

periods indicated against each:

(1) Rani Lalita Rajya Laxmi	22nd July to 30th August, 1968 (Fifth Session)
(2) Shri Lalit Sen	24th July to 24th August, 1968 (Fifth Session).
(3) Shri K. R. Ganesh	11th November to 20th December, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(4) Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah	11th to 26th November, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(5) Shri Tayappa Hari Sonavane	11th November to 20th December, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(6) Shrimati Ila Pal Chaudhuri	11th November to 6th December, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(7) Shri N. K. Somani	11th to 29th November, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(8) Shri K. Jaggaiah	11th November to 15th December, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(9) Shri M. N. Naghnoor	11th November to 20th December, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(10) Maharani Vijayamala Rajaram Chhatrapati Bhonsale	11th to 30th November, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(11) Shri Madhu Limaye	11th to 25th November, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(12) Shri Pashabhai Patel	11th to 26th November, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(13) Shri S. R. Damani	13th November to 10th December, 1968 (Sixth Session).
(14) Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait	11th November to 13th December, 1968 (Sixth Session).

I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The leave is granted. The Members will be informed accordingly.

12.37 hrs.

INDIAN POST OFFICE (AMENDMENT) BILL*

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Post Office Act, 1898.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Post Office Act, 1898."

The motion was adopted.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: I introduce the Bill.

INDIAN TARIFF (AMENDMENT) BILL*

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI): On behalf of Shri Dinesh Singh, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) :
प्रध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इंडियन टेरिफ़ (एमेंडमेंट)
बिल का विरोध करता हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will please confine himself only to the Constitutional point. He can oppose the Bill later. At this stage, he may speak only on the Constitutional position; that is all.

* Published in Gazette of India Extra-ordinary, Part II, Section 2, Dated 16.12.68.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा: हकीकत में यह संशोधन टेरिफ कमीशन की सिफारिशों को सामने रख कर नहीं लाया जा रहा है, बल्कि उनको नजर-अन्दाज किया जा रहा है। टेरिफ कमीशन की सिफारिशों को कार्यान्वित करने से कुछ उद्योगों का, जिन में मोटर उद्योग भी है, विकास होगा। लेकिन उन सिफारिशों को लागू नहीं किया जा रहा है। मिनिस्ट्री आफ कामर्स द्वारा इंडियन टेरिफ (एमेंडमेंट) बिल के बारे में जो नोट सर्कुलेट किया गया है, मैं उसमें से मोटर उद्योग के मुताल्लिक एक वाक्य को पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

"For these reasons the Commission has concluded that there is no practical alternative but to let the industry continue under the present scheme of protection."

इस बिल के पेज 7 पर कहा गया है :

"In respect of products of the automobile and automobile ancillary industries. . . the Bill seeks to discontinue the tariff protection with effect from the 1st January, 1969. . ."

कमीशन का कनक्लूजन यह है कि मोटर इंडस्ट्री को प्रोटेक्शन की स्कीम के अन्तर्गत रहने देना चाहिए, लेकिन इस विधेयक में उसको डिसकण्टिन्यू किया जा रहा है।

मोटर एन्सिलरी इंडस्ट्री के बारे में टेरिफ कमीशन की रीकमेंडेशन में कहा गया है कि उसके डेवेलपमेंट को वाच करना चाहिए, लेकिन विधेयक में उसके बारे में भी संशोधन लाया गया है। इस स्थिति में इस विधेयक से देश का औद्योगीकरण और मोटर उद्योग का विकास नहीं होने जा रहा है, बल्कि उस से विदेशी उद्योगपतियों को छूट दी जा रही है, उनका रास्ता प्रशस्त किया जा रहा है कि वे अपने माल को हिन्दुस्तान के बाजार में लायें और मुनाफ़ाखोरी करें। चूँकि यह विधेयक टेरिफ कमीशन की रीकमेंडेशन के खिलाफ़ है और सदन को गुमराह करने वाला है, इसलिए मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI MOHAMMAD SHAFI QURESHI: I introduce* the Bill.

12.39 hrs.

MATTER UNDER RULE 377

SHADOWING OF M.Ps. BY POLICE IN ORISSA

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour): Under Rule 377 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I beg to ask for your permission to raise the following:

We three Members of Parliament, namely, Janav Syed Badrudduja, Shri J. M. Biswas and myself had been on a tour to the riot affected areas of Cuttack with the following objects in mind:

- (1) To collect first hand information, on the affairs leading to the riots;
- (2) Role of the State Government and others; and
- (3) To ensure that proper compensation was given to the victims and they were rehabilitated properly.

We regret to say from the very beginning we were shadowed by a band of police (Special Branch) people. They were, no doubt, deputed to record our conversation with the people in general. It is clear that the Government's intention was to discourage, and even by implied intimidation, Members of Parliament from performing their duties by securing first hand report as to what has happened on such a deplorable happening in Cuttack. As stated above, we were on fact finding mission and in our mission we were prevented to find out as to what has happened in the affected areas because of the constant presence of watchful police officers, which to a great extent deterred people to come forward and narrate their experience before us.

* Introduced with the recommendation of the President.