

Governments that prices would drop, such that we had to relax these restrictions on credit. It was tightened again round about June. I am sorry I have not got the figures—that paper is not in my file—but the position really is that today the advances are undoubtedly dropping. The reason is two-fold. One is that rice is getting into circulation and the other is that the restriction is being put fairly tight. In the case of wheat, it has not been quite so, because the minimum credit facilities available in the country have to be utilised for stocks which are only for three or four months. Now Government are also implementing a programme of large-scale credit availability to the agriculturists consequent on the report of the Rural Credit Survey Committee, we have made available through the co-operative societies a much larger amount than was available otherwise. Precise indications of the position as it obtains in certain areas are not available. But, as regards the area from which my hon. friend Shri Viswanatha Reddy, comes it seems to be fairly certain that this extra credit is being used for the purpose of hoarding paddy and rice.

The total evaluation of the amount of credit given for any foodgrains does not reveal the position to us in full. Maybe these credits are such that they can be transferred from one type of grain to another. A person who has got two types of grains, might use the credit which is given for one grain for the purpose of financing the other grain.

Area-wise there are certain disparities. I find from the State Bank's reports in regard to the Southern Circle that while in Madras State, the advances in rice have come down appreciably, they have risen very rapidly in regard to the Andhra area, which seems to indicate that there is hoarding there. So, unless we get the details in regard to every sector, we cannot evaluate definitely where the hoarding takes place. Every attempt is being made to study the position and inform the Food and Agriculture Ministry from time to time of the

exact nature of the hoarding and the utilisation of the credit.

Contribution to Political Parties

†

*342. { Shri Naushir Bharucha:
Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:
Shri Vajpayee:
Shri Goray.
Shri Mohamed Imam:
Shri B. C. Ghose:
Shri H. N. Mukerjee:

Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a recent judgment of the Bombay High Court in respect of contribution to political parties by the Tata Iron and Steel Company wherein the learned judges have suggested some remedial measures in the companies Act, and

(b) if so, the steps proposed to be taken in the matter?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat). (a) Yes, Sir

(b) Government are considering the advisability of incorporating in the Companies Act, 1956 the conditions on which the Appellate Bench of the Bombay High Court confirmed the alterations in the Memorandum of Association of the Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Is the Government aware that their Lordships of the Bombay High Court unequivocally condemned the practice of political parties receiving contributions from big business?

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Maybe, this is common knowledge. I do not think Government would be unaware of what is common knowledge.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Am I to take it that the Government is fully aware of the fact that such a practice is reprehensible?

Mr. Speaker: What is this argument about?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: This is an individual expression of opinion which the hon. Member seeks to make on the floor of the House, where he is privileged to express any opinion he likes.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: May I know by what time the proposed amendment will be brought before this House?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am unable to give an approximate time-schedule.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In view of the Tatas and Indian Iron having been the substantial beneficiaries of Government action, will Government see to it that whatever contributions they might have made or might not have made to political parties are intimated to the House and to the Election Commission, so that the country might know whether there is a *quid pro quo* arrangement?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The trouble about the question of the hon. Member is that it is hedged by so many hypotheses. But, the point that he mentioned—he mentioned it once before—is that these companies are beneficiaries so far as governmental action was concerned. I would like to say once again that any benefits that these two companies have obtained from Government cannot be related to any subscriptions that they have given to any political party in which certain Members of Government are interested. Therefore, I do not think that this question warrants an answer. *(Interruption)*

Shri V. P. Nayar: Are there different political parties to which the Members of Government belong? I thought they all belong to one party.

Benches of High Courts

*343. **Shri Easwara Iyer:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the States in the Union where Benches of the High Courts are now functioning subsequent to the reorganisation of the States, under section 51 (3) of the States Reorganisation Act;

(b) whether the Benches so established have jurisdiction and powers to receive appeals, original petitions and other papers at the place where they are functioning;

(c) whether in any State a Bench so established under section 51 (3) of the said Act is now functioning without such jurisdiction to receive papers as aforesaid, and

(d) if so, reasons for the same?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Bombay and Kerala.

(b) to (d) Such papers are being received by the Benches situated in Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Bombay. These matters are being determined by the High Courts concerned. The Trivandrum Bench is not receiving such papers in accordance with the decisions of the Kerala High Court.

Shri Easwara Iyer: In view of the fact that the Chief Justice of Kerala High Court has put a non-judicial interpretation of section 51 (3) of the States Reorganisation Act, will the Government consider the desirability of obtaining an authoritative judicial pronouncement on this point by the Supreme Court under article 143 of the Constitution?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): If anybody is interested in obtaining a decision against the orders of the High Court, the Government certainly would not like to take such action itself. It is open to those who are aggrieved or dissatisfied to take such action in respect of this order of the High Court as they may deem proper or appropriate.

Shri Easwara Iyer: That is not my question. The decision is a non-judicial interpretation purely on the administrative side by the Chief Justice of Kerala. It is not open to any party to take it up in appeal to the Supreme Court otherwise. It is only a matter for the President to