माननीय सदस्य प्रस्ताव दें और संसद-कार्य मंत्री उसके लिए समय निश्चित करें। हमने इस विषय पर एक प्रस्ताव दिया है, लेकिन उसके सम्बन्ध में हमें अभी तक कोई सूचना नहीं दी गई है। जब भी केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारी अपनी मांग को सरकार के सामने रखते हैं, तो सरकार की ओर से कहा जाता है कि जब देश में भूमिहीनों की समस्या इतनी जटिल है और उन की हालत इतनी खराब है, तब केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों की किसी मांग को स्वीकार करना उचित नहीं है। चूंकि सरकार भूमिहीनों के संबन्ध में इतनी चिन्तित है, इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि आप ने और मंत्री महोदय ने जो आश्वासन दिया है, उसके अनुसार इस विषय पर चर्चा का अवसर दिया जाये, ताकि सरकार भूमिहीनों के प्रति अपना दृष्टिकोण प्रकट कर सके।

SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH: I entirely share the anxiety of the hon. member Shri Dwivedy. We should

organise our business generally speaking in a manner not embarrassing to members. The whole House will agree with it. But a peculiar situation arose this time which was taken notice of by the Business Advisory Committee. We had to have a number of holidays which we did not anticipate. Then a number of members from all sections of the House were anxious that certain discussions should take place and we were hard pressed for time. The original idea was that we should make up by sitting on Saturday. Also on the 24th various important non-official motions are slated for discussion. Then there will be a resolution coming on 23rd at 4 P.M. With the result that very little time is left for government business. On the 23rd as I said we are having the Resolution concerning the income-tax matter of Shri Jagjiwan Ram. Therefore, the Business Advisory Committee unanimously agreed to dispense with the lunch hour. I hope he would accept it.

SHRI SEZHIAN (Kumbakonam): His suggestion is for the future.

MR. SPEAKER: I may tell Shri Kalita that I will discuss his suggestion with the Minister and will try to find some time for it.

The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Forty-third Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 17th December, 1969."

The motion was adopted.

13.30 hrs.

[**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER** in the Chair.]

**MONOPOLIES AND RESTRICTIVE
 TRADE PRACTICES BILL—contd.
 Clause 3—contd.**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yesterday we were discussing amendments to Clause 3. One hour and 45 minutes remain for the rest of the clauses.

SHRI R. K. AMIN (Dhandhuka): Speaking on this Clause. Shri Nahata observed that there are certain investments in which Government

monopoly is a necessity, and that is why it has been excluded from the operation of this Bill.

In the economy there are certain natural monopolies or technical monopolies which require only one firm to handle a particular thing. For example, there cannot be seven or eight telephone companies in one city, and that is why it should be under the control of one firm, but it does not necessarily follow that it should be in the public sector. If monopoly is at all necessary, it should be in private hands. That is preferable because if a public monopoly misbehaves there is no one to control it. If a private monopoly misbehaves, people can go to the Government and Government can put a control over it, and there could be even a rate-fixing authority, measures like this could be taken, but on a public monopoly there can be no such check.

Secondly, if any evil enters a private monopoly, it can be detected and remedied quickly. In a public monopoly, there is no remedy at all. The evil is noticed after a very long time, and even when it is noticed, it is difficult to deal with it. That is why I say that if there is necessity of keeping a monopoly for natural or technical reasons, it should be first tried in the private section, having tried in the private sector, an autonomous body may be created, but there should be no public or Government monopoly.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Beni Shanker Sharma, You could not move your amendment yesterday when you were called. You can speak on the clause without reference to your amendment.

SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA (Banka): My only object in speaking on this Clause is that I do not want the Government undertakings to be excluded from the operation of this Bill.

Monopoly is bad in the hands of private business, but it is worse in the hands of Government as Government has so many powers in different spheres. Take the case of