

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE NOTIFICATION ISSUED BY PRESIDENT UNDER THE MYSORE BETTING TAX ACT, 1932

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) of a the Government of Mysore Notification S.O. No, 1340, dated the 19th July, 1971, under sub-section (2) of section 8A of the Mysore Betting Tax Act, 1932, read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation, dated the 27th March, 1971, issued by the President in relation to the the State of Mysore. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT—1354/71]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE NOTIFICATIONS

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) of each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) :—

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 1756, dated the 20th November, 1971, together with an Explanatory Memorandum thereon.

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 1845, dated the 7th December, 1971, together with an Explanatory Memorandum thereon. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT.— 1356/71] for (i) and (ii)]

THE DELHI ADMINISTRATION NOTIFICATION

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table :

(i) A copy (in English and Hindi) of the Delhi Administration Notification No. F. 4(132)/69-Fin. (G), dated the 24th November, 1971, under sub-section (4) of section 26 of the Bengal Finance (Sales Tax) Act, 1941, as in force in the Union Territory of Delhi.

(ii) A statement (in English and Hindi) giving reasons for the delay in laying on the Table the Notification mentioned above. [Placed in Library.

See No. LT. 1355/71 for (i) and (ii)]

STATEMENT BY MINISTER REPROCEDURES GOVERNING IMPORT OF TRACTORS

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE/
कृषि मन्त्रालय में राज्य मन्त्री (SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE). Sir, I beg to lay on the table a statement in English and Hindi regarding procedures governing the import of tractors and price fixation of tractors, with reference to the reply to starred Question No. 361 given in the Rajya Sabha on December 1, 1971. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT. — 1367/71]

TWENTY-SECOND REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE 1971-72)

श्री श्यामलाल यादव : श्रीमन्, मैं आपकी आज्ञा से सरकार द्वारा लोक लेखा समिति की उसके सीमा शुल्क के सम्बन्ध में 110वें प्रतिवेदन (1969-70) में निहित सिफारिशों पर सरकार द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के संबंध में लोक लेखा समिति (1971-72) के बाईसवें प्रतिवेदन की एक प्रति सभा पटल पर रखता हूँ।

STATEMENT BY MINISTER RE EXPLOSION IN A CINEMA HALL UN KISHANGANJ IN BIHAR

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
गृह कार्य मन्त्रालय में राज्य मन्त्री (SHRI K.C. PANT) : Sir, may I make a statement ? In the first week of November, 1971 an explosion took place in a cinema hall in Kishanganj in Bihar and an incident of sabotage took place on the railway line between Kishanganj and Hatwar. The investigation of the cases is in progress. There were some newspaper reports to insinuate that some report had been submitted by the Central Bureau of Investigation disclosing the involvement of a Minister in the State Government and a former Minister

in (these cases of sabotage. Reference to these reports was also made in this House. The fact of the matter is that the Central Bureau of Investigation has not undertaken any investigation any of these cases ; nor has it submitted any report to the Central Government. There is no information either with the Central or State Government to suggest that any Minister or any former Minister in Bihar is involved in the activities of saboteurs or agents.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE NORTH-EASTERN COUNCIL BILL, 1971

SECRETARY : Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha : —

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the North-Eastern Council Bill, 1971, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd December, 1971.

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : Sir...

MR. CHAIRMAN \ Not now, but at one o'clock.

THE INDUSTRIES (DEVELOPMENT) AND REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1971— contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We shall now take up the clause-by clause consideration of the Bill. Clause 2, there are not amendments.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill Clause 3—Insertion of new section

15/1. SHRI KALYAN ROY
(West Bengal) : Sir, I move :

"That at page 2, for lines 25 to 39 the following be substituted, namely": —

"15A. Where a company, owning an industrial undertaking, is being wound up by or under the supervision of the High Court, and the business of such company is not being continued, the Central Government may take over the industrial undertaking without any investigation."

Sir, I hope the Minister of Industrial Development will kindly consider the points that I am raising. I know his intentions are perhaps good, but unless he removes the in-built impediments, the whole purposes of the Bill will be lost. The Minister has said in Lok Sabha that the proposed Bill is to enable the Government to take over speedily the management of industrial undertakings in certain circumstances without any investigation. The whole Bill actually was conceived after the closure of the Saksaria Textile Mills at Bombay. The Prime Minister assured, that this Mill would be taken over two years back. Immediately the employers got scent of it. They went to the High Court and the whole take-over was stopped. My submission is this. This going to the High Court has become a disease with the employers, whenever they know that the Government intends to take over any mill. Now in regard to the textile mills in Bengal the Government said that out of 9 mills closed down, 4 are pending in the High Court for liquidation. You are limiting authority of the Government to take over whenever a proceeding is pending in the High Court. This is wrong. This will completely defeat the whole purpose. So, my amendment is very small and very helpful in the sense that if the case is pending in the High Court and the Government intends to take it over, then the High Court should not refuse permission, investigation will delay, as it has happened. Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhary conceived of this Bill because of the closure of the Saksaria Textile Mills. Then, you are suspending all liabilities. When the case is pending in the High Court, why should you assume the liability just because the case is pending in the High Court ?

In textile mills, in coal mines, in engineering factories and in sugar factories nun-