

takings on the Indian Oil Corporation Limited (Refineries Division).

THE BUDGET (GOA, DAMAN AND DIU), 1967-68

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C. PANT): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu for the year 1967-68.

THE CONSTITUTION (TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967

(To amend the Eighth Schedule)

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I introduce the Bill.

THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS), 1967-68

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI PARIMAL GHOSH): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India for the year 1967-68 in respect of Railways.

STATEMENT RE. TERMINATION OF EMERGENCY

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): The

Proclamation of emergency which was made in the wake of Chinese aggression has been reviewed. In actual practice, Government have already restricted the exercise of Emergency powers to certain areas only. It is their intention to seek necessary Constitutional authority to terminate with effect from the 1st July, 1967, the state of Emergency in all parts of the country except where abnormal conditions persist.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, what we cannot understand is under the Constitution the Government can revoke the Emergency. The Constitution provides for it. I don't know why this kind of variation is made here. It does appear from what he has said that they want to keep the Emergency in some parts of the country. Now this action is very wrong and I dispute the statement, Sir, that Emergency has not been used even, after the assurance given by the Government earlier in this House. In Bengal it had been used for issuing licences and so on. The D.I.R. had been used. Therefore, I say the Government should revoke the Emergency as such without qualifying or without keeping it in any part of the country. The electoral verdict has been clearly for the revocation of the Emergency entirely, over the entire country. This is what the position is. We should like to know why this kind of thing is being done again, that they want to keep it alive in certain parts of the country. The Emergency was not meant for those things. The ordinary law is adequate enough for dealing with any situation or contingency that we may envisage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think this is only a statement he has made. It was placed before the other House yesterday and it has been placed in this House to-day.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He made the statement. Is it how the Government should function? When the Emergency was proclaimed, at that time