

RAJYA SABHA

*Wednesday, the 12th March, igbyjthe 21 st
Phalguna, 1890 {Saka}*

The House met at eleven of the clock,
MR. CHAIRMAN in the Cnair.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

STATE LOTTERIES

•407. DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : f

SHRI NIRANJAN VARMA:

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS
be pleased to state:

(a) the number of States in which Gov-
ernment lotteries have been started and with
what results;

(b) whether the Central Government
have approved of this practice or agreed to
it; if not, what action is being proposed to bi
taken in this regard;

(c) whether permission has been sought
by and granted to Delhi Administration for
starting a Government lottery;

(d) whether permission has been granted
io any other Union Territory for starting a
Government lottery; if so, the name (hereof;
and

(e) whether some of the State Govern-
ments (for instance Andhra Pradesh) have
banned the sale of lottery tickets of

>:ates within their jurisdiction; and
if so what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI
VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): (a) The
Governments of Haryana, Kerala Madras,
Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West
Bengal have started State lotteries. The
Governments of Assam and Maharashtra
have also decided to float a State lottery.
The State Governments have reported that
the lotteries have proved successful in
augmenting resources.

(b) The Government of India have per-I the
State Governments to conduct State
Lotteries if they so desire subject to the
condition that tickets of such a lottery will
not be sold in another State without the
express consent of the Government of that
State.

fThe question was actually asked on the
floor of the House by Dr. Bhai Mahavir.

1—7 R. S./69

(c) The request of Delhi Administration
amission to organise lottery is under
consideration.

(d) No other Union Territory has ap-
proached the Central Government for per-
mission to start lottery.

(e) The Governments of Bihar, Gujarat
and Madhya Pradesh, have refused permis-
sion to oier State Governments ior sale
of tickets of their lotteries in these States
as a matter of policy.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: May I know, Sir,
for how long the request of the Delh¹
Administration has been under the consi-
deration of the Central Government? More
specifically, if it is a fact that the request
was originally made on ths ist of July, 1968
and the Central Government has taken
already nine months to examine it, how long
does the Central Governmen¹ think it would
need to examine the request before coming
to a decision? Secondly Sir, may I know if
the Central Government is aware that the
lottery tickets of Madras Haryana, U. P.
Punjab.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Kerala also.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR:.. . andl suppose
of some other States also including Kerala,
are being sold without restriction in Delhi ?
I am not aware if the sanction or the
approval of the Delhi Administration has
been obtained by them in this respect. Lakhs
of rupees are collected by way of revenue at
Delhi by these lotteries. Now, the delay in
the Central Government's decision fits in
with the delay in the Central Government's
action on all the recommendations and the
proposals coming from the Delhi
Administration in respect of various enact-
ments like the Motor Vehicles Bill, Cow
Protection Bill, Mayor-in-Council Bill, and
so on. Has the Central Government taken a
decision not to give prompt attention, or not
to take any prompt decision in respect of
any request coming from the Delhi
Administration?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :

It is not a fact that we deliberately delay
any proposals received from the Delhi
Administration for any legislative or non-
legislative items. As a matter of fact, Sir,
we know how the legislative programme of
the Parliament is crowded and because of
this crowding of legislative programme
of lh^ P , certain Delhi enact-
ments have been delayed like the Mayor-in-
Council Bill. The honourable Member
knows that these were introduced in the last
Lok Sabha also, but they lapsed because

of the Lok Sabha could not dispose of these enactments. It is not that the Central Government is delaying them, but the Parliament has not been able to find sufficient time to deal with these matters. The delay is not on the part of the Central Government. The Parliament has not been able to find time to deal with these enactments which we introduced in the Parliament earlier before the last general elections. As far as this matter is concerned, it is a matter of policy that we decided that we shall not stop any State Governments from issuing lotteries in order to augment their resources. But the Central Government itself has not decided to start any lotteries of its own, and since the Union Territories more or less reflect the opinion or the policies of the Central Government itself, we have taken some time to consider the request of the Union Territory of Delhi. And we have not yet taken a decision on this because if a decision of this kind is taken, it will in a way reflect the policy decision of the Government itself. That is why a little time is being taken and it is wrong to say that any deliberate effort is being made to delay this decision here.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, my one point has not been clarified. I want to know if the Central Government does not consider the Delhi Administration to be on par with other States except in respect of reserved subjects. Now, this is a reserved subject so far as the States are concerned, a subject which is in the jurisdiction of the States. Now, does the Central Government not consider this to be a subject which does not concern any of the specific responsibilities of the Central Government, take, for example, law and order? If that is so, why cannot the Central Government permit the Delhi Administration to take a decision quickly itself?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, according to the Delhi Administration Act, the status of the Union Territories is entirely different from that of the States. But still for the working purposes we have always regarded the Delhi Administration or the Union Territory of Delhi as State Administration—although it cannot be strictly so in law—except for the reserved subjects as the honourable Member himself has stated. But here as I have said, as far as lotteries are concerned, it is a matter of policy that the Government has to decide for itself. And that is why a little time has been taken, and I can assure the honourable Member that there is no deliberate effort to delay, to harm any interests of the Delhi Administration. We regard the interests

of the Delhi Administration as our own. There is no difference between us and the Delhi Administration. Why should we try to harm the Delhi Administration's interests?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: When are you likely to decide it?

(No reply)

SHRIMATI SATYAVATI DANG: Sir, the honourable Minister has just said that no other Union Territory has applied for permission for the lottery. But Himachal Pradesh has. It is surprising that it has not come here. Is it a fact that lotteries were permitted in the area of Himachal Pradesh of the erstwhile Punjab State? A discrimination has been created by not allowing them in the rest of Himachal Pradesh. If so, does the Government propose to allow lotteries in the whole of Himachal Pradesh to further the interests of social activity?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: As far as I am aware at present, I do not think the Himachal Pradesh Government has asked for our permission. But I will check up the position.

SHRI K. S. GHAVDA: Sir, Government lotteries ruin the weaker sections, especially the poorer sections, of our people. That State is violating Article 46 of the Constitution which is mandatory for the States because lotteries are a kind of exploitation. May I know, Sir, what machinery the Government has got.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: No, no.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: Yes, Article 46 says:

"The State shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people, and, in particular, of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation".

So, lottery is also one form of exploitation. That is why, I would like to know from the Government, Sir, as to what machinery the Home Ministry has got to ask the States to implement the Constitutional article which is mandatory?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, we do not regard lotteries with necessary safeguards as a form of exploitation. If there is no safeguard and if lotteries are run by unscrupulous organisers, then it is possible that there will be some exploitation, there may be dishonesty. But here

the State Governments themselves are organising the lotteries, and we have given instructions that unless the other State Governments agree, there should be no sale of lottery tickets in the territories of those States. We have come across certain instances where lottery tickets of one State have been sold in another State without the express permission of that particular State Government, and we considered this matter and now we are going to amend Section 294A of the Indian Penal Code to make it an offence to sell the lottery tickets of one State in another State without the express permission of that particular State Government because we do not want the sale of lottery tickets to be held in another State unless the State Government as a matter of policy decides to permit such a sale.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN:

Sir, since the Central Government has not taken a decision, is not the Central Government also a party when it gives permission to the States when they apply for permission for running these lotteries? It is something like Jack not doing a thing but permitting Mr. Paul to do something. Has the Central Government not considered the moral aspect of the question that even this issue of a lottery, which is a question of luck, has an element of gambling in it? And though it may augment the resources of the States—the State Governments must have convinced the Union Government of the extent of the resources they hope to raise through this means; that is perhaps why the Centre does not issue the lottery itself which it might otherwise have thought of—is not the Centre a party to the guilt in the same when it gives permission to the State authorities?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, if we consider running a lottery a guilt, we would not have given permission. Obviously, when we give permission to the State Governments to run lotteries, it is obvious that we do not consider it a guilt. But, whatever the States might do, it is not necessary that the Centre should also follow the same thing—there is difference between State administration and Central administration—and as I said earlier, we are taking due care, even by amending the law, to see that the sale of lottery tickets of a State is not held in another State without the express consent of that other State. In Gujarat, if the State Government of Gujarat does not permit a lottery by itself, then (they may not also like the sale of lottery tickets of other State Governments there in Gujarat. But they have no legal

means at present to prevent it. Therefore, after this amendment goes through, they will have this legal means of permitting a lottery if they do not want any lottery to be organised or any lottery tickets to be sold in the State of Gujarat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

PAVATE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

*408. SHRI A. D. MANI: t

SHRI M. K. MOHTA:

SARDAR RAM SINGH:

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA:

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH

BHANDARI:

Will the Minister of EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Pavate Committee has recommended to the University Grants Commission to increase the staff in the various Universities of India;

(b) what are the main features of the Pavate Committee recommendations; and

(c) whether it is a fact that the University Grants Commission is shortly going to implement the recommendations?

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES (PROF. V.K. R. V. RAO): (a) and (b) The recommendations of the Pavate Committee were examined by the University Grants Commission and referred to the Committee as reconstituted under the Chairmanship of Dr. D. S. Reddi, for further consideration and formulation of financial implications of its final recommendations. A summary of the recommendations made by the Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. Pavate and later of Dr. Reddi is laid on the Table of the Sabha. [See Appendix LXVII, ANNEXURE NO. 61]

(c) The report of the Committee was circulated by the U. G. C. to the Universities for comments. Replies have been received from 21 Universities so far. The U. G. C. is awaiting the replies of other Universities.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, it is a bulky statement which the Minister has placed on the Table of the House. May I ask

if the question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri A. D. Mani.