

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put amendment No. 21 to the vote of the House. The question is:

Page 23, omit lines 1 to 8. (21)

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 12 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 12 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall take up the rest of the clauses on the next day.

14.33 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

EIGHTY-SEVENTH REPORT

Shri Yadav Narayan Jadhav (Malegaon): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-Seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd August, 1961."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd August, 1961."

The motion was adopted.

14.33½ hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: BAN ON EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED GOVERNMENT SERVANTS—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Bhadauria on the 11th August, 1961, namely—

"This House is of opinion that Government should bring forward suitable legislation to debar retired Government employees from being re-employed in any Government or private service."

Out of 1 hour and 15 minutes allotted for the discussion, 1 hour and 11 minutes have already been taken up. There are only four minutes left. Shall I give it to the hon. Mover? I have to call the Minister yet.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): I have also to intervene.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, certainly.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Let us extend the time by half an hour more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That will be difficult, because then there will be other Members who would suffer because their resolutions may not come up.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Let us extend it by half an hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right; let us spend half an hour more on this. Shri Tangamani may have a few minutes. Then, I shall call the hon. Minister.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): I rise to support the resolution moved by my hon. friend Shri Bhadauria on the 11th August, 1961.

[Shri Tangamani]

I would like to point out that exemption may be made in the case of class III and class IV employees; also, in certain suitable cases, exemption could be made for re-employment in Government service. There can be no objection, in principle, to the utilisation of the services of capable provided they are fit in body and mind, after the age of superannuation. The objection is, however, to the abuse of the practice.

I remember that on a previous occasion, a discussion was raised on the question of reappointment of re-employment of members of the Railway Board. I distinctly remember that the names of several distinguished members of the railway board who are now in private employment were also mentioned. I also remember that on another occasion, when a discussion arose as to whether the appointment of the former Comptroller and Auditor-General as the Chairman of the Third Finance Commission would not come within the mischief of this.

The framers of the Constitution have thought it fit to provide that those who are in high position should not be lured by any kind of promise when they are in office, and, therefore, they have placed these restrictions. I shall mention only three articles in this connection. The first is article 124 (7) which says:

"No person who has held office as a Judge of the Supreme Court shall plead or act in any court or before any authority within the territory of India."

Distinctly, the framers of the Constitution want to raise the status of the judges of the Supreme Court and they do not want them to practise in the Supreme Court or in any other court in India after their retirement. Here, I must admit that I read in one of the papers the other day that a former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court was taking up some appoint-

ment or had taken up some appointment in the Fruit Packers' Association or something like that, but I find that he has subsequently resigned from that post. But that was a thing which really pained me, when I first learnt of his appointment.

Then, a salutary provision has been made in article 319 (a), which says:

"the Chairman of the Union public Service Commission shall be ineligible for further employment either under the Government of India or under the Government of a State."

A similar provision applies to the members of the State Public Service Commission.

Again, there is article 148(4) which says:

"The Comptroller and Auditor-General shall not be eligible for further office either under the Government of India or under the Government of any State after he has ceased to hold his office."

Here, I would like to recall how there was a discussion initiated by me as to whether it was proper on the part of the former Comptroller and Auditor-General to have accepted the post of the chairman of the Third Finance Commission. The hon. speaker was pleased to observe:

"Although it may not be an office of profit, still, holding an office which is directly under the Government of India may not be a very salutary practice."

Nearly nine members have spoken on this resolution, and I find that six of them, including one Member from the ruling party, did support this resolution. I was pained to find that two or three Members who did not support this could not find any other argument except to state that the talents should not be wasted.

I, for one, would like that those who hold class I posts may be given even more pension; their pension may be enhanced, but their position and their status should not be frittered away by this kind of subsequent appointments.

I remember several Members mentioning the case of the former Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry, who immediately after retirement has become a paid director of Messrs. Martin Burns; several encomia were paid to him by no less a person than the Prime Minister. When we find that such a person of eminence, has secured such a post within even a period of six months after his retirement, that is not a very good thing either for Government or for the post which he was holding.

One Member who did oppose this resolution said that persons in authority—he meant class I officers—should not seek employment for at least two years after retirement. As I mentioned earlier, I do not oppose the idea that the services of persons who have retired may be utilised in the public sector. I shall be failing in my duty, if I do not mention the name of one officer who retired from the railways, and who, I think, was also there on the railway board. I would like to mention his name also. He was one Mr. Ganapati who was responsible for the Chittaranjan, and who was also responsible for building the Integral Coach Factory in time, and whose services in Rourkela have also been appreciated not only by Government but by the employees there also. When we went to Rourkela, we were told that this officer lost his young daughter because there was no proper medical treatment for her. Let not the same be repeated in the case of other employees. Such men are there and their talents should be utilised. If they are utilised by the public sector, I shall be very happy.

But the real point which prompted my hon. friend, the Mover, to come forward with this Resolution is that those who are in power, who have got access to several documents and several secrets of administration should not sell their talents to the private sector. On the previous occasion, I referred to certain articles written by those who were paid by the Government which go against the policy of Government. These articles sought to oppose the public sector. It is this kind of practice which I felt should be discouraged. There must be some move on the part of Government to discourage at least those persons in authority who within a period of at least two years should not take up position in private service and then write articles criticising Government and their policy.

Today we were discussing a very important Bill, the Income-tax Bill. It is a very good thing that the whole income-tax law of 1922 has been revised on the advice of the Law Commission. Several Members have addressed themselves to the point that there has been evasion of the law and the law can be evaded by big business. To my surprise, I found that one of the highest officers, a former Commissioner of Income-tax, is today the consultant of a big business. How can improvement take place because these people who know the workings of the department will be in a position to tell them—I do not suggest that they are going to tell them—all about them. The purpose of appointing them in big business is to see that these talents are utilised for evasion or purposes not beneficial to the Government or the community.

This is the main point on which I wanted to add to the feelings of many Members. I hope when he intervenes the hon. Minister will appreciate the spirit of the Resolution and indicate to us the methods Government are going to adopt to discourage this type of practice of taking appointments by retired government servants in the top category.

Shri Datar: The hon. Mover of this Resolution has put it in very wide terms. The preliminary objection that arises is whether such an absolute ban can be imposed either upon Government servants or—it may also be noted—on the employers in private enterprise. You will kindly see that the wording is:

“This House is of opinion that Government should bring forward suitable legislation to debar retired government employees from being re-employed in any government or private service”.

My first objection is whether any such restrictive ban can be imposed on retired government servants in the wide terms in which the hon. Mover wants us to accept it. Secondly the question arises whether there are any instances where our officers after retirement have abused the position that they formerly held and gave certain unwarranted advantages to their subsequent employers. Therefore, I should like to point out to this House that the circumstances are not of such a nature as to invite the imposition of such a ban, even if it may be otherwise constitutional to do so.

The Resolution resolves itself into two portions. One is that they should not be re-employed in government service at all. Secondly, it is said that they should not be employed in the private sector. For that purpose, he wants restrictive legislation binding on both the Government as also the private sector. So far as Government are concerned, you are aware that we did not accept a recommendation of the Central Pay Commission for the purposes of raising the age of superannuation to 58 because we were anxious that the present age of superannuation, 55, should be adhered to for a variety of reasons so that, as some hon. Members have pointed out, young men should also have an opportunity of occupying such posts. But side by side, it was also to be noted that there are circumstances where there ought to be some sort of

extension of service or re-employment. Government have issued rules stating that specially when there are scientific or technical personnel, when a man belonging to this category retires and the question arises whether he should be re-employed or his services extended, it should be considered. Government have laid it down that in all such cases either of extension or re-employment, the interests of Government ought always to reign supreme. Therefore, in any particular case, the services of an experienced officer are necessary to be continued, Government will re-employ him or will give him extension.

There is a slight technical distinction between extension and re-employment. Extension would be continuation of service and would be confined to the post he had held, whereas in re-employment, there is no such idea of treating it as pensionable and, secondly, he may be appointed to any other post as well.

The general rule in such cases is that Government follow the principle that public interest alone has to be taken into account and not any sort of benefit accruing to the officer concerned. Then certain relaxations have been laid down so far as technical and scientific personnel are concerned. In spite of all the attempts we have been making, as the House is aware, there is still considerable paucity of scientific and technical personnel. In some cases, we have even to go to foreign countries and accept the service of experts on certain terms they demand from us. So these also have to be taken into account. It is not merely that any person can be fit to carry on any work. In fact, the assumption underlying the present Resolution is that any man can carry on any work. That is not at all correct. Secondly, we also take care to see that before an officer occupying, say, a class I post of the all India services retires, attempts are made to

see to it that another officer is properly trained.

Further, whenever it is found that any person desires to accept what is called a commercial appointment under a private firm or business, he cannot do so until two years afterwards if he is a class I officer or if he is an officer of the all-India services, until he has taken permission from Government, because Government would consider whether the advantages that he had and the knowledge that he had were likely to be utilised by him after retirement after acceptance of any such private service. If it is found after enquiries that the particular private undertaking he wants to enter has had no connection with him in his official capacity either with him or with the department, then such a permission is granted. Otherwise such a permission is not granted at all. Certain other rules have also been laid down. The hon. Member who spoke last made a reference to the income-tax Bill also. There also we are going to make a rule. Any officer of the income-tax department otherwise qualified to practise is debarred from practising before any income-tax authority for a period of two years from the date of his retirement or resignation. So, that rule also has been introduced. Wherever a man's services are sought to be extended for what can be called extraneous reasons—not reasons of Government interest—then naturally, he will not be granted such permission.

Then again, a permanent ban cannot be put on the retired servant. After all he is a citizen and is entitled to carry on his work and to follow any profession and to enter any service that he desires but in the interest of the non-abuse of the position that he got under Government service, it has been found reasonable to lay down a restriction and that is the reason why two years' limit had been laid down. Within two years, if he seeks any such employment, he has to take the permission of the Government. If he is in pensionable service,

it has been further laid down that any violation of such a rule would entail the stoppage of his pension. That is the way in which indirectly this restriction can be properly exercised. Lastly, such instances are not many. I have got before me figures about the permission granted in such cases. In 1956-57 there were only 58 cases of class I officers. The number of IAS, IPS and other officers runs into thousands and out of them only 58 cases were granted permission. In 1957-58 the number was 48; the next year, it was 70. The total for the three years is 176. Permission was granted in all cases except nine persons where it was found that it would not be in public interest to do so. So far as the extension of service is concerned, in 1957-58 there were only 215 cases of extension. They were not for a long period at all. Let it not be supposed that we grant extension or employment as a matter of course; we want to reduce the period also and the most important criterion is public interest. Now, so far as these 215 cases are concerned, cases in which the period was less than six months were 22, between six months and one year, 62; between one and two years, 22, between two and three years, 7; and over three years only 4. This number is very small when compared to the thousands of officers in class I. In 1958-59 the number was only 43. There is another kind of case also that applies to displaced government servants who came over to India after having occupied some Government position in the present Pakistan and the former States of Sind, etc. In their cases, before they are superannuated, Government have to consider their service in Pakistan also for the purpose of finalising their pension papers. It is for this purpose that a relaxation has been made so far as this rule is concerned. So, when the pension papers are not available and when certain material which is absolutely essential is not available either from Pakistan or otherwise, re-employment is granted to such people on humanitarian grounds. It may also be noted that in

[Shri Datar]

1958-59 the number was about 139 so far as re-employment is concerned and in 1959-60 it was 119 in respect of class I and 111 in respect of class II. Thus you will find that Government take the fullest care to see that whenever an extension is to be granted or re-employment is made, it is to be done solely in the public interest.

The question to be considered is whether his service is absolutely essential, whether he can or cannot be replaced by any other person. We always insist upon a particular department training officers well in advance before the particular officer superannuates. When there is paucity so far as technical and scientific personnel is concerned, Government take full care to see that Government work is not affected and development projects are not impeded.

Lastly, in respect of private service, they are their own masters. So far as the development of India is concerned, we naturally give the largest amount of importance to the public sector. But in the Indian economy we have got the private sector as well and the private sector has also to subserve the public interest. When this question arose some years ago, our late Home Minister, Pantji had to consider the whole question. He laid down that in proper cases, subject to the condition that the Government's interests were not affected, we ought to encourage private sector also and we ought to encourage people who are fairly energetic and have sufficient vitality to take service to improve their chances as well as for another human reason. When a man is drawing a high pay and he is to retire, then his income drops by a large extent. When it drops like that, it is far less than even half of what he was drawing, in that case he ought to be allowed, at least on humanitarian grounds, to supplement his income by proper and legitimate methods. But if he abuses his position, action has to be taken. My hon. friend put it very widely and in some

cases used unfair and uncharitable expressions also about the Government servants. So far as the general class of Government servants are concerned, they are carrying their work efficiently and you can trust them and their probity even after they have retired from Government service. It is not as if they carry on their work honestly while in Government service but the moment they retire they think of personal aggrandisement and make wrong use of the opportunities that they had or of the experience they had gathered while in Government service.

That is not a correct position to state.

15 hrs.

May I now turn, in general terms, to the various hon. Members who brought in certain names? In respect of those names that they brought in, the information was in a large number of cases absolutely inaccurate. Actually, there are certain Government servants who have been taken over to public Government undertakings. That does not mean that they have retired; that does not mean that they have been taken in only for the purpose of advancing their own interests. A number of officers whose names were mentioned by hon. Members have been in Government service, and they have been carrying on their work even now with full efficiency; especially when such public undertakings have to be started and especially when we require a large number of experienced people in respect of the administrative as also other fields, it is in the interests of the nation that we utilise the services of such officers. We utilise them especially because of the very rich and ripe wisdom and experience that they have had during their long years of service.

Lastly, may I also mention that they are also patriots? That aspect

should be understood. Let us not damn this very important class of officers. Our developmental work has to be carried on through the machinery of a large body of Government servants and official personnel. If they do not work properly, if they work unfairly, if they take undue advantage, then we have the Government Servants' Conduct Rules and under that, they can be pulled up and proper action can be taken against them. In proper cases they can even be dismissed from service. That is what Government have been doing.

It is not in proper taste to go on speaking about officers including those in the judicial service in highly unfair terms. It was stated by one hon. Member—I would not like to repeat that word which he used—that the Constitution was being strangled by them for the purpose of a future advantage to themselves after retirement. I should like on this occasion to correct that impression about the officers in general and the officers in the judicial service in particular. They do not look forward to their re-employment or to the employment under Government undertakings. In all such cases, often times, as you are aware, even the hon. Members opposite insist that a particular piece of work or an enquiry ought to be carried on through a retired high court judge or a retired Supreme Court judge, and thus, indirectly, they give compliments to our high officers and rightly so. But when they discuss the whole question in a certain manner, certain expressions are used which are far from correct and which are far from dignified and which are likely to be mistaken by the citizens of India.

Our judicial officers in particular are doing very well without expecting anything more than what they are legitimately getting for the purpose of administering justice in an even-handed manner between people and people and, as you are aware, between the people and the Govern-

ment also. They are no respecter of persons or institutions. Therefore, certain unfortunate expressions which were used by certain hon. friends should not be taken very seriously. Possibly, in the heat of the moment, these expressions have been used. We should try to see that our officers are encouraged whenever they carry on their good work. We should not make any sweeping remarks about the officers and others.

As I have stated, the Government have in their armoury more than sufficient powers to take action against a defaulting officer. In the circumstances, I should like to oppose this resolution. I should also like to point out to the sponsor of this resolution that it would not be in the interests of the development of India, if, by such a sweeping resolution or any sweeping legislation, he wants us to accede to his wish; then we will be depriving ourselves of the services of a large class of officers, even though, under the existing rules, they are superannuated at a certain age. I have seen a number of officers who have to be superannuated at 55 even though they could carry on their work very well. But here, we have rightly not accepted the Central Pay Commission's report, because we desire that other younger people should also have a chance. But it does not mean that in all proper cases, when there is no officer to take up that particular position, we should deny ourselves the advantages of the ripe wisdom and the experience of retired officers. Therefore, I would request the hon. Mover of this resolution not to press this resolution. If he presses, we shall have to oppose it.

श्री अर्जुन सिंह भदरिजा (इटावा)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने जिस समय ११ अगस्त को यह प्रस्ताव सदन में उपस्थित किया था, मैं ने यह निश्चित किया था कि यदि शासक दल के माननीय सदस्यों श्री माननीय मिनिस्टर आफ स्टेट की तरफ से कुछ प्रभावशाली और प्राणवान् तथ्य मेरे इस संकल्प के

[श्री अर्जुन सिंह भदौरि 1]

विरोध में उपस्थित किये जायेंगे, तो मैं इसे भवश्य ही वापस ले लूंगा। लेकिन शासक दल के सब माननीय सदस्यों और अभी अभी माननीय मिनिस्टर आफ़ स्टेट के भाषण सुन कर मैं ने यह अनुभव किया कि कोई भी ऐसे तथ्य अभी तक इस सम्बन्ध में नहीं रखे गये कि जिस से मैं इस संकल्प को वापस लू।

एक बात यह कही गई है कि सेवा से निवृत्त कुछ अधिकारियों पर कीचड़ उछाला गया है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा मेरा या हमारे किसी भी सदस्य का कोई इरादा नहीं था। मैं बहुत ही साफ़ शब्दों में बताना चाहता हूँ कि खुदा की तरफ़ से न तो कोई ईमानदार पैदा होता है और न बेईमान बन कर आता है; कुछ ऐसे सर्कमस्टान्सिज़, कुछ ऐसी स्थितियाँ होती हैं, जो आदमी को ईमानदार और बेईमान बनाती हैं। हम को, आप को और विशेष तौर पर शासन को इस बात पर हमेशा ध्यान रखना होगा, कड़ाई रखनी होगी कि हम ऐसे साधन अपने कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध न होने दें, जिस से कि उन में कोई क्षराबी आ जाये।

जहाँ तक इस प्रस्ताव का प्रश्न है, यह प्रस्ताव किसी व्यक्ति विशेष के बारे में, या किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को देख कर उपस्थित नहीं किया गया है। यह प्रस्ताव और इस की मंशा नीतियों और बुनियादी सिद्धान्तों पर आधारित है और उन्हीं बुनियादी नीतियों और सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर मैं ने यह प्रस्ताव इस सदन में उपस्थित किया है। आज भी मेरा यह मत है कि सेवा से निवृत्त कर्मचारियों के नजी क्षेत्र में, या सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में जाने पर जब तक प्रतिबन्ध नहीं लगेगा, तब तक हम अपने शासन की गोपनीयता को कायम नहीं रख सकते हैं। पिछले दिनों जब हिन्दुस्तान में दलाई लामा साहब आने नहीं पाये और उन के आने की खबर हिन्दुस्तान के अखबारों में निकल भी नहीं पाई कि उस से पूर्व ही चीन के अखबार और रेडियो ने उस खबर को

प्रकाशित और प्रसारित कर दिया। हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत के लिये यह एक बहुत बड़ी चेतावनी है।

मैं ने उस दिन भी कहा था और आज भी दोहराता हूँ कि जो अधिकारी रिटायर होने वाले होते हैं, रिटायर होने के पहले ही उन की एक आख़ सरकारी काम पर और एक आख़ हिन्दुस्तान के समायादारों के दफ़्तरों पर और शानदार बंगलों पर लगी रहती है। जैसे ही उन्हें छुट्टी मिलती है वे लोग वहाँ जा कर के वे प्राइवेट सैक्टर के किसी अडरटेकिंग में लग जाते हैं। जिन सरकारी पदों पर उन्होंने काम किया होता है और जिन कर्मचारियों ने उनके मातहत रह कर काम किया होता है, उन पर उनका कुछ न कुछ प्रभाव होना ही है और उन के उस दफ़्तर से चले जाने के बाद भी वह प्रभाव अपने स्थान पर बना रहता है और वे वहाँ से कई तरह के काम निकलवान में सफल हो जाते हैं। इससे हमेशा ही दफ़्तरों की गोपनीयता जोकि शासन का एक छिपा हुआ और बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण अंग है, अंग होने का खतरा बना रहता है, उसमें हमेशा दरार पड़न का भवसर रहता है, मौका रहता है। इस वास्ते मैं माननीय मंत्री जी तथा इस सदन से अपील करूंगा कि हम को एक जीभ से काम करना चाहिये। हम देखते हैं कि जब हम सदन से बाहर होते हैं तो इस प्रकार के संकल्पों के समर्थन में बहुत कुछ कह जाते हैं, लेकिन जब सदन के बाहर बोलने के लिए खड़े होते हैं तो दूसरी ही जीभ से बोलते हैं, इस प्रकार के संकल्पों का विरोध करते हैं। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि एक जीभ होनी चाहिये और वही बात कहें और करें जो हम सदन के अन्दर या सदन से बाहर कहते हैं। यह जो संकल्प है, यह जो प्रस्ताव है, अगर यह सही और ठीक है तो सदन के अन्दर और सदन के बाहर दोनों जगहों पर सही और ठीक है और अगर सही और ठीक नहीं है तो दोनों जगहों में से कहीं भी सही और ठीक नहीं है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर देश की बेरोज़गारी को, देश की बकारी को खत्म करना है तो फिर हर हालत में इस संकल्प को स्वीकार आपको करना ही होगा। अगर इस मुल्क के अन्दर काम में तेज़ी, फुर्ती और चुस्ती लानी है, तो उसके लिए भी यह आवश्यक है कि इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार कर लिया जाये। राष्ट्र के निर्माण की बात माननीय मंत्री जी ने कही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर राष्ट्र के निर्माण का जज़बा उनके मस्तिष्क में है तो उससे कहीं अधिक मात्रा में वह हिन्दुस्तान के हर इन्सान के मस्तिष्क में है। हर हिन्दुस्तान का इन्सान इस देश को एक नया रूप देना चाहता है और हिन्दुस्तान को नये ढंग पर बनाना और बसाना चाहता है। इस वास्ते अगर हिन्दुस्तान को नये ढंग पर बनाना और बसाना है तो मेरे इस संकल्प के समर्थन में, मैं चाहूँगा, सभी माननीय सदस्य मत दें और इसे पास करें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that Government should bring forward suitable legislation to debar retired Government employees from being re-employed in any Government or private service."

The Resolution was negatived

15.14 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: FIXATION OF PRICE OF JUTE AND DISCUSSION RE: SCARCITY OF RAW JUTE*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Venkateswar Rao. He is absent. Shri Indrajit Gupta.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta—South West): **Mr. Deputy-Speaker,** this resolution was allotted to the Food and Agriculture Ministry. But I do not see anybody here from that Ministry.

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): I am looking after this.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I am very happy. I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that minimum and maximum prices of raw jute should be statutorily fixed and enforced."

Happily, as circumstances have it, this debate becomes rather in the nature of a continuation of a similar debate which took place yesterday and which is still unfinished on a very similar and allied subject. Therefore, my task is made somewhat easier, because the same Minister also is here and it is not necessary for me to repeat many of the things said yesterday.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then he should be brief.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I shall be as brief as I can. Today there is a specific issue in this resolution—the question of fixation of price of raw jute. As far as we are able to learn, at this very moment perhaps today there is a conference taking place between the Central Government and representatives of the IJMA in Delhi to discuss this very question. Therefore, the debate in his House has a very significant bearing upon what the possible future outcome of this discussion on price fixation is going to be.

The problem, as we see it, is this. I do not think there is anybody who on principle theoretically disputes the case for the fixation of a floor or minimum price. As I had mentioned yesterday, the Chief Minister of my State, Dr. B. C. Roy has only a couple of days ago emphasised this point in a public statement and made it quite clear that unless some arrangement is made for the fixation of a floor price, neither will the jute cultivator be guaranteed any sort of protection against the interests which are trying to fleece him, viz., the middlemen and the jute mills and the big jute dealers

*The Chair later decided that the discussion re: Scarcity of Raw Jute may be taken up together with that on the Resolution re: Fixation of Price of Jute (Vide Cois 259-60).