

12 hrs.

RE. MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT
AND CALLING ATTENTION
NOTICES

SITUATION IN UTTAR PRADESH

Mr. Speaker: I have received notices of adjournment motions from about 25 hon. Members and Calling Attention Notices from 8 or 9 hon. Members about the situation in Uttar Pradesh. I do not know how I could hold the Central Government responsible for this. I would like... (Interruptions) Order, order. Let me finish first.

श्री मोर्य (अलीगढ़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मुझ एक क्षण दे दीजिए, ताकि मैं बता दूँ कि आप कैसे इस प्रस्ताव को ले सकते हैं ।

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा (बक्सर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रस्ताव क्यों नहीं लिया जाना चाहिए, इस बारे में इधर से श्री सुन ली-जिएना ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सब को सुनना तो मुश्किल होगा । मैं दो तीन माननीय सदस्यों को सुनने के लिए तैयार हूँ । वे मुझे सैटिस-फाई कर दें कि इस को क्यों लिया जाना चाहिए ।

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): U.P. is the classic example where the Constitution has completely broken down.

Shri Sheo Narain (Bansi): Where?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: In U.P. . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I would request hon. Members just to allow me to listen to the members silently so that I can decide . . . (Interruptions).

An hon. Member: You should ask the Government Benches also.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking that side also. I request members from both sides just to remain quiet.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: U.P. is a classic example where there has been a complete break down of the Constitution and the entire machinery of the State Government has been paralysed for the last so many days. The entire Government offices, the courts, even the universities are not working. Even the drivers and peons of our Ministers and judges are not attending duty with the result that absolutely no work is being carried out by the Government. In many parts of U.P. there are teachers who have not been paid their salaries for the last 16 months and the Government has been unable to make them get their salaries. They have failed in every count . . . (Interruptions).

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : गलत है ।

श्री ज० ब० सिंह (घोसी) : सही है ।

Mr. Speaker: I would request the hon. Members that I might be allowed to listen first . . . (Interruptions). Order, order. Now, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty. She should be brief.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The U.P. Government, in order to remedy the state of affairs has used fire arms, lathi charged most brutally and put thousands and thousands of people in jail. Yet, it has not been to tackle this state of affairs.

Mr. Speaker: I would request the hon. Member not to go into the merits of the case and the incidents.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, you should allow us to make our points.

Mr. Speaker: Should I call him before she has finished?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No, Sir. But you should allow her to make her points.

Mr. Speaker: I can allow only that part which is relevant under the rules.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: The Central Government is empowered under the Constitution to intervene when the administration of an entire State has been paralysed. There is absolutely no Government functioning. You may remember that this very House earlier, in the case of a Communist Government in Kerala, had allowed such an adjournment motion and the Central Government had utilised the authority of the Constitution in a much more unreasonable way in a smaller situation. All that I would say here is that here is a State which has no Government functioning and the entire State is paralysed. There is nothing but police raj. That is the only thing that exists there. This state of affairs should not be allowed to continue there.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My adjournment motion is that there is a failure on the part of the Central Government to issue necessary directives to the State Government under article 353. It says:

While a Proclamation of Emergency is in operation, then—

- (a) notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the executive power of the Union shall extend to the giving of directions to any State as to the manner in which the executive power thereof is to be exercised;"

What is happening in U.P.? I am aware that it may be construed as a law and order situation in the State. Why do we want an adjournment motion to be discussed here? These are the reasons. The first reason is that the Central Government did not pay Rs. 7½ crores to the State Government. The State Government is

wanting Rs. 7½ crores to avoid retrenchment of 30,000 employees and to pay a meagre amount of Rs. 5 or Rs. 7 to the State Government employees. The Centre has not paid that amount. That is one of the reasons why this agitation started.

The second thing is this. I come from Kanpur and I know after the 12th July, the historical U.P. Bunch day, the High Court and other courts are not functioning. There are 27,000 files pending in the Secretariat and the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh is swinging between two Das's, K. K. Das and Banarsi Das....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I will not allow all this.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me.

Mr. Speaker: He should remain within limits.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Are the merits of the case being gone into?

Mr. Speaker: No, no. I am asking him to remain within limits. I cannot hear him on the merits.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The Centre has not given Rs. 7½ crores....

Mr. Speaker: That he has said.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Has the Centre not issued directives to the State Government? Then, there has been a firing ignoring the rules and many mothers have lost their sons. About 24 persons have died. Except the Cabinet, everybody is on strike....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want that we should discuss all this... (*Interruptions*). I am not going to be bullied. If they want something, let them go to U.P. They are killers; they are murderers....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not going to hear him in this fashion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Another reason is this. The Preventive Detention Act has been used against political leaders at the instance of the Home Minister and it has been used indiscriminately. These are the reasons why there should be a proper discussion on this.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस कामरोको प्रस्ताव के सिलसिले में दो तीन बातें उठती हैं। इस सरकार की जिम्मेदारी के बारे में और उसी जिम्मेदारी को प्रस्थापित करने के लिए केवल दो तीन तथ्यों का मैं उल्लेख करूंगा, तफसील में नहीं जाऊंगा। पहले तो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश में अब कोई सरकार रही नहीं। हाई कोर्ट का काम ठप हो गया...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो बात एक दफा कही गई हो उसी को न कहा जाये।

श्री मधु लिमये : बहुत अच्छा। बांदा में जो डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट है उनकी इजाजत के बिना और उन को बिलकुल भ्रमलग हटा कर वहां सुपरिंटेंडेंट आफ पुलिस ने मनमाने ढंग से आतंक फैलाया। वहां एक बच्चे को कमर में गोली लगी थी। उस को रिक्शे में बिठा कर ले जा रहे थे। उस को कुत्ते की तरह घसीटा गया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इन बातों की इजाजत मैं नहीं दे सकता।

He will not go into all these details. (Interruptions). If these things go on, I cannot hear the Member. I have to decide the admissibility.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं अध्यक्ष महोदय, केवल तथ्यों का उल्लेख करूंगा।

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Madhu Limaye, that would not affect the admissibility.

श्री मधु लिमये : तथ्यों का उल्लेख तो करने दीजिए।

सिविल सर्जन ने कहा कि अगर पहले लाया जाता तो बच जाता। तो सिविल सर्जन सरकारी अधिकारी है, डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट सरकारी अधिकारी है। उनके अधिकार को खत्म किया गया, एक बात। दूसरी बात हाई कोर्ट का काम ठप हो गया, मचिवालय का काम ठप हो गया। तो मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त उत्तर प्रदेश में कोई सरकार नहीं है। एक सब-इन्स्पेक्टर ने अपने ही मैजिस्ट्रेट के खिलाफ डाक्टर लोहिया के मामले में शिकायत की है। तो सरकार वहां बिलकुल टूट गई। ... (श्रवण) अब मैं आपका ध्यान संविधान की दो धाराओं की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ। मैं 353 का उल्लेख नहीं करूंगा जिस के बारे में बैनर्जी साहब पहले ही कह चुके हैं। एक धारा में केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधिकारों की व्यापकता क्या है, उन को अधिकार है या नहीं, इस के बारे में जिक्र किया गया है और दूसरी धारा में केन्द्रीय सरकार का फर्ज क्या है, कर्तव्य क्या है, ड्यूटी क्या है, उस के बारे में जिक्र है। आप पहले अधिकार वाली धारा को लीजिए। 256 धारा है :

"The executive power of every State shall be so exercised as to ensure compliance with the laws made by Parliament and any existing laws which apply in that State and the executive power of the Union shall extend to the giving of such directions to a State as may appear to the Government of India to be necessary for that purpose."

तो कानून और संविधान की मर्यादा रहे इस के लिए निर्देश देने का इस को अधिकार है जिस अधिकार का इन्होंने इस्तेमाल नहीं किया है। यह तो अधिकार हो गया लेकिन एअर धारा में तो इनका बिलकुल कर्तव्य है और उस कर्तव्य से यह भाग नहीं सकते। मैं 355 धारा की ओर आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ।

"It shall be the duty of the Union...."

ड्यूटी कहाँ है,

"...to protect every State against external aggression and internal disturbance...."

और आगे देखिये :

"and to ensure that the Government of every State is carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution."

तो यह कर्तव्य है केन्द्रीय सरकार का कि हर एक राज्य की सरकार कानून और संविधान की मर्यादा का पालन करे। अगर संविधान की ओर कानून की मर्यादा टूटती है तो उनमें हस्तक्षेप करना चाहिए और निर्देश देना चाहिए जो कि इस सरकार ने नहीं किया। यह तो इनकी जिम्मेदारी और जो इनकी कर्तव्य-व्यति हुई है उनके बारे में मैंने प्रश्न किया... (ध्यान) मैं एक भी शब्द दोहरा नहीं रहा हूँ अध्यक्ष महोदय, इससे समय बच जायगा आप मेरी बात शांति से सुनिये। मैं समय बिगाड़ना नहीं चाहता। मैं अगर पुनरुक्ति करूँ तो आप मुझे रोकिए।

अब जहाँ तक कामरोको प्रस्ताव सम्बन्धी हमारे नियम हैं नियम 56, 57 और 58 उनमें मैं नियम 58 की ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिसमें शर्त दी गई है कि किन-किन चीजों को ले कर कामरोको प्रस्ताव के लिए अनुमति रोकी जा सकती है।

"Not more than one such motion shall be made at the same time."

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो आप रेवीवेंट मसजते हैं वही पढ़िए

श्री मधु लिमये : हो सकता है कि ब्राद में कोई कहे इसलिये मैं सभी के बारे में कह देना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सभी के बारे में कहने की जरूरत नहीं है।

948 (ai) LS—6.

श्री मधु लिमये : तो यह प्रस्ताव निश्चित है, स्पेसिफिक है। इन दिनों में ही यह घटना हुई है। इसमें कोई विशेषाधिकार का मवाल नहीं है। इसी तरह यह सार्वजनिक महत्व का और अविलम्बनीय महत्व का मवाल है।

अब मैं छठवीं शर्त की ओर आता हूँ :

"(vi) the motion shall not anticipate a matter, which has been previously appointed for consideration. In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by the Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time."

7 और 8 भी लागू नहीं होता। इसलिये मैं 6 के बारे में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। पहले तो मुझे जो इस सदन की परम्परा रही है उसके बारे में निवेदन करना है। सद्यः चार चीजों को लेकर इस सदन में होती हैं, बजट को लेकर

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐडमिनिस्ट्रिविटी के लिए इतना समय मैं एक मेम्बर को नहीं दे सकता। आप को मुक्तसुर तौर पर कहना चाहिए।

श्री मधु लिमये : एक तो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव, दूसरा कोई साधारण प्रस्ताव या राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण या बजट यह चार ही तो अवसर हैं जिनके ऊपर साधारण बहस हो सकती है। तो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि 15 फरवरी, 1966 को केरल के बारे में बहस हुई थी। और उसकी भाषा बिल्कुल यही थी और उस का आप ने स्वीकार था। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर साधारण बहस होने वाली थी। लेकिन चूँकि यह विषय निश्चित था, अदिलम्बनीय

[श्री मधु लिमये]

लोक महत्व का था इसलिए आपने उसे स्वीकारा है। उसका जवाबदारी (वॉइंग) मैं आप के मानने रख देता हूँ :

"The situation arising out of Kerala bandh, demanding restoration of the cut in rice ration introduced in Kerala State from 9th January, 1966 and complete collapse of the administration."

अच्छा। फिर मार्च के महीने में बजट पर चर्चा होने वाली थी। उसके बावजूद आपने एम० एम० बनर्जी साहब का बंगाल के सम्बन्ध में प्रस्ताव स्वीकार किया। इसी तरह 17 फरवरी, 1965 को पहले ही दिन होरेन मुखर्जी साहब का प्रस्ताव भाषा को लेकर जो दंगे फ़नाद हो गए उनके सम्बन्ध में था, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर पांच दिन चर्चा होने वाली थी, सभी मामलों को उठाया जा सकता था, लेकिन आपने मोचा कि चूँकि यह निश्चित मामला है, अविलम्बनीय लोक महत्व का है इसलिये होरेन मुखर्जी साहब के उस कामरोको प्रस्ताव को आपने स्वीकार किया। . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मैं और बक्त नहीं दे सकता।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। आप देखें, एक वान भी मैं दोहरा नहीं रहा हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : देखिए, यह बात सिर्फ़ नहीं है कि आप दोहराए नहीं तो सारे दिन चल सकते हैं। . . . (ध्वनि) एडमिनिस्ट्रिवलिट्री के लिए मैं तीन चार मिनट से घ्यादा नहीं दे सकता।

श्री मधु लिमये : अब मैं अपने मुद्दे पर आता हूँ। यह मेज़ पार्लियामेंट्री प्रैक्टिस है क्योंकि आखिरकार ऐंटिसिपेशन का जो नियम है, यह अंग्रेज़ों से ही हूबहू आपने लिया है इसलिये मेज़ पार्लियामेंट्री प्रैक्टिस

में जो कहा गया है वह देखें। पृष्ठ है 361

"A motion for the adjournment has been held to be out of order if the matter it raises anticipates—

(a) an order of the day or notice on the paper . . ."

तो आज क्या है? एक तो अवमूल्यन के बारे में प्रस्ताव है। उसके बारे में मैं बाद में कहूँगा। ऐन आर्डर आफ दि डे, एक क्वेश्चन आन दि पेपर, उसका भी कोई सवाल नहीं है। एक नॉटिस आफ मोशन, वह भी सवाल नहीं है। ए बिल पेंडिंग नॉटिस लाईस इस वहाँ भी सवाल नहीं है। ए मीटर रेफर्ड टू एंड नॉट येट रिपोर्टेड वाई दि सेलेक्ट कमेटी, वह भी सवाल नहीं है।

अब रह जाता है सवाल जो आर्डर पेपर है, जचिन्द्र चौधरी साहब का जो प्रस्ताव है उसके बारे में। अगर मैं यह प्रस्ताव लाता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट की सलाह लिये बिना अवमूल्यन करके सरकार अपनी जिम्मेदारी पार्लियामेंट के प्रति, जनता के प्रति निभाने में असफल रही है तो जायद आप कह सकते थे कि यह पूर्वाशा या ऐंटिसिपेशन वाला नियम इसमें बाधा रूप बनता है। लेकिन मैंने जिस विषय को लेकर यह प्रस्ताव दिया है, उसमें यह नहीं आता। अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव पर बहस होना अभी स्वीकृत नहीं हुआ है। इसलिये इस पर फैसला करते वक्त अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का कोई सवाल नहीं लाया जा सकता। क्योंकि हम नहीं जानते कि वह स्वीकृत होगा या नहीं होगा। अगर स्वीकृत हो जाय तो उस के बाद भी मैं यह कहूँगा कि यह निश्चित विषय है और निश्चित चीज पर बहस करने के लिए एडजानमेंट मोशन है।

अन में मैं लार्ड कैम्पियन का एडजानमेंट मोशन के लिए एक वाक्य पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ

श्री शिव नारायण : सब अंग्रेजों की ही बात कोट करते हो। हिन्दी वालों की भी कोट करो।

श्री मधु लिमये : यहाँ पर तो सब अंग्रेजों की ही बातें चल रही हैं।

"In applying the anticipation rule preference is given to the discussion which leads to the most effective result".

तो यह एक त्रिशिष्ट विषय है, उत्तर प्रदेश के विषय पर बहम करने का यही नरोका है, न कि अत्रमूल्यन के या अविश्वाम प्रस्ताव को लेकर एडजार्नमेंट मोशन का दूसरा मकसद भी उन्होंने बताया है—

"The form of motion generally used for the purpose of criticising the government in connection with some sudden and recent incident which can be laid to the blame of the administration."

इस में शासन का क्या दोष है, वह मैं कह चुका हूँ। अधिकार होते हुए भी वे इस्तेमाल नहीं किये गये। कर्त्तव्य इनका निश्चित है, फिर भी उनका पालन नहीं किया गया।

अन्त में इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि बांदा के बारे में यदि आप चाहते हैं कि मैं कुछ न कहूँ, तो आपकी इजाजत से सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि बांदा में खुद गया था, वहाँ पर जो आतंक चला उसके कारण करीब-करीब 32 से अधिक लोगों को मारा गया है, उनकी लाशों को नदी में डुबो दिया गया है, 24 लोगों की लिस्ट मेरे पास है और मैं आपके सामने आपकी इजाजत से टेबल पर रखना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इजाजत नहीं देता। मैं मेम्बर साहबान से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मधु लिमये साहब को मैं बार-बार रोकता रहा, आज पहला दिन है

मैं नहीं चाहता था कि इस में कोई मीन क्रियेट हो...

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने क्या मीन क्रियेट किया है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने नहीं किया, मैं नहीं करना चाहता था। आप तो मेरी बात को उल्टा ही समझते हैं। एडमिनिस्ट्रिविटी के लिए यह मुनासिब नहीं है कि सब चीजों को क्लै-आउट करते हुए मुझे सारे कास्टीच्युशन का सबक दिया जाये। इस वक्त यहाँ एडमिनिस्ट्रिविटी के लिए एक छोटा सा मामला है, उन में मैंने दरखास्त की थी कि दो-दो तीन-तीन मिनट में मेम्बर साहबान मुझे समझा दें, मेरी दरखास्त के वह पाबन्द रहे और हम किसी नतीजे पर पहुँच जायें।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कागज को तो टेबल पर रखने दो।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): I shall be very brief. I shall not refer to what has happened in U.P. to which Members have been witness. But from reports, I find that there is an upsurge in that State that the administration is nearly paralysed, that shootings have taken place, arrests on a large scale including arrests of Members of Parliament have also taken place—all these are matters of fact which are already admitted. In addition to that, I see in the papers today a report that a memorandum on the UP situation has already been presented to the President by some people, including certain Members of Parliament. I see also that this issue of disturbances in different States has become a matter of very deep concern to the Centre, and I find from the papers reports about the confabulations of the Chief Ministers of different States in conclave with the Home Minister, and God knows else, who are trying to find out ways and means of running this country largely on the basis of this country

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

being a unitary rather than a quasi-federal State. That is a development which has taken place, in spite of whatever the Constitution has provided for. I am not going to quarrel with that, but the fact of the matter is what is happening in the different States is being taken cognisance of very seriously by the Central Government. I have even seen such things, fantastic things, as a report in a newspaper called *The Patriot* the other day, to the effect that the Home Minister had even approached—I do not know the veracity of the report—to convey to you the desire of the Chief Ministers that they may be let off as far as discussions in Parliament are concerned. This is a matter which, quite apart from other implications, is almost a reflection on Parliament's position and that sort of thing. I am not going into it.

But the position is that the Centre is taking note of what is happening, the Centre is trying to make up its mind about what to do in regard to these different States, Members of the House go to those States and get mixed up in a tremendous upsurge of the people. Everybody discusses it everywhere, Government discusses it, only Parliament is so bound down by its rules that we cannot discuss it. My submission is that in view of the precedents which have been quoted before you already and with which you personally are very familiar, in view of the fact that we have discussed certain happenings in the States when those happenings impinged upon the running of the administration from the Centre when Parliament is in session and things like those that have been happening in U.P. do happen, surely they come within the ambit of our jurisdiction. I suggest that in view of the feelings aroused in U.P.,—there is no question about, there are Members who can tell you more about it from their own personal experience—in view of the feeling which have been genera-

ted in U.P., (it might be the desire of certain Members to minimise what has happened in U. P.) and in view of the constitutional position as I understand it with my limited intelligence, I would like you to give more consideration to this matter. If today for some reason you cannot quite make up your mind in our favour in favour of the admissibility of the matter, I would like you to please be good enough to give more consideration to this matter, to perhaps ask some of the sponsors of the adjournment motions to meet you in your chamber today and come tomorrow with a reasoned, well-considered verdict in this matter. I feel that what has happened in U.P. deserves the most earnest consideration by this House. Only by a very legalistic verbal interpretation of whatever rules we have, it would be very wrong if we push out discussion of a matter which does require priority. I suggest that in view of that you please take time.

Mr. Speaker: If it is the desire of the hon. Members that they want to meet me and convince me, I have no objection. If it is a clear case, I will have to hear and decide.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasargod): As far as the administration of the State is concerned, it has been already said here that it is paralysed and that it is not functioning. One thing I think everybody including the ruling party members will admit that the officers and employees are not working and the offices are also not functioning. I want to point out that in Kerala when it was said that there was a people's upsurge, though the Ministry was functioning, the offices were functioning and there was no strike or anything like that, the Ministry was dismissed. Here the situation is that the whole Government is paralysed, and so we say we should be given an opportunity to discuss it. If anybody objects, we will be able to convince him that the administration is not functioning there.

The adjournment motion is not being allowed here on this issue which shows that there are two standards. Whatever happens in some States where a non-Congress party rules, then as far as the demand of the adjournment motion is concerned, it can be admitted, but when it is a question of the ruling party, we cannot give an adjournment motion. It was said there was a people's upsurge and the ministry was dismissed in Kerala, but here when there has been firing, shooting, when the Secretariat is not functioning, we are not allowed even to discuss it here. This will show what kind of a parliamentary democracy we have got.

Shri Tyagi: I hope, Sir, by now you have made up your mind.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda): You have heard so many from the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: It was natural that I should hear them, because they have given the notices. I have done nothing wrong in that.

श्री मौर्य : यह उत्तर प्रदेश का मसला है, उत्तर प्रदेश वालों से भी तो कुछ पूछिये।

श्री शिव नारायण : उत्तर प्रदेश वालों से तो पूछने नहीं, और उनको टाइम दे देते हैं।

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): If you are inclined to accept the suggestion which has been thrown to you and the House by hon. friend Shri Mukerjee, what is the use of having this discussion? You discuss with them in your Chamber and come tomorrow if you have anything to say, because otherwise there is no meaning if you are going to listen to them or discuss with them in your chamber as has been suggested.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The suggestion made by Mr. Mukerjee is

that I should not make up my mind and give a decision today and that they would like to meet me unless the decision is in favour of the Opposition. That was his suggestion. I cannot give ruling in one's favour or another's favour. If it be the wish of the Opposition Members that we should meet once and discuss it before coming to a final decision..... (Interruptions).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That is agreed. You kindly hear some more arguments.

Mr. Speaker: Then, it is no use going on here.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): All of us may not be able to come to your chamber. So, may I say a word?

Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah): You have heard the Opposition enough; you should hear us now.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear him also. If they want that I should hear all the members and then again meet them there is no meaning in that.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): What I want to urge in this respect is this. Discussing in the chamber is one thing. It is not a condition that you give a verdict against the adjournment motion. I do not know whether you will agree with me in this respect because the matter that has been brought before the House is this. If it is a statement of fact that all the offices in the whole of U.P., in all the various districts of U.P. have ceased to function.....

Some hon. Members: No.

Shri Sheo Narain: You should also call Members from U.P. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: If Mr. Sheo Narain wants to settle this matter, I can withdraw. I can only hear one Member at a time. I will hear him also if he is insistent. I will have no objection. How can I deny anybody his say?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, I was saying that in such a situation article 355 very clearly lays down that this House, this Parliament has got a right to intervene; because this Parliament has got a right to intervene this government has got the right to intervene and if the government has got that right, this House has the right to discuss this matter that arises under these circumstances. Ordinarily I would not have supported this type of adjournment motion if it was a question of mere law and order at one place. It is not such a question; it is a question of the breaking down of the whole administration of U.P. I would therefore say that it is a fit case that an adjournment motion must be allowed to discuss this.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I will not like to repeat what has been said. There is no doubt that a grave situation is prevailing in UP. It is not only a constitutional break-down; it seems that the constitutional method of settlement of the dispute is not available now. The U.P. Government has completely failed even to sit and reason with the employees who have gone on strike. They do not say: let us sit together and go into the grievances and settle this matter. As a result of that all these outbursts are coming up and the army has been requisitioned for suppressing this movement. It seems that this movement is likely to spread to the Central Government employees and other government institutions; it has already spread to some offices in the State. It is spreading further, it will create disorder not only in U.P. but in the whole of India and therefore, it becomes the concern, the duty and the responsibility of the Central Government to intervene. Otherwise the peaceful method of solution of any problem in this country will be impossible and people will be forced to take to the methods which are unlawful, illegal, violent and agitational. Therefore it is a great responsibility that the Central Government should

discharge. It has failed to discharge its duty and Parliament is meeting here and it is right and proper that we take up this question and express our opinion as to how this matter should be settled. Therefore, I think that you should admit it, apart from the technicalities. It is such an important matter that Parliament sitting here cannot remain silent, and Parliament should be given an opportunity to discuss this matter.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): I only want to add one thing in addition to all that has been said from this side. The army has intervened there outside the purview of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act. In the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act there is a section whereby the local administration can call in the army, but the army of their own accord have offered a whole troop of clerks to run the Secretariat. Are we not entitled to know what is happening in that State?

Mr. Speaker: Is there an Adjournment Motion on that?

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Yes, Sir. We are entitled to know what is happening there, and why the army is intervening, and why it is intervening outside the provisions of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act. Is there any law in this country or not? That is what we want to know.

Mr. Speaker: Which is that Adjournment Motion that he relies on?

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: In my Adjournment Motion that has been mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: It is not in this form.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रशासन का भवन जिन मजबूत कंधों पर खड़ा है उस की एक प्रमुख कड़ी सरकारी कर्मचारी है। उत्तर-प्रदेश के सरकारी कर्मचारी अगर केवल उत्तर

प्रदेश तक ही सीमित होते तो सम्भव है केन्द्रीय सरकार की जिम्मेदारी उस में न आती लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकार की सीधी जिम्मेदारी उस में इस लिए आ गई है कि कि उत्तर प्रदेश की वह आग अब दूसरे प्रान्तों में भी भड़कने जा रही है । इस का सब से बड़ा सबूत यह है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के 22 लाख कर्मचारियों की यूनियन ने यह बात स्वीकार की है कि आगामी 26 जूलाई, को वह भी इन कर्मचारियों की सहानुभूति में प्रस्ताव पास करेंगे और दिवस मनायेंगे । इससे यह स्पष्ट प्रतीत होता है कि अब यह चीज केवल उत्तर प्रदेश तक ही सीमित नहीं है बल्कि सारे देश के अन्दर आग फैलाने जा रही है ।

दूसरी चीज यह कि केन्द्रीय सरकार की जिम्मेदारी इसलिए भी आती है कि इस में प्रान्तीय सरकार भी एक पार्टी है । प्रान्तीय सरकार के पार्टी होने से उत्तर प्रदेश के कर्मचारी अब किस से अपने न्याय की भीख मांगें ? इसलिए भी केन्द्रीय सरकार की जिम्मेदारी आती है ।

तीसरी सब से बड़ी चीज जो मुख्य रूप से मैं आप के द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार को कहना चाहता हूँ वह है कि अब तक उत्तर प्रदेश के सरकारी कर्मचारियों का यह आन्दोलन उन तत्वों के हाथ में नहीं है जो कि हिंसा और अराजकता की प्रवृत्ति में विश्वास रखते हैं लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकार अपनी उपेक्षा से मुझे भय है कि इस आन्दोलन को अराजकतावादी तत्वों के हाथ में न दे दे और अगर इस प्रकार की स्थिति आ गई तो देश का भविष्य ख़तरों में पड़ जायगा और जनतंत्र का भविष्य भी संकट में पड़ जायगा । इसलिए केन्द्रीय सरकार की सीधी जिम्मेदारी है और इसलिए वह इस के ऊपर विचार करे और आप इस काम रोकने प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करें ।

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have already allowed sufficient points to be made.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): I do not like to support or oppose the motion as such. But I rise to pinpoint a specific point which has been made out by my hon. friend Shri S. M. Banerjee, and I suggest and request you to ask the Government to explain that point before you announce your own decision on the subject.

The point made out by my hon. friend Shri S. M. Banerjee is that the complicity or the responsibility of the Central Government in the matter comes in precisely for this reason that they have failed to meet the demands of the Uttar Pradesh Government (*Interruption*). The Treasury Benches should explain to the House in what circumstances they failed to meet the demands of such a mighty government as the Uttar Pradesh State Government.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Dixit.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): Why not the Central Government ask the Labour Ministry to intervene in the matter since it is a question of strike there? (*Interruption*).

Shri Maurya rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

श्री मौर्य : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा थोड़ा सा निवेदन सुन लीजिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मैं हर एक साहब को या एक पार्टी से तीन तीन साहब को कैसे मौका दे सकता हूँ? मैं ने हर एक पार्टी से एक, एक या कहीं से दो बुला लिये हैं ।

श्री मौर्य : श्रीमन्, मुझे आप क्यों नहीं सुनना चाहते ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अच्छा, आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री मौर्य : आप मुझे क्यों नहीं सुनना चाहते ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसलिए कि आप की पार्टी के एक साहब बोल चुके हैं।

श्री मौर्य : कम्यनिस्टों में से दो बोलें हैं। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश से आता हूँ मुझे भी आप सुने। मैं बाहर रिपब्लिकन हूँ यहाँ एस० एस० पी० के साथ बैठता हूँ। जब कम्यनिस्टों में से दो बोल चुके हैं तो आप मुझे क्यों नहीं इजाजत देते? मैं उत्तर प्रदेश से आता हूँ, वहाँ गालीबारी हुई है, मेरे नाग गिरफ्तार हुए हैं, कतल हुए हैं, आखिर मुझे आप क्यों नहीं बोलने देते?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी आप बैठ जाइये।

Shri G. N. Dixit: Public Order is item 1 in the State List. It is entirely within the competence of a State Legislature to discuss matters relating to public order. The State Legislature is sitting at the moment at Lucknow. It will be a great disrespect to that august House if this Parliament discusses this matter. It is for that House alone and not for this House to discuss this matter. All the opposition parties are represented in that House and it is a disrespect to the members of those political parties in the opposition that their members there are not discussing this matter, but they want to discuss it here. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: This is not the manner in which debates are carried on in Parliament.

उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा है आप उस के बखिलाफ आगूमन्ट्स दें, दूसरी चीजें कह कर जगड़ा न पैदा करें।

Shri G. N. Dixit: There is another point. Apart from the distortion and incorrectness of facts stated here, there were only two questions raised. One was about Banda firing. There is a judicial enquiry into it and this Parliament cannot discuss a matter for which a judicial enquiry has been instituted. So, Banda is ruled out.

About other matters, I have submitted that public order is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the State Legislature. This august House should not disrespect that House sitting at Lucknow by taking that jurisdiction which the Constitution has vested in that House. I remember you gave a ruling in the last session when the Madhya Pradesh question was raised here that if we start talking of people sitting in the State Legislatures, one day the State Legislatures will start discussing us and this will be a very bad convention. With that ruling, you barred that sort of discussion in this House. So, my humble submission is, apart from the incorrectness and distortion of the facts stated here, constitutionally and under your ruling this adjournment motion is not admissible and should be ruled out.

श्री मौर्य : उन्नर प्रदेश में सर 12 फेल हो गई पूर्ण रूप से, इस के विषय में जो काम रोको प्रस्ताव यहाँ पर आया है उस को सुनने के लिये, कि वह मंजूर किया जाय या नहीं, आप ने 45 मिनट बहस में लगाये हैं। यह बात ही मेरे पक्ष में आती है कि इस में कुछ बल है। यह बहुत बड़ा बल है। इस के पीछे कि इस सदन में 45 मिनट तक इस विषय पर चर्चा चली है कि इस को मंजूर किया जाये या नहीं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : चूँकि मैं ने 45 मिनट लगाये हैं तो क्या यही काफी बजह है कि इसको मंजूर कर लिया जाये।

श्री मौर्य : जहाँ तक सरकार के फेल होने का सवाल है, वमें चल नहीं रही हैं, दफतर चल नहीं रहे हैं, सेक्रेटैरियट चल नहीं रही है, जो वहाँ पर विधान मंडल की कार्रवाई है वह एम० एल० एज की मिल नहीं रही है। वहाँ पर असेम्बली काम नहीं कर सकती। और तो और असेम्बली भवन में लाठी चार्ज हो रहा है। पन्द्रह दिन पूरे नहीं हुए हैं, 30 आदमी खत्म हो गये और एक हजार घायल हो गए हैं। जब यह सब बातें सामने आ रही

हैं तब फिर और किम तरह से सरकारी मैशीनरी फेल होगी। केरल में किस तरह से सरकारी मैशीनरी फेल हो गई थी, पंजाब में किम तरह से फेल हो गई थी। यह तमाम मिसालें हमारे सामने हैं। इस तरह में हमें पता चलता है कि भविष्य के लिये हमारे सामने खतरा है। एक स्थिति का और भी ध्यान रक्खा जाना चाहिये। अब विद्यार्थियों में भी आग फैल गई है। अगर आज सदन में विशेष रूप में कोई मजबूत फैसला नहीं लिया गया, चूंकि यू० पी० की सरकार फेल हो गई है, कागजी पत्रों पर ही रह गई है, अगर वहां पर राष्ट्रपति का रूल लागू नहीं किया गया तो वहां विद्यार्थियों में जो आग सुलग गयी है वह और भी आगे बढ़ेगा। इस लिये यहां पर जो काम रोको प्रस्ताव आया है उस पर ब्रह्म होनी बहुत जरूरी है। अगर समय मिलेगा तो उस समय मैं और भी बहुत सी बातें कहूंगा।

Shri Tyagi: On a point of order, Sir. On the question whether an adjournment motion is in order or not, it is your prerogative to give a ruling. For that purpose, if there is any technical argument to be given to prove that it is in order, that could be heard. Otherwise, if all the members were to comment on the merits, it is unconventional. I request you to exercise your discretion and give a ruling and we will support that.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): We all dislike intensely what is happening there. We are not happy about it at all. I hope all the trouble that has been brought about there will end soon. (*Interruptions*).

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रश्न नहीं है कि वहां स्थिति जल्दी काबू में आ जायेगी, यह प्रश्न मौजूदा स्थिति का है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप मुझे माननीय सदस्य को सुनने दीजिये। (*व्यवधान*)

Shri Nanda: The accuracy of whatever statements have been made regarding the incidents there is not the subject-matter of this discussion. The subject-matter is restricted to the question of admissibility and I shall confine my observations to that.

Three articles of the Constitution have been cited. The first is article 256 which says:

"The executive power of every State shall be so exercised as to ensure compliance with the laws made by Parliament and any existing laws which apply in that State, and the executive power of the Union shall extend to the giving of such directions to a State as may appear to the Government of India to be necessary for that purpose."

So far as laws made by Parliament are concerned, certainly it is the responsibility of Parliament to see that they are carried out everywhere. This has nothing to do with that. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Daji (Indore): P.D. Act, Cr.P.C. etc. are all Acts of Parliament which are not being observed. They are not provincial Acts. It is a clear case. (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने हम से कहा कि हम फैक्ट्स में न जायें, तब फिर मंत्री महोदय आरोप क्यों लगा रहे हैं ?

Shri Nanda: The next article is 355 which says:

"It shall be the duty of the Union to protect every State against external aggression and internal disturbance . . ."

Certainly wherever there is any such trouble, the Government will take care to see that protection is afforded. No such situation has arisen there. (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमय : एक एक कानून की तोड़ा गया है।

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): He is not telling the Parliament the truth. (Interruptions).

Shri Nanda: The hon. Member said that we have discussed it with them. Certainly; because we are watching in order to be able to perform our duties. As I said, no such situation has arisen there. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Minister must be allowed to have his say. He must have that permission. Only after hearing him I can give my decision. If hon. Members continue to interrupt in this manner and obstruct the hon. Minister, certainly I will ask him to sit down and there will be no decision at all.

श्री बागड़ी : सदन को भी उकसा रहे हैं और... (इंटरप्शन)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह से अगर अपोजीशन वाले गवर्नमेंट को बोलने नहीं देंगे तो

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बार-बार खड़े हो रहे हैं। बैठ जाइये।

Shri Nanda: Sir, the Government of the State is carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. The Constitution sets out certain provisions relating to the States. There is the State Government, there is a Cabinet and there is the machinery of the Government all according to the provisions of the Constitution (Interruptions). We are dealing with the provisions of the Constitution. Now, I challenge the facts stated by the Opposition. There is an attempt to bring about a break-down there, but it is met by the Government there (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Such interruptions should not be there.

Again and again I am asking hon. Members to remain silent (Interruptions). If hon. Members are determined not to allow the hon. Home Minister to have his say, that is a different thing. About 50 minutes have been spent on this. I have been exercising patience to the utmost extent. Now the hon. Home Minister is not allowed to speak.

श्री ज० ब० सिंह : वहां कोई मशीनरी फंक्शन नहीं कर रही है।

Shri Nanda: It was said that the High Court has a big record of arrears. That has been there for years and, therefore, there should have been no Government all these years? What are these facts? Is it that these arrears of 26,000 cases, mentioned by hon. Members opposite, arose during the last three or four days?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Shri Nanda: Not at all. The High Court is functioning there and . . . (Interruptions).

श्री ज० ब० सिंह : इनको चाहिये कि सही बातें बोले।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सही बात वह है जो आप चाहें ?

Shri Nanda: I do not want to go....

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): वहां अबस्था ऐसी नहीं है जैसी यह बता रहे हैं। साफ साफ झूठ बोल रहे हैं। उच्च न्यायालय काम नहीं कर रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह अनपार्लियामेंटरी है किसी दूसरे मੈम्बर के लिए कहना कि यह झूठ बोल रहे हैं।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : अमत्य कहा जाए ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : लोक सभा में बहस होनी है या सिर्फ एक दूसरे को

गालियां देनी हैं ? बहम करने की यह जगह है या एक दूसरे को गालियां देने की ? गालियां देने की यह जगह नहीं है (इंटरप्ट) अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं अज्ञ कर रहा हूँ कि जिस तरह आपने हमारे आदमियों को जिन को आप गैर ज़रूरी बातें समझते हैं उनको कहने से रोका उसी तरह से आप गृह मंत्री को भी गैर ज़रूरी बातें कहने से रोकें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या कहा है ?

An hon. Member: He is misleading the House.

डा० रामसेवक यादव : उन्होंने कहा है कि हालत ठीक हो जाएगी । हालत ठीक नहीं है । लाठी चला कर ठीक कर लेंगे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रजीब बात है । होम मिनिस्टर यह न कहें कि हालत ठीक हो जाएगी ।

Shri Nanda: Sir, I shall conclude. It is not my case that there is no trouble there. If it were my case that there is no trouble there I would not have said that the trouble would end soon. There is some trouble. That does not mean there is a break-down. Work is being hampered in certain places, but in most of the districts, in a majority of the districts it is completely normal (Interruption). The third point they raised was whether the emergency proclamation is in force. We have already, at the instance of the whole House, withdrawn those provisions. Do they want me to bring in the DIR rules there?

Shri Daji: Sir, I rise to a point of order. The hon. Minister said that he has withdrawn those provisions. Am I to understand that the emergency declaration has been withdrawn by the Government. DIR does not authorise them to interfere in the affairs of the State.

Shri Nanda: The purpose was not to use the powers under the emergency. That was the point, that we

should not use the powers under the emergency in the State. Therefore, we made some kind of an arrangement, that except in the borders and certain defence purposes they will not be used. They are not being used.... (Interruptions).

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह गृह मंत्री भी कल नहीं रहेंगे ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : लाठी भी चलाते हैं और चिल्लाते भी हैं ।

Shri Nanda: The army has not come into the picture at all.

Mr. Speaker: That is what I want to know. So far as the motion tabled by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri is concerned, I wanted to know whether the army has been called. That is being denied. The Minister says that the army has not been called at all.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: The army has not been called, but the army has intervened on its own. The army can only be called under the Criminal Law Amendment Act. It has intervened outside that Act.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, it should be brought out factually. I do not know the facts myself. An hon. Member who is equally credible as the hon. Minister is making a contradictory statement . . . (Interruptions).

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : एसा निकम्मा ग्रादमी नहीं देखा है ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : एक तथ्य की बात कहना चाहता हूँ ।

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow any further discussion on this. I am going to give my decision.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : एक निवेदन सुन लें । एक सैकिड लगेगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने सुन लिया है । बार-बार नहीं सुन सकता हूँ ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : कुछ नध्य गलन बताये गये हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: Shall I be allowed my say now?

I have heard the hon. Members, many of them, who had given notice of these adjournment motions. The matter is really grave. The matter is of very great importance. But here the limited question before me is whether it can be discussed in the form of an adjournment motion. That is the only thing (*Interruptions*). Again it is being whispered in my ears that there is a break-down of the administration. That has to be established first and then this Parliament can take it up (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : फैंक्टम के बारे में आप कहने नहीं देते हैं ।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : अपने चैम्बर में बुला कर मुनें ।

Mr. Speaker: It cannot be established... (*Interruptions*). Will I not be allowed to proceed?

श्री मधु लिमये : फैंक्टम आपको बताने नव आप फैंमला करें ।

श्री मौर्य : फैंक्ट्स रखने का मौका दीजिये, फिर निर्णय दीजिये । फैंक्टम देने को हम तैयार रहें ।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have heard in detail most of the hon. Members. Facts cannot be established by a debate on the adjournment motion. An adjournment motion can only lie on facts established or admitted. So far as the calling of army is concerned, that has been denied emphatically. (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : बाद में बतायेंगे अभी आप अपना फैंमला न दीजिये ।

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Army has not been called. The army has volunteered... (*Interruptions*).

श्री रामसेवक यादव : अपने चैम्बर में बुला कर सुन लीजिये, फिर फैंमला दीजिये ।

Mr. Speaker: Nothing might be recorded now. Only my ruling is to be recorded, nothing else. Order, order.

I have heard in detail most of the hon. Members. Article 256 has been cited. So far as the obligation to give a direction for the enforcement of laws in that State is concerned, nothing has happened and so that article does apply... (*Interruptions*). If more than one hon. Member speaks at the same time, nothing will be recorded. (*Interruptions*)* * *

अगर मुझे अपने फैंमले के बारे में दलील देने की इजाजत नहीं दी जाती है, तो मुझे मदनमर तौर पर अपना फैंमला सुनाना होगा ।

13 hrs.

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : अध्यक्ष महोदय आप इस समय व्यवस्था न दीजिए । आप महेश्वानी कर के हमारी बातें सुनिए और फिर अपना फैंमला दीजिए । आखिर एक दिन में दूनिया नही उलट जायेगी ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने तो यह तजवीज की थी कि मैं सुनने के लिए तैयार हूँ लेकिन मैम्बर साहबान ने कहा था कि हम अभी कहना चाहते हैं ।

If hon. Members are speaking simultaneously, nothing will be recorded (*Interruptions*).

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: In an earlier case in Kerala...

Mr. Speaker: I wanted to refer to Kerala. But if I am not heard what should I do? Kerala was already under President's Rule when the food debate took place.

Shri Daji: No, Kerala was treated differently.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Where was the sense of justice at that time?

Mr. Speaker: If more than one hon. Member speaks, it will not be recorded. (*Interruptions*).***

I am sorry, I cannot agree with those arguments advanced by the hon. Members. So, I cannot allow this adjournment motion. . . . (*Interruptions*). Nothing will be recorded when more than one hon. Member speaks. (*Interruptions*).***

Now, papers to be laid on the Table. Shri Sanjiva Reddy.

13.02 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON MERCHANT SHIPPING (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE

The Minister of Transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism (Shri Sanjiva Reddy): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Explanatory Statement giving reasons for immediate legislation by the Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Ordinance, 1966, under rule 71(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-6398/66*].

COPIES OF ORDINANCES

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Ordinances under provisions of article 123(2) (a) of the Constitution:—

- (i) The Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Ordinance, 1966 (No. 3 of 1966) promulgated by the President on the 6th June, 1966.
- (ii) The Jayanti Shipping Company (Taking over of Management) Ordinance, 1966 (No. 4 of 1966) promulgated by the President on the 10th June, 1966.
- (iii) The Advocates (Amendment) Ordinance, 1966 (No. 5 of

1966) promulgated by the President on the 14th June, 1966.

- (iv) The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Ordinance, 1966 (No. 6 of 1966) promulgated by the President on the 17th June, 1966.
- (v) The Criminal Law Amendment (Amendment) Ordinance, 1966 (No. 7 of 1966) promulgated by the President on the 30th June, 1966.
- (vi) The Customs (Amendment) Ordinance, 1966 (No. 8 of 1966) promulgated by the President on the 7th July, 1966.
- (vii) The Essential Commodities (Amendment) Ordinance, 1966 (No. 9 of 1966) promulgated by the President on the 12th July, 1966.

[*Placed in Library. See No. LT-6399/66 to LT-6405/66*].

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE CUSTOMS ACT AND CENTRAL EXCISES AND SALT ACT

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): I beg to lay on the Table:

- (1) A copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:—
 - (i) S.O. 870 published in Gazette of India dated the 26th March, 1966.
 - (ii) G.S.R. 639 published in Gazette of India dated the 30th April, 1966.
 - (iii) G.S.R. 640 published in Gazette of India dated the 30th April, 1966.
 - (iv) G.S.R. 641 published in Gazette of India dated the 30th April, 1966.

***Not recorded.