

any special concession shown in this country to these oil companies for exploration when similar concessions have not been given to them or have not been demanded by them. I think that is the question he has put.

Shri Morarji Desai: That is not true; similar concessions are given elsewhere.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: The hon. Finance Minister said that similar concessions are given in other countries. Is the Government aware of the fact that in 1968 there were two agreements with Italian and Japanese companies.....

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Member take the statement of the hon. Minister. If he finds that there is any discrepancy there are other methods. Next question.

Shri Tangamani: No. 337.

Mr. Speaker: Regarding the previous question I said that there are other methods. What I meant was this. If hon. Members have got information different from what the hon. Minister gives out, I would not allow a discussion here. But those hon. Members may bring those cases specifically to the notice of the hon. Minister. I am sure, if the hon. Minister has made a mistake, he will himself ask for an opportunity to correct that mistake. Otherwise, it need not come up before the House.

Shri Banga: Otherwise, he can take it to you.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Morarji Desai: I will certainly enquire into the matter and inform the hon. Member individually and also inform you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: After putting one or two questions, if there is still some difference between the hon. Member and the hon. Minister—that is, if they disagree—about a question of fact, the hon. Member concerned will pursue it separately and then bring it before me or before the House. If I find that

an error has been made on the one side or the other, I will try to give an opportunity to have it corrected.

Shrimati Bena Chakraverty: In cases where a particular question has not been satisfactorily dealt with, we have, under the Rules of Procedure, the method of raising a half-an-hour discussion. Does this ruling of yours do away with raising the matter in that way?

Mr. Speaker: My ruling does not do away with any other method.

S.A.S. Accountants

*337. **Shri Tangamani:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether in giving effect to the re-fixation of pay according to the recommendations of the Pay Commissions, S.A.S. Accountants who were deputed on war service from the office of the Deputy Accountant General, Posts and Telegraphs, Madras, were treated differently from others, and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha): (a) and (b). No S.A.S. Accountants were deputed on war service from the office of the Deputy Accountant General, Posts and Telegraphs, Madras.

However, certain S.A.S. passed clerks were deputed during the war to different accounts and audit offices and, on return to their parent office, their pay was re-fixed after giving due consideration to the pay drawn and the duties and responsibilities of the posts held by them during deputation as compared to the corresponding posts in their parent office. As such the pay fixation was not uniform in all cases.

Shri Tangamani: The hon. Deputy Minister stated that no persons were deputed, but my information is otherwise. Anyway, what I would like to ask is, whether the pay of those who were deputed to Military Accounts

Office and Civil Accounts Office were fixed on the basis of the recommendations of the Pay Commission—that was in 1947—whereas the pay of those who were deputed to Supply Accounts Office and Defence Accounts Office were fixed at Rs. 30 less than what others were getting.

Mr. Speaker: Why was there this difference?

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: The main ground for issuing these special orders for the offices which the hon. Member mentioned was that there should not be any advantage after the reversion of persons in their parent offices and they should not retain any advantages over the persons already working in the parent offices—they should not be in any advantageous position when they come back to their parent offices over those who have put in similar length of service.

Shri Tangamani: There were a number of audit persons who were deputed to military service and when they were returned, out of 12 persons we find that 6 of them got a particular scale and in the case of the other six the pay is fixed at a different rate. I want to know why there is this sort of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker: In such matters I would like hon. Members to bring specific cases.....

Shri Tangamani: I have got the names.

Mr. Speaker: Not now. The hon. Minister will then enquire into the matter and supply the information at some other time.

Rajasthan Capital

+

*338. { Sardar Iqbal Singh:
Shri Ram Krishan:
Shri Raghunath Singh:
Shri Vajpayee:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to reply given to Starred Question No. 641 on the 3rd March, 1958 and state:

(a) whether the report of the Rajasthan Capital Enquiry Committee

has since been considered by Government; and

(b) if so, the decisions taken thereon?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): (a) and (b). The Rajasthan Government have considered the report of the Rajasthan Capital Enquiry Committee and have accepted the recommendations of the Committee in their entirety.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: May I know whether the Central Government has given any direction or advice in this matter; if so, what?

Pandit G. B. Pant: I was approached by the Chief Minister, and I advised him to accept the recommendations as they were.

Shri Vajpayee: In view of the fact that Benches of various High Courts are functioning in several States, notwithstanding the recommendations contained in the interim report submitted by the Law Commission, may I know the reasons due to which the Jaipur Bench of Rajasthan High Court had been singled out for abolition?

Pandit G. B. Pant: The integration of the various States of Rajasthan followed by the integration of Ajmer-Rajasthan gave rise to certain problems as to where the capital should be situated, whether the Bench should be located, whether the two High Courts, that is, the principal High Court and the Bench should be amalgamated and there should be only one unified High Court, and whether any offices should be transferred from one place to the other. To consider these questions a Committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Justice Satyanarayana Rao and that Committee after considering these questions in all their aspects recommended that the capital should remain at Jaipur, that there should be only one unified High Court and it should be located at Jodhpur, and that certain offices should be transferred