

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE**ANNUAL REPORT (1963-64) OF THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BOMBAY**

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Sixth Annual Report of the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, for the year 1963-64. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6868/66].

ANNUAL REPORT (1963-64) OF THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, MADRAS

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir I also beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Fifth Annual Report of the Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, for the year 1963-64. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6869/66].

ANNUAL REPORT (1963-64) OF THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, for the year 1963-64. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6870/66].

THE OIL AND NATURAL GAS COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1966

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 31 of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission Act, 1959, a copy of the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals Notification G. S. R. No. 1218, dated the 23rd July, 1966, publishing the Oil and Natural Gas Commission (Amendment) Rules, 1966. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6794/66].

THE KERALA SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES PREVENTION OF EVICTION ORDINANCE, 1966

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. SHRIMATI T. S. SOUNDARAM RAMA-CHANDRAN): Sir, on behalf of Shri Rasthi Margatham Chandrasekhar, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-clause (a) of clause (2) of article 213 of the Constitution read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation (G.S.R. No. 490) issued on the 24th March, 1965 in relation to the State of Kerala, a copy of the Government of Kerala (Law Department) Notification No. 6420-H4/66/Law,

dated the 5th July, 1966, publishing the Kerala Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Prevention of Eviction Ordinance, 1966 (No. 2 of 1966). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6827/66].

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Thirty-third Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in its Eleventh Report on the Rourkela Steel Plant of the Hindustan Steel Limited.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that the Government Business in this House during the week commencing 22nd of August, 1966 will consist of:

- (1) Further discussion on devaluation of the rupee.
- (2) Consideration and passing of the Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Bill, 1966, as passed by the Lok Sabha, to be taken up immediately after disposal of questions on Wednesday, the 24th of August, 1966.
- (3) Consideration of a Resolution to be moved by the Minister of Commerce: seeking approval of the notification issued on the 2nd of August, 1966, regarding levy of export duties.
- (4) Consideration and return of the Customs (Amendment) Bill, 1966, as passed by the Lok Sabha.
- (5) Consideration and passing of the following Bills as passed by the Lok Sabha:
The Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1966; The Criminal Law Amendment (Amending) Bill, 1966.

- (6) Further consideration and passing of the Electricity (Supply) Amendment Bill, 1966, as passed by the Lok Sabha.

- (7) Discussion on the Fifty-fifth Report of the Public Accounts Committee with reference to the observations of the Committee contained in para 4-128 of the Fiftieth Report of the Public Accounts Committee, on a motion to be moved by Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel. The Government have made a request that the Rajya Sabha may have an extra sitting on Saturday, the 27th of August, 1966. It is suggested that this discussion may take place on that day.

May I explain that unless we sit on this Saturday, it would be impossible to finish the most urgent legislative work which this House has to transact. I hope the House will agree to the suggestion. If they want to discuss the P. A. C. report, we should sit on Saturday.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश): श्रीमन्, इसमें हमको एक निवेदन करना है। कल भी हमने निवेदन किया था। सेंटरडे को हम लोग जानते हैं कि छुट्टी रहती है और इसलिए पहले से ही हम लोगों के कार्यक्रम बने रहते हैं। इसलिए क्या दिक्कत है अगर इस सदन की कार्यवाही 2 तारीख तक लचकी है तो उसमें एक दिन और बढ़ा दिया जाय?

श्री धनंजय अली खान (आंध्र प्रदेश): एकमेवकार का नुकसान होता है, आपका और हमारा नुकसान है।

श्री राजनारायण: आपको मैं अपना डायरी दिखा सकता हूँ, 27 तारीख को मोतापुर का कार्यक्रम लगा हुआ है, 28 को उरई का कार्यक्रम लगा हुआ है। हम अपने कार्यक्रमों में पहले से एन्गेज्ड हैं। हो सकता है कि इस सदन के दूसरे सम्मानित सदस्य भी एन्गेज्ड हों। ऐसी स्थिति में मेरा निवेदन है माननीय चागला साहब से कि इस पर जग विचार कर लें कि अगर एक दिन आगे बैठ जायें तो बहुत दिक्कत नहीं होगी।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): May I make a suggestion? With regard to the business for next week I have nothing to say except that the P. A. C. report should be given a little more time. Now, that is the difficulty with us. We have tabled a whole number of Calling Attention Notices, many of them relating to the Home Ministry. We had been waiting patiently so that this Friday when he came here, he would deal with some of them at least and make some statements with regard to Assam, for example. We did not raise it except that we mentioned it in brief. Also we had given notice about Bihar, and so many other things. Is it not at least expected of the Home Minister that he would at least say something even if you do not formally admit the motion? Certainly the Home Minister is not precluded from saying that he has some notices and he may add something to them. Nothing of the kind happened. Therefore, I only beg of the Members opposite that they get very angry when we say something. We come prepared and give notice and bring them here but we do not get even an intimation about them. When the session ends, we get an intimation in your name that these are rejected, rejected, rejected. If that is so, you will understand that it is very difficult for us. About the Assam thing . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: In your absence Mr. Hathi made some statement about Assam and they might be considering others. Today, you saw the Home Minister . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If they have in mind it is all right. We will wait further but no statement so far has been made.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): This Saturday, it is difficult for us. As Shri Rajnarain was saying, our time is engaged otherwise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That point has been made and we will consider.

SHRI ARJUNARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Rajnarain is making a sensible suggestion that the House should not sit on Saturday and if sometimes it is planned to sit on a Saturday, this should be notified to the Members at least three weeks in advance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will discuss with the Leader of the House and with the Minister

[Mr. Chairman.] for Parliamentary Affairs and I will say when we can take it up.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Last time when I raised the question that the Monopolies Commission report and the report of the Managing Agencies Committee should be discussed, the hon. Leader of the House promised here that he would convey that to the Law Minister and report to the House what would happen. May I request through you today that those two reports are highly important and for the last two Sessions notices have been there and this may be considered in the next week or the week next to that.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I have considered this in the Business Advisory Committee. Everything that comes before this House is important but look at the time the last motion took. What is one to do? A lot of legislation is pending which is of great importance. I am sure there is nothing which will be discussed here which is not of great public and national importance, but we have to find the time. If the Chairman will be good enough to call a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee, we shall consider whether we can find time for the Monopolies Commission report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will consider both the points that have been made.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Business Advisory Committee's sole job is to allocate the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know these points that have been made. This will have to be discussed I will take up both these questions with the Leader of the House and with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, and see what I can do in this matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For the last three Sessions we have been trying to discuss the Monopolies Commission's report and the Government is avoiding. We submit that a report of this kind by a Commission appointed on the orders of the Parliament should be discussed and all the other previous reports also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know that you are anxious.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This Session it should be taken up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would call upon the Minister for External Affairs to make a statement on the Privilege Motion.

RE A POINT OF PRIVILEGE

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Shri Dahyabhai Patel seeks to treat as a question of privilege some observations made by me in the debate on International Affairs last week on a reported statement by Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Chief Representative of the League of Arab States.

The facts, if I may be permitted to recall them, are that on the 8th of August in his speech on the floor of this House Mr. Dahyabhai Patel made some rather sarcastic and unfortunate references to the Head of a very friendly State, President Nasser, to the Arab League, and to its representative here and to some statement alleged to have been made by him. In the statement Mr. Dahyabhai Patel made no mention either of the name of the newspaper or the occasion or time or place when the statement was alleged to have been made. This was on the 8th. Two days later, he gave some details. That is, on the 10th. In an intervention to a similar observation made by Mr. Lokanath Misra later in the debate I questioned whether the Arab League Representative had stated that the Indian Government got into the Suez Canal dispute *only* because of "self-interest." I lay stress on the word 'only' in this connection. I went on to say that I have not seen any such statement. The fact of the matter is that although the "Times of India" of the 31st March carried a brief report of Mr. Maksoud's statement on the Suez Canal dispute, because of the misunderstanding created the Assistant Chief Representative of the League of Arab States sent a letter to the "Times of India" giving the relevant quotation from the record of the speech. This letter was published in the "Times of India" of the 5th April. The relevant paragraphs of the letter are as follows:

"Concerning India's support to Egypt during the Suez crisis, he said: * . . . India's support for Egypt during the tri-partite aggression in 1956, was motivated