

श्री श्री ३० मं० तारिक : अभी वजीर साहब ने क्रमाया कि ताज महल में दिन को कोई टिकट नहीं होगा, लेकिन रात को लगाया जायगा और यह इस लिये कि इस यादगार को बचाया जाये। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि हुकूमत के पेशे-नज़र या हुकूमत के दिमाग में कौन सी बात आई है कि वह समझती है कि टिकट लगाने से यादगार बच सकती है। टिकट लगाने से यादगार कैसे बच सकती है ?

[अभी وزیر صاحب نے فرمایا کہ
تاج محل میں دن کو کوئی ٹکٹ
نہیں ہوگا۔ لیکن رات کو لگایا جائیگا
اور وہ اس لئے کہ اس پرانگار کو
بچایا جائے۔ میں یہ جاننا چاہتا
ہوں کہ حکومت کے پھس نظر یا
حکومت کے دماغ میں کون سی بات
آئی ہے کہ وہ سمجھتی ہے کہ ٹکٹ
لگانے سے پرانگار بچ سکتی ہے۔ ٹکٹ
لگانے سے پرانگار کیسے بچ سکتی ہے۔]

एक माननीय सदस्य : आदमी कम हो जायेंगे ।

Shri Humayun Kabir: My hon. friend does not realise a very simple thing. At night there are a very large number of people who come and who are not always of a very desirable type. Whenever there is any kind of control it enables us to keep account of the people who are coming and we have found that wherever this has been introduced it has an immediate and salutary effect.

Shri A. M. Tariq: Sir....

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow him. He may resume his seat. I have called Seth Achal Singh.

Shri Humayun Kabir: I may add that if the hon. Member will himself

visit Taj one evening, he will have the answer himself.

सेठ अचल सिंह : क्या माननीय मंत्री महोदय यह बताने का कष्ट करेंगे कि किन कारणों के आधार पर यह टिकट लगाने का विचार किया जा रहा है ?

श्री हुमायूँ कबिर : मैं ने अभी अंग्रेजी में इस का जवाब दिया है। (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Minister has just now said that he came to know that all sorts of people come there.... (Interruptions). That is to say, there are persons who came for visiting Taj and there are other persons who have no such business: Local persons may also come there.... (An hon. Member: Loafers). The hon. Minister says that if some tax is imposed, he will be able to restrict it. If any hon. Member has got a different suggestion, he may kindly communicate it to him. If the Government does one thing, then it is asked: why have you done this? If it has not done anything, then it is asked: Why have you not done this? I am surprised at this.... (Interruptions). A small matter is made big. Next question. There are a large number of questions still and I want to call question No. 1820, also.

Babina Tank Training Centre

*1813. Dr. Sushila Nayar: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have asked for acquisition of some more land for the Babina Tank Training Centre;

(b) if so, whether the compensation has been paid for the land acquired already; and

(c) how many families have been displaced by the land acquisition in this connection in the past and how many more families are likely to be displaced by the new acquisition?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Defence (Shri Fatehsinh-rao Gaekwad): (a) The Government of India have decided to acquire some more land for the Babina Field Firing Ranges.

(b) Compensation for major portion of the land has already been paid. In respect of the remaining land, offers have been made or are in the process of being made to the concerned persons by the local civil authorities.

(c) Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of Lok Sabha as soon as possible.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: Is the compensation that is being paid for the land now being acquired the same as compensation paid for the land that was acquired in the past or is it more?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): The compensation that will be paid for the land that has to be acquired will be what is recommended to us by the local authorities working for the State Government.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: Is this compensation on par with that paid for land acquired in the adjoining area of Madhya Pradesh or is it different? If it is different, what are the reasons thereof?

Shri Krishna Menon: The reasons are that Madhya Pradesh is another State and they have another administration. The hon. Member has referred to the land acquired in the past. In fact we are not acquiring any land in M.P. This firing range has a part of it in Madhya Pradesh and another part in the district of Jhansi in Uttar Pradesh. The compensation for the Madhya Pradesh part has been higher for reasons known to themselves. But I think it is only fair to say that inspite of the fact that we have no legal obligations, the Government of India have paid Rs. 3½ lakhs in addition on the recommendation of the Uttar Pradesh Gov-

ernment. People who have built houses have been paid fully. During the war when this land was not used they came back and occupied it. They were squatting in that land and they expect the Government to pay compensation. As the hon. Members know, it is public money and we have got to account for it somewhere.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: Is the hon. Minister aware that the compensation paid during the war was one anna per square foot? Is the hon. Minister also aware that the people came back because the Government of India said that they did not require the land the State Government invited them to come back? They have rebuilt the houses. Is there any justification for the Government of India not to pay compensation for the houses built by them when they are asking them to vacate them now? They have built new houses after coming back.

Shri Krishna Menon: The facts stated by the hon. Member are not in accord with what we know about them..... (Interruptions).

Dr. Sushila Nayar: Sir, I want to say....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister does not agree with the correctness of the facts. Next question....

Shri Krishna Menon: I may add, Sir, that we have now agreed with the U.P. Government that an arbitrator should be appointed as provided for in the Requisition and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act of 1952 to whom should be referred all cases where compensation offered is not acceptable. A reference has been made to the U.P. Government who have agreed to this line of action.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Sir, I request that question No. 1822 be taken up. It is a very important question. I gave notice to you already. It relates to the visit of a former commander of Armed Forces of Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker: I will call question No. 1820.

**Arrangements for General Elections—
1962**

*1820. **Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of Law be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a decision not to mention the name of the party to which any candidate might belong in the ballot paper to be used in the next general elections to the Legislatures has been taken by the Election Commission;

(b) if so, whether the Government of India or the various political parties were consulted in this regard; and

(c) what was the reaction of the Government or of the political parties in this connection?

The Deputy Minister of Law (Shri Hajarnavis): (a) Yes, Sir. The Election Commission has taken a decision that the party affiliations of the contesting candidates will not be shown on the ballot paper.

(b) The representatives of the various political groups in the Lok Sabha were consulted by the Election Commission.

(c) A suggestion that the names of parties, recognised or otherwise, be printed on the ballot paper below the names of candidates was made by some spokesmen. An alternative suggestion was also made by some other spokesmen that, if it is not possible to indicate the party affiliations of the candidates of the unrecognised parties also on the ballot paper, the party affiliations should not be shown at all even in the case of candidates sponsored by the recognised parties.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: What were the points that led them to this decision?

Shri Hajarnavis: Obviously, to treat all the Parties alike.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I want to know whether the views of the Government were taken by the Election Commission? That has not been answered.

Shri Hajarnavis: The Government did not come in. The Election Commission consults the various parties and these Parties were there—Congress Party, the PSP, the Communist Party, the United Progressive Party, the Socialist Party, the Republican Party, the Ganatantra Parishad, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Swatantra Party.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: What was the consensus of opinion among the political parties that were invited in this regard?

Shri Hajarnavis: As I said, some representatives were of the opinion that the names of all the parties were to be printed but certain others felt that it should not be indicated at all.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I wanted to know the consensus of opinion. He had been saying something else. How many were for this suggestion and how many were against it?

Mr. Speaker: Are the names of parties printed in the ballot paper? I do not know if it is so in the South India: I have not seen it being printed.

An Hon. Member: It was so in the bye-elections held.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know whether the names of parties are printed in the ballot paper. Are they printed?

12 hrs.

Shri Ranga: This time, when a conference of the leaders of the parties was called by the Election Commission, we got the impression that the Election Commission was impressed with the suggestion made that the names of the parties should be indicated under the names of the candidates concerned, where the parties are recognised for the pur-