

and as he is intelligent, if he studies it, I am sure that he will himself come to the same conclusions to which we have come. In future, if our agricultural economy and the paddy economy is to prosper, I think we must have on a large-scale the rice-milling industry both in the co-operative and public sectors and gradually we will have to eliminate the outmoded, old mills in the private sector.

Shri A. P. Chatterjee has repeated the same argument to which I have replied earlier. May I ask him. How are you going to nationalise an outmoded mill if the machinery is not worth anything at all. What is the practicality involved in it? As a slogan it is all right. We can give many slogans, but I think we should go to the brass tacks and see that some practical solutions to our problems are found out. I do not think that in this country we can try to solve our economic problems by resorting to slogans and dogmas.

Shri V.V. Ramaswamy raised the point whether societies formed by consumers for rice-milling would have their place. As I have already said, it will not affect their position, but the main purpose of the Bill is to see that protection is given to societies formed by producers and farmers. That is the position taken in the Bill, because in the name of consumers any body will form a society. The traders can form a society. What we want is to eliminate this risk. We do not want to expose our co-operative movement, by the backdoor to the danger of being exploited by middlemen. That is all I have got to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."
The motion was adopted.

THE DELHI AND AJMER RENT CONTROL (NASIRABAD CANTONMENT REPEAL) BILL, 1967.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI M.R. KRISHNA): Mr. Vice-Chairman,

beg to move:

"That the Bill to repeal the Delhi and Ajmer Rent Control Act, 1952, as in the Cantonment of Nasirabad, be taken into consideration."

The Bill is very simple and direct and its purpose is very limited. I do not think it requires any elaborate explanation, since in the Statement of Objects and Reasons it has been clearly stated that the Bill is being introduced in order to bring about uniformity in the various cantonments. The measure, which was passed by the Rajasthan Assembly, was declared to be *ultra-vires* the Constitution, since the State Government has not got the power to legislate on cantonments. Therefore, it is left to the Union Parliament to legislate another measure in respect of cantonments, and this Bill has become necessary. Since there is already in existence the Delhi and Ajmer Rent Control Act, 1952, as in force in the Cantonment of Nasirabad, until and unless the Act is repealed, we will not be able to help the State Government to bring Nasirabad also in conformity with the other cantonments. It is a non-controversial measure and I think hon. Members, who have read the Bill have already formed their opinion. I have nothing more to add except that if this measure is passed, it will help the cantonments in Rajasthan to have uniform laws relating to rent control. I hope the Members of this House will be able to give their consent to get this Bill passed.

The question was proposed.

श्री विसलकुमार मन्नालाल लो वोरडिया (मध्य प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि इस बिल का अंग्रेजी से हिन्दी में जो ट्रांसलेशन हुआ है और "रेंट" शब्द की जगह "भाटक" शब्द का प्रयोग किया गया है, वह बहुत ही कठिन शब्द मालूम देता है। यह ठीक है कि जो शब्द के लिखने वाले हैं वे विशेषज्ञ होंगे

और मैं इस चीज का विशेषज्ञ नहीं हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सदन में ऐसे शब्दों का प्रयोग किया जाना चाहिये जिसको सब लोग तथा जनता अच्छी तरह से समझ सके। अगर "भाटक" शब्द की जगह "भाड़ा" या "किराया" शब्द होता तो उसको लोग ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से समझ पाते। जिन लोगों ने इन शब्दों को रखा है मैं उनके संबंध में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ, मेरा तो अभिप्राय यह है कि हमें इस तरह के शब्दों को रखना चाहिये जिसको जनता अच्छी तरह से समझ सके। भाड़ा, किराया शब्द काफी प्रचलित है। "भाटक" शब्द संस्कृत का होगा और चूंकि मैं संस्कृत का स्कालर नहीं हूँ, इसलिए इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कह सकता हूँ और न मैं आलोचना ही करना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं यही प्रार्थना करूंगा कि यहां पर इस तरह के शब्दों का प्रयोग किया जाय जिसको सब लोग आसानी से समझ सकें, नहीं तो हिन्दी बदनाम होने वाली है और हिन्दी के प्रति नफरत पैदा होगी। यहां पर कई लोग हिन्दी के समर्थक हैं और जो लोग हिन्दी का ज्ञान रखते हैं वे "भाटक" शब्द को ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से नहीं समझ सकते हैं। इसलिए मेरा नम्र निवेदन है कि जो अथारटीज हैं उनका ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिला दिया जायेगा ताकि वे भविष्य में इस बात का खयाल रखें।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी हमारे मंत्री जी ने कहा कि यह बिल बहुत ही सीधा सादा बिल है। लेकिन मेरा नम्र निवेदन यह है कि अगर सुरक्षा विभाग भी इस गति से चलेगा तो हमारे देश का कल्याण ही हो जायेगा क्योंकि राजस्थान में जो भाड़ा नियंत्रण कानून बना था वह 1950 में बना था। स्टेट्स का मर्जर 1956 में हुआ था और उसके परिणामस्वरूप अजमेर और नसीराबाद राजस्थान में मिल गये। राजस्थान सरकार ने 1957 में एक कानून बनाया था रेंट कंट्रोल एक्ट जो अजमेर और नसीराबाद

केन्टोनमेंट में भी लागू हो और वह लागू किया गया। राजस्थान उच्च न्यायालय ने यह निर्णय दिया कि राजस्थान सरकार इस तरह का कानून नहीं बना सकती है और यह अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार को है। इसके बाद वहां की सरकार केन्द्रीय सरकार को बराबर लिखती रही कि उसके सामने इस तरह की कठिनाई है और उसे इस संबंध में जल्द ही कोई कानून बनाना चाहिये। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूंगा कि वे कुछ साल से नींद में क्यों सोये रहे और अब तक जागरूक क्यों नहीं हुए। राजस्थान की सरकार समस्त राज्य में भाटक नियंत्रण विधियों में एक रूपता सुनिश्चित करने की दृष्टि से बार बार इस बात पर बल देती रही कि राजस्थान परिमर अधिनियम 1950 का विस्तारण नमीरावाद छावनी पर कर दिया जाय। उनके बारबार जगाने पर भी आपकी नींद नहीं खुली। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा कौन सा कारण था जिसकी वजह से आप इस तरह का कानून जल्दी से पारित नहीं करा सके? इस तरह के कानून के अभाव में कितने लोगों को कष्ट हुआ, क्या सरकार को इस बात का ज्ञान है? वैसे तो मंत्री जी बतला देंगे कि यहां पर जो दिल्ली कानून था उससे काम चल रहा था। लेकिन यहां जो कानून था और राजस्थान में जो है, उसमें काफी फर्क है। फर्क इस दृष्टि से है कि वहां का विधान टेनेन्ट्स को ज्यादा सुविधा देता है लेकिन यहां जो विधान है वह इतनी सुविधा नहीं देता है। जो किराएदार हाईकोर्ट में गये और जिम पर हाई कोर्ट ने कहा कि सरकार को इस तरह के कानून बनाने का अधिकार नहीं है उन किरायेदारों की कठिनाई को दूर करने के लिए सरकार ने 6 साल का समय क्यों ले लिया और इसका क्या कारण है। इसमें फिर आप यह व्यवस्था कर रहे हैं कि वर्तमान में जो भी केसेज चल रहे हैं वे दिल्ली और अजमेर रेंट कंट्रोल एक्ट के तहत चलेंगे। आप क्यों नहीं अब उनको रिलीज दे देते हैं क्योंकि आपको दोनों अधिकार हैं।

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Minister's attention may be drawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The Minister in charge is Mr. Krishna. I thought Members are better informed.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : He was drawing the attention of that Minister who was disturbing the other Minister.

श्री विसलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-
ड़िया: खैर मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है, खुपफुस
चलती है, तो चलती रहे।

तो सभापति महोदय, ये दो बातें स्पष्ट हैं कि इस मामले में सरकार की सुस्ती क्यों रही और राजस्थान ने पहले पहल इस सरकार से कब आग्रह किया कि इसके बारे में कानून बनाया जाय और सरकार ने इसके बारे में कितना विचारसंयन किया, इसके बारे में भी थोड़ा श्रीमान् प्रकाश डाल दें।

दूसरी बात यह है कि वर्तमान में जितने भी वहां पर केसेज पेंडिंग हैं उनके ऊपर यदि राजस्थान का ही कानून लगा दें और यह जो आप इसमें लगाते हैं इसके बजाय हम वहां के कानून के तहत करवा दें तो उसमें आप को क्या कठिनाई होगी। इसके साथ साथ क्या आपने राजस्थान के कानून को और दिल्ली के कानून को देखा था और देखा था तो वह भी बतला दीजिये कि उसमें टेनेंट्स के लिये कितने लाभ हैं।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Minister in charge of this Bill made us to understand that by repealing this Act we are going to bring about uniformity of law in cantonment areas throughout the country. I am sorry that is not the position. The position is that by repealing this Act there will be uniformity of the Rent Control Order in the State of Rajasthan including the

Nasirabad Cantonment. I would like to make only one observation with regard to this, that in many cantonment areas the Defence Ministry has commandeered many bungalows, commandeered them in 1950 or 1955, and the Defence Ministry is paying very low rents. The landlords owning one building or two have been asking the Defence Ministry to release them or to at least enhance the rent. Neither are they releasing them though the landlords are put to a lot of inconvenience, nor are they enhancing the rent. In some cases the ownership of the bungalows that are commandeered by the Defence Ministry has passed on to some others, and in spite of repeated requests made to the Defence Ministry they are turning a deaf ear to this. I would therefore urge the Defence Minister that he should sympathetically consider the cases where the owners want the bungalows to be released and the cases where they want an enhancement of the rent. To give them the low rent that was fixed some ten or fifteen years ago, when everything has gone up and the prices have gone up and are spiralling—it is unfair on the part of the Defence Ministry to continue to pay low rents and to refuse to release the bungalows. I therefore urge, now that the Defence Minister is here, that he will consider these cases very sympathetically.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala) : Sir, I do not want to make a speech but I rise only to ask for a clarification. The point that I wanted to press was the question of delay, and that point has already been brought home by the hon. Member, Mr. Chordia. It is stated that the Government of Rajasthan has been pressing for the extension of the Rajasthan Act. The necessity for that extension arose in 1962 or may be 1963 when the Rajasthan High Court gave their decision. I would like to know when the decision was rendered by the Rajasthan High Court and since when the Government of Rajasthan have been pressing for this extension.

SHRI M. R. KRISHNA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, first of all about the translation

of this Bill in Hindi, since we are now trying to translate or do our work in the Central Secretariat and other Departments in Hindi, we will have to put up with this kind of translation. We in the Ministry have got people who are well versed in Hindi and whatever defects or whatever improvement my friend has suggested, these may be conveyed to the right quarters and we shall see that proper Hindi translations in the Bills, etc., are done.

About the delay, the High Court of Rajasthan has given its verdict somewhere in 1962 and as we know very well, we have got cantonments throughout the country. Suppose in one State some High Court decides or something happens, it would be right and proper on the part of the Defence Ministry to see to what extent this thing would be helpful if we introduce it in other parts of the country where similar cantonments are in existence. Therefore, this type of delay is inevitable. In any case six years' delay is a long period, we will bear it in mind. We would always try to minimise the time and try to avoid delays in future.

My hon. friend has suggested about release of bungalows and also enhancement of rent. The position regarding the hiring of bungalows has been very much liberalised. At one time because there was a lot of shortage of accommodation, the Defence Ministry was not in a position to release the bungalows which had been hired for the Defence Forces. But we have now plans to construct residential accommodation for the Defence Forces, and as and when we are able to complete buildings in the various States, it would be possible for the Defence Ministry to release them.

About the rent fixed for various accommodation, it is done on a very scientific basis. There may be some people who may be hit because the rent in the areas may be shooting up because of industries and various other developments, taking place. But in the initial stages when these

bungalows were hired by the Defence Ministry, many people preferred to let out their buildings for Defence use for two reasons : one, the rent fixed was very reasonable ; secondly, the Defence authorities have proved to be very good paymasters. But now even about the fixation of rent it is approved by the Station Commanders in most cases, and if the Station Commanders who are conversant with the rent prevailing in the area feel satisfied that the rent has to be increased, they do not even have to consult the Defence Ministry. They themselves can do it.

Regarding release of bungalows, as I have stated, it has already been taken up and in many places where we have constructed our own buildings we have released the bungalows which we have hired in the past.

I think there are no more points to be mentioned and there was nothing pointed out against the Bill. I think the Bill may be accepted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That the Bill to repeal the Delhi and Ajmer Rent Control Act, 1952, as in force in the Cantonment of Nasirabad, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH) : Sir, I move :

2. "That at page 1, line 4, for the figure '1967' the figure '1968' be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.
Enacting Formula

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir,
I move :

1. "That at page 1, line 1, for the word 'Eighteenth' the word 'Nineteenth' be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula as amended, was added to the Bill.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir,
I move :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE PRESS AND REGISTRATION OF BOOKS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Now we go on to Mr. K. K. Shah's Bill, the Press and Registration of Books (Amendment) Bill, 1967.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Press and Registration of Books Act, 1867, be taken into consideration."

The Press and Registration of Books Act, 1867, was amended in 1965 in order to make it applicable to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This was done with a view to enabling the Registrar of Newspapers for India to collect information and statistics about the Press in that State and to have a uniform law for the whole of the country, including the State of Jammu and Kashmir, for the regulation of the printing presses and newspapers, for the preservation of copies of books and newspapers printed in India and for the registration of such books and newspapers. It was provided in Section 1 (2) of the Press and Registration of Books (Amendment) Act, 1965 that it could come into force on such date as the

Central Government might appoint. In consideration with the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, the Central Government notified the 1st November, 1965, as the date of commencement of the Act in that State.

Under Section 5A of the Press and Registration of Books Act, 1867, inserted by the amendment Act of 1965, the keepers of printing presses and publishers and printers of newspapers in Jammu and Kashmir were required to make and subscribe fresh declarations within a period of two months from the date of enforcement of the amendment Act of 1965 in that State, namely, the 1st November, 1965. For the effective implementation of the Act in that State, the State Government was to take certain essential steps.

Due to certain administrative difficulties and for want of enough time, the necessary follow-up action could not be taken by the State Government well in time. Accordingly, the State Government requested for an amendment of the Act to remove the anomalous position. Since the Central Government had already issued one Notification under the Amendment Act of 1965 declaring the 1st November, 1965 as the date of commencement of the Central Act in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Government had already exhausted its power under that Act and could not therefore issue a fresh Notification in supersession of the first one to enforce the Act from a later date. Different courses of action were examined in consultation with the Ministry of Law and the Registrar of Newspapers for India, and Government are advised that the best course would be to amend Section 5A of the parent Act to provide for more time for this purpose.

Accordingly, the Bill seeks to amend Section 5A of the Act which as inserted in 1965 to extend the time-filing of declarations under the said Section up to the 30th June, 1968.

The question was proposed.