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ANDHRA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Tuesday, the 6th March, 1979.
The House met at Half-Past Eight of the Clock
(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Business of the House

Mr. Speaker:—Mr Venkayya Naidu will put the question,
Sri M. Venkayya Naidu (Udayagiri) :—No questions Sir. We
must discuss that issue regarding the sub-Collector Kothagudem.

(Interruptions from the both sides of the House)

* An asterisk before the name indicates confirmation by the Member.
Mr. Speaker:—"Unless the Speaker otherwise directs, the first hour of every sitting shall be available for asking questions". That is the position. Let me tell you that I am the servant of the House. If the House agrees that there shall be no question hour, I am prepared to follow that.

(Interruptions of "No" from Treasury Benches).

Sri P. Sundarayya (Gannavaram):—Speaker is the master of the House.

Mr. Speaker:—I am also bound by certain principles and norms. I am bound by Rules. I am the servant of the House. I should obey the House and if it is the sense of the House that there shall be no question hour, I shall follow that. If it is the sense of the House that I should proceed with the question hour, it is my bounded duty to obey it.

Sri M. Venkayya Naidu:—You have got every right. You are the Sabhapathi.

Mr. Speaker:—He is also bound by Rules.

Sri P. Sundarayya:—House means majority of the House. Majority is the Government. So, when you say you are the servant of the House, you are the servant of the Government.

Mr. Speaker:—I am not saying I am servant of the Government.

(I Interruptions)

I am servant of House.

Sri P. Sundarayya:—You are not the servant of the House.

Mr. Speaker:—I am the servant of the House.

(I Interruptions)

There is a famous saying of the Speaker of the House of Commons—"I have neither eyes to see nor the ears to hear because I am a servant of the House". That is the observation made by the Speaker of the House of Commons. I have got neither the ears to hear nor the eyes to see except of those of the House whose servant I am. I am bound to say that I am the servant of the House. As observed by Speaker Reddy, it is the duty of the Speaker to enable the House to function and not to shut out. The House is paramount, not the Speaker. He can claim no inherent right to overrule or bypass the House or arrogate to himself the powers and functions which belong to the House.

Ch. Rajeswarara (Sircilla):—On a point of submission...

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy:—House does not mean merely the majority.

Mr. Speaker:—Let the question hour go, you can do whatever you please.

Sri Ch. Rajeswara Rao:—On a point of submission . . .

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker:—You have decided in the Rules that the first hour shall be a question hour. I am following that. What else can I do?

Sri Ch. Rajeswara Rao:—I have to say whether the Speaker is servant of the House or not.

Sri P. Sundarayya:—I differ.

Sri Ch. Rajeswara Rao:—Let me clarify my position.

Mr. Speaker:—I am bound by the precedents of the House of Commons.

Sri Ch. Rajeswara Rao:—We are not bound by that. We have our own opinion; we will evolve our own procedure.

Mr. Speaker:—Then amend it.

Sri Ch. Rajeswara Rao:—That is British Parliament; we are not British Parliament. We are the Indian Assembly.

Mr. Speaker:—I am bound by the Rules.

(Interruptions from Opposition Benches)

Sri Ch. Rajeswara Rao:—This is independent India.

Mr. Speaker:—Is it the sense of the House that the question hour should be postponed.

(Interruptions from both sides)

Mr. Speaker:—If the question has to be postponed, a resolution has to be passed by the House to that effect. Let them move a resolution.

(Interruptions)

Let us proceed with the first question.

(Interruptions from Treasury Benches)

Mr. Speaker:—I say the question hour is over; all the answers and statements are placed on the Table of the house.

(Interruption from Treasury Benches).

Mr. Speaker:—(To the members on the Treasury Benches)—If they, the Opposition Members do not want the Question hour why should you have it.
Sri M Venkayya Naidu:—Speaker has already given a ruling that the question hour is over.

(While the opposition Members joined Sri M Venkayya Naidu in support, the Members on the Treasury benches wanted that the Question Hour should be continued)

Sri K. Venkataramayya:—Up to 9—30 we can have question hour. It is now 8—50.

(Sri N Janardhana Reddy was seen talking to the Chief Minister and then to the Speaker. Sri M. Venkayya Naidu took objection for this)

Sri M. Venkayya Naidu:—He can not do like that. He is not a Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker:—He has got liberty to talk.

(Interruptions)

I am adjourning the House for an hour.

Written Answers to Questions (starred)

Disappearance of Dr. George and His Family

217—

*3754-Q—Sri M. Venkayya Naidu:—Will the Minister for Home be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Dr. George and his car had disappeared while he was travelling from Kakinada to Kothapeta in East Godavari district; and

(b) the steps taken by the Government to trace that doctor's family?

A.—

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) On a report given by Dr. K. S. Chowdri, Civil Assistant Surgeon, Kothapeta, the Sub-Inspector of Police, Kothapeta registered a case under 'man missing' and letter transferred the case to III Town Police Station on point of jurisdiction. Radio messages were flashed to the neighbouring Police Stations and all Superintendents of Police. The news was published in Newspapers, with photos. Subsequently the case was entrusted to the Crime Branch, C.I.D. and whose enquiries revealed that Dr A George having drawn his pay for October, 1978 and left to Kothapeta with his wife and his son in his Fiat Car ADX-2039 on 1-11-1978. After strenuous efforts by Crime Branch, C.I.D. officers, the car was located in submerged waters in Kothapeta canal on 31-12-78 and it was brought out 1-1-79. Further the skeletal remains of all the three i.e.
Written Answers to Questions.  6th March, 1979
(Starred)

Dr. A. J. George, his wife and son were recovered in the tail ends of the canal. The jewels which were removed from dead bodies were also recovered.

Appointment of Additional Superintendents of Police in the State

218—

*3465-Q.—Sri A. Easwara Reddy (Tirupathi) :—Will the Minister for home be pleased to state:

(a) the names of the district Head Quarters where the Government appointed Additional Superintendents of Police in the State; and

(b) whether the powers of S.Ps, and Additional S.Ps. were demarcated?

A.—

(a) The following are the districts where Additional Superintendents of Police have been appointed:

1 Sriakulam.
2 Visakhapatnam.
3 East Godavari (Kakinada)
4 West Godavari (Eluru).
5 Krishna (Bandar).
6 Guntur.
7 Cuddapah.
8 Ananthapur.
9 Kurnool.
10 Ranga Reddy District.
11 Nizamabad.
12 Mahaboobnagar.
13 Nalgonda.
14 Warangal.
15 Khammam.
16 Karimnagar.

(b) Yes Sir.

Non-Distribution of Pass Books to Ryots

219—

*2917 Q.—Dr. V. Sivaramakrishna Rao (Bodwel) :—Will the Minister for revenue be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that till to day the pass Books are not distributed to the ryots in many parts all over the State as per the orders of the Government;
(b) if so, the reasons therefore,

(c) the action taken on the Revenue officials for not distributing the pass Books, and

(d) whether there is any time-Bound programme with the Government to fulfill this long-cherished dream of the ryots?

A—

(a) and (b) —24 lakh Pass Books have been distributed so far. There are 1,71,632 Pass Books still available with the following Collectors for distribution.

1. Collector, Krishna 27,296
2. Collector, Guntur 91,956
3. Collector, Anantapur 2,981
4. Collector, Warangal 1,182
5. Collector, Nalgonda 14,485
6. Collector, Nizamabad 33,074
7. Collector, Hyderabad 658

Total: 1,71,632

20 lakhs more Pass Books are under printing. As soon as the Printing is over, all the pattadaras will be issued Pass Books.

(c):—Does not arise.

(d):—The printing of pass Books is in progress in the Government printing press. After receipts of 20 lakhs pass Books, they will be distributed to ryots.

Introduction of New pattern of Tax and Loan Collections From the Ryots

220—

*3638-Q—Sri poola Subbaiah (Markapur) : —Will the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state:

(b) whether the Government propose to introduce a new pattern of tax and loan collections from ryots in our state:

(b) if so, the details of the new system; and

(c) when it will be introduced?

A.—

A statement giving the particulars is placed on the Table of the House.
Written Answers to Questions. 6th March, 1979.
(Starred)

Statement laid the table of the house.
Vide answer to L.A.Q No, 3638 (Started)

(a) In G.O.Ms No 2011 (Revenue) dated 30th November 1978 orders have been issued introducing a new pattern of all collections including taccavi and other loans

(b) 1. All current land revenue should be collected only during the Kist season.

2. Arrears of land revenue and other arrears should as far as possible be also collected during the Kist season and in any case within three months of the second Kist season.

3. Any current land revenue not collected during the Kist season of the concerned year should be collected during the Kist seasons of the subsequent year and if not so collected, then it can be collected within three months of the second Kist season of that year as in the case of arrears.

4. The Collectors should organise all revenue staff that are available with them and take up a concerted and concentrated drive for achieving maximum collections of all land revenue amount whether current demand or arrears during the Kist season and all arrears during the three months following the second Kist. This should be strictly reviewed by the Collectors. There should be no collections outside these periods when the cultivators may not be in a position to pay.

5. The above orders will apply to all defaulters of all kinds and to all collections, including Taccavi and other loans.

(c) The (orders have come into force with effect from 30-11-1978, Forcible Collections of Loans from the Ryots)

221—

*3696 Q—Sri M. Jayaramulu (Wanaparthy);—Will the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state

(a) whether it is a fact that Tahasildars are forcibly collecting loans from ryots in the months of September and October 1978; and

(b) whether the Government have issued any instructions for forcible collections?

A—

(a) No specific instances have come to the notice,

(b) No, Sir,
Establishment of more Sugar Factories in the State

222—

*2475-Q.—Sarvasri K. Govinda Rao (Anakapalle) and Ch. Vittal Reddy (Narasapur).—Will the Minister for Commerce, Export Promotion, Sugar Industries and Small Industries be pleased to state

(a) whether the Government propose to establish twenty more Sugar Factories in our State;

(b) if so, the location of the said factories, and

(c) whether they will be established in Public Sector or Private Sector or Coop. Sector?

A—

(a) No Sir.

(b) and (c) Do not arise

Starting of More Sugar Factories Under Cooperative Sector

223—

*3499 Q.—Sri G. Mallikarjuna Rao (Gurazala).—Will the Minister for Commerce, Export Promotion, Sugar Industries and Small Industries be pleased to state:

(a) the number and names of sugar factories proposed to be started under co-operative sector,

(b) whether it is a fact that the Industrial Finance Corporation of Central Government refused to finance the above factories for the reason that the co-operative sugar factories are not economical after decontrol of sugar;

(c) if so, whether the State Government are thinking of alternative sources to finance the sugar factories; and

(d) if so, the details of the alternative sources?

A—

(a) 1. Nandyal Cooperative Sugars Limited, Kurnool Dist.
2. Kovur Cooperative Sugar Factory Ltd, Nellore Dist
4. Palair Coop. Sugars Ltd, Khammam Dist
5. Annapurna Coop. Sugars Ltd, Tenali.

(b) The financial institutions have sanctioned loan to Nandyal and Kovur Sugar factories prior to de-control of sugar. After de-control of sugar the earlier Central Incentives are not applicable. They
are therefore awaiting for the new incentives to be announced by the Government of India for sanction of term loans to the remaining 4 sugar factories.

(c) and (d). The State Government have been making efforts to obtain bridge finance from National Coop Development Corporation. The State Government are also considering grant of temporary loan from their own funds. The Government of India are being requested to announce new incentives early.

Irregularities Committed By Chairman of A P Khadi and Village Industries Board, Hyderabad

224—

*3371 Q,—Sarvasri K Sathyanaryana and M Omkar (Narsampet)— Will the Minister for Rural Development be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government have received a Memorandum submitted by Sri V. Tulasiram, M.P., in the month of June 1978 regarding the irregularities committed by the Chairman and other Officers of the Andhra Pradesh Khadi and Village Industries Board, Hyderabad;

(b) the contents of the said memorandum; and

(c) the action taken thereon?

A—

(a) Yes, Sir, the Government have received a Memorandum from Sri V. Tulasiram, M.P., in the month of July, 1978, and not in June, 1978;

(b) Contents of the Memorandum are:

(1) During the year 1972-73, the Board has sanctioned more than Rs. 40 lakhs to the individual artisans under drought and Self Employment Schemes. The 'newing Machines Tools and implements purchased by Board were of Poor Standard and at cheaper rates.

(2) The Regional Officers at Vizianagaram & Kakinda who were suspended for their irregular activities have been reinstated into service pending enquiry for the reasons best known to the Board.

(3) The House Committee headed by Sri M Narayana Reddy to enquire into certain allegations against Sri B. Sriramulu, formerly President, HYCO, found many irregularities which resulted in removal of Sri B. Sriramulu from the Presidentship of HYCO. But he was appointed by the previous Government as Chairman of the Khadi Board.
(4) Sri B. Sreeramulu has selected the most reputed corrupt officer of the Board Sri D. Prasada Rao against whom several C.B.I. and ACB enquiries are still pending.

(5) Spot sanction of loans on the pretext of simplification of procedure involving disproportionate and heavy expenditure on T.A. DA, and other contingencies

(6) Cancellation of sanction of loans on the pretext of incomplete legal formalities.

(7) Recruitment of staff for the Khadi- & Craft Emporium without observing normal procedure for recruitment.

(8) Payment of advance of Rs 2 to 4 lakhs for the premises for the Khadi- n-Craft Emporium

(9) Fixation of rent for the Emporium without certification by the competent authorities.

(10) Acceptance of higher tender for interior decoration of the Khadi- & Craft Emporium

(c) An enquiry officer has been appointed to enquire into these allegations. The Enquiry Officer has submitted his report on 23-2-1979 and it is under examination.

Scarcity of Cement in A. P.

225—

*2439-Q—Sri Nallapareddi Srinivasul Reddy (Venkatagiri) :— Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state,

[a] whether it is a fact that there is acute scarcity of cement in Andhra Pradesh; and

[b] if so, the action taken by the state Government in this regard?

A.—

[a] There is some shortage of cement in the State due to reduction in allotments made by the Cement Controller, and increase in demand. As against the requirement of 6-00 lakh tonnes per quarter, 3-00 lakh tonnes on an average per quarter is being allocated by the Cement Controller.

[b] In order to meet the requirements of Irrigation Projects, Government Departments and other Organisations as well as consumers under free sale category, Government of India have been requested to allot additional quantity of 2.50 lakh tonnes per quarter. Andhra Pradesh State Trading Corporation have also taken over cement distribution in the State with effect from 1-1-1979. Andhra Pradesh State Trading Corporation have made arrangements for equitable distribution of cement, to the various consumers in consultation with the Director of Industries. With the anticipated additional allocation of cement and streamlining of distribution procedure by the Andhra Pradesh State Trading Corporation, it is expected that genuine needs of consumers would be met.
Distribution of Cement Through Govt. Agencies

**226—**

*2634-Q.—Sri Kasu Venkata Krishna Reddy (Narasaraopet).—* Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal with the Government to distribute cement through Government agencies only,

(b) if so, when it is likely to materialise; and

(c) if not, whether the Government will at least now consider to take away cement from private agencies and arrange distribution through Government agencies so as to prevent black-marketeering in the said commodity?

A—

(a) Yes Sir

(b) At the instance of the Government of India, the State Government have already taken over the entire cement trade in the State and entrusted the mechanism of distribution of cement under all the three categories in the State to the Andhra Pradesh State Trading Corporation Limited, with effect from 1.1.1979

(c) Does not arise.

Cement Quota allotted to A.P

227—

*2633 Q.—Sri Kasu Venkata Krishna Reddy.—Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the annual Quota of Cement the Andhra Pradesh State is getting from the Central Government,

(b) whether they have addressed the centre to increase the annual Cement Quota

(c) if so, the reply received from the Central Government; and

(d) if not, whether the State Government will at least now address the Centre for increase of Quota?

A.—

(a) Government of India have been allotting cement to the State on a quarterly basis. For the year 1978 a total quantity of 15.55 lakh M.Ts. of cement was allotted to the State.

(b) Yes, Sir. The cement Controller, Government of India, New Delhi was addressed from time to time to enhance the quarterly state quota from about 3.30 lakh M.Ts. to 5.50 lakh M Ts.

[c] & [d] The state's quota of cement for the I & II quarters, 1978 was enhanced to 5.00 lakh and 4.00 lakh M.Ts. respectively but from III quarter 1978 onwards the Government of India have allotting reduced quota to the state. Efforts are being made to obtain an additional allotment of 2.50 lakh M.Ts. per quarter.
Fresh licences issued to open Brandy Shops

228—

*3559 Q.—Sri P. Sreerama Murthy [Amadalavalasa].—Will the Minister for Excise be pleased to state:

(a) whether any fresh licences were issued after October, 1975 to open Brandy Shops, and

(b) if so, the number of licences issued so far?

A.—

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Two hundred and eighty two

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Rift between Hamalis and Business Community in Siddipet

228—A

S N Q No 3940—Sarvasri K.B Siddaiah (Puttur) Ch. Vittal Reddy (Narsapur), Poola Subbariah (Markapur), and K Govinda Rao (Anakapalli).—Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is law and order problem in Siddipet due to Rift between Hamalis and Business Community;

(b) whether it is also a fact that Communist Party office was attacked; and

(c) whether it is also a fact that Sec. 144 is imposed in the area?

A.—

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No, Sir However both the groups threw stones at each other and the C.P.I office name board was damaged.

(c) Yes, Sir.

Non-Payment of Amounts by Rice Mill managements to Hamalies

228—B:

S.N Q. No 3946—J.—Sarvasri Ch Vittal Reddy, Poola Subbariah and K Govinda Rao.—Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state

(a) whether it is a fact that 500 Hamalies have gone on strike on 12-2-1979 in Siddipet;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the management of rice mills have refused to pay amount which has to be paid to them;

(c) whether it is also a fact that persons belonging to management have beaten hamalies causing head injuries; and
Statements by the Ministers placed on the 6th March, 1979.

Table of the House in reply to Calling attention Matters and Matters under Rule 329:
re: Unrest in the Students and imposing Section 144 in Rajampet, in Cuddapah Dist.

(d) the steps taken in this regard?

A—

(a) It is a fact that 400 Hamalies have gone on strike from 11.2.1979 in Siddipet
(b) No, Sir
(c) In a clash between the Hamalies and the Merchants, persons from both the groups sustained minor injuries. One Hamali received an injury on the forehead.
(d) In order to maintain law and order in Siddipet town Section 144 Cr P.C. was promulgated on 16.2.1979.

120 Acres of Land to the Legislators Coop. House Building Society.

228-C.

S N Q. No. 35 38-O.—Sri D. China Mallaiah (Indurthy) —Will the Minister for Housing be pleased to state

(a) Whether it is a fact that a news items appeared recently in the press that the Government would allot 120 acres of land in the City to the Legislators Coop House Building Society and construct houses for legislators,
(b) if so, the place where the land is situated,
(c) the amount to be allotted for construction of houses; and
(d) the time by which the site will be allotted and the construction of houses will be taken up?

A—

(a) & (b) A press Note was issued that Sri Venkateswara Coop Housing Society of Legislators would be allotted 100 acres of land from the surplus land available with the Cooperative Housing Society Jubilee Hills. Construction of Houses will not be taken up by Government.

(c) The Society has to make its own arrangements to find finance from the lending agencies

(d) A committee has been constituted to finalise details regarding allotment of land etc. Construction has to be taken up by the Society getting the land.

Statements by the Ministers placed on the table of the house in
Reply calling attention Matters and Matters under Rule 329.
re: (I) Unrest in the students and imposing Sec. 144 in Rajampet in Cuddapah district.

(Calling attention Notice given by K.B. Siddaiah)
Statement by Chief Minister

On 13-2-79 at about 10.00 A.M., on instigation from some student representative from Tirupati of Chittoor Dist., all the students
6th March, 1979. Statements by the Ministers placed on the Table of the House in reply to Calling attention matters and matters under Rule 329.

re Unrest in the Students and imposing Section 144 in Rajampet, in Cuddapah Dist.

of Government Junior College and High School at Rajampet suddenly boycotted classes in sympathy with the students' agitation at Madanapalli of Chittoor District after serving notice announcing their intention to go on strike for two days on 13-2-79 and 14-2-79. Afterwards they took out a procession from the Junior College under the leadership of V. Gundiah Naidu and Rajendra Prasad, proceeded to Bus-stand from there to local Railway Station where they detained three passenger trains by disconnecting hose pipes and removing washers. Armed Reserve party was rushed there from Cuddapah to assist the local Police in the maintenance of law and order. On the same night 150 students of Junior College boarded the Madras-Bombay Janata train at 20.54 hours with a view to go to Hyderabad to participate in the proposed students rally before the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly on 14-2-1979 in connection with the students' agitation at Madanapalli. Some of the students picked up a quarrel with some passengers who objected to the entry of students into their compartment, causing inconvenience to those with reserved accommodation. So, all the students got down and as they were planning to assault the passengers, the Police intervened and persuaded the students to leave the premises, whereafter the students dispersed peacefully and went home. The train steamed off with a delay of about 41 minutes. The timely intervention by police averted a possible clash between the striking students and some of the passengers.

On 14-2-1979 students observed strike in a peaceful manner and there were no untoward incidents at Rajampet. However, contrary to the earlier statement of observing sympathetic strike only for 2 days i.e., 13-2-79 and 14-2-79, the students at Rajampet continued the strike on 15-2-1979 also and about 500 of them including some urchins suddenly proceeded from Junior College to the Bus-stand in a procession at about 10.30 A.M. and pelted stones on RTC buses causing slight damage to three of them. Some glass panes of the above 3 buses were broken for which two cases in Cr. No. 18/79 and 19/79 both u/s. 147, 427 IPC were registered at Rajampet Police Station on the complaints preferred by the RTC crew. Following this incident, the students were dispersed by the local police but about 400 of them regrouped themselves at Rajampet Railway Station at about 12—10 P.M. on the same day and caused some damage to Railway property by cutting wires and damaging signalling equipment. The miscreants were prevented by the police from causing further damage.
Statements by the Ministers, placed on the Table of the House, in reply to Calling attention matters and matters under Rule 329.

re Unrest in the Students and imposing Section 14A in Rajampet, in Cuddapah Dist

At about 3.30 P.M some of them proceeded towards North Cabin and pelted stones resulting in simple injuries to police Constables 963 and 325. In view of the trouble created by the students at Railway Station Jayanti—Janata Express which reached the North Cabin at about 2—25 P.M was taken back to Hastavaram and detained on the instructions of the Station Master, Rajampet. When the same train, after green signal by Railway authorities, was passing through Rajampet Railway Station slowly at about 5—10 P.M some miscreants traveling in the train brought it to a halt by pulling chain. The students hurled a few stones at the train. But the police dispersed them once again at 5—15 P.M after which the train safely proceeded on its journey. Thereafter the local Tahasildar promulgated prohibitory orders u/s 144 Cr P C to be in force in Rajampet town till 23—2—79 as a precautionary measure to prevent striking students from indulging in acts of violence any further.

On 16—2—1979 students in Kodur Town detained the No 11 Express, 81 Jayanti Express and 145 Navajeevan Express by removing the hose pipes. The students were warned and dispersed. The Assistant Superintendent of police, Cuddapah along with Tahasildar, Rajampet convened a meeting of elders and teachers of Rajampet Town to persuade the students not to indulge in illegal activities. Subsequently, there were no untoward incidents whatever in Rajampet.

On 17—2—1979, in Chitvel some 15 student were arrested by the Sub—Inspector of police, Chitvel on a complaint lodged by the RTC driver as bus No ATZ No, 7310 was damaged by stone pelting. The students were arrested and released on personal surity. On 19—2—1979, the students of Z P High School, Chitvel took out a procession in protest against the arrest of the students on 17—2—1979 and burnt the effigy of the Sub—Inspector. There was no incident of violence. Apart from the isolated and stray incidents in Chitvel on 17—2—1979 and 19—2—1979 the situation in Rajampet Town has been calm since 16—2—1979.

On 17—2—1979, 15% of the students Junior College attended. Thereafter both the Educational institutions started functioning as usual. The prohibitory orders u/s. 144 Cr P C promulgated on 15—2—1979 evening automatically ceased to be in force after 23—2—79 and during the period of their enforcement no inconvenience was caused to the

general public. Except the detention of some trains as well as RTC buses and slight damage to 3 RTC buses and some Railway property, there were no major law and order incidents at Rajampet during the said students' strike period.

It is not correct to say that RTC buses were totally kept off the road at Rajampet during the strike period. While it is a fact that some inconvenience was caused to the traveling public due to the detention of RTC buses and trains few times at Rajampet, it cannot be said that the normal life was paralysed. It is also not correct to say that the students of Rajampet did not attend the College when the College was opened and that the students unrest continued. The contention that the students unrest at Rajampet is being spread to Chittoor is also not correct.

The life in Rajampet has been absolutely normal since 16-2-1979 and all the students are attending their respective educational institutions regularly from the forenoon of 19-2-1979.

re (2) Behaviour of the Tahsildar Puttur Taluk, Chittoor, towards landless poor.

(Calling Attention Notice given by Sri K. B. Siddaiah and other Members)

Statement by the Minister for Revenue:

It is a fact that one Sri China Buchi Naidu of Manugunta village in Puttur taluk died on 27-11-1978. Sri China Buchi Naidu according to the Collector's report was found in an unconscious state in the premises of the Taluk Office, Puttur on 27-11-1978. He was immediately moved to the Government Hospital, Puttur at the instance of the Tahsildar and he died later in the Hospital. On a report given by the Tahsildar, the police investigated into the matter and referred the case as death by suicide. There is no direct evidence to link that the death was due to harassment caused to him by the Tahsildar or Taluk Official concerned. But there was no evidence available readily with the Government the circumstances under which Sri China Buchi Naidu should have resorted to the extreme step of suicide and why he should have preferred the Taluk Office Compound to commit this dastardly act. According to the Collector's report, Sri China Buchi Naidu, the deceased, owned Acres 5.04 of dry land in Annamakkalpalli village of Puttur taluk and it is reported that he purchased another extent of 0-30 cents subsequently. His total
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Holding is therefore to be Ac. 5-34 cents dry. He occupied ac. 0-37 cents of land in in S.No 167/1 of Mangalure village in puttur taluk The Survey No compiled an irrigation well also. The deceased claimed that he was in occupation of this land nearly 18 years ago The Tahsildar, Puttur assigned this land including the well to one Sri Chinguliah a Harjan and issued patta on 10-9-1978. Against the orders of Tahsildar, the deceased China Buchi Naidu filed a suit in O S No 145/78 in the Court of District Munsiff, puttur and obtained an ex parte decree, restraining the assignee from entering the land. One of the points contended before the Court was that the well was dug by both the deceased China Buchi Naidu and also the assignee Sri Chinguliah and both of them installed Oil Engines and pumping water from the well. The Court granted interim injunction and appointed a Commissioner to report about the facts Ultimately the District Munsiff dismissed the interlocutory petition and vacated the says. The Collector reported that main suit is still pending and therefore it would not be advisable to go in to the merits of the case as it is sub judice.

It is a fact that the deceased applied on 23.9.1978 to the Tahsildar for certified copies of certain Documents. The certified copies were despatched by post to the party on 26-11-1978 (i.e. the very day on which Sri China Buchi Naidu died). There is a delay of nearly 2 months in granting certified copies but the Collector explained that the delay was due to the fact that the Tahsildar felt it necessary to obtain the opinion of the Assistant Government Pleader on the property of issuing a certified copies, apparently because the matter was before the District Munsiff Court.

It was also explained by the Collector that delay in granting pattas was on account of consultation with the Astt. Government Pleader and incidental routine office delay which is not uncommon in Revenue Department. Added to this, Taluk Offices have no regular copyists and the work relating to the grant of certified copies has to be attended to only by regular staff.

It is also a fact that the local MLA requested the Tahsildar in October, 1978 for grant of certified copies of deceased China Buchi Naidu and it is reported that the Tahsildar informed the Honourable Member that the matter was referred to the Assistant Government Pleader.
6th March, 1979,
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(3) International Smuggling racket in the export of rare and
Costly minerals in Khammam dist.

(Matter under Rule 329 Notice given by Sri B Surama
Murthy and other) Statement by S S S N Reddy, Minister for
Mines.

It is true that a statement has appeared in the daily News
Paper "Indian Express" but it is an exaggeration to say that the loss
by way of revenue to Government is to the tune of Rs. 10 crores, as
the royalty on all the minerals produced in the State yield about 6 crores.
There is no demand for the mineral corundum outside the country. The police has seized from a person
by name Raghupati a quantity of about 10 Kgs of Corundum.

Corundum has been known to occur in Khammam district.
While the opaque variety is useful as an abrasive, the transparent
variety is used as beads and as stones for rings etc.
There are about 12 leases for Corundum as on today in Khammam
district covering an area of about 2,200 acres and the royalty collected
during 1978-79 is Rs. 1830. While some are about 10 meters deep, in
several areas the stones are collected from the surface of the soil or
just below the soil. However, some illicit workings of corundum mineral were detected by the Assistant Director of Mines & Geology
near Kodavatimetta and the Village officers are alerted on 2nd

The Deputy Director of Mines and Geology has been sent
to enquire into the matter and the Police are cognisant of the
incident. Action is being taken to check any illicit mining and
transport of the mineral and no trucks carrying corundum were
caught or released as reported in the Press.

As usual on receipt of some information, the Assistant
Director of Mines & Geology has conducted surprise visits of the
corundum mining areas and every possible action is being taken to
check the illicit mining or transport of the mineral.

(4) SCARCITY OF DRINKING WATER IN DHARMASAGAR
VILLAGE IN WARANGAL DISTRICT

(Matter Under Rule 329, Notice given by Sri Ch. Vittal Reddy)
Statement by the Minister for Panchayati Raj.

It is reported that the well sunk under Protected Water Supply
Scheme in Dharmasagaram is scooped and staining partly collapsed.
Due to this, the yield from the well has considerably reduced and
affected the normal supply. The mini P W. S schemes to this village
was executed by Public Health Department. 14 taps provided in the
village are functioning well and water is being supplied for about
1 1/2 hours daily. It is also reported that Public Health Department
has prepared an estimate for Rs 70,000 for providing 2 Nos. of 6" bore wells and installation of submersible pumpset. Directions have
Opinion of the Advocate General on the matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector Kotagudem, to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappiah, MLC.

been given to the Collector, Warangal to take up the work immediately. There is also a proposal for sanction of full-fledged Protected Water Supply Scheme to Dharmasagaram village costing Rs. 10.00 lakhs.

(The House then adjourned to meet again at 10.10 A.M.)

(The House reassembled at 10.10 A.M. with Mr. Speaker in the Chair)
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(Several Members from opposition raised the following slogans)

Mr. Speaker — As per yesterday's proceedings I asked the Advocate General to come to the House and give his opinion on the matter referred to I request the Advocate General to give his advise or legal opinion on the matter.

Sri M. Venkaiah Naidu (Udayagiri) — You have adjourned the House. Now it is 10.15 A.M. Now you cannot call the House.

Mr. Speaker — You have agreed

Sri M. Venkaiah Naidu — Nobody has agreed.

(Interruptions)
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Sri M. V. Venkaiah Naidu:—You have adjourned the House.

Sri P. Sundaraiah:—Let me make it clear. If the Advocate General’s opinion is sought to buttress the Government’s case we don’t want to hear. We don’t want the Advocate General.

(Several Members from Treasury Benches rose up in their seats)

Sri M. Venkaiah Naidu:—Point of order.

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy:—Let the Point of order of Mr Venkaiah Naidu be clarified.

Mr. Speaker:—There is no point of order.

How can you say without hearing that there is no point or order?

Matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector Kothagudem to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappiah, M. I. C.

Mr Speaker – You are reflecting on the Chair

(interruptions)

What is this disorder that you are indulging in?

Sri M. Venkata Naidu — You have heard the matter first and then decide whether there is point of order or not.

He will be adjourning the House from time to time. Like that number of times you have adjourned the House.

The House shall meet at 8.30 A.M., tomorrow, and then the business of the House shall be taken up.

The Question hour is over. The House adjourned to meet again at 9.30 A.M. today.
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స్త్రీ పుణున్న దినాలు లేదా కంద ఉపయోగపడచు?

ఎం అందూ. రీతినుంచిమలే ఉంది సూచించి ప్రపంచంలో (1) సందర్భం

please read the book

Mr. Speaker:—He has raised a point of order and I am going to give the ruling

(interruptions)

ఎందుకు ఇది మాత్రమే ఉండదు కాని ఇందులో అనునొన్నాను.

మండి నే అడుగు ప్రాంతం తమిళ ప్రపంచంలో టేముల్ని తెలియబడినాను.

మాటలు వేసి నేసాడు దినుండి అంచనా తెలియబడినాను.

మండి రాజకిందు స్థానం విభాగంలో నేసాడు దినుండి అంచనా తెలియబడినాను.

10.20 a.m

Mr Speaker—Then there is no point of order. I rule out the point of order

Sri P. Janardhan Reddy.—Even the Chairman cannot overrule the rule

Mr. Speaker:—I have given the ruling that it is out of order

Sri P. Janardhan Reddy —You must first suspend the rule.
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He is a part and parcel of the House and he has every right to give his opinion. Particularly yesterday, we have requested you to invite him and you very kindly accepted it and so he was invited. Therefore, I want that he should be given an opportunity to express his opinion. In the light of the discussions I am prepared to sit with you to find a way out.
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10-40 a.m.
Opinion of the Advocate General on the
matter relating to search warrant issued
by the Sub Collector Kothagudem to
search the house of Sri T Venkatappaiah
MLC

6th March, 1979

Sri S Jaipa Reddy:—We agree the position taken by Sri
Bhattam Sriramamurthy. There is no disagreement. We should put
questions to the Advocate General and they should be clarified by him.
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The Advocate-General considered the matter relating to the search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector, Kothagudem, to search the house of Sri T Venkatappiah, L C. The Advocate-General observed that the warrant was issued on the basis of information received that there was a secretariat of the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) in the premises. The Advocate-General noted that the warrant was issued under the provisions of Section 133 of the Indian Evidence Act.

The Advocate-General also commented on the fact that the warrant was executed in the presence of the police and the sub-collector. The Advocate-General observed that the warrant was executed without any hindrance and that the house was searched thoroughly. The Advocate-General noted that the search was conducted in a lawful manner and that no damage was caused to the property.

The Advocate-General concluded by stating that the search was conducted in accordance with the law and that no violation of the rights of the occupant of the house was observed. The Advocate-General recommended that the search warrant be upheld and that the property seized in the search be examined to determine its relevance to the case.
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In the morning,

The Advocate-General—Sir, this is the opinion of the Advocate-General on the matter relating to the Search Warrant issued by the Sub-Collector, Kothagudem, to search the house of Sri T Venkataiah, M.I.C.

The Advocate-General—Sir, I have read the affidavit of Sri T Venkataiah, M.I.C., in which he states that he has been arrested in connection with certain allegations made against him. The Sub-Collector has issued a Search Warrant to search his house. In this opinion, I shall consider the legality of the Warrant.

(The Advocate-General continues to explain the legality of the Warrant.)

The Advocate-General—Sir, that will be a very bad precedent.

Sri K. V. R. S Padmanabha Raju—Sir, that will be a very bad precedent.
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Mr Speaker — You please resume your seat. Now the Advocate General will give his opinion.

Mr Speaker — That is not the way. Mr Bhattam Sirrnamurthy. I will give you an opportunity to ask for clarifications. First let him speak.

Mr Speaker — Mr Ramamurthy, please resume your seat. Let the Advocate General talk.

Advocate General (Sri P Ramachandra Reddy).—Sir, the doubts which the Hon'ble members have expressed, will be clarified by the statement which I make. It will also help clear the doubts which they might express now.

Mr. Speaker :— Sir, I have received yesterday, by your kindness a copy of the proceedings of this House, raising certain issues in the expression of my opinion regarding the search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector at Kothagudem, to search the house of Shri T Venkatappiah, Member of the Legislative Council of the State.
The two questions which I find raised are, in the light of the allegations made by some of the Hon'ble members of the Legislature that the Sub-Collector was motivated by some malafide or by certain bias or prejudice against the particular Member of the Legislative Council He has thought fit to issue these proceedings for search warrant under the powers vested in him as Judicial First Class Magistrate, because there is some cognizable offence reported to him under the Bonded Labour Act The two questions which I just now mentioned are only in the light of those allegations of malafides made by some of the Hon'ble Members of the Legislature, that the Government has got the Jurisdiction either to suspend him or to take any punitive action against him, or at least transfer him, so that there may not be any Scope for any further allegations should be made against him or may not be any scope for his exercising malafide, further, as against the particular Member

These are the two questions which I thought were raised in the proceedings which were circulated to me by the Hon'ble the Speaker.

Now the first question that arises for consideration is, if he is a mere Sub-Collector, exercising powers in his executive capacity, the Government will certainly have, no doubt, the jurisdiction to take any action against him. But I find from the provisions of the Bonded Labour Act, that though he is an Executive Magistrate, he is clothed with the powers he is deemed practically and occupies the position of a Judicial First Class Magistrate, vested with powers, exercisable under the Criminal Penal Code, and I found from the record, that (interruptions from Opposition Benches Bell) he is a Magistrate of the First Class, with all the powers one can exercise under the Criminal Law

Now, when some bonded labours made a complaint that the Member of the Legislative Council, Sri T Venkatappaiah is keeping some bonded labour, he took cognizance of the offence under section 200 C P C, and by exercising the powers of Criminal Court, he thought fit to issue proceedings under section 93 (1) (c) of the C P C, for the purpose of the enquiry which follows on the cognizance of the complaint, he thought fit to exercise the power.

Now in pursuance of that certain search and other proceedings have taken place. The first question that arises is what is the jurisdiction which the Government.
Opinion of the Advocate General on the matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector Kotagudem, to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappiah, M.L.C.


can exercise over a Magistrate who is exercising the powers of a First Class Magistrate in regard to certain orders passed by him in the capacity of the Judicial First Class Magistrate. He is exercising judicial powers by virtue of the provisions of the Bonded Labour Act and when once that position is made clear, it is my submission that it is the correct legal position and that the forum for questioning his act either on the ground does not warrant by the provisions of Law or on the ground that he is being activated by any malafide motives, will be a superior criminal court, either the District Court or a Revisional Court i.e., which is the High Court or even the party aggrieved may approach even the High Court under Article 226, because malafide exercise of power is no power. The forum for judging this, is a superior Criminal Court, because the matter is now governed by the provisions of the Criminal Procedural Code. The Government is neither the appellate nor revisional authority, so far as the exercise of judicial power is concerned. He may be a Sub-Collector in his ordinary capacity, but here, the order has been passed, exercising the powers of a Judicial First Class Magistrate and that power which he exercised is not amenable to correction either by the Government, or, with all respects, though I have the highest respect for this House, the Legislature also is not the forum to exercise the appellate or revisional power over, what the Magistrate has done. It is of course open to the aggrieved party to move for transfer of the case on the ground that malafide, before the District Court. He can approach the High Court in Revisional Jurisdiction. He can approach the High Court in the Writ Jurisdiction, but, to ask the Government either to suspend him or to transfer him will be practically an invitation to Government to have confrontation with the Judiciary. As it is now, it is well settled where as number of decisions of the Supreme Court, especially the recent Supreme Court decisions, that the powers of the Three Tier System of Government, that is, the Legislature, Executive and Judiciary, the distinction is well recognized in our Constitutional set-up and therefore when once judicial power is exercised, it is not open either to the Legislature or to the Executive to assume power of correcting the judicial orders, as if they are the appellate or the judicial authorities. That is not allowed under the Law and as I submit that once either the Executive or the Legislature tries to exercise that Power, there will be, naturally, a confrontation with the Judicial Power; and further, suspension of the person, that means enquiry into his conduct. the Supreme Court is again and again reiterated, that so far as the members of the subordinate judiciary and calling the First Class Magistrate is concerned, the Discipline Jurisdiction rests only in
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the High Court and not in the Government. The Government may finally pass orders on the recommendations of the High Court, but the Disciplinary Jurisdiction rests only in the High Court. Therefore the Government cannot try to suspend him. I may assume, all the allegations made against him are true, but this is not the forum to enquire into it. Therefore I am answering the Hon'ble Member Shri Bhattam Sriramamurthy garu that this is not the forum to enquire, nor am I to answer whether what all he did is correct or not. It is a matter for enquiry in the proper judicial forum against this order of this Magistrate.

Regarding the question of transfer of the Sub-Collector, the Sub-Collector in his executive capacity, he is always liable to be transferred on administrative grounds, but here, in the context of the circumstances which have arisen, the aspersions, the serious aspersions cast on his integrity of the Hon'ble Legislature and also questioning his motives in issuing the search warrant, if, at this stage, the Government transfers him, the position is clear. The circumstances make it clear that because of the allegations or aspersions, caste against his integrity, the Government has thought fit to transfer. Again this will be trespassing upon the Judicial power of the Judiciary. While exercising his power as a Magistrate of the First Class, as he is not having administrative power, we cannot just pass a wheel and say "that we have transferred him on administrative ground", because the very bonded labour, who made a complaint can very well complain against the Government that because this man acted very fairly, issued a search warrant in order to protect our interest against the Member of Legislature, the Government, because of the pressure brought upon them, as our forces have thought fit, waiting a person as one under administrative power; really the crux of the matter is, it would be interferring with the exercise of the powers of Judicial functions of the Magistrate.

Therefore, at this juncture, it is my respectful submission to the Hon'ble members of the House and the Hon'ble Speaker that the Government cannot exercise any power of punitive jurisdiction, like suspending him, nor transfer him on the administrative ground, at this stage. Because the Law allows more than one ample opportunity to the party aggrieved to set right the matter if really the allegations are malpride or true. If I am assuming that they are all true, then the party aggrieved has no doubt the remedy, in more than one forum, to have it redressed, instead of taking the Government, either to punish him or to transfer him.
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That I submit, will lead to confrontation with the judiciary and will also land the Government in other difficulties like contempt of the proceedings and all that and there will be ample grounds.

Therefore I have given the opinion that the forum is not this. Even then the aspersions which are cast upon the judicial First Class Magistrate, if they have been done outside the precincts, would all amount to the contempt of the Court, but because the members of the House could enjoy the absolute immunity, (interruptions) I am giving my opinion, which you may agree or may not agree.

Therefore, I submit with all humility that the proceedings of the Judicial Magistrate, are not bound for scrutiny, either by the Government or by this Hon'ble House, nor for any action on that, except through a judicial power. That is my opinion

(Interruptions . . Bell)

Sri M Venkaiah Naidu :- Sir, all must be given opportunity to seek clarifications

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy. — Sir, the Learned Advocate General has given his considered opinion on certain issues. Naturally we welcome his opinion. But Sir, in the expression of his opinion, he presumed that the Members of this House sought correction of the search warrant orders issued by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate. The Advocate-General was not given the right issue Members of the House never sought correction or cancellation of the search warrant order issued by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate. We know fully well, though we are lay men, not legal luminaries, that this House has no appellate jurisdiction over the Sub-Divisional Magistrate. Sir, let that be very clear. We did not require any opinion on this, because we never made a plea.

Sir, secondly, in regard to the question of suspension or transfer, we did not seek suspension or transfer of the Sub-Collector on the plea that he had issued this order. We sought action against the Sub-Collector, on the plea that the Sub-Collector has had more than one occasion, to have abrasive brush with this Legislator. Therefore there is scope to believe that he acted in a malafide fashion. We did not ask the Government to transfer him because he issued this search warrant. Our Leader also made it clear that we were never apposed to the execution of the search warrant. Sir, in regard to the procedure adopted, we would like to seek clarification, although the Advocate-General can seek shelter behind the cloth that this House cannot go into the malafides, but since the House unfortunately enjoys immunity (very unfortunately Sir,) from the Judiciary, we would like to seek light from the Advocate-General.

(interruptions), Sir, I know that I am no match for the Advocate General, but in this case, since he have delivered a lengthy lecture, I would like to seek the lengthy clarification.
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Sir, in this case, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate received a petition on 18th. I know that we are not sitting in Judgement. We are only trying to find out. He received a petition on 18th against 17 farmers including this unfortunate Member of the Legislative Council. Under the Bonded Labour Act, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate can act on his own, suo moto. The petition might have been given by anybody by 'Girijana Abhyudayam' or by any Abhyudayam. Even if he has sent on his own, he could have acted.

(Intermissions from Treasury Benches) (Bell)

Let us have a decent debate. We are not opposing debates. We believe in democracy. They never believe in democracy.

(Intermissions from Treasury Benches)

Dr M Channa Reddy:—Sir, Why should he say that 'We do not believe'. We believe it.

Sir S Jaipal Reddy.—Yes Sir. I think the Chief Minister would not take away my right in Beliefs. Because well, he has taken away my rights in other manner.

Dr M. Channa Reddy:—Sir, I am not prepared to allow him to say about the 'Beliefs'. Naturally we don't allow to pass and say motives to us. I cannot allow him that kind of liberty.

(Intermission) (Bell)

Sir S Jaipal Reddy—Sir, certainly he has belief in 'Emergency' in Andhra Pradesh. He is going to threaten me with the loss of 'Beliefs'. They want to interrupt me Sir.

(Intermissions)

Sir, on 18th a petition was filed against 17 farmers, including this Member of Legislative Council. He did not act under the Act although he has certain powers to act suo-moto. On the 27th he received a petition only against this M.L.C. On 2-3-79 a meeting was held in the office of the Chief Minister to which we were invited. The Collector in that meeting admitted that the Sub-Collector has consulted him in regard to the Bonded Labour case. I would like to frame only one question from this particular confession of the Collector. Can a First Class Judicial Magistrate consult somebody outside his jurisdiction before he makes an endorsement on petition? The Additional Superintendent of police at Kothagudem admitted in that meeting that he had been consulted by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate before making an endorsement on
Opinion of the Advocate General on
the matter relating to search warrant
issued by the Sub-Collector Kothagudem, to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappiah, M.L.C

the petition—whether a particular Sub-Inspector was on duty or not—
as to whether he would be able to provide sufficient number of police
men for this great international operation—the A.S.P. admits. Can
the Sub divisional Magistrate in his Judicial capacity not in his
executive capacity before making a Judicial endorsement consult the
Police Sir, I now the difficulty arising from the mixture of powers
Unfortunately our system under so many enactments, an Executive
Magistrate has both executive and judicial powers.

(Interruptions).

Sri K. Ramchandra Reddy (Advocate General).—I did not go
into all those questions because the legality or propriety of the action
taken by him is not a matter for adjudication by this Hon House.
I have assumed all the allegations against him as true, but still the
forum where action can be taken against him is a higher judicial
forum and if that forum says he acted mala fide certainly the Governm-
et is bound to take action against him. That is why I did not
go into the facts because we have not heard him I take the allegations
are true on the face value but this Hon ble House cannot sit in
appeal on what he has don and investigate and take action, I assum-
ed the allegation are true. I have not gone into that question.

Sri M Venkayya Naidu:—Mr. Gangoli, Revenue Divisional
Magistrate, after ordering for opening of fire, was transferred subse-
quently after the incident. That being so, why should not the Magis-
trate be transferred in this case?

Sri S. Jaipal Redddy:—You have called the Advocate General
for generating light or heat—I do not know—in this House. The point
is this the Advocate General knows fully well that this House enjoys
immunity unfortunately. Taking advantage of this immunity we would
like to seek clarification and wisdom from the Advocate General. If
these facts are correct, because we would like to advise our member
suitably. We would like the Advocate General to say if these facts
points to mala fides or not. Can the Divisional Magistrate consult a
Collector, consult an A.S.P. These are the points. Thirdly Panchas
were brought.

Sri D. Sundararamayya.—This is not a forum for acquiring
knowledge.

Sri S. Jaipal Redddy:—Unfortunately an M.L.A. is paid to
acquire knowledge, not to make a festivity. I am being paid here to
acquire knowledge. Now, Sir, Panchas were brought in this case from
a distance of 5 miles. Can the Panchas be brought from a distance
of 5 miles? I agree with the Advocate General that this House is not
going to sit in judgement and act. But keeping the immunity of this
House, let the Advocate General guide us in regard to this fact.
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The Sub-Collector appears to have issued search warrant exercising powers under Sec. 91 (1) (c) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

It shall be the duty of every District Magistrate and every officer specified by him under Section 10 to enquire...
pinion of the Advocate General on the matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector Kothagudem, to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappiah, M.L.C.

The Sub-Collector appears to have issued the search warrant under sections 1 and 17 of the Bonded Labour Act.

Sri Bhattam Sreerama Murthy:—I am not yielding. I enjoyed the fun enough yesterday to stand up. I did not go to sleep. I also enjoyed the speech of Mr. Sriramamurthy. I am not commenting on the execution of the Judicial Officer.

Sri Ch. Parasuram Naidu:—On a point of order, the Advocate General is pleased to give the opinion on the assumption that what the Judicial Officer has done might be wrong. Assuming that, a certain opinion is given. My good friend, Mr. Sriramamurthy is commenting on the merits of the action of the Judicial Officer whether he is right or wrong. This is not the forum, this is not the place for that.

Mr. Speaker:—There is no point of order.

Sri Ch. Parasuram Naidu:—Can he go on making comments upon a judicial officer continuously, endlessly and aimlessly?
Then section 17 deals with “punishment for advancement of bonded labour.” When any court has reason to believe that a person to whom summons or orders under Sec. 91 or requisition under sub-section (1) of Sec. 92 has been or might be addressed will not and would not produce the documents and or thing as required by such summons or requisition—

When search warrants may be issued:— Where any court has reason to believe that a person to whom summons or orders under Sec. 91 or requisition under sub-section (1) of Sec. 92 has been or might be addressed will not and would not produce the documents and or thing as required by such summons or requisition—

103.—Magistrate may direct search in his presence:— Any magistrate may direct a search to be made in his presence of any place for the search of which he is competent to issue a search warrant.”

The matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub Collector Kohigudem, to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappiah, M.L.C.

"Any Magistrate may direct a search to be made in his presence of any place for the search of which he is competent to issue a search warrant." (Section 103, 108, 165 of the Code of Criminal Procedure)

"Such officer may after recording in writing the grounds of his belief and specifying in such writing so far as possible the thing for which search is to be made search shall be conducted.

Whenever an officer in charge of a police station or a police officer making an investigation has reasonable ground for believing that anything necessary for the purpose of investigation into an offence which he is authorised to investigate may be found at any place within the limits of the police station of which he is in charge I am underlining these words.

A police officer in charge of that area.

A police officer in charge of that area."

Opinion of the Advocate General on the matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector Kothagudem, to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappiah, M.L.C.

The provision of this Code as to search warrant and the general provisions as to search as contained in sec 100 as far as may be, apply to a search made under this section. Before making a search under this Chapter, the officer or any other person about to make it shall call upon two or more independents respectable inhabitants of that locality in which the place to be searched is situated.

11-30 a.m.

the matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector Kotagudem, to search the house of Sri T Venkatappiah, M.L.C.

[Interruptions]

Mr. Speaker:—Let him complete.

[Interruptions]
Opinion of the Advocate General on the matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector Kothagudem, to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappiah, M.L.C.
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the matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector Kothagudem, to search the house of Shri T. Venkarappiah, M.L.C.

Advocate General.—With reference to the points raised, I would like to state that in the note circulated there is a reference to Section 93 (1) (c) of the code, it is a type mistake. From the next page only the correct provision is mentioned 93 (1) (c). Attention has been invited to Section 16 and 17 of the Bonded Labour Act which deal with punishments and not with procedure relating to search warrant. Section 21 of the Act vests in the Magistrates the power of a first class magistrate for the purpose of the Criminal Procedure Code. Therefore, it attracts the provisions of the Cr. P.C so far as cognizance of the offences issuance of any warrants, even arrests and for everything Cr. P.C gets arrested. That is why the reference to 93 (1) (c) is pertinent and also relevant. Attention is invited to Sections 103 and 165.

Advocate General.—Sections 16 and 17 deal with punishment of offender. It does not deal with the procedure. Even if the magistrate mentioned 16 and 17 and if he has got powers under 93 (1) (c) Cr. P.C., the mere non-mention of the provisions will not affect the validity of any proceeding. That is a well settled law. If he has got power to issue search warrant he has got the power to issue search warrant under 93 (1) (c).
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Advocate General — Not necessary. He is proceeding under the provisions of the Bonded Labour Act. The validity or the legality of the proceeding is beyond question, because, under Section 21 he exercises the powers of judicial Magistrate under Criminal Procedure Code. Under 93(1) (c) he need not specifically mention. If the exercise of power is traceable to a valid legal provision the mere non-mention will not affect the validity of the proceeding though it is an irregularity in not mentioning 93(1) (c), but the search warrant is in no way affected thereby. The other point is, 103, 165 of the Cr P C have no application to this case. The application is of 93(1)(c) Under section 99 of the Cr P C the other provisions of the Code get attracted including section 72. Section 72 mentions the officers to whom he can issue warrant. That 72 get attracted to proceedings under 93 a police officer is one of the officers to whom he can issue warrant. Therefore there is no illegality or impropriety in the proceedings. The point that 93(1) (c) is not specifically mentioned, I would like to reiterate it again having regard to the subtle legal position it will not affect the legality of it. The other point that he has selected panchayats from outside and that he has entrusted to a police officer after making enquiries. These are matters regarding the merits of the procedure. As I submitted, it is not for me to advise the House now on this, because, we don't know the version of the officer concerned. I cannot express an opinion without hearing the other side as to under what circumstances he invited panchayats from outside or under what circumstances he sought the opinion of the A.S.P. regarding the S.I. to whom the warrant is to be issued. Further I have submitted that I have assumed all the irregularities and allegations are to be true. Now the whole question before this House is, is the Government to take action even assuming that all the allegations are true. That is why I have been emphasising that I cannot now give the opinion without the material and without hearing the other side picture, but I have assumed for the purpose of the discussion that all the proceedings on the ground alleged by the hon. Members are irregular, malafide, and not properly done according to law but still who is the authority to decide whether it is right or wrong? Neither the Government nor the hon. House can do that. It is a judicial proceedings. Therefore, the latest one of the recent cases 1970 Supreme Court, 75 Supreme Court has emphasised, I can give the references to the Members if they want that it has no province of the executive or judiciary to trespass into the judicial sphere. Therefore those things have to be kept separate. From that standpoint only I can give a legal position for the consideration of the Members of this House. The 8th issue
I am not concerned with. Even the truth or otherwise of the allegations, on merit, I will not be in a position to give a final opinion without knowing the executive position of all the circumstances attending but this search, the issue of the search warrant is legal. It is left to the subjective satisfaction of the judicial first class magistrate under 93 (1) (c). The other point raised is that section 93 (1) (A) has been read as if that is a condition precedent to applicability of the clause (c). It is not so. There are judicial decisions to that effect each clause of 93 (1)(A), (1)(B), and (1)(c) operate independently each other. One is not a condition precedent to the exercise of the power under the other. That is also judicially settled. Therefore for applying 93 (1) (c), the only thing required is subjective satisfaction of the magistrate concerned. These are the legal points which require clarification. As I submitted I am only here to elucidate the legal position applicable and tell the Members that it would not be for me to advise the Government to tresspass into the judicial sphere and either suspend him on the ground assuming that the allegations are true or even to transfer him at this stage, it will be directly leading to confrontation, because it is the judiciary that will have to consider this legality, correctness or propriety of this order as a matter for enquiry in any higher judicial forum and as I submitted more than one course is open to the effected party to set this right, to remedy the wrong if the allegations are true. The other point raised by another Member, whether there is exemption in favour of the Members of the Legislature, there is none.

He merely wanted it and I am clarifying. The second point he wanted whether the Central Government can be approached I would say it is not necessary. This Act contains ample provisions for the effective enforcement of the abolition of the Bonded Labour. This is a very laudable objection and all the Members have been saying it. Section 10 constituting Vigilance Committee to enquire about the Bonded Labour, very severe penalties have been levied. Protection is granted to the officers acting in good faith and the implementing authorities have been specified under section 10 and the duties have been specified in 11 and 12 in order to make it very effective legislation. The Central Government does not come into the picture, because central legislation itself entrusts the main responsibility of enforcement of the provisions to the State Government and the District Magistrates, and that agency acting under the authority of the State Government. Therefore, again and again I made it clear that I am not going to express an opinion on the merits and I have assumed for the purpose of elucidating the legal position that
all the allegations against the judicial magistrate are true and correct. Even then the forum is not this House or the Government but some body I request the Speaker to permit me to leave the House as I have other important work to do for the Government in the High Court.

Sri P Janardhan Reddy —No. This is insulting the House.

Sri B Machinder Rao (Secunderabad Cottonmen) :- He is part and parcel of the Assembly.

By his own personal prejudices against a particular party. He is conducting the case in a prejudiced way against a particular party.
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Advocate General:—Regarding the transfer of the case, I have been suggesting that if the allegations made are placed before a District Court, I don't think there should be much difficulty in seeking a transfer of such case on these allegations. What he will be, we cannot speculate. There are good grounds which they alleging. Place all the matter before the District Court. In respect of the discussion of the legality of the Government's action, either to suspend him or transfer him, all this necessity will be obviated. If the District Court can be moved for transfer.

Sri Ch Raseswara Rao:—Assuming what I have said you please advise me.

Advocate General.—If the allegations are made out, it is a good ground for transfer. One of the members asked that supposing the Government takes any action what will be his position vis-a-vis the court. If Girijans go to court very likely the High Court may find guilty of contempt, because aspersions are cast on his integrity. That
is not a ground to transferring a man. It will constitute interference with the due course of judiciary process. There will be a good ground for such an allegation if a gurjan or tribal goes to High Court. I have been against advising the Government to expose itself to such illegal acts which will lead to some sort of conflict with the judiciary. About transfer I have already said.

Sri S Jaipal Reddy:—We never asked for transfer on this ground. He had not earlier performed his duties properly.

Advocate General:—That itself a ground for transfer of the case from his file that he has not performed his duty. He has singled out the hon Member for hostile treatment.

Mr Speaker:—What he says is, if he is really transferred will he continue to get the same immunity?

As an ordinary magistrate or executive officer he can be transferred by the Government.

Advocate-General:—Certainly.

Sri S Jaipal Reddy:—We allege that this Sub-Collector had earlier called for the Land Assignment Committee meeting and although the Members turned up.

(Interruptions)
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Advocate-General.—So far as the constitution of Vigilance Committees is concerned, it is the function of the State Government. Of course, I have not looked into the position whether any Vigilance Committees have been constituted. The State Government will secure information and furnish him. Regarding the other point about firing this Act does not come into the picture at all. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate has the power under this Act provided he comes under the Section 21. All the executive magistrates also is vested with power of magistrate of the first class under this Act. Therefore, he will have the power subject to the other Acts which authorise him to report to any violent methods. Unless the circumstances warrant that, it is always a matter of enquiry whether he was justified in resorting the thing having regard to the circumstances of the case. This Act merely confers on him the power of a first class magistrate.

Advocate-General.—That is a matter about which I may not be able to express my opinion without seeing all the records.
Sri M. Venkaiah Naidu:—When once the Central Act is passed, it will come into force by more publishing in the Gazette. It has already been published.

Advocate-General.—I agree

Sri M. Venkaiah Naidu.—There is a provision—“there shall to constitute a Vigilence Committee.”

Advocate-General.—That is a matter to be enquired into by the State Government

Sri M. Venkaiah Naidu.—That is why we are asking the State Government to take action.

Mr. Speaker.—He is not acting in his judicial capacity

Advocate-General.—Then the law will take its own course. He will be behind the bars.

Sri K.B Siddaiah.—Mr Speaker, Sir, If the Government feels that the Sub-Divisional Magistrate acted malafide, then can the Government take action against the Sub-Divisional Magistrate? Whether the Government is having any power to take action at least to transfer him? It may be clarified by the Advocate General.

Sri P. Sundarayya.—Government after enquiry, by its own channel, comes to a conclusion that he has acted malafide....
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The matter related to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector, Kothagudem, to search the house of Sri T. Venkatapppiah, M.L.C.

Pending the final decision of the Court, if the Government has come to a conclusion, in its enquiry, that the sub-Collector has acted malafide, can the Government by any means take any action against that officer to prevent him from doing anything in the same manner in the name of the abolition of bonded labour in that area where he has developed his own vested interest? Has the Government got any remedy? Please explain us. It will be helpful to me and to the Government also.

Advocate-General.—I have been saying that if it is found after 12-20 p.m. due enquiry by the proper authority that he is being guilty of malafide, Government can certainly take action, under the administrative side, even dismissal or anything else. Here he has passed an order. You take it by way of revision or some thing to the High Court. An enquiry will be conducted and if it is proved in the enquiry that all the allegations are proved, the High Court will certainly find that he has acted on malafide. On that basis, the Government can certainly take action against him. But the Government cannot itself investigate as a Judicial Authority whether the Judicial Authority has passed orders properly and correctly or otherwise.

Sri P. Sundarayya.—None from the Opposition side will shift and give their opinion whether the order is correctly passed by the judiciary or not. We do not want to sit on the judgment. Suppose if the Government comes to a conclusion that this officer has acted malafide.
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Advocate-General — If it is not in his judicial capacity, I entirely agree that his conduct is open for enquiry from the administrative side under CCA rules. In such cases where the officers found guilty, Government does give punishment to them ranging from suspension to dismissal.

Sri P Sudarayya:—We do not want his transfer or suspension or removal from service.

Advocate-General — I agree, but so long as it is not interfere with the judicial order.

Sri P Sundarayya:—The judicial order is to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappaiab, M.L C.

Advocate-General:—That has been done under the colour 'in the discharge of his duties as a Magistrate' Therefore, that can be enquired into by a higher judicial authority.

Sri P. Sundarayya:—I do not want the Government to enquire into the validity of the order. We can challenge its propriety in the High Court To find out whether there it bonded labour in the House of the Legislator and any documents with him.
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Advocate General:—I followed the question. How can an enquiry be made? You cannot desect the enquiry. It is in respect of the judicial proceedings. There cannot be any enquiry by the administrative authority on the judicial proceedings. There cannot be any kind of administrative enquiry into the legality or correctness of the judicial proceedings. Government can independently make an enquiry either he has acted malafide. That is why, I have been saying here the entire act has been done by him in the exercise of his duties as a Judicial First Class Magistrate. It can be set aside only by the higher judicial forum and if that Forum finds him guilty, certainly Government can take action against him. Apart from that, the Government cannot have any independent enquiry as to whether in passing this order, he acted malafide or otherwise. It is a matter entirely dealt with by the judiciary.

Sri P Sundarayya:—I will reframe my question in this way.

Advocate-General:—There cannot be any enquiry.
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Advocate General—There cannot be any enquiry by the administrative authorities. It can be only by the judiciary forum. The Sub Collector has passed orders in exercise of his powers as judicial First Class Magistrate. So there is no question of any enquiry by the Government. It can only be set aside by a higher Judiciary forum. So there is no scope for transfer.

Advocate-General—Sir, once this case is transferred, it does not mean that these judicial officers cannot be touched by the Government. Because of the circumstances in which the aspersions have been cast on him, in the context of this case, the Government cannot
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transfer him now, because of the allegations made against him in respect of the judicial order. Supposing they are able to get the case transferred from his side, Government is free to transfer any officer in the exercise of its administrative power and nobody can deny the Government to transfer an officer. Because of the peculiar circumstances which developed in respect of this Officer and in the context of this order, now, because the allegation, he should not be transferred.

Mr. Speaker :— Advocate General is a member of this House just as any other member of the House. He can come in and go out as other members do and I cannot ask him to go.

Sri P. Sundarayya :— The Advocate General is not an ordinary member but he is a special member. He cannot go unless he clarifies.
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You are taking too much lenience. His position is as that of a Minister who is not a Member of this House. He can participate in the debates here. We too have a strong opinion about it and you please allow us to say and don’t stop me, whoever he might be, and whatever our Government takes a final decision, all our disciplined members will obey, but let them hear our opinion also. But unless you hear us please don’t finalise the decision. We can uphold the dignity of the House. There are three aspects here. One is human aspect, the second is legal aspect, and the third one is the privileges of the Legislators and if I can add as fourth one, is the treatment of the officers. First is the human aspect. You know there has been a long fight in this world even before Lincoln’s time. So, above this level everybody agreed about the thing. This is a very serious crime and it is shame on our part that it should exercise care after 30 years of our independence but the whole context is changed completely and there are legal aspects in it and when the
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Privilege of the House comes, certainly we should have privileges only to do our service to the people, but even our privilege cannot enslave by people. We should not only be honest but we should also appear to be honest. In that context, if there is the slightest doubt about the conduct of any of our members, we should have to clarify.

Sri B. Machandar Rao —Sir, this is not the clarification. He is giving a lecture.

Sri S. Alwar Dass:—Sir, I have the right to talk. We should ourselves sought for clarification for removal of the doubt about the enquiry. Now coming to the legal aspects, he made it clear hundred times here that this action is taken under the Act of the Bonded Labour Act. So only judicial remedy is there and neither this Government nor this Assembly has any power to question it. That aspect he has made thousand times clear. If there is any doubt you should go to the Court. If the Court agrees to convict that gentleman, you should approach the Government for the action and anything else and about transfer of this case or this gentleman, it is the duty of the Government to punish the corrupt officer but it is the primary duty of the Government to protect an honest officer even by way of transfer is an aspersion on the gentlemen who behaved honestly. If he has not behaved honestly, the Court will punish him.

(Interruptions)

That shows is reluctant to take action on the Hon’ble Member. Secondly, Sir he has consulted the District Collector who is his Boss twice. So he is very cautious in his duties and in the treatment of the Legislator and when his commitment is for the uplift of the under dogs he stood by the Bonded Labour Act.

(Interruptions)

Sri B. Machandar Rao:—Sir, it is not a clarification. He is giving a lecture.

Sri S. Alwar Dass:—Sir, he cannot take any decision. Let him sit down Sir.
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Mr. Speaker:—I am here to pull him up.

Sri S. Alwar Dass:—Sir you are seasoned Lawyar Do you honestly believe and see that all those who spoke, got clarifications or delivered speeches of their own, or opinions, when you have allowed them so much time, you cannot allow 220 people here...

Sri S. Alwar Dass:—Sir, We have got a right to participate in the debate. You cannot suppress it. Now they says that the Hon’ble Chief Minister has given the wrong notions. I want to correct before he takes a decision, even then if he takes a decision we will abide by his decision. That is what I want to say and I also want say that when there is conflict before this honest officer to his treatment towards an Hon’ble Member and his commitment to the Bonded Labour, to the under dogs and to wretcheds, he stood by the wretcheds and for that if you take any action all the 221 members will be against this House or any Government.

(Interruptions. Bell).

Mr Speaker:—Let the minister for Parliamentary Affairs say. Let me hear him also please.

Sri P Ganga Reddy:—Sir, now we have heard our Learned Advocate General who have given his considered opinion about this issue which makes it amply clear that only the higher judicial authority can go into this affair and find out whether there is any malafide or bona fide intention behind it and he has clearly opined that neither the Govt., nor the Legislature can take action regarding this issue Sir when the Legislature is involved, it is not fair, not proper for us to drag on this issue any more and I request my friends to put an end to this. If anything is found malafide in the higher judicial enquiry then the Government will not hesitate to take necessary action against him. This much assurance we can give them Sir.

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy:—Sir, Sri P. Ganga Reddy is not only the Minister for Excise but also a legal luminary.

Sri P. Ganga Reddy:—Sir, once again I request the Hon’ble Members and friends to keep in mind that when a Legislator is involved, it is not proper for us to drag on this issue any more. So, I now request to permit me to move that the regular items of the agenda may be taken up.

The matter relating to search warrant issued by the Sub-Collector Kothagudem, to search the house of Sri T. Venkatappiah, M.L.C.

(Interruptions. All the members from Opposition benches and majority of the members from the treasury Benches were on their legs, trying to seek permission of the Speaker)

Sri P. Ganga Reddy:—Sir, I request that the present topic may be closed and our regular business of the Agenda my be taken up. After hearing the opinion of the Advocate-General and after having so much of clarification, it is not necessary to prolong this issue any more and so I request the House to take up the regular business of the Agenda.

Sri K. Venkataramaiah:—Sir, When the motion has been moved let us take the opinion of the House.

(Interruptions)

(Bell............)

Sri Gowthu Lachanna:—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am raising a Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker:—No, point of order. The discussion is closed.

(Interruptions)

(Bell)

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE


Minister for Revenue (Sri N. Janardhana Reddy):—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table of the House, a copy of the Andhra Pradesh Record of Rights in Land Rules 1978, published in Rules Supplement to Part—II Extraordinary of Andhra Pradesh Gazette dated 16-9-1971 at pages 1—15, as required under Sub-Section (3) of Section II of the Andhra Pradesh Record of Rights in Land Act, 1971.

re: A. P. Housing Board—Amendments (Appointments and Payment of fee to the Counsel)

Sri N. Janardhana Reddy:—Sir, with your permission, I also beg to lay on the Table of the House, on behalf of the Minister for Housing, a copy of the amendment to the Andhra Pradesh Housing Board (Appointment and Payment of Fees to the Counsel) Rules, 1968, issued in G O Ms No 89, Housing, dated 8th November, 1978, as required under sub-section (3) of the section 70 of the Andhra Pradesh Housing Board Act, 1956.

Mr. Speaker:—Papers laid.

(Interruptions... all the members were on their legs, shouting and clapping, even thumping the tables. One or two Hon'ble Members from the Opposition Benches came to the Reporter's Table and switched off the loud speaker box. The Home Minister Sri M. M. Hashim tried to prevent the members from thumping Reporters' table, while Sri R. Chenga Reddy from the Treasury Benches, switched on the loudspeaker box. Still the disturbance continued)

స్రీ మమత హషంషార్: తిరుగుప్పు ఇంకా సవాలు ఉన్నాయి. ఈమానులు అంతే ప్రతి సవాలు ఉన్నాయి. సాధనాలు బాగా పుస్తకాలు సంఖ్యలు ప్రకారం ఉన్నాయి.

మహాస్తం: ఆశ్చర్యపు సాధనా ఉన్నాయి.

స్రీ మమత హషంషార్: సాధనాలు బాగా సాధనా ఉన్నాయి. సాధనాలు బాగా సాధనా ఉన్నాయి.

సాధనాలు బాగా సాధనా ఉన్నాయి. సాధనాలు బాగా సాధనా ఉన్నాయి.

సాధనాలు బాగా సాధనా ఉన్నాయి.
Mr. Speaker:—Now the hon. Minister for Social Welfare will move his demand.

Minister for Social Welfare and Tribal Welfare (Sri K V. R. S Padmanabha Raju).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs 47,99,15,000 under Demand No. XXVII—Social Welfare"

"That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs 15,52,79,000 under Demand No. XXVIII—Tribal Welfare"

Minister for Tourism (Smt. Roda Mistry):—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs 3,01,18,000 under Demand No. XXIX—Women & Child Welfare"

"That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 33,32,000 under Demand No. XLIX—Tourism".

Mr. Speaker:—Motions moved.

Mr. Speaker:—Now, I request the Members to move their cut motions.

(The cut motions were not moved by the Members)

Mr. Speaker:—Now. I adjourn the House till 8-30 a.m., tomorrow.

(The House then adjourned till 8-30 a.m., on Wednesday the 7th March 1979).