

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Madam, one point arises out of this . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is the business before the House.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, I do not normally intervene unless it is very necessary and unless I think it is very necessary. The External Affairs Minister said that he had other sources of information on which he based his statement which was subsequently contradicted by the Israeli Government or by some representative of the Israeli Government. But even now the contention of the Minister is that those other sources on which he relied was more correct than the letter contradicting this statement, the letter sent by the Consul or whoever it was, on behalf of the Israeli Government. May I know, Madam, in these circumstances whether he will depend more upon the Israeli Government agency or on some other sources? And if he depends more on the Israeli Government sources, is he going to contradict whatever he said? On the other hand, if he depends more on such sources rather than on the Israeli Government, then will he follow the same procedure in the case of other statements issued by other Heads of Governments?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: If the hon. Member looks at my statement, he will find that in the statement, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister were quoted as having said that they would march on to Syria. This statement, as I said, is based on information received by us which we consider to be reliable. We have sources also from the Israeli radio itself where these things were said. A contradiction by the Consul in Bombay—he is not an Ambassador—does not carry the matter any further.

REFERENCE TO BUSINESS BEFORE THE HOUSE

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we go on to the regular business for the day I want to go back to what was stated before. On the 21st June we shall adjourn. Now you know that the Business Advisory Committee has set down certain allotments of time for the different items of business. I have a letter from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs addressed to the Chairman in which he has stated that three days will be given for the discussion on the Railway Budget for 1967-68. Now, does the House consider that three days are too much or too little or just enough? I would like the House to co-operate with me so that we can expeditiously dispose of all the business.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: That will be enough.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So there will be three days for the discussion on the Railway Budget, one day for the Railways (Appropriation No. 2) Bill. Does the House agree with this?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And then for the discussion on the General Budget six days are allotted.

AN HON. MEMBER: More than enough.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In the past we never had six days for the General Budget. I think we went up to three days. But I want the opinion of the House.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): Madam, this is the only opportunity that we get for a general discussion of several matters.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have done it in shorter time. I am only putting it to the House. If the House decides that it wants six days, we shall have it. But all these years we have done it in shorter time.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, let us curtail the general discussion on the Budget by one day and have five days for it, as we have been having hitherto.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): I suggest that the six days be increased to seven days.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then we shall have six days for general discussion on the General Budget, and for the Passport Bill one day, and for the Central Industrial Security Force Bill we have one day.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Madam. That will not be enough.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And then for the Anti-corruption Law (Amendment) Bill, two hours.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We do not agree.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me finish. Next week we have four working days because Friday will be for non-official business. Therefore we have only four working days. And the week after that we have five working days because there is no non-official business on Friday. And the week after that we have three days. That brings us to the 21st June. This is the business.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We do not accept the time allocation for the Industrial Security Force Bill because we feel that it is a highly controversial measure the like of which the country has never known. Therefore there should be ample and reasonable discussion in the House. Also we are trying to get opinion from all over the country. It is in the interest of the House that we do it. We are trying to get opinion from the States, even if the Government does not get this opinion from the States made available to the House. Therefore, I say that this Industrial Security Force Bill, unless

it is withdrawn, should have at least three days for its discussion. We do not accept any kind of time limit whatsoever.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): On behalf of my group, Madam, I also join Shri Bhupesh Gupta in . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Let me also express my views. I join my hon. friend in asking that as far as the Industrial Security Force Bill is concerned more days should be allotted to it because we feel that this is a pernicious measure which strikes at the federal structure of our Constitution and which tries to raise a sort of private army to go about marauding . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not go into all that.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I am offering my reasons.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much time do you take?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: We cannot allow this. Madam Deputy Chairman, I belong to a group which is a constituent member of the United Front Cabinet in West Bengal and I speak with a great amount of responsibility. We cannot allow this kind of a military force which is being set up in the name of industrial security to rampage in the States and in the name of law and order to take over factories and undertakings in the name of protection of the Central Government undertakings. And if this is sought to be done in one day's debate, then naturally we shall filibuster and Madam, we give this warning that it will not be allowed to be passed in one day. Therefore, Madam, from the point of view of parliamentary etiquette, let me just point out to you, that more days should be allotted for the discussion on this Bill if we are not to see the parliamentary

system breaking down under the impact of this gross and pernicious Bill which the Treasury Bench is going to bring in.

(Several hon. Members stood up)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have heard Mr. Chatterjee and I think all your opinions are the same.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I say that . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already expressed your opinion on that.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): I suggest that the Minister should drop the Bill altogether. There is no question of . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is the suggestion which you are making. Let us see.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: The Bill itself should be dropped, otherwise it is going to create a lot of pandemonium in the House and . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right. Yes; Mr. Bhandari.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : मैडम, आपने ये सारे बिलों की चर्चा इस आधार पर की है कि हमारे पास समय की कमी है। जैसा कि लीडर आफ दी हाउस ने पासपोर्ट बिल के बारे में बताया, उसकी अनिवार्यता को मैं समझता हूँ और इसलिए पासपोर्ट बिल का समावेश इस हाउस के कार्यक्रम में कर लिया जाय, यह बात तो उचित है। लेकिन इंडस्ट्रियल सीक्योरिटी फोर्स बिल एक ऐसा बिल है जिसका इसी सेशन में पास होना अनिवार्य नहीं है। दूसरी जगहों से जो विचार और स्टेट्स की जो राय हम जानना चाहते हैं वह भी तब तक आ जायगी और इस कारण से इस बिल को जो विवादास्पद भी है और जिस के लिये अभी समय भी नहीं मिल रहा है उसको इस सेशन में अभी न लिया जाय और वाकी बिजनेस के लिये हम अपना समय तय कर ले।

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Madam, I take strong exception to the time allotted for this Industrial Security Force Bill. In this connection I may inform you that just now I have tabled two motions with regard to that Bill. One motion is that—I have already tabled the motions and therefore I am informing—the President be requested to refer this matter under article 143 to the Supreme Court and the other motion is that the Attorney-General be summoned to this House. If the Industrial Security Force Bill were to be taken into consideration, then naturally these two motions will come up for discussion and it cannot be finished in this session. So under these circumstances when we strongly feel that it is *ultra vires* the Constitution the Bill may be dropped or if it is to be undertaken these two motions should also be discussed.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: Madam, I have got some compromise solution. If the Government agrees, let the Industrial Security Force Bill be circulated for public opinion and let the Passport Bill go to the Select Committee so that the business will be shortened and the time limit can also be adhered to.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, the Opposition has thrown up many suggestions as far as the Industrial Security Force Bill goes and it is for the Government to consider them. But we must not forget the zero hour. The zero hour must be of a very brief period so that we do not jump the order paper every day.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Again, I submit . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please listen. You have been very brief today and you have suggested much more than you usually do.

Anyway, we must go through whatever business is put on the order paper. However controversial the

[The Deputy Chairman.]

legislation might be according to your opinion, it is for the Government to consider the methods you have suggested, not for the Chair but for the rest of the business we have agreed that we shall sit till 21st June and finish the business. I would here like to suggest that if we lost time somehow or other and if we are not able to go to the regular business we should be prepared to sit through the lunch hour and up till six o'clock or even later in the evening.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): What I was saying was that Mr. Sinha made an excellent suggestion yesterday that the Attorney-General's opinion should be invited on the Industrial Security Force Bill. I have gone through that Bill and speaking for myself—I am not going into the merits or demerits of it now—I have grave doubts as to the legality of some of the provisions of that Bill.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar): It will come on Monday and you can say this then.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That opinion will also be considered by the Government. Now let us get on to the business.

THE PROHIBITION OF BIGAMOUS MARRIAGES BILL, 1967

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Madam, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to prohibit bigamous marriages.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Madam, I introduce the Bill.

THE HINDU MARRIAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967

(To amend section 5)

श्री अर० पी० खेतान (बिहार) : महोदया, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि हिन्दू विवाह अधिनियम, 1955 में और संशोधन करने वाले विधेयक को पुरःस्थापित करने की अनुमति दी जावे।

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

श्री अर० पी० खेतान : महोदया, मैं विधेयक को पुरःस्थापित करता हूँ।

THE WORKING JOURNALISTS (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): Madam, I beg to move for leave to withdraw the Working Journalists (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions (Amendment) Bill, 1965.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Bill is withdrawn.

THE PUNJAB MUNICIPAL (DELHI AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): Madam, I beg to move for leave to withdraw the Punjab Municipal (Delhi Amendment) Bill, 1965.