

17.41 hrs.

PATENTS BILL

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Industry (Shri Bibudhendra Misra): Sir, On behalf of Shri D. Sanjivayya, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to patents, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): No.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): I have already given notice of a motion to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; he has given notice. Let me first put the motion. Motion moved:

"That the Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to patents, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I beg to move:

"That the debate on the motion for consideration of the Bill be adjourned."

An hon. Member: Postponed.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): I can move for the suspension of rule 119, then the position would be perfectly clear.

Mr. Speaker: I shall put the question. The question is:

"That the debate on the motion for consideration of the Bill be adjourned."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The further discussion on the Patents Bill is adjourned. We now take up the motions moved by Shri Kachhavaia and Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

17.42 hrs.

MOTIONS RE. INCIDENTS IN NEW DELHI ON 7TH NOVEMBER, 1966 AND BANNING OF COW SLAUGHTER—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Kachhavaia on the 2nd December, 1966, namely:

"That this House takes note of the statement made by the Minister of State for Home Affairs on the 9th November, 1966, regarding certain incidents in New Delhi on the 7th November, 1966."

and also the following motion by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri on the 2nd December, 1966, namely:

"That this House takes note of the statement made by the Minister of Home Affairs on the 4th November, 1966, regarding banning cow slaughter."

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur gave notice of an amendment; he may just move it.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I beg to make a suggestion, that before the discussion takes place, it is better that we may know the Government policy in this regard, and then we can discuss it.

Mr. Speaker: Let him move the amendment first.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): You have been good enough to admit this amendment of mine. I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

"and while welcoming the Government's statement making clear their acceptance of the principle for ban on cow slaughter and appreciating the steps already taken by Government in the matter, urges the Government to take

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

vigorous steps to implement the ban in co-operation with the States and appeals to all concerned for the abandonment of the agitational approach or fasts for this purpose."

Shri R. S. Pande (Guna): My name is also appended to that amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Members may wish to sit longer. I would ask Dr. Singhvi to speak first, since he said he had to catch the plane this evening.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is well known that a democratic government is formed on public opinion.

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar): Why have a discussion on this subject if the Government is going to announce its decision?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. After Dr. Singhvi's speech, let him raise it if he wants.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: It is unexceptionable that a democratic government is formed on public opinion. Only fools, it has been said, pure theorists, or apprentices in moral philosophy fail to take public opinion into account in their political undertakings. Sir, David Hume has said that it is on opinion only that government is founded, and this maxim extends to the most despotic and most military governments as well as to the most free and most popular.

Public opinion is an object of widespread interest. It is venerated, feared, praised, cursed, and solicited. Politicians court it; statesman appeal to it; philosophers extol or condemn it; merchants cater to it; military leaders fear it; sociologists analyze it; statisticians measure it; and constitution-makers try to make it sovereign.

17.44 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I wish to emphasise that the opinion of a whole nation, a united and tolerably homogeneous nation is, when at last it does express itself, the most competent authority to determine the ends of national policy. It is this which our Government, I think, is seeking to defy and to deny by not accepting the inexorable force of public demand in respect of banning cow slaughter, in respect of putting an all-India ban on cow slaughter.

Shri Tyagi: It is already accepted.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I do not think so. It seems to me that by defying the force of public opinion in accepting an all-India ban, if necessary, by amending the Constitution, the Government is doing violence to public sentiments. The depth of public feeling has not been fully gauged by the Government and as result a great hiatus has been created between the psychology of the people and the thinking of Government.

The stock argument used against an all-India ban is that the Constitution prevents it, because the Constitution does not confer any power on the Central Government to act in this matter, as it falls within the exclusive competence of the State Governments concerned. There is juristic opinion to support this stand. But since when has the Government been converted to the view that the Constitution is not subject to any amendment? It has amended it 23 times already. Is the Government entitled to proclaim to the world at large that the Constitution cannot be changed essentially to give expression to a constitutional mandate which is already contained in the Constitution? The Constitution was amended not only for trivial and far less pressing consideration, but even to include a whole package of Acts declared *ultra vires* by the Supreme Court to be constitutionally pro-

ected. The fact that the Central Government pleads helplessness in the matter of prevailing upon the State Governments is sufficient ground to reinforce the demand for an all-India ban on cow-slaughter.

Instead of preventing cow-slaughter as the Government claims to do and as Mr. Mathur's resolution seems to show when it says that it appreciates the steps taken by the Government of the Government of India, I would like to cite letters written by the Central Government asking the State Government to revise even the legislation they had undertaken to ban cow-slaughter. In 1950, the Central Government went so far as to advise the State Governments that the Constitution and also the economic consideration should be taken into consideration and even the legislation undertaken by State legislatures should be revised. Here is a letter written by Mr. K. L. Punjabi, ICS, Secretary to the Government of India dated 20th December, 1950:

"In view of what is stated above, the Government of India hope that the adverse effects of a total ban on the slaughter of cattle will be realised by the States and in the larger economic and other interests of the country, no legal restriction on the slaughter of useless and unproductive cattle will be imposed. The States which have already passed legislation totally banning cow-slaughter are accordingly requested to take early steps to reconsider it."

In the context of letters like this of which there are many in the country, does it lie in the mouth of the Government to claim that they accept in principle a ban on cow-slaughter? This is today only as a result of public pressure which has been exercised on the Government; this is truly in response to a national and popular demand. It is as it should be because

the Government is a democratic government and it must respect popular sentiments.

Shri Tyagi: There are States like Gujarat, M. P., Maharashtra, Mysore, Punjab, U.P. Jammu and Kashmir . . .

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Yes, I am aware that some States have imposed partial or complete ban on cow slaughter. I welcome the move taken by several State Governments. But there are State Governments which have refused or shown disinclination to fall in line with this popular demand.

I would like to make a passing reference to the incidents of 7th November. It is claimed that the organisers of the demonstration actually organised the violence. I have a letter from the Prime Minister which says that after all, those who organised this demonstration should have been aware of the consequences. Perhaps Mahatma Gandhi should have been aware of the consequences of the demonstrations and agitations he planned and by that token, this Government is actually trying to bring abuse to one of the greatest leaders of the country by saying that those who gave the demonstration, peaceful demonstration are also responsible for the unintended consequences of it, for the consequences that ensued, not so much because of the lapses of those who organised the demonstration but because of the lapses of the administration, the failure of the administration to keep law and order.

Sir, I have here a letter which I wrote to Shrimati Indira Gandhi expressing deep concern about the situation that has developed, because the lives of some of the great religious leaders of the country are in jeopardy. The response to this, I am afraid, is not very encouraging, is not very promising. I am sorry to add that in matters like this the deeper remifica-

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

tions of the problem have not been taken into consideration. I am sorry that while the Government refused to put a White Paper to bring before the country and this House the evidence that it has in its possession to show as to who organised violence, who were those mysterious culprits who organised violence—certainly, even the Prime Minister has said she appreciates that the organisers of the demonstration did not intend the consequences and therefore nobody can say that these religious leaders actually planned any violence or organised any violence, but Government is not prepared to put before the country any evidence—a large number of people are detained today. Whatever may be the views of these people, this is a Government under rule of law. If this Government has to continue to enjoy as a Government under rule of law, the Government must come before the country with the material, with the evidence they have against the people whom they are detaining endlessly.

Before I conclude, Sir, I would like, particularly, to make a plea. These persons who are being detained should be released forthwith, if what the Government says is at all true, that is to say, if they wish to secure a proper atmosphere in the country, I wish, particularly, to bring to the attention of the House the manner in which the dead bodies of many people who died in the incidents of 7th November were dealt with. I have a case by which I am greatly saddened, because in that case the body of the man who died was not even delivered to his family, whose body could not even be identified. In that case the Government played hide-and-seek, they played the cruel game of hide-and-seek. I wish to bring that case to the attention of the House. One Mr. Jhumarlal Asopa of Jodhpur, my home town, came here. He was one of the very highly placed officials in the Jodhpur

Railways. He was a respectable man, enjoyed considerable status in the Municipal Council and all that. In an effort to save a large number of women who had joined this demonstration, which showed that the organisers of the demonstration had not planned any violence because otherwise hundreds and thousands of women would not have joined it, Shri Jhumarlal Asopa sustained injuries and died. His body was carried to the Willingdon Hospital in the night. This is what his brother has to say:

“मैं वह श्री झमर लाल का पुत्र उसके शायल होने का पता लगने पर स्यान-स्यान पर डोलते रहे। भ्रत में रात्रि को 10.30 बजे उनके पुत्र को विलिंगडन अस्पताल में अपने पिता का फर्स्ट क्लास रेलवे पास जो उनको डिस्ट्रिक्ट कंट्रोलर आफ स्टोर्स के उच्च पद से उतर रेलवे से भ्रवकाश लेने के कारण मिलना था देखने को मिला। इस पर उसने डाक्टर की अनुमति से जा कर देखा तो उनका मृत शव ऐसे ही भ्रन्य 16 शवों के साथ रखा हुआ था व उनके हाथ व सीने पर गोली के घाव थे। शव को मांगने पर डाक्टर ने मुझ पर आ कर ले जाने को कहा। इस पर रजिस्टर में पूरा विवरण पता बगैरा लिखा दिया गया।

तारीख 8-11-66 को जल्दी सुबह जब शव लेने पड़े तो वहां विलिंगडन हॉस्पिटल में पूछ ताछ पर शव को गायब पाया। डाक्टर ने नर्स के नाम स्लिप भेजी जो निम्न प्रकार है:

I have seen the photostat copies.

"Sister, please tell this gentleman who has taken the body of Mr. Jhumarlal.

Signed: Doctor".

"मिस्टर से पूछताछ करने पर उसने बिल्कुल अनभिज्ञता जाहिर की व यह कहा कि ऐसा कोई व्यक्ति न तो मरा है न शव यहां आया न शव किसी को दिया गया। अस्पताल के रजिस्टर में लिखे हुए पते पर जब उन्हें दिखाया गया तो टाल-मटोल कर यह उत्तर दिया गया कि पुलिस रात्रि को 17 शवों को यहां से ले गई व अस्पताल को कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं है।"

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I myself went from pillar to post. I am grateful to the Deputy Minister, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla. He at least condescended, co-operated to the extent of finding the photographs of the deceased, if there were any, and showing them to me and the relatives, the next of kin of the deceased. Sir, I went to the Parliament Street Police Station and the shame of it is that the photograph was not there. The man is dead, the dead body was seen by the son of the deceased and yet this body is somehow spirited away by the authorities.

Who is responsible for this kind of cruel misconduct? Is this the government that claims to be a democratic government? I have talked to the brother of the deceased, the son of the deceased and I know with what great depth of feeling they have spoken about this affront to them in a democratic country. This is a matter of lasting shame, enduring shame, a blot on the fair name of the country, a blot on the name of democracy, a blot on the name of the democratic government. And this is not a single instance. There are countless cases in which dead bodies have been spirited away, in which no particulars have

been given of the dead bodies. Even in the case of ordinary accidents, particulars of those who die are given, but in this particular case the bodies were spirited away; when the bodies were in the hospital, their particulars had not been made available. Why this cloak of secrecy? Is this not cruel? Is this not unfair? Is this not undemocratic?

I would like to conclude with these words, that the Government has got to act in this matter, by accepting this claim in principle. They have aroused public feeling to such an extent that if it is not satisfied, there will be nothing but frustration and despair, and I hope there would be many more things to come, if this demand is not satisfied, because this is a national demand, this is a demand which has the backing of a constitutional mandate. I hope that the hon. Minister will be good enough, when he rises to reply, to accept the demand and also accept our demand, which is contained in the amendments which I have moved, for an impartial inquiry into the happenings of the 7th of November, including the misbehaviour of Government, in the matter of concealing the particulars of the deceased and their bodies.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Sir, I request that the time for this subject may be extended.

डा० सोबिन्द बास (जबलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां तक मेरा संबंध है, यह सदन और सारा देश इस बात को जानता है कि मेरे सार्वजनिक जीवन के प्रारम्भ से ही, जिम को लगभग 50 वर्ष बीत चुके हैं, गोबध बन्दी का प्रश्न, मेरे सार्वजनिक जीवन के सब से बड़े प्रश्नों में से एक प्रश्न रहा है। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि गांधों का प्रश्न साम्प्रदायिक प्रश्न नहीं है। यदि यह साम्प्रदायिक प्रश्न होता तो महात्मा गांधी ने, हमारे पहले राष्ट्रपति डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद ने, गांधी जी के सब से बड़े अनुयायी दिनेश्वर भावे ने गोबध बन्दी के संबंध में वह सब ने कहा होता जोकि भाज इतिहास का विषय

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

है, और आज भी विनोबा जी इस संबंध में जो कुछ कह रहे हैं वह इतिहास का विषय होने वाला है। गोवध बन्दी के प्रश्न को साम्प्रदायिक प्रश्न बनाना या किसी साम्प्रदायिक अथवा किसी राजनीतिक दल या किसी ऐसी चीज से संबद्ध करना, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ बड़े से बड़ा अन्याय है। मैं अपने सारे सार्वजनिक जीवन में किसी भी साम्प्रदायिक संस्था में नहीं रहा। मैं 1920 में कांग्रेस में आया। 40 सालों से कांग्रेस में हूँ और मेरे सद्गुण एक नहीं कांग्रेस में अनेक व्यक्ति हैं जो गोवध बन्द करना इस देश के लिये सब से आवश्यक मानते हैं।

मैं इस मत का भी रहा हूँ कि सम्पूर्ण गोवध बन्दी का काम यदि राज्यों के ऊपर छोड़ा जायेगा तो यह मामला निपट नहीं सकता, यदि मेरा मत यह न होता तो मैं इस सदन में स्वयं गोवध बन्दी का विधेयक उपस्थित न करता। वह विधेयक उम समय उपस्थित हुआ था जब हमारे राष्ट्र नायक और प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू थे। राजधर्म प्रखरानंद दाम टंडन, श्री ठाकुर दाम भागवंत और मैं तीनों को इस बात का इजाजत दी गई थी मेरी पार्टी के द्वारा कि हमारा जो मत है वह हम स्पष्ट रूप से इस सदन के सामने रखें और अपने मत के अनुसार वोट दें। पंडित जी में यह उदारता थी कि उन का विचार चाहे कैसा भी हो, लेकिन वे प्रजातन्त्र के इतने बड़े समर्थक थे, लोगों की अन्तरात्मा के विचारों के इतने बड़े समर्थक थे कि यदि उन के विचारों के विरुद्ध भी कोई विचार रखता था तो उस का पूरा आजादी दी जाती थी अपने विचारों को व्यक्त करने के लिये। इसलिए मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि जब तक केन्द्र इस संबंध में कुछ नहीं करता तब तक केवल राज्यों के ऊपर इस विषय को छोड़ देने से काम नहीं चल सकता है। इसके लिए मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि संविधान में संशोधन करने की आवश्यकता है। यदि हम 23 बार

अपने संविधान में परिवर्तन कर चुके हैं तो 24वीं बार कम से कम गोवध के विषय में जिस को बन्द करने के लिए सारे देश में इतनी बड़ी राय है, हम फिर संविधान क्यों नहीं बदल सकते हैं, यह मेरी समझ के बाहर की बात है। यदि हम 23 बार अपने संविधान को बदल चुके हैं तो 24 वीं बार भी संविधान को बदला जा सकता है।

18 hrs.

परन्तु अब मैं इस प्रकार की बात भी नहीं कहना चाहता कि जो संभव न हो। संविधान बदला जा सकता है, अब तक बदल दिया जाना चाहिये था, अब तक केन्द्र को गोवध सम्पूर्ण रीति से बन्द कर देना चाहिये था लेकिन अब तक यह बात नहीं हुई और अब जबकि इस संसद का यह अंतिम अधिवेशन है और नए चुनाव हो रहे हैं तब मैं इस बात को स्वीकार भी करता हूँ कि आज संविधान नहीं बदला जा सकता है। संविधान बदलने के लिए जो आवश्यकताएँ हैं वे आज पूर्ण नहीं हो सकती हैं, जो कठिनाइयाँ हैं उनको आज दूर नहीं किया जा सकता है। इस बात को मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ। ऐसी हालत में चार तारीख को जो नन्दा जी ने अपना वक्तव्य यहाँ पर दिया था, श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी ने जो पत्र मुनी मुशील कुमार जी को लिखा था उसके अनुसार सरकार कुछ बातें कर सकती है जो कि सरकार को तुरन्त करनी चाहिये।

पहली बात सरकार को यह करनी चाहिये कि सम्पूर्ण गोवंश के वध को इस देश में कतई बन्द किया जाए, इस नीति को सरकार स्वीकार करती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस दल की कार्यकारणी को बैठक मौजूद था—बुलाया गया था—और उस में नन्दा जी उस समय गृह मंत्री थे और वहाँ सर्वमत से कांग्रेस पार्टी की जो कार्यकारणी है उस में यह बात स्वीकार की गई थी कि सरकार की नीति इस देश में सम्पूर्ण रीति से गोवध बन्द करने की है

दूसरी बात यह कि जानी चाहिए कि जिन राज्यों में अब तक गोवध बन्द नहीं हुआ है उन में गोवध तुरन्त बन्द किया जाय और इस सम्बन्ध में आगे कोई हीला हवाला न किया जाय। पहली बात नीति की घोषणा सम्पूर्ण गोवध बन्द करने की है क्योंकि संविधान नहीं बदला जा सकता है और दूसरी बात जिन राज्यों में अभी तक गोवध बन्द नहीं हुआ है, उन में गोवध तुरन्त बन्द करनी है।

तीसरी बात एक और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ जिस में बहुत सी कठिनाइयाँ हल हो जायेंगी गाय को सरकार की राष्ट्रीय पशु घोषित करना चाहिये। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू की खुद की राय यहाँ पर रखना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने एक बार कहा था :

“भिन्न भिन्न देश वालों ने भिन्न भिन्न पशु पक्षियों को अपनी महत्वाकांक्षा या अपने चारित्र्य का प्रतीक बनाया है। उकाव संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका का, जर्मनी का सिंह और बुलडाग इंग्लैंड का, लड़ते हुए मुर्गे फ्रांस का और भालू पुराने रूस का प्रतीक है। सवाल यह है कि ये सब पशु पक्षी राष्ट्रीय चारित्र्य को किस तरह ले जायेंगे। उन में से ज्यादातर आक्रमणकारी, लड़ाकू और शिकारी जानवर हैं। ऐसी दशा में यह कोई ताज्जुब की बात नहीं है कि जो लोग इन नमूनों को सामन रख कर अपना जीवन निर्माण करते हैं वे जानबूझकर अपना स्वभाव बँसा ही बनाते हैं, आक्रमक रूप अस्तित्व करते हैं दूसरों पर गुरति हैं, गरजते हैं और झपट पड़ते हैं। और यह भी आश्चर्य की बात नहीं है कि हिंदू नरम अहिंसक हैं क्योंकि उनका आदर्श पशु है गाय।”

यह पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने खुद कहा था। सरकार को इस सम्बन्ध में घोषणा

कर देना चाहिये कि गाय हमारा राष्ट्रीय पशु है। जिस प्रकार सरकार ने मोर को अपना राष्ट्रीय पक्षी बताया है उसी तरह गाय को राष्ट्रीय पशु यदि घोषित सरकार कर दे तो बहुत से सवाल अपने आप हल हो जाते हैं। और यह बात स्वर्गीय जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने जो कही थी, उसके अनुसार है।

फिर गोरक्षा का विचार करने के लिए सरकार को एक समिति बनानी चाहिये। यह कहा जाता है कि आधिक दूष्टि से गोवध बन्द करना आसान नहीं है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह सही नहीं है। इसके लिए मैं तर्क प्रस्तुत कर सकता हूँ लेकिन मेरे पास ऐसा करने के लिए समय नहीं है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी गाय, अथवा गोब्रज का कोई भी प्राणी जीव निरर्थक नहीं हो सकता है। उसके गोबर से, गौ मूत्र से खाद तैयार की जा सकती है। उसके मरने के बाद उसके चमड़े से जूते तैयार किये जा सकते हैं। खाने के मामले में जो यह कहा जाता है कि हमारे पास खाना नहीं है, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मनुष्य जो खाता है वह गाय नहीं खाती है इसलिए एक विशेषज्ञों की कमेटी बननी चाहिये जो इस विषय पर विचार करे।

अन्त में मैं एक बात कहूँगा। जहाँ तक आन्दोलन का संबंध है मैं यह कहूँगा कि इस समय उस सूखे की स्थिति है। देश के ऊपर बड़ी भारी आपत्ति है। गांधी जी ने 1934 में जब सत्याग्रह चल रहा था, बिहार के भूकम्प के कारण सत्याग्रह आन्दोलन को स्थगित कर दिया था। इसलिए मैं आन्दोलन करने वालों से कहना चाहता हूँ, जो अनसन कर रहे हैं उन से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि इस समय की परिस्थिति को देखते हुए आन्दोलन का बन्द कर देना चाहिये, हर एक को बन्द कर देना चाहिये। साथ साथ सरकार से यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसकी अपनी नीति को घोषणा कर देनी चाहिये।

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have to now take up the Call Attention Notice.

श्री बागरी (हिसार): ग्रान एं प्वाइंट ग्राफ इन्फार्मेशन।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. We now take up the Call Attention Notice. Shri Warrior.

Shri Bagri: On a point of information, राक मन्ना के चारों तरफ पुलिस के बजाय फो। लगी हुई है। क्या।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is going on without being called. This is not to be recorded.

Shri Bagri**

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We now take up the Call Attention Notice.

18.06 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

PROPOSED STRIKEN OF EXECUTIVE EMPLOYEES OF THE KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD.

Shri Warrior (Trichur): I call the attention of the Minister of Irrigation and Power to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request him that he may make a statement thereon:

"The proposed strike of Executive employees of the Kerala State Electricity Board from 7-12-1966.

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Dr. K. L. Rao): The Kerala State Electricity Board Executive Employees Union covering 76 categories of employees from Line Helper to Junior Engineer, gave notice on 18th November, 1966, to the Chairman, Kerala State Electricity Board, of their intention to go on strike from the midnight of 6-7th December, 1966 to get their demands conceded. The major demands relate to pay revision, grant of dearness allowance linked with cost-of-living index, grant of bonus and

grant of various allowances and concessions. A conciliation meeting was called by the Labour Commissioner, Kerala on 30th November, 1966. The conciliation efforts did not succeed in bringing about a settlement. The Executive Employees of the Board went on mass casual leave on 3rd December, 1966.

2. According to a report received from the State Government on 4th December, 1966, some electric connections were tampered. The State Government have reported that power connection to water supply works was cut off in several places like Trivendrum, Quilon, Kottayam, Alwaye and Chowara.

3. Conciliation meetings held on 3rd December, 1966 and 4th December, 1966, have failed to bring about any settlement. Further details from the State Government are awaited.

4. It is unfortunate that the Kerala State which has suffered considerably due to power shortage during the past few years and which has just recovered from this chronic shortage, should suffer a setback again due to the precipitate action taken by the executive employees of the Board. I would take this opportunity of appealing to the executive employees to call off the proposed strike from 7th December, 1966 in the interest of the country. Given the goodwill and co-operation on both the sides, it should be possible for the executive employees union and the Kerala State Electricity Board to reach a settlement. The Central Government will keep in close touch with further developments in the matter.

Shri Warrior: It is reported in the Press that yesterday and the day before yesterday—two days consecutively—there was absolutely no light in Kerala and not a single bulb was burning in the Kerala State. May I know whether this is a fact and also whether it is a fact that

**Not recorded.