Fifteenth day of the First Session of the
Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly

ANDHRA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Friday, the 7th April, 1972.

The House met at Half-Past Eight of the Clock.
(Mr. Speaker, Sri P. Ranga Reddy in the Chair)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Sri N. Srinivasulu Reddy (Gudur) :- I put the question (No. 1)
Sir, but the Chief Minister is not in the House.

Mr. Speaker :- I am sorry. He has just now sent me a message
that he is slightly indisposed and he will come as soon as possible.
So I will take up this question, if he comes in time, at the end
otherwise, I may have to postpone this question for tomorrow.

Sri C. V. K. Rao (Kakinada) :- Tomorrow, some of us will
not be here.

Mr. Speaker :- I hope the Chief Minister will come. I have
said 'tomorrow' just by way of caution.

Sri C.V.K. Rao :- He could depute the Deputy Chief Minister.
That also, you can instruct, because tomorrow there will be much
more heavy work.

Mr. Speaker :- We shall see how we can manage. Sri C.V.K.
Rao will please put the next question.

Sri C.V.K. Rao :- This question also concerns the Chief Minis-
ter, Sir.

Mr. Speaker :- Then we shall go to the next question, ques-
tion No. 3, standing in the name of Sri Ch. Parasurama Naidu.

Sri Ch. Parasurama Naidu :- I put the question.
FIRE STATION AT PARVATHIPURAM

(a) whether it is a fact that the Jute Merchants Association of Parvathipuram offered through the Lions Club to contribute Rs. 50,000 for the establishment of a fire-station at Parvathipuram in Srikakulam District.

(b) whether it is a fact that the Government accepted the offer and agreed to open a fire-station at Parvathipuram if the Municipality agreed to provide a suitable land with a semi-permanent building to house the station;

(c) whether it is also a fact that the Municipality communicated a copy of the resolution agreeing to provide the land and building; and

(d) if so, whether the Government will be pleased to order immediately the establishment of the fire station at Parvathipuram?

The Minister for Home (Sri V. Krishnamurthy Naidu):—

(a) Yes Sir;

(b) It is proposed to open a Fire Station at Parvathipuram provided funds are made available.

(c) Yes Sir.

(d) The matter is under consideration of the Government.

Sri Ch. Parasurama Naidu:—Is it within the knowledge of the Home Minister that there is a communication from the Home Department that a fire station will be established at Parvathipuram on the provision of a piece of land and a semi-permanent building for the purpose?

The Minister for Home (Sri V. Krishnamurthy Naidu):—If they fulfill the conditions, we will certainly open, if funds are available.

Sri Ch. Parasurama Naidu:—Fire station, as it was the consensus of the House in the course of the debate last week, is a
matter of emergency. The expenditure required is only Rs. 1,50,000 out of which we provided Rs. 50,000 plus a site plus a semi-permanent building. Approximately a lakh of rupees have been provided by us. In this matter of an essential service, could the Government afford to give an amount of Rs. 50 to 60 thousands?

Sri C. V. Krishna Murthy Naidu:—As early as possible.

Mr. Speaker:—Whether it is vague or not, I cannot make the Minister to commit. The question hour is intended to elicit information. For that, what is it that I can do? I am sure, the Minister, coming as he does from Srikakulam, will certainly have greater sympathy and he will see that the fire station is opened there very soon.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—This is a question that I have given on 20th of last month. I fail to understand whether the Minister has got information from the Municipality concerned. It is a matter which has been hanging for the last so many years. I would like to elicit that information, whether the Minister has got information from the Municipality or not?

Mr. Speaker:—This is a question that I have given on 20th of last month. I fail to understand whether the Minister has got information from the Municipality concerned. It is a matter which has been hanging for the last so many years. I would like to elicit that information, whether the Minister has got information from the Municipality or not?

Sri M. Manick Rao:—I got a report. But knowing Mr. C. V. K. Rao, as I know, he wants more details. I require some more information and I am getting a further report. That is why I request postponement of the question.
Sri C. V. K. Rao:—Let him give the report that is really available with him now. For the other things, he can communicate to me the information that he is going to get.

Sri M. Manick Rao:—Yesterday evening I discussed with the Secretary and asked him to get some more information. At present I do not have all the details and complete information with me. That is the only reason why I am requesting the Chair to postpone this question.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—That is not satisfactory to me, because, here, it is a question which has been put on the 26th of last month and by now information should have been got very easily. Whatever information is there at the disposal of the Minister, let him submit it. For further information, you can ask him, as and when he gets it, to submit it to this House or to me direct, Sir.

Sri M. Manick Rao:—I am sorry, Sir. I wanted a detailed report and I have despatched an officer to get more information. There is no question of hiding or shielding or any such thing in this respect. As you know, Sir, I am always ready with full information. This is the only first instance where I have not received full information. This is the only first instance where I have not received full report. I appeal to the Chair to postpone the question till tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker:—While I sympathise with your difficulty, Mr. Manick Rao, the point raised is that this question was given as long back as 20th March and perhaps I must have admitted it on the same day. Now, today is 7th, i.e., 17 days intervened. What was your department doing? You must pull up your Department. This is the most important occasion when members would like to elicit information through the question-hour. As you know, since we are adjourning from tomorrow, most of the members have been pressing me to see that the questions tabled are put and answered. May I take it that you do not have information on this?

Sri M. Manick Rao:—Yes, Sir, at present.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—He said just now that he has got some information. My submission is he cannot mislead the House. I do not have complaint against the Minister individually. He is collectively responsible. He cannot shield the department.

Mr. Speaker:—I shall go to the next question. Then you will have some time. At the end of the list of these questions, try to get from your Department as much information as possible.
Sri M. Manick Rao:—Sir, I am getting the whole report this afternoon. That is why I am requesting that the question may be postponed till tomorrow...

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—Sir, he said he had some information, that he had discussed the matter with the Secretary of the Department and then he is going to get more information from Kakinada. Let him give the information that he has. He seems to be shielding the Department. Whatever information is available, let him furnish, without holding the representatives of the people to ransom.

Mr. Speaker:—After all, if the Department or the Minister are trying to do it, at the most they can do it for another 24 hours (laughter). In view of the explanation of the Minister and the difficulty he is having, the only point is, would you consider the information being obtained tomorrow?

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—have already explained to you in the Chamber that I shall not be available tomorrow. No member need tell the Speaker about his programme, but I told you and you were good enough to post the question for today. The only question is whether in a particular place electric lights are there or not, whether the people living in that area belong to the backward or exploited sections, and whether lights were put in ‘smasam’. Is that a very difficult question to answer? I do not know what is wrong with the entire Municipal Administration.

Sri V. Srikrishna (Mangalagiri).—First of all, let him place the information that is with him.

Sri E. Ayyapu Reddy (Pa.:yam):—Sir, the question hour, as you know, is to elicit information. Sri C. V. K. Rao says he knows everything. Where is the question of his getting information?

Mr. Speaker:—No, No. Don’t waste your time and don’t waste my time....

Sri V. Srikrishna:—Let him place all the information available with the Minister.

Sri M. Manick Rao:—I have open mind, Sir. If any Officer has done anything wrong, I am going to take action. Whatever I had discussed with the Secretary, it is not enough to furnish the information.

Mr. Speaker:—There is absolutely no difficulty in getting the information by telephone whether lights have been put in Fishermen’s colony and the other colony.

Sri M. Manick Rao:—Since two days, Sir, my Office is not able to get through to Kakinada on the telephone.

Sri A. Sreeramulu (Eluru):—Do not we have the wireless system?

Mr. Speaker:—Anyway we shall postpone it till tomorrow. Sri C. V. K. Rao may take the answer and then leave.
Mr. Speaker:—In a situation like this what do the members want me to do?

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—After all, the Secretary has got to get the information from the Municipality. Is the Minister saying that the Secretary could not get the information from the Fishermen's Colony and the Backward Classes Colony in Kakinada Municipality; whether the lights were put in the 'Smasanam'?

Mr. Speaker:—If the Minister assures the hon. Members that lights will be put ......

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—Before I go to Kakinada.....

Mr. Speaker:—Certain period is prescribed in the Rules. We list the questions and it is for the Minister to furnish the information to the House. The previous procedure was that after getting the replies we are placing them before the House. To avoid the long delay, we are adopting this new procedure.

(Pause)

So, I shall postpone the question to tomorrow. If unfortunately Sri C. V. K. Rao is not there, the hon. lady Member behind him will take care of the matter.

**DEVELOPMENT OF KAKINADA PORT**

* 1-J Q.—Sri C. V. K. Rao:—Will the hon. Minister for Municipal Administration be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of loan sanctioned by the Government of India for the development of Kakinada Port in the Fourth Five Year Plan;

(b) for what schemes is that amount to be spent and how much has been spent so far and the purpose for which it was spent;

(c) whether a detailed statement showing the expenditure incurred towards (1) the dredging of approach channel (2) survey and investigation work and (3) navigational aids, for 1970-71 for Kakinada port will be placed on the table of the House,
(d) whether it is a fact that there is an outlay for Rs. 33.47 lakhs to be spent for Kakinada Port in 1971-72; and

(e) if so, what are the full particulars of the said outlay?

Sri M. Manik Rao :—(a) Rs. 100.00 lakhs.

(b) A statement is placed on the table of the House.

(c) A statement is placed on the table of the House.

(d & e) : A statement is placed on the table of the House.
## STATEMENTS PLACED ON THE TABLE

(Vide answer to Part (b) of the L. A. Q. No. 1-J *(S. No. 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Name of the scheme</th>
<th>Fourth Five Year Plan Outlay 1969-'74 (Rs. in lakhs)</th>
<th>Expenditure during 1970-'71 (Rs. in lakhs)</th>
<th>Expenditure from 1-4 '71 to 29-2-'72 (Rs. in lakhs)</th>
<th>Total expenditure Cols. 4 &amp; 5 (Rs. in lakhs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Dredging the approach channel</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>32.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Realignment of Railway track and resumption of Railway land.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Navigation aids</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Development of loading hard area.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Model studies including survey and investigation.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Provision of four mechanised barges and one Water barge</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Renewal of dry dock gates.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Extension of groynes.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Provision of slipway for repair of Port Craft.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. **Expansion of the Port East Ward of Ex-Burma Shell Area.**

(a) Capital dredging by Port dredgers including reclamation and formation of stacking area.
   - 2.00
   - Nil
   - Nil
   - Nil

(b) Extension of road and rail
   - 12.00
   - 0.22
   - 0.02
   - 0.24

(c) Extension of water and power supply
   - 1.00
   - 0.82
   - 0.001
   - 0.321

(d) Construction of wharf walls and jetties.
   - 5.00
   - Nil
   - Nil
   - Nil

11. Acquisition of a grab dredger.
   - 15.00
   - Nil
   - Nil
   - Nil

12. Procurement of additional workshop machinery
   - 0.50
   - 0.11
   - 0.11
   - 0.15

13. (i) Establishment of the execution of plan works (7\% included in the above estimate)
    - Nil
    - Nil
    - 0.04
    - 0.04

(ii) Providing additional transit shed facilities at Kakinada Port.
    - Nil
    - Nil
    - Nil
    - Nil

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>10.209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Answer to Part (c) of L. A. Q. No. *1-J Given Notice of by Sri C. V. K. Rao, M. L. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the work</th>
<th>Expenditure during 1970-'71 (Rs. in lakhs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dredging the approach channel</td>
<td>14-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Survey and investigation work</td>
<td>1-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Navigational aids</td>
<td>1-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Rs. 18-11 lakhs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Answer to Parts (d and e) of L. A. Q. No. *1-J Given notice of by Sri C. V. K. Rao, M. L. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Scheme</th>
<th>Outlay proposed for 1971-72 (Rs. in lakhs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dredging the approach channel</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Realignment of Railway track and resumption of railway land</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Navigational aids</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development of Loading hard area</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Model studies including survey and investigation</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provision of four mechanised barges and one water barge</td>
<td>13.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Renewal of Dry Dock gates</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Extension of groynes</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provision of a slipway for repair of Port Craft.</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10. Expansion of the Port Eastward of Ex-Burmah Shell area,  
(a) Capital dredging by Port Dredger including reclamation and formation of stacking area | 0.75                                       |
| (b) Extension of road and rail            | 8.00                                       |
| (c) Extension of Water and Power supply   | 0.50                                       |
| (d) Construction of wharf walls and jetties | 1.00                                       |
| 11. Acquisition of Grab Dredger           | 1.00                                       |
| 12. Procurement of additional workshop machinery | 0.25                                       |
| 13. i) Establishment of the execution of Plan works (*1/2% included in the above estimate) | 0.37                                       |
| ii) Providing additional transit shed facilities at Kakinada Port. | 1.72                                       |
|                                           | Total Rs. 89.47 lakhs                      |
Oral Answers to Questions.
7th April, 1972.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—The statement concerns about the expenditure in the 1st five year plan. And now certain expenditure has been incurred in Kakinada port. I would like to know whether the Government would appoint a committee to see whether all this was properly undertaken or not.

Sri M. Manick Rao:—It is not necessary to appoint a committee because we sent the proposals to the Government of India where they have got technical people and those people approved all our estimates. The survey is not only ours but the Government of India have got its own survey department and they have to give the particulars. On that basis only our State Government is doing. If the hon. member wants particularly about any work, because we are getting the technical sanction and guidance from senior most Government of India officials.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—The expenditure during 1970-71 on dredging the approach channel has been Rs. 14.8 lakhs and the total amount has been about Rs. 18 lakhs. The question is whether this has been audited or not. If audited what were the salient remarks on that?

Sri M. Manick Rao:—I want a separate question.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—No, Sir. Here is an expenditure. I wanted an investigation by a committee. He refuses. Now I want to know whether the expenditure has been audited or not. Will he not have the information as to whether a particular expenditure is audited or not?

Sri M. Manick Rao:—Already I have said that all these things are done under the guidance of the technical experts of the Government of India. Now the hon. member wants to know about audit. If he has got any report or a particular question or item, I want him to put another question.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—I asked whether audit was done or not. Every thing is 'no be audited. If audit was done what are the comments of the audit? Should he not have that information?

Sri M. Manick Rao:—At present I do not have that audit report with me.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—It is a most unsatisfactory answer. There is an expenditure for the fourth five year plan from 1969 to 1974. From 1969 onwards the expenditure has been incurred. Is he aware that these accounts are audited or not? If he is not aware he can say: 'I am not aware of the audit'.

Mr. Speaker:—You don't have the information with you. You can say that.

Sri M. Manick Rao:—I said, Sir.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—I am sorry, Sir, the Minister is not aware whether the expenditure item is audited or not. I request through you whether he will be prepared to send to me at my address the audited statement on that expenditure in Kakinada port for 1969-70 and 1970-71 with all the remarks.
Sri M. Manik Rao:— Generally whatever the hon. members ask on that only I get information. If any further information is wanted by him if he asks...

Mr. Speaker:— He is now specifically asking that he wants audit report along with the comments, if it had been done.

Sri M. Manick Rao:— That, I will submit to him.

LANCED PROPERTY OF SRI NARASIMHA SWAMY DEVASTHANAM IN ARVAPALLI VILLAGE OR THE DEVASTHANAM IN TUNGADURTHI VILLAGE OF SURYAPET TALUK, NALGONDA DISTRICT

6—

*2-D Q—SrI K. Madhusudhana Reddy (Chennur):— Will the hon. Minister for Endowments be pleased to state:

(a) whether Sri Narasimha Swamy Devasthanam in Aravapalli village or Devastanam in Tungadurthi village of Suryapet taluk; Nalgonda district are having any landed property in Vaddekothapalli village Jangam, taluk;

(b) the name of the person who is cultivating the said land and the lease amount fixed for the same;

(c) since how many years the said person has not paid lease amount or paddy; and

(d) the action taken to recover the said amount?

The Minister for Endowments (Sri Ch. S. R. V P. Murthi Raju):—(a) Sri Pattabhi Ramaswamy Temple of Tungadurthi Village Suryapet Taluk Nalgonda Dt. is having landed property of 51.4.C.-3 Guntas Wet in Vadde-Kothapalli Village of Jangam Taluk.

(b) Sri N. Yethi Raja Rao of Vaddekothapalli Village is cultivating the said land. The trust board fixed the lease amount at Rs. 100 per acre per annum in 1967.

(c) Since 1967 the said person has not paid the lease amount.

Registered notice have been issued to Sri N. Yethi Raja Rao for payment of rents and the matter is being persued by the Department.

1. కృషి చేసిన ప్రతి వారం పడపి వయిరితే సాధారణం అండపి గుంటస వి. కొట్టడి విల్లె యింది సాధారణం అడవి కృషి చేసిన ప్రతి వారం పడపి వయిరితే సాధారణం.

2. కృషి చేసిన ప్రతి వారం పడపి వయిరితే సాధారణం అడవి కృషి చేసిన ప్రతి వారం పడపి వయిరితే సాధారణం.

3. కృషి చేసిన ప్రతి వారం పడపి వయిరితే సాధారణం అడవి కృషి చేసిన ప్రతి వారం పడపి వయిరితే సాధారణం.

4. కృషి చేసిన ప్రతి వారం పడపి వయిరితే సాధారణం అడవి కృషి చేసిన ప్రతి వారం పడపి వయిరితే సాధారణం.
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(1) Dr. ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని సహాయం లేకుండా సమాధానం చేసారు? కాబట్టి ఉద్ఘటనానికి కావండా ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని సహాయం లేకుండా సమాధానం చేసారు?

(2) ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని సహాయం లేకుండా సమాధానం చేసారు?

(3) వి. మా. వేది: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(4) ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(5) ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(6) ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(7) వి. మా. వేది: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(8) ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(9) వి. మా. వేది: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(10) ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(11) వి. మా. వేది: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(12) ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(13) వి. మా. వేది: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(14) ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(15) వి. మా. వేది: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?

(16) ముఖ్యప్రతిష్ఠాని: - అవసరం ముఖం లాయి?
ORAL ANSWER TO QUESTIONS

House adjourned for fifteen minutes

The House re-assembled at Nine fifteen (9-15) a.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)
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By force they are collecting. They are not collecting of their own will. By force they are collecting. They are not collecting of their own will. By force they are collecting. They are not collecting of their own will. By force they are collecting. They are not collecting of their own will. By force they are collecting. They are not collecting of their own will. By force they are collecting. They are not collecting of their own will.
It is a fact that the management has not disbursed the scholarships to the students for the last seven years; 
(c) whether it is also a fact that the management has obtained the signatures of the students in the acquaintance register at the time of filing applications for scholarships; and 
(d) whether it is also a fact that some of the signatures of the students are forged?

The Minister for Labour (Sri T. Anjiah):—(a) 3,91,163 as on 31-12-1971.
(b) Yes, Sir.
(c) Increase in the number of passed-out students from the Colleges/High Schools/Training Institutions etc. resulting in more number of job seekers entering the employment market.

More number of unemployed persons sought the assistance of the Employment Exchange in getting Employment.

(d) 2,44,642 persons.
Mr. Speaker: —For the main question, he has given all the information.

Sri A. Sriramulu: —Is the Government contemplating grant of any allowances to these skilled and technically qualified unemployed persons?

GRANTS TO PRIVATE HOSTELS IN KOTA PANCHAYA SAMITHI

* I. S. Q.—Sri N. Sreenivasulu Reddy (Gudur):—Will the hon. Minister for Social Welfare be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government have issued orders withdrawing the powers of Kota Panchayat Samithi regarding the disbursement grants to of the Private Hostels and

(b) if so, what are the reasons for the issue of the said Memo?

The Minister for Social Welfare (Sri M. V. Krishna Rao:—(a) No, Sir. No orders were issued withdrawing the powers of Kota Panchayat Samithi. However, in respect of some institutions, orders were issued for the payment of grants directly by the Zilla Parishad to avoid delay.

(b) Orders were issued with a view to save delay in the payment of grants to these institutions.
Oral Answers to Questions. 7th April, 1972.

Sir: Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.
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Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I think the number of persons who have passed the examination is

Madam:—I am afraid I cannot give the exact number, but I will

Mr. Kuruppu:—I mean the number of persons who have passed the examination on the 7th of April, 1972.

Madam:—I cannot give the exact number, but I will
Sri C. V. K. Rao:—I am saying that the Government has favoured that particular individual.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—I am saying that the Government has favoured that particular individual.
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SHIFTING OF KORIMERLA GIRLS HOSTEL TO INDUKURPET IN NELLORE DIST.

*2-HQ.—Sri N. Sreenivasulu Reddy:—Will the hon. Minister for Social Welfare be pleased to state:
Oral Answers to Questions.

(a) whether it is a fact that the Director of Social Welfare in his Proceedings No D. Dis 1971-72 dated 25-2-72 has ordered to shift the girls hostel at Korimeia to Indukurpeta in Nellore District;

(b) if so, the reasons for shifting the hostel at the fag end of the school year;

(c) whether the Director of Social Welfare is competent to issue the said order without bringing it to the notice of the Government; and

(d) whether any efforts were made to improve the strength of the hostel at Korimeia?

Sri M. V. Krishna Rao:—(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) As against the sanctioned strength of 35 there were only four boarders. It was considered uneconomical to run a hostel with four boarders. As the number of boarders was negligible, the shifting did not cause much inconvenience.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) Yes, Sir. But the efforts proved futile.

CONCESSIONS TO BACKWARD CLASSES

11—

* 2-I. Q.—Sarvasri C.V.K. Rao, A. Sreeramulu, Smt. J. Eswari Bai and Sri B. Ratnasabhapathy (Rajampet):—Will the hon. Minister for Social Welfare be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Supreme Court has given its decision on the appeal of the Andhra Pradesh Government regarding the concession to backward classes;

(b) if so, whether a copy of the same will be placed on the Table of the House; and

(c) whether Government have issued a G.O. in this regard, if so, whether a copy of it will also be placed on the Table of the House?

Sri M. V. Krishna Rao:—(a) Yes Sir. The Supreme Court upheld the list of Backward Classes and the concessions given to them.

(b) Two copies of the Judgement of the Supreme Court are placed in the Andhra Pradesh Legislature Library for reference of members.

(c) No Sir. Orders will be issued shortly.
Mr. Speaker:—The Hon’ble Minister may consider the request of the hon. Member.

**Co-operative Spinning Mill at Nellore**

12—

*2-0 Q.—Sri N. Sreenivasulu Reddy:—Will the hon. Minister for Handlooms & Co-operative Factories be pleased to state:

(a) when will the Co-operative Spinning Mills at Nellore start production;

(b) what is the cost of the project?

(c) how many persons belonging to Andhra Pradesh were provided employment under different categories of establishment in the Co-operative Spinning Mills at Nellore; and

(d) the number of persons from other States employed in each category?

The Minister for Handlooms and Co-operative Factories (Sri G. Rajaram):—(a) Nellore Co-operative Spinning Mills has started production from 1-6-171.
(b) Rs. 90.40 lakhs.
(c) & (d)
The particulars are as follows:

(i) Workers:

From Andhra Pradesh 144
Telugu speaking Burma repatriates 119
Ceylon repatriates 40
From Tamil Nadu 10

(ii) Office staff:

All are from Andhra Pradesh, except one who belongs to Tamil Nadu.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Mr. Speaker:—I will take up the questions to be answered by the Chief Minister at the end.

Sri V. Krishna Murty Naidu:—I requested that the question (No. 12 B) be postponed for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker:—We will take it up tomorrow.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—Tomorrow is today, as stated. We also requested you that it should be posted for today.

Mr. Speaker:—That is true. I remember to have stated that I will take it up either on the 7th or on the 8th. I was not sure whether it was ready for listing out in the question paper. Afterwards, the Minister requested me that he will be in full possession of the details by 8th. But by then the Question was published in the list. So, I will take it up to-morrow.

Smt. J. Etwari Bai:—Please see that it is not postponed.
Mr. Speaker — No. No. To-morrow the Minister for Home will have to answer.

Sri V. Krishnamurthy Naidu: —Yes.

Sri C. V. K. Rao: —We have also given one more question connected with this in the name of Sri Nagi Reddi. Both may be clubbed together.

Mr. Speaker: — In fact I did it already.

**ARREST OF SRI RAMANA ALIAS CHITTIBABU**

S.No. 12 — C

3 — I. Q. — Sarvasri V. Srikirshna, S. Papi Reddy, C. V. K Rao, Vanka Satyanarayana and M. Nagi Reddy: — Will the hon. Minister for Home be pleased to state:

(a) whether Sri Ramana Alias Chittibabu a student of B. Sc., class belonging to Srikakulam District was arrested at Visakhapatnam on 18-2-1972;

(b) if so, whether he was produced before any judicial court; and

(c) if so when?

Sri V. Krishnamurthy Naidu: — (a) The Superintendent of Police, Vizag South has reported that no such person was arrested at Visakhapatnam.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.
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Mr. Speaker:—You ask for the information.

Mr Speaker:—The Minister said that student was not arrested. Give full particulars.

Mr Speaker:—The Minister said that student was not arrested. It is said that a student belonging to Srikakulam district was arrested. He may be a student of Srikakulam or Kurnool. What you have said in the question was that he was arrested at Visakhapatnam.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—Let him not try to escape to give the answer.
Short Notice Questions and Answers. 7th April, 1974.

Whether Smt Ramana alias Chittirababu, a student of B.Sc. Class belonging to Srikakulam district was arrested at Visakhapatnam on 18-2-72. Student of B.Sc Class belonging to Srikakulam district...

Mr Speaker—The question is whether a person by name, Ramana alias Chittirababu was arrested The Minister said no such person was arrested at Visakhapatnam. What more do you want?

Sri C. V. Rao:—Whether that person is there or not. If that person is not there, then some other person was arrested at Visakhapatnam. If that person is there, then you have to get the detailed report and then you raise this on the floor of this House.

Mr Speaker:—The only course is, if you have got more details please pass them on to the Minister and ask him to get the detailed report and then you raise this on the floor of this House.

Sri V. Srikisna:—That is not the point Sir. We have given that he is a student. In the question itself it indicates that he is a B.Sc. class student.
Short Notice questions and Answer.

RELAY HUNGER STRIKE BY THE BANK EMPLOYEES

S. No. 2. D

S No. Q. No 2-U. Sri C. V. K. Rao:- Will the hon. Minister for Labour be pleased to state:

(a) whether indefinite hunger strike and relay hunger strikes were undertaken by the employees of State Bank of India branches Unions in Andhra Pradesh for their demands in the first and second week of March 1972; and

(b) if so, what are their demands and whether conciliation measures are taken up by the State Labour Department; if not, the reasonstherefor?

Sri T. Anjaiah:- (a) There were indefinite hunger strikes and relay hunger strikes from 21-2-1972 to 5-3-1972.

(b) The employees went on hunger strike demanding withdrawal of charge sheets and cancellation of transfer orders issued to some of the employees of Vijayawada Branch of State Bank of India for having resorted to illegal activities in the Bank premises. The State Labour Department is not concerned with the dispute as the State Government is not the appropriate Government under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

I don’t know that information.
Mr. Speaker: There is a question regarding Renigunta Sugar Factory by Sri A. Balram Reddy.

It is understood from the Special Commissioner of the Government New Delhi, that the steering Committee of the Government of India have cleared the application. The issue of a formal letter of intent is awaited.
Mr. Speaker:—This is the information you could obtain from your Secretariat or the Registrar of Co-operative Societies.
Short Notice Questions and Answers. 7th April, 1972.

(1) மூன்று மாதங்கள்: இரு நாள் என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை, இத்தொடர் என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை, இத்தொடர் என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை?

(2) முன்னோர் மற்றும் பிறகு போர்வோட்டம்: ஒரு செம்மை கொண்டு பிறகு போர்வோட்டம். என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை?

(3) தவறாயிரத்தில்: மத மாதிரியை என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை?

(4) மூன்று மாதங்கள்: என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை?

(5) முன்னோர் மற்றும் பிறகு போர்வோட்டம்: என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை?

(6) மற்றும் பிறகுகள்: என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை?

(7) தவறாயிரத்தில்: என்ன கொண்டு நாடு வருகை?
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Sri T. Purushothama Rao:—I could have sent it immediately to the Chief Minister to provide that information to the House.

Who has to reply to you? Just tell me:

Sri T. Purushothama Rao:—You are the guardian of the House.
Privilege Motion:

re: Letters to the Editor published in 'Zamin Ryot'.

Mr. Speaker:—When you consider me as guardian of the House, take my advice as a guardian.

Mr. Speaker:—I will find out.

Sir Syed Hasan (Chairman):—Sir, It is an identical case I am referring to you. You had specifically given a ruling that the Chief Minister should reply to the allegations made by me; I have given them in writing to the Chief Minister. Tomorrow at least, he has got to reply to them.

Regarding the other point, in the Assembly the Chief Minister has given an assurance that he would be supplying copies of G.O. No. 180. Having written to him to supply that G.O. So, this contravenes what he had said in the Assembly; he has not supplied it. May I request you to instruct the Chief Minister?

Mr. Speaker:—I have already sent the paper to the Chief Minister; as soon as he comes, I shall find out.

Sir Syed Hasan:—Shall we keep it for tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker:—Yes.

Sri M. Manick Rao:—Last time I have already made a statement here. Now that the hon. member has raised it here, I will see that water is supplied by lorries or other means wherever necessary, as early as possible. Today itself I will take action.

Privilege Motion:

re: Letters to the Editor published in 'Zamin Ryot'.

Mr. Speaker:—Sri N. Sreenivasulu Reddy in his privilege motion dated 4-4-1972 stated that Sri Nellore Srimamamoorthy the Editor of 'Zamin Ryot', a weekly magazine published from Nellore, has committed a breach of privilege of the members of the Legislative Assembly by meanly portraying the members of the Aadhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly as corrupt persons in the issue dated 31-3-72.
while reporting about the election to Rajya Sabha. Sri N. Sreenivasulu Reddy has further stated that one Sri C. V. Sesha Reddy, Sarpanch of Madamancher, has criticized his speech made in the House as a Legislator, in his letter to the Editor, published under the caption of "The candidature of Janardhana Reddy to the Rajya Sabha."

The matter was taken up in the House on 4th April, 1972 when Sri N. Sreenivasulu Reddy merely stated what is contained in his privilege motion. The matter was again taken up in the House on 6-4-72. Sri V. Srikrishna, Sri Vanka Satyanarayana Sri C. V. K. Rao Sri Ch. Parususama Naidu and Sri Kudipudi Prabhakar Rao supported the privilege motion.

The point for consideration is whether publication in the 'Zamin Ryot' a Weekly magazine portraying the members of the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly as corrupt persons in its issue dated 31-3-72 and the criticism of a member's speech in the House in the same magazine dated 31-3-72, would amount to breach of privilege and contempt of the House.

According to Erskine May, "Analogous to molestation of members on account of their behavior in Parliament are speeches and writings reflecting upon their conduct as members. On 26th February 1701, the House of Commons resolved that to print or publish any libels reflecting upon any member of the House for or relating to his service therein, was a high violation of the rights and privileges of the House."

On the 16th April 1947, in the House of Commons, Mr. Hogg made complaint of an Article written by Mr. Garry Allighan published in the "World Press News" on the 3rd April 1947, containing passages reflecting on the conduct of members of the House. The Speaker then ruled that a prima facie case had been made out and the matter was referred to the Committee of Privileges.

In another case in India, Sri Haamoham Panigrahi, Advocate, Berhampore got published on 5th April 1958, in the "Samaaja", his letter relating to the acquisition of land at Kamapalli where he contradicted what he considered to be the wrong impression created regarding the acquisition of those lands. His criticism of the relevant proceedings of the Assembly savoured of indignity to the House and reflected on the character of the members concerned. The matter was referred to the Committee of Privileges. The Committee held that to constitute a breach of privilege, a libel upon a member must concern the character or conduct of the member in that capacity and the conduct or language on which the libel is based must be actions performed or words uttered in the actual transaction of the business of the House. The Committee held that the House was put to irrelevant criticism as also the members and hence a breach of privilege has been committed.

In other case, in an editorial in "Hindustan Times" under the heading "Wrong tactics" it was stated that the members used unlawful
means and wasted the time of the House. The Speaker, Delhi Vidha Sabha ruled that the Press had exceeded the limits of fair criticism and that there was a prima facie breach of privilege.

All the same, I have taken considerable care in examining this matter with a view to avert any infringement on the freedom of Press as I felt that while trying to safeguard the privileges of the Legislators individually and the House as a whole, much more regard should be paid for protection the privileges of other citizens who also have the right of expression through Press and platform. While one should appreciate with tolerance the criticism in the newspapers, such criticism should not exceed the bounds of decency and limits of fairness.

On a perusal of the passages in question in the weekly magazine of "Zamin Ryot", dated 31-3 72, I am of opinion that it is a clear case where prima facie case is made out for referring to the Privileges Committee as very serious and damaging allegations are made not only against the M.L.A.s but also the House as a whole. Accordingly, I refer it to the Committee of Privileges for examination and report to the Assembly.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:—I am to announce to the House that the following candidates have been elected to the Committee on Public Accounts for the financial year 1972-73.

Mr. Speaker:—I am extremely sorry. I am withdrawing my announcement and I shall examine the same in detail and announce tomorrow.

I am putting off announcements of all other Committees also till I see the entire file. I shall announce them tomorrow.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 341 OF THE ASSEMBLY RULES

Mr. Speaker:—Now we shall go to matters under Rule 341 of the Assembly Rules.

The Chief Minister is not present in the House now. So all matters relating to the Chief Minister— I shall call them as soon as he comes, or I will postpone them till tomorrow.

The Minister for Finance (Sri A. Bhagavantha Rao):—Excepting the Call-attention motions all the other matters relating to the Chief Minister may be postponed, Sir. That is what he has asked me to request you, Sir.
Mr. Speaker: So, matters under Rule 341 sought to be raised by Sri Sanyasi Rao, Sri C.V.K. Rao, Smt. J. Swaraj Bai and Sri M. Nagi Reddy will be raised after the Chief Minister comes into the House today, or we shall have them tomorrow. The next matter relates to the Minister for Agriculture, to be raised by Sri Kona Prabhakara Rao.

Sri Kona Prabhakara Rao:—I am withdrawing it. I do not want to raise the matter, Sir.

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—Can a member withdraw notice?

Mr. Speaker: —What is the practice? This is a matter under Rule 341 sought to be raised by a particular member. What should happen if the Member does not want to raise it?

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—Naturally members that belong to the Ruling party, in their anxiety to get something or some information, they may give notice; but later on, they may get some pressure from the Treasury Benches and then withdraw. Once it is on the agenda, a paper of the day, could it be permitted to be withdrawn or not, is the point. I request the hon. Chair to give a ruling. We must bear in mind this background, namely, members belonging to the Ruling party, in their innocence, would like to get information but when they get some pressure from the ministers concerned, they may try to withdraw it. In order to avoid such a continuity, would it not be better to allow that matter to be answered by the Minister concerned?

Sri Kona Prabhakara Rao:—Under Rule 341 I gave notice. So long as it is not brought into the agenda, I have got a right to withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: —Now let us go through the Rule. Rule 341 reads as under:

“341. No matter to be raised without previous permission:

No matter, however important and urgent may be, shall be raised by any Member, without having given at least half an hour’s notice to the Speaker before the commencement of the sitting for the day and obtained his permission.”

So, Sri Prabhakara Rao sought my permission in writing to raise a matter under Rule 341. Permission was given to him. Now when the matter has come before the House, he wants to withdraw it.

Sri Kona Prabhakara Rao:—Permission is given only to me, Sir, to raise a particular issue. If I do not raise it, it does not become the property of the House.
Matters under Rule 341 of the Assembly Rules:

7th April, 1972.

Sri Syed Hasan:—I also agree that when once the House takes cognizance of such matter, the House has every right to discuss it, whether the hon. Member wishes to withdraw it or not.

If it is in the agenda it forms part of the proceedings of the House and it becomes the property of the House.
Matter under Rule 341 of the Assembly Rules:

If it has already become the property of the House by being put on the Agenda, then you can raise it. I have given the permission to withdraw it. If a Member says he would withdraw it, I should permit it.
Matters under Rule 3 '1 of the Assembly Rules:

re: Continuing teachers during summer vacation.

I have heard the Member say 'pointless point of order'. It cannot be tolerated. Such things cannot be permitted. It is an inexperienced type of behaviour.

Mr. Speaker:—Order, Order...

re: Continuing teachers during vacation.

The Minister for Primary and Secondary Education (Sri B. Sriramamurthy):—Government have directed that all temporary teachers, both qualified and unqualified, working in the schools under all management's be continued in service during the ensuing summer vacation i.e. summer vacation for the schools year 1971-72.
324 7th April, ’972.  
Matters under Rule 41 of the 
Assembly Rules:  
re: Continuing teachers during summer 
vacation.

As directed at the last meeting of the Assembly, a letter was received from the Director of Public Instruction, dated 12th April, 1972, regarding the question of continuing teachers during the summer vacation.

The letter states that the Directors have to consider the question of allowing teachers to continue in service during the summer vacation, and that the matter should be discussed at the next meeting of the Assembly.

It is requested that the members of the Assembly may consider the matter and express their views at the next meeting.

(Signed)  
[Signature]

[Date]
Alati unde' Rule 341 of the Assembly Rules:
7th April, 1972.
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Sir A. Bhagavantha Rao: - Sir, there were two rival groups in Balusutippa village—one led by Voleti Desalu and the other by T. S. L Naicker; besides these, 52 persons who possessed the salt fields were independent of the two groups. For some reason or the other in August, 1971 one member of the Desalu group was murdered besides some other injured by Naicker's group. In connection with the expenses of the murder case Sri Naicker's group demanded contribution from 52 independent members which they refused. On this the Naicker's group wanted to take over salt fields by force. As a result of this, the 52 salt producers joined the group of Desalu group and obtained orders of Sec. 14 from the Taluk Magistrate Mummidivaram prohibiting Naicker's group from entering the Salt fields or from interfering with the peaceful possession of the salt fields by the 52 persons till 31-1-72. But Sri Naicker instigated his party men to
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forcibly occupy the salt fields. About 500-600 fishermen of his group formed into unlawful assembly and armed with deadly weapons entered the salt fields on 16-1-72 at about 9 a.m. and destroyed the pumps, etc. installed in the salt fields; there were only 10 out of the 52 salt producers there and they sought the protection of the mobile police party stationed in the village. The Head Constable extended repeated appeals to the mob not to resort to violence and destructive acts but to seek redress in a court of law. The mob disregarded his appeal, surrounded the police party and started pelting mud balls and sprays on the police party. A few men taunted the head constable and another constable with stones as a result of which they received injuries. As the mob still pressed on the police, the head constable finding no other alternative after giving final warning to the mob in self-defence ordered to open fire towards the mob. Two rounds were fired by one constable. As the mob still persisted to safeguard the lives not only of the police party but also the lives of the 10 salt producers and arms and ammunition of the police party, two more rounds were fired by another constable. As a result of the firing, one person died on the spot, where two others received bullet injuries. The mob then dispersed. While dispersing the mob left behind one of the injured persons and took away the second. All efforts made by the Police to remove the injured to the hospital proved futile as none of the fishermen irrespective of the party affiliations refused to arrange conveyance as this is an inland village. The injured succumbed to the injuries by about 5-40 p.m. on the same day. A case in Cr. No. 5/72 of Katrenikona P. S. was registered. Of the 42 accused, 30 have been arrested so far; 8 accused surrendered on 1-4-72 before the Additional Judicial Magistrate, Amalapuram. Two of the accused died in the firing and 3 are still absconding. Charge-sheet is being filed in the court. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate has conducted a magisterial enquiry and submitted his report. The Magistrate's report is under examination of the Government. There is no need for judicial enquiry now.
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Mr. Speaker:—Leave it at that.

Sri K. Rao:—Whether circumstances warrant judicial enquiry he said. If the honour can be enquired into, why not the judicial enquiry? That is all.

Mr. Speaker:—Whether circumstances warrant judicial enquiry he said. If the honour can be enquired into, why not the judicial enquiry? That is all.
Mr. Speaker: - Do not point out direct to the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: - Do not point out direct to the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: - Do not point out direct to the Minister.

The essence of it is a judicial enquiry. But still it is characterized as judicial enquiry in technical parlance. Whether in the course of the enquiry, it was found that there were injuries on the backs of the people or on the front of the people. If it is on the backs of the people, it is definitely not the defensive action on the part of the Police. That part of information has not been placed before the House by the Honble Finance Minister. That part of the matter is not definitely spoken to. I request for an answer.

Facts stand. I do not think that there is any necessity for a judicial enquiry.
332 7th April, 19...

Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance:

re: Imposition of heavy penalties on ryots under Nagarjunasagar ayacut area on the Right Bank.

Sri A Bhagavanthu Rao: I do not think there is any necessity for conducting judicial enquiry.

(INTERRUPTION.)

Mr. Speaker:—There is no point in repeating the same points. I have given ample time for the Members. The Government says that there is no necessity for a judicial enquiry. What is the use of pursing the matter.

Sri Ch. Parasurama Naidu:—The hon. Minister has not replied to the point as to where the injuries were made. That piece of information is being avoided. The Hon’ble Speaker may kindly direct the Minister to give the specific answer.

Sri A. Bhagavanthu Rao:—I am unable to see an observation made by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate.

Mr. Speaker:—I will give an opportunity tomorrow for discussion on this matter when the Chief Minister will be present.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

re: Imposition of heavy penalties on ryots under Nagarjunasagar ayacut area on the right bank.

Sri G. V. Anjaneya Sarma (Sathenapalli):—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I invite attention of the Hon’ble Chief Minister to a very grave situation prevailing in Nagarjunasagar ayacut area in the right bank. The cultivators there are burdened with debts borrowed by them from the Land Mortgage Bank for their reclamation of their lands into wet cultivation. They have incurred great expenditure for levelling up the land and for construction of bunds with great difficulty. They have converted their original dry land to wet land. There seems to be a lot of confusion even at the time of original localisation programme. The basic difference that was shown for irrigation system on the left and right banks is there. In the Left Bank, Sir, the entire land was characterised as wet cultivation and water was supplied to them. But in the Right Bank, the mixed system of irrigation is sought to be introduced as mixed economy. Since the mixed things are bound to fail, this also failed. The water was first released in 1967 and in 1968, the Government was pleased to issue G.O. notwithstanding the approval of the original crop pattern and continuation of land into dry irrigated dry and wet. Sir, I would like to recollect the mind of Hon’ble Minister that in the entire area raising of dry crops is more beneficiary, i.e. like commercial crops of tobacco and chillies. No ryot would have willingly gone for paddy cultivation. But on account of this system of irrigation, many cultivators had to convert their land into wet cultivation. For instance, there was no rational localisation. There is
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mixed system. Some land for dry, some land for irrigated dry and some land for wet. There is percolation of water and even the land set a part for wet cultivation or irrigated dry have become unsuitable for dry cultivation. So it has become impossible for them, on account of seepage, percolation of water. I will read out the relevant portion of the G. O issued in 1966.

"The Government after careful consideration preferred the proposal to switch over to wet irrigation in Nagarjunasagar project and for localisation; for dry irrigation temporarily for the period of 5 crop years from the year 1967 to tide over the food situation in the country."

When the Government itself came forward and encourages the ryot notwithstanding the different crop pattern was approved and to switch over to wet cultivation in the interests of food production, I do not know why the ryots should be penalised for that. Actually, encouraged by that announcement and on account of geometrical impossibility, the ryots considered and the dry cultivation has been converted into wet. These are the circumstances under which this wet cultivation has been resorted to. In 1967 no water cess was collected. In 1968-69 and 1969-70 not only the water cess was demanded but also heavy penalties, now running to crores of rupees. I invite the attention of the Minister to these things and request him to remove the penalties because I am confident that they will be removed. The offence should not be continued any further. Once the whole scheme should be rationalised. There should be rational localisation. When once anybody goes into wet cultivation and after 2 or 3 years, he cannot go back to dry cultivation. That is almost impossible. So, I plea not only for removal of penalties because for the last 2 years the penalties were removed by the previous Government and this present Government also, I pray and hope that they will be pleased to remove them.

The whole thing should be rationalised. I appeal to the Government to embark a programme for re-localisation with representative teams—teams which are well versed and which know the job but not the teams which will sit under tree and take some books and characterise the land as irrigated dry, wet and dry etc. With these few words I request the hon. Minister to make a statement and upon which some of my friends who are interested in this question, will be satisfied.

Sri A. Bhagavantha Rao:—According to the report of the Collector, Guntur the total amount of the penalties levied for various types of unauthorised irrigation under Right Bank Canal of N. S. Project during Fasli 1880 is Rs. 57.35 lakhs. The penalties for Fasli 1381 are reported to be not yet settled. The Collector has reported that the penalties have been levied for unauthorised irrigation by cross-bundling of the canals' irrigation of non-localised lands and raising of wet crops of localised dry irrigated lands etc. which resulted in the diminution of supply of water to the regular ayacut as per
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the part of the localisation done under N S Project. Ord. utilisation of water for irrigation could be rendered impossible unless rules regulating the supply of water for irrigation purposes are duly observed by all. Any irregular irrigation and tampering with the damages to the irrigation works would have to be seriously viewed and severe action taken against the offenders. The Collector of Guntur has however submitted certain proposals for concessional treatment in regard to the penalties levied for raising wet corps on localised irrigated land and for irrigation of non-localised commandable lands under inevitable circumstances. These proposals are under the active consideration of the Government.

Sri G. V. Anjaneya Sarma:—The information supplied by the Collector to the hon. Minister does not seem to be very accurate because I was informed by the Tahsildar, Sattenapalli that in Sattenapalli Taluk the total amount of penalties comes to Rs. 38 lakhs 29 tho. sands. Evidently there is some mistake somewhere. The figure only relates to Sattenapalli Taluk. So many other taluks are also involved in this matter and it is bound to run into some crores. So, I request the hon. Minister to stay collection of penalties and go into the question and come to a conclusion whether there is any justification or not. What we want is immediate stay.

(Sri K. Ramanatham in the Chair)

(Sri C. V. K. Rao Rose up)

Mr. Chairman:—It is only for those who have given the question. We don’t have discussion on that. It is a Call attention motion. It is not a question.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—The hon. Speaker has given a ruling. The others can ask a question after the Minister makes a statement.

Mr. Chairman:—There is no discussion on a Call Attention motion. Let the Minister reply.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—As any other member, I am trying to elicit some information as the Hon. Speaker has permitted to do so. You cannot object to it. The Hon. Speaker’s Rulings are binding.

Mr. Chairman:—What is that ruling?

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—What he said was that as the notice of the call attention is concerned certain members give notice. Those members have a right to speak on that. Then the Minister gives the reply. After the Minister gives the reply, any member can seek elucidation on the points he has raised. That is how I got it even now. Mr. Nagi Reddy can be permitted.

Mr. Chairman:—You cannot have any discussion.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—Don’t beat us by any stick.

Mr. Chairman:—Of course you are having enough time.
Calling attention to a matter of public importance:
re: Failure of South Central Railway authorities to re-install the Budha Statue at La laguda Railway Grounds.

Sri G.V. Anjaneya Sarma:—My hon. Friend and Member from Narasaraopet has raised this question on 30th of this month and the hon. Chief Minister was pleased to state that the matter is being referred to the District Collector and a report is called for. My point in this is whether the hon. Minister is prepared to stay further collecting and harassment.

re: Failure of South-Central Railway authorities to re-install the Budha Statue at Lailaguda Railway Grounds.
Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance:

re: Failure of South-Central Railway authorities to re-install the Budha statue at Lallaguda Railway Grounds.

Sr. A. Bhagavantha Rao:—The General Manager, South Central Railway was addressed for intimating the facts of the case regarding the re-installation of the Budha Statue in the Railway premises from where it was removed and it was also enquired whether there would be any objection on the part of the Railways to accord permission for re-installing the Statue at the same place, so that the sentiments of the local Buddhists may be accommodated. The General Manager, South Central Railway while intimating that the Railway Rules preclude any religious structures to be erected within the railway boundary without the prior sanction of the Railway Board, had stated that the statue is a small one of the size of 18"x12"x8" and was taken custody of by the Engineering Subordinates lest that part of the railway colony turn into a conclave of religious buildings in due course, as he had also received representations from a number of Buddhists Societies, he has stated that he reported the request to the Railway Board for instructions. On the advice of the Railway Board, the Union Railway Ministry have advised the South Central Railway not to grant permission for use of the railway land for religious purposes particularly in town areas. The South Central Railway was accordingly intimated the President, Bharathiya Budhamaha Sabha, North Lallaguda, Secunderabad.
Calling attention to matters of urgent Public Importance:

re: Inhuman behavior of the Management towards the workers in Sarvaraya Textile Ltd. Kakinada.

Sri A. Bhagavanthu Rao:—That the matter has been referred to the Railway Board and the reply is awaited.

Sri C. Parasurama Naidu:—Will the Government be pleased to take further action so that the Railway authorities can install the Budha Statue.

Sri A. Bhagavanthu Rao:—That the matter has been referred to the Railway Board and the reply is awaited.

Sri C. Parasurama Naidu:—Will the Government be pleased to take further action so that the Railway authorities can install the Budha Statue.
7th April, 1972.

Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance:

re: Inhuman behavior of the Management towards the workers in Sarvaiya Textile Ltd., Kakinada.
Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance:

7th April, 1972.

re: Inhuman behaviour of the Management towards the workers in Sarvaraya Textile Ltd., Kakinada.

Mr. Chairman:—I request the Minister for Labour to speak.

The Minister for Labour (Sri T. Anjaiah):—Sir, The management of Sarvaraya Textiles Limited, Kakinada, issued a charge sheet to Sri P. Subba Rao, the Vice-President of the Sarvaraya Textile Factory National Workers Union, on the ground that he tried to
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waylay the Departmental Maitre's and the Supervisor at the main gate of the Factory on 29-12-71 with the help of about 100 workers. The domestic enquiry instituted by the management against the workers of the above misconduct is in progress. It is understood that the management wanted to finalise the issue and seek the approval of the Labour Court before whom certain cases of dismissal are pending. The Labour Officer, Rajamundry, however, advised the management not to be hasty in taking action against Sri P. Subba Rao and show a lenient attitude.

It is gathered that explanations were called for from the two women employees; Smt. K. Achayyunma and Smt. M. Veeramma, on 18-3-72 by the management for their failure to give a turn over of 37 Dofts per day as per the agreement. The two workers requested time for the submission of the explanations till the return of their President, Sri C. V. K. Rao, M. L. A., from Hyderabad. So far no representation has been received from the above workers by the Labour Officer, Rajamundry, and action, if necessary, will be taken in case a representation is received, from the employees.

The allegation of victimisation of workers for Trade union activities is not specific. If specific instances are brought to the notice of the Government, Government will enquire into them.
Shri V. A. J. S. Varma: I invite the attention of the Hon. Minister for Labour to the very unsatisfactory state of affairs prevailing in regard to the implementation of the recommendations of the Wage Boards for journalists and non-journalists. Sir, the Wage Board for journalists is a sole exception. That alone, of all the wage board recommendations, has got statutory sanction. If the position is so unsatisfactory in regard to Wage Board recommendations having statutory sanction, it can be easily imagined what would be the fate of non-journalists whose Wage Board has no statutory sanction. From 1965, attempt is being made to give some justice to working journalists. The Working Journalists Act, 1935 made a big attempt to do something. But the Management of Andhra Prabha at Vijayawada, of course, its parent body is Indian Express—thwarted the attempt for a long time. Ultimately a G.O. was issued in 1967 implementing the recommendations of the Wage Board. According to the G.O., the fixation of pay scales of the journalists and non-journalists has to be done on the basis of classification,—classification of newspaper establishments on the basis of gross revenue for three continuous years. According to the classification, Andhra Prabha at Vijayawada had to be placed in Class III, whereas they have managed to get it classified as Class IV. There is a lot of difference between the employees working in Class III establishment and Class IV establishment. Similarly Andhra Jyoti had to be classified according to all standards as Class IV; but it could get classification as Class IV. But injustice has been done. For example, the differences between an employee in Class III and Class IV will be like this. In Class III, Group I employee get not less than Rs. 1,200 per month, basic pay, but in Class IV, he gets only Rs. 1,000 Assistant Editors, Editors, etc. The last paid people in Class III get Rs. 300 a month, whereas in Class IV, they get Rs. 250. Thus there is a difference of Rs. 50 a month. Thus injustice has been done to them for such a long period. Recommendation 22 of the Wage Board Recommendations says that reclassification can be asked for from any year from 1968. So from 1968 employees of these newspapers establishments have been asking for re-classification. The matter has been dragged on. Some action has been taken from 1970 and we were recently informed that just a week or ten days back the Management has at last, finding no other alternative, simply gave a vague undertaking that they are agreeable for classification into I I and that they are going to implement it. Even now there will be a lot of problems of fitment and payment of arrears and the dates from which arrears become payable. According to workers, arrears have to be paid from 1968, accounting year in which they are permitted to ask for re-classification. These are all the problems. A mere vague assurance from the management—and such a management as Andhra Prabha and Indian Express—it is very difficult to accept. Let the hon. Minister depute a Special Officer to go there and work out details and see that actually money is paid. About Andhra Jyoti also, Sir, no arrears seem to have been agreed to be
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Merely they seem to have generally agreed that they can be classified as Class IV. Instead of denying them this elementary justice, the hon. Minister will have to make some prompt arrangements; and this is the fate of the employees of the Fourth Estate which is more powerful than all the three Estates.

Sri T. Anjaiah:—The Vijayawada Newspapers Employees' Union filed a charter of demands on 21-12-1971, one of which is reclassification of Andhra Prabha establishment from Class IV to Class III with effect from 1-5-1970. The Labour Department had brought out a settlement and the Management have agreed to reclassify the Andhra Prabha under Class III as per the Wage Board recommendation for Working Journalists. As a result of this reclassification, the management has to pay the working journalists arrears of allowances which, it is stated, are being worked out and will be paid shortly. The reclassification of the establishment has created between the working journalists and non-working journalists a gulf. While the benefits of this reclassification are available to the working journalists statutorily under the Working Journalists Conditions of Service and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955, there is no law governing the payment of the above benefits to non-working journalists, as they are not covered by the said Act. The non-working journalists are however covered by the Wage Board recommendations for non-working journalists, a non-statutory body, whose recommendations are not statutorily binding. However, the grievances of the non-working journalists of Andhra Prabha group Newspapers are being taken up with the management by the Labour Department and it is hoped that the Management may agree to these benefits to the non-working journalists also.

Sri G. V. Anjaneya Sarma:—I am sorry, my friend, the hon. Minister for Labour is talking in the usual departmental language. When the hon. Minister himself says that the Wage Board recommendations relating to non-journalists—because it is not statutory, the Government hopes to be able to persuade the management to implement the recommendations, I am really surprised. When there is a statute it will be implemented they will be prosecuted and there is no question of Government trying to do anything in that matter. Because a similar Wage Board has been constituted for non-journalists, because the recommendations are simultaneous, because justice is the same, the workers in the same establishment, simply because the Government of India did not make it a statute, there cannot be any excuse for the management to defy it. I particularly request the hon. Minister for Labour to call both the parties to Hyderabad and thrash out the issue. I am more worried about non-working journalists than the working journalists who have got statutory protection.
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Need for taking action on the persons responsible for the loss of thirty-four thousand rupees worth of chemical fertilizers in the office of the District Co-operative Marketing Society, Guntur.

re: Need for taking action on the persons responsible for the loss of thirty-four thousand rupees worth of chemical fertilizers in the office of the District Co-operative Marketing Society, Guntur.
Calling the attention of urgent public interest.

**Re:** Need for taking action on the persons responsible for the loss of thirty-four thousand rupees worth of chemical fertilizers in the office of the District Cooperative Marketing Society, Guntur.

Minister for Co-operation (Sri B Subba Rao):—Sir, the Guntur II Branch of the District Co-operative Marketing Society, Guntur, issued fertilisers against loan order slips purporting to have been issued by the Block Development Officers, Gvrazal and Tenaal. A sum of Rs. 28,230 is recoverable from the two Block Development Officers towards the supply. The dates on which these fertilisers were issued and the amounts involved are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3—3—72</td>
<td>Rs. 10,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7—3—72</td>
<td>4,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13—3—72</td>
<td>12,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 28,230

So far as Narasaraopet Branch of the District Co-operative Marketing Society is concerned, ten loan order slips were received by the Branch purporting to have been issued by the Block Development Officer, Gurazala during the period from 2-2 1972 to 9-3-1972.
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the following are the details of the amounts recoverable from the Block Development Officer towards the supply of fertilizers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-2-72</td>
<td>Rs. 1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-2-72</td>
<td>2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-2-72</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-3-72</td>
<td>2,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus a sum of Rs. 35,080 is recoverable from the Block Development Officers, Gurazala and Tenali against the supply of fertilizers made on the loan order slips purporting to have been issued by the Block Development Officers.

The District Co-operative Marketing Society, after issuing the fertilizer stock, sent their claims on 13-3-1972 for payment of the cost of fertilizers to the Block Development Officers concerned except the fertilizers issued on 1-3-1972 which was sent on 20-2-1972. The claims were returned by the Block Development Officers saying that the signatures on the loan order slips are not genuine and are forged. Immediately on receipt of this information on 5-3-1972 from the Block Development Officer, Gurazala the District Co-operative Marketing Society deputed two godown keepers along with the Procurement Officer to the villages noted in the slips for enquiry. The enquiry revealed that one of the villages noted in the loan order slips is not in existence in Gurazala Block and that the names of the ryots noted in the loan order slips were fictitious.

Similarly, the Block Development Officer, Tenali also returned on 22-8-1972 claims of the Guntur District Co-operative Marketing Society for sums of Rs. 10,980 and Rs. 14,430 saying that loan orders contained therein were not given by him. Before actually returning these claims, the Block Development Officer informed the District Co-operative Marketing Society by phone on 17-3-1972 that the loan orders covered by the claim for Rs. 10,980 were not those given by him. Immediately, on receipt of this phone call, the District Co-operative Marketing Society issued orders to all their branches to stop issues of I.M.S. loans until further orders. On 18-3-1972 the District Co-operative Marketing Society filed a complaint with the Superintendent of Police, Guntur Station House Officers, Lalapet (Guntur) Gurazala and Narasaraopet, and copies of these Police Complaints were given to the District Co-operative Officer, Guntur, Collector (Co-op) / (Agri) Guntur and I.G.P. The matter is under police investigation.

On the evening of 18-3-1972 one Sri Bhavanam Chena Rami Reddy of Narasaraopet was apprehended by the godown people Guntur II Branch of the District Co-operative Marketing Society as
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one of those who received fertiliser stocks on the forged loan order slips from the said godown. Sri Reddy, on interrogation by the officials of the District Co-operative Marketing Society, admitted his crime and he was handed over to the police the same night.

The whole matter is under police investigation and the Inspector-General of Police will be requested to see to it that the investigation is completed quickly and the offenders brought to book.
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Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance:

re. Enhancement of electricity charges on agriculture from 12 paise to 15 paise.
Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance:

re: Electricity charges on agriculture from 12 paise to 15 paise.

Minister for Power (Smt. B. Javarkada):—The Electricity Board is charged with the statutory obligations of promoting the Coordinated development of generation, supply and distribution of electricity in an efficient and economic manner. The cost of production of electricity has gone up considerably over the past years due to increase in cost of fuel, labour and interest charges.

In recent years the tempo of rural electrification has been increasing and agricultural sector accounts for higher proportion than before. Since this is a subsidised sector, this has given rise to fall in average revenue per unit. The average revenue per unit in 1967-68 was 17.5 paise and in 1973-74 it would come down to 15.6 paise on the existing tariff. Therefore, the Board after reviewing the position requested the Government in 1971 to agree to the enhancement of rates in respect of agricultural and industrial consumers. The Board originally proposed to increase the agricultural rate from 12 paise to 18 paise. The Government after considering the proposal of the Board agreed to the enhancement of agricultural tariff from 12 paise per unit to 15 paise per unit from 1-6-1971. However, in view of the prevailing conditions and particularly the drought conditions which gave rise to considerable anxiety, the Government decided to restore the status-quo ante.

With increasing cost, tariff is bound to be increased from time to time. In regard to revision of tariff in the agricultural sector, the following points are relevant:

1. The cost of supplying electricity at the consumer's terminals is approximately 25 paise per unit whereas today the Board is charging to agricultural consumers only 12 paise per unit.

2. Any other means of bailing water are much costlier. For example, working with diesel engine is much more costlier.

3. Economic viability is a sine qua non before lending institutions are prepared to give money to Board for rural electrification. For example, Rural Electrification Corporation insists on a net return of 15% at the end of 10 years after completion of the projects in the case of backward areas and 5 years after completion in the case of other areas, which means that gross return should be 24%. Similarly, Agricultural Finance Corporation insists on 18% return. Though the Board is sanctioning schemes at 12½%, very often it is not realised.
Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance:

4. According to Section 59 of the Electricity Supply Act 1948 the Board shall not carry on its operations under the Act at a loss.

5. The need to meet the interest liabilities to the State Government and others in full.

6. The need to contribute anticipated share of the Board to the States Fourth Plan.

7. The World Bank has financed the construction of Kothagudem Thermal Station I and II Stages. The Board has committed itself to World Bank that it would achieve a return of 9.5% on the capital. By the enhanced tariff it is estimated that the net return would be approximately 8.5% only in 1972-73 and 7.7% in 1974 and whereas with the existing tariff the net return on capital base would progressively come down from 7.3% in 1969-70 and to 6.7% in 1974-75.

8. The need to make good the loss sustained by the Electricity Board in view of waiver of Annual Minimum Guarantee with effect from the year 1968-69 in respect of agricultural consumers in the drought affected areas where land remission is granted.

Under the Low Tension Agricultural loads, the average revenue per unit in existing tariff works out to 3.4 paise including the element of shortfall in the annual minimum guarantee.

The Board has not been able to pay in full the interest due to Government on the capital into the Board from its inception. The Government consider that a revision of tariff would make it more possible to discharge its obligations to Government so far as the interest was concerned.

The increase in tariff was discussed in a meeting held at Delhi on 24-2-1971 in the Planning Commission to consider the resources for the Plan 1972-78. It was agreed therein that the Electricity Board would increase the agricultural tariff including annual Minimum Guarantee suitable to yield a net increase of Rs. 2 crores. The Rural Electrification Corporation has been financing cluster schemes. With increase in cost, if the tariff remains the same, our schemes will become unremunerative and therefore we will not be able to pose to the Rural Electrification Corporation a large number of schemes for sanction. In order that we may derive the maximum benefit from the Rural Electrification Corporation it is essential that the tariff is increased so that as many schemes as possible can be made remunerative and sponsored to the Rural Electrification Corporation.

In Maharashtra the Agricultural Tariff is 13 paise per unit and in Gujarat 13.44 paise. The other States in the Southern Region are not comparable as, in the case of Mysore and Kerala it is entirely hydro generation and in the case of Tamil Nadu Hydro generation forms a very large part. Apart from this in Andhra Pradesh we have to lay long lines of transmission to carry power from one end to the other,
Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance: 7th April, 1972.

re: Enhancement of electricity charges on agriculture from 12 paise to 15 paise.

It is, therefore, imperative that the agricultural tariff is increased. Otherwise the power plan will receive a great setback if the additional resources are not raised.

These are the recommendations of the Board and Government have not yet taken a final decision in the matter.

Sri D. Venkatesam:—May I know from the hon. Minister when the decision of the Government will come about the matter in view of the drought conditions prevailing in the State? Also, our Government has purchased power from other States and has come to an agreement. Has the agreement been finalised, if so at what rate this agreement has been reached between Madras and our State?

Smt. B. Jayaprada:—The call attention relates to enhancement of agricultural tariff. He is asking about the rate that we are going to purchase from other States.

Smt. B. Jayaprada:—No decision has been taken as yet. I do not think the Board would have issued any orders to that effect.

Sri D. Venkatesam:—Orders have already been communicated.

Mr. Speaker:—Have you got a copy of that order?

Sri D. Venkatesam:—I have got the information. If you want I will produce.

Smt. B. Jayaprada:—Let him pass on the information to me, Sir.

Smt. B. Jayaprada:—Leakages have no bearing on the cost of production. As I have already stated, the matter is under consideration only. No final decision has been taken, Sir.
7. April 19.  

Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance:

2. Seizure of Kerosene and Rice in Nellore and Kovvur by the vigilance cell.

Sri Ch. Parasurama Naidu:— his cost is for the entire electricity produced 'P' en 's' mu is lost, that means so 1. 'c' is credited to the cost unnecessarily. So if this loss is severed, the co. will get reduced.

Mr. Speaker:— You can give all those good suggestions in the next budget meeting.

re: Seizure of Kerosene and Rice in Nellore and Kovvur by the Vigilance Cell.
Papers laid on the Table:

7th April, 1972.

The Andhra Pradesh Rectified Spirit


Sri A. Bhagavantha Rao (on behalf of the Chief Minister):—

Mr. Speaker:—Papers laid.


Sri A. Bhagavantha Rao:—On behalf of the Industries Minister I beg to lay on the Table under section 619 (A) (3) of the Companies Act, 1956, a copy of the Twenty Ninth Annual Report of Messrs. The Hyderabad Chemicals and Fertilisers Ltd. for the year 1970-71.

Mr. Speaker:—Papers laid.

Amendments to the Andhra Pradesh Minor Forest Produce (Regulation of trade in Abanus Leaves) Rules, 1970.


The Minister for Excise (Sri P. Mahendranath):—Sir, I beg to re-lay on the Table copies of the Andhra Pradesh Rectified Spirit Rules, 1971 issued under the Andhra Pradesh Excise Act, 1968 which
have been published in the Rules Supplement to Part II Extraordinary of the Andhra Pradesh Gazette No. 21, dated 30-10-71 as required under section 72 (4) of the Andhra Pradesh Excise Act, 1968 together with the statement specifying the reasons for giving retrospective effect to these Rules from 1-3-71 as required under section 72 (6) of the said Act.

Mr. Speaker:—Papers laid.


Sri P. Mahendranath:—Sri, I beg to re-lay on the Table a copy of the Andhra Pradesh Arrack Manufactory Rules, 1971 issued in G.O. Ms. No. 741, Revenue dated 31-10-71 and published at pages 1-21 of the Rules Supplement to part II Extraordinary of the Andhra Pradesh Gazette issue No. 15 dated 30-10-71 as required under sub-section (4) of section 72 of the Andhra Pradesh Excise Act.

Mr. Speaker:—Papers laid.

AMENDMENT TO RULE 160 (b) OF THE ANDHRA PRADESH AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE AND LIVESTOCK MARKET RULES, 1969


Mr. Speaker:—Papers laid.


Sixth Report of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

Secretary, Legislature:—Under Clause 6 of the Direction of the Hon'ble Speaker I am to state that the Reports of the following Committees were submitted to the Hon'ble Speaker on the dates mentioned against them before the dissolution of the Fourth Legislative Assembly.
Point of Information: Collecting correct prices on fertilizer bags according to their actual weight.


Hon'ble Speaker has ordered for the printing and publishing and circulation under Rule 248 and accordingly they have been started. Under Clause 6 of the said Direction, I lay the said Reports on the Table of the House.

Mr. Speaker:—Papers laid.

POINT OF INFORMATION

re Collecting correct price on fertilizer bags according to their actual weight.
Sri Ch Parasuama Naidu; There is every difference A memorandum is not a legal document. It is only an instruction where as G.O. is part of the statute and is enforceable. A Memorandum is merely an executive instruction which cannot be enforced in a court of law. That is the instruction. The Hon'ble Minister may note.

Mr Speaker-I also look into it. Tomorrow we shall examine it.
NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS RESOLUTIONS

re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the district and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.
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Non-official Business:
Resolution
re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.
Non-official Business:
Resolution,

re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.

Mr. Speakci:—you should not make allegations against persons

Smt J Esvari Bai:—These are not allegations. These are all facts. As the Chair observed I do not want to take the names.
Non-official Business:
Resolution,
re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.

Mr. Speaker:—You should not make allegations against persons...

Smt. J. Eswari Bai:—These are not allegations. These are all facts. As the C. ir observed I do not want to take the names. I give you 200 rupees [amount] and you take the names. If you do not take the names, I give you 500 rupees [amount] and you take the names. Then I will distribute 200 rupees [amount] to you.
Resolution

re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.

7th April, 1972.

Non-official Business:

Resolution
Non-official Business:
Resolution
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Resolution
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Resolution

Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.

7th April, 1972
Resolution:

re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.
Resolution

Re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.
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Resolution

re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.
Non-official Business
Res. lutation:
re: Appointing an Advisory Committee
with the Legislators at the District
and State levels to suggest in mediate
steps for the distribution of banjar
lands.
7th April, 1972.

Non-official Business Resolution:

re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.

The entire policy of the Government will be reviewed by the time we
No: official Business
Resolution:
re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.

come to the next session of the Assembly. I entirely agree with the hon. Members in one aspect. The

(continued text)
Resolution:

re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.
Non-official Business

Resolution:

re: Appointing an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands.

Mr. Speaker:—In view of the Minister's reply are you withdrawing the resolution?

Sri V. Srikrishna:—The Minister has not promised anything. I am pressing the resolution.

Mr. Speaker:—I am putting the resolution to vote.

Mr. Speaker:—He is not agreeing for the appointment of a fresh Committee.

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

"This Assembly recommends to the Government to appoint an Advisory Committee with the Legislators at the District and State levels to suggest immediate steps for the distribution of banjar lands."

The Resolution was declared negatived. A division was demanded and the House divided thus.

Ayes . . 17; Noes . . 31; Neutrals Nil

The Resolution was negatived.

1-47 p.m. (The House then adjourned till Half-Past Eight of the Clock on Saturday, the 8th April 1972.)