

Monday, 27th August, 1951



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part I—Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

VOLUME IX, 1951

(7th August to 21st September, 1951)

Fourth Session

of the

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

1951

CONTENTS

Volume IX—From 7th August to 21st September, 1951.

	<i>Columns</i>
Tuesday, 7th August, 1951—	
Member Sworn	1
Oral Answers to Questions	1—27
Written Answers to Questions	27—46
Wednesday, 8th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	47—73
Written Answers to Questions	73—92
Thursday, 9th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	93—125
Written Answers to Questions	125—154
Friday, 10th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	155—183
Written Answers to Questions	183—206
Monday, 13th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	207—235
Written Answers to Questions	235—258
Tuesday, 14th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	259—293
Written Answers to Questions	293—308
Thursday, 16th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	309—338
Written Answers to Questions	338—342
Friday, 17th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	343—372
Written Answers to Questions	372—398
Saturday, 18th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	399—420
Written Answers to Questions	420—428
Monday, 20th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	429—457
Written Answers to Questions	457—472
Tuesday, 21st August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	473—503
Written Answers to Questions	503—518
Wednesday, 22nd August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	519—545
Written Answers to Questions	545—566
Thursday, 23rd August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	567—595
Written Answers to Questions	595—612
Saturday, 25th August, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	613—641
Written Answers to Questions	641—652

Monday, 27th August, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		653—684
Written Answers to Questions		684—702
Tuesday, 28th August, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		703—734
Written Answers to Questions		734—742
Wednesday, 29th August, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		743—774
Written Answers to Questions		775—786
Thursday, 30th August, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		787—818
Written Answers to Questions		818—830
Friday, 31st August, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		831—870
Written Answers to Questions		870—876
Monday, 3rd September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		877—909
Written Answers to Questions		909—932
Tuesday, 4th September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		933—967
Written Answers to Questions		967—986
Wednesday, 5th September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		987—1014
Written Answers to Questions		1014—1036
Thursday, 6th September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		1037—1065
Written Answers to Questions		1065—1074
Friday, 7th September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		1075—1104
Written Answers to Questions		1104—1120
Monday, 10th September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		1121—1154
Written Answers to Questions		1154—1164
Tuesday, 11th September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		1165—1201
Written Answers to Questions		1201—1208
Wednesday, 12th September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		1209—1256
Written Answers to Questions		1256—1274
Friday, 14th September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		1275—1309
Written Answers to Questions		1309—1324
Saturday, 15th September, 1951—		
Oral Answers to Questions		1325—1355
Written Answers to Questions		1356—1364

Monday, 17th September, 1951—	<i>Columns</i>
Oral Answers to Questions	1365—1400
Statement by Deputy Minister of Defence in Connection with Starred Question No. 747 of 4th September, 1951 re Control Committee on Cantonments	1400—1401
Written Answers to Questions	1401—1414
Tuesday, 18th September, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	1415—1445
Written Answers to Questions	1445—1470
Wednesday, 19th September, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	1471—1500
Written Answers to Questions	1500—1512
Thursday, 20th September, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	1513—1543
Written Answers to Questions	1543—1548
Friday, 21st September, 1951—	
Oral Answers to Questions	1549—1580
Written Answers to Questions	1580—1594

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part I—Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

653

654

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

Monday, 27th August, 1951

*The House met at Half Past Eight
of the Clock*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

**KOSHAL INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT
SYNDICATE.**

*528. **Shri Raj Kanwar:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Orissa Government have taken over the assets and liabilities of the Koshal Industries Development Syndicate Limited, Balangir, and appointed official Directors for the management of the same;

(b) whether it is a fact that this Company was a public limited liability company and was started several years ago principally by shareholders residing in the former Princely State of Patna;

(c) if the replies to parts (a) and (b) above be in the affirmative, under what section of the Indian Companies Act this action has been taken;

(d) whether the new Directorate will continue to run the company as a going concern under the supervision of Government or they intend to bring it into liquidation;

(e) if the company is intended to be brought into liquidation, when such a contingency is likely to materialise;

(f) whether the official Directors will get any fee for attending meetings of the Board of Directors;

(g) whether it is intended to amend the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Company in order to incorporate the new changes; and
228 PSD.

(h) whether Government intend to take similar steps with regard to other limited liability companies functioning at Balangir, such as the Koshal Transport Trading Company, Balangir Central Co-operative Bank, and Balangir Co-operative Stores Limited?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) The Orissa Government have not taken over the assets and liabilities of the Company. As successor to the Maharaja and Ruler of Patna State who was a major shareholder and had the power under the Articles of Association of the Company, they have nominated 6 Directors to the Board of Directors of the Company.

(b) Yes. But the majority of the shares was held by the Ruler of the Patna State.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) This is a matter for the Board of Directors to decide. The question of supervision by Government does not arise.

(e) Does not arise.

(f) The question is under the consideration of the State Government.

(g) The Articles of Association of the Company are proposed to be amended suitably to incorporate changes necessitated by the merger of the State with Orissa.

(h) Does not arise.

Shri Raj Kanwar: Of the shares of the company, may I know what is the percentage of the shares held by the Ruler and what is the percentage of the shares held by the general public?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The total paid share capital is Rs. 8.52 lakhs and the Maharaja and Ruler of Patna State held shares worth Rs. 5.5 lakhs. From these figures I have no doubt, the hon. Member would be able to work out the percentages.

Shri Raj Kanwar: Is the general public represented on the new Board of Directors?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: They must be. The State Government have nominated directors on the Board according to their own share of the power to appoint them.

Shri Raj Kanwar: Are not all the new directors officials?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I have no information on that point, Sir.

Shri Hussain Imam: May I know whether the company has been taken over under a legislative sanction or under the powers of the managing agents or under the Companies Act? How has it been taken over by the Government of Orissa?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I think the answer to part (a) makes it clear that they have taken it over as the major shareholders.

Shri Hussain Imam: Did they call together a meeting of the shareholders? Even a major shareholder has not the right to take over the concern without calling a meeting of the shareholders.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The reply is, the Maharaja and Ruler of Patna State who was the major shareholder had the power under the Articles of Association of the company to nominate the directors.

Shri Hussain Imam: That is as regards six directors. What happened about the rest?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Presumably they remain.

Shri Raj Kanwar: May I know whether the action taken by the Government of Orissa was taken on the initiative of that Government or with the approval of the Central Government?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: There was no question of the approval of the Central Government under the circumstances stated by me, Sir.

Shri Sondhi: What is the number of non-official directors on the Board?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister does not know.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: No, I do not know the total number of directors.

Shri Sondhi: Are there any non-official directors at all at this stage?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I think the powers previously exercised by the Maharaja of Patna were in regard to the nomination, i.e. to nominate half the number of directors, including the power to appoint one of them as Chairman of the Board of Directors. Therefore, I take it that the total number is 12 and the rest of them are non-officials, or at least representatives of the other shareholders.

CINEMA HOUSES

*529. **Shri Raj Kanwar:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state;

(a) whether it is a fact that seven more cinema-houses have been recently sanctioned for Delhi and New Delhi;

(b) the number of cinema-houses at present existing in Delhi; and

(c) whether it is a fact that the Prime Minister had some time ago publicly stated that no more cinema-houses would be allowed to be opened in Delhi?

The Minister of State for Information and Broadcasting (Shri Diwakar):

(a) It has been decided to permit construction of 6 cinema houses, sites for five of which have already been approved by the Chief Commissioner, Delhi.

(b) 25.

(c) The hon. Member's attention is invited to the Prime Minister's reply to supplementaries arising out of starred question No. 1 in the Constituent Assembly of India (Legislative) on the 9th August, 1948.

Shri Raj Kanwar: May I know what is the policy of the Government in regard to opening of new cinema houses throughout the country? Is the policy formulated by the Central Government a definite and uniform one for the whole country or are the State Governments left to formulate their own policies in their respective States?

Shri Diwakar: The general policy remains the same; but wherever there are circumstances which allow the construction of such things, on account of the availability of material, increase of population and so on, there is a relaxation.

Shri Raj Kanwar: May I know what is the general policy?

Shri Diwakar: I have said the general policy remains what the Prime Minister stated in the reply I referred to just now.

Shri Hussain Imam: May I know what is the extent of the income expected by the Central Government

from the entertainment tax from these new buildings?

Shri Diwakar: I cannot calculate that.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जब कि इमारत बनाने का सामना अभी भी बहुत कम उपलब्ध है और जब कि और दूसरे ज़रूरी मकान और इमारतें बनना आवश्यक हैं, तब इसका क्या कारण है कि इतने अधिक सिनेमा बनाने की इजाज़त दी जा रही है ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** When there is so much dearth of building material and when the construction of houses and other important buildings is necessary, why is permission being given for the construction of more cinema houses?]

श्री विद्याकर : नये सिनेमागृह बनाने के बारे में हमारी जनरल पालिसी तो कायम है, यहाँ दिल्ली में ख़ास करके चूँकि उसकी पापुलेशन तीन गुनी हो गई है और जो साइट्स सिनेमा के लिये दिये गये थे, वह ऐसे ही खाली पड़े हैं, इस लिये वहाँ पर सिनेमा बनाने का मौका दिया गया है, लेकिन इस के साथ एक कण्डीशन लगा दी गई है कि सिनेमा बनाने के साथ साथ ऐसी जगह भी वहाँ पर बनाई जाये, जिसमें दुकानें बगैरह भी बन जायं जिससे डिस्प्लेस्ड परसन्स हैं, उन के लिये कुछ अरेंजमेण्ट हो जाय।

[**Shri Diwakar:** Our general policy regarding the opening of new cinema houses stands; but since the population of Delhi has increased three-fold and the sites that were allotted for cinema houses were lying idle, permission has been given to construct cinema houses. However, a condition has been attached that together with the construction of cinemas, some place should be set apart where shops etc. may be built so that there might be some arrangement for displaced persons.]

सेठ गोविन्द दास : माननीय मंत्री जी ने अभी यह कहा कि दिल्ली की आबादी तीन गुनी बढ़ गयी है, तो क्या मैं यह मानूँ कि जितने सिनेमाज़ यहाँ पर हैं, उनसे तीन गुने सिनेमाज़ और बनाये जाने वाले हैं ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** The hon. Minister has said that the population of Delhi has increased three-fold. Am I to understand that three times the number of existing cinemas are going to be provided for?]

श्री विद्याकर : ऐसा नहीं है, इस प्रपोज़न में नहीं बढ़ाये जाते हैं।

[**Shri Diwakar:** That's not so; they are not increased in that proportion.]

Shri Sondhi: Is it the contention of the hon. Minister that the position regarding building materials has so much eased now that the building of these cinema houses can be facilitated at this stage?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is entering into an argument.

Shri Sondhi: But, Sir, I wanted to know ...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister has already stated that this will help some refugees and all that.

Shri Sondhi: But the P.W.D. Minister the other day said that the position regarding the availability of building materials is the same now as before; and here is another hon. Minister who says that the position has very much improved. I want to know what is the Government's case.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is the Government's case. Whatever the hon. Minister now says is the latest position of the Government.

Shri Ghule: Who decides whether the special circumstances exist so as to allow the opening of new cinemas in the various States?

Shri Diwakar: I do not know about the States. What I have stated is about Delhi.

Shri Kamath: Sir, is the hon. Minister sure that the Prime Minister did not further reinforce his earlier assurance in the last Budget Session of Parliament in 1950 by saying that priority will be given to the construction of dwelling houses rather than of cinema houses, and if so, why have so many cinema houses been built in Delhi and New Delhi when there are thousands of roofless refugees?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister has said that the Prime Minister's remarks are contained in the supplementaries to the question put on the 9th August, 1948. The question, I believe is, whether a later statement of the Prime Minister cancels this; or did he assure once again what he had originally stated?

Shri Diwakar: There has been a relaxation so far as Delhi is concerned because the situation has changed here.

Shri Sondhi: The hon. Minister stated that the plots given to the cinema houses were ear-marked for them. Am I to understand that even the private land on which a building is being constructed at Daryagunj was also government land?

Shri Diwakar: I have no information about the details. I think that question will have to be asked of the Minister in charge of C.P.W.D.

Shri Sondhi: Sir, this is a question of fact and

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: True, but another Minister is in charge of that.

Shri Amolakh Chand: What is the number of cinemas constructed in Delhi and not yet licensed by the Government?

Shri Diwakar: I have no information about that.

Shri Goenka: What is the point of time when this policy of the Government was changed?

Shri Diwakar: No policy has been changed; there is only a relaxation about it.

Shri R. Velayudhan: Of the cinema houses sanctioned already, how many are in New Delhi and how many in Delhi?

Shri Diwakar: I have no information about the details.

Sardar Hukam Singh: How many of these have been given to displaced persons?

Shri Diwakar: I have no idea.

HINDI TRANSLATION OF ACTS

*530. **Shri Raj Kanwar:** Will the Minister of Law be pleased to state whether all the Acts passed since 15th August, 1947 have been translated into Hindi?

The Minister of Law (Dr. Ambedkar): No Sir. But out of 274 Central Acts passed between the 15th August, 1947 and the end of the Third Session of Parliament last June, 113 have been translated into Hindi.

Shri Raj Kanwar: When are the remaining Acts going to be translated into Hindi?

Dr. Ambedkar: I am quite unable to commit myself.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : क्या सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई खास महकमा स्थापित किया है जो अरुछ खास आदमी इस बात के

लिये रखे गये हैं कि इन सब क़ानूनों का हिन्दी अनुवाद हो जाय ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** Have the Government established any special section for that purpose and have some persons been appointed in order that all these acts may be translated into Hindi?]

Dr. Ambedkar: There is a section in the Law Ministry consisting of Hindi translators who translate the most important Bills passed by Parliament.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जहां तक कि आगामी नये चुनावों का सम्बन्ध है, और उन के सम्बन्ध में जो क़ानून हैं, उन का क्या हिन्दी में अनुवाद पूरा हो चुका है और अगर नहीं हुआ है, तो कब तक उस के पूरा हो जाने की आशा है ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** Have all the Acts connected with the forthcoming elections been translated into Hindi, and if not, when is that work likely to be completed?]

Dr. Ambedkar: I cannot give a definite answer. So far as my information extends I think it is contemplated to translate those Acts into Hindi.

Shri Sondhi: Will they be done before the General Elections?

Dr. Ambedkar: I believe so.

Shri Jnani Ram: May I know if the People's Representation Acts have been translated into Hindi?

Dr. Ambedkar: I think they are under translation.

Shri A. C. Guha: Have the Government any idea of translating these Acts into other Indian languages as well?

Dr. Ambedkar: I believe the provincial governments have been instructed to have them translated into provincial languages.

Shri Raj Kanwar: Normally how long after the publication of an Act in English is the translation in Hindi available?

Dr. Ambedkar: There is no such thing as normality in this.

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know if the People's Representation Acts would be translated before the elections or after?

Dr. Ambedkar: It depends upon the capacity of the different departments to undertake this task but I suppose my friend can assume that Government has sense to understand that no

purpose would be served in translating them after the elections.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जहां तक चुनावों के कानूनों का मामला है, वहां तक कितनों का हिन्दी में अनुवाद हो चुका है, कितने प्रकाशित हो चुके हैं और कितने बाकी रहे हैं और कब तक कम से कम यह आशा की जाती है कि वह प्रकाशित हो जायेंगे ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** So far as the Acts relating to the elections are concerned, how many of them have been translated into Hindi, how many have been published and how many remain to be published and in what time are they expected to be published?]

Dr. Ambedkar: My friend evidently is under the impression that there is an ocean of laws which deal with representation or elections. We have got only two small Acts and one of them is the People's Representation Act. I have no doubt that

सेठ गोविन्द दास : तो जब सिर्फ तीन कानून इलेक्शन्स से सम्बन्ध रखते हैं, एक बड़ा और दो छोटे, तो उन के अनुवाद में इतना समय क्यों लग रहा है ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** When there are only three Acts pertaining to the elections, one big and two small ones, why is so much time being taken in their translation?]

Dr. Ambedkar: Because there are only about two translators.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : तो उन की संख्या आप क्यों नहीं बढ़ा रहे हैं ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** Why don't you increase their number then?]

Dr. Ambedkar: Because the Finance Minister would not give the sanction.

Shri Kamath: So far as the translation of these various Acts into Hindi is concerned may I know if the Government in the Law Ministry or in its secretariat has standardised Hindi with a standard vocabulary and a standard dictionary of Hindi?

Dr. Ambedkar: I suppose standardisation of Hindi is something which has to come in the future, unless my friend wants that the Hindi which prevails in U.P. should be accepted as the standard.

Shri Kamath: No, Madhya Pradesh?

جو ٹرانسلیشن لڑیا جائے ،
آسان ہندی میں ہو تاکہ سب کی
سجھ میں جائے -

[**Giani G. S. Musafir:** Will the Government keep it in mind that the translation should be in simple Hindi so that it may be comprehensible to all?]

Dr. Ambedkar : I think the Government will see to it.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : क्या मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से एक प्रश्न पूछ सकता हूँ कि जहां तक इन कानूनों के अनुवाद का सम्बन्ध है, यदि मुहकमे में अधिक आदमी परमानेंट तौर से नहीं बढ़ाये जा सकते तो कम से कम टेम्परेरी तौर से फिलहाल बढ़ा दिये जायें जिस से कि उन का अनुवाद जल्द जल्द से हो सके ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** May I suggest to the hon. Minister that so far as the translation of Acts is concerned, if permanent hands cannot be added to the section at least some temporary hands may be engaged for the time being so that their translation may be expedited?]

बिस्वराज मंत्री (श्री त्यागी) : मैं इस सुझाव के लिये नोटिस चाहूंगा ।

[**The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi):** I should like to have notice for consideration of this suggestion.]

TRAINING OF INDIANS UNDER POINT FOUR PROGRAMME

*531. **Shri Sidhva:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether the U. S. Government have asked the Government of India through the local Embassy to nominate a certain number of persons for training in America under the Point Four Programme;

(b) if so, what is the nature of the training;

(c) what will be its total cost and who will bear the cost of the same; and

(d) whether any persons have been so nominated?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a), (b) and (d). I would invite attention to the reply given to question No. 97 on the 9th August, 1951.

(c) According to the general agreement signed with the American Government on the 20th December, 1950, for Technical Assistance under the

گھائی جی - ایس - مسافر - کیا
سرکار اس بات کا دھیان رکھیں کہ

Point Four Programme, the cost of training is to be met by the American Government. The exact cost is not known to this Government.

Shri Sidhva: What is the total number of nominees that have been selected for this purpose?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That is given in the list.

Shri Sidhva: Would you kindly let us know?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Only on the 9th August it was given.

Shri Sidhva: I do not remember what the total number was.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member ought to refer to the answer previously given.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The number is 44.

Shri Sidhva: Are there any conditions for the purpose of training these nominees?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I do not know what the hon. Member means by conditions. Does he mean the financial conditions?

Shri Sidhva: No. You have answered that.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: They are embodied in the agreement.

Shri Sidhva: After the completion of the training what happens to them?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: They have to go back to their jobs. They are mostly government servants. Last time in answer to a supplementary question I stated that another list was likely to be compiled of trainees from the non-official sector. But so far as these 44 are concerned they are all government employees.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At this stage I might state that a number of questions are received on the same subject from different Members out of which one is admitted. The office makes a note that the other questions may be disallowed but yet there are some stray cases, where in spite of the vigilance of the office some similar questions get into the order paper. When a similar question has been answered in the same session there is no meaning in putting supplementaries saying that the hon. Member does not remember the answer to the previous question. He must refer to it and refresh his memory and it is no good spending the time of the House. I would ask the Member to proceed to the next question.

Shri Sidhva: When this question was sent I did not know that another Member had sent a similar one and an answer was given. We do not keep that in memory. Perhaps you also did not know that the question had been answered previously.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not expected that the hon. Member who puts a question should carry every thing in his mind. We do not carry the previous answers in our minds. The hon. Member could have referred to the previous answer as it was given only on the 9th August.

Shri Sidhva: Then guide me how to proceed in the matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member does not require any guidance. He could go to the library or ask the office for the answers already given.

Shri Sidhva: On every question I should do like that?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On every question which has been answered already.

Shri Sidhva: It is a new procedure!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are answers to be repeated on the floor of the House? (Shri Sidhva rose—) Order, order. Next question.

श्री भट्ट : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा सुझाव है कि चूँकि प्रश्न नम्बर ५७५ वह भी इस विषय के मुतालिक है, इस लिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि दोनों सवाल को साथ में लिया जाय।

[**Shri Bhatt:** Sir, since question No. 575 is also in connection with this subject, I suggest that both the questions may be taken together.]

MOCK ELECTIONS

*532. **Shri Sidhva:** Will the Minister of Law be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Election Commissioner has held mock elections at certain places;

(b) If so, the places at which these were held and the number of voters who participated;

(c) how much time was taken in recording the votes; and

(d) whether the Election Commissioner has formulated his plans for real elections on the basis of the time occupied by such mock elections?

The Minister of Law (Dr. Ambedkar): (a) to (d). The Election Commission directed the various State Governments in May, 1951, to hold mock elections under all the assumed conditions of polling in order to obtain actual data and experience in the conduct of the forthcoming elections as also to get an idea of the average time

required in recording votes. The Commission has asked the State Governments for information as regards places where rehearsals have actually been held, and so far a report has been received only from Orissa. The experience gained at these mock elections is to be taken into account in planning the actual number and the location of the polling stations. The tentative proposals of the State Governments framed on the experience of these mock elections will be published for general information and thereafter finalised in consultation with the Election Commission in the light of the suggestions, if any, received from the public.

Shri Sidhva: In that mock election how many votes were recorded in any one of the States?

Dr. Ambedkar: I have no information.

Shri Sidhva: What was the opinion of the Election Commissioner regarding the voting by illiterate persons? Was it very successful?

Dr. Ambedkar: There is no question of literacy or illiteracy. There was no question of marking in that.

Shri Sidhva: Even then what was the general impression of the Commissioner regarding the mock election? Does he feel.....

Dr. Ambedkar: I am afraid he has not given me the impression he has formed.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : माननीय मंत्री जी ने अभी कहा कि जहाँ तक प्रदेशों का सम्बन्ध है, वहाँ अभी केवल उड़ीसा की रिपोर्ट आई है, और कहीं से रिपोर्ट नहीं आई है, तो क्या गवर्नमेण्ट ने कोई तारीख़ मुकर्रर की है कि जिस तारीख़ के अन्दर सब प्रदेशों में यह प्रयोग हो जाना चाहिये और उस की रिपोर्ट गवर्नमेण्ट आफ़ इण्डिया के पास आ जानी चाहिये ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** The hon. Minister has just stated that so far a report from Orissa only has been received and that reports from other Provinces have not been received yet. Have the Government fixed any date by which these mock elections should be held in the States and reports submitted to the Government of India?]

Dr. Ambedkar: I don't think this is a matter in which the Government could assume or arrogate to itself the authority of issuing a directive.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जी नहीं, अथोरिटी की बात नहीं है

[**Seth Govind Das :** No, Sir, it is not a question of authority.....]

श्रीम द्दः क्या माननीय मंत्री जी बतायेंगे कि जो माक चुनाव हुए, वे वह प्रादेशिक धारा सभा और हाउस आफ़ दि पीपुल के लिये साथ साथ हुए थे ?

[**Shri Bhatt:** Will the hon. Minister please tell whether the mock elections that were held were for the State Legislative Assemblies and the House of the People both together?]

Dr. Ambedkar: I believe so.

Shri Chattopadhyay: Was any such mock election held in any of the Centrally Administered Areas and, if so, why has no report been received?

Dr. Ambedkar: I have really no information as to in what States and whether in Centrally Administered Areas they were held, but I am sure they must have been.

Shri Kamath: Did these mock elections include mock candidates and mock officers also?

Dr. Ambedkar: I suppose they had scare-crows.

Shri R. Velayudhan: From the impression gained from this rehearsal of mock election, will the next general election also be a mock election?

Dr. Ambedkar: Very likely.

Shri Sidhva: May I know the total number of voters who participated in this mock election?

Dr. Ambedkar: I have no information.

INDIAN CAPITAL ABROAD

*533. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether any representations have been made by Indian businessmen abroad such as in East Africa, Abyssinia, and Burma in regard to repatriation of Indian capital in the form of foodgrains; and

(b) if so, what steps Government propose to take so that that capital may flow to India?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) No such representations have been received from Indian businessmen abroad.

(b) Does not arise; but it may be pointed out that there are no restrictions on receipt of liquid funds from abroad. Moreover the proposed amendment of Income-tax Act provides

for exemption from income tax of cash asset received from abroad by an Indian national, within two years of his having taken up residence in this country.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether any estimate has been made of the Indian capital abroad which may be available to India or may flow to India?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: There was a census of foreign investments a summary of the results of which I think was published some time ago and which I think is available in the Library.

Shri T. N. Singh: Am I right in understanding the hon. Minister that there is no impediment in the way of Indian capital being repatriated to India from other countries? Is it not a fact that from Brazil, Burma and several other countries it is almost impossible to bring out capital by Indian residents there?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: There is no objection on our side but there may be plenty of objection on the side of the country in which the capital is situated at present. Most countries have the right to put impediments in the way of transfer of capital.

OBJECTIONS TO ELECTORAL ROLLS

*534. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of Law be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of claims and objections filed in respect of the preliminary electoral rolls in each of the Part "A", Part "B" and Part "C" States;

(b) the number disposed of so far in each State; and

(c) the number of claims and objections allowed so far in each State?

The Minister of Law (Dr. Ambedkar): (a) to (c). A statement showing the position with regard to the number of claims and objections received and disposed of in the various States as on 1st August, 1951, is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 17.]

Shri Kamath: The statement laid on the Table shows, Sir, that in Hyderabad also 4,284 women voters were disenfranchised. Were they disenfranchised for the same reasons as women in Rajasthan were disenfranchised or for different reasons?

Dr. Ambedkar: I am afraid I must have notice of the question.

Shri Kamath: Is it a fact that the disenfranchised women of Rajasthan, or their organisations, or their representatives have recently made a representation to the Government for getting their disenfranchisement removed?

Dr. Ambedkar: Yes, they have.

Shri Kamath: Is that representation of theirs under active consideration?

Dr. Ambedkar: We are considering it but we are not quite certain whether we can give any relief.

Shri Kamath: When, Sir, are the final electoral rolls likely to be published?

Dr. Ambedkar: I suppose pretty soon—I have not got the exact date.

Shri Kamath: No date has been fixed so far?

Dr. Ambedkar: Well, it certainly will be pretty soon.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Will Government take steps to see that relief is given to the disenfranchised women in Rajasthan?

Dr. Ambedkar: The question of the relief really depends upon whether we can finish the registration of these women on the electoral rolls, allow sufficient time for raising objections and for the disposal of objections so that the electoral rolls could be finalised before the date of election. All these things hang together.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Considering that it is due to no fault on their part and that the enumerators were not instructed properly either, does not Government think it necessary to take steps to see that this defect is remedied and those women are enlisted as voters?

Dr. Ambedkar: Well, I am afraid we are not discussing who is at fault—we are discussing what the fact is.

Shri R. C. Upadhyay: Is it a fact that the Prime Minister has assured that delegation of women from Rajasthan that something will be done in that direction?

Dr. Ambedkar: I am sure about it that the Prime Minister's assurance must be subject to the law of the land.

Shri Kamath: Did, Sir, the Election Commissioner receive complaints that in certain areas, in certain States, even dead persons were brought on the preliminary rolls?

Dr. Ambedkar: It does happen—I am sure about it.

Shri Kamath: It did happen?

Shri Sondhi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister is here in the House would it not be better if he made a statement in this behalf?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): My colleague, the Law Minister has made it quite clear that neither I nor any other member of the Government can give an assurance against the law—it is obvious. In this matter I have taken very particular care not to interfere in any way with the discretion of the Election Commissioner. All I have done is if anybody has come to me I have sent him on, or sent her on, to the Election Commissioner. I have certainly, when this matter came before me, expressed my sympathy with the fact that a large number of women voters have been left out and I think the whole House will feel that way; the Election Commissioner himself wants to put them in subject to the law. How that is to be done is entirely a matter for the Election Commissioner. All my sympathy was there but the only assurance I gave was of my sympathy but not of how it is to be done.

Shri Kamath: As regards the electoral rolls, has the Prime Minister received a deputation from only Rajasthan women or from anyone else also?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as I can remember they were only from Rajasthan—there may be one or two sympathisers with them from other States.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जहां तक कानून का सम्बन्ध है, कानून तो अपरिवर्तनशील नहीं है। उस में तो सदा ही परिवर्तन होता है। तो जहां तक स्त्रियों का मामला है क्या कोई ऐसी बात नहीं की जा सकती कि जिस में वह सम्मिलित की जा सकें इस सूची में क्यों कि एलेक्शन में अभी दिन हैं। पार्ट सी स्टेट्स के सम्बन्ध में कानून आया है, संसद का यह अधिवेशन भी चलने वाला है। तो क्या इस प्रकार की हमारी कोई तैयारी है या नहीं जिस में इन दिक्कतों को दूर किया जा सके ?

[Seth Govind Das: So far as law is concerned, it is not unchangeable. Changes always occur in the law. Then, is it not possible to do something to include these women in the lists for there is still time for the elections to take place? The measure relating to Part C States has come up and the present session of Parliament is also going to continue for some time. Is not then some arrangement possible to remove these difficulties?]

Dr. Ambedkar: I would like to tell my hon. friend that it would require exactly not less than two months if relief is to be given from now. That means the election will have to be postponed.

Shri R. C. Upadhyaya: Cannot the Government amend by proper legislation the mention of Mrs. so-and-so in the electoral rolls?

The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi): Husband's name cannot be amended.

Shri R. C. Upadhyaya: Not husband's name but.....

Dr. Ambedkar: The procedure for registration has been laid down by the law and that procedure must be followed.

Shri R. C. Upadhyaya: Cannot it be changed?

Dr. Ambedkar: Well, the law can be changed—it is in the hands of Parliament. I don't know how long the law will take to be amended if it is placed before Parliament.

An Hon. Member: Five minutes.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: If the law is changed, then these women could be included in the voters' list. Surely, that is the only possible way. Therefore, will Government consider placing a Bill before Parliament?

Dr. Ambedkar: It seems to me difficult to entertain a proposition that there should be one law for males and one law for females.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: If the law is question of one law for males and one law for females.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are arguing this matter out. Next question.

ELECTION COMMISSIONERS IN STATES

*535. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of Law be pleased to state:

(a) whether Regional Election Commissioners have been appointed and the requisite electoral machinery set up in each of the States; and

(b) if not, by what date it is proposed to be constituted?

The Minister of Law (Dr. Ambedkar): (a) and (b). So far, no Regional Election Commissioners have been appointed, but the question of appointing 3 or 4 such officers is under active consideration. I presume that by the expression "requisite electoral machinery" the hon. Member means the various officers to be appointed in connection with the actual conduct of elections. The position is as follows. Steps have been taken by the Election Commission for formally appointing

Electoral Registration Officers, Returning Officers and Assistant Returning Officers for each constituency in all the States as soon as the modifications made by Parliament in the various Delimitation Orders are notified and the constituencies finally determined. The Returning Officers, after they are appointed, will appoint the Presiding and Polling Officers for each polling station. These latter appointments are expected to be completed by the end of November except that in areas, if any, where elections may have to be held in October they will be completed by the end of September, 1951.

Shri Kamath: Has, Sir, any representation been received from any of the Part A or Part B State Governments to the effect that their law and order machinery or the other requisite machinery for polling and other purposes will not be able to cope with the huge work involved in the election and have they asked for any assistance in this regard so far as officers and others are concerned from the Centre?

Dr. Ambedkar: I have no knowledge on this point.

FOOD ADULTERATION

*536. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of Health be pleased to state:

(a) whether consultations with State Governments as regards measures to combat food adulteration have been completed; and

(b) if so, when Government propose to introduce necessary legislation on the subject?

The Minister of Health and Communications (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur): (a) Comments and suggestions on the draft Food Adulteration Bill have been received from all State Governments except two.

(b) The suggestions made by the State Governments are being examined. The Bill will be introduced in Parliament as soon as possible.

Shri Kamath: Which, Sir, are the two States that are so lazy about this matter?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us not use any word attacking any State Government.

Shri Kamath: 'Lazy' is not unparliamentary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not unparliamentary, but it costs reflections on the Government concerned.

Shri Kamath: All right, Sir.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: West Bengal and Delhi are the two States.

Shri Kamath: As regards the opinions and reports received from the other States, are they in favour of drastic measures to prevent food adulteration?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: They are and very valuable suggestions have been received, in particular from the Governments of Bombay and Uttar Pradesh and they are being examined now by the Director-General of Health Services. As soon as he has given his report, they will be placed before the Law Ministry.

सेठ गोविन्द दास: जहाँ तक इस विषय का सम्बन्ध है क्या इस विधेयक में कुछ वनस्पति के सम्बन्ध में किया जाने वाला है? और जहाँ तक वनस्पति के जमाये हुये तेल का सम्बन्ध है, उस सम्बन्ध में गवर्नमेण्ट क्या कर रही है?

[**Seth Govind Das:** So far as this Bill is concerned, is something going to be done in connection with vegetable oil? What are the Government doing with regard to hydrogenated vegetable oil?]

राजकुमारी अमृत कौर: वनस्पति का सबाल तो यहाँ उठता नहीं है, लेकिन जहाँ तक ऐडल्टरेशन की बात होगी मसलन घी में वनस्पति डाला जायगा तो वह कानून भंग होगा?

[**Rajkumari Amrit Kaur:** The question of vegetable oil does not arise here. But when it comes to adulteration e.g. if vegetable oil is mixed with ghee, that would be a violation of law.]

सेठ गोविन्द दास: क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि घी में वनस्पति डाला जा रहा है और इस विषय में इतना आन्दोलन हो रहा है? मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस विधेयक में जहाँ तक वनस्पति के द्वारा घी के ऐडल्टरेशन का सम्बन्ध है कोई व्यवस्था हो रही है या नहीं और इस सम्बन्ध में भिन्न भिन्न प्रदेशों की सरकारों ने गवर्नमेण्ट को क्या लिखा है?

[**Seth Govind Das:** Is it not a fact that vegetable oil is being mixed with ghee and a great deal of agitation is going on in this connection? I want to know whether any provision has been incorporated in the Bill to deal with the mixing of vegetable oil with ghee. What have the various State Governments written to the Government in this connection?]

राजकुमारी अमृतकौर : देखिये, यह तो जरूर आयेगा। जहाँ भी ऐडल्टरेशन होगा किमी किस्म का वह इस कानून में जरूर आयेगा। और कानून बहुत ब्राड (broad-based) है याने यह बहुत विशाल रूप में बनाया गया है।

[**Rajkumari Amrit Kaur:** Provision for that would certainly be made. Wherever there will be any kind of adulteration, it would be covered by this law. This Bill is a very broad-based one i.e. it has been made to cover a wide field.]

Shri R. Velayudhan: Since the Delhi State comes directly under the Health Ministry, may I know whether the hon. Minister has enquired into the cause of the delay in sending the reply?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: They have been reminded and they are now sending their replies.

Shri Kamath: Does the hon. Minister entertain any reasonable expectation of introducing the Bill in this Session or will it be introduced only in the next Parliament next year?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: Hon. Members know very well how heavy the programme for this Session is. But I certainly hope to introduce the Bill in the next Session.

Shri Chattopadhyay: Is it not a fact that initiative was taken by the hon. Minister in this direction as far back as two years?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I do not think it was two years ago, but we did address the State Governments about a year and a half ago, and then we prepared the Bill and it was circulated to the State Governments in April of this year.

SALE OF NATIONAL SAVINGS CERTIFICATE

*537. **Shri Sidhva:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) what is the total amount received from the sale of National Savings Certificates up-to-date; and

(b) what is the progress of the sale of 3½ per cent. free of Income-tax. Certificates introduced recently by Government?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) The net sales up to the end of July, 1951 amounted roughly to Rs. 138 crores.

(b) Sales up to the 18th August, 1951 have amounted to Rs. 11.53 crores.

Shri Ramalingam Chettiar: What was the result of the new loan that was floated? How much was got in cash and how much in convertible securities?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am sorry I have not the information here.

Shri Ghule: May I know whether it is not a fact that in some Part B States there are no officers even up to this day in order to accelerate the sale of National Savings Certificates?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: It may be true of some Part B States, but either commission agents or district organisers function in most of the States.

Shri Hussain Imam: Does the hon. Minister propose to increase the limit up to which these 3½ per cent. income-tax free National Savings Certificates can be bought?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: There is no such intention at the moment.

Shri Dwivedi: In addition to publicity in newspapers, what other steps have been taken by Government to popularise these certificates among the masses?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Publicity and propaganda.

Shri Sidhva: Are commission agents also appointed?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: This question has been answered several times. Authorised agents have been re-appointed. Hon. Members will remember that we had them before. We have re-appointed them in the three States of Bombay, Madras and West Bengal as an experimental measure and when sufficient time has elapsed to enable us to gauge the success or otherwise of the experiment, we shall extend that method.

Dr. Deshmukh: May I know the date when these income-tax free certificates were introduced?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: 1st February, 1951.

Shri Sondhi: In view of the fact that this experiment of having commission agents was tried during the war, does not the Government think that the experience that they have gained already is enough?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: It was tried in different circumstances. A different kind of pressure was brought to bear upon the people. We thought

therefore that under new auspices it may be worth while trying that experiment again.

Shri Hussain Imam: May I know from what date the total has come up to Rs. 138 crores as mentioned by the hon. Minister? How many of these certificates have already been discharged? Or, does this total represent the amount due?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The net sales means sales minus discharges. The figures are from 1943-44 to the end of July, 1951-52. The sales were Rs. 171 crores and 27 lakhs. The discharges have been Rs. 33 crores and 20 lakhs. The liability of India is Rs. 119 crores and 20 lakhs and the balance is the liability of Pakistan.

WORKS OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT

*539. **Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the date of organisation of the Delhi Special Police establishment;

(b) of the cases registered by the Delhi Special Police establishment from the date of its organisation till 31st December, 1950, how many relate to Gazetted Officers or Commissioned Officers, and how many to non-Gazetted or Non-Commissioned Officers; and

(c) what action is being taken to prosecute or otherwise punish the remaining officers who have not yet been brought to trial or otherwise, proceeded against?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): (a) June, 1941.

(b) Number of cases registered.—2927

Cases relating to Gazetted or Commissioned Officers.—278

Cases relating to non-gazetted or non-commissioned officers.—2027

(c) I am sorry I am unable precisely to understand the phrase "remaining officers" in this part of the question and I do not wish to guess.

Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva: May I know how many officers of gazetted and non-gazetted status were punished departmentally?

Shri Rajagopalachari: The procedure, as hon. Members know is that cases fit for prosecution are sent for criminal enquiry of which a certain number is dropped for want of proof. A certain number of cases is sent for departmental action, rather than to courts. If the question is about the

latter group, the answer is 12 officers, 117 other officials: total 189. Departmentally exonerated: 4 officers, 76 other officials—total 80. Pending departmental action: 51 officers, 136 other officials—total 187.

Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva: Will the Minister be pleased to state the nature of offences committed by these officials?

Shri Rajagopalachari: The Establishment deals with certain classes of cases which have been over and over stated—corruption and offences connected with public administration. That is the nature of cases taken up.

Shri Hussain Imam: May I ask the hon. Minister to state what is the number of cases which have been dropped because of want of proof and by whose authority were they dropped?

Shri Rajagopalachari: The department that is entrusted with the responsibility of investigation takes data and the cases are dropped under the authority of the Ministry of Home Affairs. The number of cases dropped for want of proof during the whole of this period from the time when the Establishment was started (in 1941) is 53 officers and 214 other officials—total 267, out of the total number of 2,000 and odd which I have given.

Shri Ghule: May I know whether as a result of the work done so far by the Special Police Establishment, Government have come to the conclusion that it is very difficult to eradicate corrupt officers so long as the protection given under the Constitution stands?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a matter of opinion.

WOMEN POLICE IN DELHI

*540. **Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of women in the Police Force in Delhi State; and

(b) whether Government propose to increase the number of women police?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): (a) There are 21 Women Police in Delhi. One Sub-Inspector, 2 Head-Constables and 18 Foot-Constables.

(b) There is no proposal at present to increase their strength.

Dr. Gangadhara Siva: What are the special functions of the women police?

Shri Rajagopalachari: They are employed, for instance, for interrogating women suspects, accused and witnesses, particularly purdah ladies, attending to searches and investigations in which women are concerned, attending to the welfare of women in police custody, assisting the ordinary police in connection with disorderly houses, assisting and conducting investigations of cases of offences against women and dealing with juvenile and women offenders, and also occasionally assisting in the recovery of abducted women and in the control of demonstrations in which women take an increasing part.

Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva: Do they handle women cases only or men cases also?

Shri Rajagopalachari: The cases are generally mixed. Women are specially employed in order to deal with women, but men are supposed to deal with everybody.

Dr. Deshmukh: May I know if the stopping in the increase of the women police is due to the fact that the number is sufficient to discharge all the functions they are expected to do, or because the experience of their appointment is unhappy?

Shri Rajagopalachari: I have not understood the argument.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It was said in answer to part (b) of the question that there is no proposal at present to increase their strength. Is it because the present number is held to be sufficient, or because the staff is considered to be inefficient?

Shri Rajagopalachari: The main reason why fresh proposals are not rushed forward is the desire to have more experience before making fresh proposals. This is quite a new thing so far as we are concerned and I think we have not quite enough to come to definite conclusions by experience. I would ask hon. Members to be satisfied with the answer that the delay in making fresh proposals is due to a desire to have more experience.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: Is there any proposal to start women police in other Centrally Administered areas? If not, why?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even the increase is delayed for want of experience.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: What is the scale of pay of women police—is it the same as for men, or is it different?

Shri Rajagopalachari: I have not got the information here. Notice.

Shri Kamath: Is care taken to see that married women are not recruited to the police?

Shri Rajagopalachari: If the question is related to the interest of the husbands, I can answer it from personal experience only.

RETRENCHMENT FROM THE FORCES OF UNION GOVERNMENT AND EX-INDIAN STATES

*541. **Dr. Deshmukh:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons retrenched from the Forces of ex-Indian States;

(b) the number of persons retrenched from the Union Forces;

(c) what was the number of retrenched personnel from each of the regiments from the Union Defence Forces and what are the names of these regiments; and

(d) what was the criteria on which the retrenchment was effected?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Major-General Himatsinhji): (a) and (c). It will not be in the public interest to disclose this information.

(b) More than 50,000 during 1950-51.

(d) The criterion for retrenchment in the Indian Army was the relative fighting value of the units and that amongst the States Forces personnel compatibility with Indian Army standards.

Dr. Deshmukh: May I know, Sir, if any of the retrenched personnel has been re-employed recently?

Major-General Himatsinhji: No, Sir, unless they have been re-employed in other Departments of the Central or States' Governments.

Shri Dwivedi: May I know if any steps have been taken to rehabilitate the retrenched personnel of ex-Indian States, besides re-employing them?

Major-General Himatsinhji: I have answered this question before. All the States have been asked to submit their schemes, which they have, excepting two. The Centre is now examining them.

Shri Dwivedi: Has Vindhya Pradesh submitted the scheme?

Major-General Himatsinhji: No, Sir.

Shri Ghule: May I know whether it is a fact that a large number of these retrenched personnel from Part B States have not yet been able to get their pension payment orders?

Major-General Himatsinhji: No, Sir. All the pension claims have been settled, except in cases where there are doubts and which require examination.

Shri Ghule: In how many cases have such doubts arisen, leading to the non-settlement of pension claims?

Major-General Himatsinhji: I want notice of that question.

**REMITTANCE OF INSURANCE PREMIA
FROM PAKISTAN TO INDIA AND
Vice Versa**

*542. **Dr. Deshmukh:** (a) Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state the policy pursued by the Pakistan Government with regard to the remittance of insurance *premia* direct to the Insurance Companies in India?

(b) What are the exchange facilities given by the Pakistan Government?

(c) What is the policy of the Government of India in this respect?

(d) Does the Pakistan Government give the same assistance as is given by us in this respect?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) and (b). So far as I am aware remittance of insurance *premia* direct to Insurance Companies in India by their policy holders in Pakistan is permitted provided—

(i) the policy holder is of Pakistani domicile;

(ii) the Insurance Company has no branch in Pakistan; and

(iii) the policy was taken out before the 27th February 1951.

(c) The Indian Exchange Control permits remittances of *premia* to Pakistan subject to the same conditions as those prescribed for such remittances to other sterling area countries.

(d) The policy of the Government of India differs from that of Pakistan in the following respects:

(1) No distinction is made on the basis of domicile of the policy holder, and

(2) the facility is not restricted to Insurance Companies having no branches in India.

Dr. Deshmukh: Have any efforts been made to persuade the Pakistan Government to follow the same policy as we are pursuing?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: No, Sir. It is a matter to be regulated by them

in accordance with their own appreciation of their foreign exchange situation.

Shri Rathnaswamy: Is Government aware of the number of cases of refugee policy-holders who had taken up policies in Pakistan and whose policies have matured now but whose insured amounts have not yet been paid to them?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: We have so far received no complaints from any Indian nationals in regard to difficulties in receiving the payments.

Shri Hussain Imam: May I know whether there is any difficulty in dealing with the life policies of refugees from here and evacuees from here and evacuees from Pakistan?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He gave the answer in reply to Mr. Rathnaswamy's question.

Shri Hussain Imam: I was asking about the life policies in both countries.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That is rather a separate question in regard to the special difficulties of displaced persons. All I can say is that since I do not deal with problems of displaced persons directly, I have no information on that.

Shri A. C. Guha: Have the Government any idea as to the total amount of money locked up in Pakistan belonging to Indian insurance companies?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I do not know what exactly it means.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member means with regard to Indian insurance companies what is the holding of assets in Pakistan.

Shri Sondhi: You don't call it "locked up".

Shri A. C. Guha: My question is this. The hon. Minister has stated that Indian insurance companies which have got branches in Pakistan cannot get their monthly premium money from Pakistan. I want to know what is the amount of the money locked in Pakistan of those Indian insurance companies which have got their branches in Pakistan.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The restrictions imposed by Pakistan would not, according to our expectations, affect our foreign exchange earnings, as Indian insurance companies operating in Pakistan are allowed by the Pakistan authorities to transfer their surplus funds after actuarial valuation

and after making allowance for amounts required to meet bonuses declared on policies expressed in Pakistan currency.

Shri A. C. Guha: What is the total amount which the Indian insurance companies have got in Pakistan and which they cannot bring in now?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: This is regulated by a system and there has been no occasion to make a sum total of claims arising on different occasions.

GOLD RACKET IN DELHI

*543. **Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of arrests made by the Criminal Investigation Agency of the Delhi Police in connection with the alleged gold racket during June, 1951; and

(b) the quantity of gold seized by the Criminal Investigation Agency?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): (a) 13 persons were arrested. But I must add that I am doubting whether the word 'racket' would be right in this connection. Certain firms were suspected of making spurious gold bars, of inferior quality, and selling them as first-class quality. A dozen firms were found to be indulging in these activities. Simultaneous searches were made and thirteen persons were arrested.

(b) 1074.75 tolas of gold were seized.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Have any persons been put up to the court?

Shri Rajagopalachari: These cases are pending investigation. I have some information which might be given, but I would like not to give it as it might help the preparation of false defence.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Was it only one gang or different individual firms operating?

Shri Rajagopalachari: As I said, I would not like to give the information while the cases are pending investigation.

Shri Hussain Imam: With regard to the quantity of gold seized may I know whether all of it has been found to be of spurious quality or whether any part of it has been found to be of the proper quality?

Shri Rajagopalachari: That would be a question for the defence pleader at the time of cross-examination!

TIBETANS EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SERVICES

*544. **Shri A. B. Gurung:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to my starred question No. 2733 asked on the 2nd April 1951 and state the number of Tibetans employed in the Government of India service?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): 97.

Shri A. B. Gurung: How many of them are Indian citizens?

Shri Rajagopalachari: They are Tibetan nationals employed since a long time past in the Posts and Telegraphs Department, in the Assam Railways, and in subordinate positions in Sikkim, Gangtok, Yatung and other places. They may be called Indian citizens in a way.

Shri Kamath: Since the conclusion of the Sino-Tibetan Treaty have any of these employees of Government applied formally for Indian citizenship or have they informed Government that the Chinese Government have asked them to take Chinese citizenship? Is there any information on this point?

Shri Rajagopalachari: These ninety-seven gentlemen have been employed, as I said, since a long time past, and they have not asked for any citizenship as far as I know. But our Citizenship Act is still on the anvil.

Shri Chattopadhyay: Is it a fact that a certain number of them are in the Central Intelligence Bureau stationed in Darjeeling district?

Shri Rajagopalachari: I can give the break-up. Out of these ninety-seven, eleven are in the Ministry of Communications (in the Posts and Telegraphs Department) in various places, two are in the Assam Railways, and eighty-four in the External Affairs Ministry which includes 81 Class IV servants, as they are called, and other servants employed in the Indian Mission in Tibet, Lhasa, Gyantse, Yatung and Gartok. There are three ministerial servants in the office of the Political Officer in Sikkim, and Gangtok, and one in the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung. There is nobody in the Central Intelligence Bureau, and even if there were I would not like to mention it.

Shri Kamath: The Home Minister said that our Citizenship Act is still on the anvil and is yet to be passed. But the other day the Health Minister

stated that a foreign dentist of Delhi has already acquired Indian citizenship. How can these two statements be reconciled?

Shri Rajagopalachari: I do not think that the answers are contradictory.

Shri Kamath: How?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Next question.

COMPENSATION FOR DEATHS BY
ACCIDENTS—D.V.C.

*545. **Shri Jnani Ram:** Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons that died as a result of accident in course of duties at different dam sites of the D.V.C.;

(b) the compensations paid to them by the D.V.C. and by the contractor; and

(c) the claim cases pending?

The Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Shri Sri Prakasa): (a) D.V.C. employee—1; Contractor's employees—3; Total—4.

(b) Rs. 3,000 was paid as compensation to one of the three contractor's employees.

(c) The claims of the D.V.C.'s employee and of two of the contractor's employees are pending.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Question-hour is over.

Short Notice Question and Answer

ACCIDENT TO AIR FORCE AIRCRAFT
NEAR POONA

Shri Sidhva: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) Whether it is a fact that an accident took place near Poona to the Air Force aircraft on the 20th August, 1951?

(b) If so, was there any casualty?

(c) What was the cause of accident?

(d) Was it a trial flight?

(e) Has any enquiry been made of the accident?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Major-General Himatsinhji): (a) Yes.

(b) 11.

(c) and (e). A Court of Inquiry has been set up and it may be possible to say what the cause of the accident was when its report is received.

(d) No, a training flight.

Shri Sidhva: May I know whether the accident occurred in the mid-air

and whether the aircraft burst into flames? If so, may I ask whether it was checked before it took off?

Major-General Himatsinhji: Sir, I would rather wait for the report of the Court of Inquiry before answering that question.

Shri Sidhva: May I know whether the checking or examination of this Defence Ministry aircraft is done under the Civil Aviation Board rules or whether they have got separate Defence Ministry rules for that purpose and the staff?

Major-General Himatsinhji: The rules are laid down by the Indian Air Force which are very strict and they are examined by the Indian Air Force personnel themselves.

Shri Sidhva: Am I to understand that the Civil Aviation Board has nothing to do with the checking or the examination of the aircrafts of the Defence Ministry?

Major-General Himatsinhji: The hon. Member is correct.

Shri Kamath: Is this the first big accident of this magnitude in the history of the I.A.F.?

Major-General Himatsinhji: Yes, Sir. This is the first accident in which we have lost 11 personnel.

Shri Sidhva: What was the height of the aircraft when this accident took place?

Major-General Himatsinhji: That matter will come in the inquiry later on.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO
QUESTIONS

ANTHROPOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA

*538. **Shri Kesava Rao:** (a) Will the Minister of Education be pleased to lay on the Table of the House a statement of work done by the Department of Anthropological Survey of India during 1950-51?

(b) How far has the proposal of the Government to start a Sub-Station in the Andaman Islands to study the condition of the Primitive tribes there been materialised?

The Minister of Education (Maulana Azad): (a) A statement of work done by the Department of Anthropology during 1950-51 is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 18.]

(b) Provision for establishing a Sub-Station in the Andaman Islands has been made in the current year's

budget and necessary action is being taken so that the Sub-Station may start functioning soon.

FOREIGNERS' VISIT TO D.V.C.

*546. **Shri Jnani Ram:** Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the names of personalities and missions of foreign countries that visited the dam sites of the D.V.C. in the years 1950 and 1951;

(b) the purpose of their visit; and

(c) the cost incurred by Government in arranging for their tours?

The Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Shri Sri Prakasa): (a) A list is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 19.]

(b) To see the works.

(c) The D.V.C. have spent a sum of Rs. 4,013-8-0 during 1950 and up to end of June 1951.

ELECTORAL ROLLS

*547. **Shri Jnani Ram:** Will the Minister of Law be pleased to state:

(a) the States which have completed the work of publication of electoral rolls; and

(b) the cost incurred by such States and the amount contributed by the Central Government?

The Minister of Law (Dr. Ambedkar): (a) The electoral rolls are expected to be finally published in all the States by the end of this month.

(b) Until the work of final publication of the electoral rolls is completed, it is not possible to ascertain the exact cost incurred by the State Governments on this account and the Centre's share thereof. I may however mention that during the last two financial years the amount contributed by the Government of India to Part A and Part B States as their half-share of the extra expenditure incurred by the latter on the preparation of electoral rolls was approximately 2 crores and 7 lakhs.

COLONIZATION SCHEMES FOR EX-SERVICEMEN

*548. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that various colonization schemes are being undertaken in various States of India for ex-servicemen;

228 P.S.D.

(b) if so, whether the Government of India give any loans and grants for those colonization schemes; and

(c) what amounts of loans and grants have so far been given to those schemes?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Major-General Himatsinhji): (a) Yes.

(b) The Central Government gives a grant of Rs. 750, and a loan of Rs. 1,500 on an average, per settler in respect of new colonization schemes that are being evolved for the resettlement of personnel released as a result of the recent run-down of the Army or integration of State Forces. The grants and loans are not given to the individuals, but to the State Governments which are organising the Ex-Servicemen's colonies. Financial assistance from the Centre is subject to grants from State Governments and Post-War Reconstruction Fund Committees and contribution from the settler at the rate of Rs. 500 per man from each source.

(c) Central Government has not so far made any payments, as the schemes are not yet finalised. Payments will be made in instalments in the near future.

BHAKRA-NANGAL PROJECT

*549. **Sardar B. S. Man:** Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Bhakra-Nangal Advisory Board held a meeting from 9th to 11th July, 1951;

(b) what were the main items discussed and what decisions were arrived at;

(c) in what manner, if any, it modified the existing plans of the multi-purpose project;

(d) in what way it ensured its speedy completion; and

(e) to what extent the original estimates have been revised?

The Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Shri Sri Prakasa): (a) Presuming that the hon. Member is referring to the Bhakra Nangal Control Board, the answer is in the affirmative.

(b) A statement showing important items discussed and decisions arrived at is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 20.]

(c) No substantial modification in the existing plans of the project was made in the meeting of the Control Board except for the postponement of the installation of 4 generating units

of 84,000 k.w. each at Bhakra till the development of load justifies further installation.

(d) There are a number of outstanding points of differences between participating units, to resolve which the Board has set up a Committee consisting of the representatives of the participating States under the Chairmanship of the Consulting Engineer to the Government of India for Water and Power. This Sub-Committee sent up its recommendations which were considered by the Board in its meeting held on the 23rd and 24th July 1951. The Sub-Committee's recommendations and the Board's conclusions have been circulated to the three State Governments, and final decisions will, it is hoped, be taken at the next meeting of the Board to be held on 27th and 28th August. After these decisions are taken the work on the project is expected to proceed rapidly.

(e) The original estimates have not yet been finally revised. The Bhakra Control Board will hold a meeting with the representatives of the three participating State Governments on the 27th and 28th August 1951, and thereafter the revised Project Estimate will be finalised.

TAX ON SUGAR

*550. **Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay**: Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the concessions and relaxations granted recently in the excise procedure applicable to the manufacturers of *Khandsari* sugar; and

(b) whether there is any representation or demand made by the *Uttar Pradesh Gur and Khandsari Association* regarding the tax levied on the industries?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) A note containing the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 21.]

(b) Yes, Sir.

DUTIES AND TAXES ASSIGNED TO STATES

*551. **Shri S. N. Das**: Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the various categories of duties and taxes levied and collected by the Government of India but assigned to the States, as envisaged under Article 269 of the Constitution, during 1949-50 and 1950-51;

(b) what was the total amount collected under different categories; and

(c) what proportion of these taxes and duties was attributable to States

specified in Part C of the First Schedule?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) None.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS AT PORTS

*552. **Shri S. C. Samanta**: Will the Minister of Health be pleased to state:

(a) how many Seaport and Airport Health Organisations have been set up till now and the names of places where they have been set up;

(b) what are the diseases for which passengers are isolated and segregated; and

(c) the number of passengers so segregated during 1950 in sea and air ports (month by month)?

The Minister of Health and Communications (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur):

(a) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 22].

(b) (1) Yellow fever (2) Plague (3) Cholera (4) Typhus (lousa-borne) (5) Smallpox (6) Chickenpox (7) Cerebrospinal meningitis (8) Diphtheria (9) Relapsing fever (10) Influenzal pneumonia and (11) Jigger at seaports.

(c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 23.]

LOAN TO ORISSA GOVERNMENT FOR HIRAKUD PROJECT

*553. **Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay**: Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of loans advanced by the Government of India to the Orissa Government for the Hirakud Project;

(b) the amount so far spent on this Project by the Government of Orissa;

(c) the excess expenditure incurred by the Government of Orissa; and

(d) the reason for this excess expenditure and how is it to be met?

The Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Shri Sri Prakasa):

(a) The total loan sanctioned to the Government of Orissa for the purpose upto end of June 1951 is Rs. 10,52,00,000 (Rupees ten crores and fifty-two lakhs only).

(b) The total expenditure on the Project to the end of June 1951 is approximately Rs. 10,43,00,000 (Rupees ten crores forty-three lakhs approximately).

(c) and (d). Do not arise.

ADVISORY BOARD FOR PROPAGATION OF HINDI

*554. **Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have decided to appoint an Advisory Board for propagation of Hindi;

(b) whether the appointment of this advisory body is going to be made under any scheme of work drawn by Government;

(c) if so, what will be the total expenditure involved in this scheme; and

(d) what are the important features of the scheme?

The Minister of Education (Maulana Azad): (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Rs. 17,08,000 spread over five years.

(d) The Scheme is based on a five-year plan and includes the following items:

- (1) Preparation of dictionaries of Scientific and technical terms in Hindi.
- (2) Setting up of a Central Hindi Organisation and four Regional Boards.
- (3) Giving grants to Hindi organisations engaged in spreading Hindi in the non-Hindi areas.
- (4) Opening of a new Hindi Section in the Ministry.
- (5) Establishment of a Library of Hindi books at the Centre.
- (6) Preparation of dictionaries of Hindi to/from Regional languages.
- (7) Translation of selected books from other languages into Hindi.
- (8) Translation of text books of other languages into Hindi.
- (9) Award of prizes for original work in Hindi.
- (10) Holding of exhibitions of Hindi books, charts, etc.
- (11) Preparation of bilingual series.
- (12) Preparation of a dictionary of Basic Hindi words.
- (13) Preparation of a dictionary of words common to Hindi and other Regional languages.

PLANTING OF TREES BY ARMY PERSONNEL

*555. **Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:** Will the Minister of Defence

be pleased to state what is the total number of trees planted by the army people in connection with the Vana Mahotsava programme this year?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Major-General Himatsinhji): 83,326.

REDUCTION OF ARMS LICENCES IN BORDER DISTRICTS OF PUNJAB

*556. **Sardar Hukam Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a general reduction of 33 per cent. in the number of arms licences held by citizens in the border districts of Punjab is being enforced strictly?

(b) What is the number of arms licences cancelled during the last four months in the districts of Gurdaspur, Amritsar and Ferozepore?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): (a) No percentage reduction, whether 33 per cent. or otherwise in the number of arms licences held by citizens in the border districts of the Punjab has been ordered. District Magistrates have, however, been asked to scrutinize existing licences and to consider elimination of undesirable licences.

(b) Gurdaspur	462
Amritsar	631
Ferozepore	1726.

PRODUCTION OF SULPHURIC ACID

*557. **Shri Amolakh Chand:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether the American experts who are to arrive in India under the Truman's Point Four Plan to develop Sulphuric Acid chiefly through the use of indigenous minerals, will train Indian students also;

(b) if so, whether suitable Indian students have been selected; and

(c) if not, whether Government have taken steps to select suitable persons for the requisite training?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) The services of the American Technical Expert have been obtained only for developing Sulphuric Acid Industry by using alternative methods and there is no provision for getting any students trained under him.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Some officers of the Development Wing of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry have been asso-

ciated with him in the investigation. It was intended to put a whole-time trainee to work with him but this has not been possible so far.

CENTRAL BUILDING INSTITUTE, ROORKEE

***558. Shri Amolakh Chand:** Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the amount so far spent on the Central Building Research Institute, Roorkee; and

(b) the time by which actual models and plans for suitable Indian houses will be ready for public use?

The Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Shri Sri Prakasa): (a) The capital expenditure incurred so far on the establishment of the Central Building Research Institute, Roorkee, is Rs. 4,93,000.

(b) Investigations for the preparation of a model suitable for low cost houses are under way, but no definite date can be fixed in regard to the time by which models and plans for suitable Indian houses at low costs will be ready for public use until the results of the researches in progress have been tested under all weather conditions over a period of time.

KIDNAPPING OF CHILDREN IN DELHI

***559. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state what steps Government propose to take to prevent kidnapping of children in Delhi?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): Patrolling in lanes and bye-lanes has been ordered to be intensified during certain hours. Special attention will be paid to the investigation of all "missing" reports and, in order to assist them, a special staff has been set up which works directly under the Senior Superintendent of Police.

BODIES SUBORDINATE TO THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

***560. Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) the number and names of statutory and non-statutory bodies of a permanent nature functioning under the administrative control of his Ministry, giving the following information in each case:

(i) the year of their constitution;

(ii) the recurring annual expenditure incurred by them;

(iii) the provision for the audit of their accounts; and

(iv) the method of submission of the report of their activities;

(b) the number and names of such *ad hoc* committees as were appointed since after the 15th of August, 1947 and which have finished their work; and

(c) the number and names of *ad hoc* committees which are still functioning, giving the date of their appointments and the time by which they are expected to finish their work?

The Minister of State for Information and Broadcasting (Shri Diwakar):

(a) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 24.]

(b) The Film Enquiry Committee.

(c) Nil.

DETENUS IN PUNJAB

***561. Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons whose cases have been examined in Punjab by the Advisory Board formed under the Preventive Detention Act and who have been released in pursuance of the Board's advice; and

(b) the number whose cases still remain to be examined?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): (a) The cases of 233 detenues were examined by the Punjab Advisory Board up to the end of July 1951. Of these, 9 persons were released on the advice of the Board.

(b) 31, on 31st July, 1951.

U.N. AID FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BACKWARD AREAS

***562. Shri Sarwate:** (a) Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state whether the Government of India have received report of the Experts Committee appointed by the U.N. to make recommendations for economic development of backward areas of the world?

(b) If so, what are the recommendations made by the Committee?

(c) Have the Government of India communicated their opinion, or do they propose to communicate their opinion to the U.N. with regard to these recommendations?

(d) If so, what is their opinion?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) The Government of India have seen a copy of the report made by the Experts Committee to the United Nations.

(b) A copy of the recommendations is placed on the Table. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 25.]

(c) and (d). As the report was made to the United Nations, the question of Government of India communicating their views does not arise till they are called on to do so. It is understood that the report is to be considered by the Economic and Social Council, at its 13th session now meeting in Geneva. The Indian delegation to the Council will generally support the recommendations made by the Committee of Experts.

INCOME-TAX ON GRATUITY

*563. **Giani G. S. Musafir:** (a) Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state whether it is a fact that for over a century, the gratuity given to Government servants on retirement used to be exempt from income-tax?

(b) What were the special reasons for granting this exemption to Government servants for such a long period?

(c) Is it a fact that Government have now decided to withdraw this concession and make this gratuity taxable?

(d) If so, what are the special grounds for depriving them of this accruing right?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) No, Sir. Gratuities paid by Government or by private employers to their employees are, under section 7 of the Indian Income-tax Act, liable to tax as "salaries". They have always been so liable except certain gratuities which were exempted from tax by notifications issued under section 60(1) of the Indian Income-tax Act. The gratuities which were so exempt were mainly those granted to—

(i) Naval, Military and Air Force personnel, wounded and injured in action,

(ii) widows, children or relatives of officers who were killed in action, and

(iii) certain categories of Government employees.

All these exemptions were, however, withdrawn in about 1933. Commutation of pension is not taxable.

(b) to (d). Do not arise.

NURSERY SCHOOLS IN DELHI

*564. **Shri V. K. Reddy:** (a) Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state what is the number of Nursery Schools run in Delhi and New Delhi?

(b) What is the number of children in these schools?

(c) Is it a fact that these schools have not sufficient accommodation to admit many children?

(d) If the answer to part (c) above be in the affirmative, what are the

other arrangements Government are making for admitting children to the schools?

The Minister of Education (Maulana Azad): (a) There are six recognized Nursery Schools in Delhi and New Delhi.

(b) 420.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) Action to increase the facilities for nursery education will be taken when adequate funds are available.

STERLING BALANCE

*565. **Shri Kishorimohan Tripathi:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state the position of our sterling balances in terms of rupees as it stood on the 31st March, 1950, the 31st March, 1951 and as it is expected to stand on the 31st March, 1952?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): Our sterling balances stood at Rs. 858 crores on the 31st March, 1950, and at Rs. 884 crores on the 31st March, 1951. It cannot be confidently stated how these balances would stand on the 31st March, 1952.

INCOME-TAX CASES

*566. **Shri Dwivedi:** (a) Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state whether the Income Tax Commissioners are required to decide a specified number of cases in a specified limit of time for purposes of merit or efficiency or promotion or any such thing?

(b) If so, is it not likely that important big cases involving large sums of money may remain neglected to the detriment of Government?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) There is no such limit of work specified for Commissioners of Income tax. However, standards of work have been laid down for Income tax Officers. These standards are based not merely on the number of disposals but also on the nature of the cases and amounts of income involved, etc. Merit or efficiency of the officers is judged not on the basis of disposals as determined by the yard-stick of the standards laid down, but on the quality of the disposals, etc.

(b) In view of the reply to part (a) of the Question, (b) does not arise.

III CLASS TRAVEL BY MINISTERS

*567. **Shri Dwivedi:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether any Minister of State travelled in a third class compartment while on tour or duty;

(b) if so, whether the Minister travelled as an ordinary passenger or whether the entire compartment was reserved for him;

(c) how many persons travelled with him; and

(d) whether the total of charges of fares of all the seats in the compartment exceeds the total of fare otherwise chargeable for the Minister's travel?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) Yes, the hon. Shri Mahavir Tyagi travelled in III Class while he was on official tour in June-July 1951.

(b) One of the four small compartments of a III Class Bogie, each containing 16 seats, was reserved for him in order to enable him to maintain a camp office in the compartment, keep his official papers and hold conference with the Income-tax, Customs and Central Excise officers who had been directed to report to him *en route* on important stations.

(c) Apart from H. M. (S) his party included five other persons, two of whom purchased tickets for themselves; the other three who were entitled to travel at Government expense, travelled with him during parts of the journey.

(d) No, in fact the actual expenditure incurred on reserving the compartment was much less than what the Minister would be entitled to incur, if he had preferred to use a saloon for this journey.

**OFFICERS DRAWING MORE THAN
Rs. 3,000**

*568. **Sabu Gopinath Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state how many of the officers in the Central Secretariat who are on deputation from States and who are drawing a salary of more than Rs. 3,000 p.m. have completed the tenure of the post on which they were originally brought to the Government of India?

(b) Do Government propose to return all these officers to the State Governments concerned in pursuance of the policy announced recently and if so, when?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): (a) It is not possible to calculate the required number precisely. Most of the officers, who are now drawing salaries exceeding Rs. 3,000 p.m., came to the Centre during the war and have had several transfers or promotions from the posts for which they were originally borrowed from the State Governments thus commencing in many cases a fresh tenure.

(b) The tenure system completely broke down due to war-time conditions and the later departure of European officers. It will not be possible fully to restore the system, until the Indian Administrative Service officers recruited under the Emergency Recruitment Scheme to fill the gaps in the State Cadres, have acquired sufficient experience. The nature of this problem and the solution proposed is fully explained in the Indian Civil Administrative (Central) Cadre Scheme, copies of which are available in the Library. Implementation of the scheme is now in hand and should result in some of the officers, who have been serving at the Centre for long periods, being returned to their respective States in the near future.

MILITARY HEADQUARTERS AT MUSSORIE

*569. **Shri Shiv Charan Lal:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state whether there is any military stationed in the Mussorie Cantonment?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Major-General Himatsinghji): It is not in the public interest to say where military is stationed and where it is not.

URDU IN ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY

*570. **Shri D. S. Seth:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Urdu has been made a compulsory subject in the Aligarh Muslim University in all the under-graduate classes?

The Minister of Education (Maulana Azad): Urdu has been a compulsory subject at the High School, Intermediate, B.A., and B.Sc. Examinations from the very inception of the University. Recently the Academic Council of the University has decided to introduce a change according to which instead of making Urdu a compulsory subject for all students in the above examinations the students will be required to take either Urdu with elementary Hindi or Hindi with elementary Urdu.

**RETIRED MADHYA BHARAT STATE FORCES
PERSONNEL**

*571. **Shri Ghule:** (a) Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state the number of persons belonging to the former Madhyabharat State forces compulsorily retired from service after their merger with the Indian Army and

who have not yet been given the pension payment orders?

(b) In how many cases out of these have more than three months elapsed since retirement?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Major-General Himatsinhji): (a) 247.

(b) 247.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTRE

***572. Shri J. N. Hazarika:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the progress made in the project for establishment of a Bibliographical centre at Delhi with the aid of the UNESCO; and

(b) how long the project is likely to continue?

The Minister of Education (Maulana Azad): (a) The Government have entered into an Agreement with U.N.E.S.C.O. for technical assistance for the establishment of a Bibliographical Centre in India. The proposal will be placed before the Standing Finance Committee for their approval.

(b) The project will, in the first instance, be for a period of 3 years after which the position will be reviewed.

FILMS EXEMPTED FROM CENSOR FEE

***573. Shri Amolakh Chand:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) the types of films produced in or outside India which have been exempted from Censor Fee; and

(b) the names of the films till now exempted?

The Minister of State for Information and Broadcasting (Shri Diwakar):

(a) Under rule 32(3)(b) of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, the Central Board of Film Censors may remit the examination fee in whole or in part in respect of all films which are certified as predominantly educational.

(b) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

HINDUSTAN AIRCRAFT FACTORY

***574. Shri Ganamukhi:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Hindustan Aircraft Factory put to test flights the Indian-designed trainer plane for the first time;

(b) if so, what is the altitude to which it was flown above the sea level; and

(c) whether the personnel connected with the design and the manufacture of this trainer plane were Indians?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Major-General Himatsinhji): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) 8,000 feet.

(c) All the personnel responsible for the design and manufacture of this trainer plane were Indians except one European who is in charge of the assembly work in the prototype shop.

MOCK ELECTIONS

***575. Shri Bhatt:** Will the Minister of Law be pleased to state:

(a) at how many rural and urban places, Statewise, mock elections were held;

(b) how many voters at each place participated in the mock elections;

(c) whether there were separate booths for women;

(d) how much average time was taken by each voter to cast his vote in rural and urban polling booths respectively;

(e) the percentage of votes cast;

(f) whether there was personation and challenged votes; and

(g) whether women took more time than men to cast their votes in rural and urban areas?

The Minister of Law (Dr. Ambedkar): (a) to (g). The information is being collected by the Election Commission and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

ARTICLE 171(b) OF THE CONSTITUTION

***576. Shri Deogirikar:** (a) Will the Minister of Law be pleased to state whether qualifications as equivalent to that of a graduate for electorates to elect members of the Legislative Council of a State as mentioned in Article 171(b) of the Constitution of India have been prescribed by or under any law made by Parliament?

(b) If so, what are those qualifications?

(c) If not, when will such qualifications be prescribed?

The Minister of Law (Dr. Ambedkar): (a) The hon. Member's attention is invited to section 27(3) (a) of the Representation of the People Act, 1950, which authorises the State Governments to specify, with the concurrence of the Election Commission, the qualifications which shall be deemed

to be equivalent to that of a graduate of a University in India.

(b) and (c). Notifications laying down the qualifications referred to above have been issued by the Governments of all the States which are to have Legislative Councils, namely, Bihar, Bombay, Madras, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal and Mysore. A copy each of these notifications is available in the Library of the House.

FINANCIAL ISSUES BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN

117. **Shri A. C. Guha:** (a) Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to refer to the reply given to starred question No. 214 asked on the 14th August, 1951, regarding outstanding financial issues between India and Pakistan and make a statement as to whether there have been any provisional arrangement, pending the final decision with the Pakistan Government, for the payment of provident fund money, pensions and savings bank account money?

(b) Have these arrangements, if any, been made on mutual basis of the two Governments or unilaterally by the Government of India?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) and (b). Under a mutual agreement between the two Governments provisional payments are being made in respect of pensions and balances in provident funds to displaced persons. A Central Claims Organisation has recently been set up to arrange for the provisional payments in respect of outstanding claims and to finalise the settlement of the claims. As regards savings bank accounts it has been agreed between the two Governments that transfers will be allowed in respect of all applications made upto the 31st March, 1949. The verification of the balances in these accounts which has to precede the transfer has, however, been held up and the question of the resumption is under correspondence between the two Governments.

ECONOMY DUE TO RETRENCHMENT

118. **Shri Kishorimohan Tripathi:** (a) Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state the total number of Government of India employees excluding defence personnel who have been retrenched during the year 1951-52 up to 1st August 1951?

(b) What percentage of this total number belongs to each category of Government service?

(c) What percentage of the retrenched personnel has been provided with alternative employment?

(d) What is the overall result in so far as economy in expenditure is concerned?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): (a) to (d). The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House.

OFFICERS IN MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

119. **Prof. K. T. Shah:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of (i) Gazetted, and (ii) non-Gazetted officers, clerks and Class IV servants in his Secretariat on: (i) 15th August, 1947; (ii) 31st March, 1948; (iii) 31st March, 1949; (iv) 31st March, 1950; and (v) 31st March, 1951; and

(b) the number of officers, clerks and Class IV servants appointed temporarily in the first instance and subsequently (i) made permanent; (ii) retired; or (iii) retrenched, during each of the years 1947-48 (post-partition), 1948-49, 1949-50 and 1950-51?

The Minister of Education (Maulana Azad): (a) and (b). A statement giving the required information is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 26.]

FINANCIAL CRISIS IN ORISSA

121. **Shri Sidhva:** (a) Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Government of Orissa are now faced with a financial crisis?

(b) Have the Government of Orissa asked the Reserve Bank or the Government of India to facilitate their overdrawing of a certain amount to overcome the emergency?

(c) What are the reasons for this sudden financial crisis faced by the Government of Orissa?

(d) When was it noticed and has any proposal been made by the Government of Orissa to the Government of India and if so, with what result?

(e) In what respect have the Government of Orissa suffered and what are the reasons for this abrupt crisis in their administration?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) to (e). The Government of Orissa have been having difficulties in regard to their ways and means for some time and during recent months they were having substantial overdrafts with the Reserve Bank of India. They recently examined the position, in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India and the Government of India. As a result of this examination it transpired that

the bulk of the overdraft with the Reserve Bank was due to the fact that the State Government had not taken from the Centre the loans they were entitled to take for meeting the expenditure on the Hirakud Dam. The necessary adjustments on this account have since been made. Part of the deficit of the State was also due to the cumulative effect of the revenue deficits during the last three years. To meet their current difficulties the Government of India have given an on account payment of Rs. 75 lakhs out of the State's share of income tax normally payable in March next. The current year's budget of the State provided for a revenue deficit of Rs. 98 lakhs but in view of the unsatisfactory ways and means position of the State the State Government are taking action to develop additional resources and secure economies in expenditure to an extent which will nearly wipe out this deficit. The present financial position of the State is not due to any sudden developments but reflects the cumulative results of the deficits which the State has been running for the last three years.

JUDGES OF HIGH COURTS

122. Shri S. N. Das: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the maximum number of Judges that the President has by order fixed for each of the existing High Courts in India as envisaged in Article 216 of the Constitution; and

(b) the number of Judges that each of these High Courts has at present?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): (a) No order has yet been issued by the President under Article 216 of the Constitution fixing the maximum number of Judges for the various High Courts.

(b) A statement showing the number of Judges in the various High Courts has already been laid on the Table of the House on the 22nd August, 1951 in reply to starred question No. 455 asked by Shri Shiv Charan Lal.

TREATY WITH BELGIUM FOR MAINTENANCE OF GRAVES

123. Shri Kamath: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether India, along with other member-States of the Commonwealth,

recently signed a treaty with Belgium for the maintenance of the graves of Commonwealth soldiers fallen on Belgian soil during war;

(b) if so, the number of Indian soldiers among those dead; and

(c) India's commitments under the aforesaid Treaty?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Major-General Himatsinhlji): (a) Yes.

(b) No records are available as to the number of graves of Indian soldiers in Belgium or those who died there. Imperial War Graves Commission have, however, stated that there are no graves of Indian soldiers in Belgium.

(c) As there are no graves of Indian soldiers in Belgium India has no commitments under the agreement.

MEDICAL SUPPLIES TO INDIA BY WEST GERMANY

124. Shri Sidhva: Will the Minister of Health be pleased to state:

(a) whether the West German Bundestag has requested the Government of Germany to send medical supplies to India;

(b) whether any Bill was passed by the Bonn Government in this respect, if so, whether any information has been received by the Government of India about the supply of such medicines; and

(c) the quantity that is expected to be received through the provision of this Bill and whether it is a gift or any payment is to be made for that?

The Minister of Health and Communications (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur):

(a) to (c). So far as the Government of India are aware, there was a debate on the 8th June, 1951, in the German Federal Parliament on the "Famine Catastrophe in India" and during the course of that debate, the question of sending a gift of medicines to India was also considered. No official reference has yet been received by the Government of India from the Federal Government in this connection.

Monday, 27th August, 1951



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

VOLUME XIV, 1951

(6th August, 1951 to 29th August, 1951)

Fourth Session

of the

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

1951

CONTENTS

Volume XIV.—6th August, 1951 to 29th August, 1951

	<i>Columns</i>
MONDAY, 6th August, 1951—	
President's Address to Parliament	1—28
TUESDAY, 7th August, 1951—	
Motions for Adjournment—	
Exorbitant rise in the price of cloth	29
Civil Defence of India against invasion by Pakistan	29—31
Papers laid on the Table—	
President's Assent to Bills	31
Report of the India Delegation to the Twelfth Session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council	31—32
President's Proclamation assuming to himself all functions of the Government of Punjab	32
Expenditure incurred on Medical Treatment in India and abroad of Ministers Toofan Express Accident	32
Ordinances promulgated after the termination of the Third Session of Parliament 1950-51	32
Essential Services (Prevention of Strikes) Bill—Introduced	33
Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	33
Parliamentary Prevention of Disqualification Bill—Further consideration of clauses—Postponed	33—79
Assam (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded	80—100
WEDNESDAY, 8th August, 1951—	
Business of the House—	
Hours of Sitting	101
Papers laid on the Table—	
Expenditure from the Aviation Share of the Petrol Tax Fund	102
Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	102
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Introduced	102—03
Assam (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill—Passed, as amended	103—62
Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Declaration of National Importance) Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded	162—90
THURSDAY, 9th August, 1951—	
Papers laid on the Table—	
Notifications under Section 2C of Insurance Act, 1938	191
Amendments to Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1951	191
Notification in accordance with Section 4A of Indian Tariff Act, 1934	192
Appropriation Accounts—Defence Services, 1948-49; Audit Report, Defence Services, 1950; Commercial Appendix to Appropriation Accounts, Defence Services, 1948-49; Appropriation Accounts—Railways, 1948-49 (Parts I and II); Railway Audit Report, 1950; Balance Sheets of Railway Collieries and Statements of all-in cost of coal etc. for 1948-49; and Capital Statements, Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts of Govt. Railways, 1948-49.	192—93
Resolution re President's Proclamation on Failure of Constitutional Machinery in Punjab—Adopted	193—255
Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Declaration of National Importance) Bill—Further Consideration postponed	255—60

(ii)

THURSDAY, 9TH AUGUST, 1951—Contd.

Columns

Business of the House—

Change in Hours of Sitting	260—62
Employment of Children (Amendment) Bill—Passed, as amended	262—67
Opium and Revenue Laws (Extension of Application) Amendment Bill— Passed, as amended	267—71
Sea Customs and the Central Excises and Salt (Amendment) Bill—Passed	271—73
Resolution <i>re</i> Convention for Suppression of Traffic in persons and exploita- tion of Prostitution—Further discussion postponed	273—78
Notaries Bill—Motion to consider moved	278—80

FRIDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1951—

Death of Shri Narayana Murthi	281
Motions for Adjournment—	
Dalkhowachar and Salapara Islands	281—83
Alleged election arrangement between Food Minister, U. P., and Sugar Industrialists	283—84
State Financial Corporations Bill—Presentation of Report of Select Committee	284
Tariff Commission Bill—Presentation of Report of Select Committee	284
Forward Contracts (Regulation) Bill—Extension of time for presentation of report of Select Committee	284—85
Delhi Premises (Requisition and Eviction) Amendment Bill—Extension of time for presentation of Report of Select Committee	285—93
Go-Samvardhan Bill—Extension of time for presentation of Report of Select Committee	293—94
Motion on Address by the President—Discussion not concluded	294—329
	330—72.
Papers laid on the Table—	
Correspondence between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan	329

SATURDAY, 11TH AUGUST, 1951—

Presentation of the Report of the Committee on the Conduct of a Member	373
Motion on Address by the President	373—500

MONDAY, 13TH AUGUST, 1951—

Papers laid on the Table—	
Statement <i>re</i> Railway Stores Enquiry Committee	503
Resolution <i>re</i> raising of export duty on groundnuts and levy of export duty on oilseeds and vegetable oils not otherwise specified—Adopted	504—43
Evacuee Interest (Separation) Bill—Introduced	543
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded	544—90

TUESDAY, 14TH AUGUST, 1951—

Message from the President	591
Business of the House	591—92
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded	593—708

THURSDAY, 16TH AUGUST, 1951—

Indian Explosives (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	707—08
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Further consideration postponed	708—10
Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	710—74

FRIDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1951—

Papers laid on the Table—	
Statement showing action taken by Government on assurances etc., given during Third Session (Second Part) 1951	775
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Passed, as amended	776—821
Delhi and Ajmer Rent Control Bill—Referred to Select Committee	821—31

(iii)

	<i>Columns</i>
FRIDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1951—Contd.	
Notaries Bill—Discussion on motions to consider and to refer to Select Committee—Not concluded	832—41
Import of Dates	842—52
SATURDAY, 18TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Displaced Persons (Debts Adjustment) Bill—Introduced	853
Notaries Bill—Referred to Select Committee	853—56
Evacuee Interest (Separation) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	856—99
Tariff Commission Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded	899—930
MONDAY, 20TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Forward Contracts Bill—Presentation of Report of Select Committee	931
Displaced Persons (Debts Adjustment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	931—74
Tariff Commission Bill—Discussion on motion to consider, as reported by the Select Committee—Not concluded	974—1014
TUESDAY, 21ST AUGUST, 1951—	
Papers laid on the Table—(i) Amendments to Delhi Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940, (ii) Amendments to Punjab Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940	1015—16
Tariff Commission Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded	1016—98
WEDNESDAY, 22ND AUGUST, 1951—	
Papers laid on the Table—	
Declarations of Exemption under Registration of Foreigners Act, 1939	1099—1100
Agreement <i>re</i> Loan from U. S. A. for purchase of Foodgrains	1100—01
Motion for Adjournment—	
Fast by public men of Andhra <i>re</i> formation of Andhra Province	1101—03
Tariff Commission Bill—Consideration of Clauses—Not concluded	1103—80
THURSDAY, 23RD AUGUST, 1951—	
Resolution <i>re</i> measures for increased food production—Negatived	1181—1205
Resolution <i>re</i> necessity for an All India Bar—Withdrawn	1205—09
Resolution <i>re</i> opening of Provident Fund Accounts in Post Offices—Withdrawn	1209—11
Resolution <i>re</i> altering the boundaries of West Bengal—Negatived	1212—54
SATURDAY, 25TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Railway Companies (Emergency Provisions) Bill—Introduced	1255
Papers laid on the Table—	
Statement <i>re</i> Food Position	1255—56
Business of the House	1256—59
Tariff Commission Bill—Passed, as amended	1259—87
Benares Hindu University (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	1287—1328
Aligarh Muslim University (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	1287—1328
Government of Part C States Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded	1328—56
MONDAY, 27TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Statement <i>re</i> Japanese Peace Treaty	1357—62
Business of the House	1362—63
Papers laid on the Table—	
Constitution (Removal of Difficulties) Order No. II (Third Amendment) Order	1363
Third Annual Report of Industrial Finance Corporation	1363
Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Extension ¹ of time for presentation of report of Select Committee	1363—64
Government of Part C States Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded	1364—1426

TUESDAY, 28TH AUGUST, 1951—*Columns***Papers laid on the Table—**

(i) Recommendation by I. L. C. concerning Vocational training of adults including disabled persons ; and (ii) Action proposed to be taken by Government of India on the recommendation	1427
Occupation of two islands in the Brahmaputra by Pakistan Police	1427—30
Government of Part C States Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded	1430—1524

WEDNESDAY, 29TH AUGUST, 1951—**Motion for Adjournment—**

Maintenance of electrical equipment in Parliament Chamber	1525—27
---	---------

Papers laid on the Table—

Delhi Road Transport Authority (Advisory Council) Rules, 1951	1527
Madras Port Trust (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1527
Government of Part C States Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded	1528—94

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

1357

1358

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

Monday, 27th August, 1951

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

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-32 A.M.

**STATEMENT RE JAPANESE PEACE
TREATY**

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The House will be interested to know of the latest developments in regard to the proposed Peace Treaty with Japan and the Government of India's decision thereon.

The war against Japan ended six years ago. This was followed by a military occupation of Japan which has continued till now. India, in common with other powers, was interested in putting an end to this unsatisfactory state of affairs and terminating it by a treaty of peace. Owing to differences in the approach to this question between different powers, little progress could be made.

The Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom thereupon took the lead in drafting a peace treaty with Japan. There were originally two separate drafts which differed materially from each other. Finally some minor changes were incorporated in the United States draft and the Government of the United Kingdom accepted it. The United States and the United Kingdom then became joint sponsors of the revised draft treaty and this was communicated to us on the 20th July 1951.

255 PSD

The Government gave careful consideration to this revised draft and communicated their views on the 28th July to the U.S. Government in regard to it. In this reply it was stated that the Government of India were in full sympathy with the underlying object of terminating war with Japan as soon as possible and admitting her to the community of free sovereign nations. It was pointed out that the other objective of the peace treaty with Japan should be to lessen the existing tension in the Far East and help towards a peaceful settlement of the problems affecting that area. In order to satisfy these objectives, attention was drawn to some provisions in the draft treaty and certain proposals were made on behalf of the Government of India.

On the 12th August 1951, the Government of India received the reply of the U.S. Government to their comments. Some minor variations were made in the original draft but none of the major suggestions put forward by the Government of India was accepted. The Government thereupon, after careful consideration, came to the conclusion that India should not sign the peace treaty or participate in the San Francisco Conference. It was further decided that immediately after Japan attained independent status, the Government of India would make a declaration terminating the state of war between India and Japan and, later, a simple bilateral treaty with Japan should be negotiated.

In accordance with this decision, the following communication was sent on August 23rd, 1951, to the Government of the United States, through our Embassy in Washington:

"The Government of India have the honour to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the reply of the Government of the United States of America to the representations which they had made on the Japanese Peace Treaty in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

their communication dated the 30th of July, 1951. They fully appreciate the consideration given to their views by the U.S. Government and wish to assure them that the present reply is conceived in a spirit of frank and sincere friendship for the Government and people of the U.S.A.

2. Throughout the negotiations that have taken place between the two Governments on the subject of the Treaty, the Government of India have laid emphasis upon two fundamental objectives:

(i) the terms of the Treaty should concede to Japan a position of honour, equality and contentment among the community of free nations;

(ii) they should be so framed as to enable all countries specially interested in the maintenance of a stable peace in the Far East to subscribe to the Treaty, sooner or later.

The Government of India have, after most careful thought, come to the conclusion that the Treaty does not, in material respects, satisfy either of these two criteria.

3. *Condition (i)*.—(a) It is only natural to expect that Japan should desire the restoration, in full, of her sovereignty, over territory of which the inhabitants have a historical affinity with her own people and which she has not acquired by aggression from any other country. The Ryuku and the Bonin islands fully satisfy this description. Nevertheless, the Treaty proposes that until the U.S. Government seek and obtain trusteeship over these islands, they should continue to be subject to the legislative and administrative control of the U.S. It is apparent to the Government of India that such an arrangement cannot but be a source of dissatisfaction to large sections of the Japanese people and must carry the seed of future dispute and, possibly, conflict in the Far East.

(b) The Government of India recognise that, as a sovereign nation, Japan should have the right to make arrangements for her defence as provided in Article 5 of the Treaty: If, in exercise of this right, Japan should decide to enter into defensive agreements with a friendly power, no one could reasonably object to this.

But the right should be exercised by the Government of Japan when Japan has become truly sovereign. A provision in the Treaty which suggests that the present occupation forces may stay on in Japan as part of such a defensive agreement is bound to give rise to the impression that the agreement does not represent a decision taken by Japan in the full enjoyment of her freedom as a sovereign nation. The effect of this, not only on the people of Japan but upon large sections of people in Asia, is bound to be most unfortunate.

4. *Condition (ii)*.—As already stated, the Government of India attach the greatest importance to the Treaty providing that the island of Formosa should be returned to China. The time and manner of such return might be the subject of separate negotiations but to leave the future of the island undetermined, in spite of past international agreements, in a document which attempts to regulate the relations of Japan with all Governments that were engaged in the last war against her, does not appear to the Government of India to be either just or expedient. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same argument applies to the Kurile Island and to S. Sakhalin.

5. For the foregoing reasons, the Government of India have decided, with regret, that they cannot be parties to this Treaty. It is their sincere hope that lasting peace will prevail in the Far East and, to that end, they will continue to cooperate with the U.S. and other Governments in such manner as may be open to them, consistently with the principles on which their foreign policy is based. As a first step, it is their intention, as soon as this may be practicable, to put an end to the state of war between them and Japan, and to establish full diplomatic relations with that country.

6. It has already been announced that the Conference convened at San Francisco to consider the draft peace treaty with Japan will not be open to negotiation, though attending Governments will be free to state their views on the Treaty. The Government of India feel that the statement of their views on the Treaty contained in this reply, should be adequate to clarify their own position

to the Conference. It is their intention, if the U.S. Government have no objection, to communicate this reply to their own Parliament, which is now in session, on the 27th of August. Once the document has been published, it will be available for the information of the Conference, and the Government of India will be glad if the Government of the United States, which will act as host to the Conference, will have this reply circulated to its members. As, for the reasons already stated, the Government of India will be unable to sign the Treaty, they think that it is not necessary for them to send representatives to it."

I might add that we have received yesterday replies to this communication from the Government of the United States as also from the Government of the United Kingdom, expressing regret at our decision not to sign the proposed treaty.

I regret that premature release of our reply as well as of the other part of the communications has, unfortunately, already taken place from other countries.

Shri Kamath (Madhya Pradesh) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No.....

Shri Kamath: I am not asking any questions. Sir. The Prime Minister has made an important pronouncement, but as it has taken the form of a Statement, I can see that questions are ruled out at this stage. I handed in a short notice question over a week ago, but I have not got information as to whether it has been allowed or disallowed. Apart from that, as the San Francisco Conference is scheduled for the first week of September, I would request you to be so good as to allow short notice questions after we have studied the Statement, and I also hope that the Prime Minister will be prepared to answer short notice questions, because the ordinary course will mean ten days and by that time, much of the Conference may be over. To facilitate this, I would request you further that copies of the Statement made today may be circulated to the Members of the House.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is, as no doubt you were probably going to say, not customary for a Statement like this to be discussed or questions to be put on it. But, the hon. Member is perfectly right in saying that he had put a short notice question

on this, and I am prepared, not on the Statement, but in any matter arising out of the short notice question, to give any factual information: not any discussion on it. As for my circulating this, certainly, it will appear in the newspapers; probably this evening and also tomorrow morning. It is our intention to publish a short White Paper containing two or three of these documents. It may not be ready today; but possibly by tomorrow, I shall be able to circulate.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri Sidhva (Madhya Pradesh): Before you proceed to the regular business, may I with your permission, Sir, make a submission? Several of the hon. Members have asked me to convey to you that the last date of the session is fixed for 15th of September and they desire that it should not be extended for the reason that they want to go to the various constituencies for election work. As you know, Sir, some of us have the honour to belong to the Congress and applications have been invited by the 5th of September. Some of the Members have actually left to present their nomination papers. The last date fixed by the Central Parliamentary Board is 5th October, and it is desirable that the Members should be there. The hon. Leader of the House is here. May I know whether he will be prepared to accede to the request of hon. Members? Already, some of the important Bills have been referred to Select Committees. There are seven Bills. These Bills will be coming back early next week and we will be able to finish them by that time. Some of the other Bills also, we can finish. As far as the important items of the business of the House are concerned, we have dealt with them, and we are dealing with them. I do not think the regular business of the House will be hampered if the session concludes on the 15th September.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I say, Sir, so far as Government is concerned, this Parliament is going to sit till the second week of October at least, if not longer.

Shri Kamath (Madhya Pradesh): With regard to the point raised by Mr. Sidhva, may I make a suggestion, Sir, that the Pradesh Congress Committees might be informally asked to presume that all Members have applied for tickets, unless otherwise....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How does it arise? This Parliament has no control over Pradesh Congress Committees.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

CONSTITUTION (REMOVAL OF DIFFICULTIES) ORDER NO. II (THIRD AMENDMENT) ORDER.

The Minister of Law (Dr. Ambedkar): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Constitution (Removal of Difficulties) Order No. II (Third Amendment) Order, 1951, made by the President on the 16th August, 1951, under clause (2) of article 392 of the Constitution. [Placed in Library. See No. P—197/51.]

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT OF INDUSTRIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Board of Directors of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India for the year ended the 30th June, 1951, together with statements in the prescribed form showing the assets and liabilities of the Corporation as at the close of the year and the Profit and Loss Account of the Corporation for the year, in accordance with sub-section (3) of section 35 of the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948. [Placed in Library. See No. IV.O.4(29).]

INDIAN COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Indian Companies Act, 1913, be extended upto Thursday, the 30th August, 1951."

The Committee met twice and has finalised its conclusions. Some of the Members wanted time to study the proceedings and it was considered desirable by you, Sir, as the Chairman, to make this possible. The intervening holiday and the week-end have made this request for extension of time therefore necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Indian Companies Act, 1913, be extended upto Thursday, the 30th August, 1951."

The motion was adopted.

GOVERNMENT OF PART C STATES BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the Government of Part C States Bill. Clauses 1 to 10 were under consideration.

Shri A. C. Guha (West Bengal): Day before yesterday, Sir, I moved my amendment and was speaking.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has he not not moved his amendment already?

Shri A. C. Guha: I have moved and I started speaking. Then other amendments were moved.

Capt. A. P. Singh (Vindhya Pradesh): What about those amendments which have not yet been circulated? We have given notice as you asked us day before yesterday. The office was closed yesterday. So, they have been given this morning.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I should find out from the office. The hon. Member may put questions to the office before making a statement on the floor of the House. It is easy to ascertain it.

Shri A. C. Guha: The day before yesterday, when moving my amendment as regards certain provisions for Manipur, Tripura and Cutch, I was telling the House that on several occasions, the Government had come with some legislation providing for administrative and constitutional procedure for the Part C States and that the Government had every time taken an attitude which could easily be called unhelpful, unimaginative, and to a certain extent retrograde. The dominant factor in the mind of the Government seems to be an element of suspicion towards the popular demand. Their argument is on a par, to a certain extent, with the argument that we used to hear from our foreign masters when they put forward some plea or other for withholding popular Government or independence from this country. When Government came before this House with a Bill to provide a machinery for electing Members for the Upper House from the Part C States...

Hon. Members: Not audible, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is too much noise in the Lobby and waves of sound are coming here from the Lobby.

Shri Kamath (Madhya Pradesh): And the mikes are unequally distributed. The hon. Member may move nearer to a mike, here in front of me.

Shri A. C. Guha: Sometime ago, the Government came before this House with a Bill for providing a machinery for sending Members to the Upper House from the Part C States and that Bill was practically rejected by the House. So, Government had to modify that Bill radically and practically it was a new Bill that was approved and passed by this House. And when the Government came with this Bill some months ago, there was some agreement between the Government and the Members of the House interested in the Part C States. After progressing somewhat, that agreement failed and Government could not satisfy the Members interested. So they had to bring forward modified proposals. And now they have come with practically a new Bill. Even then, there is the first dose of amendments in List No. 1. And then, after further consultations with Members interested in this matter, the Government seem to have revised their attitude regarding certain matters and so you have this second dose of amendments or concessions and they are embodied in List No. 4 of amendments given notice of by the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill. So, this is the way the Government has been changing its attitude with regard to this matter. Of course, I admit that Government, at least in this House, have responded to the demands of the Members. But at the same time, I have to say that the Government have not shown any imagination in handling this problem. They should have realised the feeling in this House and in the country, particularly of the people of those areas for which they are legislating—the feelings of the people who are concerned with this matter. Government have repeatedly revised their attitude and have repeatedly come to this House with fresh proposals. Now, after making radical concessions to the demands of the people, they have still been niggardly as regards the three States of Manipur, Tripura and Kutch.

As regards these three States of Manipur, Tripura and Kutch, the argument of the hon. Minister is that they are border States. Are we to

take it that it is an offence or crime for those States that geographically they are situated on the border of the country? It is not the people of those States who wanted the division of India. The partition of the country was accepted by the people who are now running this Government and this partition of the country has placed the States of Kutch, and Tripura in the position of border States. As for Manipur it has contiguity with Pakistan and also with Burma.

In this connection, I would like to remind the Government of the various States now forming the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics—the U.S.S.R.—and say that many States in that Union are what may be called border States. All the States in this Union do not belong to the same community or the same ethnological group, or of the same level of advancement in culture and civilisation. And yet I do not think the U.S.S.R. has withheld the popular controls in the Government of these border States. Even the States which formed parts of what were previously known as Central Asian States were not more civilised or advanced in culture or in any other matter than the people of Manipur, Tripura and Kutch. And these States are also border States and yet they have been given full responsible Government by the U.S.S.R.

But what is the position in our country? What do we find in these areas after four years of Central Government rule? I would humbly request the hon. Minister to state what is the progress made in these States as regards communications, as regards sanitation, as regards education and as regards the economic condition of the people. As far as I know, the people of Manipur, and Tripura are in no way better off than what they were four years ago. Their communications have been cut up and this House was once told by the hon. Minister in charge of Transport that perhaps the only communication available to them was the airlift, as if that was economically available to all the people. That is the means of communication that the Government has been able to give to these people during all these four years. As regards the Tripura-Assam Road, it is a sorry tale and when the hon. Minister of State for Transport and Railways made a statement about that in this House sometime ago, it brought some trouble on him. On the whole, it can be stated that the Government have not been able to do

[Shri A. C. Guha]

themselves credit as regards the Tripura-Assam Road. Only the other day I was informed in reply to a question of mine that it would take at least another eighteen months for the completion of that road. And even then I am doubtful whether it will at all be possible to stick to the timetable and complete it in scheduled time.

As regards Manipur, the House will remember that the hon. Prime Minister himself said that the people of Manipur were in no way less cultured or less developed than the people of other parts of the country. The Prime Minister had seen these people and he could speak with knowledge and say that they were not less cultured or less advanced than the people of other parts. But the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill stated only the day before yesterday in this House that these States were border States and were not so advanced and therefore it was necessary that the Centre should retain complete authority over them.

As regards law and order, the Members of this House will remember that repeatedly this matter was discussed in this House and I can say that in certain parts of Manipur and Tripura, even now, the authority of Government is only nominal. Even now the Government officials cannot go there and cannot collect the revenue and do their other duties that are expected of them. That is the position as regards law and order after four years of the rule of the Central Government. Then why should Government still insist on refusing to these people any element of self-Government, any element of popular Government, any element of independence that has dawned upon this country four years ago?

Only self-Government can make the people responsible and make them realise their responsibility to make progress and maintain law and order. In those areas the lawless elements are able to get arms even from Government armouries and police stations but arms licences from the people of those areas have been taken away, with the result the law-abiding people of the areas are at the mercy of the lawless elements. I have told the House that Government officers posted in those two States have no access to some parts of the States.

I cannot understand what argument the Government can put forward for refusing popular Government in those States. My amendment is a very

simple one. Already electoral colleges are provided in the Representation of the People Act. I know the Home Minister sometime ago agreed that this institution which had been brought into being under another Act could be utilised as a sort of Legislature. The Minister of States also did not disagree with the proposal. In this Bill no such thing is mentioned and I would ask the Minister to accept the very humble proposal of mine that the electoral colleges provided under Act XLIII of 1950 may be allowed to function as a Legislature with such powers and privileges as the President may confer on them. I have received several representations from Manipur and Tripura protesting against the step-motherly and niggardly attitude of the Government. The Government of India must have also received similar representations from those areas. I hope the Government will accede to their request and allow the electoral colleges to function as Legislatures. In my amendment I have not asked that these electoral colleges should function as full-fledged Legislatures. The President may by notification confer certain powers on them so that the popular element may be associated with the day to day administration of the Government and the people may learn democratic responsibility for the administration of those areas, which is a thing which the Government has very much in mind and has proclaimed so often. I would again ask the Government to consider the record of improvements and benefits that those people have been able to achieve in four years. From any point of view I feel there has been no appreciable improvement and so there is no argument for the Government to deny the people any share of popular representation in the Government of the States. I hope the Government will accept my amendment and allow the electoral colleges to function as Legislatures with such powers as the President may be pleased to confer on them.

The Minister of States, Transport and Railways (Shri Gopalaswami): I think Mr. Guha is referring to his amendment No. 118 in List No. 7.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What about his amendment No. 75 in List No. 3 which he moved day before yesterday?

Shri A. C. Guha: That has been changed to No. 118 in List No. 7. As the hon. Minister did not move his amendment No. 2 in List No. 1, the numbering of these amendments has been changed suitably.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I only wanted to know the corresponding number. He can now move it in substitution of his previous amendment.

Shri A. C. Guha: I beg to move:

In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, after the proposed sub-clause (2) of clause 1, add:

"(3) That in the States of Manipur, Tripura and Kutch, till such time as the Legislative Assemblies are not elected, the Electoral Colleges to be elected under the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (XLIII of 1950) will be allowed to function as legislatures with such powers and privileges as the President may confer on them."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, after the proposed sub-clause (2) of clause 1, add:

"(3) That in the State of Manipur, Tripura and Kutch, till such time as the Legislative Assemblies are not elected, the Electoral Colleges to be elected under the Representation of the people Act, 1950 (XLIII of 1950), will be allowed to function as legislatures with such powers and privileges as the President may confer on them."

Shri Lakshmanan (Travancore-Cochin): Sir, I have tabled some amendments this morning.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How can the House take note of them?

Shri Sidhya (Madhya Pradesh): We were told that the amendments given notice of today would be accepted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then Mr. Lakshmanan may move his amendment.

Shri Lakshmanan: I beg to move

In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, in sub-clause (2) of the proposed clause 2, omit the words "Part C" wherever they occur.

My reason for moving this amendment is that in this clause "State" has been defined as "any State specified in Part C of the First Schedule to the Constitution other than Bilaspur". In sub-clause (2) of clause 2 the reference to "Part C" is redundant and further nowhere in the Bill the words "Part C" are used. "State" means any State specified in Part C. Therefore, no special mention is necessary to denote Part C, when the word State is used.

Shri Gopaldaswami: Perhaps a small argument may persuade the hon. Member not to press his amendment. If his amendment is carried out we

shall have to say in sub-clause (1) of clause 1 in my amendment: "This Act may be called the Government of States Act, 1951". Are we going to omit "Part C" there?

Shri Lakshmanan: This comes subsequent to that. My amendment is only to delete "Part C" wherever they occur in the proposed sub-clause (2) of clause 2 and nowhere else.

Shri Gopaldaswami: For instance in clause 2, to which he refers, under item (g) it is said "State" means any State specified in Part C. Are we to omit "Part C" there?

Shri Lakshmanan: A State has been defined as a Part C State. But it is again stated in sub-clause (2) of clause 2...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member evidently feels it is redundant.

Shri Gopaldaswami: I see his point. In sub-clause (2) we say Scheduled Castes in relation to the Part C States. If you omit the words "Part C State", it would read, "to the State under which they are so specified". "State" having been defined in (g) of the previous sub-clause, he says that the meaning here is clear and that there is no need to repeat it here. It is a drafting improvement which he suggests.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But there is no harm in keeping it as it is?

Shri Lakshmanan: Absolutely none. I only wanted to point out that it is redundant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Minister accept this amendment?

Shri Gopaldaswami: It is not quite necessary—I would leave it as it is.

Shri Lakshmanan: Then I would not pursue the amendment.

कैप्टिन ए० पी० सिंह: मैं यह अमेंडमेंट पेश कर रहा हूँ क्योंकि नई सूची आई नहीं है, लेकिन पुराने में भी वही मतलब है जो नये में है। यह दो भागों में विभक्त है। पूर्व इस के कि मैं इस पर बोलूँ, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को बिना धन्यवाद दिये नहीं रह सकता क्योंकि उन्होंने इस बिल में बहुत कुछ सुधार किया है। जो पहला बिल था उस से यह जरूर बहुत कुछ आगे गया हुआ है। गौकि जितना हम लोग आशा करते थे उतना तो नहीं गया, तथापि अपनी तरफ से बहुत कोशिश की है। उन का यह कहना है कि.....

[**Capt. A. P. Singh:** I am moving this amendment because the new list has not been circulated, but I may submit that the old amendment is also to the same effect as the new one. It is divided into two parts. Before I proceed to speak on the amendment, I must thank the hon. Minister for the considerable improvement made by him in the Bill. This Bill has definitely gone farther than the previous one, although not to the extent we would have wanted it to be, but even than he has tried his best. Accordingly to him.....]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the number of his amendments?

Capt. A. P. Singh: Nos. 73 and 74 in list No. 3.

Shri Gopalaswami: May I point out one particular matter to my hon. and gallant friend from Vindhya Pradesh? Has he tried to see whether his amendment would fit in with the amendment that I have moved which is in list No. 4?

Capt. A. P. Singh: For that I have given notice of a new amendment but that might not have reached. Therefore, I am speaking on these amendments.

Shri Gopalaswami: Then he may move the new amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendments in a re-drafted form were moved by the hon. Minister on the 25th. Hon. Members had time to re-draft their amendments; it was also stated that the usual period of notice would be waived. Therefore, if the hon. Member has got amendments to the newly drafted amendments placed before the House by the hon. Minister on the 25th he may move them.

Capt. A. P. Singh: I beg to move:

In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar, for the proviso to sub-clause (2) of the proposed clause 1, substitute:

"Provided that all the provisions of Part A States in the Constitution shall *mutatis mutandis* apply to Vindhya Pradesh".

This seeks to delete the proviso suggested by the hon. Minister and put in its place the proviso suggested by me. The proviso to the hon. Minister's amendment reads thus:

"Provided that the provisions of sections 3, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 22 shall not come into force in any of the States of Kutch, Manipur and Tripura until such date or dates as the Central Government may by notification in the Official Gazette appoint in this behalf."

I want this proviso to be deleted so that the Bill may be applicable to all the Part C States without any distinction. My point is that all the States should be put on the same footing except Vindhya Pradesh. Why I have

made this distinction is that I see some of the representatives coming from Part C States to be agreeable to these amendments only if some modification is made and some improvement accepted by the hon. Minister. Therefore, I thought it better to put the case of Vindhya Pradesh as a separate one. Otherwise, I was of opinion that all the States, whether they be Part C or Part B or Part A, should be kept on the same level and there should be no distinction between them. As has been suggested by the hon. Prime Minister himself in his report.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Where is the place for reference to Vindhya Pradesh here? The proviso excludes Kutch, Manipur and Tripura.

Dr. Parmar (Himachal Pradesh): It is a new proviso proposed by him that Vindhya Pradesh should be treated as a Part A State.

Capt. A. P. Singh: That is another thing. But here I want that this proviso to sub-clause (2) of clause 1 should go so that all the States may be on the same level.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Rajagopalachari): Except Vindhya Pradesh?

Capt. A. P. Singh: Except Vindhya Pradesh. As regards Vindhya Pradesh I say that it has been arbitrarily put from Part B to Part C. So it has got a special claim.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: After all, whatever the hon. Member moves in the House, I have to place it before the House. I am not able to follow what he has moved. I understand that he has moved that the proviso to sub-clause (2) of clause 1 should be deleted.

Capt. A. P. Singh: That it be replaced by the one I have proposed—automatically it will be deleted and then substituted. I want that the proviso should be omitted so that all the States may be put on the same level, except Vindhya Pradesh. I make an exception in the case of Vindhya Pradesh because although I was not of this opinion, I saw some of the Members coming from Part C States giving the impression that they were agreeable to remain Part C States with certain modifications. As far as Vindhya Pradesh is concerned, the people there are in no way agreeable to remain a Part C State. They claim that they have been a Part B State and arbitrarily they have been converted into a Part C State. Therefore, they want to be put back in Part B. It is said that if we are put in Part B, we shall have a Rajpramukh. We have therefore to make a choice between two evils—either the Rajpramukh or the Chief Commissioner.

Shri Kamath: Why not go one step at a time—from Part C to Part B, and then to Part A?

Capt. A. P. Singh: If we have got to make this choice, I say that we would prefer the Rajpramukh. He will remain only as a constitutional head and will be responsible to the Legislature whereas the Chief Commissioner will be responsible to the President. It is said that responsible Government cannot be granted because the responsibility for Part C States is that of the President and therefore to give more powers to Part C States is not in consonance with the spirit of the Constitution. My point is this. What is meant by "responsibility of the President"? If the President is responsible, then his first and foremost responsibility should be that he should grant responsible Government. So, to say that because the responsibility is that of the President, therefore, responsible Government should not be given, does not appear to me to be a very sound reason.

My hon. friend Mr. Guha spoke about the three States of Kutch, Manipur and Tripura. It is said that they are frontier States or border States and therefore they should not be given any power. I remember the days when the same argument was put forward by the British Government regarding the Frontier Province and the Congress again and again insisted by resolutions that the Frontier Province should be given the same treatment which was being given to other Provinces. This has been the policy of the Congress. Now, when it is said that these three States are border States and therefore they should not be given the same rights as others, I must confess that I am confused. I do not know how this Government can say such a thing. It has always been the contention of the Congress that even the Frontier Province should be given equal powers and it was on account of the fight of the Congress that the Frontier Province was brought to the level of other Provinces. I say that a Government representing the Congress should not bring forward the arguments of the British Government.

Then, it is said that being border States they should not be treated as very much advanced States. It is said that they are weak in other respects. In this connection, I am reminded of a sloka:

अहं नैव गर्जं नैव व्याघ्रं नैवच नैवच ।

अजापुत्रं बलि दद्यात् दैवो दुर्बलं घातकः ॥

When a sacrifice is to be made, a horse is not to be sacrificed; nor an elephant; of course, in no case a lion or a tiger. But a goat or a sheep can be butchered to propitiate the gods. That is what is being done here.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta (Delhi): Poor Delhi.

Capt. A. P. Singh: Of course, I am talking of other States than Vindhya Pradesh. Vindhya Pradesh stands on a different footing. There is nothing given to Delhi. So, at least the three States I have referred to may be put along with Delhi. Delhi has got only a nominal thing which is practically nothing. So, though it has been enumerated with us, it would have been better had it been enumerated with Kutch, Manipur and Tripura. So, I say that these three States can be put along with Delhi. It would give them the satisfaction that they have got something. Moreover, it was said once that there are going to be electoral colleges and they will function like Legislative Assemblies. Of course, there will be electoral colleges and there should be no difficulty in making Legislative Assemblies just as is being done in the case of other States. So, I think that it is no use making this differentiation.

As regards Vindhya Pradesh, I do not want to take much time of the House. I have so many times put forward the case of Vindhya Pradesh and it has also been forwarded to Government. My point is simply this. We are getting telegrams and representations day in and day out from the people of Vindhya Pradesh saying that this Bill will not be acceptable to them. As far as I know, even the hon. Minister has received these telegrams. Regular meetings are being held there and I think it is but proper that Vindhya Pradesh should be given some special consideration because it has got a special significance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have got great sympathy for the hon. Member's case, but is it open under the Constitution to say that a Part C State shall become a Part A State? Does it not require an amendment of the Constitution itself?

Capt. A. P. Singh: My amendment is not that Vindhya Pradesh should be put in Part A but that all the provisions of Part A States should be applied to Vindhya Pradesh. That can be very easily done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Under article 240 of the Constitution—

"Parliament may by law create or continue for any State specified in Part C of the First Schedule and administered through a Chief Commissioner or Lieutenant-Governor—

(a) a body, whether nominated, elected or partly nominated and partly elected, to function as a Legislature for the State; or

(b) a Council of Advisers or Ministers."

Can we go beyond this?

Capt. A. P. Singh: Please read sub-clause (2) of that article.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, it is said there "any such law" would not be deemed to be an amendment of the Constitution. But the scope of the amendment is strictly limited. Merely because a Legislature is there, a State would not automatically become a Part A State for all purposes. The hon. Member wants all the provisions of Part A States to apply to a Part C State. It is not allowed under the Constitution.

Capt. A. P. Singh: Even if it has got the force of amendment of the Constitution, it can be done under sub-clause (2) of article 240.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Clause (2) of that article reads as follows:

"Any such law as is referred to in clause (1) shall not be deemed to be an amendment of this Constitution for the purposes of article 368 notwithstanding that it contains any provision which amends or has the effect of amending the Constitution."

This says that notwithstanding the fact that it is an amendment of the Constitution, provision can be made by Parliament to a limited extent. But the point of the hon. Member is that he wants all provisions of Part A States to apply to a Part C State. He wants to convert a Part C State into a Part A State. The Constitution does not provide it.

Capt. A. P. Singh: I have said '*mutatis mutandis*'.

Shri Dwivedi (Vindhya Pradesh): I want to know whether before converting Vindhya Pradesh from Part B to Part C State, Government tried

to bring a constitutional amendment before Parliament or they merely effected the change without bringing any such constitutional amendment?

Shri Gopaldaswami: May I point out that that change was effected before the Constitution came into force, under the old Government of India Act.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore, on the date when the Constitution came into operation, it was a Part C State.

Shri Dwivedi: If Government were keen on it, they could have made Vindhya Pradesh into a Part A State when the Constitution was amended during the last session. The fact that they have not done it shows that they do not want it to be done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not concerned with what they could have done or could not have done. The fact today remains that Vindhya Pradesh is a Part C State, and any transfer of an item from one Schedule to another requires the amendment of the Constitution.

When reference is made to clause (2) of article 240, it has to be realised that the scope of it is limited. It applies only to such amendments as are contemplated in the earlier clause (1) of article 240—that is either giving a Legislature with elected or nominated members or both. That does not carry us far.

Therefore, I am afraid, unless I am satisfied otherwise, this amendment is out of order.

Shri Gopaldaswami: May I respectfully say that I agree with what has fallen from you. Legislation that can be attempted in Parliament with regard to Part C States is limited by the language of clause (1) of article 240. That is to say, you have to start with a Part C State which is under the direct administration of the President through a Chief Commissioner or a Lieutenant-Governor, and for that Part C State you provide a Legislature and a Council of Ministers or a Council of Advisers. But you cannot go beyond that and change the very character of the State, that is, make it possess powers under our legislation which would make no difference between a Part C State and a Part A State. That I think is the gist of your ruling and I respectfully agree with it.

Shri Kamath: rose.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: First of all let me dispose of the point that has occurred to me. The hon. Member

has moved an amendment. I think it is out of order. I have heard the hon. Minister. I shall hear, on this small point, what the hon. Member who has moved the amendment has to say.

Shri Kamath: In the First Schedule to the Constitution Vindhya Pradesh is listed among Part B States, in spite of the fact that its change or demotion from Part B to Part C took place before the Constitution came into force.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would ask the hon. Member to refer to article 391 which reads;

"(1) If at any time between the passing of this Constitution and its commencement any action is taken under the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1935, which in the opinion of the President requires any amendment in the First Schedule and the Fourth Schedule, the President may, notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, by order, make such amendments in the said Schedules as may be necessary to give effect to the action so taken..."

The hon. Minister has said that in pursuance of this provision, under the Government of India Act, 1935, this State has been transposed from Part B to Part C. Now that is settled.

Capt. A. P. Singh: I certainly bow to your ruling to a certain extent. But my point is that I have put in '*mutatis mutandis*' which means with such modifications as may be necessary. I do not want the set-up of Part C States to be on the same lines as that of Part A States. For instance, instead of a Governor, Part C States will have a Lieutenant-Governor.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava (Ajmer): My respectful submission in respect of this point of order is that article 240 contemplates creation of a Legislature, or a Council of Advisers or Ministers or both. The constitution, powers and functions of the Council of Ministers and also of the Legislature are to be defined by Parliament by law. Therefore, it is open to this Parliament to lay down the constitution of these bodies in whatever manner they like. There is no bar in the provisions of article 240 that the constitution of these bodies should not be identical with those of Part A States. Consequently, the amendment of my hon. friend does not in any way contravene the provisions of article 240 and should not be ruled out of order.

Again, as far as I have been able to understand, the practice usually followed in such cases, as to whether a

particular clause or amendment contravenes the provisions of the Constitution, is to leave it to the House and also to be determined by the Supreme Court, if at all the question is raised.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Punjab): So far as the question as to whether Part C States can be put on an equal footing with Part A States, the position is quite clear. All that article 240 says is that there may be Legislatures, or Councils of Ministers or both. Now the question is what power should be given to the Legislatures and what power should be reserved for the Chief Commissioner. My humble submission is that there is no bar, so far as this Parliament is concerned, to confer on Part C States power similar to the ones enjoyed by Part A States. To say that all the provisions relating to Part A States should *mutatis mutandis* apply to Part C States is to legislate too much. Unless and until it is enacted in respect of the various powers which form the subject matter of the various clauses and the modifications they require as to what these powers should definitely be—unless this is enacted, to say that it should *mutatis mutandis* apply takes us nowhere because it is not a resolution or direction to the House that these things should be done. After all we must confine ourselves to the various clauses, how and in what manner these powers should be conferred on Part C States so that the power may be the same as in Part A States. A general statement of this nature that *mutatis mutandis* it should apply to the Part C States and that they should have the same powers as in Part A States would in my opinion be too vague and too indefinite. Then some other authority shall have to construe what the powers are.

As we proceed with the other clauses we shall know in what respect the hon. Member wants to have his amendments made so that the powers in regard to both the States may be the same. Therefore, the amendment is rather open to the objection that it is too vague, too indefinite and does not clearly indicate what the hon. Mover wants. I think he has given notice of other amendments also in regard to particular clauses which will come up for discussion before the House. So far as the present amendment goes it does not offend against article 240, but at the same time it is rather vague and indefinite and does not lead us anywhere.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: It is for the House to accept or reject the amendment. But that is not an objection as

[Pandit M. B. Bhargava]

regards the admissibility of the amendment. My submission, therefore, is that so far as the admissibility is concerned the ruling of the Chair should be that it is.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is only repeating what he has said.

Pandit Kunzru (Uttar Pradesh): I am rather surprised to see that so enlightened a Member of the House as my hon. friend Pandit Mukut Bihari Lal Bhargava should argue that the amendment proposed by my hon. friend Capt. Awadhesh Pratap Singh is in order. A great deal has been said about article 240 as it stands by itself in this Constitution. But we must pay due regard to the provisions of article 239, and for any rational interpretation of article 240 we must take account of article 239. Article 240 does not say that notwithstanding anything in article 239 Parliament may confer constitutional powers on Part C States. It must therefore be supposed that whatever is proposed in article 240 must be subject to the limitation contained in article 239. If this is correct, it is clear that a Part C State can neither be in the same position as a Part A State nor in the same position as a Part B State. To say that the words "*mutatis mutandis*" should suffice to make the Chair rule that the amendment is in order seems to me to be indulging in special pleading. According to the rules of this House any amendment that is proposed must be definite. The words *mutatis mutandis* are as indefinite as any words can be.

I remember that some years ago my friend the late Ch. Mukhtiar Singh, whose death we all deplore, moved an amendment to the Finance Bill which ran as follows: He was speaking about the duties to be laid on certain kinds of material. He mentioned two or three things and then said "et cetera". The Finance Member objected to it and said that there were many things that the hon. Member's amendment had not taken note of. And Ch. Mukhtiar Singh said "Sir, that is why I have used the word 'et cetera'." This was naturally greeted with laughter and the Chair ruled the amendment out of order. So I am sure that you will follow the same course on this occasion.

If it is not desired that Vindhya Pradesh or any Part C State should be in the same position as the other Part C States, then the only remedy open to an aggrieved Member is to propose changes in the clauses of the Bill before us as suggested by my hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. If Capt. Awadhesh Pratap Singh wants that the

provisions of this Bill should not apply to Vindhya Pradesh and that Vindhya Pradesh might be left in the cold rather than be given the limited powers that this Bill confers on it, let him say so and let him ask that this Bill should not apply to Vindhya Pradesh. But he cannot ask either that Vindhya Pradesh should be in the same position as Part A States or in the same position *mutatis mutandis* as Part A States, for that means nothing whatsoever.

I hope, therefore, Sir, that you will rule the amendment out of order.

Dr. Pattabhi (Madras): Looking to the new light being thrown on the matter by my hon. friend who has just spoken I find that it merely recites article 239 and does not expatiate upon it. He has not shown us how article 239 is going to restrict the operation or the scope of article 240. On the other hand article 239 begins with a justification of the other articles.....

Pandit Kunzru: May I point out.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He does not give way.

Dr. Pattabhi: But my argument is broken. I was saying that article 239 begins with the words "Subject to the other provisions of this Part". So it is the other articles of this Part that guide and control the interpretation of article 239 and it is not that article 239 guides, controls, restricts or superintends the operation of the other articles in the Part. Article 239 says that "Subject to the other provisions of this Part, a State specified in Part C of the First Schedule shall be administered by the President". Well, to this article 240 makes an exception. How far does it make an exception is a point to be considered. One Bhargava thought that this was not out of order. Another Bhargava rose and said it is not quite out of order but it is not expedient to bring such a sweeping change to the provisions of this clause. The older Bhargava wants this not to be hebeheaded, but choked to death. That is all the difference. As a matter of fact, it may be that on the merits the amendment will fall. But so far as the Deputy-Speaker is concerned he will not be in order in declaring it out of order.

Capt. A. P. Singh: May I say that what has been said by Pandit Kunzru in his argument is.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have heard the hon. Member sufficiently on this point of order. He cannot go on replying to all the points that have been raised.

Shri Sarwate (Madhya Bharat): I want to submit that I have full sympathy with the Mover of the amendment. I think that article 240 does not help him. It lays down, apart from article 239, that there must be two conditions. One is that it must be specified in Part C and secondly, it must be administered through a Chief Commissioner or a Lieutenant-Governor. These are the two indispensable conditions. Maintaining these two conditions the provisions relating to Part A States cannot be made applicable. The interpretation of article 240 itself makes it clear that provisions of Part A States cannot be made applicable to Part C States. As far as the powers could be conferred consistently with maintaining these two conditions, the powers can be conferred. In short, these two conditions cannot be done away with. Therefore, I think the amendment must be ruled out of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a very important point that has been raised and I am responsible for creating a doubt. Government also agree with me. The main point is whether in the guise of an amendment the Constitution can be amended and a Part C State converted into a Part A State. Whatever the words "*mutatis mutandis*" might mean, the hon. Member means evidently that for "Governor" "Chief Commissioner" should be substituted, but I ask him, what is to be substituted for "President"? So far as a Part C State is concerned, it is the primary responsibility of the President and he acts through a Lieutenant-Governor or a Chief Commissioner. I do not know how "*mutatis mutandis*" comes in here.....

Dr. Pattabhi: The President is responsible for the Government and for the whole of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Over the general responsibility, he is responsible in the case of an emergency with respect to a Part A State; with respect to Part B States, he has got under article 371 a right to give directions from time to time; regarding Part C States, the Constitution contemplates that he shall directly be in charge of the administration through an agent of his who is called the Lieutenant-Governor or a Chief Commissioner. A difference has been made with respect to three kinds of States. The attempt under this amendment is to displace or to place a Part C State in the Part A list without so saying it or altering the Constitution. The transposition of Part C

States to Part A States under the Constitution requires a constitutional amendment and it cannot be done under article 240, though clause (2) of article 240 gives limited power for purposes of amendment under clause (1)(a) of article 240. I am afraid the general sweeping nature of the amendment that all the provisions of Part A States may apply will enlarge the scope and is not covered by the substantive provision contained under clause (2) of article 240. As such, I would immediately rule it out of order as not coming within it and as necessitating an amendment of the Constitution and as not coming within the powers of Parliament under clause (1)(a) of article 240, but it has been explained that notwithstanding the general words in which the amendment has been introduced, all the powers of a Legislature can be conferred upon Parliament for making provision under parts (a) or (b) of article 240(1). But such amendments have not been tabled separately nor have they been brought to the notice of the House as explained by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. Lastly, Pandit Kunzru said that without such amendments in detail regarding the provisions of the Legislature, the constitution of Ministers etc., by merely using the words "*mutatis mutandis*" or "et cetera" the object cannot be achieved. Who is to do "*mutatis mutandis*"? We want a further super Parliament to do that. The amendment is vague in that respect.

So far as the Chair is concerned, it does not rule any of these points out of order. It only gives an indication. It is left ultimately to the Supreme Court, if trouble comes. It is for the courts to decide and it is for this House to decide. I personally feel that it will be enlarging the scope of the Bill, transposing a Part C State into a Part A State indirectly and substantially even though the word is not there and also the amendment is very vague and indefinite and you want another Legislature to make the changes. For all these reasons I do not think the House will accept it, but speaking from the Chair, following the previous precedents and having regard to the complications of this issue, I would not at this stage say that I am not in favour of this or otherwise; I leave it to the House to decide.

Shri T. N. Singh (Uttar Pradesh): On a point of order, I wish to refer to article 242, Sir.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have disposed of this. I have left it to the House to decide. When the hon. Member has an opportunity he can say that this amendment is out of

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

order or otherwise. I shall leave it to the House to accept or reject it.

Shri T. N. Singh: My point of order is this: Clause (2) of article 242 says:

"The arrangements with respect to revenues collected in Coorg and expenses in respect of Coorg shall, until other provision is made in that behalf by the President by order, continue unchanged."

By this amendment, we are changing the administrative machinery.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not allowing the hon. Member to make a speech at this stage.

Shri T. N. Singh: I want to know whether it is possible to maintain the administrative procedure in Coorg with reference to revenues collected.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. There is no point of order in such matters. A particular amendment has been moved. Let me finish this amendment. Both the original as well as the subsequent amendment will come for discussion and hon. Members will have reasonable opportunities to speak.

Capt. A. P. Singh: My point has been brought out clearly to the House, that is that the Vindhya Pradesh people are dissatisfied with this Bill and we are also dissatisfied. Whether my amendment is in order or not is a different question. Even the Government could have brought forward such a Bill but they did not. We could not incorporate all the details as to what should be applicable and what should not be applicable as that would have taken a long time and again that would also become superfluous if the Government did not agree. I have given this idea to the Government to let the Government know that this can be done. If my amendment is not vague, I take it that it would be in order. So the Government can do it and I hope that they will bring forward another Bill for Vindhya Pradesh. Pandit Kunzru stated that I should have said that this should not be applicable etc., but I wish to say that I never said that nothing should be given to Vindhya Pradesh. Pandit Kunzru belongs to a party which believes that whatever is good or bad should be accepted and a fight should be put up for further concessions. I do not see how he came to this conclusion that I should not speak like that.

11 A.M.

As regards the other States, there is one point about Bilaspur. That has

been left quite out of the question. That is a tiny State and there is nobody here to say anything about that poor State. It is said that a great portion of it will be merged in a dam that is being constructed. It will be physically merged nothing to say about its political merger. As long as there are persons...

Shri Gopalaswami: The hon. Member means submerged.

Capt. A. P. Singh: Yes; not only merged, but submerged.

As long as there are persons living in that State, why should that portion be left without any democratisation? If it be not possible to give them a separate entity, they may be merged with Himachal Pradesh. Their area is contiguous with the area of Himachal Pradesh. My point is that no part or no person in India should be deprived of democratic rights. That has been our stand. It is a slur on us, on Government, on Parliament that still there are some persons in India who do not enjoy democratic rights. We must try to remove that slur as early as possible. All these distinctions must be done away with. That should be kept in mind by the hon. Minister because he represents here that Government which represents the nation and the Congress. My purpose in bringing in this amendment was that it should not be said that something is being done which is not in accordance with the spirit of the report submitted by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to the All India Congress Committee. I will read from that report and you will see that he has stated that after the elections there will be no difference. But, in this Bill, the differences have been perpetuated. These are the words of the Prime Minister.....

An Hon. Member: It is not relevant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is after the elections.

Capt. A. P. Singh: It is quite relevant because he has submitted the report as Prime Minister.

Dr. C. D. Pande (Uttar Pradesh): As a member of the Congress.

Capt. A. P. Singh: This is what has been said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is after the elections.

Capt. A. P. Singh: That is another point. This Bill does not implement the proposal here. After the elections, there should have been no difference; but this Bill provides for differences. I say it is a bad augury. Nor is the Congress election manifesto implement-

ed. The spirit of the Prime Minister's statement is not implemented. That is my complaint. This is what he has said:

"There has been a good deal of feeling in Congress circles more especially in the States which are called Parts 'B' and 'C' States, in regard to their present status. There can be and should be no discrimination between different parts of India."

Mark these words:

"There can be and should be no discrimination between different parts of India. This particular classification arose out of certain historical and administrative necessities of the moment and cannot be permanent. It has, however, to be realised that certain parts of India are different or have developed differently during past years....."

In regard to Parts 'B' and 'C' States, the chief difficulty has been the lack of a Legislature in most of them. As soon as these come into existence, the differences between them and the Part 'A' States will largely disappear."

Note 'largely'. Then he defines 'largely':

"Where such Legislatures and Ministries exist, there is no reason for any differentiation to continue, except for the fact that there are certain covenants which have to be honoured."

Therefore, he uses the word 'largely'. In no covenant has it been stated that the people of the States belonging to Parts B or C should not be given democratic rights. Rather it is in this spirit, whether it be real or not, that their people will get full democratic rights that they have handed over their States to the Government. Therefore, I would rather say that it is going against the spirit of the covenants that these States are not being given full democratic rights like those belonging to Part A States. Even if the covenant is to be considered to be sacred, it is much more reasonable that we should get full rights along with others.

Again, the same thing has been repeated in the Congress election manifesto.

Shri Gopaldaswami: Why not read the whole of it?

Capt. A. P. Singh: "The Tribal folk who are a fine....."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Does the hon. Member proceed to read the whole book?

Capt. A. P. Singh: I was under the impression that perhaps I had left out some portions which he might consider to be to his own benefit.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is all said in good humour. If the hon. Minister wants to rely on any portion, he knows how best to use it. The hon. Member need not read the whole thing. He may go on.

Capt. A. P. Singh: This Bill has not been formulated even according to this report. After this report, this Bill should have been drastically changed as has been suggested by me. They themselves should have brought forward a Bill with all the provisions applicable to Part A States being made applicable to other States whether Part B or Part C. This has not been done by the Government. I am sorry that they have not gone so far as they should have gone.

As regards the other points, I shall make my submissions when we come to other clauses. There are other amendments also. I shall speak on them when they are taken up by the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, for the proviso to sub-clause (2) of the proposed clause 1, substitute:

"Provided that all the provisions of Part A States in the Constitution shall *mutatis mutandis* apply to Vindhya Pradesh".

Shri Sidhva: I beg to move:

(i) In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, in sub-clause (2) of the proposed clause 3, omit "Ajmer, Bhopal".

(ii) In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, after sub-clause (5) of the proposed clause 3, add:

"(6) That the States of Ajmer and Bhopal be merged into Rajasthan and Vindhya Pradesh, former immediately and latter as early as possible".

While we were last time discussing this Bill, we told the hon. Minister that it was a retrograde measure. We are so glad that the hon. Minister acceded to the request of this House by bringing in these new changes. I generally

[Shri Sidhva]

approve of the various new clauses that he has introduced. Last time we were also told that Ajmer would go to Rajasthan and that in regard to Bhopal he would do his best to see that it was merged in Vindhya Pradesh after persuading the Nawab.

An Hon. Member: Madhya Bharat.

Shri Sidhva: Yes; Madhya Bharat.

He told us that it was not possible for him to persuade the Nawab to this view but that he would continue his efforts at persuasion and reach a conclusion before the Bill was made into law and put into operation. But my point is that although I have always been stating that Ajmer and Bhopal should be democratically administered, that they should have democracy in them, at the same time I feel that Ajmer which was originally quite willing to go into Rajasthan has now abruptly changed its attitude—I do not know by what numbers or portion of its population—and now wants to remain a separate State. I would certainly have agreed to this proposition, but then Ajmer and Bhopal are too small and tiny and that for them to be left separate would be dangerous and derogatory for the whole country. I do not know whether the hon. Minister has ascertained the wish of the inhabitants of the place by means of a plebiscite or a referendum or sample survey as to whether they would like to remain separate or be merged with the adjoining territory. In the matter of Alwar and Dholpur, the House will remember there was strong difference of opinion whether they should be affiliated with Uttar Pradesh or with Rajasthan. And Sardar Patel appointed a committee consisting of Shri Shankarrao Deo, Shri Himatsingka and myself to ascertain the opinion of the people. We conducted a sort of sample survey to ascertain the opinion of the people and we submitted our report. I do not know whether the hon. Minister has adopted any such steps in this present instance. Of course, my hon. friend Pandit M. B. Bhargava is the leader of the people there and certainly I would attach importance to what he says. But I do not know whether the people have been asked to give their choice as to whether it would be to their advantage to remain separate or as part of Rajasthan. Rajasthan is deficit to the extent of a crore of rupees and Ajmer too is deficit and so probably both shirk the responsibility and probably Ajmer thinks that the Centre will always be at its disposal for financial matters, and so it wants to remain separate.

According to the last census Ajmer has a population of 5,89,000 and a revenue of Rs. 33,98,600. But its expenditure in 1950-51 is Rs. 64 lakhs. And so.....

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: On a point of order, Sir. I would like to know whether any discussion of the question of merger is not absolutely outside the scope of the Bill. The entire framework of the Bill presupposes that these States in Part C are to continue as separate entities and there is a scheme in this Bill to provide certain Constitutions for these entities. My hon. friend's amendments are to the effect that these two States should be merged and that should be provided for in the Bill itself. My submission is that that is absolutely out of order, because it goes basically against each and every provision of the Bill. And secondly it amounts to negating the positive clauses that there shall be a particular Constitution for these States, including Ajmer and Bhopal. By one of his amendments my hon. friend wants to delete Ajmer and Bhopal and then he says that they should be merged with Rajasthan and Vindhya Pradesh. Apart from the question of merit upon which I do not want to say anything at this stage, but reserve my right of reply to a later stage, so far as the constitutional aspect of these amendments is concerned, my respectful submission is that this negating a positive proposition enunciated in the Bill. My friend can oppose the particular clauses of the Bill, but he cannot by this back-door amendment introduce the matter of merger. That is absolutely foreign to the entire scheme of the Bill and to each and every provision of it. This Bill provides for the Constitution of these separate entities and the amendment goes to the extent of stating that these entities should be merged with Rajasthan and Vindhya Pradesh.

Shri Gopalaswami: May I reinforce my hon. friend's arguments by referring to the provisions of the Constitution. Merger can take place only by a law made by Parliament, under article 3 of the Constitution. No Bill for bringing about an increase in the area of one State or a diminution in the area of another State etc. can be introduced in Parliament "except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the boundaries of any State etc., etc., the views of the Legislature of the State or, as the case may be, of each of the States both with respect to the proposal to introduce the Bill and with respect to the provisions

thereof have been ascertained by the President." And what applies to a Bill, I submit, should apply to an amendment. Therefore, I think the amendments are out of order.

Shri Sidhva: But my point is somewhat on the same analogy as the point we were discussing before I rose to speak. Of course, according to article 3 of the Constitution Parliament may by law increase or decrease the area of any State. But here in the proposals made by the hon. Minister there is a definite mention of the allocation of seats in the Legislative Assemblies of the States of Ajmer and Bhopal. Though I say that Ajmer and Bhopal may be deleted, at the same time I am desirous that they should have a democratic system of Government and that they can get it by joining with Rajasthan and Vindhya Pradesh. If the House decides on these lines, then of course some law on the lines of article 3 will naturally be enacted. Just now Pandit Bhargava, when replying to the amendment of Capt. A. P. Singh, said that his amendment was in order. My amendment is on the same lines but because it affects his own State, probably the same arguments do not apply here.

Pandit M. E. Bhargava: No, they are quite different.

Shri Sidhva: I feel that the scope of the discussion cannot be curtailed because of article 3 of the Constitution and the amendment may not be ruled as out of order. The House can consider this proposition and if that is accepted, then the necessary law according to the Constitution will be enacted.

✓ **Shri Rajagopalachari:** I am sorry to add to the discussion on the point of order, which should be as little as possible. But we have heard so many arguments on this point that I think I should take part in it.

With regard to the last point, I take it that the hon. Member wants the two amendments to be taken together because they are interconnected. He would not simply delete Ajmer and Bhopal and not make any provision for them. So he has very properly dealt with them together. But I submit that his second amendment is open to the same objections as were rightly pointed out by Pandit Kunzru, *mutatis mutandis*. Here the words are "as early as possible". I submit that we are gradually drifting into converting clauses of the Bill into mere resolutions or directives to the Government to take certain steps. That is entirely out of order.

255 FSD

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A point of order has been raised regarding the admissibility of the amendments tabled by Mr. Sidhva. Both are connected in that, one wants to delete Ajmer and Bhopal from the list of States regulated by this Bill and the other that they must be merged with the States of Rajasthan and Vindhya Pradesh respectively. Objection has been raised to the amendments as being out of order on the ground that they involve a constitutional change under article 3 of the Constitution. Mr. Sidhva evidently accepts this position that it comes under article 3. Unfortunately article 3 requires the President's previous approval, recommendation or initiative and such a thing has not happened so far as this matter is concerned. Therefore it does not satisfy the provisions of article 3 of the Constitution. Apart from the constitutional issue, whether this also should be decided in the same manner and left to Parliament as the previous one regarding the conversion of Part C into Part A States, I feel that there is much more serious objection to Shri Sidhva's second amendment. It is beyond the scope of the Bill. The Bill contemplates the provision of Legislatures for Part C States and those States are assumed to be separate entities in the Bill. On that single ground I rule the amendments as out of order.

Dr. Pattabhi rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. When I am on my legs no hon. Member should get up.

As was rightly pointed out by the hon. Home Minister, the second amendment states that the States of Ajmer and Bhopal be merged into Rajasthan and Vindhya Pradesh, former immediately and the latter as early as possible. It is more in the nature of a resolution saying that Parliament is of a certain opinion and leaving it to the executive to carry it out.....

Shri Gopaldaswami: There is a small matter to which I should like to draw the attention of the Chair. Mr. Sidhva's first amendment is an amendment to sub-clause (2) of my proposed clause 3. He wants that the words Ajmer and Bhopal should be omitted from that. That sub-clause (2) refers to the allocation of seats in the Legislative Assemblies of the States of Ajmer, Bhopal, Coorg, etc. I do not think that could be ruled out of order. What is really out of order is his second amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I was taking both the amendments together. It is not the intention of Mr. Sidhva that those States should go without any representation whatever. On the other hand

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

he suggests another scheme by which through merger they may get a better administration or Government. Therefore, I do not think that if his second amendment is out of order and the first one is in order, he would press for the latter. Let me not stand on technicality. I take it that these two amendments go together. (*Interruption*) Am I to understand that the hon. Member agrees with the hon. Minister and wants his first amendment to be taken separately?

Shri Sidhva: My second amendment has been ruled out of order but the first one is within the scope of the Bill.

Thakur Lal Singh (Bhopal): I have one word to say regarding Bhopal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have given my ruling on the point of order raised. There will be no more discussion. Mr. Sidhva may proceed to speak on his first amendment.

Shri Sidhva: I wanted to have democratic institutions in all these places but there was the technical difficulty. I am sorry I cannot change my opinion as far as deleting Ajmer and Bhopal are concerned, although they may re-

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member wants to create a deadlock and put pressure on the Government, main in the same position as at present.

Shri Sidhva: No deadlock, Sir. They will be under the Centre. I do not want any deadlock. Ajmer has a population of 5,89,000, its revenue is 33,98,600 and its expenditure is 63,86,000. Bhopal has a population of 7,85,000 and perhaps at present nine lakhs. Its revenue is 1,36,00,000 and its expenditure 1,70,46,000. If these two are made separate as contemplated in the Bill there will be further financial commitment to the central exchequer. I wonder whether it is advisable to have such big financial commitments for such small States. The two States are deficit to the tune of 50 to 60 per cent. and I am sure another 25 or 30 per cent. will be added to it if democratic form of Government is introduced there. Let me not be accused of being opposed to the introduction of democratic form of Government in those States but it was Pandit M. B. Bhargava who raised the technical point against my amendment. I do feel that in the interests of the States themselves they should not be kept separate.

Apart from the financial point of view, it would be very unfair that you

should create small, tiny States in the bigger context of the country. Whereas the Government were externally conservative in the beginning, they have now gone over to the extreme liberal view. They thought that Members desired a liberal attitude and therefore without considering the pros and cons of the situation from both the political and economic points of view they have agreed to this proposal. I do not mind if Government are prepared to incur extra expenditure. But on the political side do Government consider that it is fair to create tiny independent States?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is not the hon. Member trying to go into fundamentals? The question of their merger is ruled out of order. They are independent States and the only question is of conferring certain powers on the Legislatures. What is the use of going into the question again as to whether they should be separate units or not?

Shri Sidhva: Because they are going to be legislative units. I mentioned the expenditure and revenue of the States. If they are to be separate States there will be additional expense of 25 per cent. or more without any benefits to the people. The hon. Minister has not told the House what the resultant benefit to the people will be if they are to have separate Legislatures and a democratic form of Government. Is it desirable that such small States should be independent entities in the interest of the country as a whole? Tomorrow some city may say that it wants a separate State just as my friend Mr. Deshbandhu Gupta wants for Delhi. Perhaps in Delhi for several reasons there should be a democratic form of Government but it should not be made a policy. It is a dangerous policy to have small States with just a city surrounded by villages. The result will be that the economy of the country will be affected adversely, as it will throw a burden on the exchequer and at the same time I doubt very much whether the people will be benefited. Their right of voting for the Central Legislature will continue. Only they will not have a local Legislature.

I am very glad at the attitude of the Government in trying to give a democratic form of Government to these States and I welcome this move. As I have already stated I will be the last person to come in the way of Bhopal and Ajmer but we have to consider the question from all points

of view. Himachal Pradesh and Vindhya Pradesh stand on a different footing; they are big States. Even in the case of Coorg I was reluctant to include it, but they have already some kind of a Legislative Council and I do not want to deprive them of it. I have not studied the case of Manipur and Tripura, but I would certainly say that if they have no municipalities then Government should first take steps to establish municipalities there. Kutch is a big State and even then it has been deprived of the benefit of a local Legislature. Why? Because it is said, it is a strategic State. Whatever may be the reason you cannot deny that right. However, I understand about two months ago Kutch has been given municipalities; it is a very good thing—let them have these municipalities. Without any disrespect to anybody I should say that even the establishment of municipalities means a step in the grant of political rights. Kutch is a big State but you are not proposing to include it in the scheme. If Kutch, Manipur and Tripura could be omitted, I see no reason why Bhopal and Ajmer should be included and should be allowed to have their separate paraphernalia. I, therefore, commend my amendment for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar, in sub-clause (2) of the proposed clause 3, omit "Ajmer, Bhopal".

✓ **Shri Rajagopalachari:** I believe Mr. Sidhva's object is general and not merely a question of technical detail as to allocation. The clause to which he has given an amendment deals only with allocation. Probably what Mr. Sidhva wants is that in the proviso to clause 1, as now proposed, that is—

"Provided that the provisions of sections 3, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 22 shall not come into force in any of the States of Kutch, Manipur and Tripura until such date or dates as the Central Government may by notification in the Official Gazette appoint in this behalf",

Ajmer and Bhopal should be added. That would be the better way of bringing it about and not simply leaving the allocation deleted and leaving the administration of the State in the air.

Shri Sidhva: I agree; that is my view. If this is accepted all consequential amendments will take place. I agree with the hon. Minister.

Dr. Pattabhi rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me first place all the amendments before the House.

Capt. A. P. Singh: The hon. Minister moved the other day amendment to clauses 1 to 10. So there are some other amendments covering these clauses.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But now there are amendments to proposed clauses 1 to 3 before us.

Shri Rajagopalachari: Sub-clause (1) of the proposed clause 1 was put aside on the previous day.

Shri Gopalaswami: On Saturday, in your absence, it was decided that my amendment relates to clauses 1 to 10 of the original Bill. For those clauses: I proposed the substitution of three clauses. The amendments to these three clauses I think are being moved now. Mr. Sidhva's last amendment relates to clause 3.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: On the last day clauses 1 to 10 were before the House and all the amendments to those clauses were moved and then permission was given by the Chair that if any hon. Member wanted to move an amendment to those amendments it would be in order if such amendments were handed in up to this morning. So, clauses 1 to 10 are before the House but the amendment of the hon. Mover proposes three clauses; he wants to do away with the rest of the clauses. I would say that as there are ten clauses before the House, any amendment to them is quite in order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I intend proceeding according to what has been arranged on the last day. The hon. Minister has moved three clauses in the place of clauses 1 to 10 by way of an amendment. I have allowed amendments to be moved to these clauses which are part of the amendment to the original clauses 1 to 10. A suggestion was made that we should confine ourselves only to clause 2 at this stage.

Shri Rajagopalachari: Sub-clause (1) of clause 1 of my hon. colleague's amendment was definitely put aside—there are some amendments to that also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It relates to short title. Then there is sub-clause (2).

Shri Rajagopalachari: That has been discussed now and amendments moved. Only short title, that is sub-clause (1) of clause 1, remains.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Excepting the amendments on the short title, that is sub-clause (1) of clause 1, all the amendments on clauses 1 to 3 will be moved and discussed as a whole and then voted upon one by one.

Shri T. N. Singh: On a point of order. Under article 242(2) of the Constitution this Bill, I submit, cannot be proceeded with unless a special order is made by the President in respect of Coorg. Clause 2 of article 242 says:

"The arrangements with respect to revenues collected in Coorg and expenses in respect of Coorg shall, until other provision is made in that behalf by the President by order, continue unchanged."

This Bill contemplates a change in the administrative set-up so far as revenue and expenditure are concerned. Article 242 specifically lays down that no change in the administrative set-up, so far as revenue and expenditure are concerned, shall be made except by order of the President. It may be said that article 240(2) covers this contingency, but since article 242(2) comes after article 240, I submit that to that extent, so far as Coorg is concerned, article 240 stands modified. I shall be thankful for your ruling on this point.

Shri Gopaldaswami: May I say a word on this point? Clause (2) of article 242 was intended to relate to conditions when Coorg was to continue as it is and there were certain arrangements already in existence as regards the revenues collected and the expenses incurred in respect of Coorg. These arrangements were to continue until the President by order changed them. Now, we are making a law as to what should be done with these revenues and expenditures as part of provisions covering the matters contained in article 240(1). Article 240(2) to which my hon. friend did refer does say that any such law, that is, the law on the passing of which we are at present engaged, if that law, makes a change which constitutes an amendment of the Constitution whether that amendment relates to an article which precedes article 240 or which succeeds it—then notwithstanding the fact that it contains any provision which amends, or has the effect of amending those articles, that will be considered to be an amendment of the Constitution without going through the procedure prescribed in article 368. I think therefore that it would be quite in order for this law to deal with something which might change even article 242 (2).

Shri T. N. Singh: I submit that the question of amendment of the Constitution does not arise so far as my point of order is concerned. I am only referring to this aspect of the problem that we are making certain changes in the administrative machinery as a result of this Bill, including Coorg State. Since a provision has been specifically made in the Constitution for the administration of Coorg and its revenues and expenditures, I say that that procedure should be followed and if anything in respect of Coorg has to be done it should be done by an order of the President only. The wording used is that, the present set-up, in Coorg "shall continue unchanged" unless it is modified by an order of the President.

Shri Poonacha (Coorg): In furtherance of what has already been explained by the hon. Minister of States, I would like to submit that the administrative arrangements so far as Coorg is concerned in respect of collection of revenues and incurring of expenditure are on a different footing from other Part C States, that is to say, Coorg has a Legislative Council and its own separate financial arrangement, that is, a budget of its own, and the same arrangements are supposed to be continued till the President by order made suitable changes in them. In accordance with the provisions of the present Bill—Clause 44—every Part C State will have its own Consolidated Fund, that is to say, it will have its own annual financial statement and a budget of its own. Since Coorg has already got one, the passing of this Bill will not in any way effect any change in the arrangements that already exist for the collection of revenue or the incurring of expenditure. Thus, there is absolutely no basis for raising a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Sub-clause (2) of article 242 is said to be standing in the way of this piece of legislation so far as Coorg is concerned. So far as the allocation of seats to the Legislature etc. is concerned, it comes definitely under article 240 and also under article 242(1) where Parliament is given the right to provide for those things and this Bill does seek to provide the constitution, powers and functions of the Legislative Council. The only other question is that so far as article 242(2) is concerned, any provision that is sought to be made in this Bill affecting the arrangements with respect to revenues will be *ultra vires* of this Parliament as being opposed to the provisions of the Constitution. Clause 44 of this Bill relates to the Consolidated Fund of the Part C States and when we come to that

Clause it will be time for us to consider how far that provision is inconsistent with article 242(2). At this stage, I am afraid this objection is a little premature. As at present advised, I consider that article 240 will override the provisions of article 242(2). That is my present opinion. It is not necessary to give an opinion on a hypothetical question. When we come to Clause 44, I shall decide that point.

Capt. A. P. Singh: I beg to move:

In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, after part (g) of the proposed clause 2, insert:

“(h) *Rajya Samchalak*—means in relation to a Part C State a Chief Commissioner or a Lieutenant-Governor, in other words the head of a Part C State.”

We have been fighting whether there should be a “Chief Commissioner” or a “Lieutenant-Governor”. This question has been discussed so many times. Once it was said by the Prime Minister that we might as well find out some Hindi word and this will put an end to the controversy, because both these words “Chief-Commissioner” and “Lieutenant-Governor” have a bad history behind them. When there was a Chief Commissioner in C.P. and other Provinces, a regular agitation took place for a Lieutenant-Governor’s Province. When it became a Lieutenant-Governor’s Province, C.P. and other fought that it should be a Governor’s Province. So, both these words have got a good record in the past. So, as suggested by the Prime Minister that we might find a Hindi word to meet the demands of the people, I have chosen the word *Rajya Samchalak*. For “Governor” they have used the word *Rajpal*. So, for a Part C State’s head I have chosen the word *Rajya Samchalak* which may refer to either a Chief Commissioner or a Lieutenant-Governor.

Next, I move the other amendment of mine. It is consequential to this.

I beg to move:

In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, for sub-clause (3) of the proposed clause 2, substitute:

“(3) Any reference in the Act to the Chief Commissioner shall be construed as a reference to the *Rajya Samchalak*.”

Then I move my next amendment.

I beg to move:

In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, for sub-clause (2) of the proposed clause 3, substitute:

“(2) the allocation of seats in the Legislative Assembly of each State shall be as shown in the Third Schedule.”

If my amendment is accepted by the House, all the States, including Tripura, Manipur and Kutch will have Legislative Assemblies.

As regards the word *samchalak* if the hon. Minister suggests some other better name, I shall have no objection to accepting it. But we do feel that some Hindi name is absolutely necessary, as we have in the case of Parts A and B States—*Rajpal* in the case of the former and *Rajpramukh* in the case of the latter.

Shri Rajagopalachari: May I ask the hon. Member to consider the omission of the words “in other words the head of a Part C State” in his amendment. There is no necessity for introducing a new sort of disquisitionary phrase “in other words the head of a Part C State”.

Capt. A. P. Singh: I have no objection to the omission of those words.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments moved:

(i) In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, after part (g) of the proposed clause 2, insert:

“(h) *Rajya Samchalak*—means in relation to a Part C State a Chief Commissioner or a Lieutenant-Governor”.

(ii) In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, for sub-clause (3) of the proposed clause 2, substitute:

“(3) Any reference in the Act to the Chief Commissioner shall be construed as a reference to the *Rajya Samchalak*”.

(iii) In the amendment proposed by the hon. Shri N. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, for sub-clause (2) of the proposed clause 3, substitute:

“(2) the allocation of seats in the Legislative Assembly of each State shall be as shown in the Third Schedule”.

Shri Dwivedi: I would like to suggest an amendment to the effect that

[Shri Dwivedi]

the words "Chief Commissioner" be dropped from the Bill wherever they occur and the word "Samchalak" substituted in their place.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: "Chief Commissioner" is a designation which is appearing in the Constitution.

At any rate, I am not prepared to waive notice for the amendment.

Dr. Pattabhi: I should like to support the amendment moved by my hon. friend Mr. Sidhva—to support the omission of the two names, namely, Bhopal and Ajmer. I should like to forewarn my hon. friends from Bhopal and Ajmer that they should not be surprised by what appears to be a reactionary step on my part. Mr. Sidhva has elaborately dealt with the financial and the economic aspects of the problem. They are of great importance. But there is an aspect which is seldom thought of, which is of greater importance and has a better bearing on the subject and the issue before us than the economic or the financial. There is a moral issue in the matter.

You take up a small State and magnify it into a dominion or a State and then invest it with all the paraphernalia of Government, confer a Ministry upon it; these Ministers are apt to hang on to those places. Your object, the object of the people of the States as well as the ultimate object of the Government is obviously to merge them in one or other of the adjoining bigger States. Now that purpose will be defeated once you create these diminutive Ministers in these States. We have already seen it in other States. I should not like to wound the feelings of my hon. friends by mentioning the names of the States.

I would only like to take the instance of Coorg. For a long time Coorg has been hanging loose, not as an independent body, because the Agent of Mysore was the Chief Commissioner of Coorg. When it came to a question of allocating Coorg in the economy of an Independent India we met with the utmost difficulties. Of the population of Coorg, possibly one lakh and 50 thousand, 40 thousand are indigenous Coorgis and the remaining are domiciled people. They have cut themselves clean into two divisions—one standing for an independent existence and the other being in favour of merger either with Mysore or with Bombay or with Madras, or with the Karnatak State to be. So that, once you create a sense of independence and consciousness of independence on the part of these

small States, the general tendency, more especially when a body of diminutive Ministers are created, is to perpetuate the existing state and the existing offices. I mean no derogation to those friends who are occupying or are likely to occupy such places, but the common purpose of both the Government and of the vast majority of the people will be defeated by the setting up of these petty Ministries. I would therefore like to ask my friends Pandit Mukut Biharilal Bhargava and Thakur Lal Singh to bear with me when I say...

Thakur Lal Singh: I wanted to say something in favour of merger, but I was not allowed.

Dr. Pattabhi: I am sure the Deputy-Speaker will allow you to speak.

In spite of what appears to be reactionary on my part, I venture to make this suggestion in the best interests of the two States and the ultimate objective which is sought to be attained both by the Government and the people of the States.

12 Noon.

Thakur Lal Singh: I would like to say a word about the formation of Bhopal, how it came into existence. It will not be a very long story. Bhopal came into existence after a covenant was signed between the Nawab of Bhopal and the Government of India. I would like to say that the signing of this covenant was not happy, and according to me it was not quite legal. Our Constitution and the Constitutions of the world say that by such covenants or agreements we should give greater rights to the people concerned and not take away their rights from them. The covenant in regard to Bhopal is the only covenant by which the rights of the people were taken away. Other covenants say that so many lakhs or crores of rupees are to be given to the Princes and they have to relinquish all their rights in regard to the governance of those States. Bhopal is the single State in regard to which it was laid down that the people of that State will have no democratic rights about the management of their own affairs for a period of five years. I should say it was not proper and not very wise, so to say. It was laid down that Bhopal would be under a Chief Commissioner and the people of the State would be denied the rights of democracy. That covenant which is against giving the rights to the people is no covenant. It is just like the agreement which we hear in the story of Shylock. And any agreement which is not proper and

which is against the prevailing laws of the State should not be adhered to and should not be taken into account. So I say that that covenant should not be agreed to, at least that portion of it by which the Fundamental Rights of the people are taken away and they are not given any hand in the administration of the State. The Nawab may be given any amount of pension which the Government of India thinks proper. But on the question of merger or non-merger of the State, to keep it as a separate State without giving any rights to the people is not proper. Therefore, I say that the bringing in of this clause in that agreement was not only illegal but improper. It ought not to have been a Part C State but should have been merged long ago either with Madhya Pradesh or Madhya Bharat—with any of the adjoining States—as other States have been. This is my first point, and it should be taken note of by the House that by accepting this covenant we have been deprived of our rights.

The second thing is the taking away of those rights which are now being given. From the very beginning, in the informal meeting, I insisted upon our hon. States Minister that if he agreed to merge Bhopal as soon as possible, then I would agree to these things, otherwise not. And he promised that if the Nawab of Bhopal agreed to merge it—which he said he would certainly do because it was in the interests of the people—it would be done. Therefore, I abstained from making further objections. If our hon. States Minister agrees to this that after the Nawab returns from Europe he will put this proposition before him, "Why are you depriving the people of the State who are fellows who did nothing but started a merger movement?"—simply because the Nawab was not acting actually according to the wishes of the chiefs who were ready to merge it, but trying to keep his State aloof—if he agrees to that, I have no objection if Bhopal is included in this. The hon. the States Minister day before yesterday made a statement on the floor of the House, which was not very clear to me, that the Nawab would be asked to accede to this proposal to merge the State as soon as possible. Then of course there will be no elections and all this will be only on paper, and before long it will have merged with an adjoining area. If that is not possible and our Government says, "we agree to the injustice which has been done to the people", we will somehow or other abide by the wrong act done to our Government by the Nawab and we will abide by whatever is given to us.

Shri Sidhva: Why? You stick to merger.

Thakur Lal Singh: I am sticking to merger. What I was saying was that this was a wrong act which had already been perpetrated on the people of Bhopal by the wrong advice of His Highness. He said, "I will have such Government by which you will have no right". This was a sort of punishment given to us. I do not know why our Government is abiding by this.

Shri Gopaldaswami: Am I to understand the hon. Member as suggesting that if merger can take place within a reasonable period of time he would drop Bhopal from this Bill altogether?

Thakur Lal Singh: If merger takes place before effect is given to this, I have no objection.

Shri T. N. Singh: The hon. Member was referring to the fact that some assurance had been given by the hon. Minister of States that Bhopal would be merged if the Ruler of Bhopal agreed. If he does not agree, will it amount to a veto of the assurance? (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Any questions or doubts that may arise in the minds of hon. Members may be put to the hon. Minister once for all instead of getting up again and again.

Thakur Lal Singh: That covenant was no covenant. It was like Shylock's agreement to take one pound of flesh. This takes away the rights from the people and therefore this ought not to be adhered to. That is what I said.

Shri Dwivedi: I wanted to say something in this connection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I want to give an opportunity to the Members belonging to the Part C States early. After all the Part C States are exhausted I will think of the others.

An Hon. Member: But others also have a right to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I know. But preference will be given to the Part C States' Members. (Interruption). Have I not got the right to choose? Until closure is moved all hon. Members are entitled to stand up and I cannot prevent them.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I would request you not to accept closure unless there has been reasonable discussion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall decide at that time. ●

Shri Dwivedi: So far as the provisions of this Bill, as it is sought to be amended, are concerned I have to thank Government for their broad-heartedness to have given the Part C States under the constitution as much democratic rights as possible, excepting of course one or two provisions about which I shall refer when they are dealt with in the House in due course.

For the present I want to bring to the notice of the House that as regards Vindhya Pradesh there is a great misunderstanding in the minds of the hon. Members here. The difference between Vindhya Pradesh and other Part C States is this that the people of Vindhya Pradesh reported to the Government about the misdeeds of the Ministers there and we requested Government to take over the Government of Vindhya Pradesh in their own hands for the purpose of better administration. It was for this reason that Vindhya Pradesh was brought from the level of a Part B State to that of a Part C State. As regards the other States, no such thing has been done. In regard to the maladministration in any other Part C, B or A State, no such representation has been made by the people. Because of the honesty of the people of Vindhya Pradesh it was converted from a Part B to a Part C State. It is strange that because the people were honest and brought to the notice of Government all the things happening there, they should be deprived of the privileges which they enjoyed before the enforcement of the Constitution. So all the differences arise. The people of Vindhya Pradesh have enjoyed a full fledged democratic set-up of a Part B State and now whatever democratization is being given to the people of Vindhya Pradesh falls short of their expectations and that is why we have been requesting the hon. Minister, so far as Vindhya Pradesh is concerned, to give as much as possible within the framework of this Bill and later on to consider the case of Vindhya Pradesh alone, if it is possible, to bring it to the level of any other State. Various provisions of the Constitution have been read here and difficulties raised for Vindhya Pradesh being given as much powers as a Part A State. I respect those provisions and I know that within the framework of the Constitution, that is, under article 239 or 240, it is not possible to bring the Government of Vindhya Pradesh to the level of a Part A State, but at the same time I would appeal to Government that so far as Vindhya Pradesh is concerned, they should be prepared to give as much power as possible or

lift its status by constitutional remedies.

In one of the clauses of this Bill, it is provided that the Chief Commissioner shall be presiding over the meetings of the Cabinet. That certainly is very objectionable so far as democracy is concerned. I am sure there is no Member in this House who will agree with this provision. I would, therefore, appeal to the hon. Minister, if it is possible, to remove this difficulty. He may make it possible for the Chief Ministers to preside over the meetings of the Cabinet. After all the general superintendence and control of the Central Government is there and the overriding power of Parliament is there with respect to the Concurrent List and the State List. We respect the view that the Central Government shall have final powers in matters where there is difference between the Chief Commissioner or the Lieutenant-Governor on the one hand and the Council of Ministers on the other. There should be no mistrusting so far as the people are concerned. I can tell you that a Chief Commissioner, however enlightened and experienced he may be, is different from the common worker who comes to the forefront by a sheer spirit of sacrifice. The Government employee with all the knowledge and experience that he may possess can be entrusted with any kind of secretarial work but in Free India there should be a representative Government and when a vacancy arises of the office of a Governor or a Chief Commissioner or a Lieutenant-Governor, it does not behove the Government of free India to nominate a person from the service class to head over people who are elected by a large number of people.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA
in the Chair]

In my opinion, the whole election business should be put aside if we are going to be headed over by persons unelected and brought from the service class, in any Legislature or an elected Government. In part A States we have accepted that public men can be appointed as Governors. In Part B States, the *Rajpramukhs* are there and they shall continue to be the constitutional heads. The difficulty does not arise in small Part C States but in States like Himachal and Vindhya Pradesh. Therefore, I suggest that somehow or the other it should be possible that the Chief Commissioner should be either a public man or he should be an elected person.

Otherwise, it is not in fitness of things that persons of this category should be provided to preside over the meetings of the Cabinets. There should be some provision of law that they should be persons who come into office after tried public life after model of the President of India if they are not duly elected. This is a drawback in this Bill which hits us most and therefore I would request that before the Bill is passed, somehow or the other, it should be possible to provide that the present Chief Commissioners will not be allowed to preside at the meetings of the Cabinets and secondly that the office of the Chief Commissioner should be held either by an elected man or he should be nominated from amongst some distinguished public men of eminence and of respectability from any other State in India. I do not say that they should come from Part C States only. They may come from Part A or Part B from among the people of any corner of India. My suggestion is that the elected members of Legislatures should not be forced to work under this shadow of a red-tape Chief Commissionership. It is my considered view that whatever may be the constitution and the provisions of this Bill, the present Chief Commissioners inherit one great drawback and it is red tapism. We had expected that the administration of Vindhya Pradesh would be better as soon as it was taken over as a Centrally-administered area but since the Chief Commissioner has gone there, he has not consulted popular opinion so far as the running of the administration is concerned. He runs the Government entirely on his own whim and that whimsical Government cannot be supposed to be a representative Government. I repeat that there have been drawbacks in the administration of Vindhya Pradesh; there have been serious breaches of law and order and various kinds of other undesirable activities going on there and the Chief Commissioner has not been able to control them because of his individual character. If he had consulted the opinion of popular public men, these things would not have happened and I therefore, appeal that this point of view should be kept in mind by Government.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: I rise to speak a few words in respect of the amendment moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Sidhva. At the very outset, I would like to inform my learned friend, the Mover of the amendment and also the House that I could not fall into the category of either the existing diminutive or petty Ministers

or would-be diminutive or petty Ministers. Therefore, whatever remarks I make may be judged on their own merits. I could very well understand my friend, Mr. Sidhva if he had moved an amendment deleting not Ajmer and Bhopal but Coorg and Delhi also from the category of those States to which a limited kind of provincial autonomy is being conceded by this measure. To seek by this amendment the omission or deletion of Ajmer and Bhopal and to retain Delhi and Coorg and at the same time to argue in one and the same breath that these tiny states should no longer exist and should be washed out of the face of the map of India is something which I am unable to understand.

My hon. friends, Mr. Sidhva as also my revered leader, Dr. Patilabhi, must be aware that at one stage when the Union of Rajasthan was in the process of formation, I, on behalf of the people of Ajmer, raised a voice from the floor of this House that in the picture of the Union of Rajasthan, which was yet in the process of forming, Ajmer must have its historic and its due place. It was I that raised that voice but my voice fell not only on the deaf ear of the Government but also on the deaf ear of this House, with the result that my single voice on that score did not gather momentum or support from any quarter of the House, with the result that the Union of Rajasthan became an accomplished fact without Ajmer being a part and parcel of that Union. At that stage I had openly stated that culturally, linguistically, historically and geographically Ajmer was part of Rajasthan and therefore must be allowed to be a part and parcel of Rajasthan to play its historical part in the Union that was yet to be formed. But at that stage the argument advanced on behalf of the Government was that uptill then no part of the territory which was once a British territory and then the Union territory could be merged in a neighbouring State or a group of states governed by Rajpramukhs. That was the argument advanced on behalf of the Government. The people of Ajmer had to reconcile themselves to the *fait accompli* of a Union of Rajasthan without Ajmer being in the Union. Now, circumstances and conditions have changed since then. Territorial and administrative integration of Rajasthan has already reached completion or is on the verge of completion. In that integrated Rajasthan, Ajmer has no place. When that particular opportunity was lost, and when at that time, the voice of the people of Ajmer was not heard, the question

[Pandit M. B. Bhargava]

naturally arises whether this is the appropriate occasion for that.

Now, as I submitted when I raised the technical objection to my hon. friend Mr. Sidhva's amendment, in so far as this Bill is concerned, the question of merger of Ajmer in Rajasthan or any other contiguous State is absolutely outside the scope of the Bill and strictly irrelevant. The only question is whether the State of Ajmer should or should not be included in the category of those Part C States wherein this Bill envisages that a limited form of provincial autonomy should be conceded immediately or whether it should be included in the category of those states in respect of which there is a provision that it will be for the President to decide the appropriate moment when the other States should also enjoy the benefits conferred upon certain States by this Bill. That is the only narrow point upon which discussion should have centred. What is the logic behind the amendment of my hon. friend Mr. Sidhva? He has given two reasons. Firstly, it is a tiny State; it has got a sparse population. Secondly, he says that it is unwise to create such tiny States on the map of India.

Shri Sidhva: Revenue also.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: I am coming to that argument; have patience.

So far as this question is concerned, as I have submitted earlier, if my hon. friend had sought the deletion of Delhi and Coorg also from the category of tiny States, I could have easily understood and the House could have easily understood and appreciated the logic of his argument.

Shri Sidhva: I am prepared to explain my position.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: By this amendment, he only seeks the deletion of Ajmer and Bhopal. The argument of tiny States existing on the map of India does not hold good.

Shri Sidhva: My hon. friend, only yesterday, agreed to merger.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, he is not giving way.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: So far as the State of Coorg is concerned, what is the population? It is only 150,000. What is the population of Ajmer? It is more than five times the population of Coorg. If Coorg is not to be deleted, why should Ajmer be deleted now? What is the population of Bhopal or Manipur or Cutch? They are almost of the same size, in the vicinity of

seven or eight lakhs. Therefore, if my hon. friend Mr. Sidhva does not want the deletion of Coorg from the category of those States, why should he on that score try to take out Ajmer?

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Out of kindness for you.

Shri Sidhva: If you are agreeable, I am in favour of including Coorg. Are you agreeable?

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: I am arguing on the amendment of Mr. Sidhva; not with Mr. Sidhva, as he changes from time to time.

Shri Sidhva: You are changing; not I.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: So far as his amendment is concerned, it does not seek the deletion of Coorg. The argument advanced by him stands rebutted by his own omission to seek the deletion of Coorg.

Then, I come to the question of revenue. Does my hon. friend know that he does not want the deletion of Delhi on the ground of finances? What is the subsidy that the State of Delhi is receiving at present from the Central finances? It is over 1½ crores. What is the subsidy that Ajmer gets?

Shri Sidhva: I do not want that mistake to be repeated.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: According to the figures given by Mr. Sidhva himself, it is only about 50 lakhs. Does my hon. friend Mr. Sidhva know that the revenue figures that he has given are wrong?

Shri Goenka (Madras): As usual.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: They do not include the revenue from income-tax. If the income-tax figures are included, the deficit which is said to be so wide, will almost vanish.

Shri Sidhva: These figures were given to me by the Library; these are not my figures.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: These figures do not include the income-tax revenue.

Shri Sidhva: That is a different matter. Income-tax is not included in the revenue of any State.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: If my hon. friend cares to find out, he will see that the income-tax revenue, which is in the vicinity of 25 lakhs, is not included in this figure. Therefore, it is

not appropriate to place facts which are either dissociated from realities or do not represent the correct picture to this House. My submission, therefore, is that neither the tiny character of the State nor the revenues should be the sole criteria for determining whether the people of this area are entitled to a limited form of provincial autonomy which is envisaged by the provisions of this Bill. No question can be decided apart from the background of a particular State. What is the background of Ajmer? Since the dawn of British rule, since it was first ceded in 1818, it has been under Central administration. From 1871, it was taken out of the charge of Lieutenant-Governor of U.P. and made into a minor administration in which the Agent of the Governor-General in Rajputana was to act as the Governor. It is the oldest of all the Centrally-administered areas, older than either Coorg or Delhi. For all these years, in spite of the fact that to all intents and purposes, historically and geographically, it was part and parcel of Rajasthan, the Centre, for its own benefit and for its own ends, has kept it separate. When the Union of Rajasthan was formed, notwithstanding the repeated and forceful demands from the people, Ajmer was kept separate. Now, in the midst of the consideration of this Bill, it is said that it must be merged, without investigating into the conditions and terms on which the merger has to take place.

As has already been pointed out so ably by the hon. Minister of States, there are constitutional difficulties coming in the way of merger. He referred to article 3. That is there. I again draw the attention of my hon. friend Mr. Sidhva to the provisions of article 239 which lays down that at best what the Central Government can do at present is to administer or govern the State of Ajmer through the instrumentality of a neighbouring Part A or Part B State. It cannot merge the identity of Ajmer as the Constitution stands at present. It can, instead of administering through a Lieutenant-Governor or Chief Commissioner, administer it through the Ruler of a neighbouring area. And that too, the Central Government is not competent under the provisions of article 239 to do unless and until it is assured that the majority of the people of the State want. That is the condition incorporated in article 239 itself. Consequently, it is not a valid argument to say today that irrespective of the wishes of the people, because it suits the financial convenience of this Government, it should be merged with a neighbouring State. I submit, that in this matter, the determining factor should be the

wishes of the people.

There is one other argument that has been advanced. To that argument, coming as it does, from a revered leader like Dr. Pattabhi, we have to give due consideration. It is said that if a certain arrangement of the character envisaged in this Bill once comes into existence in a tiny State, then, according to those who advance that argument, it is likely to create vested interests. It is likely to bring into existence a number of ambitious, diminutive or petty Ministers. And this would tend to increase the argument against merger and the opposition to merger would, according to the speaker, gather more and more momentum. I submit the fallacy of this argument is not far to seek. What is the picture incorporated in the provisions of this Bill? Notwithstanding the amendments, the powers that you give to Ajmer or to any other Part C States are only such as would keep them under the thumb of the Centre. Let me invite your kind attention to provisions of the new clause 18A that is sought to be amended by the new amendment of which notice has been given. It will be open to the Chief Commissioner to speak in the Assembly, and otherwise take part in the proceedings of the Assembly and influence the decisions of the Assembly. Similarly in clause 41, the scheme of the Bill is that whenever the Chief Commissioner is present, he would preside over the Council of Ministers and the Chief Minister—poor fellow—will have the right to preside only if by sheer accident or some chance the Chief Commissioner is absent. Not only that. If you refer to clause 45, you will find that the Chief Commissioner as also the Council of Ministers will be under the perpetual and general control of the President. The Chief Commissioner as also the Council of Ministers shall be bound to act in accordance with any directions that may be issued by the President from time to time. Similarly the new clause 46 envisages that the President, as soon as he finds either on report from the Chief Commissioner or otherwise, that he is unable to carry on the administration under the provisions of this Bill, he may ride rough-shod over the entire Constitution and suspend it. Consequently, if you keep this picture before your mind, the argument that has been advanced that if a scheme of this character is enforced in the State of Ajmer, it is likely to create vested interests loses all force. The provisions to which I have made cursory references now will convince any dispassionate and honest man that there is absolutely no possibility of such a thing happening. If the House had

[Pandit M. B. Bhargava]

heard patiently the hon. Minister, it would have seen that he made it absolutely clear that whatever scheme is envisaged by this Bill is only provisional in character, till Government takes a decision regarding merging the identity of the States with other States. (Interruption) I would remind Shri Sidhva, who has been such a redoubtable champion of the cause of the oppressed and suppressed, whether he has not said that if merger was not possible immediately, then the people of these areas should have the same democratic rights as their brethren in the Part A and Part B States. If this is a fact and it is a reasonable demand of the people of Ajmer—a demand which no Member reared in the democratic tradition can deny—may I ask the House and the Chair whether it is not necessary and appropriate that Mr. Sidhva's amendment should be rejected and till the merger comes about Ajmer should have the same rights as the people of other States?

One thing I wish to make clear. Immediate merger is impracticable constitutionally, as I have already pointed out and for all practical purposes it is out of the question. Certain things have to be worked out before the merger takes place. We will have to see what will be the administrative set-up. The level of the services that exist in that part of the country is absolutely different from that in the neighbouring State of Rajasthan. Besides, there are certain educational, medical and other facilities that exist today in Ajmer, upon which the Central Government has been spending money. What will become of these medical, educational and other developmental aspects? The Rajasthan budget is a deficit one today. It will take time for it to grow up in strength. There are vast mineral resources there which can be tapped. But the time is yet to come. But what will be the fate of the people of the province if at this stage, irrespective of the effects which this step is likely to have on the people, such an action is taken? Not only constitutionally but also for all practical purposes it will be impracticable to suggest an immediate merger without going deeply into the financial and other implications of such a step as also the question of the political, educational and other facilities that the people enjoy at present. For these reasons I submit that the amendment of Mr. Sidhva should be rejected.

Before I sit down I have to express my thanks to the hon. Minister of States and the hon. Home Minister as

also the hon. Prime Minister.... (Shri Sidhva: At whose cost?) because at the informal conference held on the 4th my State was not originally included. I have to place on record my sincere gratitude to all the three hon. Ministers who were kind enough (Shri Sondhi: What about the House?) to be convinced of the reason and justice of our case and were kind enough to include my State in the category of those States to which provincial autonomy is to be given forthwith. The original scheme was to relegate Ajmer to the category of those States to which these provisions may be extended at a future date. I am thankful that my arguments prevailed. I hope they will stick to the position they have taken which is only in consonance with the democratic traditions of the Government and that they will not accept the amendment of Mr. Sidhva.

Mr. Chairman: I think Members from Part C States should be allowed to speak first.

Shri Sidhva: They are not standing and this is an important matter.

Dr. Parmar: I have been tempted to intervene in the debate because of the amendment moved by my friend Mr. Sidhva. We from the Part C States and in fact the whole House have reason to be grateful to Government for bringing the Bill in the shape in which it has been brought. Because the one section of the former Indian States, a part of the country, which had been left out from having any share in the democratic set-up in the country, has after all found an echo in the hearts of the Cabinet and the Bill which created so much heat at one stage has come in a form which meets the aspirations of most of the critics. The labours and attempts of the States people which started with the All India States People's Conference, particularly with the Convention at Ludhiana under the able leadership of our Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, then the able guidance of Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya who worked out the liberation of the Indian States and on the administrative side integrated by the late Sardar Patel, all that picture has been completed by the present Bill. There is hardly any reason for any Member of this House to oppose this measure or to move amendments to it which might take away from its substance.

The question of Ajmer and Bhopal has been taken up by some of the very senior Members of this House; I want to place just one point of view before this august House in that connection.

The very reason, the very basis for the demand of Part C States, for which a convention was held and for which a country wide agitation was raised, was this: with the coming into force of our new Constitution, when the whole country goes to the polls, we should be able to say with confidence that no part of the country would remain without a democratic set-up after the elections.

An Hon. Member: In a truncated form.

Dr. Parmar: Yes, in a truncated form—that is much better than not to have it in any form at all.

The question of merger of Ajmer was raised by my hon. friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. Again in the matter of Bhopal my friend, Thakur Lal Singh has more than once demanded that Bhopal should be merged. But you cannot have it both ways: if you want merger and there is a case for merger, you cannot say, you cannot merge because there are administrative difficulties; and if you want it, you cannot say you should not do it because the local parties will not agree. In the case of Bhopal there is a five years' covenant. The Central Government and, naturally, this House is supposed to be a party to that covenant: so the people of Bhopal have to abide by it for five years—you cannot merge Bhopal unless the Nawab agrees. Similarly, in the case of Ajmer it has been stated that it cannot be merged, that it is not possible to do so. Well, if merger is not possible one thing is certain: the people cannot and will not go without representation. They must have the right to manage their own affairs. It is on that basis that the Cabinet agreed at the informal meeting that every part of the country must have a share in the new democratic set-up. Even though Bhopal and Ajmer may be merged later—and the hon. Minister's speech is quite clear on that point, that wherever it is possible it will be done—you cannot at this stage raise that objection and deny these people the rights which the rest of the Part C States people have been assured. In fact, it would take away the grace of the Government if these people are denied these rights.

Apart from that, of course, there has been discussion as regards the Chief Commissioner presiding over meetings of the Council of Ministers. I share the view that he should not preside. But as long as Part C States continue to be so, the President should see to it that the administration is carried on well, because under the Constitution

he alone is responsible. He should watch over things and have a say in every matter. With the coming of popular Ministries the Chief Commissioner or the Lieutenant-Governor, as the case may be, will have also to bear in mind the feelings and sentiments of those Ministers.

Another amendment has been moved by my hon. friend Capt. A. P. Singh substituting the word *Rajya Samchalak* for "Chief Commissioner" or "Lieutenant-Governor". It is for the House to accept it or reject it. As far as I am concerned, I think it will change the whole structure of the terminology of the Constitution, because articles 239 and 240 only use the words "Chief Commissioner" and "Lieutenant-Governor". Although many Members may be unanimous and this term in Hindi may be acceptable to them, it is to be considered whether it is in consonance with the two articles of the Constitution quoted by me. The Himachal Pradesh covenant is very clear that the head of that State has got to be a Lieutenant-Governor and not a Chief Commissioner.

Thakur Lal Singh: By way of personal explanation, I would like to say that Bhopal should not be kept on a par with Manipur, Kutch and Tripura. Those three States are border States. They will never be merged and for several reasons they were not and cannot be given full responsible Government. But Bhopal should not be included along with those States. That is my first point.

My second point is that Bhopal would have been merged two years ago had it not been for the covenant. Every time Government thought of merging Bhopal, the people of Bhopal were ready. Within the last fifteen days Shri Gautamji had been there and our Deputy Foreign Minister Keskar Sahab also had been there. People in large numbers came to them and said that they wanted Bhopal to be merged. Of course, there is the question of the capital of Madhya Bharat. People of Bhopal say that since Bhopal has got such a fine climate, it can be made the capital of Madhya Bharat. I think that both Indore and Gwalior will agree. At least I know of many statesmen there who agree to it. So, if Bhopal is made the capital, they will have no objection. If Bhopal is merged before the election comes, the difficulties of Madhya Bharat will be solved and cent. per cent. the people of Bhopal will be satisfied. No one will have any objection. But if somehow or other Bhopal is not to be merged for another two years, then I would

[Thakur Lal Singh]

make it clear that the people of Bhopal should not be prevented from enjoying democratic rights. They know that Bhopal cannot develop by remaining a small and separate entity. So, they always have been for merger. But you have made a wrong covenant. You have not acted rightly. Therefore, for two years at the most Bhopal will have to be kept apart. That being so, I suggest that it should be given as many rights as possible.

श्री मट्ट : मैं विशेष बोलना नहीं चाहता हूँ। लेकिन श्री सिधवा जी के संशोधन के बारे में बो शब्द कहूंगा। जब कि पार्ट सी स्टेट्स जैसी है वैसी रहते हुए उन में जिस प्रकार के जनतन्त्र के देने की इस बिल में कल्पना की गई तो उस का एतराज हम कैसे कर सकते हैं। मैं तो आगे जा कर यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि कच्छ, मणिपुर और त्रिपुरा को भी जिस तरह से टाल दिया गया है वह कह कर कि यह सरहद्दी प्रान्त है, और सरहद्दी प्रदेश है इस लिए वहाँ जनतन्त्र नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये और नहीं दे सकते हैं, इस चीज को मैं ठीक प्रकार से समझ नहीं पाता हूँ और इन में कौन सी बात सिद्धान्त की है। यह भी मैं नहीं समझ पाता हूँ कि अगर कुर्ग में, अजमेर में या दिल्ली में इस रूप से जनतन्त्र दे सकते हैं और उन की रचना हो सकती है तो कौन सा गुनाह कच्छ ने किया, और कौन सा गुनाह मणिपुर ने किया, जहाँ एक ऐसेम्बली पहले भी थी, कि हम इस बिल के द्वारा जो रचना कर रहे हैं वह वहाँ नहीं हो सकती। मैं तो और आगे जाता और कहता कि इन राज्यों को भी शामिल कर लो। लेकिन कोई कारण है कि जिससे हमारे माननीय मन्त्री मुझिकल पाते हैं और वह अभी इन राज्यों को इस के साथ नहीं बिठा सकते हैं। उन्होंने गुंजाइश ब्रूर रखी है और उस गुंजाइश में यह कहा है कि आगे जा कर हम देखेंगे कि वहाँ भी लेजिस्लेटिव ऐसेम्बली (Legislative Assembly) बन सकती है या

नहीं और कौंसिल आफ मिनिस्टर्स (Council of Ministers) बन सकती है या नहीं। तो यह एक आश्वासन है, लेकिन जो कुछ मौजूदा हालत है, अजमेर, कुर्ग और भोपाल की मौजूदा हालत को देखते हुए इस बिल में जो रचना की जा रही है वह एक तरह से ठीक है। चीफ कमिश्नर (Chief Commissioner) को जो अधिकार दिये गये हैं उनके विषय में तो जब संशोधन आयेंगे तब बोलूंगा और दूसरे मित्र बोलेंगे। लेकिन जो रचना यहाँ की गई है वह रचना इतनी ठीक हो रही है कि जिस से पार्ट सी स्टेट्स के दोस्तों को बहुत हर्ष हो रहा है सिवा दिल्ली को। और स्वाभाविक तौर से दिल्ली को चिन्ता नहीं होनी चाहिए। पूरा न्याय उन के साथ न भी हुआ हो, लेकिन उस की एक अलग रचना है, वह भारत की राजधानी है, उस को आप हक देने जा रहे हैं। मैं विलीनीकरण के मामले में कोई बहस नहीं करूंगा। लेकिन मैं एक चीज कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि मुझे यह नहीं मालूम कि अजमेर आज किसी कारण से विलीन नहीं हो सकता है किसी रियासत में याने राजस्थान में तो एक साल बाद या दो साल बाद वह कैसे विलीन हो जायगा। आम तौर से लोगों की यह भावना रहती है कि अगर उन को एक प्रकार का तंत्र स्वतन्त्र रूप से मिल जाता है तो वह लोग मर्ज (merge) नहीं हो सकते हैं। भोपाल के बारे में कहा तो जाता है, लेकिन भोपाल में भी क्रिस्म क्रिस्म के लोग हैं और वह अलग अलग राय रखने वाले हैं। इस तरह से जब उन को गद्दी मिल जाती है, धारा सभा मिल जाती है, मिनिस्ट्रियां (Ministries) मिल जाती हैं कि हम अपना काम ठीक तरह से करें, अगर घाटा आया तो केन्द्र हम को रुपया दे देगा और हमारी मदद करेगा और हमारी जैसी

स्थिति है वैसी ही बनी रहे। तो यह विलीनीकरण का सवाल मामूली सवाल नहीं है, और जिस रूप से हम उसे यहां रख रहे हैं उस हालत में तो दूसरी बात हो नहीं सकती। लेकिन मैं जरूर यह चाहता था कि अगर विलीनीकरण करना हो तो पहले से कर देना चाहिए, और उस के करने में ही फायदा था, नहीं तो कोई सवाल उठायेंगे कि कितने महीनों बाद, कितने साल बाद वहां के लोगों की राय ले ली जाय, और उस के बावजूद वहां घारासभा बनेगी उसमें ऐसे लोग आयेंगे जो बहुत कर के विलीनीकरण के हक में न भी हों, तो उस हालत में हमारे सेन्टर (Centre) को मुश्किल होगी कि वह विलीनीकरण कैसे हो।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आम लोगों की राय क्या है ?

श्री भट्ट : आम लोगों की राय तो चुने हुए जो लोग आयेंगे वह बतायेंगे और जो उन की राय होगी उस पर बहुत कुछ निर्भर करता है। मैं उस के विरुद्ध या हत में नहीं हूँ। मैं तो यह कहता हूँ कि आगे चल कर अगर केन्द्र को यह मुश्किल होने वाली है तो अगर आप अभी नहीं कर पाये हैं तो आगे जा कर कैसे कर पायेंगे। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि मुझे इसमें कुछ शंका है इस लिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज ही मर्ज कर लिया जाय। मैं तो यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक सिद्धान्त पर कुछ करना चाहे तो हो सकता है नहीं तो होना मुश्किल है। बाएबल यूनिट्स (Viable Units) का सिद्धान्त लागू कर दिया जाये तो ही हो सकता है। इस लिए मैं सिधवा जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप इतने उदार हो तो उदार होने वाले आदमी इस में काट पीट क्यों करते हैं। मैं तो यह चाहता था कि अगर मिनिस्टर साहब से हो सके तो वह कच्छ

को भी दे दें, त्रिपुरा को भी दे दें। सरहद्द होने की वजह से जनतंत्र में कोई अड़चन होने वाली है इसे मैं मानने वाला नहीं हूँ क्योंकि उन्हें कौंसिल आफ एडवाइजर्स (Council of Advisers) दे दी जायगी। तो यह बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर पार्ट सी स्टेट्स को एक सी शकल दें तो जो शकल उन की करना चाहते हैं वह कर दें। इतना कहते हुए मैं सिधवा जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस प्रकार का संशोधन पेश न करें। अगर अपनी अथॉरिटी (Authority) केन्द्र बनाये रखना चाहता है तो उसमें कोई काट पीट न की ज़रूरत।

(English translation of the above speech).

Shri Bhatt (Bombay): I do not propose to speak much but would briefly express my views on the amendment moved by my hon. friend Shri Sidava. I do not understand how can we object to the setting up of democratic administrations, as envisaged in the proposed Bill, in Part C States keeping them as they are. I would even go further and say that the way the States of Kutch, Manipur and Tripura have been given the go-by on the ground that they are border States and hence should not and cannot be accorded popular rule, is a thing which I am unable to understand. I do not also understand what principle is involved in extending popular Government to Coorg, Ajmer and Delhi on the one hand and refusing it to certain States on the other. If these States are given self-Government, what crime has Kutch committed and what wrong has Manipur done, where an Assembly did exist in the past, that the constitutional reform envisaged by this Bill cannot be accorded to them. I wanted to have these States also included, but then there must be some reasons why our hon. Minister finds this difficult and is unable to bring them upto the same level. He has certainly made a provision to that effect wherein he says that after some time it would be enquired into whether a legislative assembly or a Council of Ministers can be set up there or not. So, that is an assurance and seeing the present conditions in Ajmer, Coorg and Bhopal, one can say that the arrangements sought to be made by the Bill are in a way quite proper. As for the powers given to the Chief Commissioner, the subject would be discussed by me and other hon. Members at the

[Shri Bhatt]

time the amendments are taken up. But the administrative arrangements envisaged in the Bill are so satisfactory that our friends from Part C States, except Delhi, are feeling quite happy about it. And, as a matter of fact, Delhi should not worry. It might not have met full justice but it has its own distinctive set-up. Delhi is the capital of India and you are giving it right of self-government. I shall not discuss the subject of merger but I wish to make only one submission. If Ajmer cannot be merged at present with any State, that is to say with the State of Rajasthan, due to certain reasons, I do not know how would it merge after a year or two. The general tendency among the people is that once they are given a sort of self-government they do not like to merge with any other State. Bhopal is often quoted in this respect but even in Bhopal as at other places, there are vested interests and when they get authority, when the legislature is set up and the Ministry is formed to run the administration properly, they hope that the centre would come to their help in case there is any financial difficulty and thus they want the conditions to stay as they are. So the question of merger is not an ordinary one and in the context in which we are providing it here, there cannot be any other course. But I would certainly have wished that if ultimately merger was to take place, it should have been earlier and that only would have been advantageous, otherwise some people would raise questions as to the months and years after which the opinion of the people would be gathered, and after that if people opposing merger are returned in a majority to the legislature, when it is formed, it would present a great difficulty for the Centre in regard to the merger scheme.

An Hon. Member: What is the general opinion?

Shri Bhatt: The general opinion would be reflected by the people who are elected and much would depend on their opinion. I am neither in opposition to it nor in favour. I only submit that if in future this difficulty is to come in the way of the Centre, how will they do it at a later date if they are unable to do it now. I do not say that I have any doubts and that that is the reason why I wish them to be merged today. My only submission is that if anything is to be done successfully it can be done by following only one principle throughout and that is the principle of viable units. Therefore I wish to tell Shri Sidhva that he

is a large-hearted person and being that, why should he be worried about making any modifications in it. I wanted that if it were possible, the hon. Minister should extend this reform to Kutch and Tripura also. I am not going to admit that it would be improper to do so in view of their being border States because after all there will be a Council of Advisers. So I submit that if Part C States are being given a uniform shape, these States should also be included therein. With these words I wish to suggest to Shri Sidhva that he should not move such an amendment. If the Centre wants to retain its authority, there should not be any attempt to whittle it down.

Dr. Deshmukh (Madhya Pradesh): I am fully of the view that the amendment proposed by Mr. Sidhva should be accepted by the House. In the framing of the various Bills we have taken a very long time. Unfortunately, so far as the constitution of those States and their political continuance is concerned there has not been any very logical thinking pursued by the Government of India. That is the reason why we had some Bill originally, there were consultations, and although the Bill was put here for final disposal, so to say, it had to be referred to various Members and various amendments were accepted from time to time, which we are again altering, and the whole thing even now is in a very unsatisfactory condition. We do not yet know finally what is the Government's intention so far as the ultimate picture of the constitution of these States is concerned. I should think, rather than have something which is slightly or very nearly half-hearted, it would be better to solve the more emergent difficulties and to leave the rest of them to such time as the Government of India is in a position to take a decision on.

After all, so far as some of these States are concerned, it is proposed that this present arrangement should continue so long as a merger does not take place. To this a very legitimate objection has been taken. It is to this effect that if you really mean to merge the States at some time or the other, by creating those half-way houses you are increasing the difficulties in the way of the merger in the long run and diminishing the chances of such merger. From that point of view, I think, it is very necessary that the Government of India should come to an early decision.

What we are doing by this Bill is that we are giving some sort of a cloak of democratic administration to areas

comprising five to eight lakhs of people. And what is the set-up or administration that we are going to give them? Is it provincial autonomy? My friend Pandit Mukut Biharilal Bhargava himself will agree that there is hardly even a semblance of democracy, much less of provincial autonomy. He has himself quoted to us the various clauses where the powers of the elected representatives are hemmed in by all manner of restrictions.

Shri R. Velayudhan (Travancore-Cochin): Something is better than nothing.

Dr. Deshmukh: It is a belated gift on the part of the Centre and Pandit Bhargava is content in having this gift because he is not in a position to have anything better. But so far as we are concerned we do not regard this as a very satisfactory state of affairs at all. Creating small units of five to seven lakhs of people and giving them certain rights and constitutions, which we intend even now to scrap in time to come, is not something which can give satisfaction to anybody.

1 P.M.

After all, so far as both these areas are concerned, the popular demand has always been for merger. My friend Pandit Bhargava from Ajmer has been, even at the cost of annoying the Government of India, asking for merger from the very beginning. I am fully aware of his urging this point and in spite of that we have not been able to do so and yet while giving a semblance of a constitution to them, we are intending that ultimately, neither of these two States or other States also are going to stand on their own legs; they are going to be merged with some union or the other. I submit, this is not a very creditable position to the Government of India and if we look to the history of the way in which the various States have been carved out in India, there are very many anomalies of which I would like to remind the Government of India. For instance, they went ahead with the mergers at one time so fast that in excellently governed States, States which were better governed than any Province in British India, the rights of the people were ruthlessly trampled upon. A State like Baroda was merged without any consideration being paid to 40 lakhs of people in the State and their wishes. Our idea was to have fewer administrative units in the whole of India. With that object in view and against the protests and suspicions of the Mahratti-speaking areas of Bombay, we merged the whole large area known as

255 PSD

Saurashtra and we also merged Baroda and other areas. If the policy is to have as few administrative units as possible, then consistently with that, steps ought to have been taken from time to time to see that the small units of five or seven lakhs do not survive and that we act up to the wishes of the people inhabiting those areas and merge them in the areas they were asking for. I am afraid I cannot at all see my way to support the Government so far as the very principle of this Bill is concerned, namely, to create some sort of administrative units, which is neither provincial autonomy nor is it the rule of the Chief Commissioner himself, nor is it the President's rule, nor is there any proper representation and representative Government. This is a compromise which cannot please anybody and I am sure, however much Mr. Bhargava thinks that something is better than nothing, nobody in his State is going to thank him for this, because it is neither fish nor fowl. It is something that would not appeal to anybody and I therefore feel that rather than do something which does not appeal.....

Shri R. Velayudhan: How do you know it?

Dr. Deshmukh: I know it from pure common sense. I do not know if my hon. friend possesses any. The people want either merger or they want representative Government. Anybody who wants representative Government must have something which will have the real characteristics of a representative Government. If that is not present there and if the autocratic powers of the Chief Commissioner or of the President are going to play a part, I for one would prefer the present situation rather than encourage representatives to come into power and then find that ultimately they have no power and they are at the mercy of any and everybody. I do not think that anybody would be pleased with this. I do not see if any sensible man will aspire to be a representative under these circumstances because it is absolutely worthless. I know in my own place how a *Janpad* is working. Although its members are supposed to represent the people, they have no power; it is the executive officer who does everything. The Chairman of the *Janpad* does not have power of even looking into the daily *dak*. If this is the sort of powers that are going to be given my hon. friend, Mr. Velayudhan may be pleased with them on the principle that something is better than nothing. I do not think any sensible man will be very much after these powers.

[Dr. Deshmukh]

I therefore feel that the omission of these two States would not harm anybody. I am not prepared to say that this is the proper clause where this amendment should be given effect to, but if Parliament is so inclined and takes a decision that these two States need not be given these half-hearted reforms, I think that there would be no difficulty in omitting these States from the list and to see that whatever we are proposing does not apply to them. In fact, my suggestion would be that since so much time has been spent and Government is inclined to consider popular opinion, they should come to some decision which will be of a lasting character so that there will be no doubt in the minds of the people, and we would not worsen the situation. That is my fear, which is shared by my hon. friend Dr. Pattabhi and I agree with him that by creating these things, we will be creating more difficulties in the way of mergers and not solving any particular difficulties of ours.

My friend referred to income-tax. When my hon. friend Mr. Sidhva pointed out that these were very small States which did not have proper revenues and the Centre would have always to give subsidies, he replied that there was the income-tax revenue. Income-tax is paid by all the States in India. If my hon. friend would compare this with the position of Part A States, he will find that they pay colossal amounts and yet they get back very small amounts. From that point of view, there is not much in this argument that they pay income-tax. Even if we give the whole of the income-tax that they pay, I do not think the administration would be self-supporting.

In fact, Pandit Mukut Bihari Lal Bhargava was really letting the cat out of the bag by saying that under Central administration they have got certain medical facilities and some more money for education which other people do not get and therefore they would like to be governed in this way and not be left out. That is, at the cost of the Centre, they are trying to benefit themselves. Therefore, I think they are asking something which is not altogether reasonable. I think that we should act in a manner which will be consistent with our behaviour in regard to so many other States. Madhya Pradesh, for instance, has grown out of all proportion and it is the biggest State so far as area is concerned in the whole of India, because of the addition of a number of States. If that could happen there, I think that policy should be pursued further

and I do not see why there should not be such determination in the case of these States as there was previously, and why the Government of India should feel shy of facing the consequences of a logical action, as a matter of policy. From that point of view, I agree that similar units which are not capable of maintaining themselves, which are not viable in any sense of the word, should be merged. I for one would agree that there should be smaller States; but not of the size of five or seven lakhs. A State should have at least a population of 50 to 60 lakhs. I think there is everything to be said to accept the original suggestion of my hon. friend Pandit M. B. Bhargava to join Ajmer with Rajasthan, even if it is late now. I do not think there will be any difficulty in combining them. That would really be a lasting solution which will be accepted by the people and which will solve our difficulties.

Shri Munavalli (Bombay): I have heard the discussion very carefully and I have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting the amendment moved by Mr. Sidhva. All these States are very petty ones and the people living in those States are for merger instead of for having the responsible Government that is now being offered. In such circumstances, Government ought to take into consideration the feelings of the people and public opinion and ought to have decided accordingly. When I heard one of the Members from Bhopal speaking, I was really surprised to hear that the covenant which was entered into with the Nawab of Bhopal contained as one of its terms that the people should have no rights for five years. I am amazed to find how our Government agreed to such a covenant.

Shri Hussain Imam (Bihar): Because it suited their convenience.

Shri Munavalli: If it was suited to the Government then, at least now, they must act so as to suit the ideas and opinion of the people. When the people of Bhopal are for merger and by merging Bhopal with Madhya Bharat, Bhopal can be made capital of Madhya Bharat with unanimity, as stated by a Member from that State, the whole question of discussion over capital will be solved. If so why should we not do it? By such a step the problem will be amicably solved and harmony also will be brought about. Pandit Bhargava time after time has asked for the merger of Ajmer with Rajasthan. When Rajasthan was formed, the feeling of the people of this area and

the public opinion ought to have been taken into consideration and this merger should have been effected. But it was not done. Nobody knows why it was not so done. Even as regards Coorg, the people of Coorg were willing for the merger of Coorg with Mysore, and sometime ago we came to know and there was thick rumour also, that shortly Coorg was going to be merged with Mysore. But in spite of that, Coorg remains separate as it is. And now Coorg is being given autonomous powers and responsible Government. We have no objection whatsoever to satisfy the aspirations of the people for responsible Government. I cannot but agree with what Dr. Pattabhi said when he sounded a note of warning to the people and to the Government that by creating these small States with responsible Governments, the feeling will be engendered in them that they should be separate without being merged with any other State. Pandit Bhargava while criticising this statement of Dr. Pattabhi said that it was quite fallacious. But really speaking, it is not so. Dr. Pattabhi has, in considering this problem, brought to bear on it a realistic view and his own experience. If we look at certain things that have happened, we will find that the very people who were crying loud for the unification of Karnataka, soon after being empowered with responsible Government, have hesitated to say so. Not only that, they even want to delay the matter. There are these facts, and Dr. Pattabhi, being well aware of them, has quite correctly sounded a note of warning

and he was perfectly right in doing so. Whatever may be the ideas of the hon. Home Minister about linguistic provinces, these provinces are sure to come into existence. The other day when I asked him as to how it came about that the Congress divided the provinces on the linguistic basis, he stated that it is not proper to be always consistent. I am happy to learn this from him and I can say from his utterance that sooner or later he will again be inconsistent with what he said the other day so that he may be consistent with the principle of forming the provinces on a linguistic basis. Therefore, when I heard the other day the statement made by the Prime Minister I had some ray of hope that these linguistic provinces will emerge sooner but the very next day the Home Minister.....

✓ **Shri Rajagopalachari:** I am at a disadvantage if the discussion is allowed to range over to linguistic provinces. Shall I be allowed to reply to it? It is better to avoid totally unconnected issues over this Bill.

Mr. Chairman: So far as the question of linguistic provinces is concerned, it is certainly not very relevant to the issues before the House.

Would the hon. Member like to continue his speech?

Shri Munavalli: Yes, Sir.

The House then adjourned till Half Past Eight of the Clock on Tuesday, the 28th August, 1951.