

(बी हावी) : (क) श्री (ख). मोटर परिवहन कर्मचारी कानून, १९६१ सब राज्यों में लागू किया गया है (जम्मू और काश्मीर को छोड़कर जहां कि यह लागू नहीं होता है) ।

Atomic Plants

19. **Shri Umanath:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of atomic plants to be located during Third Plan period; and

(b) whether the Madras Government have represented for the location of a plant in Madras State?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) The first atomic power station to be located at Tarapur on the west coast of India is likely to be completed by the end of 1966.

No decision has yet been taken regarding other atomic power stations. The Planning Commission has, however, authorised the Department of Atomic Energy to select a suitable site for a nuclear station in the area of Delhi-Punjab-Rajasthan-Uttar Pradesh. The Expert Committee set up for the selection of suitable sites for locating future power stations has submitted its report on the suitability of a site in this area. The report is under consideration.

The Expert Committee has also been asked to prepare a list of about six other suitable sites for nuclear power stations in the country which can be used whenever the need arises during the Third and Fourth Five Year Plans. At least one such site should be in South India, preferably in Madras State.

(b) Representations have been received from various State Governments including Madras for the location of an Atomic Power Station in their State.

12:46 hrs.

RE: MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: Before taking up the calling attention notice, I wish to refer to a letter that has been written by the Leader of the Communist Group to me. Of course, it is a very affectionate letter—I always expect that from my hon. friends. But he has some fears that I have changed some practice dealing with adjournment motions without reference to the hon. Members. I assure him that I have not done anything of that sort.

He has referred to what I said yesterday that the adjournment motions that had been tabled or given notice of yesterday would be taken up today and I would waive the objection of any delay having taken place in notice being given. Then he has complained that so soon after he had promised me his full support and co-operation, I had perhaps changed something, which was not to his taste. I assure him that I would not do that unless I can persuade him to accept something different.

My only idea was this—perhaps the statement that appeared in the *Statesman* gave a wrong impression of my idea—that there are certain adjournment motions that need not be mentioned here. They are sometimes on matters so trivial that we only spend unnecessary time reading them or referring to them or doing something else about them. But there are certainly some motions that must be referred to. Members feel agitated about them; unless they are dealt with immediately, they do not feel inclined to take up any other business.

What I intend doing is to invite the leaders of the main Groups to a meeting. We will sit together to devise such methods as may be agreeable to them also and as may serve the purpose we have in view, as may also save as much time as possible, so that no wastage of time might take place.

Otherwise, I have not done anything contrary to the practice that has so far been followed. I intend bringing in certain modifications, but after persuading them and after discussing with them all that they desire. We will sit together for this purpose. If they have the time, we can meet to-day immediately after we conclude the business and decide what should be done.

There is one thing more I would like to say. I am sure the hon. Leader of the Communist Group is not going to withdraw his co-operation which he promised the other day so soon simply because I have disallowed his adjournment motion.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod). No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure it would be agreed that at least some time should be given to the Minister, as well as to me when I can make up my mind or collect some information about an adjournment motion. Sometimes it is only a minute before the Speaker comes here that the adjournment motion is handed over to him. He has no time to look into it. My predecessor, Shri M. A. Ayyangar, was always complaining that when questions were being put and answered here he had to look into adjournment motions, consult his office and get information. That does not look nice. That detracts from the dignity of the Chair. The hon. Members also would not like that that should be continued.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: This was not like that.

Mr. Speaker: I am not saying this is like that.

So, what I would request the hon. Members is this, that whenever an adjournment motion is to be given, it should be given at least 15 minutes in advance of the commencement of the House, so that I might be able to get any information that has to be gathered. And then, I assure the hon. Members that I will be here in my

Chamber at least half an hour before the House commences, and any Member who wants to see me in connection with any business of the House can come to me, and I can discuss with him anything that he wants.

Shri Gopalan wants to say something?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: First of all, I want to say that there is no question of non-co-operation because one adjournment motion is not admitted. During the last ten years that I have been present here, I know that only on one or two occasions adjournment motions had been allowed. But the reason is this. We saw a report in the *Statesman* of a statement given by you, or a talk with the press, wherein some new points had been raised which were not there before. So, at first we thought you were going to have some new conventions.

Mr. Speaker: Unless I have consulted him, I would not do it.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: You did not consult us.

Secondly, there is a difference between an adjournment motion and a calling attention notice. I can understand your not giving consent to an adjournment motion, but I cannot understand your changing an adjournment motion into a calling attention notice, because there is an absolute difference between the two. An adjournment motion can be disallowed, but it cannot be changed into a calling attention notice, because the seriousness of an adjournment motion and the matters contained in it are such that a calling attention notice cannot replace it. A calling attention notice only asks for some information about the matter. If we want only information, then certainly there are other methods by which we can get the information, by a question or something like that. If it is a question, then certainly we can put some supplementaries. As far as calling attention is concerned, it is only given by the Government. When Mr. Ayyangar was here, at least some-

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

times he allowed some questions for clarification on calling attention motions. Suppose you say that really, according to the rule, calling attention means no question of clarification, no question of putting questions, only explaining the position. Then, changing an adjournment motion into a calling attention notice means not even the possibility of having some answers to supplementaries or something like that. That is the reason why I said that you could have discussed this new convention with us.

Mr. Speaker: I already had that in mind, that I would request the hon. leaders of groups to meet me and discuss it.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: So, we will discuss it.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): But, can that be done without the consent of the hon. Member concerned? I wonder if notice of an adjournment motion can be changed into a calling attention notice without the Member's consent.

Mr. Speaker: It is no question of changing one thing into the other. It means that the Speaker has withheld his consent to the adjournment motion, notice of which has been given, that has not been allowed, but that another thing has been allowed, namely a calling attention notice—not that the same thing has been converted or changed.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): No, Sir. May I point out...

Shri Tyagi: If it were from another Member, it is all right.

Mr. Speaker: It automatically implies that the Speaker has withheld his consent to that adjournment motion.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That is true. There are occasions when the person who has given notice of the adjournment motions feels that it

may be converted into a calling attention notice in order to get the information, because if it is converted into an ordinary question, it will take ten or twelve days. Therefore, with the consent of the person concerned, this can be done and has been done before also.

Mr. Speaker: I would request one thing. I have said that we will sit and discuss. All these questions can be taken up there. There is no need of spending more time here. We will sit together and all these questions can be taken up. Those who are interested can come, not only the leaders; I will call a few others, and we can sit together and then decide what course we will follow.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): May I submit one thing?

Mr. Speaker: Is it necessary now when we are going to discuss all these things?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Are we going to discuss those adjournment motions which have been tabled, which you have very kindly rejected?

Mr. Speaker: What does he want me to do now?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I do not say anything. According to our information and knowledge, whatever adjournment motion we have tabled, we have tabled with the full confidence that it relates to a matter of public importance. You, in your wisdom, have either rejected or changed it into a calling attention notice. I do not dispute that. You have the right. But I feel that it is the privilege of the Opposition to table adjournment motions. If even that is curtailed, I am afraid our faith in democracy will be shaken.

Mr. Speaker: I am telling him exactly this, that he can press at the meeting what his privilege is. I would not deny the privileges he has got. I would rather safeguard them.

But I am telling him again and again that he can come and sit with me.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: But the whole incident will become a story after two days.

Mr. Speaker: Now, we take up the Calling Attention Notice; Shri Hansda.

12.15½ hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

POLICE FIRING IN ANDAMAN ISLANDS

Shri Subodh Hansda (Jhargram): Sir, under Rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

“The labour unrest in Andamans Island leading to police firing resulting in the death of three persons and injuries to many others.”

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, it is a somewhat lengthy statement; but I shall try to read it out quickly.

On the 9th April 1962, the workers of two Construction Divisions and one Maintenance Division of the Andamans Public Works Department in Port Blair and others places in the South Andaman Islands struck work without notice and took out a procession consisting of about 1,500 workers to the Secretariat building. The Principal Engineer offered to meet the representatives of the processionists to hear their demands and to explain the position. The processionists, however, stated that they had no representatives and had gathered together in their individual capacities. The Principal Engineer then asked them to let him have their demands in writing so that they

could be properly considered. The processionists, however, informed him that they could not put down their demands in writing as they were illiterate. Later, about 10 persons met the Principal Engineer in his office room and made two demands. Firstly, they wanted an increase of Rs. 5 p.m. in their emoluments and, secondly, that a regular scale of pay should be given to casual labour. The Principal Engineer informed the workers that it was not within the competence of the local administration to sanction an increase in their salary and the matter had been referred to the Government of India.

As regards the other demand, they were informed that the revised strength of the various Divisions of the P.W.D. was being fixed by the local administration and that an equivalent number of casual workers would become entitled to regular scales of pay and other benefits. The workers, however, did not pay any heed to the Principal Engineer and continued to remain in the Secretariat in spite of repeated requests to disperse and return to their work. The Labour Welfare Officer also explained to them that all their legitimate demands were being considered sympathetically and they should not resort to strike. Unfortunately the workers, instead of returning to their work, surrounded the jeeps of the Principal Engineer and other officers of the PWD and refused to let them leave the Secretariat premises. The police had to intervene in this situation to rescue the officers. At about 2.30 p.m. the crowd left the Secretariat and marched in procession to the PWD stores at Phoenix Bay where GCI sheets intended for distribution to the settlers under the colonisation scheme were being loaded in trucks by workers of the Andaman Labour Force. This work was obstructed. The District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police met the workers during the evening near the PWD stores where they were continuing to sit. Efforts were made at length to explain to them that their