

12 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER  
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE****REPORTED DECISION TO APPOINT A TRADE  
REPRESENTATIVE OF MYSORE IN LONDON**

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

"Reported decision to appoint a Trade Representative of Mysore in London."

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): The post of a Trade Agent for Mysore Government in London has been in existence for a long time; according to the Mysore Government it was created by the erstwhile Mysore State about half a century ago.

The question of continuance of the post came up for examination by the Government of India in 1953 and it was decided that the existing arrangements should be maintained. It was also agreed that the Trade Agent would function generally under the control of the High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom.

The actual selection and appointment of officers for the post has always been left to the Government of Mysore. The existing incumbent, Shri L. R. Naik, is holding the post since 1959. Some time back, the State Government decided to appoint in his place Shri S. B. Maddappa, an IAS officer of the Mysore cadre.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Sir, it is said that the Mysore State Government has been maintaining or has been retaining a separate Trade Representative in London since 1940.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: No, no.

SHRI HEM BARUA: He said "about half a century ago". Whatever that might be, now it has transpired that after this post has fallen vacant, Mr. Nijalingappa, who was the Chief Minister . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: How is that relevant?

SHRI HEM BARUA: He mentioned his name.

MR. SPEAKER: He did not mention the name of Shri Nijalingappa.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Shri Nijalingappa who was the Chief Minister of Mysore State and who now has become the President of the Congress appointed his own son-in-law, who is a very junior officer in the IAS cadre (*Interruption*). This appointment of a separate trade representative in London by Mysore Government is likely to raise political complications in the country. Other State Governments might make a similar demand. If they make such a demand it would be a legitimate demand. We say that India is one and India must function as one country. India shall not be divided into separate entities as it has been done at present. It is reported that Shri Nijalingappa does not have a very good record. He had gone to Japan on a diplomatic passport.

MR. SPEAKER: We are not discussing Nijalingappa here.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Whatever that might be, I just want to know from the Government whether they are prepared to tell the Mysore Government once and for all that Mysore Government cannot retain a separate Trade Representative in London and that Mysore Government must not approach directly the Union Finance Minister over the head of the Ministry of Commerce and the Ministry of External Affairs in this matter?

**THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI DINESH SINGH):** We should not deal with the question of the person as such. It is the question of the post.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I agree, but unfortunately it was raised in Rajya Sabha by the members of the ruling party themselves. Therefore the Opposition is doing it now. It is an unfortunate thing. You should correct your house first.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT:** As far as the question of the relationship is concerned, I think that question is irrelevant.

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara):** You have no business to say that. The Speaker has allowed it. That is not your business. You have not become the Speaker . . . (*Interruption*).

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** He must maintain a clear record. He might be the President of the Congress. Congressmen must be ashamed of it. If my own father were involved in a dirty thing like that, I would have pointed it out . . . (*Interruption*).

**MR. SPEAKER:** Will you kindly answer the latter portion of it? Shri Nijalingappa is not in question here; therefore you need not answer about Shri Nijalingappa. Shri Hem Barua has asked whether this office should be continued and why Government should not here and now say that Mysore being a part of India need not have a separate representative there. That portion is relevant, I suppose!

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur):** He can have political influence over his son-in-law.

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) :  
मोरारजी के बेटे में श्रीर निजलिंगप्पा के  
बेटे में क्या फर्क है (व्यवधान) जो भी चोरी  
करे उस को बतलाया जाना चाहिये ।

**MR. SPEAKER:** Please do not bring in other things.

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** You will agree with me if I say that for the Deputy Prime Minister to appoint his son as his personal private secretary is as much reprehensible as Shri Nijalingappa's sponsoring his own son-in-law to be trade representative in London.

**MR. SPEAKER:** He is not a Member of this House.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT:** The question that came to us was not the appointment of a particular officer or the continuance of the post. Because this particular officer, who was appointed some time ago to replace the present incumbent, had to go there and according to the rules all officers, IFS officers and others, proceeding to join duty abroad are given as advance in foreign exchange, the question for allotment of Rs. 3,000 in foreign exchange to the new officer as advance payment which will be repayable came. It was in this form that this question came. The question of continuance of this post had already been examined in 1953 when this matter came to us from the Chief Minister—the hon. Member, Shri Hanumanthaiya was the Chief Minister then—and it was decided that this post should continue . . . (*Interruption*). The question whether foreign exchange should be given or not is at the moment with the Finance Ministry who will finally decide about this matter.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Have they not decided?

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT:** There the matter stands.

As for the future, whether the post should be there or not, that is, its desirability, obviously this matter has to be considered in the light of all considerations or policies . . . (*Interruption*). If the House is not interested in the answer, I can sit down . . . (*Interruption*).

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA rose—

MR. SPEAKER: May I appeal to you, Mr. Lakkappa, not to interrupt?

SHRI HEM BARUA: It is a relevant thing, Sir. The hon. Minister said that there will be a reconsideration of this matter. But Mr. Nijalingappa, in a statement which was published in *The Hindu* has stated that the Central Government does not have any right to reconsider this point.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know about that. Shri Samar Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This is an exclusive prerogative enjoyed by only one State in India, as a legacy handed to it by way of an imperial and princely slavery. (*Interruption*). This is a right enjoyed unnoticed for the last 40 years of which 20 years after our freedom. But no attention was drawn to it by anybody. What are the reasons, and why has it been done now? There are three amazingly intriguing personal equations involved in it. The first personal equation is the tussle between Raja Dinesh Singh and the Raja of Congress, I mean the Congress President, Shri Nijalingappa. The second is . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Come to the question; come to the Calling Attention matter.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I am coming to it.

MR. SPEAKER: You can have this debate sometime later about Mr. Dinesh Singh and Mr. Nijalingappa. Not now!

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The second cycle is the personal equation between the father-in-law and the son-in-law. The third cycle is the personal equation involved in the jealousies between the senior ICS Officers in Mysore and the newly appointed junior officer Mr. Maddappa to a prize-post which is extraordinary for its princely salary and a princely allowance.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the question? (*Interruption*).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is important, Sir. Mr. Dinesh Singh who wanted a berth in the Congress Working Committee, being rebuffed by the Congress President, wanted to hit back him with the convenient stick of Mr. Maddappa's appointment. This was going on for the last 20 years; it was being reconsidered in 1953 and sanction was given several times by the Commerce Minister, but no notice was taken any time about the anachronistic position enjoyed by the Mysore State. Now, suddenly, Mr. Dinesh Singh has asked for a review. He has now a chance of hitting back. When this report came, Mr. Nijalingappa, the Congress President, from Trivandrum, admonished Mr. Dinesh Singh by making a statement in which it has been said, "This review", in the opinion of Mr. Nijalingappa, who was the former Chief Minister of Mysore, "was very wrong". "We are doing nothing wrong" he said.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the question?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Again, this is the background for the whole thing; at that time, Mr. Nijalingappa was the Chief Minister of Mysore. Now, thirdly, the Mysore Government exports sandalwood worth Rs. 1½ crores according to the statement of the Chief Minister of Mysore.

An HON. MEMBER: Scandaiwood.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Whereas West Bengal alone, exports jute and tea to the extent of as much as Rs. 391 crores, which means that out of the total export of India which is Rs. 1,094 crores, 35.8 per cent of the total is being exported by West Bengal alone. Secondly, Bihar is the chief exporter of Mica; it is the exclusive product of Bihar. Mica worth Rs. 9 crores is annually being exported from India. Then, Kerala which has cashewnut and monazite sands, exports them. (*Interruption*). It is necessary to point

out these things. From Kerala, nearly Rs. 15 crores worth of cashewnut and monazite sands are exported.

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA** (Bangalore): Sir, a point of order.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA**: In a Calling Attention, there is no point of order. Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER**: Order, order. Please conclude now. You want to give the figures for all the States of India!

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA**: While sandalwood is the exclusive product of Mysore, mica is the exclusive product of Bihar and other States also have exclusive items for export. With this background, I want to know whether the present Chief Minister of Mysore State has made the following statement in which it is said "the Government of India had agreed that there was justification for the continuance of the office of Mysore's Trade Agent in London." The report says that "it was announced here on Tuesday on behalf of the Chief Minister, Shri Virappa Patil." If it is so, I want to know whether the same right will be given to other States of India which export more than a thousand times worth of goods compared to sandalwood of Mysore and whether, if that right is given, the other States also can have their agents in other countries of the world for this purpose. These are my basic points in this matter.

**MR. SPEAKER**: The question boils down to this; it is simple. If Mysore can export about Rs. 1½ crores worth of sandalwood-oil, the question is whether all the States which are exporting—the hon. Member has forgotten the Andhra chillies—their products can have their Government representatives not only in London but in other parts of the world also.

**SHRI HEM BARUA**: Whether the Kerala Government can have their trade agent in Peking.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA**: Sandalwood earns only a thousandth part of the foreign exchange earned by India.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA**: \*\*

**MR. SPEAKER**: Nothing to be recorded. The Minister may answer the point raised by Shri Samar Guha.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT**: One of the principal reasons for having this arrangement was that the Mysore Government has a government monopoly in sandalwood. It was exporting it for a long time; it was a Mysore State Government monopoly. (*Interruption*). I do not want to be interrupted. Please hear me. The export has been steady in spite of the fact that there is production of the synthetics there. In the last year it has increased by £100,000. In rupee terms—not very precise—it will be roundabout Rs. 180 lakhs.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA**: It is just one-thousandth part of our total foreign exchange.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT**: Hear me. It is about Rs. 180 lakhs. In pounds, it is £647,000. The hon. Member says that it forms a negligible part of the total export of India. That is true, but all that is exported by the Government. I am one who believes that all our export and import trade should be in the State sector. (*Interruption*). That is not so. Please hear me. Now, the hon. Member mentioned ter and jute. All these are exported by private parties. That is the point. They are not exported by the West Bengal Government. Mr. Guha should know that many private parties have been allowed the facility of keeping their offices there. The Tatas, the Birlas, and a number of others have the facility. I do not think he objects to that. But he objects to Mysore Government having a representative there.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA**: He says, it is a monopoly of the State Government . . . (*Interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. That is all.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: What about monazite sand? What about mica? It is a Government industry . . .

MR. SPEAKER: No more debate now.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is strange. How is he justifying? (*Interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I am on my legs now. Let us not get excited. He has answered that this has been there for the last 50 years. If the Government wants to change, they may consider it. It is for them to reconsider. No more debate here. Papers to be laid. (*Interruption*). Order, order. Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed.

12.20 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REVIEW OF HEAVY ENGINEERING CORPORATION LTD., RANCHI FOR 1966-67 AND ANNUAL REPORT THEREOF

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI BHANU PRAKASH SINGH): Sir, on behalf of Shri F. A. Ahmed, I lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956:—

- (1) Review by the Government on the working of the Heavy Engineering Corporation Ltd., Ranchi for the year 1966-67.
- (2) Annual Report of the Heavy Engineering Corporation Limited, Ranchi for the year 1966-67 along with the Audit-

ed Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1506/68.]

#### GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION EXTENDING PERIOD OF SUBMISSION OF FINAL REPORT OF N.C.D.C. COMMITTEE

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES AND METALS (SHRI P. C. SETHI): Sir, I lay on the Table a copy of Government Resolution No. C2-8(7)/67-Pt. published in Gazette of India dated the 6th July, 1968, extending the period for submission of the final Report of the National Coal Development Corporation Committee (Hindi and English versions). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1507/68.]

#### REVIEW OF FOOD SITUATION IN INDIA (JULY, 1968)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI ANNA-SAHIB SHINDE): Sir, I lay on the Table a copy of the Review of the Food Situation in India (July, 1968) (Hindi and English versions). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1508/68].

AUDIT REPORT ON ACCOUNTS OF TEA BOARD, TEA (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1967 AND COTTON TEXTILES (CONTROL) AMENDMENT ORDER, 1968.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI): Sir, I lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy of the Audit Report on the Accounts of the Tea Board for the year 1965-66.
- (2) A copy of the Tea (Amendment) Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 799 in Gazette of India dated the 4th