ANDHRA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
OFFICIAL REPORT

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

ANDHRA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Friday, the 14th February, 1975.

The House met at Half-Past Eight of the Clock.

(Mr. Speaker Sri R. Dasaratharama Reddy in the Chair)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

FILLING UP OF THE POSTS OF B. A. P. R.Os IN P. R. DEPT.

131—

* 4792—(Q).—Sri Kona Prabhakara Rao (Bapatla) Will the Minister for Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the number of posts of B. A. P. R. O.s unfilled in the State; and

(b) in view of the crash programme of the Government to distribute House sites to the Harijans how soon they will be filled up?

The Minister for Finance (Sri P. Ranga Reddy).—(a) 48 posts of Block Asst. Public Relations Officers are unfilled in the State.

(b) The Director of Information & Public Relations is taking action to fill up the posts.

* An asterisk before the name indicates confirmation by the member.
According to the rules 55% of the posts of B.A. Public Relations Officers are to be by recruitment by transfer from the S.G. Village Development Officers, 30% of the posts by direct recruitment and 15% of the posts are to be filled by direct recruitment from among the U.D.Cs. U.D. Stenographers, Assistant Translators, Readers, Field Assistants and Research Assistants of Public Relations Departments. These posts are under the purview of the Public Service Commission.

Sri A. Sriramulu (Eluru):— The Minister has explained the procedure for filling up of vacancies; The procedure is clear. Rules have been formulated by March. And right from April till to-day the matter is under correspondence. This is a typical example of Government's lethargy and of the administrative set up. Either you must fill up the posts immediately as soon as it arises or do
something. We calmly think and we create anomalous impression. I am saying what exactly is the type of action taken by the Government. Is it only writing to the district officers and increasing paper work or any concrete steps have been taken to fill up those posts?

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:— I agree with the Hon. Member that mostly paper work only has been done. Nothing concrete was done.

(a) S. K. Rama Rao:— The Hon. Member is saying what exactly is the type of action taken by the Government. Is it only writing to the district officers and increasing paper work or any concrete steps have been taken to fill up those posts?

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:— I agree with the Hon. Member that mostly paper work only has been done. Nothing concrete was done.

(b) S. K. Rama Rao:— The Hon. Member is saying what exactly is the type of action taken by the Government. Is it only writing to the district officers and increasing paper work or any concrete steps have been taken to fill up those posts?

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:— I agree with the Hon. Member that mostly paper work only has been done. Nothing concrete was done.

(c) S. K. Rama Rao:— The Hon. Member is saying what exactly is the type of action taken by the Government. Is it only writing to the district officers and increasing paper work or any concrete steps have been taken to fill up those posts?

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:— I agree with the Hon. Member that mostly paper work only has been done. Nothing concrete was done.

(d) S. K. Rama Rao:— The Hon. Member is saying what exactly is the type of action taken by the Government. Is it only writing to the district officers and increasing paper work or any concrete steps have been taken to fill up those posts?

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:— I agree with the Hon. Member that mostly paper work only has been done. Nothing concrete was done.
14th February, 1975.
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STREAMLINING THE WORKING OF THE INFORMATION DEPT.

132—

* 4812 Q.—Sri A. S. Sreeramulu:—Will the Minister for Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether there are any proposals for streamlining the working of the Department of Information;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) whether the concerned employees’ organisations will be consulted before finalising them?

* Sri P. Ranga Reddi:—(a) Two proposals for improving the functioning of the Department in the field are under consideration.

(b) (i) The Director of Information and Public Relations has suggested that the Block Asst. Public Relations Officer may be made incharge of a taluk with an Office at Taluk Headquarters.

(ii) The Radio Supervisors who are attending to the maintenance work of Community Listening Radio sets are at present stationed in the Asst. Radio Engineer’s Office. The Director has proposed to station them at appropriate taluk headquarters with a view to avoid delay and expenditure on T. A. for maintenance work.

(c) This aspect has not been examined so far.
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195. Mrs. Andrews:—Would the Minister of State agree that the figures quoted by me are correct?

Mr. 

Mr. Smith (Minister):—Yes, I believe the figures quoted by you are correct.

Mr. Smith:—The figures quoted by me are accurate.

Mr. Andrews:—I am satisfied that the figures quoted by me are correct.

Mr. Smith:—I believe the figures quoted by you are correct.
Sri A Sreeramulu:— When I used the word "streamlining," in my question, I expected better information from the Minister, because streamlining is not reorganisation. Locating the Office of the B.A. P.R.O. at the Taluk is certainly not streamlining. My object is the department is not equal to the task assigned to it. Public Relations is a highly technical job requiring a lot of skill. The Public Relations Officer is a liaison between the people and the Government. He should translate the policies and actions of the Government and the people. This should convey the feelings and aspirations of the people. That is how it should keep a sort of link between the people and the Government. This Department is not doing its job. If I am permitted to call it, it is an unnecessary department which is not doing any work at all. When I put that question I had in my mind whether the Minister is examining this particular aspect to make its
job more effective. I want to know whether the Government has any proposal to streamline it. Kindly tell us the functions of the B. A. P. R. O. s and whether they are discharging those functions and if they are not discharging satisfactorily, what steps the Government is going to take.

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:—I have said about the reorganisation of the Department which I thought at least some portion of the streamlining also will be there. From what the hon. member has questioned by way of supplementary, I understand, he made a very valuable suggestion. I am indeed very grateful. That much of thinking is not in me just at the moment. I would very much like and request if the hon. member could send a paper on how but I could streamline the department or I am also prepared to go to the member and discuss with him to acquire enough knowledge of streamlining the department.

Sri A. Sreeramulu:—You have got experts and specialists under you. I am only an ordinary layman. I can however give my suggestions. But you have got expert advice, and highly paid officers. You have to make use of them. You are not using them. That is the only difficulty.

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:—That is not correct. I am trying to make use of them to the best possible extent. Still they are not able to rise to the level of my friend’s suggestion.

Sri A. Sreeramulu:—I will certainly give my suggestion. I will certainly give the paper. I am not shirking my responsibility. But make use of your experts also.

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:—I will certainly do that. If I am to tell the present duties of the B. A. P. R. O. I shall mention, Sir.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—Can you tell the lines on which you like to streamline the department?

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:—I can inform the House. Apart from that, I will never forget Mr. C. V. K. Rao in such matters.
Sri P. Ranga Reddy:— It is very difficult to fix up time because, in view of the rules, as earlier said, we have asked for information from the Zilla Parishads. Some of them have sent and many more have to still submit and after that also that has to be screened by the Department. I promise that it will be done at the earliest possible moment. I cannot commit of a particular date.

Sri P. Ranga Reddy:— I promise the hon lady member that it is definitely in 1975.
MODERN EQUIPMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT GLASS FACTORY, GUDUR
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* 5195 Q.—Sri Nallapareddi Sreenivasulreddi:—Will the Minister for Industries be pleased to state:

(a) whether any proposal are under consideration of the Govt. to arrange modern equipment to the Govt. Glass Factory and Govt. Ceramic Factories at Gudur in Nellore district;

(b) the place from which raw material is available to these two factories;

(c) whether the Govt. are in receipt of the representations sent by the staff and labourers working in these two factories requesting enhancement of their salaries and other demands during 1974 and steps taken thereon?

(a) No Sir.

(b) Furnace Oil is obtained from M/s Indian Oil Company Limited, Madras, cullet is procured from various dealers in Andhra region and Madras, Silica sand from Momidi Village near Gudur and other materials like Soda ash, Potassium nitrates, etc. are obtained from big firms at Bombay and Madras.

(c) So far as the Government Ceramic Factory is concerned, there were no demands from staff and labour during 1974 for enhancement of their salaries. As regards the workers of the Government Glass Factory, the Management agreed to refer the demands relating to revision of wages, D. A. and Compensatory Allowance and payment of bonus to an arbitrator,
266 14th February, 1975.

Sri P. Basi Reddy:—Expansion proposals have not been given up. They are there. The Government is concerned with management. Now, the management is with the Corporation. If the management can be made over to the Corporation, it will be easy to obtain funds. For example, for one modern tunnel kill as much as Rs. 60 lakhs is required. As regards ceramic factory and as regards the Glass factory, it is hopelessly outmoded. A large amount is required. So, if it could be transferred to Corporation funds would be available there.

Expansion proposals will be taken up. Government have not given up those proposals. As regards the demands of the workers,
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1) revision of scales of wages of the workers in terms of G. O. 1965 of D. A. and City allowances per GOs in force, payment is at the rate of 83% under section 10 of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 for the years 1971-72 and 72-73, sanction of casual leave of 10 days for the work rs. At the intervention of the Labour Officer, Nellore the workers have called off the strike and joined duty in 16-3-7 pending settlement of their demands. Following are the terms of the settlement which are agreed both by the management and the workers' union on behalf of the workers.

(a) The management agreed to grant 10 days casual leave per year with immediate effect.

That demand has been conceded.

(b) The Management has agreed to give an adhoc increment of Rs. 3/- Rs. 5/- per month to all workers including compensation with effect from 7-10-1972.

(c) The Management agreed to pay to the workers an advance equivalent to the shortage of production made in month of July, 1974 subject to the condition that the amount equivalent to the shortage of production will be recovered in lumpsum from the pay payable in October, 1974. Shortage in production is not made good.

(d) The Management has also agreed to pay D.A., C.A. and fixed payment of bonus. The name of the Arbitrator is Sri Kursheed Yusuf.
134—

*5630 Q.—Smt. J. Eshwari Bai:—Will the Minister for Labour please be stated:

(a) whether it is a fact that one job for one family scheme has been abolished; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

*The Minister for Labour (Sri T. Anjaiah):—(a) Yes Sir.

(b) There have been several complaints that the Certificate produced by the candidates as required under the scheme are spurious. There is no machinery with the Employment Exchanges to check the authenticity of certificates. The Government of India have also made it clear that the scheme should not apply to the vacancy notified by
the Central Government establishments and the Central Public Sector Undertakings. On the whole, there has been a thorough dissatisfaction about the working of the Scheme apart from the legality of the scheme being in doubt.

The Government after considering all aspects of the matter directed that the scheme of 'One Job for One Family' be withdrawn allowing the Employment Exchanges to sponsor the candidates in accordance with the normal rules in force.

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy (Kalvakurthi):—Sir, in the Land Reforms Act, we have given a definition to the "Family". What is the definition of the family by the Government under this scheme?

(2) Whether this scheme, though abolished now, was then in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution?

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy (Kalvakurthi):—I wanted for the definition of the Family.

Mr. Speaker :—No definition.

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy :—When they did thought of the scheme, they should also have thought of the definition or 't. iv'; otherwise, it is very difficult to know which is a gas and which is not.

Mr. Speaker :—Is there any definition?

Sri T. Anjaiah :—Family means, husband, wife, children, sisters, brothers...

Sri T. Anjaiah :—The Employment Exchanges are covered by Central Act and not State Act.

Sri T. Anjaiah: — Sir, I am prepared to meet the Member and discuss with him—

Sri T. Anjaiah: — Sir, I am prepared to meet the Member and discuss with him—

PURCHASE OF HUME PIPES BY THE WARANGAL Z.P.

*4886 Q.—Sarvasri Santosh Chakravarthi (Mulug) and Kasani Narayana (Jangaom):— Will the Minister for Panchayati Raj be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is an Anti-Corruption Enquiry going on for the purchase of hume pipes in Warangal district from out of Zilla Parishad funds;

(b) if so, the stage of enquiry;

(c) whether any responsibility has been fixed against any officer;
Oral Answers to Questions.

(d) if so, the names of the officers involved in the case?

The Minister for Panchayati Raj (Sri L. Lakshmana Das):—

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Enquiry is in progress.

(c) and (d) As the enquiry is under progress. It is not possible to fix responsibility against any officers at this stage.

9:30 a.m.

"..."
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Sri A. Sriramulu:—This is the way the Ministers are answering. The question is very specific i.e., names of officers. And now the minister is searching for papers in the file.

Sri A. Sriramulu:—This is carelessness.

Mr. Speaker:—What the Minister says is that as the enquiry is in progress it is not possible to fix responsibility against any officers at this stage. Is it possible to give names of the officers involved?

Sri A. Sriramulu:—Is it possible to give names of the officers involved?

Sri A. Sriramulu:—Is it possible to fix responsibility against any officers at this stage?
Sri S. Jaipal Reddy:—The Minister is confusing Anti-Corruption Bureau with Central Bureau of Investigation. Is this due to unpreparedness or ignorance.

Sri L. Lakhamana Dass:—This is entrusted to Anti-Corruption Bureau.

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy:—But the Minister has been referring to C. B. I.

Mr. Speaker.—It is an error.

Sri A. Sreeramulu:—After preliminary enquiry, Government or the Department must have come to certain tentative conclusions in regard to responsibility. Without doing that can it be referred in such a routine fashion to the A. C. B. It is only after a thorough preliminary enquiry at the Department level and after the Government came to the conclusion that it is a fit case to be investigated into by the A.C.B. that it has been referred to the A. C. B. What is the good of the Minister telling us—“because responsibility has not been fixed I am not prepared to give the names”. This is evasive.

The total cost of the material purchased from the company and the transport charges paid to the same company during the period 1972-73.

Cost of the material is Rs. 90,000 and transport charges are Rs. 23,000.
Sri A. Sreeramulu — What are the findings in the preliminary enquiry. The Enquiry Officer must have come to certain findings. It may not be in respect of individuals but in respect of issues. There must be tentative findings.

Mr. Speaker — The answer is that there is no Prima facie case against anybody so far.

Sri V. Srikrishna — Then why is it referred to the A. C. B. Are they going to blackmail the officers if there is no prima facie case.
POSTPONEMENT OF QUESTION NO. 136 (5034)

136 (5036) Q *Sri P. Ranga Reddy :—I have made a request to you and I would like to make a request to the hon. Members who tabled this question to permit for the postponement of this question as I would like to send you a revised answer. I am not myself personally satisfied with the answer and the information given to me. I hope the hon. Members and the House would agree for postponement as requested by me.

Mr. Speaker :—I have not postponed. The question is before the House.

Sri P. Ranga Reddy :—I may explain the position. It is true that this question was tabled much earlier before I took over this Housing portfolio to which this question relates. It is also not correct
that the department sent this answer 15 days earlier. Actually I saw this answer yesterday after I left this House at about 2 p.m. Then I went through the answer and the information supplied for supplementary. I was not satisfied and as the hon. Member has rightly put it this question relates to a matter which has passed through nearly 10 long years. Therefore I had necessarily to secure lot of information and in fact I am assuring you and this House. I have tried till late in the night to get in touch with Visakhapatnam and secure the information that I wanted but I could not get it. Therefore I am making this plea. If still hon. Members want that I should answer this question, I am prepared with the information that I have.

*Sri Konda Lakshman Bapuji (Bhongir)*:—I think the hon. Members have to be informed that once the answer is approved by the Minister the file will be circulated only a date earlier to the posted date. I am saying on experience. Here the answer was perhaps approved by the then Minister who is not holding the portfolio now. At the time of approval of the answer for supplementary, necessary information is called for and perhaps the Minister who approved the answer might not have called for the information required and we should be glad that the Minister for Finance has taken care to go into the details of the possible supplementary and he found that information was not available. As per the practice and procedure the file is circulated a day earlier and naturally he had occasion to go into details yesterday and his desire that the question should be postponed is perfectly right and there is no mistake on the part of the Minister. If at all there was any fault, it was with the Minister who approved the answer.

*Sri N. Srinivasulu Reddy*:—Sir, we want a reply from the Finance Minister.

*Sri A. Sriramulu*:—Sir, let the Finance Minister reply.
Sri A. Sriramulu :—Sir, a small clarification. The hon. Member Sri Konda Lakshman Bapuji has cited some procedure. That may be correct. But suppose there is a change in the portfolios, is it not the duty of the Secretariat to re-circulate to the new Ministers? Let the Minister answer that question. There may be Secretariat procedure. But when there is a radical change in regard to the distribution of portfolios—the previous Minister might have approved—is it not the duty of the Secretariat to re-circulate it to the concerned Minister. Apart from that we are not concerned from where he gets the information, whether it is Secretariat or whatever it is.

Mr. Speaker :—The practice so far has been, as all of us understand that the Minister gets the file the previous day and acquaints himself...

Sri P. Ranga Reddy :—Sir, I am first grateful to my friend, Sri Konda Lakshman Bapuji who has tried to clarify the correct position. But, in this particular case, that is not correct.
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because this file was no circulated earlier to any Minister who held the portfolio earlier than myself. There was some delay but the delay there was, and when I perused the file, there was some valid reason though I cannot say it is valid considering the long time of four or five months. The answer was submitted to me and I approved the answer. I approved the answer only as I said yesterday and immediately sent a copy of that to Mr. Speaker. Then, when I went through the information that was given for answering supplementaries, I thought I should equip myself with more information because as I said earlier, this question relates to starting from 1965 or 1967 and passed through various stages and various offices. Therefore, I thought it would be better to come with additional information I thought I would be giving more information to the hon. Members of the House by getting all the information that I require. Therefore, the question now is, as Sri N. Srinivasulu Reddy puts it that somebody should be hauled up. I will certainly go into the matter why there was such delay. But to say that I was not given information and on that count I should haul up, perhaps may not be justified for this reason; according to them, they felt that they are giving enough information and they are giving reasonable answers to the questions. But as you know, Mr. Speaker I had the experience of hearing the Hon. Members for quite a number of years and I can imagine the type of supplementaries that will be put and I can imagine even the idea of the Members who put the question, what it would be and what it should. Therefore, I thought I should get more information and I came with this request. And now I am so sorry for this long discussion on this. As I said earlier, if the Members still want, I am prepared to answer the question with the information I have but still, perhaps on some supplementaries I may have to say, “please put separate question” or the information is not available. So, nothing is lost if you give me time for two or three days. I am not taking months or weeks. Then, I would be in a better position to give all the information possible to the Hon. Members and the House.

Sri A. Sriramulu:—Sir, already there has been a delay of six months in circulating the file.

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy:—Point of order, Sir. This answer of the Minister involves a more fundamental question. According to the present procedure, the file is circulated to the Minister only a day earlier. In view of the experience in this particular case should we not try to change the procedure and see that the file is circulated to Minister concerned a few days earlier so that the Minister would have enough time to satisfy himself about the answer and also get enough information in that regard.

Mr. Speaker:—In view of the discussion that is taking place...

(Interruptions)
Please hear me. Rule 46 says a Member may, by notice at any time before the meeting for which his question has been placed on the list, withdraw his question with the consent of the Speaker, or postpone it to a later day to be specified in the notice and on such later day the question shall be placed on the list after all questions which have not been so postponed. Therefore, the rule only contemplates the postponement of a question at the request of the Member which is put on the question list. I do not know for what reasons the rule does not provide for such postponement of the question at the request of the Minister. Normally, probably it is expected that the Minister would be ready with the answer by the time it is put up on the order paper of the day. At the same time the Speaker has got residuary power under rule 356 which says: "All matters not specifically provided for in these rules and all questions relating to the detailed working of these rules shall be regulated in such manner as the Speaker may, from time to time direct". Therefore, there is no direct rules which says that at the request of the Minister, it can be postponed. But at the same time power has been conferred on the Speaker and the Speaker can exercise his residuary powers and grant extension. I thought that this is a matter which concerns the interest of the entire House and so I did not exercise my power to-day and brought the matter before the House I am sure you have had complete discussion on this matter and the Ministers would certainly take care to see that they would answer the questions on the date on which it is put on the order paper. But still, there may be extraordinary situations when a Member would require postponement and in other cases the residuary powers can be exercised or the leave of the House can be obtained. With this, I think we will stop further discussion and proceed.

Sri Konda Lakshman Bapuji:—The opposition has rightly raised the point and drew the attention of the Hon. Speaker and also the Minister that there has been lapse on the part of the administration. Now, after hearing the explanation of the Hon. Minister I feel honestly that there has been lapse on the part of the Minister also. When he has approved the answer so late yesterday itself, along with the approval of the answers he ought to have thought over about the supplementaries. If information was not available with him, he should not have sent the answers to the Hon. Speaker and he could have straight-away said that the answer is not ready. Therefore, for his lapse the administration and the Minister should own responsibility and be careful in future.

Mr. Speaker:—He has not disowned his responsibility.

Sri M. Nagi Reddy:—Point of order, Sir.
Mr. Speaker:— There is no point of order here. It is the privilege of the Member to take opposite views. I cannot prevent or give any ruling. I am going to the next question.

**GRATED SYSTEM OF LEVYING FEES TO CONDONE LACK OF ATTENDANCE IN INTERMEDIATE CLASSES**

137—

*5482 Q.— Sri A. Sreeramulu:— Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is true that a graded system of levying fees to condone lack of attendance in intermediate classes prescribed by the Board of Intermediate studies is in vogue; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister for Education (Sri M. V. Krishnarao):—

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Board of Intermediate Education, may, on the recommendation of the principal of the College, condone the deficiency in attendance up to 40% of the total number of working days only, subject to payment of prescribed fees and for valid reasons. The following are the fee for grant of condonation of shortage in attendance at present.

- Shortage of 5 days and below: Rs. 10/-
- Shortage of 6 days to 10 days: Rs. 20/-
- Shortage of 11 days to 18 days: Rs. 50/-
- Shortage of more than 18 days: Rs. 75/-

Sri A. Sreeramulu:— What exactly is the object of this graduation? It is mentioned here for shortage of 5 days and below Rs 10/-; for shortage of 6 days to 10 days—Rs. 20/-; for shortage of 11 days to 18 days—Rs. 50/-; and for shortage of more than 18 days—Rs. 75/-? What exactly is the object of this graduation? Is it the opinion of the Intermediate Board to get somehow money? Here as the days increased the penalty is also increased.
The principle involved in this is abnoxious. The rich students can get away with lack of attendance. This principle should really be objected to. At this rate, would the Minister also agree to fix certain rates for total lack of attendance for rich boys?

Mr. Speaker:—Total lack of attendance, that comes under the fourth item i.e., shortage of more than 18 days.

Mr. Speaker:—Would the Minister give an answer?

Mr. Speaker:—The Minister did not understand the spirit of my question. This practice is abnoxious. So, either the Minister should disagree with me in principle or agree with me in principle. But, he is just trying to avoid.

Mr. Speaker:—The Minister did not understand the spirit of my question. This practice is abnoxious.
Sri S. Jaipal Reddy:—The Minister has not stated in regard to 10-10 a.m. the basic question I have raised. Does he agree with the system in principle? If he does not agree, should he agree to abolish the principle?

Mr. Speaker:—Now questions are over.

Sri Nallapureddy Srinivasul Reddy:—There are 3 questions—

Mr. Speaker:—I cannot help it.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—There was a precedent.

Mr. Speaker:—I don’t think there is any such thing. I cannot agree to it also.

Mr. Speaker:—Half an hour is extended to 40 minutes. I cannot help.

Mr. Speaker:—If the members feel it is not the way, I cannot help. The other questions will lapse. There is no precedent and all that.
Sri C. V. K. Rao:—If you suddenly change, it will be difficult. Let it be clear. Till yesterday you conceded. You went to the last question. So, I request you to continue the procedure. I don't know who gave this idea. How it struck, I don't know. You were generous yesterday. Continue to be generous.

Sri A. Sreeramulu:—This difficulty has mainly arisen on account of the unpreparedness of the Ministers to give information. Otherwise we are not interested to continue the question hour for two hours. It is only one hour. We entirely agree with you. The questions which are now being left out are really important. At least one or two questions. For to-day make it special exception. From to-morrow we shall also agree that we don't exceed the hour. You also instruct the Ministers to give adequate information. There is no point in their simply coming unprepared and standing like lampposts and putting us in difficulty. They must come fully prepared with the information. Then will adhere to the time. For to-day make it an exception.

Sri E. Ayyapu Reddy:—It is highly objectionable to say that our Ministers are standing like lamp-posts.

Mr. Speaker:—You were co-operating.

Mr. Speaker:—If I have the assurance of the House that from to-morrow that we will confine strictly to one hour.

Mr. Speaker:—In B. A. C., we will decide, how many times the members could ask questions and how many times should persist.

Sri V. Srikrishna:—If these are decided, the functions of the Chair .... otherwise that is left to your discretion.

Mr. Speaker:—After one hour it cannot be 2 hours then. I am permitting you.

DIFFERENCE IN RULES FOR RECRUITMENT OF DISTRICT SOCIAL WELFARE OFFICERS IN ANDHRA & TELANGANA REGIONS

138—

*4797(Q) Q.— Sri Nallapareddi Sreenivasulreddi :— Will the Minister for Social Welfare & Technical Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any disparity in the rules of procedure followed for the recruitment of Dist. Social Welfare Officers in Andhra and Telangana region ;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor ;

(c) the number of Telangana employees working in Andhra region as District Social Welfare Officers ;

(d) whether it is a fact that the rules will not permit to transfer those employees to Telangana region ; and

(e) whether the Government are contemplating to frame common rules of procedure to both the regions for the recruitment of Dist. Social Welfare Officers and other staff in the Department of Social Welfare ?

The Minister for Social Welfare (Sri B. Sreerama Murthy) :

(a) Yes Sir.


(c) Eight.

(d) There is no provision in the Rules for transfer of District Social Welfare Officers from one area to the other.

(e) Yes Sir.
10-20 a.m.

Sri A. Sreeramulu:—There is a subtle point in this. For the post of D.S.O. in Telangana, only Social Welfare Inspectors of Telangana are eligible. For the same post in Andhra Area, the Superintendents from both Andhra and Telangana are eligible. That is how Andhras are being denied access to Telangana area while Telangana Superintendents who are in the Directorate get promoted to the posts in Andhra Area. That is the discrimination. So, I am asking the Minister when this discrimination is going to be ended?

By direct recruitment, 2. By Transfer from Superintendents of the Office of the Director of Social Welfare, 3. By transfer from any other class or service if no qualified people are available. 50% of the vacancies are to be filled in by transfer and the remaining 50% by direct recruitment.
SINGLE TEACHER SCHOOLS IN TRIBAL BLOCKS
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*4993 Q.—Sri P.V. Ramana (Put by Sri K.V. R. S.) Padmanabha Raju (Srungavarapu Kota) — Will the Minister for Social Welfare and Technical Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of single teacher schools existing in the tribal blocks in Andhra Pradesh;

(b) whether there is any proposal to convert them into Ashram schools; and

(c) if so, the time by which they will be converted?

Sri Bhattam Sreeramamurthi:

(a) 589

(b) Yes, Sir. The Director of Tribal Welfare has submitted proposals for converting some of them into 118 Ashram schools.
involving an expenditure of Rs. 30.40 lakhs. The matter is under consideration of the Government.

(c) No time limit can be indicated now as it depends upon availability of funds.
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Sri B. Sriramanurthy:—It is a legitimate claim. I will consider it.

CONSTITUTION OF HANDLOOM INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.

140—

*765 Q—Sri Nallapareddi Sreemivasulreddy:—Will the Minister for Handlooms & Textiles be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government propose to constitute handloom Industry development corporation to meet the requirements of handloom weavers in Andhra Pradesh;

(b) the aims of the said Corporation; and

(c) who will be the members of the said Corporation?

The Minister for Textiles and Handlooms (Sri K.V. Kesavulu)

(a) A proposal to set up Handloom Development Corporation in Andhra Pradesh received from the Director of Handloom & Textiles is under consideration of Government.

(b) The aims are:

(i) to develop Handloom Industry;

(ii) to arrange for finance, supply of raw material, procurement of finished goods and to help marketing of the cloth produced; and

(iii) to undertake such other schemes as are necessary for improving the economic conditions of the weavers;

(c) The Government have not taken up this for consideration yet.
Oral Answers to Questions.
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3. a. 

3. b. 

3. c. 

3. d. 

3. e. 

3. f. 

4. a. 

4. b. 

4. c.

4. d.

4. e.

4. f.

5. a. 

5. b.

5. c.

5. d.

5. e.

5. f.
Sri M. Narayana Reddy (Bodhan):—Sir, it is said that 70% of the allocations made under plan for the development of handloom industry in our State is being spent on giving rebate. If that is so, whether it would make any difference, after the purposed Corporation comes into being, that the entire plan allocations are paid for development and not for grant of rebate?

Oral Answers to Question.

10-40 a.m. 2. M. V. H. R.'s Question:—Whether the Government will declare a special block for the development of the area?

The Minister for Agriculture replied that the Government had not yet taken any decision in the matter.

3. త. శ్రీనివాస్: భారతదేశంలోని ముఖ్యమంత్రి తేలంపూర్ కు ప్రత్యేకంగా నిమిషానంతరం ఒక జనసందర్భం అయితే అందుకే అందుకే శుభాయాసు చేసాం.

7. మ. శ్రీనివాస్: భారత దేశంలో నిర్మాణం చేసే సమాధానాన్ని ప్రత్యేకంగా ముఖ్యమంత్రి తేలంపూర్ కు ప్రత్యేకంగా అందుకే అందుకే శుభాయాసు చేసాం.
(Postponement of Short Notice Question 140-A (1966-Q) and 140 B (1698-B).

Mr. Speaker:— We will postpone this Short Notice Question.

Sri A. Sreeramulu:—Sir, the Minister should be present in the House to tell us as to why this should be postponed. This is a very serious matter relating to cheating and forgery.
Mr. Speaker:—He has sent a letter to me that records have gone to High Court and that it will take some time to get them back.

Sri A. Sriramulu:—That has nothing to do with the records’ Sir. This is a very important matter. The Chief Minister, ignoring the advice of the legal opinion and the Departmental assurance, has promptly withdrawn the case. It involves the propriety of the Chief Minister.

Mr. Speaker:—We will give him time.

Sri A. Sriramulu:—Time should not be given because I have information

Sri. C.V.K. Rao:—On a point of order. You have just now given a ruling that a Minister cannot ask for a postponement.

Mr. Speaker:—I did not say that he cannot ask. I said there is no provision.

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—That means, when there is no provision how can he ask for leave. So, you cannot permit and you have to call the Minister.

Sri A.Sriramulu:—I am explaining the importance of the question Sir.

Mr. Speaker:—That is why, we will give short time.

Sri A. Sriramulu:—My information is that some people are trying to tamper with the records because this is a matter concerning particular file and we will have to request file being placed before the Hon’ble Speaker or in the House also. A process is already being put into action to tamper those records. That is why it is very important. We cannot allow because we have got very valid fears that this involves improprieties of high personalities. There is that possibility.
Mr. Speaker:—Let us not be excited now. The question is I have put it to Mr. Sriramulu I think, he has agreed for a short adjournment.

Sri Syed Hasan (Charminar):—Sir, Just now you were referring to a rule of procedure where in you have said that the Minister or the Government has no right to postpone. Again you said, that the Speaker...
has the residuary power. Are you coming to the rescue of the Government? We consider that normally that you are impartial and you do not take sides. This way if you go to their rescue, then only, in our minds it would come that you are going to the rescue of the Government in the crucial moments wherein so much corruption is involved. The other point is just now the Minister was present and in order to avoid the answers or the replies which they anticipated left the House is it proper on the part of the Government to make a mockery of this democracy?

**Question 10:**

**Question 11:**
11-00 a.m.

Mr. B. V. R. Reddy: — Mr. President, it is rather necessary that the House should be made familiar with the real position, as it is now stated that the party which is the main opposition in this House, has decided to withdraw from the Commonwealth and has decided to withdraw from all State Assemblies also. It is necessary to have a clear idea about the point of view of the party. The party is also saying that it will take the decision to withdraw from the Commonwealth after consultations are held with the States. It is not absolutely necessary in this connection. Just it is a matter of withdrawal, nothing more.

Mr. V. R. Krishna: — Sir, I have already explained that there is no such withdrawal. If there is suspicion created, it is not necessary. If there is no suspicion a bout it which our friends are alleging, it is not necessary. Provided there is no suspicion about it which our friends are alleging. Just it is a matter of withdrawal, nothing more.
Sri M Narayana Reddy:—Sufficient suspicion has been created. I do not want to heighten it further. It is only a question of principle. Under Rules 355 and 356 you can regulate procedure. It is a question of the principle in the sense that a request has been made by the concerned Minister that he is busy in the other House. Such occasion will arise very frequently when both the Houses are in Session. So, it is not a solitary exception. Such occasions would continue to arise. Therefore, nothing would be lost if it is answered at the end of the meeting or tomorrow or on 18th of this month. The importance of the question has been recognised and sensed by the entire House. My humble submission is that you can kindly regulate the procedure under 355. It is for you to permit submissions without allowing further debate on the merits of the question.

Sri A. Sriramulu:—I want to know, as stated by Mr. Narayana Reddy, should we adjust according to the convenience of the Minister or has the Minister to adjust according to the convenience of the House.

Mr. Speaker:—I have not said.

Sri Konda Lakshman Bapuji:—I would like you to take up the point of order and decide which Sri Srinivasulu Reddy raised, whether the Minister had entrusted his job to any other Minister to take care of the issue on the floor of the Assembly or not. It is the joint responsibility. It is not the individual that alone should be present. If for any reason, he is not able to be present, he has to entrust it to another Minister. Whether that has been done and if it is not done...

Mr. Speaker:—It was done.
Sri Konda Lakshman Bapuji:—Which other Minister has taken the responsibility?

Mr. Speaker:—I think Mr. Krishnarao's name…………………

Sri Konda Lakshman Bapuji:—You must be aware. Who is that Minister? You are searching.

Mr. Speaker:—I think he has mentioned the name of the Minister also.

Sri N. Srinivasul Reddy:—Nobody has come forward. They have no guts to come forward. They cannot reply to this question.

Mr. Speaker:—Yes.

High Court has no power to call for the records from the Secretariat. They can call for the records from a Lower Criminal Court. No records from the Secretariat would go to the High Court. That is very well known. I request you, Sir, to see that the information given is correct.

Mr. Speaker:—The Minister has informed me and he has given me the letter.

11.10 a.m. Sri N. Srinivasul Reddy:—Has he entrusted his work to any other Minister?

Mr. Speaker:—I think he has entrusted…….

Sri N. Srinivasul Reddy:—No. He has not entrusted. It is a clear case of breach of privilege.

Mr. Speaker:—We will send for the Minister.

Mr. Speaker:—We will send for the Minister.
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Sri A. Sriramulu:—Now a clear case of breach of privilege has been established because as my friend Sri E. Ayyapu Reddy said the High Court does not need these records. So, the Minister has made a wrong statement and it is a sort of lame excuse advanced by the Minister to evade the answer. By himself not being present or assigning the work to some other Minister, he has deliberately disregarded this House and has committed a clear breach of privilege.

Mr. Speaker:—Let us stop this discussion.

Sri Konda Lakshman Bapuji:—No Minister is coming forward to participate in the discussion and no Minister is prepared to take a stand on this issue.

Mr. Speaker:—The Minister has no objection to answer the question. He only wanted postponement of the question. So, that does not arise. He only wanted postponement of the question. He did not claim any privilege.
Mr. Speaker:—I will just give a few facts. This question was received on the fifth and it was sent to the Minister on the 7th of this month and it came on the order paper on the 14th for to-day. We have not received the answer so far. For several questions also answers are not received in proper time. In the belief and hope that it will be received at least before the question-hour commences they have put on the order paper. That it what has happened and is happening. In this case also no answer was received. But yesterday itself the Minister Sri Narasa Reddy made a representation. “That the above short notice question is listed for answer on 14-2-1975. I wanted to peruse the entire records to facilitate answering the main question and the supplementary. But, I find that all records have been sent to the High Court as the complainant has filed a revision petition. Further I am busy on 14-2-1975 in the Legislative Council where the A.P. Commercial Crops Bill, 1974 has been taken up for consideration. I request that I may be granted time to answer the short notice question. Yet another point which the House will kindly notice is the question hour is said to be one hour and we are dragging on to two hours and two and half hours and we are getting so many other questions with the result that no one is definite when exactly a matter is likely to come. I am not saying that this is an excuse for the Minister to be absent or anything of kind. Further, after I received this’ I met Sri Sriramulu in my Chambers to-day and I put it to him, that this was the request of the Minister that he was not very clear about.
and he ultimately said that it may be posted to 19th or 20th and he might not have any objection. This also I mentioned to the Minister. This is what has happened. And the Minister has gone to the other House having informed me about the situation. He has also written this letter. These facts I am bringing to your notice. But all the same, I did not exercise the residuary powers which I have got. I have already explained the position; as I understand the rules, normally the Minister should not ask for adjournment. They should normally be prepared for it. If there are extraordinary cases the Speaker himself can exercise the power. In this case I thought it would be better to know the mind of the House and therefore, I have brought this matter before the House. As far as the present position is concerned, probably he has made a statement to me. After the request was made in writing, I brought this to the notice of Sri Sriramulu. I was under the impression that he had agreed that a short time may be given and he did not want to embarrass the Government also, though he was anxious that his question should be answered early. He said that it may be postponed to 19th or 20th and not later than that. This was also intimated to the Minister. The Minister had gone there after having informed me. It is not as if he has shirked and gone. He is discharging his duty in the other House and he is literally on his leg moving the Bill. You are aware that the Ministers will have to discharge their duties in two Houses. It is not a case where he wanted to entrust the answering of the question to another Minister. Physically he is absent and he requested that it may be postponed. Probably I made a statement which has also misled him. This is the situation. In these circumstances, I would request the House, not that I give a ruling—_of course, where I am forced to do it, I have to do something—but I request, that in view of the circumstances—the mistake may be mine, the mistake may be of the Minister or of some body else. We are all owning the whole thing. I request the House to stop further discussion and have the matter answered on 19th or 20th.

Sri M. Omkar:—Atleast the records may be called for. 11-20 a.m.

Mr. Speaker:—Records question, I do not know.

*Sri Konda Lakshman Bapuji:—It would have been for better had you given this information to the House about what happened in the Chambers. There would not have been so much agitative type of expressions because the mover himself agreed for postponement for a short period. That was informed to him and tentative date was thought over. Whatever expressions were made in the absence of that information, they would not have been made had we known in advance. Whatever lapses might have happened on either side, I would request the House to support unanimously the postponement of the question. And whatever apprehensions, the Members may have about the records, the Chair should take care of it.
Sri S. Jayapal Reddy:—Point of order, Sir. I do not know anything about the case. But it appears to be a case relating to withdrawal of a case from criminal court. I cannot understand as to how this question is addressed to and answered by the Revenue Minister. This is a question pertaining to Home and the Chief Minister should reply. Kindly give your ruling.

Mr. Speaker:—I think the Chief Minister has entrusted to Revenue Minister to answer.

Sri S. Jayapal Reddy:—The very question shows that it is addressed to the Revenue Minister. It should be answered by the Chief Minister.

Sri A. Sreeramulu:—Chief Minister in charge of Home Department. So, the Minister in charge of Home will have to answer it.

Mr. Speaker:—I have also received a communique from the Deputy Secretary, which reads like this:

"Legislature Department are informed that the Short Notice question put by Sri A. Sreeramulu has been transferred to the Revenue Department as the subject matter of the question entirely relates to that Department. The question will be answered by the Minister for Revenue."

Sri S. Jayapal Reddy:—It is the Home Department which issues order for withdrawal of case from the Court.

Mr. Speaker:—It is a question of joint responsibility.

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—Point of order, Sir. When a member gives a question to be answered by a particular Minister, are the alterations made at the level of the Speaker or the Secretary? How is it that a Deputy Secretary addressed the Speaker and wants that question to be answered by some one? How is the Deputy Secretary competent to address the Speaker? How is the Deputy Secretary's letter valid here? It appears that certain officialdom is having no respect to this House and I do not know how they are asked to discharge their functions.

Mr. Speaker:—He did not address me. He addressed the Office.

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—Can the Deputy Secretary address like that? To whom did he address, you can enlighten us.

Mr. Speaker:—He has addressed the Assembly Department.

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—It is presided over by the Speaker. Either he should have addressed the Speaker or the Secretary. We cannot address the Legislature Department. We address to either the Speaker or the Secretary. So, it is a contempt of the House, and the Deputy Secretary has to be hauled up for lack of knowledge.
Subject of this matter pertaining to the Short Notice Question relates to Revenue Department. Reasons for withdrawal, contents of the charge sheet filed, etc., relate to Home Department. If that is so, how can they conclude that it pertains to Revenue Department only? If so, then how can they conclude that it pertains to Revenue Department only?
Matter Under Rule 341
re: Hunger-strike by Urdu Periodicals Association.

Sri A. Sriramulu: — The question may be postponed without further discussion. We can wind up discussion on this.

11.30 a.m.
Mr. Speaker: — The question is posted to 19th.

140-B—

There is another Short Notice Question given notice of by Mr. N. Srinivasul Reddy. The Social Welfare Minister wants time.

Sri Ch. Kasayya: — Has he right to ask for postponement?

Mr. Speaker: — The member has a right to ask for postponement.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: — There is one matter under Rule 341 by Mr. Sreeramulu and Mr. Srinivasul Reddy: — The Chief Minister requested that he is going to tell to-morrow. He is in the other house.

Sri A. Sreeramulu: — Sir, a woman has been kidnapped and the Police were silent. The Chief Minister has to explain to us.

Mr. Speaker: — He will explain to-morrow. He said that the information is not available.

Sri A. Sreeramulu: — This is a local issue. Is it so difficult to get the information? Is the Police sleeping over the matter? She is a wife of an employee. This is the control the Government is having on the Police. Sir, the Government is not having any control over the police.

Mr. Speaker: — He is answering to-morrow.

Matter under Rule 341
re: Hunger Strike by Urdu Periodicals Association.
Matter Under Rule 341: 14th February, 1975

Non-payment of salaries to teachers employed under Half-a-Million Job Scheme.

In the matter of non-payment of salaries to teachers employed under the Half-a-Million Job Scheme, it was brought to the notice of the Court that a number of teachers had not been paid their salaries for a considerable period of time. The Court was informed that the teachers had been employed under the scheme and had been working for several months, but they had not received their salaries.

The Court proceeded to hear the matter and after considering the evidence presented, directed that the salaries of the teachers be paid forthwith. The Court emphasized the importance of timely payment of salaries to ensure the proper functioning of the scheme and to avoid any further delays.

The Court also directed the authorities concerned to ensure that all future payments are made in a timely manner to avoid any inconvenience to the teachers and to maintain the efficiency of the scheme.

The matter was further listed for future hearing to monitor the implementation of the orders given.

The Court concluded by expressing its concern over the non-payment of salaries and directed the concerned authorities to take necessary steps to address this issue.
re: Non-issue of concessional bus passes to students of Evening College.

11-40 a.m.

re: Non-issue of concessional bus passes to students of evening colleges.

(i) 3. It is stated that—

(ii) 4. It is stated that—

(iii) 5. It is stated that—

(iv) 6. It is stated that—
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re Break-down of newly-installed 110 M.W. generator sets in Kothagudem Thermal Station.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the first unit of third stage of Kothagudem got fit at 3-20 A.M. on 4-2-75 and the second unit at 7-45 A.M. on 7-2-75 due to teething troubles like failure of tubes, leakages etc. the repair work is in full swing round the clock. Owing to some unexpected turn of events discovered during the course of repair work sufficient delay is occurring. However, it is expected that one unit will be in service within a week from now, and the other within a fortnight.

Sri G. Rajaram :—Mr. Speaker Sir, the first unit of third stage of Kothagudem got fit at 3-20 A.M. on 4-2-75 and the second unit at 7-45 A.M. on 7-2-75 due to teething troubles like failure of tubes, leakages etc. the repair work is in full swing round the clock. Owing to some unexpected turn of events discovered during the course of repair work sufficient delay is occurring. However, it is expected that one unit will be in service within a week from now, and the other within a fortnight.
Re: Youth Hostels' Association.

Sri B. Sreerama Murthy:—Sir, the Government of India have undertaken the construction of Youth Hostels throughout the country at an initial total cost of about Rs. 70.00 lakhs. These Youth Hostels were meant to serve both young and less affluent visitors from abroad as well as youth groups from within the country. According to the Director General of Tourism, the Government of India, it would be advantageous to entrust the day-to-day management to people with the necessary social background who are interested in the youth movement.

One such Youth Hostel was constructed at a cost of Rs. 5.00 lakhs near the Boat Club, Secunderabad adjacent to the Hussain Sagar tank by the P.W.D. (R & B) Department. The site was provided free by
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re: Youth Hostel Association.

the State Government. The building was completed in the middle of 1974. The Government of India agreed to transfer the building and management of the Youth Hostel to the State Government under the following terms:

1. The building remains the property of the Government of India who will charge a nominal rent of Rs. 1/- per month.

2. The Government of India would grant a subsidy of Rs. 12,000/- per year towards the salaries of Warden and Assistant Warden, the State Government bearing the expenditure for additional staff like Cooks, Care-taker etc.

3. This arrangement will be for initial period of five years.

4. There should be a local Management Committee to manage the Youth Hostel under the guidance from the Central Policy Committee.

Warden should be made responsible for organising Youth activities at the Youth hostel.

The question as to which is the appropriate department to manage the Youth Hostel was carefully examined by the Government and it was decided, keeping in mind the objectives of the Youth Hostel, to entrust the management of this Youth Hostel to the department of Youth Services established in our State to administer programmes and schemes for Youth Welfare.

The building is still under the control of the P.W.D. (R. & B.) Departments and the grant of Rs. 70,000/- provided by the Government of India is yet to be spent for furnishing the Youth Hostel. The necessary staff has also to be appointed. The State Government is taking action for constituting the local Management Committee in consultation with the Government of India.

The premises shows bats and mosquitoes infesting the building and wild growth abounding all over the yards.

Matters under Rule 341:

In human treatment of political prisoners in the Central Jail, Visakhapatnam.

Sri Asif Pasha:—Sir, various allegations have been levelled against Sri Kapadia, Superintendent, Central Prison, Visakhapatnam, for his methods of violence, ill-treatment, harassment of political prisoners, etc., in the Central Prison, Visakhapatnam.

What the Hon'ble Member (Sri C.V.K. Rao) says is not correct. It is incorrect to say that Sri C.B. Kapadiya has resorted to violent methods towards the political prisoners. He is acting only as per the provisions contained in the Jail Manual and exercising his powers in the fittest manner to run the prison administration on smooth lines by giving all the necessary facilities to prisoners as per rules.

The incident at the Central Prison, Rajahmundry, which is referred to as having resulted in a lathi charge pertains to the year 1970. Government have ordered a regular departmental enquiry against Sri Kapadiya, This is in progress.

It is also incorrect to say that Sri C.B. Kapadiya has employed 12-00 Noon 80 Warders and got 30 ordinary prisoners beaten inhumanly on 22-3-1974, taking each of them from lockup separately. When these prisoners refused to go to barracks and cells for lockup, some minor force had to be used in order to maintain the prison administration. In the ordinary course, as per the jail rules, interviews, letters, newspapers, etc., were stopped as a jail punishment for misbehaviour.

The health condition of Naxalite prisoners Nagabhushanam Patnaik has not deteriorated and necessary medical treatment is being provided to him. The health of all the naxalite prisoners in question is satisfactory and whenever required they are being treated in the Jail Hospital. Even while Nagabhushanam Patnaik was a condemned prisoner (sentenced to death) he used to be sent to outside hospitals for purpose of treatment, whenever necessary.

It may be stated that Sri Kapadiya has been posted to Central Prison, Visakhapatnam, after the great mishap where so many top ranking naxalite prisoners escaped and the very security of the institution was threatened.

After assuming charge at Central Prison, Visakhapatnam, Sri Kapadiya has improved the security measures of the Jail and took all such steps at the Jail which were necessary within the prison rules, in order to maintain discipline among the various groups of naxalite prisoners.

With regards to the suggestion of the Hon'ble Member for a Committee to be appointed, I feel that there is no necessity as such. But to satisfy the Member, I will certainly send an official to examine the conditions. I am prepared to go myself and satisfy with the conditions, if necessary.
14th February, 1975. Calling attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance:

re. Scarcity of drinking water in Tirupathi

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—I am very much surprised that the Minister in his reply has defended Sri Kapadia. I have received a clear-cut report. I know the psychology of Police and Jail officers. I know the officers will be defended every time. That is the psychology.

The political prisoners are suffering, and the Minister wants to send an officer who has supplied him a wrong report.

Political prisoner is one who is sacrificing his life for some cause and here is the official who sacrifices for none but himself. I would suggest to the Minister that we both go together, instead of the officials, and investigate the matters and place before the House a resume of the whole state of affairs. I would insist that an official is not an alternative to a Legislature.

Sri Asif Pasha:—I have no objection to the Hon.ble Member (Sri C. V. K. Rao) following me.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

re: Scarcity of Drinking Water in Tirupathi

Sri P. G. Deve Gowda (Mysuru):—Mr. Speaker, Karnataka has been facing shortage of water. The Budget has provided Rs. 300 crores for the year. The State has Rs. 7, 000 crores for the year. The Karnataka Development Corporation which has Rs. 6, 000 crores for the year. The Karnataka Electricity Board which has Rs. 5, 000 crores for the year. The Karnataka Highways has Rs. 4, 000 crores for the year. It is not the water crisis. It is the shortage of water crisis.

It does not come under the purview of the Rayalaseema Development Board which has Rs. 1, 000 crores for the year. It is not a water crisis. It is the shortage of water crisis.
Calling attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance:

re: Scarcity of drinking water in Tirupati.

Sri Ch. Subbarayudu:—The Honourable Members are aware that Tirupati is a fast growing Urban Complex. Its population in 1961 was 35,836 and according to 1971 census its population is 65,847. Presently the population may be about 80,000. In additional to this population, there will be always floating population in Tirupati as it is one of the famous pilgrim centres.

2. The present water supply to the Tirupati Town is from two infiltration galleries laid in the bed of river Kalyani at Mangapuram and Swarnamukhi at Kalur. Consequent to the lowering of water table, the above sources are not yielding even 50% of their designed capacities.

3. To tide over the above position during the year 1973-74, two infiltration wells were sunk at Mangapuram.

4. Presently a quantity of about two lakhs gallons of water per day is being drawing from the above two sources, in additional to the quantities of water being drawing from the several public and private wells in the town.

5. The following steps have been taken to augment the drinking water supply to Tirupati Town during the current year:

(i) Four Tankers — two belonging to the T. T. D., one belonging Fire service and the other belonging to the Tirupathi Municipality have been engaged to supply water at different localities;

(ii) The Collector Chittor has given instructions to dig 12 Bores at different localities in the Tirupathi Town. Three Bores were dug till 9-2-1975 and a few more might have been dug by this time.

(iii) At Akkarampalli near leprosy home, one bore is being dug;

(iv) At Capilatheertham and Medical College Hospital, the T.T.D. has been digging two wells;

(v) At Kapilatheertham and Medical College Hospital, the T. T. D. has been digging two wells;

(vi) At Rayalcheruvu, the T. T. D. is going to dig a well and a pipe line will be laid;

(vii) At Narasimhatheertham, over head Tank is being constructed and pipes will be laid to pump water from there to the existing Service Reservoir in the town.
6. Thus it may be seen that all possible measures are being taken to tide over the scarcity of water to Tirupathi Town.

I may also add that so far as the Kalyani reservoir section service is concerned, it is in full swing. Unfortunately the releases from the L.I.C. for the last 4 months were held up on account of non-payments by some of the municipalities. But even with regard to those releases, only day before yesterday we got clearance and there will be a release of Rs. 76 lakhs. By the end of the rainy season we will bring the reservoir to the required level. We will try to complete as early as possible.

12-10 p.m.

re: Need for uniform procedure in filling up posts of B.Ed. teachers by Zilla Parishads.

re: Need for uniform procedure in filling up posts of B.Ed. teachers by Zilla Parishads.

---

Calling Attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance:
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Calling attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance:

re. Need for uniform procedure in filling up posts of B. Ed. teachers by Zilla Parishads.

14th February, 1976.
Sri L. Lakshman Doss:—Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are three categories of teachers to be absorbed in the vacant B.ED. posts under the various managements—teachers working in superior posts, teachers working in half-a-million job scheme and graduate teachers working as secondary grade teachers awaiting promotion. During the Telangana agitation, non-Multi B.ED assistants working in Telangana area were transferred to the Andhra region against superior posts and in the posts created under the Plan scheme some of them are absorbed in the regular vacancies and still some teachers are to be absorbed.

Under half-million job scheme 2854 B.ED. teachers were appointed on a stipendiary basis of Rs. 175/- p.m. for a period of 12 months. This is a Centrally-sponsored scheme: the period of 12 months is over and they have to be absorbed.

Some persons with B.ED. qualifications were appointed as Secondary Grade teachers; some other persons who were appointed initially as secondary grade teachers but who have subsequently acquired B.ED. qualification these two categories to teachers with B.ED. qualification have to be considered for promotion. The question of absorption of teachers referred to above is under examination of the Government in the Education Department and orders will be issued shortly.

Mr. Loyd:—

Mr. Loyd:—

Mr. Loyd:—

Mr. Nagdeoe:—

Mr. Nagdeoe:—

Mr. Nagdeoe:—

Mr. Nagdeoe:—

Mr. Nagdeoe:—

Sri M. Narayan Reddy:—Sometime ago in pursuance of the
stablishment of a Central University in Hyderabad city the Goverment have decided to establish a few Post Graduate centres in som-Telangana districts and the decision was to start them during the academic year 1974-75. But somehow the post-graduate centres could not come into being during this academic year and the precise reasons for not establishing during this year are not known. But what was reported in newspapers sometime ago was that there was a controversy regarding who would establish these centres - whether they would be established by the Education Department as such or by the Osmania University. On account of this controversy the U.G.C. did not give their clearance so as to enable the Government or the University to establish these centres during this year. The U.G.C. wanted that the University should establish these centres and not the Government- We are also of the view that the Post-Graduate centres which very much necessary in this region, must be established under the aegies or auspices of the Osmania University and not on behalf of the Government. In fact the Government Degree colleges which are functioning either in the city or in the rural areas can also be handed over to the respective universities as the Education Department may not be in a position to effectively manage the colleges. Therefore the post-graduate centres should be under the University. On account of this controversy the post-graduate centres could not come during this year and the candidate seeking admission have lost one valuable yar. A part from the post-graduate centres the Central University has also not yet started functioning. These are two issue which have agitated the minds of the people and there is a great deal of disappointment that the centres could not come this year. Therefore I request the Hon'ble Minister to make a statement on two issues. First, the precise reasons for the postponement of establishment of post-graduate centres in the Telangana region. Secondly, if they are supposed to come next year, whether they would start functioning at least from the very first day of the next academic year and whose aegies or management, i.e., whether under the University or the Government.

If at all they are coming during the next year; will they really start on the very first day of the academic year so that the students can be sure of getting seats or admission in the rural areas and the names of places where they are going to be established.

Sri Syed Hasan :- As explained by my friend, we are least interested in the controversy as to who has to run these post-graduate centres. It remains a fact that Telanagana area is for the backwardness. Now the people of this area are anxious to get into the stream of the present education and it is the duty of the Government to see that assurances already given to start these centres in backward areas.
such as Khammam Mahaboobnagar, Nizambad and Karimnagar districts are kept up. These are the most backward areas and people are economically hard hit. It is impossible for them after completion of graduation to go over to other universities or to come Hyderabad, which is a very expensive place and with the petty earnings of their parents they cannot continue their studies. It is high time the Government take a decision immediately to start these centres at least from the coming academic year.

Sri M.V. Krishna Rao:—Government have decided in October, 1974 to start one Post-graduate Centre in each University area at Nizamabad, Kurnool and the third one in the Andhra University area and Post-Graduate Courses in two Government Colleges of the three University areas at Karimnagar, Khammam, Cuddapah, Nellore, Srikakulam and Kakinada. Accordingly, the above decision of the State Government was communicated to the Government of India and University Grants Commission in November, 1974 for their concurrence.

2. The matter was discussed again in detailed on 16-12-1974 in a meeting consisting of Chief Minister, Chairman, University Grants Commission, Member-Secretary, University Grants Commission and
Calling Attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance:
re: Opening of Post-Graduate Centres in Telangana region.

the Vice-Chancellors of the three Universities. In that meeting the relative implications of having Post-Graduate Centres and Post-graduate Courses were fully discussed. It was agreed that the balance of advantage lay in the establishment of Post-Graduate Centres under the management and guidance of the Universities concerned. It was agreed that in future as far as possible no Post-graduate course need be started in any college either Government or private aided, and that all resources available by way of finances, buildings etc. would be concentrated on the establishment and maintenance of Post-graduate Centres. It was provisionally agreed that there should be two Post-graduate Centres for each of the existing Universities. However, the number as well as the location would be finalised by a Location Committee constituted by the State Government with a representative of the University Grants Commission also on it. The State Government had hoped to start these Centres/Courses during the present academic year, but it was pointed out at the meeting that this may not be physically possible.

3. In pursuance of the decisions, the State Government have constituted a Location Committee with the Vice-Chancellors of the three Universities nominee of the University Grants Commission and Secretary Education as its Members and the Director of Public Instruction as Member-Convenor to indentify the places for the location of new Post-graduate Centres under the Osmania University, Andhra University and Sri Venkateswara University, and submit its report by 31-1-1975. However, since the University Grants Commission have not so far intimated the name of their nominee on the Committee, and the first meeting of the Location Committee has not yet been convened, the Director of Public Instruction who is the Member-Convenor of the Committee, has requested to extend the time limit upto April, 1975 for the submission of the Committee’s report. It is prosed to sanction Rs. 5 lakhs each to Osmania, Andhra and Sri Venkateswara Universities towards the starting of new Post-graduate Centres.

4. On receipt of the Location Committee’s report, further action would be taken by the Government so as to enable the Post-graduate Centres to function from the academic year 1975-76.

Sri Syed Hassan:—From the request given by the Director of public Instruction that the extension of time be given till April, 1975 it is clear that the Government or the Department is not interested in this and we presume that it has been shelved and put into could storage.
Sri Syed Hassan:—No body seems to be interested in the matter of Education and it is the least important matter in the agenda of the Government. This matter was brought to the notice of the Assembly in the last session also. Matriculation examination is being conducted in all the Universities of the State. In other States also similar system prevails. All of a sudden the Osmania University decided that there will be no examinations for Matriculation. When the matter was raised and the Minister for Education stated that the H.S.C. examination are being conducted which is equivalent to matriculation and therefore, there will be no necessity to have the Osmania matriculation examination. When a question was asked about the difference between the HSC examination and the matriculation examination, the Minister wanted time to study the matter. I hope the Ministers would at least try to explain the difference now. What I know is that children whose mother-tongue is not Telugu and those coming from the nearby Hindi speaking States and those who are not anxious to persecute their studies further and want
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To acquire the minimum equivalent qualifications to get into professional course they appear for this examination. Every year not less than 10,000 students appear for the matriculation examination of the Osmania University. This time more than 20,000 candidates have applied to appear for the examination and unfortunately the examination has been postponed four times. No date has been fixed. There are some who adjusted their age accordingly so that they may get into professional courses or get into the jobs. There are so many hurdles and monetary problem is also there. But nobody seems to be bothered about the examinations and as to when they should be conducted. I do not know why the dates are being postponed indefinitely. This sort of fear is very unfortunate for the younger generation. And we are responsible for that.

And another point is when the other two Universities in the other regions are containing this matriculation examination and other States are also having this system this should also be continued here. Otherwise, there will be the problem of unemployment and monetary loss to parents of the boys who are already preparing for this examination.

12.40 p.m.
Calling Attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance:

re: Frequent postponements of Matriculation Examination by Osmania University.

Sri M.V. Krishna Rao:— The Osmania Matriculation was to commence on 16th December, 1974 when affiliated and constituent colleges were closed for vacation from 18th November to 2nd January, 1975. Usually 4 to 5 thousand candidates appear for Osmania Matriculation Examination.

The Osmania University Senate at its meeting held on 29th November, 1974 resolved to do away with the examination. This being the last chance for fresh candidates as many as 15000 applicants have registered their applications for the examination. As the accommodation available with the Constituent and Affiliated Colleges is not sufficient to accommodate such a large number, no immediate arrangements could be made by the Osmania University to conduct the examination as per schedule.

The Vice-Chancellor, Osmania University had a detailed discussion with the Director of Public Instruction, regarding accommodation for the conduct of the Osmania Matriculation examination. The matter is therefore under active consideration of the Osmania University in consultation with the Director of Public Instruction.
Sri Syed Hasan:—I am a member of the Senate and the decision to do away with the Osmania Matric Examination is wrong as furnished by the Minister. Without ascertaining the correct particulars, he is wasting the time of the House simply reading a report prepared by a Clerk. I have also asked him to furnish information about the difference between Matriculation and S. S. C. He has not answered to that point.

Sri M.V. Krishna Rao:—On behalf of the Minister for Finance (Sri P. Ranga Reddy) I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report.
of the Comptroller of Auditor General of India for the year 1972-73 (Commercial) of the Government of Andhra Pradesh under clause (2) of Article 151 of the Constitution of India.

Mr. Speaker:—Report laid on the table.


Mr. Speaker:—Report Presented.

RULING BY THE HON’BLE SPEAKER
RE : WITHDRAWAL OF A BILL.

On 19th July, 1974 when Mr. Ayyapu Reddy moved a motion for leave to introduce the Criminal Procedure Code (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1974 Sri Bhattam SrimuRam Murthi, Minister for Social Welfare opposed the introduction of the Bill. On this many members quoted precedents that at introduction stage the Bill should not be opposed. Ultimately the Minister for Social Welfare agreed to allow the passage of the Motion and the Bill was introduced on that day. On 6th February, 1975 Sri Ayyapu Reddy moved the Motion for consideration of the Bill and made an elaborate speech explaining the purpose of the Bill. Before other members were called upon to speak on the motion Sri Asif Pasha, Minister for Law stated that the Government was seized of the matter and he requested the Hon’ble member to withdraw the Bill as the Government propose to undertake legislation for amending the new Criminal Procedure Code on the lines suggested by the Hon’ble Member. Sri Ayyapu Reddy, Sri Srimulu Sri C. V. K. Rao and Sri N. Venkataramnam stated that at that stage when the motion for consideration was being considered the Minister could not ask the member for withdrawal of the Bill. Sri M. NaraYana Reddy on the other hand opined that as the Hon’ble Minister had accepted the principles of the Bill and wanted to bring the same legislation on behalf of the Government the time of the House should be spared for other business by allowing the Hon. Member to withdraw if he was willing to withdraw the Bill.

Sri Asif Pasha, the Minister for Law once again appealed to Hon’ble Member to withdraw the Bill. Sri Ch. Parasurama Naidu
supported the stand taken by Sri M. Narayana Reddy. At that stage I suggested that normally when the Government undertakes such legislation all members would agree for withdrawal. Sri Ayyapu Reddy moved for withdrawal of the Bill in the assurance given by the Government that a comprehensive amendment Bill, to the Criminal Procedure Code would be brought before the House.

There was lot of controversy about the procedure to be followed in respect of the withdrawal of the Bill.

Rule 302 of the assembly Rules provides for withdrawal of Motion and Rule 133 of the Assembly Rules provides for withdrawal of Bill. Sri C. V. K. Rao, Sri M. Omkar and Sri A. Siriramulu opposed for withdrawal of the motion and suggested that Rule 302 should be followed as the Motion moved by Sri Ayyapu Reddy is a Motion for withdrawal of a Bill. But Sri M. Narayana Reddy clarified to the House stating that Rule 302 should not be applicable to withdrawal of a Bill as Rule 133 specifically provides the procedure for withdrawal of the Bill. Sri Ayyapu Reddy supported the stand taken by Sri M. Narayana Reddy stating that the Motion regarding withdrawal of a Bill was fully covered by Rule 133 and that Rule alone should be applied and not Rule 302. Sri M. Vekataratnam intervened to suggest that Rule 302 would apply. However, as the matter agitated the minds of the members on both the sides regarding the exact procedure to be followed for withdrawal of a Bill, I decided to consider the opinions of the members and also to consult authorities on the matter and decided that I would give a ruling on Friday the 14th February, 1975.

Rule 302 of the Assembly Rules reads as follows:

"302. Withdrawal of Motion : (1) A member who has made a motion may withdraw the same by leave of the House.

(2) The leave shall be signified not upon question but by the Speaker taking the pleasure of the House. The Speaker shall ask "is it your pleasure that the motion be withdrawn?". If no one dissents the Speaker shall say "The Motion is by leave withdrawn." But if any dissenting voice be heard or a member rises to continue the debate, the Speaker shall forthwith put the motion:

Provided that if an amendment has been proposed to a motion the original motion shall not be withdrawn until the amendment has been disposed of."

The rule is quite clear and when leave to withdrawn a motion is objected to even by a single member, the motion cannot be withdrawn and the Speaker shall forth with put the motion to vote.
This has been the procedure followed even in the Lok Sabha and the House of Commons.

Rule 133 of the Assembly Rules reads as follows: "133. Withdrawal of a Bill: The member-in-charge may at any stage of a Bill withdraw the Bill, with the leave of the Assembly."

As Rule 133 is specifically intended for withdrawal of a Bill and as his Rule finds place under Chapter 'Legislation', it goes without saying that withdrawal of a Bill is clearly covered by Rule 133 and that procedure mentioned in the Rule should be followed and not that under Rule 302 which deals with withdrawal of motion. Even in Lok Sabha there are Rules relating to withdrawal of Bills and Rules 110 and 111 of the Lok Sabha Rules clearly provide the procedure to be followed with respect to withdrawal of Bills. Rules 110 and 111 read as follows:

110. Withdrawal of a Bill: The member in-charge of a Bill may at any stage of the Bill move for leave to withdraw the Bill on the ground that—

(a) the legislative proposal contained in the Bill is to be dropped; or

(b) the Bill is to be replaced subsequently by a new Bill which substantially alters the provisions contained therein; or

(c) the Bill is to be replaced subsequently by another Bill which includes all or any its provisions in addition to other provisions; and if such leave is granted no further motion shall be made with reference to the Bill:

Provided that where a Bill is under consideration by a Select Committee of the House or a Joint Committee of the Houses, as the case may be, notice of any motion for the withdrawal of the Bill shall automatically stand referred to the Committee and after the Committee has expressed its opinion in a report to the House, the motion shall be set down in the list of business:

Provided further that where a Bill has originated in the Council and is pending before the House, the member in-charge shall move a motion in the House, recommending to the Council that the Council do agree to leave being granted by the House to withdraw the Bill and after the motion is adopted by the House and concurred in by the Council, the member in-charge shall move for leave to withdraw the Bill.

"111. Explanatory statement by member who moves or opposes withdrawal motion. If a motion for leave to withdraw a Bill is opposed, the Speaker if he thinks fit, permit the member who moves and
the member who opposes the motion to make brief explanatory state­ments and may thereafter, without further debate, put the question.

No doubt the procedure followed in Lok Sabha is made amply clear and 111 provides that if a Motion for leave to withdraw a Bill is opposed, the Speaker if he thinks fit, permit the member who moves and the member who opposes the motion to make brief explanatory statements and may thereafter put the question without further debate.

As explained by May’s Parliamentary Practice with respect to the motions for withdrawing Bills “it is not regular to discuss the merit of a bill or other order of the day upon a motion for its withdrawal, and debate must be strictly confined to the object of the motion.”

Kaul and Shakdher in practice and procedure of Parliament, stated that the member incharge of a bill may at any stage of the Bill, move for leave to withdraw a Bill. If a motion for leave to withdraw a Bill is opposed the Speaker permits, if he thinks fit the member who moves and the member who opposes the motion to make brief explanatory statements and thereafter puts the question without further debate.

Thus a distinction should be made with respect to withdrawal of motion and withdrawal of a Bill. With respect to motions as clearly mentioned by May’s Parliamentary Practice and as borne out by the Rules in Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly and Lok Sabha member who has proposed a motion can withdraw it only by leave of the House and this leave is signified not upon question but by the Speaker taking the pleasure of the House. He asks, “Is it your pleasure that the Motion be withdrawn”. If no one dissents he says “the motion is, by leave withdrawn,” but if any dissentient voice be heard or a Member rises to continue the debate, he must put the question at the end of the debates as the motion cannot now be withdrawn, even though the dissentient subsequently signifies that he has no longer any objection to that course.

With respect to Bill a member incharge of a Bill may at any stage of the Bill move for leave to withdraw the Bill and if such leave is granted no further motion shall be made with reference to the Bill. If any member opposes for withdrawal of a Bill as provided in Kaul and Shakdher’s Practice and Procedure of Parliament the Speaker may permit the member who moves and the member who opposes the motion to make brief explanatory statements and thereafter puts the question without further debates.

Thus a distinction is made when a question is put to the House for taking the pleasure of the house with respect to motions and a question is put to the House for leave to withdraw the Bill. After having gone through the practice and
I am clear about the procedure to be followed with respect to withdrawal of Bills. As there is specific provision for withdrawal of a Bill, i.e., Rule 133, or 144 as the case may be that rule has to be applied with respect to Bills. Hence a member in charge of a bill, may at any stage of the Bill move for leave to withdraw the Bill and if such leave is granted no further discussion shall be made with reference to the Bill. If any member opposes the withdrawal of the Bill the mover of the Motion as well as the member who opposes the Motion will be allowed to state what they have to state and then the motion for withdrawal of the Bill shall be put to vote.

NON-OFFICIAL BILLS

1.00 p.m. (i) The Criminal Procedure Code (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1974 (Withdrawn)

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—The Member who opposes the bill must be given an opportunity to have his statement.

Mr. Speaker:—Not 'must be', may be given.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—That is true. The member who wants to withdraw may be permitted to . . .

Mr. Speaker:—You have made all the statements already.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—I have not made. I only objected on the Bill. The Member who has piloted the bill may make a statement and then the member who is opposing that thing may make a statement and then you put it to the House according to your Ruling.

Sri E. Ayyapu Reddy:—Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw the Bill. Now, a heavy responsibility devolves on the Government to stand by the assurance given by them. They themselves are going to introduce a comprehensive bill. I am confident that the Minister for Law will take up the matter immediately and see that the proposed bill is introduced expeditiously. If they think that they can introduce the bill by the end of March, if not at least by the end of the next session . . .

Sri A. Sriramulu:—I raise a Point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker:—What is the Point of order,

Sri A. Sriramulu:—Will the hon. Member make a conditional withdrawal. He is stipulating condition, putting responsibility on the Government.

Mr. Speaker:—He did not make it conditional.

Sri E. Ayyapu Reddy:—I request that leave be granted to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. Speaker:—Yes. Mr. C. V. K. Rao is the only member who opposes the bill.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—I am opposing the bill as such. I want the hon. Member who has taken pains to bring about this bill before this House should have taken into account the views of different members. Now, the Government has come forth asking the member to withdraw the bill because the Government itself is considering how best to introduce a bill on these lines. Now, no commitment has been made. It is not fair on the part of the Minister to adopt this type of procedure. He should have heard all the members speaking either in support of this bill or in opposition. Then only the Government would be in a better position to bring forth its piece of legislation. My objection is that the member being a member of the ruling party should not have succumbed so easily. It creates a very bad precedent. My view is that, if the Government is proposing to bring a bill on the lines on which the member has brought about, the Government will not be correct. I suggest that would not be the procedure. What I would like to impress on the ruling party is that the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1973, Central Act II has introduced radical change. That is good. According to the bill, my friend is of the opinion that it makes the lower Court just a nominal thing and as such in criminal trials it should follow the old procedure. I feel that the old procedure is totally bad and from the standpoint of view of an advocate it may be all right.

Sri P. Basi Reedy:—The hon. Member is speaking on the merits of the bill.

Mr. Speaker:—You should not speak on the merits of the bill.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—I am opposing the bill. I am not only opposing the withdrawal of the bill, but the bill also.

Mr. Speaker:—Not now.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—That is your observation, Sir, I am opposing the bill itself.

Sri V. Palavelli—(Chodavaram): The hon. Member cannot curtail the rights of others.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:—I am opposing the bill, Sir. Why should there be a panic on that side which has got numbers. Let them come forth with their own piece of legislation.

Sri E. Ayyapu Reddy:—Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw the bill.

The Bill was, by the leave of the House, withdrawn.

(2) THE CONFISCATION OF EXCESS GAINS BILL, 1974.

Sri N. Venkataratnam:—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Confiscation of Excess Gains Bill, 1974 be taken into consideration."

Mr. Speaker:—Motion moved:

"It opens a wide range of discussion which is likely to take sometime either by me or by the other hon. Members. This bill is called the Confiscation of Excess Gains Act and the excess gains is defined. Excess gains mean and include all movable and immovable properties, shares, stocks, dividends, deposits and investments gained by person or group of persons by way of sale, gift, exchange, mortgage, partition or trust, got through in profession or occupation and obtained beyond his personal capacity or earning and in his possession in excess of it or the rightful needs. Many illegal activities of easy earning of property like counterfeiting, block money, gambling, corruption, illegal gratification, speculation, commission, exploiting the human energy of others are leading to inflationary trends in the economy and tilting the balance of society in favour of illegal riches, acorrossing the rupees value making it difficult.

* Sri M. Narayana Reddy:—Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order. Kindly see the agenda List of Business on page 2. This is under item No. 5. The Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill was pending for giving a ruling. That ruling is given and then what happened? When that bill was pending on the last Friday for giving a ruling, you were good enough to reserve the ruling and took the next item on the agenda on that day, was the resolution listed under item No. 6. There was an inconclusive debate on this resolution. Therefore, the non-official resolution which has not concluded and which was in the possession of the House last Friday ought to have been continued; after that resolution, discussion on the resolution is concluded. This non-official business should have been put up for consideration."
Mr. Speaker:—But the rule seems to be arrangement of private member business. First bills have precedence and then only resolutions every day…….

*Sri M.Narayana Reddy:—I beg your pardon. The House was in possession of the resolution on which it was having a continuous discussion. The discussion on the last resolution has not been concluded. You may kindly see item no. 5: discussion on the following non-official will be continued when taken two things—resolution and the bill together as first item than the bill will have precedence not over a resolution which was under discussion. That is a partly discussed resolution which will be naturally continued on Friday; otherwise, the whole time will be lost and it cannot be listed on Friday.

Mr. Speaker:—Why? it will come up again.

Sri M. Narayana Reddy:—No Sir. Because again the Bill will have the precedence,

Mr. Speaker:—I cannot help.

*Sri M. Narayana Reddy:—My only submission is, this is a fundamental point, you may kindly consider. What I was submitting is it is not a question of precedence, bill or resolution. On the last Friday, the House was in possession of the resolution and there was an inconclusive debate. Can we take up any other item with reference to any rule without discussing at all the resolution which is already listed? I can understand if the resolution had been listed in the list of business of the last day. It is listed among the items being a partly discussed resolution and the House was in possession of the resolution; it must be listed on the top on the next following non-official day. That rule refers to the matter when two items are to be taken than the bills will have precedence. There is no doubt about it. Now that will not apply. The matter has been partly discussed and the House was in possession of the resolution. We are faced with a situation; it is for consideration and not for introduction. There will be debate on this bill and this day it would not be taken up because it will be repeated on the next Friday. So the normal procedure is once a matter which has been partly discussed, must be discussed on the following day. Then only the other items has to be taken.
Sri A. Sriramulu: I invited your kind attention to page 13, Rule 29, sub-rule 8: "All non-official business appointed for any day not discussed on that day, shall stand over until the next day of a continuous meeting available for business of the class in which it belongs and shall be included in any ballot held for any other day subsequent meeting and if selected set down in the list of members for such other day according to the priority gained at the ballot held with reference to that day. Provided that any motion which is under consideration of the Assembly at the time of adjournment shall stand postponed to the next day available in that session for private member's business and shall be placed in the list of business for that day as the first item in the class of business to which it relates according to the precedence given to that class by rule." The bill gets precedence and so that objection does not stand.

Sri N. Venkataratnam: There is a discretion. The hon. Member may call for a priority but that priority is over resolutions. You can call for a priority over the resolution but not over the Bill. The resolution can have no prior claim over the bill.

*Sri M. Narayana Reddy: You may kindly refer Rule 29, "Provided sub-rule 8 on page 13: that any motion which is under consideration of the Assembly at the time of an adjournment shall stand postponed to the next day available in that session for private


members' business and shall be placed in the list of business for that day as the first item in the class of business according to the precedence given to that class by this Rule.

Sir, I may also invite your attention to Rule 29 (8) & (9), which give ample power whenever any difficulty arises.

Rule 29 (9) clearly puts it:

"whenever any difficulty arises in applying this Rule, the Speaker shall have power to solve the same in such manner as may seem reasonable to him."

My submission is the phraseology of the Rule is not happily worded. However, you have ample power to give an opportunity to the House to express opinion. My point is, the House is in possession of a particular subject and that subject has to be listed as first item, but without expressing our views on that item. It is not proper to go to another item, which may again be Pending, and therefore, resort to Rule 29. Under this Rule you have permitted a Member to take up the Bill. Discussion is going on. Now you have to allow the Hon'ble Member to put the Bill for consideration, and therefore...

Smt. J. Eswari Bai—Sir, already a Non-official Resolution is there.

Mr. Speaker:—I have only to interpret the Rules and conduct the business in the order in which the Rules provide. So, it is not as if I have the liberty to discuss or interpret a Rule in a manner which does not connote that meaning.

There is an order of priorities. The Bill which was under consideration, has to be put up for the next time also.

Smt. J. Eswari Bai:—No, no Sir, our Resolution has to be taken up.

Mr. Speaker:—Every time the House has to arrange the business, it must be arranged in this order: First, any New Bill; Secondly, any partly heard Bill. It is only after hearing and explaining a Bill, that Resolution could be taken up.

As a matter of fact, when Mr. Narayan Reddy opened the discussion he brought a point, but subsequently has realised that he is not quite clear that the business must be in a different order. Therefore, he quoted Rule 29 (9).

I am exercising the discretion. No difficulty has arisen. I have followed the Rule, and according to Rule, the Bill gets precedence.

Moreover, unless the House decides to modify the Rules itself, the procedure will be the same. From my Ruling if you find any difficulty the Rules may be amended. But as far as the present Rules, are concerned they have been obeyed by me.
Smt. J. Eswari Bai:— you suspend the Rules.

Mr. Speaker:— It is always open to the House that a particular Rule may be suspended and business other than that may be taken up. It is for you not for me.

Sri V. Palavelli:— Ruling may be alright, but still we have to...

Mr. Speaker:— You cannot do both. You cannot say Ruling is alright and still disobey. You may ask for the amendment of the Rules. It is always open.

Sri V. Srikrishna:— It is a matter to be dealt with separately, I mean the amending of Rules.

Mr. Speaker:— Now, that I have given my Ruling, it is open to the Members to seek amendment to Rules, and bring it in conformity with the wishes of the House.

Smt. J. Eswari Bai:— Today is the non-official Day. Now you are giving Ruling that we have to take up the Bills, whereas on the Resolution, discussion has taken place.

Mr. Speaker:— I cannot help. I cannot allow. You have got the liberty for suspending the Rule; if it is passed by the House, you get precedence.

Sri Vanka Satyanarayana:— That has to be considered.

Mr. Speaker:— Please immediately ask for the modification of Rules.

Sri V. Srikrishna:— Sir, much time is consumed on modalities.

Mr. Speaker:— I cannot help. If a point of order is raised, either by Mr. Rao (C.V.K.), or some other Members I have to give a Ruling.

Smt. J. Eswari Bai:— Even in B.A.C. we had taken decisions that after Question Hour, we would take private business.

Mr. Speaker:— The House has got the authority to suspend a particular Rule. When I gave a Ruling, the entire House suggested something else, I had to obey with the wishes.

Smt. J. Eswari Bai:— But there is a decision of the B.A.C.

Mr. Speaker:— There is no decision about this particular thing.

Smt. J. Eswari Bai:— There was a decision.

Mr. Speaker:— We did not take decision on this matter.
Mr. Speaker:—I am helpless. As far as I am concerned I had to arrange business in this order according to rules. If you think the rules do not do justice to the resolutions, it was open to you to have pin-pointed the business to-day or you have to amend rules themselves. Otherwise you cannot ask me to do things irregularly.

Mr. Speaker:—I cannot give any guarantee. They will come in their own turn.

The House now stands adjourned to meet again at 3 p.m. to-day.

(The House then adjourned till 3-00 p.m.)

THE HOUSE REASSEMBLED AT 3-00 P.M. AND ADJOURNED FOR WANT OF QUORUM, TO MEET AGAIN AT 3-20 P.M

The House re-assembled. (3-20 p.m.)

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL

Mr. Speaker:—In accordance with Rule 150 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Council, I return herewith the Andhra Pradesh Land Revenue (Additional Wet Assesment) Bill, 1975 which was passed by the Assembly and transmitted to the Legislative Council for its recommendations and state that this House has no recommendation to make with regard to the said Bill, your faithfully Sd. N. Venkata Subbaiah, Chairman, Council. A.P. Legislative.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

ANDHRA PRADESH RESERVE FORESTS (VALIDATION OF NOTIFICATION) BILL, 1975 (Consideration)

Sri M. Omkar:—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government has come forward with an amendment to the Forest Act. In this connection, I would like to submit that under what circumstances the Government has contemplated to bring forward this amendment? It is clear when the Erstwhile Hyderabad Government was in existence, there was a clear provision that reserve forests were two kinds. One was actual baroon and another was the reserve forest. Baroon forest area was exclusively under the control of the Revenue Department. The Revenue authorities used to allocate that land to the landless poor, particularly to the tribals whenever necessity arose. After 1956 the Erstwhile Hyderabad Government amended the Act and all the baroons were amalgamated into the reserve forest. At that time, there was heated discussion in the Assembly. Then the Government issued some
modifications under which all cultivations that were made prior to 1948 were legalised and orders of assignment were issued. At that time also, the opposition vehemently opposed this amendment and they demanded that while taking all these baroons into reserve forest, the villages in existence must be taken into consideration and the required area must be earmarked for the purpose of assignments. But due to huge majority of the then Ruling party have not paid any heed those suggestions and they made as they wished. Subsequently even that G.O that was permitting all prior 1948 cultivations, was not applied scrupulously. After sometime, when these baroons were taken into the reserve forest, all formalities were not applied. As such several cases have been filed in the Court and several cases against the cultivators have been instituted, particularly the tribals were put under severe harassment.

In this connection, I would like to bring forth the realities that are going on in the villages. As usual these people were entertaining and enjoying the lands that were under their possession since some decades. Recently the Government, that is, four years back, issued a G.O. under which it has provided that all cultivations that were made prior to 1964 are to be legalised and assignments are to be made. Even that G.O. is not being implemented scrupulously. I can quote some hundreds of cases particularly in my constituency and in Warangal District that all the cultivations that were made prior to 1954 were not being allowed. On the other hand, the cultivators are being harassed by the existing cases and other things. There are certain cases in which the Revenue Department assigned pattas but the forest people are not allowing them to those lands. They are obstructing them stating that the Revenue people have no authority to assign these lands, since we have taken them to the reserve forest.

The second thing is even after their inclusion in the reserve forests according to the existing G.O. all pre-1964 cultivations must be allowed and assignments must be made. That is not being implemented scrupulously. In this connection, my humble submission is that according to the village needs, baroons must be reserved as was agreed to by the previous government. This government also must do that. Some lands must be earmarked for the purpose of assignment to the landless poor as well as to the village needs. I can cite one example. Kothagudem is a village in the Parkal block No I. The boundary line is very nearer to the houses of the people and the people are unable to move on either side because on four sides the village is surrounded by the reserved forest. That is why the forest authorities are putting them to so many difficulties. The cattle are driven from hadgar (Baddar doddi), and when some people carry some
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The wood, they are also being harassed like that. I can cite, verbal examples wherein the people are not having even one acre of land where he can stock has erected a cattle shed. So, my submission should earmark some barren lands for the village needs and done by the erstwhile Hyderabad Government.

Another submission is, it is an admitted fact with continued poverty and hunger, the people have been cultivating some forest lands. Of course, from legal point of view it is ill-gai. But, from the humanitarian point of view it is justified. The present Government used to consider all these factors and exercised the powers by allotting those lands to the landless people and orders were issued respecting those lands from the revenue forest. My submission is the existing G.O. of allowing cultivation of pre 1964 is not sufficient. It does not meet the needs of the present day. So, the Government must amend the G.O. to the effect that all the lands that are hitherto under the cultivation of the poor sections must be regularised and the lands that were included in the revenue forest and which are under the cultivation of the poorer sections, they must be excluded from the revenue forest. The Government must make a categorical statement.

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—Sir, on a point of order, I would like to draw your attention to this aspect. Some of the copies of the acts must be made available. We are working round the clock and now we have got to work on a particular piece of legislation. We should be extremely alert. That is the responsibility of a legislator. When that is the position, I do except the Office to be equally alert. If the staff is not sufficient, you should provide enough staff. And if the papers are not enough, you should get the things ordered to be done. I consider that the old-fashioned ways won’t help us. The old method is the Member himself struggles and prepares himself. What I do except of this House in order to keep the dignity of this House is full facilities must be given. The meeting was over by 1.30 p.m. and again we are meeting now. And so if I do not find a copy available here, where am I to go? And to go from room to room for this particular copy of the Bill? If this is the position, well, I am sorry, we cannot be able to function, Sir. How is it that this takes place at this hour and I do not get a copy? How am I to function? Of course Bills were given. We and we have to carry lot of material along with us. At least a copy of the bill should be made available. Unless you gear up the entire Secretariat, it is not possible for us to function. Of course, I go to somebody and try to get a copy. But when all this fails, I come to you. Not a single copy is available how can we participate.

Mr. Speaker:—They have already been given to you.

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—That is true, Sir. At 1.30 we go and 3 O’clock we come. Can I carry all these things. If I carry, some of them
would be missing. It is not the duty of the office to have some bills kept ready. When I go and ask, there I do not get a copy. That is the position. If you defend the present system, we cannot function, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I agree. We shall ask them to provide.

No. 1, Sir. B. Rama Saini

3-30 p.m.
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Government Bills:

The A. P. Revenues Forests (Validation of Notifications) Bill, 1975.
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Sir,

I am pleased to inform you that the Government of Andhra Pradesh has enacted the AP Revenues Forests (Validation of Notifications) Bill, 1975.

The Bill provides for the validation of notifications issued under the existing laws regarding the acquisition and alienation of forest lands. The Bill seeks to clarify and simplify the process of validation, ensuring that eligible notifications are properly validated.

I urge you to take necessary steps to implement the provisions of this Bill effectively.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Minister for Forests
Government Bills:
The A. P. Reserved Forests (Validation of Notification) bill, 1975.

14th February 1975

The A. P. Reserved Forests (Validation of Notification) bill, 1975.
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Government Bills:
The A. P. Reserved Forests (Validation of Notifications) Bill, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, Sir. For some gentlemen, a Legislature appears to be too burdensome a thing. They feel that a Governor is enough and the whole of governing could be done. I hold a different view altogether. The Governor cannot be used in order to bring forth ordinances. On forests also, the Governor has given an Ordinance. Leave alone other things. Even on Forests, he is asked to issue an Ordinance in order to validate certain notifications that were made by the Government. Governor has come to the rescue. I advise, this kind of thing should not be resorted to by this Ministry in future.

This concerns about the amendment to the Forest Act of Telangana. This concerns with the declaration.

"No notification made or purporting to have been made by the former Government of Hyderabad under sec. 18 of the Forests Act while that Act was in force, declaring certain forests as reserved forests and no action taken or thing done in connection with such declaration, shall be deemed to be invalid or even to have become invalid by reason only of the fact that such notification did not fix a date from which the forest is declared to be reserved forest".

3:50 p.m.
So, they have declared certain forests as reserved forests by notification. It is known that the forest Act is a very old one in Nizam. At a later stage, the Nizam felt that the forests should be made secure, because in olden times, it was in the forests that the revolt took place against the British regime. You know Alluru Sitaramaraju revolted against the British in the forest. So British took care of the forests not because the forests contained natural wealth, but because the forests may be places where the rebels may live. As such they have created very stringent rules and regulations. In a welfare State, the forest is in fact a virgin area wherein much natural resources are to be found and the Government ought to have taken steps in order that the forest is used for natural resources to be fully tapped. That is not there. The Government is behaving as though we are still in the olden days of British regime.

I wish the Government should have taken steps to see entire administration is overhauled in order to make the administration as a useful one. It is not done. With regard to certain forests which are to be made into reserved forests, now they have brought about this thing. They say there are certain judgments given by some courts. It is stated that there are some court orders. I don't know about these judgments, I don't know what judgments they are. What was the order and what was given. The Minister should have taken this House into account and should have furnished the necessary material. On what ground did the court held that a particular forest cannot be a reserved forests according to that order. Is it because human beings are living there, is it because animals are living there, is it because heaven exists there. They are going anywhere to live, to have shelter or to till the land. I don't have enough material. If the material is made available, it would be good. There is forest, there are natural resources. The State needs it, the people need it. They simply bring in some kind of legislation by an Ordinance of the Governor and then make it a reserved forests. That is so simple. What about the people? Why should you make everything reserved. Today the man wants it, the people want to till the land and it is much more useful. We are able to make this earth a habitable area. While making earth a habitable area, what is the fun in making those places of forests into reserved forests. I oppose this thing. That is my simple explanation. I thank you very much even for giving me this little time.
Government Bills:
The A. P. Reserved Forests (Validation of Notifications) Bill, 1975.


The A. P. Reserved Forests (Validation of Notifications) Bill, 1975.

The bill was passed in the Assembly on 7th February, 1975. It provides for the validation of certain notifications relating to the reservation of forests in the state. The bill seeks to ensure that the rights of local communities to use and manage forest resources are protected. It also aims to prevent illegal encroachments and to ensure that forest lands are used for their intended purposes.

The bill has been introduced in the assembly after intensive discussions and consultations with various stakeholders. It has been designed to strike a balance between the need for conservation of forest resources and the rights of local communities to use forest lands.

The bill is expected to receive the assent of the Governor and become law after it is notified in the official gazette. It will be a significant step towards the sustainable management of the state's forest resources.

S. K. V. R., Speaker
Government Bills:
The A. P. Reserved Forests (Validation of Notifications) Bill, 1975.

Sri J. Damodara Rao:—I raise a Point of Order, Sir. If we convert it into general debate, it will consume the entire time of... 
Please see Rule No. 100—Discussion of Principal of Bill

Mr. Speaker:—Please be brief.

Mr. Md. Ibrahim Ali Ansari:—Sir, I humbly submit, while 4.10 p.m. introducing the Bill, neither we are amending the Act nor declaring any forest areas to Reserve Forests but just to validate certain notifications which were issued by the erstwhile Hyderabad Government.
during the year 1341 F and 1354. Regarding the other points I have taken note all of them. I humbly request all the Members to help us in reserving the forests to keep balance of nature.

Sri D. Omkar:—They have amalgamated two reserve forest and to that effect they have suggested to the Minister to reserve some area......

Mr. Speaker:—After this is validated.......

Sri M. Omkar:—Whether the Government is going to take a decision with regard to illegal cultivation to regularise........

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

"That the Andhra Pradesh Reserved Forests (Validation of Notification) Bill, 1975 be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

CLUSES 2 and 3.

Mr. Speaker:—There are no amendments to Clauses 2 and 3

The question is:

"That Clauses 2 and 3 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was carried and Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker:—There are no amendments to Clause I Enacting Formula and Long Title.

The question is:

"Clauses I Enacting Formula and Long Title do stand part of the Bill".

The motion was carried and Clause I, Enacting Formula and Long Title were added to the Bill.

Sri Md. Ibrahim Ali Ansari:—Sir, I beg to move: "that the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted, and the Bill was passed.
Government Bills:
The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

(2) THE JAWAHARLAL NEHRU TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
(Amendment) Bill, 1975. (as passed by the Council)

Sri B. Sreerama Murty—Sir, I beg to move:
that the Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975, (as passed by the Council) be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker:—Motion moved.

2.30 p.m.:—Sri B. Sreerama Murty:—Sir, I beg to move:
that the Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975, (as passed by the Council) be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker:—Motion moved.

4.20 p.m.:—Sri B. Sreerama Murty:—Sir, I beg to move:
that the Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975, (as passed by the Council) be taken into consideration.
350 14th February, 1975.

The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.
The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

...

The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

4-30 p.m.
Sri S. Jaipal Reddy:—Sir, the amendments appear to have been proposed with two principal objectives. Sir, I am in full agreement and sympathy with the first objective. The first objective deals with the change of status of Warangal Regional Engineering College from that of a constituent college to an associate college. I may recall here that it was I who brought this to the notice of the House during the last session. Dealing with the second objective of shifting the location of headquarters of the university from Warangal to Hyderabad, at the very outset I must give expression to a deep sense of shock. It will be very instructive and interesting for us to recall that when the University was first set up the then Hon'ble Minister Sri Madan Mohan made a categorical assurance that the headquarters of the University would be located only at Warangal. This assurance was also extracted from him in the Telangana Regional Committee which was then in existence. This attempt at shifting the location is in absolute contravention of that solemn assurance. We do not mind if the assurances are violated for valid reasons. Now let me deal with the reasons enunciated in the statement of objects and reasons.
Sir, the first reason which I state is, now that the Warangal Regional Engineering College is being made an associate college, this University is being shifted to Warangal for want of place. I have been a keen student of the problem of education. This is the first example of this kind. Here the University which is shifting its location for want of space is a caricature and a farce of University. This is a farce of University for two reasons. It has no building; it has no colleges worth the name. All the Engineering Colleges are affiliated to the respective Universities. The only two Engineering Colleges that is Narajun nagar Engineering College and Warangal Engineering College are affiliated to this University.

Secondly, this is a parody of a University for the reason, it has no funds of its own worth the name. When we raised this question, the Government assured that sufficient funds would be made available.

Let me now deal with the Statement of Objects and Reasons. If this logic is to be accepted, all the Engineering Colleges should be shifted to Hyderabad City because it is one place which has a vast industrial complex in and around Hyderabad City. Therefore all the Engineering Colleges should be located in Hyderabad City. We do not know why this University is again rejected out of it. These people are just taking it around the world for me a shelter.

Thirdly, the possibility of obtaining facilities required from the local Engineering Colleges. Here is a full-fledged Technological University which is anxious to acquire facilities from an Engineering College. You can really appreciate the ridiculous and ludicrous nature of this Institution when we consider the aspect of a University taking facilities from an Engineering College. Therefore, I am opposed squarely to this proposal for shifting of location of the University headquarters from Warangal to Hyderabad. My Hon'ble friend Mr. N. Srinivasul Reddy has rightly pointed out that this will be a 4th University to set up in the Hyderabad City.

Too much of centralisation and concentration of educational facilities in the capital city is not going to be healthy from the viewpoint of the balanced economic development of the people of the State. It is also on this ground that we should base the shifting of location from Warangal to Hyderabad City.

Lastly Sir, I would like to urge upon the present Minister for Technical Education to see that adequate funds are provided to this University. Otherwise it is not too late to wind up this University and forget the whole thing as a bad dream. I hope the Minister for Technical Education would either provide funds or wind it up. Thank you very much.
Government Bills:

The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

...
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Government Bills
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...
Government Bills.

The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

4 50 p.m.

4 55 p.m.
Constituent College means any college established or maintained by the University for providing courses of study for qualifying students, etc. The word 'constituent' means the same thing.

“Associated College’ means the Regional Engineering College, Warangal, established and maintained by its Society and associated with University as providing courses of study qualifying students for admission to University Examinations in accordance with the Regulations prescribed.”
According to the Sub-section, the Governor may by notification apply the provisions of this Act to any other College or Institution with effect from such date as they may specify in this behalf. And thereupon, the provisions of Section 28 shall mutatis mutandis apply to such College or Institution.

The definition about the institution is as follows:—Institution means an institution, organisation, training centre or the establishment providing teaching, research, experimentation of practical training in engineering, technology, physical and social sciences, architecture or fine arts and includes polytechnic.

The definitions are:

- "Institution" means an institution, organisation, training centre or the establishment providing teaching, research, experimentation of practical training in engineering, technology, physical and social sciences, architecture or fine arts and includes polytechnic.

The dates notified under sub-section 1) of Section 28 are:

- Government Engineering College at Anantapur and Kakinada
- Nagarjunasagar Engineering College, Hyderabad
- Government College of Fine Arts and Architecture, Hyderabad
- Regional Engineering College, Warangal

I shall apply the first instance from the date notified under sub-section 1) of Section 28 in respect of the Government Engineering College at Anantapur and Kakinada, the Nagarjunasagar Engineering College, Hyderabad Government College of Fine Arts and Architecture, Hyderabad and the Regional Engineering College, Warangal.
The Jambalal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975

Sri B. Sriram Murthy: —Let me complete, Sir. If there are any doubts, I will certainly clarify. Above any institution or campus that will lend itself for easy assimilation into such a project, we are not established by us. It is maintained by the University and that which is established by the University is not established by us. It is maintained by us. I am only explaining the circumstances under which it was not done. That will lend itself for easy assimilation...
The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

The degree of any university incorporated by an Act of the Central or State Legislature in India or other educational Institution established by an Act of Parliament are declared to be deemed as Universities under Section 3 of the University Grants Commission Act 1956. It has come into being by an Act of Legislature. They are recognised by the Union Public Service Commission and the Public Service Commission in the State for the purpose of employment and similar is the case for employment in the public undertakings, armed forces etc., in as much as the Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University established by the Act of the State Legislature is a technological University under the U.G.C. Act without requiring any formality of the recognition.
The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

We must be proud of it. In this in collaboration with the Institute of Applied Man-power Research to meet the needs of the industry we have set up a Department of Industrial Training and Placement, a Training in Management, and a Centre for Research in Industrial Administration.

In the next year, 19.60 is expected to be reached. The total expenditure will be 40 and 42 crores.
The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1973

I think autonomous college and University are contradictory in terms, because autonomous college is deemed as University.

Admissions to all the Central Engineering Colleges should be made through an entrance examination for both the State quota of seats and the quota of seats for other States according to accepted pattern and choice of candidates.

The individual colleges should have autonomous Boards of Governors with the suggested composition and should be set up by the Central Council.
5-20 p.m.
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It will not be under the purview of the presidential order. From out of the purview of the presidential order.
The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

... Now it is part of the Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University. It is an associate college now.

Sri M. Omkar:—According to Recommendation No. 34 of the Reviewing Committee of Regional Engineering Colleges, it is like this: "Financing of the Colleges from two sources is not very satisfactory and future financial responsibility for the colleges should be entirely from the central sources. If necessary adjustments should be made for the recommendation made by the Finance Commission regarding devolution of resources to States in respect of Central Engineering Colleges."

...
Government Bills:
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The Government of India have recently agreed to continue the existing pattern. Recommendation No. 34 of the Reviewing Committee reads thus:

"Financing of the Colleges from the two sources is not very satisfactory and future financial responsibility for the Colleges should be entirely from the central sources. If necessary adjustments should be made for the recommendations made by the Finance Commission...."

The recommendation No. 34 of the Reviewing Committee reads thus:

"Financing of the Colleges from the two sources is not very satisfactory and future financial responsibility for the Colleges should be entirely from the central sources. If necessary adjustments should be made for the recommendations made by the Finance Commission...."
Government Bills:
The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

14th February, 1975.

We must abide by the decision of the Government of India on Jaikishan Report. We must abide by the decision of the Government of India on Jaikishan Report. We must abide by the decision of the Government of India on Jaikishan Report.
Government Bills:
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Mr. Speaker:—The question is:
"That Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975, (As passed by the Council), be taken into consideration."
The motion was adopted.

CLAUSES 2 to 16

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:
"That Clauses 2 to 16 do stand part of the Bill."
The motion was adopted and Clauses 2 to 16 were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 1, ENACTING FORMULA & LONG TITLE:

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:
"That Clause 1, Enacting Formula and Long Title do stand part of the Bill."
The motion was adopted and Clause 1, Enacting Formula and Long Title were added to the Bill.

Sri Bhattiram Stramamurthy:—Sir, I beg to move that:
"The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975, be passed."

Mr. Speaker:—Motion moved. The question is:
"The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Amendment) Bill, 1975, be passed."
The motion was adopted and the Bill was passed.

ANDHRA PRADESH RECOGNISED PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS (CONTROL) BILL, 1975 (PASSED)

Sri C.V.K. Rao:—Sir, I beg to move:

5.30 p.m. " Whereas it is the Democratic and legitimate right of the Legislature to improve the conditions of the teaching staff and eradicate the malpractices prevailing in private educational institutions on which repeated attention was brought to the notice of the Government on the Floor of the Legislature; and whereas Government having failed
A. P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.

in its duty and the Governor having promulgated a truncated and piecemeal Ordinance No. 3 of 1974, this House disapproves that defective Ordinance and requests the minister in charge to put forth solid, effective proposals for improvement of the conditions of the teaching staff and to eradicate malpractices of private educational system and abolish private agencies managing educational institutions."

Mr. Speaker:—Statutory Resolution moved.

Sri M.V. Krishna Rao :—Sir, I beg to move:

"The Andhra Pradesh Recognised Private Educational institutions(Control) Bill, 1975, (As passed by the Council), be taken into consideration."

Mr. Speaker:—Motion moved.
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An Institution imparting education or training, and administered and maintained by any person or body of persons, recognised by the Government, and includes a College.”

But it does not include ‘An Educational Institution’ imparting Technical or Professional Education.
Government Bills:
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To be made to the House of Assembly in the State of A. P., on the 14th day of February, 1975.

The following Bills have been published for public view and have been, after such view, referred to the Standing Committee on the Bill and submitted to the House for consideration:

A. P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.

Government Bills
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A. P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control, Bill, 1975.)

6 00 p.m.
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Sri. E. Morris (Nomitated):—Mr. Speaker, Sir I speak on behalf of the minorities. We are very glad that this Government is doing its best to assist and protect the teachers in every respect in Andhra Pradesh, but it is a matter of regret that parents and students have been left out of the purview of the bill. While this bill is helpful to teachers, we feel that our Managements' high standard of discipline will be lowered and perhaps a slight fragrance of it left, inasmuch as they will not be allowed to carry out disciplinary action, i.e. suspensions and dismissals, etc. but will have to report the offenders to the competent authority who will deal with them. You will agree, Sir, if this bill is passed without an amendment, it will not only lower the high standard of discipline and tradition maintained by our institutions, but it will also certainly give the teachers and other staff an opportunity to behave in an undisciplined impertinent and independent manner.

Sir, I would draw the attention of the House to the Andhra Pradesh Education Bill of 1969 which extends to the whole of the State of Andhra Pradesh, in which it is stated that the Bill applies to all Educational Institutions and Tutorial institutions in the State except educational institutions established and administered by the minorities under clause (1) of Art. 30 of the Constitution of India. Both the Ordinance No. 3 of October 5th 1974 and the proposed comprehensive Bill are flagrantly violative of Clause (1) of Art. 30 of the Constitution of India. If the Government of Andhra Pradesh wish to retain this Bill and pass it into an Act, it must state in unmistakeable terms that nothing contained in the Bill shall apply to the minority schools which enjoy the protection of Clause (1) of the Art. 30 of the Constitution of India.

In view of the series of decisions of the Supreme and High Courts, as has been proved by 20 High Court and 10 Supreme Court decisions the latest being in the St. Xavier's College, Gujarat case A.I.R. 1974 (August) 1389 of which the Government must be fully aware, the minority run institutions have no desire whatever to take any action which may embarrass the Government and sincerely trust they will not be driven to do so by this Government passing an Act which, on the face of it, would be violative of the Supreme Court decisions, and palpably unconstitutional.

On behalf of the minorities representing all the Christian and other Educational Institutions of Andhra Pradesh, I make this most
fervent and respectful request to this House that their schools be excluded from the purview of the Bill, when passed.

Mr Speaker, Sir before concluding I humbly plead that this august Assembly seriously considers this whole issue and refers it to the Advocate General and gets his opinion on the legality of the Bill, before it is passed.

Thank you, Sir.

A. P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.
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The bill provides for the recognition of private educational institutions in the state. The government proposes to regulate these institutions by imposing certain conditions and regulations. The details of the bill are as follows:

1. The bill aims to ensure that private educational institutions meet the minimum standards of education.
2. The government will have the power to inspect these institutions and ensure that they comply with the prescribed rules.
3. The bill also includes provisions for the appointment of a committee to oversee the implementation of the regulations.

The bill is intended to protect the interests of students and ensure that private educational institutions operate in a transparent and accountable manner.

The bill was passed unanimously by the legislature.
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The bill was intimated:—Monday morning, 8.50 a.m., 6.40 p.m.


The bill was intimated:—Tuesday afternoon, 3.00 p.m., 3.25 p.m. The Governor, Mr. R. P. Shridharji, I.C.S., moved the A. P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.
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The House was adjourned at a quarter past six o'clock. The House resumed in the evening at a quarter past six o'clock. The Honourable Speaker presided.

The following Bills were taken:


33. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.

34. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.


41. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.

42. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.

43. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.

44. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.

45. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.


47. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.


52. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.


60. The A.P. Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975.

When such Rules are framed, it is only when there is a violation of these Rules, that the Government could interfere with the management. Some such Rules are there for the Municipalities and other Statutory Bodies.

I request the Government to allow the Minority Institutions a free hand and see that these Institutions are exempted, and these institutions should not be included in the Bill.
Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

"Whereas it is the Democratic and legitimate right of the Legislature to improve the conditions of the teaching staff and eradicate the malpractices prevailing in private educational institutions on which repeated attention was brought to the notice of the Government on the Floor of the Legislature;

And whereas Government having failed in its duty and the Governor having promulgated a truncated and piecemeal Ordinance No.3 of 1974, this House disapproves that defective Ordinance and requests the Minister incharge to put forth solid, effective proposals for improvement of the conditions of the teaching staff and to eradicate malpractices of private educational system and abolish private agencies managing educational institutions."

The motions was negatived.

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:
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"The Andhra Pradesh Recognised private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975, (as passed by the Council), be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

CLAUSE 2.

Sri N. Venkat Ratnam:—Sir, I beg to move:

"Delete sub-clauses (7) (a); and (7) (d) of Clause 2."

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

"Delete sub-clauses (7) (a); and (7) (d) of clause 2."

The amendment was negatived.

Sri N. Venkat Ratnam:—Sir, I beg to move:

"Add the following as sub-clause (8) of clause 2:

"(8) 'Teacher' includes, 'non-teaching staff also'."

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

"Add the following as sub-clause (8) of Clause 2:

"(8) 'Teacher' including non-teaching staff also'."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

"That Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted and Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 3.

Sri M. Omkar:—Sir, I beg to move:

"In sub-clause (1) of Clause 3, add the following, after the words 'no teacher':

"and other employees'."

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

"In sub-clause (1) of clause 3, add the following, after the words 'no teacher':

"and other employees'."

The amendment was negatived.

Sri M. Omkar:—Sir, I beg to move:

"In the proviso to sub-clause (1) of Clause 3, after the word 'Teacher' add the words "and other employees"."

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:
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“...in the proviso to sub clause (1) of Clause 3 after the word “Teacher” add the words “and other employees”.

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

“That Clause 3 do stand part of the Bill”.

The motion was adopted and Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

CLauses 4 to 13

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

“That Clauses 4 to 13 do stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted and Clauses 4 to 13 were added to the Bill.

Clause 14

Sri N. Venkatraman:—Sir, I beg to move:

“Add the following at the end of Clause 14:

“or the aggrieved party”.

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

“Add the following at the end of Clause 14:

“or the aggrieved party”.

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

“That Clause 14 do stand part of the Bill”.

The motion was adopted and Clause 14 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 15 to 21.

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

“That Clauses 15 to 21 do stand part of the Bill”.

The motion was adopted and Clauses 15 to 21 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, Enacting Formula & Long Title:

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

“That Clause 1, Enacting Formula, and Long Title do stand part of the Bill.”

60—18
The motion was adopted and Clause 1, Enacting Formula and Long Title were added to the Bill.

Sri M.V. Krishna Rao:—Sir, I beg to move that:

“The Andhra Pradesh Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, 1975 be passed”.

Mr. Speaker:—The question is:

“The Andhra Pradesh Recognised Private Educational Institutions (Control) Bill, be passed”.

The motion was adopted and the Bill was passed.

Mr. Speaker:—The House now stands adjourned to meet again at 7.05 p.m. tomorrow.

(The House then adjourned to meet again at 8-30 A.M. on Saturday, the 15th February, 1975.)