CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED WARNING BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE WATER SUPPLY AND SEWAGE DISPOSAL COMMITTEE OF THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION DELHI, FOR STOPPAGE OF THE SUPPLY OF DRINKING WATER TO THE NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTTEE IN CASE OF ITS FAILURE TO PAY THE ARREARS

डा० भाई महावीर (दिल्ली) : दिल्ली नगर निगम की जल-प्रदाय तथा मल-व्ययन समिति के चेयरमैन द्वारा दी गई इस चेतावनी के समाचार की ओर कि यदि नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका 30 सितम्बर, 1970 तक 53.19 लाख रुपए की बकाया राशि का भुगतान करने मे विफल रहती है तो उसके अधीन क्षेत्रों में वितरण के लिए उसे पीने के पानी की सप्लाई बंद की जा सकती है, मैं स्वास्थ्य तथा परिवार नियोजन और निर्माण, आवास और नगर विकास मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूं।

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING AND WORKS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, it has been reported in the press that Shri V. D. Sharma, Chairman of the Water Supply Committee of the Municipal Corporation of Delhi has warned that if the New Delhi Municipal Committee fails to pay the arrears of charges of bulk supply of water given to it by the Delhi Municipal Corporation by the end of September, 1970 water supply to the New Delhi Municipal Committee would be stopped. The Water Supply and Sewage Disposal Undertaking have stated that in the handout for the press, Shri Sharma did not say that water supply to the New Delhi Municipal Committee would be stopped. They have further stated that Shri Sharma merely said that some stern measures will have to be taken in dealing with the situation.

The dispute between the Municipal Corporation of Delhi and the New Delhi Municipal Committee regarding the water charges to be paid by the latter to the former is an old one Prior to the formation of the Municipal Corporation of Delhi on the 7th April, 1958, filtered water was being supplied in bulk by the erstwhile Joint Water and Sewage Board to the erstwhile New Delhi Municipal Committee area through various mains emanating from service reservoirs where bulk meters were provided to record the qunatities of water supplied to the New Delhi Municipal Committee. After the formation of the Corporation, some areas of the erstwhile New Delhi Municipal Committee were transferred to the Corporation and as such a few of the water distribution mains from the reservoirs became common. Since the meters were provided only at the reservoirs, it became difficult to apportion the bulk quantities between the areas ceded to the Corporation and the present New Delhi Municipal Committee area.

The Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 provided, *inter alia* that the Corporation shall be bound to make bulk water supply to the N.D.M.C. and for the purpose of measuring and recording the quantity of water supplied to the N.D.M.C., shall affix meters at points of junction between the communication pipes of the N.D.M.C. and the Corporation. Both these bodies mutually agreed on an *ad-hoc* basis for apportionment of the total bulk supply in the erstwhile New Delhi Municipal Committee area. The agreed formula somehow did not work and dispute arose between the parties regarding quantity of water supplied to the New Delhi Municipal Committee. The Municipal Corporation of Delhi continued to bill the N.D.M.C. according to their own calculations and the N.D.M.C. kept on making payments on *ad-hoc* basis.

In 1965, both the parties resolved to refer the dispute to the then Chief Commissioner of Delhi for arbitration. The matters referred for arbitration were the quantity of water supplied in bulk by the Corporation to the N.D.M.C. from the year 1958-59 onwards, the correctness of the calculation of the supply of water in this regard, and the proportion in which the cost of disposal of sewage has been apportioned between the two parties from the year 1958-59 onwards and the correctness of the calculation of cost in this regard.

The Chief Commissioner gave his first award which was a part award because it pertained only to the quantity of water supplied by the Corporation to the N.D.M.C. from 1958-59 onwards on 7th June, 1966. The arbitrator divided the Mains in three groups. Under group 'A' were included the Mains exclusively for the N.D.M.C. area, group 'B' comprised the common Mains and in group 'C' were included the Mains exclusively for the Corporation area. The Chief Commissioner directed that the N.D.M.C. will pay for 100% of the quantity of water supplied through the supply lines in Group 'A', 70% of the

[Shri K.K. Shah]

quantity of water supplied through the supply lines in group 'B' and that the Corporation will bear full cost of the quantity of water supplied through the supply lines in group 'C'. In respect of two particular supply lines where certain ancillary issues were involved, the Chief Commissioner indicated specific calculations to define liabilities. This award was accepted by the N.D.M.C. but the Corporation represented against it on the ground that it was based on certain factual errors. The Lt. Governor of Delhi, formerly the Chief Commissioner, made an order on the 13th June, 1969 in which he directed the Corporation to complete by September, 1969 the steps necessary for re-arranging the distribution system and affixing suitable meters at all the points necessary in such a way that the supply actually made to the N.D.M.C. thereafter could be correctly and independently measured and until this was done, the basis adopted in his award in June, 1966 would be continued beyond March, 1967. He also re-affixed the calculations given by him in his earlier award regarding one particular main line. He further determined the rates to be adopted for the cost of supply of water and bulk disposal of sewage. This award was not questioned by the N.D.M.C. but the Corporation represented to the Lt. Governor against it on the grounds that they had completed all the necessary metering before the 1st April, 1969 and that they were not agreed to accept the continuance beyond 31st March, 1967 of the basis earlier adopted upto that date.

The Lt. Governor made another order on the 19th December, 1969 in which he decided as follows :

(1) Bill sent by the Corporation which are based on actual measurements recorded from meters fixed after 31st March, 1969 should be paid by the N.D.M.C. as and when received.

(2) If the N.D.M.C. questions the correctness of the readings of the meters, the Committee should first make payments for bills received and then ask for checking according to the procedure laid down, of the meters considered to be faulty. and

(3) In respect of the period from the 1st April, 1967 to the 31st March, 1969 the quantity supplied in bulk to the N.D.M.C. should be calculated on the basis of average recordings on the newly installed meters after making allowance for the supply each year having been to some extent in excess of the supply made in the previous years. The details of quantities to be billed for 1967-68 and 1968-69 will be separately set out and communicated to the two local bodies. The Corporation in the meantime may submit its demands based on actual meter recordings for final adjustment in accordance with the principle enumerated above.

This order was not questioned by the Corporation but the N.D.M.C. represented against this order mainly on the grounds that certain meters had been out of order for long periods, that some meters were got fixed much later as against the contention of the Corporation that they were in position by 1-4-1969, and that there was duplication in measurements leading to inflated billing.

The Lt. Governor passed another order on the 4th February, 1970 which order was superseded by another order passed on 5th February, 1970. By virtue of the 5th February order, he stayed the operation of his earlier order of December, 1969 on the representation of the N.D.M.C. Thereafter, the Lt. Governor directed the Chief Engineer, Floods, Delhi Administration to carry out checking in the company of the Chief Engineers of the N.D.M.C. and the Corporation or their nominees the claim of the Corporation that all the necessary meters as had been ordered to be installed in his order of the 13th June, 1969, had been installed by the end of March, 1969 and the contention of the N.D.M.C. that this had not been done. After receiving the report of the Chief Engineer, Floods, the Lt. Governor passed another order on the 10th March, 1970 in which the decided :

(1) That bills sent by the Corporation for the first three quarters of 1969-70 shall be paid by the N.D.M.C. immediately. The amount of Rs. 28 lakhs paid by the N.D.M.C. to the Corporation at the instance of the Government of India shall be adjusted towards the dues for supply of water and sewage disposal during the year 1969-70.

(2) In respect of the period from 1-4-67 to 31-3-69, the Corporation would prepare a revised bill on the basis of average recordings on the newly installed meters during 1969-70. The quantity supplied in bulk to the N.D.M.C. shall be 2% less during 1968-69 and 4% less during 1967-68 as compared to the metered supply during 1969-70. The sum of Rs. 20 lakhs paid by the N.D.M.C. to the Corporation earlier shall be adjusted towards arrears for supply of water and the disposal of sewage for the period from 1-4-1967 to 31-3-1969.

(3) The rate of payment of water supplied during the period 1-4-67 to 31-3-69 will be 46 paise per 1000 gallons. The rate for water supply during 1969-70 will be 58.6: per 1000 gallons subject to adjustment in the bill for the fourth quarter of 1969-70.

This order has not been questioned by the Corporation but the N.D.M.C. considered it in its meeting dated 3rd April, 1970 and passed a resolution to the effect that the award of 13th June, 1969 may be considered as final. Accordingly they represented to the Lt. Governor against it mainly on the grounds that the necessary meters had not been installed by the Corporation till late in the year 1969-70 and that other directions regarding double locking of the meters, etc., given in his order of the 13th June, 1969 had not been complied with by the Corporation. The Lt. Governor requested the Chief Executive Councillor to call a meeting of both the parties and to hear them. The Chief Executive Councillor held a meeting on the 6th May, 1970 and thereafter both the parties have submitted their respective viewpoints in black and white to him. The matter now rests there.

Meanwhile the Corporation is stated to have sent bills in the amount of Rs. 42.19 lakhs pertaining to the period ending March, 1970 and Rs. 11 lakhs for the period from April, 1970 to June, 1970 making a total of Rs. 53.19 lakhs to the N.D.M.C. for payment. The stand taken by the N.D.M.C. is that the payments made already by them are in excess of what is due from them upto 31st March, 1970 and unless their latest representation made to the Lt. Governor is decided, they are not prepared to make any further payment on this account. The amount due has been calculated by the Corporation on the basis of the Lt. Governor's orders of March, 1970 whereas the N.D.M.C. have calculated it on the basis of his orders of the 13th June, 1969.

SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, on a point of order. Asimilar statement was given, I think, last week and you were in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No. . . . About this?

SHRI S. D. MISRA : Not about this. It was a big statement.

The Minister has now taken fifteen minutes to read the statement. I assume it will be about eight or nine pages and so many dates and so many figures have been given. How to follow up immediately and put questions. A similar statement was made about another Calling-Attention Notice. We requested you and if I remember, either you or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : No.

SHRI S. D. MISRA : Either you were in the Chair or somebody. We had requested that such a long statement should be laid on the Table of the House and only then we should be allowed to put questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

SHRI S. D. MISRA : I do not know if the Chairman has followed all these dates, etc. How can we put questions when we have not followed it? What is your direction in this matter? You said that you would look into the matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Not about this. It was about another matter. The matter with which we were concerned before to which you have drawn my attention was a statement made by the Minister not relating to any Calling Attention Motion. So far no question has arisen before me with reference to the Calling Attention Motion, whether the statement can be laid on the Table or not. I understand from my office that so far in no case has any statement with regard to Calling Attention Motions been laid on the Table. But I can say this that the statements which the Ministers have to make should be shorter, if possible.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Sir, I am bound to carry out your instructions. But the Calling Attention Notice was received on the previous day. All the Members are interested in it. It is an important and urgent matter and if I do not read out all the facts for the information of the House, how will they be able to understand it? It is for you to decide it and I am prepared to carry out your orders.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. D. MISRA : There can be many suggestions on this. At least today the problem has come before the House. I do not object to such bigger statements; let them be still bigger, 10 pages and more. But there is one suggestion which I want to make. At least those Members who have given notice may be supplied with the statement so that we can borrow from them and understand it. What is the difficulty in circulating the statement to those Members, if not to all?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) : Thank God, the Minister had only one day to prepare the statement. If he had three days, the statement would have been still longer. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. K. SHAH : The statement contains so many facts and figures. If I omit one fact and become unfair to one or the other by omitting something, you will take me to task. This is a matter which has been pending from 1958 to 1970.

(*Interruptions*)

श्री लाल श्राडवाणी (दिल्ली): मैं यह ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं कि पिछली बार जब यह सवाल खड़ा हुश्रा . . .

श्री सभापति : सवाल इसके मुताल्लिक नहीं था . . .

श्री लाल श्राडवाणी : वह कालिंग अटेन्शन के बारे में ही था श्रौर एक कापी जब उसकी श्री भूपेश गुप्त को मिल गई . . .

श्री सभापति : तो मैं नहीं रहा हूंगा चेयर में।

श्री लाल श्राडवाणी : लेकिन वह कालिंग अटेन्शन के संबध में ही था।

MR CHAIRMAN : I was in the Chair when an oral statement was made by a Minister; it was not on a Calling Attention Motion.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : I think it was about the Calling Attention Motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Anyway, I will look into it. But I have now said that the statements made by the Ministers in response to the Calling Attention Motions should be as short as possible. Of course I cannot lay down any hard and fast rule about the length of the statements but it is for the Ministers to judge it. But I expect that the statements should be as short as possible.

SHRI S. D. MISRA: Probably I could not make my point clear. I did not mean to suggest that the statement should be short. It should be short, to the extent possible but if the Minister says that nine pages are the shortest possible in the circumstances, in that case, I say that because it is a long statement, you should determine how to proceed so that we know beforahand how to put questions.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन् श्राप खुद ही देखिए, इस बात पर छ: श्रौर श्राठ मिनट का समय क्यों ले लिया गया।

श्री सभापति : श्राप बैठ जाइये।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Misra's point I will consider. I will examine the rules and I will consider it.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair].

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Dr. Mahavir.

डा० भाई महावीर : श्रीमन्, जितना लम्बा वक्तव्य मंत्री महोदय ने दिया है, उतना लम्बा सवाल मैं नहीं पूछूंगा श्रौर श्रगर वे स्वास्थ्य मंत्री नहीं होते तो इतना लम्बा वक्तव्य पढ़ने की उन्हें कठिनाई नहीं होती। लेकिन बाकी विभागों के साथ स्वास्थ्य की भी चिन्ता वे करते हैं, इसलिए वे इतनी दिलेरी से ऐसे श्रोर्डियल में से गुजरे, इसके लिए मैं उन्हें बधाई देता हूं। लेकिन जिस प्रकार से इस सवाल को केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अभी तक निपटाया है, लटकाने की कोशिश की है, उसके लिए मैं उन्हें बधाई नहीं दे सकता हूं तथा इसके लिए मुझे खेद है।

मंत्री महोदय ने जो बातें कहीं श्रौर जितना लम्बा वक्तव्य दिया उतना लम्बा सवाल न पूछते हुए मै दो तीन बातों की तरफ स्पष्ट श्रौर प्वाइंटेड प्रश्न करना चाहूंगा। पहले दोनों श्रध्यक्षों में यानी नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी श्रौर दिल्ली कार्पोरेशन के बीच झगड़ा चलता रहा श्रौर उसके बाद यह फैसला हुश्रा कि होम सेक्रेटरी श्री एल० पी० सिंह इसमें बीच बचाव करेंगे। श्री एल० पी० सिंह के बीच में पड़ने के बाद दोनों संस्थाश्रों के इंजीनियरों ने इन प्वाइन्टसो से संबंधित झगड़ों का निरीक्षण किया जहां पर मीटर लगे हुए थे। उन्होंने यह देखा कि वहां पर मीटर ठीक तरह से लगे हुए हैं या नहीं। नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपेल्टी श्रौर कारपोरेशन के वाटर से संबंधित चीफ इंजीनियरों ने इस चीज का निरीक्षण किया, लेकिन निरीक्षण करने के बाद नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपेल्टी के चीफ इंजीनियर ने उस पर दस्तख़त करने से इन्कार कर दिया। जब उन से पूछा गया कि श्राप इस पर दस्तखत क्यों नहीं

करते हैं तो उन्होंने जवाब दिया कि मुझे इस तरह के आदेश नहीं हैं कि मैं दस्तखत करूं। मुझे तो केवल निरीक्षण करने के आदेश है और दस्तखत करने के आदेश नहीं हैं। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपेल्टी कमेटी के प्रतिनिधि जो उसके प्रधान की ओर से वहां पर गये हुए थे वे इस मामले को निपटाना नही चाहते थे बल्कि जो आदेश दिए गये थे उनका भी वे पालन करना नही चाहते थे और उससे अपने को अलग रखना चाहते थे। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हू कि क्या यह बात सच है। और अगर यह बात सच है तो इस मामले को निपटाने में बाधा आई या नही।

मैं यह भी पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह बात सच है कि 53 लाख रु० देने की बात जो कही गई है वह नहीं दिया गया है। माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा कि पानी बद करने की धमकी नहीं दी गई है। मैं समझता हूं कि जल प्रदाय तथा मल व्ययन समिति के चेयरमैन की सज्जनता और सयमता है जो उन्होने इस तरह की धमकी नही दी है। लेकिन उनकी सज्जनता और संयमता का जो परिणाम हुआ है कि कारपोरेशन को आज इस समय लगभग 2 करोड़ 10 लाख रुपया पानी के खाते में नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपेलिटी से लेना बाकी है। 53 लाख रु० जो हैं वह तो एक दूसरे एकाउन्ट में उनके नाम पर हैं। क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपेलिटी जो कि पूर्णतया एक नामिनेटिड बाडी है उससे कारपोरेशन का जो रुपया अभी तक बाकी पड़ा हुआ है उसको दिलाने की कोशिश करेगी और इस रुपये को दिलाने के लिए वह कानूनी तौर पर जिम्मेदार है या नही? अगर है, तो मंत्री महोदय का यह कहना कि 1958 से यह मामला लटक रहा है और लटका देने की जो नौबत आई, उसके लिए कानूनी जिम्मेदारी होते हुए भी आप ने इस तरह की नौबत क्यों आने दी।

आपने एक बार फैसला करके जो कम ज्यादा पैसा होता था और जो पैसा मिलना चाहिए कारपोरेशन को वह आपने क्यों नहीं दिलवाया? मैं यह भी पूछना चाहता हूं कि इस तरह का झगड़ा बिजली के बारे में है या नहीं। यह दो पैसे प्रति यूनिट टैक्स जो कारपोरेशन लेता है वह नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी जो अपने इलाके में बिजली सप्लाई करती है लेती है लेकिन वह टैक्स लोगों से ले लिया जाता है, कारपोरेशन को नही दिया जाता जबकि कारपोरेशन से बिजली ले ली जाती है। वह टैक्स और दिल्ली के नागरिक देते हैं, नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी के इलाके में रहने वाले लोग भी उस टैक्स को नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी के पास पहूंचा देते हैं लेकिन म्युनिसिपल कमेटी उसको कारपोरेशन के हवाले नही करती। अगर ऐसा है तो ऐसा क्यों है? अगर टैक्स नही देना है तो यह रुपया इकट्ठा क्यों किया जाता है और अगर इकट्ठा किया जाता है तो दिया क्यों नही गया। इसी तरह इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बिल ढाई करोड़-पौने तीन करोड़ रुपये के नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी ने म्युनिसिपल कारपोरेशन को दिए हैं या नही। इसी तरह से फायर ब्रिगेड के खर्चे का सवाल है जो कारपोरेशन करता है नई दिल्ली के इलाके में फायर ब्रिगेड को मेन्टेन करने के लिए। आप मुस्करा रहे हैं लेकिन मैं इन बातों को असम्बद्ध नहीं मानता। इन्हीं बातो पर यहा तक स्थिति आई है कि आपस में चेतावनियां और धमकियां देने की नौबत आ चुकी है। इसी के साथ जुड़े हुए दूसरे सवाल है, जहां नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी से कारपोरेशन को अभी तक पैसा जोकि मिलना है नही मिल रहा है। हमारा यह आरोप है कि नामिनेटेड बाडी का चेयरमैन, गवर्नमेंट का सिविल सर्वेंट केन्द्र सरकार के इशारे के बगैर इस तरह का रवैया नहीं अपना सकता। जो उसने रवैया अपनाया है वह आपके प्रोत्साहन पर और श्री चह्वाण के आश्रय के कारण यह जो रवैया वह अपना कर चल रहा है उसका कारण यह है कि केन्द्र सरकार वाटर सप्लाई कमेटी से अपना लोन वापस मांगती है लेकिन नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी से जो कर्जा दिलवाने की उसकी जिम्मेदारी है वह कारपोरेशन को दिलवाती नहीं और जब कारपोरेशन पैसा नही दे सकता तो आप कहते हैं कि हम कब तक कर्जा देते जायें, निगम पैसा वापस नहीं करता। पैसे की कमी के कारण आम लोगों को पानी की कठिनाई होती है तो फिर यहां सम्मानित सदस्यों के सामने भी प्रश्न आता है, इस सदन का समय भी बर्बाद होता है और दिल्ली के नागरिकों को कष्ट होता है, परेशानी होती है। अगर नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी यह सब भुगतान करने के लिए जिम्मेदार है तो केन्द्र सरकार अपनी जिम्मेदारी से क्यों मुकरती है, उसने क्यों नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी के नामिनेटिड आफीशियल प्रेसिडेन्ट को आदेश नहीं दिया कि जो रुपया बनता है उसको तुरन्त दे दे।

[डा० भाई महावीर]

आरबीट्रेशन के जरिए जो फैसला होता है उस पर अपील हो रही है। उसके खिलाफ अपील हो रही है। जब इंस्पेक्शन हो गया तो उसके बाद भी साइन नही करते और आखिर में एवार्ड दे दिया। अभी आपने बताया एक दिन लेफ्टिनेंट गवर्नर ने एवार्ड दिया, दूसरे दिन बदल दिया और मेरी जानकारी है कि तीसरे दिन फिर बदल दिया और तीनों दिन वह कारपोरेशन के खिलाफ और नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी के पक्ष में होता गया। तीसरे दिन सबसे ज्यादा था कमेटी के हक में और कारपोरेशन के खिलाफ। ये एवार्ड लेफ्टिनेंट गवर्नर ने हर रोज क्यों बदले? क्या यह केन्द्र सरकार का दबाव नहीं था? अगर यह केन्द्र सरकार का दबाव नहीं था तो दो पक्षों की आपस में लड़ाई में आप तीसरे पक्ष के नाते निष्पक्ष होकर बता सकते थे, लेकिन ऐसा है नहीं।

You are very much a party in the dispute. You are very much a party because the NDMC is wholly and solely a nominated body. The President is an official and he is flouting all canons of official and public behaviour simply because of the encouragement that he has from some high-ups in the Central Government. So, that is the charge, and I would like the hon. Minister to explain to us why it is that this official is not being made to reconcile himself to the fact that whatever money has to be paid by the NDMC should be paid by them. And the Corporation should not be pressed between two mill-stones; On the one side there is the demand of the Central Government for repayment of loans, and on the other side there is the non-payment of the charges which are due to it from the NDMC.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Sir, I with great regret must emphatically say that my friend, Dr. Mahavir, is neither serving the Corporration nor the Delhi Administration nor the NDMC because he has made allegations. (*Interruptions.*) You have made allegations now and you must be prepared to hear me. I have heard you. Now you must be prepared to hear me.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Yes, we want you to speak and explain them.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : His allegation about the Lieutenant-Governor being advised by Chavan Saheb, or the NDMC being asked by us not to pay, is out of his imagination, because our relationship with the Delhi Administration has been exceedingly good. So far, all disputes, whichever have been brought to us, have been amicably and with understanding settled. There may be sometimes a little politics here and there, but the politics, which my friend has created here, has not so far happend between the Delhi Administration or the Delhi Corporation or the New Delhi Municipal Committee.

Sir, how does my hon. friend say after all these facts which he has not controverted that the first award of June 1969 was not accepted? On the contrary the Lieut. Governor's later awards have been more favourable to the Corporation than to the NDMC so that that allegation also does not stand. When the matter comes to me I will certainly intervene but if they think that Mr. Malhotra can resolve the difference between the two and if he is looking into it I have no objection. Why should I impose myself till it comes to me? I am sure my friend knows that the other party is not here. One party is raising the question on behalf of the Corporation and I think that is not fair. Let us deal with it as an administrative matter; Let us not bring politics into this.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: I am sorry my questions have not been replied. The pointed questions I asked was, was there a joint inspection, did the Engineer of the NDMC refuse to sign the Report, are there dues of electricity tax, are there Electricity Boards dues, is it a fact that the NDMC is not paying those dues, is there a dispute about the fire brigade expenses? Now these are the things which have to be answered. It is quite all right for the hon. Minister to say that he is not asking them not to pay but that is not what I said. I said you are responsible for making him pay but you are not doing your duty. Whatever the reasons may be.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Now my hon. friend himself will be statisfied how politics is injected. For example, I have stated that the Lieut. Governor passed another order on 5th February and by virtue of the order of 5th February he stayed the operation of his earlier order of December 1969 on the representation of the NDMC. Thereafter the Lieut. Governor directed the Chief Engineer, Floods, Delhi Administration, to carry out checking in the company of Chief Engineer of New Ddelhi Municipal Committee and the Corporation of their nominee. The claim of the Corporation

is that all the necessary meters that had been ordered to be installed by his order of 13th June had been installed and the contention of the NDMC is that that had not been done. After receiving the Report of the Chief Engineer, Floods, the Lieut.-Governor passed another order.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Was that Report signed by the NDMC Engineer?

SHRI K. K. SHAH : When the order has been passed on that Report . . .

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : You are silent on what I asked, anyway . . .

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I have not seen that Report but on that Report order has been passed.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : I am sorry that the hon. Minister should have brought in political insinuations of the kind that he has done. I would only like to draw his attention and ask him whether it is not the responsibility of the Central Government to intervene in a matter of this kind and to give an award finally. I would draw his attention to section 268 of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act which says very clearly that if any dispute arises between the Corporation and the NDMC on the payment of any sum demanded by the Corporation and NDMC may require the Corporation to refer the matter in dispute to the Central Government and the decision of the Central Government thereon shall be final. This is the first part of the provision, and the proviso is still more important. My charge is that the Central Government as well as the New Delhi Municipal Committee have been guilty of flouting this statutory provision which says : "Provided that where the dispute relates to the liability of the New Delhi Municipal Committee to make any payment to the Corporation the payment *shall* be made to the Corporation pending the decision of the Central Government." As the hon. Minister himself has stated, the matter has been pending since 1958 right up to the present day. Now, the NDMC has taken up a certain stand and the Corporation has taken up a different stand. When the two stands vary, the Central Government has to give an award. Unfortunately, it has been changing this award four times or five times as the hon. Minister himself has stated. That certainly creates difficulties My question is, why has not the New Delhi Municipal Committee made the payment which it is required to make pending decision on the dispute ? This is my categorical question. I would also like to read the second part of this section which says that the Central Government shall consider the statement submitted by the Corporation together with the statement from the said New Delhi Municipal Committee "within six weeks of the date of reference." The statutory provision is that any dispute of this nature should be settled within six weeks.

Here we have a dispute that has been pending for years and the Government is unable to take any decision. The Government is unable to make even the NDMC pay the amounts due to the Corporation.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Here also I regret to say that Mr. Advani is entirely incorrect. Just listen. The matter was referred to the Lt.-Governor. He is the representative of the Central Government. The award of the Lt. Governor, as I pointed out, was not accepted by the Corporation. Will he not hold the Corporation responsible if the June, 1969 award was not accepted? When the Corporation does not accept the award, you have nothing to say. Now, Mr. Advani, as a Member of the House you must forget that you belong to a particular party and you must try to be fair and just. I expect you to do that.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : I am afraid the hon. Minister has not followed my point. I can concede the possibility that after the award is given, all that the Corporation has said is ruled out, that the Corporation's case is not accepted by the Central Government and the NDMC's case is entirely accepted. I can concede that, but the law very specifically provides that until a decision is taken by the Central Government, pending the decision, the NDMC has to make all the payments.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I will give you a reply. I did not want to give an opinion, but since you are asking my opinion, I give it. The award of the 5th February, 1970 set aside the award of December, 1969, but not the award of the 13th June, 1969. Now, please try to appreciate it. Now, if the award of the 5th February had set aside the award of the 13th June, 1969, your contention would have been correct, so far as the NDMC is concerned. Now, please listen and I am sure that in the light of what I say you will be able to advise the Corporation and also the Chief Executive Councillor, because he is looking into it and the matter is with him. The award of the 5th February, as I pointed out, set aside the award of December, 1969, but not the 13th June, 1969. The NDMC

[Shri K. K. Shah.]

say that they are paying according to the award of the 13th June, 1969. Now, you will see the difficulty. How do you hold the Central Government responsible?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : I am sorry I have been repeatedly pointing out that the award comes in only as a decision of the Central Government. At the moment, as he has conceded, the award is still pending and it has to be given by the Lt.-Governor on the advice of the Chief Executive Councillor. Pending the award, is it not the statutory obligation of the NDMC to make all the payments demanded by the Corporation? Is it not a stututory obligation?

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I think you have not taken into consideration what I have said. It is payment according to the decision of the 13th June, 1969 . . .

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : This will come later.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : It has not been set aside. You have left a loophole in the order and the loophole is that the NDMC say that payment is to be made on the basis of the award of the 13th June, 1969, which they have made. According to you, payment should be made according to the order of the 5th February. Now, this is a legal point. So, what can I do?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Chandra Shekhar.

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति, महोदय, मैं एक बात ही पूछना चाहूंगा।

श्री उपसभापति मैंने चन्द्रशेखर जी को बुला लिया है। आपकी तरफ से दो हो गये। बाद में देखेंगे।

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : मैं कोई नया प्रश्न नहीं पूछ रहा हूं केवल एक चीज स्पष्ट करना चाहता हूं।

श्री नेकीराम (हरियाणा) बाद में कह लेना। बेकार में गड़बड़ी कर रहे हैं।

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : गड़बड़ी होगी तो देख ली जाएगी। मेरा निवेदन है कि माननीय मंत्री महोदय स्पष्ट नहीं कर पाये, मैं भी नहीं समझ पाया हूं। पहले यह बता दे कि क्या अवार्ड फाइनल हो गया है, और अगर अवार्ड फाइनल नहीं हुआ है, चाहे जून 1969 हो, 1969 हो या 1970 हो, अगर एवार्ड फाइनल नहीं हुआ है तो क्या कारपोरेशन पर यह उत्तरदायित्व नहीं है कि "पैंडिग अवार्ड पूरी रकम जमा करें, फिर बीच वाला, दर्मियानी, जो आना हो उसके अनुसार पहले जो बिल कारपोरेशन के अनुसार गया है, उसके अनुसार रकम जमा करे। क्या यह अनिवार्य नहीं है।

श्री उपसभापति इसका जवाब दे दिया है।

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर . उपसभापति महोदय, मैं समझता हूं, नहीं आया है।

श्री उपसभापति अभी 13 जून को जो इन्टेरिम अवार्ड है उसके मुताबिक पेमेंट कर रहे हैं।

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर . इन्टेरिम अवार्ड का प्रश्न नहीं है। मैं इन्टेरिम अवार्ड का प्रश्न नहीं पूछ रहा हूं। मैंने इन्टेरिम अवार्ड के पेमेंट के बारे में कहा . .

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I am extremely sorry. Do not try to mix up things. That the Corporation has failed to repay the loan to the Government of India has nothing to do with these dues. I do not want that both should be mixed up. This is not correct. I do not want that politics should should be brought into here. You cannot ask me to sit as a judge and give a decision. Unluckily it has not become a legal issue and it will have to be decided.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKAHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : I am sorry to see this apologetic attitude of the hon. Minister. The first questioner, Dr. Mahavir, said that the NDMC should be pressurised only because an official is the Chairman of the NDMC.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Why because?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Because an official happens to be the Chairman, so the NDMC should be pressurised by the Government to pay according to the wishes of the Corporation. I should like to know categorically from the Minister if it is not a fact that the NDMC is paying the dues according to the award given by the Lieutenant Governor and the Corporation is demanding more than the award. If it is a fact, what *locus standi*. Dr. Mahavir or the other friends have before the House to ask the Government to pressuriese the Chairman of the NDMC? The other point is the Minister is expecting justice from the Jan Sangh. They are playing to the gallery just to gain a political point. Unless and

untill the matter comes to the Central Government, unless and untill the award given by the Lieutenant Governor is accepted by the Municipal Corporation, how can the NDMC be pressurised to pay more according to the wishes of the Corporation because the conflict is on the point of the assessment itself? Unless and until the assessment is clear, the NDMC cannot pay according to the wishes of the Municipal Corporation, and the hon. Minister should not feel shy and should not be so much afraid of Dr. Mahavir and other Jan Sangh Members.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I must makeit clear that I am not afraid when justice is to be done. I am afraid of nobody. But my friend's contention is corrrect. The contention of the NDMC is that they have paid according to the award of 13th June—I have made it clear—which has not been set aside. Therefore, it is correct.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, श्यामधर मिश्र जी की बात पहले मान ली गई होती तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता। मगर मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या सरकार यह बतायेगी कि कारपोरेशन का नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी पैसा नहीं दे रही है, इसका रेफरेन्स किस तारीख को पहली बार किया। सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट को कारपोरेशन ने रेफरेन्स कब किया...

SHRI K. K. SHAH : The fact that the Lieutenant Governor . . .

श्री राजनारायण उधर मत जाइए बैठिए, बैड मैनर्स

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I hope my hon. friend will know how to behave. He has no business to ask me to sit down. It is for the Chair to ask me to sit down.

श्री राजनारायण : चेयरमैन की बिना इजाजत के अगर कोई मंत्री उठ कर, खडा होकर, बोलने लगे, बिना सवाल पूरा हुए, तो उस मेम्बर का कर्त्तव्य है कि उसको बैठाए।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर राजनारायण जी, अपनी गलती को पार्लियमेन्टरी पद्धति नहीं बनाइए। चेयर की कृपा को पार्लियमेन्टरी पद्धति न बनाइए कि जब चाहें आप खड़े हो जायें। We also know how to ask you to set down.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, हमारा भी इस सबन्ध में जो पार्लियमेन्टरी प्वाइट है उसको सुना जाना चाहिए। मै आपके सामने दिल्ली म्युनिसिपलिटी ऐक्ट जो है उसमें से एक अंश पढ़ देना चाहता हूं जो इस प्रकार से है।

"(1)If any dispute arises between the Corporation and the New Delhi Municipal Committee or, as the case may be, the Military Engineer Services as to the liability of the said Committee or Services to pay any sum demanded by the Corporation or as to the right of the said Committee or Services to any refund, or as to the amount of any refund, from the Corporation, then, the New Delhi Municipal Committee or, as the case may be, the Military Engineer Services may require the Corporation to refer the matter in dispute to the Central Government and the decision of the Central Government thereon shall be final:"

मेरा प्रश्न यह था कि अगर नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपलिटी और कारपोरेशन के बीच कोई झगडा है और उसका कोई फैसला नही होता है, तो कारपोरेशन उसको सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट के पास रैफर करेगी। या फिर अगर नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपैलिटी का कोई झगड़ा कारपोरेशन के साथ हो और उसका फैसला न हो तो वह उस मामले को सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट के पास रैफर करेगी। मैने सवाल किया था कि कारपोरेशन को नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपैल्टी ने उसका पैसा नही दिया, तो इसके बारे मे फर्स्ट रैफरेंस कब किया गया।

अब मैं इसके आगे चलता हूं और वह अंश पढता हूं।

"Provided that, where the dispute relates to the liability of the New Delhi Municipal Committee or, as the case may be, the Military Engineer Services to make any payment to the Corporation, the payment shall be made to the Corporation pending the decision of the Central Government."

हो सकता है कि सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट का एजेन्ट रिप्रेजेंटेटिव यहा के लेफ्टिनेन्ट गवर्नर हों और सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट किसी आर्डर या नियम के मातहत लेफ्टिनेंट गवर्नर को अपना अधिकार दे देती है। यह एक बात जानकारी मे आ जानी चाहिये। मगर इसमें यह लिखा हुआ है कानून में कि जब इस तरह का झगड़ा होगा तो म्युनिसिपैल कमेटी कारपोरेशन को पैसा दे देगी और जब

[श्री राजनारायण]

फाइनल एवार्ड होगा तो उसके मुताबिक जितना उनका निकलेगा वह मांग लेगी। इस कानून की पूर्ति नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपैल्टी ने नही की। सीधी सी बात है और इस चीज को लम्बा करना और पेचीदा बनाने की आवश्यकता नही है। मैं यह बात जानना चाहता हूं कि इसमे "शैल" एवार्ड लिखा हुआ है. "shall be made to the Corporation pending the decision of the Central Government".

सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट के फैसले होने तक कारपोरेशन को वह पेमेंट हो जाना चाहिये था। अगर हम इस कानून की तह मे, उसकी गहराई में जाये तो हर एक व्यक्ति इसी राय का होगा जिस राय का मैं हू। हमने जो प्वाईट बतलाया है उसके मुताबिक नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपैल्टी कारपोरेशन की कानून की धारा 268 का उल्लंघन करती है यह जानते हुए भी कि वह एक नामिनेटिड बाडी है और सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट उसे नामिनेट करती है। तो मै सरकार को यह सुझाईव देना चाहता हूं कि वह इस कमेटी को भग क्यो नही कर देती है।

जो कमेटी कानून की मान्यताओ की तह में काम नही करती उस कमेटी को रखने का औचित्य क्या है? एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूं। यहां बहुत से लोग है जो जनतत्र के मौखिक हिमायती है, उनसे मैं यह कहना चाहता हू कि नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल क्यों है? किसी कारपोरेशन में डबुल एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है? जनतंत्र के हिमायतियो, जनतंत्र का मखौल मत करो। मै चाहता हू कि सरकार इस बात को समझे और नई दिल्ली म्यूनिसिपल कमेटी को हमेशा के लिए भग करे और सारी रेस्पासिबिलिटी, सारी जिम्मेदारी म्युनिसिपल कारपोरेशन को दिलवाए। जब कारपोरेशन है, इलेक्टेड बाडी है तो वह सुप्रीम है, मगर उस कारपोरेशन पर इनडाइरेक्टली अपना कन्ट्रोल रखने के लिए आर्थिक दृष्टि से इस सरकार ने जनतत्र की हत्या करके नामिनेटेड बाडी बना रखी है जो कानून की तह मे काम नहीं करती और कारपोरेशन के काम में नित्यप्रति बाधा पैदा करती रहती है। इसलिए उन तीन सवालों का जवाब दीजिए कि एक्ट की पाबन्दी क्यो नही हुई, न ई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी को अस्तित्व मे रखने का औचित्य क्या है जनतंत्रीय दृष्टि से और इसी अपराध को लेकर उस कमेटी को भग क्यों न किर दिया जाय। इन सवालों का सीधा जवाब दे दे।

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Sir, the first question was : when was the reference made? In December, 1959 a meeting was held by Mr. Malhotra, the then President of the New Delhi Municipal Committee with the officers of the Municipal Corporation. In that meeting, among other decisions, from 1st April, 1958. This has been going on since then. It was the contention of the Corporation that 23 per cent. and not 35 per cent., as decided, was supplied. This is number one.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान, आप सुनते जाइए, हमारे सवाल का जवाब यह नही है। हम इन आकडो में नही जाना चाहते, हम आंकड़ो के जगल में फसेगे नही, हमारा केवल यह कहना है कि जब रिफ्रेंस हो गया तो टिल पेंडिग दि डिसीजन म्युनिसिपल कमेटी ने कारपोरेशन को पैसा क्यों नही दिया। पाइन्ट यह है।

श्री के० के० शाह : यह भी गलत है। मैंने अभी आपको बताया, आपने सुना होगा, यदि आप एवार्ड की बात करते है Then award is the final decision.

श्री राजनारायण . एवार्ड की बात नही करता हूं, एवार्ड तो फाइनल डिसीजन है। श्रीमन्, फिर मत्री महोदय कन्फ्यूज कर रहे है। कानून मे लिखा है--चाहे उसको आप एवार्ड कहिए, चाहे फाइनल डिसीजन --गवर्नमेंट का फाइनल डिसीज़न न होने तक वह पैसा दे देगा और बाद मे जो भी डिसीज़न होगा उसको मानेगा। कानून की भाषा मत्री न समझे तो मेरा अपराध नही है। मै फिर पढता हू--

"Provided that where the dispute relates to the liability of the New Delhi Municipal Committee or, as the case may be, the Military Engineering Services to make any payment to the Corporation, the payment shall be made to the Corporation pending the decision of the Central Government."

क्या मतलब हुआ।

श्री के० के० शाह : मुझे इसका पता नही कि राजनारायण जी एवार्ड और डिसीज़न मे फर्क करते है या नही। एवार्ड का माने डिसीज़न हो गया।

श्री राजनारायण : वही तो मैं भी कह रहा हूं।

श्री के० के० शाह : अभी मुझे बोलने दीजिए, आपको मैंने सुन लिया। 13 जून, 1969 का एवार्ड डिसीज़न है एक दूसरा डिसीज़न है और फिर 5 फरवरी, 1970 का एवार्ड है : 5 फरवरी 1970 का एवार्ड दिसम्बर, के एवार्ड को सेट एसाइड करता है, जून 1969 के एवार्ड को सेट एसाइड नहीं करता है। यह लीगल क्वेश्चन है...

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं फिर अदब से साथ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि सदस्यों ने जिन्होंने कालिंग अटेंशन दिया है उनके अधिकारों की आप रक्षा करें।

श्री उपसभापति उनका कहना है कि 13 जून, का एवार्ड फाइनल है।

श्री राजनारायण : हम फाइनल नहीं कह रहे हैं, हम कहते हैं कि एवार्ड कभी भी हो, एवार्ड के लिए ६ वीक्स लिखा हुआ है, उस पर हम नहीं जा रहे उस पर बाद में जाएंगे। आज मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूं कि जब मामला रिफर हो गया तो then and there that amount shall be paid to the Corporation. एवार्ड बाद में हो, इसलिए लिखा हुआ है कि पेंडिंग एवार्ड कारपोरेशन को वह पैसा मिल जाना जरूरी है। आगे कहा है :—

> "The Central Government shall consider the statement together with like statement received from the said Committee or Services within six weeks of the date of the decisions."

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जब पहला रिफरेंस हुआ तो उसके ६ हफ्ते के अन्दर सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने कोई फैसला किया या नहीं, यह एक अलग चीज है, मगर उस फैसले के होने तक कमेटी को रुपया दे देना जरूरी था एकार्डिंग टू दि एक्ट।

श्री के० के० शाह : डिसीजन हो गया। डिसीजन नहीं होता तो क्या बात थी। आप इसे पढ़िये।

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Was any payment made?

SHRI K. K. SHAH : But not after the decision.

(*Interruptions*)

श्री के० के० शाह : डिसीजन हो जाने के बाद की बात है। क्या बात करते हो भाई।

श्री राजनारायण इसीलिए सदन का समय बचाने के लिए हमारे मित्र श्यामधर मिश्र जी ने कहा था, चेयर से पहले ही निवेदन किया था कि इतना लम्बा स्टेटमेंट है। हम तो सरकार की मदद करना चाहते हैं; मगर सरकार है कि अपने जाल में खुद उलझ गयी।

श्री उपसभापति . आप का सवाल हो गया और जवाब भी आ गया। अब आप बैठिए।

श्री राजनारायण : जवाब आ गया ? लेकिन जवाब ठीक नहीं दिया है।

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र . मैं एक सीधा सा सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या एवार्ड जब दिया जाता है तो क्या दोनों पार्टीज़ को यह छूट है कि उस को मानें या न मानें या सरकार यह समझती है कि दोनों पार्टीज़ कारपोरेशन और म्युनिसिपल कमेटी उस को स्वीकार करे या नहीं, क्योंकि इतने लम्बे ब्यान में जो माननीय मंत्री जी ने दिया उस में तमाम तारीखों में एवार्ड दिये गये और न केवल दिये गये बल्कि वे बदलते रहे हैं। तो अब भी अगर कोई एवार्ड देने वाले हों तो बाद में वे उस को कब तक बदलते रहेंगे और कब उस को फाइनल समझेंगे। मैंने तो एवार्ड के मायने यह समझे है कि जो पंचनामा हो गया वह फाइनल हो गया। लेकिन तीन तारीखें माननीय मंत्री जी ने दीं कि जिन में एवार्ड बदलते रहें हैं और अभी भी वह फाइनल नहीं है। तो सरकार क्या समझती है। क्योंकि लेफ्टिनेंट गवर्नर जो कोई ऐक्शन करता है वह सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट की ओर से फाइनल ऐक्शन होता है उन्होंने एक फैसला दिया, अमुक तारीख के बाद वह क्यों नहीं फाइनल समझा गया और क्या जरूरत थी लोगों के उस पर रिप्रेज़ेंटेशन लेने की ? क्या जरूरत थी उन पर विचार करने की। क्या इस के मायने यह होंगे कि तब तक यह फाइनल नहीं समझा जाएगा जब तक कि म्युनिसिपल कारपोरेशन और नई दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कमेटी दोनों के उस पर हस्ताक्षर न हों जायं कि हम इस से संतुष्ट हैं ?

श्री के० के० शाह : मुझे ताज्जुब होता है। अपने दोस्त को मैंने बताया कि 7 जून, 1969 को एवार्ड

[श्री के० के० शाह]

हो गया। वह एवार्ड कारपोरेशन ने मान्य नही किया है। According to the award of the 7th June, 1969, payment has been made. According to that award, *nothing* remains due. It is not the contention of the Corporation that according to the award of the 7th June, 1969, anything is due.

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र : मैं कारपोरेशन की ओर से नही बोलना। और म्युनिसिलपल कमेटी की ओर से भी नही बोलता। मै कहता हूं कि वह सीधा सा जवाब क्यों नही देने एज ए मिनिस्टर कि एक फैसला हुआ और वह फैमला यह है। आप कफ्यूजन क्रियेट करना चाहते है।

श्री के० के० शाह : मै कन्फ्यूज़ नही क्रियेट करता। यह हो गया है और यह आप के मामने रखा है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right, that is enough, I think. Papers to be laid on the Table.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

THE DRUGS AND COSMETICS (SECOND AMENDMENT) RULES, 1970

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING AND WORKS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under section 38 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, a copy of the Ministry of Health, Family Planning, Works, Housing and Urban Development (Department of Health) Notification S.O. No. 2008, dated the 26th May, 1970 (in English and Hindi), publishing the Drugs and Cosmetics (Second Amendment) Rules, 1970. [Place in Library *see* No. L.T.-3892/70].

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS (1968-69) OF THE NATIONAL MINERAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIOL LTD. AND RELATED PAPERS

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS, AND MINES AND METALS (SHRI NITI RAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY) : Sir, I bet to lay on the Table, under sub-section;1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956, a copy each of the following papers (in English and Hindi):—

(i) Eleventh Annual Report and Accounts of the National Mineral Development Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1968-69, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Corporation

[Place in Library. *See* No. LT-3922/70 for (i), and (ii).]

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962, a copy each of the following Notifications (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance)—

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 1033, dated the 11th July, 1970, together with an Explanatory Memorandum thereon.

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 1095, dated the 25th July, 1970, together with an Explanatory Memorandum thereon.

[Placed in Library. *See* No. L.T.-3966/70 for (i) and (ii)].

ANNOUNCEMENT *RE* ARREST OF SHRI SURAJ PRASAD

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have to inform Members that I have received the following telegram dated the 9th August, 1970, from the Sub-divisional Magistrate, Dumraon :

"Shri Suraj Prasad, M.P. has been arrested to-day, the 9th August at 11-20 a.m. under section1 151 Cr. P.C. while going to commit cognisable offence, *i.e.* criminal trespass, with purpose to forcibly occupy private land which might have led to serious clash."